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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

I now propose to examine and summarise the views upheld by Samkhya-Yoga and the Gita, regarding concept of personality. Before summarising the findings and giving the concluding remarks on the subject of my enquiry, I feel it necessary to justify certain seeming digressions here and there in course of my discussions. Samkhya theory of evolution, dualism of mind and matter, problem of reincarnation, doctrine of Karma etc., which belong to philosophy proper and should not usually creep into psychology, have been deliberately brought under discussion, because Indian Psychology is incomplete and loses relevance without its philosophical background. The tenets and views of Samkhya-Yoga were contained in a few slokas, and it was, therefore, necessary to go into the commentaries and Kindred literatures in an attempt to collect relevant materials for clearer grasp of the subject under investigation. Certain topics, in course of my investigation, necessitated detailed discussions with a view to bringing out the Western and Modern points of view, for facility of proper comparison and estimate of the subject. It is hoped that while going through the discussions contained in different chapters, facts stated above should be borne in mind.

The main aim of my enquiry was to determine the concept of personality as found in Samkhya-Yoga and also the Gita.
I feel that in spite of having differences in some other respects, they hardly differ in respect of the fundamental facts regarding the concept of personality. I have, however, spared no pains to bring out, as far as practicable, the difference in points of view of these three systems under relevant contexts.

An attempt was made in the First Chapter to point out in brief the main view-points of Sāmkhya-Yoga. Knowledge and realization of the Self were goals of philosophical enquiry of Sāmkhya philosophy and Yoga practices. The fundamental aim was to remove the causes of human miseries. Philosophy meant darsana or insight into true nature of things. The insight or knowledge as power was instrumental for emancipation of the self. Psychology as other Sciences was subordinated to such a fundamental philosophical enquiry. The findings of psychology were results of practical experiences of the thinkers themselves. They were the results of intuition rather than those of experiments and logical dissertations. The mind and intellect in psychology were not considered as modes or attributes of the Self, but were thought to be products of Nature, distinct from the Self or Spirit. Mind as such was usually a function of Chitta, which is subject to the working of three Gunas of Prakṛti. Sāmkhya-Yoga accepted two selves - the empirical or bodily self and Spiritual or real self. Only the former is active and subject to pain and rebirth. The response-attitude of the mind associated with I-feeling (Asmitā) of the bodily self
enmeshes the ego with the environment, and renders it subject to the feeling-tone and emotional tensions. Samkhya-Yoga propounded modified Dualism of mind and matter both originating from Prakrti or Nature. Samkhya is primarily an epistemology of the self, and Yoga is practical method of realising it.

Like other systems of Hindu thought, Samkhya-Yoga and the Gita gave important place to the body, and recognized intimate relation between the mind and the body. The body was considered the requisite for proper discharge of duties. Though not in modern sense, they arrived at the main laws and principles of anatomy and physiology. The Tantras and Yogic literatures emphasized on anatomy and physiology as also in the medical and musical Sciences. They also accepted the fact that personality is highly dependant upon physical constitution and development. Yoga like the medical Sciences, stressed upon training of the body and the senses, and brought out the importance of the nervous system and specially the Cerebro-spinal system. Great importance was laid particularly on the ganglia and plexuses, because of their functional importance. The spinal-sympathetic system, as the seat and regulator of the mento-emotional life, was regarded as the important physical factor of personality. The entire physical basis and life-forces (vāyus) can be controlled and regulated by means of specific practices, laws of health, dietary and prescribed observances. The physical postures, control of breath, prescribed dietary etc., are all considered necessary for healthy physical basis of personality. Yoga was a positive as well as normative Science of physiology and psychology, and not curative and psychiatric in aim like psycho-Analysis of the modern age.
The next important aspect of personality is the unconscious and its role in the constitution and functional aspect of personality. Samkhya and the Gita hold that Chitta is mainly the reservoir of the unconscious, which embraces the Id, instincts and innate drives including prenatal and repressed wishes of modern psychology. The unconscious is the content of the Chitta accumulated, according to the theory of Samskāras (impressions) in consonance with the law of Karma. The impressions of actions as bhāvas(potencies) and psychic dispositions (Karmaśayas) remain accumulated in the Chitta as nuclei of conduct and character, and also as bhāvas(potencies) for lives to come, embodied in what is called the Linga sharira(merging body). The transmigrating subtle body is held to be the carrier of the unconscious in personality. These, however, are modified and modifiable through environmental influences. The accumulated Samskāras are also regarded as the determinants of the species, longevity and nature of experiences in life. This theory, however, does not mean fatalism or determinism. The accumulated Samskāras are of three kinds - good, bad and indifferent, according as they are vestiges of actions done respectively under the basic principles of Prakṛti as Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas.

