

*sishṭha*, for at ३. १. १ he substitutes: *Vasishṭhasya* for the *amushya* of the text (pag. 367, 18).

7. The last to be named, not the least in value, is the *Vedadīpa* of *Mahidhara* (, who lived *Samvat* 1654). This excellent commentary to the *Vāj. S.* furnishes us in general with a clear and comprehensive survey of the ritual to which the several verses of the *Vāj. S.* belong, and with a good explanation of the single rules quoted throughout from the *Kātyāsūtra*. There are some instances, see e. g. १. ६. २ २५. २. ७ *Mahidh.* at १. १७ (compare *Karka* at ३. २. १२), where its *Kātya*-text seems to differ from ours. I suspect there either a fault of our (resp. my) copies of the *Vedadīpa* or a nodding on the part of its author.

The text of the *sūtras* alone is given in the following mss.:

1. E. I. H. 2844 (१.-१ second hand), *adhyāyas* I-XI and XII-XXVI, a very inaccurate and defective copy, on 75 and 78 leaves, *Samvat* 1745 *citra-bhānusamvats(ar)e Vireçvaradevasya dharmakṛitasya li.* 1

2. British Museum 5350, 1 (R), *the same*, on 67 leaves, *Samvat* 1838 *Jaipure Harisukhena*. Incorrect.

3. Bodleyan. Mill. 85 (M), *the same*, on 112 and 94 leaves. The *pūrvārdham* is written: *Samvat* 1656 *purohitaparamānandena*, the *uttarārdham*: *Samvat* 1751 by *Jāgeçvaraçamghaji*. This copy was unknown when in 1846-47 I came, for the first time, to England. To Dr. Aufrecht's kindness I owe its first acquaintance and the collation of several passages. I have since myself examined it throughout.

4. Chambers 790s (३.-३ second hand), *adhyāyas* II. III, on 15 leaves, (4 and 5 wanting).

5. Chambers 732 (३.-३ second hand), *adhyāyas* XII-XXVI on 154 leaves, an excellent old copy, though somewhat damaged, especially at foll 118-130 (२३. २. ३७-२५. ३. ३२): the foll. 3-6 (१२. १. ३-३. २३) are wanting. Many marginal glosses.

Seeing, twelve years ago, the incompleteness of all the commentaries and their immense bulk. I considered when collecting the materials for this Edition, what I ought to do. After long hesitation I resolved to give to *Karka's* commentary on the *uttarārdham*, as the oldest, the shortest and the completest, the preference over the scattered and still voluminous fragments of *Deva's vyākhyā*: and as it appeared to me impossible too to copy as well as to publish the