

Bṛhaspati and the Barhaspatyas

Ramkrishna Bhattacharya
(Pavlov Institute, Calcutta, India)

Abstract The name of Bṛhaspati is associated with the materialist doctrine in India. He is supposed to be the preceptor of the gods. It was in order to help them in their battle against the demons that he created the materialist doctrine and thereby deluded the demons. This story, Puranic in origin, can be traced back to a late *Upaniṣad*, *Maitrī*. However, the story given in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and other sources does not contain anything specifically materialistic; all the heretical doctrines preached by Māyāmoha appear to be pre-existing; the Jains and the Buddhists are particularly mentioned, not the Lokāyatikas or the Cārvākas. More interestingly, in some other later sources, Bṛhaspati does not seem to be a god or a demi-god; he is as much a human as Kapila, Gautama and other founders of philosophical systems are. This trend of treating Bṛhaspati as a human is found in Kṛṣṇamiśra's play, the *Prabodhacandrodaya*. He belongs to the camp of Kali. Whatever be the identity of Bṛhaspati, his attribution to materialism is inappropriate and has got nothing to do with the development of materialism in India.

Summary 1 Bṛhaspati and His Relation to Materialism. – 2 The View of the Demons, *Asura-mata*. – 3 Bṛhaspati and Śukra: Two Rival Gurus. – 4 Two Stories in the *Matsya Purāṇa*. – 5 The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*. – 6 Other Purāṇic Sources. – 7 The Evidence of the *Devī-bhāgavata (Mahā) Purāṇa*. – 8 The Harivaṃśa: the Rājeyas in Place of the Demons. – 9 Three Sources for the Accounts of Anti-Vedic Views. – 10 The Upshot (1). – 11 Vācaspati in the *Prabodhacandrodaya*. – 12 Kali in the *Naiṣadhacarita*. – 13 Importance of Bṛhaspati. – 14 Philosophy vis-à-vis Religion. – 15 Bṛhaspati Humanised. – 16 Evidence from the *Mañimēkalai*. – 17 Intelligence of Bṛhaspati: Evidence from the Pāñcatantra. – 18 The Upshot (2). – 19 Inappropriate Attribution.


Keywords Bṛhaspati. Heretics. Materialism. Māyāmoha. Purāṇas.

1 Bṛhaspati and His Relation to Materialism

The first question to settle is: which Bṛhaspati? There are several Bṛhaspatīs in ancient Indian tradition. One is an author of an *Arthaśāstra* (now lost, but mentioned in *Kautilīya Arthaśāstra* 1.2.4), another is an author of a *Dharmaśāstra* (although the full text is lost, a sizeable number of fragments is available), and there is yet another Bṛhaspati mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (Mbh), who was appointed by Drupada, the king of Pāñcāla, to teach *Nīti* (polity) to his sons (Mbh, Āraṇyakaparvan 33.56: *nītiṃ bṛhaspati-proktām*). No, we are not going to speak of any of them. We are concerned here with that Bṛhaspati whose name is associated with

DOI 10.30687/AnnOr/2385-3042/2018/01/008

Submitted: 2017-04-29 | Accepted: 2018-03-08

© 2018 |  Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution alone

the origin of materialist philosophy in India. One of the many names for materialism in Sanskrit is *Bārhaspatya(mata)*, the *Bārhaspatya* view. The word is a derivative of *Bṛhaspati*, who is generally represented as the preceptor of the gods, *devaguru*. The namesakes of *Bṛhaspati* are also used to denote the same person (there are no fewer than 29 names of *Bṛhaspati*, according to the Sanskrit lexicon, *Śabdakalpadruma*, s.v. “*bṛhaspati*”). In the *Padma Purāṇa* (PPu), Uttara-khaṇḍa, 236.5 (Vangavasi ed. = Anandashram ed. 263.69) he is called Dhīṣaṇa; Kṛṣṇamiśra in his allegorical play, *Prabodhacandrodaya* (PC), calls him Vācaspati (Act 2, 40); Śrīharṣa in his philosophical treatise, *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādyā* (KhKhKh), 15, and Jayarāśi in his polemical work, *Tattvopaplavasimha* (TUS), 125, call him Suraguru, the preceptor of the gods. How could such a pillar of the Establishment be the founder of a heretical doctrine like materialism? He should surely be on the side of the gods, not of the demons. The question struck F. Max Müller (1971, 96) too, but the stories in the *Maitrī Upaniṣad* (MaiUp) and other sources (see below) convinced him that the divine chaplain preached materialism only in order to delude the demons. Yet, in *some* of the Purāṇic accounts (but by no means all), *Bṛhaspati* and the demons are shown together. Thereby hangs a tale. Let us follow the trail as found in the Purāṇas and other sources, all respectable and brahmanical in origin and *ipso facto* eminently orthodox and conformist in all respects.

2 The View of the Demons, *Asura-Mata*

Before going to that story, let us have an ‘aside’. Śaṅkara and following him some other non-dualist Vedāntins, such as Ānandagiri, Dhanapati, Nīlakaṇṭha, Madhusūdana, Śrīdhara and Hanumat, gloss “the view of the demons” (*asuras*) mentioned in *Gītā* 7.8 as those of the Lokāyatikas. Lokāyata is one of the several names for materialism (for other names see R. Bhattacharya 2013a, 3-8). Śaṅkara’s identification prompted S.N. Dasgupta to search for the origin of the *asuras*. He discovered them in Sumer: “We thus know that the *lokāyata* views were very old, probably as early as the Vedas or still earlier, being current among the Sumerian people of pre-Aryan times” (1975, 3: 531). G. Tucci (1925, 40), on the other hand, refused to endorse this view. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (1959, 14), though not agreeing with Dasgupta, entitles the first chapter of his *Lokāyata*, “Asura-view”. K.C. Chattopadhyaya (1975, 153-4, fn. 42) criticised Dasgupta quite harshly for offering such a view. He also notes that “D.P. Chattopadhyaya has been misled by Prof. Dasgupta in his *Lokāyata* and he has assumed that the *Lokāyata* system was the philosophy of the Asura people” (154 fn. 42). However, Dasgupta’s conclusion is so absurd on the face of it that it does not merit any discussion (for further details, see R. Bhattacharya 2016).

To resume the original narrative: what made Śaṅkara associate Lokāyata with the *asuras*, which no other commentator on the *Gītā*, except the non-dualist Vedāntins, does? The answer can be found by following the story of the deception of the demons occurring in the Upaniṣads and more particularly in the Purāṇas.

3 Bṛhaspati and Śukra: Two Rival Gurus

The association of materialism with the demons is first found in MaiUp 7.9:

Bṛhaspati, having become Śukra, created this false knowledge for the security of Indra, and the ruin of the Asuras. Through it they point to what is auspicious as being inauspicious, and say that one must ponder the injurious character of the scriptures like the Veda etc. Hence one must not learn that knowledge, else it is like a barren woman: its fruit is near concupiscence; even one who has fallen away from his proper conduct must not embrace it.

Thus the text says: “Widely opposed and differently directed are what are known as knowledge and ignorance...” (Van Buitenen 1962)

The alliance of Indra with Bṛhaspati may even be traced back to the *Rgveda* (Rv 8.96.15). Indra with Bṛhaspati as his ally is praised for having overcome the godless people. The similarity between the Rv passage and the MaiUp one, however, may also be purely fortuitous.

4 Two Stories in the *Matsya Purāṇa*

In the *Matsya Purāṇa* (MatPu) there are two accounts involving Indra, Bṛhaspati and the sons of Rāji, collectively called the Rājeyas (chs. 24 and 47). The Rājeyas had grown so powerful as to usurp the power of Indra, the king of the gods. In order to assist Indra, Bṛhaspati performs a sacrifice called Paiṣṭika and deludes the Rājeyas with *jina-dharma*, the Jain religion. Once they were alienated from the Veda and *dharma* as also got addicted to rationalism (*hetuvāda*, 24.24-48), Indra overcame them with his thunder:

*gatvātha mohayāmāsa rajiputrān bṛhaspatiḥ | jinadharmam samāsthāya
vedabāhyaṃ sa vedavit || vedatraṣṭiparibhraṣṭāṃś cakāra dhiṣaṇādhīpaḥ
|vedabāhyān pariññāya hetuvādasamanvitān ||* (MatPu 24.47-48)

In the second account we are told that Indra himself sends his daughter, Jayantī, to Śukra and directs Bṛhaspati to the demons (47.183). No details

of what Bṛhaspati taught the demons are stated. We only learn that Śukra cursed the demons and left them (47.204).

The two stories are variations of the original story found in the *Harivaṃśa* (see below). The setup is the same: the only difference is that one has the demons, the other, the Rājeyas. Otherwise, the theme of delusion by means of a non-Vedic religious doctrine is common to both.

5 The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Matsya Purāṇa*

In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*, Uttarabhāga (*Yogav*), ch. 101, too, there is a reference to the followers of Bṛhaspati who claimed that the Other World does not exist (*na vidyate paro loko bārhaspatyasya yasyatu*, 101.3). Ānanda Bodhendra Sarasvatī, a commentator on the *Yogav*, apparently knew nothing about materialism. He explains Bārhaspatyas as the followers of the *buddhaśāstra* (scripture of the Buddha, i.e. the canonical work of the Buddhists) written by Bṛhaspati (*barhaspatyasya bṛhaspati-praṇīta-buddha-śāstrānusāriṇaḥ*). He also mentioned the doctrine of momentariness of consciousness and referred to the accounts in the MatPu and other sources in which Bṛhaspati is said to have written a *buddhaśāstra* in order to delude both the sons of Raji and the demons (*rajiputrānām-asurānāṅca vimohanāya bṛhaspatinā buddhaśāstram praṇītam iti matsyapurāṇādau prasiddham*, note on 101.3). Apparently the commentator, who pompously entitled his work as *Vāsiṣṭha-mahārāmāyaṇa-tātparya-prakāśa*, was deficient both in philosophy and Purāṇic studies. However the MatPu 24.47 refers to the Jain doctrine, not the Buddhist.¹

6 Other Purāṇic Sources

The story is narrated more elaborately in PPU, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, ch. 13, with both Bṛhaspati and Śukra present. While the MaiUp story (7.8-9) starts and stops abruptly - we are not told the reason that made Bṛhaspati assume the form of Śukra and why Indra had to be given security - the PPU provides the backdrop. It borrows another story from the Vpu (3.18), although there is neither Bṛhaspati nor Śukra in it. But Indra's insecurity is duly explained.

