

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*

Noriyuki KUDO

One More Manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu:
Transliteration of Manuscript E (1)

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

One More Manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu: Transliteration of Manuscript E (1)^{*}

Noriyuki KUDO

Introductory Remarks on the manuscript

As far as Nepalese sources are concerned, only two manuscripts (called [A] and [B]) are available for editing a text of the *Karmavibhaṅga*, although our research reveals that both of them have been deposited with an additional different piece of manuscript respectively,¹. These two were used by Sylvain Lévi for his edition² and later by myself.³ Besides these, there are some fragmentary manuscripts in the Hoernle collection in London and in the Turfan collection in Berlin.⁴ The text in those manuscripts belongs to the first class of the *KV* which commonly has fourteen sections and is regarded as a canonical treatise. Furthermore, after the publication of *KV[K]*, I luckily came to know that several fragments in the Schøyen Collection, Norway, contain the text parallel to the *KV*. They are two different fragments: one fragment preserves the text corresponding to the opening story of the *KV* and parallel to the reading of MS[A] and the other fragments correspond to the text of latter part of the *KV*, i.e., §§ 65, 76, and 74 in that order.⁵ We have, therefore, materials that have emerged from several different areas such as Nepal, somewhere in Central Asia, and Afganistan or Pakistan.

Needless to say, materials from Nepal are most important because only Nepalese manuscripts cover the text as a whole. A closer look, however, shows that some folios are missing in each manuscript: MS[A] lacks one folio (no. 49) and MS[B] lacks folios of nos. 1-3, 8-10, and 16-17. This fact compels us to edit the *KV* in some portions on the basis of the reading of a single manuscript. Certainly we have other sources of this text,

^{*} Diwakar Acharya not only gave me valuable information about this manuscript and supplied the images of it but also gave me a number of suggestions in reading the manuscript. I am very grateful to him. Without his help and kindness this paper could not have been carried out in this form. Any errors that remain here, of course, are my own.

¹ Kudo 2004: 217-224 (MS[C] included in [B]), 225-227 (MS[D] included in [A]).

² Lévi 1932.

³ Kudo 2004.

⁴ Hoernle collection: No. 149 x/1-2, folio-nos. 56-57 (in: Hoernle 1916: 46-52), found at Jigdalik, near Kuča, in 1906 (acquired by G. McCartney and later sent to Hoernle); Turfan collection: Kat.-Nr. 1210 (X 1718), Bl. 51 (in: *SIT* VI, pp. 5-6), found at Qizil by Le Coq in 1904-5. They are all Sanskrit fragments of the text called “Śukasūtra.”

⁵ I reported on these fragments in Kudo 2005. Later, I gave a presentation on them along with the collated text at the XIVth Conference of the IABS, London, 30th August 2005.

namely six translations in the canonical Chinese tripiṭaka and three in the canonical Tibetan Kanjur. They are, however, secondary. The number of the sections and their sequence are different from each other and their contents are not always the same.

Recently, Diwakar Acharya, at present a Research Assistant of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project, University of Hamburg, found valuable materials for the study of the *KV* in the Nepalese manuscript collection. He kindly informed me of the existence of the first three folios of manuscript B which were supposedly lost and a newly identified manuscript of the *KV* as well. Inspection is still going on through the images reproduced from the microfilms of the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project which are kindly supplied by Diwakar Acharya but hereunder I will present the first part of the transliteration of this new manuscript (abbrev. MS[E]).

According to the NGMPP index card, the detail of this manuscript is as follows:

“MS. No. ca 951 [= 4-951], Subject: Bauddha No. 20 kha

No. of leaves: 10, Incomplete, Size in cm: 35 x 9, Reel No. A 914/4

Script: Newari, Nepale (*sic.*) loose paper, Colour: Light yellow.”

The number of lines per side is 10 or 11⁶ and there is no binding hole. The title is written on the recto of the first folio in the middle: Karmavibhaṅgasūtra ; evaṃ Kukkurasūtra. The latter title (“A dog sūtra”) is so far unknown; it seems to reflect the content of the opening story of the *KV*. And we can also find the same title on the left margin of the verso of the second and third folios in three lines: Karma/vibhaṅga/sūtra. This manuscript preserves the text from the very beginning, namely from the opening story up to the middle portion of § 32-a, in the middle of the story of Maitrāyājña. It ends in the middle of Maitrāyājña’s vow (*praṇidhāna*) after he talks to a person in hell and then recognizes his fate (Lévi 55.6 = *KV/K* 106.6). Therefore, although it is incomplete, it covers almost half of the text of *KV*.

Comparing this with the other two manuscripts, [A] and [B], this manuscript has all the folios up to § 32-a; MS[A] covers the same extent (up to 32v.4) while MS[B] lacks folios 8-10 and 16-17. The end of MS[E] corresponds to somewhere in folio no. 17 of MS[B] which is unfortunately unavailable at present.

The reading of MS[E] is almost identical with that of MS[B], which indicates that we can reconstruct the damaged portions in MS[B] by means of this new manuscript.⁷ It seems to me that this manuscript is likely to be a direct or at least a closely related copy of MS[B]. There is no doubt that they belong to same manuscript transmission. As seen in the transliteration of MS[B], there are many portions which are lost due to the damage of the folio: the damage is found on the top and bottom corners of both sides. Therefore, the reading is normally missing from the end of one line to the beginning of next line. In some cases MS[E] does not retain the text and in other cases it gives a reading different from MS[A]. In the following, I will first present the reading of MS[B] wherein the text is not preserved and next the reading of [E] (the corresponding portion is underlined). For convenient reference the reading of [A] is also given with a dotted

⁶ Eleven lines are found on 1 verso and both sides of 4th folio; ten lines on the rest of folios.

⁷ In *KV/K*, I reconstructed those damaged portions on the basis of the reading of MS[A]; but some of the suggested readings are now to be changed. I will note some of them in the following footnote.

underline. These are not, however, all the examples which show a similarity or co-identity between [B] and [E].

1) [B]2r.2: [*beginning of line*] + + + + + .kha

[E]:1v.7: etarhy api tvam śāṅkha

Cf. [A]2v.5: etad api te saṅkha

2) [B]2v.6: sthita (2v.r) + + + + + + +

[E]2r.5: sthita āsaṃ | tadāsau māṇava te

Cf. [A]4r.4: 'vaṣṭhitaḥ | tena khalu puna(r) samayena

3) [B]3r.1: [*beginning of line*] + + + + + + + + + [v]. vadāmi |

[E]2r.6: bukkarim (< bukkāram) akarot tadāham eva vadāmi |

Cf. [A]4r.5: bukkati | tam eṇam evam vadāmi |

4) [B]3r.3: kiṃ punar bha{{ga}}vān*

[E]2r.9: kiṃ punar bhavān*

[A] 4v.4: punar bhagavān*

Comment: In this case, the aksara *ga* is cancelled by the scribe in [B]; accordingly, [E] reads *bhavān* while [A] reads *bhagavān*. It is interesting to note that in the opening story when [A] reads *bhagavan* [B] and [E] read *bhavan* (see [A]4r.2 = [B]2v.4 = [E]2r.4; [A]4v.2 = [B]3r.2 = [E]2r.7-8), see also the next example.

