

CHAPTER IV

CONCEPT OF MIND IN AYURVEDA

- 4.1. Introductory
 - 4.2. Analysis of the Ayurvedic concept Regarding Mind
 - 4.3. Life and Mind - a configurational view
 - 4.4. Soul or the self
 - 4.5. The Nature of Mind
 - 4.6. The Senses
 - 4.7. Three functions of the mind
 - 4.8. Perception and Cognition
 - 4.9. Conation, Emotion and Motivation
 - 4.10. Dream, Sleep etc.
 - 4.11. Sushruta's Concept of Mind
 - 4.12. Discipline of the Mind
 - 4.13. Contribution and Summary
-

4.1. INTRODUCTORY

' Psychology, in the sense of reflection upon the nature and the activities of mind, is a very ancient discipline.'¹

Psychology grew as a part of expanding knowledge in ancient India. It was an important part of their philosophical approach to life and nature. Their approach was empirical and pragmatic even though the subject was treated philosophically. As it has been described in the

¹G.Murphy. An Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology, (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956), p.X.

previous chapter, the ancient Indian approach was basically synthetic and did not treat the subject of psychology as an independent discipline. The different systems of philosophy in ancient India have duly treated the subject of psychology in their own style but none has given it a separate treatment. This was so because their purpose was quite different. 'It was not the purpose of any school or speculation in India to develop an independent psychological theory. But from the earliest times we do find an interest in man, his mind and its processes. And this interest naturally engendered in course of time numerous contributions which should now be styled as psychological.'²

The ancient Indian Philosophical systems were quite unanimous on the question of the existence of mind. Their views differed on the nature and content of mind but there was no controversy as to the very basic question of its existence. They all accepted the existence of mind. 'There is not a single system of Indian philosophy, which does not deal with the concept of mind. Some are more epistemological³ in their analysis of the concept while others are psychological.'

These philosophical enquiries in the field of psychology in ancient India paved the way for sound psychological theories later on in Yoga and Tantra psychodynamics. 'Philosophical

²S.K.Ramchandra Rao. Studies in Indian Psychology. (All India Institute of Mental Health, Bangalore, 1958), p.58.

³Saraswati Channakesavan. The Concept of Mind in Indian Philosophy. (Bombay: Asia Publication House, 1960), p.VII.

enquiries are enormously important in the history of psychology.'⁴

But in contrast to the unanimity about the existence of mind in ancient times, there is a complete lack of unanimity on the very basic subject of the existence of mind in modern psychology. There are extreme views on this topic. On one hand it is said that it exists, and on the other extreme mind is considered a myth.

Frank Keyon has argued elaborately to prove that mind is a myth. He has named his book 'The Myth of the Mind.'⁵ He calls man physio-chemical machine.⁶

Spearman points out that the trouble of the extreme views on mind in modern psychology still persists. 'Even when authors did manage to indicate their views with sufficient precision, these views often proved to be widely discrepant from one another. For instance, some psychologists would, but others would not, make their science include some kind of soul.'⁷

Some authors accept some kind of soul while others on the other extreme even deny the existence of mind, the subject matter of psychology. 'At one extreme, only matter and therefore body are taken to be real, mind is

⁴R.S. Peters. 'Brett's History of Psychology (Abridged), 1962, p.33.

⁵F. Kenyon. 'Myth of the Mind, Thinkers Library, 1941. Front Page and Title.

⁶Ibid., p.109

⁷Spearman. 'Psychology Down the Ages. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1937), pp.26-27.

but 'sound and fury signifying nothing.' At the other extreme, nothing is real except mind, matter being only a foolish illusion.'⁸

Some modern psychological views don't stop at the denial of self or mind but some of them even deny intellect and therefore can be named as anti-intellectual. It is not out of mere malice towards any soul-theory that such a stand is taken by them, but it is entirely due to their specific scientific attitude that they are so. 'For psychology with its determined devotion to the scientific method, becomes at time almost bitterly anti-intellectualistic!⁹

This comparison between the ancient Indian approach to mind and modern approach thereto suggests that there was unanimity about the existence of mind then but chaotic and conflicting views are expressed in modern psychology. This is so because the ancient Indian thinkers had certain basic unanimity with regard to mind as an instrument of the self. 'It is because Indian thinkers have realised from early times that manas(mind) is only an instrument of knowledge for the self and that Indian psychology has taken a different line of development than that of western psychology.'¹⁰

⁸ Ibid., p.52

⁹ Edna Heibreder. Seven Psychologies: Student Edition. New York, p.14.

¹⁰ Sarasvati C. The Concept of Mind. (Bombay: Asia Publication House, 1960), p.7.

4.2. ANALYSIS OF THE AYURVEDIC CONCEPT REGARDING MIND

It is useful now to inquire into the details of the concept of mind in Ayurveda. The analysis of the material can be given as follows:-

(1) Life and Mind :

Charaka describes the relation of life and mind and place of mind in the scheme of human life.

(2) Soul or the Self:

Soul or the self occupies the central position in human life according to Charaka as he falls in line with philosophical systems in the acceptance of the soul theory. The relation of soul and mind is to be properly understood in order to delegate proper place to mind.

(3) The concept of mind with all its limitations and functions in relation to life and the world is to be described to follow mind's activities.

(4) Mental phenomenon can be generally apprehended in three general ways i.e. perception, cognition, emotion and motivation.

(5) Intellect has a very high place in mental faculties and it is to be recognised in order to follow the full range of mental aspects of human life.

(6) Senses have their place in mental activities as doors of perception and instruments of motor activities.

(7) Topics like dreams, sleep and swooning are also treated in this connection as Ayurveda has covered a very wide area as its subject matter.

(8) Mental discipline occupies an important place in Ayurvedic concept of mind and it is to be expressed by self-control and right conduct. This is why full emphasis is laid on right conduct in Ayurveda, every now and then in all relevant contexts.

(9) Contribution of the concept of mind in Ayurveda. It is proper to take up these topics one by one in order to comprehend the concept of mind in Ayurveda.

4.3. LIFE AND MIND - A CONFIGURATIONAL VIEW

Ayurveda means science of life. Life is a very wide subject covering nature's all live performances and man's being and his activities. Life cannot be comprehended without its comprehensive connotations. Life has many phases. Having described Ayurveda as the science of life, Charaka defines life itself: 'Life is spoken of by such synonyms as 'The union of the body, the senses, the mind and the spirit,' 'The support, 'The animation,' 'The flux,' and 'The link' (between the past life and the future one.),'¹¹

This definition of life is very significant. It signifies that life is the conjunction of the spirit, mind,

¹¹Charaka-Samhita. S.A.1, Sl.42, Vol.II, p.9.

senses and the body. There is a definite place of mind in the scheme of life according to Ayurveda. Mind has its function to perform and it is to be the link between the senses and the spirit. Mind is helpless without the senses on one side and the spirit on the other. The body is their physical counterpart. This same conjunction of body, senses, mind and spirit is called 'animation,' 'Support,' 'Flux' and 'Link' because these are its different and apparent aspects. All these together convey the true and complete meaning of life. Life is not any one of these aspects singly but it is a whole and a configuration of all of them together. Charaka repeats its statement in different and significant terms when he says: 'The mind, the spirit and the body are together as it were, the tripod, the world endures by reason of cohesion and on that are all things established.'¹²

