

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

LOKĀYATA IN ANCIENT INDIA AND CHINA

Author(s): Rasik Vihari Joshi

Source: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. 68, No. 1/4, RAMAKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDARKAR 150TH BIRTH-ANNIVERSARY VOLUME (1987), pp. 393-405

Published by: [Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41693336>

Accessed: 03/02/2014 19:50

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

LOKĀYATA IN ANCIENT INDIA AND CHINA

By

RASIK VIHARI JOSHI

I propose to discuss in this paper the materialistic philosophy of India known as Lokāyata or Cārvāka. Unfortunately, the basic sources of this system are not available today. Probably, the sources have been destroyed due to lack of royal patronizer and also due to Brahmanic, Buddhist and Jain philosophers. To understand the doctrines of this system, we have to remain satisfied with writings of the opponents of Lokāyata. The *Bṛhaspati-sūtra*, supposed to have been written by Bṛhaspati, the founder of this system, is lost. I have made an attempt in this paper to reconstruct the *Bṛhaspati-sūtra* through cross references scattered in Sanskrit literature. The present paper is divided into two sections : Section I deals with Lokāyata in ancient India and Section II with ancient China.

I

The term "Lokāyata" is made of two Sanskrit words, viz. *loka* and *āyata* i. e. " world view " or " life view " or " view prevalent among people ". Lokāyata was also known as Cārvāka who was a disciple of Bṛhaspati. This was a kind of primitive pre-materialism in ancient Indian clan society. In all probability, it was linked with Tantrism when Aryans came to India. Lokāyata declared the identity of body and soul and that all beings were results of the combination of two sexes. According to D. Chattopadhyaya, from about 10th century B. C. to the beginning of Christian era, when slave system was developing, Indian materialistic philosophy including Lokāyata very much developed as a popular system of philosophy and did exert great influence among the traders, craftsmen and other lower castes of the then Indian society. Lokāyata was the oldest heterodox system in India and certainly pre-Jain and pre-Buddhist. Several references to Lokāyata are available in the oldest texts of Jain and Buddhist literature. The *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga* and the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* (V Section) of Jain literature, and the *Samanna-phala-sūtra*, the *Mahāvibhāṣā-śāstra*, the *Mahāyāna-nirvāṇa-sūtra* and the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* of Buddhist literature contain valuable information regarding Lokāyata.

The *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga* is one of the oldest and most important works of the Jain Āgama Prakṛt literature. Śīlānka, the oldest commentator of the *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga*, has used four terms for Cārvāka, viz. (1) Bārhaspatya (2) Lokāyata
RGB...50

(3) Bhūtavādin (4) Vāmamārgin. Śīlānka clearly mentions that the Cārvākas secretly indulged in improper conduct. He discusses in detail as a prima facie view the fundamentals of Cārvāka philosophy, stating that they were *tajjīvavādin* or *taccharīravādin*, i. e. they believed in the identity of body and soul. They did not accept existence of an internal independent Ātman apart from body, existence of next world, rebirth, and completely discarded the theory of action.¹

The Upāṅga literature is equally important in Jainism. In the *Rāyapa-senaiya-sūtra*, Mahāvīra narrates a story of an ancient king Paesi (Pradeśī) of Kōkaya Pradeśa.

The king Paesi was personified unrighteousness. There was no place for religion and moral conduct in his life. Once Keśīśramaṇa, a follower of Pārśvanātha, went to Paesi in his city Seyambiyā (Śvetāmbī) and had a long discussion with Paesi on the identity or non-identity of body and soul. The king argued that his grandfather loved him very much, he led a life of a sinner and unrighteousness and therefore according to theory of action he should have been doomed to hell. He should return from hell to warn his dear grandson against indulging in sinful acts but he never returned. Therefore, there is no next world and no existence of soul after death. On this Keśīśramaṇa replied that people in hell are not free to return and hence his grandfather could not come to warn him. Paesi further argued that his grandmother was a very pious and god-fearing lady, she also loved him very much. She should have gone to heaven according to the theory of action. She was certainly free to come from heaven but she also never came to warn him. Therefore there was no next world and the soul did not exist after death.

The discussion testifies that even before Mahāvīra, during the period of Pārśvanātha, the materialistic philosophy of Lokāyata (i. e. Nāstikavāda) was popular in ancient India.

