CONCLUSION & ESTIMATE
CHAPTER VII

(Conclusion and Estimate)

The main concern of Indian philosophy has been the discovery of the Mind. In the course of their effort to discover the first cause of the Universe, they discovered the Universal Mind i.e Brahman.

Indian Mind was never satisfied by the identification of the body with the notion of 'I'. They always searched for a permanent and a stable 'I'. In this effort, they discovered the Individual Self i.e.; Ātman. Both the terms Brahman and Ātman are used with reference to the Universal Mind quite often. However, whenever a reference to the Individual Mind is to be made, the term Ātman is used. The term Jīva is also used with reference to the Individual Mind. The earliest expressions
viz: Brahman, Ātman and Jīva occur in the Vedas. Therefore, it is clear that these concepts had developed in the Vedic period only. However, these were not taken for granted.

The Upaniṣads take deep interest in the discovery of Ātman and Brahman. ‘Atma vāre draśṭavyah̄’ is their aim ‘Brahma Viṣjiññāsasva’ is their enquiry. For this purpose, the Upaniṣads adopt different methods. One method is to examine the states of waking, dream and deep sleep and try to find out at what level a substrate of psychological states could be identified. It is difficult to identify a stable substrate of psychological states. It is difficult to decide at that stage whether these very states constitute the Mind or whether these are only functions of the Mind, and behind these there is a substrate which is the Mind and which supports these states. But, during the deep sleep state and the Turīya state, when empirical psychological states are absent, the Mind i.e. the substrate of these states, can be identified as different and independent of these states. This is one method that is adopted by the Upaniṣad and the Vedānta schools to discover the Mind. This method is primarily demonstrated in Māndukūkhyā Upaniṣad but other Upaniṣads also frequently make a reference to it.

In the chapter on ‘Upaniṣadic thought on the concept of Mind’, a detailed account of this method as given
in different *Upanisads* is narrated with appropriate critical comments. This method of discovering the Mind is psychological method.

Another method adopted in the *Upanisads* is the epistemological method. *Upanisads* raise the question whether the Mind i.e. *Ātman* can be ascertained by the epistemological method. Whether one can see, hear or speak about the Mind is a question that is frequently raised in the *Upanisads*. This is answered by pointing out that 'one who sees cannot be seen, one who hears cannot be heard and so on. In this way, *Upanisads* show that the Mind is beyond epistemological reach. It can be only intuitively comprehended. It is 'Svayam Prakāśa'-It is Self-conscious. *Upanisads* talk of the paradox of the Mind being the seer, hearer etc. But not the seen, heard and so on. The inability to reach the Mind i.e. *Ātman* epistemologically does not disprove its existence, but only points out that the epistemological means are fitted to comprehend the outside objects and the other objects, but not the very observer.  

′Parāśākhāni Vyatṛkṣāti Svayaṁbhūh′

This fact of the Mind being beyond the epistemological reach is discussed in *Kena Upanisad, Chāndogya, Brhadāraṇyca* and in almost all *Upanisads*.

Whether the Mind is the source of Matter or matter
is the source of Mind or both of them are two independent realities, is the question on which the position is not clear in Upaniṣadic thought. There are passages that declare ‘Brahma Vā idam agra āsīt’ ‘Ātma Vā idam agra āsīt’. This gives an impression that the Mind or the conscious being is the source of the cosmic evolution. But there are also passages that declare ‘Sadeva Somya idam agra āsīt’, ‘Ākāśo Vā namaraśṭ̄payoh nirvahitā’. Which give an impression that there is something non-conscious that has been the source of the cosmic evolution. But in these passages, the observations like ‘Tadaikṣata’ made a little later, attribute thinking power to the primary source of the cosmic evolution. Therefore, it seems that Upaniṣads thought of the Mind or the conscious being to be the primary source of the entire cosmic set up. Upaniṣads probably did not bother with the questions whether Cetana can be the cause of the Acetana or vice-versa and whether Cetana admits the change or modifications. It is later Vedānta schools that had to examine these questions and formulate the appropriate theories of causation. Among the systems of philosophy, Sāṁkhya-yoga and Nyāya-Vaisēṣika have taken a clear stand that the Matter and the Mind are the two distinct realities and one does not emanate from the other. On the other hand, the Buddhist have gone to the other extreme that the Mind alone is the basic principle and the Matter is only
a projection of the Mind. The Vedānta schools have borrowed the Sāmkhya concept of Prakṛti in some form or the other and have made it the primary source of the matter. The Avidyā of Advaita has the features of the Prakṛti of the Sāmkhyas in so far as this also consists of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. In Viśistadvaita, the prakṛti is made the Śarīra of Brahman. It is the Śarīra aspect of Brahman that undergoes modification. It's subtle form is the source of the material world and its gross is the material world. In Dvaita, Brahman and Prakṛti are two separate realities and it is Prakṛti that is the material cause for the material world. The Jaina also have thought of Jīva and Adīva. That is to say, the Mind and the Matter as distinct realities. Thus, the conscientious in Indian philosophy consider the Mind and the Matter i.e. the thinking substance and the non-thinking substance as two distinct realities. However, the Buddhists and Advaitins are in favour of considering the Mind or consciousness alone as the primary reality and allow only a functional or practical reality to the Matter.