This clarifies the synonym of life as 'Support' because it is a support of all these three. Life is a 'Flux' as it is ever changing. Life is a 'Link' because life persists. Life is 'Animation' as it is apparent from its sentient aspect. Charaka describes sentient and the insentient along with eternal substances wherein mind is also a substance: 'The five proto-elements, ether and others, together with spirit, mind, time and space constitute the totality of

¹² Ibid. SA 1, Sl. 46, Vol. II, p. 10.

substances. Possessed of the senses, a substance is animate, devoid of the senses, it is inanimate.¹³

This is a pragmatic distinction between the sentient and insentient and it effectively describes life as it seems. Man is defined in a similar fashion in 'The section on the human embodiment' in the fourth verse. But this description reaches its climax when Charaka compared man as a small edition of the macrocosm: 'The earth is represented in man as hardness, water by moisture, fire by heat, air by vital breath, the ether by the interstices and the self by the indwelling spirit. Similar to the office of God in the world is the might of the individual soul in man. God's greatness in the universe is seen as the creator; in the body, the soul's greatness is seen as the mind, what Indra is in the universe the ego is in man, the sun corresponds to the power of seizing, Rudra to anger, the moon to beneficence, the Vasus to pleasures, the two Aswins to lustre, the Maruts(winds) to enthusiasm, the Vishvadeva (Universal Gods) to sense organs and the sense objects, darkness to delusion, light to knowledge; just as there is the act of creation in the universe so also in man there is fertilization or impregnation. Corresponding to Kritayuga is the period of childhood, corresponding to Treta is youth; corresponding to Dwapara is old age; corresponding to Kali is infirmity and

¹³Ibid.SA 1, Sl.48, Vol.II, p.11.

corresponding to the end of a world cycle is death in man. In this manner by pursuing this analogy, O' Agnivesha, you are to understand the unity of all those different members in the world and in man which we have left unmentioned here.¹⁴

This descriptive analogy amply signifies that Charaka views man as a configuration, as a sentient being with his physical, mental and spiritual aspects having a unity of their own, reflected in his uniqueness. Here the emphasis is on the whole man and in the true sense of the word, it is a holistic apprehension and appreciation of man.

This configurational view of man in Ayurveda is due to philosophic approach. It is synthetic. It views man as a whole, as a unit. This fact is corroborated at every stage as one goes to analyse different psychological concepts in Ayurveda.

Similar holistic approach is seen in modern psychology also. Although all schools of modern psychology do not recognise such an approach, still however, the tendency is on the increase to consider man as a whole and judge him and understand him as an organic whole. 'Whereas the laboratory worker is free to restrict himself to limited aspects of human nature, the psycho-therapist must deal with the whole man and may have to work with hypotheses which are not unproved but probably unprovable.'¹⁵

¹⁴ Ibid., Vol.III.Sh.AI. Sl.5.p.1073

¹⁵ Anthony Stor. The Integrity of Personality. (A Pelican Book, 1960), p.13.

This equally applies to the foregoing description of life, by Charaka. Here is another support to the theory of whole man. 'A human body is not just an organism; it is an organic machine in conjunction with consciousness, at present in conjunction with a passive consciousness.'¹⁶

Consciousness here represents spirit of the self. Charaka regards the self as the master of the human body. King too thinks consciousness to be active master of human body but he says that at the present moment, it has not reached that stage of evolution or manifestation. But he thinks positively that 'I' the spirit of consciousness can master the human body if he only wills. 'On the other hand, laboratories do not make scientists, but vice-versa. 'I' possess a fully equipped and ever-present laboratory, it is the body to which 'I' am attached, perhaps the possibility of experiment in that laboratory is the real reason why 'I' have a body. I can wake up if 'I' will.'¹⁷

King's statement may seem idealistic to mechanistic view point in modern psychology but it certainly upholds Charaka's approach to life and its conglomeration. To the ancient Indians, human body was an ever present laboratory and their conclusions are based on the experiments carried on in this handy laboratory, subjectively and objectively.

¹⁶C.Daly King. The Psychology of Consciousness. (Kegan Paul Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd., London, 1931), p. 216

¹⁷Ibid., p. 246.

That is why they searched the origin of 'I'. The experience of 'I' is ever-recurring, universal and immediate, experienced by one and all. By their search of 'I' in the human organism, the ancient Indian philosophers unequivocally and un-exceptionally found out that at the root of 'I', is the self or the 'soul. This pragmatic view makes their philosophic approach scientific. By observations of the world at large by the means then available and coordinating the objectives facts with the observed facts in the inner world by introspection carried on with constant vigilance and Sadhana, they formulated their sciences. By this sort of search of the self they could make the best use of the human laboratory and it is as useful today in bridging the gaps in psychological research. This method of their research made their philosophies truly scientific and saved them from mere arm-chair speculations.

4.4. SOUL OR THE SELF

In the footsteps of other systems of philosophy and especially Nyaya-Vaisheshika System, Charaka places soul in the centre of his psychological thesis. It is for the soul that the science of Ayurveda was made and it is the self that is the subject matter of Ayurveda because man is the self 'That (aggregate of mind, spirit and body) is

man. He is regarded as the subject matter of this science and it is indeed for his sake that this science has been promulgated.¹⁸

Though all the six systems of Indian philosophy promulgate the central idea of the self and God (The individual consciousness and the cosmic consciousness) their concepts of soul and God are not identical. But all of them accept the idea of soul unequivocally and this is a matter of great importance. Charaka describes the nature of the spirit, 'The spirit, which is changeless and transcendental becomes the cause of consciousness when united with the mind, the sense objects and the senses. It(the spirit) is the eternal witness observing actions.'¹⁹

But the spirit is no mere witness, but he is a doer too. He is the knower, doer and witness at the same time. Charaka's soul is not inactive as described in Sankhya but the self is ever active and the real doer. 'Thus man is able to perform various actions. He is given that particular appellation which is characteristic of the actions which he does either as an agent or instrument or the doer.'²⁰

Such is the spirit or the self. It occupies the central place in Indian psychology because it is consciousness itself,

¹⁸Charaka-Samhita.Vol.II,SA I,Sl 47,p.10

¹⁹Ibid.,SA I,Sl.56,p.13

²⁰Ibid.,SA.4,Sl.22(2),Vol.II,p.66.

it is awareness and man is man because of the self. Such self has its seat in man. Even though it covers the whole body, it has its special seat, or central place wherein it can be realised. Charaka points out that heart is the seat of the spirit. 'Further it(heart) is the seat of the supreme vital essence; in it, too, is the seat of the consciousness. Therefore, the heart is called the Mahat and Artha by the Physicians.'²¹

As the soul has its seat in the heart so also mind and senses and body also are dependent on the heart as mind and senses and the body naturally follow the self. 'The body with its six limbs, the understanding, the senses, the five sense objects, the spirit with its attributes, the mind and the mental concepts, are all dependent on the heart.'²²

Heart is the main support of the spirit and its mental and physical adjuncts 'The heart is regarded by the cardiologists as the support of all these (above mentioned) factors, even as the central pole is of the thatchwork of a wigwam.'²³

In Upanishads, heart is considered the seat of the soul. Raman Maharshi, the late South Indian Sage of Arunachalam used to show heart as the seat of the spirit from his own experience of self realization.²⁴

²¹ Ibid., S.A. 30, Sl.7, p.588

²² Ibid., Sl.4, p.588

²³ Ibid., Sl.5, p.588

²⁴ Raman Maharshi. Raman Vani, published by Ramansharam, 1945, p.10.

