PREFACE.

AFTER five years spent in the collection of materials for an Edition of the Rig-veda and its Sanskrit Commentary by Sáyanáchárya, the first volume is now completed, comprising the first Ashtaka (Ogload), and about the fourth part of the whole.

When I first entered on this undertaking, I saw but little chance that I should ever succeed in carrying it out, and my only hope of success was derived from the firm conviction that, in the present state of philological, historical, and philosophical research, no literary work was of greater importance and interest to the philologer, the historian, and philosopher, than the Veda, the oldest literary monument of the Indo-European world. There were many difficulties to be overcome in carrying out this work. In the public Libraries of Germany no MSS. of the Rig-veda and its Commentary were to be found, except some old copies of the text and a small and worm-eaten fragment of Sáyana’s Commentary in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was necessary, therefore, to spend several years in the Libraries of Paris, London, and Oxford, in order to copy and collate all the necessary Vaidik MSS. A complete *apparatus criticus* having been brought together in this manner, it became possible to commence a philological study of the Rig-veda, and to prepare upon a safe basis a critical edition of both its text and commentary. But a still greater difficulty remained, the expense of publishing such a work. These obstacles have been such, that although the want of an edition of the Veda has been keenly felt by all Sanskrit scholars, and although there were many fully qualified for such a work, yet no one has been found to undertake it, since the first edition of the

---

*a* An introductory Memoir on the Veda is in the Press, and will be published separately.
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Rig-veda by the late Dr. Rosen was interrupted by the early death of that highly-gifted scholar. It is owing to a concurrence of many fortunate circumstances, and particularly to the kind encouragement and liberal assistance which I have received from various quarters, that these difficulties have been at length overcome. For several years I was able to advance but slowly, being entirely left to my own resources, and having but few leisure hours to bestow upon Vaidik studies. But the further I proceeded in my work, the more encouragement I received. Amongst those who took an active interest in it, I have to mention with sincere gratitude the names of Alexander von Humboldt and Professor E. Burnouf in France, and of Chevalier Bunsen and Professor H. H. Wilson in England. The final success, however, of this undertaking is owing to the well-known liberality of the Honourable the Court of Directors of the East-India-Company, whose enlightened views on this subject cannot be better expressed than in their own words: "The Court consider that the publication of so important and interesting a work as that to which your proposals refer, is in a peculiar manner deserving of the patronage of the East-India-Company, connected as it is with the early religion, history, and language of the great body of their Indian subjects."

This first edition, however, of the Rig-veda and its Sanskrit Commentary is not intended for the general scholar, but only for those who make Sanskrit their special study, and for those among the natives of India who are still able to read their own Sacred Books in the language of the original. It would have been more agreeable to myself to have kept for my own use the materials which I had collected for the Veda, (I allude especially to the Sanskrit Commentary,) devoting all my time to their study, and communicating to the public the last results only of my researches. But I felt that I should perform a more useful work by at once making public those materials, without which no philological study of the Veda was possible. A greater number of Sanskrit scholars will thus be enabled to contribute their share towards the elucidation of Vaidik antiquities, and we may now look forward to a more complete study of Vaidik literature than it is in the power of any single individual to bestow upon so comprehensive a subject, and to a better understanding of Vaidik language, religion, and mythology, than can be expected from a scholastic Indian commentator of the fourteenth century after Christ.

I determined therefore on publishing first a complete text of the Rig-veda-
sanhitá, (the Sanhitá and the Pāṇini-text,) together with the only complete commentary on the Rig-veda now existing, the Mādhavīya-vedārtha-prakāśa by Sāyanāchārya. As the limits of this publication were fixed, it became necessary to save space as much as possible, in order to get at least the whole of the text and commentary into the prescribed compass of the edition. For this reason, as well as because this edition was destined for the use of Indian as well as European scholars, I had to exclude, and to reserve for a separate work, all critical and explanatory notes of my own, together with the various readings of the MSS.

My principal object in this present edition is therefore to give a correct text of the Rig-veda, and to restore from the MSS., a readable and authentic text of Sāyana’s commentary. The former was by far the easier task. The MSS. of the Rig-veda have generally been written and corrected by the Brahmans with so much care that there are no various readings in the proper sense of the word, except those few which are found noticed as such in the Commentaries or in the Prātiśākhyaas. Even these are generally of small importance, and seldom affect the meaning of a sentence. For the most part they arise from niceties of orthography and calligraphy, which by themselves are of little importance to a European scholar, though they may become of interest if considered with reference to the peculiarities of the old Sākhas or branches of the Veda. The hymns of the Rig-veda are happily much more free from these orthographic minutiae than the prayers of the Śaṅkha and Yajur-veda. Of real importance, however, for critical purposes, are the alterations which the verses of the Rig-veda have undergone when incorporated into the ceremonial prayers of the Śaṅkha, Yajur, and Atharva-vedas. But neither are these alterations to be considered in the light of varia lectiones, and, as they cannot be used for a critical restoration of the received text of the Rig-veda, they will better be considered in a general critical account of the whole Vaidik literature.

For the text of the Rig-veda I have made use of the following MSS.

1. Sanhitá-text.

S. 1. A manuscript in the collection of the Rev. Dr. Mill. now belonging to the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It contains all the eight Ashtakas (Ogdoads)

---

b The importance of these alterations has been pointed out by Professor Beney, in his valuable edition of the Śaṅkha-veda-sanhitá; Introduction, p. lvii. "Die Hymmen des Sāma-veda herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Glossar versehcn von Theodor Bentey, Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus, 1848.
of the Rig-veda. The first Ashtaaka consists of 89 leaves without a date, the last leaves having been replaced by a modern hand. The second comprises 70 leaves, and has no date. The third, of 92 leaves, is dated Samvat 1777. The fourth, of 100 leaves, is dated Samvat 1776. The fifth, of 102 leaves, is dated Samvat 1771. The sixth, of 104 leaves, has no date, the last leaves being of more modern origin. The seventh consists of 90 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1777. At the end of the sixth Adhyaya, Vargas 14—28 are wanting in this MS., but have been added afterwards by the original writer on two separate leaves. The eighth Ashtaaka consists of 104 leaves, without date. There are four different handwritings to be distinguished in this manuscript. Ashtakas 3—7 are written by the same hand, about the year A.D. 1720, at Benares. The name of the writer, however, is every where carefully scratched out with yellow ink. The last ten leaves of the sixth Ashtaaka are written by the same person, who copied the second Ashtaaka. The first and last Ashtakas again are copied by a third writer: while some few leaves on white paper belong to a fourth and quite modern hand, and have probably been supplied by the Pandit employed by Dr. Mill.

