CHAPTER III

NATURE AND FUNCTION OF MIND IN INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY.

Earliest Knowledge:

It is in the early Upaniṣads that we get the illuminating note, uttered in a way that reveals the note as new. Deussen speaks of it thus, "It was here that for the first time the original thinkers of the Upaniṣads to their immortal honour found it when they recognised our Ātman, our inmost individual being, as the Brahman the inmost being of universal nature and of all her phenomena".¹ It is observed that man wills, feels and thinks. The seer of the Upaniṣad presupposes the identity of the knower and the known. That which is identical within becomes dual in outward expression. As regards the various expressions of inner identity it is said in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad, "Know thou the self as riding in chariot, the body as the chariot, know thou buddhi as the driver, manas as the reins, the senses, they say are the horses, objects of sense, where they range over; the self, combined (Yukta) with senses and with mind, Enjoyer has he been by wise men called."²

The way of explanation and description of various instruments of human knowledge is mainly symbolic. It is mainly by the help of analogy that the nature of self,
mind and buddhi are described. The outer objects are
given the names of inner capacities. So the sun, the
moon, river, ocean, lamp, various animals, liquids,
vegetables and the rest of material and living things
are given the names of inner abilities. To some critics
of the Upaniṣads the similes and metaphors may seem
common and childish. But if the time and the stage of
knowledge are taken into account the Upaniṣadic seers
have explained the problems quite satisfactorily. It may
be said and felt that religion, mysticism, metaphysics
and psychology were woven together in Upaniṣadic
literature and such a combination in the present state of
advancement of knowledge may create confusion. Such
criticism can be replied by maintaining that this type of
specialization of knowledge is of recent origin. The
ancient seers received visions and saw the truths of
things in an intuitive way. They expressed these truths
as they grasped them by mind directly, without any mediate
reasoning process. As regards analogical reasoning it is
said that "All description involves giving an account of
the thing described in terms of something else; and if
the thing in question is unique, such an account must
necessarily falsify it..... Life being unique, we can
speak of it only in terms of metaphors. Nor should this
necessarily cause disquietude, provided that we remember that metaphors are not to be mistaken for literal truth. All thinking must be by analogy; it consists of translating one thing into terms of something else, and depends, as Aristotle pointed out upon intuitive perception of similarity in dissimilars. It is by no accident that all the great thinkers have been masters of metaphors. 3

"People say, 'The mind was elsewhere; I did not hear - it is with the mind truly that one sees..... that one hears..... therefore even if one is touched on the back, he discerns it with mind". Such general observation regarding mind can be seen in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. Analytical treatment is not found adequately but a kind of synthesis was known to the Upaniṣadic seers.

We find in the Upaniṣads that the heart was regarded as the seat of the soul. "What we know as the space inside the heart, therein is this immortal golden being, namely mind. What we know as hanging like a nipple between the bones of the palate, through it, is the entrance to the Lord on the passage right up to the skull. The soul gains autonomy, joins the ruler of mind, becomes the lord of speech, the lord of sight, the lord of hearing,
the lord of knowledge, becomes (in short) the Brahman who bodies himself forth in space. 5 The passage tells us that the sense-centres as well as the intellect centre are to be referred to the brain, because it is said that the soul can obtain mastery over these only by moving to the brain from the heart; yet the actual path which has been indicated cannot be traced without difficulty. What is the meaning of the "Nipple-like" presentation? Is it pituitary? Deussen and Max Muller have both understood it to be the pituitary. Are we to suppose that the Upanishad-philosopher was so fortunate as to witness a skull dissected open and to observe that the pituitary body is situated just above the pair of bones of the hard palate and then to be able to suppose that the soul in the heart could travel along the course of the sympathetic nerves to the pituitary body, and through it move further to its overlord in the lateral ventricle, around which, is the grey matter and various special sense-centres are situated? The latter interpretation is not impossible; but one does not know whether the Upanishad-philosopher knew anatomy enough to trace the actual path, or was interested in occultism enough to see the path-eye. 6
The Maitrī Upaniṣad raises the question of the efficient cause and entitles the soul with the power of action. It tells us regarding certain seers in past who were called Vākubbliyas and who went to the Prajāpati Kratu and asked him as to whom was the driver of the chariot of the body: "The body, venerable Sir, is verily like an unmoving cart; may your honour be pleased to inform us if you know who is its mover'. And it is said in the Upaniṣad that answer which they elicited from the Prajāpati was that the mover of the body-chariot was the soul. "The pure, tranquil, imperishable, unborn entity who stands independently in his own greatness". It is said in the Kauśhitaki Upaniṣad that soul is to be the master of all bodily faculties, the master of all sense-activities. "As a razsor is placed in the razsor-case, or fire in the fire-hearth, similarly does this conscious self pervade the body upto the very hairs and nails. These senses depend upon the soul as the relatives upon the rich man, even so does this conscious self feed with the senses and the senses feed on the self". One can observe here that the word soul or self is used in different meanings. In some cases, it is mind, antahkarana, cetana or buddhi. Mrs. Rhys Davids refers to Jacobi's invaluable concordance and
mentions his account of various names frequently used in the principle Upaniṣads. Manas, citta, vijñāna, buddhi, cetas, cetanā are mental terms of very general import. Nevertheless only one is found used with this general import as very much preferred, both early and late. It is clear that in the phrase manas, mind, the ancient Upaniṣadic teachers found with its real meaning of "minding with purpose", the most suitable for the society with whom they had to live and work.

Soul which is eternal, beyond space and all-pervading has a mind as its instrument to feel and perceive the eternal objects of the world. In the Vājasneya Samhitā, one reads the entire discourse on the nature of mind. In the first verse of this collection, mind is characterised as something "which goes afar" which implies that it is not bodily sense but it is the soul. "May that mind of mine be of auspicious resolve.... which goes afar when I am awake, and which similarly comes back when I am asleep". It is not a physical sense organ for then it cannot be conceived as going out of the body. In the third verse of the same set one finds the threefold description of mental activities, vijnāna, intelligence, feeling and resolution. In the fifth and sixth verse mind
appears as an entirely and the epistemological subject. One finds a definite attempt to describe the nature of mind which is taken to be a principle of both the individual and social mind. That divine entity which goes to distant realms while making and while sleeping is the undying flame in the race. It is Prajñāna - knowledge and cetas, the principle of life and Dhāriti, the principle that holds on resolution. It is manas that is able to grasp past, present and future. The mind of particular man is superior to the collective or social mind for after all the social mind exists only through the individual mind.

The term mind is used very often in the sense of soul, and in some places its capacity as a psychical instrument is referred to. It is that which knows name and form, which is not equivalent to the body but something which includes the body. Every object is known because it has a form and a name. Form is known by mind, hence it is a mental thing. Name is expressed by speech. When a man knows these two things, he knows the whole universe. In the second chapter of the Aitareya Aranyaka we find a further advance in the psychological analysis and also a clear enunciation of an idealistic doctrine according to which all reality is mind dependent; in fact it is knowledge itself. A distinction is drawn between self as
the real knower and mind as simply a sense-organ. It is explained also how the self of man is more developed in respect of understanding and knowledge than that of other things.

