

weakened, is still alive in South Asia. On the other, it surely demands extra effort from Sanskritists trained outside the tradition and certainly daunts scholars who might be interested in the topic but have no training in Sanskrit.

These, as well as other editorial choices (many Sanskrit quotations are left untranslated and *devanāgarī* script is often not transliterated), elude in particular the understanding of a potential and, in my opinion, highly desirable reader of the volume: the linguistic historiographer. As it is considered desirable for non-Western traditions to be seriously taken into consideration by those studying the history of linguistic ideas, it is necessary to make them accessible. The danger is otherwise of cloaking them in a veil of exoticism. Also, there are so few occasions on which a volume on solely *vyākaraṇa*-related topics goes to press that it would be worth taking the chance to attract as much scholarly attention as possible to a topic that deserves it in full measure.

**Giovanni Ciotti**

Manuskriptkulturen in Asien, Afrika und Europa, Universität Hamburg

PRIMOZ PECENKO (Posthumously completed by Tamara Ditrich):

*Āṅguttaranikāyapurāṇaṭīkā. Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī.*

xvi, 486 pp. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2012. ISBN 978 0 86013 491 6.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X13000682

The completion of the last *ṭīkā* edition of Primož Pecenko undertaken before his early death is welcome news. Finishing off something of this sort is too often a rather thankless task, so special credit must go to Tamara Ditrich for performing this work.

One of the most interesting historical features of the Theriya school, writing in Pali, is the manner in which the main focus of activity seems to have shifted between southern India and Ceylon. In the first half of the first millennium AD at least, the main activity takes place on the island. Earlier it may have been further north. In the second half of the first millennium most of the literary activity in Pali seems to take place in the Tamil country, associated with such names as Ānanda and Dhammapāla. In the twelfth century we see the focus shift back to Ceylon with the revival associated with the name of Sāriputta and others. It is this which becomes the literary orthodoxy transmitted in later Southern Buddhism.

Such developments took place in a number of areas, but the one that concerns us here is the history of the *ṭīkā*s to the four *Āgama* commentaries of Buddhaghosa. In Helmer Smith's *Epilegomena* to the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (1948) four *ṭīkā*s (Līnatthapakāsinī I–IV) attributed to Dhammapāla and four attributed to Sāriputta (Sāratthamañjūsā I–IV) are listed. The former are classified as *porāṇaṭīkā* (pt) and the latter simply as *ṭīkā* (ṭ). However, when it comes to printed editions, only the first three of Dhammapāla's pt have hitherto been published in any version. Similarly, only the fourth part of Sāriputta's ṭ (on the *Āṅguttaranikāya*) (=Mp-ṭ) has been published. Hence doubts have been expressed as to whether the fourth part of Dhammapāla's *ṭīkā* and the first three parts of Sāriputta's have ever existed.

Burmese scholars have from time to time indicated the existence in Burma of the former: Dhammapāla's *ṭīkā* on the *Āṅguttara* commentary. To Pecenko goes the credit of obtaining a copy of a manuscript of this and completing the bulk of the editorial work on it. Although Pecenko (*JPTS* XXVII, 2002) has argued that full sets of both *ṭīkā*s have existed and may still exist, I am not yet convinced that this is the case.

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.