

Typographisch ist das Werk sehr schön und sorgfältig bearbeitet worden, jedoch sind auch in diesem, in vielen anderen Publikation weitaus mehr, verschwindend geringe Fehler wie *maṭhalaṭhī* (S. 165 m) statt *maś-galaṭhī* zu entdecken. Dieses schmälert jedoch den Wert dieser Arbeit keineswegs.

Im Ganzen ist diese vorliegende Arbeit Clarks eine gelungene und empfehlenswerte Lektüre, die gleichzeitig in einigen Teilfragen, bezüglich der Indizes, als ein Nachschlagwerk dienen kann. Zu hoffen bleibt, daß diese Art von Arbeiten auch auf die andere Türksprachen ausgedehnt werden, damit wir Turkologen nicht mehr länger neidisch auf die Früchte anderer, weiter entwickelter philologischer Disziplinen sein müssen.

Südasiens

Oberlies, Thomas: *Die Religion des Ṛgveda. Erster Teil – Das religiöse System des Ṛgveda* –. Wien: Publications of the de Nobili Research Library (ed. Gerhard Oberhammer). 1998. XIV + 632 S. – Bespr. von H. W. Bodewitz, Leiden.

This book may fill the reader with a mixture of admiration and irritation. The admiration is caused by the vast knowledge and wide reading of the author, the irritation by the complete lack of restriction, as a result of which this book of more than 600 pages only forms the first volume of a planned triad.

The central part of the trilogy will consist of a rewritten version of the Habilitationsschrift of the author which was presented in 1991 (University of Tübingen): *Kompositionsanalyse der Soma-Hymnen des 9. Liederkreises*. In order to understand the difficulties of the studied text Dr. Oberlies regarded an extensive study of the complete Vedic religion indispensable and this brought him to the idea of replacing Oldenberg's *Religion des Veda* by a new handbook, an ambitious and daring enterprise.

The present volume deals with Soma and Ṛgvedic religion; the social structure and the religious system; soma, power and the legitimation of power; intoxication by soma and its interpretation; form and function of the Soma hymns. The subject of the planned third volume will be sacrifices, rites and rituals.

It looks as if volumes one and three will be a modern counterpart of Oldenberg's handbook. On the other hand the trilogy aims at forming some sort of unity. Here one may have one's doubts. The emphasis on Soma/soma (the god and the drink) and especially on the composition of the ninth book of the Ṛgvedasaṃhitā will inevitably do harm to the total interpretation of Vedic religion, which is not restricted to Soma rituals and in its mythology and early attempts of philosophy should not be treated from the exclusive point of view of Soma or soma.¹

Moreover, Oldenberg did not restrict his research to the Ṛgvedasaṃhitā, as Oberlies does in the present vol-

ume. The mentioned text is rather onesided. How can Vedic ritual be examined (in volume three) purely on the basis of the information provided by this text? If one excludes the data of the post-Ṛgvedic literature and considers them as later developments without relevance for the pure Vedic religion of the oldest Saṃhitā, then a dangerous path is followed in analysing Vedic mythology.²

The irritation is already aroused by the bibliography consisting of 137 pages. In his preface the author states: "Das umfangreiche Literaturverzeichnis mag ein Beleg für mein Bemühen sein, nichts wirklich Wichtiges übersehen zu haben. Doch ist dies mehr Hoffnung denn Gewißheit". Oldenberg's handbook, which only has some references in its footnotes and misses a bibliography, forms the opposite of its claimed successor. More and more one begins to like Oldenberg, a man with moderateness (and vision).

The 137 pages of the bibliography do not exclusively contain titles referred to in the text. The system of the bibliography is not clear. I am under the impression that, as far as rather recent articles and books are concerned, it is a list of publications received rather than a well thought out list of literature relevant to the subject.³ Many publications are indeed discussed or mentioned in the present volume, but even here the choice is sometimes surprising. Gonda's publications are predominantly present in the bibliography, but one misses in connection with Viṣṇu (p. 219–222) a reference to his *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism* (1954), with regard to Prajāpati (p. 380, n. 206) references to more publications than only "The Highest Principle in the Early Veda" (Selected Studies VI, 2, p. 547–551)⁴ and concerning Mitra (p. 187–192) references to his *The Vedic god Mitra* (1972) and articles on the subject.⁵ There are more striking omis-

² It is remarkable that Oberlies has no hesitation in dealing with the Upaniṣadic *pañcāgnividyā* in connection with the soma of the Ṛgvedasaṃhitā (p. 483–487). It is true that he feels entitled to do so after having discussed the "ṛgvedische 'Wiedergeburtstheorie'" (p. 478–483, the weakest pages of this book, in which a collection of untenable ideas on life after death is found which completely baffles me).