S. 2. Another manuscript in the collection of Dr. Mill, now belonging to the Bodleian Library. This also is a complete copy of all the eight Ashtakas. The first Ashtaaka consists of 103 leaves, without date. The second has 93 leaves, and is dated Saka 1679 (A.D. 1757). The third fills 97 leaves, and is dated Saka 1677. The fourth comprises 92 leaves, and is dated Saka 1679. The fifth consists of 62 leaves; the sixth of 86 leaves; and the seventh of 76 leaves; all of them without dates. Leaves 12—37 in the seventh Ashtaaka have been supplied by a modern writer. The eighth Ashtaaka comprises 130 leaves, and is dated Saka 1776. In this manuscript also four different writers can be distinguished: to the first belong Ashtakas 1—4; to the second, Ashtakas 5—7; to the third, the eighth Ashtaaka; and to the fourth, the modern additions in the seventh Ashtaaka.

S. 3. The third manuscript belongs to Mr. Colebrooke's collection, deposited in the Library of the East-India-House, where it forms Nos. 129—132 of the Catalogue. No. 129 contains the Grihya-sutras of Asvalayana and the first and second Ashtakas. The first Ashtaaka contains 59 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1862; the second contains 60 leaves, and is of the same date. No. 130 contains the third and fourth Ashtakas; the former of 53, the latter of 54 leaves;
both dated Samvat 1802. No. 131 contains Ashtakas 5 and 6; the former of 54 leaves, the latter of 56 leaves; both dated Samvat 1802. No. 132 contains the Sarvánukrama and Ashtakas 7 and 8; the former of 56, the latter of 61 leaves; equally dated Samvat 1802. The whole Manuscript was evidently written by one person, about the year 1745: his name is scratched out, but seems to have been Somagopakásinátha.

II. Pada-text.

P. 1. A manuscript in Dr. Mill's collection, now belonging to the Bodleian Library. It contains all the eight Ashtakas. The first Ashtaka consists of 97 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1727, Saka 1592 (A.D. 1670). The second contains 129 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1728. The third fills 109 leaves, and is not dated. The fourth has 107 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1727. The fifth contains 84 leaves, without a date; the last leaf having been supplied by a modern hand. The sixth Ashtaka comprises 89 leaves, and is not dated. The seventh consists of 95 leaves, and is dated Samvat 1672 (A.D. 1615). It was difficult, however, to read the last page, which contains the date and the name of the writer, but has been pasted over with yellow paper. The eighth Ashtaka contains 86 leaves, but breaks off with the last Varga of the seventh Adhyáya. The rest has been supplied by a modern manuscript, without accents, dated Samvat 1857, Saka 1722 (A.D. 1800). In this manuscript also four different hands may be traced. The oldest part is the seventh and eighth Ashtakas, written in A.D. 1615: next come Ashtakas 1—6, written in A.D. 1760: thirdly, the supplement of the eighth Ashtaka, written in A.D. 1800; and lastly, some few leaves of still more modern origin, probably copied by a Pandit employed by Dr. Mill.

P. 2. A complete copy of the Rig-veda-saúhitá, bequeathed by John Taylor M.D., to the Hon. Court of Directors of the East-India-Company, and entered

---

All that can be read is स्मलि संवत 1952 यर्का संवत गरवाण । संवत ् नारायणपुरुः।<br>Even this has been traced over with ink, by which it became still more illegible. Afterwards another writer has given the date at which the accents were added, but there also we can only read संवत 16—etc. To judge from the handwriting of the MS. and from the fragmentary passages which are still legible, I conclude the MS. to have been written by Damodara-Sádasya, who generally signs himself चार्यवर्मणालयं चार्यतत्त्वाकाटकीयवल्लकरण प्रभासमहस्तास्मिन (or स्मलि or स्मलितस्मिन). He was still alive in Samvat 1766.
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in the Catalogue under No. 2032. It has been copied at Bombay, and is bound together in one large volume: its date is from Śaka 1736 to 1737: the name of the writer Rāmabhaṭṭa, called Śeśenkaṭa.

It was not necessary for an editor of the Rig-veda to collate a greater number of MSS., or to classify them according to their age and origin. I have seen nearly all the MSS. of the Rig-veda which exist in Europe, and I feel convinced that no use can be derived from them as manuscripts, because all of them are but transcripts, more or less carefully executed, of one and the same text. If there were, as in other Sanskrit works, corrupt passages, on which doubts might exist, a comparison of the Sanhitā-text with the Pada-text, or a reference to the Commentary, would have been sufficient to remove such doubts. But so far from this being required, the reading of the Sanhitā-text, the Pada-text, and the text which the commentator had before him, can each be established with such certainty by the MSS., that it would be wrong to correct even the smallest differences in the quantity or accent of vowels which occur occasionally between these three texts, but which are always supported by the full testimony of each class of MSS. There are instances in almost every hymn where a long vowel occurs in the Sanhitā-text, while the Pada-text has a short one. The commentator considers these productions of a short vowel as Vaidik liberties. But in some cases where a long vowel seems to be regular, and the Pada-text has notwithstanding a short one instead, this shortening is equally pronounced by Sāyana as a Vaidik irregularity: for instance, Ry. 1. 37. 11, पचसस्यः instead of पचसस्यत्: 1. 61. 14, मृत्यु instead of मृत्यु. Instances occur where the text followed by the commentator is different from the text of our MSS. Ry. 1. 48. 5, पहल is both in the Sanhitā and Pada-text an oxytone, while Sāyana explains it as a paroxytone. Ry. 1. 116. 1, the Pada-text has चंभय, while, according to Sāyana, the author of the Pada-text (Śakalya) must have read चंभय. Ry. 1. 61. 9, the Pada-text ought to have, according

\[\text{with Vaidik literature; Jahrbücher für wissens-}
\[\text{schaftliche Kritik, Berlin, 1844, p. 131.}
\]

\[\text{फर्दिवत्स्य हन्दसाकरुः॥}
\]

\[\text{छोरुसमस्य छाओरकः कर्नः । Cf. } 1. 84, 4, 112.\]

\[\text{1, 84, 6, the short } i \text{ in रचित्र instead of रचित्र is called सर्वग्रहितयां शून्यम् हन्दसाकरुः; while } 1, 11, 1,\]

\[\text{रचित्रम् रचित्रम् is explained by शब्दाद्वन्द्वम् शोधितप्रति मुहम् । Cf. Pāṇini, VIII. 2, 17, 2.}\]
to Sāyana, श्रावः, but all the MSS. have श्रारः. Rv. 1, 52, 10. श्रारः has no accent in the Sanhitá and Pada-text, while Sāyana explains it as if it were a paroxytone.