According to Samkhya-Yoga and the Gita, the unconscious in the Chitta is the potential cause of the conscious life of personality. The Freudian concepts of the conscious, preconscious and unconscious are only states (Vṛttis) of the mind-stuff (Chitta) differing only in degree of clearness.
The conscious does not differ from the unconscious in kind, but only in degree of clearness and vividness. Dream is a work of the Chitta-transformation in sleep, when impressions, in the light of consciousness, appear real. Yoga is a process of Psycho-synthesis as contrasted with modern Psycho-Analysis of the Freudian School.

Instincts are also considered to be a form of the unconscious. They are a form of the unconscious active potencies (Karmasayas). Instincts as native springs of action are usually regarded as inborn psychic dispositions, enabling the agent without prior training, to be interested in specific stimulus with particular types of response. The response involves all cognitive, affective and constitutive elements. Freud also agreed on the influence of instincts on human personality. He gave more stress upon Eros or Sex-instinct and Death instinct. The libido derives its forces from instinctive drives. According to McDougall, emotions and sentiments have their core on the corresponding instincts. Thus in the opinion of these writers, instincts not only guide vital activities of lower creatures, but they are also raw-materials in building up character and personality. Character is, therefore, organisation of impulsive and instinctive tendencies in the light of reason, and will is only that organization in action.

Samkhya-Yoga philosophy also admits the existence of unconscious drives and instinctive urges in both animals and men. Yoga Psychology in particular recognizes the prominent role of the unconscious drives of the Chitta causing tensions,
complexes and transformations of the mind-stuff. By prescribed practices and meditation, these drives can be controlled and sublimated for wholesome ends. Sāmkhya-Yoga and the Jīta consider that these originate from the impressions of past experiences accumulated in the Chitta as Kāmarṣaya (active potencies) and Vāsanās (Psychic dispositions) residing in the Linga Sharīra. Clinging to life and fear of death (Abhinivesha) are such instincts. To them, instinct is neither a product of evolution, nor a form of lapsed intelligence. The innate drives and instinctual urges are but eloquent of the impressions of past life and experiences. These are but vṛttis (tendencies) innate in the Chitta or mind-stuff. Seedless contemplation (nirvijra Samādhi) of Yoga and injunction of Knowledge (Jñāna Yoga) of the Jīta are held to be specific means for sublimation of the unconscious drives and integration of personality. Sāmkhya-Yoga psychology does not consider instincts and innate urges as untaught abilities in men and animals inherited from parents and ancestors, and endowed at birth, but rather they are held to be the remnants of experiences of prior lives as Vāsanās and Kāmarṣayas in the Chitta. They serve as the seed of activities in our present life to be performed in our respective surroundings.

Personality is thus a cross-section of a growing Reality far above and beyond it. In course of its activities, it is ever under the abiding influences of three active principles (gunās) of Prakṛti (Nature). True knowledge (Sāmkhya) begets power (Yoga) to widen continually the field of consciousness, to remove avidyā and to integrate and
develop personality on sound lines. Neuroses and psychoses in their view originally spring from some form of avidyā (ignorance), which is the cause of all forms of pain and suffering. Self-knowledge and self-purification alone can remove rivalry among the Id, Ego and Super-Ego, and can synthesise the conscious and the unconscious, and remove the antithesis between the flesh and spirit in our life. The paths indicated by the Gita, Knowledge embodied in Śaṅkhya and accessories of Yoga all aim at integration of personality and attainment of perfection. In a wholesome personality, there is no room for conflicts and complexes, disorders and tensions.

What is meant by heredity? What hereditary elements enter into the constitution of personality? To what extent personality types are determined by hereditary factors and by the cosmic principles of Nature called 'Gunas'? I tried to answer these questions in the next chapter and to ascertain the views of Śaṅkhya-Yoga and the Gita.

