

## UTTARAJJHAYANA-SUTTA XIV : USUYĀRIJJAṀ

K. R. Norman

The fourteenth chapter of the Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta,<sup>1</sup> entitled Usuyārijjaṃ tells of the two sons of a purohita, named Usuyāra, who determine to leave the world and become (Jaina) monks. Their father tries to dissuade them, but fails. He follows them after they have gone forth, and is followed in turn by his wife. The king proposes to confiscate his property, but is dissuaded by the queen. He too goes forth, and the queen follows him. Jātaka No. 509 of the Pāli collection (Hatthipāla-jātaka=Ja IV 473-91) tells what essentially is the same story, although there are some minor differences, e. g. there are four sons. The parallels between these two texts, also with some verses of the Mahābhārata, were long ago noted by Western scholars, and studies of their relationship were made by Leumann<sup>2</sup>, Franke,<sup>3</sup> and Charpentier.<sup>4</sup>

In both the Pāli and the Pkt versions the story is told in a mixture of *śloka* and *triṣṭubh* verses. In the Ja version there are 26 verses, of which 20 are *tr.* and 6 *śl.*; the Pkt version has 53 verses, of which 32 are *tr.* and 21 *śl.* Although the stories are similar, the direct parallels in the verses are not numerous. Among the *tr.* verses only six are held in common, and in several of these the parallelism extends only as far as a single pāda. Portions of three *śl.* verses in the Pāli are found in four *śl.* verses in the Pkt. On *śl.* verse in the Pkt corresponds to a *tr.* verse in the Pāli. With one exception, in *śl.* metre, the verses held in common all occur in the dialogues between the various characters in the story.

It has been pointed out by Alsdorf<sup>5</sup> that in such stories in mixed verse, the earliest version was probably in pure *tr.* verses, and the *śl.* verses probably

1. Abbreviations : Utt=Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta : Ja=Jātaka; Sūy=Sūyagaḍaṅga; Mvu=Mahāvastu; MBh=Mahābhārata; *tr.*=*triṣṭubh*; *śl.*=*śloka*; v (v). =verse (s) in Utt; g (g). =gāthā(s) in Ja; Skt=Sanskrit; BHS=Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; Pkt=Prakrit; AMg=Ārdha-Māgadhī; PED=Pāli-English Dictionary; v. 1.=variant reading; cty=commentary.
2. E. Leumann, *WZKM* 6 (1892), pp. 12 foll.
3. R. Otto Franke, "Jātaka-Mahābhārata-Parallelen", *WZKM* 20 (1906), pp. 317-72 (= *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 344-99).
4. J. Charpentier, "Studien über die indische Erzählliteratur", *ZDMG* 62 (1908), pp. 725-47 (= Charpentier, 1908).
5. See L. Alsdorf, "Das Jātaka von weisen Vidhura", *WZKS* 15 (1971), p. 56.

represent later additions. It seems likely that this is true also of the present story, but if the earliest version was in *tr.* metre, it is nevertheless clear that some of the *tr.* verses are also later additions. The story in Utt begins with six narrative verses in *tr.* metre (vv. 1-6) which tell the background to the story. These are lacking in Ja, which has three introductory verses in *sl.* metre (gg. 1-3). Similarly the Ja story concludes with six *tr.* verses in which the queen discusses with the townspeople her intention to become a wanderer (gg. 21-26). There is no direct parallel to these in the Utt version, where the end of the story is told in five *sl.* verse (vv. 49-53).

The work done by the early scholars has stood the test of time, and when Charpentier made a new edition of Utt in 1922<sup>1</sup> there was little he could add to what he and others had done earlier. Since that time, however, further comparative studies, especially by Alsdorf,<sup>2</sup> have shed light on the relationship between Jaina and Buddhist texts, and in this paper I should like to make a further examination of some of the verses of Utt XIV and their counterparts elsewhere, in the hope that progress may be made in their interpretation and understanding.