5) [B]4v.4: yathā bhavatā gautamena [*omit*] anyad api tāvad vyaṃ bha«ga»vantam

[E]3r.8: yathā bhavatā gautamena [*omit*] anyad api tāvad vyaṃ bhaga(3r.9)vantam

Cf. [A] 7r.4: jathā bhagavatā gautamena [*omit*] anyad api tāvad vyaṃ bhagavantam

6) [B]6v.4-5: varṇavādi(6v.5) + + + + + + bh[i]nandanam

[E]4v.2: °varṇavādītā yuddhadarśa«nam śāstrā» bhinandanam

Cf. [A]10v.4: varṇavādītā | amitramarābhinandanam

7) [B]6v.5-6: °kukkuṭādayo ghātyante tasya ;(6v.6) + + + + + + trās cānye ca janāḥ

[E]4v.3: °kukkuṭādayo ghātyante tasya =(space for 8 akṣaras)= trās cānye janāḥ

Cf. [A]11r.1: °kukkuṭādayas tasya yajñapravarttakasya putrā(h) pautrās cānye ca janāḥ

Comment: This example apparently reflects the reading in [B]. A space is left open between *tasya* and *trās* in [E], which indicates that some letters are lost in this place. Same treatment in case of missing portion is found in [B]7v.5-6 = [E]5r.3 and [B] (missing) = [E]5r.6 below.

8) [B]6v.6-7r.1: tas[yai](7r.1) + + + + + + + vamāno nīyate |

[E]4v.4: tasyaiva cāgrato 'nyair ekah paśū ravamānaḥ nīyate |

Cf. [A]11r.2-3: tasya grhasya pārśv(e)na rājapathas tena paś(ū) ravamāno

9) [B]7r.1-2: kāryā(7r.2) + + + + + .. [e]ṣa paś[ū] ravamāno

[E]4v.5: kāryānanabhijñānām | ya eṣa paśū ravamāno

Cf. [A]11r.4: kāryārthan tu bravīmi | ya eṣa paś(ū)ra(vamāno)

10) [B]7v.3-4: kāruṇyacittatā | (7v.4) + +tvānām

[E]5r.1: kāruṇyacittatā duḥkhitām satvānām

Cf. [A]12v.1: kāruṇyacit(t)atā | glānā(nām) satvānā(m)

11) [B]7v.4-5: tathā stūpacaitya(7v.5) + + + + [śi]rṇnānām

[E]5r.2: tathā stūpacaityabimbānām bhagnaśirṇnānām

Cf. 12v.2-3: tathā st(ū)pac[ai](12v.3)t[y]avīhārānām {vi}śirṇnānā(m)

12) [B]7v.5-6: ṛiṣibhūtena {1} (7v.6) + + + + + .. [sy]. sārthasya

[E]5r.3: ṛiṣibhūtena =(space for approximately 11 akṣaras)= sya sārtha [end of line]

Cf. [A]12v.5: tena kila ṛiṣibhūtena pañcābhi(jñ)ena tṛṣ(ṇ)ārttaḥ sārtha°

Comment: A space is left open between -tena and sya, which indicates some letters to be supplied but unknown; see also the above example [B]6v.5-6 = [E]4v.3.

13) [B]7v.6: tatra ca sārthe bo; [end of folio; next one, no. 8, is missing]

[E]5r.4: tatra ca sārthe bo =(space for approximately 11 akṣaras)= (5r.5) ya enikūle janatām grhītvā |

Cf. [A]12v.5-13r.1: tatra sā(13r.1)rthe bodhisatvah sārthavāho (°)bhūt* | ya Enikūle janatām grhītvā |

Comment: Folio no. 8 of MS[B] is missing; thus [E] does not give the following portion after *sārthe bo*. In the next line, however, [E] starts again continuously in context.

14) [B]: [Folio no. 8 missing]

[E]5r.6: sa ca rājā =(space for approximately 5 akṣaras)= (5r.7) babhūva |

Cf. [A]13r.4: sa ca rājā bodhisatvo babhūva | |

Comment: Although MS[B] is not available, [E] has the missing portion in the text. This is the sole example in which [E] indicates the missing portion in itself in a case when the folio which has the corresponding passage is lost.

15) [B]11r.1: (11r.1) + + + + + .. pitroḥ vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ

[E]6v.10: adattādānānumodanaṃ | mātāpitror vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ |

Cf. [A]18v.3: tadabhyānumodanaṃ | mātāpitro(r) vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ |

16) [B]13r.4: tatra katamaṃ karma pretalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | ucyate | | tatra katamaṃ karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | ucyate | |

[E]8r.8: tatra katamat karma pretalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ || ucyate || tatra katamat karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ || ucyate |

Cf. [A]22v.3: katamat{a} karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | (22v.4) ucyate |

17) [B]15v.2: + + [p]ūrvaṃ bhikṣavaḥ Jāmbūdvīpe manuṣyāṇāṃ aparimāṇam āyur bhavati || yathānyatarasmiṃ, asti Jambūdvīpe Mahākośalī nāma nagaram Mairāyajño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva ||

[E]9v.6: bhūtapūrvaṃ bhikṣavo Jāmbūdvīpe manuṣyāṇāṃ aparimāṇam āyur bhavati yathānyatarasmiṃ | asti Jambūdvīpe Mahākośalī nāma nagaram tatra (9v.7) mairāyajño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva ||

Cf. [A]26v.4: bhūtapūrvvaṃ bhikṣavo Ja(m)budvīpe manukṣā(26v.5)ṇāṃ (< manuṣyā°) aparimāṇam āyur bhavati, yathā rājo Māmdhātuḥ | athānyatarasmin nagare Mairāyajño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva |

Comment:

The above two examples show the difference between [B]/[E] and [A].

18) [B]: 15v.6: sa bhūyaḥ udyānaṃ gataḥ sahāyair uktaḥ [*end of line; next two folios 16-17 missing*].

[E]9v.10: [*beginning of line*] bhūya udyānaṃ gataḥ sahāyair uktaḥ tat katham <tvayā> na gantavyaṃ iti | tena gatvā mātā pṛcchate | deśāntaram gamiṣyāmīti

Cf. [A]27v.1-2: sa bhūya udyānaṃ gataḥ | sahāy(ai)r uktaḥ | atha gantavyam iti | tena mātā āpṛstāḥ | de(27v.2)śāntaram gamiṣyāmīti |

Comment: Folio no. 16 of [B] is lost. The reading of [E] is slightly different from that of [A].

We can classify the above examples in this way:

[reading available: ○; not available: ×; identical: =; different: ≠]

1) [B] ×; [E] ×; [A] ○

7, 12, 13, 14?

