THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ABSOLUTIVE IN -ŪṆA(M)
IN UTTARAJJHĀYĀ

Herman Tieken, Leiden

§ 1. Introduction

The Āyāra, Sūyagaḍa, Dasaveyāliya and Uttarajjhāyā are generally regarded as the oldest texts of the Jaina canon. However, among these four texts the Uttarajjhāyā falls somewhat out of tune. In this text, which mostly consists of *śloka*, *triṣṭubh* and *vaitālīya* stanzas, a strikingly large number of classical *āryā*s is found (see ALSDORF 1966). These *āryā*s, around 130 altogether, form a younger layer representing a more recent metrical practice. The majority of the *āryā*s, 109, is found in the dogmatic and disciplinary chapters in the last third of Uttarajjhāyā. About half of these have been identified by ALSDORF as borrowings from younger texts, such as Piṇḍa and Oha-Nijjutti, Āurapaccakkhāṇa and Maraṇasamāhi. For these texts BRUHN coined the term "late canonical and post-canonical verse (i.e. *āryā*) literature" (L.V.L.) (BRUHN 1996). Of the remaining *āryā* stanzas 17 are found in the legendary chapters and seem to have been composed *ad hoc*. A special category is formed by vv. 5-15 in the 10th chapter, which are strange patchworks of *vaitālīya* and *āryā* Pādas (ALSDORF 1966: 159).

According to ALSDORF, Uttarajjhāyā is an early canonical text with later additions. If I understand ALSDORF correctly he actually postulates an Ur-Uttarajjhāyā, that is, the present version without the classical *āryā* stanzas.[1]

---

1   This may be gathered from the following statement: "This would, *at first sight* [italics mine], indeed seem to indicate that Utt. marks the true beginning of the use of the Āryā in canonical literature – that, as SCHUBRING puts it, we see the Āryā "hineinragen" into some of the chapters of the archaic Utt. Actually, however, it can be shown that all the Āryās of Utt. are just as secondary as those very few of Dasaveyāliya and Sūyagaḍa" (ALSDORF 1966: 158). ALSDORF's position on this point is summed up by BRUHN as follows: "Uttarādhyayana itself is an early canonical text with L.V.L. material embedded in seven of its c. thirthy-four metrical chapters" (BRUHN 1996: 9). BRUHN correctly leaves out here the *āryā* stanzas found in the legendary chapters, which

However, the *āryā* stanza is not the only late element found in this supposedly early text: there is also the absolutive in -*ūṇa*(*ṃ*). The absolutive in -*ūṇa*(*ṃ*) is typical of the literary Prākrit Māhārāṣṭrī, in which dialect it is also the only type of absolutive.[2] The form is not found in the Aśoka inscriptions,[3] while in Pāli texts only seven instances have been traced. However, no less then five of these are found in Thera- and Therīgāthā, a poetry which also in other respects is akin to the lyrical tradition in Māhārāṣṭrī.[4] Jaina canonical texts show quite a number of different absolutive formations.[5] However, instances of -*ūṇa*(*ṃ*) are extremely rare. Āyāra seems to have only one instance, in 1.8.1.199: *viyattūṇa* (v.l. for *viyattā* adopted in the text; other v.l. are *viuttā* and *viyatta* [cp. Cūrṇi: *viyattaṃ*]). The very same word, but in a different context, is found in Sūyagaḍa 1.5.2.8/334 (*vigattiūṇaṃ*, v.l. *viyattiūṇaṃ* and *vigaṃtiūṇaṃ*). Besides, Sūyagaḍa has *baṃdhiūṇa* in the stock phrase *hatthehi pāehi ya baṃdhiūṇaṃ* in 1.5.1.14/313, 1.5.2.2/328 and 13/339. The form is not found in, for instance, the Vivāga or the first chapter of Nāyādhammakahāo, which I have checked for this purpose.[6] Clearly, the

2   appear to be composed *ad hoc*. In fact, as *ad hoc* compositions these stanzas considerably complicate the scenario.

2   I leave aside here a few instances of the infinitive used as absolutive, found in the Sattasaī. E.g. *bhaṇium* in *gāthā*s 297, 298, 307 and 613 (ms R. Also ms Bh, for which, see WEBER 1883: 186, no. 548); *mottuṃ* 360 and 364; and *valiuṃ* 484 and 595.

3   It should be noted that *abhivādetūnaṃ* in the Calcutta-Bairat Rock-inscription is an emendation for a fragmentary text (*abhivāde*[.]*naṃ* (HULTZSCH 1925: 172).

4   Therīgāthā: *āpucchitūna* (426), *voḍhūna* (Appendix II, 441), *apakaritūna* (447), and *chaḍḍūna* (469). Theragāthā: *nikkhamitūna* (73). For a summary of the discussion of the origin of these instances in these texts, see NORMAN (1971: XXXI, § 27). Quoting Warder NORMAN mentions basically two possibilities: deliberate archaisms (with reference to Aśoka's Calcutta-Bairat inscription; however, see previous note) to make rather late texts look old or dialectical borrowings. On the "relationship" between Thera- and Therīgāthā and Sattasaī, in which latter text the absolutive in -*ūṇa* is the regular form, see LIENHARD (1975).
    The other two Pāli instances are: *kātūna* (Vinaya III.96.32, commentary on Pārājika IV) and *hātūna* (Jātaka IV.280.17 = Jātaka 484, *gāthā* 10).

5   E.g. *esittā* (Uttarajjhāyā 1.32), *ṭhāvaittāṇaṃ* (9.32/260), *naccā* and *kiccāṇaṃ* (1.45), *āgamm*[*a*] (1.22), *avasohiya* (10.32/322), *laṃghiyā* (1.33), *tuliyāṇa* (7.30), *gahāya* (4.2/118), *āhacca* and *kaṭṭu* (1.11), *caittu* (1.48; < *esittā* x *kaṭṭu* ?), *daṭṭhuṃ* (1.12).

6   It should be noted that absolutives are very numerous in these texts. They play an important role in narrating successive actions. As a typical sentence I may quote

absolutive in -ūna(m) was not the regular type in the early eastern dialects which continued in Pāli and Ardha Māgadhī (AMg).[7] Against this background Uttarajjhāyā as well as Dasaveyāliya present a curious picture. In Uttarajjhāyā no less than fifty instances of the absolutive in -ūna(m) are found;[8] in Dasaveyāliya, which is one third of the size of Uttarajjhāyā, ten instances are found. In this respect the situation in both texts shows a striking agreement with the so-called L.V.L. texts. In, for instance, the *nijjutti*s the absolutive is found regularly side by side with the usual AMg types of absolutive.[9]

To the instances found in Dasaveyāliya I will return in the conclusion (§ 8). First I would like to have a closer look at the instances in Uttarajjhāyā. For, in the distribution of the absolutives ending in -ūna(m) in this text it is possible to recognize something like a pattern. Most of the instances are found typically in "frames", that is, passages which introduce or sum up the dialogues in the legendary chapters or the tracts in the

Nāyādhammakahāo I.12 (p. 14, lines 11-12: ... *diṇayare teyasā jalaṃte sayaṇijjāto uṭṭheti, uṭṭhettā ... uvāgacchati, uvāgacchittā aṭṭaṇasālaṃ aṇupavisati, aṇupavisittā...*

7   On the other hand, the absolutive in -ūṇa is the only type in Paiśācī. In fact, this may be one of the reasons to question VON HINÜBER's interpretation of this dialect as an early Eastern dialect (VON HINÜBER 1981 and 1985). There are other features beside the absolutive, which seem to link Paiācī directly to late Māhārāṣṭrī Prākrit from western India. This point will be elaborated by me on another occasion.

8   This count has been based on the JĀS edition. The reverse word index of YAMAZAKI & OUSAKA has only 49 instances (YAMAZAKI & OUSAKA 1997: 125-126 sub -ūṇa, 266 sub -ūṇaṃ, and 298 sub -ūṇam.). However, this index has been based on CHARPENTIER's edition of 1922, which in 26.50/1043 has *vandittāṇa* instead of *vaṃdiūṇa* in the JĀS edition.