(1) The first verse which is common to the two versions is v. 9 (≈g. 4), in which the purohita tells his sons of the duties of a brāhmaṇa, which they should fulfil before they become wanderers. In Charpentier's edition<sup>3</sup> the verss reads :

*ahijja vee parivissa vippe  
putte paritthappa gihanṣi jāyā  
bhoccāṇa bhoe saha itthiyāhiṃ  
āraṇṇagā hoha muṇi pasattā.*

The Pāli version has *adhicca* in place of Pkt *ahijja*, which might be thought to show voicing of *-cc-* > *-jj-*. It is, in fact, due to a development from a different form. The Pāli is derived from *adhītya* (which occurs in the Skt version of the verse), whereas the Pkt is derived from *adhīya*, with *-iy-* > *-iyy-* > *-ijj-*.

Charpentier notes (p. 333) that Ja has *tāta* instead of *jāyā*, and he suggests reading *tāyā*. I do not understand his reference to Devendra apparently taking *jāyā* as an attribute of *putte*. According to the edition of Devendra's cty available to me, he takes it as a vocative and glosses it as *jātau putrau*, whereas he glosses *putte* as *putrān*. Although Charpentier reads *tāyā* in v. 18, which might seem to support his suggestion, he gives a v. 1. *jāyā*, and this seems to have been the reading known

1. J. Charpentier (ed.): *The Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, Uppsala 1922.
2. See L. Alsdorf, "The story of Citta and Sambhūta", *Dr. S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume*, Benares 1957, pp. 202-208.
3. References to Utt are to Charpentier's edition, unless otherwise stated. References to Ja are to Fausbll's edition.

to Devendra, who glosses it *he jātau*. Charpentier himself reads *jāyā* again in v. 22, and once again Devendra glosses this as *he jātau*.

A Skt version of this verse occurs in the Mahābhārata in a story about a brāhmaṇa who is asked by his son about the action to be taken when the world is passing away (MBh [crit. ed.] Śāntiparvan XII. 169). In the MBh the verse is followed by the equivalents of vv. 21-23. Not only does the *ll.* metre of these verses suggest that they are an addition to the story, but this is confirmed by the fact that they are lacking in the Ja version, although they do have a separate existence elsewhere in the Ja collection, at Ja VI 26, 11-16\*.<sup>1</sup>

(2) In the version in Utt, as part of the discussion aimed at persuading his sons not to become wanderers, the purohita tells them that their action would be profitless, because the soul is not eternal. He states (v. 18) :

*jahā ya aggī araṇī asanto  
khīre ghayaṃ tellaṃ ahā tilesu  
em eva, tāyā, sarīraṃhi sattā  
saṃmucchai nāsai nāvaciṣṭhe.*

Jacobi translates (p. 64):<sup>2</sup> “As fire is produced in the araṇī-wood, as butter in milk, and oil in sesamum seed, so, my sons, is the soul produced in the body; (all these things) did not exist before, they came into existence, and then they perish; but they are not permanent.” In a footnote to his translation “soul” he states (p. 64 n. 1) : “*Sattā* is the original; it is rendered *sattva* by the commentators. Perhaps *sattā* is the prākṛit for *svātmā*; at any rate the context of the next verse proves that the soul is intended.”

The Jaina Viśva Bhārati Prakāśana edition (Ladnun 1975) reads in pādas a :

*jahā ya aggī araṇīu ‘saṃto*

and Devendra seems to have had the same reading before him when he commented : *yathāiva casyāvadhāraṇārthatvāt ‘agniḥ’ “araṇīu” tti ‘araṇītaḥ’ agnimanthanakāṣṭhāt ‘asan’ avidyamāna eva sammūrccoti, yathā kṣīre ghṛtaṃ tailaṃ atha tilesu, evam eva he jātau ! śarīre sattvāḥ “sammucchai” tti ‘sammūrccanti’ pūrvam asanta evotpadyante. tathā “nāsai” tti naśyanti “nāvaciṣṭhanti” na punar avatiṣṭhante śarīraṇāṣe tannāśāt, iti sūtrārthaḥ.*

It would seem that Jacobi’s translation is based upon the cty explanation, but this presents considerable difficulties. Although Charpentier’s reading *araṇī* is not easy to explain, Devendra’s lemma *araṇīu* with the gloss *araṇītaḥ*, i. e. a quasiablative explained as *agni-manthana-kāṣṭhāt*, is also inappropriate, since in the context

1. See also H. Lüders. *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanon* Berlin 1954, § 20.
2. H. Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras Part II* (= *Sacred Books of the East* 45), Oxford 1895.

