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§ 1. The editors of the Indo-Iranian Journal have rendered an important service to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit studies by reprinting, as Indo-Iranian Reprints, V (1960), E. Obermiller's edition of this text, which originally appeared as Vol. 29 of Bibliotheca Buddhica (Leningrad, 1937). Copies of this work are so hard to find that the reprint had to be made from a microfilm. It is noted with regret that this made the reproduction "not come out as clearly as in the preceding volumes of this series". This seems rather an understatement. Many letters can hardly be interpreted at all, at least in the copy sent to this writer. Subscript and superscript signs, particularly the signs for $u$ and $r$ under consonants, are often missing altogether, and not a few consonant sigts are practically illegible. The "Sanskrit-Tibetan-English" Index, by Edward Conze, is helpful. But unfortunately it is far from complete; and also it appears to be much less than accurate in quoting the actual forms found in the text. To cite a single instance, the Index quotes sprsa(ya)ti (Skt. sprsiati), without indication that any hybrid form occurs. Yet twice at least, in 1.10 d spuśati, and in 7.1 d spuśetu, O.'s text seems to have spus', with MIndic $u$ for $r$ (as in Pali phusati). This is a very important form; it belongs in § 3.92 of my BHS Grammar. In various other occurrences of the same verb the reprint shows spass- (e.g. 3.6b), but since Conze's Index recognizes only sprs $s$-, and since it is certain that some $u$ and $r$-vowel signs were lost in the reproduction, we cannot know whether the true reading for what appears as spa-was spr-, spur, or spa- (the latter being also a conceivable MIndic reflex of spr-). This is not the only case in which the Index fails to reproduce the text accurately; see e.g. on nidistsa and dudharsu (below, § 10).
§ 2. Conze also quotes many readings from an old Calcutta ms., called C. Some of these, considered "clear and unmistabakle corrections of O.'s text", are cited on pp. 127-8 of the reprint. Many others are listed in an article in I.I.J., IV (1960), pp. 37-58. It would have been
more convenient for users of the text if the C readings recorded at least in the two separate lists on pp. 39-41 and 41-56 of this article had been incorporated in a single list with that on pp. 127-8 of the text-reprint, which (as Conze clearly indicates) by no means exhausts the superior readings found in C ; and conversely, some variants of C on $\mathrm{pp} .127-8$ are not the "clear and unmistakable corrections of O.'s text" which he considers them, but on the contrary corruptions. Conze forces a serious student of the text to look in at least three different lists in two different publications in order to approach a sound critical edition of the text.
§ 3. Having taken this trouble, I must say I found it rewarding. The Rgs. (Conze's abbreviation) is a very interesting and important contribution to BHS, which I wish I had been able to use in my Grammar and Dictionary. Its chief value, to be sure, lies in confirmations of my results. It contains not many words, and very few grammatical forms, which I failed to find in the works I used. Still, there are some of both categories; I shall list below, $\S 14 \mathrm{ff}$., the most interesting and important. And some of the forms for which my documentation was scanty find welcome reinforcement here.
§ 4. Perhaps the text's most important general contribution is its very striking confirmation of my analysis of BHS meter and its relation to phonology and orthography ("Meter, Phonology, and Orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit", J.A.O.S., 66 (1946), pp. 197-206; abbreviated "Meter"). Some persons, intelligent but inexperienced in this field, have, I know, found it hard to believe my statements about the seemingly arbitrary way in which BHS versifiers substitute short syllables for long and vice versa, to fit the meter. If they read this text, it should convince them.
§ 5. All of the 301 stanzas of Rgs. are in what Obermiller called "irregular" vasantatilakā meter. They would be very irregular if they were written in standard Skt., but one who understands BHS meter (which of course could not be expected of Obermiller in 1937) will not find them irregular. Only a few - relatively very few (see § 30) - emendations are needed in the text as printed to make the meter perfect, as BHS meter. The ms. C, by the way, often provides the needed "emendations"; others are immediately suggested by the habits of this text, as printed, and/or of other BHS metrical texts, in situations precisely parallel to those which call for emendation.
§6. Obermiller himself notes the "constant substitution of long vowels for short ones and the reverse metri causa". Indeed, there is surely not a single stanza, hardly even a päda or quarter-stanza, which does not illustrate this fact.
§7. But that is by no means all. Single consonants may be doubled, and double ones simplified, for the same reason. Of the first, daśad-disí 12.1 c "in the ten directions", is an example found very often elsewhere ("Meter", $\S \S 25,62$ ). In the next verse, 12.2a, O.'s text has daśadiśi, but ms . C daśaddiśi, as required by meter, and this is rightly adopted in Conze's Index.
§8. As to the simplification of double consonants, O . barely called attention to it, on p. 10 note 2 , where he noted that in 1.9 d anupäda- is "metri causa for anutpäda-". He did not think of $t p$ - as a "double consonant", because in his day it was not yet known that the language of BHS verses cannot be understood except as based on a MIndic dialect, only partially and imperfectly Sanskritized (and much more Sanskritic in writing than in actual pronunciation). Most strikingly, at the beginning of any word, only a single consonant could be pronounced, and hence a short vowel at the end of a word preceding a Skt. initial consonant cluster constitutes a short syllable; if a long is required, the syllable must be lengthened m.c. ("Meter", $\S(15,39-47$ ). This is not infrequently recognized in the orthography, as in ti- $=$ tri- Rgs. 6.5 c ; khipitva (ksi-) 7.6d; dïpa (so ms. C, text dvīpa) 15.4 c ; tamba (ms. C; O stamba) 19.3a; ganthi ( $\mathrm{gra}{ }^{\circ}$ ) 22.5 d . Much more commonly, the orthography is sanskritized as regards the consonantal initial, but the treatment of a preceding vowel proves the metrical values. In a posterior member of a compound, this simplification is optional or variant; but noun compounds most commonly follow the practice of independent words.
§ 9. Now, Obermillet was right in recognizing anupäda as metri causa, for the word which in Skt. would be an-utpäda; but it is really the MIndic (cf. Pali uppäda) assimilated consonant that was simplified. It is the opposite, or converse, of daśad-disí, above, for daśa-disí. More than a dozen times the noun upäda, its cpds., and the verb upädayati, are so written as meter demands, in Rgs.; 1.9d; 10d; 24b; 25a; 26c (anupäd'upädu, "non-production and production"); 27 b (printed sarveṣu pädu, understand sarves’'upädu); 2.12c; 5.2c; 6.3a (read citt'upädo); 19.8d; $20.1 \mathrm{~b} ; 22.8 \mathrm{~b} ; 30.1 \mathrm{c}$. In all these, even the writing accords with the meter, showing $-p$ - for $-t p$ - (really, $-p p-$ ). When, therefore, we find in 11.7 b a writing utpādayisyanti, but meter requires a short first syllable, who will doubt that the Index is right in bracketing the $t$ ? The true form, as Conze saw, began upäda ${ }^{\circ}$. In 28.7a, text -samutpädu, without v.1., not recorded in Index, meter requires samup ${ }^{\circ}$ by emendation. Unfortunately Conze's Index makes false (unmetrical) emendations of 1.23 b pratiupanna to pratiutpanna, and of 6.3 cittupāda (text cittap ${ }^{\circ}$ ) to cittutpäda.