³ In this connection I am grateful for 26 items bearing my name, but I must admit that, though all items are relevant to Vedic religion, only few of them concern Ṛgvedic religion. However, the Dutch article by my countryman Bremmer, "Onder de parfum, in de sla, tussen de vrouwen: Adonis en de Adonia" (1987) will even be less helpful for the international specialist of Ṛgvedic religion and soma.

⁴ See Gonda's bibliography (*Sel. Stud. VII/1*, 1991, p. XXII to XXIII) for the years 1984–1989 (including i.a. 3 monographs on Prajāpati). It is true that the emphasis is not on the earliest, Ṛgvedic aspects of this deity, but in a handbook with such an enormous list of literature one expects more references than the mentioned article.

⁵ See e.g. "Postscript on Mitra", *ABORI* 58–59 (1977–1978), p. 137–150. One may agree with the rejection of Gonda's interpretation of this deity, but a sentence like "Alleine daran scheitert das Bemühen, Mitra als 'freundlichen' Gott zu erweisen, wie dies Bergaigne und Gonda versuchten" without any reference to the mentioned book (which is also missing in the bibliography) is not to be expected in a handbook with high claims. Moreover, it is not fair to mention criticisms of Thieme's and Schmidt's views by e.g. Kuiper and to leave out Gonda's mentioned article in this connection. See also Bodewitz, "The Study of Vedism, Past, Present and Future", *Trends in Indian Studies* (ed. J. Vacek and J. Dvořák), Prague 1998, p. 31–44 (espec. p. 39).

¹ E.g. the concept of "Seelenvorstellungen" is treated as an excursus of nine pages added to chapter four "Der Soma-Rausch und seine Interpretation".

sions.⁶ The list of literature seems to be mostly correct.⁷ The inclusion of literature from the "Religionswissenschaft" in the bibliography and in the discussions of the text itself is very useful, but should have been more selective.⁸

Oldenberg wrote his own text and scarcely took into account views and publications of colleagues. Oberlies has some views of his own, but also tries to include as many references as possible. Since the amount of publications on a particular subject is mostly based on the divergency of views and interpretations, the inclusion of a very large number of references implies the necessity of a critical discussion of the different views.

In the case of Oberlies the situation is not always quite clear. Sometimes critical remarks are made on views of scholars, sometimes positive remarks. In general the preferences of Oberlies are intelligent and he avoids outdated views. However, by selecting portions of theories of several scholars the total view of Vedic or Ṛgvedic religion becomes blurred. Since several scholars have put forward ideas which challenge the views of others which cannot be combined with their own, Oberlies sometimes seems to try to achieve the impossible in his mixing up of attractive ideas of scholars who rather fundamentally disagree in their theories.

Let me make this clear by taking one issue as an example. The Vṛtra and Vala myths have been recognized to be cosmogonic myths. Of course they are not the only cosmogony to be found in the Veda, but they occupy a central position. As such they may be connected with several aspects of Vedic mythology, with ideas on cos-

mology and with a coherent picture of the Vedic pantheon (including the role of the anti-gods). Whatever may have been the original meaning of the names and functions of Vedic gods, they should play a role in the total system of a developed Vedic mythology and religion at a certain stage.

In an article which was written for a general audience of scholars (i.e. not exclusively for Vedists) Kuiper once tried to sketch his ideas on the basic concept of Vedic religion (*History of Religions* 15 (1975). p. 107–120). Other, more detailed studies by this scholar worked out this basic concept and agreed with the sketched issue. Now Oberlies accepts most of Kuiper's views, but he also accepts ideas which are rather different, e.g. on the existence of a heaven made of stone. The rock which represents the primeval hill in the cosmogonic myths, is interpreted as heaven by Oberlies. This rock is opened by Indra in the Vṛtra as well as in the Vala myth. "Der Vala-Berg, der steinerne Himmel und Indras Vater erweisen sich als ein und dieselbe, lebensfeindliche primordiale Welt, die es zu zerstören gilt. Und so berichten denn auch die Mythen von der Zerstörung des Steinhimmels, von der Spaltung des Vala und von der Tötung des Vaters alle von ein und denselben kosmogonischen Tat Indras, die den Beginn einer neuen Zeit markiert" (p. 369f.).

