

The Half-Yearly  
Mysore University Journal

Vol. I]

July 1927

[No. 2

CRITIQUE OF SOUTH INDIAN ART.

BY PROF. S. V. VENKATESWARA

(Department of History, Maharaja's College, Mysore.)

In my paper on 'The Development of Hindu Iconography' (J. R. A. S., 1918, p. 526) I mentioned the three principles of interpretation of Indian art as explaining iconographical details. Symbolism is one of these principles. The artist's vision of life is that of a moving picture—a flowing stream, not a standing pool—of which one could catch but a fleeting vision in a moment of supreme significance; but which could not be compelled to stay awhile to render a scientific analysis or clear-cut expression possible. This vision could be communicated to others not from brain to brain through words, but in a language of joy unto which words fail to reach (*Yato vācho nivartante*). The impression the artist wants to convey works on the sensibility of the beholder in the manner suggested by his intuition and according to the methods peculiar to his art. Life is an incessant activity, a ceaseless striving, an unfolding of destiny, as seen steadily and as a whole in æsthetic vision (*Jagat, samsāra, anah, anilam, vāyu, kratu*). The aim of the South Indian artist was mostly in the way of objectifying the supersensuous comprehension of Fact, with the help of stone and chisel, paint and brush. What the Aryan did in verbography, that the Southern genius essayed to do in art and iconography. The art-work of the latter is suggestive of a progressively higher sense like the Vedic utterances of the former. It is absurd to suppose that 'ideas of symbolism grew up in South India in the present century'. Such ideas are quite common in Aryan literature from the

## THE EKAŚLOKA ŚĀSTRA

OF

## NĀGĀRJUNA BODHISATVA.\*

Translated from the Chinese

BY H. R. RANGASWAMY IYENGAR, M.A.

(Government Oriental Library, University of Mysore.)

The nature of *bhāva* (*Bhāva-svabhāva*) is non-permanent (*anitya*). Accordingly, *bhāva* is *abhāva*. The nature of *svabhāva* is (also) *abhāva*. It is therefore taught that there are only *sūnyatā* and *anityatā*.

If it is asked with what *artha* or meaning I write this sāstra of one *gāthā*, and whom I intend to refute by teaching such *artha* or doctrine, I say in answer that I write for those who by continuous reading have produced in themselves a feeling (literally, *mind*) of weariness in regard to compilations of great length, and also for those men of keen intellect who, having already made an extensive study of countless sāstras and having dived deep (reflected) in the meaning of the sea of *Tathāgatha dharma*, have produced in themselves not only weariness, but also a doubt as to a lurking mark of difference (*bhedalakṣhaṇī*) in the doctrine of "non-difference of *anityatā* and *svabhāva-sūnyatā*". To destroy such a doubt I write this sāstra.

What *artha* (or doctrine) do you teach?

Now, I shall explain:—All *dharmas* are *anitya* and *svabhāva-sūnya*. *Svabhāvasūnyatā* is not different (*vyatirikta*) from *anityatā*. The nature of all *dharmas* is *svabhāva-sūnyatā*. Nothing is, therefore, *nitya*. All Buddhas, Pratyeka and Srāvaka, have obtained *Vairāgya* or detachment (by believing) in the doctrine of *sūnyatā* and have not obtained *Vinirmukti* (by believing) in the doctrines of annihilation or *ucchedavāda* and of permanence or *sāsvatavāda* of the *samskāras*.

\* This is an improved translation prepared under the guidance of Prof. Tucci, University of Rome, of one of the minor works of NĀGĀRJUNA preserved only in Chinese. The EKAŚLOKABHĀSHYA preserved in Tibetan (Mdo. iii. 72. tshigs. su bcad pa gcig paḥi bshad pa) is not identical with it. Prof. Edkins has presented a translation of the 'Ekaśloka Śāstra' in his "Chinese Buddhism". As it does not bring out the full philosophic import of this work, I have attempted to retranslate it by using Sanskrit technical terms as far as possible.—H. R. R. Iyengar.