with *khīre* and *tilesu* we should expect another locative. Secondly, the explanation of *sattā* as the equivalent of Skt *sattuāḥ* necessitates the taking of *sammucchai* and *nāsai* as plurals, i. e. the equivalents of Skt *sammūrcchanti* and *naṭyanti*. We can, however, provide a locative by dividing Charpentier's reading as *araṇīa* 'santo, and assuming that the expected Ardha-Māgadhī reading *araṇīe* 'santo was replaced by Charpentier's reading as a result of the existence of the word *asan* in the cty's explanation,

The second problem can possibly be resolved by referring to the Sūyaga-ḍaṅga where a similar point of view is put forward by another non-Jaina, a śramaṇa or brāhmaṇa : *se jahāṇāmae kei purise tilehinto tellaṃ abhinivaṭṭittā ṇaṃ wadaṃsejjā ayam, āuso, tellaṃ ayaṃ pinnāe, evam eva n' atthi kei purise wadaṃsettāro ayam, āuso, āyā iyaṃ....se jahāṇāmae kei purise araṇīo aggaṃ abhinivaṭṭittā ṇaṃ wadaṃsejjā ayam, āuso, araṇī ayaṃ aggī, evam eva jāva sarīraṃ. evaṃ asante asaṃvijjamāṇe jesiṃ taṃ asaṃte asaṃvijjamāṇe tesiṃ taṃ su-y- akkhāyaṃ bhavati, anno bhavati jīvo annaṃ sarīraṃ* (Sūy II. 1.16 = Suttāgame I, pp. 137.38). Jacobi gives a somewhat condensed translation (p. 341) : "As a man presses oil from the seeds of Atasi, and shows the oil and the oil-cake separately, so nobody can show you the soul and the body separately. The same applies also when fire is churned from Araṇi-wood. Those who believe that there is and exists no soul, speak the truth."

A comparison between this passage and v 18 indicates important differences. The speaker in the Sūy passage is saying that it is possible to separate oil from oil-seed, or make fire from a fire-stick and show the two separately, but it is not possible to show the soul separately from the body. In v. 18, if we follow Jacobi's translation, the speaker is saying that oil is not in the seed, nor fire in the fire-stick, nor the soul in the body. So Sūy and Utt seem to be contradictory.

This contradiction can be resolved by assuming that we should read not *araṇīa* 'santo, as just decided, but *araṇīa santo*. We should then translate : "Like fire being in the fire-stick". It would seem that the reading in Utt, with a negative *asanto* or (with prodelision) 'santo, and Devendra's explanation of this reading, are in fact based upon the Sūy passage. The Utt passage states (if this suggestion is correct) that the soul is in the body, just as oil is in the seed and fire in the fire-stick, and if you destroy one you destroy the other with it. In the Sūy passage it is stated that it is possible to take oil from the oil-seed and make fire with the fire-stick and show them separately, but this cannot be done with the soul and the body.

The reason for this is that one and the same illustration has been used to serve two different purposes, and other examples can be given of illustrations being used in this way.<sup>1</sup> It is clear that Devendra, or the cty tradition he was following,

1. I have dealt with another example in "Kriyāvāda and the existence of the soul" in *Buddhism and Jainism* (ed. H. C. Das et al.), Cuttack 1976, Part II, pp. 4-12.



Devendra, must also be masculine, to agree with *bandho*. There seems to be no reason for reading *niyaya* 'ssa, since *niyayo* 'ssa would have exactly the same metrical length. It would therefore seem better to divide the words as *niyay' assa*, i. e. to assume that the final vowel of *niyayo* has been elided before *assa*. Jacobi, taking *niyayassa* as a genitive singular, translates it as "of the soul", although this meaning does not seem to be attested elsewhere for *niyaya* or *niyaka*, from which he presumably thought *niyaya* was to be derived.

If we accept Devendra's explanation, and assume that *niyay' assa bandho* stands for *niyataḥ (= nis̄cito) bandhaḥ asya*, we can translate "its binding is fixed, determined, settled". The rest of Jacobi's translation of pāda c seems to be an interpretation rather than a translation, since he takes *ajjhatthaheum* to mean "caused by its bad qualities", which seems to be based upon the explanation : *adhyātmasabden ātmasthā mithātāvādaya ihocyante, tatas taddhetuḥ tannimitto*. This, however, implies the reading *-heṅ* rather than *-heum*, and the assumption that the word agrees with *bandho*. There seems to be no objection to keeping Charpentier's reading, and taking it as an adverbial accusative. We can therefore translate : "because of the things connected with the soul".