The weak point in this assumption is that heaven, the result of the cosmogonic activity of Indra, would have been present already before the mythic actions of Indra. This does not convince. On p. 366 Oberlies had already observed: "Der Vala ist der primordiale Hügel, der sich 'in Gestalt einer Insel als erster fester Platz aus den chaotischen Urgewässern erhob und Raum schaffte für das aufkeimende Leben'". This looks like a reference to a primeval situation in which heaven still did not exist. However, on p. 367 Oberlies states: "Die Reste dieser primordialen Welt, eine ungeheure Steinmasse und das Urwasser, werden in das neu entstehende Weltgebäude eingebaut; dort bilden die Steine das Randgebirge und die Unterwelt (...), das Urwasser den himmlischen Ozean und das unterirdische Meer".

Here Oberlies seems to regard both the heavenly ocean and the subterranean waters as the continuation of the primeval waters, but he does not draw the conclusion that subterranean waters are only identical with the heavenly waters in as far as these are representatives of the nocturnal situation. His n. 155 on p. 369 further illustrates his misunderstanding of the situation after cosmogony: "Daß die Sonne und die Morgenröte(n) im Vala eingeschlossen sind, deutet darauf hin, daß dieser Felsen – vorsichtig formuliert – etwas mit dem Himmel zu tun hat, daß er eine Vorform des späteren Himmels ist". This argumentation completely fails to convince me. The sun enters the subterranean world at night and reappears at dawn from the subterranean world and from the subterranean waters in some sort of re-enactment of the cosmogonic myth.

The additional observation "Natürlich ist dieser Felsen, der Logik der ṛgvedischen Kosmogonie entsprechend, ebenso die Vorform der Erde und der Unterwelt" is an example of the author's attempts to combine com-

⁶ Restricting myself to Gonda I may draw attention to the fact that some articles on Vedic kingship and books on kingship in other cultures are mentioned (e.g. Höfler, "Der Sakralcharakter des germanischen Königtums", in: *Das Königtum* (ed. Th. Mayer), Konstanz 1956, p. 75–104), whereas Gonda's *Ancient Indian kingship from the religious point of view* (first published as articles in *Numen* 3–4), Leiden 1957 (with reprints in 1966 and 1969) is omitted. For a criticism of Dumézil's theory on the functional tripartition Oberlies (p. 243, n. 465) refers to Brough (1959), Schlerath (1995, 1996) and even to an unpublished lecture by Dunkel from 1991, but references to Kuiper (see 1961b of the bibliography), Hildebeitel and Gonda (both in *Asian Studies* 34 (1974) and both omitted in the bibliography) are missing. Gonda's *Triads in the Veda* (Amsterdam 1976) might have been included in a bibliography of 137 pages.

⁷ Kuiper 1987, however, is mentioned before 1985 and would be "Besprechung von Hoffmann/Narten 1987. *Kratylos* 1987, 61–67" which must be a mistake. It should refer to a review of Narten 1986. Kuiper 1951, "Nōropi khalkhō" should be "Nōropi khalkhōi".

⁸ In his preface (p. XII) Oberlies creates the impression that especially Indology does not care about "Religionswissenschaft". Actually, several "Religionswissenschaftler" have their basis in Classical Philology and most of them hardly care about Indology, whereas several Indologists at least have a basic knowledge of Greek and Roman religion. More than twenty years ago Burkert gave a lecture in Holland on comparative Indo-European mythology in which he also dealt with the myth of Heracles finding the cattle. I had to draw his attention to the Vala myth and Schmidt's book on this subject; he simply did not know the existence of the myth, its Indological treatment and its relevance to the subject of his lecture.

pletely different views. O.'s conclusion "Hillebrandts (...) and Kuipers (...) strikte Ablehnung der (...) These, die vedischen Inder hätten sich den Himmel *steinern* vorgestellt (...), ist unbegründet" (p. 369, n. 155) is entirely unconvincing.

