

from Vṛddha-Garga really occurs there, I guess that Vṛddha-Garga (*i. e.* the book) either formed a kind of *pariṣiṣṭa* or appendix to Garga, or that both works did not differ more from each other than different redactions of old Sanskrit books occasionally do. It must be remarked that many quotations from Vṛddha-Garga in Utpala do not recur in the Mayúracitrakam appended to the Gárgí-Sanhitá.

My codex is not only mutilated, but also extremely incorrect and carelessly copied; the omission of words and whole passages is of but too frequent occurrence. The verses of Garga found in the commentary to the Veda-calendar and published by Prof. Max Müller in the preface to the 4th Vol. of the R̥gveda, are not to be found in my fragment, and could not indeed have made part of it, because their place would be in the earlier part, precisely that which is lost; there is, however, reason to believe that they are taken from the Gárgí-Sanhitá.\*

For ascertaining the approximate date of the Gárgí-Sanhitá we have in the first place the well known verse :†

स्नेच्छा हि यवनास्तेषु सम्यक् क्वास्त्रमिदं स्थितम् ।  
ऋषिवत्तेऽपि पूज्यन्ते किम्पुनर्देवविद् द्विजः ॥

“The Greeks are Mlecchas, but amongst them this science is duly established; therefore even they (although Mlecchas) are honoured as R̥shis; how much more then an astrologer who is a Brahman.”

Still more valuable is a whole chapter in the Gárgí-Sanhitá containing some historical accounts, more explicit in regard to

\* The objection that may be raised, is that the verses in the commentary to the Jyautisha are not of astrological character; the objection would be unanswerable if Sanhitá in this case has to be taken in its limited sense.

† It is a mistake of Colebrooke to ascribe these lines to Varáha-mihira; I should not have remarked this, were it not that the mistake has been repeated again and again, long after Weber had given the correct statement.