

Vol II Issue VIII Feb 2013

Impact Factor : 0.1870

ISSN No :2231-5063

Monthly Multidisciplinary
Research Journal

Golden Research

Thoughts

Chief Editor
Dr.Tukaram Narayan Shinde

Publisher
Mrs.Laxmi Ashok Yakkaldevi

Associate Editor
Dr.Rajani Dalvi

Honorary
Mr.Ashok Yakkaldevi

IMPACT FACTOR : 0.2105

Welcome to ISRJ

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595

ISSN No.2230-7850

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

International Advisory Board

Flávio de São Pedro Filho Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Mohammad Hailat Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of South Carolina Aiken, Aiken SC 29801	Hasan Baktir English Language and Literature Department, Kayseri
Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Abdullah Sabbagh Engineering Studies, Sydney	Ghayoor Abbas Chotana Department of Chemistry, Lahore University of Management Sciences [PK]
Janaki Sinnasamy Librarian, University of Malaya [Malaysia]	Catalina Neculai University of Coventry, UK	Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Horia Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania
Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ilie Pinteau, Spiru Haret University, Romania
Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Xiaohua Yang PhD, USA
Titus Pop	George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher	Nawab Ali Khan College of Business Administration

Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade ASP College Devrukh,Ratnagiri,MS India	Iresh Swami Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur	Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur
R. R. Patil Head Geology Department Solapur University, Solapur	N.S. Dhaygude Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur	R. R. Yaliker Director Managment Institute, Solapur
Rama Bhosale Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education, Panvel	Narendra Kadu Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune	Umesh Rajderkar Head Humanities & Social Science YCMOU, Nashik
Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	K. M. Bhandarkar Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia	S. R. Pandya Head Education Dept. Mumbai University, Mumbai
Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain	Alka Darshan Shrivastava Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar
Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar Arts, Science & Commerce College, Indapur, Pune	G. P. Patankar S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka	Rahul Shriram Sudke Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore
Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust),Meerut	Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director,Hyderabad AP India.	S.KANNAN Ph.D , Annamalai University,TN
	S.Parvathi Devi Ph.D.-University of Allahabad	Satish Kumar Kalhotra
	Sonal Singh	

**Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.isrj.net**



THEORY OF CAUSALITY: SAMKHYA AND NYAYA APPROACHES

PAYEL CHATTOPADHYAY

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy,
Burdwan University

Abstract:

There is a debate in between the Indian philosophers whether the created things are existent or nonexistent or both existent and nonexistent before creation. All the different Indian Philosophers posses different views to solve the problem. Among them the Nyaya, Vaisesika and Mimansak hold the view of Asatakaryabada and Samkhya philosopher are Satakaryabadi. According to Samkhya the universe is the evolution of prakriti. They admit two theories one is Purus and another is Prakriti. Purus is conscious but prakriti is ignorant. But when the state of the Purush is reflected on prakriti then prakriti things itself as conscious and begins to evolutes itself. Then the evolution takes place. Thus from the atomic prakriti the created world is formed and after dissolution universe dissolved in prakriti. Prakriti is sata that's why the evolution is also Sata. The main maxim of Satakaryabad is, the created things or the effect is always sata or existent. Before formation an effect lies in its cause. Creation is nothing but another form of cause. So, Satakaryabad has to be accepted to establish evolutionary theory. In Nyaya Vaisesika view atom or Paramanus are the ultimate reality or Paramanus are the atomic cause of the universe. The atoms come together and by adjoining of them gradually the universe come into existence. After dissolution the complex things are destroyed into pieces. And the atoms become separated and come into atomic form. So, world is created from atoms. This theory of Nyaya is called Arambhabad. To establish Arambhabad they have to accept another theory named Asatakaryabada. Asatakaryabada means Karya is Asata before its creation. That means Karana is Sata but Karya is Asata before creation and become Sata after creation. Comparison of these two opposite theory is the subject matter of my discussion.

KEY-WORDS:

Theory of Causality, Philosophy, Samkhya and Nyaya, Buddhists.

