INTRODUCTION

The study of the nature and functions of the Mind, and the relation between the Mind and the Body has been a fascinating subject both in the Western and Indian Philosophies. With the advent of modern psychology another dimension has been added to it's study.

Is there a Mind distinct from the body, is a question that is raised both in the the west and in India quite from an early time. Upaniṣads raise this question in a big way and affirm the existence of the Mind as distinct from Matter. Later systems of Indian Philosophy systematise this concept and work out its Ontological, epistemological and psychological aspects in detail.

For the expression Mind, there is no corresponding Sanskrit expression that brings out all shades of the meaning of this expression. Therefore, it is better to explain the import of the expression Mind, bring out the different shades of its meaning, and point out the relevant Sanskrit expressions. Philosophical categories
and the concepts of one philosophical tradition do not exactly agree with the philosophical categories and the concepts of another philosophical tradition. Therefore, no philosophical term of any two traditions exactly agree.

Generally the expression Mind stands for the entire subjective side as against Matter which stands for the objective side. Mind is a thinking substance while the Matter is non-thinking, according to Descartes. The whole universe is classified into Mind and Matter. From this point of view, the corresponding sanskrit expressions will be Cetana and Acetana. Mind is Cetana and Matter is Acetana. The expression mind is also used in the sense of soul, self or ego. In this sense the corresponding sanskrit expressions will be Ātman, Jīva, Asmadpada-Vācyā. The expression Mind is used to convey the entire universal consciousness, the Universal Mind as against the Individual Mind. This universal consciousness principle is designated by the terms Brahman, Paramātma, Paramacetana etc in Indian tradition. Thus the expression mind stands for Cetana in general as well as, Ātman or Jīva—the Individual Self or soul and Brahman, Paramātma or the universal self Paramacetana. One has to understand one of these meanings depending upon the context. An important point to be noted here is that all these meanings distinguish the mind from matter. Mind represents the spiritual and
conscious being while matter represents non-spiritual, non-conscious side of the universe. Whether both these are ultimate, and what is the relation between these two, are the questions that will be examined in due course.

In the writings on Indian philosophy, the expression Mind is also used in the sense of 'Manas' which is material according to most of the systems of Indian philosophy. It is not the subject or knower, nor it is of the nature of consciousness. It is only an instrument of knowledge. It is an aid to the knower. By itself, it does not undergo any experience. It only provides experience to the knower. This 'Manas' is also translated as mind in the writings on Indian philosophy. We will examine its propriety or otherwise later. In any case, the usage of the expression 'Mind' in the sense of 'Manas' is current. Therefore, the study of 'Manas' also has to be included in our study of the concept of Mind.

The knower, the knowledge and the instrument of knowledge constitute the areas of investigation, in our study of the concept of Mind. The characteristics and the relation among these three will be examined in detail. In respect of the relation between the knower and the knowledge, broadly, there are three views, viz.,

1. Knowledge is an essential characteristic of the knower, it is the very essence of the knower.
2. Knowledge is an attribute of the knower. It is not his essential characteristic but only an attribute or a quality of the knower.

3. There are two varieties of knowledge. viz., one that is an essential characteristic of the knower, the second, that is externally provided. These represent the different metaphysical views in respect of the self or the knower and the knowledge. The instrument of knowledge are 'Manas' and Indriyas i.e., senses. Sometime the term Antahkaraṇa is also found. Manas and Antahkaraṇa are not exactly synonyms. The nature of Manas and Antahkaraṇa are described differently in different systems. So also is the nature of the Self or the Soul. In respect of the relation between the self and Manas or Antahkaraṇa, there are broadly three views. 1. Manas is different from the self or the knower. 2. Antahkaraṇa is a constituent of the knowing self or the empirical self. 3. The knowing self itself functions both as an Agent and an instrument in certain respect, and also has an external 'Manas' in other respects. These differences are due to the difference in respect of the metaphysical position of the respective philosophical systems and also the epistemological procedure.

The Ontology of Ātman and Manas are discussed a good deal in Indian philosophy. The existence of Ātman is established both by a kind of intuitive perception and speculative arguments. In
majority of the systems Ātman is spiritual and self-conscious. It is a substratum for cognitive, Volitional, and emotional functions.