9   Āyāra-Nijjutti: *viyāṇiūṇaṃ* 104, *caiūṇaṃ* 242; Sūyagaḍa-Nijjutti: *namiūṇaṃ* 1, *souṇa* 18, *nāūṇa* 24 and 26, *souṇaṃ* 39, *chettūṇa* 51, *ghettūṇa* 52 and 53 (°*ūṇaṃ*), *souṇa* 63, *nikkhiviūṇa* 103, *caiūṇaṃ* 192; Dasaveyāliya-Nijjutti: *namiūṇaṃ* 1, *pannaveūṇaṃ* 2, *vaṇṇeūṇaṃ* 28, *kāūṇaṃ* 44, *bhamiūṇa* 84, *kahiūṇa* 196, *souṇa* 219, *kāūṇaṃ* 398; Uttarajjhāyā-Nijjutti: *daṭṭ[h]ūṇa* 95, *mariūṇa* 99, *kāūṇa* 123, *hoūṇa* 129, *laddhūṇa* 161, *mottūṇaṃ* 167, *mariūṇa* 220, *caiūṇa* 257, *nāūṇaṃ* 259, *payahiūṇa* 267, *thaveūṇaṃ* 268, *caiūṇa* 269, *souṇa* 291, *ghettūṇa* 295, *pāsiūṇa* 299, *souṇa* 302 and 306, *daṭṭhūṇa* 334, *souṇa* and *kāūṇa* 347, *kāūṇa* 364 and 368, *souṇaṃ* 370, *daṭṭhūṇa* and *sariūṇaṃ* 372, *vīsajjiūṇa* and *vaṃdiūṇaṃ* 399, *caiūṇaṃ* 403a, *souṇa* 403b, *kāūṇa* 405, *nāūṇa* 415, *ghittūṇa* 427, *āpucchiūṇa* 435, *kāūṇa* 436 (= 405), *pāsiūṇa* 468, *vosiriūṇa* 469, *souṇa* 479, *caiūṇaṃ* 495, 518 (°*iūṇa*), 522, 526, *nāūṇa* and *caiūṇa* 545. In the first 889 verses of Āvassaya-Nijjutti I have counted 47 instances of the absolutive in -ūṇa(m). For instances in Piṇḍa and Oha-Nijjutti, see BOLLÉE's reverse index of 1991, p. 150 sub -ūṇam.

dogmatic or disciplinary chapters. This would show that to the redactors who compiled, or pieced together, the individual chapters of Uttarajjhāyā the absolutive in -ūṇa(ṃ) had somehow become a regular option. This, in combination with the rarity of instances of the absolutive in -ūṇa(ṃ) in Āyāra and Sūyagaḍa, puts the remaining instances which are found in the main body of the text of Uttarajjhāyā in an exceptional position. When all is said and done, we might have to abandon the idea of an Ur-Uttarajjhāyā, that is, a version of the complete text but without the āryās and the frames. We should at least reckon with the possibility that Uttarajjhāyā is a late compilation in origin, which happens to include old, inherited material as well.

Before elaborating this conclusion the distribution of the absolutive in Uttarajjhāyā will be considered.

§ 2. Absolutives in "frames": the legendary chapters (17 instances)

In the light of the history of the genre the frames in the legends form a special case, distinct from those in the disciplinary and dogmatic chapters.

The core of the legends is made up of dialogues (see ALSDORF 1955, 1957, 1962a, 1962b, 1964), which are framed by narrative passages, often consisting of only one or two verses, introducing the next speaker. An example is chapter 12, which relates the story of Harikeśa. Of the 47 verses 1-5, 8, 19-20, 24-25, 29-30abc, 35cd-36 and 47 contain narrative passages. All the remaining verses consist of dialogue (or rather, alternating monologues).

ALSDORF compared these legends to the old Vedic ākhyāna, a literary type otherwise exemplified in the Jātakas. The core of the ākhyāna consisted of dialogue in verse. Whatever information might have been required in the presentation of the dialogue, such as the context and the development of the plot, if any, was added in the nature of comments and was anyhow not textually fixed.

As far as the Jātakas are concerned the literary tradition itself has recorded the existence of versions consisting only of the dialogue verses side by side to one in which the verses are embedded into a prose text, the Jātakaṭṭhavaṇṇanā. Whereas in the Jātakaṭṭhavaṇṇanā the introductions to the dialogues and the transitions in the underlying "story" are thus supplied in prose, in Uttarajjhāyā the corresponding text is in verse.

The different origins of the dialogue verse passages, on the one hand, and the narrative passages, on the other, become clear from the comparison of those Uttarajjhāyā legends which have parallels among the Jātaka stories. A case in point is the twelfth chapter of Uttarajjhāyā already referred to, which corresponds to Jātaka 497 (CHARPENTIER 1909 and ALSDORF 1962: 128 ff.). A significant number of the dialogue verses of the Uttarajjhāyā version have direct parallels in the Pāli version. No such correspondence is found between the narrative passages in the two versions. It is clear that the redactors of the Uttarajjhāyā version started off with a fixed set of dialogue verses, which, but for relatively minor adaptations, they left unchanged. To this text they next supplied narrative verses of their own making.

The difference in origin between the respective passages also becomes clear from a minor, but telling, linguistic difference. Thus, the dialogue verses contain several instances of the first person plural pronoun *vayam* (12.11/370 and 40/399,[10] 13.18/424[11] and 30/436, 14.43/484 and 45/486), which is absent from the narrative verses, which have *amhe* (e.g., 12.33 /392).

This state of affairs has been established for the legends of chapters 12, 13 and 14, for which complete parallels are available among the Jātakas, namely in Jātaka 497, 498 and 509 respectively[12] (note that in Uttarajjhāyā the legends are found in exactly the same order as in the Jātaka collection). However, even if for the other legends no such parallels are available, it would seem that they too have been pieced together on the basis of old,

10 The first hemistich of 12.40/399 reads:
   kaham care bhikkhu vayam jayāmo pāvāim kammāim paṇullayāmo.
   The word *care* does not make sense here. The explanation in the commentary, *care-mahi ity arthaḥ*, only betrays the commentator's embarrassment with the word. It may be queried if we have to do with a scribal mistake due to the interference from Dasa-veyāliya 4.30/61:
   kaham care *kaham ciṭṭhe kaham āse kaham sae*
   kaham bhumjamto bhāsamto pāvam kammam na bamdhaī.
   See also Dasaveyāliya 6.23d/286, *kaham esaṇiyam care,* and 24d/287, *rāo tattha kaham care.*

11 In the same line is found the indeclinable past tense form *vasīya: jahim vayam savvajaṇassa vesā* vasīya *sovāganivesaṇesu.* This past tense is otherwise found only in late texts, in particular the *nijjuttis* (see BALBIR 1989: 510-512).

12 On the relationship between Uttarajjhāyā 12 and Jātaka 497, see CHARPENTIER (1909) and ALSDORF (1962: 128 ff.), on Uttarajjhāyā 13 and Jātaka 498, see ALSDORF (1957), and on Uttarajjhāyā 14 and Jātaka 509, see CHARPENTIER (1908).

inherited material. The story of Jayaghoṣa in chapter 25 seems to have served mainly as a pretext for presenting verses which define the true brahmin. Several of these verses have close parallels in Suttanipāta and Dhammapada (for which, see CHARPENTIER 1910). The other verses, for which no direct parallels are available, may well have been fashioned for the occasion. However, if so, the authors grafted these new verses on the pattern of the old ones. Note in this connection the common refrain *taṃ vayaṃ būma māhaṇaṃ*, which, incidentally, contains another instance of the first person plural *vayaṃ*.

The following seventeen instances of the absolutive in *-ūṇa(ṃ)* have been culled from the frames in the legendary chapters.

