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There is a significant question regarding the organization of the practice of medicine. The question is that whether health is better served by the general practitioner treating the whole man or by a specialist treating a special organ. To this question, different and sometimes contrary answers have been given in both ancient as well as modern times in the history of western medicine. In fact, in the modern age Allopathic system of medicine, the specialization in various disciplines of medical profession has been accepted as an irreversible phenomenon. We see in our times that the chain of specialization is ever-expanding. Newer and newer disciplines in the medical profession are emerging. Quite often, a trainer of one discipline feels quite alien to the other disciplines of the same profession. This question is very significant as it has a direct bearing on a more fundamental question that whether the reductionist model of modern science can successfully capture the nature of reality as a whole or something significant still remains to be explained by it as suggested by those who believe that nature can be better interpreted in holistic terminology. This question is still a burning question and in Ayurveda, we find a very interesting, ingenious, original, and unambiguous answer. Moreover, the position of Ayurveda gets never changed on this fundamental question.

In the history of western medicine, we find that a high degree of specialization has been supported since ancient times. Herodotus reports a high degree of medical specialization in Egypt. Herodotus writes that, “each physician treats a single disorder, and no more: thus the country swarms with medical practitioners, some undertaking to cure diseases of the eye, others of the hand, others again of teeth, others of the intestines, and some those which are not local.” It should be noticed here that these lines do not
represent the Herodotus's own views on specialization. In fact, here he seems to be comparing the Egyptian practice of medicine with the Greek medicine. Also in the writings of Hippocrates, the father of western medicine we find some hints regarding the popularity of specialization in medical profession during his time. The Hippocratic Oath says that, "I will not cut persons laboring under the stone, but will leave this to done by men who are practitioners of this work." It definitely indicates some sort of division of labor in the organization of Greek medicine. It is especially true in case of some specific tasks that requires some special skills as well as in the case of surgery. But still it can broadly be said that Hippocrates favored a generalist physician who can treat the person as a whole though some specific tasks can be left for specialist. Galen, the able successor of Hippocrates in the history of western medicine also defended the general practice against the specialization. According to Galen, the treatment of the disordered part as if it could be isolated from the living unity of the whole man is, to Galen, one of the deplorable consequences in medical practice of atomism or mechanism in medical theory.

This question has been repeated time and again by the various thinkers as well as practitioners in the history of western medicine. The opinion was divided with each side pressing advantage in its favor. Montaigne, for instance, defends the claim for specialists in medical profession by citing the analogy with the advantages of specialization in other arts. Montaigne writes that, "as we have doublet and breeches makers, distinct trades,.................., etc. to trouble his head with than the tailor who undertakes them all; and as in matter of diet, great persons, for their better convenience, have cooks for the different offices......so also as to the cure of our maladies." After Freud proposed his psychoanalytical theory the things started getting changed. With the passage of time the awareness regarding the psychological origin of many bodily disorders also increased and as a result of it, a new factor enters into the argument. In the medical circle, such an understanding started taking roots that there are hidden or obscure psychological causes behind most of the diseases and
hence it is necessary for a medical practitioner to know his patient as a person. Clearly, such a position tends to favor a generalist who may be better able to trace the hidden psychological causes of disease rather than a specialist.

In Ayurveda, it has been clearly stated that a practitioner in ayurvedic medicine should be a qualified person in all respects. Ayurveda is a holistic system of medicine which perceives man in its entirety rather than in its parts. The aspiring physician is free to choose some particular branch of medicine as his special area of interest but he is required to have an adequate knowledge of the other branches of medicine as well. It is further said that the intending physician should also possess knowledge of other sciences to the extent possible for him along with the knowledge of philosophy so that he can have a comprehensive grasp of Ayurveda. Without mastering all these arts and sciences, it is not possible for a practitioner to grasp the real significance of the diverse information in Ayurveda and its philosophical foundation.

Ayurveda is a holistic system of medicine that is deeply rooted in the Indian philosophy. The term holism has been derived from *Holos* – a Greek word for whole. In Ayurveda, the whole is seen as more than the sum of the parts. Ayurveda believe in the cure of the person himself and not just eradicating the disease itself. It visualizes a person at all the three dimensions of its existence, i.e. physical, psychological and spiritual. The ultimate aim of Ayurveda is the well-being of a person at all three levels of his existence instead of just achieving the state of diseaselessness. It is strongly believed in Ayurveda that the healing energy is part of every person. This healing energy is capable of proving a repair and regeneration process for every injury and disease we get. The strengthening of this in-built healing mechanism is the central objective of Ayurveda.

Ayurveda is a Sanskrit word that is derived from two roots: *Āyur*, which means life, and *Veda*, or knowledge. Ayurveda is, basically, the
science for longevity. The principles of positive health were discovered by mankind long before even the advent of writing. The first documented text on health and disease was Ātharvaveda. Later on we find more specific texts on Ayurveda like Carakasaṁhitā, Suśrutaśaṁhitā, etc. According to the Purāṇas, the science of longevity was transferred from Brahma to Prajāpatī and Aświnikumars and through them to Indra, the king of Devas. Further this knowledge was transferred to sage Bhāradvāj by Indra who imparted the same to the sage Ātreya. This description is also upheld in the popular medical treatise of the physician Caraka. Later on this ancient wisdom was spread all around by his disciples.

Ayurveda prescribes mainly the herbal drugs along with balanced diet, yoga, massage and certain other healing exercises. The holistic principle is strictly followed in the application of all these techniques. For instance, in regard to herb, all parts of the herb are used instead of segregating the herb into its constituents and then use the desirable biochemical as drug. Normally in the modern day pharmaceutical industry based on western allopathic medicine the single active agent in the herbs is used. But Ayurveda does not approve such an approach. The holistic principle suggests that the whole herb has a wider healing potential.

Ayurveda considers nature and man as essentially one. The universe is said to be the macrocosm and the man is said to be the microcosm. It is because what exist in the universe exists in man. According to the pañchamahābhūta siddānta of Ayurveda, everything in this universe is an extension of the five fundamental elements, i.e. earth, water, fire, air, and ether. Therefore, there is a close relationship between the external world and the internal system of man. The earth is the first element that provides hardware to the body. It includes bones, muscles, tissues, skin, hair, etc. the second element is water which represents blood, secretions of the glands, vital fluids, hormones, and etc. fire is another element that gives motion, energy, vigor, and vitality to the body. It also plays major role in digestion, circulation of blood and other vital fluid. Air, the next element is responsible
for respiration. And finally there is ether that is responsible for the functioning of man’s mental and spiritual faculties.

