

Offprint from:

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』
平成17年度（第9号）2006年3月発行

*Annual Report of
The International Research Institute
for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2005
[= ARIBAB], vol. IX March 2006*

Diwakar Acharya and Noriyuki KUDO

The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2006 · Hachioji
JAPAN

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2006・八王子

The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*

Diwakar ACHARYA and Noriyuki KUDO

Sylvain Lévi published the *Karmavibhaṅga*¹ first in 1932 from transcriptions of two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. He was not able to use the original manuscripts during his actual editorial procedure and the basis of his edition was the transcriptions prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman.²

Now the originals have become accessible, and recently one of the authors has published the transliterations of all the Sanskrit manuscripts found in Nepal which were so far available to him.³ Kudo, however, did not know at that time that the first three folios of the second manuscript (= MS[B]) he transliterated are not lost but are preserved in the same National Archives of Nepal. Diwakar Acharya, working as a member of the Nepal German Manuscripts Preservation Project (later as a Research Assistant of the Nepal German Manuscripts Cataloguing Project), was able to identify and catalogue these folios. These folios were previously deposited in the collection of Hemraj Sharman who had supervised the transcriptions of some Nepalese manuscripts for Sylvain Lévi, but Hemraj Sharman was not aware that these belong to the second manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* of which a transcription was prepared for Lévi even in spite of the fact that he found the second manuscript and informed Lévi of this finding.⁴

Apart from the two manuscripts Lévi and Kudo used for their editions, i.e., manuscripts A and B, there is yet a third manuscript of the text. This new manuscript was also found by Diwakar Acharya; it is written in Newārī script on Nepalese paper, and is incomplete in the available 10 folios.⁵ Furthermore he noticed two western notebooks containing the Nāgarī transcription of two original manuscripts respectively in the private library of Hemraj Sharman, probably the same ones he had prepared for

¹ Lévi calls the text *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, but Kudo has argued in favour of calling the text simply *Karmavibhaṅga*, see Kudo 2004: viii–xi.

² Lévi 1932: I: “Un peu plus tard, tandis que j’étais au Japon, une lettre de lui — écrite dans ce sanscrit élégant qu’il manie avec une aisance magistrale, m’annonçait la découverte d’un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, et bientôt après j’en recevais la copie”, cf. also Kudo 2004: vii. As to Hemraj Sharman’s personality and activities, see Garzilli 2001.

³ Kudo 2004: vii.

⁴ Lévi op cit.: “... m’annonçait la découverte d’un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, ...”

⁵ The third manuscript bearing accession no. 4-951 can be found on NGMPP reel no. A 914/4. A part of this manuscript is transliterated in another paper of this issue, see pp. 43-60.

Lévi.⁶ All of them are preserved in the National Archives and have been filmed by the NGMPP, and are now accessible.

In the following, we will present a transliteration of the three relocated folios of the second manuscript of Lévi's edition. These folios are kept separately and treated as a new manuscript with a new accession no. 5-141, and are filmed by the NGMPP on Reel no. B 22/26. They are slightly damaged at right, left and bottom margins. The appearance of the damage does not correspond to that of other folios of MS[B]: the first three folios are damaged at the right lower corner while the rest of MS[B] is not. It seems to suggest that they might have been kept separately for a long time.

The conventions used in this paper follows Kudo 2004: xv. In the left margins of both pages the pagenummer and line of the above book are given for convenient reference to the reading of MS[A]. In footnotes, we report the variants from the first manuscript (MS [A]) of Lévi's edition. In addition, after inspecting the third manuscript (hereinafter abbrev. MS[E]),⁷ we notice that this manuscript in general follows the reading of MS[B]; rather it seems to be, most probably, a direct copy of MS[B]. It is, therefore, significant to include the reading of MS[E] for a reconstruction of the portions where MS[B] is damaged.⁸ For the sake of convenience, we use the same brackets Kudo used in his transliteration; we also supply or cancel a punctuation mark, introduce line breaks and arrange the text in paragraphs.⁹

As these folios belong to MS[B], orthography and scribal tendency are already pointed out; we do not repeat here the peculiarity of these folios. However, since these folios preserve the introductory story of the KV and they show consistent readings in several words which do not correspond to those of MS[A], we would like to indicate some points: this MS generally gives *śaṅkhakukkura* together as a compound, and the same is true with *śukamāṇava*, which is not the case in MS[A]¹⁰; some phrases are omitted but they seem to be redundant in context (see nn. 20 and 27).