Two extreme views are there. According to one, nothing can happen as effect, which was not present in potential form in the cause producing it. As such, growth and development of personality consist in unfolding the potentialities endowed at birth in the context of present environment during the process of maturation. Śaṅkhya theory of evolution seems to maintain this view. The modern behaviourists have gone to the other extreme. The nurture and training alone can make personality what it is. Others occupy the middle ground and hold that personality is the joint product of heredity and environment, and none can be left out of account.
The question of hereditary elements in personality and transmission of specific character was also discussed in the ancient medical sciences of both Charaka and Susruta. They, however, attributed the congenital variations in the issue to chance (Daiva). The Uitā as well as Śāmkhya accepted personal heredity on the basis of Sat Kārya "dā and eternity of human and moral values. This conclusion was in consonance with the doctrine of Karma. There is no place for external agency in creation, nor any scope for play of chance. Actions with their effects beget habits and character as impressions (Samskāras), and they in return build up personality. Activities comprising of cognitive, affective and conative aspects of our minds not only offer us concrete experiences in life, but also their effects so get into our very being, that they determine the structural and functional aspects of our personality. Śāmkhya maintains that parental endowments of personality are variable and perishable, but those of personal heredity as subtle elements of the mergent body are certain and lasting. The hereditary endowments work or tend to work of their own accord in obedience to either of the three cosmic principles (Jīnas). The Uitā and Śāmkhya maintain that birth and death will ever continue by turns, unless those potencies or impressions are rendered void by means of contrary deeds. The parents are responsible for supplying materials for a new physique, but the pattern of the body and the type of personality are largely the products of inherited personal potencies and dispositions (karmāsayas and vāsanās). There is nothing in personality, which is a gift or product of chance.
The Gitā and Śāmkhya-Yoga maintain heredity in a special sense. Hereditary elements in personality are not endowments or gifts from some other sources, but are personal acquisitions of past lives carried forward to the present implicitly for experience in the present and building up the future. This is neither mechanistic nor deterministic in its basic position.

On the other hand, those schools did not ignore the need of environment and society in formation and development of personality. The rules and observances of the Gitā and Yoga eloquently mention social and ethical virtues, which will lose meaning without environmental factors and society. Personality can grow and develop in society and through inter-personal relationship. Human values and ethical virtues have no meaning for one leading a solitary life of a Robinson Crusoe. Human personality has deeds and duties to be done through human associations and interpersonal relationship. This is clearly mentioned in Śāmkhya-Yoga and the Gitā. The hereditary potentialities of personality as seeds of actions require environmental back-ground for experience (bhoga) and development (parināti).

Traits or types in the accepted sense of the term was not then in vogue. Śāmkhya-Yoga and the Gitā unanimously held that all evolutes come into being and function in obedience to the three cosmic principles of Nature (Prakṛti and guna). The principles of Nature, therefore, are responsible in course of their working in and through all things and beings, and regulating their individual actions, according to
the type and pattern of their own. Accordingly, preponderance of one of the principles or its combination with another principle produces six different types or patterns of personality. The main types of personality are, therefore, six - Sāttvika, Rajasika, Tamasika, Sāttvika-rajñasika, Sāttvika-tamasika, and Rajasika-tamasika. Thus the causality of the three principles of Nature (gunas) was accepted to explain individual variation and types of personality in Śāmkhya-Yoga and the Gītā. The Gītā explains in detail the works, likings, disposition, food and habits of the three main types of personality in its Section "Jūna Traya 'ībhāga Yoga".

Human personality is so unique, varied and rich that trait names and recognised types can hardly be properly justified. The names used in Śāmkhya and the Gītā are too wide to connote aptly their accurate denotations. The types were selected, however, in conformity with the fundamental cosmic principles. Regarding the trait names, even a reputed modern writer on the subject felt constrained to observe in the following way - "The dynamic mental structures and substructures are too many to identify and name. Language fails to supply the required lexicon to enumerate elements of mental life. Trait-names, therefore, need to be used with caution."(1).

Nextly, in order to arrive at a comparative estimate of the study of personality, a chapter has been devoted to a brief review of the concept of personality with its integration and development as maintained by the modern psychologists of the west.