$\S$ 10. There is a plenty of other cases of noun and verb cpds. in which the orthography accords with meter in simplifying a (MIndic) double consonant ( $=$ a Skt. consonant cluster). Regrettably Conze does not always show the perceptivity which he did in most of the upäd-group of words. In $12.8 \mathrm{~d}, 9 \mathrm{c}$, and 22.2 b , O.'s text has nidisṭa, metrically correct, for (Pali nidd-,) Skt. nird ${ }^{\circ}$. In the two last cases, ms. C has the false and unmetrical Sktization nirdișta, which Conze adopts, pp. 46, 50 of I.I.J., and Index; his Index does not even record nidișta. Again, in 20.2b and 27.3b, O.'s text dudharsu; ms. C, unmetrically, sanskritizes to durdharsu, which is the only form of the word in Conze's Index. Other cases will be found below.
§ 11. There are actually a few hybrid forms which, orthographically, have sanskritized one part of a word but left another part MIndic, and where meter is not even involved. So the gerund of labh appears as labdhä 29.7 b , and labdhäna $20.15 \mathrm{~b}, 16 \mathrm{~b}$, and 29.8 b . This enables me to correct my treatment of the form labdhä in Gr. § 35.52. This form occurs seven times in the Mahāvastu, where Senart always emended to labdhvā. But, as I now see, Senart was wrong. It (and now labdhäna) must be taken as (orthographically) semi- sanskritized representatives of the Pali laddhä(na); see Geiger, 209. Doubtless the real (original) pronunciation was precisely as in Pali; but since meter is not involved, we cannot with assurance change the orthography; to do that would be over-bold; who can know at what point in BHS tradition any particular sanskritization may have been introduced?
§ 12. The quantitative scheme of each line of Rgs. is $\cup \cup-\cup-\cup \cup \cup$ $-v \cup-v-X$. This is just as in the Skt. vasantatilakā, except that for the initial long syllable two shorts may be, and very commonly are, substituted. But, somewhat curiously, no other long syllable is ever replaced by two shorts. It is also surprising that the replacement of two shorts by a long hardly occurs with certainty. ${ }^{1}$ (See "Meter", $\S \S 10,36$ ).

[^0]§13. It should also be added that any pāda may end in a vowel which is either long or short (as in Skt.; "Meter", § 48), but that, nevertheless, the final vowel of a pāda, if naturally short, is rather often lengthened, tho by no means always. E.g. 3d person presents, 1.25a upädayātī; 10.5c bhontī; 15.5a samnahantī; 19.2 c anupräpunātī, etc. But much more often such vowels are left short at the end of a pāda (e.g. bhonti 17.2c). I have noted the same phenomenon in the verses of some other BHS texts, and am doubtful about its significance. There seem to be too many cases of pāda-final lengthened vowels to be ignored or emended; but also far too many vowels left short in that position.

## ADDITIONS TO EDGERTON'S BHS GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY

§ 14. Coming to forms that should be added to my BHS Grammar and Dictionary (I shall abbreviate "Gr." and "Dict."), one was noted in Obermiller's Introduction: raha for MIndic (Pali) araha(nt). It occurs in Pali in noun compounds after $i$, only for the adjective araha, q.v. in CPD. Similar forms are recorded in Gr., $\S \S 4.1-11$. All such forms seem to have started as cases of loss of initial $a$ (and other vowels) by MIndic sampdhi after final vowels. But, as my Gr. shows (l.c.), the aphetic forms came to be used also after anusvāra, rarely after other consonants, and sometimes after pause (at the beginning of a line of verse). They most commonly concern "light words" ( $p i$ for api, etc.; many cases in Rgs.). In Rgs., raha occurs after a preceding final $a 31.2 \mathrm{a} ; 31.5 \mathrm{~b}$; after $i, 30.12 \mathrm{c}$; after $\bar{t}, 23.2 \mathrm{c}$; after $u, 18.4 \mathrm{~b}$ (ms. C); after anusvāra, 30.9 c (ms. C); initial in line, $21.5 \mathrm{~b} ; 29.9 \mathrm{~b}, 10 \mathrm{c}$. Similar is ranya for aranya, recorded (after $i$ ) in Gr., § 4.11; also now in Rgs. 21.4b (initial in line) and 7c (after $i$ ).
§ 15. Obermiller, p. 4, refers to the dvandva raha-pratyaya in which pratyaya $=$ pratyekabuddha. My Dict. records this (chiefly as epithet of buddha or jina), and the Dict. gives (from texts) an explanation of the (at first sight strange-seeming) form. However, the form (raha-)pratya$y a ̄ n a$, "vehicle(s) of arhats and pratyekabuddhas", Rgs. 21.5b; 29.9b, 10 c , has not been met with before. It is evidently a haplological form, for pratyaya-yāna. In 31.2 a pratyayana alone is probably the same haplological form (rather than gen. pl. of pratyaya); it is followed by raha-bodhi; both words depend on sprhā (possibly in one long cpd.; or as

[^1]stem-forms used as oblique cases, here gen. or loc.; Gr., §§ 8.3 ff ., 10.2).
$\S$ 16. Endingless stem-forms used as oblique cases, especially in $a$-stems (Gr., §§ 8.3-11), are frequent. A particularly clear case of a locative (Gr., §8.11) is vïñãana 2.1c; the parallel nouns are all locs.; note rūpasmi, vedanäyām, cetanãyãm, dharmatāyām. Also of $i$-stems (Gr., §§ 10.2, 65-68): 2.2d pratyekabhūmi, loc. (parallel to arahantabhūmau, buddhabhūmau).
§ 17. In 1.2 d tasyänubhävaśriyasā (so Index) we apparently have an extension of s'ri- in stem-final -as-, unrecorded previously. The stems $s$ srī and strī show other curious extensions in BHS (Gr., §§ 10.4-6). The masc. stem śriya- reminds us that in BHS, as in Pali, $a$-stems show an instr. sg. in -asā (Gr., § 8.41) not rarely. The form śriyasä may be analogical to tejasä specifically; tejas is often closely associated with śrī.