⁶ The transcript of Lévi's MS [A] bears accession no. 5-265 and is filmed on B 94/3, and that of MS[B] bears accession no. 5-263 and can be found on reel no. A 109/9. For the latter, see "Brief Communication" in this issue.

⁷ Kudo used abbrev. MS[C] and [D] for the extra folios contained in the same bundle of MS[B] and [A] respectively, see Kudo 2004: 218-224 and 225-227.

⁸ For details see the other paper on MS[E] in this issue (pp. 43-60).

⁹ See Kudo 2004: xi-xii.

¹⁰ The circumstances of this paper are as follows: Diwakar Acharya found these folios and other materials of the KV; later, in October 2005, he sent his first draft of this paper containing the transliteration of them to Kudo through E-mail. Kudo sent him back the first draft with corrections and suggestions. Later both agreed to publish it under joint authorship. Kudo revised the transliteration and reformulated the layout, and he added the reading of MS[E] by means of the images supplied by Diwakar Acharya.

Transliteration:

(1 recto) ॐ¹¹ karmavibhaṅgasūtra ||¹²

(1v.1) ++ .. vajrāya¹³ ||

211 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye Bhagavān* Śrāvastyām viharati sma |
Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme ||

213 atha sa¹⁴ Bhagavā[n pū] .[vā] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.2) + + [ya]¹⁵
prāvīkṣat* sāvādānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran*¹⁶ yena
Śukamānava¹⁷ Taudeyaputrasya niveśanaṃ tenopasaṅkrāntas <|>

216 tena khalu punaḥ sama .[c] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.3) + + +¹⁸
śaṅkhakukuro¹⁹ goṇikāstṛte paryaṅke niṣaṅṅaḥ | asyāntaropadhānaOyām²⁰
kāṃsapātryām śālimāṃsodanaṃ paribhūṅkte²¹ <|> adrākṣīt* śaṅkhakukuro
Bha[ga] .. + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

4.5 + (1v.4) + + + + [n](*)²² śaṅkhakukuram²³ etad avocat* |

¹¹ An auspicious symbol, cf. Roth 1986.

¹² This title is written in the middle of the folio. It seems to be quite similar to the title appearing in the colophon.

¹³ Read *namo bevajrāya*. The two opening verses in the form of invocation to Buddha and a statement *bhagavatā sūtram bhāṣitam*, which are found in A, are not found in this manuscript. Needless to say, these are original in MS[A] so they are absent also in the Chinese and Tibetan translations.

¹⁴ = MS[E]; [A] omits *sa*.

¹⁵ Read *pū(vā)hne nivāsya pātracīvaran ādāya śrāvastīm piṇḍāya*, cf. MS[E] 1v.1-2: *pūrvāhne nivāsya pā + + + [van ā]dāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya*.

¹⁶ MS[E] reads *piṇḍāya carā**; [A] reads *piṇḍāya caran* (Lévi reads *piṇḍopacaranam* and Kudo notes this and remarks that the manuscript reading is a mistake for *caranam*).

¹⁷ For *°mānava*° = MS[E]. It is just possible to retain this compound, but a reading natural to the style of the text would be *Śukasya mānavasya Taudeyaputrasya* as found in [A].

¹⁸ Read *sama(ye)na Śukasya mānavasya Taudeyaputrasya niveśane*, cf. MS[E] 1v.2.

¹⁹ Read *śaṅkhakukuro*.