These five elements were further crystallized into three doṣa-s, namely, vāta (air), pitta (bile), and kapha (phlegm). These doṣa-s are, basically, biological organizations. These three doṣa-s are present in every individual only the proportion of each doṣa-s varies from one individual to another. Based on the predominance of one or the other of these three doṣa-s, all individual beings are classified. The root cause of any disease can also be traced in these three doṣa-s as well. Any imbalance in the composition of these doṣa-s lead to a disease. The job of a physician is to correct any such imbalance.

Ayurveda works under the backdrop of such a spiritual and holistic philosophy. Therefore, there is no surprise that Ayurveda proved to be effective in those areas where allopathic system of medicine fails to deliver like chronic diseases such as arthritis, osteoporosis, etc. Also the life style related problems are best addressed by Ayurveda. Furthermore, Ayurvedic medicines which are largely composed of herbs and drugs are free from side-effects. There is no addition of synthetic chemicals and materials here that might have a harmful impact on the human body.

It may be fairly said that these strengths of Ayurveda can be fairly attributed to the Holism, a principle in which Ayurveda has a firm faith and which is based on the wisdom of its ancient seers. In holism, the whole is more important rather than parts. The whole is not just the sum-total of its parts. It is much more than that. But in case of mechanism, things are just reverse. Here the parts become more important. We can understand this principal through the functioning of a machine. In a machine, any fault to any of its part can halt the functioning of a machine. Therefore, every cog in the machine is important. The whole here can be reduced to the sum-total of parts. The whole is nothing more than that. The allopathic system of medicine views the human being as a machine. The human body has
various parts and there is a specialist of every part of human body to ensure the healthy functioning of each part. The human being as a whole is totally ignored here. There can be a case here to be studied by the medical researchers to find the empirical connection between the mechanistic approach of allopathic system of medicine and the huge side effects it leads to. The Ayurvedic vision of human being is altogether different. Man, here is to be seen in its totality. The vitality of human being cannot be understood by reducing the human body into its fractured parts. We know through our common experience that human being can survive even if parts of his/her body are amputated. It is not the case with the machine. In case of machine, the proper working of every single part is a pre-requisite for the smooth overall functioning of the machine. Even a single cog can bring down the whole of machine. Therefore, man cannot be reduced to a machine. The holistic principal of human body cannot be equated with the mechanistic functioning of a machine. The vitality cannot be reduced to the working of a machine. Such a vision of ancient seers of Ayurveda can hardly be challenged. This vision also justifies why a physician should be generalist rather than a specialist. Furthermore, it also puts light on the question that why the canvass of the knowledge of an ayurvedic practitioner should be so wide that it covers almost everything in the universe that is worth knowing.

Ayurveda is not merely a system of medicine only. The medical knowledge alone does not exhaust the field of Ayurveda. The ultimate aim of Ayurveda is mundane happiness and spiritual elevation of man. The term Ārogya is quite often mentioned in Carakasaṁhitā as the goal of Ayurveda. Ārogya implies that a man should be happy at all the three levels of his existence, i.e., physical, psychological and spiritual. Therefore, the concept of health is a comprehensive concept in Ayurveda that covers all aspects of the existence of man. It is because of this reason that Ayurveda developed into a comprehensive encyclopedia of knowledge. It covers medical subjects like diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutics, surgery, genetics, gynecology, obstetrics, aetiology, physiology, biology, diet, ethics, personal hygiene, preventive treatment and social medicine. It also covers allied subjects like
botany, environmental science, animal biology, cultivation, pharmacognosy, compounding and chemistry. Interestingly, Ayurveda also includes such subjects like psychology, parapsychology, cosmology, climatology, philosophy and religion. The status of a Vaidya in Ayurveda can be awarded to only that fellow who has mastered all these fields of knowledge. It can be fairly said that the scope and objectives of Ayurveda are far wider than those of formal medical science. Indian medical science is unique in its character because of certain fundamental theoretical postulates which are absent in modern medicine. Some of these theoretical postulates are not based on our ordinary observation. Instead they are grounded in metaphysical reasoning. These special theories and concepts of Ayurveda merit special examination if we sincerely wish to understand the distinctive character of Ayurveda.

According to Ayurveda, every single entity of this universe whether it is matter, or energy, or intelligence and motility has evolved out of cosmic forces. Now the immediate next question emerged is that how the synthesis of the ingredients of cosmic forces takes place? Is it merely a matter of accident, or the result of a slow and gradual evolution through the various stages? At this point Ayurveda subscribe to the Sāṅkhya system of Indian philosophy. Accordingly, Ayurveda says that every new life is a novel creation that is created out of the fundamental components present in prakṛti. It all happens when prakṛti, the ultimate ground comes into a mysterious contact with the puruṣa, the absolute self-conscious principle. It should be noted here that prakṛti is completely devoid of awareness in all its forms and mutations. Awareness and hence life emerged as a result of kṣetrajña (eternal, indestructible and ubiquitous soul) which voluntarily enters inside a material body as karmapuruṣa. It remains there till death of the material body.

Prakṛti, the eternal mother principle is basically constituted of three fundamental guṇa-s or reals. They are known as Sattva (essence of intelligence stuff), rajas (essence of energy), and tamas (universal inertia or
material existence) respectively. Now these three guṇa-s have an inherent potentiality of growing into various life forms through the complex permutations and combinations of the 16 mutations. The three guṇa-s are first mutated into the three forms of ahaṁkāra or ego. They are spiritual ego of manifestation and transformation, the subjective ego of energy and motion and the objective ego of mass and inertia. The first ego combines with the second creates the five organs of sense-perception, the five operative organs, and also the mind which is the versatile organ. The third ego combines with the second to create the five tanmātrā-s (subtle particles with the potentiality of materialization and perception). The five tanmātrā-s are the are the originators of the five material elements and of the perceptible phenomena of vision, sound, smell, taste, and touch. Therefore, a living being is a complex combination in which karma-puruṣa is united with a material body, mind, sense organs and motile organs which are contributed as well as sustained by the 24 elements of prakṛti.

All living beings have a self, a mind composed of three guṇa-s, ten organs evolved out of the three egos, and a material body composed of the five gross elements present in the form of kāla-s, i.e., protective layers, dhātu-s, i.e., matters like blood, body fluids, bones, tissues, etc., mala-s, i.e., excretions and eliminations, agni, i.e., digestive fire, kriyā-s, i.e., natural activities like respirations, sleep, pulsations, metabolic processes, etc. it may be noted here that each fundamental component of the living organism contributes its specific traits and properties to the individual in the proportion in which they are present.