Though it is spiritual, it functions through a physical body. Two levels of physical vestures are thought of for the Ātman. One is subtle body designated as Sūkṣma-saṃśīra or Linga sārīra, and the other is gross body i.e., Sthūla sārīra made out of the five elements viz., Prthvi, Ap, Tejas, Vāyu and Ākāśa. This Ātman or self is eternal. In majority of the systems it is Vibhu (all pervasive) but in one or two systems it is considered to be atomic with a capacity to function throughout the body. It is only the Cārvāka system that denies Ātman and envisages the evolution of consciousness in the matter itself by a certain combination of matter. This view of the cārvāka is Dehātmavāda i.e., the theory of the body itself as self. Similarly, the views that the Manas itself is self, all senses together constitute self are also discussed. Though these views were not particularly held by any system, these were discussed as possible alternatives for the concept of a separate Ātman, and rejected. The Buddhists on the other hand deny the matter and envisage that the matter is a projection of the mind. It is interesting to note that similar discussions were carried on in western philosophy also in respect of self or soul. Plato considered the soul to be a distinct immaterial essence being, imprisoned in the body.
emphasized the essential unitary spiritual character of the Mind. Different theories of the mind prevalent in the western philosophy could be broadly classified into three groups viz., 1. Materialistic theories, 2. Dualistic theories 3. Idealistic theories. The Indian theories of Dehātmavāda, Prakṛti-Puruṣavāda and Vijñānavāda broadly correspond to these. The doctrine of Ātma occupies a central place in Indian philosophy. The study of the concept of Ātman is a major area of the study of the concept of mind.

Manas is material and atomic. It is also designated as Citta, Cetas, Hṛdaya etc. Its location and movement in the waking, dreaming and deep sleep states is discussed in detail. This will be noticed in the relevant contexts.

Antahkarana concept largely figures in Samkhya and Advaita systems. Buddhi, Ahamkāra and Manas are treated as its constituents in Sāmkhya, while Manas, Buddhi, Ahamkāra and Citta are considered as its functional names in Advaita assigned to Antahkarana itself in samkhya, the Puruṣa remaining only in the background. In advaita also these are the functions of Antahkarana but the Caitanya is very much present there.

In Indian tradition psychology was not developed as a separate branch of study till recently. However, good many observations are found in Upanisaṣaś detailing the volitional and
emotional functions of *Ātman* and *Manas*. The experiences of waking, dreaming and deep sleep state are analysed. In later systems also these are discussed as the qualities of *Ātman* and the transformations of *Manas* and *Antaḥkaraṇa*. Consciousness, no doubt is the chief characteristic of *Ātman* but bliss is also an equally important constituent. A *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ananda* constitute the essential characteristic of *Ātman* and *Brahman*. The self is not merely a conscious entity but it is also a blissful entity. Some times, *Kāma* is also stated to be a basic feature. While describing the nature of *Ātman* and *Manas*, volitional and emotional aspects are given as much importance as the coditional aspect.

Utmost importance is given to the consideration of knowledge in Indian philosophy. Different theories of truth and error are promulgated. Extreme views like there is no true knowledge at all, and all knowledge is true knowledge are held. Stages of knowledge like *Nirvikalpaka* - indistinct and *Savikalpaka*-distinct, *Vyavasāya* and *Anuvyavasāya*- knowledge and awareness are worked out. The nature of memory, recognition, doubt etc are discussed. A whole system of epistemology, envisaging different modes of cognition such as perception, inference, verbal testimony etc, is worked out. The problem whether the validity of knowledge is self-evident or needs verification is discussed in detail. Though
the theory of knowledge constitutes a different area by itself and epistemology also constitutes another major area of study, investigating the role of the Mind in these areas is certainly a part of the study of the concept of Mind.

Therefore, to the extent to which a reference to these is necessary to clarify the concept of Mind in the respective systems, such a reference will be made. Ontology, epistemology and psychology have a bearing on each other and therefore, while discussing one aspect, reference to the other aspects becomes necessary.