²⁰ Read *°dhānāyām*. Lévi reads *asmattaropadhānāyām* from MS[A] and corrects it to *asṃantakopadhānāyām*. Kudo suggests to read *asṃāntaropadhānāyām* on the basis of the reading of the third Tibetan translation: *kbar gzhong rdo ba'i kbar blangs pa la* | (Phug drag 157b2; London MS Kanjur 200b3-4; s'Fog Palace 716.2) [Kudo 2004a: 850-849]. However both MS[B] and [E] read *asyāntaropadhānāyām* throughoutly.

²¹ MS[A] reads *bhūṅkte*. Then follows in [A]: *Bhagavān adrākṣīt saṅkhakukura(b) goṇikastrate (sic.) paryaṅke niṣarūṅ(b) || asṃāntaropadhānāyā(ṃ) kāṃsapātryā(ṃ) paribhūṅjānaṃ* |, which is not found in our manuscript and [E]. This line probably is secondary.

²² Read *Bha[ga](vantaṃ dvāramūle, dṛṣtvā ca punar bukkati | atha Bhagavān)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.3.

"etad api te śaṃkha na damayasi²⁴ ○ yad api²⁵ bhokkārād²⁶ bukkāram āgataḥ
<|>"

4.7 evam ukte śaṃkhakukura²⁷ abhiṣiktaḥ²⁸ ku[pit]. + + + + + (1v.5) + + + + +
[ṅkā]ḥ²⁹ avatīrya adhaṣtāt paryaṅkasya dārusyandanikāyān niṣaṇṇa○ḥ |

4.10 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputra³⁰ bahinirgato³¹
[']bhūn* <|> kenac[i]d [e]v. k. r. ṅ. yen.³² <|>

4.12 [athā](1v.6) + + + + + .. s³³ Taudeyaputraḥ | adraṅsīt* Śuko māṇavas
Taudeyaputraḥ śaṃkhakukuram³⁴ adhaṣtāt paryaṅkastha³⁵ dārusyāndanikāyāṃ³⁶
niṣaṇṇaṃ³⁷ dṛṣṭvā ca punar antarjanaṃ āmantrayate |

6.2 "kene;(2r.1) + + + + + k[i]ñcid uktaḥ <|>"³⁸

"ko (')smākaṃ āryaputra⁴⁰ śaṃkhakukuraṃ⁴¹ kiñcid vakṣati |

6.5 api tv āgato (')bhūt* śramaṇo Gautama⁴² dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā ca punar⁴³ bukkati |
tam ena⁴⁴ śramaṇo G[au]t. m. ev. m [ā]h.⁴⁵ <|>

'(2r.2) + + + + + .kha n.⁴⁶ damayasi⁴⁷ yad asi bhokkārād⁴⁸ bukkāram āgataḥ |'

²³ For śaṃkhakukuraṃ.

²⁴ = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

²⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads *asi*.

²⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads: *bbokārād*.

²⁷ For °kukkuro.

²⁸ For śaṃkhakukuro 'bbiṣiktaḥ; [A] has 'tiṣayitaroṣa° for *bbiṣiktaḥ kupita°*. This reading most probably is secondary. A standard expression 'bbiṣiktaḥ kupitas caṇḍibbūto 'nāttamaṇāḥ appears several times in the subsequent passages in this manuscript and MS[E].

²⁹ Read *kupit(aś caṇḍibbūto 'nāttamaṇā goṇikaṣṭrītāt parya)ṅkā*, cf. MS[E] 1v.4.

³⁰ For °putro.

³¹ For *bahinirgato* = MS[E] 1v.5; [A] reads: *bahirgato*.

³² Read *ev(a) k(a)r(ā)n(i)yen(a)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.5: *eva karaṇīyena*.

³³ Read *athā(gataḥ Śuko māṇava)s*. This reading is based on MS[E]: *athāta āgataḥ Śuko māṇavas* (1v.5).

³⁴ For śaṃkhakukuram.

³⁵ For *paryaṅkasya*. It is interesting to note that MS[E] has also *paryaṅkastha*, probably a scribal error.

³⁶ A scribal error for *dārusyandanikāyāṃ*.

³⁷ For *niṣaṇṇaṃ* = MS[E]; [A] reads instead *prapatitaṃ*.