Soma forms the central theme of this book, but sometimes the connection between discussed items and this central theme are debatable.

Oberlies interprets the soma drink as hallucinogenic and I am inclined to agree on this point. However, he also assumes that R̥gvedic poetry, especially of the ninth book, would have been directly influenced by the consumption of soma.⁹ "Es können wenig Zweifel daran bestehen, daß auch die halluzinogene Wirkung des Soma einen großen Einfluß auf die Komposition der Soma-Hymnen hatte" (p. 146, n. 22). Indeed, Nobel's index to Geldner's translation of the R̥gvedasamhitā (p. 248–249) seems to contain enough material for this assumption. Still I have my doubts. The composition of a hymn may either have been made before a Soma ritual or (in an improvisation) during the ritual.

If the first possibility is taken into account, then the influence of soma would imply its consumption outside the ritual context, for which there are no indications. Soma is not the alcohol of artists and poets. The sacredness of this drink excludes its private pressing and it was not for sale in bottles.

If the references to its hallucinogenic influence which are made in some hymns would imply that the hymns were made during the ritual, then some other problems arise. A priestpoet cannot be influenced by soma which still is in preparation. Not only the early morning service would seem to exclude this possibility. Even the whole ninth book of the R̥gvedasamhitā dealing with the purification of soma and containing most references to inspiration by soma cannot refer to the actual situation. It would be like the position of poets sitting in a distillery and making inspired poems in which the inspiration is attributed to spirits still waiting for the final phase of distillation.

My conclusion therefore is that the poets who were the first priests (or at least participants of rituals), knew the influence of soma through personal experience, but were not intoxicated when they composed their hymns.¹⁰

⁹ On p. 144 ff. he combines several factors which might have influenced the composition of Vedic poetry: it was oral poetry, it had the same schematic approach as that of the Brāhmaṇa texts and moreover the "Bilderreichtum" of the Soma hymns would be based on the hallucinogenic effect of the soma drink. I am afraid that rather different factors have been put together here. The poetry of the Veda is indeed oral, but these short hymns of about ten verses cannot be compared with long epic stories as analysed by Parry. The difference between the authors of the Brāhmaṇa texts ("vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft") and poets, assumedly intoxicated by soma, is also rather great.

¹⁰ Even the well-known hymn 10.119 ("Selbstgespräch eines Somabetrunkenen") only describes the results of intoxication but is not a product of intoxication. The structure of the hymn is too balanced for such an assumption.

The soma drink has a counterpart in the Vedic pantheon and according to Oberlies god Soma was together with Indra the most important deity (p. 152), a conclusion which will not be shared by all scholars. Indeed, too much attention was paid in the past to the nature of the plant from which the drink was made rather than to the nature of the drink itself. The deity represents the fluid rather than its origin. However, the problem of a deity who is at the same time a "Göttertrank" is not easily solved. In the book under review deity and drink are not always clearly distinguished.

After a theoretical introduction on the typology of deities and a concise survey of the Vedic gods we arrive on p. 241 at a treatment of "Soma und die Götter der R̥gveda" (1.6.2.22, p. 261–268), a chapter which, however, is mainly dedicated to Indra. After the interesting short paragraph 1.3 "Die Komplexität der Gottesgestalt 'Soma'" (p. 150–152) one looks in vain for an application of the theories on deities to god Soma. Oberlies states: "Verschiedene Aspekte der Gottesvorstellungen laufen in der Konzeption eines 'himmlischen Göttertranks' zusammen" (p. 242), but ultimately we are left with a characterisation of mead and its being stolen, a probably Indo-European myth which in the Indian context was developed into the "Mythos des Soma-Raubes" (p. 247), which Oberlies correctly associated with Indra's activities in the Vṛtra myth. The soma (god Soma) had to be released from the primordial hill of chaos in order to be drunk by Indra and to give him the opportunity of destroying this chaotic 'world'. Conclusion: Soma is the deification of a drink of gods and was originally drunk by Indra before his cosmogonic act. One may doubt whether such a 'deity' (together with his consumer) can be regarded as the most important god of the Vedic pantheon. Rather one may assume that the onesided information of the R̥gvedasamhitā falsely creates this assumption.

