

It is impossible that one person can be put into different litters at the same time ; hence it follows that we have to read *çibikām* (not *çivī*^o).

457, 2, sq. :

*"parārtha-phala-janmāno na syur mārṅa-drumā iva
"tāpa-chido mahāntaṣ cej jīrṅāranyaṃ jagad bhavet,"
yad dṛishṭvā, tam sa sujanaḥ pṛishṭvā ca 'anvaya-nāmanā
haste -valambya 'udaharat kúpāt tasmād uvāca ca :*

The word *yad* is here a causal conjunction, introducing the whole of the former śloka, whereas the finite verb in the chief sentence is *udaharat*. A quotation is wholly out of question for two reasons ; firstly, because *yad dṛishṭvā* is not synonymous with *iti matvā* or *kṛitvā* ; secondly, because no *sujana*, especially if he be a Hindu, would call himself a noble or great man. Enough ; we have to do away with the brackets, to put a semicolon after *yad*, and to omit the same after *dṛishṭvā*. The construction is, accordingly : *yaj jagad bhavej jīrṅāranyaṃ yadi mahānto na syus tāpacchidaḥ | sa sujano dṛishṭvā tam pṛishṭvā cānvayanāmanā avalambya hasta udaharat kúpāt*.

458, 11, sq. :

*"satatam asyai gāyantyai vīṇāyām Çaurinā svayam
dattam sva-gītakam, kāshtā, gāndharve paramāṅgataḥ.
"yo vādayati vīṇāyām, tribhir grāmaiṣ ca gāyati
gāndharva-kovidāḥ samyag Vaishṇavaṃ stuti-gītakam,
sa me patiḥ syād.' "* i. ā.

The first śloka ought to run thus :

सततमस्मै गायन्त्यै वीणायां शौरिणा स्वयम् ।

दत्तं स्वगीतकं काष्ठां गान्धर्वे परमां गतः ॥

In other words : the single brackets have to be closed after *svagītakam* ; then follows according to the editor's system : *"'kāshtāḥ gāndharve paramāṃ gataḥ | yo vādayati i.ā.' "* i.e. "one who having attained the highest degree of excellence in music, accompanies on the lute," etc.

Ibid. 24 : Such *ārsha*-forms like *yūñjantyās* must be left to the *Mahābhārata* and kindred works ; Somadeva could not use such forms in a style like his.