³⁸ Read *kenai(vāyaṃ śaṃkhakukuraṃ)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.6.

³⁹ MS[E] has *antarjana āba* after this (1v.6).

⁴⁰ = MS[E]; [A] reads 'smākaṃ madb(y)e madīyaputraṃ.

⁴¹ For śaṃkhakukuram.

⁴² For *Gautamo*.

⁴³ MS[A] reads °mūle 'vasthitaṃ tam ekha (< eṣo); [E] reads °mūle dṛṣṭvā cāyaṃ punar.

⁴⁴ For *enaṃ*.

⁴⁵ Read *Gaut(a)m(a) ev(a)m āb(a)*.

evam uOkte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ⁴⁹ kupita⁵⁰ caṇḍībhūta⁵¹ (')nāttamanā⁵²
 goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkāḍ avatīryādhasāt paryaṅka(2r.3) + +
 [ru]syandanikāyān⁵³ niṣarṇṇaḥ⁵⁴ | "

6.11 atha Śukamāṇavas Taudeyaputra⁵⁵ 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto
 (')nāttamanā Śrāvastyā niṣkrāmya⁵⁶ yena Jetavanam Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāmes⁵⁷
 tenopasa (2r.4) + + s⁵⁸

6.14 tena khalu⁵⁹ samayena Bhagavān anekaśatāyāṃ bhikṣuparśadi pura;Ostān
 niṣarṇṇo dharman deśayati | adrākṣīd Bhagavān* Śukam māṇava⁶⁰ Taudeyaputrat⁶¹
 dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca puna(2r.5) + + ṇām⁶² āmantrayate sma | |

8.4 "paśyatha yūyam bhikṣavaḥ ŚukamāṇavaTaudeyaOputrem⁶³ dūrād
 evāgacchantam <|>"

"evam Bhagavam | "

8.7 "sacet* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro (')smiṃ sama[y]e [k]ā[l]am k. r[y]ād⁶⁴
 yathā (2r.6) + +. [i]kṣiptaḥ⁶⁵ | evam kāyasya bhedāt paraṃ maraṇād
 apāyadurgatiṃ vinipātan⁶⁶ narakeṣūpapadyate | tathā hy anena mamāntike
 citta⁶⁷ pradūṣitam <|> cittapradūṣaṇa⁶⁸ he[to] + + + + + + + (2v.1) + + [t⁶⁹

⁴⁶ Read (*etarhy api tvaṃ śaiḥkha na*, cf. MS[E] 1v.7; [A] reads *etad api te saṅkha na*.

⁴⁷ = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

⁴⁸ = MS[E]; [A] reads *bbokārād*.

⁴⁹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *'riśayitaḥ*.

⁵⁰ For *kupita(s)*.

⁵¹ For *caṇḍībhūto*.

⁵² For *kupitaś caṇḍībhūto 'nāttamanā*.

⁵³ Read *paryaṅka(sya dā)ra*^o, cf. MS[E] (although it reads *paryaṅkastha*).

⁵⁴ For *niṣarṇṇaḥ*.

⁵⁵ For *'putro*; *Taudeyaputro* has been dropped in [A].

⁵⁶ MS[A] reads {*goṇikā*}<<*n na*>>*ṣkrāmya*. Kudo assumes that several words have been omitted here and suggests a long sentence making pair with a later passage ([A] 6r.5-v.1) to insert, and says that "at the very least *Śrāvastyān* is necessary" [Kudo 2004: 6, fn. 16]. MS[E] reads *Śrāvastyāṃ niṣkrāmya* (1v.9).

⁵⁷ For *'ārāmas*.

⁵⁸ Read *tenopasa(kranta)s*.

⁵⁹ MS[A] and [E] read *tena khalu punaḥ*.

⁶⁰ For *māṇavam*; [A] reads *māṇavakaṃ*.

⁶¹ A scribal error for *'putram*.

⁶² Read *puna(r bhikṣū)ṇ(āṃ)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.10: *punar bhikṣūnām*; [A]: <<*pu(na)r bhikṣū*>>*n*. See also [B]4r.4; [A]6v.2; [E]3r.2.

