

# Za hor and its Contribution to Tibetan Medicine, Part Two: Sources of the Tibetan Medical Tradition\*

Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp

**Abstract:** Our understanding of the various South, West, Central, and East Asian influences on the Tibetan medical traditions is still in its beginnings, even if serious progress has been made during the past few decades of research in this area. This essay probes a little further into these matters by looking at several treatises that have not yet been examined from this angle. These treatises include several smaller tracts in the iatrosophia-collections that are attributed to the early thirteenth century Gtsang stod pa Dar ma mgon po. To be sure, the *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* ( 月王药诊 ) or the *\*Somarāja* of the second half of the eighth century is no doubt one of the oldest and more important texts of the Tibetan medical tradition that, not unlike the *Four Books*, the *Rgyud bzhi* ( 四部医典 ), also has a very complicated biography. Using an unpublished and hitherto unknown manuscript, which shows interesting variations from the late eighteenth century xylograph, I address several passages from this work, including one that Zur mkhar ba Blo gros rgyal po (1509-after 1579) cites in his commentary on the first chapter of the last of the *Rgyud bzhi* that deals with embryological issues.

---

\* The present essay is essentially a continuation of van der Kuijp (2010), even if Za hor as such plays no fundamental role in the present article. This will be reserved for Part Three, which will be published in one of the next issues of the *Bod rig pa'i dus deb /Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology*. In my translations from the Tibetan, I have dispensed with brackets where I added details that implicitly reside in the original text.

The multiple origins of the Tibetan medical traditions present us with interesting, if not daunting, problems. True, based on the notion of the three elemental substances or constituents (*nyes pa/skyon gsum, tridoṣa*), the imbalance of which causes disease, their most fundamental theoretical foundation is undoubtedly Indic, but their diagnostics, therapeutics, and pharmacology, to name but a few branches, show definite additional Tibet-external influences. Famously, and certainly not the only early treatise to have done so, the *Rgyud bzhi* or the *Four Books*, which appears to date from the second half of the twelfth century, acknowledges foreign influences quite clearly in one of the last verses of the penultimate chapter of *Book Four*, the *Last Book*, *Phyi ma 'phrin las kyi rgyud*, where we read:<sup>1</sup>

*bde gshegs rnams kyis sprul pas 'gro don du //*  
*rgya gar yul du sman gyi sbyor ba gsungs //*  
*rgya nag yul du me btsa' rtsa sbyongs gsungs //*  
*dol po'i yul du gtar ga gtso bor bstan //*  
*bod kyi yul du rtsa chu'i brtag pa bstan //*  
*lha yi 'khor la gso dpyad 'bum pa gsungs //*  
*drang srong 'khor la tsa ra ka sde brgyad //*  
*mu stegs 'khor la dbang phyug nag po'i rgyud //*  
*nang pa'i 'khor la rigs gsum mgon po'i skor //*  
*gso dpyad rgyud 'dir thams cad 'dus par bstan //*

The Tathāgatas, through wondrous re-embodiments, for the sake of the world,  
 Stated the compounding of medicines in the area of the Rgya gar-Indic subcontinent;

---

<sup>1</sup> See Zur mkhar ba (2005: 692-693). For a systematic and path-breaking study of the *Four Books* in its entirety and some of its sources, see Yang Ga (2010). The origins and authorship of the *Four Books* were hotly debated issues, no doubt because of their palpable obscurity. Its authorship is attributed to [a] G.yu thog Yon tan mgon po (12<sup>th</sup>c.) whose dates remain unknown. In the brief biography of this elusive man, 'Ja' tshon snying po (1585-1656) writes that he was its author and, quoting him, states that he had identified himself with a number of earlier individuals (*de thams cad kho bo rang yin*) whose re-embodiment he considered himself to have been. The list of these individuals begins with 'Tsho byed Gzhon nu [= Kumāra Jivaka, a figure in the canonical Buddhist *vinaya* literature] in the Indian subcontinent and ends with Dwags po Lha rje, that is, most probably Sgam po pa Bsod nams rin chen (1079-1153); see 'Ja' tshon snying po (2013: 431). This could have implications for the year in which the *Four Books* may have been composed. For what may so far be the earliest mention of the *Four Books*, see van der Kuijp (2010: 24). Several dates have been proposed for G.yu thog, but none of these are backed up with a philological apparatus and should thus be discarded. It is clear that 'Ja' tshon snying po does *not* suggest that there were two G.yu thog-s, an "old" (*rnying*) and a more "recent" (*gsar*) one as became *en vogue* only a little later in particular at the court of Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho (1617-1682).

Stated moxibustion and channel purification in the area of Rgya nag-China;<sup>2</sup>  
 Mainly taught phlebotomy in the area of Dol po;  
 Taught pulse reading and uroscopy in the area of Bod-Tibet;  
 Stated the *Gso dpyad 'bum pa* to the circle of deities;  
 Taught everything in summary fashion in this *Gso dpyad rgyud*:  
 The eight-sectioned Caraka to the circle of seers (*drang srong, rṣi*),  
 The \**Īśvarakṛṣṇatantra* to the circle of non-Buddhists and,  
 The cycle of the protectors of the three families to the insider-Buddhists.

The Grwa thang text of the *Four Books* from which these ten lines of verse were taken is a retyped version of the original xylograph that derived from the printing blocks that Zur mkhar ba Blo gros rgyal po (1509-after 1579) had apparently prepared in 1546.<sup>3</sup> Being retyped, it has little text-critical value and therefore should, in the absence of a facsimile edition of the original xylograph, only be used in conjunction with such other xylographs of the *Four Books* as are available for purposes of philological control. This we have done. We know that a number of different xylograph-editions of the *Four Books* were prepared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this connection, O. Czaja, who based himself on the Sde srid Sangs rgyas rgya

2 The usual translation of *rgya gar/dkar* by "India" is problematic, and the same holds for *rgya nag* by "China," since these prejudice the areas denoted by these toponyms and do not account at all for their shifting boundaries over time. For example, when we read in the Dunhuang document of the *Li yul chos kyi lo rgyus* - see Emmerick (1967: 85, lines 61-62) - that Gandhara and Kauśāmbī are places in *rgya gar*, then the translation of *rgya gar* by "India" simply will not do - Chinese *xitian* 西天 or *tianzhuguo* 天竺国 would certainly be much more apt. Similarly, the translations of *rgya nag* by "China" or 中国 or *handi* 汉地 or *neidi* 内地 are equally problematic. This is illustrated by the Tibetan notion that Shing kun, that is, Lintao 临洮 or Taozhou 洮州, is located on the "Sino-Tibetan frontier" (*rgya bod kyi sa mtshams*) as we read, for instance, in the writings of Karma pa II Karma Pakshi (1204/6-1283); see Karma pa II (1978: 20). Brag dgon Zhabs drung Dkon mchog bstan pa rab rgyas (1801-after 1867) has it that Chu ma mkhar [= Ch.? zhou, ? 州] also lies on the "Sino-Tibetan frontier"; see Brag dgon Zhabs drung (1982: 21) and the translation in Wu et al. (1989: 26). The same applies to the territory and boundaries of the Tubo 吐蕃 state as described in the Tang sources as well as, for example, the area of Mnga' ris as part of Bod-Tibet, which extended at one point well into present day Pakistan. Further, *bod* is also not always used in the usual sense of "Tibet" or the Tibetan cultural area. For instance, there are passages in Thu'u bkwan III Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma's (1737-1802) 1772 history of Dgon lung monastery in which such places in Amdo as Sum pa, etc. are *not* located in Bod and where, instead, *bod* is exclusively equated with, or used with reference to, Dbus/Gtsang; see, for example, Thu'u bkwan III (1988: 27, 33)

3 See Schaeffer (2003: 625 ff.). For the Grwa thang edition of the *Rgyud bzhi* and its history, in which Karma pa VII Mi bskyod rdo rje (1507-1554) also played an as yet uncertain role, see Zur mkhar ba (2005: 700-703) and the interesting remarks concerning the Grwa thang, Po ta la, Beijing Zung cu ze [= ?Zhizhu si 智珠寺] (mid 18<sup>th</sup>c.), and the Khal kha ku' [= ?Qalqa-Ulaanbaatar] xylograph-editions in Sog po Lung rigs bstan dar (1986: 264-266) - see also his undated medical history with special emphasis on the transmission of the *Four Books* in the eighteenth century Sog po-Mongol scholar Lung rigs bstan dar (no date); see further Gyatso (2009: 84-85) and the more detailed listing in Yang Ga (2010: 120-125). Finally, for Zur mkhar ba himself, see the detailed remarks in Czaja (2005-6) and (2008).

mtsho's (1653-1705) celebrated history of medicine of 1703, noted the putative existence of what he called "the version of the Jo nang pa school" that derived from the printing blocks of Rtag brtan [dam chos gling] monastery.<sup>4</sup> The construction of this monastery began in 1615 when Karma phun tshogs rnam rgyal (?1586-1620/21) released the funding for this project to his chaplain Tāranātha (1575-1634) and it was more or less completed in 1619. Aside from the problem of implying with his wording that this edition was sectarian based, something that is not found in the Sde srid's work that he cites, the carving of the blocks had begun under Tāranātha's aegis, but was continued by one named Kun dga' rgyal mtshan—it is unclear whether he was his nephew (*dbon*) or an official (*dpon*)—after which it was edited by a certain 'Tsho byed gzhon nu of Lhun grub sdings, alias Gnya' pa Bdud rtsi 'gyur med. An exponent of the Northern Tradition (*byang lugs*) of Tibetan medicine, the latter is said to have been Tāranātha's personal physician (*bla sman*). But there is a problem. For one, Tāranātha makes no mention of a project of carving such blocks in his autobiographical writings that extend to the year 1631. For another, since Dalai Lama V caused the name Rtag brtan phun tshogs gling to be changed to Dga' ldan phun tshogs gling in 1658, thereby turning this monastery into a Dge lugs pa institution, this would mean that the printing blocks for this edition must have been prepared sometime between 1631 and 1658. Secondly, Tāranātha nowhere mentions this Bdud rtsi 'gyur med in his oeuvre. This is really all that can be said about the timeframe of when the printing blocks might have been carved. But what is interesting is that Dalai Lama V does state in his autobiography that the text of the Rtag brtan edition had indeed been prepared under the influence of Tāranātha's religious views (*chos lugs*). Unfortunately, he does not let us in on, or give an example of, what this influence might have looked like. So far so good! In the absence of a xylograph from its printing blocks, it is not possible to gauge the relationship between it, the somewhat earlier one that was prepared by Sprul sku Nor bu rgyan pa (?1589-?1633) in Dwags po sgam po, and the Dga' ldan phun tshogs gling recension of the *Four Books* of 1662 that was “published” with Dalai Lama V's imprimatur, whereby the latter has been wrongly called the Potala edition. This edition was essentially based on the Grwa thang xylograph and suffice it to say that Dalai Lama V registered this recension in his autobiography as well as in his *Afterword* detailing its printing history, which is contained in his collection of this kind of ephemera.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the so-called Lha ldan Poṭala (sic) edition—*po ta la* should read po ta la—was prepared by the Sde srid in 1690, as we are told in the colophon of the Lhasa

---

4 Czaja (2007: 358-359) and Sde srid (1970: 328-329, 389) and (1982: 325, 384-5); see also the translation in Kilty (2010: 289, 337). Much of the Sde srid's wording is lifted from a passage in the Dalai Lama V's autobiography, for which see Dalai Lama V (1989: 637-638). Quoted in Czaja, the 1982 edition of the Sde srid's history is a typeset reprint of the Lhasa Zhol xylograph, which was reprinted in Sde srid (1970). Unfortunately, it is rife with typos and can only be used with a healthy dose of skepticism.

5 See Dalai Lama V (2009: 168-174).

Lcags po ri edition of 1888-1892, which is by and large copied from Dalai Lama V's *Afterword* to the *Four Books*' 1662 edition and the colophon of this 1690 edition, which the Sde srid, too, in part reproduced in his own *History*.<sup>6</sup> Strangely, he himself did not explicitly mention the date of his 1690 edition in his *History*. Finally, the 1733 Sde dge edition that was subvented by the Bstan pa tshe ring (1678-1738), the king of Sde dge, seems to have been nothing more than a "recarve" of the Sde srid's edition and, if so, has little if any independent philological value.<sup>7</sup>

The ten lines that were just quoted constitute all that the *Four Books* has to say on the subject of its sources and the available commentaries do not really elaborate very much on this, which is kind of surprising. It is of course also quite striking to see how Dol po, an area in what is now northern Nepal, is privileged to the degree that it is placed on par with the entire subcontinent, the entire area of China as defined in the twelfth century, and the entire area where Tibetan culture held sway. Sog po Lung rigs bstan dar's undated study of a large number of unusual lexemes in the *Four Books* adds to this passage that the inhabitants of Dol po take the life of others for their sustenance and that they enjoy meat and blood.<sup>8</sup> The therapies mentioned in connection with Rgya nag-China and Dol po have their individual chapters in the *Four Books' Last Book*, even if therein no mention is made of their origins.<sup>9</sup> The same holds for pulse reading and uroscopy.<sup>10</sup> Yang Ga has argued persuasively that the so-called the *Rgyud chung*, which he and others attribute to G.yu thog Yon tan mgon po,<sup>11</sup> played an incisive but by no means the only role in the formation of these and many other chapters of the *Four Books*. At one point, he cites Zur mkhar ba to the effect that: ...*rgyud chung bdud rtsi snying po kha che zla dgas mdzad pa ltar bcos nas brtsams* /.<sup>12</sup> And he interprets this phrase in the sense that G.yu thog "made the text appear to be a composition of Candranandana." I am not sure about this interpretation. Rather, I believe Zur mkhar ba's point is that G.yu thog wrote this work on the basis of having made emendations (*bcos*) in accordance with the writing[s] of Candranandana (?10<sup>th</sup> c.), for which and on whom see below. Finally, in the remaining lines, the *Gso dpyad rgyud* refers to the *Four Books*, and the "eight-sectioned Caraka" indicates the *Carakasamhitā*, which, as far as we know, became known to the Tibetan tradition through various references to, and quotations from, the *Padārthacandrikā*, Candranandana's study of Vāgbhaṭa's (7<sup>th</sup> c.) *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā*.<sup>13</sup> But the other two references, the *Gso dpyad 'bum pa* and the

6 *Rgyud bzhi* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph] (1978: 121 ff.).

7 See the colophon in the handy, bilingual Mongol-Tibetan publication of this work in *Rgyud bzhi* [Sde dge xylograph] (1991: vol. 2, 1876-1877).

8 Sog po Lung rigs bstan dar (1986: 517).

9 Zur mkhar ba (2005: 655-658, 666-669, 659-665); see also Yang Ga (2010: 255-256, 258-259, 256-258).

10 Zur mkhar ba (2005: 584-593, 594-598); see also Yang Ga (2010: 242-246).

11 Yang Ga (2010: 112-118).

12 Yang Ga (2010: 113, n. 331).

13 For this commentary, see Vogel (1965: 15-16) and Meulenbeld (1999: 665-666).

\**Īsvara*ṅṣṅatantra, are at this stage of my research impossible to verify.<sup>14</sup>

I should add here that we find the very same chapters that were just signaled for the *Four Books* in the earlier *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* or \**Somarāja*,<sup>15</sup> as I will refer to it below in my brief discussion of this very important but as yet little explored work. There, however, no indications are given as to the putative origins of these diagnostic methods and therapeutic tools.

Before I continue my narrative, let me first clear up a slight misunderstanding: In his valuable essay on Yuan dynasty printing projects of Tibetan texts that were sponsored by the Mongol imperial court, Ska ba Shes rab bzang po suggested that the xylograph of a work titled *Yan lag brgyad kyi snying po* was none other than the *Sibu yidian* 四部医典, that is, the *Four Books*, the full title of which is *Bdud rtsi snying po yan lag brgyad pa gsang ba man ngag gi rgyud*.<sup>16</sup> The xylograph in question derived from printing blocks that were fully carved in the Yuan winter capital of Dadu 大都 during the fifth lunar month of 1311. But I believe that this xylograph did not contain the text of the *Four Books* that had been carved into the printing blocks, but rather that it was the text of the Tibetan [?re-]translation of Vāgbhaṭa's *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* [plus auto-commentary], which the great Lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po (958-1055) had carried out in possibly 1015.<sup>17</sup> As a matter of fact, Vāgbhaṭa is mentioned in the very xylograph-colophon as Dpal ldan Dpa' bo. Beginning with its initial verse as cited by Ska ba Shes rab bzang po, the colophon mentions several individuals. Its first verse states the following:

*shes bya'i mkha' la mkhyen brtse yi nyi zer gyis //*  
*ma rig mun pa'i tshogs rnams rab **sangs cing** //*  
*yon gtan [read: tan] rab **rgyas kun gyi dpal** gyur pa'i //*  
*ti shri chen po'i zhabs la gus pad mdud //*

The words that I reproduce in bold indicate the name of the “great Imperial Preceptor” to whom homage is paid, namely, Sangs rgyas dpal (1267-1314) of Sa skya monastery's Khang gsar Residence.