It may be interesting to note here that all living beings and non living matter possess the similar fundamental constituents. The pañca mahābhūtas theory of Ayurveda can be of great help to grasp this point. The five elementary particles are earth, water, fire, air, and space. All material substances with diverse properties and characteristics are constituted of these five fundamental elements. The earth supplies mass, hardness, compactness, inertia, roughness, density, smell, etc. The water principle
gives coldness, softness, taste, fluidity and viscosity. The fire principle provides colors, visibility to objects, motion, digestion, anger, courage, spontaneity of behavior, visual sensations, etc. The air principle is responsible for perception by physical touch, pulsation, sense of lightness and the tactile sense. The ether or space principle provides sounds, porosity, bodily cavities, functional division of the tissues into finer and finer branches, and the sense of hearing. Now out of these five fundamental elements arise an infinite number of matters with diverse properties as a result of various permutations and combinations that are possible with these five elements. Some contain only a single element while other contains two or more than two elements. The complexity of properties of any type of matter also depends on the number as well as proportion of various elements out of which that matter has emerged. Organic matter and all other living substances are composed of all the five elements in different proportions.

All living organisms like plants, animals, etc. possess various resultant characteristics and properties that emerged out of the possible combinations of these five elements. Apart from these, the living organisms also contain the sense perceptions corresponding to the five elements along with the motor activity of locomotion, manipulation, speech, reproduction and evacuation. In addition to all these characteristics, the man possesses certain special attributes too. These are mental perception, will, logical faculty, memory, knowledge gained by experience and creative thinking, and voluntary movements. All these attributes are the peculiar characteristics of man. It is also true that even among men there are wide differences in personalities, abilities, mental levels, and behavior. The response of Ayurveda to this issue is that the difference among men is due to the different combination of three reals or guṇa-s.

It may be interesting to mention here about the actual process of how a man come into being. According to Ayurveda, there are infinite numbers of puruṣa-s. Each puruṣa is actually a disembodied soul capable of penetrating anywhere in space. Puruṣa when enters into the complex of sperm and
ovum, it immediately endows the impregnated matter with its own properties of awareness, perception, volitional movement, creative ability, knowledge, self-expression, and self-perseverance. Hence, creation of life is possible only with the help of combined contributions of the kṣetrajñā and the parents who contribute their bija- (sperm and ovum) that contains the essence of their mental and bodily constituents. If the kṣetrajñā does not enter into the zygote then there can be no possibility of the creation of life as the conception would in this case fail to occur. Therefore, the process of fertilization by the act of mating is not sufficient for the creation of life. Although human endeavor is a necessary condition for the creation of life but it alone is not sufficient. The intervention of the disembodied soul is necessary. The soul creates its own body by gathering to itself the elements like ākāśa and others in due order. But here it is also significant to note that the karmapurūṣa is subject to certain limitations due to the residual effects of karma of previous birth. Here it may be mentioned that the theory of cosmic evolution of matter and life and the theory of common constituents of living and non-living matter are based on Sāṁkhya and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrines. The attributes of the five primal elements was first discussed at length by Sāṁkhya philosophy for the first time and was accepted later on by all the Indian schools with slight variations. Also the idea of the eternal and omnipotent soul residing inside a body as a result of the residual effects of karma of previous births has been borrowed from Sāṁkhya and Nyāya schools of philosophy. It would be appropriate here to discuss in details regarding the origin of man in Ayurveda as it would help us understanding the true nature of human body, mind, the subtle body and the soul from the standpoint of Ayurveda.

Origin of Life: reflecting from the holistic perspective of Ayurveda

According to Caraka, a human body is constituted of five elements, viz. ether, air, fire, water and earth. The semen is basically constituted of air,
fire, water and earth only but as soon as it forms it gets connected with the ether as ether is omnipresent and all-pervading. Similar is the case with the blood or śoṣita of the mother. The interesting thing here is that the foetus (an unborn or unhatched vertebrate in the later stages of development showing the main recognizable features of the mature animal) cannot come into being simply by the union of the semen of the father and the blood or śoṣita of the mother. The combination of these two ingredients can produce the outcome of a foetus only when the ātman with its subtle body (bhūtātmā) and manas becomes connected with it by means of its karma. The semen of father and blood of mother can operate as the causes of the production of the body but only when they come in connection with the subtle body transferred from the previous body of a dying being. Suśrūta also seems to support the above thesis of Caraka when he mentions in his work that the soul comes into contact with the combined semen and blood along with its subtle elemental body. Though at one place, Suśrūta also mentioned that the materials of the developing foetus are agni, soma, sattva, rajas, tamas, the five senses, and the bhūtātmā. Suśrūta stresses here that these 11 elements contribute to the life of the foetus and are also called the prāṇas or life. Vāgbhatta the elder says, “The moment the semen and the blood are united, the life principle or jīva, being moved by manas, tainted, as the latter is, with the afflictions of attachment, etc., comes in touch with it.” It would be worthwhile here to put forth the perspective of various schools of Indian philosophy regarding the debate on the origin of life and then move on to the Ayurvedic perspective to demonstrate that how Ayurveda tends to synthesize the various opinions into a synthetic whole and also quite often taking stands which are wholly unconventional and unprecedented if the opinions in the currency fail to bear the acid test of experience.

