

30, 368 : For *putrāya 'avarjito* (पुत्रायावर्जितो) read *avarjito*, which needs no explanation.

Ibid. 370 : For *striyaḥ* read *striyāḥ* ; the genitive case of *strī* being invariably *striyāḥ*.

36, 88 :

*Tasmiñ ca rājñi kulavo rajaḥsu guṇa-vicyutiḥ,
Sāyakeshv avicāraḥ ca goshṭheshu paçurakṣhiṇām.*

Without some change there is no means of mending this sloka. The original reading must have been, I think :

तस्मिन् राज्ञि कुवत्तरजःसु गुणविच्युतिः ।

सायकेषुविचारस्य गोष्ठेषु पशुरक्षिणाम् ॥

Which, to keep as close to the original as possible, may be rendered : “and in his reign a falling down from the string (गुणविच्युति) occurred with the pollen of lotuses,” no falling off from virtue (गुणविच्युति) occurred in men ; “discussion about shafts and arrows occurred only in the conversations of the (peaceable and unhurt) cowherds,” not in the armies preparing for battle. That the cæsura divides a compound word into two parts, as we see in *kuḥala* | *rajaḥsu*, is a licence of which our author avails himself sparingly.

43, 38 : *Surā* is undoubtedly a typographical error for *surāḥ*, and so is *tasyā puro*, p. 44, 62, for *tasyāḥ*.

48, 161 :

Kim nirarthena dehena jīvitāpi mṛitena me ?

In the MSS. this was written :

किं निरर्थेन देहेन जीविनापि मृतेन मे ।

or, perhaps, as it ought to be :

किं निरर्थेन देहेन जीविनोऽपि मृतेन मे ।

“What shall I do with this useless body that is dead, although I still breathe ?”

67, 70 : For *āçāsitaḥ* read *āçvāsitaḥ*.

90, 66 :

*Abravīt tām ca : “putro me tvayā, 'arthe, śikshyatām ayam
Veçyayoshit-kalā, yena vaidagdhyaṃ prāpnuyād asau.”*

From the interpunction it would seem that the editor takes *arthe* for a verb, but there is no such verb ; there is a very