

although it shows many striking coincidences with S in that part of S where S does not coincide with A. B and D, and partly N, show manifest traces of being influenced by the commentary; A and S show, it would seem, a total independence of C, and may be considered as constituting a class apart, which can scarcely be said of B, D, N, E. The differences of C and A, S are here and there so remarkable that one might think them to exhibit different redactions, perhaps different editions issued by the author. As a general remark, applying to all the MSS. it may be said that all of them are worse than indifferent.

It is no mock modesty that prompts me to say that, having such materials at my disposal, I look upon this first edition of the Br̥hat-Sanhitá as an essay of an edition, rather than an edition which would require but few occasional corrections from future editors. The bad condition of the MSS. is so bewildering, the great number of the subjects treated of is so distracting, the class of works to which the Sanhitá belongs, is so little explored, that, it is hoped, a large allowance will be made for the difficulties I had to cope with. After all, Varáha-mihira's work is so interesting that the shortcomings of the editor cannot rob it of its value.

I cannot conclude without offering my sincere thanks to Prof. E. B. Cowell who was not only instrumental in furthering the publishing of the work, but, with his well-known kindness, furnished me with MSS. from Calcutta.

Nor must I omit to say that I owe the first hint of editing Varáha-mihira to my honoured friend Prof. A. Weber. If the Br̥hat-Sanhitá proves a useful addition to the store of Sanskrit literature, Sanskrit scholars will, therefore, have to thank him in the first place. Had it not been for his suggestion, it would, perhaps, never have been undertaken, and but for his steadfast encouragement, it would certainly never have been brought to a close.

*Benares, 23rd March, 1865.*