All this shows that Charaka like all other Indian philosophers regards self as the Central thesis and its place in the body is heart. The inclination of the Indian philosopher or the scientist is for the recognition of the self as the fundamental principle of life and the universe. 'The bias of the Indian philosophers has been towards the self as the basic principle, for which everything else exists and acts, and mind is not an exception to the rule.'²⁵

The individual self is born and reborn and has a continuous series of existences. But in all those existences, there is always felt an identity. This identity belongs to the self. This thesis of Charaka on the conscious self cannot be denied on even apparent grounds of consciousness in man. The denial of consciousness comprises within itself²⁶ the denial of everything else including the original denial.'

The conscious self, according to Charaka and other Indian philosophers is not only meta-psychical but meta-psychical as it is above all things and even above the mind. They consider the self or consciousness as the fundamental facts on which they build up their sciences and philosophy. To them the spirit is the permanent fundamental fact indispensable to start with the building

²⁵ Sarasvati C. The Concept of Mind in Indian Philosophy. (Bombay: Asia Publishing House), p.130.

²⁶ Dally King. The Psychology of Consciousness, (London: Kegan Paul Trench Trunber & Co., Ltd., 1953), p.32.

up the scientific edifice of mind and life.

Modern View.- After knowing the place of the self in Ayurveda and Indian Philosophy in general it is interesting to find out what place it is given in modern psychology and modern science in general. Herein too, modern psychology seems to express various views and even extremes opinions. Some psychologists are inclined to recognise some sort of 'self' or consciousness while some mechanistic schools like behaviourists not only deny the self but even deny the very existence of the mind.

Psychologists of analytic schools regard self as the individual as known to the individual. The organism perceives, thinks about and responds to itself.²⁷

This attempt to recognize the self as growing consciousness with its centralization around the I - feeling is an attempt to understand the self by analytical method. But after the recent upgrowth of parapsychology in the west, a new tendency appears to be creeping up to recognize some sort of a 'soul' : 'There is now evidence that such an extra-physical factor exists in man... What has been found might be called a psychological soul... There is no conflict between this psychological soul and the common theological meaning of the term.'²⁸

These are the words of a pragmatist and an experimentalist in parapsychology at the Duke University

in America. Physicists do not lag behind in the acceptance
 27. Gardner Murphy. Personality. (Harper & Bros., Publi. '47), p.¹⁹
 28. J.B. Rhine. The Research of the Mind, .p.205.

of consciousness: 'I regard consciousness as fundamental. I regard matter as derivation from consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness. Every thing that we talk about, everything that we postulate as existing requires consciousness.'²⁹ These words were delivered by the Nobel Prize Winner Prof. Planck, the physicist. His words seem to reflect the views and approach of the ancient Indian philosophers. Even more than him, MacTaggart expresses the same idea about consciousness rather strongly and emphatically 'We have no reason to suppose that matter exists at all, and to talk of matter existing without consciousness is absurd. The only things which have, in any sense, the qualities attributed to matter are the sensations experienced by the selves.'³⁰

These words have a Vedantic strain of spiritual monism. Eddington puts the same statement in a scientific style when he says: 'All through the physical world runs that unknown content which must surely be the stuff of our consciousness.'³¹

These are the considered views of prominent physicists of modern times who have to deal with matter and not mind. These are modern psychologists who too recognize some sort of a self or soul or consciousness. Royce says, 'The human soul is spiritual.'³²

²⁹ B.L. Atreya. Yoga Vashitha and Modern Thought. (Banaras Hindu University, 1934), p. 17.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 16 ; 32. James Royce. Man and His Nature.

³¹ Ibid., p. 28 (McGraw Hill Book Co., p. 313).

He succinctly puts the case of 'soul' by quoting prominent psychologists thus: 'The reason why soul is inescapable and always bobs again after an occasional submersion by a wave of materialism, is that it is the logical conclusion from facts. Eminent neuro-physiologists like Wilder Penfield and Karl S. Lashley have concluded that the brain is simply the instrument used by the soul.'³³

These views show that the materialistic conception of man and the world is no longer dogmatically adhered to as before in the modern scientific thought. Animism is still thought of and has its footing in the modern developing thought. It helps those psychologists who accept the idea of the self or consciousness. 'I am fortified by the knowledge that a few influential contemporary philosophers, adhere to the animistic conception of human personality, or at least regard the psycho-physical question as still open, as also by certain indications that the 'Mechanistic dogma' no longer holds the scientific world in so close a grip as during the later part of the nineteenth century.' Says William McDougall.³⁴

Even neurologist like Wilder Penfield talks of the 'Operator' of the human machine. 'Can we visualize a spiritual element of different essence capable of controlling

³³ Ibid., pp. 290-291

³⁴ W. McDougall, Man and Body. (Methuen, 1938), p. XII.

the mechanism ? When a patient is asked about the movement which he carries out as a result of cortical stimulation, he never is in any doubt about it. He knows he did not will the action. He knows there is a difference between automatic action and voluntary action. He would agree that something else finds its dwelling place between the sensory complex and the motor mechanism that there is a switch board operator as well as the switch board.³⁵

The question of consciousness is not a matter of speculation but a matter of direct experience of one's own self. 'We do not observe consciousness; we have it or are it.. We believe that this original and primordial fact of experience, namely consciousness, which is indoubtable for the individual is of universal human validity and constitutes perhaps the lowest common denominator of human life. It is not a question of admitting any one else's consciousness but simply one's own.'³⁶

But this is not the end of the least common denomination; the self is considered by some psychologists as a reality which has two aspects of the mind and the body; the distinction of the mind and the body cannot be explained in any way. It is becoming increasingly difficult for a

³⁵The Physical Basis of Mind: Edited by Pater Lashlett, Basil Blackwell. (Oxford, 1950), p. 64.

³⁶D. King. The Psychology of Consciousness. (London: Kegan Paul Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1934), p. 4.

psychologist to maintain the distinction between his conception of 'body' and of 'mind.' Body and mind are two aspects of one life and there is greater sense of reality in this view.

This reality is no other than that of consciousness and is recognised by all those psychologists who accept the thesis of the self. Some of them see the unity of the consciousness in the individual self and that of the universal consciousness. 'Cosmic consciousness, is a higher form of the consciousness than that possessed by ordinary man. This last is called self-consciousness and this faculty³⁷ upon which rests all our life(both subjective and objective.)'

All these remarks, though not many in number in comparison to mechanistic trends, are powerful enough to convince that modern psychology is not bereft of the idea of the self or consciousness. These remarks put together nearly reach the concept of the self described by Charaka though individually, the authors of these remarks may have their own notions about the self and consciousness. Still however, all of them subscribe to the basic idea that self is a reality and has mind and body as its two aspects. Psychologists who hold such views on the self are now on the increase. Even the experimentalists now turn to the

³⁷Richard M. Bucke. Cosmic Consciousness. (E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., Twenty first Edition, 1962), p.1.

fundamental idea of the self. The mechanistic approach once overclouded the idea of the self but it no longer holds unchallenged sway in the field of modern psychology. 'But then came a break in the clouds. The introspection of the self was rendered amenable to experiment. And among those who have availed themselves of this method, there has been, if not perfect accord, at least a fair measure of this. The general result has been back to the common sense again.'³⁸

It is a happy augury that this trend is on the increase and back-to-common-sense approach is gaining ground with all the fervor of research.