(1) Personality - Prof. G.W. Allport.
Psychology of personality came into being recently with a view to giving a fuller picture of the human mind and personality. But the method of study, being influenced by the scientific method and accuracy, did not take proper care for the richness and dignity of human personality as a "relatively enduring and unique organization". There can be no science of psychology based upon the study of "generalized mind". Individuality of every man is unique, distinct and separate from the rest. Personality is different from individuality, and is too complex and abstract to define with accuracy. G.W. Allport made a very comprehensive study of the subject, and examined the viewpoints of numerous writers from different stand-points. He distinguished personality from individuality, character, attitude, temperament etc. He attempted to bring out the flaws and inadequacies of definitions given by various writers. He finally gave his own working definition of personality making good the defects of others and analysed the concepts involved in it. He defined personality as a "Dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment." (1) Allport deserves due credit for the merits of his definition, but nevertheless, it overlooks some of the essential elements without which personality falls short of its richness and proper connotation. Personality is something and does something, and it presupposes that which is behind the specific responses and acts, and is within the individual psycho-physical system. In matters of behaviour and reactions to environment, human personality

(1) Personality - Prof. G.W. Allport, p. 48.
unlike plants and animals is unique, and exhibits mastery over the situations. The dynamic organization requires also a driving but regulative force. We, therefore, feel the need of including character in the structure of personality together with an underlying spiritual subject or principle, which is within, behind and beyond the individual to systematise, to string together and to evaluate the behaviour-patterns in its own history. The "I" and "Me" of psychology, philosophical or metaphysical, as they may be, must be there as the basic principle of personality in true sense of the term. The psycho-physical organization with its response-patterns is only the 'Persona' or the outward mask of the underlying principle, that governs it by its presence or proximity (Sannidhamatram). These writers possibly wanted to avoid such a philosophical concept to make their definitions free from such a bias in psychology as an empirical science. Allport has himself rightly maintained that personality is a dynamic organization with inherent teleology in its behaviour, patterns, but he, however, ignored the nature of teleology and the organizing inherent principle, and thus makes his definition yet open to objections.

Some writers define personality as "the total quality of an individual's behaviour as it is revealed in his habits of thought and expressions, his attitudes and interests, his manner of acting, and his personal philosophy of life."(1). These definitions make personality equivalent to individuality in action. This is rather a biosocial description of the individual. Personality is not the sum-total of behaviours

(1) Psychology-Woodworth & Marquis-p.87-88.
and activities of the individual. We have also to
distinguish value-experience from empirical experience.
We cannot logically substitute adverbial for the substantive.
W. Brown rightly observes, "The distinction which emphasises
the essential importance of value over against chance
experiences that occur to us from moment to moment, and
from day to day, is extremely important for our theory of
personality, because it puts the centre of gravity in the
right place." (1).

The bio-social definitions stress upon the social
behaviour of the individual, and render personality as a
social gift. The behaviourists, on the other hand, make
personality as equivalent to physical behaviours of the
individual. There are some psychologists, who make
personality the product of workings of the endocrine glands.
But the facts pertaining to pathology cannot logically
explain those relating to normal beings. We have also seen
that the dynamic theory of the psycho-analysts is responsible
for compartmentalization of the individual. It finds only
the warring aspects of our nature, e.g. conscious and
unconscious, Id and Super-ego etc. In the opinion of Freud,
personality is the product of the conflict of the Id having
pleasure-principle with Ego having reality-principle. The
theory has also made much of the Sex-instinct. It over-
emphasised the Sex-instinct, and arrived at many unwarranted
inductive generalisations. Personality is not always a
sum-total of three distinct parts rarely in unity and mostly
at war. It ignores also essential human goodness and noble

(1) Mind and Personality - W. Brown, p. 298ff.
sentiments in men. The differential psychology headed by Francis Galton laid greater stress on the degree and nature of individual differences. It has ignored the fact that in the midst of differences, personality normally maintains unity and functional autonomy. Personality cannot properly be represented by enumerating and measuring the manifest differences of the individuals alone.

According to the Gestalt School, personality as an organized whole of different aspects, should be studied as Gestalts or pattern by means of empathy or intuition. It criticizes the over-simplified theory of personality of the behaviourists. Personality is not an automation of the sensory-motor reflexes, but is a unique whole or a configuration. Kaffka maintains that the ego goes on growing and developing maintaining its configuration or pattern. Kaffka is right in holding that personality is an organic whole or a dynamic organization. But he did not clearly state the nature of organization and also what personality is. His concept of the Ego is also ambiguous and too wide.