Notwithstanding the great accuracy with which the MSS. are written, occasional mistakes occur. Letters, syllables, and words are sometimes left out, sometimes misplaced in one or other of the MSS., owing to inevitable inadventures on the part of the copyist. They never occur, however, in more than one MS. in each instance, and I know only one case in the first Ashtaka where a real varietas lectionis might seem to have arisen in this manner, Rv. 1, 112, 19; MSS. S. 1, 2, 3, and P. 1. have जनु, which Rosen has adopted; while P. 2. and the Commentator have निरजनु.

As to the spelling of words, I have endeavoured as much as possible to preserve consistency, and never to deviate from the general laws of Sanskrit orthography, except where Vaidik peculiarities were based on the unanimous authority of all the MSS. Each MS. has its own peculiar character, which must be known and taken into account in order to make proper use of it.

Sāyana does not explain how लोकवर्ती could be without an accent in the text, though generally he endeavours to account for irregular accents; that is to say, to reconcile them with the rules of Pāṇini. See, for instance, 1, 61, 1, where he even admits of स्वरंतिनी: This is the writers of MSS. admit themselves in several cases. For although they generally say at the end of a MS. that they have copied it as it was in the original, and that it is not their fault if mistakes occur, yet they complain frequently of the hardships and difficulties of their work. I subjoin a few specimens of their poetry:

चतुर्भुजमन्यायात्वः फलं मानेऽन्नविते सताः यत्रं न ज्ञाते कि जुस्ता न तस्कुपुषु "

"If I have written a mistake here, because I could not see, or my mind was wandering, noble persons may correct it all, but let them not be angry with writers."

मुत्तबधी महाभाषायी भौभाषाय पराराय: तद्दुबदगुप्त व अभे रोपो न रौससे "

"A Muni even may err; Bhima even was vanquished: be it right or wrong, no fault must be given to me."

यथा युग्मपङ्क्ति हुया तात्र तलिते मया ।

"As I have seen the book, so I have written it; be it right or wrong, it is not my fault."

कर्म तस्यतिमेव वरेन प्रतिपन्नप्रमुखः ।

"My back, my hips, and my neck are broken: my sight is dim in looking down: keep this book with care which has been written with pain." Others read दष्टपूर्वः: instead of दस्तपूर्वः.

Rv. 1, 50, 6, for instance, in order to support a conjecture, great stress has been laid on the fact that in सुरवर्तः, वर्तः, the long अ of वर्तः has been added by a later hand in S. 3. (Cf. Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Veda. Drei Abhandlungen von R. Roth, p. 82.) Yet though S. 3 is certainly a very accurate copy, it could scarcely be expected to have preserved traces of an older
Some MSS., for instance, avoid certain groups of double letters, not only where the reduplication arises from phonetic laws, but also where two independent letters have been joined together. This shorter way of writing occurs not only in Vaidik, but also in other MSS., and cannot be considered as affecting the pronunciation of words, because the simple letter makes the preceding vowel long, as if a double letter had been written. I have seen, therefore, no reason for adopting this way of spelling in a printed edition, because other Vaidik MSS. frequently give the double letters where they ought to stand, according to the laws of Sanskrit grammar, and because a deviation from these laws might lead to confusion. Some MSS. write a double aspirate, where, according to the laws of Sanskrit grammar, the first of the two letters ought not to be aspirated. I mean forms like वसित्रृ instead of वसित्रृ etc. As good MSS., however, restrict this peculiarity to the group ज instead of ज, and as in this case also carefully written MSS. preserve the regular form ज, it would have been to no purpose to give up a general phonetic law (on the incompatibility of two aspirates) for what may be after all a mere difference in writing. But although I have tried to be as consistent as possible in the way of spelling, yet I have submitted to the authority of the MSS. in cases where their testimony was quite unanimous.

reading than Yāska had before him in the Nirukta, where this verse is quoted (Nirukta, xii. 22) with the long a. The fact is, as will appear from a more accurate collation of this MS., that S. 3. dispenses most frequently with writing the long vowel in cases of Anumāsika in words where there can be no doubt that the long vowel is necessary, and where all the other MSS. have it. Instances of this occur continually, and have generally been corrected by the writer who added the accents; as in 1, 48, 14. लोकान जाति; 1, 45, 1. कृष्ण चातिए वर; 1, 44, 1. देवेय प्रवरुष; 1, 44, 4. मनोय साध; 1, 44, 7. देवेय पुरु; 1, 47, 5. चामर चचम, etc. Sometimes the long vowel is not written, but, according to the laws of Vaidik grammar, the quantity is marked by a particular sign: Rv. 1, 63, 1. महो २५५; 1, 52, 12. घुरु २५ चाति; 1, 59, 6. चर्थ २५ चपरो; here also another hand has added the long vowel. Rv. 1, 59, 1. again, we find गर्ध २५ पं instead of गर्ध. This does not at all exclude the possibility of an old mistake in this verse (Rv. 1, 58, 6), but it shows that, in order to make proper use of a MS. it is not sufficient to collate a few passages, but that the whole character of a MS. must be studied by a careful collation before it can be used as an authority for particular passages.

k Other groups, which also occur occasionally, but never in all the MSS. at the same time, are उ, ए, उ and ए. Cf. Benfey, Sāma-veda, p. xxxiv.

1 ज may be meant for ज, in the same way as अ is meant frequently for अ. Bukka’s name is spelt गुरु and गुर; and in words like गर्ध and गर्ध it is often difficult to say which form is meant; as words like गुरु also, where there can be no doubt as to the double k and its pronunciation, are written गुरु.
particularly with regard to nasal letters, because in such cases there was reason to suppose that certain peculiarities, if exhibited by all the MSS., might rest upon the authority of that Prātiṣṭhānya to which our MSS. belong. Whether with the conflicting testimonies of old Grammarians, quoted in the Prātiṣṭhānyas, it will be possible to restore the whole Sanhitā of the Rig-veda in such a manner as to include all the minute niceties of spelling prescribed by different members of each Śākhā, is a question on which I should feel inclined entirely to submit to Professor Roth's authority, who has devoted much time and learning to this interesting branch of Vaidik literature.

There is only one case where I thought it better to deviate from the way of spelling adopted by the Vaidik MSS.: this is with regard to the Avagraha. The Vaidik MSS. use the Avagraha where a hiatus arises from two vowels meeting at the end and beginning of two words, while the common custom has been to use this sign to mark the elision of an initial a, which has been dropped in order to avoid a hiatus between it and a preceding vowel. If the Vaidik use of the Avagraha had been adopted, it would have been necessary to introduce a new sign for cases of real elision, which the Vaidik MSS. do not mark at all. Instead of this I have preferred to retain the Avagraha where it is of real use in marking the place where a letter has been dropped, and to exclude it where it has no other purpose than that of marking a hiatus\textsuperscript{m}, which is quite as clear to the eye without any such sign.