2) [B] ×; [E] ○ ≠ [A] ○

1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18

3) [B] ○ = [E] ○ ≠ [A] ○

4, 5, 16, 17

In the first case, it is probable that the blank space in [E] was a reflection of the damaged portion in [B] and that the scribe of [E] could not reconstruct any text according to the context. If so, the scribe might have seen the MS[B] which is already damaged. This assumption implies that [E] is a direct copy of [B] (chart: [B] with damages → [E] with blank space for the damaged portion). If not, the scribe of [E] might have used another unknown copy of [B] which also contains the missing portions as seen in [B] (chart: [B] with damages → [?] with blank space for the damaged portion → [E] with blank space for the damaged portion). This latter scenario is, however, too cumbersome.

In the second case, even though some portions are illegible or lost in [B], the scribe was able to reconstruct the word(s)/phrase(s). The readings are thus created by the

scribe of [E], so they are different from those of MS[A]. In this case, there is a possibility that he used another manuscript to reconstruct the text but if so, we have to face to another problem: why did he so in the first case above?

The third case deserves attention as another piece of evidence which represents the relationship of [B] and [E]. The readings of [E] reflect those of [B], which are corrected or cancelled by [B] itself. They are not identical with [A]. This fact implies that [B] and [E] belong to one manuscript transmission while [A] belongs to another transmission, probably a later one.

The above observations lead us to the following assumption:

MS[E] is most probably a direct copy of [B]; if it is not the case, it still deserves to be considered a very close copy of it. Here what I mean by “very close” is that the original manuscript on which the scribe of [E] had based his transcription might have been at least one which belonged to the same manuscript transmission of MS[B]. Judging from the first case above, MS[B] that was damaged on the corners of folios was used by the scribe for transmitting the text.

In addition, it is worth noting that MS[E], we now have it, preserves the text up to § 32-a in the middle without any textual gap. If this manuscript is a direct copy of [B], its scribe might have used the missing folios of MS[B], namely folio nos. 8-10 and 15-16. In its present state of preservation in the National Archives of Nepal, MS[B] lacks those five folios. As we report in another paper in this issue, the first three folios of MS[B] were retrieved from the collection of Hemraj Sharman. Comparing the readings of both manuscripts, exclusively the reading in the first three folios of MS[B] with [E], the corresponding reading of MS[E] is almost identical with that of [B]. The places where MS[E] and [A] show differences are restricted to cases in which a part of the folios of MS[B] is damaged and thus the reading is not recovered. When [B] reads differently from [A], [E] follows the reading of [B]. Therefore, MS[E] is a manuscript which transcribed the entire MS[B] or another copy of it including the now missing folios of MS[B]. Since the first three folios were preserved separately, it is hoped that the missing folios of MS[B] and the rest of MS[E] will be found again.

On the Orthography of MS[E]

The orthography of this manuscript is quite correct. Although some damaged akṣaras are found on the corners of the folios, there are few, if any, scribal errors. It is quite interesting that the readings which seem to be an error are identical with that of MS[B] (for instance, see [E]2r.4 = [B]2v.4 = [E]2r.4, n. 55 below). Besides them, phenomena frequently found in the Nepalese Sanskrit manuscripts such as loss of anusvāra / visarga, duplication of consonant after *r-*, and the replacement of class nasals by anuvāra are scarcely recorded. Due to the lack of the final folio which might have a colophon, the date is unknown. On the basis of the script used here, this manuscript belongs to 17th century or later but this dating is uncertain.⁸

⁸ Diwakar Acharya suggests to me that the date of this manuscript is mid of 17th c. MS[B] belongs to 13th century or later; [A] has a colophon which tells us its date 531 (= 1410/11 CE).

Transliteration of Manuscript E:

(I recto, in the middle) om namaḥ śrī mahāboddhāya |
Karmavibhaṅgasūtra ||
evaṃ kukkurasūtra || ||

2.1 (Iv.1) .. namaḥ śrī mahāboddhāya |

2.11 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye Bhagavāṃ Śrāvastyām viharati sma <|>
Jetavane mahāvihāre 'nāthapiṇḍadasyārāme mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena
sārdhāṃ⁹ |

2.14 atha sa Bhagavān pūrvāhne¹⁰ nivāsyā pā + + + (Iv.2)[ram¹¹ ā]dāya Śrāvastīm
piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat sāvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran^{*12} <|> yena
Śukamāṇava Taudeyaputrasya niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāñtas <|>

2.16 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śukasya mānavasya Taudeyaputrasya niveśane
śa + + + (Iv.3)ro¹³ goṇikāstrīte paryāṅkaṃ¹⁴ niṣarṇaḥ | asyāntaropadhyānāyāṃ¹⁵
kāṃsapātryā(ṃ) śālimāṃsodanaṃ paribhūṅkte¹⁶ | adrākṣit* śāṅkhakukuro¹⁷
Bhagavaṃtaṃ dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā ca punar bukkatī |

4.5 atha Bhagavān* śaṅkhaku .. (Iv.4)tad¹⁸ avocat* |
"etad api te śāṅkha na damayasi yad api¹⁹ bhokkārād bukkāram āgataḥ |"
evaṃ ukte śāṅkhakukuro²⁰ 'bhiṣiktaḥ²¹ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto 'nāttamaṇā
goṇikāstrītat paryāṅkāḍ avatīryādhasat paryāṅkasya + + + (Iv.5)ndanikāyāṃ²²

⁹ MS[B] does not have "mahāvihāre" and "mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārddhāṃ."

¹⁰ For pūrvāhne.

¹¹ Read pā(tracīvā)ram.

¹² = MS[B]Iv.2; [A]2r.1: carana(ṃ).

¹³ Read śa(ṅkhakukku)ro.

¹⁴ Read paryāṅke, cf. [B]Iv.3.

¹⁵ = MS[B]; [A] reads asmāntaro<pa>dbānāyāṃ (< aśnāntaropadbānāyāṃ).

¹⁶ Here this manuscript exactly corresponds to that of MS[B] while [A] has one more sentence: bhuṅkte | Bhagavān a(2r.3)dt[ā](kṣ)[it]* [sa]ṃ[kha]kukura goṇikāstrate paryāṅke niṣarṇa(b) || asmāntaropadbānāyā(ṃ) kāṃsapātryā(ṃ) paribhūñjanāṃ.

¹⁷ For °kukkuro.

¹⁸ Read °ku(kkuram)etad.

¹⁹ = MS[B]Iv.4; [A]2r.4: na damayati yad asi. See also [E]Iv.7 and 2r.6.

²⁰ Read °kukkuro.

