

HOW TO ADDRESS KINGS: BUDDHIST LETTERS TO INDIAN RULERS

Richard F. Nance

Approaching Elliot Sperling’s office door in Goodbody Hall on the campus of Indiana University, one confronts a sign on which the following verse, drawn from the *Sa skya legs bshad*, has been inscribed:

rgyal pos go 'phang bstod drags na /
de yi tha ma brlag pa'i rgyu /
sgo nga mkha'la 'phangs gyur na /
chag pa nyid las gzhan ci 'byung /

No translation is provided. While I suspect that most readers of this Festschrift will not require one, here is James Bosson’s rendering of the verse:

“If a king extols someone and promotes his rank,
it will in the end be the cause of that man’s destruction.
If an egg is thrown up into the air,
what happens but that it breaks?”¹

I will not attempt to speculate as to why Elliot chose this particular verse to adorn his office door (though I suspect it may have something to do with his view of university administrators). Instead, I want to focus in this paper on an idea that informs the verse: because kings are potentially dangerous people, encounters with them need to be managed carefully if no one is to come to harm. In this small contribution, I wish to trace some of the ways that this idea surfaces in a particular corpus of texts, a group of letters that appears to reflect how Buddhists presented themselves to Indian kings, or wished to be seen as presenting themselves to these kings, during the first and early second millennia CE. Although these remarks will touch only briefly on matters Tibetan (and will bypass discussion of China altogether), I hope that they will serve as something of an *amuse-bouche* for the considerable *mkhas pa'i dga'ston* that the editors of this festschrift have assembled for readers, and I hope that Elliot—who has done so much over the course of a long career to enrich and transform our understanding of political history in Asia—will accept them in this spirit.²

1 Bosson 1969:246. Bosson also notes a variant reading—*rgyal ngan go 'phang bstod drags na*—that permits a reading in which the figure of the king shifts from an issuer of praise into an evil object of praise. This reading helps to explain John Davenport’s decision (2000:144) to go with “Excessive praise of an evil king’s status eventually will lead to his destruction.”

2 A fuller study of narrated encounters between kings and figures of Buddhist authority would need to investigate salient differences in the portrayal of kings vis-à-vis (1) bodhisatt(v)a(s), in texts such as the *Rurujātaka* in its various iterations (see, for example, Āryasūra’s *Jātakamālā*, Chapter 26); (2) buddha(s), in the *Kosalasamyutta* section of the *Samyuttanikāya*; the *Rājadeśasūtra*; and two dissimilar texts preserved

Although most of these letters seem to have been composed originally in Sanskrit, or something close to Sanskrit, none of the texts on which I will focus is extant in its entirety in any Indic language. All are collected in the section of the Tibetan *bsTan 'gyur* that has received the rubric *spring(s) yig*.³ This is a Tibetan translation for the Sanskrit term *lekha*, a term used not only to refer quite generally to written documents but also, and more narrowly, to letters.

The corpus is small. Only thirteen texts among the forty-five that are collected in the *spring(s) yig* section of the canon are explicitly marked as letters.⁴ Moreover, unlike the letters known to us from ancient Greece and Rome, these texts are not accompanied by any guides to letter composition and evaluation (on the model of, e.g., Demetrius's *On Style* or Libanius's *On Letter Form*).⁵ The small size of the collection and the absence of accompanying guides make it very difficult to determine whether and to what degree the authors of these texts were aware of, and sought consciously to adhere to, specific rhetorical norms for letter-writing.⁶ One of the thirteen letters—the *Suhṛllekha*, attributed to Nāgārjuna—is quite well-known and has received extensive attention.⁷ The other letters remain understudied, although mention must be made here of the pioneering and altogether remarkable work that has been done on these texts by Michael Hahn and Siglinde Dietz over the past three decades, work to which the present paper is deeply indebted.⁸

Why were these thirteen letters preserved within the Tibetan Buddhist canonical collections?⁹ One reason is likely to have been that they were assumed to come from eminent authors of

under the title *Rājāvavādakasūtra* (D. 214–216), one of which appears to have been cited by Śāntideva in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*; (3) Buddhists, in (most famously) the *Milindapañha*; and (4) non-Buddhists who are given pride of place in Buddhist sūtras, as in the figure of Satyavādin in the *Satyakaparivarta* (cf. Jamspal 2010).