14 For references, see Kilty (2010: 69, 271, 86) and Kilty (2010: 86, 103).

15 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 308-316, 228-233, 305-308) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 393-404, 292-297, 390-393) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 278b-285b, 206a-210b, 275b-278b)].

16 Ska ba Shes rab bzang po (2009: 47); see also Xiong (2009: 91), who rightly seems to have felt uneasy with the identification of this being a xylograph of the *Four Books*.

17 Zur mkhar ba, and his view was no doubt shared by others, points to the circumstance that the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* [plus autocommentary] was first translated by the team of Paṅḍita Dharmasrīvarma, Nye bor Lo tsā ba Dbyig gi rin chen, Mar po Rig pa gzhon nu, and Dbyig gu Dge slong Shākya blo gros during the early part Lha bla ma Ye shes 'od's (947-1019/24) life; see Zur mkhar ba (2001: 262, 300).

...hweng tha'i hu'i i ci

...an edict (*i ci* < Ch. *yizhi* 懿旨) of the Empress Dowager (*huang taihou* 皇太后)

...

*blo ldan dam pa chos kyi sgra sgyur pa'i //*

*skal ldan yu gur ka shi smir zhes byas dang //*

...was called a fortunate Yu gur Ka shi smir,  
an intelligent translator of the holy dharma and...<sup>18</sup>

...

*yar lung mchig gi sman pas don 'di bskul //*

...this item was requested by a physician from ?Mchig in Yar lung (but see below).

...

*tshig gi sdeb dang yi ge'i tshul la mkhas //*

*dge bshes ye shes dpal gyis brtson pas bsgrubs pa yin //*

...the editing of the final text was energetically realized by Dge bshes Ye shes dpal,  
learned in the spelling of words and the modality of graphs.

...

Assistants: Bsod nams dpal sāše (?) and Ston pa Sangs rgyas dpal

Managers: Dbang thi gung (< Ch. Wang ?? 王 ??) and Gcang zing ne (< Ch. Zhang ?? 张 ??)

*'di yis grogs byed bsod nams dpal sāše dang //*

*ston pa sangs rgyas dpal gyis byas //*

*gnyer pa dbang thi gung dang //*

*gcang zing be' /*

Indeed, it is virtually certain that the Sde srid had this xylograph in mind even if what he wrote about it in his history of medicine, at least as it is reproduced in the old Lhasa Zhol xylograph of his work, is quite flawed in several respects; he stated:<sup>19</sup>

---

18 I am unsure of how to assess these two lines. The phrase *yu gur ka shi smir* points to Uyghur and Kashmir, but it is not clear to me how this fits in these lines.

19 Sde srid (1970: 184) and (1982: 177).

*dpal phag mo gru pa'i dus tsi na'i rgyal khab tu'ang dar bas rgyal po hwang tha'i hu'i  
i tsi'i yar klungs mchig sman gyi [read: gyis] bskul nas pho brang ta'i tung du ye shes  
dpal gyis zhush dag ste brkos pa'i rgya par yang yod /*

In his masterful translation of the Sde srid's work, Kilty rendered this problematic sentence as:<sup>20</sup>

During the time of the glorious Phakmo Drupa (1302-64), these works became widespread in China also, and during the reign of Huangti Huichi, at the request of Yarlung Chikmen, these texts were edited and revised by Yeshé Pal (1350-1405) in the Taitung palace in China, and a Chinese wood-block edition was produced.

Note here first of all the Sde srid's quaint use of *tsi na* for China, which of course must go back to Sanskrit *cīna*<sup>21</sup> and is yet another example of the Sde srid's penchant for employing uncommon words. Given the extreme paucity of full-fledged histories of Tibetan medicine predating the Sde srid's work that have been published so far, I have not been able to ascertain an earlier source for this statement. For example, it is not found in Dpal ldan 'tsho byed's study of *circa* 1400,<sup>22</sup> many sections of which were excerpted by the Sde srid for his own work, or Zur mkhar ba's undated historical account. The latter may be hinting at something to what the Sde srid intended, when we read in his survey of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* and its extensive Tibetan commentarial literature that the text was block printed "in the land of the Mongols" (*hor yul du*).<sup>23</sup> The ethnonym *hor* presents us with a problem. While it is definitely used to designate the Uyghurs in writings that date from or deal with Tibet's imperial period (7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> c.),

---

20 Kilty (2010: 170).

21 For a discussion of the word "China" and its origins, which Wade (2009: 18-22) recently traced back to "*zina*, the Lolo/Yi autonym for the people and polity known in Chinese as 夜郎 Yelang", and for an interesting Sanskrit loan word in the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 of the second century B.C.E., see Toh (2010), where the words in question are *keśī* and *jisi* 雞斯. A Chinese dietary detail and Chinese silk or cloth seems to have been known to both Caraka and Suśruta.

22 See Brang ti (2005). Long ago, I located an as yet unpublished, forty-eight folio *dbu med* manuscript of his *Shes bya rab gsal rgyas pa* [*Bdud rtsi snying po yan lag brgyad / gsang pa man ngag gis rgyud kyi spyi don shes bya rab gsal rgyas pa*] which was part of the huge collection of Tibetan texts of the Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, Beijing.

23 We find this Zur mkhar ba (2001: 308).



it refers to the Mongols from the thirteenth century onward.<sup>24</sup> But we do have a "blind spot" when dealing with its occurrence in writings that postdate the ninth and predate the thirteenth century. But later sources have conflated these. The early twentieth century Qalqa scholar Sog po Blo bzang rta dbyangs cites such a case in the first chapter of his magnificent history of Buddhism among the Mongols in which he not only used Tibetan and Mongol sources, but also Chinese and Russian ones. The case in question is Paṅ chen Lama Blo bzang dpal ldan ye shes (1738-1780) who had written a tract where the ethnonym *bha ta hor*, which surfaces in eleventh and twelfth century Tibetan literature, is equated with *mon gol*.<sup>25</sup> Be this as it may, Sog po Blo bzang rta dbyangs also seems to admit that *hor* covers a very wide variety of different ethnic groups, for he himself even uses the term *hor* for events that took place during the Han and Tang dynasties where it is of course out of the question that it refers to the Mongols. To be sure, he is certainly not alone in having done so, since, for example, Sum pa Mkhan po Ye shes dpal 'byor's (1704-1788) chronicle of 1748 is one among other possible precedents that he cites to this very same effect!<sup>26</sup>

As a testimony to the Sde srid's influence, De'u dmar Bstan 'dzin phun tshogs (1673-after 1727) has a very similar passage in his later, undated history of medicine:<sup>27</sup>

*dpal phag mo gru ba'i dus tsi na'i rgyal khab tu'ang dar bas rgyal po hwang thi'i hu'i  
i tsi'i dus yar klung chags sman gyis bskul nas pho brang ta'i tung du ye shes dpal  
gyis zhus dag btang ste brkos pa'i rgya par yang yod /*

On the other hand, we do not find a reflex of this statement in 'Be Lo tsā ba Tshe dbang kun khyab's late eighteenth century study of the history of Tibetan medicine, who, *contra* Dar mo Sman rams pa Blo bzang chos grags (1638-after 1697),<sup>28</sup> the Sde srid and others clearly takes

24 The term *hor gyi rgyal po*, "king of [the] Hor," occurs in the manuscript of the *Li yul chos kyi lo rgyus* and, following an earlier suggestion made by J. Bacot, Emmerick (1967: 85, line 63, 107) states that it refers to the Turks. However, L. Ligeti proposed in his magisterial study of Pelliot Tibétain 1283 that had been studied by Bacot, in Ligeti (1971: 172-176), that, bearing in mind that the document appears to refer to events of the late ninth and early tenth centuries, the ethnonyms *hor* [and *dru gu*] are unstable and on occasion refer to the Uyghurs [and the Turks] and vice versa. Thang dpon Tshe stobs (1990) contributed some interesting remarks on *dru gu* in the Ge sar epic.

25 See the first section of his large chronicle in Sog po Blo bzang rta dbyangs (1964: 31a ff.).

26 Confer the second part of his work in Sog po Blo bzang rta dbyangs (1964: 42a), where he cites Sum pa Mkhan po (1975: 628) [= 1992: 1008]; see also the translation by Pu and Cai (2013: 537), where *hor yul* is simply rendered *huo'er diqu* 霍尔地区, "hor region."

27 The passage is found in De'u dmar (1994: 673).

28 The year 1710 in which he allegedly passed away is so far found only in Don rdor and Bstan 'dzin chos grags (1993: 681), where it is stated, without proper foundation, that the exact date of his death is unclear but that he lived for seventy-three years.

issue with the notion that there were two individuals called G.yu thog Yon tan mgon po.<sup>29</sup>

There are several aspects about these partly garbled passages that need to be discussed and weeded out before we can venture an almost adequate translation. In the first place, though the expression *hwang tha'i hu* and *hwang thi'i hu* unambiguously reflect Chinese *huang taihou* 皇太后, that is, "empress dowager," the immediately preceding *rgyal po*, "emperor," can perhaps be best explained by the fact that the Tibetan transcription *hwang tha'i* looks like *huangdi* 皇帝. But the genitive particle *'i* links it to the obviously non-Tibetan term *i tsi*, which can therefore not be interpreted as the putative name of the lady in question, but rather as the Tibetan transcription of Chinese *yizhi* 懿旨, that is, an edict that is issued by an Empress Dowager. On the other hand, the phrase *hwang thi'i hu'i i tsi'i dus* of De'u dmar is arguably a further corruption and does suggest that *hu'i i tsi* was taken as the name of a Chinese emperor, and the presence of the second *dus* indicates that something took place or is alleged to have taken place during his putative reign. It is not necessary to take the phrase *dpal phag mo gru pa* to indicate Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan (1302-1364), the founder of the so-called Phag mo gru dynasty. Indeed, it can simply refer to the Phag mo gru era that for the Sde srid and his mentor Dalai Lama V basically stretched from the 1350s to 1643! Further, no name of an emperor of China during the Yuan, Ming or Qing can be identified with anything that remotely resembles Tibetan *hu'i i tsi*.<sup>30</sup> The word *mchig* in the Sde srid's phrase *yar klungs mchig sman* makes no sense, but I think a solution presents itself when we consider the variant in De'u dmar's passage, that is, *chags*. I suggest that we read its homophone *phyag*, so that we arrive at the phrase *yar klungs phyag sman*. The expression *phyag sman is* used as an epithetical prefix in the name of the fairly well known physician Phyag sman Rin chen rgyal mtshan.<sup>31</sup> Hence, if correct, then the phrase should read "a/the Phyag sman of Yar klungs." In light of the above remarks, a translation of the Sde srid's passage *sans* bracketed additional information might thus be ventured as follows:

Because the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* had also had spread to the capital of China at the time of the lustrous Phag mo gru's reign over Central Tibet, there also exists a Chinese xylograph of the text that was edited and carved by Ye shes dpal in the palace of Ta'i tu{ng} [*< Ch. Dadu 大都*] by order of the Empress Dowager, having been petitioned by the Phyag sman of Yar klungs.

29 See 'Be Lo tsā ba (n.d.: 36a). I am very grateful to Dr. Yang Ga for having shared with me a copy of this rare work. It also appears that Zur mkhar ba did not consider the existence of two G.yu thog pa's either.

30 In an endnote to his translation of this passage, Kilty (2010: 522, n.373) suggests that he may possibly be identified as "Huizong [= ?Huizong 徽宗, vdK] (1133-70), last of the Yuan emperors". The last Yuan emperor was Toyon Temür or Shundi 順帝, whose reign lasted from July 19, 1333 to May 30, 1370, that is, roughly until two years after the fall of the Yuan.

31 His name appears in many places; see, for example, Taube (1981: 62, n. 233).

Entitled to a measure of reliability if only because of the unlimited access to local library resources the Sde srid must have enjoyed due to his position as the *de facto* ruler of Central Tibet, we can now, thanks to the discovery of Ska ba Shes rab bzang po, take exception to his use of *rgya par* and to his dating of the carving of these blocks to the period of Phag mo gru paramouncey in Tibet, which lasted *de jure* from the 1350s to 1643. This large time span leads me suspect that he himself was not altogether sure when exactly the carving of these blocks had taken place and, unfortunately, he nowhere else in this work discusses other "foreign" xylographs of Tibetan texts.

Ye shes dpal [ʔbzang po] is by no means an unusual name in religion in Tibet. Since he figures as editor of the printing blocks, it is likely that he had extensive training in Indo-Tibetan medicine, but I have so far not found any trace of a well-known Tibetan physician by this name.<sup>32</sup> Even if there is, as far as I am aware, no concrete evidence of traces of Tibetan or Indo-Tibetan medical knowledge in Yuan sources, there is earlier evidence that the Mongol court entertained relations with at least one Tibetan physician. A recently published set of Tibetan archival documents contains an imperial edict (*shengji* 聖旨) of 1277 or 1289 in the so-called 'Phags pa script<sup>33</sup> in which Qubilai addressed a Lha rje Seng ge dpal from Rong.<sup>34</sup> The word *lha rje* is said to be connected to *rgyal po'i rje*, "lord of the king" -*lha*, "god," is one form of address used for the Tibetan *btsan po*-king-and it is one of several Tibetan words for a physician. To judge from the fact of the very existence of this edict and the contents of its *dispositio*, Seng ge dpal must have been a well-to-do and influential individual. It turns out that Qubilai employed a number of Tibetans as his personal physicians (*sman bla*). One of these was a certain Lha rje Nyi ma dpal. Brang ti Dpal ldan 'tsho byed mentions him in his history of medicine as one who had received an edict (*'ja' sa < Mon. ĵasar*) from the Mongol court with which the inhabitants of Lha ri sgrol lung were given a tax-exempt status (*dar rgan < Mon. darqan*).<sup>35</sup> Curiously, Nyi ma dpal is not registered in Brang ti's earlier listing of the six Tibetan physicians "who were honored by the powerful Mongols".<sup>36</sup> these six were:

32 See Taube (1981), the very useful biographical dictionary of Tibetan physicians in Byams pa phrin las (2000), Bla ma skyabs (1997).

33 It should be pointed out the designation "Phags pa script" is based on what it has been called in Chinese sources. Neither the numerous Tibetan biographies of 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1235-1280) nor any other Tibetan sources breathe a word about his alleged development of this script, which the Tibetans call *hor gyi /pa'i yi ge*, "Mongol script," and the Mongols call *dörbeljin üsüg*, "square script," -in Tibetan *hor yig gru bzhi pa* and *hor yig gsar pa*, "new Mongol script." No doubt following Chinese precedent, later Mongol historiography attributes the script to 'Phags pa, and sometimes even to his uncle Sa skya Paṇḍita.

34 This edict has been published several times, including in Sgrol dkar (1995: 1-3), Wang Mingxing 王明星 and Jia Yang 甲央 [*< Tib. 'Jam dbyangs*] (2000: 20-21).