(4) v. 20 is the equivalent of g. 10, which is the sons' final statement before they abandon the world. In the version in Utt it is followed by v. 27, which is the equivalent of an earlier verse (g. 7) in the Pāli version. As we shall see, it is probable that v. 27 has been misplaced, and it should really come before v. 20. The verse reads :

*jahā vayaṃ dhammam ajāṇamāṇā  
pāvaṃ purā kammam akāsi mohā  
orubhamāṇā parirakkhiyantā  
taṃ n' eva bhujjo vi samāyarāmo,*

Jacobi translates (p. 64) : "Thus being ignorant of the law, we formerly did sinful actions, and through our wrong-mindedness we were kept back and retained (from entering the order). We shall not again act in the same way". This translation seems strange, and the presence of the singular verb *akāsi* in pāda b causes difficulties.

The cty explains : *yathā vayaṃ 'dhammaṃ' samyagdarśanādikaṃ ajānānāḥ 'pāpaṃ pāpahetuṃ 'purā' pūrovaṃ 'kamma' anuṣṭhānaṃ 'akāsi' tti akārṣma krtavantaḥ 'mohāt' ajānāt 'avarudhyamānāḥ' nirgamaṃ gṛhād alabhamānāḥ 'parirakṣyamānāḥ' anujīvbhīr anupālyamānāḥ 'tat' pāpakarma naiva 'bhūyo 'pi' punar api samācarāmaḥ, yathāvad viditavastutvād iti sūtrārthah.*

A comparison with Pāli g. 10 shows the correct way of interpreting this verse. It reads :

*ayaṃ pure luddaṃ akāsi kammaṃ  
 sv āyaṃ gahīto, na hi mokkh' ito me  
 orundhiyā naṃ porirakkissāmi  
 māyaṃ puna luddaṃ akāsi kammaṃ.*

This shows that pāda b of the Utt version originally referred to a singular subject, but has been incorporated into a verse with a plural subject. This explains why Devendra has to take *akāsi* as being a plural verb. It is also clear that *orubhamāṇā* and *parirakkhiyantā* do not refer to the past, but to the future. We may therefore translate: "As formerly we did evil because of our delusion, not knowing the doctrine, being restrained and guarded we shall not do it again".

(5) In v. 27 the sons point out that only those who are friendly with death know when they will die, and are therefore able to make plans for the future. This seems more appropriate as an answer to the purohita's suggestion that they delay their departure until they have raised sons to take their place in the home. We may deduce, therefore, that this verse has been misplaced, and it should come earlier in the story, as its Pāli equivalent (g. 7) does. The fact that in Utt it is a *sl.* verse, whereas in Ja it is a *tr.*, suggests that it was originally an addition in *sl.* metre, which was transformed into *tr.* in the Pāli tradition. If it is an addition, then the fact that its position varies in the different traditions is understandable.

The difference between Pāli *sakkhi* and Pkt *sakkhaṇ* is probably to be explained by the assumption of the palatalisation of *-a > -i* after the *-y-* of *-khy-* before it was assimilated and disappeared.<sup>1</sup> PED lists *sakkhi* and *sakkhī* as neuter and feminine respectively.<sup>2</sup> There is no obvious reason for the change of gender, and except for the final *-i* there is no evidence that the word is feminine here. The lengthening of the final vowel is probably *metri causa*, since the fifth syllable of a *tr.* pāda is usually long before the caesura when two short syllables follow.

(6) Although Alsdorf in his article about the use of the verb *vam-* to refer to the abandonment of worldly belongings and sensual pleasures states<sup>3</sup> that the equivalent of Pāli g. 17 is not found in Utt, it does in fact occur there, split between vv. 44 and 45. The Pāli version has *hatthattham āgatā*, while Utt reads *hatthajjam-āgayā*, for which the punctuation *hatth'* [for *hattham*] *ajja-m-āgayā* is suggested by Charpentier (p. 335).