⁶³ A scribal error for *'puram*; MS[E] reads *Śukam māṇavam Taudeyaputram* (1v.10).

⁶⁴ Read *k(n)ryād*.

⁶⁵ Read (*bhallo n*)*ikṣiptaḥ*.

⁶⁶ MS[E] reads *'durgativinipātam* (1v.11); [A] reads *'durgativinipāte 'vīcau*.

⁶⁷ For *cittam*.

pa]ram marañād apāyadurgatiṃ vinipātan⁷⁰ narakeṣūpapadyante ||”

8.13 athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthā⁷¹ bhāṣate ||

8.14 praduṣṭacittaṃ dṛṣṭvaiva ekadyam⁷² iha pudgalaṃ <|>
et. + + + + + + + + + (2v.2) + +⁷³ ke ||

idānīm bata doṣo (‘)yaṃ⁷⁴ kālaṃ kurvīta māṇava⁷⁵ <|>
narakeṣūpapadya; Ote⁷⁶ cittaṃ hy etena dūṣitaṃ ||
10.1 yathā hy ucitaṃ nikṣiptaṃ evam eva tathāgate ||
cittapradūṣaṇa[he]. [o] .. + .. [ti]⁷⁷ [d]u g. [ti]⁷⁸ <|>

10.3 (2v.3) + + [Śu]ko⁷⁹ māṇavaḥ Taudeyaputro yena Bhagavān*s⁸⁰ tenopasaṃkrānta
upaOsaṃkramaṇya Bhagavatā sārddhaṃ saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanī saṃrañjani⁸¹
vividhān kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣarṇṇaḥ⁸² | Śuko mā(2v.4) + + [s]⁸³
Taudeyaputrau⁸⁴ Bhagavantam idam avocat* |

10.8 "āgamaḥ⁸⁵ bhavān Gautama⁸⁶ aOsmākan niveśanam <|>"

"āgamaḥ⁸⁷ māṇavaḥ⁸⁸ <|>"

"mā bhavata⁸⁹ Gautamena{m}⁹⁰ śaṅkhakukkura⁹¹ kiñcid uktaḥ <|>"

⁶⁸ MS[A]: °d(ū)ṣaṇād dbeto; [E]: °dūṣaṇā(d) betor.

⁶⁹ Read betor evam ibaṅke satvāḥ kāyabbedā[ti], cf. [E]1v.11-2r.1.

⁷⁰ MS[A]: °durgatāvīcau (Kudo thinks that it is a scribal error for °durgatyavīcau); [E]: °durgati°.

⁷¹ For gāthā(m).

⁷² For ekatyam, cf. MS[A] and [E].

⁷³ Read et(au) arthaṃ vyākāṛṣic chāstā bbikṣugaṇānti)ke, cf. MS[A] and [E].

⁷⁴ = MS[E] 2r.1; [A] reads batādbikṣepaṇ; Lēvi reads batāvīkṣepaṇ.

⁷⁵ For māṇavaḥ.

⁷⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads °padyete (< °padyeta. The reason is that it is originally written as °padyate but insufficiently corrected as °padyete).

⁷⁷ Read °dūṣaṇabeto(h satvā gacchant)ti, cf. MS[E]: °dūṣaṇabetos sa<tvā> gacchanti (2r.2); [A] reads °dūṣaṇād dbetoh satvā gacchanti.

⁷⁸ Read du(r)g(a)ti(m).

⁷⁹ Read (athā) Śuko, cf. MS[E]; [A] has atbādbikṣepya.

⁸⁰ For Bbagavāṇs. [A] has Bbagavāṇi.

⁸¹ For saṃmodanīṃ saṃrañjanīṃ, cf. MS[E]; [A] has saṃmodanīyāṃ saṃrañjanīyāṃ.

⁸² For niṣarṇṇaḥ.

⁸³ Read mā(ṇava)ḥ.

⁸⁴ For °putro.

⁸⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads āgato.

⁸⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads Gautamau (< Gautamo).

