

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
[= ARIB], vol. IX March 2006*

Noriyuki KUDO

Brief Communication: A notebook transcribing the manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*
prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman at the request of Sylvain Lévi

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

Brief Communication:

A notebook transcribing manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* formerly belonging to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman

Before the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project (= NGMPP) was launched, the collection of Hemraj Sharman (1878-1953), the Raj Guru of Nepal, has already been incorporated into the National Archives of Nepal as the fifth series.¹ This collection was sold by his family after his death to the Nepal government of the time for Rs. 300,000.² The Nepal government decided to house his collection in the National Library (or Nepal Rashtriya Pustakalaya); later the government aggregated all the manuscripts kept in governmental institutions such as the National Library, the National Museum, and the Bir Library (or Durbar Library) into the National Archives of Nepal.

I am grateful to Diwakar Acharya who kindly informed me of the fact that in the materials filmed by the NGMPP several manuscripts of the *Karmavibhaṅga* and related historical documents are now available in the form of microfilm.³ Among them, the transcriptions in a western style notebook, probably prepared or supervised by Hemraj Sharman at the request of Sylvain Lévi in 1922, are included.⁴

The notebooks, which formerly belonged to Hemraj Sharman's private collection, are invaluable witness of Lévi's editorial procedure.⁵ In Lévi's edition, I could find many instances that Lévi's reading and his notes concerning the variant readings from the manuscripts differ from those of genuine manuscripts; putting this and his introduction together, I had to conclude that the transcriptions he used for his edition were not a faithful text but one which might have been affected by partial Sanskritization, namely that a scribal or wrong reading was corrected to normal Sanskrit expression/wording. It was, however, mere speculation at that time because we could not know how far this

¹ I am thankful to Diwakar Acharya who kindly gave me this information. The description in this paragraph is mainly based on his information and on Garzilli 2001, "A Sanskrit Letter Written by Sylvain Lévi in 1923 to Hemaraja Śarmā along with Hitherto Unknown Bibliographical Notes," in: *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* XII, pp. 115-150, especially pp. 119-120.

² Garzilli *op. cit.*, p. 119 and n. 14.

³ There are two original Sanskrit manuscripts. One is the first three folios of manuscript B used by Sylvain Lévi and myself in our respective editions; the other is a newly identified paper manuscript in Newārī script. As to the former, I would like to request readers to refer our paper published in this issue (Diwakar Acharya and Kudo, pp. 33-42); for the latter see another paper in this issue (pp. 43-60).

⁴ We cannot know who made this transcription: Hemraj Sharman himself or someone who worked with him? According to Diwakar Acharya, the transcription of MS[A] bears No. 5-265; on microfilm, B94/3 and that of MS[B] bears No. 5-263; on microfilm, A109/9.

⁵ S. Lévi 1932: *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux. Probably the same situation might have happened when Lévi published the *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* in 1925, of which the Nepalese manuscripts were also found by Hemraj Sharman. At present we can see the facsimile edition of the original Sanskrit manuscripts along with the transcriptions in a western notebook: *Three Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript: the Trisvabhāvanirdeśa, the Viṃśatikā with its Vṛtti, and the Triṃśikā with Sthiramati's commentary*, ed. by K. Mimaki, M. Tachikawa and A. Yuyama (Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum I), Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1989, especially Mss H and I. See also Garzilli *op. cit.*, pp. 121-22.

kind of Sanskritization was introduced into the transcriptions.

Now we have two different materials of the manuscripts: one is the original manuscripts and the other is the transcriptions of them. Comparing each of them *verbatim ad literatim*, we can see that most of the variant readings recorded by Lévi were introduced by the copyist in the process of the transcriptions prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman.

Here, due to the limit of time, I only report on the transcription of MS[B]. According to NGMPP index card, the size of this notebook is 16.5 x 20.5 cm. The text is written only on the right pages, on 42 pages of 20 lines each. This notebook was produced or distributed by a company called “Naran Chandra Pal & Bros., Calcutta”; on the book cover there is a trade name “EMPIRE EXERCISE BOOK” and portraits of Queen Victoria and Albert; between the two portraits the date “1923” is printed.⁶ On the top of the first page of the transcription a succinct memorandum is written by the one who transcribed: “*ādītas tṛtīyapatraparyantaṃ nāsti !*” (“There is no folio from the beginning to the third”). It is certain that at the time when Hemraj Sharman or someone who engaged in preparing this transcription he was not aware of the existence of the first three folios which also belonged to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman.