Chapter 9: Nami.
caiūṇa (1/229), *avaijjhiūṇa* and *viuruvviūṇa* (55/283),[13] and *vaṃdiūṇa* (60/288) all occur in "late" *āryā* verses framing the dialogue passages.
caiūṇa in 61/289. According to ALSDORF (1962a:16) this verse, a *śloka* coming after two *āryā*s, would, despite its narrative function, have belonged to the old, original material:

> *namī namei appāṇaṃ sakkhaṃ sakkeṇa coio*
> *caiūṇa gehaṃ vaidehī sāmaṇṇe pajjuvaṭṭhio.*

If the *āryā*s were added to material consisting of *śloka*s, this does not mean that every *śloka* is automatically original. The evidence against the authenticity of the stanza is formed by the puns they contain: *namī-namei* and *sakkhaṃ-sakkeṇa*. In the Pāli tradition as well as in the epic the king's name was Nimi. The verse occurs also as 18.45/595.

Chapter 12: Hariesa.
pāsiūṇaṃ (4/363) is part of the introduction, which is concluded in 5/364:
... *abaṃbhacāriṇo bālā imaṃ vayaṇam abbavī.*

Chapter 13: Citta and Saṃbhūa.
soūṇa (2/408) is found in an *āryā* verse which is part of an introduction consisting of three *āryā*s (1-3) followed by a *śloka* (4; ... *baṃbhadatto* ... *imaṃ vayaṇam abbavī*).

---

13   avaijjhiūṇa *māhaṇarūvaṃ* viuruvviūṇa *iṃdattaṃ*
      vaṃdai abhitthuṇaṃto imāhi mahurāhi vaggūhiṃ.
      The second hemistich = Āvassaya-Nijjutti 426cd.

Chapter 14 Usuyāra.
daṭṭhūṇa (4/445) is found in a verse which is part of the introduction

Chapter 18: Saṃjaya
soūṇa (18/568) is found in a verse summarizing 11-17.

Chapter 20: Mahāniyaṃṭha
kāūṇa (7/710) is found in a verse which is part of the introduction; *kāūṇa*[14] and *abhivaṃdiūṇa* (59/762) in a verse summarizing the preceding text. On the metre of the latter verse, a patchwork of *āryā* (a and c) and *śloka* Pādas (b and d), and its status as a conclusion, see ALSDORF (1966: 159 and note 2).

Chapter 21: Samuddapāla.
Verse 9/772: *taṃ* pāsiūṇa *saṃvegaṃ samuddapālo imaṃ bavī* introduces what Samuddapāla is going to say.
In the very last verse, 24/787: *duvihaṃ* khaveūṇa *ya puṇṇapāvaṃ* ... , the story is summed up.

Chapter 22: Rahanemi
soūṇa (18/805): soūṇa *tassa vayaṇaṃ ... ciṃtei.*
soūṇa (28/815): soūṇa ... (29/816) ... *rāīmāī viciṃtei.*
daṭṭhūṇa (39/826)[15]: daṭṭhūṇa ... (40/827) ... *tayaṃ vade.*

§ 3. Absolutives in "frames": the other chapters (6 instances)

The following six instances are found in the frames in the so-called doctrinal and disciplinary chapters.

---

14 The phrase, *kāūṇa ya payāhiṇaṃ*, found in 20.7/710 and 59/762, is also found in Āvassaya-Nijjutti 426:
      so viṇaeṇa uvagao kāūṇa payāhiṇaṃ ca *tikkhutto*
      vaṃdai abbhitthuṇaṃto imāhi mahurāhi vaggūhiṃ.

15 For the first hemistich the following variant reading has been noted: *rahanemī taṃ tu* pāsittā *bhaggajoyaparāyaṇaṃ.*

Chapter 7

The chapter presents four parables on the fool and the wise man: *jahāesaṃ*
1/179), *jahā kāgaṇie* (11/189), *jahā ya tiṇṇi* (14/192),[16] and *jahā kusagge*
(23/201). The moral is summed up in 30/208:

> *tuliyāṇa bālabhāvaṃ abālaṃ ceva paṃḍie*
> *caiūṇa bālabhāvaṃ abālam sevaī muṇi,*

> A wise man weighs in his mind the state of the sinner and that of the virtuous man;
> quitting the state of the sinner, a sage realises that of the virtuous.
> (Translation JACOBI 1895: 31)

Chapter 26
42/1037 reads:

> *pāriyakāussaggo vaṃdittāṇa tao guruṃ*
> *thuimaṃgalaṃ ca* kāūṇaṃ *kālam sampaḍilehae.*

It marks the transition from the preceding passage to the next. On top of
that, as I will try to show, it appears to introduce a passage which may itself
well be a later addition. Furthermore, its meaning and vocabulary suggest
we might have to do with a later fabrication.

To begin with the first of these two points; as already shown by
ALSDORF, the chapter as a whole falls apart into two separate tracts, of
which only the first, 1-7, corresponds to the title of the chapter, *sāmāyārī*.
The second part, 8-53, supplies "a detailed time-table for the monk's day
and night, divided into four porisīs each" (ALSDORF 1966: 179). The
greatest part is taken up by the enumeration of the various activities to be
performed by the monk during the four *porisī*s of the day. With verse 42 a
passage begins doing the same for the night.

The latter topic was anticipated in verses 17/1012 and 18/1013:

> *rattiṃ pi cauro bhāge kujjā bhikkhū viyakkhaṇo*
> *tao uttaraguṇe kujjā rāībhāgesu causu vi* (17)

> *paḍhamaṃ porisi sajjhāyaṃ bitiyaṃ jhāṇaṃ jhiyāyaī*
> *taiyāe niddamokkhaṃ tu cautthī bhujjo vi sajjhāyaṃ* (18)

The latter of these two verses is repeated after verse 42. As 43 it forms the
opening of the passage on the division of the night. According to ALSDORF

---

16 On this parable, see ROTH (1973).

its position as 43 would be the original one. In his reconstruction of the original text of 8-52, which had suffered several lengthy insertions of demonstrably late material, ALSDORF placed 18 together with 17 between 42 and 44 (ALSDORF 1966: 200).

However, ALSDORF seems to have missed the point of the curious circumlocution for sleeping, *niddamokkham*, "release from duty for the sake of sleep". This compound can only be explained as the outcome of the attempt to stay as close as possible to the text of verse 12/1007, with *mo*kkha echoing *bhi*kkhā in *taiyāe bhikkhāyariyam*. Verse 18 looks very much like a mere reworking of 12 created to complement 17 in the same way as 11/1006 was complemented by 12. Or, the sequence:

> divasassa *cauro bhāge kujjā bhikkhū viyakkhane*
> *tao uttaragune kujjā* dinabhāgesu causu vi (11)
>
> *padhamam porisi sajjhāyam bitiyam jhānam jhiyāyaī*
> taiyāe bhikkhāyariyam *puno cautthī sajjhāyam* (12)

might have suggested to add to 17:

> rattim *pi cauro bhāge kujjā bhikkhū viyakkhano*
> *tao uttaragune kujjā* rāībhāgesu causu

a verse somehow duplicating 12, that is

> [*padhamam porisi sajjhāyam bitiyam jhānam jhiyāyaī*
> taiyāe niddamokkham *tu cautthī bhujjo vi sajjhāyam*]

If my interpretation of the origin of 18 is correct, it would follow that the original position of 18 was after 17, and not, as suggested by ALSDORF, after 42, where it is found without 17.

Furthermore, should the programme for the four *porisī*s of the night given in 18 indeed be a later fabrication, one may also question the authenticity of passage 42-49, which fills in the schedule for the night. In this connection two points should be noted. In the first place, as a verse stating a "programme" for the night 43 is virtually ignored in the passage 44ff. Where 18/43 mentions study in the first *porisī*, meditation in the second, "release from duties for the sake of sleep" (*niddamokkham*) in the third, and, again, study in the fourth, the passage which follows skips the first, second and third *porisī*s and proceeds immediately to the last and fourth *porisī*. The second point is that 43-49 has no original text. It has in its entirety been pieced together from verses found earlier: 43 = 18, 44a and c

= 36a and c, 45abc = 37abc, 46cd = 38cd, 47-49 = 39-41 (with *rāiyaṃ* for *desiyaṃ*).

