

Concept of Inherence (Samavaya) Depicted in Vaisesika School of Philosophy

- Dr.S.Muhunthan -

Abstract

Vaisesika Philosophy accepts Samavaya (inherence) as a sixth category. When two things cannot exist separately the close relationship between them is known as inherence. This has to be seen differently from conjunction (samyoga) which is but a separate relationship between two separate things which can exist separately. This is an instance where the soul-knowledge and ether _ sound relationship is an intimate_connection between the two inseparable things. The action of these two things is absent unlike as in conjunction, the union does not come to an end in disjunction. It is imperceptible to the senses, it is one, and it is eternal. Entities related to inherence cannot be separated (ayuta-sidda) and since they are intimately connected, the one cannot exist without the other. A Similar definition is given by Prasastapada also. He treats inherence as the relation that subsists between two inseparable things related to each other. e.g the substance and the content. He further holds that it is the cause leading to the idea "This subsists in this abode." . Inherence is not a productive agent and it is super_sensuous. Inherence is something established by inference and is different from substance, quality, activity, generality and particularity. It exists between five kinds of inseparable entities as follows: action and substance; substance and attribute; genus and species; eternal and particular substances; and the whole and parts. Sridhara argues that, though virtue and pleasure reside in the self they are not related by inherence because their relation is not like that of the container and the contained. A conjunction of two things can be separated apart. But inherence is inseparable. In the case of conjunction, it comes to an end as soon as the conjoined members are disjoined while connection remains indestructible. Conjunction links two independent substances. The members linked through inherence cannot be separated and they stand in the relation of the container and the contained. Two things related by inference cannot be separated, unless at least one of them is destroyed. The relation between two things conjoined is external, while inherence is an internal relation.

In the case of a samyoga (conjunction) two different entities are joined together without forming a real whole which entering into each samavaya (inherence) is a real coherence. According to Nyaya, samavaya (inherence) is cognized through Perception (pratyaksha). But for the Vaisesika point of view it is inferential. It must be accepted as constituting 'its own relation and consequently, super sensuous in character. The senses are capable of cognizing positive categories only through one of the relations recognized in the system.

Key words: Samavaya (inherence), Vaisesika, Samyoga (conjunction), Padarthas, Aprthaksiddahi

Introduction to Philosophy of Vaisheshika

Vaishseika subscribes to the Philosophy of Pluralism and realism. It believes that reality is not one but many. The meaning of the word "Vaishseika" The name Vaisheika has been derived from the Sanskrit adjective. 'vishesha' which semantically indicates peculiarity or specialty. This theory emphasizes the plurality of matters in the universe, by asserting the peculiarity akin to every matter in this Universe.

The founder of Vaishesika:

Ganatha is supposed to be the founder of Vaishedika philosophy. He is also indicated by the names – Ulluka, Kasyapa, Ganapaksha and Ganapooj. The Vaishedika Sutra, a treatise created by him, is considered to be the first work on Vaishedika theory.

The word 'gana' covers such meanings as grain and particle / molecule. Thus, it would appear more suitable to identify this name as that of the introducer of atomic theory. (Radhakrishnan, S., 1991:178)

Vaisesika Treatises:

The earliest work of Vaisesika philosophy is Vaisesika Sutra of Kanada. It contains ten adhyayas or chapters each divided into two parts called ahnikas and consists of 370 sutras.

It has been clearly proved that Vaishedika Sutra was by time, prior to Buddha Dasgupta who points out that the ideas given about atoms in treatises like that

Lankavatara sutra are based on Vaishedika sutra. He has also mentioned that it proceeds the time of Buddha. (Dasgupta,S.,1992:280)

Prasiddapatha wrote a commentary on Vaishedika sutra during the 4th century B.C. This commentary was known by the name “Padarthe Dharma Sangraha” Rather than be reckoned as a commentary; this work could be identified as another original treatise on Vaishedika because Padartha Dhama Sangraha contains several peculiar ideas which are not found in Vaishedika sutra itself. (Radhakrishnan,S.,1991:180)

There are other two Bhasyas on the Vaisesikasutras viz. Ravana-bhasya and Bharadvaja-vrtti, but these are now probably lost. Prasastapadabhasya has been expounded by several writers of whom Vyomasiva, Sridhara and Udayana are the most important. Their works are Vyomavati, Nyayakandali and Kiranavali respectively. Saptapadarthi -It is another important guidebook to Nyaya-Vaisesika philosophy, by Sivaditya. (Shastri, D.N.,1964:102)

The Padarthas:

Vaisesika subscribes to the philosophy of pluralism and realism. It believes that reality is not one but many. In its syncretistic form it accepts seven padarthas.