Jain Bhadra-Gaṇī, the author of *Veśeṣāvāśyaka Mahābhāṣya*, occupies a significant place in Kṣamāśrama Jain literature. The Gaṇadhara-vāda is a part of this Mahābhāṣya, wherein Mahāvīra had a long discussion with eleven Brahmin savants. In this context, the points of view of Indrabhūti and Vāyubhūti are noteworthy.

Indrabhūti vehemently denounces the existence of an external Ātman apart from body and accepts 'perception' alone as the only means of valid knowledge. Vāyubhūti propounds that consciousness is produced by the combination of the

-
1. (a) *Sūtra-kṛtāṅga* : I. I. I. II-12.
 (b) *Śīlānka-Tīkā* : I. I. I. 7-8.

first four basic elements. He gives an analogy to support his stand-point of certain flowers, molace and water which, put together, produce liquor.² The doctrines of Indrabhūti and Vāyubhūti definitely belonged to Lokāyata tradition.

Several other Jain writers such as Hemacandra, the great dialectician, and Malli Sen Sūri, the philosopher, have severely criticised the Cārvāka epistemology in the *Anya-yoga-vyavahedadvātriṅśikā* and the validity of perception as the only proof of knowledge in the *Syād-vāda-Mañjarī* respectively.³ Besides, both these Jain critics refute the Lokāyata view of the production of consciousness by the combination of the first four basic elements. Hemacandra also gives a long account in his *Tri-ṣaṣṭilakṣaṇa-śalākā-puruṣa-carita* Mahākāvya, of the previous life of Ṛṣabhadeva as the king Mahābala who was very lustful and fallen person. Sambhinna-mati, one of his ministers, supported the King's way of life, advocating that there was no soul and rebirth. It is useless to perform any religious ritual or to follow rules of moral conduct. Here, we find seventeen arguments which give a clear picture of Lokāyata philosophy in ancient India.⁴

In the Buddhist literature the Lokāyata is also frequently referred to as Nāstika i. e. Natthika Darśana. I give below three references to prove that Buddhist literature was also fully familiar with Lokāyata :

- (1) Pūraṇa-Kassapa, in the *Dighanikāya* (2. 16-17) advocates Lokāyata doctrine. The text states : 'once the king Ajātasātru approached Pūraṇa-Kassapa and enquired about the visible reward of entering into the order of Saṃnyāsa. Pūraṇa-kassapa replied : "Your Majesty, there is no result by performing the so-called good action, by killing or torturing others, or by stealing, or by sexual relations with other women". He, thus, clearly denounces the theory of action.⁵ The *Anguttara-Nikāya* refers to two Brahmin disciples of Pūraṇa-Kassapa who were Lokāyatas.⁶
- (2) In the Tripiṭaka literature, we find two personages Ajitakesakambalī and Payāsī who were contemporaries of Buddha. According to them all vedic rituals were worthless; there was no result of good and bad actions; nobody could tell us the personal experience regarding the next world. All bodies are made of the four elements and dissolve into them after death; hence any ritual for ancestors is meaningless.⁷

2. *Veśeśāvatyaka-Mahābhāṣya* (Gaṇadharavāda) Gāthā. 1549-1553; 1650-1651.

3. "Pratyakṣam evaikam pramāṇam iti manyante Cārvākāḥ", *Syād-vāda-mañjarī*.

4. *Triṣaṣṭi-lakṣaṇa-śalākā-puruṣa-Carita*, I. I. 329-345.

5. S. N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy* (III) p. 520-21.

6. B. M. Barua, *History of Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy*, p. 278.

7. *Digha-Nikāya*.

- (3) In Pali literature, too, we find the doctrine of Sañjaya Velaththi-Putra who was totally indifferent to this question of the origin of the universe, cycles of births and rebirths and the theory of action. He was rather a sceptic (*samśayavādin*) and agnostic (*ajñānavādin*). Obviously, he was influenced by Lokāyata.

II

In Chinese classical Buddhist literature, Lokāyata has been transcribed as "Lu-kā-yā-tuo", "Lu-ge-ye-duo", and "Lu-kā-yi-duo"; it was translated as "Zhuo-bo-ka" which was none else but Sanskrit "Cārvāka". We also find some other terms such as "Wu-hou-shi-lun" (doctrine of denying life after death), "Shi-Lun" (doctrine of this world); "Shi-Jian-Xing" (popular doctrine of this world) and "Shun-shi-Wai-Dao" (popular doctrine prevalent in this world).