At this point I would like to turn to the meaning and choice of words of 42. In this connection we should first have a look at the first hemistich, *pāriyakāusaggo vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ*. Following the definition in Āvassa-ya, *kāussagga* denotes a brief period of silent meditation performed while standing. The silent standing posture is maintained for as long as it takes to pronounce the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula, with which the monk praises the "*arahaṃta*s, *siddha*s, *āyariya*s, *uvajjhāya*s and all *sāhu*s".[17] In any case, its end is marked by the recitation of this formula. It would thus appear that the phrases *pāriyakāussaggo* and *vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ* are virtually synonymous. The praising of the *guru*, the "elder teacher", marks the end or the completion of the *kāussagga* meditation. *thuimaṃgalam ca kāūṇaṃ* would then be saying practically the same as what has already been said in *vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ*.

However, *thuimaṃgala* clearly refers to the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula as a whole. *thuimaṃgalam ca kāūṇaṃ* reduces the meaning of *vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ*, as if the latter referred to the recitation of only a part of the formula. However, it is almost certain that *vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ*, as a *pars pro toto*, covers the whole formula, or at least, the activity. In this connection I may refer to 51/1046:

> *pāriyakāussaggo vamdittāṇa tao guruṃ*
> *tavaṃ sampaḍivajjittā karejja siddhāṇa saṃthavaṃ.*

The second line may be translated as follows:

> Having completed the (meditative) *tapas*, i.e., the *kāussagga* meditation, one should praise the *siddha*s.

It seems doubtful if in lines 1 and 2 we have to do with successive stages in the recitation of the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula, if only because in this formula the *siddha*s come before the *guru* (either the *āyariya* or the *uvajjhāya*). Rather, it seems that the second line merely repeats what is said in the first line, but in different words.

---

17 Āvassaya 5.4/37: ... *jāva arahaṃtāṇaṃ bhagavaṃtāṇaṃ namokkāreṇaṃ na pāremi tāva kāyaṃ ṭhāṇeṇaṃ moṇeṇaṃ jhāṇeṇaṃ appāṇaṃ vosirāmi.* See also WILLIAMS (1963: 213 ff.).

On the other hand, it is quite possible that later redactors of the text have taken the two lines of 51 as referring to successive parts of the formula. In fact, it might have been such an interpretation of this very verse 51 which has lain at the root of the text of our verse 42. In this connection it should be noted that if, as argued above, the passage 43-49 is indeed a later addition elaborating 18, the schedule for the day would originally have ended with the present verse 51. When the schedule for the night was added, verse 51 was moved on. A new verse was composed to serve as a conclusion of the schedule for the day and, at the same time, as an introduction to that for the night. This verse, our 42, may be explained as an adaptation of the present verse 51. The first line of 51 was maintained unaltered. The text of the second line had to be adapted to make place for the proper introduction of the following topic: *kālaṃ sampaḍilehae*, "he examines time". What remained was Pāda 4: *karejja siddhāṇa saṃthavaṃ*. *thuimaṃgalaṃ ca kāūṇaṃ* may be explained as a replacement of the latter text, by which what according to one interpretation looked like an enumeration of the individual parts of the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula was short-circuited by a reference to the formula as a whole.

This explanation of the origin of *thuimaṃgalaṃ ca kāūṇaṃ* rests heavily on the identification of the passage 43-49 as a later addition and, with that, on the idea that 42 is a duplication of 51. We could do without these factors by adopting the text transmitted by Śāntisūri, in which the first Pāda of 42 instead of *pāriyakāussaggo* reads *siddhāṇaṃ saṃthavaṃ kiccā*, that is, "having praised the *siddhas*, next having praised the *guru*, and having (finally) recited the complete praise formula". On the other hand, the variant reading of the first Pāda might also have been entered into the text to anticipate *thuimaṃgalaṃ ca kāūṇaṃ* by creating something like an enumeration. Note that in this case, exactly as in the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula, the *siddhas* are found before the *guru*.

In either case, the introduction of *thuimaṃgala* seems secondary. In any case, the phrase does not seem to do full justice to *vaṃdittāṇa tao guruṃ*, or for that matter, *siddhāṇaṃ saṃthavaṃ kiccā*, as a *pars pro toto*. The idea of an enumeration of parts of the formula adding up to the complete formula is, as far as I can see, only a later reinterpretation.

For the purpose of this study it suffices that the Pāda *thuimaṃgalaṃ ca kāūṇaṃ* is most likely a later fabrication. As such the above conclusions are supported by the choice of words. For apparently the term *thuimaṃgala* is very rare. Going by the Āgama Śabdakośa, it is not attested in the other

canonical texts. The only instance I have been able to trace is late, namely Oha-Nijjutti 138a: *thuimangalam āmantaṇa*. Another point to be mentioned here is the absence of references to the *paṃcanamokkāra* formula in the disciplinary or dogmatic parts of the canon (see ROTH 1974).

Chapter 35:
Chapter 35 is an exposition on the behaviour of the ideal monk. Verse 20/1451 provides some kind of conclusion:

> nijjūhiūṇa āhāraṃ kāladhamme uvaṭṭhie
> caiūṇa mānusaṃ boṃdiṃ pahū dukkhā vimuccaī.

> Rejecting food when the time of death arrives, and leaving the human body, he becomes his own master, and is liberated from misery.
> (Translation JACOBI 1895: 205-206)

It should be noted that the verb *nijjūha-* "to reject"[18] is otherwise attested only in late texts.[19] See Vavahāra 2.6: *parihārakappaṭṭhiyaṃ bhikkhuṃ ... no kappai tassa gaṇāvaccheiyassa nijjūhittae*, "Quant au religieux en état d'isolement ... son coadjuteur n'a pas le droit de le laisser sans soins" (CAILLAT 1966: 60); Kalpasūtra 2. 23 *sāgāriyassa aṃsiyāo ... (a)nijjūḍhāo*, "Sind die Einzelgaben eines Herbergers ... nicht verteilt" (SCHUBRING 1905: 51), 4.25: *se nijjūhiyavve siyā*, "so ist er *aus dem Gaṇa auszuschliessen*" (SCHUBRING 1905: 56). Furthermore, the verb is found in the *nijjutti*s and the *nijjutti-bhāsya*. E.g. Piṇḍa-Nijjutti 661:

> chahiṃ kāraṇehiṃ sāhū āhārento vi āyarai dhammaṃ
> chahiṃ c'eva kāraṇehiṃ nijjūhinto vi āyarai

> A monk conforms to the (rules of the) dharma if he eats for six reasons, and he conforms (to them) also if he renounces (food) for six reasons.
> (Translation ALSDORF 1966: 195);

---

18 To be distinguished from *nijjūha-* "to subject to the analytic process of *nijjutti*". See, e.g., Dasaveyāliya-Nijjutti 12 (*nijjūḍhaṃ*), 14 (*nijjūhagaṃ*) and 15 (*nijjūhiyā*).

19 The relationship between this verb and the words *nijjūha* and *nijjūḍhaa* in Nāyā-dhammakahāo and Paṇhāvagaraṇāiṃ is not clear. See Nāyādhammakahāo 1.1.9 (p. 8, l. 5) = Paṇhāvagaraṇāiṃ 1.1.18 (p. 642, l. 13): *nijjūhaṃtara ...* (commentary: niryūhakaṃ *dvārapārśvavinirgatadāru* antaraṃ *staraviśeṣa eva 'pāṇīyāntaram' iti sūtradhārair yad vyapadiśyate, niryūhakadvayasya yānyantarāṇi tāni vā niryūhakāntarāṇi*.) and 1.1.28 (p. 62, l. 7): *ciranijjūḍhae* (commentary: nijjūḍhe *tti* nirdvāri(ṭi?)taḥ).

