

More Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata

More Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata

By

Ramkrishna Bhattacharya

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



More Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata

By Ramkrishna Bhattacharya

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Ramkrishna Bhattacharya

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4082-0

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4082-8

For
Dr Krishna Del Toso
A close friend, an excellent collaborator, and a fellow-traveller

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Chapter One.....	1
Relevance of the <i>Kaṭha Upaniṣad</i> to the Study of Materialism in India	
Chapter Two	24
From Proto-materialism to Materialism	
Chapter Three	40
The Pre-Cārvākas and the Cārvākas	
Chapter Four.....	49
Who are the <i>lokāyatika brāhmaṇas</i> ?	
Chapter Five	65
Pre-Cārvāka Materialism in the <i>Vasudevahimṭhī</i>	
Chapter Six	70
Materialism in the Old Tamil Epics: The <i>Maṇimēkalai</i> and the <i>Nīlakeśi</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	79
<i>Lokāyata</i> and <i>lokāyatika</i> in the <i>Milindapañha</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	84
<i>Lokāyata</i> and Its Derivatives in the <i>Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	90
Pre-Cārvāka Materialism in the Jābāli Episode in the <i>Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa</i>	
Chapter Ten	109
The Cārvāka/Lokāyata and Greek Materialism	

Chapter Eleven	117
Materialism: East and West	
Chapter Twelve	124
The Base Text of the Cārvākas and Its Commentaries	
Chapter Thirteen	139
The Cārvāka/Lokāyata: Classification of Source Materials	
Chapter Fourteen	144
Commentators on the <i>Cārvākasūtra</i>	
Chapter Fifteen	156
What the Cārvākas Originally Meant	
Chapter Sixteen	171
The Social Outlook of the Cārvāka/Lokāyata	
Chapter Seventeen	176
Two Obscure Sanskrit Words Related to the Cārvāka: <i>pañcagupta</i> and <i>kuṇḍakīṭa</i>	
Chapter Eighteen	181
Verses Attributed to Bṛhaspati in the <i>Sarvadarśanasamgraha</i>	
Chapter Nineteen	197
Bṛhaspati and the Bārhaspatyas	
Chapter Twenty	
Cārvāka Miscellany I	223
Cārvāka Miscellany II	229
Cārvāka Miscellany III	241
Bibliography	251

PREFACE

The book is a sequel to my *Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata* (Firenze 2009; London 2011). It is gratifying for any author to find his book on the materialist systems in India well-received. In this work, materialism in India has been treated not merely as a doctrine but in various stages of its development both in north and south India. The first book has succeeded in invoking interest among Indologists and researchers in the history of ideas. Explorations in Tibetan material, not available either in Sanskrit or in any other language, have been started in right earnest by Dr Krishna Del Toso, the dedicatee of this book. He has done some pioneering work in this area and widened the scope of further research.

It has been my attempt to bring to notice two major themes: the first is to disabuse all students of philosophy of the notion that there has been one and only one variety of materialist thought in India; secondly, the Cārvāka fragments reveal that the two main charges brought against materialism – unbridled hedonism and rejection of inference *per se* as a means of knowledge – are without any foundation.

Three chapters have been devoted to the commentators on the base text of the Cārvākas. This has so far been an unexplored area. I hope new discoveries in this field of study will be made in the foreseeable future.

Bṛhaspati is widely believed to be the founder of the materialist system in India. A detailed study of the role of this legendary figure as found in various sources relating to materialism, however, made it clear that the association of Bṛhaspati with the Cārvāka/Lokāyata is an invention of the opponents of materialism. So the name, Bārhaspatya, as a synonym for the Cārvāka or Lokāyata does not stand either to reason or to fact. The Cārvākas never called themselves Bārhaspatyas.

I would like to thank all editors and publishers of the scholarly journals in which most of these chapters first appeared in slightly different forms. Thanks are due to Amitava Bhattacharyya, Sourav Basak and Siddhartha Dutta for preparing the press copy and helping me in all possible ways. My friends, Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya, Sanjit Kumar Sadhukhan, Sunish

Kumar Deb, and, last but not least, Tirthankar Mitra also deserve kudos for their assistance. I am much beholden to A. Mahalingam, Chennai, for providing me with an interlinear translation of several passages from the Tamil epics.

Ramkrishna Bhattacharya
3 Mohanlal Street
Kolkata 700 004
lokayata_rkb@yahoo.com
29th September 2019

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ABORI</i>	<i>Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute</i>
<i>AC</i>	Hemacandra. <i>Abhidhānacintāmaṇi</i>
<i>ĀD</i>	Jayantabhaṭṭa. <i>Āgamaḍambara</i>
<i>ĀLVṛ</i>	Jñānaśrībhadra. <i>Āryalaṅkāvatāravṛtti</i>
<i>AN</i>	<i>Aṅguttara Nikāya</i>
<i>Aṣṭ</i>	Pāṇini. <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>
<i>AYVD</i>	Hemacandra. <i>Anyā-yoga-vyavaccheda-dvāṭṛṃśikā</i>
<i>BJS</i>	Brahmajālasutta
<i>BORI</i>	The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
<i>BṛhadUp</i>	<i>Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad</i>
<i>BS</i>	<i>Brahmasūtra</i>
<i>ChāUp</i>	<i>Chāndogya Upaniṣad</i>
<i>C/L</i>	<i>Cārvāka/Lokāyata</i>
<i>DBhPu</i>	<i>Devibhāgavata Purāṇa</i>
<i>DN</i>	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>
<i>EPU</i>	<i>Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads</i>
<i>Gītā</i>	<i>Bhagavadgītā</i>
<i>GrBh</i>	Cakradhara. <i>Granthibhaṅga</i>
<i>HV</i>	<i>Harivaṃśa</i>
<i>JM</i>	Āryaśūra. <i>Jātakamālā</i>
<i>KA</i>	Kauṭīliya. <i>Arthaśāstra</i>
<i>KauUp</i>	<i>Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad</i>
<i>KaṭhaUp</i>	<i>Kaṭha Upaniṣad</i>
<i>KenaUp</i>	<i>Kena Upaniṣad</i>
<i>KhKhKh</i>	Śrīharṣa. <i>Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya</i>
<i>KS</i>	Vātsyāyana. <i>Kāmasūtra</i>
<i>LBS</i>	Lokāyatikabrāhmaṇa Sutta
<i>LoS</i>	Lokayatika Sutta
<i>LS</i>	Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra

<i>LV</i>	<i>Lalitavistara</i>
<i>MaiUp</i>	<i>Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad</i>
<i>Manu</i>	<i>Manusmṛti</i>
<i>MatPu</i>	<i>Matsya Purāṇa</i>
<i>Mbh</i>	<i>Mahābhārata</i>
MLBD	Motilal Banarsidass
<i>MN</i>	<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>Milindapañha</i>
<i>MŚ</i>	Nāgārjuna. <i>Madhyamakaśāstra</i>
<i>NC</i>	Śrīharṣa. <i>Naiṣadhacarita</i>
<i>NM</i>	Jayantabhaṭṭa. <i>Nyāyamañjarī</i>
<i>NS</i>	<i>Nyāyasūtra</i>
<i>PC</i>	Kṛṣṇamiśra. <i>Prabodhacandrodaya</i>
<i>PNTA</i>	<i>Pramāṇanayatattvalokālamkāra</i>
<i>PPu</i>	<i>Padma Purāṇa</i>
PTS	Pali Text Society
<i>Pu</i>	<i>Purāṇa</i>
<i>PV</i>	Dharmakīrti <i>Pramāṇavārttika</i>
<i>PVSVṬ</i>	Aviddhakarna. <i>Pramāṇa-vārttika-svopajña-vṛtti-ṭīkā</i>
<i>Rām</i>	<i>Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa</i>
<i>RT</i>	Kahlana. <i>Rāja-taraṅgiṇī</i>
<i>Rv</i>	<i>Ṛgveda</i>
<i>ŚatBr</i>	<i>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa</i>
<i>ŚB</i>	<i>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa</i>
<i>SDPS</i>	<i>Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra</i>
<i>SDS</i>	Sāyaṇa-Mādhava. <i>Sarvadarśanasanḡraha</i>
<i>ṢḌSam</i>	<i>Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya</i>
<i>SK</i>	<i>Sāmkhyakārikā</i>
<i>SKa</i>	Haribhadra. <i>Samarāicca Kahā</i>
<i>SKS</i>	<i>Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra</i>
S-M	Sāyaṇa-Mādhava.
<i>SMS</i>	<i>Sarvamatasaṅgraha</i>
<i>SN</i>	<i>Samyutta Nikāya</i>
SPhS	Sāmāñña-phala-sutta
<i>ŚveUp</i>	<i>Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad</i>

<i>SVM</i>	Malliṣeṇa. <i>Syādvādamañjarī</i>
<i>SVR</i>	Vādidēvasūri. <i>Syādvādaratnākara</i>
<i>TaittiBr</i>	<i>Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa</i>
<i>TaittiSaṃ</i>	<i>Taittirīya Saṃhitā</i>
<i>TRD</i>	Guṇaratna. <i>Tarkarahasyadīpikā</i>
<i>TS</i>	Śāntarakṣita. <i>Tattvasaṅgraha</i>
<i>TSP</i>	Kamalaśīla. <i>Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā</i>
<i>TSPC</i>	Hemacandra. <i>Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-carita</i>
<i>UBhPK</i>	Siddharṣi. <i>Upamiti-bhava-prapañcā-kathā</i>
<i>Vasu.</i>	Saṅghadāsagaṇi Vācaka. <i>Vasudevahimḍī</i>
<i>VDMPu</i>	<i>Viṣṇudharmottara Mahāpurāṇa</i>
<i>VPu</i>	<i>Vishṇu Purāṇa</i>
<i>Vyoma</i>	Vyomaśiva. <i>Vyomavatī</i>
<i>YS</i>	Hemacandra, <i>Yogaśāstra</i>
<i>YTC</i>	Somadevasūri. <i>Yaśastilakacampū</i>
<i>YOV</i>	<i>Yogavāsīṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa</i>

CHAPTER ONE

RELEVANCE OF THE *KĀṬHA UPANIṢAD* TO THE STUDY OF MATERIALISM IN INDIA

The genesis of materialism in India has so far been viewed from two mutually exclusive points of view. Erich Frauwallner (1997, vol. 2, 216 *et seq*) and those who follow his approach prefer to locate it in the Jain and Buddhist canonical texts, particularly in ‘Paesi (rājañña) suttanta’ (‘The Discourse of Governor/King Paesi’) (Franco and Preisendanz 1998, 179; Franco 2011, 634). Frauwallner has even claimed Paesi to be ‘the first materialist’ (1997, vol. 2, 216). This is a glaring example of mistaking fiction for fact. There is no evidence of the existence of a king or a provincial governor called Paesi who had conducted some experiments to find out the nature of the soul.¹ From the Prakrit version of the Paesi legend and some

¹ In a review article of Bollée’s translation of the Jain Paesi legend, Piotr Balcerowicz (2005) has thoroughly dealt the issue. Although the names and hence the characters in the narratives in the Buddhist canonical work (‘The Discourse of King Pāyāsi’) and the two Jain secular works [Rāyapasenaijja (‘Dialogue of King Prasenajit’) and Haribhadra’s *Samarāiccakahā*, *SKa* (*The Story of Samarāditya*)] vary widely, the original story must have been the same. G. Tucci observes: ‘The analogies which the *Pāyāsisuttanta* shows to have with the Jaina *Rāyapaseṇiya* and some passages of *Samarāiccakahā* cannot be explained as mutual borrowings, but rather as various derivations from real doctrines followed in ancient times’ (Tucci 1925 in *Cārvāka/Lokāyata* (C/L), 389. See also Tucci 1923/1971, 109 *et seq.*). This ‘parable’ was presumably manufactured with the express view of discrediting those who did not believe in the immortality of the soul. This task is accomplished by a Buddhist monk in the Buddhist Pāyāsi dialogue, and by a Jain monk in the two Jain versions of the story. The dialogue between the king and a Buddhist or a Jain monk is a well-known and oft-used narrative device encountered in many later works, such as Āryasūra’s *Jātakamālā* (*The Garland of Birth Stories*), Somadeva’s long poem dealing with various religious and philosophical issues from the Jain point of view (*Yaśastilaka-campū*, *YTC*), and the Jain scholar Hemacandra’s *Triṣaṣṭi-Śalākā-Puruṣa-Carita*, *TSPC* (*Lives of Sixty Three Eminent Persons*). The same device is found even earlier in Saṅghadāsagaṇi (sixth/seventh century CE)’s *Vasudevahimḍī*, *Vasu*. (*The Wanderings of Vasudeva*). For details see Chap. Five below.

other sources, Frauwallner and others further claim that materialism was born in royal circles (Frauwallner 1997, vol. 2, 216, Franco and Preisendanz 1998, 179). However, when they refer to Ajita Kesakambala, another materialist thinker mentioned in greater details in another Buddhist canonical text, ‘Sāmaññaphala-sutta’, SPHS (‘The Discourse on the Fruits of Being a Monk’) they do not seem to notice that Ajita practised renunciation and asceticism to the extreme and had nothing to do with any royal court or any prince (R. Bhattacharya 2009/2011, 21-32). Thereafter Frauwallner and others come down several centuries later, to the Common Era and explore the doctrine of the Cārvākas or Lokāyatas.