$\S 18$. Twice, in 1.2 c and 5.7 a , occurs a stem printed, and recorded in the Index, as Nopatapta, and identified correctly with the lake Anavatapta (BHS, see Dict.), Pali Anotatta or Anavat ${ }^{\circ}$. The word in Rgs. should be spelled Anopatapta; it occurs both times after a final $-a$; loss of one of the two $a$ 's is normal BHS samdhi. This form is however new. It is evidently a modification of the regular BHS and Pali form, doubtless analogically influenced by Pali and BHS anopa, variant of Skt. (also BHS) and Pali anūpa, "marsh".
§ 19. In 4.4 c parighetu-kämo "wanting to acquire" (so Tib.) contains a previously unknown Prakritic infinitive, -ghetum, to be connected with Māhārāș̣̦ī ghe-ūna, cf. AMg. -ghettūna; Pischel, 586. Add to "Miscellaneous forms" of root grah- (4), Gr., p. 211a.
§ 20. In 12.6 c niśrya is an extraordinary gerund form, to ni-śri-, heretofore unrecorded, and for which I know no exact parallel. It can scarcely have existed in the original MIndic language, in precisely this form ("Meter", § 14). Yet the meter requires just two syllables ( $-\cup$ ). The ms. C reads here niśritya, an obvious secondary sanskritization which spoils the meter. But in the next verse, 7a, where O.'s text reads niśrita, ms . Chas the same niśrya; other changes in the line make both readings metrically correct, but it can hardly be doubted that niśrya, $-\cup$, is to be read in both vss 6 and 7, whatever the original pronunciation may have been. The closest parallel I know is the gerund paśya, Gr., § 35.16, and I would add niśrya to that section. What I called the "telescoping" (haplology) in paśya (ger. to paśya-ti) may be said to occur here too, if we start with the present niśraya-ti; but niśreti is also BHS, and may perhaps better be taken as the base for niśrya. The (perhaps seemingly obvious) emendation niśriya is metrically impossible; niśritya is even worse.
§21. Vibhāvanā 1.7 b 'abolition, or deprivation", and vibhāva(ya)ti 7.3 b "abolishes, does away" ( ${ }^{\circ}$ va-mäna, "depriving oneself"); Dict. has only ppp. vibhāvita. Both noun and verb occur also in Suvikrāntavikrämipariprcchā (ed. R. Hikata, 1958), 73.1 and 88.13 ff. respectively.
§ 22. gacchati saṃkhya loke 7.3c, "becomes talked about, is spoken of"; so Pali saṃkham gacchati; add saṃkhyä in this use, Dict., 547a.
§ 23. cūdi $(-b a d d h a ̈) ~ 4.1 \mathrm{c}=c u ̄ d i k a \bar{a}-b a^{\circ}$ Dict.; no cūdi recorded. Similarly, väli 27.2a, "sand" = BHS and Pali välikã (Skt. välukā); no väli recorded. Meter correct in text both times. Must we assume these two forms as primary words, underlying the two familiar suffixal $k \bar{a}-$ formations? The only apparent alternative would be that the syllable $k \vec{a}$ was dropped (m.c.? cf. Gr., § 3.118), which seems to me less likely.
$\S 24$. vyusthito (Index vyusṭhito) 1.11 c ; the regular Skt. vyutthito would be as good metrically. False hyper-sanskritism?
$\S 25$. In 8.3 c the first word looks like jāniva, which I cannot interpret (not even by reading $c a$ or tra for $v a$ ). Read jāti (loc., Gr., § 10.68?) (i) va? - In 3d $a k \bar{a} s a$, misprint for $\tilde{a}^{\circ}$.
§ 26. ksipişyati 7.6c; no v.1.; unrecorded. Perhaps a mere error or misprint for $k s i p i s^{\circ}$; otherwise, analogous to some future in -issya-(Gr., $\S \S 31.3 \mathrm{ff}$.).
$\S 27$. chinatī 32.1 b ; interesting as the first present form of this stem discovered; add to Gr., § 28.12, and delete * from china-ti; Gr., p. 212b, s.v. chid- (2).
§ 28. anukarsin 21.4c, "exalting", in ätmänukarṣi para-pamsayi. No derivative of $a n u-k r s$ has been noted anywhere in this meaning; add in Dict. (also add pamsayin).
§ 29. A few other forms, including some not strictly new in principle but not individually recorded in Gr. or Dict., may be grouped together. The list might be extended: sanaddha, m.c. for samna ${ }^{\circ}$ (Gr., § 2.89), 1.18c and 15.5 b . - bhaviyām, 1 sg. opt., 2.4 b , add to Gr., § 29.34. - präpunetum 2.4c (and spusetu, § 1 above), add to Gr., § 36.8. - otäru (Pali otãra) 3.1d, add to avatāra in Dict. - Add to Gr., § 8.25: Nom. sg. i, m.c. for $e$, in sarvi Rgs. 4.2c (with naro), and read or understand in 4.3 c sprhānti, i.e. sprhä plus ante for antah "there is an end of desire" (karandakasmim, "for the box"). - paricārika "service" 7.5 b (read ${ }^{\circ} k \bar{a} y a$, dat.) and 7.6a ${ }^{\circ} k a ̈ y a ̄ m, ~ a d d ~ i n ~ D i c t . ~-~ a n u b u d h(i s y) a t i, ~ 7.5 d, ~ a d d ~ t o ~ G r ., ~ § ~ 28.30 . ~-~ k a r i-~$ yäti $13.1 \mathrm{~b}, 3 \mathrm{sg}$. opt.; Gr., § 29.34 and (siyäti) §§ 29.40, 41. - sämudriya, "sea-going", fem. ${ }^{\circ} y \bar{a}$, and praluptaka, fem. ${ }^{\circ} i k a \bar{a}$, "wrecked", 14.2a; both seem unrecorded previously; add in Dict. - niryäyanăya 16.6a, inf. to niryāyati $=$ niryāti; add Gr., p. 226b s.v. yā (2). - duvi- 22.2d, for $d v i-$;
add Gr., § 19.3. (See below § 40.) - vyodäna, and anopalabdhih (m.c.), 22.7 b , add in Dict. s. vv. vyavadäna and anupa. - grhamänu, 22.13c, add Gr., p. 211a s.v. grah (4), present. - aśru "cloud", in 23.1a sūryu vigatäśrumaricimälä; not recorded in this meaning (I hesitate to attribute to the author the bold and original poetic conceit that clouds are "tears" of the sun!). - 24.6 c , read samparäti with C, m.c. for samparati (Pali id.; add in Dict.), "restrains himself" (āyati, "in the future", § 40 below). täntaka, 27.2c; spellings yantaka, yāntaka, occur sporadically for yattaka, $y a ̈ t t a k a$ in my Dict. Perhaps, however, $t t$ should be read for $n t$ in all such cases. - manyati "is conceited" (so Pali mañnati) 31.6b; add in Dict. anapeksaka 31.9b, not in Pali or Skt.; add in Dict. - hirana "gold" 31.10c; Skt. Lex.; here may be m.c. for hiranya (Pali hirañña); add in Dict. - matsariya (so ms. C) $31.10 \mathrm{~d}=$ Skt. mātsarya, Pali macchariya; add in Dict. - dadayanti 31.15b, to dadati; add to Gr., §38.21. - In 31.13b yäv'(ad) asti sattva tribhave samanvāharitvä, read (or pronounce) m.c. samanäharitvā (for Pali samannā${ }^{\circ}$ ); Gr., § 2.89. But in 12.1d, ima prajñapäramita mātra (read mātu with ms. C and Conze) samanvāharanti, there must be a deeper corruption concealed in the last word; to read samanä ${ }^{\circ}$ would still be metrically overlong by one short syllable. One can only conjecture, boldly and at present without confidence. It may be that the original had samarcayanti "they honor", which would fit meter and sense. A later copyist might have substituted the very common BHS (and Pali) samanvähar ${ }^{\circ}$, "fix the mind on", for samarc ${ }^{\circ}$, which is not recorded in Pali, though known in Sanskrit.