3 In the Derge edition (henceforth D.), the relevant section (D. 4158–4202) encompasses the whole of volume *nge*, and extends backwards into the previous volume (*ge*), beginning on folio 107a.

4 That is, only thirteen are identified with titles incorporating the term *spring yig* or some variant thereof (e.g., *spring pa*; *'phrin yig*, etc). Another seventeen texts are marked as *gtam* (Skt. (*pari*)*kathā* (“communication,” “remarks,” “sermon”)). The remaining texts bear titles that identify them as instructions (*bstan pa*, here used to translate *nirdeśa*), commentaries (*bshad pa*, here used to render *ṭīkā*), and prophetic utterances (*lung bstan pa*, *vyākaraṇa*), among other things. None of these identifying titular terms—including *spring yig*—is confined to the *spring yig* section of the canon. It thus appears that in the compiling of the Tibetan canonical collections, the category *spring yig* was used as a loose umbrella term for different sorts of text.

5 See Trapp 2003:179ff.

6 Michael Hahn notes that the letters preserved in the Tibetan canons are “not nearly as formalized and standardized as their western counterparts,” and suggests that this lack of standardization may stem from the fact that “there were many fewer epistles in Buddhist literature than in Greek or Roman traditions” (Hahn 1999: xxvi). Hahn’s reasoning here is not entirely clear to me. The fact that few letters have been preserved hardly entails that only a few were composed; and even if we grant that only a few were composed, it’s not at all clear how their relative rarity warrants conclusions regarding the standardization of their formal features.

7 Lindtner 1997 provides a useful bibliography of sources. See also Walser 2005 and Scherrer-Schaub 2007 for treatment of specifically political dimensions of the Nāgārjunian corpus.

8 Dietz 1983, 1984; Hahn 1999; Hahn and Dietz 2008.

9 Such preservation appears to have started early. The catalogs of materials that would, over time, come to be taken up into what we today know as the Tibetan *bsTan 'gyur* are revealing in this regard, with the Lhan kar ma *dkar chag* registering eleven of the thirteen *lekhas*, and the *'Phang thang ma* registering nine. See Herrmann-Pfandt 2008.

Indian Buddhist intellectual history: Mātṛceṭa, Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, Kamalaśīla, Jitāri, Atiśa, and Mitrayogin. Another is that their content was taken to recommend preservation: in general, the letters eschew detailed presentations of intricate metaphysical matters in favor of providing basic moral instruction. Consider, for example, the following passage, drawn from the *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha*:

The Lord of Death, who is no man's friend,
 Will descend upon you suddenly.
 Therefore, with great effort turn to the holy Dharma
 And do not say, "I will do it tomorrow."
 "I will do this tomorrow, not today"
 Is not good for a man to say.
 Without any doubt, that tomorrow will come
 When you no longer exist.¹⁰

Passages of this kind are quite common in the letters, are of general applicability, and may have been believed to be worth preserving because they were held to speak to an audience that reached beyond the letters' immediate addressees.

These addressees are various, including students, teachers, sons, monks, and even the general public. Most often, however (in seven out of the thirteen extant *lekha* texts), the addressees are kings. Sometimes—as in the *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha* or *Vimalaratnalekha*—the specification of addressee is precise enough to allow us to pick out a particular individual to whom the letter is purportedly targeted. In other cases (e.g., the *Suḥṛllekha*) the specification is somewhat vaguer.