The period separating Ajita, the itinerant prophet, and Purandara, author of both a base text and an auto-commentary of the Cārvākas, is generally glided over or rather treated as a dark period or a *tempora incognita*. Apparently the Tamil epic *Mañimēkalai* (composed sometime between the fourth and the seventh century) is unknown to many scholars, although some authors had already drawn the attention of scholars to the philosophical content in that epic.² *Mañimēkalai* is the most valuable link to trace the development of materialism after Ajita and before Purandara.³

However, the narrative both in Pali and Prakrit highlights only one aspect of materialist thought, namely, denial of the existence of any immortal soul, and hence, of the doctrine of karman and its consequence, namely, rebirth. Therefore, it is not justified to treat the Paesi legend as a true exposition of the *materialist doctrine* as a whole. It can at best be called an early instance of proto-materialist thought in India,⁴ comparable in certain respects to the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (*KaṭhaUp*), which seems to have been commissioned to serve the same purpose, namely, to combat proto-materialist thought, although karman is conspicuous in its absence in the first chapter, the original form of the text (the second chapter with its three sections modelled on the first is palpably a later addition, as suggested by Max Müller and supported by Whitney (see below).

² In canto 27, *Mañimēkalai*, the heroine of this epic, visits the representatives of several philosophical or religious schools – logician (Nyāya), Śaivite, Brahmvādin, Vaiṣṇava, Vedist, Ājīvika, Jain, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, and Bhūtavādin (materialist) – and listen to their doctrines. Several literal English translations and a very readable abridged paraphrase of this epic are available (see Bibliography).

³Not only materialism, but Ājīvika fatalism (*niyatīvāda*) too is represented in a novel manner (Basham 1981, 239).

⁴ Frauwallner (1997, vol. 2, 221) himself admits: ‘Materialism gains for it an importance from the moment only when it emerged in the form of a regular doctrine and took up arms against the remaining philosophical schools.’

The other approach of tracing the rise of materialism in India was initiated by Hermann Jacobi. He described Uddālaka Āruṇi, a philosopher mentioned in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (*ChāUp*), as a hylozoist, and hence a proto-materialist, and compared him with Thales of Miletus, a Presocratic philosopher.⁵ Walter Ruben, a student of Jacobi, made a study of the thought of Uddālaka Āruṇi.⁶ Following his lead Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya made a detailed study of the two prose Upaniṣads, the *Chāndogya* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* respectively, to fix the dates of both materialism and idealism. Uddālaka Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya appeared as two major representatives of the two trends.⁷

This paper seeks to highlight the importance of a metrical Upaniṣad, the *Kaṭha* (composed before or around the sixth century BCE) as a philosophical text, for it contains evidence of the genesis of materialism. It clearly shows that the point of difference between idealism and materialism in India originally centred round the issue of the existence or non-existence of the Other World (*paraloka*), that is, concerning *ontology*; other issues, epistemological, ethical, etc. followed thereafter. Buddhist and Jain canonical works also corroborate the same conclusion. The study of this Upaniṣad has not been altogether neglected, but the bearing it has on the rise of materialism and its opponents' strategy to combat it has not received the attention it deserves. No comparison of this Upaniṣad with later brahmanical works (such as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Rām* and the *Mahābhārata*, *Mbh*) has been properly attempted. Hence the text of the *KaṭhaUp* deserves a new look.

I

If philosophical speculations (as opposed to theological debates) in India started with the search for the first cause (*jaḡatkāraṇa*, the cause of the universe) recorded in *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (*ŚveUp*) 1.2, another question too arose or perhaps had already arisen by the fifth century BCE: is death the end of humans or is there something beyond? Speculations regarding the first cause had gradually given rise to several mutually exclusive claimants, namely, Time (*kāla*), Own Being (*svabhāva*), Destiny or Necessity (*niyatī*), Chance (*yadṛcchā*), (Four or Five) Elements (*bhūtāni*), and Self or God (*puruṣa*). These six are merely mentioned in the *ŚveUp*; elaborate

⁵ Hermann Jacobi 1922, 146; 1923, 11 *et seq.*

⁶ Ruben 1962, 345-54. It has been reprinted in Joachim Heidrich and others (eds.) 2002, 261-70. See also Lars Göhler 2002, 77-84.

⁷ D. Chattopadhyaya 1985, 164-227, 1990, 59-88, and 1991 vol. 2, 89-148, followed Ruben in this respect.

explanations or the details of any of them are absent.⁸ The speculation about death, however, led to only two definite and clear-cut conclusions: one set of people believed and declared that there are two worlds, this world (*ihaloka*) and the other world (*paraloka*); another set of people denied the existence of the second.⁹ This is the starting point of the struggle between idealism and materialism in India, for the assertion of the Other World necessitates the admission of existence of the extra-corporeal soul, which is immortal, while the denial of the Other World automatically implies rejection of this concept of the soul. This is but an oblique expression of the matter-consciousness debate, whether consciousness can or cannot exist without the substratum, matter.

The doubt concerning the existence of the Other World can be traced back right to the *KaṭhaUp* – an Upaniṣad almost certainly designed to promote belief in life beyond this life. Quite appropriately Yama (Death), the lord of the world of the deceased (*pretaloka*), is chosen to be the mouthpiece of the orthodox (*āstika*) brahmanical view. The *KaṭhaUp* has been subjected to thorough examination and the issues involved (doubt, scepticism, the world of the dead, etc.) have been discussed from various angles (for a select bibliography, see S. Bhattacharya 2000). Nevertheless it merits a fresh study.

A few words about the text of the *KaṭhaUp* first. Even a cursory reading reveals that the first redaction ended with the first chapter (*adhyāya*) divided into three sections (*vallī*) (1.1-3); the additional chapter divided similarly into three sections (apparently modelled on the first) which follows in the text that has been traditionally handed down to us is almost certainly a later addition, grafted to the story. The whole work may be described as a duologue (*saṃvāda*) between Yama and Naciketas. *KaṭhaUp* 1.3.16ab in fact refers to it as ‘the episode of Naciketas, proclaimed by Death, everlasting’ (*nāciketam upākhyaṇaṃ mṛtyuproktaṃ sanātanam*. W.H. Whitney’s translation 1890, 104).