## EMENDATIONS REQUIRED BY METER

§ 30. Before listing individual instances of emendations required by meter, it will be convenient to mention together, in groups, several classes of such cases which occur frequently.

Rgs. contains 301 vasantatilakā stanzas, or 1204 lines of $14-15$ syllables each (since each line may begin with one long or two shorts). Since the last syllable is anceps, there are in each line 13-14 syllables subject to strict metrical determination, a total of 15,652 to 16,856 syllables. In almost every line there is at least one syllable which is altered in pronunciation metri causa; in many lines there are several such. By a moderate estimate, I believe there must be fully 2000 such individual cases of m.c. lengthening or shortening; probably more. The vast majority present the needed adjustment in the writing. I count here some cases
included in $\S 40$ below, where either O . or ms . C has the proper metrical orthography, so that no emendation is needed. I also make one other reservation. The writing of a consonant cluster at the beginning of a word, as in Sanskrit, is not counted here as a case requiring emendation, simply because it is a standard, nearly universal convention, tho we have seen ( $\S 8$ above) that simplification occurs fairly often in accord with the pronunciation that is obviously required; no syllable is ever long if it contains a short final vowel before a written consonant cluster, except by m.c. lengthening. Leaving such cases aside, only $60-70$ cases require emendation m.c. Of these, some twenty concern future forms (§ 38 ), a rather special case where Sanskritizing orthographic convention has prevailed in a common morphological category. The rest are slight alterations of types familiar in mss. and texts of BHS verses, including those of Rgs. itself. I recall only two cases, in the whole work, where I feel so deep a corruption has occurred that any correction must, for the present, be speculative (see § 12, note 1, end, and § 29 , end).
$\S 31$. We have already mentioned in $\S 9$ the many cases in which the verb utpädayati and its noun derivatives have to be pronounced upād ${ }^{\circ}$, and we saw that in this case even the written text almost always has $u p \bar{a} d^{\circ}$ when it fits the meter. The few exceptions where emendation is needed were listed there. Another simplification of (Skt.) $t p-$ to $-p$ occurs in pacupanna (for Pali paccuppanna), metrically required in 16.2 b , though the text sanskritizes the orthography to pratyutpanna. ${ }^{2}$
$\S 32$. We saw in $\S 6$ that substitutions of long vowels for short and vice versa, m.c., are recorded constantly. I have noted the following few exceptions which require emendation. First, final vowels: 1.5 a prajñā-, read prajña-; and 1.9 a samjñā, read samjña (both of these are very common, the quantity of the $a$ almost invariably according in writing with the meter); samjña $\bar{a}$ for (m.c.) ${ }^{\circ} a$ also $1.25 \mathrm{a} ; 6.4 \mathrm{~b}$ saiks $a$, read ${ }^{\circ} \bar{a} ; 10.9 \mathrm{~d}$ nirvrti, read ${ }^{\circ} t \tilde{i} ; 16.4 \mathrm{~b}$ pañca, read pañcã or pañcam or pañco, see "Meter", $\S \S 24-26,53 \mathrm{ff}$; note that $o$ m.c. for final a (co for ca etc., "Meter", $\S \S 54-57$ ) is quite common in Rgs., tho I believe never recorded in Index; 20.6 b jagati, read ${ }^{\circ} t \bar{i} ; 20.13 \mathrm{~d} c a$, read $c o$ or $c \bar{a}$.
§33. In the middle or beginning of words, the same changes are quite familiar, if less common (cf. Gr., Chapter 3, passim). In the following

[^2]emendation is needed: 2.2a nityam (before anitya-), read nityäm or nityan ("Meter", $\S \S 19,50) ; 11.4 \mathrm{~d}$ sūtrānta, read (or pronounce) sutanta (Pali suttanta, cf. § 39 below); 25.2d nirupalambho, read nir-u$p^{\circ}$ (contrast nir-ūpalepa, properly for nir-upa ${ }^{\circ}, 18.2 \mathrm{~b}$ and 5 b ) or nirop ${ }^{\circ}$ (cf. an-opalabdhih 22.7 b for $a n-u p a^{\circ}$ ), "free from false fancy", see Dict. s.v. upalambha (Index wrongly); 29.6c arūpya-, read ärūpya (Index keeps $a r^{\circ}$, referring wrongly to 19.6); ärūpya is common in BHS (Dict.) and occurs in Rgs. 29.2 b , but may have $\bar{a}$ as vṛddhi of secondary derivation; 31.11 b bhaviṣyati, read bhavisäti (lengthening of thematic vowel m.c. is frequent here and elsewhere in BHS, Gr., $\S 27.1$; on $s$ for $s y$ see $\S 38$ below).
§ 34. Final nasalized vowels (anusvära; "Meter", $\S \S 26,63$; see also above, § 32 under $16.4 \mathrm{~b}, \S 33$ under 2.2 a ): 1.6 b , anumātra lambhonti (!so printed; ignored in Index) tasya, read anumätr' ala (m.c. for alạ̣) bhonti tasya (alam-bhavati "is a match for", with gen.); 6.8c yam prabhavo yadalaksanaṃ ca, read ya (short) -prabhaväs ca ya (short) -lakṣnāās ca (partly with C, p. 43 of Conze in IIJ, IV); 13.2a grāmaṃ, read grāma; 19.5b, read anupürva for $\mathrm{C}^{\circ} v a m\left(\mathrm{O} .^{\circ} v e\right.$ ); 25.3b, akuśalam api, read ${ }^{\circ}$ laṃ api; 32.5c buddhavamssam, read with C and meter ${ }^{\circ}$ vamśu; 5d saṃghavamśam, read ${ }^{\circ} v a m s{ }^{\circ} u$ or ${ }^{\circ} v a m s ́ a ~ m . c . ~$
§ 35. dukha and dukhita for duhkha, duhkhita (Gr., § 2.85). In this case the Rgs., as printed, never recognizes the shortening to dukh-; but other BHS texts do so, like Pali, and Rgs. meter requires dukha 1.25a; $3.5 \mathrm{~b} ; 6.2 \mathrm{~d}$; and dukhita 12.5c; 14.9a; and 20.16d.