The *Gāthā* says:—

If you admit that '*Nirodha*' and '*Sūnyatā*' are permanent existences, you obtain the view of the permanence of things i.e., *Sāsvatadr̥ṣhti*; (and) if you say that things (existing) are afterwards destroyed, you obtain the view of the annihilation of things or *Ucchedadr̥ṣhti*. It is for this reason I say that all *dharmas* are *svabhāva-sūnya*. Buddhas, Pratyeka, Srāvaka, and Arhan, have been benefited by this *artha* (doctrine).

To refute whom? I shall explain:—

If a man who has some such opinion teaches that *anityatā* exists separate from the *samskāras*, then he has no right view (*samyagdr̥ṣhti*). If *anityatā* is separate from the *samskāras*, then *anityatā* would be *nitya* like the *Ākāśa*. If we admit it, then the *bhāva* of *samskrta* and of the *asamskrta*, would not differ. If the *samskrta* is inseparably connected with the *asamskrta*, then, because of its association with the *asamskrta*, an earthen pot, (which is *samskrta*, for instance), could not be destroyed. If the *asamskrta* is in association with the *samskrta*, then, because of this association *Nirvāna* (which is *asamskrta*), becomes destructible. If they are not different (from each other), then all *dharmas* are indestructible like the *Nirvāna* which is *nitya* and is not born of any cause (*pratyayā-nutpādāt*). If the *samskrta* is not from causes and is not different from *Nirvāna*, then the *samskrta dharma* cannot be called *anitya*. If the *samskrtas* are not from causes and yet are *anitya*, then the *Ākāśa Nirvāna* cannot be called *nitya*. If (it is) so, the *samskrta* and the *asamskrta* are not *dharmas* clearly distinguishable. If *anityatā* is separate from the *samskrta* and is still called *anitya*, then the *samskrta* though separate from *nityatā* must be *nitya*. This is not the right view. If it is right, in what sūtras is it taught?

For what *artha* do you teach it?

What you now say is not reasonable (*yukta*). Your perverse thinking cannot indeed understand it. Therefore what you now say is not the right way (*samyagdr̥ṣhti*).

If there is somebody who maintains that *dharmas*, past, present and future, are *svabhāva-siddha*, we shall know then that he has not the right view. Why? Because it is a *darśana* (or *dr̥ṣhti*) of the *ahetūtpāda* (i.e., the theory according to which things come into existence without a cause).

If you say that the *bhāva* of the future is not by any cause but *svabhāva-siddha* (comes of its own self), then the present also is not produced by any cause, but is only *svabhāva-siddha*; for the future and the present are equal and are not definitely distinguishable. If their *svabhāvas* are the same, and the *dharmas* of the present are produced by causes, why not the *dharmas* of the future be also produced by causes?

If you now say that this *artha* (*svabhāva-siddhatā*) is based on the meaning taught by the sūtras, your statement is not correct and is not convincing. It cannot then be believed. And indeed if the future *dharmas* are not produced by causes but are due to their own nature, the future *dharmas* like the void would have no cause. Being free from causes they are not produced by any cause. In reality, then, there is no future. And because there is no future the present and the past do not exist. The three notions of time have no existence (*bhāva*). If time exists (as *svabhāva-siddha*) then this would mean *nityadr̥ṣhti*; and there will be *ahetu-samutpāda*. If the disciples of Buddha have a view like this, then they cannot be distinguished from the *Tīrthikas* like *Kapila*. This sāstra is not written for heretics like *Kapila* and *Ulūka* \*; but for you all who hold a view similar to mine.

To refute whom, have you taught this?

I have been induced to write this sāstra in order that you all may refute and reject the perverse views of men who hold such opinions.

I will now explain the meaning of the EKAŚLOKA GĀTHĀ.

The *Gāthā* says:—The nature of *svabhāva* is *anitya*. What has *Utpatti* is known as *bhāva*. It is called *Svabhāva* because it has *bhāva-dharma*. Some take this *dharma* to be *bhāva*. *Dharma* in *skandha*, *dhātu* and *āyatana* has *bhāva-sabdapratyayapraṇṛtti*. (We) say, for instance, one *bhāva*, two *bhāvas* and many *bhāvas*. Likewise because one, two and many have each its own *bhāva*, therefore we call it *svabhāva*. For example, earth, water, fire and air are respectively hard (*kaḍhina*), moist (*sneha*), hot (*uṣṇa*), and moveable (*cancala*). Each has its own *svabhāva*. And because the nature of every one of the things has its own special mark (*svalakṣhaṇa*) it is said that each has its *svabhāva*.