Piṇḍa-Nijjutti-Bhāsya 550:

āgāḍhajogavāhī nijjūḍh'attaṭhiyā va pāhuṇagā
sehā sapāyachittā bālā vuḍḍh'evamāīyā

[Gesondert für sich essen] ... die [als Unverträgliche] aus der Gemeinschaft ausge-
stossen sind ...
(Translation METTE 1973: 125);

and Oha-Nijjutti-Bhāsya 299:

taie vi avihigahiyaṃ vihibhuttaṃ taṃ gurūhi 'ṇunnāyaṃ
sesā nāṇunnāyā gahaṇe dente ya nijjuhaṇā,

... wird (solche Speise) angenommen und wenn einer (sie) anbietet, erfolgt
Ausschluss (der beiden Beteiligten aus dem *gaṇa*).
(Translation METTE 1973: 143)

Chapter 36
jāṇiūṇa (1/1453). In this *āryā* verse the reader is invited to listen attentively
to the following (*io*) treatment of the *jīva* and *ajīva*, "knowing which
(*jāṇiūṇa*) the monk will be victorious in self-restraint".

The exposition is summed up in 249/1701, another *āryā*: *iti jīvam ajive
ya soccā saddahiūṇa ya ... ramejjā saṃjame muṇī*. According to ALSDORF
(1966: 163) this verse formed the original conclusion of the chapter: "The
rest of the chapter ... can only be regarded as a later appendix." On the
composition of this "appendix", see ALSDORF (1966: 163-178) and BRUHN
(1996: 26-28).

§ 4. Miscellaneous instances (8 instances)

The 23 instances mentioned in the two previous paragraphs are all found in
frames. The eight instances discussed in the present paragraph belong to the
body of the text. However, the verses or passages in which they are found,
seem to be later additions.

Chapter 9
bhettūṇaṃ in 9.22/250. According to ALSDORF (1962: 12-13) passages 21/
249 and 22ab/250 represent a later addition.

Chapter 10
10.16/303, 17/307, and 19/309 read:

laddhūṇa *vi mānusattaṇaṃ āyariyattaṃ puṇarāvi dullahaṃ*
bahave dasuyā milakkhuyā samayaṃ goyama mā pamāyae (16)[20]

laddhūṇa *vi āyariyattaṇam ahīṇapaṃcimdiyatā hu dullahā*
vigalimdiyatā hu dīsai ... (17)

...   ...

laddhūṇa *vi uttamaṃ suiṃ saddahaṇā puṇarāvi dullahā*
micchattanisevae jaṇe ... (19)

According to ALSDORF (1962: 111-115) these verses follow upon an inter-
polated passage (5-15). By implication verses 16 and following would
belong to the original text. However, ALSDORF overlooked the fact that in
16 and 17 the absolutive *laddhūṇa*, which is otherwise typical of Māhārāṣṭrī
Prākrit, is found side by side with another element typical of that dialect,
namely the suffix *-ttaṇa*, in *mānusattaṇaṃ* and *āyariyattaṇaṃ* (or, as
emended by ALSDORF, *āriyattaṇaṃ*; see ALSDORF 1962: 112). The regular
form in AMg is *-tta*, as in, for instance, *micchatta* in 19. This would mark
16 and 17,[21] and with these 19, as late.

Chapter 13.
datthūṇaṃ in 13.28/434. As already pointed out by ALSDORF (1957: 202)
the first hemistich of this verse, *hatthiṇapurammi cittā* datthūṇaṃ *naravaiṃ
mahiddhiyaṃ*, is an *āryā*, the second hemistich a *śloka*.

Chapter 18
45/595 = 9.61, for which, see above, § 2.

Chapter 19
19.20/624 and 22/626 read:

> *evaṃ dhammaṃ* akāūṇaṃ *jo gacchai paraṃ bhavaṃ*
> *gacchaṃte se duhī hoi vāhirogehiṃ pīlie* (20)

---

20 Cp. Āvassaya-Nijjutti 836:
    iya dullaha*lambhaṃ* mānusattaṇaṃ *pāviūṇa jo jīvo*
    ṇa kuṇai pārattahitaṃ so soyai saṃkamaṇakāle.

21 For metrical reasons ALSDORF proposes to eliminate the word *ahīṇa* in *ahīṇa-*
    paṃcimdiyatā in 17 and 18. In this case, however, the usefulness of metrical conside-
    rations may be questioned. For one thing, we have to do with patchwork verses here,
    and, secondly, *ahīṇapaṃcimdiyatā* is a standard descriptive expression. Other
    instances are found in, e. g. Vivāga 1.16 (p. 719, l. 11-12): *tassa ṇaṃ vijayassa
    khattiyassa miyā nāmaṃ devī hotthā -* ahīṇa*padipuṇṇa*paṃcimdiya*sarīrā - vaṇṇao,*
    and Ovāiya 1.15 (p. 11, l. 19 ff).

...
evaṃ dhammaṃ pi kāūṇaṃ *jo gacchai paraṃ bhavaṃ*
gacchaṃte se suhī hoi appakamme aveyaṇe (22)

They are part of the passage 18-22, which is hemmed in between 17 and 23-24. In both 17 and 23-24 Miyāputta is speaking about himself. Note *imaṃ* and *me* in ... *caittāṇaṃ imaṃ dehaṃ gaṃtavvam avasassa me* in 17/621,[22] and the first person singular in *tārayissāmi* in 24/628. By contrast the passage 18-22 speaks about a person in general. Most likely we have to do with an interpolated passage here.

§ 5. Variant readings (6 instances)

In several cases the modern editor of the text had a choice between a variant having the ending -*ūṇa(m)* and one having one of the regular AMg endings. Sometimes the one form was chosen, sometimes the other. Unfortunately, the principle underlying the choice was not made explicit. I have traced the following instances:

1.21c: *caiūṇa āsaṇaṃ dhīro* has a variant reading *caittā āsaṇaṃ dhīro*. The metre of the Pāda with *caiūṇa* is ambiguous. It can be taken as a *śloka* Pāda with nine syllables, as was done by JACOBI (1879: 611) or as an even *āryā* Pāda.[23] We may well have to do with one of those instances of the secondary transformation of a *śloka* Pāda into an *āryā* Pāda (see ALSDORF 1966: 159, note 2, p. 178 and p. 183, note 1).

9.3/231: For *bhuṃjittu namī rāyā* there is a variant *bhottūṇa namī rāyā*. The verse is an *āryā* which forms part of the introductory passage to the dialogue. For the status of *āryā* verses in Uttarajjhāyā, see above.

18.37a/587 and 47a/597: For *puttaṃ rajje ṭhaveūṇaṃ*[24] there is a - metrically equivalent - variant ... *ṭhavittā ṇaṃ*, or *ṭhavittāṇaṃ*.

19.17a/621 For *caittāṇaṃ imaṃ dehaṃ* there is a variant *caiūṇa u dehaṃ pi*.

---

22 For *gaṃtavvam avasassa* me, see 18.12b/562: *gamtavvam avasassa* te.

23 The same ambiguity is seen in 1.22a: *āsaṇagao na pucchejjā. śloka* Pāda (JACOBI 1879: 611), or even *āryā* Pāda.

24 = Uttarajjhāyā-Nijjutti 268d.

22.39/826 For *datthūna rahanemiṃ taṃ bhaggujjoyaparāiyaṃ* the following variant reading has been noted: *rahanemī taṃ tu pāsittā bhaggajoyaparāyaṇaṃ* (This instance has already been quoted above, § 2).

22.48cd/835:

> *savvaṃ kammaṃ khavettāṇaṃ siddhiṃ pattā aṇuttaraṃ.*

The selection of *khavettāṇaṃ* instead of *khameūṇa* is justified by the parallels in 25.43/995:

> *khavettā puvvakammāiṃ saṃjameṇa taveṇa ya*
> *jayaghosavijayaghosā siddhiṃ pattā aṇuttaraṃ,*

and Dasaveyāliya 3.15/31:

> *khavettā puvvakammāiṃ saṃjameṇa taveṇa ya*
> *siddhamaggam aṇuppattā tāiṇo pariṇivvudā.*

These latter instances show that we have to do with a stereotyped "conclusion", the text of which could apparently be adapted as required by the context. It will be argued below that the absolutive in *-ūṇa(ṃ)* is typical of the language of the authors of the narrative frames. We should therefore reckon with the possibility that they wrote *khameūṇa*, and that *khavettā* is the secondary reading here.

