

VARIOUS READINGS.

To Mr. Thomann of Zürich I am indebted for a collation of E. I. H. 309 (E) concerning several passages in the two first prapâhikas, and to my dear and learned friend Dr. W. Pertsch for a very minute collation of M., which beautiful ms. does however not exhibit the whole kâṇḍa — as I have in the Preface (p. ix) erroneously stated — but contains only the Bṛihad-Âraṇyaka portion, beginning with the third prapâhika.

The accentuation of the Bṛihad-Âraṇyaka, especially in its three last adhyâyas, is in a very strange state and offers much cause of perplexity, the accentual signs being frequently either wholly wanting or strangely misplaced. The thorough coincidence of M. with A. (Chambers 15) in almost all these blunders leads me to suspect, that the fault is not exclusively that of the copists, but partly an original one, such as might be ascribed to the later addition of these last chapters to the more ancient body of the work. I feel authorized to this assumption by similar instances in the Pariçishṭas to the several Vedasaṃhitâs as well as in the Nirukti and (as I learn from Dr. Pertsch) in the Taittirîya-Âraṇyaka, and moreover by the fact, that the vaṇṇas which are unquestionably of a late origin particularly abound in such blunders and mistakes (see already the vaṇṇa at the end of the tenth kâṇḍa p. ८२६.).

The reason of this strange circumstance may be sought for either in a less careful preservation of these portions before their becoming a canonical part of the holy text, or in a partial misapplication of the accentual