⁸ The verse is interpreted in another way too. Some take the word *yoni* in 1b as another name for *prakṛti*. The number of claimants then will go up to seven. I prefer to follow the view of commentators like (pseudo-)Śaṅkara, followed by Friedrich Max Müller in his translation (Sacred Books of the East, SBE, vol. 15, 232). Many later sources record these and other, newer claimants; one of the most significant is the all-enveloping idea of karman. For a list of some of the later claimants, see R. Bhattacharya (2001 and 2012 Appendix). The list is not claimed to be exhaustive.

⁹ Yājñavalkya in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (BṛhadUp)* 4.3.9 speaks of a third abode, the abode of dream, *svapnasthāna*, which lies in-between this abode and the next. But that is an illusory world and need not detain us.

Friedrich Max Müller noticed all this but said: ‘We have no means, however, of determining its (sc. *KaṭhaUp*’s) original form, nor should even be justified in maintaining that the first Adhyāya ever existed by itself, and that the second was added at a much later time’ (1884 xxiii). Whitney was more categorical: ‘These last two verses (sc. 1.3.16-17) are such as one should expect to find at the end of a treatise, and we have a right to suppose that the Upanishad originally closed here, the rest being a later extension’ (1890, 104).

Even the first chapter may not be free from interpolations. Müller had ‘little doubt’ that 1.1.16-18 ‘are later additions’ (1884 xxv) and attempted to justify his view. Whitney endorsed it as a ‘very plausible suggestion’, pointing out that ‘the last part of [verse] 18 is the same with 12d, above’ (*śokātigo modate svargaloke*) (1890, 96). Ludwig Alsdorf has rightly observed: ‘Evidently its (sc. *KaṭhaUp*’s) popularity has caused it to suffer particularly badly from the hands of interpolators and copyists’ (1950, 622). The intrinsic probability of these additions however cannot be proved due to the lack of manuscript support. The *phalaśruti* (‘recital of benefits,’ as J.L. Brockington 1984, 189 renders it) stanzas (16-17) at the end of 1.3 certainly sound like the finale as such stanzas do in other, later works such as the Purāṇas and even in *vṛatakathās* in modern Indian languages. The stanzas in the *KaṭhaUp* run as follows:

The episode of Naciketas, proclaimed by Death, everlasting, the wise man that has spoken and heard is happy in the Brahma-world.

Whoever may repeat aloud in the assembly of Brahmans this highest mysterious [episode], or, with devotion (*prayatna*), at the time of an ancestral sacrifice, he is fitted for endlessness. (104)

Two aspects of the *phalaśruti* are worth noting. The effect, we are told, is that both the narrator and the listener of the tale of Naciketas are sure to reach the Brahmāloka, the world of Brahman (Brahmā). In the Yajurvedic tradition, the sacrificer (*yajamāna*) had to perform a sacrifice called Somayāga and pile up a five-layered tortoise (-shaped) fire altar, *Kūrma Citi*, either rectilinear or circular, consisting of 1000 bricks, in order to gain this world after death (*Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* 20.9 = *Baudhāyana Śulbasūtra* 9.1). In the Upaniṣadic era, it seems, the goal could be achieved without much hassle just by listening to the story when it was being recited. Secondly, recital or even listening to this episode is also effective in the *śrāddha* (rites for the ancestors) ceremony. The association of the episode with Yama seems to have given rise to the legend of this additional benefit.

Whatsoever, this is the normal and expected conclusion of a didactic tale. But that is not all. The *KaṭhaUp* is worth studying for other reasons

too. One of which is its importance as a document of the confrontation between reason and credo (to borrow from the title of a book by Walter Ruben published in 1979) that led to the rise of materialism in ancient India.

II

Philosophical idealism (as opposed to ‘idealism’ in common parlance, meaning ‘the practice of forming or pursuing ideals, especially unrealistically’, as given in the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, COED 2011), in the Upaniṣads has generally been traced back to Yājñavalkya (particularly as he is represented in the *BṛhadUp*). Yājñavalkya opens the way for subjective idealism: the doctrine of *māyā* (illusion), preached vigorously by Śāṅkara and his Advaita-Vedāntin followers can very well claim Yājñavalkya as their original guru.¹⁰ The adversary before Yājñavalkya was common-sense realism which, according to him, induces humans to rely rather naively on sense perception and induces them to admit the result of such perception to be real. In order to combat these ‘mistaken’ notions Yājñavalkya tries to convince Janaka that things perceived in real life are no more real than those seen in dreams.

Doubt concerning the existence of an object amenable to sense perception can be easily resolved. Either one accepts what one sees, hears, etc. as real or one agrees with Yājñavalkya that the visible world is as unreal as things seen in a dream. But what to do with such notions as that of the immortality of the soul or self (*ātman*), its other-worldly existence after the death of a human, etc.? It cannot be verified by sense perception. This is where Yama and Naciketā come in. What their dialogue contains exhibits a purely Indian development of idealism insofar as it asserts *redeath* (*punararmṛtyu*).¹¹ Redeath also implies rebirth (*punarjanma*), not once, but over and over again.

¹⁰ D. Chattopadhyaya in his last days was engaged in preparing a Bangla monograph (unfinished) called *Bhārate Bhāvavāda Prasāṅge* (On Idealism in India), a sequel to his *Bhārate Vastuvāda Prasāṅge* (On Materialism in India). No fewer than eight unfinished drafts of the sequel have recently been printed in a posthumously published work (2011, 58-82). Four such drafts open with a free translation of *BṛhadUp* 4.3.9-13 where Yājñavalkya speaks of man’s third world, the dream abode (73, 74, 78, 79).

¹¹ *Punararmṛtyu*, according to Sāyaṇa, is ‘the death that follows after the present inevitable death’ (Müller 1884, xxii n1). The word occurs in *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, *TaittiBr* 3.1.8, *BṛhadUp* 1.5.2 and *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad* 3.35.7. See Tucci 1971, 51-52, Halbfass 1992, 291-92.