The VPU story runs as follows. The demons had defeated the gods in war. The gods decided to seek the assistance of Hari (Viṣṇu), who created a creature called Māyāmoha (illusion-cum-delusion personified). This al-

¹ MaiUp 7.8, however, specifically refers to *nairātmyavāda*, the doctrine of no-soul, which, as the commentary says and almost all scholars agree, refers to Buddhism. See the commentary on MaiUp, BI ed., 206-7, also J.A.B. van Buitenen 1962, 153, fn. 127.

legorical character, first assuming the form of a Jain monk and then that of a Buddhist mendicant, misled the demons by speaking against the Vedic religion which is based on sacrifice (*yajña*) involving slaughter of animals. He urged them to follow the path of reason rather than accepting verbal testimony (*āptavāda*). This kind of instruction made the demons stray from the path of merit (*dharma*). Prior to that, they too were as much Veda-abiding and seeker for freedom (*mokṣa*) as the gods. Thus they got weakened, and the gods then could overcome them quite easily. The gods, by defeating the demons in a battle, got back the right of receiving oblations from the mortals on earth, which the demons had previously usurped.

The PPU story says that Bṛhaspati, taking advantage of Śukra's absence, disguised himself as Śukra and appeared before the demons. He taught them all kinds of anti-Vedic views, decrying non-vegetarian diet, performance of sacrifices and rites for the ancestors (*srāddha*), and indulgence in coitus. The gods and the brahmanas, they were told, also drink wine and eat flesh. Hence, the religion adopted by them cannot contribute to the attainment of heaven and/or freedom. Instigated by the Jain and Buddhist preachers (Illusion incarnate, Māyāmaya Puruṣa in disguise), the demons started questioning the validity of performing Vedic rites.

This part of the story in the PPU is almost wholly taken from VPU 3.18 with some significant variations. For one thing, it makes use of the rivalry between the two preceptors, Bṛhaspati and Śukra; they openly quarrel with each other, whereas neither Bṛhaspati nor Śukra appears in the VPU. The teachings of the Jain and the Buddhist monks are less elaborately stated in the VPU than in the PPU.

The PPU story is highly intriguing for another reason. Śukra was away from the demons. During his absence, Bṛhaspati appears to them in the guise of Śukra. Śukra comes back after sometime and challenges Bṛhaspati. The demons are at a loss to decide who the real Śukra is, since both look alike and each of them claims to be so. Bṛhaspati then taunts Śukra:

There are thieves in the world who steal others' goods.
But such an object as a stealer of the form and the body (of another person) is not seen.
When Indra was guilty of the lapse of killing a brahmana by slaying Vṛtra [a demon], it was you who absolved him of that (lapse) by the help of the science (*śāstra*) of Lokāyatika.

santi corāḥ pṛthivyām ye paradravyāpahāriṇaḥ |
evaṃvidhā na dr̥ṣṭāśca rūpadehāpahāriṇaḥ ||
vṛtraghātena cendrasya brahmahatyā purābhavat |
lokāyatikaśāstreṇa bhavatā sā tiraskṛtā ||
(PPU, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa 13. 291-92)

To the best of my knowledge, no such achievement of Bṛhaspati in exculpating Indra from his lapse of killing a brahmana (Vṛtra) is to be found anywhere in the whole corpus of Sanskrit literature, excepting the PPU, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa. It is also not clear how and why Lokāyatika-śāstra could be of any use in making a person free from any lapse. No religious law-book (Dharmaśāstra/Smṛti) contains such a provision. Does Lokāyatika-śāstra in this context mean anything other than materialism or a text of disputation (*disputatio*), a sense found in Pali and Buddhist Sanskrit works (for details, see R. Bhattacharya 2011, 187-96)?

7 The Evidence of the *Devī-bhāgavata (Mahā)Purāṇa*

In between the VPu and the PPU there is *Devī-bhāgavata (Mahā)Purāṇa (DBhMPu)*, 4.13-15 which too has been utilised in the PPU (see Hazra [1940] 1987, 25). Indra, after losing his kingdom, tells Bṛhaspati what he should do to help him. The preceptor of the gods then assumes the form of Śukra and preaches the Jain religion to the demons. The original Śukra appears and challenges Bṛhaspati in his disguise. Faced by two Śukras, the demons are at first perplexed, but ultimately opt for the pretender rather than their true guru. Śukra in rage leaves the demons, his *yajamānas*. Bṛhaspati's mission is over, for he has been able to alienate the demons from Śukra.²

Two later Purāṇas, *Śiva Purāṇa* (ŚivaPu), Rudra-saṃhitā, Yuddha-kāṇḍa, chaps. 1-5, and *Liṅga Purāṇa* (LiṅgaPu), part 1, ch. 71, too have this motif of delusion (*moha*). The same motif is retained in order to accommodate the original story of the rivalry between the two gurus. These two Purāṇas, however, offer slightly different versions of the same tale. Bṛhaspati in all these later texts plays a vital role in convincing the demons to deviate from the Vedic path. It is to be noted that although Māyāmoha preached not only Jain and Buddhist views but also the views of *all other* heretics, *pāṣaṇḍas* (see VPu 3.18.21), only the Jain and the Buddhist doctrines are highlighted.

In the PPU, the change of roles (Bṛhaspati appearing as Śukra and deluding the demons), as stated in the MaiUp before, is reintroduced. Bṛhaspati also appears in other Purāṇas (see Appendix 1 below). But in the stories relating to the deception of the demons, he is *not present invariably* in

2 The story contains several instances of unconscious humour. For example, Śukra laments that the guru of all gods and the author of a Dharmaśāstra, whose words are accepted as authoritative, could stoop so low as to adopt the doctrine of the *pāṣaṇḍas*, and submitting to greed, turned out to be a heretical savant (*pāṣaṇḍa-panḍita*). How can the people then make him an *ācārya*? Śukra further laments: "Bṛhaspati, the best of the brahmanas, is deceiving my stupid *yajamānas* (sc. the demons) by assuming another dress like an actor!" (13.59-62).

all versions. Sometimes he is invoked to delude the demons (as in MatPu 24.47-48), sometimes others do it instead of him (as in the ŚivaPu and LiṅgaPu, in which a Jain sage [*muni*] called Māyāpuruṣa [Illusion-person] created by Viṣṇu deludes the demons; cf. Māyāmoha in VPu 3.17.41).

8 The *Harivaṃśa*: the Rājeyas in Place of the Demons

The earliest source for the tale of Bṛhaspati in relation to the conflict between Indra and the sons of Rāji as well as the war between the gods and the demons, however, is not the Purāṇas, but the *Khila Harivaṃśa* (Hv). Although the work has been reshaped as a Purāṇa (which originally it was not) and several hundred lines have been added, it is still one of the earliest sources for locating Bṛhaspati as the deluder. In a passage of the Hv (Harivaṃśa Parvan critical edition ch. 21; vulgate ch. 28), Bṛhaspati, at the request of Indra, sets out to defeat the Rājeyas who had usurped Indra's power. In order to restore the kingdom of the earth to Indra, Bṛhaspati first performs a sacrifice to weaken the Rājeyas and thereby he succeeds in reinstating Indra to his former glory. In an additional passage (after 21.34), however, Bṛhaspati also writes a book on *Arthaśāstra* (book of polity) containing the *nāstika* view. It was highly prejudiced against *dharma*, and full of anti-vedic teachings (*nāstivādārthaśāstram hi dharmavidveṣaṇam param*, line 1). The Rājeyas were taken in by it. They deviated from the path of virtue, and consequently were ousted from power by Indra.

The story of king Veṇa/Vena is found in the Hv Harivaṃśa-parvan ch. 5 and also in several Purāṇas (for details, see Appendix B below). This king in his overbearing pride orders his subjects not to follow those instructions that are prescribed in the scriptures. He used to declare, "Do not perform sacrifices, do not pay homage to the gods and do not donate for religious purposes" (Hv Harivaṃśa-parvan ch. 5. 6-7). The sages tried to dissuade him but could not succeed. Hence, he had to be done away with. Interestingly enough, there is no reference to any book composed by Bṛhaspati (as interpolated in the additional passage 327* in the Hv Harivaṃśa-parvan, ch. 5) or any doctrine, such as Jainism or Buddhism (as in the VPu and the PPU, discussed above), nor any reference to logic or sophistry (as in the MatPu): Veṇa apparently made up his doctrine all by himself. No mention is made of Bṛhaspati in the Hv chap. 21 (crit. ed.) or in any of the Purāṇas that contain the tale of Vena. Only in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Mahāpurāṇa* (VDMPu) the word *lokāyata* occurs twice:

[Vena] always indulged in unholy scriptures, and was a well-known Lokāyatika. He issued orders that were irreligious.