INTRODUCTION

It is found after considering the interpersonal relationship between them which exist in the world that there is a causal relationship between each other. Of them the antecedents are causes and the consequences are effects. Maharshi Annambhatta in his Tarkasamgraha told that, that which exist uniformly before action without being irrelevant is cause and that which occurs after cause is effect. Nayayiks say that effect is prierly absent negetum that mean Pragabhava Pratiyagin. According to Nyaya-vaisasike philosophers God creates suitable spheres of sufferable or enjoyable for the creature according to their lot or luck. Hence the sphere is created things or 'jannya drabya'. On the other hand in samkhya there are two theories one is purusa and other is prakriti. Prakriti is the unity of three gunas or trigunatmaka. If disturbance is created in trigunatmaka prakriti then the equilibrium is disturbed and evolution takes place.

Universe is the evolution of prakriti. After dissolution the universe ceased in prakriti. So the concept of this universe is nothing new but the formation of prakriti. Naturally, the Sankhya philosophers to explain their theory have opted for Satakaryabad. On the other hand the Nyaya Vaisesika and Mimansa philosophers have initiated Asatakaryabada and Armbhavada. So analyse the options of these two schools is the central point of this article.

As Samkhya-sutra composed by Maharshi Kapil is now a lost episode Samkhya-Karika is the principal composition of Sankhya philosophy. Vachspati Mishra, the analyser of 'sarvadaršana' to explain Samkha-karika composed Samkhatattva-kaumudi. In Sankhatattva Kaumudi it is said that 'Karyat Karanamatram gamyate'(no.8) which means that by the knowing the manifested or extensive effect or creation we can get idea of atomic cause. But about the nature of basic causes behind the creation of this universe different philosophical schools shows differences of opinion Maharshi Goutam initiating Asata karyavada state that 'whether the created substances are sata or asata or both sata and asata before its creation.' If any of these three options is not accepted then existence of the effect will become unreal and the conception of cause effect relationship will become fake. Regarding the nature of cause and effect and their relationship the possible options are as follows:

1. Cause and effect both are real entity – Samkhya thinkers are of this opinion.
2. Cause is real entity while effect is unreal – said by Mimanshas of Vaisesika and Nyaya School.
3. Cause is unreal but effect is real – the opinion of Nihilist Buddhists.
4. Cause is real but effect is neither real nor unreal something other such as Mithya or indescribable held by Advaita Vedantists (non Dualist).
5. Cause and effect are both real and unreal - said by Jainya philosophers.

to oppose the view of Jainism Maharshi Gautam expressed that, 'Sadasatobbaidharmmyat', (47//390//) that is to say, the Sata has Sattva as its nature and the Asata has Asattva. But these two properties being opposite cannot remain in the same segment. So, Sata and Asata cannot be identical.

Buddhists have admitted Karana as Asata. To establish this view they give the evidence of the seeds. From the abolition of seeds germination is possible. Dissolution of seeds is nothing but an evidence of non existence that means dissolution leads to non existence of matter. So, from non existence comes the existence of matter. Saint Sankracharya mentioned in Vedanta Darshan has also mentioned that this version is taken as Buddhist opinion. In Upanishada it has been mentioned as view of opponent. In Chhandogya Upanishada Asat-karanavada has been taken as view of opponent. There it has been mentioned there is no proof of Sata being derived from Asata. In fact before creation this universe was in one and only eternal sata. To oppose this view the idealist Buddhist (bijanavadina Buddha) said that before creation this world was non existence or asta that is it was non entity or nature of absence and from this non entity this universe which has an entity was created. In the next verse in Chhandogya Upanishada it has been asked, to oppose the above theory, in which evidence the above theory can be proved? How from the non existence the existence can be created? Rather this universe has been characterized science early time as unparalleled Sata.

Maharshi Gautam in the 17th verse of the 4th chapter raised argument against Asata-karanvad and told that, cannot be the cause of anything which is a non entity. The thing which is nothing but a void notion cannot be the material cause of anything. If the material cause of this universe be Asata then universe must be Asata. Because Inter categorical matter becomes the basic material of Inter categorical (sajatiya) matter. Besides this in Indian philosophical concept the quality of the material cause is the Asamavayi karana of the quality of the production or the final effect. But the abhava category or among the seven categories abhava has no quality. So which will be created from that object? Which has no quality must be a thing that has lack of quality. So the opponents view is that the abolition of the seeds is not the cause of germination rather germination is the changed form of seed. If cannot be conceived that germination is possible without seed or a pot without soil. So cause is not non entity or Asad-vastu.