Profuse references are preserved in the Chinese versions of Buddhist writings. The Chinese Buddhist Dictionary entitled *Yi-Qie-Jin-Yin-yi* by Hui Lin translates "Lu-kā-ye-ti-kā" i. e. Lokāyatika as wicked doctrine. It is interesting to note that *Daśa-bhūmi-vibhāṣā-śāstra* translated into Chinese in the latter half of Chin Dynasty during 384-417 A. D. refers to Lokāyatika as Lu-ka-ye-jin" i. e. Lokāyata Sūtra. This seems to be none else but *Bṛhaspati Sūtra*. I may mention that the Chinese translation of the *Śārdūla-Karṇa-Sūtra* (She-Tou-Jain-Tai-Zi-Jin) during western Chin Dynasty also refers to "Shi-li-Jin" i. e. the doctrine of this world.

References to Lokāyata have been preserved in several Chinese writings. Right from the period of three kingdoms (265-280 A. D.) to the period of Ming Dynasty (1368-1644 A. D.) more than fifty references are scattered in the Chinese versions of Buddhist commentaries and works. I should like to draw the attention of scholars to three of these references:

- (a) The *Brahma-jāla-sūtra*. It systematically expounds the Lokāyata doctrine and was translated into Chinese as early as the third century A. D. by Chin Chien in the kingdom of Wu (225-253 A. D.).
- (b) The *Śramaṇa-phala-sūtra* translated into Chinese during the East Chin Dynasty.
- (c) The edition of the *Brahma-Jāla-Sūtra* with Chinese translation and notes by Chi-Kuang during the period of Ming Dynasty.

An outline of Lokāyata on the basis of these records is given below :

- (1) The *Brahma-Jāla-Sūtra* and the *Mātāṅgī-Sūtra* give ample evidence that the followers of Lokāyata contributed a lot to the development of secular sciences such as medicine, astronomy and agronomy.
- 2) The Chinese references provide material to understand Lokāyata views on epistemology and social norms.
- 3) The *Mūla-Sarvāsti-Vāda* Nikāya-Vinaya (Vol. 35) mentions that frequent debates took place between Lokāyata and Buddhist. Lokāyatas were often rough in their language and behaviour and the debates were converted into fights with heated words, abuses, blows, kicks and sticks.
- 4) The Lokāyata doctrines were mostly distorted and misinterpreted by Chinese Buddhist monks in such a way that they suited to their ideology. Let us remember that Lokāyata and Buddhist arrived in China almost at the same time from India. The *Annals of Tang Dynasty in India* refers to a Lokāyata (Lu-kā-yi-tuo) who went to China from India at the instance of Emperor Kao Tsung (650-680 A. D.) of Tang Dynasty.
- 5) Profuse references to Lokāyata and its doctrine are preserved in *The Establishment of the Theories of Buddhist and other Religious Sects* written by the Chinese-Tibetan Buddhist savant Hijamdbyan-sbshed-phirorje.
- 6) In the *Memories of the Eminent-Hinen Chao*, Yi-tsing refers to a discussion between Hiuen-tsang and a Lokāyata Mahāyāna-Devana at Nalanda (India), where-in the Lokāyata adhered to the origin of all beings and all substances from the first four basic elements while Hiuen-tsang supported the Mahāyāna point of view. The reference testifies that Lokāyata still exerted its influence in India in the 7th century A. D.
- 7) The Chinese Buddhists were scared of Lokāyata and considered them as their dead enemy. They prohibited their followers to study Lokāyata and translated *lokāyata* by "evil doctrine". Chi-tsang (550-625 A. D.) bracketed Lokāyata, Confucians and Taoists together in his "San-Lun" (Three Scriptures) and pronounced Lokāyata as "wicked interpretations". The Buddhists considered Lokāyata as bad as Confucians and Taoists during Northern and

Southern Dynasties and Sui-Tang Dynasty. And they always criticised these three.