35 Brang ti (2005: 107-108).

36 Brang ti (2005: 91).

1. 'Bal sman Nyi ma of Shag ram in Snye mo
2. Sbas sman Dkar nag of Shang in G.yas ru[ng]
3. Brang ti Grags 'bum of the Sman grong in Snag mtha'
4. Lha rje Phag the of Dgon thang in Yar klung[s]
5. Lha rje Phag mo gru pa of G.yu srid in Yar stod
6. Lo ston Yon tan of Khe re 'bras

Another early source for the multiple influences on what was becoming the Tibetan medical tradition, but slightly later than the *Rgyud bzhi*, is the medical history of Ches rje Zhang ston Zhig po Thugs rje khri 'od, an unpublished manuscript of which was studied by D. Martin in his usual consummate fashion.<sup>37</sup> Seven traditions (*lugs*) are isolated in this work, which the author, who does not appear to have been familiar with the *Rgyud bzhi*, completed in the wood-mouse year; Martin suggests that this year most likely corresponds to 1204. Among these seven, the fifth to the seventh pertain to the traditions found in the human realm. Whereas Rgya nag-China and Bod-Tibet receive their own rubrics in, respectively, the sixth and seventh traditions, the fifth pertains to a number of different "schools" and their exponents, including a certain Jinamitra who we will briefly meet again below. Thus, Ches rje mentions, in the rough, the Kashmir Valley (*kha che*) with Vāgbhaṭa and a \*Sthiramati, O rgyan (Swāt) with Jinamitra, as well as the Kathmandu Valley (*bal po*), northern Afghanistan [Arabo-Persia] (*stag gzig*), Dol po, Turko-Uyghur (*hor*), Tangut/Xixia (*mi nyag*), Khotan (*li*), north-eastern Afghanistan (*phrom*, *khrom*).<sup>38</sup>

The dating of Ches rje and his work may not be entirely unproblematic if we accept, as we must, that Gtsang stod Dar ma mgon po was one of his key disciples and the author and/or compiler of the so-called *Zin thig* and *Yang thig* collections of medical treatments of various diseases<sup>39</sup> - *thig* is perhaps better written as *tig*. A *zin tig* as a literary genre is said to indicate a collection of medical texts that deals with the treatment of diseases, so that *yang tig* would mean an additional (*yang*) treatise following, as it were, in the footsteps of the earlier *zin tig*. However, the term *zin tig* is also used for a single tract that concerns the treatment of a single

37 For what follows, see Martin (2007: 311-12, 314-17).

38 For *stag gzig* [and its many variant readings from *ta zig* to *stag gzigs*] and *phrom* /*khrom*, and their rough location, see now also Martin (2011: 126-127). For the erstwhile Tibetan presence in what is now part of Afghanistan, see Beckwith (1987: 130 ff.), and, more recently, Mock (2013: 5-9).

39 See Gtsang stod pa (2006), even this volume does not clearly demarcate where the *Zin thig/tig* ends and where the *Yang thig/tig* begins. For a manuscript of this work, see Gtsang stod pa (1975); see tbr.org W1KG12775. Gtsang stod pa (1976) seems to be filiated quite differently. Not found in the other two editions, it begins [pp. 1-9] with a short tract on some controversial points in medicine, the *Gso ba rig pa la 'jug pa'i rtsod spong*. Finally, yet another recension is Gtsang stod pa (2013).

disease or disorder. Thus, in the collection published in 2006, we encounter a passage in the *Rma yi zin thig*, a tract that deals with various ways in which wounds are treated, in which first the observation is made that he drew on the *Small Commentary on the Yan lag thig* [or: on the *Yan lag thig* and a *Small Commentary*], the *Zin thig* and *Yang thig*, whereafter he added his own empirical observations (*nyams*): (*yan lag thig 'grel chung // zin thig yang thig nyams kyis bsdebs*).<sup>40</sup> All things being equal [and of course they are not!], this presents us with a curious situation, namely, that a larger work can apparently be cited in the smaller work that forms one of its constituent parts! The entry of *zin tig* in the recent Tibetan-Tibetan medical dictionary is not very helpful in discerning its intent and, indeed, most of it is taken up by particulars surrounding the annual plant with the same name that has been primarily identified as the *Ajuga lupulina* Max. var. *major* Diels, although it is also sometimes used as a synonym for other plants.<sup>41</sup> An older Tibetan treatise on medical botany that was allegedly a translation from the Sanskrit by a certain Śāntigarbha has a number of entries for *zin tig*.<sup>42</sup> Mentioned in passing by Martin and in a slightly more detailed fashion by me, the textual history of this work and its origins are quite problematic, if only *prima facie*, because it contains several references to Tibet (*bod*) and the Tibetan language (*bod skad*).<sup>43</sup> If anything, then, it appears to be a hybrid work, the more so since it clearly privileges the Tibetan side of things, evidence for which we already encounter in the opening pages. There the text reads at one point:<sup>44</sup>

<i>bod yul du skyes sngo sman shing sman bshad //</i>	[a]
<i>gnas mchog khyad 'phags kha ba can 'di ni //</i>	[b]
<i>sman mchog zil ba can du rab grags pa //</i>	[c]
<i>rgya gar rgya nag bal po gser gling yul //</i>	[d]
<i>dru gu dol bo khrom gyi yul dag na //</i>	[e]
<i>sman mchog 'di dag mi skyes bod yul skyes //</i>	[f]

40 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 573).

41 *Bod lugs gso rig tshig mdzod chen mo*, ed. Bod rang skyong sman rtsis khang (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006: 773-774); see also Pasang Yonten Arya (1998: 145, 221, 223-224). However, on p. 13 of this work, we are also told that *zin tig* is equally used to denote lime powder. These references show the wide margins of uncertainty that surround the identification of specimen from Tibetan medical botany and the Tibetan *materia medica* in general, the study of which has barely gotten out of the starting gate. Aside from a massive number of specialized studies of the pharmacology of plants used in Tibetan medicine that are published in China and written in Chinese, an important study of a select number of such plants in English is Kletter and Kriechbaum (2001).

42 See the *Gso dpyad rin po che'i 'khrungs dpe bstan pa*, *Gso rig sman gyi ro nus ngos 'dzin gsal ston phyogs sgrig rin chen sgron me*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Mes po'i shul bzahag 2 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007: 125, 176, 190).

43 See Martin (2011: 133-134), van der Kuijp (2010: 30-31, n. 2), and the relevant passages in *Gso dpyad rin po che'i 'khrungs dpe bstan pa*, 75, 81, 116, etc.

44 See *Gso dpyad rin po che'i 'khrungs dpe bstan pa*, 75.

A published manuscript from Khams and the original manuscript of the former which has writing in black and red, both signal important variant readings in [b] and [c]:<sup>45</sup>

<i>bod yul du skye ba'i sngo sman shing sman bshad //</i>	[a]
<i>gnas mchog khyed 'phags kha ba can gyi ri //</i>	[b]
<i>sman mchog zil pa can du grags pa de //</i>	[c]
<i>rgya gar rgya nag bal po gser gling yul //</i>	[d]
<i>gru gu dol po phrom gyi yul dag na //</i>	[e]
<i>sman mchog 'di dag mi skye bod yul skye //</i>	[f]

Thus, plants and shrubs/trees used in the preparation of medicines (*sngo/shing sman*) in Tibetan medicine hailed from the Tibetan area proper, from Rgya gar, Rgya nag, the Kathmandu Valley, the Indonesian Archipelago (*gser gling*), that is, Sumatra and/or, Java, D/Gru gu [?Turkic region], Dol po, and Khrom.

Gtsang stod pa often states that he wrote his small tracts on the basis of his own experiences (*rang gi nyams myong*) as a practicing physician and mentions on occasion that the efficacy promised by the texts he was using was confirmed by this very experience. His work can perhaps best be described as closely resembling the Byzantine *iatrosophion*, and what A. Touwaide has written about Byzantine medical literature also applies to the Tibetan medical literary corpus:<sup>46</sup>

Classical texts were used for study and such other texts as the *iatrosophia* were used for the practice of medicine. ... Medical manuals reflect the free use of the body of classical medical knowledge as a reference to be validated by experience and further developed according to its usefulness in daily therapeutic practice.

It is not surprising that the combination of precept and practice, the theoretical and the empirical, is in evidence throughout the history of Tibetan medicine, and this is, of course, something that we can expect to have been the case in every medical tradition that has a circumscribed and determinate theoretical foundation. Things become interesting when we have instances of the empirical conflicting with the theoretical at which point different strategies of interpretation, and perhaps even paradigm shifts need to take place. Of course, this includes biomedicine as well with its global reach and origins.

---

45 *Gso spyad* [sic. *dpyad*] *sngo sbyor tshogs kyi man ngag rin chen 'khrungs dpe bstan pa* (Leh: Tashi Y. Tashigang, 1974), 6-7 [3b-4a], and *Ibid.* [3b-4a], tbrc.org W4CZ16918.

46 See Touwaide (2007: 170), as quoted in Clark (2011: 2-3).

Of some importance is the fact that this same collection of Gtsang stod pa contains numerous little texts in which individuals are named and that several of these texts are even dated with a year. One of the editors of the 2006 edition noted in the overview of Gtsang stod pa's life that one of them was written in the water-female-sheep year in Skyid grong, whereby he or she identified the year in question as corresponding to 1043. The text to which is referred is no doubt the first of the following three tracts that contains concrete dates and places of composition<sup>47</sup>

1. *Stongs tshad bcos pa* [*A Cure for Hollow Fever*], water-female-sheep year, in Mang yul, Skyid grong
2. *Sman mar sbyor ba* [*Preparation of Ointment*], dragon year, in La stod Ding ri
3. *Rlig rlogs gso ba* [*Treatment of Testicular Swelling*], rat year, in Ma khra ru gshongs

Aside from the fact that several texts in the 2006 edition of the collection mention a G.yu thog, a Brang ti, and Paṅ chen 'Bum phrag gsum pa. The latter should probably be identified as the contemporary and associate of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (?1059-?1109) with whom, later sources inform us, he founded a seminary at Zhwa lu monastery that was dedicated to the study of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*. One text also notes Mitrayogin and this does shed light on the *terminus a quo* of the composition of at least this one little work in the collection, namely the *Mthong nyams gso ba'i mi tra dzo ki'i phyag len, A Method [or: Treatment] of Mitrayogin that Cures Impeded Vision*.<sup>48</sup> There is no doubt that he must be the same Mitrayogin whom Khro phu Lo tsā ba Byams pa'i dpal (1172-1236) had invited to his monastery in Khro phu in order to consecrate the place where he, Khro phu Lo tsā ba, intended to construct the large Maitreya statue and the structure that was to house it. Mitrayogin accepted his invitation, left the Kathmandu Valley in 1200, and stayed at his monastery [and probably elsewhere in Central Tibet] for about one year. As far as I know, he then returned to the subcontinent. Thus, the water-female-sheep year in which Gtsang stod pa composed the *Stongs tshad bcos pa* would therefore most likely have been the year 1223, that is, the water-female-sheep year, which occurred three sexagenary cycles subsequent to 1043!

A number of Gtsang stod pa's texts are explicitly handed down from the hoary and non-human past. A case in point is the *Mgo rma gso ba, Healing Head Rma [Wounds and Fractures]*, which contains the following line of individuals along which it was transmitted, the

---

47 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 86).

48 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 169-174). For Mitrayogin's ties to ophthalmology, see also Czaja (2007: 348).

first of whom is a mysterious lady called the Black Muse:<sup>49</sup>

Mkha' 'gro Nag mo-Bla ma Dzwa ki-Bla ma Kun dga' bsod nams-Dpon po Bkru me  
ma-Bla ma 'Bum pa brtson 'grus-Mkhan chen Se le 'od-Bla ma Bsod nams bzang po-  
me

Another text, the *Dbang ril snyan bryud*, *Aural Transmission of the Power Pill*, places Gtsang  
stod pa three generations after Lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po:<sup>50</sup>

Rin chen bzang po-Mang po Sman btsun-Zhang ston Zhig khri 'od-Lha rje Dar ma  
mgon

To be sure, this would be a bit of a stretch, chronologically speaking!

We have seen that the *Rgyud bzhi* stated that treatment by moxibustion hailed from China.  
Yet, it uses the expression *hor gyi me btsa'*, "Turko-Uyghur heat therapy," and not once *rgya  
nag gi me btsa'*, "Rgya nag-Chinese moxibustion," in the main body of the text. Interestingly,  
the import and origin of "Turko-Uyghur heat therapy" is somewhat discussed by Zur mkhar ba  
in his 1542 commentary on the first book of the text, the *Basic Book*, *Rtsa ba'i rgyud*; there we  
read:<sup>51</sup>

*skabs 'dir hor gyi me btsa' zhes pa la kha cig na re / snying po bsdus par rdo dkar  
bsregs pa la bshad ces zer mod / der thal sman gyi me btsa' bshad mod kyang hor gyi  
me btsa'i don ma grub pas mi 'thad la / hor gyi me btsa' zhes pa man ngag rgyud du  
dugs kyi khongs su bsdus pas na / go snyod snum du btsos pa'am 'khar [or: mkhar]  
gong srin can dug la snga rabs kyi bzhed pa ltar legs pa yin no //*

In this context, some have indeed alleged with respect to the expression 'Turko-  
Uyghur heat therapy': "Limestone burning (*rdo dkar bsregs pa*) is mentioned in  
Vāgbhāṭa's *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā*."<sup>52</sup> This is incorrect because, although powdered

---

49 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 458). Of course, I am fully cognizant that "muse" is a problematic translation of *mkha' 'gro*  
[*ma*] / *dākinī*, but one can easily argue that "she who goes in the skies" is not a very helpful one either.

50 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 602).

51 Zur mkhar ba (1989: 82) *ad* Zur mkhar ba (2005: 15).

52 This is presumably an abbreviation of *rdo thal dkar po*; see Dga' ba'i rdo rje (1995: 65-66). It would appear  
that the expression *rdo dkar bsregs pa* does not occur in the Tibetan translations of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā*, its  
autocommentary, or the commentary by Candranandana!



medicine heat therapy (*thal sman gyi me btsa'*) is indeed mentioned therein,<sup>53</sup> it does not fulfill the intent of Turko-Uyghur heat therapy. And in as much as the term 'TurkoUyghur heat therapy' is subsumed under "heat, sudation" (*dugs, \*sveda*) in the *Instruc-tions Book (Man ngag gi rgyud)*,<sup>54</sup> the position of earlier generations, namely, heating by boiling cumin (*go snyod*) [Carum carvi L.] oil or with a kind of impure quartz,<sup>55</sup> is fine.

Gtsang stod pa also speaks of *hor gyi me btsa'*. A case in point is in fact his tract titled *Me btsa'*, which basically begins with the statement that *hor gyi me btsa'* is one of five therapies in which heat/fire is used:<sup>56</sup>

*rdo shing spra ba ras bal dang //*  
*hor gyi me btsa' lnga bshad kyang //*  
*rang re'i lugs kyi spra ba'i mer //*  
*sngon gyi drang srong mkhas rnams bzhed //*

Although the five: application of fire by stone, wood, *spra ba*,<sup>57</sup> Cotton (*ras bal*), and the hor application of fire, are mentioned, The seer and the learned of yore professed, The fire of *spra ba* of our own tradition.

Gtsang stod pa mentions towards the end of this little work that there is also a "Chinese tradition" (*rgya nag gi lugs*), which he associates with texts by a certain Ha sha[ng] (< *heshang*

53 This may refer *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* I: 17, 17c: *kṣārāgni*, even if it there is an obvious dvandva compound that is respectively rendered as "Verätzung und Feuerbehandlung" and "caustic alkali and branding by fire" in, respectively, Hilgenberg and Kirfel (1941: 97) and Murthy (1991: 222). The Tibetan translation in *Bstan 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang, vol. 111 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 2003), no. 3547, 233, faithfully rendered it by *thal sman me btsa'*.

54 Zur mkhar ba (2005: 200) *ad A General Treatment of Fever (tsha ba spyi bcos)* chapter: *dugs kyis 'phral gyi zug gzer bcag pa dang //*, and Dar mo Sman rams pa (1989: 144), who comments on *Book Three* of the *Rgyud bzhi*.

55 Dga' ba'i rdo rje (1995: 53) under *dkar* [*dkar* is homophonous with '*khar and mkhar*] *gong srin can*.

56 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 520-530).

57 According to Dga' ba'i rdo rje (1995: 239-240), the term *spra ba* or *spra thog/tog pa* refers to the *Leontopodium franchetii* Beauv., which grows in Khams [= Western Sichuan] and Yunnan provinces. It is mentioned in the Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā*, in *Bstan 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang, vol. 111, 224, where it corresponds to *būka* in *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* I: 15, 24a. However, Hilgenberg and Kirfel (1941: 85) identified *būka* as *Mimusops Elengi* L. or Spanish cherry, which is in every respect quite different from the *Leontopodium franchetii* Beauv. See also Meulenbeld (1974: 580) *sv bakula*.