$\S 36$. Compounds of nir, nis (Gr., § 2.86). The regular and correct nidistsa (Skt. nird ${ }^{\circ}$ ) has been noted above, § 10. I have noted only one case requiring emendation m.c.: 1.21 b nirvāpayi, read nivāp ${ }^{\circ}$.
§ 37. In Gr., § 2.7 and "Meter", § 44, it was noted that compounds of root grah in BHS give reason to believe that not only in full-grade forms orthographic $g r$ was assimilated to $g g$, but that this $g g$ was analogically carried over to the weak-grade forms (Skt. -grh-), since in verses meter regularly demands a long syllable in such forms as pari $(g) \operatorname{grh}$-, exactly as in Pali (pariggahita, ppp.), tho the BHS writing usually simplifies $g g$ to a single $g$. In Rgs. the printed text always has single $g$ in such forms ( $-g r h$-), but repeatedly uses them in positions where meter requires a long syllable before $(g) g$. They occur in $14.4 \mathrm{a}, 10 \mathrm{c} ; 15.5 \mathrm{c}$; and 29.4 c .
§38. As in the preceding paragraph, orthography has been completely sanskritized in the case of futures in -isa- for -isya-; but meter very often demands a short syllable before written -sy-. See Gr., §§ 31.26-29, especially $\S 28$ end. The forms occur: 1.25 b harisyämi ... kariṣyämi, but meter requires short both times before $s y$; and so other futures in 3.6 b ,
$6.6 \mathrm{~b}, 11.1 \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}, 11.2 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{c}, 11.4 \mathrm{~b}, 11.5 \mathrm{~d}, 11.6 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{c}, 11.7 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{~d}, 11.8 \mathrm{a}, 12.2 \mathrm{~b}$, $24.3 \mathrm{~d}, 4 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, 31.11 \mathrm{~b}$ (read bhavişäti for bhavişati, § 33 above). Twenty cases in which the same morpheme, the future infix, violates the otherwise practically inviolable metrical scheme! Can this be considered an accident?
§ 39. Miscellaneous cases of necessary, but unrecognized, simplification m.c. of two consonants (cf. especially Gr., § 2.89): 1.4a yaj jinu, read ya jinu (orthography in Rgs. frequently shows such forms as $y a$ with metrical correctness); 8.1 b sarvajña, read savajña (MIndic savva-); 11.4 d sūtränta, read sutanta (§ 33 above); 11.9 b pratyarthika, read pacatthika (Pali pacca ${ }^{\circ}$ ) ; 11.10b durläbhu, read du-1 ${ }^{\circ}$ (cf. dudharṣu, § 10 above; in 25.2b, however, Index properly keeps duśilya); 17.4d catur-dhyāna, read $c^{c a t u-d h^{\circ}}$ (cf. Gr., § 19.13); 17.5b, for anadhyosita (unmetr.) read anajhosita, m.c. for Pali (an)ajjhosita; 20.20, in b read (vä)puna for punah (sa); and in d, vā puna with C for va punas (sa); 29.1a caturbhī, read catubhï (add to Gr., § 19.18); 31.14b siraścheda, read sira-ch ${ }^{\circ}$ (ch does not "make position" in BHS; printed text Sanskritizes the MIndic stem síra).

## EDITORIAL ERRORS

§ 40. Finally, I append a list of what seem to me editorial errors, whether made by Obermiller and left uncorrected, or made by Conze. Corrections of Obermiller already made by Conze, whether in his Index, or in his lists of variants, pp. 127-8 of the Reprint, and I.I.J., IV, pp. 39-57, are of course not included here. Corrections already noted by me above will not, as a rule, be mentioned below.
1.1a upasthapitvā, clearly printed in O.; to upasthapeti (Dict., and Gr., p. 237a, s.v. sthā 9). Index to upasthayati (which is rare and doubtful, Gr., p. 236b, s.v. sthā 3).
1.7a, Index Srenika; the word is not a proper name here, but an epithet of certain non-Buddhist mendicants, Dict. s.v. (1) śrenika. abhuti; Index "has had", as if a verb. It is a noun, with $u$ m.c. for $\bar{u}$; Skt. and Pali $a$-bhūti "calamity". The Tib. renders not by 'byuñ ba (Index) but by dmigs med, "no support".
1.8a vyuparikssate, and c ${ }^{\circ} k s a m a ̄ n u$; no note, but Index (ignoring $\left.{ }^{\circ} k s a t e\right)$ vyupapariksamänu. My Dict. s.v. vyupaparikss ${ }^{\circ}$ records the haplological form vyupariks ${ }^{\circ}$, with three occurrences in verse and one in prose. The Index reading would be metrically impossible. The meaning is "investigates" (Index awkwardly).
1.10 d spuśati, Index sprśati; see above, § 1.
1.21b yaträ ruhitva, and Index cites ruhitva; combine and understand āruhitva, as in 1.22a unambiguously.
1.23 b , omit 'pi before prati- (metr.).
2.5a, ya bhāsyati (bhäsyamānāme); Conze p. 127 reads with Tib. and (doubtfully) ms. C yo srnoti, which gives the true meaning but is metrically impossible. Read ya śrnvati (3 sg.), a good BHS form (Gr., § 28.6).
2.5c nirvānato (kept in Index) adhigato; read nirvān' (nom. sg.) ato ("thence, therefore").
2.7 b närhammi ( C nārhatva), surely a misprint or misreading for närhasmi (loc., Gr., § 8.64). I have not found the Pkt. loc. ending -ammi in BHS.
2.11 b , read with C samjiña for text ${ }^{\circ} j \tilde{n} a$ (unmetr.).
2.11d päramitehu, read with $\mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ tehi (instr. in sense of loc.; Gr., $\S \$ 9.105$; 7.30 ff .).
2.13d anägatu adhvanasmin, read probably anägati (or ${ }^{\circ} t a$, loc., Gr., § 8.11).
3.2c te hī prapūrnasi ya ksetrasahasrakoṭyo. Index (as apparently Obermiller) took prapūrnasi as a verb ('would fill"), but this is quite impossible. No em. is necessary; only correction of false division. Read tehī (instr., Gr., § 21.37) prapūrna (n. pl. of ppp.) siya (= syāt, Gr., § 29.41) kse ${ }^{\circ}$.