We have now seen that the soul or self is the basis of real search. Self is referred specially as that which is inner, central to activities of mind. Mind is light; it has unique symphony and it has the highest speed in movement. Mind evolves into what can be called understanding. All our experience is psychological since what we receive by the senses has no meaning till it is translated into the terms of sense-mind. Mind, sometimes, is regarded as the sixth sense. It may be the only sense and that the others, vision, hearing, touch, smell, taste may become specializations of the sense-mind, which although it normally may use the sense-organs for the basis of its experience, yet exceed them and become capable of a direct experience proper to its own inherent action. Later on in the Upaniṣads mind and soul became separated and this suggestion was carried forward in the making of Darśanas. In what follows, I will consider the views of Darśanas regarding the nature and function of mind and how various commentators have attempted to tackle specific physiological and psychological problems.
Nyāya System:

In Nyāya system, Gautama establishes the existence of five sense-organs by the help of inference from five distinct functions. Vātsyāyana argues that there are five purposes (Prajoyana) of the senses; touching, seeing, smelling, testing and hearing; these five purposes require five distinct organs, viz. the tactual organ, the visual, the olfactory, the gustatory and the auditory organ. Touch is apprehended by the tactual organs; but it does not apprehend colour. So we infer the existence of the visual organ which serves the purpose of apprehending colour. We move on to the other senses and lastly we infer the existence of auditory organ which serves the purpose of apprehending sound. The function of one sense organ cannot be performed by another. So the existence of five sense-organs is inferred from five kinds of sense-activities. The diversity of sense-organs is proved by diversity of their locations. Things with distinct locations are always found to be distinct as in the case of jars. If the whole body were the seat of all the sense-organs, then deafness, blindness and the like would be impossible. It is shown that the five sense-organs involve different processes (Gati). The visual organ, which is of the nature of light, issues out of the pupil and moves out to the objects.
ended with colour. The tactual organ and others come into contact with their objects resting in their own sites. They do not move out to their objects like the visual organ. The auditory organ also does not move out to its object. Sound travels from its place of origin to the auditory organ in a series of waves. This shows that the sense-organs are Prāpyakāri; they apprehend their objects by coming into direct contact with them; The five sense-organs have different magnitudes. The auditory organ is nothing but akasa which is all pervading; still it cannot apprehend all sounds because its scope is restricted by the disabilities of the substratum in which it subsists. The all pervading akasa located in the ear- hole owing to the adṛṣṭa of a person assumes the role of auditory organ, and produced the perception of sound through it. The five sense-organs have their origin (Jāti) in five material elements. The objectory organ is made up of earth and apprehends smell which is its characteristic quality. The Gustatory organ is made up of water and apprehends taste which is its characteristic quality. There is community of nature between the sense organs and their objects. A sense organ apprehends the distinctive quality of that substance which enters into its constitution. The Vaiśeṣika also agrees with this view.
Mind as sense organ:

Gautama does not distinctly mention anywhere that the mind (Manas) is a sense-organ. But Vatsyayana points out that Gautama's definition of perception, as a non-erroneous cognition produced by the intercourse of the sense-organs with their objects, implies that mind is a sense-organ. Vatsyayana includes the mind in the sense-organs and points out its distinction from the external senses. Viśvanāth regards the mind as a sense-organ. He argues that the perception of pleasure must be produced through an instrument just as the visual perception of a colour is produced through the instrument of the eyes; and this instrument is the mind (Manas) which is the sense-organ. Prāastapāda describes the mind as the internal organ (Antaḥkaraṇa). He argues that pleasure and pain are not perceived through the external senses; but that they must be perceived through an instrument and that is the mind. Śaṅkara also gives the same argument.

According to Vaiśeṣika manas is one of the man 'dravyas' or substances. In the philosophy of Vaiśeṣikas dravya is one of the categories or padārthas. A substance is that which has qualities. Atman or soul is a substance and it is in nature spiritual. It has intelligence as a
quality. Similarly manas is one of the nine substances. It is shown in the system that mind cannot be identified with soul and secondly that mind is the internal organ serving as the instrument of knowledge for the soul. Both Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems hold that manas is different from Ātman.

Kaṇāda, before describing what manas is and how it functions, gives us reasons which are supposed to prove the existence of manas. Both Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika rely on the important factor of concentration in the proof provided for the existence of mind. The dependence of intellectual activities, whether they are perceptual or conceptual, on attention is stressed and from this the instrument of intellection is inferred. The Vaiśeṣikas have been led to acknowledge the existence of mind, because of the evidence that though the sense-organs are functioning, still the self does not get any knowledge of the object. Mind must be in contact with the object through the medium of the sense-organ on the one hand, and with the self or the Ātman on the other hand. It may happen that the sense-organs come into contact with the object and mind with the soul; still if there is no contact between manas and the sense-organs, no knowledge can be produced. This is why although the objects are before us we do not see them; though sounds are there, we do not hear them, i.e. get their meaning and
implication. Mind is absorbed at some other place and that object on which mind is concentrating or attending, that is the only object cognized by the soul.

Śrīdhara says in his Nyāya Kāndali, "The contact of the objects, the sense-organ and the soul, depend upon some other cause in the bringing about the due effect, because even when the former contacts exist, the necessary effect does not appear ...... and this instrumentality upon which they depend is that of mind". It may be objected against this and said that this is not true, since we find that man is capable of attending to more things than one at a time. Both the Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas object that the feeling of simultaneity is owing to the rapidity of transition of internal sense. The Nyāya Sūtra says, "The non-simultaneity of cognition is the indicative of mind". Vātsyāyana in his bhasya says that non-simultaneity here means the non-simultaneity of the cognitions of several things through several sense-organs.

The next sutra raises the objection that in practice this does not happen and that we do experience simultaneity of cognitions. The Bhasya cites the following example: "When
the pupil perceives his teacher going in the forest he has the following notion, "This teacher reads- walks- holds the water pot- looks at the path- hears the sounds proceeding from the forest- becomes frightened- keeps on the lookout for signs of serpents or tigers- remembers the place of destination. The next sutra gives the counter argument.

"This perception is like the perception of fire-circle and is due to the rapidity of motion. The illusory experience of simultaneity is caused by the rapidity of succession. Therefore mind is essential for perceptual knowledge and it must exist. It is proved by this that there must be one mind only for a particular body, for otherwise, simultaneity of cognitions would be possible.

It is said in the Nyaya Bhasya that "If there were several minds it would be possible for several sense-organs to be in contact with several minds. It would be possible for several sense-organs to be in contact with several minds simultaneously, whereby there should be several cognitions appearing (through these contacts) at one and the same time... but this never happens, therefore there is a single mind (in one body). The corresponding Vaiśeṣika Sūtra goes a step further and
says, not only non-simultaneity of cognitions, but also that of volitions is indicative of the fact that mind is one for one body. The efforts of one man appear one after the other. When there is effort in one direction, he does not put forth effort in any other direction. These activities show the singleness of mind. "Just as we pass a pin through several pages of a note-book we feel it is done at once and simultaneous, we experience that mind attends to many objects at the same time. But this is an illusion created by the speedy shifting of the mind. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika thinkers do not admit the possibility of a mixed mode of consciousness. Every psychosis is simple. There cannot be a psychic compound of simultaneous psychosis owing to the atomic nature of mind. The Vaiśeṣikas maintain that moving and supporting one's own body is the result of innumerable single efforts.

Self and mind cannot possess the same characteristics. If self is all-pervading mind cannot be so. The Vaiśeṣika Sūtra holds that all-pervading nature of self and ākāśa is not present in mind. It is maintained in the Praśastapāda Bhasya that 'All knowledge arises because the contact
between the soul and the object through mind is the "non-inherent cause of cognition". If mind were all-pervading like Ātman there would be simultaneous cognition of all objects, which it is said, not the case. Mind is proved to be atomic by Vaiśeṣika thinkers.