The next question in respect of the concept of the Mind is it's extension or the scope of the operation. As the primary source of the entire cosmic set-up, naturally it is all pervasive. Therefore Upaniṣads always envisage Brahman or Ātman as all pervasive. Since in the Upanisadic thought, the Universal
Mind and the Individual Mind are not clearly demarcated, both are treated as all pervasive. But, the Individual Minds have functional limitations. The *Sāmkhya Puruṣa* and the *Ātman* of *Nyāya Vaiśeṣika* are also all-pervasive. The *Nyāya Vaiśeṣikas* explicitly state that the *Ātman* is *Vibhu*, while the *Sāmkhyas* do not explicitly mention it. But the real point is Mind or the conscious being is not material. The dimension is the characteristic of Matter. Therefore, raising this question whether the Mind is all pervasive or atomic is futile. One can talk of only a functional dimension for the Mind. This is realised in the systems in which the Mind is stated to be atomic. For instance, in the systems of *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, *Dvaita* and *Jaina*, the Mind is considered to be atomic. But, it functions through the entire body by *Dharmabhūtajñāna*, by *Rāśmi*, and by *Saṅkoca-Vikṣaṇa* in these three systems respectively.

In the systems of *Sāmkhya*, *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and *Jaina*, there is no concept of Universal Mind. In *Sāmkhya*, there are only *puruṣas* who represent Individual Minds but not *Īśvara*. In *Yoga* and *Nyaya Vaiśeṣika*, though there is *Īśvara*, he is also an exalted individual. He has nothing to do with the direction or regulation of Individual Minds, nor he partakes in the functioning of the Individual Minds. In *Vedānta* schools however, *Brahman*
represents the Universal Mind and Jivas represent the Individual Minds. The Universal Mind is all pervasive while the Individual Minds function in the respective bodies. The Universal presence of Brahman is particularly brought out in the Tārā Upaniṣad and frequently mentioned in all other Upaniṣads.

While the Upaniṣads tried to discover the Mind by an analysis of the psychological states during waking, dream and deep sleep states and going beyond it, the later systems tried to establish the existence of Mind by logic. Both the Śāṅkhyas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas try to establish the existence of Mind as separate from the body by arguments. Śāṅkhyas mainly advance two arguments.

1 A complex entity like Prakṛti is extended to service the purpose of someone else, and this someone else is Puruṣa. Unless the serving of the purpose of someone is envisaged, the whole process of the evolution of Prakṛti loses its significance. In the nature around us, it is found that all evolved entities serve the purpose of something or the other. There is nothing in the Nature that is completely isolated from the rest of Nature. Each aspect of the nature serve the purpose of someone else. However, the Nature need not be conscious of this fact.