⁸⁷ A usage of the third person singular for the first person singular (according to Diwakar Acharya). MS[A] has āgamaṇa (< āgamanam).

⁸⁸ Read māṇava as in MS[A] and [E].

- "ihāham māṇava pū;(2v.5) + + + .. [sya]⁹² pātracivaram ādāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat* <l> sāOvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran yena tava⁹³ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ <l> upāsaṃkramya⁹⁴ dvāramūle sthita⁹⁵ (2v.6) + + + + + + + +⁹⁶ śaṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstṛte mañcake (')dhiruhe (')syāntaropadhānāyāṃ⁹⁷ kāmsa{m}pātryāṃ śālimāṃsodana⁹⁸ paribhuṅkte | adrākṣic chaṃkhakukkura⁹⁹ māṃ dvāramūle sthita¹⁰⁰ dṛṣṭvā ;(3r.1) + + + + + + + + [v].¹⁰¹ vadāmi |
- 12.2 'etad api śaṅkha na damayasi¹⁰² yad api¹⁰³ bhokkārād bukkāram āgataḥ |' evam ukte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhuṭo (')nāttamanā goṇikāstṛtāt paryaṅkād avatīryā(3r.2) + + + + +¹⁰⁴. [ā]rusyandanikāyāṃ¹⁰⁵ niṣaṇṇaḥ |"
- 12.7 "kiṃ punar bhavān*¹⁰⁶ Gautama{h} śaṅkhaOkukkurom¹⁰⁷ asmākaṃ pūrvasyāṃ¹⁰⁸ jānīte |"
- 12.9 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam¹⁰⁹ arthaṃ pariprākṣit¹¹⁰ mā te bhaviṣyati āghatāś cākṣānti;(3r.3) + + + s[o]¹¹¹ daurmaṇasyaṃ <l>"
- 12.11 dvir api trir api Śuko māṇavas 'Taudvaputro BhagavaOntam etad avocat* <l>
- 12.12 "kiṃ¹¹² punar bha{{ga}}vān*¹¹³ Gautamau¹¹⁴ 'smākaṃ śaṅkhakukkuraṃ

⁸⁹ MS[A] reads {{māṇava}} bhagavatā.

⁹⁰ = MS[E] 2r.4.

⁹¹ For °kukkuraṃ.

⁹² Read pū(rvābhe nivā)sya, cf. MS[E] 2r.4.

⁹³ = MS[E]; [A] reads bhagavat atra (< bhavato `tra).

⁹⁴ For upasaṃkramya.

⁹⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads °mūle `vasthitā.

⁹⁶ Read (āsāṃ | tadāsan māṇava te) on the basis of MS[E] 2r.5; [A] reads tena khalu pūna(r) samaye.

⁹⁷ = MS[E]; [A] has `dhirūdho `smāntaro°.

⁹⁸ For °danaṃ.

⁹⁹ For °kukkuro.

¹⁰⁰ = MS[E]; [A] reads `vasthitāṃ.

¹⁰¹ Read (bukkāram akarot tadāham e)va on the basis of the reading in MS[E]2r.6: bukkarim | < bukkāram| akarot tadāham e)va; [A] reads ca punar bukkati | taṃ e)am evaṃ.

¹⁰² = MS[E]; [A] reads damayati.

¹⁰³ = MS[E]; [A] reads asi.

¹⁰⁴ Read avatīryā(dbastāt paryaṅkasya), cf. MS[E]2r.7.

¹⁰⁵ Read (dārusyandanikāyāṃ).

¹⁰⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads Bhagavān.

¹⁰⁷ A scribal error for °kukkuraṃ. MS[A] reads here: śaṅkhasya kuk(k)urasyāsmākaṃ.

¹⁰⁸ Both MS[A] and [E] have jātau after pūrvasya.

¹⁰⁹ = MS[E]; [A] reads tam.

¹¹⁰ MS[E]2r.8: pariprākṣit; [A]4v.3: pariprākṣit*.

¹¹¹ Read °(ś ca ceta)so, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹¹² MS[A] omits kiṃ.