和尚)<sup>58</sup> Ma hā ya na-his name is well known to those interested in the Sino-Tibetan debates held in Central Tibet in the second half of the eighth century-and a so far unknown Mi ka pan ti. He states furthermore that he drew his inspiration for this work from his teacher Che rje, from treatises and instructions that belonged to the traditions (*lugs*) of Rgya gar-subcontinent, Rgya nag-China, and Hor as well as from the Kathmandu Valley, the Tibetan cultural area, and the Sog po-Mongol area. Finally, he writes at the outset of his *Yul thig 'od kyi dra ba*, that is, *Yul thig?? Lattice of Light*, yet another work on heat therapy:<sup>59</sup>

*rgya gar las sman sbyor byung //*  
*khrom las chu yi brtag pa byung //*  
*bal po la ni gtar kha ste //*  
*rgya nag reg pa rtsa la bzhur //*  
*hor las me btsa' las byung ngo //*

The preparation of medicine originated in the Rgya gar-subcontinent;  
Uroscopy originated in Khrom;  
Phlebotomy in the Kathmandu Valley-Nepal;  
Sphygmology originated in Rgya nag-China;  
Heat therapy originated in the Turko-Uyghur area.

To be noted is that Ta zig/Stag gzigs and Dol po are *not* mentioned in this list.

Still earlier than the sources mentioned so far are the six Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts that deal with medicine.<sup>60</sup> Of these, Pelliot Tibétain 127, 1044, and 1058 treat of heat therapy. The latter consists of diagrams depicting two human bodies with a number of specific points to which heat is to be applied. However, as Luo Bingfen 罗秉芬 has pointed out, the heat therapy indicated in these documents differs quite substantially from Chinese moxibustion techniques and, what is more, one of these even contains a reference to a "treatment that issued from the

---

58 Zur mkhar ba (1989: 31) cites another Ha shang as the author of a '*Bum 'grel*.

59 Gtsang stod pa (2006: 532).

60 See Yoeli-Tlalim (2012: 53-60). These documents are edited and translated into Chinese in Luo (2002), which is an updated, expanded and corrected version of the earlier Luo and Huang (1983). One important problem with these contributions is that the authors mistakenly believe that the *Rgyud bzhi* dates from around 800, inasmuch as they ascribe its authorship to the elder G.yu thog Yon tan mgon po and formulate arguments from this indefensible ascription.

land of the king of Rgya gar-the Indic subcontinent" [as well as to "Arabo-Persian paper"]<sup>61</sup> With its alleged connections with China and written in [inconsistent] verse and once in a while with short passages in prose-these *prima facie* inconsistent features need to be carefully scrutinized -, the *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* or *\*Somarāja*, too, has a substantial chapter on heat therapy. Not only does this particular chapter exhibit considerable overlap with the corresponding chapter in the *Rgyud bzhi* but, as in the latter, the chapter on phlebotomy immediately precedes it.<sup>62</sup> A careful comparative study of the structure of, as well as of a select number of chapters from, these two treatises remain an outstanding desideratum. The other three documents, Pelliot Tibétain 1057, India Office Library Tib J 756 and 1246-these are labeled P.t. 1057, S.t. 756, and S.t. 1257 in Luo Bingfen's volume-are more general fragments on the treatment of certain diseases. In these, references are made to treatments that hailed from Rgya nag-China, Zhang zhung, and Dru gu (Turko-Uyghur region). To be sure, all the available Tibetan medical histories already tell us as much when they relate in very general and fairly vague terms what had transpired on the medical front in the era of the Tibetan empire-kingdom (7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup>c.) and the 'foreign' influences that helped give shape to the Tibetan medical traditions.<sup>63</sup>

Indeed, in a preliminary examination of these histories, Chr. Beckwith indicated long ago that the tradition itself acknowledges the presence of a number of foreign physicians, including a certain Galen[os], who were active at the Tibetan imperial courts, even if it does not always clearly spell out in detail what, if anything at all, was borrowed from where.<sup>64</sup> And recently, Martin, Rin chen rgyal and Yoeli-Tlalim re-opened the question of the degree of influence of the "West", that is, Greco-Arabo-Persian medicine may have exerted on Tibetan medicine.<sup>65</sup> They have also shown that, with respect to uroscopy or urine analysis as an important diagnostic tool, the medical text of the *\*Somarāja* of uncertain provenance, even if it also follows the basic Āyurvedic theoretical foundation of the "three humors", contains clear Greco-

---

61 Luo (2002: 41, 66-67); Luo (2002: 53-104), contains informative essays on the history of moxibustion, Tibetan *me btsa'*, and a comparison of what these documents have to say with the relevant chapter on *me btsa'* in the *Rgyud bzhi* (see infra n. 51). But see also the general overview on the subject, the typology of *me btsa'*, and the sources in Dpa' ris Sangs rgyas tshe ring (1994: 135-149).

62 See, respectively, *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 390-393, 393-404) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 305-308, 308-316) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 275b-277b, 277b-285b)] and Zur mkhar ba (2005: 659-665, 666-669).

63 An excellent account of a good number of these and their inter-textualities is given in Garrett (2007: 363-387).

64 See Beckwith (1979) and now also the references in Yoeli-Tlalim (2010: 195, n. 3). Rin chen rgyal (1999: 95-102) and (2011: 286-297), seems to have been unaware of Beckwith's earlier essay.

65 See, respectively, Martin's paper cited above in n. 37, Yoeli-Tlalim (2012), which repeats much of what she has written in her other papers that are mentioned in this essay, and, for example, Rin chen rgyal (2007) - I should like to thank him for kindly providing me with a copy of his valuable dissertation some years ago-as well as its publication in Rin chen rgyal (2011) and Rin chen rgyal (2013).

Arabo-Persian elements<sup>66</sup> and, this does add a layer of complexity to this work with its Chinese connections, that the *tridoṣa* theory did make its way into China in the eighth century, as was shown in detail by Chen Ming 陈明.<sup>67</sup> Furthermore, quite definite Chinese influences in this treatise can be found in its treatment of the complex notion of *rtsa*, as was shown by Zhen Yan 甄艳 in his dissertation on Tibetan sphygmology.<sup>68</sup> Martin drew attention to a certain physician with the name *tsan pa/ba shi la ha* whom he tentatively identified as Tsan [= name of people at "the extreme north-east of Asia Minor"] Basileos, even though some Tibetan writers suggest that he was associated with the Myang river valley.<sup>69</sup> Tsan pa shi la ha's work on the thoracic cavity (*byang khog*) was recently published and it includes an interesting historical narrative of its origins and transmission.<sup>70</sup> We may add here that the *Bi ci pu ti kha ser*, a work that allegedly hails from the era of Khri srong lde btsan and is primarily concerned with diagnostics and therapeutics, appears to share this same basic theoretical Āyurvedic foundation, even though its precise provenance is also uncertain.<sup>71</sup>

Let us now take a closer look at the *\*Somarāja*. To be sure, it hardly merits saying that, not unlike the *Rgyud bzhi* and a host of other Tibetan medical treatises, this work also has a significant number of as yet unsolved text-critical and text-historical problems.<sup>72</sup> While its title is *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* in Tibetan, Tibetan sources often refer to it by its presumed or assumed Sanskrit title *Somarāja* and I have done the same.<sup>73</sup> The recently made available "editions" of this work consisting of retyped manuscripts all go back to the late eighteenth century Sde dge xylograph, the printing blocks for which were prepared, according to the printer's colophon (*par byang*), under the sponsorship of one whose name was apparently Blo gros rgyal mtshan. This man is styled *nor 'dzin skyong ba*, that is, "protector of the container of wealth [= earth]," an epithet that is reserved for holders of the highest offices like governors and local, more or less sovereign rulers. We do not find an individual with this name in the various expositions of the House of Sde dge. That said, I did note on another occasion that a Blo gros

66 See, in particular, Yoeli-Tlalim (2010).

67 See, for example, Chen (2006).

68 See Zhen (2004: 42-76).

69 Martin (2011: 128-130), but see also van der Kuijp (2010: 32-33, n. 1) where some earlier sources are cited for him being possibly a Tibetan even if this appears unlikely.

70 Tsan pa shi la ha (2014: 201-235).

71 Martin (2011: 130-131, n. 38, and 136). Two dissimilar but quite corrupt editions of this work have been published so far, one in Lhasa (2005) and the other in Beijing (2006) in the prestigious Arura series (vol. 033).

72 See also the detailed remarks in Rin chen rgyal (2011: 13-14). Rin chen rgyal's witnesses of the text of the *Somarāja* were the Sde dge xylograph, including the Indian reprint published in Leh [and not in Delhi!]-this is *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989) -, as well as a manuscript for which see below.

73 The term *somarāja* is also one of the dozen or so names for the *Abelmoschus moschatus* (L.) Medik [= *Hibiscus abelmoschus* L.]; see also Dga' ba'i rdo rje (1995: 305).

rgyal mtshan was the sender of an official document to the court of the Qianlong emperor (r. 1735-1796) in which he requested certain favors for the military services he had rendered in campaigns against Rjes rong, Lcags mdud, Mgo log, and Sa ngan.<sup>74</sup> Signed with the royal family of Sde dge's seal of a scorpion and dated the eighth day of the third lunar month of the thirty-eighth year of Qianlong, that is, April 28, 1773, we learn from this memorial that he also held the office of a Commissioner of the Pacification Office (*xuanweishi* 宣慰使). Bstan pa tshe ring (1678-1739), arguably the most famous ruler of Sde dge, was the first to have held this title, which the court of the Yongzheng emperor (r. 1722-1735) had awarded him in 1733. His second son Phun tshogs bstan pa inherited this title and it was passed on to his successor and younger brother Blo gros rgya mtsho (1722-1774).<sup>75</sup> I have yet to encounter a Blo gros rgyal mtshan among members of Sde dge's ruling family and I wonder if he might not be the same as Blo gros rgya mtsho? The miniature on the right-hand side of the xylograph's fol. 5a depicts Karma Bstan pa'i nyin byed, that is, the great Si tu Paṅ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1700-1774), a man of extraordinary talents and by every measure one of the greatest scholars of Khams, Sichuan or, I daresay, even of Qing China.<sup>76</sup> A renowned physician and practitioner of Indian,<sup>77</sup> Indo-Tibetan, and Chinese medicine in his own right, he sort of proofread the edition of the \**Somarāja*, according to an entry in his diaries for around the middle of December of 1772, and gave his permission to use the said miniature of himself.<sup>78</sup> The xylograph's printer's colophon also states *inter alia* with due enthusiasm that this work is superior to all medical treatises and that its renown is indisputable. That said, it had nonetheless become somewhat of a rarity over time, so that Blo gros rgyal mtshan had come to the decision to patronize the carving of the printing blocks. The evidence suggests that this was the very first time that blocks for this work were carved.

In his dissertation and published book, Rin chen rgyal shed important light on the historiography of the text of the \**Somarāja*, which is extant in the aforementioned xylograph

74 See van der Kuijp (1988: 19, n. 21).

75 Kolmaš (1968: 40-41).

76 For Si tu Paṅ chen and the vast range of his learning, see the issue “Si tu Paṅ chen: Creation and Cultural Engagement in Eighteenth-Century Tibet,” of the on-line *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 7 (2013).

77 In a diary entry for the middle of 1724, we learn that he was reading a bit from Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* and Candranandana's commentary while he sojourned in the 'Bri gung pa meditation cave complex of Rgyang grags, not far from the place where Mi la ras pa had his famous encounter with a Bon po; see Si tu Paṅ chen (1968: 130), and also 'Be Lo tsā ba's biography of his master Si tu Paṅ chen in Si tu Paṅ chen and 'Be Lo tsā ba (1972: 500).

78 Si tu Paṅ chen (1968: 696): *smān yig par gyi mā phyi 'u sti [sic] lnga bskur 'dug / so mā rā dza bsgrig lugs blta rgyu bskur byung /*. The more correct text of portions of this entry are found in Si tu Paṅ chen and 'Be Lo tsā ba (1972: 627): *smān yig par gyi mā phyi pusti lnga / so mā rā dza bsgrig lugs gzigs rgyu sogs 'byor ba zhal bkod gnang /*.

as well as in manuscript form[s].<sup>79</sup> Noteworthy is, first of all, that both contain numerous interlinear annotations, the lettering of which was carved, or written, in smaller letters than the wording of the main text. The somewhat corrupt translator's colophon ('gyur byang) of the xylograph relates the following:<sup>80</sup>

*'phrul kyi rgyal po khri srong lde'u btsan gyi sku ring la / rgya nag gi be ci hangka  
ma hā la dpe zhus te hwa shang ma hā ya na dang / be ro tsa nas bsgyur ro //*

During the lifetime of the charismatic king Khri srong lde[u] btsan (ca.742-ca.800), the text was edited for the Chinese physician (*be ci*)<sup>81</sup> Hang ka ma hā and was translated by the monk (*hwa shang* < Ch. *heshang* 和尚) \*Mahāyāna and Vairocana.

Continuously paginated, the xylograph contains what is evidently an editorial introduction to the text of the \**Somarāja* and the actual \**Somarāja*; the introduction then consists of fols. 1-3a and the text of the \**Somarāja* begins on fol. 3b. In the introduction, we are told that Master Klu sgrub snying po [Nāgārjunagarbha/sāra] was born in the Bhe ta [= Vedali/Vidarbha] region in the south of the Indian subcontinent and that his intellectual interests included medicine. Mañjuśrī was staying at the central peak of a five peaked mountain (*ri bo rtse lnga*) that make up Mount Wutai, Wutaishan 五台山, and taught there the \**Somarāja*. The introduction does not relate that Nāgārjuna was present on this occasion, even if we are told in very general terms that he had requested a work on medicine, albeit without offering any explicit indication to whom he might have addressed this request. Giving several reasons, the editor then proclaims that even dummies can make sense of this work, after which he proceeds to give the titles of each of the one hundred and thirteen chapters for what he now calls the *Gso dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po'i mdo*.<sup>82</sup> And this marks the end of the anonymous introduction.

The xylograph of the text then begins with what can only be called a pseudo-Sanskrit title *so ma rā dza* [= *ja*] *bhai ṣa dzya* [= *jya*] *sā dha na*, that is, *somarājabhai-ṣājyasādhana*, which is supposed to be reflected by Tibetan *smān dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po*—it does not, for the Tibetan should have read something in the order of *Zla ba'i rgyal po smān gyi sgrub pa/thabs*. The term *sādhana* is quite out of place here, for there is nothing remotely *sādhana*-like to be found in this work; it contains no evocations, no spells, indeed, nothing that indicates any form of religious esotericism. Two lines of homage follow this titular identification; the

79 Rin chen rgyal (2007: 2-17) and (2011: 3-37).

80 See *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 407).

81 For this term that ultimately derives from Sanskrit *vaidya*, see van der Kuijp (2010: 32, n. 1).

82 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 4) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 3)] has a gloss under chapter eighty-six, "vomiting" (*skyugs*), namely, "four text-witnesses do not have it" (*ma dpe bzhi la mi 'dug*).

first is dedicated to Mañjuśrī and the second to [a] Nāgārjuna. Two miniatures adorn fol. 4a, with Mañjuśrī on the left—and Nāgārjuna on the right-hand side of the page. That it is the text's intention to equate this Nāgārjuna with the Nāgārjuna of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpatantra* finds support in the fact that both suggest that their Nāgārjuna was a first-stage (*sa dang po*) Bodhisattva. Our text did so in the *mise-en-scène* that begins immediately after the lines of homage and that stands separate from its first chapter. There we are also told that Nāgārjuna wishing to become a learned scholar, wanted to benefit the world and requested from Mañjuśrī instructions in the healing sciences at Mount Be ta (*sic*), Mount Be ta, which stood at the center of a mountain range comprising five peaks.<sup>83</sup> Acquiescing, the latter began his explanations and the rest is history and...text. Consisting of a panegyric of Mañjuśrī by Nāgārjuna, the last chapter of the xylograph recapitulates bits and pieces of the preamble and earlier portions of the text and mentions the names of some sixteen seers—one of whom is called Caraka! Each of the four sets of four seers is connected to one of four mountains peaks at which Mañjuśrī gave specific medical instructions. The fifth, the central peak, is called Mount Be ta/Bhe ta and there Mañjuśrī gave instructions to the [unnamed] "four great seers" (*drang srong chen po bzhi*) in the more theoretical aspects of medicine and therapeutics.<sup>84</sup> This particular chapter is absent in the manuscript that is in my possession as it is in another manuscript of the \**Somarāja* which Rin chen rgyal was able to consult.