- 8) The Buddhist monks mis-interpreted the Lokāyata doctrine of atom (*aṇu*) stating that there was consciousness presiding over the atoms of four elements. Chih-chou of Tang Dynasty said that the atom of Lokāyata has emptiness which results in mind; that atom has purity which results in senses, and atom has non-impurity which result in form and sound.⁸ This was explained by Ting Pin of Tang Dynasty in his critical notes on the *Dharma-gupta-vinaya-vārtika* (Vol. 10) that Lokāyata accepted only (*aṇu*) as the cause of entire universe and the four elements as the cause of all forms, sense organs and intellect. He, however, refuted Lokāyata doctrine, arguing that there was always a pure spirit behind the elements and this spirit was mind. Truly, all forms arise from elements but only light illumines and others do not. Similarly, it's only mind which perceives.
- 9) Indian leftist Tantrism and Chinese Taoism were related to Lokāyata. Tantrism recognised creation by the combination of two sexes, and Taoism advocated that universe was a result of two principles viz. Ying and Yang. Both systems accepted practices for longevity and vitality. Both recognised mysticism, but also played an important role in the development of sciences such as medicine and chemistry in ancient India and China. There is no doubt that Taoism arrived in India in 7th century A. D.. The *Annals of Tang Dynasty* state that Wang Hsuen-tse, a Chinese author, had requested to the Emperor to send him a statue of Lao-tse also a book of Lao-tse entitled *Tao To Chang* to India. I was told by my friend and colleague Prof. P. V. Bapat several years ago that this book was translated into Sanskrit by Hiuen-tsang. I have not so far been able to catch hold of this Sanskrit translation.
- 10) The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* refers to the doctrine of Lokāyata as *Śarīra-buddhi-viśayopalabधि-mātram*, i. e. connected only with body, intellect and object.⁹ This valuable work was translated into Chinese by Bodhiruci during Wei Dynasty and throws much light on the doctrine of Lokāyata. One full section is devoted to Lokāyata entitled as "Lu-chia-yeh-to". I quote below a legend from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* regarding the origin of Lokāyata :

8. Chih-chou, *Revelation of Vidyā-mātra-siddha-śāstra*, Vol. I.

9. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (ed.) Bunyu Nanjio, Kyoto, 1923, p. 174.

“ Also Indra, learned by the study of several śāstras and author of his own (Sanskrit) grammar, through the disciple of Lokāyata dressed as a Nāga, declaring in the court of Indra in heaven, ‘ O Indra ! either your chariot of thousand spokes will be destroyed or all my hoods one by one ’; thus, having conquered Indra of Gods through the disciple of Lokāyata dressed as a Nāga and having destroyed the thousand-spoked chariot of Indra, again returned to this world ”.¹⁰

While interpreting this reference, Prof. Giuseppe Tucci has translated the phrase *sva-śabdaśāstra-praṇetā* as — author of his own śāstra i. e. Lokāyata. Obviously, Prof. Tucci has missed the point, and so have the Chinese translation by Śikṣānanda, Guṇabhadra and Bodhiruci as well as Tibetan translations. None of them have taken into account the word “ Śabda ”. The word *śabda-śāstra* undoubtedly stands for grammar. We know that *Aindra Vyākaraṇa* was written by Indra. That is exactly what is meant by the phrase *sva-śabdaśāstra-praṇetā* i. e. author of his own Sanskrit grammar. We also come across two sūtras relating to the doctrine of Lokāyata written by Purandara, a follower of Bṛhaspati. The first sūtra is quoted by Abhayadeva in the *Sanmati Prakaraṇa Tīkā* as *etac ca Purandara-mataṁ* (this is the doctrine of Purandara); second by Kamalaśīla as *Purandaras tv āha* (thus speaks Purandara). Let us remember that Indra is a synonym of Purandara. Both belong to Lokāyata tradition. In all probability this is the same Indra who wrote *Aindra Sanskrit grammar*. I have not yet been able to investigate *Aindra Vyākaraṇa*. An enquiry into that Vyākaraṇa will probably prove my contention.

I give below the resumé of the doctrines of Lokāyata :

- (1) It is declared that motion in matter (i. e. atom) is due to the inherent potentiality of matter itself and thus denied the necessity of accepting any super-natural agency such as God to account for creation. Matter itself is the basis of consciousness.
- (2) Consciousness is produced by the combination of elements. Mind and body are unified. There is no eternal soul apart from body. Since consciousness is connected only with body, body itself is soul. So long there is body, there is soul; when body is destroyed soul is also destroyed. Consciousness becomes stronger by rich food and exercise.