Two of the seven letters to kings fall outside the purview of this paper; they are addressed not to Indian rulers but to the Tibetan emperor Khri srong lde btsan. (The longer of the two, the "Letter Comprising Treasures" [*gCes pa'i bsduṣ pa'i phrin yig, Sārasaṃgrahalekha*] of dPal dbyangs, appears to have been composed originally in Tibetan.)¹¹ The remaining five letters are Mātṛceṭa's "Letter to the Great King Kaniṣka" (*Mahārājakanīṣkalekha*); the aforementioned "Letter to a Friend" (*Suḥṛllekha*), attributed to Nāgārjuna; Jitāri's "Letter Entitled 'Stages of Purification of the Jewel of Mind'" (*Cittaratnaviśodhanakramanāmalekha*), Atiśa's "Stainless Jewel Letter" (*Vimalaratnalekha*); and Mitrayogin's "Letter to King Candra" (*Candrarājalekhaka*).¹²

If the traditional attributions can be trusted, these letters were composed at very different times. The letters from Mātṛceṭa and Nāgārjuna both likely date from the second century. After the time of Nāgārjuna, there is a remarkable silence that spans more than seven centuries: We appear to

10 Translation Hahn 1999:35. The Tibetan (*Ibid.*:34) reads: 'chi bdag su dang mi bshes pa // glo bur dag tu 'bab 'gyur bas // sang dag bya zhes ma bzhes par // dam pa'i chos la bsnur te mdzod // 'di sang deng 'di mi bya zhes / bya ba mi la bzang po min // nam zhig khyod ni med 'gyur ba'i // sang de gdon mi za bar 'ong.

11 For more on this letter, see Dietz 1984:85–91, 400–529; Hahn and Dietz 2008:201–248, 438–455; and note 22 below.

12 There is a further second-century work included among the *spring yig* texts that is also framed as a direct address to a king, and is quite well-known: Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī*. I will not, however, be discussing this work here, as it is traditionally classified not as a *lekha* but as a *parikathā*. On this distinction, see Dietz 1984:109.

have no letters between Buddhists and Vākāṭaka or Gupta rulers; none between Buddhists and post-Sātavāhana rulers of South India; none between Buddhists and Harṣa; none between Buddhists and the early Pāla kings. It is not that *lekhas* do not exist from this interim period, but they are not addressed to Indian kings. The correspondence with kings finally picks up again in the late 10th century with Jitāri's letter, whose addressee has been tentatively identified as Mahīpāla I (10th–11th c.). Atiśa's letter, addressed to Nirypāla / Nayapāla, dates to the mid-11th century.¹³ Mitrayogin's letter appears to date from over a century later; it is addressed to a Gahadvala king, possibly Jayacandra (r. 1170). We thus have two flurries of activity—one in the second century, and one in the early second millennium—that surround a long period during which letters between Buddhists and Indian kings do not appear to have survived, at least not as letters. We will return to this point.

The corpus is, moreover, resoundingly one-sided. We hear the voices of Buddhists in these letters; we do not hear the voices of kings. At times, the letters register a sense of occasion—that is, they suggest that they are being composed for a particular purpose, or in response to a specific request made by the party to whom they are addressed. But the status of this “other party” is more complex than one might initially presume, since what is said in a letter usually has less to do with what the recipient of that letter needs or wants than it does with what the author of the letter *assumes* that the recipient needs or wants. A letter may or may not offer insight into its real-world addressee's actual dispositions and its author's true feelings. When, for example, Mātṛceṭa entreats Kaniṣka in the *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha* to “act toward animals / who are sorely troubled by sorrow, with even greater compassion than / you have shown toward human beings,” this does not entitle us to conclude either that Kaniṣka was particularly compassionate toward human beings, or that Mātṛceṭa sincerely presumed him to be.¹⁴ What we are faced with in this case, as in the letters more generally, is rhetoric that has been carefully designed for the achievement of certain ends, and tailored to a particular audience.

Which audience? The answer may seem obvious: the kings to whom the letters are addressed. Yet this is not the only option. The advice proffered in the letters is routinely generalizable to audiences beyond kings, and it is possible that at least some of the letters were written with the presupposition of a wider readership in mind. If so, this would almost certainly have influenced their form and content. It is also possible that the nominal addressee of a letter was *not* actually among those targeted by the letter—that, in other words, the letter was written solely for others, with the aim of showing those others that, or how, a Buddhist intellectual might properly address a king. This possibility may seem far-fetched, but the level of rhetorical sophistication that informs these letters is sometimes striking. For instance, among the *lekhas* addressed to those who are not kings, there is a letter to a monk composed by someone who not only adopts the *nom de plume* of Avalokiteśvara, but also—in a rather Kierkegaardian authorial move—inhabits the role of the celestial bodhisattva in giving counsel.¹⁵

13 The *Vimalaratnalekha* is the most securely datable of the later letters, and appears to have been composed in 1040, while Atiśa was en route to Tibet. See Dietz 1984:67.