This sign of increasing inclination in acceptance of conscious self is well indicated by G. Murphy: 'In a future psychology of personality there will surely be a place for directly grappling with the question of man's response to cosmos, his sense of unity with it, the nature of his esthetic demands upon it, and his feelings of loneliness or of consummation^a in his contemplation of it.' Murphy draws attention to the lacuna in some of the psychological concepts of the self and emphasizes its dignified role in man's life: 'There may be a touch of neurotic phobia in the persistence with which the modern study of man has evaded the question of his need in some way to come to terms with the cosmos as a whole. Whenever people have stopped the dizzying round of

³⁸ Spearman : Psychology Down the Ages., p.403.

earning a living or the fascinating task of taking one another to pieces physically or metaphorically - whether they be Hindus or neo-Platonists, or the Whitmans and Sandburgs of an industrial age - they have felt incomplete as human beings except as they have endeavoured to understand the filial relations of man to the cosmos which has begotten him, and have tended, in proportion to their degree of seriousness, to recognize the relativity of selfhood and the fundamental unity of that ocean of which the individual personalities are droplets.'³⁹

He gives warning against the suppression of the primary instinctive feeling of self-hood and its relation with the Infinite by dogmatic attitude or evade the same under one reason or the other. 'It would of course be inexcusable dogmatism to insist that this or that is the psychological reason for such experiences whether they derive from oedipus complexes, from fear of the 'too-bigness' of life or from a primitive intellectual need for integration of experience. No one knows how adequate these queries may be or what other factors may be involved. But our study of man must include the study of his response to the cosmos of which he is a reflection.'⁴⁰

³⁹Gardner Murphy. Personality. (Harper Brothers, publishers, 1947), p. 919.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 919.

In concluding this topic on Soul, it can be said that the concept of soul in modern psychology is approaching nearer to the concept of Soul in Charak. This is a happy augury and shows some signs of the creation of integral approach in science and psychology.

This much of discussion on this fundamental idea of the self, leads us to the concept of mind.

4.5. THE NATURE OF MIND

After understanding the self as the knower and the doer and as the central pivot of mental and physical phenomenon, it is but natural to know the nature of mind which is the chief instrument of the self in his conscious activities. The mind is an instrument only. This fact is very clearly stated by Charaka. 'The mind which is supersensual is designated 'Sattva' and some call it 'chitta'. Its function is dependent on the presence of the mental object and the spirit. It is the cause of the activity of the sense-organs.'⁴¹

Mind is above the senses. It is the connecting link between the senses and the spirit, but at the same time it moves the senses and serves the self. It is sentient only because of the presence of the self. This much description of the mind gives its initial introduction. To know the

⁴¹Charaka-Samhita, Vol. II, S.A.8, Sl.4, p.123.

nature of the mind something more is required to express the nature of the mind: 'On account of the multiplicity of mental objects, sense-objects and impulses, as also of the combinations of the qualities of Rajas, Tamas and Sattva, the mind appears as multi-faceted in one and the same person. There is no multiplicity of minds, because a single mind cannot have contact with many sense-objects simultaneously. Hence all sense organs do not function at one and the same moment.'⁴²

Mind is one and only one though it may appear to be many due to the mutiplicity of mental objects; they are innumerable and they create mutiple impulses in the mind; similarly the combination of three qualities of Rajas,Tamas and Sattva also have their effect on the mind and mental activities and these in turn cause the appearance of multi-faceted mind. Charaka says that in reality it is not so. A mind acts on a single subject at a time. So the mind is one in each man. This mind has its distinct characteristics in each man as it may have been affected by the qualities and individual traits. This trait in the mental make-up of man contributes to create his own personality. Tamasic trait creates an indolent person, Rajasic an active and indulgent personality and Sattvic a wise and balanced personality.

⁴² Ibid.,S.A.8,S1.5,p.123.

This is what is meant when Charaka says that, 'Whatever trait manifests most frequently in a man's mental make-up, of that mentality he is said to be by the wise, on account of his predominant association with it.'⁴³

The combinations of the traits, impulses and the qualities are innumerable so the personalities too are innumerable. That means, each person has his own personality in accordance with this combination and the predominance of a quality and a trait. Each man is made out of the same elements, qualities and their combinations, still however, he is unique and is an epitome of the universe. 'Man is the epitome of the universe(Macrocosm). There is in man as much diversity as in the world outside; and there is in the world as much diversity as in man.'⁴⁴

Materiality of Mind.- Such mind is not sentient, but insentient or unconscious. Here the unconscious is not used in the sense of the subsonscious but in the sense of insentient or that which is not consciousness but material. The word used by Charaka for this meaning is Achetan meaning material or insentient. 'The mind is unconscious but active. The impeller, however is the self⁴⁵ of which when yoked to the mind, all activity is predicated.'

⁴³Charaka-Samhita. S.A.8,Sl.6,p.123.

⁴⁴Ibid.,Sh.A 5 Sl. 3(1) p.1071

⁴⁵Ibid.,Sh.A.4 Sl.75,p.988.

Mind though material is active. Its impeller is the self. These verses and those on the self quoted before signify that only the self is consciousness while everything else is matter or material though there are different strata of matter like the gross and the subtle matter. Mind is made of subtle matter and is the instrument of the self. 'Because the self is the conscious element, therefore, it is called the agent or doer, while the mind though actually performing, is not called the doer, because, it is devoid of consciousness.'⁴⁶

This material concept of the mind is generally the same all throughout the ancient Indian philosophy. Mind is quite distinct from the self as it is material, of course it is made of subtle matter. Still however, it partakes of the nature of the soul on one side and influences and is influenced by the senses on the other. 'Indian philosophers from the very beginning have avoided this pitfall by recognising mind or Manas as something distinct from the self or the Atman, though partaking of its nature as intelligence through association with it. Since it is subtle in nature it is not gross matter.'⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Ibid., Sh.A. 1 Sl.76, p.988

⁴⁷ Saraswati C. The Concept of Mind in Indian Philosophy. (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960), p.1.

It follows from this that Manas like any other material object possesses priority, posteriority and speed. To sum up the concept of mind in Ayurveda, it can be described in short as this: It is atomic and one, is of subtle matter, is an inner organ and by unity with the self it works for the self and does all mental movements like perception, cognition and connexion.

By describing mind as material, Ayurveda alongwith other systems of philosophy, placed mind in the class with insentient categories and has thus facilitated the attribution of faculties and functions it performs. This description is quite consistent with the philosophy it adhered to. It also gives scope for the evolution of mind in due course. Thus in short, mind in Ayurveda is (1) material and atomic (2) is made of subtle matter (3) is the inner organ of the self (4) exists for the self and (5) does all the mental functions like perception, cognition etc. This is a workable and rational concept.