3.3 b , text seems to print kareya-r-ananta ${ }^{\circ}$ (possible, Gr., § 29.28; $\S 4.61$ ), but since subscript $u$ is often missing (above, § 1), perhaps kareyur was intended.
3.4b yata utpatī daśabaläna vināyakānämp; utpatī is not a verb, "come forth" (Index), but m.c. for utpatti (cf. above, § 39): "whence is the origination of..."
3.6 d , prasutā, m.c. (Gr., §3.46) for prasütā, is kept in the Index, properly as regards this passage; but the other three passages there cited all read prasūtä (with correct meter), which Index ignores.
4.3b yasmi, read yasmin with C.
4.3c sprhänti, Index takes as a verb, "emit radiance!" See § 29 above for the true analysis and meaning.
4.5a pūrvaṃgamā bhavatu (C ${ }^{\circ} t i$, better) dänu dadantu prajñāa; Index "control" for pürvamgamä; it means "foremost" (Dict.), and this is what Tib. means (snon du'gro ba). It agrees with prajñāa as subject of bhavati (or ${ }^{\circ} t u$ ), as does also dadantu (Gr., §§ 18.1; 9.13).
4.6 c chäyanā, a new word; not in Index. Did Conze mean to read chāya-ta? That would seem to me a good emendation: "shade-condition" (like viśsesa-tā, same line, "differentiation").
4.6 d , also $21.5 \mathrm{c}, 29.6 \mathrm{a}$, anyatra, means "on the contrary" (Dict.). Index "all equally, but".
5.9c vinispta, kept in Index, is metrically impossible; and, strangely, the metrically correct reading would be vinihsyta, the standard Skt. form! C has instead pramuktita $(h)$ which would be acceptable.
5.9 d , separate ${ }^{\circ}$ gane siya $(=$ syãt $)$.
7.3b prajña vibhävamãnah (separate); Index "one who develops to the end"; for the true meaning see $\S 21$ above.
7.5 a , read bodhisattva varapāramiteha.
7.7 c , read vrajitvana (ger.) for ${ }^{\circ}$ tva na.
10.1d, read with C na ca dharmi, for yo eva.
10.3 b , read with C paśyayeyā (cf. Gr., § 38.21 s.v. paś-).
10.4 b , read with C śrunanāya ("who gets to hear"), inf. based on pres. stem śrunati; add to Gr., § 36.15.
10.5a, read sāgarajalaṃ vraji (cf. C, p. 45) paśyanāya (Gr., § 36.15). - 5d, read abhyās' (for 'se) ito, "near from this place".
12.5 d , read na ca with C for na pi (api follows in same line).
12.7b, read täpet' imã (dharani), and in c separate -niśrita dharmarãjo.
$12.8 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{c}$, read: rūpasy'adarśanu adarśanu vedanāye
saṃjñāy'adarśanu adarśanu cetanãye
vij̄ñāna-citta- (text cita) -manu ( = mano) -darśanu yatra nāsti...
14.3a śraddhasaṃgato (unmetr.), read with C śraddhaya (m.c. for ${ }^{\circ} y \bar{a}$ ) gato.
14.5a, read ghatake apakvi, "on an unbaked pot", and in c paripakvi, "thoroughly baked". Text apaksi, paripaksi. Index translates as I do, but keeps the text without note.
14.7 b vilayam upaiti (unmetr.), kept in Index; read with C vilayam prayäti (metr.). - Read vannijebhih.
15.1a, read with $\mathrm{C} y e .$. bodhisattvã.
15.1c, read tehi and (with C) -prayuktaih.
15.3c, separate bodhi skandha; for parāmrśeyā Index "misconstrue"; it means "adhere wickedly to" (the skandhas, as bodhi); Dict. s.v.
15.3d, deśayitavyam, read with $\mathrm{C}{ }^{\circ} v y a$, m.c. - ädikarmaka $={ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{ika}$, add in Dict.
15.6a, samudägata is wrongly quoted in Index under samanvāgata, which in fact occurs (as stated in Index) in text at 31.9a, but is there metrically impossible, as it would be in 15.6a. The two words are virtually synonyms, "provided with" or "attained to" (Dict. s. vv.); note that Tib. on these two passages is virtually identical. This being so,
it seems clear that samudägata should be read (instead of samanvägata) in 31.9 a in accord with meter, just as in 15.6 a .
15.8 b sthito grahe, unmetr.; read with X (the xylograph, Obermiller, p. 3) sthita agrahe ( = ägrahe, Gr., §§3.32-36); or (sanskritized) ägrahe. 16.3c prajā, misprint for prajñā. (Interpret yujyatu (u)pāya-.)
16.4 b avalobhaya, Conze with C avalābhuyu; neither reading fits Tib., which means "with little strength" (Index). Clearly the true reading is abalo (or abalā, but nom. sg.) bhuya ( $=b h u \bar{u} y a ̈ t$, m.c.).
16.4 c , read trāya- (for trāyas-) triṃśa-.
16.4 d , osariyi, read ${ }^{\circ}$ iya (opt., or possibly gerund); "would let itself (ätmānam) down", Dict. s.v. avaśirati (4).
16.5c, text certainly intends praṇidhïn; Index prānidhi.
16.6 b pitamätasamiñã, read as one word; "regarding (all people in the world) as father or mother".
17.1 b arañāya (liñga), gen. of arañā (Dict. s.v. araṇa 3), "freedom from depravity". Index, strangely, "of those who are secluded in Peace":
17.1d, read $\operatorname{tän}$ (or $t \bar{a} m$, acc. pl.) vyäkurū (m.c.); cf. Conze, p. 47 of I.I.J. 17.2c separate -variita vidū.
17.4b, read with C and X $v r s a b h i ̄$; see Dict., s.v. vrsabhin; not in Index.
17.6a, read with C purusestriya-. Render: "and they do not report actions of desire (so Tib., 'dod pa'i las can; Index 'plausible lies'!) of men and women".
17.6b, separate pravivikta prajña-.
18.5d, read nāstĭ for nãsti, m.c.; cf. X nästis (triloka).
19.3b, read $v \bar{a}$ with C for $v a$ (m.c.).
19.5a, read daka wtih C for udaka (m.c.).
19.6d, read arnave with C for ärnave (kept in Index).
19.8b, paśyatva, read paśyitva (not in Index; misprint?).
19.8c, read prajānamänā with C (or ${ }^{\circ} n a$ ).
20.1a prajäṃ, read prajñäṃ (misprint).
20.4 , read with C: sattvadhātau (loc.) in b, bhümi (pl.) in c, and sthitino (gen. of sthiti, "permanent abiding") for sthituno in d. Other corrections in Conze, p. 48.
