

Every one who knows MSS. will, I suppose, agree with me that no MS. can be an authority as to whether we have to read, for instance, **एष्यामि** or **ऐष्यामि**. If the meaning be, "I shall go," we have to read *eshyāmi*, even if all known MSS. had the contrary; but wherever the context requires "I shall come," we know the author to have written *aishyāmi*. I need not explain why *eti*, *eshyāmi*, etc., gets confounded with *aiti*, *aishyāmi*, etc., whereas, in verses at least, *gacchāmi* remains distinct from *āgacchāmi*. There are a pretty considerable number of passages where the editor has erroneously put *eshyāmi* instead of *aishyāmi*.

For instance, p. 64, 17¹:

Tad aham bālakāv etau nītvā tvat-pitri-veçmani

Sthāpayāmi; tvam āśva 'iha, çīghram eshyāmy aham punaḥ.

The meaning is obviously, "I'll soon *come* back," not "I'll *go* back."

The same error occurs 72, 202; 80, 368; 91, 100; 109, 148; 165, 79; 178, 88; 283, 240; 293, 113; 331, 34; 457, 83; 504, 31; 505, 36; 539, 126; 564, 25.

A mistake of the same kind, but in a contrary direction, is the reading Gautama, 139, 319, which ought to be Gotama, for the Rshi himself is meant, not one of his descendants or followers.

Again, 249, 328, we find *tad-anyair devatair*, read *daivatair*, there being a word *devatā* but no *devatam*.

If these and similar mistakes must be ascribed to the MSS., or rather, most probably, to some of them, in other instances it is but justice to absolve them wholly; e.g. 461, 85:—

Tena 'udvāha-vidhīm yuktyā praudhā sâ niravartayat;

Samkalpaika-pradhânâ hi divyâ nâma khilâḥ kriyâḥ.

The second half-śloka is perfectly meaningless; the Nāgarī had:

संकल्पिकप्रधाना हि दिव्यानामखिलाः क्रियाः ।

which, in Roman characters, is:

Samkalpaikapradhânâ hi divyânâm akhilâḥkriyâḥ.

¹ The first number here and in the sequel denotes the page, the second the śloka.