[The sages said:]

You should not flout the rules established by your ancestors and obeyed by your forefathers by following Lokāyatika sayings.³

*asacchāstrarato nityaṃ lokāyatikasattamaḥ |
cakāra loke maryādāṃ dharmabāhyo narādhipaḥ ||108.6||*

[*r̥ṣaya ucuḥ*]
*pūrvapravṛttāṃ maryādāṃ pūrvaiḥ pūrvataraiḥ kṛtām |
lokāyatika-vākyena na tvaṃ hantumihārhasi ||108.8||*

9 Three Sources for the Accounts of Anti-Vedic Views

By far, we have come across three stories that speak of the anti-/non-Vedic views (but *not* materialism, only the Jain and the Buddhist *religious credos*, not the Jain and the Buddhist *philosophies*). All of them are recorded by the authors of the Purāṇas that are brahmanical in origin and considered canonical by all devout Hindus. The stories are the following.

First, the gods and the demons engaged in an eternal war with the outcome of the battles continuously oscillating from one to the other party.

Second, the story of Rāji and his sons as found in two versions. They were either duped by Bṛhaspati (as in MatPu 24.47) and/or by some god-created being who preached anti-Vedic doctrine/s to them and led them astray from the Vedic path (as in MatPu 24.44-48) and *Vāyu Purāṇa* (VāyuPu 92.87-99). It is for all practical purposes the same as the first, with the demons replacing the Rājeyas (see Appendix 1 below).

Third, the story of Vena as found in two versions. In one version (Hv, *Harivaṃśa-parvan* ch. 5, both critical edition and vulgate), king Vena proclaims himself superior to all brahmanical gods, sacrificial rites, etc. That is how he staked his claim to receive all forms of oblations. In one version he is said to have performed the most heinous lapse: he encouraged mixture of castes, *varṇa-saṅkara* (ŚivaPu, Vangavasi ed. 52.3-4; for further details concerning Vena see Vidyalankara 2006, 1:1081-87). All this infuriated the sages who finally assassinated him. No supernatural aid was required. The sages did so by trampling him under their feet (or by some other means, such as, by yelling a mighty roar, as in the account given in *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 4.14.34). So it was Veṇa's *hybris* (insolence) that brought about his downfall; Bṛhaspati's aid was not required. The sages were competent enough to deal with him. No Indra or Bṛhaspati was found necessary.

3 The available English translation of this Purāṇa by P. Shah (2000-2002) uses such words as "materialist (follower of carvaka [sic])" and "Carvak's [sic] preachings" (I:214), although there are no such words in the original.

Only the account in the VDMPu, as shown above, contains the name Lokāyata, which may very well be a later addition, as is the composition of a non-vedic Arthaśāstra by Bṛhaspati in the Hv (see above). However, the VDhMPu does not mention Bṛhaspati even once. In any case, Vena was an autodidact; he did not need anyone to misguide him.

Let us now analyse the three sources one by one.

In the first instance, the battle against the demons necessitated the creation of one, or more than one, anti-Vedic religion. They require either the help of Bṛhaspati or the intervention of Illusion (*māyāpuruṣa*) or Illusion-cum-Delusion personified (*māyā-moha*). However, as has been noted above, Bṛhaspati is not present *invariably* in all the stories. It is only in the Hv, the MatPu (one version) and the *Devibhāgavatam* (Dbh-Pu) that Bṛhaspati appears all alone to practise deception. There is no mention of materialism by any of its many names, such as, Lokāyata or *bhūtavāda* (both occurring in the *Maṇimēkalai*, a Tamil epic composed in the sixth century CE) or Cārvaka-mata, etc. whatsoever in the texts that mention Bṛhaspati. The antagonist is mostly *jina-dharma*, the religion of Jina (Mahāvīra), and sometimes Buddhism, another anti-Vedic religion, or both. These two non-Vedic religions were highly critical of animal sacrifice in the rites for the ancestors (*śrāddha*) and in sacrificial rites (*yajña*), and found fault with drinking wine in the Sautrāmaṇī sacrifice (for details see R. Bhattacharya 2013b, Appendices A and B). It has been shown that the objection has its origin in the *religious* standpoint of the Jains and the Buddhists, the doctrine of non-injury (*ahiṃsā*) being their chief article of faith. *It has got nothing to do with materialism as such.*

10 The Upshot (1)

To sum up then: in the two stories that have so long been fancied to have mentioned Bṛhaspati (VPu 3.18 and PPU Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, ch. 13), he *has no role to play as the preacher of materialism*. In fact, as the stories go, Buddhism, Jainism and other heretical doctrines appear to be pre-existing. The creature made by Viṣṇu merely makes use of them: he is *not* shown to be their progenitor. The demons, instigated by a Jain and/or a Buddhist monk and other heretics (*paṣaṇḍins*), speak out against the Vedic religion, but not against religion as such, since they too were desirous of freedom (*mukti*) and they preferred the alternatives to the vedic way, that's all. In any case, materialism is nowhere to be found in what Māyāmoha preaches or what the demons tell one another in the VPU and the PPU accounts.

Notwithstanding this role of Bṛhaspati, as related to Jainism/Buddhism, it is Bṛhaspati alone who is proclaimed to be the *ācīriyar* (Sanskrit *ācārya*, master, founder) of the Lokāyata system in the Tamil epic, *Maṇimēkalai*

(27.80). But here he is on a par with Kapila, Kaṇāda and other human originators of the rest of the five philosophical systems. This Bṛhaspati is *not* identified with 'bhagavān Suraguru', as Śrīharṣa (KhKhKh, 15) and Jayarāśi (TUS, 125) do. Similarly in the PPU Uttara-khaṇḍa (Vangavasi ed. 236.2-5 = Anandashrama ed. 263.66-69), he is treated as much as a human being, trailing no cloud of glory from the world of the gods:

Goddess! Let me tell you the names of the dark (*tāmasa*) *śāstras*, listen to me. The very remembrance of these deludes even the cognizant ones. At first I speak of the Śaiva *śāstras*, such as the Pāśūpatas and others. Then listen to the Brahmana, who being enthralled by my power preached the following *śāstras*. Kaṇāda spoke of the great doctrine of Vaiśeṣika; similarly Gautama spoke of Nyāya, Kapila of Sāṃkhya, and Dhīṣaṇa [Bṛhaspati] of the highly reprehensible Cārvāka view (*dhīṣaṇena tathā proktāṃ cārvākam atigarhitam*).

We shall see that the same is true of the *Prabodhacandrodaya* and the *Naiṣadhacarita* (NC) (see below). This gradual degeneration of Bṛhaspati from the status of the preceptor of the gods to an ordinary human who could always be eulogised but never to be worshipped as a god is worth noting.⁴

Taking leave of the Purāṇas, let us now turn to secular works and see the role that Bṛhaspati is made to play in them.

11 Vācaspati in the *Prabodhacandrodaya*

In Kṛṣṇamiśra's allegorical play, the PC, Act 2, Vācaspati (another name of Bṛhaspati) is *not* represented as the progenitor of the materialist system. He is merely the author of the science (*śāstra*) of a doctrine that *pre-existed* (see below) among the forces of the evil. King Mahāmoha (Great Delusion) declares,

This science was composed by Vācaspati *who followed our view* and he has given it to Cārvāka. This science is popularised in the world by him through his disciples and their disciples. (Act 2, C/L, 345; trans. by S.K. Nambiar, modified in C/L; emphasis added)

⁴ Jonardon Ganeri admits that the date of Bṛhaspati is 'unknown' (2011, 703), but in the Appendix to his paper it is stated that "[t]he first known reference to Bṛhaspati is from the sixth century.... It is reasonable to speculate, therefore, that Bṛhaspati is no later than 200 ce" (703, fn. 32). Whatever be the merit of this dating, it assumes that Bṛhaspati is a human, not a god or demi-god who existed from times immemorial.

tad etadasmadabhiprāyānubandhinā vācaspatinā praṇīya cārvākāya samarpitam \ tena ca śiṣyopaśiṣya-dvāreṇāsmiṃloke bahulikṛtaṃ tantram \ (40)

Vācaspati/Bṛhaspati here no longer belongs to the side of the gods; he does not produce this science to help Indra in particular and the gods in general to regain their former glory. He is now under the power of the Prince of Evils and works as per his instruction. Vācaspati thus recedes into the background. It is Cārvāka who, along with Kali (personification of the Iron Age), now appears, very much like a principal of a school, or rather an instructor in a hermitage (*āśrama*). He has his own disciples, as any Sāṃkhya or Nyāya or Vedānta guru would have. The purpose of Mahāmoha, it is to be noted, is not to delude the gods, but to corrupt the humans on earth. Cārvāka here is shown to be wholly subservient to Mahāmoha, who calls him (Cārvāka) his “dear friend”. Cārvāka approaches him and says:

Cārvāka: So this is king Mahāmoha! (*going near him*) May the king be victorious! I salute you.

Mahāmoha: Welcome, Cārvāka, be seated here.

Cārvāka (sits): Kali prostrates before you.

Mahāmoha: Ah! Kali, unimpaired blessings be upon you!

Cārvāka: By your grace all is well. He has accomplished everything (ordered by you) and wishes to (worship at) your feet. For -

After receiving the great command (from you) and having accomplished it by destroying his enemies, he is now happy and delighted, and with his great joy feels blessed and prostrates himself at the lotus feet of the Lord! (Act 2, v. 24, C/L, 346)⁵

But there is a problem. Hearing Cārvāka’s words Mahāmoha says:

Mahāmoha: And what has that Kali achieved?

Cārvāka: Lord, he caused the virtuous to forsake the path shown by the Vedas and act according to their own wish. It is thy glory, my Lord - neither mine nor Kali’s (*tadatra heturna cāpyaham*) - for this achievement. (Act 2, v. 25)

The people of the north and west have forsaken the three Vedas, not to speak of tranquillity and self-restraint. In other places too, the three Vedas exist only as a means of livelihood. (C/L, 347)

5 This is the second verse attributed to Bṛhaspati in SDS, 5.50-51,13.112-3. The verse occurs with variants in several other sources. See R. Bhattacharya 2011, 84-91. Some other verses occurring in PC, Act 2 are also found in the SDS and other sources. See R. Bhattacharya 2011, 84; Śl.2= PC, 2.26; Śl.3=PC, 2.20; Śl.4=PC, 2.21.