²¹ = MS[B]Iv.4; [A]2r.5: 'tīṣayitaroṣa° for 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupita°

²² Read (dārsya)nda°.

niṣaṇṇaḥ |

4.10 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro bahirnirgato²³
'bhūt <l> kenacid eva karaṇiyena |

athāta āgataḥ²⁴ Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputraḥ <l> adrākṣīt* Śuko māṇavas
Taudeyapu .[r].²⁵ + (1v.6)śāṅkhakukuram²⁶ adhasat paryaṅkastha²⁷
dārusyandanikāyāṃ niṣaṇṇaṃ dṛṣtvā ca punar antarjanam āmantrayate |

6.2 "kenaivāyaṃ śāṅkhakukuraḥ²⁸ kiñcid uktaḥ |"
antarjana āha²⁹ |

6.5 "ko 'smākaṃ āryaputra śāṅkhakukuraṃ³⁰ kiñcid vak[s]. +³¹ <l>
(1v.7) api tv āgato (')bhūc chramaṇo Gauttamaḥ | taṃ³² dvāramūle dṛṣtvā
cāyaṃ punar³³ bukkati | tam enaṃ śramaṇo Gauttama evam āha |
'etarhy api tvam³⁴ śāṅkha na damayasi yad asi³⁵ bhokkārād bukkāram āgataḥ
|'

evam ukte śāṅkhakuku ..³⁶ (1v.8) (')bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaḥ caṇḍībhūto
(')nāttamaṇā³⁷ goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkād avatiryādhasat paryaṅkastha³⁸
dārusyandanikāyāṃ niṣaṇṇaḥ |"

6.11 atha Śukamāṇavas Taudeyaputro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto (')nāttamaṇā
(1v.9) Śrāvastyāṃ niṣkrāmya³⁹ yena Jetavanam Anāthapiṇḍadasyarāmaṃ
tenopasaṃkrāntas <l>

6.14 tena khalu punaḥ⁴⁰ samayena Bhagavān anekasātāyāṃ bhikṣuṣarpaṣadi purastān

²³ MS[B]1v.5: *bahī(r)nirgato*; [A]2v.1: *bahirgato*.

²⁴ MS[B]: illegible; [A]2v.1-2: *athāgaccha*.

²⁵ Read °*pu(t)[r](ab)*.

²⁶ Read (śā)ṅkhakukuram.

²⁷ Read *paryaṅkasya*; this reading (probably a scribal error) is same as that of MS[B] 1v.6, see also [E]2r.7 = [B]3r.2 (missing).

²⁸ Read °*kukkurah*.

²⁹ Both MS[A] and [B] lack this sentence.

³⁰ Read °*kukkuram*.

³¹ Read *vaks(ati)*, cf. MS[B]2r.1.

³² Both MS[A] and [B] lack this word.

³³ MS[B]2r.1: *dṛṣtvā ca punar*; [A] 2v.4: 'vaṣṭbitaṃ tam ekha (< eṣa).

³⁴ MS[B]2r.2: missing; [A]2v.5: *etad api te*.

³⁵ = MS[B]2r.2; [A]2v.5: *na damayati yad asi*. Cf. [E]1v.4 and 2r.6.

³⁶ Read °*kukku(rab)*.

³⁷ For (')*nāttamaṇā*.

³⁸ Read *paryaṅkasya*, see also [E]1v.6; [B] missing.

³⁹ MS[B]2r.3: *Śrāvastyā niṣkrāmya*; [A] omits the word *Śrāvastyā(n)*.

niṣaṅṅo dharman deśayati | adrākṣīd Bhagavān* Śukam māṇavaṃ
Tau(1v.10)deyaputram dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūnām⁴¹
āmantrayate sma |

8.4 "paśyatha yūyam bhikṣavaḥ Śukam māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputram dūrād
evāgacchantam |"

"evam Bhagavan* |"

8.7 "sacet* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro 'smiṃ samaye (1v.11) kālam kuryād
yathā bhalla nikṣipta evam kāyasya bhedāt param maraṇād
apāyadurgativinipātam⁴² narakeṣūpapadyate | tathā hy ane{{.}}na mamāntike
citta(m) pradūṣitam | cittapradūṣaṇahetor⁴³ evam ihaṅ satvāḥ
kā(2r.1)ya bhedāt param maraṇād apāyadurgativinipātam⁴⁴
narakeṣūpapadyante |"

8.13 athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyām velāyām gāthā⁴⁵ bhaṣate |

8.14 pradūṣacittam dṛṣṭvaiva ekatyam⁴⁶ iha pudgalaṃ |
etam artham vyākāṣm⁴⁷ { | } śāstā bhikṣu(2r.2)gaṇāntike | |
idāniṃ bata doṣo (')yam⁴⁸ kālam kurvīta māṇavaḥ |
narakeṣūpapadyate cittam hy etena dūṣitam |

10.1 yathā hy ucitam nikṣiptam evam eva tathāgate |
cittapradūṣaṇahetos⁴⁹ sa<tvā> gacchanti⁵⁰ durgatiṃ | |

10.3 atha⁵¹ (2r.3) Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro yena Bhagavāṃs tenopasaṅkrānta
upasaṅkramya Bhagavatā sārddham saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodaniṃ vividhaṃ
kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣaṅṅaḥ | ⁵²Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavantam
etaḍ avo(2r.4)cat* |

"āgamad⁵³ bhavān* Gauttama asmākaṃ niveśanaṃ |"

"āgaman⁵⁴ māṇava |"

⁴⁰ MS[B]2r.4 lacks *punaḥ* while [A]3r.2 has.

⁴¹ For *bbikṣūn*. MS[B]2r.5: + + *nām*; [A]3r.4: «*bbikṣū*» *n*. See also [E]3r.2.

⁴² MS[B]2r.6: °*durgatiṃ vinipātān*; [A]3r.5-v.1: °*durgativinipāte*.

⁴³ = MS[B]2r.6: °*pradūṣaṇaheto(r)*; [A]3v.1: °*prady(<ū>ṣaṇād dbeto(r)*.

⁴⁴ MS[B]2r.6: °*durgatiṃ*; [A]3v.2: °*durgatāvīcau (<-gatyavīcau)*.

⁴⁵ = MS[B]2v.1. For *gātbā(m)*.

⁴⁶ = MS[A]3v.3; [B]2v.1: *ekadyam*.

⁴⁷ For *vyākāṣm*.

⁴⁸ = MS[B]2v.2; [A]3v.3: *idāni(m) batādbikṣepam*.

⁴⁹ = MS[B]2v.2: °*pradūṣaṇa[be](t)os*; [A]3v.4: °*pradūṣaṇād dbetob*.

⁵⁰ Cf. MS[B]2v.2: .. + .[ti]; [A]3v.4: *satvā gacchanti*.

⁵¹ MS[B]2v.3: missing; [A]3v.5: *adbikṣepya*.

⁵² Before this MS[A] alone has *ekāntaniṣa(r)ṇaḥ* (4r.1).

⁵³ = MS[B]2v.4; [A]4r.1: *āgat(o)*.