At Ja V 347, 14 the *cty* explains *hatthattham* (Ja V 346, 9\*) as *hatthe atthaṃ pattam*, which confirms that the text being commented upon included *-tth-*, but at Ja II 383, 9\* Fausbll's edition reads *hatthattam*, and the authenticity of this reading

1. See K. R. Norman, "The palatalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan" *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)*, Vol. 25, pp. 328-42.
2. See PED, s. v. *sakkhī*.
3. L. Alsdorf, "Vāntam āpātum", *Indian Linguistics*, Vol. 16, pp. 21-28.

is confirmed by BHS *hastatvam* (at Mvu II 182, 4\*, although the Pāli equivalent at Ja IV 459, 28\* has *hatthattham*). In the Utt version, Devendra explains *ajja* as a vocative (= *he ārya*), but Charpentier suggests that it is to be derived from Skt *adya* “today” = “now” (p. 335). Since, however, the variation in spelling in Pāli indicates that there was doubt about the derivation of the word, it is possible that *-jj-* represents an attempt on the part of the scribal tradition to make sense of something which had been inherited but found unintelligible.

The fact that in the Utt version vv. 44-45 come after v. 38 (= g. 18) supports Alsdorf's view<sup>1</sup> that in Ja the two verses which are intended to dissuade the king (gg. 17-18) are in reverse order, and g. 18 should come before g. 17.

(7) The queen also utters v. 46 to dissuade the king from taking the purohita's possessions. It has no parallel in the Pāli version, but one exists in the Mahābhārata, in a section describing the attainment of happiness and tranquillity. The fact that it is an addition in the Utt story is shown by the fact that it is not quite appropriate in the context, and this is confirmed by its being in the *śl.* metre. It was probably added because like vv. 44-45 it deals with birds and food. The

verse reads : *sāmiṣaṃ kulalaṃ dissa vajjhamāṇaṃ nirāmiṣaṃ  
āmiṣaṃ savvaṃ ujjhittā viharissāmi nirāmiṣā.*

Jacobi translates (p. 68) : “As an unbaited (bird) sees a baited one caught in the snare, even so shall we avoid every bait and walk about, not baited by anything”.

This translation is only acceptable on the supposition that the first line is some sort of accusative absolute construction, and Charpentier has drawn attention<sup>2</sup> to its lack of clarity. Franke had already given a reference for the Skt parallel, which was quoted by Charpentier :<sup>3</sup>

*sāmiṣaṃ kuraraṃ dṛṣṭvā vadhyamānaṃ nirāmiṣaiḥ  
āmiṣasya parityāgāt kuraraḥ sukham edhate* (MBh XII. 171).

The first line means : “Seeing the eagle with bait being killed by those without bait”, and this is confirmed by another verse quoted by Franke :<sup>4</sup>

*sāmiṣaṃ kuraraṃ jaghnur balino 'nye nirāmiṣāḥ  
tad āmiṣaṃ parityagya sa sukham samavindata.*

Translated into Pkt, the first line of the first verse would read : *sāmiṣaṃ kulalaṃ dissa vajjhamāṇaṃ nirāmiṣe*, with the instrumental plural ending *-e* instead of the more usual *-hi*, which would not scan. It is likely that the Jaina redactor did

1. L. Alsdorf, “Vāntam āpātum” *Indian linguistics*, Vol. 16, p. 27.
2. Charpentier, 1908, p. 739 n. 2.
3. *ibid.*
4. Franke, *op. cit.* (in n. 3), p. 345 n. 1.



not recognise this rare ending-*e*,<sup>1</sup> and in the belief that it was a nominative in-*e* (it would be difficult to fit a locative in-*e* into the sentence), he changed it to -*am*.

Charpentier stated (p. 335) that *viharissāmi* in pāda d spoiled the metre, and suggested reading *carissāmi*. He also believed that *urago* in pāda c of v. 47 made bad metre, and proposed to read *uāgo*. He further suggested (p. 333) reading *bavh-* in place of *bahu-* in pāda b of v. 7, without comment. All three suggestions are unnecessary. When Charpentier made his edition of Utt little work had been done on such questions as the resolution of vowels in metrical texts. The words he queried are all examples of the common resolution of an initial long syllable in a *tr.* or *fl.* pāda.<sup>2</sup>

(8) The one exception to the statement that all the parallel verses occur in the dialogue is v. 48 (=g. 20). The verse reads :

*nāgo vva bandhanam chittā appaṇo vasahim vae*  
*eyam paccham mahārāyam Ussuyāri (v. 1 Ussu-) tti me suyam.*