1.Substance (dravya), 2.Quality(guṇa), 3.motion or action (karma),4.universal (sāmānya), 5.Particularity (viśeṣa), 6.inherence (samavāya), and 7.absence (abhāva). Of these, the first six comprise the classical list of categories, found even in the Vaisesika-sutra, while the seventh (absence) is a distinctive addition by the later school. Most of these types are themselves subject to subdivision: thus, there are nine types of substance, twenty four types of quality, etc.(<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/early-modern-india/#VaiSysCat>)

Definition of Samavaya:

Samavaya (Inherence) is defined by Kanada as the relation between a material cause and its effect which again is the cause of the idea that such a thing subsists in this abode.

“...samavahya is that relation of things mutually involved or associated in nature and bearing to one another the relation of the contained and the container- which is the source of intuition in the

form of 'it is here'. Ayutasiddhih-inseparable association, is the non-existence of things unrelated..... (Sinha,N.,:1923:243)

According to Kanada's definition, Samavaya is something that creates with regard to cause and effect, the idea of this being present in that. Samavaya appears to have been accepted primarily in order to bring out the relation between the inherent cause and its effect. This can be illustrated by an example where parts of wood form the inherent cause of the chair. According to the Vaisesika theory of causation, the effect, Viz, chair is said to exist in the wood by reason of inherence.

Likewise, cloth is supposed to reside in threads, believed to be its inherent cause, by way of inherence. It is incorrect to assume that Kanada was ignorant of the non – causal instances of samavaya simply because Kanada has not specially mentioned about the non- casual situations of samavaya relation, such as universal and particular. As it is easy to comprehend the samavaya relation through the causal phenomena, Kanada instantiated them for the purpose of defining Samavaya.

The work of later writers has explicitly extended the concept of inherence to non-causal phenomena. The work of prasastapada contains an explicit mention with regard to the extension of the scope of such non causal instances and their peculiarities etc.

At this stage a new concept of inseparability is introduced by Prasastapada into the definition of samavaya. Samavaya according to him, refers to the affiliation between two inseparable objects which are related as the locus and the located, producing the notion of one existing in the other.

“Inherence is the relationship between things that are inseparably connected, and which stand to each other in the relation of the container and the contained,- the relationship between, namely, that serves as the ground of the notion that ‘such and such a thing subsists in this.’.....”
(Ganganatha, Jha, 1916:675)

According to Sridhara, the author of *Nayaya Kandali*, inherence *Samaya* is that relation existing between two inseparable entities as in the case of a substratum and its content.

(Ganganatha, Jha, 1916:676)

The questions now arises as to whether two objects of different ontological status could have an inseparable relation between them. answering to this questions, Sridhara comes out with the explanation that being related by *smavaya*. the two objects become inseparable. In this regard, the causal and non-causal phenomena in realtion to *samavaya* are clearly distinguished by sridhara.

Further explaining his views, sridhara speaks of parts and whole, effects substances and their qualities, eternal substances and their non-eternal qualities, movements and the substances that move under the causal instances of *samavaya*. With regard to the non-causal phenomena he cites eternal substances along with their qualities the universal and the particular and the eternal substances along with their particularities.

Sridhara argues that, though virtue and pleasure reside in the self they are not related by inherence because their relation is not like that of the container and the contained. A conjunction of two things can be separated apart. But inherence is inseparable. It is found to reside in five places:

- (1) Inherent quality in substance
- (2) Inherent movement in substance
- (3) Inherent universal(or class) in the individuals of substance
- (4) Inherent particularity in eternal substances
- (5) Inherent whole(*avayayin*) in parts

The last of these, is regarded as one eternal though subsisting in many places and in many things. (Jha, *Durgadhara*, 1997:25)

A clear view of *samavaya* could be had, by comparing and contrasting it with *samyoga*, which is accepted by *vaisesika* as another kind of relation.

Samavaya and Samyoga:

Whereas samavaya is a relation existing not only between substances but also between non-substances samayoga is a relation that exists between substances only.

