

2. foll. 54. — *kāṇḍa VIII* E. I. H. 657. foll. 36. — *kāṇḍa XIII* E. I. H. 149. foll. 24: and partly of a fourth, viz: of *the first kāṇḍa* from the *fourth brāhmaṇa* of the *seventh adhyāya* (where the common copy of the *Mādhavīyabhāshya* failed) as far as the end (in B. only as far as VIII, 3, 14), occupying 12 leaves in A. nine in B. and sixteen in C. —

3. *Dvivedaśrīnārāyaṇasūnu Dviveda Ganga's* commentary of the *Mādhyaṇḍina Āraṇyaka*: a very excellent copy (= M.) in the collection of the Rev. Dr. Mill, since added to the Bodleian library: foll. 322. —

There are extant in Europe several copies of commentaries on the *Vrihad-Āraṇyaka* in the *Kāṇvaśākhā*, but as they have been already published by Dr. Roer in the *Bibliotheca Indica* nro. 6. Calcutta 1848, I do not think it necessary to notice them here.

III. *Rishitarpaṇam*. Chamb. 606 b. 735. foll. 11. a sort of *anukramanī* of the *Mādhyaṇḍina Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, enumerating *a.* the *beginning* words (*pratīkāni*) 1) of each *adhyāya*. 2) of each *hundred* of (the 7624) *kaṇḍikās* (2800-5400 are enumerated twice differently). 3) of each *prapāṭhaka*. 4) of the *last kaṇḍikā* of each *kāṇḍa*: *b.* the closing words of each *kāṇḍa*. —

**B.** The accentuation in the manuscripts of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is rather strange, as there only *one* sign is made use of, an horizontal stroke beneath the line, for denoting the *udātta* as well as the *svarita*. The *udātta* has the stroke beneath itself: नृषद्म्, the *svarita* beneath the preceding syllable: वीर्यम्. To avoid this ambiguity I have denoted the *svarita* in this edition by *two* horizontal strokes beneath the preceding syllable: वीर्यम्. — Before a following *accented* syllable the preceding *udātta* loses its denotation: 1) before an *udātta*: केतपूः केतम् instead of °पूः केतम्, महो ये धनम् i. of महो ये धनम्, पर्णि न वेरुनु i. of पर्णि न वेरुनु, अग्निर्हि वै धूर्य i. of अग्निर्हि वै धूर्य (१.१.२.१.), but रथवाही सा हि न स्त्री न पुमान् i. of °ही सा हि न स्त्री न पुमान् (५.५.३. ३५.), as there would be wanting too many signs. A *seeming* exception only is ये-यमसुराणाम् १.६.३. २८, as the second यम् is not accented: see पाणिनिसू० ८. १.३. 2) before a *svarita*: नेद्यद्म् १.७.२. १., मानुषं नेद्यद्म्, यज्ञो वै स्वः, देवा वै स्वः. — The preceding *svarita* on the contrary retains its denotation be-