In the following, romanization of the transcription of fourth folio is given line by line, corresponding to Lévi 1932: 28.9–29.28 = Kudo 2004: 19.1–25.10⁷: wherever this transcription differs from the reading of actual manuscript I put letter(s) in bold italics and give the difference under each line; some letters are underlined in this notebook itself probably for indicating an insertion or correction, which is written in the margin of the notebook.

e.x. *ñjaro* goṇikāstṛtāt

MS: kku → ñja

[meaning]: *ñja*. In MS it is written as *kku* but transcribed as *ñja*.

The sigla “x” indicates that letter(s) in bold italics are actually absent in the manuscript. In general, a portion where a line is broken is left open or marked by a dot in this notebook.

Romanized text of the transcript of MS[B].

p. 1 (right page)

ādītas tṛtīyapatraparyantaṃ nāsti | śrīḥ

karmavibhaṅgaḥ ||

1 4A]⁸ ⁹tadupadarśaya | atha śāṅkhaku

2 *ñjaro* goṇikāstṛtāt paryaṅkāḍ avatīrya yenānyasta¹⁰mapurāṇavāsagr

MS: kku → ñja¹¹

⁶ This indicates that preparation of the transcription of MS[B] was done at least from 1923 onwards.

⁷ N. Kudo 2004: *The Karnavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. (BPPB VII), Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism.

⁸ Folio numbers and sides (A or B) are written in arabic numerals and roman script.

⁹ Before this, a space is left open.

¹⁰ On the right margin, “ta” is found.

¹¹ I have already pointed out that the word *kuñjara* in Lévi 1932 was most probably a mistranscription of

- 3 *ham* tenopasan¹²krānta upasaṃkramya catura paryaṅkapādukāt pāda¹²
MS: han → haṃ; saṃ → saṅ; da → du
- 4 tamadhyāṅ ca mukhatuṅḍakeno(pa)jighra<<ti>> yatih yatah
5 śuko mānavas taudeyaputro kṛtākṛtasya hiramṇyasuvarṇasya catu
MS: ṇa → na; ra → raṃ; rṇṇa → rṇa
- 6 ro lohisaṃghātān adhigatavān madhyāc ca sauva . . .¹³ kamaṅḍalum* |
MS: ca → c ca; x → m*
- 7 atha śuko mā(na)vas taudeyaputras tatsuvarṇaṃ gopayitvā hr
MS: ṇa → (ṇa); nsu → t su; rṇṇa → rṇaṃ
- 8 ṣṭaṣṭodagrapṛitisaumanasya jāto¹⁴ śrāvastyā niṣkramya yena bhaga
9 vāms tenopasan¹⁵krāntas tena khalu samaye . . . vān¹⁵ anekasatāyāṃ
MS: saṃ → saṅ; sa → śa
- 10 bhikṣuparṣadi purastān niṣaṅḅo dharmam deśayati | adrākṣic chukaṃ mā
MS: rṇṇo → ṇṇo; rma → rmaṃ
- 11 ṇavaṃ taudeyaputraṃ dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūṅāṃ āmantra
MS: x → ṇ; x → r
- 12 yate sma | paśyatha yū . . . kṣavaḥ¹⁶ śukaṃ māṇavaṃ taudeyaputraṃ dūrata e
MS: x → kṣa; n mā → ṃ mā
- 13 vāgacchantam evam bhagavan* saccec chuko mānavas taudeyaputro smi
MS: m bha → ṃ bha
- 14 n samaye kālam kuryād yathā bhallo nikṣipta¹⁷
- 15 deveṣūpapadyeta | tathā hy anena mamāntike cittam prasāditam citta
MS: nte → ta |; m pra → ṃ pra
- 16 prasādanā heto bhikṣavaḥ¹⁸ | evam ihaike satvāḥ kāyasya bhedāt su
MS: n su → t su
- 17 gatau svargalo¹⁹
- 18 4B) tasyām velāyāṃ gāthām bhāṣate |²⁰“prasannacittam dṛṣṭvaiva e
MS: m → ṃ; m → ṇ; x → ṃ
- 19 kadyam iha pudgalam* | etam arthaṃ vyākārṣic chāstā bhi<<kṣu>>gaṅānti

kukkura, see Kudo et al 1999“*Mahākarmavibhaṅga* and *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (1): Two Original Manuscripts preserved in National Archives of Nepal,” [with S. KARASUUMA and T. FUKITA] in: *ARIRIAB II* [in Japanese], pp. 93-128, esp. 98-99 and Kudo 2004: 343, s.v. *Śaṅkhakuṅjara*.

