

465, 178 :

*dharmāsanopaviṣṭā hi durbalam balinam, param
ātmīyaṃ vata jñānti dhīrā nyāyaika-darśinaḥ.*

The meaning is that righteous kings and judges know no difference between a feeble and a powerful (or a poor and rich) person, between a stranger and a kinsman. The word वत (which at all events had to be written *bata*) in the printed text, is a mis-read च न.

466, 3 : *Rishyamūkha*° is a slip of the pen for *Rishyamūka*°, as it is rightly printed a little before, śl. 184.

467, 14. The word *anasūyā* denoting here a well-known person from the Rāmāyaṇa, should be written *Anasūyā*. For my part, certainly, I consider the use of capitals in a Sanskrit text to be an undue concession to European habits or prejudices, but the system once adopted should be persevered in.

Ibid. 25 :

*Sampāti-vacanottirṇa-vāridheṣ ca Hanūmataḥ
yatnāt pravṛittau jātāyām, gatvā kapilaiḥ saha, i. ā.*

Not जातायां but जाताया is the word we want.

Ibid. 30 :

*yābhyā saṃ Gandharva-purāc Ṣṛāvastīm prāpito °bhatat,
Bhagīrathayaṣā yasyām yena sā paryanīyata.*

If the person who had married *Bhagīrathayaṣas* were not known otherwise, and could be indicated only by his achievements being mentioned, the word *yena* would be right; but not here, because it is *Naravāhanadatta*. Therefore the sentence requires *tena* instead of *yena*.

468, 38 :

*aham ca tatraiva °eshyāmi Caṇḍasinhena sūnunā,
sa hi Vidyādharendraiḥ ca svakair abhyudayāyate.*

Sa hi is out of place here; *abhyudayāyate* is so everywhere; read *saha* and *abhyudayāya te*.

481, 193 :

*bandhu-prāpti-prado hy esha bhāryā-ryatikaro mayā,
ari-marde °dhunā mukhyam aṅgam, ity abhinanditaḥ.*