- "mā bhavatā⁵⁵ Gautameṇa{m}⁵⁶ śāṅkhakukkuram kiṃcid⁵⁷ uktaḥ | "
- 10.11 "ihāham māṇava pūrvāhṇe nivāsyā pātracīvaram ādāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍā(2r.5)ya prāvīkṣam⁵⁸ <|> sāvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran yena tava⁵⁹ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta upasaṃkrāmya dvārainūle sthita āsaṃ⁶⁰ | tadāsau māṇava te⁶¹ śāṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstrte mañcake (')dhiruhe⁶² (')syānta(2r.6)ropadhānāyāṃ kāṃsapātryāṃ śālimā(m)sodanaṃ paribhu(m)kte | adrākṣic chaṅkhakukkuro māṃ dvāramūle sthitaṃ⁶³ drṣṭvā bukkarim akarot⁶⁴ tadāham eva⁶⁵ vadāmi |
- 12.2 'etad api śāṅkha na damayasi yad api⁶⁶ bhokārā(2r.7)d bukkāram āgataḥ | ' evam ukte śāṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto (')nāttamaṇā goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkād avatiryādhasat paryaṅkastha⁶⁷ dārusyandanikāyāṃ niṣaṇṇaḥ | "
- 12.7 "kiṃ punar bha(2r.8)vān* Gautama śāṅkhakukkuram asmākaṃ pūrvasyāṇ jātau⁶⁸ jānīte | "
- 12.9 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam arthaṃ pariprākṣir⁶⁹ mā te bhaviṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntiś ca cetaso daurmaṇasyaṃ | "
- 12.11 dvir api trir api (2r.9) Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavantam etad avocat* | "kiṃ⁷⁰ punar bhavān*⁷¹ Gauttamo 'smākaṃ śāṅkhakukkuram pūrvikāyāṃ jātau saṃjānīte | "
- 12.14 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam arthaṃ pariprākṣir⁷² mā te bhavi(2r.10)ṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntiś ca cetaso daurmanasyaṃ <|>"
- a{r}ddhā va⁷³ māṇava { | } yāvat trir apy etam arthenālabdhāḥ |

⁵⁴ MS[B]2v.4: *āgamat*; [A]4r.1: *āgamaṇa(n)*.

⁵⁵ = MS[B]2v.4; [A] 4r.2: *Bhagavatā*.

⁵⁶ = MS[B]2v.4 (superfluous anusvāra).

⁵⁷ = MS[B]2v.4; [A]4r.2: *kañcid*.

⁵⁸ MS[B]2v.5: *prāvīkṣat** = [A]4r.3.

⁵⁹ = MS[B]2v.5; [A]4r.3: *bba{ga}vat(o) atra*.

⁶⁰ MS[B]2v.5 partly corresponds here (*sthita* [2v.6] + +); [A]4r.4: '*vaṣṭhitaḥ* for *sthita āba*.

⁶¹ MS[B]2v.6: missing; [A]4r.4: *tena khalu puna(b) samayena*.

⁶² = MS[B]2v.6; [A]4r.4: '*dhirūḍbo*.

⁶³ = MS[B]2v.6: *stbitan*; [A]4r.5: '*vaṣṭhitaṃ*.

⁶⁴ For *bukkāram akarot*.

⁶⁵ MS[B]3r.1: missing; [A]4r.5: *taṃ eṇaṃ evaṃ*.

⁶⁶ = MS[B]3r.1; [A]4v.1: *na damayati yad asi*. Cf. [E]1v.4, 7.

⁶⁷ For *paryaṅkasya* (MS[B]3r.2: missing), see also [E]1v.6 = [B]1v.6.

⁶⁸ MS[B] lacks this word (3r.2); [A]4v.2: *jāto* (< *jātau*).

⁶⁹ MS[B]3r.2: *pariprākṣit* = [A]4v.3. See also [E]2r.9 below.

⁷⁰ = MS[B]3r.3; [A] lacks this word.

⁷¹ In MS[B], the aksara "ga" of *bhagavān** is cancelled by the scribe (3r.3); [A]4v.4: *Bhagavān**.

⁷² MS[B]3r.4: *pariprākṣit* = [A]4v.4-5. See also [E]2r.8 above.

- 14.3 "ṣ}tena hi māṇava śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāṣiṣye | yas te māṇava pitā Taudeyaḥ (2v.1) sa eva⁷⁴ kāyasya bhedād dhīnāyāṃ śvānāyonāv⁷⁵ upapannaḥ ||"
- 14.6 "kim etad⁷⁶ bho Gautama evaṃ bhaviṣyati | asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya iṣṭayajña āhitāgnir ucchritayūpaḥ | sa niyataṃ⁷⁷ kāyasya bhedāc chubhe⁷⁸ (2v.2) brahmaloke upapanno bhaviṣyati ||"
- 14.9 "anenaiva te māṇava mātābhīmānena pitā Taudeyo hīnāyāṃ⁷⁹ śvānāyonāv⁸⁰ upapanno 'pi tu⁸¹ māṇava yaḍi me bhāṣitaṃ na śraddadhāsi tena hi tvam māṇava (2v.3) yena svakaṃ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāma upasaṃkramya śaṅkhaṃ kukkuram evaṃ vada <|>
- 14.13 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyo 'dhirohatu goṇi<kā>strtaṃ paryaṅkam'
adhi(2v.4)rokṣati⁸² | adhiruha «ntaṃ»⁸³ cainam evam vada <|>
- 14.16 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro ('smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyaḥ paribhūṃjita bhavān asyāntaropadhānāyāṃ kāṃsapātryāṃ śālimāṃsodanaṃ'
- 16.3 pari(2v.5)bhokṣate⁸⁴ | bhuktavantaṃ cenam⁸⁵ evam vada <|>
- 16.4 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro ('smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyo yat te 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta⁸⁶ svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitaṃ

⁷³ = MS[B]3r.4. For *adbā ca* ("In this way"). [A]4v.5: *anyathā tvam*.

⁷⁴ = MS[B]3r.5; [A]5r.1: *esa*.

⁷⁵ MS[B]3r.5: *śvāyonāv*; [A]5r.1: *śvāyonāv* (< *śvā*^o). Cf. also [E]2v.2 below.

⁷⁶ MS[B] alone has *tu* here.

⁷⁷ MS[B]3r.6: missing; [A] 5r.2: *samṇīyataṃ*. On this form, Lévi corrects it as *samṇīyate* and Edgerton, basing on Lévi's edition, picks up this word as one of entries of MIndic passive form of a verbal root *jñā-* with a prefix *saṃ-*: "Pass. *samṇīyate*, is known, 27.27 (BISG p. 214, §§ 2.015; 37.3, n. 1, Dic.)." However, since the sequence of the akṣaras "*samṇīyataṃ*" is clear in [A], the above explanation seems doubtful. Judging from the reading in this manuscript, the form "*samṇīyataṃ*" in [A] seems to be a mere scribal error for "*saṃṇīyataṃ*" (additional anusvāra and interchange of *i* and *ī*) and thus it might be read as "*sa niyataṃ*" ("He, inevitably"). If so, the line break here should be changed as in [E]: "*asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya iṣṭayajña āhitāgnir ucchritayūpaḥ | sa niyataṃ kāyasya bhedāc ...*" (Our father, Taudeya, had performed the required sacrifices, ... He inevitably, after his death, ...).

⁷⁸ = MS[B]3r.6. For *chubhe* (*subbre*) as found in [A].

⁷⁹ = MS[B]3r.6; [A]5r.3: *mabādānapati*(*r*).

⁸⁰ = MS[B]3r.6; [A]5r.1: *śvāyonāv* (< *śvā*^o). Cf. also [E]2v.1 above.

⁸¹ MS[B]3r.6: *pi tu*; [A]5r.3: '*pitur*, cf. KV[K]: 14, fn. 13 suggested to read "*upapannaḥ | pitur*" but this reading should be changed to "(*'*)*pi tu*" as in [E].

