i.e. "all the actions of heavenly beings depend only upon their own will."

A similar correction has to be applied at 417, 22:

Kim, deva, nîti-tattva-jîto 'py ajânann iva muhyasi ? Sva-parântaram aprekshyam; ataḥ kasya 'iha vikramaḥ ?

I fear no contradiction if I assert that when is to be rendered, in Roman characters, through aprekshya? matah; the sign of interrogation after muhyasi has to be changed into a semicolon, by those at least who see any use in the introduction of European interpunction into Sanskrit texts. For my part I regard this system as an intrusion. The translation runs nearly thus: "How can you, my Prince, who are so well versed in politics, indulge in illusions, as if you were ignorant of them, not taking into consideration the difference between yourself and the foe? Who would think here of violence" (i.e. who would approve of it)?

Justice is also due to the MSS. 376, 119:

Sa tam alokayamasa, jihvaya 'asrik-kanim lihan.

The Nagara text has a sarqual, rightly, or may be wif, wrongly, but, at all events, the meaning is: jihvaya sṛkkaṇt (or rather sṛkvaṇt) lihan, "licking the corners of his mouth with his tongue."

The foregoing examples may show that some errors may be cleared without the aid of MSS. I shall now proceed to point out some more of the kind in regular order, and at the same time notice some typographical errors likely to puzzle the reader.

Page 14, 36: Here and elsewhere, e.g. 153, 39; 280, 169, etc., the editor writes abruvam. It may be that some MSS. have it, but that is no reason why it should be Sanskrit. In many copies and a are scarcely to be distinguished; hence we find at least a dozen times used in print against once in the MSS. Whether the editors thought of used, or thought nothing at all, does not matter. That form abruvam is as preposterous as a form advisham or abruvtt.

22, 189: For janmabhûmiḥ parâ-priyâ read parapriyâ. Our home is not our "most excellent or supreme sweetheart," but "very dear."