\* *Kapila* and *Ulūka* are the founders of the Sāṅkhya and Vaiśeṣika systems.—S.V.V.

If some were to argue that (it is called) *svabhāva* because the *lakṣhaṇa* of *utpatti*, *sthiti* and *bhāṅga* is the same, the meaning is not correct. For, the nature of *svabhāva* is *anitya* and the name *bhāva* is the *parikalpana* of men having such an opinion. Accordingly, apart from *dharma* there is no *bhāva* which is *anitya*. The *svalakṣhaṇa* itself is *anitya*. So has Buddha taught the *Bhikṣhus*. All the manifold *samskāras* are certainly *anitya*, because, it has been so taught. Now if it be maintained that apart from *dharma* there is *anitya-svalakṣhaṇa*, this is not correct. If you do not understand what is *anityatā* I shall now explain it.

The *Gāthā* says:—Thus *bhāva* is *abhāva*. The *abhāva* of *bhāva* is the *anityatā* imagined by you. *Anitya* is *abhāva*. Therefore, there is *abhāva* of *bhāva*. Because *svabhāva* is *abhāva*, we called it *abhāva*. The *Gāthā* says, the nature of *svabhāva* is *abhāva*. Apart from *abhāva* there is nothing which can be regarded as *bhāva*. Hence we say that *svabhāva* is *abhāva*.

If you were to argue that apart from *abhāva* there exists some *bhāva*, this meaning is not correct; for you have not been taught this *dharma* by the sūtras. If you maintain that *abhāva* is *svabhāva*, this too is not correct as this is not the teaching of the sūtras. In what sūtras has Bhagavān (world-honoured) taught such a *dharma*? The sūtras of Bhagavān Buddha, do not teach this *artha*. (And) what is not a sūtra teaching cannot be fully established. And what is not the teaching of the sūtras of the great saint cannot be trusted.

Therefore, I substantiate my statements by the *upadeśa* (of the sūtras).

The *Gāthā* says:—Therefore it is taught that there is *sūnyatā* and *anityatā*. This is according to the teaching of the text (*Tiao-fu-san-mih-ti*). Buddha taught the *san-mih-ti* that the eye is *sūnya* and *anitya*; that there is nothing which does not act, nothing which does not perish, and nothing which does not change—Why? Because, it is its *svabhāva*. The ear, the nose, the tongue, the touch, and the *manas* are also like this. Bhagavān in this sūtra has taught 'sūnyata as well as *anityatā*'. From this meaning, we know that all *dharmas* are *sūnya* and *anitya* and *anitya* is *abhāva*. If the nature of all *dharmas* is *abhāva*, the *abhāva* meaning (*abhāvārtha*) becomes established. Whatever *artha* is included in the sūtras, that becomes established. Whatever is not

included in the sūtras that meaning does not stand (lit. destroyed). (And) because what I say is included in the sūtras that *artha* is established. Therefore the meaning that *svabhāva* is *abhāva* is well established.

EKAŚLOKA ŚĀSTRA.

*Note.*—Every *dharma* has different names *bhāva*, *svabhāva*, *dharma*, *dravya*, *vastu*, *sat*; but the meaning is the same. Accordingly whether you say *bhāva*, *svabhāva*, *dharma*, *vastu* or *dravya* there is no difference. Each is only a variety of *bhāva*. The right word (sound) *Sz-po-po* (*Svabhāva*), says a Buddhist dictionary, can be translated either as *svabhāva-bhāva*; or as *adharmadharma*, or as *abhāva-bhāva*.

D. C. AND C. C. MACHINES.

BY M. L. ANNAPPA, B.SC.

(Asst. Professor, Engineering College, Bangalore.)

D. C. MACHINES.

From a knowledge of the no-load saturation curve of the machine (either by experiment or from design) can be derived the various quantities connected with the machine, like induced voltage, terminal voltage, max load current, etc., in the case of a generator, and quantities like speed, torque, starting torque, max torque in the case of a motor. The following work gives a method for accomplishing the result. Residual magnetism in the machine is neglected, but can be taken into account by introducing an extra constant term in the Frolich relation. This work was suggested by the method employed by Dr. Berg in his book.