Cārvāka and Kali thus become two separate entities, their activities, too, are in different regions of India. A few lines before this, they seem to have been presented as one and the same person! To add to this confusion, Cārvāka is made to quote a verse, presumably composed by Bṛhaspati, whom Cārvāka calls the *ācārya* (master):

The Ācārya [Bṛhaspati] has said:

‘Oblations in the fire, the three Vedas, the carrying of three staves tied together, and smearing of oneself with ashes – all these are the means of livelihood of those who are devoid of intelligence and manliness’.
(Act 2, v. 26) (C/L, 347)

After quoting the verse Cārvāka adds:

Those in Kurukṣetra and other places, my Lord, need not fear the birth of Knowledge and Spiritual Awakening, even in a dream.

To which Mahāmoha replies:

Well done. That great holy place is rendered useless. (C/L, 347)

So far as the PC is concerned, Bṛhaspati has become thoroughly humanised, having no association with the gods or the demons either. He is not required to deceive either the demons or the Rājeayas. Now he has got a new associate: Kali (or he is Kali himself).

12 Kali in the *Naiṣadhacarita*

Śrīharṣa in his *Naiṣadhacarita* (NC) Canto 17 provides an account of the charges made against the gods by a materialist and the counter-charges brought against him by the gods. However, Śrīharṣa dispenses with Bṛhaspati altogether. The charges against the gods are first brought by an anonymous member of Kali’s army (NC 17.36). When the gods had made their reply in defence, the accuser appears before the gods and humbly admits:

Ye gods, I am not guilty, I am subject to others, I am a panegyrist of Kali. My tongue (lit. mouth) is fluent in flattering him. (17.108; trans. by K.K. Handiqui, slightly modified)

No sooner had he said this than Kali himself steps out and starts denouncing the gods (17.112-39). It is now his turn to speak of materialism and condemn the gods, the Vedas, and the *āstika* philosophical systems

such as Mīmāṃsā, non-dualist Vedānta and Nyāya. Neither Cārvāka nor Mahāmoha, nor even Bṛhaspati, has any role to play in this narrative.⁶

13 Importance of Bṛhaspati

Our interest in Bṛhaspati is not prompted by idle curiosity. The brahmanical authors would not permit the demons or the Rājeyas to formulate their own anti-Vedic views; Bṛhaspati or Māyāmoha or some other creature like Māyāpuruṣa fashioned by some god is required to preach to them and convert them to one or the other of the non-Vedic doctrines. Only in the case of king Vena/Veṇa no such supernatural aid is required (in all but one source; see Appendix B). The reason is evident: the *nāstika-śāstra* (heretical science) is to be understood as a product specially manufactured with the express purpose of deluding the demons, or any other force opposed to the gods, such as the Rājeyas. This *nāstika-śāstra* is not to be taken as a proper philosophical doctrine at all; it comprises all anti-Vedic views rolled into one.

Second, it is to be noticed that the term *nāstika-śāstra* does not necessarily mean materialism; the Buddhists, and more particularly, the Jains were always included in the ambit of *nāstikas* when the name is used by brahmanical authors. The mythographers, as in Greece and Rome so in India, loved to give free rein to their fancy; a consistent account either of events or of doctrines is rarely found – nor is it to be expected – in the Purāṇic tales. It is the Jain view that is mostly mentioned and reviled in the Purāṇas. R.N. Dandekar (1993, 752) has rightly observed that the authors of the Purāṇas knew more of the Jains than the Buddhists (as their main enemy) and their knowledge of materialism and its adherents was extremely vague. Sometimes the materialist doctrine is attributed to the Buddhists or the Jains, simply because the authors of the Purāṇas were more interested in defending Brahmanism *as a religious dogma*, not as any pro-Vedic philosophy. Their interest in and knowledge of different philosophical schools, whether orthodox or heterodox, appear to be minimal, almost non-existent. Ganesh Thite has recently shown that the *Sautas*, rhapsodes of *itihāsa-purāṇa* (legendary history), were practically ignorant of Vedic rites and sacrifices; their ignorance, rather than their knowledge, is revealed in different recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. Thite writes:

6 K.K. Handiqui in his English translation of the NC has quite illegitimately introduced the name Cārvāka (17.92, 95) while the text has no such word. On the other hand, he renders Lokāyata as “heretic” (17.97) where the word has been employed as a proper name, and should have been retained in translation. See R Bhattacharya 2016, 597-615.

Much of these epics were transmitted from generation to generation by the wandering bards, monks and public narrators, some of whom may be semi-learned brāhmaṇas. In any case these people cannot be said to be academicians or scholarly people. (2014, 418)

The same remark applies equally to the redactors of the Purāṇas. They knew practically nothing about the three main heterodox philosophical systems. It would hold true for some commentators (like the commentator on the *Yog* mentioned above) and the like.⁷ So far as the Purāṇas are concerned, total emphasis is laid (besides fabricating new fantastic stories) on *religion*; philosophy was merely a side issue. Opposition to Buddhism and Jainism was exclusively religious in nature; philosophy, whether *anekāntavāda*, or *viññānavāda* meant nothing to the redactors of the VPu although these two *vādas* are mentioned in VPu 3.18.10,16. They knew only the rudiments, or more probably merely the names of the heretical doctrines, that's all. The stories in the VPu and the PPu concerning the deception of the demons bear clear testimony to this. The preacher of *anekāntavāda* appears as a *naked monk* (Digambara) and that of *viññānavāda* as one wearing a blood-red robe, the typical dress of a Buddhist mendicant. Add to this the fact that, besides the Buddhist and the Jain, Māyāmoha in the VPu also converted the rest of the demons by preaching other heretical doctrines (*anyānapyanya-pāṣaṇḍa-prakārairbahubhiḥ*, VPu 3.18.21), which again appear to have already existed in full-fledged form. The *pāṣaṇḍas* do not represent any philosophical doctrine; they collectively constitute a combination of the non-Vedic religious cults, so graphically described in the MaiUp 7.8.

MaiUp 7.8 is the first source for the study of heresiology in India. The Purāṇas too contain many such passages, making the unclothed (*digambara*) Jains appear as the arch enemy of the Vedas. More interesting, however, is the long list of diverse religious communities, no fewer than forty six, enumerated by Siddharṣi in his *Upamiti-bhava-prapañcā-kathā* (906 CE). There are such strange names as Uktamda, Ulka, Khumkhukha (Khumkhuka), Cuñcuṇa, Pakṣāpakṣa, Vidyuddanta and the like (1-21, 547-48; see also Jacobi's Preface, xxvii-xxxv). Unfortunately most of these heretical sects are now difficult, if not impossible, to identify. The list incidentally mentions the Kālamukhas the Kāpālikas and the Lokāyatās (547). According to Siddharṣi, the towns dwelt by Bhavacakras, Naiyāyikas, Vaiśeṣikas, Bauddhas and Mīmāṃsakas have the same names, those of Lokāyatās are called Bārhaspatyas (*lokāyatam iti proktam puramatra tathā*

7 Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācāryya Śarman (18th century) makes similar ludicrous mistakes in his *Vidvan-moda-taraṅgiṇī campū*. He confuses between the Cārvāka and the Jaina doctrines. There is an English translation of the work by Kalikrishna Deb Bahadur (1832), entitled *Fountains of Pleasure to the Learned*.

param l bārhaspatyāśca te lokā ye vāstavyāḥ pure 'tra bhoḥ ll, 661). Why this special provision is made for the Lokāyatas is a matter of conjecture; nothing definite is known about it.

In any case, if MaiUp 7.8 is the *locus classicus* of heresiology, Siddharṣi's works is an elaboration of the list of heretics by a Jain guru. In both cases, the heretics belong both to the Great Tradition and the Little Tradition.

14 Philosophy vis-à-vis Religion

Objections to materialism on religious grounds were thus brought into the domain of philosophy with the well-known distinction made between the *āstika* and the *nāstika* schools. The distinction was for all intents and purposes religious, not at all philosophical, all referring to the three Vedas, the (Vedic) gods, the sacrificial rites and the twice-born.⁸ These are the four props of brahmanical religion. Once the concept of *nāstikya* was introduced to the domain of philosophy, it could only reiterate purely religious objections – whether *nāstika* means a denier of the Other World or of the authority of the Veda or any other idea inimical to orthodoxy (for instance, whether matter or consciousness appears first, as found in BṛUp 4.5.13 – opponent's view – and its rejection in 4.5.14). Such a distinction is not to be found in the list of the Six Systems based on argument (*ṣaṭ-tarkī*).⁹ Despite the difference in the lists of names – some include Mīmāṃsā, some do not – the *āstika* and the *nāstika* systems rub shoulders with one another apparently without any concern, paying no attention either to the Other World or to the Veda.

15 Bṛhaspati Humanised

Bṛhaspati, as we know from the Tamil epic *Maṇimēkalai*, was long ago accepted as the original teacher (*ācārya*) of the Lokāyata school:

These are the systems that accept logic:
Lokayata, Buddhism, the Sankhya.
Nyaya, Vaisesika, and Mimamsa.
The teachers of these six: Brihaspati,
Buddha, Kapila and Akshapada,

⁸ *mohitās tat yajuḥ sarvāṃ trayīmārgāśritaṃ kathām / kecid vinindāṃ vedānāṃ devānāṃ aparedvijja / yajña-karma-kalāpasya tathānye ca dvijanmanām// VPu 3.18.22cd-23.*

⁹ For a detailed discussion of *ṣaṭ-tarkī*, see Gerdi Gerschhiemer 2007, 239-48. Incidentally Siddharṣi, too, speaks of the followers of six philosophical systems, namely, Bhavacakras, Naiyāyikas, Vaiśeṣikas, Bauddhas, Mīmāṃsakas and Lokāyatas (*Upamiti*, 661).