I have now to state the principles which I have followed in editing the Commentary of Śāyana. If the MSS. of the Rig-veda are generally the best, the MSS. of the Commentaries are nearly the worst to be met with in Sanskrit libraries: they have generally been copied by men who did not understand what they were writing, and the number of mistakes is at first sight quite

\textsuperscript{m} The Avagraha is used in Vaidik MSS., not only where an elision ought to have taken place, according to the general laws of Sanskrit grammar; (for instance, द्वंस्योऽवरः, पूर्वस्त्र सारस्त्र, विद्यांसः सरस्त्र, शुद्धमस्त्र सारस्त्र;) but also after those vowels which Sanskrit grammarians call pragrihya, and which are never affected by a following vowel, like सर्वधर्मस्यायाम्, समानमन्त्रेऽधर्मस्यायाम्, समस्तमन्त्रेऽधर्मस्यायाम्. The same sign is put also after a vowel which has been modified by the influence of one immediately following, as समान्तंत्रं, विद्या सारस्त्र, शुद्धमस्त्र सारस्त्र; and even where a final consonant has been dropped on account of a following vowel, as द्वंस्योऽवरः, विद्यांसः सरस्त्र, शुद्धमस्त्र सारस्त्र. By being employed for so many purposes, and this not at all consistently, the Avagraha, as it stands in Vaidik MSS., is of little use.
discouraging. No class of writings would have needed more to be copied by men who were masters of their subject than commentaries such as these, which abound in short extracts, taken, without any further reference, from other books on grammatical, etymological, ceremonial, theological, and philosophical subjects. Most of these quotations are only detached fragments, full of technical expressions, and often quite unintelligible by themselves. In order to understand, nay frequently in order to read these passages, it was necessary to have recourse to the works from which they were taken. Some of these works were already published, but others existed only in MS., and had first to be analysed, and furnished with alphabetical indices, before any use could be made of them. By this process, however, a double advantage was gained. In most cases a comparison with the work from which passages were quoted served to correct the mistakes of the Commentary; while in other cases a frequent recurrence of the same quotation in the Commentary furnished also the means of correcting false readings in the original works, or supplied, at all events, a well-authenticated varietas lectionis. Sometimes, however, the same passage is quoted differently in different places of the Commentary. This may be accounted for by the fact that Indian authors trust so much to their memory as to quote generally by heart. Such slight differences, therefore, I have left unaltered whenever they were supported by the testimony of the best MSS.

As to the other part of the Commentary, which contains the original explanations of Mādhava, as edited by Sāyana, a similar advantage for a critical restoration of corrupt passages was derived from the frequent repetition of the same explanations in different hymns, which also made it easier to become familiar with the style of the Commentator, and his whole way of thinking and interpreting the Veda. It was a further advantage that the MSS. were most numerous for the first book of the Commentary, and, as Sāyana says with regard to the first Adhyāya of his Commentary, युन्यक्षायनम् सवें भोगुः प्रभोति पुरुषम्, "he who has got through this, can understand the rest." it might, at all events, be said with some truth, that after having worked through the first Ashtaka, an editor may go on to the rest with a smaller number of MSS.

For the first Ashtaka I had twelve MSS. However, we have learnt from Greek and Latin philology that a great number of MSS. is not at all desirable for critical purposes. In most cases those numerous MSS. which have been
collated for classical authors have only served to spoil the text; to make the
reading of doubtful passages still more doubtful; and to give rise to a mass of
conjectural readings, based either upon the authority of the transcriber of a
MS., or upon that of an ingenious editor. In this manner an immense deal of
labour has been wasted in classical philology; so that now, after the simple
rules for using MSS. have been laid down by a new school of critical philolo-
gers, such as Bekker, Dindorf, Laelmann, and others, almost all the old
ditions of classical authors have become useless for critical purposes, with the
exception of some of the editiones principes, which, as they simply reproduced
one MS., though generally a very bad one, can claim for themselves at least a
certain degree of authenticity. Before MSS. can be used for critical purposes, it
is necessary that they should themselves be examined critically, in order to
determine their origin, their age, and their genealogical ramifications, and thus
to fix their relative value. If it were possible to recover the original MS. of a
work, as written by the author himself, there would be no need of criticism; we
might dispense with all later MSS., and we should merely have to reproduce
the original text, pointing out at the same time such mistakes as the author
himself might have committed. But generally our MSS. are much later than
the composition of the works which they contain, and, if compared with one
another, they are found to differ from each other, partly in mistakes and omiss-
sions, partly in corrections and additions, arising, in the course of centuries,
from the hands or heads of ignorant or learned transcribers. For the most
part these various readings are not peculiar to one or the other MS. only, but
the same mistakes occur generally in several MSS. at the same time. Now,
if there are, for instance, certain MSS. which omit a certain number of pas-
sages that have been preserved in others, we may safely conclude that the MSS.
which coincide in omitting these passages flow from the same original source.
But out of the number of MSS. which thus coincide in omitting certain sen-
tences, some may again differ in other characteristic passages, and thus form
new classes and subdivisions. By carefully collecting a large number of such
characteristic passages, all the MSS. of an author arrange themselves spontane-
ously, and form at last a kind of genealogical series, where each has its
proper place, and commands, according to its position, but not according to its
age, its proper share of authority. For a MS. may be of modern date, yet
if by a comparison of certain classical passages it can be shown to have been
copied immediately from an old MS., it inherits, so to say, a greater share of authority than MSS. which, though of greater age, are of more distant relationship. Here, however, a distinction must be made between the authenticity and the correctness of a certain reading. As the date of the oldest MS. reaches but seldom to the age of the author of the work, we can only expect by a critical, and, so to say, genealogical arrangement of MSS., to arrive at the best authenticated, not at the original and correct text of an author. It sometimes happens, indeed, that all the MSS. of a work can be shown to have originated from one MS. which is still in existence, as is the case, for instance, with Sophocles. But most frequently there remain in the end two or more different groups of MSS., each with its own peculiar readings, and each group entirely independent of the other. In the former case the best that can be done in a merely critical edition is to reproduce the oldest and best authenticated MS. But it frequently happens, that even in the oldest MS., upon which all the others depend, mistakes occur, which have been corrected in more modern MSS., sometimes by mere conjecture, sometimes by using quotations from an author occurring in other works which have preserved a more ancient and more correct reading. Such passages are open to philological discussions, and have to be treated in notes. In the latter case, if there remain several independent branches of MSS., the task becomes more difficult; and as each class of MSS. may claim for itself the same degree of authenticity, it becomes the duty of an editor to choose in each particular case the reading of that class of MSS. which may seem to him most correct, and best in accordance with the general style of the author. Frequently, however, even in this case one class of MSS. will be discovered, which by its general character of correctness acquires a right to overrule the testimony of the other classes in doubtful passages. All this must be finally settled before a critical edition of any author can be commenced; and it is necessary, therefore, for an editor to collate most carefully even those passages where the various readings of MSS. bear the evident character of mere mistakes, but where, notwithstanding, the omission of a single letter may often serve to point out the connection of a certain class of MSS. Grave errors and long omissions are generally much less characteristic as marking a family likeness between certain MSS. than small and insignificant mistakes, because the former have often struck those who copied a MS., and have induced them to correct erroneous readings on their own authority, or to supply important
omissions from other MSS., in case they could be procured. The more insig-
nificant mistakes, on the contrary, were more likely to be overlooked and to
remain unaltered.