14 Translation Hahn 1999:45. The Tibetan (*Ibid.*:44) reads: *mi rnams la ni mdzad pa bas // sdug bsngal lhag par brtags pa yi // dud 'gro rnams la ches lhag par // khyod kyi thugs rjes mdzad du gsol.*

15 On this letter, see Dietz 1984:12–18, 132–141; Hahn and Dietz 2008:77–82, 386–388.

Regarding the matter of audience, then, there would seem to be at least three options: A letter might be written as a direct address to its nominal addressee with no presumption of wider circulation; it might be written as a direct address to its nominal addressee with a presumption of wider circulation; or it might be written as a pseudo-direct address in which the nominal addressee is no more than a rhetorical conceit. How should we decide between these options in any given case? It is tempting to think that we can read off something about the function of, or intended audience for, a text from the rhetoric it deploys. And sometimes we can—or, at the very least, we can rule out certain options as untenable. For example, the presumption that negative views *about* kings will not be expressed in exchanges *with* kings seems reasonable enough; a text that is stridently critical of kingship is not likely to have a king as its intended audience.¹⁶ One occasionally does come across this sort of thing in Indian Buddhist literature, but it is hard to avoid reading such encounters as fictions.¹⁷

Consider, for example, the fourth chapter of Āryadeva's third-century *Catuḥśataka*, on the subject of pride.¹⁸ In this chapter, Āryadeva specifically assails the pride of kings—and he pulls no punches.¹⁹ As a riposte to the claim that the pride of kings is justified owing to the greatness of their linages, Āryadeva and his commentator Candrakīrti insist that kings today are more often than not the sons of fickle and confused women who tend to sleep around a lot with men from other castes, thereby repudiating their own.²⁰ This denunciation is framed as a direct address to an unnamed king; it is embedded in a chapter that is peppered with second-person pronouns

16 Cf., however, McDaniel 2012:45–46, which points to stories that circulate in contemporary Thailand regarding the 19th-century monk Somdet To's propensity to insult kings directly and unambiguously. Whether these stories are fictitious is not easy to determine.

17 To brand the encounters as fictions is not to say, of course, that the passages relating them could not have been composed with particular pedagogical goals in mind—a point that is emphasized by Richard Gombrich (1988:81) regarding certain passages in the Pali canon that concern kings. Gombrich's treatment is provocative, but I am less sanguine than he regarding our ability to tease apart passages that grant an unimpeded view of the Buddha's (or early Buddhist tradition's) honest take on kingship from passages that enshrine “institutionalized fantasy” (Ibid.:82).

18 The whole of the root text and the commentary on chapters 1–4 have been translated into English by Karen Lang (Lang 1986, 2003). See also Zimmermann 2006.

19 The *Bodhisattvayogacaryācatuḥśatakaṭīkā* is extant in fragmentary Sanskrit (Hariprasad Shastri 1914) and in a complete Tibetan translation (D.3865); it was translated during the late 11th century by sPa tshab Nyi ma grags.

20 See Lang 2003:204–5. This portion of the text is unfortunately not extant in Sanskrit. The Tibetan of the relevant verse by Āryadeva (Lang 1986:52) reads 'das dus shin tu ring ba dang / mi mo rnam yid g.yo ba ste / de phyir rgyal rigs zhes bya ba / rigs las 'ga' yang yod ma yin. Candrakīrti unpacks the verse's implications regarding caste repudiation in a way that presumes familiarity with the texts of *dharmasūtra* and *dharmasāstra*, some of which offer elaborate accounts of the perils of, and punishments for, inter-caste union. See Āpastamba 2.27.8–2.27.13; Vasiṣṭha 18.1–18.18; 21.1–21.5 (Olivelle 1999:70–71, 298–299, 306–307); *Manavadharmaśāstra* 8.352–8.378, 8.382–8.385 (Olivelle 2005:186–187, 730–737). We may note here that Candrakīrti's point is not that ascriptions of caste are generally and fundamentally misguided; his point is, rather, that the world is a messy place, and so one needs to be very careful in presuming that the conditions for membership in a twice-born caste have in any particular case been met. It is for this reason—and arguably not out of a desire to reject the system of caste altogether—that Candrakīrti concludes his discussion with a verse insisting that “an intelligent person in this [world] does not take pride in caste” (*mkhas pas 'dir / rigs gyi nga rgyal bya min nyid*).