The entity of cause Sankhya, Nyaya-Vaisesika, Mimansak, Advaita Vedanta (non dualist) all these astike schools accept cause as Sata or existent before its creation but in Vedanta though the Karana is Sata but effect is indescribable, that means, different from Sata and Asata that is Mithya. Advaita Vedantaist have described Brahma is one and only Sata, it is Parramatta Sata. This universe is the evolution of Brahma. So Brahma is Sata but universe is the illusion of Brahma. Universe or Karya is controlled by the knowledge of Sata Brahma. After getting the real nature of Brahma the universe and the other creation will become restrain. To establish that view Advaita Vedantaist has to admit Satakaranavada. In the other hand Samkhya's view though the whole universe that can be felt and proved to be helping factor must cannot be

called Asata. And one which is admitted as Sata cannot be Asata at the same time. Maharshi Guatam with help of this verse “Vyaktanvyaktanam pratyakhsa pramanyat” (11.353 //), opposed the idea of Samkhya that unexposed or (avayakta) matter (that is trigunatmikaprakriti or the prakriti is the unity of three gunas) is the root cause of physical manifested. According to Maharshi Goutam the atomic forms of earth, water etc. are the exposed cause of physical substances or bhuta pardatha. Though the atom of the earth, water etc. are supra sensible but the quality of compound earth, water etc. are also the quality of their atomic form. So the atomic forms are as same as manifested substance in that sense Maharshi called atoms 'Vaktya' or exposed. This atoms come together to form dyad, triad, quatrain and the physical substances have the same quality as the quality of atom. This view of Nayayiks is known as Arambhabad. If Arambhabad is accepted then Asata Karyavada also must be accepted. The theory that universe comes out of atoms is follows from Arambhabad. In the dissolutionary state though the atom exists but the universe cannot. Universe comes to existence with the coagulation of atoms. Hence, universe is Asata before creation but becomes Sata after creation and after destruction this world takes shelter in atoms. To establish the theory of pradhana (i.e. purush and Prakriti) satakaryabadi Samkhya refutes Asatakaryavada. To give reason they state in Samkhyakarika that - “Asadakaranadupadanagrahanat sarvvasambhabavhavat. Saktasya sakyakaranat karanabhavacca satkaryam..” //9//

The explanation of this verse is that, Karya or the effect is Sata or existent before its creation, because if Karya be Asata or non entity then no one can produce it. Cause and effect are uniformly connected. Otherwise anything can be produced from any cause or any matter. And anything which is nonexistent cannot be related with a thing which is existent. Therefore effect is Sata or existent. In fact Karya is identical with Karana. The cause is Sata, so, is the karya. In the commentary of this verse Vachaspati Mishra has assembled the following argument in support of Sata karyavada-

i. If Karya be Asata like sky flower etc. then nobody will be able to produce Karya. No artists can convert blue to yellow. Likewise, if Karya be Asata then no cause is capable or component to create thus Karya. So, samkhyas remark is that karya is not absolutely nonexistent before creation because creator's volition can create it.

The opponents give argument it, existence and nonexistence both are the features of an effect. Through the effect is nonexistent before its creation but it becomes existent after coagulation of an all the cause. To oppose this theory Sankhya says that entity and non entity both are the properties/qualities. A qualifier must need a qualified for existence. For example: in the case of a red colored pot; redness is a quality and pot is a qualifier or a substance. The redness cannot exist without pot. Actually no qualifier can exist without qualified. Likewise, through the entity and non-entity are nothing but same quality then it must need a qualified for existence. So, it has to accept that effect is Sata or existing thing. Because if one regards Karya or effect as Asata then he has to consider a base where the properly Asata or entity will stay. For that, the Sankhya view is that through the Karya is Sata before its creation or appearance but it remains implicitly in cause and after creation it becomes explicit.

ii. The Sankhya teachers are against this Asata Karyavada. Going to put the second argument they say Upadanagrahanat'. To explain its meaning it is told that effect is not more than elementary cause. In Upanishada it is told that;

