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CHAPTER - X.

METAPHYSICAL STUDY OF PERSONALITY.

A comparative Review.

The Saikhya-Yoga view of personality being more
metaphysical or philosophical than psychological, it will be
reasonable to attempt at an examination of its plausibility
in the light of the opinions of some of the modern philosophers
of the west. For this purpose, I shall try to select a few
of the representative views of different schools of philosophy
and to make a critical estimate on the subject. The problems
connected with the concept of personality even from the
philosophical standpoint being numerous and far-reaching,
the discussion will be intentionally so brief as to touch upon
the relevant points only.

W. James went beyond the limits of psychological analysis
in his treatment of self, and passed into the field of metaphysics.
As the exponent of Radical Empiricism, James started from the
concept of consciousness and made a substantial departure from
Locke, Hume, and Herbart. To him mental-life is a stream of
ever-changing sensations or 'sequence of different'. He called
it "the Stream of Thought". The sequence of changes is marked
by continuity. Consciousness is, for him, changing but
continuous. In every instant, the field of consciousness is
given all at once. Consciousness is primarily a selection
within this field of experience, some being emphasised and
others ignored. The 'Me' and 'Not-Me' is a division made
between those emphasised and those ignored. To James, the
empirical person is 'Me' and the judging thought is 'I'. The 'Me' is an 'empirical aggregate' of things objectively known. The 'I' is neither a permanent metaphysical entity nor a principle like 'Pure Ego', but a 'Thought' of the moment different from but appropriative of those of the foregoing moment. (1) We do not have any direct knowledge of a transcendental thinker. Every passing thought is taken up by the successive one which knows it, and that is also transmitted in the similar manner. The present thought thus appropriating the foregoing ones constitutes the so-called 'Self'. (2) Experience is a continuous whole which is broken up and analysed into objects and their relations by the activity of the mind. This analysis is based upon interests, purposes and also the temperament of the perceiver. Duplicity of consciousness and content was denied by James. The relation of knower and the known, the subject and the object is called by James 'pure experience'. Thus his theory of 'Pure experience' not only did away with dualism of matter and mind, subject and object etc. together with consciousness as such, but he seems to throw away with the swaddling clothes, the baby also.

In his attempt to fight against dualism, monism and absolutism, the personality is thrown into the rushing 'Stream of Thought'. The distinction of physical and psychical vanishes, and in the free play of pure experience, self and personality vanished in his system. In trying to deny consciousness, and to point in its place bodily feelings, he has unawares affirmed

(1) Principles of Psychology-James W. p.400 ff.
the reality of the Self and confirmed consciousness as such. The active and synthetic character of the subject cannot be ignored, and it is incomprehensible how 'experiences reporting themselves to one another', as James observed, could satisfactorily get over apparent dualism.

W. James also tried to establish his theory of experience without the self or the subject, and thus his theory is liable to the same criticisms as are usually levelled against Hume's view of psychology and metaphysics. James gives us a picture of the world of experience, where there is hardly any room for ideals and values - truth, beauty, goodness, justice etc. 'Something eternal must draw us on'.(1). His philosophy is too much subjective, and failed to do justice to individuality, self and personality of men.

F.H. Bradley is a recognised representative of Absolute Idealism. To him, nothing should be considered as real, which is not free from contradiction. The Absolute or the ultimate Reality is free from contradiction. Non-contradiction is in his view the criterion of reality. Experience plays the main role in Bradley's system. The world as revealed to our senses and intellect is mere appearance involving confusions and contradictions. The truly real is the Absolute, which is Experience. It is supra-personal. The world of ordinary experience is full of individuality and diversity, and is thus mere appearances. The Absolute as the truly Real is apprehended by intuition, called by Bradley Experience. In the Absolute as the transcendental whole, the elements cohere and it harbours them in its bosom in their transmuted and sublimated

(1) Introduction to Philosophy - G.T.W. Patrick.
forms. And, therefore, the Absolute may be grasped by Experience transcending the limitations of the intellect. Empirical Sciences, therefore, can deal only with appearances and Absolute as the truly Real lies beyond their grasp.(1). The Absolute of Bradley is thus a Super-personal principle, which transcends all contradictions and relations ordinarily attributed to the concept of personality. The ordinary world of experience is also rendered 'a block universe', as James called it.