Kanada and Jaimini. At present
The six systems of logic in use are
Through perception, inference, the Shastras,
Analogy, presumption and negation.
(27.78-85. Trans. Prema Nandakumar)

What is to be noted is that Bṛhaspati is presented here as a human being, very much like the Buddha, Kapila, Kaṇāda, and others. Bṛhaspati is just a founder of a philosophical system, based on logic. There is no motive of deluding anybody, whether the demons or the sons of Raji. Lokāyata is a positive system of philosophy, very much like Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, and others.¹⁰

We come across the name Bārhaspatya as a synonym for the Cārvāka/Lokāyata and Nāstika at least from the eighth century CE. The Buddhists and the Jains too used this name to designate the materialists along with the other name, Nāstika. This term meant only the materialists to them, whereas it included *them* in the vocabulary of the brahmanical philosophers and, more importantly, law-makers. However, as we have seen, Bṛhaspati does not play his role as the deluder of the demons or of other human enemies of the gods in all the Purāṇic accounts.

There is little room for doubt that materialism in its different manifestations is not *invariably* connected with Bṛhaspati. In the Buddhist tradition, for example, Ajita and Pāyāsi were considered competent enough to formulate their materialist ontology without being duped by any divine or semi-divine being. It is the same with the Jain tradition in which king Paesi appears as an independent agent preaching materialist ontology, denying any life beyond this life. It is only in the brahmanical tradition that materialism is projected right from the outset (even before the basics of the doctrine is stated) as a false doctrine manufactured by Bṛhaspati in order to delude the demons or the sons of Raji. The purpose was to ensure the safety of the gods and enable them to have their due share of the sacrifices.

R.C. Hazra noted long back:

In order to warn the people against violating the rules of the Varṇāśrama dharma numerous stories have been fabricated to show the result of violation. ([1940] 1987, 235)

¹⁰ The omission of Jainism or the doctrine of pluralism (*anekāntavāda*) and probabilism (*syādvāda*) in the list given in the *Maṇimēkalai* is significant but not inexplicable. This is the first instance of *ṣaṭ-tarkī*. Another enumeration is later found in the work of Jayantabhaṭṭa (NM, ch. 1, 9: Sāṃkhya, Ārḥata, Buddhist, Cārvāka, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika). The second, third and fourth are *nāstika* systems; others, *āstika*. Rājaśekhara (ch. 2, 191) follows another schema, which too includes Jainism.

He refers to the story of Raji, Vena and the demons mentioned above.

Besides these and similar other stories, there are numerous chapters on the description of the ages (*yuga*), on hells and on the results of actions. (235)

The intention of the redactors of the Purāṇas is crystal clear: to create fear in the minds of listeners and dissuade them from following *any of the current non-Vedic religious doctrines*.

The source of all this, of course, is MaiUp 7.8. After enumerating the story of Bṛhaspati in disguise (quoted above), it quotes almost verbatim from the KaṭhaUp and the ĪśāUp. The reference to Kaṭha 2.5 is obvious. But what is not so obvious is the leap from the story of Bṛhaspati to the discourse on *vidyā* and *avidyā*. However, this account was amplified in the Purāṇas. The purpose was evidently to highlight the falsity of the non-Vedic doctrines (Buddhism and Jainism in particular). Yet Bṛhaspati's name got associated with Lokāyata (see *Maṇimēkalai* 27.78-80) and later the Cārvāka (see TSP vol. 2, 520, *bārhaspatyādayaḥ*), the philosophical system all human in origin, untouched by any demi-god or any preternatural entity.

Whatever be the original function of the preceptor of the gods, we know of him in relation to only one activity, namely, deluding the unsuspecting demons either in the guise of Śukra (hinting at an old rivalry between the two preceptors) or working in the background without assuming any disguise (as in the *Khila Harivaṃśa* account, critical edition, Harivaṃśa-parvan ch. 21; vulgate ch. 28).

In the Purāṇas, however, the Jains in particular turn out to be the chief target of attack. In the later part of VPu 3.18 the unclad one (*nagna*) assumes a more generic character: whoever is bereft of the cloak (*saṃvaraṇa*) of the Veda, not the Jains alone, is branded as a *nagna*. There is another story (most probably an interpolation), which reveals the gruesome effects of not abiding by the rules of Dharmasāstra. The process of maligning all heterodox communities must have started much earlier than the fifth century, when the VPu was redacted. As Hazra observes: 'The hatred towards the Nagnas in Vāyu 78.24, 79.25, the Jains and the Buddhists, as also the occurrence of the Nirgrantha and Pāṣaṇḍa in chaps.78-79 suggests the date: the end of second century A.D.' (1940/1987, 16). Bṛhaspati then was merely incidental in the plan of condemning the non-believers in the sanctity of the Veda and the Dharmasāstras. In other words, religion rather than philosophy was at issue.

16 Evidence from the *Maṇimēkalai*

The association of Bṛhaspati with Lokāyata is first found in the *Maṇimēkalai* (see above). It further speaks of another materialist doctrine called *bhūtavāda*. A *bhūtavādin* expounds his system to Princess Maṇimēkalai and tells her in which respect it differs from Lokāyata (27.265-276). In later times, when *bhūtavāda* is no longer recognised as a different school of materialism (although in the Tamil epic, Lokāyata and *bhūtavāda* are two *distinct* schools with some area of difference), Bṛhaspati lost the stature of an *acārya*: he became just a name as attested by the PC. Like Kaṇāda or Gautama, he is made to appear as quite a human figure, not as a semi-divine teacher of a system of philosophy which is to be taken as it is, not as an instrument of delusion. Bṛhaspati of this play carries no association with the Purāṇic Bṛhaspati, the fabricator of a system meant to delude the demons and the sons of Rāji. Apparently Kṛṣṇamiśra did not care to remember the VPu story in which Māyāmoha preached Jainism and Buddhism, two anti-vedic *religious* systems, not any *philosophical* one. Śrīharṣa preferred to identify the materialist with *kali*, the personification of an eon (*yuga*) degenerating from the *satya* or *krta* (the Golden Age). Everything was proper and righteous in the first *yuga*: things started degenerating in the *tretā* and the *dvāpara* till it reached its nadir in the *kali*. In the NC too, materialism is projected basically as an anti-religious system and only partially as a philosophical one. The putative materialist harangues against five items: 1. The sacrificial rites (*yajña*) and fire sacrifice (*agnihotra*), 2. Purity of caste (*jātiśuddhi*), 3. Gender discrimination, 4. The concept of heaven and hell, and 5. Worship of gods (*devapūjana*). All these are related to the brahmanical religion, both Vedic and Purāṇic.

The attitude towards the *āstika* philosophical systems too is most evident in Kali's denunciation of Mīmāṃsā (NC 17.61) and more particularly of Nyāya (Gautama, aka Gotama, the founder of this system, is called 'the most bovine', *go-tama*, NC 17.75). In the Jain and Buddhist philosophical works, as also in their religious texts, the philosophical aspects (epistemology, ontology, etc.) of materialism are treated more seriously, without any reference to its non- or anti-vedic character.

17 Intelligence of Bṛhaspati: Evidence from the *Pañcatantra*

The intelligence of Bṛhaspati (and Śukra, also called Uśanas) is proverbial. We often come across one character or the other in the Mbh being compared with either of the two: *yathā buddhiṃ bṛhaspatiḥ*, *yathovāca purā śukraṃ mahābuddhir bṛhaspatiḥ*, *bṛhaspatisambuddhyā*, all in reference to Bhīṣma. Vidura is said to have excelled both Bṛhaspati and Śukra in intelligence.¹¹

In the *Pañcatantra* we read:

Modesty (or shame), affection, clearness of voice, discretion, goodness of heart (or mental ease), vitality, passion, relationship with one's kinsmen, absence of pain, sports, discharge of religious duties, knowledge of the *śāstras* (or action in conformity with their precepts), *a talent like that of Suraguru (Bṛhaspati)*, purity and the thought about (desire for) conforming to the rules of conduct – all these proceed in the case of men when the pot in the form of the belly is full of grain (*i.e.*, when men are in affluent circumstances). (Book 5, tale 12, verse 91, 498)

*lajjā snehaḥ svaraviśadatā buddhayaḥ saumanasyaṃ
prāṇonaṅgaḥ svajanamamatā duḥkhaḥānirvilāsāḥ |
dharmaḥ śāstraṃ suragurumatīḥ śaucamācāracintā
sasyaiḥ pūrṇe jaṭharapiṭhare prāṇināṃ sambhavanti ||* (253)

Here there is no question of non-conformism: the intelligent man is both *śāstra*-abiding and prosperous. It may be noted in this connection that the boasting of Jayarāśibhaṭṭa that he has out-Bṛhaspati-ed Bṛhaspati (1940, 125) alludes to this super-intelligent Bṛhaspati, not to the alleged founder of the materialist system.

E.W. Hopkins in a rare flash of humour says, “Bṛhaspati (the planet Jupiter) is preceptor of the gods and gives them instruction orally, as well as composes a Śāstra for them and others [meaning presumably the demons], but otherwise he is remarkably inactive” (1972, 181).¹²

Whatever might have been the original function of the preceptor of the gods, we know of him in relation to only one activity, namely, deluding the unsuspecting demons either in the guise of Śukra or working in the background without assuming any disguise (as in the *Khila Harivaṃśa* account).

¹¹ Further examples would be found in Sörensen, *s.v.* ‘Bṛhaspati’ and ‘Çukra’. There is a Bangla proverb, *buddhi-te bṛhaspati*, meaning a veritable Bṛhaspati in intelligence, applied to any highly intelligent person (also employed satirically).