“Vacarambhanam Vikaronamadheyam

Mrittiketyeva satyam”(Chhandogya Upanishada —(6 / 1 / 4)

That is to say from the knowledge of an earthen pot we can come to know all other earthen things. Soil or earth is the only truth. All other things comes from earth is nothing but the different name and shape of earth. In our daily usage we differentiate effect from cause but effect is nothing but another form of cause. From intellect we can another all the things made from soil. According to Sankhya effect remains implicitly in its elementary cause. For example, oil remains implicitly in sesame or 'Til' so that oil secreted from sesame oil is nothing but the another form of seeds. In Samkhya's opinion, such finally existence of Karya in Karana can be known from perceiving the causality or causation in universe. In this connection it is mention that the Samkhya teachers are non believer in God. The matter coming as an effect is the transformation of cause; it is only a name in new word. Effect is not different from cause. It is true that cause and effect are made different in practical use but effect is only the transformation of cause. If an intelligent person can have to the knowledge of an earthen pot and realizes that pot, plate etc are made of soil, then the person gets the clear knowledge of all earthen matters. So, pot, plate etc are the different names of soil, nothing different from it.

In the opinion of Sankhya thinkers amidst the Upadanakaranam Karana entity exists unmanifestedly. For example oil comes out of 'Til' as oil exists unmanifestedly in 'Til'. Oil is a stage of Til, nothing separate. In Sankhya opinion, Karana exists finally in Karya. So, they say that by care of doer Karma (action) is possible on from this it is prove that Karya before creation is not at all Asata.

Existence can be known by realizing the attitude of material cause-effect relationship. In this connection it is mentioned that the Samkhya teachers are non believer in God. They say that existence of Karya in Karana is due to laws of nature. All the other hand the opinion of those who believe in God definite Karya is manifested by a definite Karana and this happens as to the volition or will of God. It is God who has made it clear that this Karya comes out this Karana. In fact no scientific experiment can create Karya out of any Karana. Science true experiment can discover the internal power of Karana behind any Karya or can manifest the Karya out of Karana but cannot create the Karya. It must invariably be accepted the unchallenged control of nature lies behind the determination of cause effect relationship. For this it is derived that a definite cause gives rise to definite effects. That the entity of effects comes before cause can be admitted from this.

iii. To furnish the third argument Vachaspati Mishra said, "asambaddhameva Karanyai Kasmad Karyamna Janyate? Tatha Ca Asadevotpatesyate Ityate Aha Sarvva Sambhadabhabat." (//9//) Hence if it be admitted for argument's sake that cause produces Asata (non entity) effect not related to it, then a few inconveniences are faced. So, from any cause any effect may come out if there is no relationship between a definite cause and a definite effect. For ex, if there is no entity of oil in the seed (TIL) then oil could have been extracted from the sand particles. So, in order explain causal rules the Sata Karya theory must be admitted.

The Nyaya philosophers have wanted to solve this problem by unfolding the concept of Pragabhava (prior absence). In the opinion of Nyaya School, Abhava (non existence) is of four types – prior absence or Pragabhava, subsequent non existence, mutual non existence and absolute non existence. The Abhava before the production of a produced product is Pragabhava. Because of the Pragabhava present in the Til (seed) oil is extracted but as there is nonexistence (Atyantabhava) of oil in sand oil cannot be extracted from sand. The Nyayaists also say that the knowledge that Pragabhava of oil is present in the seed not in sand is earned from the material cause-effect relationship. That is, it is particularly found that oil is extracted from seed not from sand. From this it is inferred later that seed and not sand, produces oil.

But the problem arises because all the philosophical schools do not admit Pragabhava. Because Pragabhava is negatum pratiyogin. Then comes this questions whether pratiyogin destroys Pragabhava all the moment of its production or just after. To get a Karya requires a Karana. So, on the moment of production if there is no pratiyogin, it cannot destroy Pragabhava. Again, it cannot be told that pratiyogin destroyed Pragabhava just after its production. Because pragabhava and other causes being present on the moment of production and then pratiyogin may be produced. But that goes again practical experience. Besides if Pragabhava destroys pratiyogin then cause may be called killer of effect. To solve all these problems if it is told that Pragabhava destroys the basic cause of pratiyogin, then the problem comes that in the destroyer the presence of destroyed is admitted. But that is not convent. So, Pragabhava is to be derecognized. If Pragabhava is refuted then Asata Karyavada based on Pragabhava is also refuted. Then Sata karyavada becomes prime.

