

Prefatory note

The present project is a study of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika ontology with reference to the category of *samavāya*. The intention of the study is to inquire into the ontological status of *samavāya*. The present study differs from usual studies of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika thought in juxtaposing such point of view as those which either do not admit the concept of *sambandha* or relation, or admit *saṁyoga*, but disallow *samavāya*. It is hoped that by such juxtaposition of views, the uniqueness and the necessity of admitting *samavāya* would be thrown into high relief. The point about ontology has always been kept in view in a distinguished manner from considerations of epistemology and the problem of induction (causality). Of course, such considerations have been paid attention to as and when needed, yet it is the ontological status of *samavāya* that has been the uppermost concern of the present study.

Another feature of the study is the inter-systemic references to the debate concerning *samavāya*. The ontological issues entail metaphysical questions. Often metaphysics in traditional Indian ways of understanding the furniture of the world mingles the descriptive with the revisionary. Ultimately the question turns on the issue of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika metaphysics is descriptive or revisionary. No clear cut answer could be given as P.F. Strawson

might demand to know. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika list of *padārthas* is a mixed bag. Some of the categories are ontologically empirical while others like *sāmānya* or *samavāya* are different. To say that *samavāya* is ontologically empirical requires a revision of the concept of *pratyakṣa* itself. The sense, in which a blue jar is perceived, is certainly not the way in the *samavāya* of blueness *in* the jar is apprehended. The logical realistic empiricism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika seeks to retain both descriptive as well as revisionary metaphysics at one stroke, and this has been target if the critics of the *samavāya*. This is a metaphilosophical issue, and we need not take any sides at this moment. To reiterate, the present study is directed towards understanding the concept of *samavāya* as an ontological issue in the context of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realism and logical empiricism.

The present study is structured into twelve chapters, incorporating concluding remarks, besides an appendix. The table of contents stands as follows: The first chapter introduces the concept of *samavāya*, to be followed in the second, by the larger framework of Indian philosophical systems. There are also references to philosophical views of British and European philosophers. The third chapter is a statement of the Vaiśeṣika category of *samavāya*. The chapter is twofold in approach, expository and critical. The fourth pursues the concept of *samavāya* as ramified by the Nyāya, even though the system of Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya are ontologically *samāna-tantra*, there are extensions, ramifications and reconstructions.

The fifth chapter is devoted to considering various definitions of *samavāya* and the sixth chapter takes into the account the arguments offered in support of admitting *samavāya* as a relation in

the metaphysical scheme. I have felt to be inclined to accept the arguments offered by Gangeśa and Vallabha.

The seventh chapter is worked out around the concept of *samavāya* as employed in formulating the Nyāya view of causation. This has been an important issue.

The eighth chapter takes up the Mīmāṃsā views as adumbrated by Kumārīla and Prabhākara. These reservations about *samavāya* have also been noted in due seriousness.

The Buddhist critiques of *samavāya* are the content of ninth chapter. It has been interesting to note their reasons for not endorsing into their scheme of things.

The Jaina understanding of *samavāya* is what the tenth chapter is devoted to.

The eleventh chapter takes up Śaṅkara's arguments against *samavāya*. The followers of Śaṅkara, such as Citsukha and Vyāsatīrtha, have contributed richly towards the Advaita critique of *samavāya*. Their views have been noted as well.

To conclude the project the twelfth chapter records some of the debated issues concerning *samavāya*, and also an overview of the previously discussed issues in the previous chapters.

The appendix is there to put on record some important points that needed highlighting separately.

All the major schools of Indian thought have been brought into focus and as for the method of the study; it has been descriptive, analytical and comparative.

My duty will remain incomplete if I do not record my gratitude to those hearty and helpful people having a company of toils, hard labours, patience and inspiration in my journey period.

I express my gratitude and indebtedness to my supervisor and promoter of studies, Dr. Amal Kumar Harh, Reader-in-Philosophy, Coochbehar College, Coochbehar, for his valued guidance, constructive criticism and sustained interest in my work. Dr. Harh inspires me to create interest in Indian Philosophy in teaching several Sanskrit texts when I worked at Coochbehar College as his colleague. Despite his pre-occupations he spent unbelievably enough in solving problems raised at the time of discussion. Without his encouragement and well-wishing the project could not have been completed.

The present Dean of the faculty of Arts, Commerce and Law, who also the chairperson of the Department of Philosophy, Professor Raghunath Ghosh has been ever unfailing in inspiring me with his observation and suggestion. I have greatly benefited academically in my meetings with him. To him I tender my deep gratitude.

For the other faculty members of philosophy particularly Professor Bhaswati Chakraborty, Professor Manjulika Ghosh, Dr. Kantilal Das, Reader-in-Philosophy, Dr. Jyotish Basak, Reader-in-Philosophy, I put on record my appreciation. They have been very kind indeed in providing assistance, constructive comments and suggestion.

I owe a great deal to Professor Arunabha Basu Majumder, Honourable Vice-Chancellor, and Dr. Dilip Sarkar, Registrar of North Bengal University for extending their kind co-operation and encouragement in various ways.

I must thank gratefully to Dr. Biman Chakraborty, Principal, Balurghat Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Balurghat, for his generosity, help and encouragement.

I thank the different Librarians, namely, the Librarian of National Library, Kolkata; the Librarian of Indian Council of Philosophical Research, Lucknow; the Librarian of North Bengal University; the Librarian of Balurghat Mahila Mahavidyalaya for extending their co-operation and help. I shall be failing in my duties if I do not record my debt to Mr. Brindavan Karmakar, Deputy Librarian of North Bengal University for his various kindnesses.

Working project such as the present one has been a taxing enterprise. All through the drafting of the thesis my wife, Kajal Pal, stood beside me. She has been a great supporting companion.

Last but not the least my thanks are due to my sons, Arnab Pal and Anish Pal, who permitted me to work with unfailing patience during the writing of this thesis ignoring their play times with me.

To others who have been connected in any way in the successful completion of the project I offer my thanks and appreciation.

University of North Bengal
Darjeeling.

The.....*11 th August*....., 2008.

Asit Baran Pal
(Asit Baran Pal)