The principles of integration and development of personality were then discussed. Personality develops as an integrated whole and as a joint product of heredity and environment. The whole psycho-physical organism grows on to the fullest stature of the Individual, maintaining unity and functional autonomy. The process of development is never the same in different individuals or in the same individual in all the stages. Development of personality is mainly through the process of maturation and learning.
Some psychologists improperly try to explain development of personality by means of will-to-live or innate drives. The complex and unique human personality can hardly be explained by such a mechanical theory of drive alone. Maturation and learning help personality to grow in a dialectical process. Through varied experiences in course of development of personality, self-consciousness and Personal identity underlie the entire process. Throughout the process of growth, personality exhibits self-regarding and self-asserting sentiments, as the basic facts of individual life. Integration and development also require a basic philosophy of life to help in unification and to evaluate personal experiences and activities. By a process of maturation, personality develops vertically by the degree of integration and complexity, while it also develops horizontally through variety and comprehensiveness of its experiences. These varied experiences are intermixed and interwoven into the fabrics of personality as a whole.

What then is dissociation or disintegration of Personality? If integration takes place in course of growth and development, how does dissociation or disintegration come about? Personality is a dynamic and organized whole. In course of development, it always maintains its autonomy and identity, while systematizing and owning the varied experiences. Dissociation and disintegration take place, when sudden trauma or emotional shock or tensions cause failure of the self to own and organize its experiences.
According to some, disintegration and dissociation are the effects of some physical disorder-like disorder of endocrinal system, abnormal working of glands, and such other physical diseases. In the opinion of others like Charcot, Morton Prince and Jannet, like the physical units, different mental units normally merge into the whole of personality. The disorder in psychical units give rise to abnormal phenomena, e.g. double and multiple personality, alternating and co-conscious personality etc. and these can be cured by means of hypnosis, psycho-analysis, free-association etc., thus helping the Subjects to remove underlying tensions. McDougall, on the other hand, holds that dissociation and disorder in personality result primarily from conflicts of instinctual needs giving rise to clash of primary sentiments and basic interests. The Sociologists and environmentalists object to the reasons put forward by the normic School, and they lay greater stress on the social environment and social needs of the individual.

The psycho-analysis of Freudian School are of opinion that human nature primarily involves dualism or antithesis. Personality is, as it were, the battle-ground of conflicting psychic forces. The unconscious is the abode of the suppressed and repressed wishes seeking predominance over the rational and conscious life of personality. These suppressed forces in the unconscious, if not released or sublimated, give rise to various forms of complexes and tensions. Thus Freud adopted a principle of universal Psychic determinism in explaining all forms of personality disorders.
Post-Freudians like Adler and Jung were not in complete accord with Freud, and they made substantial departures. Adler in his Individual Psychology and Jung in his Analytical Psychology put forward fresh theories to explain disorder in personality. Adler did not altogether deny the sex-instinct, but he put greater stress on 'Style of life' together with feelings of superiority and inferiority as basic facts in the individual. Jung, on the other hand, tried to harmonise Freuds' Unconscious sexual Libido and Adler's will-to-power by introducing the concepts of archetypes or racial unconscious and psychological types. The extrovert is prone to emotion, and the introvert is more subject to will, according to Jung.

It may, however, be pointed out that in spite of their therapeutic and Psychiatric values, on closer observation, the truth of these theories are still open to question. The conscious and not the unconscious, though larger in scope, is the real essence of personality. Although there is some truth in these theories, they give only a scanty view of the field that yet lies ahead of psychology. With regard to study of personality, we are constrained to feel that much has yet to be said and explored in future.

The philosophy of the Uitā and Śāmkhya-Yoga arose in an attempt to solve the riddles of life. The one originated in search of the true and the real, and the other in quest of measures to get over misery and to attain bliss. It was a sincere effort to attain true insight(darshana). It was thus practical in searching for the end and means. Psychology
was to a great extent ancillary to philosophical pursuit. Psychological findings were not empirical in the sense as results of laboratory experiments, but they were practical, in so far as these were meant for living. These results, therefore, could enlarge the conclusions of physics and confirm the ideals of morality and religion. These facts, therefore, are required to be kept in view.