10. Indro 'pi Mahāmate ! aneka-śāstra-vidagdha-buddhiḥ sva-śabda-śāstra-praṇetā, tacchīsyena nāga-rūpa-veśa-dhāriṇā svarge Indra-sabhāyām pratijñāṁ kṛtvā, tava vā sahasrāro ratho bhajyatām, mama vā ekaika-nāga-bhāvasya phaṇacchedo bhavatu, iti sahadharमेṇa nāga-veśa-dhāriṇā Lokayatika-sīsyena devānām Indraṁ vijitya, sahasrā-ratham bhāntvā, punar api imāṁ lokāṁ āgataḥ.

- (3) Since memory, feelings, senses and life exist only in body, and not outside the body, they are simply attributes of body.
- (4) The theory of action cannot be proved. There is no result of good or bad actions. Who knows for certain that next birth and next world exist? Who knows that good and bad actions result in happiness and unhappiness? We daily experience that sinful persons prosper and enjoy in this world.
- (5) All divine literature and all religious practices are made by priests for their own benefits. Religion is for foolish people. There is no God. Only weak people believe in God. Nature alone is responsible for all happenings without any God. World is self-existent.
- (6) Only this perceptible world is real, rest is unreal. Body is life. There is no other life after the death of body.
- (7) Sensory experience is the only valid source of knowledge.
- (8) All beings are created by male and female sexes.
- (9) All men are equal. There is no purity or superiority of caste. Social equality is the supreme philosophy. Lokāyata declared that there was no milk in the veins of a Brahmin and blood only in a Śūdra. Hence all are equal.

I have no hesitation to accept that my study of Chinese Buddhist literature is not very profound but I believe that a deeper research in these sources will bring out more facts about this materialistic system of Indian philosophy which is in no way less important.

Reconstruction of the Bṛhaspati-sūtra

1. *athātas tattvaṃ vyākhyāsyāmah |*
(Now onwards we shall explain the elements.)
2. *pṛthivyaptejovāyuriti tattvāni |*
(Earth, water, fire and air elements.)
3. *tatsamudaye śarirendriya-viśaya-samjñā |*
(The names body, senses and objects are in their aggregate.)
4. *tebhyaś caitanyaṃ |*
(From them consciousness [appears].)

5. *kiṇvādībhyo mada-śaktivat /*
(As intoxicating power from *kiṇva* (seed) etc. ingredients.)
6. *kāma evaikāḥ puruṣārthaḥ /*
(Sex is the sole object of human life.)
7. *anumānam apramāṇam /*
(Inference is not valid.)
8. *caitanya-viśiṣṭaḥ kāyaḥ puruṣaḥ /*
(Body endowed with consciousness is man.)
9. *maraṇam evāpavargaḥ /*
(Death itself is liberation.)
10. *na dharmānś caret /*
(one should not follow religious duties.)
11. *esyat-phalatvāt /*
(Since the result is in future.)
12. *sāṁśayikatvāc ca /*
(And doubtful.)
13. *ko hy abālīṣo hastagataṁ paragataṁ kuryāt /*
(Who but a silly will hand over (his) possession to other ?)
14. *varam adya kapotaḥ śvomayūrāt /*
(Better a pegeon of today than a peacock of tomorrow.)
15. *varam sāṁśayikān niṣkād asāṁśayikaḥ kāṛṣāpaṇaḥ /*
(Better a definite ordinary coin than a doubtful golden coin.)
16. *śarīrendriyasamghāta eva cetanaḥ kṣetrajñāḥ /*
(The conscious soul is only the aggregate of body and senses.)
17. *kāma eva prāṇinām kāraṇam /*
(Only sex is the cause of beings.)
18. *para-lokino 'bhāvāt paralokābhāvah /*
(Since none has seen next world, it does not exist.)
19. *ihaloka-paraloka-śarīrayor bhinnatvāt tadgatayor api cittayor
naikāḥ santānaḥ /*

RGB...51

(Since bodies of this world and next world are different, the minds are also different, hence no continuity.)