**Limitations of Nyāya View:**

Mind is believed to be substance which has qualities of coming into contact with external objects. So it has disjunction and conjunction as its qualities. The relation of Saṃyoga subsists between the mind and external objects. Praśastapāda says that consciousness cannot be a property of the body, sense-organs and the manas. There is some entity beyond mind which possesses the quality of consciousness. Śrīdhara maintains that "mind cannot be touched. It is like the self which cannot be touched, though material like the body". Since mind is related to other objects which are external to it by the relation of Saṃyoga it produces cognitions of all objects. Though the contact between the self and the mind is external in some sense it may be said to be renewed with each new mental act. The Nyāya System takes for granted the
naturalistic relation between the self and the object.

"The outward object is conceived as making an impression on the self, even as a seal does on the wax. The Nyāya theory of perception does not solve the central problem of physiological psychology as to how the stimulus of an external object on the sense-organ which is resolved into a form of mechanical contact becomes transformed into a psychical state".23

Mind is unconscious:

If mind is material then it follows that it has no consciousness. The Bhāṣya on Vaiṣeṣika Sutra (3, II, 22) says, "It must be regarded as unconscious; as otherwise the whole body would be the common ground (of all experiences and sensations)". Śridhara says in his Nyāyakāṇḍli that "Mind is not conscious, because it is an instrument of consciousness like a jar. It is self which makes use of the mind for cognitive purposes. Mind is only an instrument. In the Nyāya Sūtra it is said that "Mind if it is like the soul, can claim consciousness but it cannot do so because all substances, sense-organs and mind function only when they are impelled to activity by something else. If these by themselves were intelligent, no external impelling agency is required. This is
indicated by the fact that our bodies and minds are always controlled by something other than themselves.°

**Jaina Parsana:**

According to the Jaina system, there are five sense-organs: tactual, gustatory, olfactory, visual and auditory, having for their characteristic the capacity of perceiving touch, taste, odour, colour and sound respectively. Each of these again is of two kinds: Physical and Psychical. They are called "dravya indriyas" and "bhāva indriyas". The physical senses are caused by the rise of the corresponding physique-making karma. The psychical senses are caused by the "Destruction-cum-subsistence" (Kṣhyopāśama) of knowledge-obscuring karmas.

What is meant by the term 'destruction-cum-subsistence'? The Jain philosophers recognize five different states of the soul. "The first of them is its essential state. This is the state in which the soul possesses the characteristics belonging to it by its very nature which can never be changed through the manifestation of karma. The soul, for instance, can never become unconscious. The second state is the result of the manifestation of karma.
All accidental qualities of the soul that are produced through the rise of karma belong to this state. The third state is produced by the suppression of karma (auspaśamika bhāva). All states of the soul arising through the subsistence of karma come under this category. The state resulting from the destruction of karma is the fourth one (Kṣṣṇāyika karma). This is the consequence of the total annihilation of a particular type of karma. The fifth state is a mixed form of the second, third and fourth states. In it the process of the destruction-cum-subsistence of a particular kind of karma occurs. The completely obscuring (Sarva-ghātin) karmic particles that are manifesting themselves are annihilated, those existing in potentia are suppressed, and the partially obscuring (Deśa-ghātin) ones are continued to manifest in this state.

Mind as internal sense-organ:

Jaina thinkers did not merely assume the existence of mind without any evidence. They found the evidence in the experiences of the world. They gave the empirical proof for the operation of mind. The contact of the sense-organ with the soul alone does not give cognition in the relevant experiences, because there is the absence of 'Manas'. Something else is necessary for the occurrence of cognition, and that is the mind.
Abhīdāmarājendra maintains that the word 'Manas' has a functional significance, because it describes the function of the mind like thinking, imagining and expecting. From this functional significance of mind its structure is inferred. Upaniṣadic philosophers supposed that mind for its formation depends on 'Alimentation'. It is supposed that mind for its formation is being manufactured out of the food that we take. Food takes three different forms: the heaviest becomes excrement, the medium quality becomes flesh, and the subtlest part becomes mind just as the churning of curds give the subtlest which is butter. In the Jaina system the analysis of mind is done in a similar way. The karmas which spring from the lower phase of the human body give rise to the modes of life and consequently the dispositions of mind. Jaina thinkers believe that mind is an internal sense-organ. Pujiyapāda writes in his commentary Sarvāthā Siddha on the Tattvārth- sutra that mind is the internal sense-organ. It is called 'anindriya' since it does not occupy a particular site in the body nor does it last for a long period, whereas the sense-organs have their seats in the different parts of the body and last for a long time. The mind, therefore, not a sense-organ in the ordinary
sense, but it enjoys unique status since it cognizes internal activities. The same opinion we come across in the Tattvārtha bhasya. Vidyāranya argues that the mind is not a sense-organ because it is different from the sense-organs. The sense-organs prehend specific objects. One sense-organ cannot prehend the object of another. Such is not the case with the mind. It can cognise all objects of all senses. So it cannot be regarded as a sense-organ. Mind is an important instrument that helps the self in cognizing internal states like pleasure, pain, etc. Hemacandra given the definition of mind as follows: "Mind is the organ of cognition of all objects of all the senses." All objects of all the senses and not specifically determined such as touch is of the tactual sense, are cognized by the mind. So it is called the organ of cognition of all objects. The phrase 'The organ of cognition' has been inserted in order to emphasize the instrumental character of the mind.

Physical and Psychical Mind:

The mind is of two types, according as it differs as physical and psychical. "The physical mind is nothing but the material atoms transformed into the form of mind". T
The Jaina philosophers conceive an indefinite number of groups (Varganās) of material atoms. "The psychic-mind is in the shape of attainment consisting in the "destruction-cum-subsistence" of the relevant obscuring karma and in the form of conscious activity of the self apt to cognize its object". Thus the states of mind in the Jaina system are just like that of the other senses, the only dissimilarity being that of other senses are external and have specific objects for their cognition, whereas the mind is internal and has no special object for its cognition. It cognizes all objects of all the senses, and thus, serves as an organ. The internal activities, e.g. pleasure, pain, recognition, love, aversion, etc., are performed by the mind. All these activities are rooted in sense-perception. All the various states of mind are based on the sensory cognition and hence, the fact that mind is the organ of cognition of all objects of the senses is vindicated, whatever is the object of sensory perception is also the object of mental cognition.

According to the Janas, with the solitary exception of the visual sense-organ all the senses grasp their objects
when they come into direct contact with them. The visual sense perceives the object at a distance without coming into direct contact with it. The Jainas do not hold that the senses go out to their objects in the form of modifications (Vṛttis) to assume their form, and cognize them, but in their opinion the objects themselves come in contact with the senses, whereas the senses remain in the state as they are situated in their sites.

"Ancient Philosophers could not free themselves from the animistic ideas in spite of the fact that they had advanced in the direction of conceiving the immaterial as distinct from the material. The Jaina view expresses the naturalistic approach to the analysis of mental states.... The Jainas were trying to see the problem from a more analytic and empirical point of view".  

