§ 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 signs 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 *spr̥sa(ya)ti* (Skt. *spr̥ṣati*), without indication that any hybrid form occurs. Yet twice at least, in 1.10d *spuṣati*, and in 7.1d *spuṣetu*, O.’s text seems to have *spuṣ-,* 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 *spa*- (e.g. 3.6b), but since Conze’s Index recognizes only *spr̥ś-,* 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 spr̥-, spu-, or spa- (the latter being also a conceivable MIndic reflex of *spr̥-*). This is not the only case in which the Index fails to reproduce the text accurately; see e.g. on *nidiṣṭa* and *dudharsu* (below, § 10).

§ 2. Conze also quotes many readings from an old Calcutta ms., called C. Some of these, considered “clear and unmistakable 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 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, §§ 14 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" vasantarālakā 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 pāda or quarter-stanza, which does not illustrate this fact.