Psychology, therefore, had its basis on the metaphysical theories. Sāmkhya, in its practical approach, did not aim at speculation or knowledge for its own sake, but as means to an end, e.g. mitigation of evils and sufferings, including disorder and dissociation in personality. Sāmkhya proposed at the outset to trace the causes of all three forms of sufferings, mental, bodily etc. and to get rid of them for good by removing their causes.

The medical sciences of the ancient Hindus as embodied in the Samhitās of Charaka and Susruta based their philosophy and anatomy mainly on the evolutionary theory of Sāmkhya. It clearly meant by personality as a subject of treatment, a dynamic organization of Nature and Spirit, outer and inner, animality and divinity organized on the basis of the doctrine of Karma. Sāmkhya-Yoga also considered personality as an evolute arising from the process of cosmic evolution from conjunction of Nature and Spirit giving rise to the dynamic organization of mind-body (Nature) and spirit (Consciousness). The evolution is held to be teleological, aiming at release of Spirit from Nature.
The basic theory of evolution on which concept of personality as an evolute rests was subject to tremendous criticism of many thinkers and commentators. This was due to misrepresentation and misinterpretation of the original views of Sāmkhya. I discussed these in fair details in a foregoing chapter. I have reasons to believe that Sāmkhya, the Gītā and Vedānta differ only in approach and details, but not in their fundamental positions. Sāmkhya is scientific and inductive in method, starting from the many to the one, from effect to the cause, from the empirical to the real, whereas Vedānta is speculative and deductive in approach, starting from the cause to the effects, from the one to the many. The Gītā is descriptive and explanatory effecting a link between the two. I, therefore, maintain that Sāmkhya in its original form is theistic, and puts forward Ideal Realism or Modified Dualism. Human personality is, therefore, the truest from the reality illustrating the process of cosmic evolution at its best and also representing the macrocosm in a microcosm. Sāmkhya like the modern physical sciences denies reality of matter, time and space. In the unmanifest (Avyakta) these categories do not exist.

According to Sāmkhya-Yoga and the Gītā, personality is a dynamic organisation of Nature as mind-body with spiritual consciousness as its unifying centre. The self or spirit, as the source of consciousness, is inactive, whereas mind-body as product of Nature is active and receives guidance and light from the presence of the spirit. The dualism of activity and the unconscious, and inactivity and the conscious
is the basis of personality. The dynamic whole of personality is a rich and complex organism consisting of the physique and its parts, the mind with its states and processes, the organs of action and knowledge together with self as the centre of consciousness. Western Psychology makes mind the centre and basis of personality, in which the conscious and the unconscious, the Ego and the Id etc. play their role. But Śāmkhya-Yoga and the Gita make a substantial departure by making mind and body active parallel processes of Nature devoid of Consciousness, with self as the regulative principle of the system as inactive but source of consciousness.

The dynamic organization of Psychophysical aspects of personality has two essential attributes, e.g. Self-consciousness and Self-identity with functional autonomy. These fundamental facts of personality do not admit of satisfactory explanation without self or spirit as principle of consciousness, of organization and regulation. This organization is not mechanical or accidental, according to Śāmkhya-Yoga, but has inherent teleology due to the presence of the conscious principle for whose experience (bhoga) and release (apavarga), the organization has come into being. Freud was right in recognizing antithesis in our personal life, but he ignored one vital fact that conflict of the conscious and the unconscious, the spirit and Nature, rationality and animality is the life-breath of personality, and is the cradle of morality and other human values. The functional autonomy attributed to human personality means that the dynamic psycho-physical organization has a regulative and governing
principle to unify and harmonise the varied experiences and activities for the organic whole of personality. We have, therefore, to admit that self, as the conscious principle in personality, is the governing principle maintaining identity, purpose and autonomy of the organization. If we consider personality as only dynamic psycho-physical organisation, it will mean only blind and mechanical activities of body-mind as evolutes of Nature(Prakrti).