and vocative forms. In a more contemporary idiom, what Āryadeva and Candrakīrti are saying amounts to, “king, you ain’t nothing; your mama’s a slut.” I take this to define one rhetorical extreme in the positioning of Buddhists vis-à-vis kings—an extreme of inventiveness, whose fictionalized nature allows for, and indeed can be inferred from, the purity of the antagonism it depicts. We are very far here from the faithful account of a real-world interaction.

Rhetoric of this kind is conspicuously absent from the letters. In its place, we find unctuous flattery. The *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha*, for example, reminds its addressee Kaniṣka of “the fragrance of your irresistible good qualities [that] has imbued every corner of the world, so that even the greatest men, fully confident in their own abilities, do not shun your friendship.”²¹ Kaniṣka is praised as being like a god (*lha*, **deva*) hailing from a noble solar lineage (*’phags rigs nyi ma yi / gdung rgyud*).²² Such laudatory language echoes through the rest of the corpus, from the *Suḥrīllekha*’s stipulation of its addressee as “naturally possessed of good qualities [and] fit for virtue “ (*yon tan rang bzhin dge ’os*) through the *Vimalaratnalekha*’s extolling of its addressee as one whose previous virtuous practices have resulted in his present perfection—again, like a god (*lha khyod da lta phun sum tshogs*).²³

Can we conclude from this flattering tone that these authors presumed that their words would have as their sole audience the nominal addressees of their letters? Can we at least conclude that they thought that their words would reach their nominal addressee among others? I think the answer to both of these questions has to be “no.” At least, nothing in the letters *requires* us to draw either of these conclusions. After all, a flattering tone might be struck by an author for whom the nominal addressee was no more than a rhetorical conceit: an author whose sole aim was to offer a lesson to fellow Buddhists on how to compose an effective letter to a king.

So where does this leave us? Perhaps with a growing sense of impatience. Surely the interpretation of these letters is a more straightforward matter than I am making it out to be. They are letters, after all. But no one has denied this. My aim has been to remind the reader of the interpretive challenges that letters present. These are challenges that we are apt to neglect or forget, assuming that a letter’s rhetorical form dictates how, and by whom, it is intended to be read. This assumption is unjustified. What we take a letter to be saying will depend on the work we take it to be doing. The work we take it to be doing will depend on the audience we take it to be addressing. And the identity of this audience is underdetermined by the text. That the reader may feel a certain impatience with the concerns raised above—and it is an impatience that I myself share—may be symptomatic of a shared desire to avoid acknowledging that the initial interpretive choices we make regarding these letters must be at once less constrained and more consequential than we might wish.

21 Translation Hahn 1999:7. The Tibetan (*Ibid.*:6) reads: *bzlog pa med pa’i yon tan gyis / phyogs rnams kun tu bsgos pas ni / mi mchog rnams kyang thugs thub par / mdza’ bshes bzhin du ’dzem pa med.*

22 Translation Hahn 1999:27, 31.

23 Cf. *Vimalaratnalekha*, verse 2: “Previously you have practiced giving and the ten virtuous actions, observed the *pośadha* and have cultivated patience and zeal. Now you, [like] a god, are perfected.” (*khyod kyis sngon chad sbyin pa dang / dge ba bcu dang gso sbyong dang / bzod dang brtson ’grus la goms pas / lha khyod da lta phun sum tshogs.*)

Whether or not these letters were composed to serve as models for other would-be letter writers, this seems to be how some of them ended up being used. The letters are treated much as other authoritative texts in Indian Buddhism were treated: they are cited in other sources, including other letters, and appropriated as the basis for exegetical commentaries.²⁴ At times, they appear also to have been appropriated wholesale as the basis for other works. As has long been recognized, Atiśa's *Vimalaratnalekha* is almost identical with another of Atiśa's works, the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī*—a text of great importance in the development of the textual tradition associated with the Tibetan bKa gdams pa order.²⁵ The texts closely parallel one another, but at certain points, each presents material that the other does not.²⁶ This raises a natural question: if one of these texts is based on the other, as clearly seems to be the case, which came first?