20. *etāvān eva puruṣo yāvān indriyagocaraḥ |*
(That much is man which is seen by senses.)
21. *pratyakṣam evaikam pramāṇam |*
(Perception is the only valid proof.)
22. *kāyād eva tato jñānam prāṇāpānādyadhiṣṭhitād yuktaṁ jāyate |*
(Therefore knowledge arises only from body possessed of *prāṇa* and *apāna* etc., the vital breaths.)
23. *sarvatra paryanuyoga-parāṇy eva sūtrāṇi Bṛhaspateḥ |*
(The sūtras of Bṛhaspati are always intent on refuting.)
24. *lokāyatam eva śāstram |*
(Only Lokāyata is a scripture.)
25. *pratyakṣam eva pramāṇam |*
(Perception in the only valid proof.)
26. *pṛthivyaptejovāyavas tattvāni |*
(Earth, water, fire and air are elements.)
27. *artha-kāmau puruṣārthau |*
(The purpose of life is wealth and sex.)
28. *bhūtāny eva cetayanti |*
(The elements alone produce consciousness.)
29. *nāsti paralokaḥ |*
(There is no next world.)
30. *mṛtyur evāpavargaḥ |*
(Death itself is liberation.)
31. *daṇḍa-nītir eva vidyā |*
(The only lore is science of politics.)
32. *atraiva vārtāntarbhavati |*
(Herein is included agriculture.)
33. *dhūrta-pralāpas trayī |*
(The three vedas are nonsensical prattling of a swindler.)

34. *svargotpādakatvena viśeṣābhāvāt |*
(They don't have any excellence as they simply produce heaven.)
35. *loka-prasiddham anumānam cārvākair apīśyata eva, yat tu kaiścil laukikaṁ mārgam atikramyānumānam ucyate, tan niśidhyate |*
(The world-known inference is equally desired by Cārvaka, only inference beyond this world, accepted by others, is denied.)
36. *paśyāmi śṛṇomītyādi-pratītyā maraṇa-paryantaṁ yāvantīndriyāṇi tiṣṭhanti tāny evātmā |*
(Due to apprehensions, " I see ", " I listen ", all senses which remain till death are soul.)
37. *itar endriyādyabhāve sattvāt mana evātmā |*
(Since it exists in the absence of other senses etc., mind is soul.)
38. *prāṇa evātmā |*
(Vital breath is soul.)
39. *laukiko mārgo 'nusartavyaḥ |*
(The world view should be followed.)
40. *loka-vyavahāraṁ prati sadṛṣau bāla-paṇḍitau |*
(Equal are a child and scholar towards worldly behavior.)

These forty Bṛhaspati sūtras are scattered in Sanskrit literature. Sūtras nos. one to three are quoted by Jayarāṣi Simha in the *Tattvopaplava-siṁha*. He mentions " Thus spoke Sūtrakāra ". Nos. two to five are quoted by Bhāskara in *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*. Bhāskara clearly mentions that the sūtras are written by Bṛhaspati (*tathā ca Bārhaspatyasūtrāṇi*). These sūtras have been frequently quoted by several authors, such as by Kamalaśīla in the *Tattvasaṁgraha-pañjikā* and by Guṇaratna in the commentary *Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā* on the *Ṣad-darśana-samuccaya*. Kamalaśīla designates them as " their sūtras " (*tathā ca teṣāṁ sūtrāṇi*) and Guṇaratna clearly refers as Lokāyata-sūtraṁ. Nos. two to four and eight are quoted and discussed by Śāṅkara in his *Brahmasūtra bhāṣya*; nos. six, eight and nine by Sadānanda in the *Vedāntasāra*; six is quoted by Nīlakaṇṭha in his comm. on the *Bhagavadgītā*. He refers to it as Bṛhaspati-sūtra (*tathā ca Bārhaspatyaṁ Sūtraṁ*). Abhayadeva quotes no. seven in his *Tattva-bodha-vidhāyini*, stating : *tathā ca Bṛhaspati-sūtraṁ*. Vācaspati Miśra also quotes no. eight in his commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā*, stating : " and thus is Bṛhaspati-Sūtra " (*tathā ca Bārhaspatyaṁ sūtraṁ*). Vātsyāyana quotes