⁸² For *adbhokṣyati* as in MS[A]5r.5 (a verbal form in Fut. is expected); [B]3v.1: + + + .. [te].

⁸³ MS[B]3v.2: + + + *baṃ*; [A]5r.5: *adbhokṣyaṃ*.

⁸⁴ For *paribhokṣyate* as in MS[A]5v.1 (a verbal form in Fut. is expected); [B]3v.3: + + + [kṣ](ā)te.

⁸⁵ For *cainam*.

⁸⁶ = MS[B]3v.3; [A]5v.2: *mama santam*. Read *santam* as in [A].

tad upadarśaya <|>
upada(2v.6)rśaiṣyati |"

16.8 atha Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavato⁸⁷ bhāṣita{{m}}m udgr̥hya paryavāpya yena svakaṃ nīveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta upasaṃkramya śāṅkhakukkuram idam avocat* |

"saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhaku(2v.7)kkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyo 'dhirohatu goṇikāstṛtaṇi paryāṅkam <|>"

adhirūḍho 'dhiruhaṃ⁸⁸ cainam evam āha |

18.2 "saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Tau(2v.8)deyaḥ paribhuñjatu bhavān asyātaropadhānāyāṃ kām̐sapātryāṃ śālimāṃsodanaṃ <|>"

paribhuktavān* | bhuktavantam̐ cainam evam āha |

"saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitā(2v.9)bhūt Taudeyo yat te 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta⁸⁹ svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitam̐ tad upadarśaya |"

19.30 atha śāṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstṛtāt paryāṅkāḍ avatīrya yenānyattamapurāṇavāsagr̥ham̐ tenopasaṃkrānta (2v.10) upasaṃkramya catura⁹¹ paryāṅkapāḍakān pāḍena pari«taḥ samullikhati» {{karṣayati}}⁹² madhyam̐ ca mukhatuḍakenopajighrati <|> {yataḥ}⁹³

yataḥ Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro kṛtākṛtasya hiraṇyasavarṇṇasya caturo lo(3r.1)hīsaṃghāṭān̐ adhigatavān̐ madhyāc ca sauvarṇakamaṇḍalum̐⁹⁴ |

21.1 atha Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputras tatsuvarṇam̐ gopayitvā hr̥ṣṭatuṣṭodagr̥pṛitisaumanasyajātaḥ <|> Śrāvastyā niṣkramya yena Bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃ(3r.2)krāntas <|>

21.4 tena khalu⁹⁵ samayena Bhagavān̐ anekāśatāyāṃ bhikṣuparṣadi purastān̐ niṣaṅṅo dharmam̐ deśayati | adrāksic̐ Chukaṃ māṇavam̐ Taudeyaputraṃ dūrād evāgacchantam̐ <|> dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūn̐⁹⁶ āmantrayati (3r.3) sma |

⁸⁷ = MS[B]3v.4; [A]5v.3: *bbagavātā* (< *bbagavatā*).

⁸⁸ MS[B]3v.5: *adhirubani* only; [A]: 5v.5: *adhirūḍhani* only.

⁸⁹ = MS[B]3v.6-4r.1: *sa +*; read *santani* as in [A]6r.2: *mama satum̐* (< *santani*).

⁹⁰ From here transliteration of MS[B] (folio no. 4 onwards) is available in KV[K]: 19ff. Thus, the page numbers and lines of the transliteration of [B] in KV[K] are given from here on in squares.

⁹¹ For *caturah*.

⁹² The original reading seems to be "*pāḍena parikarṣayati*" but corrected to "*pāḍena paritaḥ samullikhat*" ("he digs up with his forepaw"). In MS[B] it runs as follows: *pāḍana*(4r.2) + + + + .. *kbalita*{*ma*}*dhyān̐ ca*.

⁹³ MS[B]4r.2 also has superfluous word {*yatiḥ*}.

⁹⁴ MS[E] omits a word *daṇḍa* which is found in [A]6r.5; [B]4r.3: missing.

⁹⁵ = MS[B]4r.3; [A] adds *punah* (6v.1).

"paśyatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ Śūkaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ dūrata evāgacchantam |"

"evaṃ Bhagavan* |"

"sacec Chuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro 'smin samaye kālaṃ kuryād yathā bhallaṃ nikṣipta <|> evaṃ kāyasya (3r.4) bhedāt* sugatau svargalokadeveṣūpapadyate | tathā hy anena mamāntike cittaṃ prasāditaṃ cittaprasādāna⁹⁷ hetor bhikṣava evaṃ ihaike satvāḥ kāyasya bhedāt sugatau svargalokadeveṣūpapa(3r.5)dyante |"⁹⁸

21.15

athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ bhāṣate |

21.16

prasannacittaṃ dṛṣṭvaiva ekatyam iha pudgalaṃ |

23.1

etam arthaṃ vyākārṣic chāstā bhikṣugaṇāntike |

idānīm kālaṃ kurvīta śuko (')yaṃ mā(3r.6)ṇavo yaḍi |⁹⁹

upapadyeta deveṣu cittaṃ hy etena prasāditaṃ | |¹⁰⁰

yathā dūritaṃ nikṣiptaṃ evaṃ eva tathāgate |

cittaprasādāna¹⁰¹ hetoḥ satvā gacchanti sadgatiṃ¹⁰² | |

23.6

atha Śūko māṇavas Taudeyaputro (3r.7) yena¹⁰³ Bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrānta <|> upasaṃkramya Bhagavatā sārddham saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanīm samrañjanīm vividhāṃ kathāṃ vyatisāyaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ | ekānta(m)niṣaṇṇaṃ Śūkaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ Bhagavā(3r.8)nn idam avocat* |

25.1

"kaccin māṇava tat tathaivaṃ yathā mayā śaṅkhakukkuro vyākṛtaḥ |"

"tathā bho Gautama tat tathaiva yathā Bha<ga>vatā Gautamena śaṅkhakukkuro vyākṛtaḥ | anyad apī tāvad vayaṃ Bhaga(3r.9)vantaṃ¹⁰⁴ Gautamaṃ pṛcchema kaṃcid eva pradeśaṃ saced avakāśaṃ kuryāt* praśnasya vyākaraṇāya Bhagavān*¹⁰⁵ |"

⁹⁶ For *bbikṣūn*. MS[B]4r.4: *bbikṣūnām*; [A]6v.2: *bbikṣūṇ*. See also [E]1r.10 above.

⁹⁷ = MS[B]4r.6; for °*prasādanā*.

⁹⁸ = MS[B]4r.6. The last sentence beginning from *tathā hy* is omitted in [A], see KV[K]: 21, fn. 9 (the corresponding passage in [B] is found in 2r.6-v.1).

⁹⁹ This line differs from either that of MS[A] and of [B]. [B] reads (4v.1): *idānī(ṇi) kālaṃ kurvīta māṇavaḥ* |. Probably the scribe of MS[E] follows the reading of [B] (*idānīm kālaṃ kurvīta*) as it is and reconstructs the rest by himself or by using another (unknown) source.