The concepts of Atman, Manas or Antahkaran and the cognitive and emotional functions of these, no doubt, constitute the major area of the study of the concept of Mind, but an equally important area is the relation between the Mind and the Body.

The questions that arise out of this problem are three.

1. Whether the Mind is only a function of the body or is there any separate or independent entity called Mind.

2. Whether Matter is only a projection of the Mind or is it a separate and an independent entity.

3. If the two are different, what is the relation between the
two. Which of them controls the other. These questions form the very core of the philosophy of Mind. This is raised both in the Western and Indian Philosophies. It is not possible to go into all the arguments, for and again in this respect. But the chief points have to be noted and critically examined.

Another special area of study, particularly, in Indian tradition of the philosophy of Mind is that of the Universal Mind and the Individual Mind. The Universal Mind is termed as Brahma, Paramātman, Īśvara, Paramapuruṣa etc., while the individual mind is Ātma, Jīva, Puruṣa etc. The Universal Mind is the central principle of the Universe. It is the ground of the whole universe. Its relation with the rest of the world is envisaged in three ways: 1. The rest of the world is a transformation of this Universal Mind. 2. Rest of the world is projected on it. 3. The Universal Mind is only an agent or efficient cause while the rest of the world is a transformation of a Primordial Matter. In some systems such a Universal Mind is altogether dispensed with. These systems do not accept Brahma or Īśvara or a Parama Puruṣa. It is interesting to note that even an orthodox system like Pūrvamāmaṣa does away with Īśvara. This problem of the Universal Mind and its relation with the rest of the world is also a major problem. It is a fundamental problem for systems like Vedānta.
The relation between the Universal Mind and the Individual Mind is also envisaged in three ways. 1. The Universal Mind itself gets bifurcated into Individual Minds. 2. The two are distinct but are very intimately connected. 3. The two are different, but the Individual Minds are entirely dependent upon the Universal Mind. Whatever is the way these are related, one thing is clear that both these consist of Sat, Cit and Ānanda. A Special point of the Indian concept of Mind is, it is not only a conscious being but it is also a blissful being. In fact, its dynamism is more due to its blissful nature and urge to find fullest expression for this aspect of its nature, rather than the mere fact of its being a conscious being. Upaniṣads particularly bring out this aspect of the Mind. This bliss should not be confused with the ordinary pleasure. This bliss is the very basic characteristic of the Mind.

The study of the Mind as a conscious entity takes our study beyond human beings also. Animals, birds and many other creatures are conscious beings. Some of these have thinking capacity and feelings also. We do find a mention of these aspects in our sacred literature and medical literature. Systems like Jaina system especially make a note of this in the context of their ethical teachings. Therefore, a brief reference to this aspect will also be made.
To gather the Indian thought on the above issues of the concept of Mind, it is proposed to collect observations from ten principal Upaniṣads and a few other upanisads that especially deal with the Mind. Sāṁkhya and Yoga Systems, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṁsā and the three school of Vedicānta, Jaina and Bauddha systems. A study covering such a vast area has to be naturally selective but not exhaustive. Therefore, the thoughts on the central issues of the concept of Mind will be especially gathered and critically analysed. For details, references will be provided. Our objective is to present the Indian thought of Mind with a Critical perspective so that modern scholars of psychology, social anthropology, mental health etc., may utilise it for their interdisciplinary study and have an idea of the Indian perspective of the Mind.

A Few studies on the concept of Mind in Indian tradition have already appeared. These are of two types:

1. Study of the concept of Mind purely from psychological point of view mostly deriving the material from Yogasutras and comparing the same with modern psychological approach.

2. Study of the concept of Mind from philosophical point of view giving a narration of the views of different systems.

In addition, there are books on specific topics like consciousness, bilas, Ātman, Yoga etc. These adopt a single point of
been a need to bring the philosophical aspect and specific issue in a wider perspective. It is also necessary to maintain academic norms in dealing with such subjects, without any commitment to this or that system, or a subjective approach. Keeping this in mind, an attempt is made in the foregoing chapters to present the Indian thought on the concept of Mind.