In the *KaṭhaUp*, we find Naciketas spelling out his *doubt* (*vicikitsā*, 1.1.20) which however is not his alone. What Yama teaches him with much reluctance (after failing to dissuade him from knowing ‘the supreme secret’ unknown even to the gods) is directed towards discrediting the unbelievers whose existence apparently posed a threat to the theological-cum-philosophical climate of the country. The *KaṭhaUp* provides a document recording the conflict between those who believed in the existence of the Other World and those who firmly refused to do so in the early Upaniṣadic times (roughly between the seventh and the fourth century BCE), before the advent of the Buddha and Mahāvīra. Śaṅkarācārya (eighth century) in his commentary on this Upaniṣad takes fling at the vile arguers, *kuṭārṅkikas* and the heretics, *pāṣaṇḍins* who vitiate the mind of the people (gloss on 2.3.12). He refers to the *astitvavādins* and *nāstikavādins*: the first admit that the self, *ātman* exists and the second think that there is no self which is the root of the world, *nāsti jagato mūlamātmā*. This shows that the two worlds, *āstika* (affirmativist) and *nāstika* (negativist) owe their origin to the *KaṭhaUp* 1.1.20. The affirmation and negation are related to the existence of the Other World. Only in later times, these pair of words were employed to suggest a believer in and a defiler of the Veda (as stated in the *Manusmṛti*, *Manu*. (Code of Manu), 2.11), a theist and an atheist (the meaning is current even today in modern Indian languages), etc.¹²

Why is the existence of the Other World so important to the author/s of the *KaṭhaUp*? The answer is provided by Jayantabhaṭṭa more than a millennium and a half after the redaction of the *KaṭhaUp*: ‘The reply to (the objections against the admission of God raised by) the Bārhaspatyas [materialists],’ he writes. ‘would simply be the establishment of the other-world’ (*Nyāyamañjarī*, NM 1982-84 Āhṅika 3, 275; trans. in C/L 156).¹³ In other words, once the existence of the Other World is established, the materialists’ objections to the existence of God, etc. are automatically refuted. Unless the Other World is admitted, the whole ethical system involving merit (*dharma*) and demerit (*adharmā*), reward and punishment, hope for heaven and fear of hell, in short, everything related to God and His arrangements made for human destiny cannot be established. It was not so

¹² For some other meanings see R. Bhattacharya 2009/2011, 227-31 and 2009, 49-56.

¹³ Objection is raised by a putative opponent as to why the production of earth, water, etc. is not being explained by perceptible causes alone, and what is the use of admitting an imperceptible cause, an agent in the form of God. Jayanta asserts that there is no harm in doing so, for those who admit the Other World also admit an imperceptible cause in the form of *adr̥śya karman* (unseen *karman*, i.e., merit and demerit) too.

much the question of the priority of matter or consciousness that divided ancient Indian speculators into two distinct camps; the principal issue was whether the self can or cannot exist without the body.¹⁴

It is not that the issue of the prioritization of matter or consciousness had never been raised in ancient India. In *BṛhadUp* 2.4.12 and again at 4.5.12 Yājñavalkya tells his wife Maitreyī of the materialists' view: 'Arising out of these elements [earth, air, fire, water, and space] into them also one (sc. the self) vanishes away. After death there is no consciousness' (Trans. R.E. Hume), *etebhyaḥ bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tānyevānu vinaśyati | na pretyasañjā'stīti*. Generations of writers, both Vedists and Jains, have made the materialists quote this passage (several instances are provided in Bronkhorst 2007, 155-56, 321). Such an unexpected declaration quite naturally confuses Maitreyī; so her husband has to explain his purpose by saying: 'Lo, verily, I speak not bewilderment (*moha*). Sufficient, lo, verily, is this for understanding' (*BṛhadUp* 2.4.12-13=4.5.13-14). But even here too the issue is: what happens to the soul after the death of a human. Jayantabhaṭṭa makes an interlocutor object to his statement that all precepts based upon the Veda are considered valid. The putative opponent cites *BṛhadUp* 2.4.13 and says that the precepts of the Lokāyatikas and others [meaning all sorts of materialists] too would be valid then. In his reply Jayanta says: 'The Lokāyata doctrine is based only upon such statements as represent the viewpoint of the opponent (*pūrvapakṣavacana*). Thus, there are subsequent Brāhmaṇa statements replying (to the previous ones).' He then cites the reply of Yājñavalkya (4.5.14): 'Well I am not preaching ignorance. The self is indeed indestructible. It only has a connection with the senses, etc.' (*NM*, Āhṇika 3, 387-88; trans. in *C/L* 157).

In the *BṛhadUp* the metaphysical question of what is real and what is not was followed by another question, namely, whether consciousness can have an existence of its own without the body to contain it, and if so, what happens to every individual consciousness after the death of the body. It is no wonder that the independent existence of the self apart from the body would be sought to be 'proved' by the *perceptible* example of the stalk that can be separated from the *muñja* grass (*KaṭhaUp* 2.3.17), an example (*udāharāṇa*) which has a parallel in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, *ŚatBr* 4.3.3.16. The Buddha also employs the same example in the 'Mahāsakuladāyisutta' to suggest that the body and the self are not identical: 'this is the *muñja* grass, this is the fibre, . . . this is the sword, this is the

¹⁴ While discussing the theses nos. 5 and 6, K.N. Jayatilleke identifies the first with the materialist school in India that identified the soul with the body, and relates the second to the doctrine referred to both the *Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra*, *SKS* and the *KaṭhaUp* (1963/1980, 243, 246-7. See also 99-100 and 131-32).

sheath,' *ayaṃ muñjo, ayaṃ īsikā, . . . yaṃ asi, ayaṃ kosi . . .* (*Majjhimanikāya, MN, part 2, 27.3.19, 250*).

Oddly enough, the same example also occurs in the Jain canonical work, *SKS 2.1.16*. There it is a materialist who throws the challenge:

As a man draws a fibre from a stock [stalk] of Muñga grass and shows it (you, saying): "Friend, this is the stock [stalk] and that is the fibre;" and takes a bone out of the flesh, or the seed of āmalaka [Emblica Myrobalanos] from the palm of his hand . . . so nobody can show you the self and the body separately . . . those who believe that there is and exists no self, speak the truth. Those who say that the self is different from the body, are wrong. (Trans. H. Jacobi, SBE, vol. 45/2, 340-41)¹⁵

In the *KaṭhaUp*, however, there is no reference to any creator-god in relation to either the self or the Other World. As the two other heretical (non-Vedic) schools, Buddhism and Jainism, evince, god is not essential to the belief in the Other World and rebirth. Nor is the belief in the existence of heaven and hell directly related to any belief in god/s. The idea of the imperishable self and its repeated return can always be traced to every human's actions, *karman*. Meritorious actions beget heaven: inestimable actions, hell. The functioning of *karman* is just; both reward and punishment are meted out in exact proportion to every human's action. The doctrine itself eschews the possibility of any accident, *yadṛcchā*; a rigid as-you-sow-so-you-reap kind of causality governs this office.¹⁶

It is in the second (added) chapter of the *KaṭhaUp* that the idea of 'in accordance with one's *karman*', *yathākarma* is first mooted (2.2.7).¹⁷ The

¹⁵According to Jayatilleke, "The use of this example signifies the practice of *jhāna* or *yoga* since it was said that "one should draw out (*ātman*) from ones own body, like an arrow-shaft from a reed". . . . Now in this Upaniṣad the *ātman* is claimed to be seen by these yogis as distant from the body as a result of the practice of *yoga*, against which the Materialists argued . . . that this could not be objectively demonstrated' (1963/1980, 246-47). Jayatilleke however admits: 'This is a somewhat different argument from the one stated in the *Brahmajāla Sutta* but both these schools seem to be very similar in their outlook' (*ibid.*).