¹⁰⁰ This line is also different from that of MS[A]; in [B] this portion is missing due to the damage of folio (4v.1-2). The reading in [E] might be reconstructed by the scribe on the basis of its corresponding line but in opposite sense found in [E]2r.2 and [B]2v.2: *narakeṣūpapadyate cittaṃ hy etena dūṣitaṃ*.

¹⁰¹ = MS[B]4v.2; for °*prasādanāt*.

¹⁰² MS[B]4v.2: *saṅgatiṃ* (< *sadgatiṃ*); [A]7r.1-2: *sadgatiṃ*.

¹⁰³ = MS[A]7r.2; [B] omits this word, cf. [E]2r.3.

¹⁰⁴ In MS[B], an akṣara *ga* in Nāgarī script is inserted here (4v.4, cf. KV[K]: 25, fn. 3). The relationship of this insertion and the reading of [E] is unknown.

- 25.4 "śrṇu .. māṇava¹⁰⁶ yadyad eva kāmṅkṣasi |"
 "ko bho Gautama ko hetuḥ <|> kaḥ pratyayo yenehaike satvā (3r.10) alpāyūṣo (')pi dīrghāyūṣo (')pi bahvābādhā api alpābādhā api durvarṇṇā api suvarṇṇā api alpeśākhyā api maheśākhyā api nīcakulīnā api uccakulīnā api anādeya(3v.1)vākyā api | ādeyavākyā api | alpabhogā api mahābhogā api duṣprajñā api mahāprajñā api | kasya nu bho karmaṇo vipākenedaṃ satvānāṃ nānātvaṃ prajñāyate ||"
- 27.1 ¹⁰⁷tatra Bhagavāṃ (3v.2) Śukam māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputram idam avocat* |
 "karmavibhaṅgan te māṇava dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayisyāmi | tac chṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi<kuru> bhāṣiṣye 'haṃ te¹⁰⁸ |"
 "evaṃ Bhagavann" iti Śuko māṇavas Tau(3v.3)deyaputro Bhagavataḥ pratyāśrauṣīt* |
- 27.4 Bhagavān idam avocat* |
 "karmasvakān ahaṃ māṇava satvān vadāmi | karmadāyādā karmayonayaḥ karmapratisāraṇāḥ | karma māṇava satvān vibhajati <|> ya(3v.4)d idam hīnotkṛṣṭamadhyamatāyāṃ |"
- 27.10 tadyathā¹⁰⁹ |
 1¹¹⁰. asti karmālpāyūṣaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 2. asti karma dīrghāyūssaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 3. asti karma bahvābādhasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 4. asti karmālpābādhasaṃvartta(3v.5)nīyaṃ |
 5. asti karma durvarṇṇasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 6. asti karma prāsādikasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 7. asti karma alpeśākhyasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 8. asti karma maheśākhyasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 9. asti karma nīcaku(3v.6)lopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 10. asti karma uccakulopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 11. asti karma alpabhogasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 12. asti karma mahābhogasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
 13. asti karma duṣprajñasaṃvartta(3v.7)nīyaṃ |
 14. asti karma mahāprajñasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |

¹⁰⁵ Both MS[A] and [B] omit this word although in [B] the folio is damaged.

¹⁰⁶ MS[A]7r.5: *precha māṇava*; [B]4v.5 is damaged.

¹⁰⁷ This passage exactly corresponds to that of MS[B]5r.1-2 while [A] reads differently. As to the difference between them, it is interesting to note that one of the fragments in the Schøyen Collection preserves a part of this passage corresponding to that of MS[A] (SC 2382/49a, side A).

¹⁰⁸ MS[B]5r.2: + + + + +; [A]7v.4: *maṇasikuru bhāṣiṣye*. As to [B], I suggested to read "(*manasikuru bhāṣiṣye*)" on the basis of [A] but it should be changed to "Read (*manasi<kuru> 'bam te*)" as found in [E] although some akṣaras are supplied (KV[K]: 27, fn. 2).

¹⁰⁹ = MS[B]5r.3; [A] omits this word.

15. asti karma narakopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
16. asti karma tiryagyonyupapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
17. asti karma pretalokopapattisaṃ(3v.8)mvarttanīyaṃ |
18. asti karma asuralokopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
19. asti karma manuṣyalokopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
20. asti karma kāmāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
21. asti ka(3v.9)rma rūpāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
22. asti karma ārūpyāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
- 24.¹¹¹ asti karma upacitaṃ na kṛtaṃ |
23. asti karma kṛtaṃ nopacitaṃ |
25. asti karma kṛ(3v.10)taṃ upacitaṃ ca |
26. asti karma naiva kṛtaṃ naivopacitaṃ |
27. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣv āyuhḥ kṣapayitvā narakeṣv evopapadyate¹¹² |
- 28.¹¹³
29. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ (4r.1) pudgalo narakeṣūpapannamātra evam uktāḥ¹¹⁴ |
asti karma tiryagyonyupapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ¹¹⁵ |
30. asti karma niyatopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ¹¹⁶ |
- 31.¹¹⁷
32. asti karma deśāntaravipakṣaṃ |
33. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ (4r.2) pūrvaṃ sukhito bhūtvā paścād duḥkhito bhavati |
34. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvaṃ duḥkhito bhūtvā paścāt sukhito bhavati |
35. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvaṃ sukhito bhū(4r.3)tvā paścād api sukhito bhavati |
36. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvaṃ duḥkhito bhūtvā paścād api duḥkhito bhavati |
38. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo daridro bhavati tyāgavān* |¹¹⁸

¹¹⁰ This number corresponds to that given by Lévi in Roman numerals.

¹¹¹ In this list, section headings 23 and 24 are mentioned in reverse as is case in [B].

¹¹² = MS[B]5v.3. This heading is listed in an abridged form; later § 27 starts (9r.2 = [B]14r.6) with a following phrase: *tatra katamaṃ karma yena samānvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣūpapannab paripūrṇaṃ nairayikam āyuhḥ kṣapayitvā cyavanti.*

¹¹³ MS[E] omits heading 28 as also in [B].

¹¹⁴ In MS[B], the beginning of 5v.4 is damaged; I suggested to read this missing portion as “e(vopapadyate |) on the basis of [A] (KV[K]: 29, fn. 18) but this should now be changed to “e(vam uktāḥ)” as found in [E].

¹¹⁵ = MS[B]5v.4. This heading is identical to that of 16.

¹¹⁶ = MS[B]5v.4.