¹² However, Kāvya (Śukra) is credited with preparing an abridged version of an encyclopedia of *Nīti*, *Dharma*, etc. originally composed by Brahman and successively abridged by Śiva, Indra and Bṛhaspati. Mbh, crit. ed. 12.85-91.

18 The Upshot (2)

The upshot of the preceding account is that the birth of materialism *cannot be ascribed to Bṛhaspati*. There is no uniformity in the legends given in the Purāṇas. Moreover, the story of Vena has no Bṛhaspati to delude him. He became a Lokāyatika all by himself (as in the VDMPu account but not in any other source). The sons of Raji are sometimes said to be deluded by Indra via Bṛhaspati (*VāyuPu*) but in other accounts (for example, the MatPu) they, like Vena, turned anti-vedic all by themselves. In any case, right from the *Maṇimēkalai* we find Bṛhaspati as totally anthropomorphic as much as Kapila, Kaṇāda or Jaimini. No halo of divinity, or even semi-divinity, is found around his head. The basic theme – delusion of the demons and the sons of Raji – is also conspicuously absent in the PC and the NC. Materialism is as much a system of philosophy as the other five *tarkas*. Materialism may not be a right kind of philosophy, acceptable to religious orthodoxy, but there is no question of rejecting Lokāyata as a philosophy that is not to be taken seriously. Everyone speaking of *ṣaṭ-tarkī* mentions materialism as a matter of fact; even though, like the Buddhist and the Jain systems of philosophy, it is admitted to be outside the Vedic periphery.

19 Inappropriate Attribution

Anantalal Thakur (2015, 188) has acutely observed that no Buddhist, Jain or Carvaka is known to have admitted himself to be a *nāstika*: others called them so. Similarly there are reasons to believe that the first and the last of the four names given to the materialists in India, viz., Bārhaspatya, Cārvāka, Lokāyata and Nāstika (Hemacandra AC 3.525-527 and many other works; for details see R. Bhattacharya 2013a, 3-8) were actually employed by the opponents of materialism. The alleged Cārvāka aphorism, “The aphorisms of Bṛhaspati are everywhere merely for the sake of objections”, *sarvatra paryanuyogoparāṇyeva sūtrāṇi bṛhaspateḥ*, as also its variants (see R. Bhattacharya 2011, 96-7, 106-7) is a case in point. Anantavīrya calls this sentence a *sūkta*, “a good or friendly speech, wise remark”, *not* an aphorism, *sūtra* (277). The word *sūtra* is sometimes found used rather loosely. For instance, Karṇakagomin calls the first line of a verse, *viśeṣe anugamābhavāt sāmānye siddhasādhanam* (26), a *sūtra*, which most certainly it is not (for the various readings of the verse, see R. Bhattacharya 2011, 86 Śl. 16).

The name Bārhaspatya as applied to materialism, whether pre-Cārvāka or Cārvāka, is, however, inappropriate in all respects. In fact it is a misnomer insofar as none of the sources, whether belonging to *itihāsa* or *purāṇa*, refer to Bṛhaspati as the progenitor of materialism. Wherever he is found writing a *śāstra*, it is related to polity, or any work admittedly

anti-Vedic in nature, it is never represented as a philosophical base text. In the Ppu he preaches Jainism, Buddhism and other heretical doctrines. But, as has been shown above, the nature of the objections to the Vedic sacrificial rites is at bottom *religious*, never *philosophical*. In spite of the mention of *anekāntavāda* and *viññānavāda*, all that the converted demons speak of is non-injury and celibacy, not materialism or any philosophical doctrine at all. There is of course a reference to other *pāṣaṇḍa* views (as in the Vpu 3.18.21), but there is nothing to show that any of the tenets preached by Māyāmoha refers to materialism as such. As to Jainism and Buddhism, at least two names, *anekāntavāda* (pluralism) and *viññānavāda* (doctrine of consciousness) are mentioned in the Vpu (3.18.10,16). Some fanciful etymology of the names too is given. However, what the Deceiver (or Deluder) actually does is to speak of non-injury, celibacy and teetotalism, all of which are tenets connected with rules of religion, not philosophy. The rest of the Purāṇic sources too do not bother about philosophy: there opposition is entirely religious.

There are also some other grounds for challenging the attribution of materialism to Bṛhaspati. First, the purpose behind bringing in Bṛhaspati or such allegorical characters as Māyāmoha or Māyāpuruṣa is explicitly directed to portray the non-vedic systems as false, designed to delude the enemies of the gods, be they mythical creatures like the demons or humans like the sons of Rāji. Second, the identity of the followers of Bṛhaspati is never divulged. Guṇaratna in his zeal to associate all philosophical systems with a corresponding religious cult in one-to-one correspondence, makes the Cārvākas and the *cārvākaikadeśīyas* (a section of the Cārvākas) identical with the Kāpālikas, the worshippers of Śakti, who are and had always been very much theistic, with some practices of their own (TRD, 300) that may appear reprehensible to some. This supposed identification is more than unwarranted; it is a calumny pure and simple. D.R. Shastri (1982) made a thorough study of the alleged relationship between the Cārvākas and the Kāpālikas. He came to the conclusion that there is no basis for equating the two (Shastri 1982, 174-85) as Guṇaratna does.¹³ S.N. Dasgupta too made a study of the Kāpālikas and came to the conclusion that there was no philosophical basis of this sect: “[W]e have no proof that the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas had any distinct philosophical views which would be treated separately” (1975, 5: 3). He further says, “[W]e know practically nothing of any importance about the Kāpālikas and the

13 D.R. Shastri (1982), however, has been too lenient towards Guṇaratna. He has tried to trace the course of the steady degeneration of the Cārvākas, referring to the so-called ‘cunning (*dhūrta*) Cārvākas’ mentioned by Jayantabhaṭṭa (NM 1:100) and related it to Guṇaratna’s description of the Kāpālika orgy. All that Guṇaratna says lacks evidence: everything appears to be concocted. What made the Jain savant go for such an equation between the Cārvākas and the Kāpālikas is to be wondered at.

Kālāmukhas" (5). He reiterates this opinion again on another occasion (50). Therefore Guṇaratna's facile identification of the Cārvākās and the Kāpālikas is not at all acceptable (for a detailed study of the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas, see Lorenzen 1991).

Unfortunately we cannot be certain who first used the name Bārhaspatya to designate the materialist system, whether pre-Cārvāka or Cārvāka, and also its adherents. Kamalaśīla (eighth century) mentions Cārvāka (both in singular and plural), Lokāyata and Lokāyatika, and Nāstika (TSP, 520, 633, 637, 639, 657, 663, 665, 939 and 945) as well as Bārhaspatya (520). Haribhadra (eighth century) speaks of Lokāyata (*ŚDSam* verses 79c and 80a, p. 299.17 and p. 301.2) and Cārvāka (verse 85d, p. 307.18) but not of the other two. From his reference to *āstikavādin* (verse 78d, p. 299.8), however, it may be presumed that he was conversant with its opposite, *nāstikavādin*. In the ninth century Bārhaspatya is used both as an adjective and as a countable noun by Jayanta (*bārhaspatyām* (singular) in NM I:43.11 and *bārhaspatyānām* (plural) I:275.20) and by Śīlānka (*Ācāra.*, 189, and *Sūtra.*, 9-10). Somadeva Sūri (tenth century) too mentions the *bārhaspatyas* (*Yaśastilaka*, 269) as Anantavīrya attributes the authorship of the base text of the materialists to Bṛhaspati (*bṛhaspateḥ sūtrāṇi*, the aphorisms of Bṛhaspati, 177) as does Abhayadeva (eleventh century) and others (for details see R. Bhattacharya 2011, 106-7 notes). Hemacandra (twelfth century) in his lexicon, *AC*, records all four names as synonymous (3.526-27) as does Sāyaṇa-mādhava (*SDS*, 2, lines 13-15,22).

No philosophical work that has so far come down to us offers any explanation of the name Bārhaspatya. Of course, nobody knows for certain why Nyāya is called Nyāya; once it stood for Mīmāṃsā also (cf. Jaimini's *Nyāyamālāvistara*). There is no way of ascertaining whether Yoga originally meant the philosophical system propounded by Patañjali or a system of logic that is now called Nyāya. Phanibhushana Tarkavagisha says that Nyāya also was once called Lokāyata (1981-85, I: xv). So it is too much to expect that some kind soul would inform us why Bārhaspatya was chosen as another name for the materialist system as well as its adherents, and how and from when it got attached to materialism. All we know is that right from the eighth century CE, when the name Cārvāka is found in philosophical literature, it already has no fewer than three other synonyms. Some of them might have already been in use (such as, Lokāyata, Bhūtavāda and Cārvāka), but some others (such as, Dehātmanvāda and Bhūtacaitanyavāda), or more fanciful ones (such as Mahā-bhūtodbhava-caitanya-vādi-mata or Bhūtamātratattvāda), not to speak of such derisive nicknames as Pañcagupta and Kuṇḍakīṭa.¹⁴ All of these, beginning with

14 For the fanciful names see Franco 1997, 243, n3. For the derisive ones see R. Bhattacharya 2011a *passim*.

ṇahiyavādī, *natthiyavāī*, *nāhiyavādī* (*Vasudevahiṃdi*, 169, 275, 329) were coined by the immaterialist critics.