¹⁶ Cf. 'Don't delude yourself into thinking God can be cheated: where a man sows, there he reaps: if he sows in the field of self-indulgence he will get a harvest of corruption out of it; if he sows in the field of the Self he will get from it a harvest of eternal life.' Galatians 6:7 (*The Jerusalem Bible*). The office of *karman*, however, is autonomous, independent of god/s or any other higher authority such as Time or Own Nature.

¹⁷ The term *yathākarma* occurs only thrice in the principal Upaniṣads. In *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad (KauUp)* 1.2 it is used in the same, technical sense ('And according to his deeds and according to his knowledge he is born again here as a worm or an insect

concept of the Other World too consequently (but not initially) led to the concept of heaven and hell as found in many other ancient civilizations. But in India the belief in the existence of two such actual places is also accompanied by the idea of karman. The twin concepts of rebirth and redeath are closely allied to karman; the denial of the Other World is not only a mark of stupidity but also fraught with dire consequences, as Yama tells Naciketas (*KaṭhaUp* 1.2.5-6).

The word karman, we find in the Upaniṣads, has already acquired a new signification distinct from what it meant in the Vedic culture, viz. *yajña*, ritual sacrifice.¹⁸ This development is rarely to be met within non-Indian traditions. The idea of the Other World is found in all cultures, as is its denial. Such beliefs and their denials mark, among other things, the emergence of two opposite philosophical approaches called idealism and materialism respectively. Nevertheless the concept of the Other World did not lead either to the concept of rebirth and/or the doctrine of karman in any other culture so far known to us. Yet it is odd that Yājñavalkya refuses to discuss in public the question where humans go after their death. He offers Ārtabhāga, the sage who raised this question, to have a private discussion away from the ears of all (*BṛhadUp* 3.2.13–3.3.1). Maurice Winternitz was astonished by this extraordinary confidentiality: ‘This great doctrine of deed [karman], later (especially in Buddhism) preached in all streets and by-lanes is in the Upaniṣads still a great mystery’ (1981, vol.1, 239). The phrase, ‘great mystery,’ perhaps unintentionally, echoes *paraṃ guhyam* in *KaṭhaUp* 1.3.17 (cf. also *paramam guhyam* in *ŚveUp* 6.22).

The same is the case with the question of the condition of humans after their death in the *KaṭhaUp*. Here too we find a similar secrecy concerning the answer to resolve the doubt that assailed young Naciketas about what happens after the death of a human. Yama at first firmly refuses to say anything about this *asti-nāsti* problem. He tries to dissuade Naciketas first by offering him a valuable gift of the knowledge of a Fire and naming it

or as a fish, . . . as something else in different places.’ Max Müller’s translation, SBE, vol. 15); in *BṛhadUp* 1.5.21 however *yathākarma* refers merely to the mundane functions or organs of work in general.

¹⁸ Karman has also been used in *Kena Upaniṣad* (*KenaUp*) 4.8 and in other Upaniṣads in this sense. In fact, originally *karman* and each and every derivative from the root *kr*, such as *karṭr*, *kārya*, *kṛt*, *kriyā*, etc. are all related to yājñic practice. Cf. *Mbh*, crit. ed., 12.224.73, 12.230.21. See R. Bhattacharya 2002, 153-163.

after him (Nāciketeta).¹⁹ Finding Naciketas still insisting on receiving answer to his question Yama warns him:

Even by the gods of old hath it been doubted as to this; for it is not easily to be understood; subtle (*anu*) is that subject (?*dharmā*). Choose another boon, O Naciketas; do not trouble me; let me off from that. (1.1.21)

It is also to be noted that the doctrine of *karman*²⁰ is not at all mentioned in the first chapter of the *KaṭhaUp*: the only issue is the assertion of the Other World. The question of reward and punishment received by the dead according to virtue (*puṇya*) and sin (*pāpa*) has no room in any of the first three sections. It is only in the second chapter (almost certainly a later addition) that we hear of the indwelling self either entering the womb for acquiring bodies or following the ‘motionless’, *sthānu* (such as trees, etc., according to Śaṅkara) in accordance with one’s action and inconformity with one’s knowledge (*KaṭhaUp* 2.2.7). The word used for the self, *dehin*, ‘that which dwells in the body,’ has been identified as ‘a later coinage dating from *Ka[ṭha]* and *Śve[tāśvatarā]* (2.14 – 3.18)’ in an editorial note to *Kaṭha* 5.7=2.2.7 (*Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, EPU 24). Otherwise the first chapter is quite unconcerned with *karman* and pays more attention to redeath, a fate destined for those who deny the existence of the Other World. Yama teaches him ‘what bricks, or how many, or how’ (*yā iṣṭakā yāvātīr vā yathā vā*) (*KaṭhaUp* 1.3.15) are to be piled.²¹ Yet Naciketas’ refusal to be satisfied with the unsought-for gift of the know-how of piling a Fire altar, *agni* (even though it is to be named after him) and his insistence on learning the secrets of what happens after death also reveal a gradual shift from ritual (*karma*) to pure knowledge (*jñāna*).

¹⁹ Whitney notes that the derivation of *nāciketeta* from *naciketas* is ‘not quite satisfactory’ (1890, 90); the name of the Fire should have been *nāciketasa*. In any case, there is no ‘acceptable etymology for either word’ (91).

²⁰ For an account of the origin and development of the doctrine of *karman*, see Wilhelm Halbfass 1992, 291 *et seq.* He points out:

Only the Cārvākas and other ‘materialists’ appear as rigorous critics of its (sc. the doctrine of *karman* and *saṃsāra*) basic premises that the belief in a continued existence beyond that, in cycles of death and birth, in the retributive, ethically committed causality of our actions. For the materialists, as far as they are known to us from the reports and references of their opponents, death, that is, the dissolution of our physical body, is the end.

There is no inherent power of retribution attached to our deeds (1992, 293).

²¹ It is worth noting that the word *iṣṭakā* occurs only twice in the *Upaniṣads*: once in *KaṭhaUp* 1.3.15 and once in *MaiUp* 6.33.