20.5 b , read with C tahi (one word, "there") and ima for iha.
20.6 c , text sattväna jñānapranidhāna-baläna sevam, which is perfect meter and seems to make sense. Conze, p. 128, would read with C adhiṣthänam eva for balāna sevaṃ. This reading would be possible, if we elide initial $a$ - and read (or pronounce) dhithanam m.c. (§ 39 above), for MIndic (Pali) adhitţhāna.
20.7b, read with C caratī imạ̣̃ for caratīti (i)mäm.
20.13: in b read grhya with C, and probably upasthiheya ("would approach"), nearly with C (conjectural reading of Index is poor as to form and sense); and in d paripãti "would cause to fall down" for pariyāti.
20.14d, read with C na ca for nä, and for paśyati dharmacārī, paśyayatī (Gr., § 38.21) ca dharmān, with Tib. and nearly with C (Conze, p. 40).
20.15: in a, read vrajitvana (ger.), one word (also in 16a); in b , puna for (misprint) yuna; in d, sva- with C for sa.
20.17d na ca, read saci with C.
20.20a ${ }^{\circ} k a ̈ y \bar{a}$, read with $\mathrm{C}^{\circ} k a ̈ y o$.
21.2c for vāṃ́o (kept in Index, s.v. anusaptam!), read vaṃśo.
21.5b: for janayanti, Conze, p. 40, recommends na janti; probably he intended na jananti, which is certainly the true reading.
21.7 a so ca , read with C so ce (metr.).
21.8 b , read with C niyatāgrabodhau.
21.8 c , read with C -ariha- for -arthya-.
22.2d, duvi-kāranena; duvi for $d v i$ (above, § 29). According to Conze, p. 50, C has durvik ${ }^{\circ}$, and he actually adopts that in the Index(!!), though he translates "for a double reason"! Here, the reading dur- is not only unmetrical but nonsensical. Tib. gñis "two".
22.6 b , for 'pi pätyate (unmetr.), read with C (Conze, p. 40) visu padyate (metr.).
22.6c, (u)pagato; Index "swallowed", which I cannot understand, and which is certainly not supported by Tib. khas len $p a$, which $=$ Skt. (abhy)upa-gam-.
22.7a udgraho, Index "take notice", which makes no sense; Tib. 'dzin pa, "seizure"; "as a seizure, so impurity is declared (to be)". Add in Dict. s.v.
22.7 c , read m.c. ya for yo (C. yah) kiliśyati (for $k l i^{\circ}$, cf. saṃkileśo in a). 22.7 d , read with C bodhisattvo.
22.12d, nasitva (unmetr.), repeated in Index, glossed "when it had been lost"; read with C näsitva (metr.) "having lost it".
23.2c, for abhibhonti probably read ${ }^{\circ}$ bhoti (subject is certainly sing.; but cf. Gr., § 25.30 ); note in 23.1c text avibhonti (!) but Conze with C abhibhoti.
23.3d, for patu-dharo (unmetr.) read pattla-dhäro (metr.), "wearer of the (royal) headband". See Dict. s.v. paṭu (often confused with pattca).
23.4c, ete hi, C etarhi, read etarahi (§ 12 above, note 1).
24.2 b , prajñã, read with C prajña (metr.).
24.2c, read khagapaksina (gen.) for ${ }^{\circ}$ paksi na.
24.3a, read with C vidu for gada, and bodhisattvā.
24.3b, divide viruddhaka- (found in Pali) -rusta; Index viruddha-karusta (karustia separately listed and defined "angry")!!
24.4 c , read $k$ ṣänti-vikalāna (gen. pl.) for ${ }^{\circ} k a l a ̈ ~ n a . ~$
24.5a, O. ayu ( = ayaṃ) vyäkrtu (metr. correct); Conze, p. 128, for this with $\mathrm{C} a$-vyäkrtu (metr. impossible).
24.5 b , read cittam with C (metr.) for citta.
24.5 c , separate ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{k} s$ sanika $\mathrm{khila}{ }^{\circ}$.
24.5d, O. samnahitatavya (kept in Index!), metr. false and grammatically absurd; C omits one ta, which is an obvious dittography.
24.6 c , Index "carry out" for äyati, apparently understanding a verb, which is impossible; it is an adverb, "in the future", m.c. for ayatim; to be added s.v. in Dict. (Pali also has āyati.)
25.1c, read ubhaye with C.
25.2 b , read with C dusillyo for ${ }^{\circ} y e$ (cf. $\S 39$ above).
25.2 c , read with C ärädhit' (for ${ }^{\circ}$ tah, n. sg.) esa (or with O. es u, which could be n. sg., or also loc. pl., sc. buddhadharmesu). - Read with C ${ }^{\circ}$ dharmān.
25.3 c , read mostly as Conze with C, p. 128, but with sūryam yathä for süryam yavā (gagani gacchati); and in d with C 'ndhakāro. Render c-d: "as, when the ray-filled atmosphere moves toward the sun, darkness does not stand (remain) before it".
25.5a, separate ${ }^{\circ}$ tendriya niruddhiya ("stopping", ger. of ${ }^{\circ}$ ruddhati, Gr., § 28.19), and read with C anye.
25.5 d , read with C sarve ti $\left(=\right.$ te) pāramita ukta ta (sc. atah) saṃ $^{\circ}$.
25.6b, read with C sarvesu bhoti ... bodhisattvo. - 6 c , with C sthihatī. 6d, with C siksati-m-etam.
26.2c, anta after ${ }^{\circ}$ guñan unmetr.; read ata $(h)$; Tib. de phyir.
26.2d, Conze with C jagatī for yagatī, perhaps rightly, but cf. Gr. § 2.34.
26.4 b , read with C prāpto.
26.4 d , read with C sadrśs; note text correctly abhyāvakäsa, m.c. for abhyava ${ }^{\circ}$ (which Index reads).
26.5a, for bhonti read with C bhotī (with gen., "it occurs to").
26.5 b , separate ca karoti (with C, for O. ${ }^{\circ} n t i$ ). Index records cakaroti as one word, "perform"!!
26.5 c , separate ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{ka}$ arya nidarśayantaṃ.
26.6a with $\mathrm{C}{ }^{\circ}$ carito and bhoti; b, with C parimocayisye; c, with C ${ }^{\circ} v i v i d h a ̈ m$ and ${ }^{\circ}$ samprayogäm.
26.8b, O. käroti (misprint?), C kurvate, both metr. impossible; read karoti.
27.1b, divide krtaañjalīpuṭa (so C) pranamya namasyayanti.
27.2b, read with C sattvās $t i(=t e)$. For parikalpa read parikalpya, gdve., "to be reckoned"; cf. 3.3d.
27.2 c , read with C romi.
27.5 b , divide laghu antarīkse.