The Self has been considered by Bradley as only 'finite centre of consciousness'. Such consciousness is only a state of individual mind. Such self-consciousness involving 'this' and 'mine' falsifies its claim to be real, as it is vitiated by individuality and plurality. True Experience transcends the self and is thus true Reality.

According to Bradley, the concept of personality suggests an inner consciousness of discord and harmony, of antithesis and synthesis, of relationship and distinction between man and man. But as religious consciousness transcends all such opposition of subordinate elements, personality which bears the sense of distinction among selves and God, who as the indwelling spirit pervades and absorbs all finite centres, and so dissolves all distinctions and concepts of individuality. "A person, I should add, to me must be finite, or must cease to be personal". "...If the personality of God is required for religion, in the sense that without it religion is ruined, I can answer at once No."(2).

(1) Principles of Philosophy- H.M.Bhattacharya.
(2) Essays on Truth and Reality-p.449,Bradley F.H.
By contrast, we thus find that in Spinoza, God is identical with the Absolute, whereas in Bradley, God is different from the Absolute. But in both of them, the category of personality which involves plurality, individuality and distinction of selves is unreal, and can never be applicable either to God or to man. Individuality and distinction of selves and consciousness as such, are self-contradictory. "The personality, for instance, that is proved in a philosophical treatise, may, so far as religion is concerned, be no more than impersonal. And it is not simply the reality perhaps of a special Providence, but the whole matter of personal intercourse, love and friendship, which is really here at stake."(1).

In brief, we may point out by way of criticism, that Bradley seems to make experience the capital at the exclusion of the experient subject, which is an abstraction. The duality of subject-object is always involved in experience, and the so-called 'transcendental' experience is rendered an unthinkable exception. It is inconsistent to think of a 'block universe' without the so-called 'appearances' and the experiencing subjects.

The impersonal transcendental Absolute devoid of relations with the finite selves is beyond comprehension. No reality of any experience can be understood bereft of its dependence on a subject or self. No knowledge or experience can be accepted at the exclusion of the reality of its subject or self. Impersonal Experience or transcendental Reality, which has no relation with finite centres of consciousness must always lead

(1) Essays on Truth and Reality-p.450, Bradley F.H.
logically to either Solipsism or Scepticism. If life and personality do not find legitimate places in a system of philosophy, it is reduced to a paradoxical abstraction.

"Bradley's criticism of Subject and Object is also most inclusive, and quite unconvinsing. The fluctuating margin of Self and Not-self is a psychological characteristic devoid of metaphysical interest, since both subject and object are still essentially present in all experience."(1).

Moreover, even in denying and doubting and in carrying on our fine metaphysical speculations, we admit the reality, as Descartes asserted, of the self or personality of the subject. Experience, whatever it is, must include the subject of experience. "Surely the truth is that the Self and Experience stand or fall together in this matter. Neither are accurately definable. Both must be accepted. The Absolute Reality must be revealed in Experience as embodying subjects of experience."(2).

His Impersonal and Transcendal Absolute devoid of self-hood and personality, which at the same time is ideal of personality embodying religious, moral and aesthetic values is self-contradictory. The recognized prominence of feeling in the Absolute Reality and its enjoyment in the face of denial of personality are strikingly incongruous and inconsistent. The plurality of the universe of selves and beings may be seeming appearances, but it must find a place and form an essential aspect of the reality of the Absolute.

Prof. Josia Royce, as a representative of American Idealism, showed greater interest in the concrete and individual.

(1) The Problem of Personality, p. 50-51, E. N. Herrington.
(2) Loc. cit - p. 52.
He began his system with an enquiry into the individual conscious centres and particular objects of the world and tried to furnish the conception of the Absolute through them. Unlike Bradley and Bosanquet, who began with the timeless and impersonal Absolute as metempiric unity, he started with the empirical and psychological basis of individual experience. Individual consciousness goes on expanding gradually towards a higher unity. "The real Self is the totality of our empirical consciousness when viewed as having unity of meaning, and as exemplifying, or in its totality fulfilling an idea." (1). The essence and unity of real self consists in the consciously chosen and adopted plan of life, and it should not be equated with the empirical facts of consciousness which are ever-changing and fragmentary. The finite centres of empirical consciousness and the objects as its contents are not appearances, as Bradley maintained, but they are real factors ever growing into the concrete unity of Universal Thought.