It may be noted from the above passage that the consciousness and matter are both necessary ingredient of a living being. The living human being which is the object of treatment of Ayurveda is essentially a living, conscious being. How this consciousness which alive the matter emerges in the matter? Ayurveda tends to explain this phenomenon with the help of
bhūtātmā, i.e. the subtle body together with the soul presiding over it. Suśruta called it karma-puruṣa and according to him, the medical treatment is of this karma-puruṣa and body. The doctrine of subtle body is a contested one in Indian philosophy and it appears that Ayurveda borrowed this doctrine from Sāṅkhya School of philosophy. The Sāṅkhya-kārikā speaks of a subtle body and the body inherited from the parents. The subtle body continues to exist till salvation is achieved. At each birth the subtle body receives a new body and at each death it leaves it. The subtle body is constituted of mahat, ahaṁkāra, the eleven senses and the five tanmātrās. It is further explained that as the subtle body is closely associated with the Buddhi, which possess the qualities of virtue, vice, intelligence, etc., therefore, as a result, it becomes associated with these attributes. The subtle body faces the consequences of successive rebirths as a result of its association with the Buddhi. This process remains continued till the Buddhi becomes dissociated from it by the attainment of true discriminative knowledge. A question here can be raised and has been raised in the tradition that why one should postulate the existence of a subtle body. In Sāṅkhya-tattva kaumudi, it is argued that it is necessary to postulate the existence of a subtle body as the Buddhi cannot exist without a supporting body and the subtle body is this support during the interval between one death and another birth. Interestingly, the existence of subtle body has been challenged within the tradition. Vācaspati, for instance, argued against the position of Sāṅkhya philosopher by pointing out that if Buddhi in itself is incapable of leaving the body and occupy another then how can it connect itself with a subtle body at the time of death? But as we know that Sāṅkhya claims that the Buddhi is such that it cannot itself, simply by contraction and expansion, leave any body at the time of death and occupy another body without intermediate relationship with a subtle body. The objection Vācaspati raised here is that if we assume some body, e.g. A, to make the Buddhi transmit from one body to another, then we will have to postulate another body to make the connection possible between the Buddhi and the previously postulated body.
A. Therefore, it will lead to infinite regress. Vacaspati here is establishing the yoga view as expounded by Vyasa. He further says that if Sāṅkhya philosopher claims that the connection between Buddhi and subtle body has no beginning in time then it is also not tenable. The answer is that any such subtle body has never been perceived by anybody on earth. Moreover, it also cannot be proved by any other source of knowledge like inference. For instance, the yoga view can explain the same instance without postulating any subtle body. Therefore, this postulate is not necessary and hence, an unnecessary assumption only. Vacaspati here seems to applying the Ockham razor’s principle according to which if something can be explained with the help of minimum terms, then there is no need to postulate any extra term or entity. The similar view can also be found in the Vyāsa-bhāṣya on Patanjali’s Yoga-sūtra.\textsuperscript{xv} Basically, according to the yoga school of philosophy the citta is all-pervading or omnipresent. Each soul is associated with a separate citta. There is a close interrelationship between the citta and its vṛttis. For any ordinary person, the citta always has vṛttis or modifications. Now the connection of a citta with any specific body depends on whether that body does have capacity to manifest that particular type of vṛtti or not? Therefore, the manifestation of the omnipresent citta of a soul disappears in its dying body and become functional in a fresh body that is born. Thus, according to Vacaspati, there is no need of admitting a subtle body.\textsuperscript{xv}

Besides, there is another school of Indian philosophy that rejects the existence of any subtle body and affirms that the role of a subtle body in the development of the foetus is no more than a fiction. This school of philosophy is no other than the Vaiśeṣika School of philosophy. According to Vaiśeṣika philosophers, the subtle body has nothing to do with the origination, growth and nourishment of the foetus. Basically, heat is the main behind all disintegration and reintegration involved in the process of the formation of the foetus. The theory behind this process is that once the semen of the father and the blood of mother get united in the womb of the mother, the heat inside the womb causes the successive formation of dyads and triads. As a result, the body of the foetus develops. Once the body of the
foetus is formed then antahkaraṇa can enter into the body which was not possible before since it requires a body to support it. It is also stated there that the heat perform its function under the influence of the unseen power or adṛṣṭa. Similarly, Nyāya School of philosophy also denies the existence of a subtle body. According to Nyāya, the soul is omnipresent and all-pervading. Therefore, at the time of rebirth the omnipresent soul gets connected with a particular body.

No such discussion regarding the existence of subtle body can said to be complete without including the version of Buddhism on this issue. Candrakīrti provides us an interesting account of the Buddhist view. The foetus is formed as a result of the combination of the six constituents. These six dhātus are earth, fire, air, ether, water and vijñāna. It is by the combination of all these six dhātus that the life emerges. Here the first five dhātus are contributed by the combination of father’s semen and mother’s blood. The five dhātus mentioned above operate together under the influence of the sixth dhātu, i.e. the vijñāna to start the life.

In Carakasaṁhitā, one can see that all these various perspectives have been considered and systematically analyzed to reach to a justified stand on this substantial issue. In the text, we find a summary of the discussions amongst various sages on the subject of the causes of the formation and development of the foetus. The debate between the sage Bhāradvāj and the sage Ātreya is very interesting and illuminating and worth mentioning here. The sage Ātreya claims that where there is a union between a man with effective semen and a woman with no defective organ, ovary and blood then the foetus begins to develop if at the time of the contact between the semen and blood the soul comes in contact with it through mind. Now if proper care is taken regarding the nourishment of the foetus, then at an appropriate time the child is born. The whole development can said to be due to the aggregate effects of all the above elements. The foetus is basically a byproduct of elements from the mother and the father, the soul, the proper hygienic care of the parents’ bodies and food juice. It is
significant to note here that the soul comes in touch with the body through an intermediate vehicle of the *manas*. This thesis of the sage Ātreya was challenged by the sage Bhāradvāj on ground that any of the causes mentioned by Ātreya can said to be a valid cause. For instance, the union of father's semen and the mother's blood is said to be the cause of the birth of foetus but it is a common observation that in spite of the union of the parents, it often happens that they remain childless. Therefore, the union of parents cannot said to be the cause of foetus. Furthermore, the self cannot produce the self. It is because if the self could produce itself, it would have situated itself in the best possible conditions. But it is not so as we know that sometimes the birth does occur at very unsuitable places. Also we sometimes notice that the foetus is deformed which could not have been the case if the soul would have produced itself. Moreover, if it produced itself, did it produce itself without being born or produce itself after being born. It is not difficult to judge here that both choices are absurd. Again, it is not justified to consider the proper hygienic habits to be the cause of birth as there are many persons on earth who does have all these attributes but have no child. At the same time, there are many persons who lack these attributes but still have children. To consider food juice as the cause of birth is senseless because if it is true then everybody on earth could have the privilege of having children. The sage Bhāradvāj also criticized the sage Ātreya on the point made by him that the *manas* is the intermediary vehicle to make possible the connection between two bodies. He argued that if such an assertion is valid then why should we forget the events of our past life? Therefore, in the words of the sage Bhāradvāj, none of the above mentioned cause can said to be a valid one.