27.5 c , read with C va anilam for $v a$ (Conze p. 41 ca ) apulam, and -äbhiprāyo.
28.3d, read with C parihäyati.
28.4 c and 6 b , divide sarve $t \mathrm{i}$.
28.4 c , connect ${ }^{\circ}$ päramitāprasūtā (one word).
28.4d, read with C na pi ca vardhati (metr.).
28.7a, anuddhaväye is senseless; Tib. skye med proves the true text an-udbhavãye (Skt. udbhava). It is an abl.; the ending -aye is transferred from the $\bar{a}$-decl. (any oblique case) to the $a$-decl.; my Gr., § 8.45, happens to record it there only as dat. The parallel aksayata( $h$ ) proves the case intended. Render $\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}$ : "But the Bodhisattva who understands the Origination by Dependence (read ${ }^{\circ}$ samupädu, $\S 9$ above) as non-origination, and this Prajñā as non-extinction, He..." See Gr., § 7.47, on this function of the abl.
29.1a, read with C viharāti mahānubhāvo.
29.1c, C punä́sraya for panä ${ }^{\circ}$; both are possible; cf. Dict. s.v. pana. Divide -dhyāna sān̄gā.
29.1d, read with C prāpunitvā.
29.2d, read with C na punäśravakssay' imi (C ime) sikșati.
29.3c, read tatrā m.c., or tatrasthitāna as a cpd. (see "Meter", § 42).
29.3 d , read with C upapadya yathäbhiprāyam (O. unmetr.).
29.5a, read with C em eva te, for evam ete, unmetr. The form em (see Dict.) is common in Rgs., though not noted in Index.
29.6 d , for yatra ha, unmetr., read with C $m \bar{a} s y \bar{a} h a$ "lest there be"; Gr., § 42.7.
29.7 d , read pravisitvana for ${ }^{\circ}$ tva na (Tib. seems to have a negative, but by false division).
29.9a, read samädhi for (misprint) samadhi.
29.9 c , O. asamähito is correct and is kept in the Index; Conze p. 53 with C samähito, which is wrong in both meter and sense.
29.9 d , text näviko bhinnabhävo, which makes no sense, though no v.l. is cited (Index ignores it). Read bhinna-nãvo "shipwrecked", which occurs in Pali, Jāt. iii.159.5, in comm., glossing bhinna-plavo of iii.158.26. Here proved by Tib. mñan pa ( $=$ nãviko) gru (ship) źig bżin (destroyed).
29.10c, for nandabodhisattvo (unmetr.) read with C na tu bodhicitte.
29.12c, read with C ākrustiu cāpy abhihatāpy atha tāditā vā.
29.12d; the verb is certainly vadhisyati, with C ; before it, probably $a n u$ (adverb, as in 13c where Index rightly "thereupon"; no cpd. anu-vadhis recorded). C is cited as puna anu-vadh ${ }^{\circ}$, which Conze p. 54 accepts, but it is of course metrically impossible; puna was doubtless originally a gloss on the adverb anu which has got into the text.
29.14a, with C sukhatäm for sugatām.
30.2b, the stem is samudānaya (Dict.), not samudāna (Index).
30.2 d , read pāramita for para ${ }^{\circ}$ (misprint?).
30.3 d and 5 c , read with C ärabdhavirya.
30.6 c , read with C ätmasamjño.
30.6 d , read with C sarvajñatäya bhavi düru nabho va bhümeh; so Tib., which Index quotes as rendering the very different version of O.!
30.8b, read with C sukhamam (Dict.), for susukham (lect. fac.).
30.9 c , read with $\mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ vidunäm raha- for vidunärhata- (lect. fac.).
30.10c, niśāmayätī; Skt. ${ }^{\circ}$ yati and Pali nisämeti, "observes, attends to, minds"; Index "preach" (?), adding "cf. C", which, on p. 54, is quoted as niśyamayātī; this seems to me a senseless corruption.
30.11 c , read dvitiyo (m.c., Dict.), then with C ca agni sakalam siri praksipeyā.
30.12 b and 31.1 d , with C tam for tãm.
31.1c, with C kriya $a$ for (unmetr.) kriya.
31.3a ägamu, "authoritative doctrine"; Index "comes"! (poor rendering of woodenly literal Tib.).
31.5a kuśalahpathebhiś, one word (Gr., § 8.12).
31.5b, with C -rahäna (gen. pl.) sprhä.
31.5d, pāräjiko, $\mathrm{C}^{\circ} k a ̄ \underline{m}$; read ${ }^{\circ} k a \bar{a}$ (abl.).
31.6 b, see above $\S 31$, note 2 ; also delete $c a$ (unmetr.) before atma in the C reading adopted by Conze.
31.7 c , Conze, p. 128, adopts prasrto of C for pasrto; even if pra- was written, $p a$ - was pronounced, and such MIndic spellings are not rare (above, §8).
31.11 b , with C hi momuhānām for sā muhānäm.
31.12 c , with C dvipa.
31.15 c , wtih C vidunäm raha- for vidunārhata-.


[^0]:    1 The most probable occurrence is 1.17 a mahasatva so'tha kenocyati kāranena, where, unless there is some far-reaching and obscure corruption, the syllable ke-takes the place of two shorts. The others do not prove a long for two shorts. In 19.8c, text durabhiksi, which has epenthetic $a$ (Gr., § 3.101) for (C) durbhikssa, in which, if it were accepted, $d u r$ would be a long for two shorts. In 21.3 d and 4 d , paryutthita, par $(y)$-might stand for two shorts, but almost certainly was originally pariyu (cf. Pali pariyut!hita). In 23.4c, text ete hi, better with C etarhi, where-tar-might represent two shorts; but the true reading is almost certainly etarahi, as in other BHS (Dict., s.v.). Finally, in 3.1a, text ya imäm grahīsyati paryāpunatī sa (better ca with C) nityam, the long syllable parshould be a single short, not two. This is a more deep-rooted corruption, which can be corrected only speculatively. Possibly the original had grahisi (Gr., $\S \$ 32.63,71$ )

[^1]:    pariyāpunati (as in Pali, for Skt. paryāp-). A copyist may have first sanskritized -riyto $-r y$-, and then made a future out of the rare aorist grahisisi.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Among other cases involving Skt. $u d$ are three forms from ut-krs-, in all of which there is support for the metrically correct simplification to $-k$ - (from MIndic $-k k$-) in the text, so that no em. of the consonants is needed: 21.4c ätmän' ukarsi; 28.5a ukrsta; 31.6 b ätmana karşayeyā, but C atma utkars ${ }^{\circ}$, read atma ukars ${ }^{\circ}$ (the O . text surely intended atman' ukarṣ${ }^{\circ}$ ); on atma see Dict. s.v.

