

94. 484. — The editions of this Upanishad are enumerated by *Gildemeister* in his *Bibliothecae Sanscritae Specimen* p. 23. —

II. Manuscripts of the *Commentaries* on the *Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā*, whether with the text or without it: —

Of *Ūaṭa's* Commentary I have found only a few fragments, extracted from the whole work to illustrate a *Rudrajapa* which contains in eight lectures the following verses of the *Vājas. S.*: XXIII, 19. 33. 34. XXXIV, 49. 1-6 «२» XXXI, 1-22 «२» XVII, 33-49 «३» XXXIII, 30-43 «३» XVI, 1-66 (*) «५» III, 56-63. XXXIX, 7-9. XXV, 19. XVIII, 36. V, 21. XIV, 20. XXXVI, 17 «६» XVIII, 1-29 «७» XXXVI, 1-24 «८». *Ūaṭa's* explanation is given for XXXIV, 2 — III, 63, besides some small fragments relating to the XVIIIth lecture. The mspt. is dated Samvat 1643: it belongs to the collection of the Rev. Dr. Mill, which has been added to the Bodleian library. —

For *Mahīdhara's* Commentary, the so-called *Vedadīpa*, I have made use of several copies. My transcript is made from E. I. H. 2479. 2465 (= A.), which manuscripts, containing also the unaccented text, were copied in *Calcutta*, probably for Mr. *Colebrooke*, by two different scribes, foll. 1-20. 83-189 in 2479 by the one, foll. 21-82. 190-294 in 2479 and foll. 1-140 in 2465 by the other. The first of them copied from a mspt., which must have been pretty correct, with the only exception, that the explanation of XIV, 1-30 is wholly wanting. The second scribe on the contrary copied from a rather incorrect mspt, belonging to the college of Fort William (dated Samvat 1791, see p. L), in which the interpretation of XXXIV, 22-58 is wanting, besides a great number of smaller defects. —

A second manuscript (= M.) belongs to the above mentioned collection of the Rev. Dr. Mill, since incorporated with the Bodleian library: it contains only the explanation of the first twenty adhyāyas, without the text. The first three adhyāyas, contained in the first 52 old leaves, were purchased at Benares; the following twelve, occupying from foll. 53-277 inclusive, were copied by two different scribes in *Calcutta* (foll. 53-97 by the one, foll. 98-277 by the other) from a second copy, and a very correct one, belonging to the college of Fort William, (except three leaves), the remaining five, from foll. 278-371 incl.,

(*) A commentary of this adhyāya, as it occurs in the *Taittirīya Sanhitā* ashṭaka IV, praṇa 5, anuvāka 1, made by *Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra*, is extant E. I. H. 1625 b. Having made a transcript of it I am now in the possession of three different explanations of this curious adhyāya.