As Helmut Eimer has noted, the biographies of Atiśa concur in placing the letter first, with the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī* following some three years later.²⁷ Let us assume that this chronology is correct, and that the letter came first. If so, then one of the most important texts in the *bKa' gdams legs bam* is a light revision of a letter to a Pāla king: the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī* turns out to be a letter in śāstric disguise. Yet there is no way to tell this from close inspection of its rhetoric: it looks like any number of other short texts composed to provide basic instruction in moral behavior.

24 See, for example, the sprawling missive authored by the Tibetan monk sBa dPal dbyangs, mentioned above, that explicitly targets both the emperor and the people of Tibet (*bod rje 'bangs*). In this letter's opening section (Dietz 1984:402–404), dPal dbyangs notes its rationale: because relevant sources “are not comprehensible when they are expounded in an extensive way, I have therefore collected a few of them that are easy to apply and a pleasure to remember” (*rgyas par bshad na mi rtogs pas / de las bsgrub sla gzung bde rnam / nyung zad tsam zhig bdag gis bsdebs*). The resulting letter incorporates lengthy passages from the *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha* and *Suhrillekha*, and dPal byangs clearly sees these antecedent letters as continuous with the various other sources he cites (among them the *Udānavārga*, Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī*, and Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*). For instances of letters being taken up as root texts for commentary, see D. 4190–4192.

25 For a translation, see Jinpa 2008:61–64. The version of the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī* that was incorporated into the *bKa' gdams legs bam* is slightly different from the one extant in the various editions of the *bsTan 'gyur*; on these divergences and what they tell us about the transmission of the text, see Eimer 1981. A history of the early transmission of the *bKa' gdams legs bam* is provided by Erhard 2002.

26 The specific forms of address that characterize the *Vimalaratnalekha* and show it to be written to a Pāla king are missing from the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī*. The *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī*, for its part, contains verses advising its audience to forsake material possessions—verses that are missing from the *Vimalaratnalekha*. The *Vimalaratnalekha* takes a king as its nominal addressee, while the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī* appears to be a brief instruction that is generally targeted.

27 Eimer 1981:324; cf. Erhard 2002:36. The priority of the letter is also affirmed by the 16th century Tibetan polymath dPa bo gtsug lag phreng ba (1504–1566), who notes in his *Scholar's Feast* (*Chos 'byung mkhas pa 'i dga' ston*) that the *Bodhisattvamaṇyāvalī* is in fact “a compilation by 'Brom [i.e., Atiśa's direct disciple 'Brom ston rgyal ba 'i 'byung gnas] of the speech of the Jo bo.” The relevant passage is cited in Erhard 2002: *byang chub sems dpa' nor bu 'i phreng ba ni 'brom gyis jo bo 'i gsung bsdus pa yin*. Intriguingly, and as Erhard also notes, dPa bo gtsug lag phreng ba goes on to note that “as this [text] and the letter to the king Neyapāla composed by Jo bo (Atiśa) arose for the most part as one and the same work, it is said that that king is of one mindstream with 'Brom” (*'di dang jo bos rgyal po nirya (=neya) pa la (=pāla) la 'phrin yig mdzad pa phal cher gcig tu byung bas rgyal po de 'brom dang thugs rgyud gcig po zhes ...*)—a claim that may have been motivated as much by concerns for political legitimation as anything else.