By his famous doctrine of Internal and External Meaning of Ideas, Royce did not only reorient the problem of Knowledge and its Validity, but he also tried to give a novel interpretation of reality and the finite centres of consciousness. The conception of reality is based upon the ethical nature of selfhood. The Absolute is considered as a Person involving a conscious process in its realm for fulfilment of Meaning. Ideas and Objects are inextricably bound up in the totality of experience. By his doctrine of the self-representative series, Royce found a solution of the problem of one and the many raised by Bradley. The Absolute as the whole of Reality includes

in its life and realm the infinite collection of selves. The Absolute as such is not but an intellectual unity, but is also a universal Will. How is individual will compatible with Absolute Will? How is autonomy of individual will reconciled with Divine Will? Human will is temporal, but Divine Will is eternal. Moral freedom, individuality and immortality, unity and plurality are there truly and necessarily for the Absolute for its own purpose viewed from the point of eternity.

Now, giving due recognition to and sympathy for the impressive metaphysical arguments embodied in the system of Royce, some points deserve mention by way of criticism.

Royce indeed tried to save human individuals from the all-absorbing Absolute advocated by the British idealists. But if the finite individuals are unique expressions of the Absolute Will, they cannot have true individuality, if not, there cannot be harmony in the Absolute Will as expression in finite wills. In any case, the same defect of logical abstractionism holds good against his system. He also ignored the importance of feeling over and above thought and will in respect of both finite and infinite consciousness. Moreover, the ethical nature of the Person or the subject is expressed in thoughts, purposes and strivings. The subject-object relation, which is prominent in experience, was not duly recognized by Royce. The Self or the person as the subject of experience cannot but be recognized. The concept of Self has been rendered simply a mathematical or impersonal concept in this system.

Besides, Royce's doctrine reduces the self to an ethical
concept, and he denies any ego or permanent being apart from the life-plan or meaning. But meaning requires a conscious self or person to which all experiences belong. His ethical self or meaning guarantees the reality of the Self or subject to which all experiences belong. The denial of the existential self belies our inner experiences and removes the bed-rock of personal identity. So, the ethical Self certifies the existence of the Self or 'I', which owns all experiences. In brief, Royce's monistic conception of the Absolute has denied the requirements for true freedom and individuality of the individual person.

Prof. G.H. Howison's 'Personal Idealism' was expounded in protest of Idealistic Monism, which failed to safeguard Personality both human and divine. He propounded his rational pluralism for offering due recognition to personality, treating God as the Final cause and the centre in a society of persons. Personality is a socio-ethical concept, and he considers a person as a 'Self-active member of a manifold system of real beings'.(1). The universe is a society of persons or the 'City of God'.(2). The person must possess autonomy and self-determination in ascertaining rights and duties in social relationships with other selves. His conception of time is a form of consciousness in each individual of self-activity, and as such, in its two aspects of sequence and succession, the active self connects its bits of experience to its own synthetic unity.(3) Thus the self in its moral aspect and social relationship asserts its reality. So, the reality of the individual and the Ideal is established on the basis of self-definition and moral

---

(1) The Conception of God, p.91f., Prof. Howison.
(2) The Limits of Evolution, p.174f., -do-
(3) Ibid, p.301.
relationship. The failure of individual human will is the root of evil in the world. He regards universe as a communal system of experience of persons, and space and time exist as a form of correlation of minds. Thus Howison builds up his system upon the concept of personality.

It may be noted that Howison in his social and ethical concept of personality, had the credit of restoring the central place to Personality in the cosmic system that was ignored in Absolute Idealism. But his concept of relations was stressed so far as to land him in a divided universe. His analogy of a society and too much emphasis on the Final cause outweighed the existential aspect of the Universe. God has been made by him the formal meeting-point of abstractions without concrete personality. He seems to make light of concrete experience and his concept of personality was too much a-priori.