With regard to the twelve MSS. of the Commentary to the first Ashṭaka
of the Rig-veda, I have only succeeded in reducing them to three independent
classes. It is not very likely that MSS. should still be found in India contem-
poraneous with Sāyana, though, if we could trust native authorities, copies of
Sāyana's works have been buried in the ground near Vidyānāgara. Excluding
these MSS., the existence of which is extremely problematical, I am convinced
that there are no MSS. at present which have any claim to be considered as
exhibiting the Commentary exactly such as it came from the hands of Sāyana.

I shall proceed to give a list of those MSS. which I have made use of for
this edition. I shall call the three classes, to which all the MSS. belong, A, B,
and C, marking at the same time each particular MS. by its own number.

A.

A 2. A manuscript in four volumes, containing all the eight Ashṭakas. It
was presented by Colebrooke to the library of the East-India-House, where it is
entered under Nos. 2133—2136. It contains also the text of the hymns, but not
throughout. In some Ashṭakas the accents also are marked. It is dated
between 1747 and 1760 a, and has been written by different hands at Benares.
It is on the whole the most valuable MS., and the only one which represents
this first class of MSS. throughout the whole of the Commentary, though in
some of the later Ashṭakas long passages are wanting in this MS. also.

For the first Ashṭaka I have to include in this class—

A 1. An old MS. of the National Library at Paris, containing the first

a First Ashṭaka:

Sixth Ashṭaka: संवत ५०६ = 1749 A.D.

Fourth Ashṭaka: बालकमात्रांस्निसिद्ध गृहोऽस्मिनेण संबंधितो मुद्रा।

Seventh Ashṭaka: संवत ५५२ दशे धार्मिको गृहः कुटुम्बपथ नित्यानीतियोऽगुरुः

This gives Śākā 1673, or 1751 A.D.

This gives Śākā 1669, or 1747 A.D.

VOL. I.
Ashtaka only. It is well written, and indeed gave me the first hope that a critical edition of Sayana might still be possible. It is dated Samvat 1625° (1682 A.D.), and is in many respects more useful than A 2. But, though of earlier date than A 2, it cannot be considered by any means as the original from which A 2 was copied: for although the omission of passages which stand in A 1, might be ascribed to the negligence of the transcriber of A 2, yet there are also whole lines which are left out in A 1, but which are not wanting in A 2. Both MSS. flow from one original source, and their authority is on the whole equal; though A 1, as being the earlier branch, has thereby some advantages over A 2. The absence of the other seven Ashtakas in A 1, is a great loss for an edition of the Commentary.

To the same class must also be referred A 3, the MS. of the first Ashtaka in Sir R. Chambers’ collection, now in the Royal Library at Berlin. Of this old MS., which is in a very bad state of preservation, I possess no complete collation, but only short notes and extracts which I made before I had seen the MSS. at Paris and London, and before I was in a position to conceive the possibility of a critical edition of the Commentary. A comparison of several characteristic passages, however, shews the connection of this MS. with A 1, and A 2, with which it coincides in several of its right as well as of its wrong readings. As I was not able, however, to verify in each particular passage the reading of this MS., it is not to be understood as included in the general designation of class A, unless especially mentioned.

B.

The second class, B, is represented by two MSS., both of them complete copies of the Commentary. I owe my first acquaintance with this class of MSS. to the kindness and liberality of Professor F. Burnouf, who allowed me, during my stay at Paris, to copy and collate the MS. of Sayana in his possession. Besides several passages which are corrected or supplied by this MS. in places where mistakes or omissions occur in A. or C, it contains also a number of passages which evidently bear the character of later additions: they stand frequently without any connection with the rest of the Commentary, and I had no doubt that they owed their origin to marginal notes which had been added by Brahmins while studying the Veda, and which in later copies had been

° विदार्शकराणांभि समः || संग्रह १६५५ रूप कैला- || प्रयोगमुद्या पुज्जोत्सन्नतिः || शुभं अस्तु || कल्याणी
मृदुल गुरी || चढळ योगसंवतसात्र्य योगीगिरिशास्त्रीय भुवान ॥
incorporated into the text, though sometimes inserted in a wrong place. This supposition I found fully proved by another MS., which has lately been added to the library of the East-India-House, and which is evidently the very MS. from which Professor Burnouf's copy was taken. In this MS. all those spurious passages, which occur neither in A. nor C., have not yet been incorporated into the text, but appear still as marginal notes. Nay, it is even easy to see how, by mistaking the signs of reference, the transcriber was led to misplace some of these additions. I call the MS. of the East-India-House B 1., and that of Professor Burnouf B 2.; though the latter is on the whole so carefully copied, that both may be considered as one MS.

C.

The third class of MSS. is much more numerously represented, but consists almost entirely of modern copies, executed, with more or less care, for the use of European scholars. Yet this class of MSS. also was indispensable for restoring a complete and correct text of Śāyāṇa: for though omissions and mistakes are very frequent, yet some difficult passages are given more correctly in this class of MSS. than in either A. or B.; while others, which are partly omitted in A. or B., receive occasionally great help from a comparison of C. Modern additions occur, but very seldom, and their late origin is so evident that they cannot be mistaken. The following is a list of this last class of MSS.