As Chatterjee & Datta mentioned

“Conjunction (samyoga) is a temporary or non- eternal relation between two things which can, and usually do, exist in separation from each other. Two balls moving from opposite directions meet at a certain place. The relation which holds between them when they meet is one of Conjunction (Samyoga). It is a temporary contact between two substances which may again be separated and yet exist (yutasiddha). As distinguished from conjunction, samavaya is a permanent or eternal relation between two entities, of which one inheres in the other.”
(Chatterjee, S., 2007:226)

When there are fruits in a tray the relation between the fruits and the tray is samayoga. whether it be in the presence of samayoga or its absence, objects related though samayoga remain unmodified. To explain this further one might say that the fruits when kept in the tray, are brought into the relation of conjunction with the tray, none of the relata i.e. the fruits and the tray undergo any modification.

They remain as they were prior to their relation by conjunction. Likewise, even when the fruits are taken off from the tray, that is to say, when the relation of conjunction between them is distributed, the fruits and the tray remain as they were. To be more explicit, as long as the relation of conjunction does not make any difference from its relata it can be considered as an external relation. In the western philosophical tradition and external relation is one that is not affected by its relata.

Contrary to this when the relata is affected by the relation, it is referred to as internal relation. the fruit and tray example referred to above is an instance of external relation pertaining to samayoga. On the other hand when milk and water are brought together it is known as internal relation because though independently they remain unaffected, they are liable to get mobilized or changed when they are related by mixing.

Conjunction and inherence are matters that differ on three important points. The first point is where conjunction occurs exclusively between two substances as in the case of an a stick and a person, whereas inherence exist

- 1) between two substances as in the case of cloth residing in threads which is its samavayakarana
- 2) between a substances and a non-substance as in the case of qualities, movements, universals etc. which reside in their respective substrata and also
- 3) between two non-substances as in the case of universals that are found in qualities and actions. The second major difference lies in the fact that conjunction is found between two substances which can be separated, while inherence subsists between two inseparable entities. A table and a table cloth related by samayoga are separable, whereas substances and its quality related by samavaya are inseparable. Thirdly, Samavaya related entities are always in a container – contained relation, as in the case of the following examples:

Container

Threads
 Jasmine flower
 Ball
 A particular cow

Contained

cloth
 fragrance
 its movement
 Universal cowness

Ultimate substances like tome their particularities such a container – contained relation does not exist in the case of two substances connected by samayoga. Thus in the case of fruits and the tray which is an example of conjunction, the relation of the container and the contained does exist. But when it comes to two moving balls the relation of the container and the contained does not exist. some further difference between samavaya and samayoga could be cited here. Before being conjoined, the relata exist as unrelated to each other in the case of a conjunction (samavoya). But when it comes to inherence, the relata are always related to each other as a substratum and sits content.

Conjunction is a temporary feature whereas inherence is eternal and one fold. conjunction is defined by sivaditya as an eternal relation though its relata are transient. Just as one being inheres in a number of existing entities, even so one inherence subsists between innumerable pairs of relata. Just as being is

eternal even so inherence is eternal. Conjunction which indicates a temporary relation is different from conjunction.

What produces samayoga is the very action of one or both of its relata. It can be produced by another conjunction also. Inherence on the other hand is produced neither on the other hand is produced neither by the action of one nor both its relata. Conjunction gets destroyed when its relata are disjoined. Inherence is beyond destruction. The relation, whereas inherence is a relation between a substrata and its content.

The notion – this subsist in this abode_ is caused by inherence, in the case of the categories of substance quality, action universality and particularly. Conjunction does not cause such a notion. It is a relation that exists between two substances which as in the case of the container and the contained may not be related to each other. Inherence is a natural and inseparable relation, whereas conjunction is adventitious and it denotes separable relation.

Inherence is defined by Udayana an intimate relation that exist between two entities that are inseparable from each other. According to him, Samavaya is a relation found between a substrata and its content which is natural and not adventitious. A natural relation is something not produced by out-side force. Conjunction on the other hand is an adventitious and temporary relation. Inherence is an inseparable relation which is not caused for any necessity. **(Sastri, Gaurinath,1980:28)**

Inherence is something of a unique character and it is sufficient to relate all its relata. Substances and their attributes, substances and their actions wholes and parts, universal and particulars, eternal substances and their particularities. Whereas inherence is only one, conjunctions are numerous. While inherence is imperceptible, conjunction is perceptible. Inherence differs from conjunction in several ways viz. it is not produced by the actions of any of its relata. any disjunction of its relata does not destroy it: its relata are not capable of independent existence unrelated to each other. It is also interred from the constant subsistence of a content in a substrata; it is one, eternal and imperceptible.

