

The Daṣagīti contains twelve stanzas, but we have to deduct the invocation and the colophon, so that the remainder corresponds to the name "Ten stanzas." It is a common, if not universal practice, not to take into account the invocation, nor the colophon, although in our MSS. such verses are numbered as if they formed part of the body of the work. To give one out of many instances, the Sāṅkhya-Kārikā is said in the colophon to contain seventy stanzas, but with the addition of matter unconnected with the Kārikā, as such, the number of the stanzas is seventy-two.\*

The Āryabhaṭa-Siddhānta or Āryabhaṭīyam is a very concise book, for the whole is complete in 111 stanzas in Āryā metre. If we deduct from this number the opening and closing stanzas, and also the invocation, placed at the beginning of the 2nd chapter and identical with that of the Daṣagīti, we get 108. This number coincides so exactly with one of the two significations in which the numeral *ashṭaṣatam* may be taken, that there can be no hesitation in pronouncing the Āryāśṭaṣatam "the hundred and eight stanzas" to be identical with the Āryabhaṭa-Siddhānta. Colebrooke never having seen a MS. of it, rendered Āryāśṭaṣatam by "eight-hundred couplets" (Alg. XXXII.) and certainly *ashṭaṣatam* may mean 800, but does not necessarily do so. That in this case it has to be taken in the other sense, is now decided by the testimony of the MS. itself.

\* Wilson finds it difficult to explain why the Sāṅkhya-Kārikā should be said to contain seventy, instead of sixty-nine verses. The reason is obvious enough; vs. 71 and 72 have nothing whatever to do with Sāṅkhya philosophy; it is wholly fortuitous and indifferent to that philosophy that a certain Iṣvara-Kṛṣṇa composed a poem in 70 verses, but the authority for the Sāṅkhya doctrine is to be sure something connected with that doctrine. This explanation is properly speaking superfluous, for it matters not at all whether Iṣvara-Kṛṣṇa is right or wrong in deeming vs. 70 essentially different from vs. 71 and 72, he *does* so. I wish only to point out that in doing so he is logical, and that the difficulty is of Wilson's own making; so it could not be expected any commentator would deem it necessary to explain what needs no explanation.