I would, however, like to point out that the association of Bṛhaspati to the founder or *ācārya* of materialism (as *Maṇimēkalai* says) is *not* explicated anywhere in the whole corpus of Sanskrit literature available to us. He may at best be called the propagator of the *nāstika* view in the broad sense of the term (which would include the Buddhist, the Jain and many other religious systems and cults, belonging to both the Great Tradition and the Little Tradition), but not in the narrow sense of the term which would signify materialism alone. Howsoever, it is worth noting that Indian writers believed in two Bṛhaspatīs: one set (for instance, the Purāṇa redactors, Jayarāśi, and Śrīharṣa, author of the of the KhKhKh) viewed Bṛhaspati as a god, and the other set (for instance, Kṛṣṇamiśra and Śrīharṣa, author of the NC) considered him to be purely human, associated with Kali, who represents the force of evil. The materialists in India never called themselves Bārhaspatyas, for by calling themselves so, they would admit their affiliation either to the chaplain of the gods or to Kali. Both of them would be inadmissible to the atheistic thinkers. In any case, it is high time to get rid of the false notion that the Bṛhaspati in Indian philosophical literature, whether divine or human, has anything to do specifically with materialism.

Appendix 1

A tabular representation of the presence/absence of Bṛhaspati in deluding the demons/the *Rājeyas* is given below, followed by a summary of the observations made in this essay.

Purāṇa	Deluder	Deluded	Means
<i>Agni</i> 16.1-13	The Buddha disguised as Māyāmoha	Demons	Buddhism
<i>Devībhāgavata</i> 4.13-15	Bṛhaspati Disguised as Śukra	Demons	Jainism (4.13.54-56)
<i>Garuḍa</i> 1.32	The Buddha	Demons	Not given (Buddhism?)
<i>Harivaṃśa</i> . <i>Harivāṃśa</i> -Parvan. Ch. 21	Bṛhaspati	Rājeyas	Sacrifice [and by composing an Arthaśāstra or a Dharmaśāstra]
<i>Līṅga Pūrvabhāga</i> 71.85-94	Nārāyaṇa disguised as Māyin and Muni (The Buddha)	Demons	Anti-Vedic Śāstra having 16,00,000 books.
<i>Matsya</i> 24.44-48	Bṛhaspati	Rājeyas	Sacrifice and <i>jinadharmā</i> (24.47).

Purāṇa	Deluder	Deluded	Means
<i>Matsya</i> 47.183-206	Bṛhaspati disguised as Śukra	Demons	Not mentioned.
<i>Padma Sṛṣṭi</i> . 13.366-371	Māyāmaya Puruṣa	Demons	Buddhism, Jainism and other <i>pāṣaṇḍa</i> doctrines (cf. <i>Viṣṇu</i> 3.18)
<i>Śiva Yuddhankhaṇḍa</i> Ch. 4.1-2	Māyāmaya Puruṣa	Demons	Jainism
<i>Vāyu</i> 92.87-99	Bṛhaspati	Rājeyas	Sacrifice
<i>Viṣṇu</i> 3.18	Māyāmoha created by Hari (Viṣṇu)	Demons	Buddhism, Jainism and other <i>pāṣaṇḍa</i> doctrines (3.18.1-21)

It is not clear, at least to me, what van Buitenen says apropos MaiUp:

Section 7.9 brings Bṛhaspati who has the (late) reputation of being a false teacher, on account of the materialist *smṛti* ascribed to Bṛhaspati. Here he invents the false knowledge of the unorthodox. 7.10 is a more enlarged-upon doublet of 7.9, but here the false knowledge is authored by Brahmā. (1962, 88-9)

What could be a 'materialist *smṛti*'? Is it not a contradiction in terms?

Bṛhaspati is found in some of the Purāṇas working as a deluder either of the demons or of the sons of Rāji, who had threatened the power and position of Indra. He does not produce, so far as my knowledge goes, anywhere in the Itihāsas and the Purāṇas, a work of *smṛti*. It is only in an additional passage in the HV that Bṛhaspati is said to have composed a Book of Negative Arthaśāstra and/or Dharmasāstra. So far as the so-called *Bārhaspatya Dharmasāstra* is concerned, enough fragments are available to reveal the basically orthodox character of the work. The author's respect for Manu and the thoroughly traditional views expressed in most of the cases are only too apparent (see R. Bhattacharya 2011, 25-6). As to the *Bṛhaspati-nīti* mentioned in the Mbh, Āraṇyaka Parvan, 33.56-57 (crit. ed.), Jacobi's view is decisive: "The *Nīti*-teachings of Brihaspati which Draupadī expounds in *Mahābhārata* III.32 [vulgate], are at any rate as orthodox as one can wish!" (1970, 737; 1918, 104). So the very idea of 'materialist *smṛti*' is downright absurd.

Admittedly the Puraṇic stories lack coherence and consistency. When the texts were composed by different persons living in different parts of India, no unified pattern is to be expected. Yet it is clear on the surface that the story of Indra and the Rājeyas was but a parallel to that of the gods and the demons. The presence of Bṛhaspati in some of the stories and his absence in some others are equally intriguing. In any case he is not indis-

pensable to the restoration of the authority of Indra. Even when Bṛhaspati takes an active part in deluding the demons/Rājeyas, he is found having recourse to some sacrifice (for example, Paiṣṭika-yāga), not producing a base text of any materialist philosophy. Hence, the association of Bṛhaspati with materialism is never established in the Itihāsas and the Purāṇas.

Is this Bṛhaspati, who is 'credited' with conceiving materialist philosophy, his sole purpose being with the sole purpose of deluding the enemies of the gods and make them stray from the Vedic path, a demi-god or a human being? The question arises inevitably, for the putative authors of the *Bārhaspatya Dharmasāstra* (*Bṛhaspati-smṛti*) and the *Bārhaspatya Arthasāstra* mentioned by Kauṭilya, are never treated as divine but thoroughly human by nature and origin. Even in the PPU Śiva mentions Dhīṣaṇa along with Kaṇāda, Gautama, Kapila as the authors of non-Vedic sāsāstras (PPU *Uttara-khaṇḍa* Vāṅgavasi ed. ch. 236.2-7ab = Anandashrama ed., ch. 263.66-70). One verse refers to Viṣṇu disguised as the Buddha in order to destroy the demons (*daityānāṃ nāśanārthāya viṣṇunā buddharūpīnā*, Vāṅgavasi ed. 236.6ab = Anandashrama ed. 263-69cd). Hazra thinks that the whole chapter is an interpolation "by some persons belonging to the Śrī or Mādhva sect" (1987, 126).

Appendix 2

The Story of Vena is found in the following works (excepting the Mbh):

HV Harivaṃśa Parvan, ch. 5

Brahmāṇḍa, ch. 68

Bhāgavata, 'part 4, chs. 14-15

Vāyu, ch. 62

Śiva, ch. 52.16-18

Viṣṇu-dharmottara, l.108

Padma Bhūmikhaṇḍa, chs. 36-9

Skanda ?

The earliest source of the Vena legend is a single verse in the Mbh (crit. ed. 59.99). Vena is said to have been under the sway of wrath and malice and performed unmeritorious acts (*adharmā*) on his subjects. The sages killed him with a *kuśa* grass empowered by a spell (*mantrapūta*). All Purāṇas follow this account. Only one verse in the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara* I.108 mentions Lokāyatika (a later addition?). In any case, all sources mention Vena's indulgence in anti-vedic acts, but all by himself, with none to inspire or provoke or assist him. Only in the PPU *Bhūmikhaṇḍa*, Viṣṇu deludes Vena by preaching Jainism.

Acknowledgements

Amitava Bhattacharyya, Krishna Del Toso, and A. Mahalingam (for helping with the Tamil source). The usual disclaimers apply.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- AC = Setha, H.T.; Doṣī, B.J.; Jayantavijaya, M.M. (eds.) (1914-19). *The Abhidhānacintāmaṇi of Hemachandrāchārya. With His Own Notes.* 2 vols. Bhavnagar: N.L. Vakil.
- Bhaṭṭācāryya, Cirañjīva Śarmma (1916). *Vidvan-moda-taraṅgiṇī*. Edited and transl. by Janakinath Kavyatirtha. Kalikata: Chatra Pustakalaya.
- BṛUp = *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. See EPU.
- Caturavijaya, M.; Punyavijaya, M. (eds.) (1989). *San̄ghadāsagaṇi: Vasudevahiṃḍī prathama khaṇḍam*. Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Akademi.
- Chakravarti, Nagendranath (ed.) (1961-62). *Kāvyaṃimāṃsa Rājaśekhara or Kāvyaṃimāṃsā*. Santiniketan: Visva Bharati.
- Cittalaicattanaṛ [Sīthalai Sāttanār] (1989). *Maṇimēkalai*. Transl. by Prema Nandakumar. Thanjavur: Tamil University.
- Cittalaicattanaṛ [Sīthalai Sāttanār]. *Maṇimēkalai*. Online Tamil text. URL http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/4_drav/tamil/pm/pm141_c.txt.
- EPU = Limaye, V.P.; Vadekar, R.D. (eds.) (1958). *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*. Poona: Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala.
- Garuḍa Purāṇa. Pūrvakhaṇḍa* (1985). Kalikata: Nababharata.
- Gītā. Bhagavadgītā*. Sanskrit text. URL http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gret_utf.htm#BhG.
- Hv = Vaidya, P.L. (ed.) (1969). *Harivaṃśa*. 2 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- HV = Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1905). *Khila-Harivaṃśam* (vulgate). Kalikata: Vangavasi.
- HV = Bhattacharyya, Srijib (ed.). *Khila-Harivaṃśam*. Kalikata: Aryyasastra.
- ĪśāUp = *Īśā Upaniṣad*. See EPU.
- KA = Kangle, R.P. (ed.) (1965-72). *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*. Parts 1-3. Bombay: University of Bombay.
- KaṭhaUp = *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. See EPU.
- Kumar, P. (ed.) (2006). *The Agnimahāpurāṇam*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
- Kumar, P. (ed.) (2006). *Śrīgaruḍamahāpurāṇam*. Eng. trans. by M.N. Dutt. Introduction by P. Kumar. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.