The next philosopher, I now propose to mention, is Mr. F.C.S. Schiller, in whose writings personality finds widest recognition. His main views spread over his various works, chiefly in his 'Riddles of the Sphinx', 'Personal Idealism' and philosophical essays in 'Humanism'.

Against Scepticism and Agnosticism, Schiller advocated like Descartes the reality of the Self as the foundation of experience and philosophy. In his opinion, consciousness of the self is the key to all knowledge, experience and reality. In his attempt to solve the primary 'riddles', he finds solutions by his doctrine of plurality of reals, his concept of a non-phenomenal and personal but finite God and theory of immortality. The World-process is a process of Becoming in time with an Ideal of perfection of activity. He refuted Kant
by pointing out that the self as the subject in all experience and knowledge and can never be reduced to a form or object. Intelligence is the light of the self. Hume was in his vain quest to find reality of the self in the contents of experience turning his back on the subject of experience. But Schiller made the Self the centre in reconstruction of Reality. Schiller drew a distinction between the phenomenal Self and the transcendental Ego, which gives the form and unity to the varied contents of experience. The phenomena of 'multiple personality', 'secondary selves' bear evidence to the fact that such changes may be possible only to our empirical Self, but the transcendental self lies deeper as ideal of our progressive life. Evolution is meaningful only when it is teleological process of reality. God was considered by Schiller as personal and intelligent Spirit interacting with the finite Ego.

Cause as a category has meaning only in respect of persons. Schiller also thinks that conception of personality is the highest expression of knowable reality. God is not only understood as the Cause, but also as a Personality as Ideal of the world-process. He, therefore, considers God not as an Impersonal Absolute, but as Supra-personal including but at the same time transcending individual human personality. Knowledge and philosophy must always proceed from immediate experience and experienced self, and a-priori method of super-human system ignores this basic principle.

Commenting on the system of Schiller, some points deserve mention. His philosophy of personality under the title 'Humanism' is really valuable in many respects. His stress on reality of
the self and on immediate experience in epistemological and philosophical pursuit also deserves appreciation. Besides, he makes a distinction between the Empirical Self and the Transcendental Ego, making the latter the unifying principle of experience and the basis of interaction with the Divine. But then it is difficult to comprehend how such duality of Self can facilitate interaction with the Divine. But Schiller's concept of God, through personal, is liable to the charge of being "finite and pathological."

Moreover, making God finite and in time, Schiller cannot justify his pluralism working for Unity. God as Perfect Personality having power of Self-determination might affect the desired unity.

According to Dr. H. Rashdall a person possesses consciousness, and has feeling and thinking, distinguishing himself from other objects and Selves. So, individuality forms an essential aspect of personality. Besides man, personality in some form and degree also belongs to all forms of conscious life. God as the Ideal of personality possesses it in its fullest essentials. Regarding the distinction God and World, Rashdall remarks that consciousness of God is such that "He is eternally and inseparably annexed but which is something other than the content of his Will." (1). He ascribes also Will to God as Final Cause and considers thought as expression of self-activity. The universal consciousness of God includes all finite selves. His concept of the Absolute includes all persons including God. Rashdall thus occupies an intermediate position between the monists and pluralists.

(1) Personal Idealism - Dr. H. Rashdall.
Rashdall's view, as we find, is vague and has lot of confusions. He did not state clearly the ethical aspect of personality, and is silent regarding the relation between the existential and ethical aspects of personality. He has of course recognized the place of personality in interpretation of knowledge and experience, but reduced God to the level of other selves.

Prof. A.S. Pringle-Pattison was one of the foremost critics of the Hegelians and the Neo-Hegelians, of Kant and the Post-Kantians. In two of his main works, 'Hegelianism and Personality' and 'Man's Place in the Cosmos', he laid bare his views and restored Personality from the waste of the 'block-universe'. He tried to lay the foundation of metaphysics of reality in place of logic of abstractions. He forcefully pleaded for the value of personal experience and existence of the self. He advocated the hard truth of our existence and personal experience involving subject-object relation. He asserted Descarte's modified adage 'ago ergo Sum', vindicating certitude of self-existence.