"Mahāvīra points out to Gaṇadhara that it is not correct to maintain consciousness is produced by the collection of the bhutas, material elements like earth and water, as intoxication is produced by the mixture of the ghataki flower and jaggery, although it is not found in their constituents separately. On the contrary, cetana is the quality of the soul. It is different from the bodily aspect." In this we find the refutation of the
Lokāyata view. Every jīva is a composite of body and souls of which the soul is the active partner, whereas the body is the inactive passive one. Jainism avoids the limitations of both mentalism and materialism by recognizing the correlativity of mind and matter. It is to be seen, however, that the distinction of 'self' and 'not-self' is the outcome of the essential character of mind. Dr. Radhakrishnan remarks that 'It accepts the two substance theory in all its nakedness, looking upon knowledge as something apart, a process taking place between them.... To the question as to why the Jīva should suffer the fruits of karma if the two are independent, a sort of pre-established harmony is suggested'.

Buddha parāsana and the Nature of Mind:

According to Buddhism individuality is an unstable state of being which is ever growing. "Buddha in his early attempts to seek enlightenment had tried the path of mental concentration and physical austerities recommended to him by the Śrāmaṇaś and the Ājīvikas." He got better power for introspection than his teachers and he saw what he consequently established as principle that if there is anything abiding in existence. It should be the body and
not ape-like consciousness or mind. There can be no individuality without putting together; there can be no putting together, no connection without a becoming; there can be no becoming without becoming different; and there can be no becoming different without a dissolution, a passing away which sooner or later will be inevitably complete.

Buddhism recognises six types of consciousness and corresponding varieties of six bases (āśryas). The organs of vision, audition, smelling, tasting, touch and consciousness itself; and there are six objects (viṣayās): colours, sounds, smells, tastes, touches and ideas. There are six senses including the mind. The mind is the faculty of intellect that cognizes non-sensory objects. It is immaterial and invisible. Excluding the mind, there are five sense-organs that are called eye, ear, nose, tongue and skin. They are composed of a kind of a translucent and subtle matter. They are divided into classes: Prāyakāri and aprāpyakāri. The organs of smell, taste and touch prehend their objects when they come in direct contact with their objects. The organs of vision and audition prehend their objects without entering into direct contact.
We come across a way of speaking which clearly refers to mind as man's instrument. "Two conditions are needed for release of mind: withdrawing work of mind from what appeals to sense, and fixing it on the opposite". 39

There is another passage. "All things are rooted in desire, have their origin in work of mind; mental contact gives rise to them; their confluence is feeling; their chief state is concentration; mindfulness is their dominant influence; wisdom is their beyond; and of all things release is the core". 40

Mrs. Rhys Davids says that "In deciding anything about so delicate and elastic a matter as the range of any word for man's inner immaterial world, no hard and fast line can be drawn but we may say with some confidence, that in "mano" unaccompanied by prefixes of sentiment, we have the mind as active, literally, "measuring", "judging" and "valuing". In citta, it is more usual to see the man as impressed, affected with reaction thereto as implicit". 41

In other place, it is said "Mind-ways, not necessarily introspective, find frequent expression in the complementary terms vitakka and vicāra. The former is usual word in the
Suttas for active work of mind as turned out to an object, for restless discursive intellection, without the prefix, it meant argument, dialectic, logic. And Takka, we find, depreciated when compared with the darsana, or vision— we might call it intuition— not won through intellect. 

It is further said, "The point here submitted is that the vogue, in the early centuries of Buddhism, of preoccupation with analysis of mind, resulted in an interesting, unmistakable increment in the terms for "mind ways" or "mindings". These two last terms are fitter than 'mind'— a dangerous word as tending to be conceived a substance more than as process; as an 'is' rather than a 'becoming'; and to be used as a dummy-man. Every one of the mind-terms cited is process or way rather than state."

Later development of Buddhist system:

As time passed, the teaching took different radical forms. Nāgasena and Buddhaghosa made diverse interpretations of the agnosticism held by Buddha. "Phenomenalistic doctrines which remind us of Hume are developed with great skill and brilliance. Buddha makes psychology the fundamental discipline from and through which metaphysical problems are to be approached. Our attention according to him should shift from the absolute mind of metaphysical speculation to the human mind of psychological observation. Human consciousness apparently
is the playground of his being and vanishing ideas. The soul was totally rejected by later thinkers in the Buddhist system. Ideas were regarded as feeling states and there was no substrative in which they could subsist. The internal instrument was regarded as fluctuating with the changing qualities of external world with which it comes into contact. Subject and object were both meant to be changing.

As to the distinction between the outer and the inner, the objective and the subjective, the following passage is pertinent. "Which are the states, which are ajjhata (personal, subjective, internal)? Those states which for this or that being, related to the self, to the individual, to one's own, are referred to the person.... Which are the states that are bahiddha (non-personal, objective and external)?" All are dhammas or mental presentations, whatever is the immediate object of perception, thought or understanding. The individuality of man consisting of both rupa and nama, body and mind, is said to be congeries of mental states. In book I of Dharma Sangini those mental states or Dhammas which reveal the nature of mind ornama, the states of internal sense, are
discussed. In book II, the states revealing the rupa or the outer world, the products of external sense are given. Dharma is a comprehensive term including the objects of external and internal senses.

Nama, the mental, includes citta, emotion, vijñāna or consciousness and manas or mind. A division is made of nāma into the five skandhas which are (1) Rūpa, material attributes; (2) Vedana, feeling; (3) Saṃjña, perception; (4) Saṃskāras or mental dispositions; (5) Vijnāna or consciousness. They have got different subgroupings as affectional, volitional and intellectual. It has got member of accompanying karaṇas or efficient.

The distinction between body and mind, the physical and psychical aspects of the individual is broadly recognised. In the psycho-physical organism, the part that is relatively stable is the body, or rūpakāya, and the unstable one is the mind. On the mental side we have perception, conception, feeling or affection and conation or will. Saṃjña, vedana and vijñāna are used for these functionings. Saṃjña is the recognition of the general relations as well as the perception of all kinds, sensus and mental. Vedana is affectional reaction. It is
experience in which these are qualities of pleasant, painful and neutral resulting from contact with objects of sense, and itself producing 'tanhā', craving or desire. The series of cognitions called cittasamitana goes on uninterruptedly through the successive existences. The object of consciousness may be either an object of sense or of thought. 

Avijja and Consciousness:

A question can be raised that if self is purely dynamic, how is it that one feels so much bound down by the material things about us? The reply is that the source of all bondage is Tanhā springing up from the common root of all existence, the Avijja. Once the Avijja be there, the objective contact in the dynamic series comes up, and the twelve constituents in chain of causality appear as different stages leading on from birth to death and death to birth. The doctrine of patichccha-sampāda gives us the series of causes and effects developing under the influence of avijja in twelve stages. (1) Avijja (2) Sañkhāra (3) Patisandī-vinnāna (4) Nāma Rupa (5) Salāyatana (6) Phassa (7) Vedana (8) Tanhā (9) Upādāna (10) Kamma bhāva (11) Jāti (12) Jara Marapa.