This concept of the mind is worth comparing with the concept of the mind in modern psychology. Here again, there is no unanimity as is described earlier. This state of affairs is well stated by Royce thus: 'The word 'mind' with its adjective 'Mental' is a very ambiguous term and the source of many difficulties in both philosophy and

psychology. Webster's dictionary gives eight primary and five secondary meanings for a total of thirteen different meanings for the word.'⁴⁸

Apart from the dictionary meanings, there can be hardly one uniform meaning of the term 'mind' in modern psychology as different schools interpret the word on the basis of their own thesis. Behaviourists would altogether deny its very existence and call it only a function of the brain. But some of the scientists and psychologists accept the existence of the mind. Let us first see the views of the scientists on the subject of mind: 'The mind is as it were, a definite centre in which the self which in itself universal and absolute can centre itself so as to particularise a word.'⁴⁹

How much this concept of the mind is very near to the Ayurvedic concept described above. It is interesting to know that modern physics is moving more and more towards the idea that mind is more real than matter. 'In comparing the two we recognize that physics, at all events, can only give us knowledge of relations and such knowledge can only be acquired by and exists in mind. In this sense, mind is certainly more real than matter.'⁵⁰

⁴⁸James Royce: Man and His Nature. (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc.,), p. 48

⁴⁹Kingsland: Rational Mysticism, p. 354. Quoted by B.L. Atreya: Yogavasistha and Modern Thought, 1934.

⁵⁰Dampier Wetham: A History of Science, p. 274-275.

Leaving apart the physicists, some of the modern psychologists too accept some sort of a concept of the mind. Though the concept of the mind and the self given by modern psychologists who believe in their existence by scientific reasoning may not be the same or similar in details but they all believed and still believe that both of them have existence and their existence is more real than matter whose existence is not even questioned by the mechanist or behaviourists but matter to them is the only solid supporting ground. But the very facts and comprehensive data suggest that there is 'something' which cannot be proved by mechanistic approach. This is what is affirmed by Sherrington when he states: 'The physical basis of mind encroaches more and more upon the study of mind, but there remain mental events which seem to be beyond any physiology of the brain.'⁵¹

Munn gives a generally, acceptable meaning of the term 'mind': 'A general term representing the sum total of all intelligent behaviour including memory, thought and perception often used as synonymous with conscious experience.'

The existence of mind, in one form or the other is being accepted more and more. It would be quite pertinent to round up this topic by an apt statement by Sherrington:

'Mind, even admitting those grades of it which are only with difficulty decipherable, seems still a phenomenon more restricted in distribution than life itself. Both in time and space there seems a surplus of life without it. In the

⁵¹Perter Lashelett: The Physical Basis of Mind. (Oxford), 1950, p.3.

sense of recognisable mind, it seems a relatively novel terrestrial fact.⁵²

4.6. THE SENSES

As is already described, senses are activated by the mind and are led by the mind. Senses contact the sense-objects and when led by the mind create sensation which leads to the cognition of the object. 'The sense-organs when led by the mind, are capable of contacting the sense-objects.'⁵³ Without the backing of the mind the senses cannot act fruitfully and cannot create any perception or cognition.

According to Charaka, there are five sense-faculties, five sense-materials, five sense-organs, five sense-objects and five sense-perceptions. Thus it has been laid down on the subject of the senses.⁵⁴

The five sense-faculties are sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch and the five sense-materials are ether, air, light, water and earth, and the five sense-organs are the eyes, the ears, the nose, the tongue and the skin, and the five sense-objects are sound, touch, shape, taste and smell.⁵⁵

⁵² Sir Charls Sherrington: Man and His Nature. (Cambridge University Press, 1942), p. 205.

⁵³ Charakasamhita. Vol. II. S.A. 8, Sl. 7, p. 124

⁵⁴ Ibid., S.A. 8, Sl. 3, p. 122.

⁵⁵ Ibid., S.A. 8, Sl. 8, 9, 10, 11, p. 124

The senses are in general, aggregates of all the five proto-elements, namely ether, air, light, water and earth, yet each proto-element has a particular relation with a particular sense-organ. 'Although, the senses which are recognised by means of inference, are in general, aggregates of all the five proto-elements, yet light in the eyes, ether in the ear, earth in the smell, water in taste and air in the touch are found to predominate.⁵⁶

So, there is correspondance between the sense-organ and the sense-object in regard to the similarity and predominance of a particular element. This is due to their innate affinity. 'From among these, each sense, predominant in one element in particular, contacts objects which have a similar predominance of that element, owing to innate affinity and ubiquity.'⁵⁷

Such an account of the senses by Charaka is in general line of the ancient Indian approach to senses. Such an account is apparently pragmatic but is inferential in matters of details. It is based on observation as far as possible but due to lack of any finer instruments, the conclusions are drawn on inference and speculation to complete a theory on observed facts. Modern scientific methods and instruments have done a wonderful job in finding out the facts about the

⁵⁶ Ibid., S.A.8, Sl.14, p.125

⁵⁷ Ibid., S.A.8, Sl.14(i), p.125

senses and their workings. Even in absence of such means, the ancient Indians could bring forth a workable theory of the senses.

Sushruta follows Sankhya and holds that there are eleven sense organs; five of them are organs of knowledge and five are organs of action and the eleventh is mind which partakes of both. The sense organs evolve out of Ego(Ahamkara) under the influence of Rajas or energy.⁵⁸

Like Sushruta Charaka also holds that there are eleven sense organs and considers mind as the eleventh and internal organ. Moreover, Charaka holds that the organ of touch pervades all sense organs. They are mere modifications of the sense of touch. All the sense organs apprehend their objects by coming in touch with them. Contact is nothing but touch. So the sense of touch is co-terminous with all the senses. It is always connected with the mind which presides over all the external senses.⁵⁹ Here the Nyaya Vaisheshika influence on Charaka is clearly seen.

Charaka and Sushruta holds that senses are Prapyakari i.e. they move out to their object in the form of Vrittis or modifications, assume their form and apprehend them. This is due to the influence of Sankhya and Nyaya Vaisheshika systems. This doctrine of Prapyakaritva is as old as Rigveda

⁵⁸Sushruta-Samhita:S.L(4-5) & (2,3).

⁵⁹Charakasamhita.S.A.11,S1.38,p.175

Therein is stated in various Mantras that the mind goes out and contacts the object and compares it with the swiftest object.⁶⁰

This theory of Prapyakaritva of the mind and the senses may not be tenable in the light of the modern physiological and experimental investigations but it at least expresses the dynamic concept of the mind held by ancient Indians. It is quite different from the SOR theory of modern psychology no doubt, but dynamic nature of the senses and the mind is well expressed by this theory of Prapyakaritya.

4.7. THREE FUNCTIONS OF THE MIND

After having known the nature and functions of the senses, it is necessary now to come to the three main functions of the mind i.e. perception, cognition and emotion. It would be interesting to know that Ayurveda has to say on these aspects of the mind. These functions can be classified and named differently but in the context of the psychological ideas in Ayurveda, this threefold general classification is more suitable. It would be advisable now to turn to them and see what Ayurveda has to say on each of them.

4.8. PERCEPTION AND COGNITION

Perception and cognition go together. One cannot expect a description of these two processes in Ayurveda. Ayurveda

⁶⁰ Rigveda. 1-85-4 etc.

treats the subject of psychology as far as it concerns the science of life in general and related to its main subject of medicine in particular. Still, however, Ayurveda has treated the processes to some extent as far as its main motive is concerned.