According to him, the Self expresses itself in self-activity, i.e. Will, which belongs only to Personality as a unitary conscious being. The self gives its existential evidence in felt activity in Will, although thought and feeling also are its part and parcel. Kant's Transcendental unity of consciousness and Hegel's concept of Absolute deny personality to both men and God. As all ideals are embodied in the person, Idealism becomes meaningless with the denial of personality to man and God. (1). The individual self is the court of appeal

(1) Hegelianism and Personality, Pringle-Pattison, p. 228.
in matters of experience and knowledge, and personality expresses itself best in an act of Will. By stressing the importance of self-activity and personal experience, Pringle-Pattison has clearly acknowledged the place personality in correct philosophical approach to reality.

Lotze and W.Brown consider personality as the ideal of perfection. To Lotze, personality means "the Ideal of Perfection." Perfection is complete in God and can be attained by human individuals in varying degrees. W.Brown maintains that "Personality is a process of development, in which we have parallel processes of individuation and assimilation". He again adds, "When we pass to philosophical consideration of the problem, we shall find that personality has a universal element that contrasts it with the individual and singular, and that in this respect, it is an ideal never completely achieved by finite minds."(1). Thus personality is an exalted ideal of perfection. Lotze's personality seems to be an abstraction. W.Brown also over-estimated the spiritual and universal aspect of personality. The existential and experiential aspects of personality also need not be ignored.

Turning now to the Śāmkhya view of personality, it is pertinent to discuss at the outset some of the important ideas connected with the concept of Personality. Experience, consciousness, mind and such other psycho-metaphysical concepts have altogether different bearings. The distinctions between mental and physical, conscious and unconscious, Self and not-Self etc. deserve also to be carefully examined and noted.

(1) W.Brown, Personality...p.13-14 and p.239.
According to Sāṃkhya, the whole universe is made up of the Vyakta (Manifest) and Avyakta (Unmanifest). The manifest is caused, perishable, limited, manifold, dependent, emergent, has form and is supported by others; while the unmanifest is just the reverse. The Spirit (purusa) is consciousness, and Nature (Prakrti) with all its products is unconscious but active. The whole Manifest or external world springs up from this unconscious origin by virtue of three modes of cosmic energy (jñanas). (1)

Thus contrary to the western psychology, Sāṃkhya upholds that mind and the objective world, thought and thing are not dissimilar owing to their common origin. Mind and matter are, therefore, not removed from one another by an unbridgeable gulf. (2). The self or spirit is the unfailing light or consciousness, which illumines whatever comes in contact with it. It is consciousness that gives unity in the manifold contents of experience and converts them into a moving continuum. (3).

The concept of space and time also belongs to the manifest or objective world. Individuality and plurality also pertain to the objective world in its course of evolution. According to Sāṃkhya, Purushas (selves or spirit) are many as finite centres of consciousness and experience. Therefore, there is no experience either without the subject or consciousness, or without the object as contents of experience. And due to the workings of the three cosmic principles of activity or Jñanas, experiences must be pleasant, painful or indifferent. The stage designated as Mahat-tattva is...

(1) Sāṃkhya Sutra XI.
(2) Sāṃkhya and Modern Thought- Dr.J.Ghosh, p.31.
(3) Ibid - p.35.
of consciousness of the Collective Ego. (1). The cosmic process is, however, teleological and dynamic, although Nature (Prakrti) is unconscious.

The psycho-physical constructs of Nature form one aspect of personality. According to Sâmkhya-Yoga and the Uita, the psyche and the physique spring from the common source Nature (Prakrti) by a parallel process of evolution. The psycho-plasm, however, influences and guides the bioplasm in its activity and growth. They derive their laws from Nature, and organise and work accordingly. According to Sâmkhya-Yoga, the laws of the psyche give order and concordance to the physical laws. Yoga practices, therefore, lay greater stress on restraint and regulation of mental processes and transformations. The activities of the mind-body are meant for the experience and release of the principle of consciousness. (2).