Another basic theory advocated both by Sāmkhya and the Gita is the doctrine of Karma(actions) involving the concepts of impressions (Samskaras) and Linga (mergent body). This theory of Karma is very significant in those systems, because it is used to explain heredity, the unconscious, instincts and many other important facts regarding personality. The law states that everything in the manifest world is governed by the law of causality. An activity means putting forth energy as cause, and that energy will return an effect. This is also the interpretation of modern sciences regarding universal law of causation and conservation of energy. By dynamism in personality, we mean, the intelligent will in action. The body, being meant for the service of will, is called, therefore Karma Sharira(active body), and as such activities performed by the human individual are purposive, self-initiated, meaningful and value-making. So, they are called purushakāra (Voluntary and creative) as distinct from spontaneous and reflex actions. The activities of a person create values and are subject to various standards of judgment, being activities of a free and rational agent. These activities
are meant for the experience of the agent as being happy, painful or indifferent. These activities also affect others in the environment.

The effect of karma or actions go on accumulating in form of bhāvas (potencies) and impressions (samskaras), which are responsible for creating Linga (mergent body). The linga is the cause of the psycho-physical constructs, and the seed of rebirth and future experiences. The linga is also the carrier of personal heredity embracing the unconscious drives and congenital aptitudes. The potencies in the unconscious, as elements of character, contain two kinds of potentialities - natural (prakrtikāh) and modified (vaikrtikāh), according as they are effects of prior lives, or of education, training etc. So, nothing can enter into the complex fabrics of personality, unless they are experienced by the agent in course of activities. Libido, Id, Archetypes etc., whatever names we attribute to the forms of the unconscious, the cause must be sufficient to explain them. The unconscious elements in personality cannot belong to this life alone, but must largely be inherited. The parental materials producing the embryo cannot carry all the psychic dispositions. If they at all do, what is the mechanism? Sāṇkhya in consonance with its law of causality and Karma theory, held that Linga or mergent body, as the abode of Bhāvas of prior existences, is the repository of the varied elements of the unconscious. The innate propensities and the unconscious impressions are reciprocal and relative to the acquired experiences and deeds in life-time. The past impressions are necessary both in the
process of fresh experiences and in the act of memory, and as such, they modify and are modified by the present deeds and experiences. Personality is thus the product of the past and the present, the innate and the acquired, the conscious and the unconscious, and by their new combinations, prepares the Linga or the seed of the future mode of life and existence. This is never fatalism nor rigid causality, but seems to be rather a more comprehensive concept of the unconscious and personal heredity. The dynamism of personality rests upon the will, which moves to action at the spur of the objective stimuli in the context of the bhāvas or inner propensities. Personality grows on through the impact of the subjective and the objective. The subjective (bhāvas) generally influences thought and actions of the person.

There is in Śāmkhya what is called Pratyaya Sarga (Subjective Evolution), which means that will develops in accordance with the cosmic principles (guna) urging the intellect in its act of determination (adhyāvāsaya). Disorder and disintegration of personality are regarded to be the effects of disabilities of some aspects of the psycho-physical organisation. Will, in course of its evolution or in action, is liable to many forms of disabilities. There are five forms of error, twenty-eight forms of handicaps or imperfections of organs, nine forms of false contentment and eight forms of success. (1). Behaviours and response-patterns, as outward expressions of the will, are usually held to be determinants of personality. Śāmkhya-Yoga psychology has, therefore, reasons to put more stress upon the study of the

(1) Kārī. 47.
will, the methods of its training and the various forms of impediments that bring about disorders and distractions. The causes of disintegration and disorders of personality are held to be disabilities of the will, arising from various causes enumerated above. The accessories of the Yoga and the paths laid down in the Gita are the prescribed ways for integration and perfection of personality.

The Yoga and the Gita stress mainly upon training of the will and intellect to function according to the principle of reason (Sattva), and to avoid the forces of restlessness (rajas) and ignorance (tamas). Restraint, purity, dispassion, detachment etc. are prescribed for purifying the will and the intellect. Intemperance and carelessness cause diseases of both the mind and the body. When a life is led in observance of rules and laws of health of body-mind, personality develops and progresses towards perfection. The main forms of obstacles enumerated in Yoga are diseases (bodily and mental), dullness, doubt, carelessness, laxiness, worldliness, false notion, missing the point and instability. These are the weaknesses of the will.