- pūrvikāyām jātau saṃjānīte <|>"
- 12.14 "alam māṇava ti;(3r.4) + +[m].¹¹⁵ tam artham pariprākṣīt¹¹⁶ mā te¹¹⁷ bhaviṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntīś ca cetaḌso daurmanasyaṃ |"
- 14.2 arddhā va¹¹⁸ māṇava yāvat trir apy etam arthenālabdhās¹¹⁹
 "tena hi māṇava śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhā(3r.5) + +¹²⁰ | yas te māṇava pitā Taudeyaḥ sa eva¹²¹ kāyasya bhedād dhināyām¹²² śvāyoḌnāv¹²⁴ upapannaḥ <|>"
- 14.6 "kim etat tu¹²⁴ bho Gautama eva¹²⁵ bhaviṣyati asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya¹²⁶ iṣṭayajña [āhi] .[ā] .[ir] .[c]. [itay]. [pa]h¹²⁷ (3r.6) + + + ..¹²⁸ kāyasya bhedāc chubhe¹²⁹ brahmaloke upapannau¹³⁰ bhaviṣyati <|>"
- 14.9 "anenaiva te māṇava mānābhīmānena pitā Taudeyo hīnāyām¹³¹ śvānāyonāv¹³² upapanno pi tu¹³³ māṇava ya[di] + + + + + + + + na¹³⁴ (3v.1) + + .. ṇava¹³⁵ yena svakan niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāma upasaṃkrāmya śaṅkhakukkuram evaṃ vada <|>
- 14.13 'saced bhavāc¹³⁶ chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyām jātau pitābhūt

¹¹³ MS[E] reads *bhavān**; [A] reads *bbagavān*.

¹¹⁴ For *Gautamo*, cf. MS[E].

¹¹⁵ Read *tāṣṭha mā* [m](e), cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹¹⁶ MS[E]2r.9: *pariprākṣīt*; [A]4v.4-5: *pariprākṣīn*.

¹¹⁷ = MS[E]; [A] reads *mā ih(C) eva ca te*.

¹¹⁸ = MS[E]. For *ardhā ca* ("in this way"). [A] has *anyatbā tvam*.

¹¹⁹ MS[A] reads *artba(m) mā ...* (Dīwakar Acharya suggests to read: *artbam ālabdhas*).

¹²⁰ Read *bbā(sīsyē)*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²¹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *esa*.

¹²² For *dbīnāyām*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²³ Is this a mere scribal error for *śvānāyonāv* as found in MS[E]? MS[A] reads *śvāyonāv*. See [E]3r.6 below, and fn. 132.

¹²⁴ Both MS [A] and [E] omit *tu*.

¹²⁵ For *evaṃ*, cf. MS[E].

¹²⁶ = MS[E]; [A] has *ca youau* instead of *Taudeya*.

¹²⁷ Read *ābi(t)ā(gn)ir (u)c(chr)itay(i)paḥ*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²⁸ Read (*sa nīyatam*) on the basis of MS[E] 2v.1; [A] reads *saṃnīyatam*. Lévi edits this word as *sannīyate* and Edgerton includes it as a sole example of MIndic passive form of *saṃ-√jñā-*. However, on the basis of the reading of MS[A] Kudo doubts this reading and explanation although he could not offer any conclusive comment on this word, cf. Kudo 2004a: 847-846. Here "*sa nīyatam*" means "Ic, inevitably"

¹²⁹ = MS[E]. For *chubbre* as found in [A].

¹³⁰ For *upapanno*; A *upapano*.

¹³¹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *mahādānapati(r)*.

¹³² = MS[E]; [A] reads *śvāyonāv*, cf. fn. 123.

¹³³ Read (*pi tu*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *pitur* (Kudo suggested to read "*upapannaḥ | pitur*" [Kudo 2004: 14, fn. 13] but this reading should be changed as in [E]).

¹³⁴ Read (*ne bbāṣitam na śraddadbāsi teṇa*.

¹³⁵ Read (*hi tvam māṇava*.