C 1. A complete copy of the Commentary in the National Library at Paris. It is advantageously distinguished from the rest, in so far as some very considerable omissions common to all the C. MSS. have been supplied in C 1. from another MS. Yet there can be no doubt that, with these exceptions, all the rest of this MS. descends from the same original source as the other C. MSS. There is, for instance, a long omission at the end of the fourth Adhyāya of the first Ashtāka: all the C. MSS. break off in the third verse of the twenty-fifth Varga (p. 534 of my edition), with the words तामिकाकार, so that twenty pages are altogether wanting. It is difficult to account for this omission, and I suppose this loss to have happened very early, because in A. and B. also, where the Commentary goes on to the end of the fourth Adhyāya, there is a peculiarity in the style of the Commentator not quite in accordance with the rest of his work. That this omission has been supplied in C 1. from a different MS. is evident, and can be traced even in the smallest particulars. Thus, for instance, throughout the whole of this supplement the merely grammatical part of the
Commentary is always divided by a line from the rest, while in all the rest of this MS. the beginning of the grammatical explanations is not marked at all.

C 1b. A second MS. of the National Library at Paris, comprehending the first Ashṭaka only, and very negligently written.

C 2. The next MS. of this class is a copy which Dr. Mill brought over from India, and which he kindly lent me for my edition. It will hereafter be deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, for which the whole collection of Dr. Mill's Sanskrit MSS. has been lately purchased. It contains all the eight Ashṭakas complete, with the usual omissions of the C. MSS., and is written very carefully and distinctly.

C 3. One volume, containing the first Ashṭaka only. It belonged formerly to the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, afterwards to Professor Wilson, and is now deposited in the Bodleian Library.

C 4. A complete copy of Sāyaṇa's Commentary, forming Nos. 78—86, in Professor Wilson's collection of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bodleian Library. It is dated Samvat 1890 = 1833 A.D.

C 5. Another copy belonging to the same collection, and entered in the Catalogue under Nos. 57—66. It comprehends the first, third, and fourth Ashṭakas only; the second being supplied by another MS., No. 74, which contains six only out of the eight Adhyāyas.

C 6. A Bengali MS., containing the text and commentary of the first two Adhyāyas of the first Ashṭaka. This likewise forms part of Professor Wilson's collection, and is entered in the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library under No. 75.

That all these MSS. must be considered as separated from the MSS. of Sāyaṇa himself by at least one degree, I conclude from the existence of such mistakes as are common to all the three classes of our MSS. I do not mean to say that Sāyaṇa may not himself have committed mistakes in writing his commentary. On the contrary, there are mistakes in all the MSS. which must probably rest upon Sāyaṇa's own responsibility. For instance, Rv. 1. 114. 4, the grammatical explanation of तुर्भः: evidently contains a mistake: yet all the MSS. quote the same Sātra of Pāṇini (III. 3, 126), and there can be little doubt that Sāyaṇa himself is the author of this wrong quotation. If mistakes of this

P Instead of दुःखभूतार्थार्थेऽक्षमान: साययान भारे चन्द्रमय: विनेतादाता: दीर्घादतर्कायां दर्शते गतिः काशोपयपदातिहारसम्मोक्षे॥
kind occur only in one class of MSS., or in two, but not in all three at the same time, it must frequently remain uncertain whether they are to be laid to the charge of Sāyana or his transcribers. For instance, Rv. 1, 97. 3. A. has संग्रामवस्तु संग्रामवस्तु, while B. and C. read संग्रामवस्तु संग्रामवस्तु. Sāyana might have written both, but I have retained the reading of A, as, in cases like this, A. generally represents the more authentic reading, B. and C. being more liable to corrections. Rv. 1, 102. 3. however, I have adopted the reading of B. and C, संग्रामवस्तु, instead of विचारतानां: (A 2), because, as A 1. coincides here with B. and C, the reading of A 2, can only be considered as resting upon the authority of the transcriber of A 2, and not upon the collective authority of A. Sometimes old mistakes have been corrected in the more modern MSS. Rv. 1, 66. 3. A. and C. read सत्त्वस्तु वारंभिकंतति सत्त्वस्तु: संग्रामवस्तु:, while in B. the grammatical fault, वारंभिकं, has been corrected into रु. Though वारंभिकं may have originated with Sāyana himself, I have of course adopted the reading of B. I shall now quote however, some passages where mistakes common to all the MSS. cannot be ascribed to the author, but must have crept into the MSS. before any of our present copies were written. There are evident traces of corruption in the text of the Commentary in explaining the grammatical formation of भृगु, Rv. 1, 110, 2. All the MSS. omit देशकारों: but have yet the च after भृगु:, which leaves no doubt that देशकारों: must have preceded it. Again, Rv. 1, 115. 5, where चार्येश्वरेऽ is explained, the MSS. have only चार्येश्वरेऽ, which explains merely the first part of चार्येश्वरेऽ, and necessarily requires the addition of either देशु or देशनाम, or some similar word, to explain the second part. This, however, is omitted in all the MSS., and I was obliged to supply it by conjecture. There is one passage towards the end of the first Ashākā (Rv. 1, 126. 7.) where the omission of several letters is marked in the A. as well as in the C. MSS., and where the B. MSS. also, though they do not mark the omission, are of no use for restoring the text. In this case I was unable to fill out this omission, and I have marked it in the same way as the MSS. do. Sometimes old omissions have been supplied by the transcribers, but not always successfully. Rv. 1, 99. 1. all the MSS. in explaining चराश्रावं: read इति प्रस उद्दालि, thus making चराश्रावं an accusative plural, while it ought to be the genitive singular, and therefore इति उस...

9 There is probably also a corruption in the words कंचनार्द्ध which precede the lacuna. One might conjecture कंचनार्द्ध, but this must remain uncertain till new MSS. can be procured.
That उदाय়ন is indeed nothing but a conjecture of the copyists, becomes clear when we see that A₂ has ইংং ই: and, thus marking an old omission in the original MS. from which it was copied, without any attempt to correct it. Such blanks occur most frequently in A₂, and in some cases evidently because the MS. from which it was copied was worn off at the margin, so that the blanks return always at regular intervals, that is to say, always at the end of a line of the original MS. Yet although in many other respects too, the A. MSS. exhibit the best authenticated reading, yet it is impossible to consider either B. or C. as descending from A, on account of the omissions, additions, and mistakes which are peculiar to each of the three classes of MSS., and have never found their way from one class into another. What I had to do therefore as an editor was first to find, by a collation of the different copies of each class of MSS., the reading of each of the three principal classes, and afterwards to choose that reading which, by weighing the authority of the three classes, and by taking into account the whole style of Śāyāna, seemed to be the most authentic. Considering, however, that this edition of the Commentary is not only a critical work, but at the same time destined to be useful for studying the Veda, I have never carried these critical principles so far as to leave a corruption in the text, which, though it might rest upon the authority of the best MSS., was still so evident, that any body, if acquainted with the rules of the Sanskrit language, would have seen it, and, if conversant with the style of Śāyāna, would have safely corrected it. I have even added some few passages, which, though they belonged only to one class of MSS., B. or C., yet seemed to be useful where
they stood. So that I may safely assert, that whatever good was to be found in the MSS. will be found in this edition, while much that was faulty in them has been corrected.