In that inherence is a relation between a substance and the other categories, it differs from substance. It also differs from non-existence. Therefore it has been treated as a distinct category by Nyaya-vaisheshika. Samavaya however, does not come under a distinct category.

an appointment of sridhara questions as to why a universal quality like cow-ness is held to be different from an individual cow, when the two are not cognized as two separable objects, but as only one, Sridhara answers as to the undivided cognition in the form_ this is a cow_ there is no distinction between the individual cow and its universal cowness. The cognition is due to the efficacy of samavaya. On the other hand where samavaya is concerned there is the cognition of the relation between the two separate objects. but it is the magic power of samavaya that makes the two objects related by it. to appear as if they are blended together like an iron ball and fire.

In the case of samavaya, sridhara's review is that the two related objects manifestly appearing to be two, whereas in samavaya relation they appear to be one, despite being two in reality. This peculiar character of samavaya, unites its relata in such a way, that one cannot perceive the relata as distinct and inseparable.

An object like a table that is normally considered to be a single object is in reality a mosaic of many, according to what Nyaya-vaisheshika. A person with a discerning intellectual capacity, is aware of the existence of many reals. In the first instance there is the table which is the substance that provides the substratum for the residing of its qualities. Action and the universal. thus a table is not really one single entity, but a mosaic of many which include substance (dravya), qualities (guna) such as color, size, shape etc. actions (kriya) like its movements and its universal, viz, tableness. Thus, what is looked upon as one entity namely the table is many in its reality.

However, the qualities, actions and the universal of the table are not perceived as separate entities by one who looks at the table.

To connect a conjunction with its relata, inherence is required, for instance, the relation of conjunction between hand and the book, has to be related to the hand and the book only by means of inherence. However no other relation

is needed for the relation of inherence with its relata. Non-existence and inherence are not related inseparably with anything. While inherence is an inseparable relation conjunction is a inseparable relation.

Differs from Nyaya Philosophy:

It is in respect of one's knowledge of samavaya, that Vaisesika tends to differ from Nyaya. While samavaya is perceptible according to Nyaya, it is denied by Vaisesika. In the view of Nyaya, samavaya is an attribute of the object in which it resides by that very relation, and it is perceived, like non-existence by the sixth kind of contact known as visesana-bhava.

Unlike Nyaya, the Vaisesika concludes that samavaya is not perceived because it was aware of the difficulty in establishing sense contact in samavaya. It is noted by prasatapada that samavaya is imperceptible because it has no relation of subsistence, as may be found in the case of universal existence that resides by samavaya relation in the perceptible objects.

In his muktavali, Visavarnatha notes that the objects in relation through samavaya such as the jar and its color through perceived. According to the observation of various scholars, as the Nyaya school was not fully aware of the difficulties pertaining to the perception, it holds that samavaya could be perceived through the sixth form of contact viz, visesana-bhava.

Samavaya and aprthaksiddhi:

Sometimes, the Vaisesika variety is treated as equal to the aprthak – siddhi doctrine of Visistadvaita, because in both cases the relata are considered inseparable. Yet, a close scrutiny divulges that the apparent similarities found in both do not form sufficient grounds to view them as equal.

An important doctrine that forms part of Visistadvaita, is aprthak-siddhi. It is intended to explain the organic relationship between god, the individual souls and matter.

Like Vaisesika, the Visistadvaita, too acknowledges two types of entities viz.

- 1) The separable (yuta siddhi)
- 2) The inseparable (ayuta-siddhi)

However the term aprthak-siddhi is used by Visistadvaita in place of ayuta siddha. Thus it would appear that the aprthak-siddhi of Visistadvaita, and the samavaya of Vaisesika are similar. This may be the reason why some people try to equate these two doctrines, whereas on the grounds of their philosophical facts they are far apart. While the followers of Vaisesika treat samavaya as a distinct category those of the Visistadvaita, school do not look upon aprthak-siddhi as a separate category. As Hirianna stated

“...Ramanuja formulates the relation, so important in his system, of aprthak-siddhi or inseparability which obtains between substance and attribute and may be found between one substance and another. It may be described as the pivot on which his whole philosophy turns. It is parallel to, but not identical with, the Nayaya-Vaishesika Samavaya. The two agree in so far as the relata which they bring together are regarded as quite distinct and real; but while Samavaya is an external relation, the conception of aprthak-siddhi is that of an internal one.”
(Hirianna, M., 1994:399)

The term aprthak-siddhi indicates the nature of the two terms which are related to each other as substance and attribute. The relata which are by nature inseparable are aprthak-siddhi in which prthak means separate and aprthak means not separate.