Different from "my" manuscript, Rin chen rgyal describes a slightly incomplete manuscript to which he had access but which is not available to me. The manuscript apparently formed part of the vast Tibetan holdings of the Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities [Mi rigs pho brang, Minzugong 民族宫], Beijing.<sup>85</sup> Rin chen rgyal does not remark on its length but does state that its title page has *Gso ma ra dza*, whereas its pseudo-Sanskrit title is given as *Gso' ma ra dza bai ṣa ta namā tan dra*, for which it offers *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i rgyud* as its alleged Tibetan equivalent. Immediately after

83 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 9-10) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 3-4)] offers Mount Be ta (*be ta ri*), which it locates at "the center" (*dbus*). Of fundamental significance is that, apart from a plethora of important variant readings and additional interlinear glosses [in red and black ink], the manuscript of the *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 1b-2b) about which more will be said below consistently has *ghe'u de shan* for the Sde dge xylograph's *be ta ri*. Tibetan *ri* surely reflects Chinese *shan* 山, "mountain." Further, there is little doubt that we should see in *ghe'u de* an early pronunciation of *wutai* 五台. For this reason, I am inclined to submit that *Ghe'u de shan* reflects Chinese 五台山. To be sure, Mañjuśrī is associated with Mount Wutai and this item also plays a fundamental role in an early work on Indo-Tibetan *materia medica*, for which see, for example, the 'Jam dpal gyi sng'o 'bum gsal ba'i sgron me, *Gso rig sman gyi ro nus ngos 'dzin gsal ston phyogs sgrig rin chen sgron me*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe mnying zhib 'jug khang, Mes po'i shul bzahag 2 (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 1-23; the manuscript is reproduced on pp.403-413.

84 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 406-407) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 318)].

85 What follows is to some degree based on Rin chen rgyal (2007: 15-16) and (2011: 31-34).

the title it has *bam po dang po*, "first *bam po*,"<sup>86</sup> which is followed by a statement in homage of apparently only Mañjuśrī. In all, it consists of one hundred and twelve chapters, whereby three metrical feet at the end of the last chapter on the *Efficacy of Medicine* (*sman gyi nus pa*) or the *Efficacy of Elixir-Medicine* (*bdud rtsi sman gyi nus pa*) are missing, as are Nāgārjuna's panegyric of Mañjuśrī and the printer's colophon—it is thus most probably not a copy of the Sde dge xylograph or filiated with one or the other witness of the text that was used towards the edition of what was to become the Sde dge text of the \**Somarāja*. To be sure, there is plenty of additional evidence for this. Rin chen rgyal points out that, unlike the latter, the manuscript was not edited in accordance with the norms of *Sum-Rtags* grammar; that its paleography suggests that it dates from the tenth/eleventh century; that many readings of the manuscript differ from those of the xylograph; that the manuscript contains more glosses than the xylograph; and that it contains a number of revisions. And, finally, the number of its chapters differs from the xylograph. A version of the *Somarāja* in one hundred and twelve chapters was apparently also countenanced by the Sde srid and Sum pa Mkhan po, whereas Mnga' ris Chos skyong dpal bzang (1479-?) apparently registered a version in [?one hundred and] eleven chapters!<sup>87</sup> A little later, Dpa' bo II Gtsug lag phreng ba's (1504-1564/66) observations anent Tibetan medical literature includes the remark that the \**Somarāja* had one hundred and fifteen chapters and that it was translated by Hwa shang Ma hā thi tha, Rgya phrug Gar mkhan and others during the same king's reign.<sup>88</sup> A Rgya phrug Gar mkhan, that is, a young Chinese dancer, is mentioned in the *Dbal/Sba bzhed* in connection with Khri srong lde btsan whose playmate he was and who was dispatched to China in search of Buddhist texts.<sup>89</sup> In the view of this historian, this work was associated with Princess Jincheng (金城公主) who, he states, had brought a copies of Chinese astrological and medical works to Central Tibet [in circa 710]. The Sde srid repeats Dpa' bo II's remarks, albeit *sans* the reference to the princess, and adds that a later translation of this work by the Chinese monk Mahāyāna and Vairocana had one hundred and twelve chapters.<sup>90</sup> In his critical edition of the *Rgyud bzhi*, Zur mkhar ba points out that he used a long (*che*) and a short (*chung*) version of the text. He is quite critical of this tract in his history of

---

86 For the variations of the meaning of *bam po* as a unit of text-length, see van der Kuijp (2009). This text-unit is found only in most of Tibetan translations of canonical texts but never in non-canonical texts. Given that the \**Somarāja* has thusfar not been found in any collection of canonical works—the same holds for the *Rgyud bzhi* -, it would appear that the presence of *bam po dang po* in the manuscript is pretentious and was added in conscious imitation of a canonical text.

87 See the sketch of his works and days in Byams pa phrin las (2000: 268-272), which is in part based on a manuscript of his *Bdud rtsi'i chu rgyun* history of medicine, which is [or was] housed in the library of Nor bu gling kha, Lhasa, and unfortunately remains unpublished.

88 Dpa' bo II (1986: 1518-1519).

89 See *Dbal' bzhed* (2000: 44, n. 101); see also *Sba bzhed* (1982: 5).

90 Sde srid (1970: 158-160), and Kilty (2010: 149-152), which includes a translation of the chapter headings.



medicine, for he writes that:<sup>91</sup>

*...so ma ra dza ni klu sgrub dang 'jam dbyangs kyis gsungs pa ma yin te rgya nag gi sman pa mkhas pa zhig gis brtsams pa yin yang 'gyur shin tu ma legs pas nongs...*

...the *Somarāja* was not by enunciated \*Nāgārjuna and \*Mañjuḥṣa; although it was a composition by a Chinese medical scholar, inasmuch as the translation is quite infelicitous, the text is in error...

Given his misgivings concerning its authorship and provenance, it is precisely for that reason that he characterizes the \**Somarāja* in his 1545 commentary on the *Explanatory Book of the Rgyud bzhi* as a "Chinese medical work" (*rgya nag gi sman dpyad*).<sup>92</sup> In connection with his comments on the first chapter of the *Rgyud bzhi's Last Book*, he quotes passages from the \**Somarāja* as well as from an unidentified exegesis of the so-called *Rtsa mdzod* and writes, evidently without any inclination to pull punches, regarding their authors' understanding of the structure of the channels/vessels/pulses (*rtsa*):<sup>93</sup>

*rtsa mdzod rtsa 'grel ni bod kyi sman pa ci yang mi shes pa zhig gis brtsams pas gtan tshigs su mi rung zhing /so ma rā dza ni / sgra ji bzhin bsgyur ma shes pa'i nyes pa tsam ma gtogs / rgya nag gi sman dpyad khungs thub tu 'dug mod / de las kyang snying rtsa thi gu bsgril ba ltar bshad kyi don snod kyi rtsa kun bsgril bar ma bshad /*

Since the *Rtsa mdzod*, the basic text and commentary of were written by some Tibetan physician who understood nothing at all, it cannot function in an argument, and, aside from the simple mistake of not having understood the literal translation, the \**Somarāja* is indeed an authentic Chinese medical work. It likewise explained

---

91 See, respectively, Zur mkhar ba (2005: 701) and Zur mkhar ba (2001: 207-208). Be this as it may, he uses the phrase "Nāgārjuna's *Somarāja*" (*klu sgrub kyi so ma ra dza*) in Zur mkhar ba (2001: 250)!

92 Zur mkhar ba (1989a: 128). Giving detailed reasons, this *Book* was severely edited in Dar mo Sman rams pa (1989a: 664-665), and the original xylograph concludes with a benedictive prayer of Dalai Lama V of 1679; see Dalai Lama V (1991: 152).

93 Zur mkhar ba (1989b: 692-693) *ad* Zur mkhar ba (2005: 586): *bltas dus...gnas du blta //*.

the coronary channel (*snying rtsa*)<sup>94</sup> to be like a coiled cord, but it did not explain that all the channels of the "solid" organs (*don*) and "container" organs (*snod*)<sup>95</sup> are coiled.

Zur mkhar ba cites the *Rtsa mdzod* and its commentary on several other occasions, but I am not able to identify their author[s]. These works are mentioned neither in his history of medicine nor in that of the Sde srid, but his references do suggest that both were written in prose.<sup>96</sup>

Notwithstanding his misgivings about the \**Somarāja*, Zur mkhar ba does cite it a number of times in, for example, his study of the *Explanatory Book* of the *Rgyud bzhi* without batting an eye or addressing his reader that there might be something philologically amiss with the passages that he was quoting.<sup>97</sup> Commenting on its first chapter that deals with the prenatal development of the human body (*lus kyi chags pa*), he does suggest that what the text of the \**Somarāja* had to say about this does not square with what is stated in the Buddhist canonical literature, sutra and tantra.<sup>98</sup> The quoted passage reads under the heading of gestation (*ma yi mngal du gnas pa ni //*):

*dang po zhag bdun las kyi rlung //*  
*rgyu ste mer mer po de ni //*  
*kun gzhi 99 'dzin pa'i rlung zhes pas //*  
*dang po'i zhag ni gcig na 'o //*

---

94 The *snying rtsa* is discussed in the \**Somarāja's* sixteenth chapter where, however, no mention is made of its coiled shape; see *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 78-79) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 59-60) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 51b-52b)]. For the various *rtsa*, see *inter alia* Meyer (1983: 118-127) and Garrett (2008a), which I have not seen. See further Zhen (2007) and the very recent publication of Gyatso (2015), which I have also not yet seen.

95 For these, see *Bod lugs gso rig tshig mdzod chen mo*, ed. Bod rang skyong sman rtsis khang, 363, sv *don snod*.

96 Zur mkhar ba (1989b: 700, 718).

97 See, for example, Zur mkhar ba (1989a: 128-129, 210).

98 Vāgbhaṭa treats embryology, pre-natal care, and the pre-natal development of the fetus in *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* II: 1, 37-66; see Hilgenberg and Kirfel (1941: 165-168) and Murthy (1991: 366-372). For recent studies of what is at stake here, see Meyer (1983: 111-116), Das (2003: *passim*), and Garrett (2008: 72ff., 88ff.).

99 The term *kun gzhi* or *kun gzhi rnam shes* occurs a number of times in the \**Somarāja*, the first incidence of which is found in *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 11) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 4) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 3a)], together with the term "impression" (*bag chags, vāsana*). It is obvious that their use was inspired by Yogācāra Buddhism, as is clear from the aforesaid passage, which states: '*gro ba drug ni thams cad la // las dang nyon mongs dag dang ni // kun gzhi rnam shes bag chags las // grub ste...* I intend to return to these terms in the \**Somarāja* on a future occasion. Notwithstanding the fact that the term *kun gzhi /kun gzhi rnam shes* (*ālaya / ālayavijñāna*) is absent from the *Rgyud bzhi* as it is from the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*, the twelfth chapter of the *Rgyud bzhi's Explanatory Book* does contain the typical Yogācāra triad of *gzhan dbang* (\**paratantra*), *kun brtags* (\**parikalpita*) and *yongs grub* (\**pariniṣpanna*), for which see Zur mkhar ba (2005: 53).

*zhag gnyis mngal ni 'jug pa'i rlung //*  
*'byung bas mer mer por 'gyur ro //*  
*zhag gsum mngal ni 'khrugs pa'i rlung //*  
*mkhrang 'gyur zhes par 'gyur ba'o //*  
*zhag bzhi kun nas sdud pa'i rlung //*  
*'byung bas gor gor por 'gyur ro //*  
 ...

And he comments: <sup>100</sup>

*...zhes pa la sogs pa'i zhag bdun phrag dang po'i dus gyi zhag re re la rlung mi 'dra*  
*ba re re dang slar bdun phrag gnyis pa nas bzung ste / bdun phrag bzhi bcu rtsa*  
*gsum gyi bar du rlung mi 'dra ba re re dang bcas te 'phel ba'i tshul 'byung yang / mdo*  
*dang rgyud sde sogs nas 'byung ba'i tshul dang mi mthun par snang bas 'dir ma smos*  
*so //*

...since also the prenatal development in the said passage, beginning with the dissimilar kind of wind-motility (*rlung*, \**vayu*) for each day of the first week and the again the second week up to the forty-third week, together with each respective dissimilar kind of wind-motility, appears to be inconsistent with the way in which its development is dealt with in the sutras and tantras, I have not spoken of it here.

The passage that Zur mkhar ba cited from the \**Somarāja* manuscript to which he had access differs a bit from the readings of the Sde dge xylograph, which has it that: <sup>101</sup>

*dang po zhag bdun las kyi rlung //*  
*rgyu ste mer mer po de ni //*  
*des ni kun gzhi 'dzin pa'i rlunga //*  
*dang po'i zhag ni gcig na 'o //*  
*zhag gnyis mngal ni 'jug pa'i rlung //*  
*'byung bas mer mer por gyur to //*  
*zhag gsum mngal ni 'khrugs pa'i rlung //*  
*mkhrang 'gyur zhes par gyur pa'o //*

100 Zur mkhar ba (1989a: 129).

101 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 11-12) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 5) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 3b-4a)].

*zhag bzhi kun nas sdud pa'i rlung //*  
*'byung bas gor gor por gyur to //*  
*[zhag ni lnga la thal byed ces //*  
*rlungb 'byung ltar ltar por 'gyur to //*  
*zhag drug pa na sdud byed ces //c*  
*rlung 'byung nar nar por gyur to //*  
*zhag bdun pa na thogs med ces //*  
*rlung 'byung bu ga can du gyur //]*

*a note: bar du khrag dang chu ser lus pa.*

*b note: dam chu sha chas su chags.*

*c note: dbang po dang yan lag rten chags pa.*

Zur mkhar ba's reservations notwithstanding, there is some overlap when we compare the terminology used in the Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* for the embryonic period of human prenatal development with that of the \**Somarāja* and the *Rgyud bzhi*. But it is also obvious that there are some crucial conceptual differences, especially between the narratives of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* and the \**Somarāja*:

#### *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā*

Gestation period	embryonic shape		
week one	<i>kalala</i> <sup>102</sup>	<i>nur nur po</i>	jelly mass
month two	<i>ghana</i>	<i>gor gor po</i>	club-shape
	<i>peśi</i>	<i>mer mer po</i>	oval-shape
	<i>arbuda</i>	<i>nar nar po</i>	oblong/long and round

The three possible shapes that the embryo can take on during the second month of gestation foretell the outcome of the fetal gender: *gor gor po*-male, *mer mer po*-female, and *nar nar po*-neither male, nor female.<sup>103</sup> Comparing the periodization and terminology in the \**Somarāja* and *Rgyud bzhi*,<sup>104</sup> we notice that once again the latter is very much indebted to the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasaṃhitā* or, perhaps less likely, on an Indic source that is quite close to it.

102 For a discussion of this term and *peśi* below, see Das (2003: 535-536, 562-563).

103 On the "neither male, nor female" question in general, see the highly illuminating paper in Gyatso (2003) and the observations in Gyatso (2010).

104 Zur mkhar ba (2005: 22-23).

*Somarāja**Rgyud bzhi*

Gestation period	Fetal shape	Gestation Period	Fetal shape
day two/week one	<i>mer mer po</i>	week two	<i>nur nur po</i>
day three	<i>mkhrang 'gyur</i>	week four	<i>gor gor po</i>
day four	<i>gor gor po</i>		<i>mer mer po</i>
day five	<i>ltar ltar po</i>		<i>nar nar po</i>
day six	<i>nar nar po</i>		
day seven	<i>bu ga can</i>		

In the recent Chinese translation of the \**Somarāja*, *mkhrang 'gyur* and *ltar ltar po* were respectively translated as *ningho* 凝厚 and *bishi* 闭尸.<sup>105</sup> While the overall quality of this translation of the text does not always inspire confidence—indeed, truth be told, the \**Somarāja* is a difficult work—, in the present instance, the translators followed one of the time honored renditions of the relevant vocabularies that are found in the corpus of Chinese translations of many Sanskrit Buddhist texts. For example, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Vasubandhu (4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> c.) isolated five embryological stages in accordance with what the Tibetan translation of Jinamitra and Ska ba Dpal brtsegs of *circa* the year 800 refers to as "from the *Gtsug lag*" and Paramārtha (499-569) and Xuanzang (ca.602-664) in their respective Chinese translations [I] and [II] as *ru ji yen* 如偈言 and *ru sheng shuoyen* 如圣所言, which, excepting Chinese [I], reflects the extant Sanskrit text's *ityāryaḥ*.<sup>106</sup> Tabulating the equivalents, we obtain the following:

Sanskrit	Tibetan	Chinese [I]	Chinese [II]
<i>kalala</i>	<i>nur nur po</i>	柯羅邏	羯刺藍
<i>arbuda</i>	<i>mer mer po</i>	頰浮陀	頰部曇
<i>peśi</i>	<i>nar nar po</i>	俾尸	閉尸
<i>ghana</i>	<i>mkhrang 'gyur</i>	伽 [訶] 那	鍵南
<i>praśākhā</i>	<i>rkang lag 'gyus pa</i>	波羅捨佉	鉢羅奢佉

105 Ma et al. (1993: 4); see also Ma et al. (2012: 3) of what is essentially a reprint of this Ma et al. (1993), albeit with a somewhat different chapter arrangement.