The laws of Sandhi and other euphonic laws I have endeavoured to observe in the same way as they have been practically carried out in the best Sanskrit MSS., considering it necessary, in a work like that of Sáyana, to avoid the innovations of European, as well as the antiquated subtleties of Indian grammarians. I have also followed the custom of the MSS., which sometimes suspend very properly the laws of Sandhi in order to avoid certain combinations of words, by which either single words or the structure of whole sentences might become obscure and doubtful. In this manner the Sandhi becomes for the SANSKRIT what punctuation is for other languages, only it is as difficult to lay down general laws for the one as for the other.

I have now only to mention those works which I made use of for verifying the quotations in Sáyana's Commentary. There is first of all Páñini, whose grammatical rules are most frequently quoted by Sáyana, sometimes at full length, sometimes only with a few words by way of reference. I have derived great advantage for verifying and understanding these technical rules from Professor Böhtlingk's edition of Páñini, which, whatever may be said against some parts of it, is a most excellent and meritorious work. In the quotation of

'...I must mention here one expression of Sáyana's, which occurs very frequently, but has given rise to doubts, and is, as it seems, not yet understood rightly. There are two rules of Pánini's, consisting of the words सामवितयम् प: the one (VI. 1. 19.) teaches that a vocative case has the accent on the first syllable; the other (VIII. 1. 19.) restricts this rule, by saying that if a vocative be preceded by another word, and do not stand at the beginning of a Pada, it has no accent at all. In order to distinguish between these two rules, Sáyana calls the accent prescribed by the former rule, which occurs in the sixth Ashtaka, पाषिकमात्वमात्रेन: while the suppression of the accent, as prescribed by the latter rule in the eighth Ashtaka, is called by him सामवितयम् निमित्त: or सामवितयम्.
rules I have seldom had occasion to differ from his edition, and where I have done so, it has only been after mature consideration. In the quotation of the Vārṭṭikas also I have followed Professor Böhtlingk's edition, though it is to be regretted that he has left out many of them. These, however, could easily be found in the Calcutta edition of Pāṇini, though for some of them I was obliged to have recourse to the Mahābhāṣya. In order to make this edition more useful, I have been induced to add the references from Pāṇini in the first Adhyāyas, but afterwards I have done so only whenever a new rule was quoted for the first time. Professor Böhtlingk (now Counsellor of State to His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia) could not render a more valuable service to Sanskrit philology, than by publishing a second and complete edition of Pāṇini and his Commentaries, a work for which he must possess at present the most ample materials.

Two other collections of grammatical Sūtras which are quoted by Sāyaṇa are the Unādi-sūtras and the Phit-sūtras of Sāntanāchārya. Both of them form part of the Siddhānta-kaumudi, as published at Calcutta, 1811, but they have been edited with much less care than Pāṇini's Sūtras. They have been reprinted in the Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, 1843 and 1844, by Professor Böhtlingk, but require, particularly the Unādi-sūtras, a careful collation of MSS. and the help of commentaries. I have quoted the Sūtras after Professor Böhtlingk's text, as being more accessible than the edition of the Siddhānta-kaumudi; but I have been continually obliged to have recourse to the MSS. and Commentaries of the Unādi-sūtras.

A fourth grammatical work quoted by Sāyaṇa is the Dhātupatha. Of this work we have a most excellent edition by Professor Westergaard of Copenhagen, at the end of his Radices Linguae Sanscritae. I have quoted it only a few times, as it is very easy to find Sāyaṇa's quotations with the help of Prof.

1 The MS. from which I have derived the greatest use is the Unādivritti, by Ujvaladatta, a work which has been composed after a careful collation of old MSS. and Commentaries. It frequently points out words and Sūtras as being of later origin, and as not occurring in old Commentaries. In our printed editions some Sūtras are left out, others mixed with the Commentary; some are incomplete, others incorrect; and the meaning and formation of words are frequently mistaken. I merely mention this here to point out how unsafe it would be to make use of our present editions for lexicographic purposes; but I shall soon have an opportunity of returning to this subject, when examining the historical value of this and other works previous to Pāṇini.
Westergaard's Radices. Sāyāna has himself written a Commentary on the Dhātupātha, before he wrote his Commentary on the Veda, and has frequently readings peculiar to himself, which he has defended in his Commentary, and which Prof. Westergaard also has generally mentioned in his edition.

Another work frequently used by Sāyāna for explaining the Veda is Yāska's Nirukta. This work existed only in manuscript when I began to print Sāyāna's Commentary, and as the greater part of the Nirukta is contained in Sāyāna's works, I was obliged to copy and analyse it, in order to verify Sāyāna's quotations. For though, with the help of the Sarvāṅukrama, all the passages from the Veda which are explained by Yāska may be traced back to their places in the text by referring to the Commentary on the Nirukta, where the Devatā and Rishi of each passage are given, yet it is very difficult, vice versa, to find always the place in the Nirukta where a passage of the Veda has been explained by Yāska; still more so when only a few words out of Yāska's explanations are quoted by Sāyāna. In the course of carrying this first volume through the press, a very correct edition of the Nirukta has been published by my learned friend Professor Roth in Germany. Prof. Roth had kindly informed me beforehand which of the two recensions of the Nirukta he would follow in his edition, and I am glad to find that consequently the references which I have always given, when the Nirukta is quoted by Sāyāna, coincide with his edition. In some few places Sāyāna's quotations from Yāska do not exactly correspond with the text of the Nirukta; but this is probably owing to Sāyāna's manner of quoting, which, as I have mentioned before, is generally done from memory. Although these differences were very slight, yet I could not, in accordance with the principles of my edition, take it upon myself to correct them. I have not added references to Sāyāna's quotations from the Nighāntus, because these lists of Vaidik words are already arranged systematically under different heads, and thus require no further reference.

The same applies to Sāyāna's quotations from Kātyāyana's Sarvāṅukrama. I have myself compared every passage quoted from this Index of the authors, deities, metres, etc. of each hymn. But as this Index follows exactly the same order as the hymns of the Rig-veda, it would have been useless to add the references. In those cases also where Sāyāna quotes from the Sarvāṅukrama

\[ \text{Sāyāna quotes his Dhātavṛtti, Rv. 1, 42, 7, 1, 51, 8, 1, 82, 1, etc.} \]
certain rules on metre and other subjects contained in the Paribhāshā, I have abstained from giving the references, because this Introduction to Kātyāyana's Sarvāṅukrama is likewise so well arranged, and so short, that it is as easy to find a reference as to find the quotation itself.