They are well defined by Charaka. Perception and cognition take place when there is a conjunction of the soul, the senses, the mind and the sense-objects. It takes place at once and is definite in nature. 'Perception or observation is defined as cognition, definite and immediate, arising from the conjunction of the soul, the senses the mind and the sense-objects.'⁶¹

This means that the organiser and perceiver is the soul, mind is its instrument, the senses are the secondary instruments or the doors of perception and cognition and the sense objects are objects of perception and cognition. 'The self is conscious. It is conscious of objects when it is in conjunction with the sense organs. It has consciousness, perception, retention, recollection, reasoning, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, emotion, volition, subconscious impressions, habits, merit and demerit.'⁶² This comment of Chakrapani on Charaka's thesis of perception and cognition is appropriate in as much as the self is placed in the centre

⁶¹ Charaka-Samhita: S.A.11, Sl.20, p.165

⁶² J.Sinha: Indian Psychology, Vol.II, p.6.

of psychic phenomenon.

Perception and cognition take place once the senses come in contact with mind and the mind in turn comes into contact with the self and when all the three uniformly come in contact undisturbed, then only right cognition takes place. But when one of them is absent there cannot be any perception or cognition. When mind is inattentive, cognition does not take place. This is well borne out when Charaka says: 'The presence of cognition or absence of cognition constitute an indication of the mind. Thus if the spirit, the senses and the sense-objects are opposite but the mind is elsewhere, there is no cognition, but with the mind present, there is cognition.'⁶³

Cognition takes place only when the mind is attentive. Here is depicted the role of attention in the mind and its utility in perception and cognition.

The perceptions are five as are the senses. These perceptions are fleeting and are of the nature of decisions by the reasoning power or intellect i.e. Buddhi. Intellect is the power of reasoning and decision: 'The five perceptions are the visual perceptions etc... They are fleeting and are of the nature of decisions.'⁶⁴

Buddhi has its play as soon as mind perceives the object. An object is cognized by the senses, perceived by the mind

⁶³Charaka-Samhita: Sh.A.1,Sl.18-19,p.975

⁶⁴Ibid.,S.A.8,Sl.12,p.124

and decision is made by Buddhi. Buddhi, thus, is the faculty of decision.⁶⁵

As the mind plays its part in perception and cognition, the senses in turn play their own part. There can be no question of absence of the senses but there can be overcontact, or non-contact or miscontact of the senses with senses-object and that would result in misunderstanding or wrong perception and wrong cognition. Only by right and appropriate contact of the senses with the sense object, there would be right perception and right cognition. By over-contact, non-contact, and mis-contact of the senses together with the mind getting vitiated, lead to impairment of understanding in their own respective spheres. On the other hand, right contact, regaining the normal state, conduces to the enhancement of understanding in due manner.⁶⁶

But this is not all. If the perceptions are false and perverse, they may affect the mind itself and create disorder in the mind and its power of understanding and cognition. This happens because it is the nature of the mind to think. If once it gets habituated to wrong perceptions and thereby to wrong thinking, its power of cognition would be adversely affected. 'The object of the mind is that which is thinkable. The right as well as the excessive, deficient and erroneous perceptions are the causes respectively of the order and the disorders of the mind and understanding.'⁶⁷

⁶⁶.Ibid.S.A.8,Sl.15,p.126

⁶⁷.Ibid.S.A.Sl.16,p.126

Over and above, the mental and sensual causes of abnormalities, there are some objective causes also which create abnormalities in perception and cognition. 'Further even a perceivable object escapes observation under the following conditions: Viz. when it is too close or too near the observer, when it is obstructed by other objects, when there is some defect in the perceiving sense-organs, when the observer's attention is elsewhere, when the object is merged in the mass, when it is over-shadowed by something else, or lastly when it is microscopic.'⁶⁸

The sense perception or the cognition is very limited. It may be even abnormal or defective due to the reasons shown above. This means that things are not always what they seem apparently by sense-perceptions or mental cognition. It also means that there are things which are not visible. 'Hence, it is an unfounded statement to make that only the visible exists and nothing else.'⁶⁹

The object of perception may be visible or invisible. There is a wide range of objects of perception and cognition. It is succinctly described by Charaka thus: 'Whatever, admits of being imagined, ~~thought~~ about, considered, meditated upon, in fact, whatever can be known by the mind all that goes by the name of the 'object.'⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Ibid., S.A.11, Sl.7, p.162

⁶⁹ Ibid., S.A.11, Sl.8, p.162

⁷⁰ Ibid., S.A.1, Sl.20, p.975.

Intellect or reason(Buddhi) plays its part in cognition and knowledge. It is the supreme faculty of the mind and so it is to be used for the three goals of life- namely virtue, wealth and happiness. 'That faculty of the mind which assesses the contribution of the various factors at work in a given case and which takes into account the past, the present and the future, is to be known as reason (Buddhi). It is by exercise of reason that the three ends of man(virtue, wealth and happiness) are achieved.'⁷¹

Intellect or the faculty of reasoning has not only the capacity for knowledge and cognition but has the conative faculty also. It is the supreme power of man to attempt to reach his goal. This is the power by which he takes decisions, and can command his mental forces and the senses and the body.' The functions of the mind are the direction of the senses, control of itself, reasoning and deliberations. Beyond that is the field of intellect.'⁷²

Before we conclude this topic, we would like to compare the foregoing theory of cognition and perception with those in the modern psychology. Detailed comparison is not of place here. As the different schools of modern psychology have their own theories, it is needless to go into such a comparison or contrast. The structural approach, the

⁷¹Ibid.,S.A.11,Sl.25,p.166

⁷²Ibid.,S.A.1,Sl.21,p.975.

functional approach, the Gestalt approach, the behaviourist's approach and the psycho-analytic approach have very little common with the theory of cognition and perception in Ayurveda. The philosophic approach in the west has much common with Ayurvedic theory. 'Cognition might thus be summarily described as union with the form of an object immaterially. More fully, it is the act by which the knower becomes the known internally by possessing, in addition to his own form, that of the object but without its matter.'⁷³

4.9. CONATION, EMOTION AND MOTIVATION

After reviewing the theory of cognition and perception, it is now necessary to describe the theory of conation, emotion and motivation in Ayurveda. It is already mentioned that the intellect or reasoning is the power of decision. But there are emotional forces which affect the intellect, reasoning, and the life itself and its goal. 'Three indeed are the pursuits that should be followed by every man who is possessed of unimpaired intelligence, understanding, energy and enterprise and who wishes to secure his good both in this world and hereafter. They are the pursuits of life, the pursuits of wealth and the pursuits of the other world.'⁷⁴

⁷³ James Royce: Man and His Nature. (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc.), p.187

⁷⁴ Charakasamhita. S.A.11, Sl.3, p.158.

These are the three main drives and motives in the life of every man. The first among them is the drive for long and healthy life as it is the basis of the other two. Health is not enough, it requires wealth to make life happy. To be happy in this life, is not enough but to earn wealth in such a righteous way that one would earn merit and have a happy life in the other world or have salvation. These are the three main drives and motives of man which urge man to action. These are the springs of actions of man.