iv. The Nyayaists, to establish the relationship between cause and effect, raises the question of Sakti Sambamdhya. According to this school, effect may not be present in Karya beforehand but a particular type Sakti is present in the Karana from which is produced Karya. As effect lies in cause, Karana produces Karya. So, a particular type of Sakti present in the Karana. Following this argument the Samkhya teachers ask a question to Nyayaists whether producing power lies in a particular Karana or in any Karana and any time. So, answer this question it has been told in Samkhatattva Kaumudi, "Sa Sakti Saktakaranasraya sarvvatra ba syat sakye ba." To say that Sakti power lies everywhere means any cause may produce any effect. This may lead to arise and objection. So the Nyayaists must have to say that definite Sakti power lies in a definite Karana. But this also leads to a problem whether the effect is related or unrelated to effect produce in Sakti (power). The question of no relation can be admitted. Because then these objection may be raised that Gahta-producing power may be Pata-producing power. And if the effected is related to the Sakti then the effect must be Sata as Sata cannot be related with Asata by this the Satakaryavada is supported.

v. Another argument of Samkhyatattva Kaumudi is, the nature of cause and effect. Effect is not different from cause. As the cause is Sata or existent then the Karya or effect must be Sata.

In Chhandogya Upanishad 454||2|| of Samkara's interpretation it is shown argument in support of this. Even if effectual object and causal object are taken to be two different objects still they are not as different as cow from a horse. Although in ball of clay there is the existence of ballness but there is no existence of potness and in a pot there exist potness in it but there does not have any existence of ballness but in a ball of clay and in a pot there is the property of mudness. So pot, jar etc. are the transformation of

clay nothing separate from it. Thus the whole universe is the transformation of Brahman nothing new. As from the concept of the shape of a rope the illusive knowledge of the shape of a snake is produced thus the Brahman who is clam (void of Sattva, Rajas, Tamas qualities), unborn or endless or infinite (Aja), the universe is created. The knowledge of universe is nothing but illusion, it is neither real nor unreal it is mittha. So from Sata is born another identical Sata.

vi. With the help of sixth argument in the Samkhyatattva Kaumudi it is going to prove the inseparable relationship between cause and effect. Their arguments are as follows:

To show that there is no basic differences between cause and effect it is said in Samkhyakarika, 'Karanabhavacca'. That means if cause and effect are so different from each other then cause effect relationship cannot be produced. For example a cow is very much different from a horse so no cause effect relationship can be established between them and a gold piece and a gold bangle are not too different so a cause effect relationship between them is possible.

The Nayayist, to give reason against the above says is the cause and effect are so different and this can be realized by observing the difference in regards of the time of their creation, destruction and their action. For example, the time of creation of soil and the time of the creation a pot are different. Likewise when a pot is destroyed it converts into soil and when soil is destroyed it converts gradually into quarried, triad, dried and at last into atom. From this it can be realized that the time of the production and destruction of soil and pot are different and their needs are also different. Because by a pot we can fetch water but it cannot possible with the use of soil. In the other hand soil can produce pot but pot cannot produce soil.

But the Samkhya says that these three reason do not took the very difference of cause and effect because as ice is from water but ice is not at all totally different from water or as the piece of gold and a golden bangle are related in causal relation still they are not to separate things; ice is the transformation of water and bangle of gold. Though there is difference in their time of production or destruction or in their ability to doing something in Samkhyakarika it has been uttered for example that turtle hides all its body parts into its body cover but when it starts moving it pushes out all its body part and then it is seemed that body parts are produced but body parts are not separable from body. Likewise pot is the modification of soil not anything different. Rather from realizing that the causes are substrate and effect are substrate tam and they are inseparable in their course of existence it is also realized that they are separable. For example the threads are inherent or Samabaye cause of piece of cloth, and they cannot exist separable. Even the weight of the thread is as same as weight of cloth made by it. By these examples it is proved that effect is nothing but the modification of cause.

The opponents put objection against Sata Karyavad that if Karya be Sata before creation then the existence of some total of all Karana (Karanabayapar) will become useless and if the Samkhyaists say that cause is inevitable for the effect to come into existence then the question comes whether that existence or appearance of the effect is Sata or Asata? If the appearance is Sata then Karana has got no role to play. If the appearance be Asata then for its creation the existence of a different cause is required or for the appearance of the appearance there is needed another cause and for the second appearance again a new cause is required. And in this way another cause is required for that new appearance. So in this case the fallacy of infinite regress comes into existence.

But the same question will arise against Nayayikas. In the opinion of Nayayists Asata Karya is produced from Sata Karana if that production is not Sata then production of that production has to admit. So here also fallacy of infinite regress will arise. To avoid this fallacy if it is admitted that the production is Sata but the Karya is not, then Sata Karyavada is admitted. So we have to admit Sata Karyavada of Samkhya and according to Samkhyaists, although Karya is Sata but it is not expressed before the presence of some total of Karana (Karanabyapar). This unexpressed form of Karya becomes expressed. For not becoming express it cannot be called Asata. In deep darkness and object cannot be visible but that does not prove the non entity of that object. Similarly effect becomes unexpressed before its production but that un expression does not prove its non existence. It is to be mentioned in this context that this unperceivable nature of Karyabastu is not due to darkness or defect of sense organ but due to the covering for which effect is not perceived before its production and which lies in Karana but in another form of Karya. So, in Samkhya opinion effect is Sata and existence of effect means that it is expressed from cause.

To oppose this theory of Sata Karyavad Nyaya, Vaisasika, Mimansak has been vocal. Maharshi Goutam to argue against it has said, "Utpada-vyaya darsanat". 48||39||

By this verse Maharshi has tried to prove that as it has been shown the destruction of a created thing so from this perception it is proved the non existence of a created things before its creation and existence after creation. The creation or destruction of created things is proved in perception and everyone admits it. This realization by all is negated if the existence of Karya before its creation is admitted and object which is Sata

is not created. But if it is admitted that Karya is Sata or existent before its creation or appearance then also it has to admit that it exist internally. As a result each causal object attains the characters of eternity like Atma (Soul). But this decision is against experience the creation of objects like pots are to be realized. The creation can be assumed from the assumption of destruction of those whose creation or destruction cannot be experienced the destruction of all the objects are assumed at the time of disaster. The Samkhyaists put objection that the creation of an Asata or nonexistent object is never possible. To reply this it can be said that the Samkhyaists have raised this objection because they could not differentiate between Asata object and unreal or unfounded or Aleek objects. The created objects may be Asata but not Aleek like sky lotus. Both Sattva or existence and Asattva or non existence may be the property of an object it is prove that an object which is Asata before creation is Sata after creation and there is no hard and fast rule that the object for the Asata property being present in it must show its existence. As in the unreal concept of sky lotus the property unreal is there and for this the concept sky lotus must not show its existence in reality. Besides, having the knowledge of the property of potness it can be easily said that the pot is nonexistent or Asata. It is not that he who mentioned that "pot is nonexistent" he mentions the term 'pot' with its all features. According the knowledge of pot it can be said that another pot before its creation is Asata.

But again another objection may be raised. Only by the above argument cannot be prove the nonexistence of Karya, because if Karya is Asata the property of Asattva can be found everywhere. As a result, this rule that a definite effect comes from a definite cause doesn't hold. For example, if the soil creates nonexistent pot then this question arises why soil does not create nonexistent cloth? In reply to this question the interpreter of Nyayasutra vatsyana says is as follows:

"Idamasyatpattaye Samarthana na Savvamiti Praguipatterniyata Karana karryam Buddhya Siddhamutpatti Niyamadarsanat" 49//392//

That means, only this cause produces only this effect not any other else. It can get by reason that a definite effect is always produced from a definite cause.

To elaborate this: sing the creation of a definite effect from a definite cause or to ensure cause effect relationship between to objects this lesson is learnt a very particular cause must give rise to a particular effect in future. This type of knowledge is intellectually proved by assumption. So, it is resolved before creation that a effect is always backed by cause.