The chain of these causes does not give us the relation between the different states of consciousness any more
than the cause of it. If consciousness be regarded as a result of contact between sense and object due to Avijja, it ought to cease with the removal of avijja. The objective bias of Buddhism breaks down here. For it is held that even if avijja were to be uprooted, the current of consciousness would flow on in the same dynamic manner. In Buddhism it is the bhāvapūtaka of the Hinayāna and the Ālaya-vijñāna of the Mahāyāna that keep on flowing in its pure state during the life of Jīvan Mukta or at the same time of an Arhat's death. 50

Sāṃkhya Darśana:

The Sāṃkhya recognizes eleven senses: five organs of knowledge, five organs of action and mind as the internal organ. 51 The Sāṃkhya Kārikā sometimes mentions eleven senses and sometimes thirteen. 52 Adding intellect and ego to the above list it becomes thirteen. Sāṃkhya thus recognizes two varieties of senses: external and internal. It, again, divides the external senses into two classes: sensory organs i.e. the organs of knowledge and motor organs, i.e. the organs of action. The visual, the auditory, the olfactory, the gustatory and the tactual organs are of knowledge. The vocal,prehensile, the locomotive, the respiratory and the generative organs are of action. By sensory organ the Sāṃkhya means the determinate
Sensory psycho-physical impulses which react to the objects perceived. In the language of modern psychology the sensory organs are the receptors, whereas the motor organs are the effectors. These organs are not the products of gross matter but of the ego which may be called psychophysical. The function of the internal sense-organ, i.e., mind is reflection or discrimination. It carefully reflects upon the objects intuitively apprehended by a sense-organ, and determines it like and unlike this, discriminates it by relating the object to its properties in the subject predicate relation. Vijnānabhaṅkus holds that the intellect (buddhi) and the ego are the subtle sense-organs. The Sāṅkhya maintains that the sense-organs move out to their objects in the form of modifications (vṛtti), take in their forms, and prehend them. They cannot grasp their objects without being related to them. If the sense-organs cognise their objects without being related to them, then they may cognise all objects, distant and hidden. But this is not a fact. Therefore, the sense-organs must be conceived as moving out to their objects and assuming their forms without having connection with the body. This process is possible only by means of a peculiar modification of the senses.
The Vaiśeṣika system has its ontology which is realistic. For epistemology it has to depend upon Nyāya system. So also yoga Darśana depends for its only on Sāṁkhya system. Sāṁkhya and Yoga are as a pair of interdependent thoughts. The puruṣa or the self that is bound by prakṛti must find its release and the process of release is stated by Yoga.

According to Sāṁkhya there are three fundamental characteristics which are seen in everything that is experienced. They are Sattva (intelligence stuff), rajas (energy) and Tamas (mass and inertia). The Guṇas take three different courses of development from Ahaṁkāra according to which the latter is said to be Sāttvika, rājas or tāmasa. From ahaṁkāra in its Sattva aspect (Vajkarīka) are derived the mind and the five organs of perception and the five of action; and from the same in its Tamas aspect (bhūtādi) the five fine and gross elements. The Rajasa aspect (Taijaśa) plays its part in both and is present in the results. Vijñānabhiṣkṣu holds that the Sāttvika ahaṁkāra gives rise to manas, the rajasa gives rise to the ten organs and the tāmasa to the five Tanmātras.
Mrs. Rhys Davids mentions the parallel as found by Deussen between Maitri Upanisad and Sāmkhya Kārikā, and refers to some points regarding which common ground is seen (1) standing aside as spectator well placed (2) binds self by self (3) for their own ends, depending on specific ends (4) begins with intellect, ends with the elements or extends to the subtle body. (5) the subtle body without support (or subject or attachment). 57

From the Tanmātras or the five fine elements by a preponderance of tāmas, the five gross elements arise. In all these developments, though one of the gunas may be predominant, the others are also present, perform their functions and help indirectly the evolution of products.

Mind is the organ which has an important function of synthesising the sense-data into percepts, suggesting alternative courses of action and carrying out the restrictions of the will through the organs of action. As in the case of the intellect and the self-sense, so also in the case of mind no distinction is made between the organ and its function. Mind is said to be the door-keeper, and the senses are regarded as the doors. 58
Buddhi, ahaṅkāra and manas are not always carefully distinguished. They are taken as the inner instrument (antaḥkaraṇa). This inner instrument is one and one only according to the threefold distinction of mere states. As in the case of the seed, the sprout and the huge tree, etc., it falls under the relation of effect and cause.

Vijñānabhikṣu quotes a verse from vāya purāṇa to this effect. The co-operation is necessary for both perception and action. Mind assumes manifold forms in connection with different senses. Mind is not all-pervading since it is an instrument since it is an instrument possessing movement and action; and it is connected with the senses.

The Sāmkhya thinkers are Satkāryavādins and hold that the effect is already in the cause. Wisdom cannot belong to Puruṣa who is pure consciousness, therefore, it must belong to mahat which is the first evolute of Prakṛti. From this mahat is created ahaṅkāra translated both as ego and self-consciousness. Psychologically the sense of selfhood is impossible with a non-ego or an
object. But the development of the objective comes after the rise of ahaṁkāra in the Sāmkhya theory of evolution. We have to admit the possibility of cosmic ahaṁkāra out of which individual subjects and objects arise.

Ahaṁkāra is conceived as mental while Buddhi is more cognitive in function. Ahaṁkāra seems to be more practical. Psychologically, the function of ahaṁkāra is self-love. Agency belongs to it and not to the purusa or self.65 We infer the existence of ahaṁkāra from its effects.66 The puruṣa identifies itself with the acts of Prakṛti through ahaṁkāra. It passes to the self the sensations and suggestions of action communicated to it through mind. It thus helps in the formation of concepts and decisions.

Naiyāyika holds that the work of one sense-organ cannot be done by another sense-organ, it is contended that indriyas are only five organs of cognition. But in the case of karmendriyas the function can be translated by another motor-organ. "A person who is blind can never perceive colour, whereas a lame man can walk with the help of aids."67 The Sāmkhya thinker rejects the belief held by the Naiyāyika that the indriyas are generated from the elements and that they are eternal.
The Sāṃkhya holds with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika that the visual organ moves out to its object. But it does not hold like it that the visual organ is made up of light though it has the power of gliding, since the phenomenon of movement of the visual organ can be explained by its Vṛtti or function. Aniruddha says that the fact that the visual organ moves out to distant objects like light, and manifests them, leads to the misconception that it is made up of light. But in reality the visual organ is related to its objects through its Vṛtti or function. Vijnānabhikṣu says that the visual organ, though not made up of light, shoots out to distant objects like the sun by means of its particular modification called Vṛtti without altogether leaving the body, even as the vital air (Prāṇa) moves out from the tip of the nose up to a certain distance by means of its particular modification called vitalizing without altogether leaving the body.

It is said that the senses must be something other than their gross physical counterparts. To the statement that senses, are nothing but their physical counterparts, it is replied that it is a mistake to identify the two. Aniruddha’s commentary strengthens this argument. If the
senses were to be identified with their sites, then a man whose ears are cut should be deaf, and a man who has cataract should be able to see colours. But both are known to be impossible from experience.\textsuperscript{71}

Still another objection is raised by the Pūrva-pakṣins, viz., that the opinion of the Sāṃkhya thinkers that there is only one self-consciousness which because of diversity of powers does the various functions.\textsuperscript{72} This is self-contradictory. Because if a difference in power is held, then the singleness of the self-consciousness does not hold good. It is again asked, is it not illogical to assume that the various kinds of organs arise out of one single ahaṃkāra?\textsuperscript{73} It is replied that mind is single leading sense-organ and the other ten are kinds of power of this mind.\textsuperscript{74} Experience informs us that all sense-organs function as modification of egoity.