No attempt has been made here to derive expressions for armature reaction, etc., but the simplest of such expressions given by Dr. Berg has been employed. Any other equally good but different expression can be easily included in this method of derivation.

Notation.

- $I$  = Full load armature current in amps.  
 $E_o$  = Rated voltage of the machine (*at no-load*).  
 $Z$  = Total No. of effective conductors in armature.  
 $(2p)$  = No. of poles in the machine.  
 $2a$  = No. of paths in the armature.  
 $\alpha$  = Angle of brush shift in Electrical degrees.  
 $A$  = Constant of effectiveness of cross ampere turns.  
 $k_{sh}$  = Leakage constant for the shunt winding and the armature.  
 $k_s$  = Leakage factor for the series winding *w. r. t.* the armature.  
 $\beta$  = A fraction (usually  $\epsilon 1$ ).  
 $n$  = No. of turns in a series winding per spool.  
 $r_a$  = Resistance of the armature.  
 $r_{sh}$  = Resistance of the shunt winding.  
= No. of turns in a shunt spool.

Office of Commonwealth Relations  
ST. BRITAIN INDIA OFFICE LIBRARY

CATALOGUE OF THE  
TIBETAN MANUSCRIPTS  
FROM TUN-HUANG  
IN THE  
INDIA OFFICE LIBRARY

By the late LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE  
CHINESE MANUSCRIPTS

By KAZUO ENOKI

Published for the  
Commonwealth Relations Office

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1962

# CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	<i>page</i> ix
CORRIGENDA	x
INTRODUCTION	xiii
I. VINAYA TEXTS	i
II. SŪTRAS AND COMMENTARIES with identified Sanskrit titles	22
III. SŪTRAS translated from Chinese or with only Tibetan titles identified	74
IV. SŪTRAS AND COMMENTARIES, unidentified fragments	82
V. TĀNTRIK WORKS with identified Sanskrit titles	100
VI. TĀNTRIK WORKS, identified texts, without ascertained Sanskrit titles	151
VII. TĀNTRIK WORKS, unidentified fragments	157
VIII. ŚĀSTRAS with identified titles	180
IX. ŚĀSTRAS, unidentified	209
X. TIBETAN WORKS	221
APPENDIX. CHINESE MANUSCRIPTS	
INTRODUCTION	241
I. BUDDHIST CANONICAL TEXTS, identified	245
II. BUDDHIST CANONICAL TEXTS, unidentified	255
III. MISCELLANEOUS BUDDHIST WORKS AND DOCUMENTS	258
IV. TAOIST CANONICAL WORKS	260
V. SECULAR WORKS AND DOCUMENTS	260
VI. MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS	265
VII. CHINESE TEXTS IN TIBETAN OR BRĀHMĪ CHARACTERS	266
TIBETAN INDEX	270
SANSKRIT INDEX	276
CONCORDANCES	283
PLATES. Four specimen manuscripts	<i>at end</i>

Begins: གུང་རྒྱལ་གྱི་སེམས་འདི་སྒྲོབས་དཔོན་ནི་མཁྱིན་  
རབ་གྱི་མཚོག་སངས་རྒྱས་སྤྲས་པས་མཛད་དོ། ། ལྷོགས་  
ནི་ཨདྲི་ཡོ་གར་གཏོགས་སོ། ། རྒྱངས་ནི་གུང་རྒྱལ་གྱི་སེམས་  
གྱི་ལུང་ཐམས་ཆད་ནས་སྤྱང་ངོ། . . .

'This *Bodhi-citta* has been made by the most learned (*vidvadvarya*?) Ācārya Buddhaguhya. The topic is *Atiyoga*. The documents from all the *Āgamas* on *Bodhi-citta*.'

(b) Foll. 1b and 2a, ll. 4 and 5. Six *ślokas* and a half, red, large hand, black interlinear glosses.