2 The Second argument is prakṛti consists of
three guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. All evolutes of Prakṛti are also considered as constituted of these three guṇas. To have a complete view of the Universe, one has to think of another entity which is not constituted of these three. That is to say, a Triguṇaḥarita entity has to be thought of. Thus Sāṃghāta Parār-thattva and Triguṇaḍi viparyaya are the two arguments on the basis of which the puruṣa or the Individual Minds are accepted in Sāṁkhya. Of course, mere Puruṣas do not make the functional minds in Sāṁkhya. They have to get the co-operation of Buddhi or Antahkarana.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas also establish Ātman i.e. Mind by arguments. Their chief argument is, the senses, Manas etc., are instruments. These instruments obtain knowledge of the external objects. That is to say, these lead to certain activities. No activity can be undertaken by instruments alone. An agent is necessary. Such an agent is Ātman. On the same lines, they also establishĪśvara or Paramātman. The world itself is a product. There are so many other products in the world that are not man made. These products require an agent and such an agent isĪśvara.

Both the Sāṁkhyas and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas do not take in to account the psychological factors nor they go by the epis-
temology of perceptual comprehension. They go by logical arguments. The Buddhists also accept Ālaya Vijñāna in place of Ātman.

The Jains have of course accepted Ātman. The only difference between the Buddhistic approach and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika approach is that, according to Buddhists, Ālaya Vijñāna is Kṣaṇika or momentary where as according to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, Ātman is permanent. In any case the Mind is accepted by both. For Vedāntins acceptance of Ātman has been an Upanisadic inheritance. However, they also advance good many arguments to establish it, only to meet the challenges of Carvākas and the Buddhists, whose theory of momentariness was not at all acceptable to Vedāntins.

For the Individual Minds to function, and deal with the external objects, a mechanism is found mentioned in Upaniṣads only. This mechanism consists of Manas or Antahkarana, Jñānendriyas and Karmendriyas. In fact Upaniṣads mention the manas, the eye, and speech almost as an integral part of the personality. The five Jñānendriyas and the five Karmendriyas mentioned in the Upaniṣads are adopted as a part of this mechanism by almost all systems of philosophy. The jaina-philosophy makes a detailed analysis of the different species possessing these Indriyas in single or in multiple. There is not
much difference of opinion in respect of the nature and number of \( \text{Jñānendriyas} \) and \( \text{Karmendriyas} \) though their contact with the external objects and the way in which they provide information to the \( \text{Manas} \) and \( \text{Ātman} \) is differently described in different systems. But in respect of \( \text{Manas} \) or \( \text{Antaḥkaraṇa} \) there is considerable difference of opinion. The concept of \( \text{Antaḥkaraṇa} \) was probably developed in the \( \text{Sāmkhya} \) system first and later adopted by the \( \text{Vedānta} \) schools. The \( \text{Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas} \) go by such a concept of \( \text{Manas} \) which is not consisted of \( \text{Ahamkāra} \) and \( \text{Buddhi} \) and not an evolute of \( \text{Prakṛti} \). Thus, broadly there are two varieties of this inner sense called \( \text{Manas} \) or \( \text{Antaḥkaraṇa} \). One developed in the \( \text{Sāmkhya} \) and the \( \text{Vedānta} \) tradition, and the other developed in the \( \text{Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika} \) tradition. The \( \text{Jaina} \) concept of \( \text{Manas} \) is nearer to the \( \text{Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika} \) concept of \( \text{Manas} \) while the \( \text{Buddhistic} \) concept of \( \text{Manas} \) is altogether of a different type. Thus, the \( \text{Manas} \) or \( \text{Antaḥkaraṇa} \), the \( \text{Jñānendriyas} \) and the \( \text{Karmendriyas} \) constitute the physical equipment and the instruments of the Mind for its functioning. The concept of \( \text{sūkṣma S'arīra} \) or \( \text{Liṅga S'arīra} \) is also developed in \( \text{Sāmkhya} \) and \( \text{Vedānta} \), consisting of the \( \text{Manas} \) or \( \text{Antaḥkaraṇa} \) and these \( \text{Indriyas} \).

The main function of the Mind is to obtain
knowledge. Now, what is the nature of this knowledge and what is the relation between this knowledge and the Mind is a question that is very relevant to the study of Mind. In this respect, there are three views in Indian philosophical tradition.