The term siddhi carries two means viz,

- 1) existence – Sithi
- 2) cognition – pratiti

Thus, the term aprthak-siddhi indicates that unlike two physical objects, attribute and substance cannot exist as two separate entities. Aprthak-siddhi on the other hand signifies that one cannot comprehend substance and attribute separately. For example blueness as an attribute of the blue lotus flower, does not exist by itself except as an aspect of the lotus. One does not even cognize them as separate reels. (Pandey, R.R., 1978:160)

On the other hand they are never seen to be existing separately. Substances and their attributes remain inseparable because of their intrinsic character. The need to postulate a separate relation like samavaya to account for their relation arises, because they are on the whole organically related. This is the reason

why, Ramanuja posits that one does not need any separate relation beyond the very nature of the substances and its attribute. Thus the admission of aprthak siddhi as a separate principle beyond its relata, takes one only towards the fallacy of infinite regress like samavaya.

Thus aprthak –siddhi is just principle used to describe the inseparable relation existing between substance and attributes, and it does not form distinct category over and above the relata. It may be treated as a self-linking relation (suarapa-sambandha) existing between two inseparable entities. Depending on the qualities of its relata, aprthak- siddhi may either be eternal or non – eternal. (Mohanthi,J.N.,2000:48)

The relation will be non- eternal as in the case of the lotus and its blueness, if the relata are non – eternal without referring to the relation that exist between Isvara, jivas and matter, the significance of the aprthak- siddhi in Visistadvaita cannot be understood. The Core Philosophy of Visistadvaita is that god is the supreme reality there is no other reality that equals him or independent of him. In addition to god the Visistadvaita accepts the existence of souls and matter.

In keeping with the assumption that god is supreme and that nothing is there independent of god, Visistadvaita is bound to explain the status of the principles behind soul and the matter. Independent of god souls and matter cannot be expected to possess existence. It is on this basis, that Visistadvaitas hold that the souls and the matter are dependent on its substances while souls and matter would be the attributes of isvara. If god is the soul, souls and the matter should form his body.

On the other hand if god happens to be the masters, jivas and prakrti are his servants. This reveals the dependency of the souls and the matter on isvara. What is characterized by Visistadvaita as inseparable relation, is this relation on Isvara or dependence of soul and matter on Isvara or the dependence of attributes on their substances.

Thus it will be seen that aprthak-siddhi refers to an organic relation while samavaya is a mechanical relation in which two independent reals co-exist inseparably. While the purpose of samavaya is to separate the reals, preserving

their identify the aprthak siddhi is intended to unity, harmonize and relate thing organically. This denotes the prevalence of an essential difference between the samavaya of Vaisesika and the apparthak siddhi of visistadvaita.

Conclusion:

The relation of inherence ties together as a substance or a quality or a motion with appropriate entities exemplifying the other positive categories :a quality with a substance; a motion with a substance;a universal with a substance; a quality,or a motion,a whole(substance) with the parts constituting it; an ultimate individuator with the ultimately indivisible substance to which it belongs. Thus inherence may be regarded as the ontological glue that ties together entities exemplifying the different positive categories, and makes possible a unified thing as well as a unified world despite categorical differences and a pluralistic ontology.

References

1. Chatterjee,S.,Datta,D.,(2007),**An Introduction to Indian Philosophy**,NewDelhi, Rupa Publications.
2. Dasgupta,S.,(1992),**A History of Indian philosophy vol.ii.**,New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass,.
3. Ganganatha,Jha,(Trans),(1916), **The Padarthadharma Samgraha of Prasastapada with Nyaya Kandali of Sridhara**, ,Benares, Medical Hall Press.
4. Hiriyanan,M.,(1994),**Out Lines of Indian Philosophy**,Delhi,Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
5. Jha,Durgadhara,(1997),**Prasastapadabhasya with Nyayakandali**, Varanasi, Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.
6. Mohanthy,J.N.,(2000),**Classical Indian Philosophy**,UK, Rowman& Littlefield Publishers.
7. Pandey,R.R.,(1978),**Man and the Universe-In the Orthodox Systems of Indian Philosophy**,Delhi,GDK Publications.
8. Radhakrishnan,S.,(1991),**Indian Philosophy vol.ii**,Bombay,Oxford University Press.

9. Sastri, Gaurinath,(1980),**KiranaVali**, Sampumananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi.
10. Shastri, D.N.,(1964),**Critiques of Indian Realisim**, Agra University.
11. Sinha,N.,(Trans),(1923),**The Vaishesika Sutras of Kanada**,Allahabad,Vijaya Press.