After a short survey of Vedic ritual (p. 269–331) the next chapter deals with society and the religious system (2.1–9) followed by a treatment of cosmogony (2.10–14). Here there is no more reference to soma or Soma, drink or deity. I will return to the debatable contents of this chapter.

In the next one ("Soma, Macht und Herrschaft (slegitimation)" (p. 391–447) the central subject again appears, be it (after a long discussion of all kinds of contests) only from p. 429 onwards, where the question is asked: "Was hat nun Soma (...) mit diesen Wettkämpfen zu tun? In the answer all kinds of connections between the soma drink and contests and victories are mixed up (ranging from the "Mythos vom Raub des Soma" to the "Erst-runk' des Soma"). I fail to see any coherence here.

In the fourth chapter the interpretation of the "Soma-Rausch" is treated. Excursions deal with the conceptions of yonder world, with views on life after death and on paradise, with the R̥gvedic doctrine of rebirth, with soma and the pañcāgnividyā, with Yama's realm and with conceptions of the soul. Some of them are rather unconvincing. It is remarkable that this chapter of 57 pages has only 10 pages which more or less have some

connection with the interpretation of intoxication by soma. The structure of this portion is as weak as its contents. The digressions, insertions and addenda may have some internal relation, but they miss a clear connection with the central topic of the chapter.

The last chapter ("Form und Funktion der Soma-Hymnen") is useful, though I suppose that it is more relevant to the planned, second volume than to the understanding of god Soma and R̥gvedic religion.

In this book on god Soma the dark, nocturnal and lunar aspects are almost completely overlooked, though in a certain stage of Vedic religion Soma and moon became equated. In this history of R̥gvedic religion the moon is only mentioned in some footnotes and its association with Soma in the R̥gvedasamhitā is only accepted in 10.85.8–11 (p. 181, n. 153; p. 241). One may indeed reject Hillebrandt's views on the early lunar aspects of Soma, but the later identity of Soma and moon did not come out of the blue and traces are visible in the R̥gvedasamhitā, a text which hardly deals with god Soma outside the sphere of the purification of the soma drink. In the classificatory system Soma mostly belongs to the North, a quarter of space which is sometimes also associated with Varuṇa and waters, i.e. with the nocturnal sky.¹¹ Oberlies (p. 175, n. 128) explains the relation between Soma and Varuṇa i.a. by referring to their common origin as Asuras and to the fact that both live "im Wasser/Himmelsmeer". Agni and Soma are even more often associated as former Asuras, but they never share the same quarter of space. Agni is light and the East, Soma represents darkness. The waters of Varuṇa and Soma are the subterranean waters (the continuation of the primeval waters) and the nocturnal sky.

Varuṇa's connection with waters and nether world is hardly mentioned in this book.¹² Here Varuṇa is a god of heaven. Strange enough in "Varuṇas tönernem Haus" (RV. 7.89,1), interpreted as the urn, the bones of the cremated are buried in the earth (p. 304). This seems rather to refer to the nether world. On p. 194f. we read: "Als Herrscher über die primordiale Welt wird er mit deren Zerschlagung und Eingliederung in die neu entstandene duale Welt, als deren 'Fundament', die Unterwelt (...),

¹¹ See Brian K. Smith, *Classifying the Universe*, New York/Oxford 1994, p. 151–154. In a forthcoming publication I will extensively deal with the systems of classification and the nether world. Soma is sometimes also associated with the West (Varuṇa's own quarter) and the South (the quarter of death and the nether world).

¹² On p. 361 Oberlies states: "Varuṇa wird zu einem letztlich doch unbedeutenden Gott der Wasser" (referring to the post-vedic situation). However, already in RV. 2.38,8 Varuṇa is associated with waters and night (see Geldner's note: "Sobald die Nacht kommt und die Menschheit schläft und die Augen zumacht, darf er sich in sein eigenes Haus, in das Wasser zurückziehen"). See also RV. 8.41,2–3 on Varuṇa living in the waters and enclosing the nights. Only in two footnotes (p. 188, n. 190; 191, n. 206) a connection with the night is mentioned (apparently as a late development). However, on p. 341 we find a reference to Varuṇa's seat in the waters which is not specified as such in the index: "er 'wohnt' an einem bestimmten Ort, in den Wassern", but with the addition: "in einem himmlischen Palast".

zum Gott der Unterwelt, des Nachthimmels und der Wasser". This localisation (not specified as such in the index) is rather surprising in view of the further characterisations of Varuṇa by Oberlies. It is true that a reference to Kuiper is added between brackets, but a criticism of this view is not given in the text.