106 See, respectively, *Bstan 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 2003), vol. 79, no. 3319, 304, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, comp. G. Ono (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924-34), vol. 29, no. 1559, 204c9-13, and no. 1558, 47c17-20, and Vasubandhu (1981: 433).

Note that every single Chinese equivalent is a transcription rather than a translation of the Sanskrit term. The circa 800 *Mahāvīyutpatti* has *gor gor po* for *ghana*, and similar alternative Tibetan [and Chinese] equivalents for some of these-*chu bur can* and *skyon* for *arbuda* and *gor gor po*, *rngams su* and *chen po* for *ghana*-are met with in the translations of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.<sup>107</sup> And it will be noticed that there are some interesting terminological variations in the translation of Rin chen bzang po, who rendered *arbuda* by *nar nar po*, *peśī* by *mer mer po*, and *ghana* by *gor gor po* as well. In fact, these variant translations have their precedent in a number of canonical Tibetan sources.<sup>108</sup>

It is by now also well known that the transmission of the text of the *Rgyud bzhi* is also beset with unexpected pitfalls and philological problems, many of which have yet to be dealt with in full. At the same time, we are at present also a great deal more aware of the problematic transmission of the text of the *\*Somarāja*, because we can now also begin to take into account the readings of the beautifully calligraphied manuscript of this work in one hundred and twelve chapters with two hundred and eighty-seven folios, with annotations in red and black ink, that was made available to me through the kindness of Mr. Yumpa, who discovered the manuscript among the vast library holdings of the Potala palace. Indeed, as indicated earlier, it contains a veritable plethora of readings that differ quite substantially from the Sde dge xylograph and its retyped incarnations. In the first place, its colophon reads:

*rgya gar 'gyur rgya gar gyi mkhan po kri sna pan pi(sic) ta dang / bod kyi lo tsā ba ban  
de chos kyi shes rab kyis bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab // rgya nag 'gyur khri srong  
lde btsan sku ring la / rgya nag gi sman pa be [read: bi] ci hwang ka ra la dpe zhus te /  
hwa shang ma hā ya na pu ṭa dang bai ro tsa nas bsgyur ro // gcig zhus /<sup>109</sup>*

Thus, it explicitly states that there were two translations, one from Sanskrit by Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita and the Tibetan translator, the Venerable Chos kyi shes rab, and one from Chinese that was edited ?for (*la*) the Chinese physician-*bi ci* Hwang-kara and translated by Hwa shang Mahāyāna pu ṭa and Vairocana during the era of Khri srong lde btsan. I am not sure what to do with the "*pu ṭa*" that is affixed to "Mahāyāna" - might *pu ṭa* reflect Sanskrit *putra*? Virtually this very same passage is also found in somewhat faded red ink on the title page in a note below the title. However, it does *appear* to add - as I said, this passage is written in faded red ink - that the text of this particular manuscript was based on five dissimilar manuscript witnesses (*phyi mo mi 'dra ba lnga*) and it has something illegible about a/the *vaiḍūrya dkar po*, which I take

107 Sakaki (1962: 275, no. 4070) and Hirakawa (1973: 51, 150).

108 See, for example, the passages of the *Garbhāvakraṅtisūtra* in Kritzer (2014: 90-91, 173-174).

109 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 287a).

to be a reference to the Sde srid's famous work on the astral sciences of 1683-1685. It is quite possible that the manuscript dates from this period. In the dissertations of Zhen Yan and Rin chen rgyal, it is only the latter who devotes separate sections to the notion that the \**Somarāja* was translated from Chinese and Sanskrit. Rin chen rgyal deals at some length with that part of the colophon of the text in which it is noted that it was translated from the Chinese.<sup>110</sup> In his detailed discussion, he first cites two articles that were published in the *Krung hwa gso rig lo rgyus*, that is, the *Zhonghua yishi zazhi* 中华医史杂志, one by Zhang Xingqian 张兴乾 and Zhang Huixuan 张辉焯, and the other by Skal bzang phrin las of the Gansu College of Chinese Medicine's Department of Tibetan Medicine.<sup>111</sup> The former interpreted the colo-phon's *hangka ma hā* to refer to the *Huangdi neijing taisu* 黄帝内经太素 by the early seventh century Yang Shangshan 杨上善. In their opinion, *hangka* was ultimately a reflex of Chinese *huang* [di nei] *jing* 黄[帝内]经 and the evidently Sanskrit term *mahā* stood for Chinese *da* 大 or *tai* 太, and this was basically short for Chinese *taisu* 太素. They then argued that the fact that Hwa shang Ma hā ya na is mentioned suggests that it was Princess Jincheng had brought a copy of Yang's work to Central Tibet [in circa 710] and that portions of the text do indeed bear some similarity to the *Huangdi neijing taisu*. These include, in their view, its exposition of the five elements (*khams lnga*), of the function (*byed nus*) of the *don* and *snod* organs, of the linkage of the faculties (*dbang po*) with the *don* and *snod* organs, and of beneficial and harmful foods. Finally, they suggested that portions of the architecture of the *Somarāja*, consisting of a number of dialogues between Mañjuśrī and Nāgārjuna, was reminiscent of the *Huangdi neijing*, since the latter was composed around a dialogue between Huangdi 黄帝 and Qi Bo 岐伯.<sup>112</sup> Rin chen rgyal writes that not only did an eminent Chinese historian of medicine Tshe Can-hphun-I am unable to identify him-not buy into this idea, but Zhang and Zhang's proposal was also vehemently disputed *in toto* by Skal bzang phrin las for a variety of reasons, first and foremost among which was that these are two independent works and that there is no clearcut evidence that the Chinese princess had brought a copy of this work to Central Tibet. Further, the tradition makes no such claim and neither do some of the main notions found in the \**Somarāja* assume influences from the *Huangdi neijing taisu*. Thus, for example, its description the way in which the body comes into being through the three poisons, that is, attachment, hatred, and stupidity, together with the paternal semen and maternal blood, and its position on gestation and embryology have no resonance in that Chinese work. And there are many other fundamental differences between the two, one of which is that, crucially, the \**Somarāja's* position on medicinal substances and their properties also differ in every respect from the *Huangdi neijing*

110 What follows is based on Rin chen rgyal (2007: 4-8) and (2011: 8-15).

111 Rin chen rgyal (2007: 14, nos. 164 and 168) and (2011: 295, nos. 164 and 168), which reference Zhang and Zhang (1986: 235-237) and Gazang chenlai (1992). I am afraid I have seen neither.

112 For an annotated translation, see now Unschuld et al. (2011).

corpus.<sup>113</sup> Thus, Rin chen rgyal agrees that Zhang and Zhang's claim holds no water and can therefore not be accepted. Instead, he writes, we should look elsewhere for possible foreign influences. Taking up a portion of the colophon, he writes that one of these influences is Ta zig/ eastern Afghanistan (*phrom, khrom*) on the basis of the fact that the term *bi ci* is mentioned. Though ultimately a reflex of Sanskrit *vaidya*, "Tibetan" *bi ci* is likely of some Indo-Iranian origin and thus only indirectly a reflex of *vaidya*. He then argues that *bi ci hangka mahā* could very well indicate Tibetan *Sman dpyad chen mo* and concludes that the *\*Somarāja* is none other than the *Sman dpyad chen mo*, a Tibetan translation of a compendium of Chinese medical texts that were allegedly brought to Central Tibet during the first half of the seventh century by Princess Wencheng 文成 who wedded King Srong btsan sgam po (604-?649). In this attribution he was no doubt influenced, unduly it appears, by Dpa' bo II and the Sde srid who, unlike the works of their precursors and contemporaries that are available to me such as those by Brang ti, Stag tshang Lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen (1405-1477), and Zur mkhar ba, are so far the only historians of medicine known to me to make mention of this work!<sup>114</sup> Be this as it may, neither Dpa' bo II nor the Sde srid admit any alleged relationship between these two works and, in fact, clearly keep them strictly separate. Rin chen rgyal's arguments for the relationship between the *Sman dpyad chen mo* and the *\*Somarāja* are rather unconvincing and I think one would be very hard pressed first to accept the equivalence of *Bi ci hangka mahā* with *Sman dpyad chen mo*, and then the latter with the *\*Somarāja*.

Finally, Rin chen rgyal writes as a last riposte to the parallel Zhang and Zhang have drawn between the *\*Somarāja* and the *Huangdi neijing taisu* that works written in dialogue form are found everywhere and that, therefore, the fact that both are written in this way is not a compelling argument, as they assumed, for their connecting these two. Indeed, two other cognate works that immediately come to mind are the *Rgyud bzhi* and the *'Bum bzhi, Four Lakhs*, of the Bon po [see below]. The *Rgyud bzhi* consists of a series of dialogues between Drang srong Yid las skyes pa and Rig pa'i ye shes and his brothers, and the *'Bum bzhi* is arranged according to a dialogue between Ston pa Gshen rab and Dpyad bu Khri shes.

Rin chen rgyal also briefly takes up the assertion that the *\*Somarāja* was translation from an Indic, that is, Sanskrit source, and refers to the well-known passage from U rgyan gling pa's (1323-?) *Blon po bka' thang* where it is stated that Nāgārjuna composed (*mdzad*)

113 Here, Skal bzang phrin las apparently cited a passage from the *\*Somarāja*'s ninety-fourth chapter on medicines and foods; see the *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 320) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 250) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 255b-256a)].

114 Sde srid (1970: 156) and (1982: 150) [= Kilty (2010: 148)] and Dpa' bo II (1986: 1518). This bit of information or disinformation also entered into the general surveys of the history of medicine in China; see for example Yu (1983: 102). For Stag tshang Lo tsā ba's piece on medicine, see Stag tshang Lo tsā ba (2007: 44-57); he refers his reader to his own study of medicine, the *Gso dpyad spyi don*, on p.46.



the \**Somarāja*.<sup>115</sup> He rightly voices his skepticism and states that it is difficult to accept such a proposition. Thus, we arrive at an impasse. Since there is no evidence for either its bona fide Chinese nor its assumed Indian origins, all that can be said for the moment is that its contents suggest that the \**Somarāja* is a hybrid text in which influences from a number of different medical traditions have come together. Nonetheless, the fact remains that it is largely Indic in nature and that it is more than highly probable that it entered the Tibetan tradition from China rather than from the Indian subcontinent.

In my manuscript, the passage on gestation that Zur mkhar ba quoted and which I cited above, plus the entries for the days reads as follows:<sup>116</sup>

*dang por zhag bdun las kyi rlung //*  
*rgyu ste mer mer po de ni //*  
*des ni kun gzhī<sup>a</sup> 'dzin pa'i rlung //*  
*dang po zhag gcig bzhag na'o //*  
*zhag gnyis mngal du 'jug pa'i rlung //*  
*byung bas mer mer por 'gyur to<sup>b</sup> //*  
*zhag gsum la<sup>c</sup> ni 'khrugs pa'i rlung //*  
*mkhrang 'gyur zhes par 'gyur pa yin //*  
*zhag bzhi kun nas sdud pa'i rlung //*  
*'byung bas gor gor por 'gyur to //*  
*zhag lnga pa la thal byed ces //*  
*rlung byung ltar ltar po ru 'gyur //*  
*zhag drug na 'du sdud byed pa'i //*  
*rlung byung nar nar por gyur to //*  
*zhag bdun pa na thog med zhes //*  
*rlung byung bu gu can du 'gyur //*

<sup>a</sup> In black: *sems*.      <sup>c</sup> In black: *ma*.

<sup>b</sup> In red: *to*.

Comparing these two, we notice a number of differences. Indeed, a critical edition of one single chapter of the \**Somarāja*, let alone the text as a whole, is still outstanding, as is much of the corpora of Tibetan medical texts that have seen the light of day over the past few decades or so in [often badly] retyped versions. Even the most studied of all, the *Rgyud bzhi*, still

115 U rgyan gling pa (1986: 499).

116 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms., 3b-4a).

awaits a critical edition. Zur mkhar ba mentions the existence of a *Bsdus don-Summary* of the \**Somarāja* from the pen of a certain Gzhon nu dbang phyug, but this work, has yet to be recovered.<sup>117</sup>

It is of course the case that the numerous medicinal substances that are registered in the Tibetan *materia medica*, including those that are found in medical treatises treatises and collections of medical instructions in Tibetan, indicate the presence of commerce with foreign regions as well as, although this is not necessarily a given, additional possible foreign influences on Tibetan medicine. In this connection, Yoeli-Tlalim repeatedly signaled several terms in the Tibetan *materia medica* as "deriving probably from Persian or Arabic," such as *dar ya kan*, camphor (*ga phur*, *ga phor*, *ga bur*, etc.) and saffron (*kur kum*).<sup>118</sup> Following the earlier work of Chr. Beckwith,<sup>119</sup> she states that *dar ya kan* refers to theriac, that the word "seems to be derived from the Arabic or Persian form of the potion *tiryāq*" -or from the Greek is *thēriakē-*, and she cites the occurrence of this word in India Office Library Tib. J 756. There, however, the equivalent is stated to be *duxingcai* 独行菜, which is none other than the *Lepidium apetalum* Wild. or Peppergrass that is widely found in the Tibetan area.<sup>120</sup> Contrary to the *Rgyud bzhi*, the \**Somarāja* devotes one entire chapter to it and even styles it a *bdud rtsi*, an elixer.<sup>121</sup> Further, the herbal *dar ya kan* and its types are given detailed entries in virtually all the Tibetan works on *materia medica*.<sup>122</sup> And Zur mkhar ba reports that Nag tsho Lo tsā ba Tshul khriims rgyal ba (1011-ca. 1070) and Atiśa (982-1054) rendered the *Sha sbyor bdud rtsi dar ya kan* into Tibetan, and we can expect this to have been included in one or the other collection of medical instructions.<sup>123</sup> Of course, it goes without saying that the many non-Tibetan names in the Tibetan *materia medica* do not necessarily point to foreign influences on the *theoretical* foundations of Tibetan medicine, even if they may, upon detailed examination, indicate foreign therapeutic methods and the preparation of medicines, let alone intriguing dimensions of trade and commerce.

Given the testimonies of these sundry sources, it is incumbent on us who take an interest in the development of Tibetan medicine to try to determine with greater precision the obvious

---

117 Zur mkhar ba (2001: 273).

118 See Yoeli-Tlalim (2010: 196-197, 206), (2012: 358-359), and (2012a: 56-57). Her statements in especially the latter concerning the origin of the Tibetan word for camphor are flawed, being based on a misreading of the remarks in Laufer (1916: 457, no. 49) and Laufer (1967: 478-479, 591). Laufer stated that, in all its different spellings, the Tibetan word for camphor derives from Sanskrit *karpūra*.

119 Beckwith (1980); see also Nappi (2009) for some interesting historical remarks on theriac.

120 See, respectively, Luo (2002: 156, l. 432, 261) and Dga' ba'i rdo rje (1995: 218-219).

121 *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1989: 312-316) [= *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (1985: 244-247) = *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* (ms.: 221a-223a)].

122 See the entry in Pasang Yonten Arya (1998: 97-99).

123 Zur mkhar ba (2001: 263).

and the not so obvious influences and constituent parts that may be traced to medical traditions that held sway beyond the borders of the large swath of land that was dominated by Tibetan culture. Other questions need to be raised as well, such as the role of the physician in Tibetan society and the onset of the personal physician, the development of medical traditions and the institutionalization of medical training within the monastery, the traditional center of learning, and the rise of what may be called hospitals. In connection with the latter, Zhwa dmar IV Chos grags ye shes (1453-1524) mentions a certain *Sman khang pa Ye shes dpal* in an entry for *circa* 1412 in his 1517 biography of 'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392-1481).<sup>124</sup> The present Tibetan word for hospital and infirmary is *smān khang*. Thus, one cannot help but wonder whether *smān khang* in this context in fact means "hospital" or whether it merely was a toponym? And if it indeed did mean "hospital"—at present, I would be unwilling to bet the farm on this—, then it would be a rather early source for the presence of such an institution in the Tibetan cultural area.