- KhKhKh = Śrīharṣa (1914). *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyam*. Edited by Lakshman Shastri Dravid. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot.
- Līngapu = Shastri, J.L. (ed.) (1985). *Līngapurāṇa. With a Commentary by Ganesha Natu*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Līngapu = Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1989). *Līngapurāṇa*. Kalikata: Nababharata Publishers.
- MaiUp = *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*. See EPU; see also Van Buitenen 1962.
- MatPu = Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1910). *Matsya Purāṇa*. Kalikata: Vangavasi.
- Mbh = Sukthankar, V.S. et al. (eds.) (1933-66). *The Mahābhārata*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- NC = Handiqui, K.K. (trans.) (1956). *Śrīharṣa: Naiṣadhacarita*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute.
- NM = Shastri, G. (ed.) (1982-84). *Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa with the Commentary Granthibhaṅga by Cakradhara*. 3 vols. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.
- Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1905-06). *Yogavāsiṣṭha (sic) Rāmāyaṇa*. Bangla transl. by Pancana Tarkaratna. Kalikata: Bangabasi.
- DbhPu = Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1981). *DbhPu. Devībhāgavatam*. Kalikata: Nababharata.
- Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1985). *Śiva Purāṇa (Revised by Srijib Nyayatirtha)*. Kalikata: Vangavasi.
- Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1989). *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. Kalikata: Nababharata.
- Pancanana Tarkaratna (ed.) (1990). *Vāyu Purāṇam*. Kalikata: Nababharata Publishers.
- Pañcatantra = Kale, M.R. (ed.) (1982). *Pañcatantra of Viṣṇuśarman*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- PPu = Tarakanta Devsarmma et al. (eds.) (1884). *Padmapurāṇa. Bhūmikhaṇḍa*. Kalikata: Vangavasi.
- PPu = Tarakanta Devsarmma et al. (eds.) (1910). *Padmapurāṇa. Sṛṣṭikhāṇḍa*. Kalikata: Vangavasi.
- PPu = *Padmapurāṇa. Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa* (1893-94). Poona: Anandashrama.
- PPu = *Padmapurāṇa. Uttara-khaṇḍa* (1894). Poona: Anandashrama.
- Peterson, Peter; Jacobi, Hermann (eds.) (1901-14). *Siddharṣi: Upamitibhava-prapañcā-kathā*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- Pt. Sukhlalji Sanghavi; Bechardas Doshi (eds.) (1924-31). *Abhayadevasūri. Tattvabodhavidhāyinī: Siddhasenadivākara-praṇītam Saṃmatitarkaprakaraṇam Abhayadevasūrinirmitayā Tattvabodhavidhāyinyā vyākhyayā vibhūṣitam*. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vidyapitha.
- Ravi Prakash Arya (ed.) (2005). *Valmīki: The Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki*. Eng. transl. by Vihari Lal Mitra. Delhi: Parimal Publication.

- Sastri Panasikara, W.L. (1918). *Valmiki: The Yogavāsiṣṭha of Valmiki with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmāyaṇatātparyaprakāśa*. Edited by W.L. Sastri Panasikara. Mumbai: Nirnaya Sagar Press.
- SDS = Shastri Abhyankar, V. (1979). *Sarvadarśanasamgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- SDS = Joshi, K.L. (eds.) (1981). *The Sarva-darśana-samgraha*. Transl. by E.B. Cowell and A.E. Gough. Ahmedabad-Delhi: Parimal Publication (Ch. 1 on the Cārvāka first appeared in *Pandit* 9, 1874-75, then reprinted in C/L 246-57).
- ŚḌSam = Jain, M.K. (ed.) (1969). *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya of Haribhadra Sūri. With the Commentaries of Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā of Guṇaratnasūri and Laghuvṛtti of Somatilaka Sūri and an Avacurṇī*. Calcutta: Bharatiya Jnanapitha.
- Shastri, J.L. (ed.) (1983). *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sita Krishna Nambiar (ed.) (1971). *Kṛṣṇa Mīśra: Prabodha Candrodaya of Kṛṣṇa Mīśra*. Edited and transl. by Sita Krishna Nambiar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sivadatta; Panshikar, V.L. (eds.) (1928). *Śrīharṣa: Naiṣadhacarita*. Edited and transl. by Sivadatta and V.L. Panshikar. Mumbai: Nirnay Sagar Press.
- Somadevasūri (1903). *Yaśastilakacampū*. Edited by Pandit Shivadatta and Kashinath Pandurang. Parav. Mumbai: Nirnay Sagar Press.
- Sontakke, N.S.; Kashikar, C.G. (eds.) (1946). *Ṛgveda Samhitā, The*. Puna: Vaidik Samsodhana Mandir.
- Śivamahāpurāṇa (1963). Kashi: Pandit Pustakalaya.
- Tarkavagisa, Phanibhushana (1981-85). *Nyāyadarśana Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya*. 5 vols. Calcutta: West Bengal State Book Board.
- Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya* (1975-79). Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- TRD = "Tarkarahasyadīpikā" (1905-14). Suali, Luigi (ed.), *Haribhadra's Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya. A Review of the Six Systems of Hindu Philosophy: with Guṇaratna's Commentary Tarkarahasyadīpikā*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- TS = Dvarikadas Sastri (ed.) (1968). *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Śāntaraḡṣita with the 'Pañjikā' Commentary of Ācārya Kamalaśīla*. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati.
- TSP = *Tattvasamgrahapañjikā*. See TS.
- TUS = Sukhlalji Sanghavi; Rasiklal Parikh (ed.) (1987). *Jayarāśibhaṭṭas Tattvopaplavasīṃha*. Bauddha Bharati: Varanasi.
- Valmiki: Yogavāsiṣṭha of Mahakavi Vālmiki* (1994). Edited by and Hindi transl. by Mahaprabhulal Goswami. Varanasi: Tara Book Agency.
- VDMPu = Kshemaraja Srikrishnadasa (ed.) (1912). *Viṣṇudharmottara Mahāpurāṇa*. Mumbai: Sri Venkatesvar Steam Press.
- Vpu = Wilson, H.H. (ed.) (1840). *The Vishṇu Purāṇa*. Transl. by H.H. Wilson. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

Secondary Sources

- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna (2011). *Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata*. London: Anthem Press.
- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna (2013a). "Development of Materialism in India: the Pre-Carvakas and the Carvakas". *Esercizi Filosofici*, 8, 1-12.
- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna (2013b). "Verses Attributed to Bṛhaspati in the Sarvadarśanasamgraha Chap. I: A Critical Appraisal". *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 41, 615-30.
- Bhattacharya, Ramkrishna (2016). "Reflections on the Jabali Episode in the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa (Ayodhyākāṇḍa)". *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 44(3), 597-615, 617-18.
- C/L = Chattopadhyaya, D.; Gangopadhyaya, M.K. (eds.) (1990). *Cārvāka/Lokāyata*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
- Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad (1959). *Lokāyata*. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- Chattopadhyaya, Kshetresh Chandra (1975). "The Lokāyata System of Thought in Ancient India". *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, 31, 137-55.
- Choudhury, Radhakrishna (1954-55). "Heretical Sects in the Purāṇas". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 37, 234-57.
- Dandekar, R.N. (1993). "Heretical Doctrines in the Purāṇas". *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 72-73, 737-53.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath (1975). *A History of Indian Philosophy*. 5 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Franco, Eli (2009). s.v. "Lokāyata". Jacobsen, K.A. et al. (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Ganeri, Jonardon (2011). "Emergentisms, Ancient and Modern". *Mind*, 120(479), 671-703.
- Gerschhiemer, Gerdi (2007). "Les 'Six doctrines de spéculation' (ṣaṭtarkī). Sur la categorization variable des systems philosophiques dans l'Inde classique". Preisendanz, Karin (ed.), *Expanding and Merging Horizons. Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 239-58.
- Hazra, R.C. [1940] (1987). *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hazra, R.C. [1958] (1963). *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*. 2 vols. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- Hopkins, E.W. (1972). *Epic Mythology*. Varanasi: Indological Book House.
- Jacobi, H. (1918). "A Contribution Towards the Early History of Indian Philosophy". *Indian Antiquary*, 47, 101-9.
- Jacobi, H. (1970). "Zür Fruhgeschichte der indischen Philosophie". Reprinted in Kölver, B. (Hrsg.), *Kleine Schriften*, Teil 2. Wiesbaden: Franz

- Steiner Verlag. Or. ed., *Seitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1911.
- Lorenzen, David N. (1991). *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two Lost Śaivite Sects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mani, Vettam (1984). *Puranic Encyclopaedia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Müller, Friedrich Max (1971). *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Shah, Priyabala (trans.) (2000-2002). *Viṣṇudharmottar-purāṇa*. Delhi: Parimal Publications.
- Shastri, D.R. (1982). *Cārvāka Darśana*. Bangla translation. Kalikata: Paschim Banga Rajya Pustak Parshad.
- Sörensen, S. (1978). *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Thakur, Anantalal (2015 CE). *Kaṇāda ki nāstika (Is Kaṇāda a nāstika)?, Nivandhābalī*. Kolkata: New Age Publishers.
- Thite, Ganesh Umakant (2014). "Vedic Ritual, Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata". Nabanarayan Bandyopadhyay (ed.), *Vedic Studies. Silver Jubilee Volume, School of Vedic Studies*. Kolkata: Rabindra Bharati University, 417-26.
- Tucci, Giuseppe (1925). "A Sketch of Indian Materialism". C/L, 384-93.
- Van Buitenen, J.A.B. (ed.) (1962). *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*. Transl. by J.A.B. Van Buitenen. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.
- Vidyalankara, Sasibhushana (2006). *Paurāṇika Abhidhāna (Jibanīkośa)*. Kolkata: Sarkāra.