It is said in the Sāṃkhya Sūtras that mind is dual in nature. It is the eleventh indriya. The five organs of sense and five organs of action are evolutes of ahaṃkāra when sattva and tamas become predominant. Rajaḥ is the common factor for both. The peculiarity of mind is
that among the organs of cognition, it is an organ of cognition, for it perceives the senses of pleasure and pain and among the organs of action, it is an organ of action, for it acts like other organs of action as the cause of knowledge. Vījñānabhaṅku is of the opinion that manas alone is of the pure Sāttvika form, whereas the other ten sense-organs are due to the predominance of tāmas. Mind connects sensations perceived by organs of sense into concepts. It is the act of identification on the part of mind with the organs of knowledge and those of action. Amiruddha says that "without the superintendence of mind, the senses do not function and so do the organs of action".75

When the sense-organ has an immediate apprehension of the object the mind reflects upon it, breaks up its object and its component factors, viz., the substance and its adjuncts its "Thatness" and "whatness" and thus assimilates it to similar objects and discriminate it from separate objects. Īśvarakṛṣṇa defines the function of mind as reflection or discrimination.76 Vācaspati Miśra explains it thus "The mind carefully reflects upon the object intuitively apprehended by a sense-organ and determines it as relating the object to its properties in
the subject predicate relation. The first apprehension is simple and immediate; it is produced by the mere thing; but when after this, the thing as distinguished from its properties, by its genus and the like, is recognised, that process of determination is the operation of the mind. Vijñānabhiṣkṛta also describes the function of the mind as determination or ascertainment. Gauḍapāda's commentary on this kārīkā holds that the mind is that which "intends" the "function" of both the organs of sense and action. Mind reflects on what is given by various organs and transmits a definite opinion to the soul through individuation and intellect. Intellect is the highest organ which is responsible for total knowledge to the Puruṣa (self).

The relation of external organs to the internal organs has been well described by calling the former the gateways or doors of knowledge and latter the gatekeepers. The external organs receive immediate impressions from external objects and communicate them to the internal organ (antahkāraṇa) which in its different functions of reflection (manana), self-appreciation (abhimāna) and determination (adhyavasāya), makes them definite and determinate, and receives them for the enjoyment of the self.
The external sense-organs come in contact with external objects and thereby supply us with the "manifold of intuitions" in the language of Kant. The function of the particular senses is simple apprehension. What they apprehend is mere manifold, a congeries of discrete impressions, though each apprehends only a manifold of a particular kind. The mind operates on this "manifold of intuitions and synthesizes the congeries of discrete impressions into groups. Until the discrete sensations given by sensibility (or the external senses) are formed into groups, there can be no perception of them as things. It is the function of mind (manas) to form these groups and thereby to transform a certain number of sensations into one distinct percept. The fluctuating sensations are referred to the unity of the empirical ego, when the consciousness supervenes that the sensations are 'mine', that I perceive it. It is the function of the intellect to define and ascertain objects by recognizing a certain type. And it is the intellect which imports the empirical relations of space and time which are categories of the understanding. According to the Sāṃkhya synthesis proceeds from internal instrument as mind, empirical ego and intellect. According to Kant, space and time are the
A Priori forms of intuition. Knowledge is the joint product of sensibility and understanding. Sāṃkhya thinkers, however, do not oppose sensibility and understanding to each other; sensibility, mind, self-appreciation and intelligence all are channels of perception; all these are opposed to the self or Puruṣa which alone is consciousness-sensibility, mind, ego and the intellect being but insentient evolutes of prakṛti for the enjoyment of the self. It follows from this elaboration that mind is part of the unconscious principle and belongs to the physical order of existence. It stands in direct opposition to the Puruṣa which is pure consciousness.

Jaimini's system:

Jaimini who is the propounder of Pūrva Mimāṃsā defines perception as the cognition produced in soul by the contact of sense-organs with objects and it is said that it cannot apprehend Moral law which is super-sensuous. Gautama also defines it in the same manner. Unlike Gautama Jaimini's definition does not indicate different kinds of perception as indeterminate and determinate. It does not lay down the condition of valid perception. The
Mimāṃsaka recognizes two kinds of sense-organs: external and internal. The olfactory, gustatory, the visual, the tactual and the auditory are of the first kind. Of these the first four are made up of earth, water, light and air respectively. The auditory organ is of the nature of space (Dīk) confined within the ear-hole. The mind is the only sense-organ. It is atomic in nature since there is no possibility of simultaneous cognitions. "In the perception of external objects it acts jointly with the external sense-organs. It depends upon a particular mark (liṅga) in producing inferential cognition. In bringing about recollection it has to depend upon the subliminal impressions." 80

Nature and Function of Mind in Advaita Vedānta:

In Śaṅkara Vedānta one universal, eternal, ubiquitous, infinite and permanent light of consciousness is named as Brahman. The eternal consciousness is manifested in three ways. It is manifested by various objects and called object-consciousness (viṣaya caitanya). It is brought as instrumentation by mental modes and called cognitive-consciousness (Pramāṇa-caitanya). When it is modified by mind it is named cognizing consciousness (Pramāṇa-caitanya). There is one cosmic consciousness
consciousness which is determined by mind or internal organ (antākṣaraṇa), its activities or mental modifications (antākṣaraṇa vr̥tti) and the object cognized (viśaya). They are determinants of the universal illumination of consciousness.\(^{81}\)

All activity assumes the self-sense and so far as we are aware, it is of the form of pain and motivated by desire.\(^{82}\) Activity and enjoyment are dependent on a dualistic vision, which is not the highest truth.\(^{83}\) There can be no agency without the limitation of the atman by a body and every limitation is unreal.\(^{84}\)

The epistemology of Vedanta is inextricably related to its ontology. Vedantic view of mind bears a close correspondence to its metaphysical outlook.\(^{85}\) The author of Maṇḍukya Kārīka, Gaṇḍapāda, says that Iśvara is Brahma the ultimate Reality, seen through the veil of Maṇḍā and hence he is believed to be the creator of the world of multiplicity. If the Universal Jīva alone is real and everything else is illusory, a question is raised who creates this world of variety. It is replied that actually the world is not created. The whole expressed and
unexpressed world of things and ideas is the imagination (Kalpaṇā) of the mind of the cosmic self. The process of creation if at all there is one is explained in this way. During destruction, all the things and ideas are destroyed. They remain as potencies in the mind of Isvara and during creation, these again take form and shape, born out of the residual knowledge and vasanas and are limited by them. The individual jīva is also created; he is a product of imagination and competent to effect further imagination. When the fire stick is moved speedily, the illusion of circularity is created; it is meant for the spectator but not for the person who moves it. In like manner the illusion of multiplicity of the world is created. Person who is ignorant takes the illusion of variety to be real.

The bodily self, the vital self, the mental self, the intellectual self, and the blissful self are the gradations of the individual jīva. They are called sheaths of the individual jīva in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad. The bodily self is the gross self constituted of the sense-organs. Behind the gross indriya is lying the subtle indriya which is more enduring and powerful. The gradations
reveal to us the subtle nature of the self which progresses from bodily plane to the highest plane of bliss where the identity with the cosmic and the Universal existence is sought.

Vedānta has the knowledge of the universe through knowledge of the self. It is really upon a self-awareness present to our conception that the knowledge of the contents of our self is based. If we can extend our faculty of mental self-awareness to awareness of the self, we may become possessors in experience of the truths which form the contents of the universe.

The waking self comes into contact with the external world in nineteen ways. There are five organs of perception: sight, sound, touch, smell and taste, the five organs of action, the five vital breaths, the mind, intellect, mind stuff (chitta) and egoity. The waking self which so comes into contact with the external world has its cosmic counterpart which is called the Vaiśvānara self.

