

*uttamapātra*, always speaks Sanskrit in the rest of the play. Another objection appears to be that wherever they are intended to be chanted or spoken by the King they are mostly tautological, containing the substance of Sanskrit verses immediately preceding or following them, which is a very suspicious circumstance against their genuineness. Thus for example, stanza 8 (page 107A.) is merely a repetition in Prakrit of stanza 7; stanza 44 is a Prakrit repetition of stanza 45 (page 117A); stanza 49 is a mere tautology of the Sanskrit stanzas 48 and 50 (page 118A.), and so forth.

A third objection seems to lie in the fact that a great many of the Prakrit verses though claiming to be parts of the King's soliloquy are full of descriptions and vague allusions and references in the third person to some one in his situation rather than to him distinctly. For example, see stanzas 28, 62. As regards some others again, it is clear that they are not to be repeated by the King, and yet it is not plain whose parts they form. Examples of such are stanzas 1 and 5.

A fourth and perhaps the strongest objection against the passages is that not only are none of them required in their respective places, but several of them appear to interrupt the free and natural flow of the sentiments as expressed in the Sanskrit passages; *i. e.* not only would they not be missed were they not to occur where they are found, but their absence gives a better continued sense from the Sanskrit than is now the case when the latter is so often interrupted by them.

When I was in Madras in the hot season of 1874 I had occasion to see the family Library of Rao Bahadur Raghunath Rao, the present Devan of Indore, and on examining a Devanāgarī Ms. of the play, which, I was informed, had been taken to that part of the country by the ancestors of the family when they