¹¹⁷ The heading “*anivato babatti*” does not appear in this list as in [B] but section 31 starts in

37. (4r.4) asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgala āḍhyo bhavati matsarī |
 39A¹¹⁹ asti karima yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo daridro bhavati matsarī |
 39. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgala āḍhyo bhavati tyāgavān* |
 41. (4r.5) asti pudgalo yasya karma kṣīṇaṃ nāyuh |
 40. asti pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karma{h} |
 42.¹²⁰
 43.¹²¹
 43a. asti pudgalo yasya nāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karmāni ca | api tu kleśāḥ kṣīṇā bhavanti¹²²
 |
 44. asti pudgalaḥ kāyena sukhi(4r.6)to¹²³ na cittaena |
 45. asti pudgalo yas¹²⁴ cittaena sukhi na kāyena |
 46. asti pudgalaḥ kāyena ca sukhi cittaena ca |
 47. asti pudgalo naiva kāyena sukhi na cittaena |
 48. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo 'pāyeṣū(4r.7)papanno 'bhirūpo
 bhavati snigdha kāyaḥ snigdha cchaviḥ, nayanābhirāmo darśanīyaḥ |
 49. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo 'pāyeṣūpapanno durvarṇo bhavati
 rūṣakāyo ghoradarśanaḥ pratikūladarśanaḥ |
 50. (4r.8) asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo ('pāyeṣūpapanno durgandho
 bhavati jihvendriyo¹²⁵ bhavaty avyaktendriyaḥ |
 51. daśānām akuśālānām karma pathānām vipākena daśānām bāhyānām
 bhāvānām abhivṛddhiḥ prajñā(4r.9)yate |
 51A. daśānām kuśālānām karma pathānām vipākena daśānām bāhyānām bhāvānām
 vipattiḥ prajñāyate |¹²⁶
 62. daśānusamśās¹²⁷ tathāgatacaityāñjalikarmaṇi |
 63. daśānusamśās tathāgatacaityavandanāyāḥ |
 64. daśānusamśāḥ(4r.10) chatrapradāne¹²⁸ |

¹¹⁸ The headings 37 and 38 are listed in reverse as is case in MS[B].

¹¹⁹ This number with the capital letter A is given by me. This heading is found only in MS[B]6r.1 and [E]; but this topic is not discussed later.

¹²⁰ Cf. MS[A]9v.2: *aṣṭi* (< *asti*) *pudgalo y(a)syāyuh karmūnāni ca kṣīṇāni*. Although this heading is not found in [B]26v.1, the topic is discussed, see KV[K]: 159, 7-9.

¹²¹ Cf. MS[A]9v.2-3: *aṣṭi* (< *asti*) *pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ pu(ṇy)āni ca*. Neither the heading nor the section itself is found in MS[B], see KV[K]: 161.

¹²² The line division in MS[B] (KV[K]: 31, 19-20) should be changed to "43. / 43a. *asti pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karmāni ca | | api tu kleśāḥ kṣīṇā bhavanti | |*" as in [E].

¹²³ =? MS[B]6r.2-3: *sukhi* + +; [A] 9v.4: *sukhī*. As to [B], I suggested to read "*sukhi(to cit)tena*" but it should be changed to "*sukhi(to na cit)tena*" (KV[K]: 33, fn. 1).

¹²⁴ = MS[B]6r.3; [A] omits this word.

¹²⁵ = MS[B]6r.5; read *jihvendriyo* as in [A]10r.2.

¹²⁶ = MS[B]6r.6 but not in [A]; however this topic is not discussed independently.

¹²⁷ In the following, the word *anusamśā* is always (except in the next case) written as *anusamśā*.

¹²⁸ MS[E], same as [B], reads °*pradāne* instead of °*pradānasya* as in [A].

85.1

65. daśānusamśā ghaṇṭhapradāne |
 66.¹²⁹
 67. daśānusamśā āsanapradāne |
 68. daśānusamśā bhājanapradāne |
 69. daśānusamśā bhojanapradāne |
 70. daśānusamśā yānapradāne |
 71. daśānusamśāḥ pratiśrayapradāne |
 72. daśā(4r.11)nusamśāḥ pānakapradāne |
 72A. daśānusamśā phalapradāne¹³⁰ |
 73. daśānusamśā mālāpradāne |
 74. daśānusamśā muktapuṣpapradāne |
 75. daśānusamśā dīpapradāne |
 76. daśānusamśā gandhapradāne |
 76A. daśānusamśā dhūpapradāne¹³¹ |
 77. (4v.1) daśānusamśāḥ pravrajyāyāṃ |
 78. daśānusamśā araṇyavāse |
 79. daśānusamśāḥ paiṇḍapātikatve |
 80. daśā vaiśāradyānāṃ¹³² |

iti samuddeśāḥ¹³³ karmavibhaṅgasya dharmaparyāyasya¹³⁴ || ||

(To be continued)

Convention:

()	restored akṣara(s)
[]	damaged akṣara(s)
< >	omitted (part of) akṣara(s)
{ }	superfluous akṣara(s)
{{ }}	erased akṣara(s)
« »	interlinear insertion
+	one lost akṣara
..	one illegible akṣara

¹²⁹ MS[E], same as [B], omits the heading: *daśānusamśā vastrapradānane*; but this topic is discussed later; see [B]31r.4-6: *katame da + guṇā vastrapradānasya | ucyate ||*...

¹³⁰ = MS[B]6v.2 but not in [A]. Although this subject is listed here, it is not discussed later.

¹³¹ = MS[B]6v.3 but not in [A]. This subject is not discussed later.

¹³² In MS[B], I suggested to read *vaiśāradyā(ni)* on the basis of [A] (KV[K]: 35, fn. 12) but this should now be changed to “*vaiśāradyānāṃ*” as in [E].

¹³³ MS[B]6v.4: + + [m]. *d. śāḥ*. I suggested to read “*(aya)m ud(d)eśāḥ*” but this should now be changed as in [E] (KV[K]: 35, fn. 13).

¹³⁴ = MS[B]6v.4 but [A] lacks this word.

- . illegible part of an akṣara
 * virāma
 ' avagraha

Abbreviations:

- KV: *Karmavibhaṅga* (or *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* in Lévi)
 KV/KJ: See Kudo 2004.
 Lévi: See Lévi 1932.
 MS[A]: No. 4-20
 MS[B]: No. 1-1697
 MS[C]: appended to MS[B]
 MS[D]: appended to MS[A]
 MS[E]: No. 4-951
 r recto
 SC: Schøyen Collection
 SITT: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*
 v verso

References:

Diwakar Acharya and Noriyuki Kudo

- 2006 "The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2005*, vol. IX, pp. 33-42.

Edgerton, Franklin

- 1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven, 1953.

Hoernle, A. F. R. (ed.)

- 1916 *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford.

Kudo, Noriyuki

- 2004 *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. (BPPB VII), Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism.

- 2005 「サンスクリット本『カルマ・ヴィバṅガ』テキスト形成の考察」『印度學佛教學研究』53-2, pp. 871-866 (L). ("The Textual History of the Sanskrit *Karmavibhaṅga*," in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 53-2, 2005.3, pp. 871-866(L)).

- 2006 "Brief Communication: A notebook transcribing the manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* formerly belonged to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2005*, vol. IX, pp. 297-300.

Lévi, Sylvain

- 1932 *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgapadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), textes sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali en tibétain, en chinois et en koutchéen*, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil IV: Ergänzungsband zu Teil 1-3 mit Text-wiedergaben, Berichtigungen und Wörterzeichnissen bearbeitet von L. Sander und E. Waldschmidt, Wiesbaden, 1980 (VOHID Bd.X, 4).

(This research is supported in part by a Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) from JSPS)

[Keywords] *Karmavibhaṅga*, Nepalese manuscript, NGMPP