541, 5 : For *eti* " goes," read *aiti* "comes."

Ibid. 8 :

> *pitâ ca tat-samam tasya Candraketuh sa sainikam*
> *ahvânâya pratîhâram visasarja rathânugam.*

A body of troops must accompany the chamberlain for safety's sake, the latter alone being the messenger to call the prince (*tasya-âhvânâya*). If this be true, the edited text ought to have *sasainikam*.

543, 55 :

> *kavacanam* is a slip of the pen for *kavacam*.

547, 32 : The word *sugata* has the same right to be considered a noun proper as Buddha ; therefore we have to write *Sugata ;* likewise p. 549, 75.

Ibid 46 :

> *striyo -pi 'icchanti pum-bhâvam, yâ drishtvâ rûpa-lolubhâh.*
> *tasyâs te ko bhaved na 'arthî, tulya-rúpah sa kim punah ?*

In this form the whole sloka is entirely unintelligible ; a single *Anusvâra*, however, is sufficient to render the meaning clear ; read :

> स्त्रियो ५पीच्छन्ति पुभावं या दृष्ट्वा रूपलोलुभाः ।
> तस्याखे को भवेन्नार्थी तुञ्चरूपः स किमुनः ॥

"Who would not desire to possess you, at whose sight even woman should wish to be man, etc."

557, 68 :

tatah sa pakshivahano — Muktâphaladhvajah. Since Mukt. does not carry the birds, but these carry him, the author wrote पक्षिवाहनो.

580, 62 :

> *drishtvaiva tena kodande namatyâ 'âropitam gunam,*
> *tac-çikshayaiva 'ucchiraso -py anaman sarvato nripâh.*

A form *namatyâ* does not exist ; if it were *namantyâ*, it would be the instrumental case of the feminine, but no word of the feminine gender has anything to do here. In short, नमत्यारोपितं is to be divided into *namaty* (Locat. sing. belonging to *kodande*) and *âropitam*. Moreover, read तच्छिक्षयेव ; *eva* is out of place.

Ibid. 80 :