

It seems more likely that Sāriputta wrote his *ṭikā* on the *Aṅguttara* commentary precisely because only a partial manuscript of Dhammapāla's was extant. I find it regrettable therefore that the numeral *catutthā* "fourth" has been included in the title. As far as I know, this inclusion of a numeral in the title has no basis in any manuscript or edition of any of the pts. This point applies especially to Pecenko's three volumes of his incomplete edition of Mp-ṭ, although in that case the use of the numeral can be justified by reference to the late fourteenth-century *Saddhammasaṅgaha*. But the account of the creation of the *ṭikās* in that work seems confused and historically unreliable. There is no reason to think that either Dhammapāla or Sāriputta ever used such a numbering.

The edition is based upon a single Burmese Ms copied in Rangoon in 1892. At least one other Ms exists in Burma, but Pecenko's death prevented his obtaining a copy of it. This edition is much enlarged by the inclusion of the corresponding passages of Sāriputta's *ṭikā*. This seems rather wasteful, given that many are easily located in Pecenko's edition of this part of that *ṭikā*. It is in any case easier to refer to a separate volume for comparison rather than to have to look at notes, some of which are at the foot of the page and others collected into an appendix. Moreover, the variant readings of Mp-ṭ are only given in Pecenko's edition; so that has in any case to be looked at. For the *tikanipāta*, passages have been cited from the Burmese edition, since Pecenko's edition of Mp-ṭ does not reach so far. This is obviously useful.

Sāriputta was a leading figure in the twelfth-century revival of Buddhist activity in Ceylon, so this work provides a valuable means of further assessing his contribution. After a preliminary look, it seems that there is very little that is new or original in his writing. He has a very thorough knowledge of the earlier commentaries and subcommentaries and draws material from a number of them. Of course, if his aim was to replace an incomplete or partially lost *ṭikā* to the *Aṅguttara*, then originality would not have been his objective in this work.

It is to be hoped that Pecenko's work will make possible a more complete evaluation of Sāriputta's writings and a better understanding of his historical role in the history of Southern Buddhism.

L.S. Cousins

Wolfson College, Oxford

PATRICK OLIVELLE and MARK MCCLISH:

The Arthaśāstra: Selections from the Classic Indian Work on Statecraft.

256 pp. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Indiana University Press, 2012.

\$16.95. ISBN 978 1 60384 848 0.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X13000694

In *Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism*, (Leiden: Brill, 2011, reviewed in *BSOAS* 76/2, 330–32), Johannes Bronkhorst devoted considerable space to the *Arthaśāstra*, drawing extensively on the 2009 PhD dissertation of Mark McClish at the University of Texas. With the publication of *The Arthaśāstra: Selections from the Classic Indian Work on Statecraft*, we are presented with the fruits of McClish's research. The book has two parts: a general introduction of over 83 pages, written by Patrick Olivelle, and a translation of sections of the *Arthaśāstra* by Mark McClish, introduced with useful explanatory and contextualizing paragraphs. This covers pp. 1–156.

If the summary given by Bronkhorst encourages readers to anticipate that the many problems surrounding the compilation, redaction and history of the *Arthaśāstra* will be addressed in this book, they will be disappointed. McClish's dissertation may indeed have contained the hard philological and text-critical footwork needed to understand the *Arthaśāstra*, but the present book has not been designed with Indologists in mind. Rather, it is a teaching text for academics who need an up-to-date translation of the *Arthaśāstra* for their students. The book is admirably suited to this purpose and Patrick Olivelle's introduction is a reassuring sign that the scholarship is sound. The design of the book is commendable, notably pp. lxxii–lxxxii, which give the complete table of contents of the *Arthaśāstra* with a clear indication (in bold characters) of the translated portions that follow.

Once we have finished being students, however, just how we might use this book to further our study of the *Arthaśāstra* is a different sort of problem. The book has a short one-page bibliography listing items that are well known. The background scholarship is dealt with summarily in a footnote on p. ix. While I am flattered to find myself mentioned there, readers will find no critical engagement with my treatment of the *Arthaśāstra*: I can only assume from the general run of the introduction that the authors of the present book do not accept my interpretation. The point here is not whether they agree with me or not – I am content to be shown to be wrong and have this pointed out – but rather that the book does not position itself in the history of the study of the *Arthaśāstra*. Thus the translations, covering 156 pages, have only 78 footnotes. These consist of short explanations or comments without reference to the further literature. For example, on p. 60 in footnote 41 we read: “The meaning of this expression is unclear. Some think it is some sort of structure built with beams. Why such a structure should be specified is unclear. Commentators take it to be a beam above the post to which the elephant is tied so as to make the tying of the elephant easier. These all seem like guesses.” There is no doubt a great deal of scholarship lurking behind these remarks, but even a specialist will spend much time tracking down the sources. So while a generation of students will no doubt benefit from this new translation, Indologists will probably use the book only to check McClish's understanding of difficult passages in tandem with digital versions of the Sanskrit text, such as that available through the SARIT website.

Given what has been said so far, there is probably little reason to enter into an extended analysis of the introduction, designed as it is for students. It too lacks footnotes, thus when a reference is made on p. xii to Cāṇakya's authorship and the fact that “Prominent scholars have taken the position that the existing tradition should be accepted as historically accurate until it is conclusively disproven”, I am, for one, completely in the dark about who is being referenced. Perhaps it is A. L. Basham whose dogged insistence on a literalist reading single-handedly set back the study of the *Arthaśāstra* several generations? Anyway, one hopes that students returning from their philosophy lessons will rise in open rebellion against this blatant appeal to authority. There is plenty otherwise to irritate the historian, such as the use of the “classic period” (p. xxvii) and the “Vedic period” (p. xxiii), both unknown to current archaeology and history. The proposed dating of the text (p. xx) rests on slim evidence and slightly faulty numismatics; as always there is an effort to make the text as old as possible. Moreover, there is not much exploration of the tradition to which the text belonged (the *purohita*?) and thus the historical readers who may have consulted it. This book is certainly a useful step forward when it comes to making the *Arthaśāstra* accessible and intelligible, but a genuinely historicist reading, buttressed by all that philology and Indology can offer, is awaited.

Michael Willis

The British Museum, London