¹² A space is marked by this type of dot. MS[B]: *pādana*(4r.2) + + + + + .. *khita*{*ma*}*dhyāṅ*.

¹³ MS[B]: *sauva*(4r.3) + + ..

¹⁴ On the right margin, “*yo | tab*” is found.

¹⁵ MS[B]: *tena khalu samaye*(4r.4) + + + *vān*.

¹⁶ MS[B]: *yū*(4r.5) + + + *vaḥ*.

¹⁷ MS[B]: *nikṣip*.. .. *ṃ* *s. g. [tau] sva*(4r.6) + + + [nt]e.

¹⁸ On the right margin, “*r bhi*” is found.

¹⁹ MS[B]: *svargalo* .[e] + + + + + + + + + (4v.1) + + + *s tasyām*. As those missing akṣaras are not indicated in this notebook, Lévi gives a note: “B om. athā ...” (Lévi 1932: 29, fn. 4).

²⁰ A double quotation mark is given in this notebook.

MS: x → m*

20 ke | idānī<<ṃ>> kālaṃ kurvīta māṇavaḥ | upapa²¹

MS: x → ṃ; ṅ → ṃ

p. 3

1 dūritam nikṣipta evam eva tathāgate | cittaprasādanā heto satvā gaccha
2 nti saṅgatiṃ*²² | | atha *śuko māṇava*s taudeyaputro bhagavāṃs tenopasaṅkrā

MS: su → śu; māvaṇa → māṇa; saṃ → saṅ

3 nta upasaṅkra²² saṃmukhaṃ dānī²³ saṃrañjanī vividhāṃ

MS: sa → saṃ; saṃ → saṃ; ja → ṅja

4 *vyāsisāryaikānte niṣaṃmah* | ekāntaniṣaṃmaṃ *śuka*m māṇavaṃ taude

MS: kathāṃ vya → vya; ryo → ryai; ṛṇṇa → ṇṇa; su → śu; vam → vaṃ

5 yaputraṃ bhavān idam avocat*, kaccin māṇava tat tathaiva yathā mayā śaṅkha

MS: bhagavān → bhavān; t* mā → n mā

6 kuṅjaro vyā²⁴ bho gautama tat tathaiva,²⁵ yathā bhagavatā gautamena śa

MS: kku → ṅja; bhavatā → bhagavatā

7 ṅkhakuṅjaro vyākṛtaḥ | anyad api tāvad vyaṃ bhagavantaṃ gautamaṃ pṛcchema
ka

MS: kku → ṅja; m bha → ṃ bha

8 ṅcid eva pradeśaṃ saced avakāśaṃ kuryāt praśnasya vyākaraṇa²⁶ yadyad eva

MS: sna → śna; .. + → raṇa

9 kāṅkṣasi | ko bho gautama ko hetuḥ kaḥ pratyayo yenehaike satvā alpā

MS: kām → kāṅ; ka → kaḥ

10 yuṣo pi dīrghāyuṣo pi bahvābādḥā §²⁷ api § alpābādḥā § api § du11 rvarṇā § api suvarṇā api²⁸ maheśākhyā api nīcaku

MS: ṛṇṇā → ṛṇṇā; + → pi; .. → ma

12 līnā api § uccakulīnā api anādeyavākyaḥ api āde

MS: nā-m → nā

13 yavākyaḥ api § alpabhogā api mahābhogā § api duṣprajñā § a

14 pi mahāprajñā § api ka(5A) [rest is omitted]

Noriyuki KUDO

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

²¹ The text ends in the middle. MS[B]: *upa*[p]. + + + + + + + + + + (4r.2) + + + *dūritam*.²² MS[B]4v.2: *apasakr*. .. + + + + .[ā]rdba.²³ MS[B]: (4r.3) + + .. *nī*.²⁴ Before this, a space is left open. MS[B]: *vyā*(4r.4) + + .. *bho*.²⁵ This comma is written as it is.²⁶ MS[B]: *vyā*[ka] .. (4v.5) + + + + + ..²⁷ This symbol is given as it is.²⁸ Before this, a space is left open. MS[B]: *a*(4v.6) + + + + + .. *beśākhyā*.