This takes me to the announced return to chapter two, in which Varuṇa acts as the protagonist of an Āditya religion, while Indra is the leader of an Indra religion and Agni of an Agni religion. In this chapter Oberlies tries to structure the Vedic pantheon by interpreting it as "Abbildungsebene gesellschaftlicher Wirklichkeit" (p. 333).

Some scholars may accept this startingpoint, others reject it. I for one would not interpret religion as reflecting a social system.¹³ Of course one may try to follow such an approach, but my criticism is that one has to choose and cannot mix up the one structure with the other. Kuiper, who also rejects the presupposition that religion would reflect a social system, gives priority to a mythological structure.¹⁴ Now the problem is that Oberlies does not reject this structure but in the second chapter of his book starts from a different structure. R̥gvedic society was characterized by a succession of *yoga* "enterprise" (often in the form of raids) and *kṣema* "settlement". "Diese *yōga* + *kṣēma*-Lebensweise prägte das soziale und religiöse Leben der vedischen Stämme" (p. 337). As a religious reflection of this social bipartition Indra and the Maruts would represent the *yoga* and Varuṇa and his Ādityas the *kṣema*. Indra would be the divine counterpart of the "Kriegskönig", Varuṇa of the "Friedenskönig". Thus they were temporary leaders. Agni now would be the permanent one: "dasjenige Element, das dem Leben der vedischen Gesellschaft Kontinuität verleiht" (p. 347). The conclusion drawn by Oberlies runs: "Ich meine, die Aktualisierung verschiedener 'Subsysteme' vor dem Hintergrund eines Kontinuums ist die Grundstruktur rgvedischer Religion, die die gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit reflektiert" (p. 361).

Three critical remains should be made here. First, I doubt whether really Vedic society had such "komplementäres Königtum" (p. 349). If indeed the preclassical society knew almost seasonal raids (as assumed by Heesterman) one needed also seasonal elections of warlords, unless these princes left the distribution and supervision of the wealth obtained by themselves in wars and raids to some non-fighting managers. Anyhow, there is hardly any proof for the hypothesis. Secondly, I doubt whether the assumption of a factor of continuity in the form of a *viśpati* is acceptable and whether such a permanent leader would guarantee the rest and quiet not given by the *kṣema* leader. And if so, whether Agni is the right divine counterpart here.¹⁵ Thirdly, the paralle-

¹³ See also Gonda, "Postscript on Mitra", *ABORI* 58/59 (1977/78), p. 137–1590 (espec. p. 140f.).

¹⁴ See Bodewitz, "The study of Vedism, Past, Present and Future" in: *Trends in Indian Studies* (ed. J. Vacek and J. Dvořák, Prague 1998, p. 31–44 (espec. p. 40).

¹⁵ It is remarkable that Agni is not accompanied with a group of gods in this construction. Why are the Vasus not given this role?

lism of society (the prototype) and pantheon (the reflection) would imply that after the *yoga* activity of Indra (and his Maruts) and the subsequent *kṣema* peace of Varuṇa (and his Ādityas) again an explosion of *yoga* by Indra would follow, since in Vedic society such a succession also is found. Proofs for such a cosmic succession of activity and rest are missing.¹⁶

Concluding this review I must admit that in spite of all my criticism feelings of admiration are still in my mind. Nevertheless I cannot regard this handbook (vol. I) as the real successor of Oldenberg. The structure of the planned trilogy with its emphasis on Soma and soma, the assumption of a pantheon based on a debatable social system of power and its distribution, the attempt to combine rather conflicting ideas on Vedic religion and the restriction to the religion of the Ṛgvedasamhitā (in spite of incidental attempts to combine the data with developments which should be placed at the end of the Vedic period) result in a work which does not make the impression of being well balanced.

Hüsken, Ute: Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin. Berlin: Reimer 1997. 519 S. 8° = Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 11. Lw. DM 148,-. ISBN 3-496-02632-4. – Bespr. von K. R. Norman, Cambridge.

