

*mûsh mûshitum*, a form *mushitum* has no existence ; there fore we have to correct *mûshitum*.

390, 44 :

*Eshâ ca citram yuvayoh patantî dhûlir ânane*  
*Vâtoddhûtâ 'ahata-châyam âvayoh kurute mukham.*

From the context it appears that Chaṇḍasinha wonders how two delicate girls could bear so well the inconveniences of the wilderness, amongst others the whirling dust ; even men felt these inconveniences. The dust “spoils” the fresh “colour” even of men’s faces. This is precisely the reverse of what is exhibited in the printed text : in Nāgari it is all right :

वातोद्धुता हतच्छायमावयोः कुरुते मुखम्.

398, 5: The editor writes *tamasâ vṛitaḥ* (तमसावृतः). I doubt whether this is right. The common expression is certainly *tamasâ âvṛitaḥ*, because darkness covers, enwraps a person *on every side*. It is common and natural enough to say, *ayaṃ bandhubhir vṛitaḥ*, or *panthâḥ pāshāṇair vṛitaḥ*, but in neither case the notion is that of enwrapping. Unless the contrary be proved I deem it prudent to stick to *tamasâ âvṛitaḥ*.

Ibid. 9 : After *prati* a full stop ought to be put ; and in śloka 10, after the second *iva*, a semicolon, the verb being *prāptavān asmi* in śloka 11.

399, 31: Probably *jyotibhir* is a typographical error for *jyotirbhir*.

400, 55: If I have well understood the editor’s system of transcription, the words *Arohinika* and *Aratika* should be written *a-Rohinika* and *a-Ratika*.

406, 186 :

*kṣhaṇâc ca śānte pavane, niḥṣabda-stimito =mbudhiḥ*  
*dadau praśānta-kopasya sajjanasya samānatām.*

There is no question of “giving,” but of “putting on, taking,” the appearance of something. Consequently read *dadhau*.

421, 101; Instead of *sa prīti-bahumānam* read *sapṛīti-bahumānam*.