The discussion goes on and in response to the objections raised by the sage Bhāradwāj, the sage Ātreya suggested that the aggregate effect of all the above elements causes the birth of a child. The mistake the sage Bhāradwāj committing time and again was that he was considering all these factors separately and then rejecting them one by one. In the words of Ātreya, “it is the combined effect of all the above elements that a child is
produced and not by any one of them separately. This same idea has been expressed in the same text at other place as well, where it is said that just as a medical room is made up of various kinds of things, or just as a chariot is made up of a collection of its various parts, so is the foetus made up of the combination of various entities which contribute to the formation of the embryo and its development. This idea of the sage Ātreya expresses the same insight as has been manifested in the Buddhist idea where it is stressed that a foetus is produced by the combination of the six dhātuṣ, i.e. earth, fire, air, water, ether and ṛjñāṇa.

The sage Bhāradvāj further argued that even if it is granted that the foetus is an outcome of a number of combined causes but then what is the precise order in which the various elements combine together to produce the various parts? Furthermore, what sort of explanation the sage Ātreya would suggest to that fact that a child born of a lady is a human child and not that of some other animal? Again, if a human being is born out of human being, why it is not necessary that the child of a stupid fellow is also stupid, the child of a blind person blind and so on? To these questions, the sage Ātreya gave a very befitting reply. According to him, there are four kinds of beings, viz. those born from ovaries, eggs, sweat and vegetables. In each class, the beings do exist in countless variety of forms. Now the form of the aggregate elements depends upon the form of the body where they assemble. We know very well that any metal assume the form of any mould in which they are poured. Likewise, when the foetus-producing ingredients assemble in a particular body then the foetus takes that specific form. To the next question, the reply of Ātreya was that a man is not affected by the disease of his father unless the disease of the father turns so acute and chronic that it starts affecting his semen. Therefore, the son would inherit the disease only when the disease has its germ in the semen of his father. The underlying assumption here is that the encoding for the growth of each cell of the body of a child has its germ in the semen of the father and therefore, any defect in the semen will manifest itself at some level on the body of the son. It may be objected here that Ātreya here ignoring the contribution of the blood of the
mother for the inheritance of the child as scientifically, he owes his genetic inheritance to both parents. But the point here is that the sage Ātreyya is responding to a specific objection to his thesis raised by the sage Bhāradvāj. As the objection raised by Bhāradvāj specifies only the semen of father, therefore, Ātreyya too in responding to the objection talks in that specific term only and ignore other terms. Otherwise, in preceding paragraphs of the text, he accepted the equal contribution of both parents in the genetic inheritance of the child. Normally, the child does not owe sense-organs to his parents. The presence or absence of the sense-organs is basically due to one’s own destiny or the fruits of karma (daiva). Hence, there is no certain law that the son of a madman will be a mad only or the next generation of a person with defective sense-organs will also be defective. It all depends on one’s karma basically and the debts or surpluses of karma-s got transferred from a dying body to a fresh body through the intermediation of a subtle body.

After showing an interesting resemblance of the Ayurvedic perspective with the Buddhist thesis on the concept of subtle body along with quoting the views of various Indian schools of philosophy, it seems necessary to mention some reference to the Vedānta views regarding the nature of subtle body. According to samkara, the subtle body is constituted of five particles of the elements of matter. Those whose deeds are good go to the region of moon while those whose deeds are not good suffer in the kingdom of Yama and then are again born in this world. Those who go to the moon to enjoy their rewards stay there till they exhaust the whole of their fund of virtue and consequently cannot stay there any longer, start their downward journey to this planet again. Interestingly, in this journey they pass through ether, air, smoke and cloud and then are showered on the ground with the rains and absorbed by the plants and again taken into the system of the persons who consume them and again discharged as semen into the wombs of their wives and are reborn again. The interesting point here is the order in which the soul gets combine with the five elements successively. We can see that this order runs from subtler to grosser.
To conclude this discussion regarding the theory of subtle body, it can be suggested that among all schools of Indian philosophy, only the Sāṁkhya and Vedānta agree to the existence of a subtle body. The physician Caraka too agrees to the idea of the existence of a subtle body. There is a marked difference in the approaches of Sāṁkhya and Vedānta schools of philosophy regarding the constitution of the subtle body. According to Sāṁkhya School of philosophy, the subtle body is constituted of tanmātrās. On the other hand, the Vedānta school of philosophy believes that the fine particles of the gross elements of matter constitute the subtle body. In this regard, the position of Caraka comes nearer to the Vedānta rather than Sāṁkhya. A related discussion at this stage regarding the nature of soul in Ayurveda is badly felt as the origination and growth of foetus, the prime object of our discussion in the preceding paragraphs is said to be basically derived from soul in Ayurveda. The term jīva in Ayurveda has been designated for the foetus.

Nature of Soul in Ayurveda: A Break from the Tradition

In Carakasaṁhitā, the question of the nature of soul has been dealt in detail. According to Caraka, the soul is one of the four components of life process. The soul constitutes the tripod of life along with the body and mind sustaining the phenomenal world. As we have seen with regard to many concepts, the nature of concept in Ayurveda has always been visualized in terms of its practical connotations and significance. This probably may be due to the bare necessity for a discipline of applied science like Ayurveda. On the similar line of thinking, the nature of soul in Ayurveda is drastically different from what other schools of philosophy say regarding the nature of soul.

According to the Sāṁkhya School of philosophy, self is pure intelligence or pure consciousness. The self has been said to be puruṣa in the Sāṁkhya philosophy. The cause of the origin of the process of evolution lies in the marriage between the avyakta (prakṛti) and puruṣa (soul). On the
other hand, in the *Vedānta* school of thought the self has been visualized in terms of the unity of being, pure intelligence, and bliss. It is not difficult to see the kind of difficulties a medical science would face by considering such absolute nature of the self. The pure intelligent being devoid of all kinds of attributes and beyond all time and space can not be of much help when it comes to address the mundane problems of this world and management of the physical miseries of our finite world. Accordingly, the Ayurveda suggests the idea that the self is conscious only when it is associated with mind and sense organs. The self is never without the mind-organ and through it there is always some kind of consciousness in the self. Therefore, the term *jīvātmā* is mentioned in *Carakasaṃhitā* to designate soul. *jīvātmā* is empirical in nature and relevant to the medical framework. The point here is that the soul though an agent of consciousness cannot in absence of the sense organs have any knowledge of the external world leading to any practical action. We know very well that a potter who knows how to make a jug cannot succeed in making it unless ha has the organs which are necessary to make it. Similarly the self itself cannot perform any work of practical significance unless all the required accessories to perform such an action are present. It should be noted here that the very presence of the sense organs and mind is crucial if the self has to become the cause of consciousness. Even if the senses do not operate, the attribute of consciousness will remain with the self. For instance, while dreaming our senses lie inoperative but the self is conscious.