To be sure, in broad strides, the Indic influences are more than merely obvious in virtually all the major Tibetan medical texts that have been published to date, the so-called three “homours” being their theoretical foundation. It is patently the case that the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* [and his *Vaiḍūryakabhāṣya* autocommentary] as well as his commentator Candranandana's *Padārthacandrikāprabhāsa* played recognizable roles in its formation, as did to an as yet to be determined degree the *Siddhisāra*. The author of the latter was Ravigupta (6<sup>th</sup> c.) and, as D. Wujastyk has shown, he may have been either Vāgbhaṭa's grandfather or great-grandfather; in any event they appear to have been closely related by blood.<sup>125</sup> According to Yang Ga's estimate, almost twenty percent of what we find in the first appears to have been simply taken over or recast in one way or another by the author[?s] of the well-known *Rgyud bzhi*<sup>126</sup> and this may very well be a conservative estimate. It then goes without saying that the medical school of Rin chen bzang po, Vāgbhaṭa's and Candranandana's translator, also played a critical role in the development of medicine in Tibet, as did the various instructions that were either written out or compiled by one or the other Indic Nāgārjuna. Indeed, in some sense, we should consider the *Rgyud bzhi* to be an adaptation and perhaps even a consolidation of the traditions that trace their line of descent to Rin chen bzang po's "school" and the conceptually wider world of Tibetan medicine with its other "foreign" influences. Martin also entertained a very similar same notion.<sup>127</sup>

Finally, truth be told even if this still needs a more detailed inquiry, the '*Bum bzhi*, the

124 Zhwa dmar VI (2009: 469).

125 Wujastyk (1985: 74-78).

126 For a detailed study of the materials on which the compiler of the *Rgyud bzhi* has drawn, see Yang Ga (2010: 146 ff.).

127 Martin (2007: 318-320).

*Four Lakhs*,<sup>128</sup> the Bon po counterpart of the *Rgyud bzhi*, that is attributed to Drang srong Dpyad bu khri shes, appears to be later than the *Rgyud bzhi* and is by and large as derivative as the latter. This is an exceedingly interesting and a textually very complex work. Several scholars have voiced the opposite view, namely, that it is the *Rgyud bzhi* that postdates the *'Bum bzhi*, and among those who hold this opinion are Nam mkha'i nor bu and Thub bstan phun tshogs, to name but two.<sup>129</sup> The idea is that its putative author, the Drang srong, was one of the eight sons of Gshen rab m[y]i bo, the founder of Bon, who, according to Nam mkha'i nor bu's calculations was born in 1917 B.C.E., a dating with which Thub bstan phun tshogs agrees.<sup>130</sup> Although this goes against all the evidence, at least two Tibetan Buddhist traditions, the early Bka' gdams pa and the Sa skya pa, pushed the date of the passing, that is, the nirvana, of the Buddha into hoary past of the third millennium B.C.E., which is of course as untenable as having Gshen rab being born in 1917 B.C.E., let alone several millenia earlier! According to the "colophon" of the first *Lakh*, which is titled *Thugs 'bum nam mkha' sngon po*, Gshen rab mi bo related this work to Dpyad bu khri shes. Another supposed argument for its antecedence is that the text of the *'Bum bzhi* shows considerable age, numerous stylistic and spelling problems, and no redacting.<sup>131</sup> Well, I think it fair to say that when Zur mkhar ba took it upon himself to prepare an edition of the *Rgyud bzhi*, he must have also used manuscripts that exhibited similar features. It is furthermore quite striking that the "colophons" of the second and the fourth *Lakhs*, the *Sman 'bum dkar po* and the *Sdug bsngal zhi byed gso byed nad 'bum nag po*, mention that, at an appropriate time, these *Lakhs* were excavated from Bsam yas rtse by three Ban dhe-s and that a Lha rje G.yu thog pa had requested it from them. Needless, this important work and its obvious connections with the *Rgyud bzhi* need to be fully investigated.

My earlier article and the present one have, I hope, paved the way for a study of two brief medical texts that are associated with Za hor. These are the *Za hor rgyal po'i bcud sbyor* and the *Za hor rgyal po'i bcud bzhi'i man ngag*.<sup>132</sup> The first deals with a treatment of kidney ailments (*mkhal ma'i gso thabs*), whereas, transmitted through Gtsang stod pa to a Phyag sman Sug pa, the second addresses the origin and composition and use of four elixirs or tonics. It is readily

128 See Khyur sman pa gling G.yung drung bkra shis (2003) and *Gso rig 'bum bzhi*, ed. Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zib 'jug khang, Arura 036 (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006). For a study of this work that was written in 1888-9, see 'Tsho byed 'Jigs med nam mkha' rdo rje (2006).

129 See, for example, Thub bstan phun tshogs (2004: 99-103), which is reprinted in the foreword to his edition of the *Gso rig 'bum bzhi*, for which see Thub bstan phun tshogs (2005: 1-12). See also Me tog rgya mtsho (2007).

130 See Nam mkha'i nor bu (1996: 47 ff.), and his views and those of others that are cited in Bellezza (2010: 31, n. 2).

131 Aside from the relevant Duanhang manuscripts and their philological problems, for an idea as to how corrupt a twelfth century manuscript of a medical text might look like, see Pa tshab Pa sangs dbang 'dus and Glang ru Nor bu tshe ring (2007: 76-83, 212-235). To be sure, many other examples can be given of manuscripts of this kind.

132 See 'Brug mo skyid and Rdo rje rin chen (2004: 165, 173-176) as well as Bha ro Phyag rdum et al. (2006: 369-370, 377-381).

apparent from the foregoing and the sources used for this paper that Za hor virtually played no role in the build-up of the theoretical foundations of Tibetan medicine, and that it also played a very minor role, if this be not two mere cameo appearances, in its inventory of treatments and therapies. Well, so be it! But even if they are two cameo appearances, this will not deter me from expending some time on an examination of these treatises in the third and final part of this essay.

## Bibliographies

### Tibetan Sources

- 'Be Lo tsā ba [Tshe dbang kun khyab]. (n.d.). *Gso ba rig pa'i khog dbub kun gyi bu yig sgo brgya 'byed pa'i lde mig*, unpublished dbu med ms., folios 51.
- Bha ro Phyang rdum et al. 2006. *'Bum khu tshur // Khu tshur 'bum // Be'u bum nag po*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang. 369-370, 377-381. Arura, vol. 034. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Bla ma skyabs. 1997. *Bod kyi mkhas pa rim byon gyi gso rig gsung 'bum dkar chag mu tig phreng ba*. Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Bod lugs gso rig tshig mdzod chen mo*, edited by the Bod rang skyong sman rtsis khang. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006.
- Brag dgon Zhabs drung [Dkon mchog bstan pa rab rgyas]. 1982. *Mdo smad chos 'byung*, edited by Smon lam rgya mtsho. Lanzhou: Gan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Brang ti [Dpal ldan 'tsho byed]. 2005. *Rgyud bzhi'i spyi don shes bya rab gsal rgyas pa*. Delhi: Tashi Y. Tashigang.
- 'Brug mo skyid and Rdo rje rin chen, ed. 2004. *Yan lag brgyad pa'i khong nying 'bum khu tshur*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Bstan 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, edited by Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 2003.
- Byams pa phrin las. 2000. *Gangs ljongs gso rig bstan pa'i nyin byed rim byon gyi rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.
- Dalai Lama V [Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho]. 1989. *Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i rnam thar*. Vol. 1. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.
- 1991. *Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i rnam thar*. Vol. 3. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.
- 2009. *Sku gsung thugs rten gsar bzhengs dang rin po che'i mchod rdzas khang bzang gi*

- dkar chag dang tham phud deb khrims yig 'go rgyangs sde bzhi'i sgo 'phar phyed ba'i skal bzang*. *Collected Works*, edited by the Ser gtsug nang bstan dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu phyogs sgrig khang. Vol. 19. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.
- Dar mo Sman rams pa [Blo bzang chos grags]. 1989. *Man ngag gi rgyud kyi dka' 'grel / Rgyud bzhi'i 'grel pa mes po'i zhal lung*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Smad cha. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- 1989a. *Bshad pa'i rgyud kyi rnam bshad / Rgyud bzhi'i 'grel pa mes po'i zhal lung*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Stod cha. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- Dba' bzhed*. 2000. *The Royal Narrative concerning the Bringing of the Buddha's Doctrine to Tibet*, edited and translated by Pasang Wangdu and H. Diemberger. Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- De'u dmar [Bstan 'dzin phun tshogs]. 1994. *Gso ba rig pa'i chos 'byung rnam thar rgya mtsho'i rba rlabs drang srong dgyes pa'i 'dzum phreng*. *De'u dmar gso rig gces btsu*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang. Smad cha. Arura 044. 1013-1212. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Dga' ba'i rdo rje. 1995. *Khrungs dpe dri med shel gyi me long*, edited by Chab mdo sa khul sman rtsis khang. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Don rdor and Bstan 'dzin chos grags, comp. 1993. *Gangs ljongs lo rgyus thog gi grags can mi sna*. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.
- Dpa' bo II [Gtsug lag phreng ba]. 1986. *Chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Smad cha. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Dpa' ris Sangs rgyas tshe ring. 1994. "Me btsa'i lag len dang phan 'bras skor rgyas par bshad pa." *Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig* 1: 135-149.
- Gso dpyad rin po che'i 'khrungs dpe bstan pa*, *Gso rig sman gyi ro nus ngos 'dzin gsal ston phyogs sgrig rin chen sgron me*, edited by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Mes po'i shul bzhag 2. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007, 73-208.
- Gso spyad* [sic. *dpyad*] *sngo sbyor tshogs kyi man ngag rin chen 'khrungs dpe bstan pa*. Leh: Tashi Y. Tashigang, 1974.
- Gso rig 'bum bzhi*, edited by Khyur sman pa gling G.yung drung bkra shis. Vols. 6-7. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2003.
- Gso rig 'bum bzhi*, edited by Thub bstan phun tshogs. Asia Nor bu dpe tshogs. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2005.
- Gso rig 'bum bzhi*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zib 'jug khang. Arura 036. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006.
- Gtsang stod pa [Dar ma mgon po]. 1975. *Slob ma'i don du zin thig and Bu la gdams pa'i yang thig*. In *Two Works on the Essentials of Tibetan Medical Practice*, edited by Tsering Paljor Emchi. 2 vols. Leh: Tashi Y. Tashigang; see tbrc.org W1KG12775.

- 1976. *Slob ma phan pa'i zin tig*, edited by Shes rab rgyal mtshan. 2 vols. Gangtok; see [tbrc.org W24026](http://tbrc.org/W24026).
- 2006. *Gtsang stod zin thig dang yang thig*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang. Arura, vol. 042. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- 2013. *Zin thig bsam 'phel nor bu and Yang thig rdo rje pha lam*, edited by Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang. Arura, vol. 098. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- 'Ja' tshon snying po. 2013. *Rje btsun g.yu thog yon tan mgon po'i rnam thar nang nas nyung 'dus*. Gsung 'bum, edited by Si khron bod yig dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu rtsom rig khang. 422-436. Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang.
- 'Jam dpal gyi sngo 'bum gsal ba'i sgron me, *Gso rig sman gyi ro nus ngos 'dzin gsal ston phyogs sgrig rin chen sgron me*, edited by the Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang. 1-23. Mes po'i shul bzhag 2. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007.
- Karma pa II [Karma Pakshi]. 1978. *Nyid kyi ltas dang cho 'phrul bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rnam thar*. In *The Autobiographical Writings of the Second Karma pa Karma Pakshi*, Gangtok: 9-21.
- Khyur sman pa gling G.yung drung bkra shis, ed. 2003. *Gso rig 'bum bzhi*. Vols. 6-7. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Me tog rgya mtsho. 2007. "Dpal ldan rgyud bzhi rgyal ba'i bka' dang bon gyi 'bum bzhi las bsgyur ba yin min skor la dpyad pa blo gсар sgo 'byed lde mig," *Zla chu*, edited by Bu des tshe ring. 82-97. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Nam mkha'i nor bu. 1996. *Zhang bod lo rgyus ti se'i 'od*. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.
- Pa tshab Pa sangs dbang 'dus and Glang ru Nor bu tshe ring. 2007. *\*Sman dpyad, Gtam shul dga' thang 'bum pa che nas gсар du rnyed pa'i bon gyi gna' dpe bsdams bsgrigs*. Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang: 76-83, 212-235.
- Rgyud bzhi* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph]. 1978.
- Rgyud bzhi* [Sde dge xylograph]. *Gso rig rgyud bzhi / Anayaqu uqayan-u dörben ündüsün*. 2 vols. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe, 1991.
- Rin chen rgyal. 1999. "Bod kyi gso rig lo rgyus thog gi sman pa ga le nos yang snying su yin la dpyad pa." *Bod ljongs zhib 'jug 1*: 95-102.
- 2007. *Sman dpyad so ma rä dza'am zla ba'i rgyal po zhes pa'i gzhung gi grub tshul dang rig gzhung ma lag skor gleng ba*. Beijing University of Chinese Medicine doctoral dissertation.
- 2007a. "Sman dpyad so ma rä dza dang krung lugs gso rig gi rtsa brtag rig pa'i lta ba 'ga'i dpyad bsdur." *Krung go'i bod rig pa 1*: 76-86.
- 2011. *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po'i gzhung don la dpyad pa*. Xi'ning: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

- 2013. "Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po zhes pa'i gzhung dang ta zig gso rig gi lta ba 'ga'i dpyad bsdur." *Krung go'i bod rig pa* 1: 171-191.
- Sba bzhed*. 1982. edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Sde srid [Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho]. 1970. *Dpal ldan gso ba rig pa'i khog 'bugs legs bshad baiḍūr ya'i me long drang srong dgyes pa'i dga' ston* [*Āyurveda in Tibet*] [Sde dge xyograph. Leh: Tashi Y. Tashigang.
- 1982. *Gso rig sman gyi khog 'bugs* [based on Lhasa Zhol xylograph], edited by Blo bzang rgya mtsho. Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Sgrol dkar, ed. 1995. *Bod kyi lo rgyus yig tshags gces btus*. Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1995: 1-3.
- Si tu Paṅ chen [Chos kyi 'byung gnas]. 1968. *The Autobiography and Diaries of Si tu Paṅ chen*, edited by L. Chandra. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Si tu Paṅ chen [Chos kyi 'byung gnas] and 'Be Lo tsā ba [Tshe dbang kun khyab]. 1972. *Sgrub brgyud karma kaṃ tshang brgyud pa rin po che'i rnam par thar pa rab 'byams nor bu zla ba chu shel gyi phreng ba*. Vol. II. New Delhi.
- \**Sman dpyad, Gtam shul dga' thang 'bum pa che nas gsar du rnyed pa'i bon gyi gna' dpe bsdams bsgrigs*, edited by Pa tshab Pa sangs dbang 'dus and Glang ru Nor bu tshe ring (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 2007), 76-83, 212-235.
- Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po*. 1985. edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- 1989. Sde dge xylograph, edited by Tashi Y. Tashigang. Leh.
- Ibid.*, Unpublished *dbu med* ms., folios 287.
- Sog po Blo bzang rta dbyangs. 1964. *The Golden Annals of Lamaism* [*'Dzam gling byang phyogs chen po'i hor gyi rgyal khams kyi rtogs pa brjod pa'i bstan bcos chen po dpyod ldan mgu byed ngo mtshar gser gyi deb ther*], edited by L. Chandra. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Sog po Lung rigs bstan dar. 1986. *Rgyud bzhi'i brda bkrol rnam rgyal a ru ra'i phreng ba'i mdzes rgyan*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- (no date), *Gso ba rig pa spyi dang bye brag tu dam pa'i chos dpal ldan sman gyi rgyud bzhi'i chos byung tshul dri med baiḍūrya'i me long, dbu can ms*, fols. 151, tbrc.W17680.
- Stag tshang Lo tsā ba [Shes rab rin chen]. 2007. *Rig gnas kun shes nas bdag med grub pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos kyi rnam par bshad pa nyung gsal kun dga'*. Collected Works, edited by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang. Vol. 1. 22-92. Mes po'i shul bzhag 29. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.
- Sum pa Mkhan po [Ye shes dpal 'byor]. 1975. *'Phags yul rgya nag chen po bod dang sog yul dam pa'i chos 'byung tshul dpag bsam ljon bzang*. Collected Works, reproduced by L. Chandra. Vol. 1. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- 1992. Edited by Dkon mchog tshe brtan. Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang.