26.45/1040 and 50/1045:

> *porisīe caubbhāge* vaṃdiūṇa *tao guruṃ*
> *padikkamittu kālassa kālaṃ tu padilehae* (45)

and

> *kiṃ tavaṃ padivajjāmi evaṃ tattha viciṃtae*
> *kāussaggaṃ tu pārittā* vaṃdiūṇa *tao guruṃ* (50).

In both cases, however, a variant is available, namely *vaṃdittāṇa*. It should be noted that we have to do with a stock phrase. In all other instances the transmission is uniform, having *vaṃdittāṇa*. Line 45ab corresponds literally to 22ab/1017 and 37ab/1032. The phrase *vaṃdittāṇa tao guruṃ* occurs, besides, in 8d/1003 (*vaṃdittā ya tao guruṃ*), 40ab/1035, 42ab/1037 and 51ab/1046 (all have *pāriyakāussaggo vaṃdittāṇa tao guruṃ*), and

41ab/1036 and 49ab/1044 (both read *paḍikkamittu nissallo vaṃdittāṇa tao gurum*).

A special case is formed by the variants *pucchiūṇa* and *pucchaṃteṇa* in 20.57/760, which seem to be related to the variants available for Pāda c, namely *nimaṃtiyā* (absolutive) and *nimaṃtio* (past participle). The verse has been transmitted in basically two forms, namely

> pucchiūṇa *mae tubbhaṃ jhāṇaviggho u jo kao*
> nimaṃtiyā *ya bhogehiṃ taṃ savvaṃ marisehi me*

The obstruction of your meditation which I made *having asked* you all these questions and *having talked* to you about enjoyments, please forgive me all that.

> pucchaṃteṇa *mae tubbhaṃ jhāṇaviggho u jo kao*
> nimaṃtio *ya bhogehiṃ taṃ savvaṃ marisehi me,*

The obstruction of your meditation which I made *by asking* all these questions and *the fact that I have talked* to you about enjoyments, please forgive me all that,

respectively. In the first version Pādas abc form one sentence, both *pucchiūṇa* and *nimaṃtiyā* being dependent on *mae ... jhāṇnaviggho ... kao*. In the second version we have to do with two different "sins" and two separate sentences, each with a construction of their own. The latter version may have to be preferred in the light of *taṃ savvaṃ* in Pāda d. Apart from that the second version is syntactically the more difficult version. However, this dilemma only concerns the variants *nimaṃtiyā* and *nimaṃtio*. That is to say, if the text did indeed originally read *nimaṃtio*, its substitution by *nimaṃtiyā* need not automatically have led to the substitution of *pucchaṃteṇa* by *pucchiūṇa* as well.

When all is said and done, the only thing these instances show is that the substitition of a regular AMg absolutive by one ending in -ūṇa(ṃ), or vice versa, was an option in the course of the transmission of the text.

§ 6. Absolutives in -ūṇa(ṃ) in *āryā*s.

As shown by ALSDORF all *āryā*s in Uttarajjhāyā are later additions. For completeness' sake below those instances of the absolutive in -ūṇa(ṃ) in *āryā*s mentioned so far have been brought together.

1.21	*caiūṇa*
9.1/229	*caiūṇa*
9.55/283	*avaijjhiūṇa* and *viuruvviūṇa*

9.60/288   *vaṃdiūṇa*
13.28/434   *daṭṭhūṇa*
20.59/762   *abhivaṃdiūṇa*
36.1/1453   *jāṇiūṇa*
36.249/1701   *saddhahiūṇa*

§ 7. Remaining instances (13 instances)

All the instances discussed so far either belong to the narrative parts of the text or, which comes to the same, to those parts of the text which frame tracts, or are found in interpolated passages. This leaves us with the following 13 instances, which are found in what constitutes the "core" text:

6.14d/175   *kaḍaṃ* laddhūṇa *bhakkhae.*
7.3d/181   *sīsaṃ* chettūṇa *bhujjai.*
7.14b/192   *mūlaṃ* ghettūṇa *niggayā.*
9.28c/256   *nagarassa khemaṃ kāūṇaṃ.*
11.7d/334   *suyaṃ* laddhūṇa *majjaī.*
12.18d/379   *kaṃṭhammi* ghettūṇa *khalejja jo ṇaṃ.*
13.21d/428   *dhammaṃ* akāūṇa *parammi loe* (cp. *dhammaṃ (a)kāūṇaṃ*
                 in 19.20 and 22, quoted above. Note that there as here
                 "having, or not having done *dharma*" is mentioned as an
                 important factor determining one's fate in the afterworld.
                 19.20 and 22 are most likely later insertions)
13.33a/439   *na tujjha bhoe* caiūṇa *buddhī* (*caiūṇa* functions as an
                 infinitive here!)
23.41/877   *chettā* nihantūṇa (*nihaṇiūṇa*).
29.3/1103   (prose, p. 244, l. 21) *micchattavisohiṃ* kāūṇa.
29.19/1119   (prose, p. 247, l. 24) *bhāvavisohiṃ* kāūṇa.
36.55d/1506   *kattha* gaṃtūṇa *sijjhaī.*
36.56d/1508   *tattha* gaṃtūṇa *sijjhaī.*

§ 8. Conclusion

The findings presented here may be summed up as follows. If we disregard those instances of the absolute in *-ūṇa(ṃ)* for which variants – meaningful variants: *pucchaṃteṇa* for *pucchiūṇa*, or substitutes: *caittā* for *caiūṇa* – are available (§5), this leaves us with a total number of 44. Of

these, eight are found in late passages (interpolations or composed *ad hoc*, §
4). Of the remaining 36 instances no less than 23 are found typically in the
"frames" (§§ 2-3). In the case of the legendary chapters, which account for
17 instances (§ 2), the differences in origin of the dialogue text, on the one
hand, and the narrative frames, on the other, are established by the history
of the genre as well as by a linguistic feature (*vayaṃ* against *amhe*).

Of the six instances found in frames in the other chapters (§ 3) five
appear to be late. Two are found in late *āryā* verses (36.1/1453 and 249/
1701), two occur in a verse which contains a late word (35.20/1451), and
one in a verse which is most probably a later fabrication (26.42/1037).

It appears that a vast majority of the instances of the absolutive in
-*ūna(ṃ)* in Uttarajjhāyā have found their way into the text through frame
passages composed by the redactors who compiled the individual chapters.
It would also appear that many of these narrative frames are late
compositions, that is, are later than the material they frame (leaving aside
those tracts which are themselves late, e. g. in chapter 26, for which see
ALSDORF 1966: 169ff and BRUHN 1996: 29ff). It follows that the text as
we now have it is a late compilation. So far my conclusion does not differ
from the one drawn by ALSDORF. However, another question presents
itself, namely whether we are indeed entitled, as ALSDORF suggests, to
postulate an Ur-Uttarajjhāyā, that is one without the *āryā* verses and
without the frames.

The answer to this question would, at least in the present context,
depend on the explanation of the origin of those absolutives in -*ūna(ṃ)*
found in the interior of the text (§ 7). Given the rare instances in Pāli as
well as in the other texts of the Jaina canon we may start from the
assumption that these instances of -*ūna(ṃ)* in Uttarajjhāyā are most
probably later additions. This would leave us with basically two options:
they are the result of interferences of the same redactors or compilors, who
added the frames, or they have found their way into the text in the course
of its subsequent transmission.

To begin with the latter possibility, the instances collected in § 5 show
that in the course of the transmission of the text the absolutive has been
liable to variation. However, the variation may have worked in both
directions. That is to say, in at least one case (22.48) we should reckon with
the possibility that, contrary to expectations, the "later" absolutive in
-*ūna(ṃ)* was the original reading and the "earlier" type ending in
-*ettāna(ṃ)* the secondary one.

As to the other possibility, the following points should be considered. In the first place it should be noted that Uttarajjhāyā is a compilation. The fact that the principle behind the arrangement of the individual chapters has not been made explicit is not exceptional. The same situation is found in, for instance, Dasaveyāliya. The situation becomes more problematical if we turn to the individual chapters and try to imagine what they look like without the frames. Here we may again make a distinction between the legendary chapters, on the one hand, and the dogmatic and disciplinary ones, on the other.