An interesting observation made by Ātreya in *Carakasaṃhitā* is that when the senses are completely restrained, and the *manas*, or mind-organ is also properly controlled, disciplined and concentrated in the self then in such a situation one can have knowledge of all things even without the activity of the senses. The soul, therefore, is in itself the knower as well as the agent. This statement is very important to understand as this statement on the one hand accepts the general thesis of Ayurveda regarding the nature of soul that the soul can be the agent of consciousness only in the presence of mind and sense-organs but at the same time, it also asserts that the soul
does have the capacity to know everything even when all our sense-organs and mind-organ are completely restrained. The point here is that an action comes from the combination of an agent and an instrument. The agent here is the self and the instruments implied are sense-organs and the mind-organ. Therefore, the nature of soul in Ayurveda is a completely fresh idea and is unprecedented in the history of Indian tradition.

In the third chapter of śārīrasthānam of Carakasaṁhitā, the physician Caraka put forth the following argument for the nature of soul in Ayurveda. According to him, an agent cannot develop the knowledge necessary for an action in the absence of sense organs. It is because an action that takes place by means of certain factors does not take place without them. For instance, if there is no clay then a potter cannot proceed even if he has knowledge. At the same time it is mentioned there that there is a common wisdom concerning the supreme self. This wisdom suggests that the supreme self has the power of self knowledge. The supreme self is great, all-knowing and all-pervading. Now the question that emerges is that how to reconcile these two apparently contradictory positions regarding the nature of self? On the one hand, the self has been said to be dependant on our sense organs and on the other hand, the soul has been claimed to be the independent source of knowledge.

It is mentioned in the later verses of the same chapter of śārīrasthānam that having reined in the senses, and having reined in the flighty mind, and having entered into the supreme self, he who knows the self becomes firmly established in his own knowledge. The central point here is that once the distracting senses and the frivolous mind are disciplined and restrained and the spirit starts its inward journey then the self is capable of revealing the undiscovered secrets of existence that are hidden to our senses. Interestingly, the very presence of senses is there but they are not operating. Therefore, the contradiction mentioned above was only apparent and not real as the self always remain with the mental faculty and never alone. But at the same time, it is capable of independently knowing all
existing things without the intermediation of sense organs. Caraka further reinforce his argument by citing an illustration. When a person fall asleep and his senses, speech, and movements have ceased and he starts dreaming than he has knowledge of objects, of joy and of sorrow. We cannot call him as someone who has no cognition. Therefore, knowledge without the intermediation of senses is possible even though the presence of mind is required.

Now in Ayurveda, mind and soul together with body constitute the tripod on which life rests and functions. Mind and soul together are counted among nine eternal causes and also among spiritual elements. Mind and soul contribute and complement each other in respect of consciousness and action. Soul is devoid of action but conscious while the mind is active but devoid of consciousness. Mind cannot act until it is combined and inspired by the consciousness of the soul. The all pervasive soul while in contribution with mind appears to be active and it is said to be agent of actions. No discussion in Ayurveda relating to the soul can said to be complete without saying at least a few words on the concept of mind and its relationship vis-à-vis other components of the life process.

**Concept of mind in Ayurveda:**

It is very interesting to note the definition of health given in the Ayurveda. A person is said to be healthy if he is happy at all the three levels of its existence, i.e., physical, psychological and spiritual. The term spiritual here should not be taken in other-worldly sense but it should be seen as concerning the spirit in which we live. In Ayurveda, happiness itself has been considered to be essential to health. If one is not happy at any of the above mentioned three levels then it can be taken as the biggest cause of illness and premature death. It is also significant to notice here that it is a counterthesis to those who are accustomed to thinking of disease as an unfortunate affliction unrelated to our states of mind. But, Ayurveda, in contrast explicitly
believe in an intimate connection among body, mind and spirit. Also the current advances in medical science are forcing doctors to begin to take it seriously. The idea of a psychosomatic cause behind every disease is becoming more and more popular in the medical circle now a days. The idea of Ayurveda is that it is possible to take charge of our thoughts and emotions in such a way that they become health-inducing rather than illness originating. While a positive attitude heals and protects, the negative emotions such as sorrow, anger, hate, hopelessness are antagonistic to life and health. This thesis of Ayurveda is really interesting and deserves a thorough probe by contemporary medical specialists. It will be appropriate here to begin by establishing the nature of mind in Ayurveda and its relationship vis-à-vis body and soul.

Ayurveda considers the delighted mind to be a pre-requisite for the attainment of health. Ayurveda counts mind among the three pillars on which the life rests and functions. Mind is also counted among the four dimensions of life process. As far as its origin is concerned, there are two views prevalent in Ayurveda. According to the first position, mind is born out of āhaṁkāra. This position also belongs to Śāṅkhyā and has been supported by Suśrūṭa. The second version that belongs to Caraka considers bhūtas to be the source of origin of mind. It is important to note that mind is an insentient substance. Consciousness is not an attribute of mind. But mind is active and it activates the soul. It also becomes conscious in the presence of soul. Such a position is quite in contrast to the western position where mind is identified with consciousness normally, though at times they are also accepted to be different entities that are closely linked.

Mind and body are said to be the home of diseases. The two doṣas that are responsible for diseases are rajas (agitation) and tāmas (indolence). In view of its constant conjunction with the three primordial constituents of prakṛti, i.e., sattva, rajas, and tamas, there have been described three dispositions of mind – sāttvika, rājasika and tāmasika. This tridoṣa theory has its roots in the Śāṅkhyā philosophy. Like Śāṅkhyā, Ayurveda too
believes that mind has three constituents in the form of three attributes or qualities namely sattva (denoting illumination), rajas (denoting activity or energy), and tamas (denoting inertia). Ayurveda considers the latter two as vitiators (malas) and recommends a few therapeutic measures to eliminate them from the surface of the mind. Mental faculty is said to be of three types. Sattva is free from defects as it is endowed with sacredness. Rajas (energy) and tamas (inertia) are the other two types. The former is defective because it promotes wrath (roṣāmsa) while the second is problematic as it leads to ignorance (mohāmsa). Thus while rajas and tamas are the causes of psychological disturbances and disorders sattva is a principal of harmony and is said to be a disease free state.