So what does this tell us? There are at least two lessons that might be drawn here. First, the parallelisms between the two documents suggest that Buddhist intellectuals of the late first and early second millennia CE likely did not presume teachings that were held to be suitable for Indian kings to differ very much from teachings that were held to be suitable more generally. If this is correct, then letters to kings may not be a very helpful resource for understanding the specific ways in which specific Buddhists of that time period may have sought to appeal to specific Indian kings. A second lesson amounts to a reminder of something we are often tempted to forget: we still know very little about how Buddhists in India actually used the texts that have come down to us. Few would presume, on opening a text of moral instruction, that its rhetoric had been borrowed from a document that might originally have been composed as a personal letter to a single specific addressee. There may well be other cases in which teachings nominally addressed to single individuals were surreptitiously repackaged to target more general audiences. I don't want to suggest that this sort of thing was common practice; the point is simply that we don't yet know how common it was, and we have yet to consider its potential implications.

In short: much work remains to be done. While it's perhaps regrettable to end with a reaffirmation of our ignorance, particularly in a volume designed to honor the achievements of a great scholar on the occasion of his retirement, it also seems an appropriately Buddhist way to close. *Maṅgalam!*

ABBREVIATIONS

D. = Digital scan of the Derge (sde dge) canon, available via the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center: <http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work_Object-W22084> and <http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work_Object-W23703>.

WORKS CITED

- Bosson, J. 1969. *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian*. Uralic and Altaic Series 92. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Davenport, J. 2000. *Ordinary Wisdom: Sakya Pandita's Treasury of Good Advice*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Dietz, S. 1983. "The Author of the Suḥṛllekha." In Steinkellner, E. and H. Tauscher, eds. 1983. *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy: Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Symposium held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13–19 September 1981*, Vol. 2:59–72. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- Dietz, S. 1984. *Die buddhistische Briefliteratur Indiens: nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Eimer, H. 1981. "Die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge der Verszeilen in der Bodhisattvamaṅyāvalī." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 15:323–330.

- Erhard, F-K. 2002. "The Transmission of the *Thig-le bcu-drug* and the *Bka'-gdams legs-bam*." In Eimer, H. and D. Germano, eds. 2002. *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*, pp.29–56. Leiden: Brill.
- Gombrich, R. 1988. *Theravāda Buddhism: A social history from ancient Benares to modern Colombo*. London: Routledge.
- Hahn, M., trans. 1999. *Invitation to Enlightenment: Letter to the Great King Kaniṣka by Mātṛceṭa / Letter to a Disciple by Candragomin*. Berkeley: Dharma Publishing.
- Hahn, M. and S. Dietz, trans. 2008. *Wege zur Rechten Erkenntnis Buddhistische Lehbrieife*. Frankfurt: Insel.
- Hariprasad Shastri, ed. 1914. "Catuṣṣatikā by Ārya Deva." *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* III.8:449–514.
- Herrmann-Pfandt, A. 2008. *Die lHan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- Jamspal, L. trans. 2010. *The Range of the Bodhisattva, A Mahāyāna Sūtra*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Jinpa, T. trans. 2008. *The Book of Kadam: The Core Texts Attributed to Atiṣa and Dromtönpa*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom (Institute of Tibetan Classics).
- Lang, K. 1986. *Āryadeva's Catuṣṣataka: On the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Lang, K. 2003. *Four Illusions: Candrakīrti's Advice to Travelers on the Bodhisattva Path*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindtner, C. 1997. *Master of Wisdom: Writings of the Buddhist Master Nāgārjuna*. Berkeley: Dharma Publishing.
- McDaniel, J. 2012. *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk: Practicing Buddhism in Modern Thailand*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Olivelle, P. 1999. *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, P. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C. 2007. "Immortality extolled with reason: Philosophy and politics in Nāgārjuna." In Kellner, B., H. Krasser, et al., eds. 2007. *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ: Papers dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, Vol. 2:757–793. Vienna: Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde.
- Trapp, M. 2003. *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology, with Translation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Walser, J. 2005. *Nāgārjuna in Context: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Early Indian Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zimmermann, M. 2006. "Only a Fool Becomes a King: Buddhist Stances on Punishment." In M. Zimmermann, ed. 2006. *Buddhism and Violence*, pp.213–242. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute.