Chapter IX

THE DVAITA CONCEPT OF VIŚEṢA CONTRASTED WITH VIŚEṢA OF THE VIŚEṢIKA SCHOOL
The Vaiśeṣika school has a category called Viśeṣa. Its conception of Viśeṣa and the purpose for which it has been accepted are entirely different from those of Viśeṣa in the Dvaita school. Their similarity does not go beyond the name.

In the Vaiśeṣika school, Viśeṣa is conceived as a differentiating factor. This may be explained in the following way: Things like pots are mutually different because of the difference of their parts. This holds good up to dvyanuca. When we come down to the atoms of the same substance, they cannot be distinguished by the difference of parts as they are all partless. There must be some other factor to bring about difference among the atoms of the same class. For this purpose, the Vaiśeṣikas recognise a distinguishing factor called Viśeṣa.

The term Viśeṣa etymologically explained as a differentiating factor (viśagāte ahaṁ iti viśeṣaḥ or viśeṣayatiḥ viśeṣaḥ).

This is the reason for giving it the name in the Vaiśeṣika school.

In the Dvaita school also, the term is employed in the same sense, but in a different set-up. Here, this concept is intended to account for the judgments of difference within any

---

1. अनंते जैन अनंततः उत्कस्तां कर्त्ताय महाभृत्य शुचकारत शुची ज्ञेयः।

आनेत्य अनंतश्री उत्कस्तां उक्तमुद्रा। उत्कस्तां नाकाश्चोरत्तोऽत्पत्तेत् शुचियेष्ठत्तत् युक्ते संयोगेन निमित्तमुद्रा। ते श्री अश्वाकाशिनः दुर्योगुः।
   Sridhara. Nyāyakanda, V.SS. 1895, p.323.
given instance, eternal or non-eternal where difference does not exist as a matter of fact. It is thus a differentiating factor in a very limited sense inasmuch as it explains the judgments of difference explained already *supra* p. 6. But in the Vaiśeṣika school, Viśeṣa is the cause of mutual difference between atoms and such other eternal entities where no other differentiating cause can be found. Thus, while Viśeṣa of the Dvaita school accounts for the judgments implying difference between substance and its attributes which is not there in reality, Viśeṣa of the Vaiśeṣika school accounts for the actual difference between atoms of the same class and also between other eternal entities like space, soul and mind. Thus, both the function and the scope of the concept of Viśeṣas in the two schools are entirely different. The scope of Viśeṣa of the Dvaita school is much wider as it is accepted in all entities. The scope of Viśeṣa of the Vaiśeṣika school is confined to eternal entities only.

Another important point to be noticed is that Viśeṣa of the Dvaita school helps to preserve the unity of substance and its attributes explaining the distinction of reference, whereas Viśeṣa of the Vaiśeṣika school brings about difference between entities. This point is most important as pointed out by Dr. B.N.K. Sharma. He says: "It suffices to keep the Viśeṣas of the two systems as the poles apart and expose the fallacious assumption of some scholars that the Viśeṣa of Madhva system is either derived from or inspired by those of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas".2

2. *Philosophy of Madhvacarya*, p. 36.
Both the concepts are regarded as svanirvāhaka by their respective schools in order to circumvent infinite regress.

The Muktāvali of Viśvanātha Pancānana explains viśēṣa of the Vaiṣeṣikas very briefly in the following way: Substances like ghaṭa, down to dvyaṅkha are mutually different because of the difference of their parts. But, viśēṣa alone is the differentiating factor in atoms. That, of course, is self-differentiated. Therefore, there is no necessity of another viśēṣa in it.

Viśēṣas of the Vaiṣeṣika school are all eternal. Viśēṣa of the Dvaita school is eternal in eternal entities and non-eternal in non-eternal things like a pot. Their number is innumerable in both the schools.

Viśēṣa of the Vaiṣeṣikas is called antya-viśēṣa. The word antya is interpreted as that which rests at the end. This is further elaborated as partless substance, thus confining viśēṣa to substances which have no parts. These substances, obviously, are ākāśa, kāla, dik, ātma and manas.

---


4. Ibid., p.119.
The Neo-Naiyayikas dismiss this *Viséga* with the argument that if *Viséga* is invested with the power of *svanirvāhakartrtva*, atoms and other eternal substances themselves may be invested with such a power as it would save the assumption of a new entity.⁵.

But, according to Rāmarudra, a commentator on *Dīnakaśīram*, even this view of the Neo-Naiyayikas is not acceptable to Dīnakaśa. Rāmarudra makes this observation on the basis of the word 'say' (śuń) in Dīnakaśa's sentence quoted above. Rāmarudra elaborates: The inference which proves atoms may not necessarily prove mutual difference among atoms and therefore a differentiating factor is necessary.⁶.

Thus *Viséga* of the Vaiṣeṣika is subject of controversy within that school itself. But *Viséga* of the Dvaita school has never been a subject of controversy among the adherents to the Dvaita school.

---

⁵. द्वारा ना कर्दनु पूर्ण देश तत्त्वाध्याय आत्मनां स्वरूपः। व उपरि वेदेन्द्रातः न नृष्टिः।

⁶. उपातिः पिप्पलदन्ति धुमन्नोऽवनदृष्ट। खरृऽऽ मेलू अशुभकावलं गदाङ्गनवत॥

Dīnakaśa, *Dīnakaśīram*, p.123.

Rāmarudra, *Rāmarudriyaṇa* (to be found in the volume named *Karikāvallī*), Balanāmana press, Madras, 1923, p.123.
The Dvaita school refutes this *Videsa* of the Vaiśeṣikas in the following manner: Atoms have parts and therefore, they can be mutually distinguished by their parts. Those parts in turn are mutually distinguished by their parts. As every part has its parts, there is no difficulty for the mutual differentiation of any part.

There is no need to accept *Videsa* by the Vaiśeṣikas in *ākāsa*, *kāla*, etc., as these can be mutually distinguished by their essential characters.

---

7. "राजायोगिनीतं मतं कालं विवाक्षा परमाङ्गणः कालकालं सङ्काळे, राजाय प्रभायं।
उपोक्ष राजायोगिनिः परमाङ्गणः कालकालं सङ्काळे परमाङ्गणः कालकालं सङ्काळे।
तथैव विवाक्षा गुणादेशः। उपोक्ष राजायोगिनिः परमाङ्गणः कालकालं सङ्काळे।
तात्तत्त्विक्षणं विवाक्षा गुणादेशः।


उपजते सर्वो गुणं आसः संस्केतं यसः तर्कं।
उपजते सर्वो गुणं आसः संस्केतं यसः तर्कं।

- *Anuvākhyana*, p.76.