This book is a detailed study by Dr. Ute Hüsken (= UH) of the rules for nuns (*bhikkhuni*) in the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga of the Theravādin Vinaya-piṭaka. It is based upon the Pali Text Society editions of the Vinaya-piṭaka and of the Samantapāsādikā (= Sp.), the commentary on the Vinaya, but variant readings from oriental editions are given in brackets.

Included in the Introduction (Einleitung (pp. 13–41) is an account of previous studies of the rules for bhikkhunīs (Forschungsgeschichte, pp. 30–36), and UH makes frequent references to her predecessors' work throughout her study.

Since it is based upon the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga, the book does not include the rules which are common to both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, with the result that only some of the bhikkhunī Pārājika, Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya and Pācittiya rules are included, and UH does not include any Sekhiya and Adhikaraṇasamatha rules, although the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga does in fact give the first and last Sekhiya rules, and also an abbreviated form of the Adhikaraṇasamatha rules.

¹⁶ Oberlies tries to construct such a cosmic counterpart on p. 361: "Jetzt greifen die Ādityas ein. Sie ordnen den von Indra geschaffenen Roh-Kosmos und halten ihn aufrecht, indem sie Normen aufstellen und für deren Einhaltung sorgen. Ihr Wirken erstreckt sich bis zur Zerstörung des Kosmos, bis zum Einbruch des (erneuten) Chaos, bis zum nächsten *yōga*". However, this would suppose some sort of Yuga system of cyclical destruction and creation, which is absolutely not Vedic.

For each section of the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga UH follows the same pattern: the rules are quoted in Pāli, together with a German translation. After the rules and translations there is a section of comment, e.g. about *ayam pi* (p. 65 n. 116), which proves that the four bhikkhu Pārājika rules, which apply to bhikkhunīs also, are to be assumed to precede the four exclusively bhikkhunī rules, and about *nissāraṇīya* (p. 107), where the meaning of this word is discussed. Other problems which are discussed include the ambiguous phrase *ūnadvādasavasam gihigatam* "a married woman less than twelve years old" or "a woman married for less than twelve years" (pp. 255–65), where UH accepts the former as the correct meaning.

In the footnotes the *padabbajaniya* (word analysis), which follows each rule in the Vinaya, is quoted and translated, and then the appropriate portions of the Sp on both the rule and the word analysis. Sometimes the comment of the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī, the commentary on the Pātimokkha, is given, where this differs from the Sp.

Although the translation into English of the entire Vinaya-piṭaka in six volumes (*The Book of the Discipline*, London, 1938–66) by Miss I. B. Horner (= IBH) was a magnificent undertaking (and is frequently referred to by UH), nevertheless it is inevitable that it should contain errors, and UH draws attention to and corrects these in a number of places, e.g.:

(Pācittiya 2) *saṃharāpeyya*: IBH "let grow"/UH "entfernt" (p. 151 n. 31) [IBH herself said later that it should be "remove"].

(Pācittiya 4) *jatumatṭhake*: IBH "in an application of lac"/UH "bei einem künstlichen Penis"; "constantly"/"selten" (p. 154).

(Pācittiya 81) *pārivāsikachandadānena*: IBH "by showing favouritism to (monks) placed under probation"/UH "aufgrund einer Zustimmung vom Tag zuvor" (p. 276 n. 826).

Similarly, in place where IBH translates literally without giving any indication of whether she realises the implication of the rules, e.g. Pācittiya 3, Pācittiya 5, UH shows that the rules are intended to remove the possibility of sexual stimulation.

At the end of each section there follows a discussion of the form and content of the rules common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs which, as noted above, are not included in this study as they are not in the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga. UH includes tables, showing how many there are of these, and the way in which they are combined. She does not quote the Pāli, nor does she translate the rules in full, but merely gives a summary of the meaning. The comparison of the Pācittiya rules is very long (pp. 293–333) because there are so many of them. To make the situation clearer, UH lists the rules by categories, such as hygiene, sexual conduct, textiles, utensils, etc.

She also includes (pp. 341–458) the rules for bhikkhunīs which are given in Cullavagga X of the Vinaya-piṭaka, beginning with the eight *garu-dhammā* which had to be accepted by Mahāpajāpatī, the first bhikkhunī. The rules in the Cullavagga are not arranged according to the categories of the Bhikkhunī-Vibhaṅga, and do not