The word sattva has multiple connotations in Ayurveda. Etymologically, this term has been derived from ‘sat’ participle implying ‘being real’. The word sattva in Ayurveda has mainly the following meanings: one of the three constituent of mind, personality type or temperament, nature or svabhāva, life, foetus, potential extract, sediment essence, or qualities like clarity of thought, purity of heart, generosity, etc. Sattva is said to be the principle of manifestation. It is a characteristic that is a dominating factor in space as well as in cognition. The two other guṇas are rajas and tamas. The former is the principle of energy and the latter is a dominating factor in conservation. Sattva, on the other hand is the capacity for shining forth of something that really exists. It facilitates the individual’s advancement towards summum-bonum. It is well known that the concept of triguga in Indian tradition is very old. In fact it is as old as the Veda itself. The concept of sattva, rajas, and tamas has been indirectly mentioned in the Vedas. But it was conceptualized later on. Bhagavad Gitā gave a detailed account of these three traits and their implications and applications.

Mind and body are the two important dimensions of our four dimensional life. The four dimensions of our life are body, sense organs, mind and the soul. In an illustration Caraka also says that mind, body and soul are the three pillars (tridanda) of human existence. The soul is free of
any disease. The home of disease is either body or mind. It is very significant to note here that the mind influences the body and vice versa. This process of intimate interaction continues to work in the causation as well as in the precipitation of a disease. This is equally true in case of treatment as well. A treatment aimed at purifying or pacifying a mind does have similar effects on the body. Basically mind and body are two different manifestations of matter. The only difference is that while one is a subtle manifestation of the matter while the other is a gross manifestation of the matter. Therefore, the difference is only in degree and not in kind. In other words, they are qualitatively alike but quantitatively different. The west started taking interest in ESP only in the last century but in the east they have a long history of more than two thousand years. Such kind of supernatural perceptions were never seen with suspicion here in India. In fact, they were taken as the potential powers of 'mind'. they are the latent powers exist within every ordinary human being and can be aroused by gaining control over the mind by a systematic practice of yoga. They are addressed to some extant in the Upaniṣads but their detailed systematization was done for the first time by Patanjali in his Yogasūtram. Patanjali presents a systematic method of achieving these ESP through proper discipline and concentration of mind. They were also discussed later in Śāṅdilya Upanisad, Yogavāśiṣṭha, etc. In the history of Ayurveda, the physician Caraka mentioned some extra-ordinary perceptions of mind.

Patanjali in his famous work Yogasūtram has described many supernatural powers. Though the central aim of Yoga is to achieve the state of liberation and Patanjali in his work prescribed a detailed and systematic method to achieve that aim but during the rigorous and disciplined practice of aṣṭāṅga-yoga many special powers also appears in the practitioner. Such powers are not acquired as a result of an intentional effort on the part of yogi. They are rather the byproducts. Such powers are superhuman powers and Patanjali instructs the practitioners not to indulge in such kind of activities as they may distract him from his real aim. The mind of a yogi becomes so intense that when he concentrates on certain objects he starts
acquiring special powers. The mind of a yogi is divested of all impurities. It gets connected directly to the cosmic mind. In such a state, the puruṣa is established in its real nature. The knowledge the yogi obtains is true and infinite. Some of these powers are: divine vision (ādārśa), divine touch (vedanā), divine taste (āśwāda), divine smell (varta), divine hearing (śravaṇa), spontaneous enlightenment (prātiṣṭha), achieving minuteness (animā), achieving hugeness (garimā), reaching anything (prāptī), rule anything (prākamya), etc.

Another popular Sanskrit text, Yogavāśīṣṭha suggests another powerful impact of the mind on human body. According to the text, the majority of the diseases, whether physical or psychological, have their origin in the mind and are curable if the mind is trained and educated to think properly. Furthermore, it says that the physical body is basically a creation of the mind and can be changed by it into any condition. Mind can determine as to how long one can live, or how to live young and well. According to the text, every ordinary mind possesses many extra-ordinary powers, though the mind itself is not conscious or aware of it. A concentrated, cultured and refined mind can attain various potentials like acquiring the knowledge of thoughts and feelings of others, becoming extremely minute, becoming heavy and steady like a mountain, flying free through the space, entering the other person’s body, moving in empty space, etc. such kinds of super-human powers have also been described in the Yogasūtram of Patanjali in detail.

The text was written by the author to achieve liberation or a state of godliness and the author advocates a systematic method of aṣṭāṅga yoga for this purpose. But during the practice of yoga many special powers are acquired by the practitioner. These special powers are certainly not intended by the author but they are helpful tools to make the practitioner reach his final aim that is liberation. However, Patanjali strongly cautions the use of these powers as any such attempt would result in disaster. These supra-normal powers are the temptations. A practitioner is not expected to be allured by these special powers. He should reject them outright as they are the seed of the evil and with their rejection, the path to liberation becomes
open and clear. Interestingly, the physician Caraka also mentions many supernatural powers that anyone can achieve. In Carakasamhita, these special powers have been mentioned as Iśvaras. They are āveśa (entering others body), cetasojñāna (thought reading), arthānām chandatah kriyā (performing activities at will), dṛṣṭi (super-natural vision), śrotā (super-natural audition), kānti (effluent aura), smṛti (brilliant memory), and istaṭaścāpyadarśana (invisibility at will). Suśruta also mentioned regarding these special powers in his popular medical treatise, Suśrutasaṁhitā. Therefore, the possibility of inculcating extra-ordinary powers by human beings has been equally supported in our indigenous system of medicine.

Another important question can be regarding the method/or methods to achieve these extra-normal states of mind. Patanjali mentioned about five such techniques, namely, auśadhi (herbs-minerals-rasāyanas), mantra (incantations), tapa (penance), samādhi (absolute tranquility) and jaṇma (birth). It is interesting to note that the use of ausadhi has been mentioned as the first technique to attain special powers by the Patanjali. In traditional Indian text, certain drugs have been mentioned that can heighten the powers of human mind. Ayurvedic texts also discuss a certain group of the drugs called Medhya rasāyanas which improve the intellectual faculties. Suśruta mentioned that soma is rejuvenating drug consuming which one can attain super-normal powers. However, before applying any rejuvenating drug for such purpose, the body has to be strengthened and purified with the help of certain procedures which are known as Pancakarmas and the process is called as kāyākalpa. Patanjali has used the term kāyaśaripat which appears similar to kāyākalpa. The second technique is mantra or incantations. Mantras are the sacred words which if repeatedly pronounced in a definite frequency under suitable conditions can unfold certain potential powers. There are varieties of mantras for different purposes. The third technique is tapa or penance. In our tradition, it is a long held belief that practice of austerity measures, penance and asceticism can produce extra-ordinary powers. In yoga, there are procedures like āsanas, mudrās, etc. that are basically the specific postures of the body to gain control over the body.
main idea here is to subdue the body to realize the supremacy and supernatural powers of the mind. The next technique is *Samādhi* or absolute tranquility. The term *Samādhi* refers to the eighth and the last stage of *Aṣṭāngayoga*. It results in omniscience and omnipotence. The last possible way could be that a person is born with such super-normal powers. Indian schools of thought strongly believe in the idea that the extra-ordinary powers are acquired by one’s own effort in the previous life. In one’s present birth that fellow just enjoy the fruits of one’s actions in his or her previous life. The postulate here is that mind carries the impressions from one birth to another and the potential powers acquired in the immediately preceding birth become explicit in this life.