At the root of all drives and motives is the desire. Desires use senses. They may be good or bad and perverse. Charaka maintains that envy, grief, fear, anger, pride, hatred, and the like are the affections of the mind (Manovikars) due to perversion of the intuitive knowledge (Prajnaparadha). Confusion of such intellect is the root of all unwholesome emotions. Sorrow is due to comprehension of non-eternal things as eternal due to the confusion of the intellect (Buddhivibhransha), lack of self-control and lapse of right memory.⁷⁵

Charaka maintains that there is a reciprocal relation between feeling and desire. Pleasure is the cause of desire and aversion is the cause of pain. Both these are kinds of desire (Trushna). Pleasure and pain are mental modes. The

⁷⁵ Ibid., S.A.11, Sl.19, p.165..

self which is above all modes of mind appears to experience them because of its association and false identification with the mental modes. When the mind is concentrated on the self and acquires a pure vision of it, pleasure and pain are no longer experienced.⁷⁶

Charaka, though agreeing with the current philosophical notion of his times with regard to desire, pleasure and pain, his main emphasis is on the three fundamental urges in life, namely health, wealth and life in the other world. All wrong desires or emotional perversities are due to Prajnaparadha. At the root of all these is grasping (Upadha). It itself is sorrowful and is the cause of all sorrows. All sorrows can be got rid by the removal of this grasping. It can be compared to Asakti (attachment) in Gita.

Prompted by upadha or the grasping and vitiated by Prajnaparadha, the mind gives rise to emotional abnormalities like Moha, aversion, anger etc. At the back of all these are the confusion of intelligence, want of self-control and lack of right knowledge. This is how Prajnaparadha is defined by Charaka and about this we shall have to think in more detail in the next chapter on psychosomatics in Ayurveda. It is in a wider sense an error of judgment, or misapplied intelligence and is at the root of all kinds of moral

⁷⁶Charaka-Samhita; Sh.A.1, Sl.130 to 140, Vol.III, pp.1000 to 1002.

depravities. Prajna generally means integral intellectual outlook connected with mental bent and inclination. 'It means an intellectual outlook, as integrally connected with, and determining, the mental bent and inclination.... This mental inclination probably involves both intellectual outlook and a corresponding volitional tendency.'⁷⁷ Thus Prajna means in general, wisdom or mental inclinations in general when it is steady. When the mind is upset by Rajas and Tamas, Prajnaparadha takes place.

Though Charaka was influenced by the current philosophical thoughts about the cessation of all action for cessation of all sorrow, he has duly emphasised the positive urges of life. Thus he does not preach the ideal of leaving off desires and attachments and actions of all kinds. His idea of life is that one should live a life in a manner that is conducive to health, long life and proper enjoyment, keeping always in view the high ideals of life. He rigidly puts full emphasis on right conduct and showed that controlled and balanced life is the normal life and ~~leads~~ one to the highest ideal of human life. 'This unique character of Charaka's ethical position is very clearly proved by the code of conduct, virtues and methods of leading good life elaborated by Charaka. He no doubt shows

⁷⁷S. Dasgupta: A History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. II, (Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 491.

lip-sympathy with the idea of giving up all actions(Sanyasa) but his real sympathies seem to be with the normal scheme of life involving normal enjoyment and fruition of desire. A normal life, according to Charaka, ought also to be virtuous life, as vices and sins are the sources of all sorrows, sufferings and diseases in this life and the next.⁷⁸

Thus are described the motivation and emotions and conative life by Charaka. There is something common in this description with the emotions described in modern psychology as far as the general aspects are concerned; but there is very little common between them in detail and naming of emotions and their cause and their roots.

4.10. DREAM, SLEEP ETC.

As Charaka has to deal with life in all its entirety and specially as he duly considered the mental aspects of life as playing a predominant part in man's life, he had mentioned and described dreams and has mentioned the importance of sleep and has not forgotten to suggest the part played by memory. He mentions ego and does not forget its part in man's life.

Charaka and Sushruta described various kinds of dreams which are the prognostic of impending diseases and death. Charaka suggests a physiological explanation of the morbid dreams which precede death. Moreover, Charaka says that some dreams are about those subjects which are desired(Prarthita). Here it can be seen that Charaka almost participates Freud as far as he shows desire to be at the root of some of the

⁷⁸. Ibid., p.408.

dreams. Charaka describes seven kinds of dreams viz. seen, heard, otherwise perceived, desired, imagined, prognostic of future good or evil and produced by provoked bodily humours.⁷⁹ Charaka had his own style of interpreting dreams, Interpretation of dream is not a novelty of this century. Sushruta has his say on this topic and states that in dream man repeats what he has experienced before due to the activity of Rajas.⁸⁰ They interpret dreams and sleep in the light of the triguna theory of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas.

Charaka maintains that a person goes into sleep when his mind is tired and so his sense-organs withdraw from their objects owing to fatigue. Sleep is also due to the excess of inertia (Tamas), phlegm, fatigue of body and mind, disease and the influence of the night.⁸¹

Sushruta like McDougall considers sleep as an innate propensity.⁸² Yoga too considers sleep as one of the five primary vrittis or mental propensities.

According to Charaka, there is slight consciousness (Moha) in intoxication. There is still greater unconsciousness in swoon (Murchha). There is complete unconsciousness in apoplexy. When the provoked and perverted bodily humours attack the heart, the seat of consciousness, a person's consciousness is confounded.⁸³

⁷⁹Charaka-Samhita: I.A.5 Sl.43 p.1221

⁸⁰Sushruta-Samhita: Sh.A.4, Sl.13, p.469

⁸¹Charaka-Samhita: S.A.21, Sl.35, p.355.

⁸²Sushruta-Samhita: Sh.A.24 Sl.27-29, p.469.

⁸³Ibid. S.A.24, Sl.12, p.465.

It can be seen from this that physiological reason predominates in swoon, and sleep.

Memory has also been described by Charaka:

'Recollection is so called because by dwelling upon what was seen, heard or otherwise experienced, it collects again the fulness of past experience in the mind.'⁸⁴ This is no mean concept of memory in Ayurveda.

It follows from the foregoing description of mind that mind has a very wide connotation in Charaka-Samhita. It includes all mental functions and faculties. In its narrow meaning of Manas it is only an inner sense. But in its meaning it includes all mental phenomena including ego-feeling, intuition and insight. Diriti or will has important place in Ayurvedic concept of mind. This is seen in the emphasis laid on good conduct by self-control and in the definition of Prajnaparadha.

4.11. SUSHRUTA'S CONCEPT OF MIND

Unlike Charaka, Sushruta follows Sankhya ideas about the mind. He has made due changes in applying them to the science of life but as far as the concept of mind is concerned he follows Sankhya concept. According to Sankhya, the Purusha or the self is non-active and when in association with the mind it experiences pleasure and pain and the

⁸⁴ Charaka-Samhita: Sh.A.I, Sl.149, Vol.III, p.1004.

actions of the qualities. Sankhya regards the body, senses, mind, intellect, and egoism (Ahamkara) as evolution of prakriti constituted of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, the three eternal qualities. There is interaction between the body and mind in perception and volition and even interaction between body, mind and the self as self or purusha is active according to Sushruta's change in Sankhya concept of the self. The mind is insentient. Mind gives rise to Vrittis or mental modes, when mind contacts an object.