After homage to Bhagavat Samantabhadra:

\* ཇི་ཚམ་དོག་སྤྱད་ཟབ་མོ་ཞིག།  
། སྒོ་འི་ཡུལ་དུ་སྤྲང་[འགྱུར་?]ན།  
། ལྷོགས་ཟབ་མོ་ཉམས་སྤྱང་ན།  
། སྤྱང་བ་ཡིན་སྤྱིར་དེ་ཉིད་སྤྱན། \*

'As long as the profound *avikalpa* appears in the field of the mind, one apprehends the profound *avikalpa*; therefore, as there is apprehension (*anubhava*), that is not the reality (*tattva*).'

\* ཇི་བཞིན་བའི་ཚམ་བཅུད་དེ།  
། ཚམ་ལ་ཚམ་ནི་ལྷི་འཇུག་པས།  
། ཇི་ཚམ་ཟབ་མོ་འི་ཚོག་བཛོད་ཀྱང།  
། དོན་དང་འཚམ་བར་གལ་འགྱུར།  
.....\*

' . . . As long as one even pronounces profound words, how can there be *artha-mātra* (?)'

(c) The colophon follows, as above: . . . . ཅུང་། །  
རྗོགས་སྒྲོ།

595

Ch. 9. 1. 52, Pothī; 43·8 c. × 9 c.: fol. 1, numbered (letter) 20; ll. 3: *dbu-can*.

རྗོགས་སྒྲོ་བཅུད་པ་གཅིག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་རབ་དུ་བྱེད་པ།

*Tshigs-su-bcad-pa-gcig-pa-ḥes-bya-baḥi-rab-tu-byed-pa* (*Eka-gāthā-nāma-prakarāṇa*)

Author: Nāgārjuna. Wanting in *Bstan-hgyur*, but see Nanjio 1212, the work called *Eka-śloka-śāstra*.

རང་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་སྤྱི་དག།  
། དེ་བཞིན་ངོ་བོ་ངོ་བོ་སྤྱད།  
། རང་བཞིན་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་སྤྱད་པས།  
། དེ་སྤྱིར་སྤྱང་དང་སྤྱི་དག་གསུངས།

596

Ch. 51. 1. 2, Pothī; 52·2 c. × 8·6 c.: foll. 29, numbered ྐ 19-22, 24-26, 28, 30-34, 47-51, 58, 62, 64-72; ll. 6 (up to fol. 30) and 7 (fol. 31 et seq.): *dbu-can*.

ལས་བརྒྱུད་རྩ་གཅིག་པོ། *Las-brgyaḥ-rtsa-gcig-po* [*Ekottara-karma-śataka*]

Incomplete.

*Bstan-hgyur*, Mdo-ḥgrel, LXXXII. 2 (foll. 109-298), Cordier, p. 406.

Fol. 31a. End of the second *khaṇḍa*.

597

Ch. 08, Pothī; 45·5 c. × 7·5 c.: foll. 5, numbered (letters) 1-5; ll. 6: *dbu-med*.

ལི་ཡུལ་གྱི་དག་བཅོམ་བས་ལུང་བསྟན་པའ། *Li-yul-gi-dgra-bcom-bas-luñ-bstan-paḥ* (*Kamsadeśīyārhad-vyākaraṇa*)

The legendary religious history of Khotan.

*Bstan-hgyur*, Mdo-ḥgrel, xciv. 45; Cordier, p. 433: T.t.d., I, pp. 73-87.

598

Ch. 9. 1. 3, Pothī; 55·5 c. × 8·9 c.: foll. 6, numbered 1-6; ll. 5: *dbu-can*.

ལི་ཡུལ་གྱི་དག་བཅོམ་བས་ལུང་བསྟན་པ། *Li-yul-gyi-dgra-bcom-bas-luñ-bstan-paḥ* (*Kamsadeśīyārhad-vyākaraṇa*)

Identical with 597 but for orthographical variants. See also 601. 2.

## You are free:



to **Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work



to **Remix** — to adapt the work

## Under the following conditions:



**Attribution** — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).



**Noncommercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



**Share Alike** — If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

## With the understanding that:

**Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be **waived** if you get permission from the copyright holder.

**Public Domain** — Where the work or any of its elements is in the **public domain** under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.

**Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:

- Your fair dealing or **fair use** rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
- The author's **moral** rights;
- Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as **publicity** or privacy rights.

**Notice** — For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to this web page.