Another author whom Sāyana quotes most frequently with regard to the Vaidik ceremonial is Āśvalāyana. There are twelve books of Śrauta-sūtras, and four books of Grihya-sūtras, none of them as yet published. Sāyana quotes these Sūtras continually, whenever a hymn or part of a hymn of the Rig-veda occurs which is to be employed by the Hotri-priests at a certain act of a sacrifice. Now if, like the Sūtras to the Yajur-veda, the Sūtras of Āśvalāyana followed the same order as the hymns, it would not have been difficult to find Sāyana's quotations in the MSS. of Āśvalāyana's Sūtras, and it would scarcely have been necessary to give a reference to each of Sāyana's quotations from Āśvalāyana. But the Rig-veda has preserved its old arrangement and its genuine form, and has not been supplanted by a Hotri-veda, or a prayer-book for the Hotri-priests; such as the Yajur-veda is for the Adhvaryu-priests, and the Śāma-veda for the Udgātri-priests. If, like these two so-called ceremonial Vedas, the Rig-veda also consisted only of such passages as are requisite for the Brahmanic sacrifices, arranged in the same order as they have to be recited by the Hotri-priests at different ceremonies, the order of the hymns and of the Sūtras, and probably also of the Brahmanas, would be the same. But, as it is, the Rigveda represents to us the old collection of sacred poetry, as it has been handed down by tradition in different Vaidik families, each of which claimed a certain number of ancient poets (Rishis) as their own. The poems therefore which have been incorporated in the Rig-veda-saṅhitā are arranged according to the old families to which the poets of certain songs are said to have belonged, and consequently those passages which in later times were selected as most appropriate to be employed at the grand sacrifices by the Hotri-priests, are found scattered about in different parts of this old collection. Sāyana, who of course knew Āśvalāyana's Sūtras by heart, quotes these Sūtras whenever one of those verses occurs which Āśvalāyana has prescribed for any one of the different sacrifices. But all that Sāyana adds, to enable one who has not learnt by heart these sixteen books of ceremonial Sūtras, to find their place in Āśvalāyana, consists in mentioning the name of the particular part of the ceremonial, and sometimes in giving the beginning of the chapter where a certain Sūtra
occurs. By the help of Indices, however, I have succeeded in verifying these passages also, and I have always added the book and chapter where Sāyana’s quotations are to be found in Áśvaláyana’s work. If, in the passages which Sāyana quotes from the Brāhmaṇas, he had restricted himself to the Brāhmaṇas of the Rig-veda, I should have added references to these quotations also. But as Sāyana takes his quotations promiscuously from all the Brāhmaṇas, whether connected with the Rig-veda or the Sāma-veda, Yajur-veda, and Atharva-veda, I determined rather to give no references whatever for these Brāhmaṇa passages than to do it incompletely. Besides there was the difficulty that these Brāhmaṇas and Áranyakas, which as yet exist only in manuscript, are not always divided in the same manner; so that if I had adapted my references to the MSS., they might perhaps not have been found in accordance with the editions of several of the Brāhmaṇas which are now preparing for publication. In many instances I have derived great help from the original MSS. of the Brāhmaṇas, particularly as Sāyana’s quotations from these works are generally full of mistakes, arising from old Vaidik forms, which the transcribers did not

It is not only on account of the vastness of the Brāhmaṇa literature that I found it impossible to verify every quotation, but there are many Brāhmaṇas of which there are not even MSS. to be procured in any of the European libraries. Some seem lost even in India, and are only known by name. With regard to the Brāhmaṇas of the Sāma-veda, I had stated, in a letter to my friend Professor Benfey at Gottingen, that there are eight. Prof. Benfey has kindly mentioned this in the Preface to his edition of the Sāma-veda; and as Dr. Weber has lately published some observations with regard to Prof. Benfey’s and Mr. Colebrooke’s statements on the Brāhmaṇa literature of the Sāma-veda, I owe it to Prof. Benfey and to myself to make good my assertion. Sāyana, in his Commentary on the Sānavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa, says:

तत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍ततततत‍तततতত taller than the last column.
know and understand. Frequently, however, I found also that real differences existed between a passage as quoted by Sāyana and the text as exhibited in the Brāhmaṇas, which can only be accounted for by the supposition that Sāyana used some Brāhmaṇas in a Śākhā different from that which was accessible to me in manuscript.

I have only to express, in conclusion, my sincere thanks for the instruction, the advice, the encouragement, and assistance which I have received, in the course of my studies, from those distinguished Oriental scholars whose lectures I have followed at the Universities of Leipzig, Berlin, and Paris, as well as from those whom I met with there, and with whom I became connected by the ties of kindred pursuits and friendship. To mention the liberality with which foreigners are admitted to the rich collections of the National Library at Paris, the Library of the East-India-House in London, and the Bodleian Library at Oxford, would only be repeating what is known to all who have had occasion to consult those Libraries. Yet this ought not to prevent me from acknowledging the personal obligation under which I feel myself towards M. Hase, M. Reinard and M. Munk at the National Library at Paris, and towards the Rev. Dr. Bandinel and the Rev. H. O. Coxe at the Bodleian Library at Oxford, for the kindness which I have received at their hands during my studies at Paris and Oxford. Private collections also of Sanskrit MSS. have been freely thrown open to me, in France by Professor Burnouf in England by the Rev. Dr. Mill; and I avail myself of this opportunity to return my thanks to both of these eminent Oriental scholars. I have also thankfully to acknowledge the kind assistance of my learned friend Dr. Ch. Rieu at the British Museum, by whose careful corrections many misprints and mistakes have been removed, which, notwithstanding the great accuracy and ability of the compositor employed on the present volume, could scarcely be avoided in so extensive a work. Above all, however, my thanks are due to Professor H. H. Wilson. It would be presumptuous on my part were I to speak of his unequalled achievements in different branches of Oriental philology. But it would be ungrateful were I not to acknowledge the kindness with which he has assisted me in my undertaking. To his recommendation I owe the liberal patronage which the Honourable the Court of Directors of the East-India-Company have bestowed upon this work, and without which its publication would scarcely have been possible. While I was preparing this edition his books and manuscripts were at
my disposal; whenever I wanted advice, he was ready to give it; and he has even given his valuable time to correct the press. The English translation of the Rig-veda by Professor Wilson, which is soon to appear, will be a new proof of the interest which he has taken in this work. To have been allowed to enjoy his acquaintance, and to avail myself of his instruction, will always be to me the best compensation for what I have lost in living so long away from my own country and my old friends.

M. M.

OXFORD.

October 1849.