- Thang dpon Tshe stobs. 1990. "Dru gu go rdzong dang Khri lde srong btsan." *Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig* 2: 105-116.
- Thu'u bkwan III [Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma]. 1988. *Bshad sgrub bstan pa'i 'byung gnas chos sde chen po dgon lung byams pa gling gi dkar chag dpyod ldan yid dbang 'gugs pa'i pho nya*, edited by Grags pa. Xi'ning: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Thub bstan phun tshogs. 2004. "Gso rig 'bum bzhi dang Rgyud bzhi bsdur nas dpyad pa," *Bod ljongs zhib 'jug* 2: 99-103.
- ed. 2005. *Gso rig 'bum bzhi*. Asia Nor bu dpe tshogs. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Tsan pa shi la ha. 2014. *Byang khog dmar byang gsal ba'i sgron me*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang. 201-235. Arura, vol. 101. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- 'Tsho byed 'Jigs med nam mkha' rdo rje. 2006. *Zhang bod gso rig dga' ston rol ba'i rgyan*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zib 'jug khang. Arura 022. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- U rgyan gling pa. 1986. *Bka' thang sde lnga*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Yan lag brgyad pa'i khong nying 'bum khu tshur, edited by 'Brug mo skyid and Rdo rje rin chen. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004.
- Zhwa dmar VI [Chos grags ye shes]. 2009. *Dpal ldan bla ma dam pa mkhan chen thams cad mkhyen pa don gyi slad du mtshan nas smos te gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam pa[r] thar pa yon tan rin po che mchog tu dgyes pa'i ljon pa*. *Gsung 'bum*, vol. 1, edited by the Yangs can dgon ris med dpe rnying myur skyob khang nas bsgrigs. 459-564. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang.
- Zur mkhar ba [Blo gros rgyal po]. 1989. *Rtsa ba'i rgyud kyi rnam bshad / Rgyud bzhi'i 'grel pa mes po'i zhal lung*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Stod cha. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- 1989a. Zur mkhar ba. *Bshad pa'i rgyud kyi rnam bshad / Rgyud bzhi'i 'grel pa mes po'i zhal lung*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Stod cha. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- 1989b. *Phyi ma phrin las rgyud kyi rnam bshad / Rgyud bzhi'i 'grel pa mes po'i zhal lung*, edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Stod cha. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- 2001. *Sman pa rnams kyis mi shes su mi rung ba'i shes bya spyi'i khog dbubs* edited by Gzhon nu nyi ma and Klu sgrub rgya mtsho. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- ed. 2005. *Grwa thang rgyud bzhi*, edited by the Mtsho sngon zhing chen bod kyi gso rig zhib 'jug khang, Arura 020. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

## Other Sources

- Beckwith, Chr. 1979. "The Introduction of Greek Medicine into Tibet in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99: 297–313.
- 1980. "Tibetan Treacle: A Note on Theriac in Tibet." *The Tibet Society Bulletin* 15: 49-51.
- 1987. *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia: A History, of the Struggle for Great Power Among Tibetan, Turks, Arabs and Chinese During the Early Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bellezza, J.V. 2010. "gShen-rab Myi bo, His life and times according to Tibet's earliest literary sources." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 19: 31-118.
- Cai Jingfeng 蔡景峰 and Hong Wuli 洪武婭 . 2000. "Cong <Zangyi jiuliaofang> dui Zangyi yu Zhongyi jiuliaofa de bijiao yanjiu 从《藏医灸疗方》对藏医与中医灸疗法的比较研究 [Comparative Study of Moxibustion between Traditional Tibetan Medicine and Chinese Medicine]." *Bod ljongs zhib 'jug / Xizang yanjiu* 西藏研究 1: 125-130.
- Chen Ming. 2006. "The Transmission of Indian Ayurvedic Doctrines in Medieval China: A Case Study of *Aṣṭāṅga* and *Tridoṣa* Fragments from the Silk Road." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 9: 201-230.
- Clark, P.A. 2011. *A Cretan Healer's Handbook in the Byzantine Tradition: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Czaja, O. 2005-6. "Zur mkhar ba Blo gros rgyal po on the Controversy of the Indian Origin of the *Rgyud bzhi*." *The Tibet Journal* XXX-XXXI: 131-152.
- 2007. "The Making of the Blue Beryl—Some Remarks on the Textual Sources of the Famous Commentary of Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho (1653-1705)." *Soundings in Tibetan Medicine: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*. Ed. M. Schrempf. Leiden: Brill: 346-371.
- 2008. "Mi pham dge legs rnam rgyal (1618-1685) and His Reply to the Famous Public Letter of Zur mkhar ba Blo gros rgyal po (1509-?1579)." In the *Written Treasures of Bhutan. Mirrors of the Past and Bridge to the Future*, edited by J. Ardussi and Sonam Tobgey, 75-142. Thimphu: National Library of Bhutan.
- Das, R.P. 2003. *The Origin of the Life of a Human Being: Conception and the Female according to Ancient Indian Medical and Sexological Literature*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Emmerick, R.E. 1967. *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Garrett, F. 2007. "Critical Methodologies in Tibetan Medical Histories," *Journal of Asian Studies* 66: 363-387.
- 2008. *Religion, Medicine and the Human Embryo in Tibet*. London/New York: Routledge.
- 2008a. With V. Adams, Jampa Kelsang, Yumba, Renchen Dhondup. "The Three Channels in Tibetan Medicine, with a Translation of Tsutrim Gyaltsen's 'A Clear Explanation of the

- Principal Structure and Location of the Circulatory Channels as Illustrated in the Medical Paintings." *Traditional South Asian Medicine* 8: 86-114.
- Gazang chenlai 尕藏陈来 [ > Tib. Skal bzang phrin las]. 1992. "<Yuewang yaozhen> yu <Huangdi neijing taisu>《月王药诊》与《黄帝内经太素》[The *Sman dpyad zla ba'i rgyal po* and the *Huangdi neijing taisu*]." *Zhonghua yishi zazhi* 中华医史杂志 22, 2: 115-118.
- Gyatso, J. 2003. "One Plus One Makes Three: Buddhist Gender Conception and the Law of the Non-Excluded Middle." *History of Religions* 43: 89-115.
- 2008. "Spelling Mistakes, Philology, and feminist Criticism: Women and Boys in Tibetan Medicine," *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 14: 81-98.
- 2010. "Looking for Gender in the Medical Paintings of Desi Sangye Gyatso, Regent of the Tibetan Buddhist State." *Asian Medicine* 6: 217-292.
- 2015. *Being Human in a Buddhist World. An Intellectual History of Medicine in Early Modern Tibet*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hilgenberg, J. and W. Kirfel, tr. 1941. *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahr̥dayasaṃhitā*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Hirakawa Akira, ed., et al. 1973. *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, Part One: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese*. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan Kabushikikaisha.
- Hong Wuli 洪武婁 and Cai Jingfeng 蔡景峰 . 1983. "Xianzai zuizaode jiufa zhuanzhu - <Dunhuang gu Zangyi jiufa canjuan> 现在最早的灸法专著 ——《敦煌古藏医灸法残卷》[The Earliest Monograph on Moxibustion to Date-Dunhuang Fragments on Moxibustion in Ancient Tibet]." *Bod ljongs zhib 'jug / Xizang yanjiu* 西藏研究 3: 48-55.
- Kilty, G. tr. 2010. *Mirror of Beryl. A Historical Introduction to Tibetan Medicine*. The Library of Tibetan Classics, edited by Thupten Jinpa. Vol. 28. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Kletter, C. and M. Kriechbaum, ed. (2001). *Tibetan Medicinal Plants*. Stuttgart: Medpharm Scientific Publishers.
- Kolmaš, J. 1968. *A Genealogy of the Kings of Sde dge*. Prague: Academia.
- Kritzer, R. 2014. *Garbhāvakraṅtisūtra. The Sūtra on Entry in the Womb*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph series XXXI. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W.J. 1988. "Two Early Sources for the History of the House of Sde dge." *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 8: 1-20.
- 2009. "Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*." *Bod kyi rig pa dus deb/ 藏学学刊 Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 5: 114-132.
- 2010. "Za hor and Its Contribution to Tibetan Medicine, Part One: Some Names, Places, and Texts." *Bod kyi rig pa dus deb/ 藏学学刊 Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 6: 21-50.
- Laufer, B. 1916. "Loanwords in Tibetan." *T'oung Pao* 17: 403-552.
- 1967. *Sino-Iranica*. Taipei: Ch'eng-Wen Publishing Company. [Reprint].
- Ligeti, L. 1971. "À propos du 'Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le nord'." In *Études*

- Tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, edited by A. Macdonald. 166-189. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, A. Maisonneuve.
- Luo Bingfen 罗秉芬, ed. et al. 2002. *Dunhuangben tubo yixue wenxian jingyao* 敦煌本吐蕃医学文献精要 / *Tun hong nas thon pa'i bod kyi gso rig yig cha gces btus* [A Selection of Literary Pieces on Tibetan Medicine from Dunhuang]. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Luo Bingfen 罗秉芬 and Huang Bufan 黄布凡, tr. 1983. *Dunhuangben tubo yixue wenxian xuanbian* 敦煌本吐蕃医学文献选编 / *Tun hong nas thon pa'i bod kyi gso rig yig cha bdam bsgrigs* [A Compilation of Tibetan Medical Literature from Dunhuang], edited by Byams pa phrin las. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Ma Shilin 马世林, et al., tr. 1993. *Yuewang yaozhen* 月王药诊. Lanzhou: Gansu minzu chubanshe.
- 2012. Shanghai: Shanghai kexue jishu chubanshe. [Reprint].
- Martin, D. 2007. "An Early Tibetan History of Indian Medicine." In *Soundings in Tibetan Medicine: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by M. Schrempf. 307-325. Leiden: Brill.
- 2011. "Greek and Islamic Medicines' Historical Contact with Tibet. A Reassessment in View of Recently Available and Relatively Early Sources on Tibetan Medical Eclecticism." In *Islam and Tibet: Interactions along the Musk Routes*, edited by A. Akasov et al. 117-143. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Meulenbeld, G.J. 1974. *The Mādhavanidāna and Its Chief Commentary, Chapters 1-10*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- 1999. *A History of Indian Medical Literature*. Vol. IA. Groningen Oriental Studies Volume XV/IA. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Meyer, F. 1983. *Gso-ba rig-pa. Le système médical tibétain*. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Mock, J. 2013. "A Tibetan Toponym from Afghanistan." *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 27: 5-9.
- Murthy, K.R. Srikantha, tr. 1991. *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*. Vol. I (*Sūtra Sthāna and Śārīra Sthāna*). Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy.
- Nappi, C. 2009. Bolatu's Pharmacy Theriac in Early Modern China." *Ancient Science and Medicine* 14, 6: 737-764.
- Pasang Yonten Arya. 1998. *Dictionary of Tibetan Materia Medica*, tr. Yonten Gyatso. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pu Wencheng 蒲文成 and Cai Rang 才让 [*< Tshe ring*], tr. 2013. *Sum pa Mkhan po Ye shes dpal 'byor. Sungba fojiao shi* 松巴佛教史. Lanzhou: Gansu minzu chubanshe.
- Sakaki Ryōzaburō, ed. 1962. *Mahāvīyutpatti*. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 1. Tokyo.
- Schaeffer, K. 2003. "Textual Scholarship, Medical Tradition, and Mahāyāna Buddhist Ideals in Tibet." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 31: 625-627.

- “Si tu Paṅ chen: Creation and Cultural Engagement in Eighteenth-Century Tibet,” [special issue] *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 7 (2013).
- Ska ba Shes rab bzang po. 2009. "Zangwen 'Yuanban' zhi kao 藏文‘元版’之考 [Investigating Tibetan Language 'Yuan Xylographs']." *Zhongguo zangxue* 中国藏学 1: 41-50.
- Taishō *shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, comp. G. Ono (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924-34).
- Taube, M. 1981. *Beiträge zur medizinischen Literatur Tibets*. Monumenta Tibetica Historia, Abt. Scriptorum, Band I. Skt. Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Toh Hoong-Teik. 2010. "Notes on the Earliest Sanskrit Word Known in Chinese." *Sino-Platonic Papers*, vol. 201.
- Touwaide, A. 2007. "Byzantine Hospital Manuals (*Iatrosophia*) as a Source for the Study of Therapeutics," In *The Medieval Hospital and Medical Practice* (AVISTA Studies in the History of Medieval Technology, Science and Art, volume 3), edited by B. Bowers. 147-173. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Unschuld, P.U. and H. Tessenow in collaboration with Zheng Jinheng. 2011. *Huang Di nei jing su wen. An Annotated Translation of Huang Di's Inner Classic-Basic Questions*. Vol. 1 and 2. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vasubandhu. 1981. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Part 1. Ed. S. Dwārikādās. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati.
- Vogel, C. 1965. *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā*. Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GmbH.
- Wade, G. 2009. "The Polity of Yelang (夜郎) and the Origins of the Name 'China!'" *Sino-Platonic Papers*, vol. 188.
- Wang Lei 王蕾 . 1991. *Xizang yixue lishi* 西藏医学历史 [History of Tibetan Medicine]. Nanjing: Yilin chubanshe.
- Wang Mingxing 王明星 and Jia Yang 甲央 [< Tib. 'Jam dbyangs], ed. 2000. *Baozang. Zhongguo xizang lishi wenwu* 宝藏：中国西藏历史文物 [Treasures. Historical Relics of China's Tibet]. Vol. III. Beijing: Zhaohua chubanshe.
- Wu Jun 吴均 et al., tr. 1989. *Brag dgon Zhabs drung Dkon mchog bstan pa rab rgyas, Anduo zhengjiao shi* 安多政教史 [Political and Religious History of Amdo]. Lanzhou: Gansu minzu chubanshe.
- Wujastyk, D. 1985. "Ravigupta and Vāgbhaṭa." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48: 74-8.
- Xiong Wenbin 熊文彬 2009. "Yuandai huangshi chengyuan shikande zangwen fojing 元代皇室成员施刊的藏文佛经 [Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures Published with the Financial Aid of Members of the Yuan Dynasty's Imperial Family]." *Zhongguo zangxue* 中国藏学 3: 91-103.
- Yang Ga. 2010. *The Sources for the Writing of the Rgyud bzhi*. Harvard University doctoral

dissertation.

- Yoeli-Tlalim, R. 2010. "On urine analysis and Tibetan medicine's connections with the west." In *Studies of Medical Pluralism in Tibetan History and Society*, edited by S. Craig et al. 195-212. Andiast: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- 2012. "Re-visiting 'Galen in Tibet'." *Medical History* 56: 355-365.
- 2012a. "Central Asian Mélange: Early Tibetan Medicine from Dunhuang." In *Scribes, Texts, and Rituals in Early Tibet and Dunhuang*, edited by B. Dotson et al. 53-60. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Yu Shenchu 俞慎初 . 1983. *Zhongguo yixue jianshi* 中国医学简史 [*A Concise History of Chinese Medicine*]. Fuzhou: Fujian kexue jishu chubanshe.
- Zhang Xingqian 张兴乾 and Zhang Huixuan 张辉煊 . 1986. "<Suoma nengza> yu <Huangdi neijing taisu>《索玛能札》与《黄帝内经太素》 [The Somarāja and the Huangdi neijing taisu]," *Zhonghua yishi zazhi* 中华医史杂志 (1986); 235-237.
- Zhen Yan 甄艳 2004. *Gudai zangyi maixue fazhan shi yanjiu* 古代藏医脉学发展史研究 [*A Study of the Developmental History of Ancient Tibetan Sphygmology*]. China Academy of Social Sciences doctoral dissertation, Beijing.
- 2007. "*rTsa* in the Tibetan Manuscripts from Dunhuang [translated and interpreted by V. Lo]." *Asian Medicine* 3: 296-307.

◆ Author: Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp, Harvard University.