These are the distinguishing features of Sushruta's changes in Sankhya concept of the soul and mind. Sushruta has not entered very much into such psychological concepts as is done by Charaka. This makes it clear that as far as this thesis is concerned the main source of material is Charaka as he has depicted his own psychological and philosophical ideas in his treatise. He has given almost all the main important features of the mind in his treatment of psychological topics. Not only that, like all other schools of philosophy and other sciences, of his times, he has given prominence to the discipline of the mind. Unlike Sushruta, Charaka is more than a medical authority. Sushruta only gives occasional references to philosophical and psychological topics but Charaka gives complete views, though sometimes succinctly, on philosophical and psychological themes. One would readily agree with Keith when he writes: 'Charaka, however, as we have him is more than an author on medicine; he gives us information

of a considerable number of points of philosophy.'⁸⁵

4.12. DISCIPLINE OF THE MIND

The concept of the mind in Ayurveda is incomplete without depicting the disciplinary aspect of controlling the mind. The psychodynamic approach of Ayurveda is the culmination of its psychology. It definitely maintains that mind can be controlled and should be controlled in order to make life normal and happy. 'Therefore, all those desirous of their welfare should always remember and put into practice all the rules and of right conduct.'⁸⁶

The rules of conduct are given by Charaka in detail covering all the rules of hygiene, dietetics, clothing, courteous manners, right emotions, noble thoughts, generous attitude and religious sentiment conducive not only to bodily health but to mental and spiritual progress. Here there is no fear of suppression of abnormal urges but on the contrary non-control thereof would lead to abnormalities is clearly indicated. The observation of such rules of conduct gives both physical and mental health and self-control. 'By the observance of these rules, one achieves at once both the objects, viz. health and the conquest of the senses.'⁸⁷

⁸⁵ A.B.Keith: A History of Sanskrit Literature. (Oxford University Press, 1953), p.507.

⁸⁶ Charaka-Samhita. Vol.II, S.A, 8, Sl.17(3), p.127

⁸⁷ Ibid., S.A.8, Sl.18(1), p.127.

This is the way of character-formation and Charaka holds that without sound character there cannot be truly happy life. Only by character and observance of rules of right conduct man can advance on the path of achieving the three ends in life and by concentrating on the self one can ultimately realise it. 'From the accession of the pure understanding all these proceed... the total avoidance of the wicked, continence and abstinence and various austerities... dreading attachment, fixing of the mind and understanding in the self and the investigation of the true nature of things - all this procures from the recollection of the true nature of the self.'⁸⁸

This depicts the aim of psychology in Ayurveda and its psychodynamics. It is self-realization by living righteous and normal life.

This view can be well supported by many modern psychologies. McDougall has well stressed this dynamic aspects of psychology in his book 'Character and Psychology.' William James has in a masterly manner described the role of higher sentiments and good habits in life and observance of rules of life. Modern investigations in this field predict the same thing: 'The native propensities are the chief part of the raw material which becomes organised to form character.'

⁸⁸ Ibid., Sh.1, Sl.143-146, p.1003

⁸⁹ William McDougall: The Energies of Man. (London: Mothuen & Co., Ltd., 1950), p.188.

The first stage is the formation of sentiments. The second stage is the building of the sentiments into an harmoniously cooperating system. Such a system of sentiments is character.'⁸⁹

This is similar to the formation of character by good actions and healthy impressions which are much emphasized by Ayurveda.

Some investigations are carried on in the study of character formation and social behaviour in recent times and a few quotations would be appropriate here there from. 'There does seem to be such a thing as individual character: a persisting pattern of attitudes and motives which produce a rather predictable kind and quality of moral behaviour.'⁹⁰

Moral character is closely concerned with culture and culture shows off the society and the individuals. 'The content and the organization of moral values are largely set by culture. Not only the specific rules, but the definition of what classes of attitude and action have moral aspects are a large and important part of the behaviour pattern we call 'Culture.'⁹¹

It would be quite in the fitness of things, now to end this topic by a quotation from a book on modern psychology which quite reasonably sums up the whole argument in favour

⁸⁹William McDougall: The Energies of Man. (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1950), p.188

⁹⁰Robert F. Peck. The Psychology of Character Development. (New York: John Wiley & Sons), p.164

⁹¹Ibid., p.174.

of right discipline and conduct. 'Let people realize clearly that every time they threaten some one or humiliate or hurt unnecessarily or dominate or reject another human being, they become the forces for the creation of psycho-pathology, even if these ^{be} small forces. Let them recognize that every man who is kind, helpful, decent, psychologically democratic, affectionate and warm is a psychotherapeutic force even though a small one.' ⁹²

This concept of character formation and health now leads us to the subject of psychosomatics.

4.13. CONTRIBUTION AND SUMMARY

Reviewing the concept of mind in Ayurveda, it can be seen at once that it covers almost all aspects of mind. It is scientifically derived from observed facts outside and inner experiences carried out in the inner world. It gives a fairly clear idea of the working of the mind. It presents not only the nature of the mind but also the purpose of minds' activities. But this is not the end of Ayurvedic concept of mind.

Its chief contribution lies in the way in which it bridges the gap between the spirit and matter. It describes mind as composed of subtle matter and it is related to the self or soul because it is the only instrument for the conjunction of the soul on one side and with the material object on the other side. In this wise, looking from the objective view it is material but viewing it from its utility to the self, it is spiritual in as far as it is the only instrument of the soul. So

⁹² Henry Clay. Psychology of Personal and Social Adjustment. (American Book C., 1959), p. 43.

Ayurveda has supplied the missing link between the spirit and matter by the distinct nature of the mind. Such a link is much searched for by some modern psychologists but there is much to be done. Yet in this direction Ayurvedic concept of mind can shed some light here.

And last but not the least important feature of Ayurvedic concept of mind is purposiveness. Mind and its activities are purposeful and in this it amplifies the ultimate purpose of the mind and life of man. This final aim is salvation wherein mind becomes as pure as the spirit and it merges in the self. Here is seen the Upanishadic influence. It also clarifies the fact that mind by purification can become completely spiritual and shows the ultimate spiritual nature of mind. 'The Naiyayika includes self and mind in the category of substance. But its substantiality is spiritual.'⁹³

SUMMARY

Psychology as a discipline of the mind of man is as old as civilization. Almost all systems of Indian philosophy treated the subject of mind in their own way but there is complete unanimity as to its existence. This is not so in the present-day psychology. Some psychologists and even question the very existence of mind. But Ayurveda has given mind an important place in the scheme of man's life. But mind

⁹³ Saraswati C. The Concept of Mind in Indian Philosophy.
(Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960), p. VII.

is not everything in Ayurveda. Ayurveda firmly postulates the soul-theory in its psychological concepts. Even some of the modern physicists and psychologists are more and more inclined to accept the spiritual nature of man. Stating soul as the knower and the real doer, Ayurveda and especially Charaka outlines the nature of mind. It does the work of the medium between the senses and the soul. It has various faculties but by nature is material though composed of subtle matter. It carries on different functions like perception, cognition etc. Emotions and drives have their due functions to carry on the life of man. Dreams, sleep etc. are also subtly described and interpreted. Sushruta's concept of mind is somewhat different from Sankhya. The main bulk of psychological material is available in Charaka. Ayurvedic concept of mind bridges the gap between the spirit and matter in its own style.