Nos. nine to fifteen in the *Kāma-sūtra* stating " Thus the *Laukāyatikas* " (*iti laukāyatikāḥ*). Number seventeen is quoted by Śāṅkara in his *Gītā-bhāṣya* and number eighteen by Kamalaśīla in the *Tattvasaṅgraha-panjikā*. Śāṅkara clearly says " This is the view point of the *Laukāyatikas* (*iti Laukāyatika-dṛṣṭir iyam*). Kamalaśīla states : *tathā hi tasya etat sūtram*. From the context, it is clear that the word *tasya* stands for *Lokāyata*. Number eighteen is also quoted verbatim in the commentary of the *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa*. Nos. nineteen and twenty-one are quoted by Kamalaśīla as *Lokāyata-Sūtra*. Number twenty-one is quoted by Abhayadeva as *Cārvāka Sūtra* in the *Tarka-prakaraṇa-ṭīkā*. Twenty-two is quoted in the *Tattva-saṅgraha* as (*tathā ca sūtram / kāyād eveti, Kambalāśvataroditam iti*). Let us remember that Kambalāśvatarā was another writer of *Lokāyata* philosophy like Purandara in the materialistic philosophy of Bṛhaspati. Number twenty-three is available in the *Sammati-tarka-prakaraṇa*, as spoken by *Cārvākas* (*iti cārvākair abhihitam*). Eleven sūtras, nos. twenty-four to thirty-four, are quoted by Kṛṣṇamīśra in the *Prabodha-Candrodaya*. The text runs as follows : *iti eta dasmākam abhiprāyāṇuvartinā Vācaspatinā praṇīya cārvākāya samarpitam, tena ca śiṣyopaśiṣyadvāreṇa asmin loke bahulikṛtam tattvam*. Number thirty-five is quoted by Śāntarakṣita in the *Tattva-saṅgraha*. Śāntarakṣita states : *purandaras tvāha* (Purandara spoke) and *laukikam liṅgam iti cet* (in case of world view). Nos. thirty-six to thirty-eight are quoted by Sadānanda in the *Vedāntasāra*. Sadānanda refutes them as " others' opinions " (*iti kecit, ity anye*). The last two sūtras are quoted by Jayarāsi-Simha in the *Tattvopaplavasīmha*.

In 1824, Prof. F. W. Thomas edited a manuscript of the *Bṛhaspati-Sūtra* but it was proved to be a fabricated one. There is no doubt the *Bṛhaspati-sūtra* did exist in ancient India and probably it consisted of the sūtras and also the ślokas. This mixed style was not uncommon as we have the same style in the *Kāma-sūtra* of Vātsyāyana and the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭilya. We also find several ślokas in Sanskrit literature written by Bṛhaspati and exposing the philosophy of *Lokāyata*. I believe that these ślokas were also a part of the *Bṛhaspati-Sūtra*. I am also inclined to believe that at least one Sanskrit commentary, if not two, was written on the *Bṛhaspati-sūtra* in the third century B. C.. The *Divyāvadāna* refers to a bhāṣya of *Lokāyata* (*Lokāyatam bhāṣya-pravacanam*); which was this bhāṣya? Obviously lost. Patañjali in the *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya* in the second century B. C. refers to a text *Lokāyata* on which was written a bhāṣya or varṇikā entitled " Bhāguri " (*varṇikā bhāgurī Lokāyatasy, varṇikā bhāgurī Lokāyatsya* — *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* 7. 3. 45). This testifies that there existed a work entitled *Lokāyata* and at least one Sanskrit commentary was well known in the second century B. C.; but it has also been lost. It has been brought to my notice by some of my friends that a

work on Lokāyata entitled *Guang-zhu-Jin* does exist in Chinese version. I have not so far been able to procure this. I believe that when the entire text of the *Bṛhaspati-sūtra* i. e. the sūtras and the ślokas will be reconstructed with the above mentioned Chinese text, it will throw ample light on this important system of Indian philosophy.

Bibliography

1. Dakshina Ranjana Shastri, *Cārvāka-śaṣṭi*, Calcutta, 1924.
2. Dakshina Ranjana Shastri, *Cārvāka-darśana*, Calcutta, 1959.
3. Deviprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata-Darśana*, Calcutta, 1956.
4. Deviprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata — A Study of Ancient Indian Materialism*, New Delhi, 1959.
5. Guiseppe Tucci, *Linee di una storia del Materialismo Indiano*, Roma, 1923.
6. Huang Hsin-chuan, *Lokāyata and its Influence in China*, Peking, 1978.
7. Mādhavācārya, *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha*, Uma Shanker Shastri, Varanasi, 1964. English Tr. : E. B. Cowell & A. E. Gough, Varanasi, 1961.