Jacobi translates (p. 68) : "Like an elephant who has broken his fetters, go to your proper destination. O great king Iṣukāri; this is the wholesome truth I have learned". It is clear that if this translation is correct, then *tti* has been misplaced, and a comparison with Pāli :

*idaṃ vatvā mahārājā Esukārī disampati*  
*raṭṭham hitvāna pabbajī nāgo chetvā va bandhanam*

suggests that we take *vae* in pāda b not as an optative "you should go", but as an example of the not uncommon usage in Pkt of an aorist which has a form identical with that of an optative.<sup>3</sup> The name *Us(s)uyāri* would then be a nominative, not a vocative, and we should have to assume that the word *mahārāyam* (or the v. 1.

1. For examples of this ending in Pāli see W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg 1916, § 79.6, and add *gūṇe desah' upāgataṃ* (Buddhavaṃsa 2.32); *dasahi kusale upāgato* (Cariyāpitāka 74); *aṭṭhapade pi kilanti, dasapade pi kilanti* (Vinaya-pitāka II 10,17 = III 180,22; cf. —*ehi pi kilanti* at Niddesa I 379,6-7); *citrāggaler-ugghusite* (Ja VI 483,5\*). For Pkt *ege jīe jiyā paṃca paṃce jīe jiyā dasa* (Utt 23.36); *sārīramāṇase dukkhe bajjhamānāṇa pāṇiṇam* (Utt 23.80).

2. See K. R. Norman, *Elders' Verses I*, London 1969, §§ 26 (d), 36

3. For a recent survey of this phenomenon, see K. R. Norman, "Notes on the Vessantara-jātaka", in *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus*, Wiesbaden 1981, pp. 168-69. In view of the statement made there. (p. 169) about the normalisation of readings, it is perhaps of interest to note that in an example quoted above Mvu II 182,4\* reads *āgacche* while Ja IV 459,28\* reads *āgañchi*.

-rāya) had been introduced as a replacement for *mahārāyā*. We could then translate : “King Iṣukāra went forth to that auspicious (place) as an elephant breaking its fetters (goes) to its own dwelling. Thus have I heard.”

Since it is in both versions, we can deduce that this *śl.* verse was an early addition to the story, and at one stage must have formed the end of the narrative. It therefore follows that everything that comes after it is a later addition, as Charpentier notes (p. 335). In both versions the reference to the queen going forth comes after this verse, and it seems possible that at an earlier stage of the story there was no mention of her doing this. Both traditions would have had no difficulty in adding independently details about her going forth, to round off the story and to give a parallel to the purohita’s wife following the purohita.

We may draw certain conclusions : (a) The Utt and Ja versions of the story have six *tr.* verses in common. These are all dialogue, and are ascribed to the same speakers and occur in the same order in the two traditions. They cover the episodes of the purohita trying to dissuade his sons, their reply leading to their going forth, the purohita’s decision to follow them, and his wife following him. This is the very oldest part of the story.

(b) An early addition in *śl.* metre tells of the sons’ replies to their father, the queen’s attempt to dissuade the king, and the king’s decision to go forth. These verses were added to the story early enough for them to be in both traditions. The Pāli tradition converted the first of them into *tr.* metre.

(c) The Jaina version contains two *tr.* verses giving the brahmanical and anti-brahmanical views of the soul. These may belong to the earliest version of the story, although they are similar to passages found elsewhere in Jaina texts. The Buddhist version either never knew them, or omitted them.

(d) The version in Utt adds a dialogue in *śl.* verses about the threat to the world. These also occur in the MBh, in company with the first verse uttered by the purohita.

(e) The Utt version adds another *śl.* verse, also found in the MBh, about the greediness of birds.

(f) Each version adds separate introductory verses, in the *śl.* metre in the Ja version and in *tr.* metre in the Utt. The Utt version also adds narrative verses in *tr.* metre to clarify the story. The Ja version has its prose story, so such narrative verses are not required.

(g) Each version adds a conclusion. The Ja adds verses in *tr.* metre dealing only with the townspeople and the queen, since the prose can tell the rest of the story. The Utt version adds verses in *sl.* metre dealing with all six participants. Both versions tell of the queen going forth, but the details may be of independent origin, since her action follows naturally after the king's, and is a parallel to that of the purohita's wife.