The spiritual principle is considered all-pervasive and universal, but due to 'Ego-sense' (Ahamkâra), it is manifold in the phenomenal world. The spiritual principle is immutable, which the physical constructs are ever-changing. (3). Man is, thus, not alone a human animal, but his personality has a dominant spiritual principle, which makes him also a spiritual being. His psycho-physical organization is steered and regulated by the same spiritual principle.

"Yathâ prakâshhayatyekah krtanam lokamima ravih,
Ksetram ksetri tathâ krtanam prakâshayati Bhârata."

- Oh, Bhârata, as the only Sun shines all these worlds, so also the only Self shines all the bodies." (4). But according to Sâmkhya, the spiritual principle (Purusha) is pure indivisible.

---

(1) Sâm.Śâtras.-p.30, by Dr.R.N.Chukan.
(2) Sâm.Sutra.-XXI. (3) Personality-Dr.S.R.Jayaswal,p.9.
(4) Uita, Chap.XIII,Sl.54.
knower or consciousness, akin to James' 'Pure Ego'. The spiritual principle also represents the highest Ideal, Supreme Value and Reality.

Regarding the psychophysical organization of personality, one point deserves mention. In Sāmkhya view, there is no intrinsic difference between the so-called mental and physical. They spring from a common stock, Nature (Prakṛti), and so there is always a correspondence between the subjective and objective series. The Cosmic principles (Gunas) have two forms—Perceived (Vyavasāyatmaka) and perceiver(Vyavasyēyatmaka). (1). On the physical aspect of the Sense-world (Bhāvākhyā), there are sensibility (Prakhyā), activity (pravṛtti) and relentiveness (sthiti), whereas on the objective (Lingakhyā) side, there are perceptibility (bodhyatva), mobility (kriyātva) and inertia (jādyā), in conformity with Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. (2). Sāmkhya thus attempted to reconcile dualism between mind and matter considering both fundamentally of mental origin. The organs of sense are considered simply as doors (dvāra) to receive stimulations from outward objects, and these in turn depend upon the mental states, which are regarded as the warders (dvāri). Such pan-psycho conception of the world considering 'matter-stuff' as 'mind-stuff' finds support in some eminent physicists' conception of the world today. The old dualism of mind and matter'seems likely to disappear through substantial matter resolving itself into a creation and manifestation of mind. (3). Some again consider ultimate substance of world-building to be 'mind-stuff', which is an 'aggregation of relations and relata'. But this stuff is not spread in space and time. (4). It is believed even by scientific minds to-day that mechanical concepts

(1) The Study of Pātanjali, Dr. S. M. Dasgupta, p. 3.
are gradually giving place to mental, and present day science seems to lend support to idealism. As the beginning of the road to explore nature is mental, the chances are that the end also will be mental.(1).

Sāmkhya-Yoga also offers more important place to will in explaining the origin, and development of personality. The Freudians, as we have seen, made much of wish in explaining the functional aspect of personality, and attempted also to account for all behaviour disorders as results of unconscious repressed wishes. Sāmkhya-Yoga holds that residues of will as Bhāvas (potencies) remain eternal in sukṣma sharīra (subtle body), and continue to affect the life of personality all throughout its career. The elements of Nature supply only the raw-materials, but the pattern of physique and organization is determined by the Linga (mergent body) as residues of the will. These impressions of will lie eternally as Saṃskāras (impressions) or potencies (vāsanās) woven into the fabrics of personality. Such potencies in personality have been regarded by Sāmkhya-Yoga as the germs of subjective evolution (Pratyaya Sarga).(2).

It is believed that impressions of past lives accumulate in the chitta and make it undergo various transformations accordingly. The external stimuli offer the occasion for the mind-stuff to undergo transformations. That is why Yoga enjoins methods and practices, which restrain transformations of chitta propelled by innate psychic potencies.

It will not be out of place to make a brief reference to certain facts embodied in some of the Yoga sutras, which have bearing on the concept of Self and give new meaning to Personality

(2) Sām. Sutra, 46.
Psychical researches have been carried on and the results thus arrived at have claimed to prove them beyond dispute.