To begin with the legends, in the case of the Jātakas there is evidence pointing to the existence of texts consisting of the bare dialogue verses (LÜDERS 1941: 136 ff.). However, the existence of such bare texts only shows that the dialogue text was fixed and that it was left to the imagination of the narrator, or the reader, to make up the story. The very fact that the stories were not fixed, accounts for the popularity of this "ascetic poetry" (ALSDORF) among the various religious streams of India; each could, and did, adapt the material to its own purposes. Whatever "sectarian" elements one wished to introduce had to be relegated to the story. This means that even if in the source from which the Jains borrowed the material the dialogue verses had been embedded in full-fledged prose stories, the Jains most likely ignored the prose text anyway. It follows that the agreement between Uttarajjhāyā and the Jātakas on the point of the dialogue verses does not tell us anything on the format of the source used by the Jain redactors. On the other hand, even if the hypothetical first Jain redactors worked from a version which consisted only of the verse dialogue, we cannot be certain that they repressed the urge to add narrative passages of their own making. In any case, the Jātakaṭṭhavaṇṇanā, on the one hand, and the present text of the Uttarajjhāyā, on the other, would testify to the universality of this urge.

Turning to the dogmatic and disciplinary chapters, it appears that if we remove the verses containing absolutives in -ūṇa(ṃ) and the āryā verses the result is a highly irregular text. Side by side with chapter 31, which has been neatly introduced and summed up, we would have had chapter 36, without any introduction or conclusion, and chapter 20, with an introduction, but no conclusion. The origin of this uneven situation is very difficult to explain. As to the process of the compilation of the Uttarajjhāyā the hypothesis involving an Ur-Uttarajjhāyā, that is, the present text without the later addition, seems to be premature. In the case of the legendary

chapters the scenario clearly overestimates the importance of the so-called bare version of the Jātakas, in the case of the dogmatic and disciplinary chapters its complications have so far not been followed up properly.

The lack of evidence for the one scenario is of course no proof for the other. Nevertheless, we should seriously consider the possibility that the Uttarajjhāyā is in fact a late compilation, that is, that it would, generally speaking, be as late as the latest material found in it.

In this connection it should be noted that in combining old and late material Uttarajjhāyā does not stand on its own. As I have shown elsewhere, Āyāra and Sūyagaḍa by their use of *tuy(v)atta*- as a common word for "lying down" seem to linked more or less directly to the commentatorial literature on the Buddhist Vinaya (TIEKEN 1997a). This relatively late word is found side by side with (metrical) material which JACOBI dates between the fourth and the third centuries B.C. (JACOBI 1884: CLI ff.).

Furthermore, the occurrence of *tuppa*, a late, western word, in some of the narrative canonical texts would place the origin of these text as we now have them in Gujarat and not in early Magadha as one might conclude on the basis of other, archaic, features (TIEKEN 1997b).

All these indications, however rare, seem to corroborate the traditional legend which dates the compilation of the canon in our era and in Gujarat. As I see it, the real challenge put to us is to explain how old and authentically eastern material has found its way into the Jaina texts which are relatively recent compilations made in the western parts of India.

These considerations apart, another question is how and when the absolutives ending in -ūṇa(m̐) have found their way into Uttarajjhāyā. If the narrative texts of the Jaina canon, in which the absolutive ending in ūṇa(m̐) is completely absent, are indeed late texts as well, this only underlines the exceptional position of Uttarajjhāyā on this point. Furthermore, if the absence of this absolutive in the narrative texts is the result of a conscious process of archaization, which has led to the selection of the archaic -*ettā* type, this would suggest that Uttarajjhāyā was compiled, or added to, by redactors working within a different, or later, literary tradition. The insertions involving *āryā* verses would indeed suggest that in the case of the absolutives, too, we have to do with interferences from a literary, or rather textual, tradition rather than from, for instance, the contemporary spoken languages. In this connection I may refer again to the fact that the absolutive ending in -ūṇa(m̐) is otherwise typical of the *nijjutti*s. The same is the case with the *āryā* metre. In this connection it should also be noted that in the traditional classification of the canon

Uttarajjhāyā has, together with Dasaveyāliya, been linked to three texts of the *nijjutti* class, namely Āvassaya-Nijjutti, Piṇḍa-Nijjutti, and Oha-Nijjutti. The five texts together are styled Mūlasūtras. It may be concluded, at least as a working hypothesis for further research, that Uttarajjhāyā as we now have it has been compiled by the very same redactors who wrote the *nijjutti*s. In any case, rather than treating Uttarajjhāyā as one of the "Seniors" of the canon, further research on Uttarajjhāyā should in the first place be focused on its role side by side with the other four Mūlasūtras, that is, the very role assigned to the text in the traditional classification of the canon.

By way of conclusion I would like to return to the ten instances of the absolutive ending in *-ūṇa(m)* in one of the other Mūlasūtras, namely Dasaveyāliya. Unlike in Uttarajjhāyā most instances are found in the body of the text. Only three instances are found in what may be labelled a conclusion: *laddhūṇa* (5.2.47/260), *daṭṭhūṇaṁ* (49/262), and *sikkhiūṇa* (50/263). The distribution of the instances in Dasaveyāliya is, however, peculiar in another respect. Seven of the ten instances are found in the fifth chapter on the begging tour.[25] It can hardly be a coincidence that this is the very same topic covered by Piṇḍa-Nijjutti!

25 Apart from the three instances quoted just now, the instances are: *daṭṭhūṇa* (5.1.21/ 103), *paḍipucchiūṇa* (5.1.107/189; v.l. *paḍipucchiyā(ṇa)*, *paḍipucchitāṇa*) *gaheūṇa* (5.1.116/198), and *daṭṭhūṇaṁ* (5.2.31/244). The three remaining instances are: *daṭṭhū-ṇaṁ* (6.25/288), *viyāveūṇa* (6.37/300; v.l. *viyāvae*), and *daṭṭhūṇaṁ* (8.54/442).

REFERENCES

Āgama Śabdakośa: *Āgama Śabdakośa (aṁgasuttāṇi śabdasūcī)*. *Bhāga: I*. Ed. Ācārya Tulasī and Yuvācārya Mahāprajña. Jaina Viśva Bhāratī. Lāḍanūṁ 1980.

Alsdorf 1955: Alsdorf, L., "vāntam āpātum". In: *Suniti Kumar Chatterji Jubilee Volume*. Presented on the occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday (26th November, 1955). Poona = *Indian Linguistics* 16 (1955), 21-28 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 178-185).

Alsdorf 1957: Id. "The Story of Citta and Sambhūta". In: *Felicitation Volume presented to Prof. S.K. Belvalkar*. Ed. S. Radhakrishnan, S.K. De *et al*. Benares, 202-208 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 186-192).

Alsdorf 1962a: Id. "Namipavajjā: Contributions to the Study of a Jain Canonical Legend". In: *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*. Ed. E. Bender. New Haven, pp. 8-17 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 215-224).

Alsdorf 1962b: Id., "Uttarajjhāyā Studies". *Indo-Iranian Journal* 6 (1962): 110-136 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 225-251).

Alsdorf 1964: Id., "The Ākhyāna Theory Reconsidered", *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 13 (1963/64): 195-207 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 36-48).

Alsdorf 1966: *The Āryā Stanzas of the Uttarajjhāyā. Contributions to the Text History and Interpretation of a Canonical Jaina Text.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jahrgang 1966. Nr. 2. S. 153-220. Wiesbaden.

Āvassaya: *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttarajjhayaṇāiṃ and Āvassayasuttaṃ.* Ed. Muni Shri Puṇyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 15. Bombay 1977.

Āvassaya-Nijjutti: "Āvaśyaka-Niryukti". In: *Niryukti-saṅgrahaḥ*. Ed. Vijayāmṛta-sūrīśvara-Paṭṭadhara and Vijayajinasūrīśvaraḥ. Śrī Harṣapuṣpāmṛta Jaina Granthamālā. Lākhābāvāla-Śāṃtipūrī, 1989, pp. 1-189.