This Fire along with its name, Nāciketa, has already been mentioned in the *TaittiBr* (3.11.8). Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* chap.1 (Paspāśāha, Calcutta ed. 98, Poona ed. 39) refers to a line from this passage: ‘He who arranges the Nāciketa Fire and he who knows how to do it (gains such and such rewards),’ *yo ’gni nāciketamcinute ya u cainamevaṃ veda (TaittiBr, part 3, 1237)*. The sole concern of the story of Naciketas and Yama in the *TaittiBr* was the Nāciketa Agni and nothing else. Patañjali explains that the performance (of this altar, *cayana*) along with the knowledge becomes fruitful.²² The rules for piling the Nāciketa Agni are also laid down in *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* 19.6.²³

Sukumari Bhattacharji sums up the situation thus:

From the text it would seem that the fire was already called by his (sc. Naciketas’) name although Yama expressly says that henceforth this fire shall be named after Naciketas. However that may be, the mystic association in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* makes sense only in the perspective of this episode in this Upaniṣad (sc. *KaṭhaUp*). (vol. 2, 1986, 76)

III

The *KaṭhaUp* nevertheless keeps a balance between sacrifice (*yajña*) and knowledge (*jñāna*). In the *Īśā Upaniṣad (ĪśāUp)* there is an attempt to combine both sacrifice and knowledge although Śaṅkara in his comments on *ĪśāUp*, verse 2, claimed that the contradiction between the two is ‘as unshakable as the mountain,’ *parvatavad akampyam* i.e., there can be no

²² For two translations of this section of the *TaittiBr*, see Müller (SBE, vol.15, xxi-xxii) and Whitney (1890, 89-90) respectively. The time gap between the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā (TaittiSaṃ)* and the *TaittiBr* on the one hand and that between *TaittiBr* and the *KaṭhaUp* on the other must have been considerable, for there is no mention, not even the slightest hint, of metempsychosis in the *TaittiSaṃ* (Keith 1967, clxxii) and the *TaittiBr*, whereas it occupies a focal position in the discourse of Yama in the *KaṭhaUp*.

²³ The details of this *citi* for the Nāciketa *cayana* are given in Kulkarni 1987, 155. Interestingly enough, along with some *golden* bricks two naturally perforated (*svayamātrṇṇā*) pebbles are also recommended. Such golden bricks are also mentioned in the *Mbh (Āśvamedhika Parvan, critical edition (crit. ed.) 90.30, vulgate (vul.) 88.31)*. But in the *Śulbasūtras* all bricks (except the naturally perforated ones) are made of clay and burnt in kilns. The number of bricks in the *Nāciketa Agni* is also far less than the *citis* mentioned in the *Śrautasūtras*, such as the Hawk altar (*Śyenaciti*), Trough altar (*Droṇaciti*), etc.: only seventy seven, 75 (clay bricks)+2 (naturally perforated pebbles), as opposed to a thousand bricks in five layers, 200×5, in other *citis*.

reconciliation of the two. In the *KaṭhaUp* knowledge is *not* upheld over ritual; Yama voluntarily offers Naciketas the mystery of a Fire which is 'hidden in a cave', *nihitaṃ guhāyām* (1.1.14), i.e., as secret as the knowledge of the Other World.²⁴

Yet one cannot but feel a strong undercurrent of conflict between knowledge and sacrificial rites in the *KaṭhaUp*. The superiority of *śreya* (lit. more preferable; Olivelle 1998 renders it as 'good') over *preya* (lit. more delectable; in Olivelle's rendering 'gratifying') is asserted in no uncertain terms in 1.2.1-3. Rammohun Roy, who was the first to translate the '*Kuth-opunishud of the Ujoor-Ved*' into both Bangla and English²⁵ eschewed all euphemism and boldly rendered the words as 'knowledge' and 'rites' respectively. Thus, the verse,

anyadccchreyo' anyadutaivapreyas-teubhenānārthepuruṣaṃsinītaḥ|
tayoḥśreyaādadanāsyasādhubhavati-rhīyate'rtādyaupreyovṛṇīte || (1.2.1)

is translated by Roy as follows:

Knowledge of God which leads to absorption, is one thing; and rites, which have fruition for their object, another: each of these producing different consequences, holds out to man inducements to follow it. The man, who of these two chooses knowledge, is blessed; and he who, *for the sake of reward*,²⁶ practises rites is excluded from the enjoyment of eternal beatitude. (vol.2, 1995, 28)

Yama himself admits:

I know that fruition, acquirable by means of rites, is perishable; for nothing eternal can be obtained through perishable means. *Notwithstanding my conviction of the destructible nature of fruition*, I performed the worship of

²⁴ Cf. *Mbh*, vul. 3.313.117c: *dharmasya tattvaṃ nihitaṃ guhāyām*. . . . The verse has been found to be a later insertion, and accordingly rejected in the constituted text of the crit. ed. (see Appendix I. Additional Passage 32 line 67 therein). Whether or not the interpolator had *KaṭhaUp* 1.1.14 in mind, the intertextuality between the two passages is obvious.

²⁵ Müller acknowledges Roy's contribution in SBE, vol.15 Introduction, xxi and more elaborately in his Hibbert Lectures: 'It (sc. the *KaṭhaUp*) was first introduced to the knowledge of European scholars by Ram Mohun Roy, one of the most enlightened benefactors of his own country and, it may still turn out, one of the most enlightened benefactors of mankind' (1878/1901, 332)

²⁶ In a note to the Preface to his 'Translation of the Ishopanishad / One of the chapters of the Yajur-Ved' Rammohun Roy said: 'Whenever any comment, upon which the sense of the original depends, is added to the original it will be found written in Italics' (vol.2, 1995, 41).

the sacred fire, whereby I became possessed of this sovereignty of long duration. (1.2.10. Roy, vol.2, 1995, 29)

It is also worth noting that there is no mention of any kind of knowledge excepting that of the Nāciketa Fire in the *TaittiBr*, which is quite different from the mysterious knowledge that is applauded in the Upaniṣads. The anecdote in the *KaṭhaUp* is to be understood as adding a new dimension to the old rite. In a sense what follows Yama's granting this unsought-for boon to Naciketas suggests a negation of the ritual aspect and a transition to the new glorification of knowledge so often emphasized in the Upaniṣads.²⁷

Apparently the debate, already current among the thinkers concerning what happens to a person after death, called forth the composition of the *KaṭhaUp*. The issue that brought a rift between the promoters of knowledge as opposed to those of sacrifice is only one aspect of the antagonism between the ritualists and the gnostics (promoters of knowledge). There is another aspect: those who believed in the existence of the Other World and those who did not. The *KaṭhaUp* is primarily concerned with the second aspect. No doubt it draws on the *TaittiBr* story, but the difference between the two is quite apparent. The *TaittiBr* is not at all concerned with knowledge whereas the focus of the *KaṭhaUp* is the 'secret knowledge' about the lot of humans after their death. The Nāciketa Fire itself is treated as a sort of consolation prize freely offered to Naciketas in order to dissuade him from enquiring about the resolution of the doubt that troubled his mind, and apparently not his alone but of many others. Naciketas accepts the knowledge of the Nāciketa Fire but steadfastly refuses to give up his desire