1. Knowledge or consciousness is the very essential nature of the knower.

2. Knowledge is an attribute of the knower.

3. Knowledge is an activity of the knower.

The Upaniṣads and the Vedānta schools take the view that knowledge is the very essential nature of the knower. However, they think of two types of knowledge, viz. Svarūpa-ñāna and Vṛtti-ñāna, while the Svarūpa-ñāna is the very essential nature of the knowing Self, the Vṛtti-ñāna is the modification of Antaḥkaraṇa. Vṛtti-ñāna pertains to the external objects and the mental states while the Svarūpa-ñāna enables one to cognize oneself and one's intrinsic qualities like Bliss. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas go by the second view that knowledge is an attribute of the knowing Self. While the Mīmāṃsakas consider knowledge to the activity of the knowing Self. Whether the knowledge is Svayam-Prakāśa or requires something else to reveal is also a question that is raised in a big way. Vedāntins go by the theory of Svayam-Prakāśa nature of knowledge. That
is to say, it is Self revealing. However, in case of Svarūpa jñāna, it is Self revealing both in the sense that it is Self-conscious and also reveals itself without any other aid. But in case of Vṛtti jñāna, it is not Self conscious but only Self revealing. In the Viśīṣṭādvaita, in place of Vṛtti jñāna, Dharmabhūtajñāna is accepted. This is also Self-revealing but not Self-conscious. In Sāṃkhya also knowledge is Self-revealing. In Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika there are two stages of knowledge, viz-Vyavasāya and Anuvyavasāya. While Vyavasāya needs Anuvyavasāya for its revelation, Anuvyavasāya does not need any further stage of knowledge. In Purva-Mīmāṃsa, according to Brāhmaṇas the knowledge is not Self revealing. It is only to be inferred. But, according to Prābhāṣikās, it is Self-revealing. The knower, the knowledge and the known are revealed together according to Prābhāṣikās. According to Jainas and the Bauddhas also, the knowledge reveals itself.

Right from the Upaniṣadic time, the cognitive, emotive and the rational functions of the Mind are listed in large number in Indian philosophy. The nature of these is explained more or less in the same way. Some consider each one as a separate quality while others consider them as different varieties of cognition. Some of the emotive qualities are considered as basic, while others are derived. The theistic schools of Vedānta
think of two types of cognitive and emotive qualities viz-Prākṛta and Aprākṛta. The Prākṛta pertain to Jīva when he is in transmigration while Aprākṛta pertain to the liberated and the God. In Indian philosophy, it is advised that the emotive qualities be regulated and a kind of mental discipline be developed.

The whole Yoga system is intended to help the developing of such a discipline. The discipline prescribed by the Yoga is accepted by Vedānta and other systems. Vedānta prescribes certain additional programmes as Sravaṇa, Manana, etc. The Upāsana, Bhakti and Saranāgati are also prescribed in theistic schools.

The purpose of the study of the nature and functions of the Mind in Indian philosophy is not merely to make academic or scientific study, but it is to discover the true nature of the Mind which is bliss, to harness and enjoy this bliss. The basic characteristic of both the Universal Mind and the Individual Minds is not merely the consciousness but also blissfulness Ātman is both Vijñānānagha and Ānānadamaya. If one follows the discipline prescribed, one will be able to discover the true nature of oneself and also the true nature of the Universal Mind. The two are always in harmony. But the Individual Mind will have diverted from it during transmigration. It is to restore this
harmony and to discover this Bliss, a study of the Mind has to be undertaken. This is what is declared in the passages like 'Atma va are Drastavyah.' Thus, the exposition of the concept of Mind in Indian philosophy is not only psychological and epistemological but it is value oriented.

The contribution of this thesis to the extension of knowledge in the field of the concept of Mind in Indian philosophy, is three-fold

1. The Upanisadic thought on the Mind, the thoughts in different systems of Indian philosophy including Jainism and Buddhism are brought together in this thesis and classified into different aspects such as the nature of Mind, the functions of Mind, the relation between the Mind and matter and other allied aspects.

2. The three approaches adopted in Upanisads and later philosophical systems for the study of the concept of Mind, viz psychological, epistemological and logical are shown with appropriate illustrations and extracts of the source passages.

3. The Value orientation of the study of the Mind, the empirical and transcendental levels of the Mind, and