Āyāra: Āyāraṅga-Suttam [*Ācārāṅgasūtram*]. Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 2 (I). Bombay 1977.

Āyāra-Nijjutti: W.B. BOLLÉE, *The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetâmbara Siddhânta: Āyāranga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagaḍa.* Text and Selective Glossary. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung. Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 169. Stuttgart 1955.

Balbir 1989: Balbir, N., "Morphological Evidence for Dialectical Variety in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī". In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Ed. C. Caillat. Paris, pp. 503-525.

Bollée 1991: Bollée, W.B., *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-Nijjuttis of the Svetâmbara Jain Tradition.* Beiträge zur Südasienforschung. Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 142. Stuttgart 1991.

Bruhn 1996: Bruhn, K., "Ludwig Alsdorf's Studies in the Āryā", *Berliner Indologische Studien* 9/10 (1996): 7-53.

Charpentier 1908: Charpentier, J., "Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 62 (1908): 725-747.

Charpentier 1909: Id., "Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 63 (1909): 171-188.

Charpentier 1910: Id., "Zu Uttarajjhayaṇa XXV", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 24 (1910): 62-69.

Charpentier 1922: Id., *The Uttarādhyayanasūtra being the First Mūlasūtra of the Svetāmbara Jains.* Edited with an introduction, critical notes and a commentary. Uppsala.

Dasaveyāliya-Nijjutti: See *Āyāra-Nijjutti*.

Hinüber 1981: von Hinüber, O., "Die Paiśācī und die Enstehung der sakischen Orthographie". In: *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*. Ed. K. Bruhn and A. Wezler. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 23. Wiesbaden, pp. 121-127.

Hinüber 1985: Id., "Pāli and Paiśācī as Variants of Buddhist Middle Indic", *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 3 (1985): 61-77.

Hultzsch 1925: Hultzsch, E., *Inscriptions of Aśoka*. New Edition. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* Vol. I. Oxford (reprint: Delhi 1969).

Jacobi 1879: Jacobi, H., "Über des Çloka im Pāli und Prākrit. Bemerkungen über Dr. Zimmer's Abhandlung 'Zur Pāligrammatik'", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 24: 610-614 (= *Kleine Schriften* I, 189-193).

Jacobi 1884: Id., *Jaina Sūtras. Part I. The Ākāraṅga Sūtra. The Kalpa Sūtra*. The Sacred Books of the East Vol. 22. Oxford (reprint: Delhi 1973).

Jacobi 1885: Id., *Jaina Sūtras. Part II. The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra. The Sūtrakritāṅga Sūtra*. The Sacred Books of the East Vol. 44. Oxford (reprint: Delhi 1973).

Jātaka: *The Jātaka together with its Commentary being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. Vol. IV. Ed. V. Fausbøll. London 1887 (reprint: London 1963).

Kalpasūtra: SCHUBRING, W., *Das Kalpa-sūtra. Die alte Sammlung jinistischer Mönchsvorschriften*. Einleitung, Text, Anmerkungen, Übersetzung, Glossar. Indica. Texte, Übersetzungen und Studien ... Ed. by E. Leumann. Heft 2, Leipzig 1905 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 1-71).

Lienhard 1975: Lienhard, S., "Sur la structure poétique des Theratherīgāthā", *Journal Asiatique* 263 (1975), 375-396.

Lüders 1941: Lüders, H., *Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXVI, 3. Leipzig (reprint Nendeln, Lichtenstein, 1966).

Mette 1973: Mette, A., *Piṇḍ'esaṇā. Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjutti über den Bettelgang übersetzt und kommentiert*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der geistes- und socialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jahrgang 1973, Nr. 11. Wiesbaden.

Nāyādhammakahāo: *Nāyādhammakahāo* [*Jñātādharmakathāṅgasūtram*]. Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 5. Bombay 1989.

Norman 1971: Norman, K. R., *The Elders' Verses II Therīgāthā*. Translated with an introduction and notes. Pali Text Society Translation Series No. 40. London.

Oha-Nijjutti: W.B. Bollée, *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-Nijjuttis of the Śvetâmbara Jain Tradition*. Volume II. Text and Glossary. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung. Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 162. Stuttgart 1994.

Oha-Nijjutti-Bhāṣya: See *Oha-Nijjutti*.

Ovāiya: *Uvaṃgasuttāṇi 4 (Khaṇḍa* 1). *Ovāiyaṃ. Rāyapaseṇiyaṃ. Jīvājīvābhigame*. Ed. Ācārya Tulasī. Lāḍanūṃ 1987.

Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṃ: *Aṃgasuttāṇi* 3. *Nāyādhammakahāo, Uvāsagadasāo, Aṃtagaḍadasāo, Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo, Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṃ, Vivāgasuyaṃ*. Ed. Ācārya Tulasī and Muni Nathamala. Lāḍanūṃ 1974.

Piṇḍa-Nijjutti: See *Oha-Nijjutti*.

Piṇḍa-Nijjutti-Bhāṣya: See *Oha-Nijjutti*.

Roth 1973: Roth, G., "The Similes of the Entrusted Five Rice-Grains and their Parallels". In: *German Scholars on India, Contributions to Indian Studies I*. Ed. the Cultural Department Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi. Varanasi, pp. 234-244 (= *Indian Studies. Selected Papers*. Delhi 1986, 117-127).

Roth 1974: Id., "Notes on the Paṃca-namokkāra-parama-maṅgala in Jaina Literature". In: *Brahmavidyā*. The Adyar Library Bulletin Mahavira Jayanti Volume 38 (1974), pp. 1-18 (= *Indian Studies. Selected Papers*. Delhi 1986, 129-146).

Sattasaī: Weber, A., *Ueber das Saptaçatakam des Hāla*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes VII. 4. Leipzig 1881 (reprint Nendeln, Lichtenstein, 1966).

Sūyagaḍa: *Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttaṃ* [*Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram*]. Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 2 (2). Bombay 1978.

Sūyagaḍa-Nijjutti: See *Āyāra-Nijjutti*
Thera- and *Therī-gāthā*: *Thera- and Therī-Gāthā*: (*Stanzas Ascribed to Elders of the Buddhist Order or Recluses*). Ed. H. Oldenberg and R. Pischel. Second Edition with Appendices by K.R. Norman and L. Alsdorf. London 1966.

Tieken 1997a: Tieken, H., "Middle Indic *tuvaṭṭa-*", *Sambodhi* XX (1996): 16-23.

Tieken 1997b: Id., "Middle-Indic *tuppa*, Tamil *tuppu*, and the region of origin of some Śvetāmbara Jaina texts", *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 13-14 (1995-1996): 415-429.

Uttarajjhāyā: *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttara*[*j*]*jhayaṇāiṃ and Āvassayasuttaṃ*. Ed. Muni Shri Puṇyavijayaji and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak. Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 15. Bombay 1977.

Uttarajjhāyā-Nijjutti: See *Āyāra-Nijjutti*.

Vavahāra: SCHUBRING, W. and CAILLAT, C., *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons. Āyāradasāo, Vavahāra, Nisīha*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 11. Hamburg 1966.

Vinaya: *Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. Vol. III. The Suttavibhaṅga, First Part. (Pārājika, Saṃghādisesa, Aniyata, Nissaggiya). Ed. H. Oldenberg. London 1881 (reprint: London 1964).

Vivāga: See *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṃ*.

Weber 1883: A. Weber, "Ueber Bhuvanapāla's Commentar zu Hāla's Saptaçatakam", *Indische Studien* XVI. Leipzig (reprint Hildesheim 1973), pp. 1-204.

Williams 1963: Williams, R., *Jaina Yoga. A survey of the mediaeval śrāvakācāras*. Oxford (reprint Lala Sundar Lal Jain Research Series Vol. I. Delhi, 1991).

Yamazaki & Ousaka 1997: Yamazaki, M. and Ousaka, Y., *Uttarajjhāyā. Word Index and Reverse Word Index*. Philologica Asiatica. Monograph Series 11. Tokyo.