The relevant point that can be drawn from the above mentioned discussion regarding the special powers is that both mind and body stay in an intimate relation to each other. Both have an immediate and direct impact on each other. One can transcend the limitations of the body by controlling one’s mind and one can also heightened the powers of human mind by consuming certain rejuvenating drugs at bodily level. Another important aspect of human life is his spiritual realm of existence which forms the core of his being. The spirit is said to be beyond all the processes of decay and growth as it is complete and full in itself. Hence, the spirit cannot be trapped into any disease. But it is also true that any disturbance at the spiritual level has essentially its repercussions on the other two levels of existence. For Ayurveda, all the three levels of existence are important in all aspects of medicine, viz. physical, psychological as well as spiritual. For instance, the treatment in Ayurveda has been prescribed to be three-folded encompassing all levels of human existence. They are treatment by faith or divine therapy, treatment based upon scientific reasoning and treatment by self-control or psychotherapy.

Towards the end, it seems necessary to clarify the subtle difference among the many terms used in Ayurveda like *mahat* or *buddhi*, *ahmkāra* or ego, and *citta*. These terms are quite often used in the Ayurvedic treatises
but they are confused with each other at most of the time in academic circle. In Ayurveda, all these terms have very specific connotations. The term, buddhi is derived from the root budh. The root budh implies that by which one knows or is aware (Buddhyate anayā). Buddhi is one of the instruments of cognition by which one ascertains the specific characteristics of an object. According to Caraka, “Buddhi is one which determines the specific attributes of the objects and impels the individual to speak or act intelligently.”

Buddhi or mahat is, basically the primary evolute. It is the very first category to appear out of prakṛti. Suśruta used the term mahat for buddhi. In Sāṅkhya School of philosophy also, the term mahat has been used to denote Buddhi. Interestingly, this term represents the first phase of evolution at the cosmic as well as individual levels. Buddhi has also been referred to as prapañch bija since it sows the first seed of the phenomenal extension. Buddhi is so subtle and infinitesimal that it is beyond the capacity of sense-organs or mind organ to perceive it. It is mahat or great as it is the recipient of universal knowledge. It has no limitation as far as comprehension is concerned and in fact, it is fundamental to knowledge of all kind. It is dominantly sāttvika in nature and is a linking factor between the self and the objective faculty. Since it is the essential link between the soul and the nature, therefore, it partakes of the nature of soul as well as nature, i.e. it ‘knows’ as well as ‘works’.

In Ayurveda, Buddhi has very significant pathological as well as therapeutic implications. Pathologically, the impairment of intellect is counted among three principle and primary causes of the disease. In Carakasaṁhitā, it is mentioned that excess, under or wrong utilization of buddhi can lead to many pathological conditions of body as well as mind. The term prajñāparādha or the intellectual blasphemy has been used to denote the excess, under, or wrong utilization of buddhi. Buddhi has important Therapeutic import also. Buddhi is counted first among the agents to cure the psychological disturbances. In Carakasaṁhitā, the concept of satyabuddhi is discussed that signifies the state of highest wisdom. For a person with such complete knowledge considers himself or herself...
responsible for all the external events and get rid of all bondage as well as miseries. With the virtue of such highest realization, the person is free from attachment and hatred.

Now it would be appropriate to reflect some light on the interrelationship between buddhi and mind. In Carakasamhita, buddhi has been placed at a higher pedestal than mind in the process of perception. Caraka states that, “control of sense organs, self restraint, hypothesis and consideration represent the field of action of mind. Beyond it flourishes the realm of intellect.” The significant point to be noted here is that a thing that is subtle is always considered superior in Ayurveda and in the order of hierarchy the subtle entities are paced at the top. For instance, first comes the soul, then intellect, then mind, then sense organs and so on. Among the intellect and mind, the intellect is said to be superior to mind as the intellect does have a capacity to take judgment. On the other hand, mind is merely capable of feeling and not deciding.

In the hierarchy of the cosmological evolution, another important term is ahaṅkāra. Literally, it means that which makes for the awareness of ‘I’ factor (aham iti jñānam kriyate anena). In ordinary language usage, it signifies self-love, pride, arrogance or high esteem of oneself. This term has important philosophical as well as medical connotations. Philosophically, it suggests the erroneous notion that the physical and physiological complex of man himself is the experiencing self. In medical terminology, it is used in the sense of body awareness that generates anxiety in case of illness. Ahaṅkāra has been derived from buddhi and actually is a dynamic principle of specific individualization. Though buddhi is predominantly sātvika, ahaṅkāra is rajas in character. Ahaṅkāra consists of activities of continual adjustment to the changing situational involvements. Functionally, it can be referred to as the basic urge for self-preservation.

Regarding the relationship between ahaṅkāra and mind, the physician Caraka has a different opinion from Sāṅkhya philosophy. In
Sāṁkhya philosophy, mind is an evolute of ahaṁkāra. Mind is said to be derived from sattvika type of ahaṁkāra along with the five connative sense organs and five cognitive sense organs. There is also a variety of opinion within Sāṁkhya School itself regarding the evolution of mind. For instance, Vijñānabhiṣku asserted that only mind is an evolute of sattvika ahaṁkāra. All other sense organs are derived from rajas and tamas. But Caraka disagrees from both of these positions. In fact, he is not ready to accept that mind is derived from ahaṁkāra. He also does not specify in his work as to from what mind can be derived. According to him, mind, ahaṁkāra, and intellect are three aspects of one single internal instrument, i.e. antahkaraṇa.

Now after sketching a detailed picture of the holistic perspective of Ayurveda regarding life and its existence on earth, it would be appropriate now to come to more specific concepts related to medicine like health and disease. They have deliberately been written in this order as in Ayurveda the concept of health or ārogya has been given the central place and disease has been seen as nothing else than the non-existence of health. These issues will be specifically dealt in the next chapter.
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