Question arises as to how mind perceives the external objects. It is replied that the translucent antahkarana which is of the nature of light (Taijasa) moves out to the object through the channel of the sense-organs and is
modified into its form. This modification of the internal
organ into the form of the object cognized is called Vyrtti.
Vyrtti is the mental mode which apprehends the object.91
Out-going of the apprehension of mental mode to the object
is involved in perception only. In inference and other
kinds of cognition the mental mode does not go out to
the object. But in the case of the perception of a jar,
the mental mode which apprehends the jar goes out to the
jar is modified into its form, and occupies the same
position with it.

Śaṅkara agrees with Sāṁkhya in holding that the mind
goes out to the object and assumes its form, so that the
form of the object corresponds to the form of the
apprehending mental mode. It is worth noting here that
western psychology in general gives priority to the object
which acts upon mind or subject. As against this, Sāṁkhya-
Vedānta gives priority to the mind or subject, which goes
out to the object, acts upon it and assumes its form.

"The physiological account of the perceptual process is
vague. There is a yawning gulf between the cerebral
process and the mental process. It cannot be bridged over.
How the cortical vibration in the sensory centre in the
brain produces a sensation in the mind is a mystery. The
Sāmkhya-Vedānta mitigates the uncompromising dualism of matter and spirit by admitting that buddhi or antahkarana is an intermediate reality between unconscious matter and conscious spirit. It is material, no doubt, but it is made up of very subtle matter and is, so to say, hyper-physical entity. It is plastic and translucent in nature and reflects the light of consciousness, on the one hand and takes in the form of the object on the other. According to the Sāmkhya-vedānta, the object does not break in upon the mind and imprint its form in it, but the mind goes out to the object and assumes its form.

In Western psychology the term mind is ordinarily taken to mean the subject of consciousness which manifests the self. In Indian thought, mind is not generally identified with self and consciousness. Mind is considered to be an instrument of self. Mind is believed to be part of matter. It is quite clear in Sāmkhya school where mind is derived from Prakṛti. Naiyāyika believed that it is not only material but an internal sense-organ owing to which experiences of pleasure, pain and other internal states are possible. Advaita vedānta maintained that mind with all other categories is only a creation of Avidyā.
The rise of Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Śūndhādvaita, Dvaita and Dvaitādvaita schools of thought gave impetus to rationalistic speculation. In addition to intuition as the instrument of knowledge they started from reason and tested the results it gave them.

Nature of Mind in Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy:

The out-going nature of mind is not still explained. Why does mind reach the outside objects and assume its form? No satisfactory reply is given to this question in the systems so far treated. If mind projects itself on the objects and imposes its own characteristics and qualities, how far the knowledge thus obtained, of the external world to be taken as true and real? The plausible reply so far received is that it is relatively true but likely to be sublated and transmuted at a higher level which is plane Supreme and quite different in kind from other planes of experience. If it is held to be Māya then it has to be located somewhere in the absolute Reality. But the Absolute is totally real and has entire possession of Sat that is existence, Chit, that is consciousness and Ānanda that is bliss. As the Māṇḍukya Upaniṣad says, "He is beyond relation, featureless, unthinkable, in which all is still".
How can there be activity in the Absolute which has realized everything and nothing remains to be achieved? The relative world of mind, activity, rational knowledge, attainment of truth, beauty and goodness remain part of a vast and "Cosmic illusion" which has no room in the omniscient, omnipotent and all-blissful Brahman. It remained a riddle like the sphinx of the ancients, knowledge gained by Rational Mind leads us to agnosticism in one form or another. It tells us by reaching there that the ultimate is unknowable.

This is not the highest truth and finding. New relation has been discovered by Sri Aurobindo in modern times between Absolute and the cosmic universe on the one hand and mind and supermind on the other hand.

Attempts made by other Āchāryas as Rāmānuja, Madhva, Nimbārka and Vallabha have not been successful in solving the problem as to how omniscient and omnipotent Absolute can sustain Māyā which has its origin in ignorance and incapacity. In modern thought, Sri Aurobindo maintains that Absolute is both individual as well as universal, static as well as dynamic, transcendent as well as immanent. The Absolute possesses the Supreme energy which
is manifested in all parts of the universe. The universe is an evolution of the Supreme energy which is called Supermind.  

Various parts of the Being:

Unless we understand and classify the several parts of the Being, we will not be able to link up the nature of the individual with that of the Reality. In order to understand the philosophy of Mind in Sri Aurobindo's scheme of thought, it will be at the outset necessary to know in the beginning that it is from the standpoint of practical psychology or Sādhanā that Sri Aurobindo looks at the parts of individual's being. From the point of view of Yoga which implies the transformation of each and every part of one's being towards the realization of ultimate end, Sri Aurobindo classifies physical, vital, mental and higher cognitive aspects of the individual being. This classification is not be understood as tightly separated parts. "It must be remembered that while this classification is indispensable for psychological self-knowledge and discipline and practice, it can be used best when it is not made too rigid and cutting a formula. For things run very much into each other and a synthetical sense of these powers is as necessary as the analysis. Mind is, for instance, everywhere. The physical mind is technically placed below the vital and
yet it is a prolongation of the mind proper and one that can act in its own sphere by direct touch with the higher mental intelligence.  

The structure of the mind and body can be tabulated as below:

| Mind proper has three parts: Thinking Mind, Dynamic Mind and Externalising Mind. |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mental Vital or Vital Mind |
| Mental Physical or Physical Mind |
| Vital proper has four parts: Mental vital, emotional vital, central vital and lower vital. |
| Physical as physical vital, Mechanical mind and Physical subconscient and inconscient. |

Definition of Pure, Dynamic and Externalising Mind:

These parts may now be clearly defined and distinguished from each other. "Thinking mind is concerned with ideas and knowledge in their own right", "dynamic mind is concerned with putting out of mental forces for realization of the idea", "and externalising mind is concerned with the expression of them in life not only by speech, but by any form it can give." It is quite usual for
the dynamic and formative part of the mind to be more quick to action than the reflective and discriminative part to control it. The true thinking mind does not belong to the physical, it is a separate power. When the mind is turned towards the Divine and the Truth and feels and responds to that only or mainly, it can be called a psychic mind- it is something formed by the influence of the psychic being on the mental place. According to Sri Aurobindo, psychic being is the Antarātman, the evolving soul in the individual and rules over all the three parts, mental vital and physical, of the individual.

**Vital Mind:**

The mental vital or vital mind gives a mental expression by thought, speech or otherwise to the emotions, desires, passions, sensations and other movements of the vital being; the emotional vital is the seat of various feelings such as love, joy, sorrow, hatred, and the rest; the central vital is the seat of the stronger vital longings and reactions, e.g. ambition, pride, fear, love of fame, attractions and repulsions, desires and passions of various kinds and the field of many vital energies; last, the lower vital is occupied with small desires and feelings, such as make the greater part of daily life, e.g. food,
desire, sexual desire, small likings, dislikings, vanity, quarrels, love of praise, anger at blame, little wishes of all kinds— and a numberless short of other things.

The sphere and function of the vital Mind is very significant in Sri Aurobindo's philosophy of mind as it clearly separates pure mind from other ignorant, superficial, egoistic and externally conscious parts of individual's physico-mental organism. Vital mind proper is a sort of a mediator between vital emotion, desire, impulsion, etc. and the mental proper. It expresses the desires, feeling, emotions, passions, ambitions, possessive and active tendencies of the vital and throws them into mental forms. The pure imaginations or dreams of greatness, happiness, etc., in which men indulge are one peculiar form of the vital mind activity. It is through this vital mind that the vital passions, impulses, desires rise up and get into the Buddhi and either cloud or distort it.