These investigations have given rise to a new branch of study known as Para-psychology. Prof. J.B. Rhine, one of the exponents of this branch of Psychology remarks, "It has now been established by scientific means that there is an extra-physical element in man", and "The conclusion is inescapable that there is something operative in man that transcends the laws of matter, and therefore, by definition, a non-physical or spiritual law is made manifest."(1). The findings of the modern psychical researches have gone a great way to give a new meaning to human personality and have borne scientific evidence as to the presence of extraordinary powers and super-normal factors in man.(2).

Yoga believes that powers of the mind flitter away due to its conjunction with various senses and being influenced by the past impressions. In Section II of the Yoga Sutras, various methods and practices are, therefore, prescribed to make the mind fit for proper contemplation and concentration. It can receive the light and power from the perennial source of consciousness only when the covering of the phenomenal impressions, is removed.

Tatah kṣiyate prakāśavaranam- Thence is destroyed the covering of the light.(3).

Dhāranāsā ca yogyātā manasāh.- The mind becomes fit for the stages of contemplation.(4).

Section III dwells specially upon nature of contemplation and trance, and describes the supernormal powers accruing therefrom. The super-normal facts described in various sutras

(1) New World of Mind, J.B.Rhine, p.194-196.
(2) An Introduction to Para Psychology-Dr.B.L.Atreya, Chap.X.
(3) Yoga Sutra II,52.
(4) Yoga Sutra,II,53.
are said to be the effects of a mental process called Samyama, which consists in unifying the processes of contemplation, absorption and trance in the act of perception or experience.

Trayamakatra Samyamah — The three together converged on one object constitute Samyama. (1).

Regarding Extra-sensory Perception, Yoga states that by proper practices and observances, the mental world of personality can be lit up with the flood of consciousness or spiritual light, and by dint of Samyama on relevant objects, Pratibha or super-normal power of intuition can be attained. Such a power enables a person to have a complete knowledge of anything independently of sensory apparatus. (2). Telekinesis, super-normal cognition, telepathy, etc. such other super-normal facts, which have long been subjects of investigation under Psychical researches at present, have been explained and supported by different Yoga Sutras. (3). It is further stated in Sutra 50, that practice of Samyama exclusively on the distinctive relation between Sattva and Purusa enables a person to have mastery over all things and the knowledge of all. Commenting on all such super-normal facts referred to in Yoga psychology, Dr. B. L. Atreya observes, "This brings home to psychology that the range of human personality is much more extensive and its powers of knowledge and action much more numerous and wonderful than known to the present day Scientific psychology." (4). There are thus numerous mysterious facts pertaining to the power and nature of personality of man. Sākhya also holds that the external organs are capable of giving us knowledge of the phenomenal world in the present, but the three internal organs

(1) Ibid, III, 4.  
(2) Ibid, III, App. 37 & 44.  
(3) Yoga Sutras, Sect. III.  
(4) Intro. to Para Psychology - Dr. B. L. Atreya, p. 112.
are capable of furnishing knowledge of the past, present and future. (1).

"Sāmpratākālam vāhyam trkālam abhyantaram karanaṁ." So, it appears that personality has the potentiality of having super-normal cognition and power beyond the limitations of space-time transcending the sphere of normal experience through physical mechanisms. But such knowledge and power are always subject to the prescribed practices and definite way of life.

We have attempted to describe in brief the picture of personality as depicted in psycho-metaphysical theories of Sāmkhya-Yoga. But the general metaphysical position advocated by Sāmkhya, from which Yoga-psychology and the concept of personality are derived, is not wholly free from inconsistencies. We propose now to examine how far Sāmkhya succeeded in solving the problems it undertook to solve, and also whether the concepts propounded by it reasonably fits into the nature of personality.

Buddhism was based upon the ever-changing contents of experience and denied the reality of the subject and object of experience. The Radical Empiricism of James also, as we have seen, depicts a picture of an empirical world without the self, and his system is too much subjective to allow any place to individuality, self or personality of men. Against such a subjective view, Sāmkhya tried to assert reality of the phenomenal world by its dualistic realism. But its dualism of Purusha and Prakṛti together with plurality of infinite Purushas has rendered its metaphysical position

(1) Sāmkhya Sutra, XXXIII.
unsound and inconsistent. There cannot be organisation of
personality if it is allowed to be constituted of two elements
contradictory in nature. Sāmkhya purusa is such that "we
cannot ascribe to it any features such as personality or
creative force."(1). The differences of Purushas, as pointed
out by Sāmkhya, may be attributed to the phenomenal selves
but not to the transcendental Purusha as mere consciousness.
Gaudpada, therefore, was inclined to accept Prursha as one.
There is thus a confusion all throughout between jiva and
purusha. Moreover, Prakrti, which has to be the dramatis
personae in the world-drama with unconscious motive, seems
in final analysis to be mere abstraction.