The other decision taken by the interpreter's previous interpretation is that effect comes out the power of cause. According to Nyaya the effect producing power lies in cause and for that power a special effect comes from a special cause. Udayanacharya in Nyaya Kusumanjali has proved by argument that is power or 'Sakti' is nothing but Karanattva or causness seeing the production of cloth from thread it can be realized that thread as a causal as got the power to produce cloth. The Samkhyaists again put objection because it is not possible for the effect to relate with that the power which is in cause if there is no existence of effect or Karya. If an effect is Asata then it cannot be related with the power in Karana which is Sata. That means, the relationship between Sata and Asata is not possible. And in that case the objection must be raised against the creation of any effect from any cause if there is no relationship between the power in cause and the effect which is produced by it. So, it has to admit that effect exist before the presence of some total of cause or Karanavappara.

In response to this objection the Nyayaist say that if the Karya will be alike or unreal just like sky lotus then that cannot be related with anything which is Sata or real. But Karya up to the last moment before its creation is Asata but is Sata from the very moment of its creation. As a result it is not that the relationship between Karya and Karana is not possible. But in the opinion of Nyayists, the relationship between Karya and the power in cause before the production of Karya is neither Samavayee or inherence nor Samyoga or consumption. So it cannot be shown any substrate-substratum relationship between the power and the effect. And so there is no need of the presence of Karya before. Hence the relation between the power laying in Karana and the future Karya is possible. We are aware of our future death. Between knowledge and the

subject of the knowledge there is subject based relation or a relation named Bisoyita In this case the subject is Asata still the relationship between the knowledge and its subject is possible. So by this instance it can be proved that effect can relate with the power of cause. Effect producing power lies in cause and so particular effect comes out of particular cause. In Nyaya theory effect and its creation are identical. For example though the potness and the essence of substance (Dravattva) are identical yet Dravattva is not necessarily identical to potness. Similarly the creation of Karya being not Karya itself but they are identical. And in that case fallacy of infinite regress is not held responsible in the probable perspective. Rather, Satakaryavadi has to admit that Karya and its expression is identical, otherwise the fallcy of infinite regress becomes prominent. And if Karya and its expression will be identical then there will be no need of Karana. Here for the sake of argument and cross argument judging from the point of view of reality Asata Karyavada is to admitted.

That Karya and karana are two completely different segment is admitted by neither Sata Karayavadi nor Asata Karyavadi but the problem is about the nature of their relationship. With Samkhya metaphysics or evolutionary theory Sata Karyavada is compatible whereas Asata Karyavada has to be admitted if Arambhavada is considered.

REFERENCES:

- 1.Udan. Kiranabalee, (1991) Sree gaurinath Sastri, west Bengal state booh board, Kolkata.
- 2.Bhattcharta. Amit, (2005) Nyaya Vaisesika Basa ,2d part, Sanskrit book depo. Pp.- 84-88.
- 3.Annambhatta, (1983) Tarkasamgraha-Dipika, Gopinath Bhattacharya, Progressive pub.
- 4.Tarkabagis, Phani Bushan, Nayadarshan, (1983) 2nd and 3rd part, west Bengal state book board.
- 5.Chandogyo Upanishada (2002) Durgacharan Samkhya Vedantatirtha, 1st and 2nd part, deb sahitya kuthir.
- 6.Bhattacharya. Bidhubhushan, (1984) Sankhyadarsane R Bibarna, west Bengal state book.
- 7.Purnachandra Vedantachunchu, (2007), Samkhyakarika, west Bengal state book board.
- 8.Chatterjee and Datta, (1984), An introduction to Indian Philosophy, Calcutta University.
- 9.Sharma. Chandradhar, (2009) A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy, Motilal banarasi das, Delhi.
- 10.Dasgupta. Surendranath (2010), A history of Indian Philosophy, vol. 1 Motilal banarasi das, Delhi.
- 11.Prasastapad, Prasastapadbhasya, edt. Sri Shamapada Tarkatirtha, 1st anr 2nd Part, Damodar Ashram.



ARUP CHATTOPADHYAY

PhD Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Burdwan University .

Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished research paper.Summary of Research Project,Theses,Books and Books Review of publication,you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed,India

- * International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- * OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed,USA

- EBSCO
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Databse
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Golden Research Thoughts
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005,Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.isrj.net