As the vital mind is limited by the vital view and feeling of things, so the mind in the physical or mental physical is limited by the physical view and experience of things, it mentalises the experiences brought by the contacts of outward of life and things, and does not go beyond that, unlike the externalising mind.
which deals with them more from the reason and its higher intelligence. But in practice these two usually get mixed together. The mechanical mind is a much lower action of the mental physical which, left to itself, would only repeat customary ideas and record the natural reflexes of the physical consciousness to the contacts of outward life and things.

In Sri Aurobindo's philosophy the term "Manas" of Indian Psychology has different meaning based on Yogic experience. "What answers to this movement of the Manas there would be two separate things - a part of the physical mind communicating with the physical-vital. It receives from the physical senses and transmits to the Buddhi- i.e. to some part or other of the Thought-Mind. It receives back from the Buddhi and transmits idea and will to the organs of sensation and action". It is said moreover that "In physical mind there can be an action of intelligent reasoning and coordination which is a delegation from the Buddhi and would perhaps not be attributed to the Manas by the old psychology. Still the larger part of the action of physical mind corresponds to that of Manas, but it comprises also much of what we would attribute to vital mind and to the nervous being. It is a
little difficult to equate this old nomenclature with that of this Yoga, for the former takes the mixed action of the surface and tries to analyse it—while in this Yoga what is mixed together on the surface gets separated and seen in the light of the deeper working behind which is hidden from the surface awareness. So we have to adopt a different classification.97

**Physical Mind and Pure Mind:**

Distinction between pure mind and physical mind is significant for it brings out the possibility of independence of pure thought and perception of ideas in contradistinction to the data and method of positive sciences such as physics and chemistry. There are some Philosophers who believe that all knowledge is derived from sense-experience. But so long as we confine ourselves to sense-experience and physical consciousness, we can conceive nothing and know nothing except the physical world and its phenomena. But we are in possession of certain conceptions, such as universality, necessity, absolute, permanence, self-consistency and the like which are not warranted by any purely physical data or any physical experience. And how are we to account for them? There can be no dispute about
the fact that there is in man the power called reason whose functioning explains their existence. The complete use of pure reason brings us finally from physical to metaphysical knowledge.

Sri Aurobindo describes the nature of physical mind as "that which is fixed on physical objects and happenings, sees and understands these only, and deals with them according to their own nature, but can with difficulty respond to higher forces. Left to itself, it is sceptical of the existence of physical things, of which it has no direct experience and to which it can find no clue; even if it has spiritual experiences, it forgets them easily, loses the impression and result and finds it difficult to believe. To enlighten the physical mind by the consciousness of the higher spiritual and supramental planes is one object of this Yoga, just as to enlighten it by the power of the higher vital and higher mental elements of the being is the greatest part of human self-development, civilisation and culture".98

Physical vital in this classification of individual being is "the vehicle of the nervous responses of our physical nature; it is the field and instrument of the
smaller sensations, desires, reactions of all kinds to the impacts of the outer physical and gross material life. This vital physical part is therefore the agent of most of the lesser movements of our external life; its habitual reactions and obstinate pettinesses are the chief stumbling block in the way of transformation of the outer consciousness by the Yoga. It is also largely responsible for most of the suffering and disease of mind or body to which the physical being is subject in nature.  

As to the gross material part, it is not necessary to specify its place, for that is obvious; but it must be remembered, Sri Aurobindo insists, that this too has a consciousness of its own, the obscure consciousness proper to the limbs, cells, tissues, glands, organs. To make this obscurity luminous and directly instrumental to the higher planes and to the divine movement is what is meant by making the body conscious in the Yoga of Sri Aurobindo. Instead of its obscure, limited and half-subconscience, it is to be made full of a true, awake and responsive awareness.

Sri Aurobindo and Indian Psychology:

The above classification of mental, vital and physical aspects of the individual being is different from the traditional yogic and vedantic classification.
of mind held in Indian psychology. The parts of mind regarded and described as Manas, buddhi, chitta and ahankāra are retained to a certain extent but for the adequate use in the transformation they are clearly distinguished by Sri Aurobindo from what he describes as the vital mind and the physical aspect of individual being. The traditional nomenclature, it is believed by Sri Aurobindo, indicates still the surface and ordinary movements of individual being. There is at the depth of surface mind and consciousness the inner mental, inner vital and subtle physical which have direct contact with external nature. Sri Aurobindo says that "There is an inner as well as an outer consciousness all through our being, upon all its levels. The ordinary man is aware only of his surface self and quite unaware of all that is concealed by the surface. And yet what is on the surface, what we know or think we know of ourselves and even believe that, that is all we are, is only a small part of our being and by far the larger part of us is below the surface.... The truth is that all this that is behind, this sea of which our waking consciousness is only a wave or series of waves, cannot be described by any one term, for it is very complex. Part of it is subconscious, lower than
our waking consciousness, part of it is on a level with it but behind and much larger than it; part is above and superconscient to us. What we call our mind is only an outer mind, a surface mental action, instrumental for the partial expression of a larger mind behind of which we are not ordinarily aware and can only know by going inside ourselves. 

Following the ancient vedic tradition the Tantra conceives of creation in terms of several planes of existence from the plane of bliss at the summit to the plane of physical matter below, each plane being a manifestation of its own psychological principle. And this organisation planewise is reproduced in human organism as well. There are in the being of men certain nodic which are so to say centres connecting him with these universal planes of existence; and when properly tapped they open up in one's being their respective planes and the powers that are characteristic of the principles governing those planes. These are called centres or 'Cakras' in the Indian Yogic system.

In Sri Aurobindo's Yoga the centres have each a fixed psychological use and general function which base all their special powers and functionings. The mūlādhāra
governs the physical down to the subconscient; the abdominal
centre-svādhiṣṭāna- governs the lower vital; the naval
centre- mābhipadma or mañāpri- governs the larger vital;
the heart centre- padma or anāhata- governs the
emotional being, the throat centre- visuddha- governs
the expressive and externalising mind; the centre between
the eye- brows- ajñācakra- governs the dynamic mind, will
vision, mental formations; the thousand petalled lotus-
sahasradala- above commands the higher thinking mind,
houses the still higher illumined mind and at the highest
opens to the intuition through which or else by an over­
flooding directness the overmind can have with the rest
communication or an immediate contact.

In the navel is the main seat of the dynamic
vital consciousness whose range is from the heart level
to the centre below the navel (lower vital, sensational
desire centre). These mark the domain of the vital being.
The centre of the psychic is behind the heart and it is
through the purified emotions that the psychic most easily
finds an outlet. All from the heart above is the domain of
the mental being- with also three centres, one in the
throat (the outward going or externalising mind), one between the eyes or rather in the middle of the forehead (the centre of vision and will) and one above communicating with the brain which is called the thousand petalled lotus and where are centralised the thinking mind and higher intelligence communicating with the greater mind planes above (illumined mind, intuition, overmind).

Thus it can be seen that the function of mind is to limit the external objects and measure them for the benefit of the knowing self. But knowing self is not a static substratum but an infinite power and capacity deluded only by the veil of ignorance. Because knowing self is delimited by ego-centre, it believes mind and its adjunctive instruments to be the final powers for knowing the external objects. The subject-object dualism is taken to be final by the impact of self-willing ego. If the veil of ignorance is removed by proper instrumentation of various powers of personality, mind can be seen to rooted in higher and more capable powers of psyche. The function of mind is to organize and systematize knowledge. It does not create knowledge but gives form and shape to it.
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