²⁷ Cf. what R. E. Hume says about this strange mystification of knowledge:

KNOWLEDGE – not “much learning,” but the understanding of metaphysical truths, was the impelling motive of the thinkers of the Upanishads. Because of the theoretical importance of the knowledge in that period of speculative activity, and also because of the discrediting of the popular polytheistic religion by philosophical reasoning, there took place in India during the times of the Upanishads a movement similar to that which produces ethics and a substitution of philosophic insight for traditional morality. Knowledge was the one object of supreme value, irresistible means of obtaining one's ends. This idea of the worth and efficacy of knowledge is expressed again and again throughout the Upanishad not only in connection with philosophical speculation, but also in the practical affairs of life. So frequent are the statements describing the invulnerability and omnipotence of him who is possessed of this magic formula, that *yo evaṃ veda*, 'he who knows this,' becomes the most frequently recurring phase in all the Upanishads (1921, 38-39).

to know the answer that would satisfy him. The reworking of the *TaittiBr* story thus helps to kill two birds with one stone: on the one hand it upholds knowledge over ritual, and, at the same time, denounces those who deny the existence of the Other World.

On the basis of available evidence it may be stated that the struggle between idealism and materialism in ancient India ensued around the question of existence of the Other World. Other issues, particularly the epistemological and metaphysical ones, followed in due course. Right from the Jābāli episode in the *Rām* (crit. ed., Book 2 (Ayodhyākāṇḍa) canto 100; vul., canto 108) down to the verses found at the end of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava (S-M)'s *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha*, *SDS* (*Compendium of All Philosophies*), chap. 1, the denial of the Other World and hence the futility of performing *śrāddha* (rites for the ancestors) occupy the centre stage. The *KaṭhaUp* in this respect stands as a milestone. Yama is no less an important figure than Yājñavalkya in the history of the rise of idealism in Indian philosophy. He is an *āpta*, a truly knowledgeable person, not just a god, but a god of the dead, Lord of the world beyond this human world, and best fitted for sermonizing on the existence of the Other World.

IV

Prajñākaragupta in his commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* (*PV*) writes: "There is no Other World, nor any world here, no proof of the Other World, no doubt, no transformation of the great elements, etc." [All this is] cognition only,' *'na paroloko nehaloko na parolokavādhanam <-sādhanam> na saṃdeho na mahābhūtapariṇatir ityādi' vijñā<a>ptimātrakam eva* (57). With reference to the first part of this statement containing double negation,²⁸ Eli Franco says, no doubt inadvertently, 'This is an allusion to the famous Cārvāka saying: "This is the world, there is no other" (*ayaṃ lokaḥ paraṃ [paraḥ] nāsti*)' (1997, 112 n35). However, *ayaṃ loko paraḥ nāsti* is not met with in any *Cārvāka fragment* so far known to us (For a collection of such fragments see R. Bhattacharya 2009/2011, 78-86). Actually the statement alludes to *KaṭhaUp* 1.2.6:

²⁸ It has been shown that the denial of the existence of both this world and the Other World (as found in the SPhS, *Dīghanikāya*, *DN* (*The Long Discourses*, part 1, 2.4.21-23, 48-49) is just a turn of phrase signifying the loss of both pleasure (*abhyudaya*) in this world and *summum bonum* (*niḥśreyasa*) in the other. See R. Bhattacharya 2009/2011, 49-50 and n24.

The transition does not show itself to the childish one, heedless, befooled with the folly of wealth, thinking, “*this [is] the world; there is no other*” – again and again he comes under my control. (Emphasis added)

*nasāmparāyah pratibhāti bālaṃ pramādyantaṃ vittamohen mūḍham|
ayaṃ loko nāsti para itimānī punaḥ punar vaśam āpadyateme||*

Yama assures the doubting Naciketas that a person holding such views dies only to be reborn, to die again and again to be sent back to the earth; he never attains emancipation (*mukti, mokṣa*) from the cycle of rebirth and redeath.²⁹

The sentence quoted from Prajñākaragupta, however, is not derived from the *KaṭhaUp*. It simply echoes the words attributed to Ajita Kesakambala in the Pali Buddhist canonical text, SPhS:

There is no (consequence to) alms-giving, sacrifice or oblation. A good or bad action produces no result. *This world does not exist; nor does the other world.* There is no mother, no father. There is no rebirth of beings after death. (*DN*, part 1, 2.4.21-23. *Ten Suttas*, 83. Translation modified.)

natthi mähārāja dinnamaṃ. natthi yiṭṭhamaṃ. natthi hutamaṃ. natthi sukaṭadukkaṭānaṃ kammānaṃ phalaṃ vipāko. natthi ayaṃ loko. natthi paro loko. natthi mātā. natthi pitā. natthi sattā opapātikā. (SPhS, *DN*, Part 1, 2.4.21-23; 48-49):

It should be noted that while introducing the doctrine of Kumāra Kassapa in the ‘Pāyāsirājaññasutta’ (*DN*) the opening words of this discourse are quoted verbatim albeit in a different order: ‘There is no other-world, there is no beings reborn other than from parents, there is no fruit of deeds, well-done or ill done,’ *natthi paro loko, natthi sattā opapātikā, natthi sukaṭadukkaṭānaṃ kammānaṃ phalaṃ vipāko* (*DN*, part 2, 10.1.2, 236). In some other Suttas too we find the same formula repeated (e.g., ‘Apañnakasutta’ *MN*, part 2, 10.1.3-4, 78-79 and ‘Sandakasutta’ *MN*, part 2, 26.1.3, 213).

In fact, only this part of the proto-materialist doctrine is known and referred to in the *Tipiṭaka*. Because of the total rejection of everything that was considered sacred and beyond question, this doctrine was called ‘the doctrine of annihilation’ *ucchedavāda*, as opposed to the brahmanical view

²⁹ Whitney notes that the unworthy people do not go to hell, ‘(of which there is no trace in the Hindu religion of this period), but to a repeated return to earthly existence. Transmigration, then, is not the fate of all, but only of the unworthy’ (1890, 92). It should, however, be noted that the heaven, *svarga loka*, with all its splendour is mentioned in *Kaṭha* 1.1.13 and in other Upaniṣads.