Further Sāmkhya claimed to establish unity of human
knowledge, but absolute duality of its subject and object of
Purusha and Prakrti, it has defeated its purpose by segregating
consciousness from other elements of human nature. This is
indeed a great blow to personality, life, morality and
knowledge.

Moreover, the relation of Buddhi to Purusha seems to
be very artificial. Sannidhi, fitness etc. cannot indeed
change the nature of Buddhi by its very definition to be an
instrument of experience of Purusha. But carefully following
the train of arguments, it would be plausible if the manifest
world of Prakrti and the unmanifest Purusha were regarded as
two aspects of a single Eternal Spirit. So the phenomenal
duality springs from a unity above itself.

But we must note that Sāmkhya's sole motive was to
establish reality of the empirical and spiritual worlds from

the subjectivity of Buddhism, and in so doing it exaggerated the difference between Purusha and Prakrti, between the Self and not-Self being sightless of their interconnectedness. This deficiency of the system has been reasonably made good in monistic Idealism of the Gita, which assumes One Supreme Self as the eternal ground of many finite selves.(1).

Some commentators like Vijnanaaviksu gave theistic interpretation of Sankhya interpreting Mahat-Tatta in its two forms - Savikara (manifest) and Nirvikara (Absolute). In the latter form Mahat-Tatta was considered same as God or Supreme Purusha or Avyakta.(2). The stage designated as Mahat-Tatta was considered by some commentators as Hiranyagarbha or Collective Ego also.(3). Nevertheless, on examination, the interpretations do not appear convincing.

Purusha and Prakrti, the Self and the not-Self are not to be regarded as irreconcilable differences, but they are inevitable aspects of a higher Reality, which unifies and absorbs them in its unique whole of Personality. The reality of the object is correlated with the reality of the subject. The activity and plurality of the objective world and non-activity and consciousness of subject springs from a common source and they must be understood as such. From its own statement, Sankhya does not make any difference among the Purushas as pure consciousness. The Self is possible to live a phenomenal individual life as long as it is under the influence of activities of Prakrti. Sankhya aimed at establishing the reality of the empirical world and the self against Buddhism and other systems which considered consciousness as selective agency.

Sāmakhyā holds that Purusha sees and experiences
the objective world of Prakṛti through the agency of
Buddhi, which is opposed to it being an evolute of Nature.
But in certain passages, it seems to surrender its dualism
and states that apparatus of cognition is not altogether
unlike consciousness.(1)

If the transcendental Self or Purusha remains from
start to finish on an unassailable pinnacle without any
organic connection with the empirical ego, Purusha cannot
experience the afflictions or sorrows arising from the world
of fleeting forms and event alleged to be the creation of
Nature and mind. The magic touch of consciousness or
illumination by Purusha through other unconscious agency
fails to explain satisfactorily experiences. Sāmakhyā view
of unity of matter, life and mind is, of course, scientifically
legitimate. Nature in Sāmakhyā is not only the source of life
and mind, but it contains the seeds of all forms of beings.

Sāmakhyā must give up its half-hearted dualistic realism
and should search for the solution the problems of life and
personality. In the empirical Self or jiva, the Purusha and
Prakṛti must not stay as contradictory elements but should
find a medium for organic unity. And inadequacies and seeming
inconsistencies of Sāmakhyā can be avoided, when the two
fundamental elements of evolution, e.g. Spirit and Nature
spring out of a higher unity and strive for a common goal. The
Self and not-Self are involved in every bit of knowledge as well
as in existence. Personality is the highest organic unity or
synthesis of these two fundamental principles of evolution.

(1) V. Bhāṣya, 52.

*****