Some modern psychologists also lend support to such a view. W. McDougall in his 'Social Psychology', observes that there can be no moral conflict and emotional tensions in an integrated personality having clear self-consciousness (atma jnana) and strong sentiment for perfection and ideal of self. This consists in expanding our horizon of consciousness, subordinating our unconscious nature to the abiding spiritual

(1) Sutra 30, Section I.
principle. This is what Yoga and the Gita describe and prescribe. The unconscious drives arise in the three internal organs (antah karanas), and they are required to be restrained (nirodha) by the conscious principle. Man is not a human animal, but is also a spiritual being. If we leave out of account his spiritual nature, personality degrades itself to a dynamic psycho-physical automaton. Concept of personality is never applicable to such an organization. It is unconscious and blind, according to Sāmkhya-Yoga. Consciousness does not mean sentience or life. It means light of reason and self-consciousness. According to Sāmkhya, spiritual principle alone is conscious and free from change. Nature and its products are active, mutable and unconscious. Personality has duality in its nature, due to conjunction of Nature and Spirit. Duality begets conflicts, and gives scope for creating and appreciating values. Personality may, therefore, be regarded as the true form of Reality. The unconscious of the Freudians will have no meaning without the conscious spirit. Morality becomes a figment of imagination without the conflict of Nature and Spirit, dust and deity, and without having a standard and principle of judgment. This principle was what James calls 'Pure Ego', and Freud termed 'Super-ego', but these represent only a partial aspect of the Spirit (Purusha).

The dualism of mind and matter in western psychology was reconciled in Sāmkhya and the Gita. The psychical and the physical are parallel processes of the same Nature (prakrti)
working and evolving according to the three Cosmic principles (gunas). They are effects of the same cause working under same principles with reciprocity and interaction. Even in the psycho-physical organization of personality, they evolve and function in due correspondence. Sāmkhya-Yoga and the Gītā give priority to psychic forces due to their influence on the physical aspect. In perception and feeling, the senses are regarded only as the gates of objective impressions, but the mind and internal organs are the warders (dvāri) to receive these sense-data.

Western psychology as an empirical science confines itself to the study of the psycho-physical organization and its overt behaviours. Physical reactions and responses are experimented upon and studied to infer about the mental states and processes. But Yoga-psychology makes its method intuitive, trying to know the essence of personality by an act of identity. It is more a process of knowing through the feeling of identity. In the act of self-consciousness, the process, the knower and the known become one and the same. For such an act, some rules are to be observed and lived through, so as to attain that fitness. Yoga enjoins rules for reorganizing and integrating the psycho-physical whole of personality, so that by gradually enlarging the conscious and narrowing down the unconscious, the Spirit may identify itself in the act of self-consciousness. ("Tadā drastursvarupsvasthānam"- Yoga Sutra).
Are there forms of Personality? According to some writers, Sāmkhya recognizes three forms of personality. Mr. A.K. Majumdar is of opinion that Sāmkhya admits three forms of personality, in order of degree of self-consciousness. The Absolute is a Super-personality, being eternally self-conscious, the human personality as a willing self-conscious agent and other forms of beings en bloc are sub-human persons, possessing more imperfect forms of self-consciousness.\(^{(1)}\).

It may be pointed out that concept of personality involves an organization of Nature and Spirit, animality and rationality, a duality apart from self-consciousness. The Absolute is free from duality, and the beings of lower forms are supposed to be devoid of rationality and self-consciousness in true sense of the terms. Moreover, Sāmkhya-Yoga and the Uitā describe and prescribe paths and means for the human personality alone, neither for the Absolute nor for sub-human persons. These prescribed duties and rules are for regulation of Purusakāra activities (acts of rational Will). Self-consciousness is usually attained in and through the exercise of rational will. Hence, it is reasonable to restrict the psychological concept of personality to human beings alone.

The intelligent will in the personality is its essential element based upon the conscious self as its steering principle. The activities of the will give rise to experiences of the self, create values and sustain the dynamism of the organization. The exercise of the will begets the impressions (Samskaras) and psychic dispositions (Bhāvas), which are germs of the future of personality as

\(^{(1)}\) The Sāmkhya Conception of Personality-p.149.
well as the essence of character. The intelligent will of human personality is, therefore, the most important constituent, determining its entire career by linking up the past, present and future in its unique history. This view is supported also by the medical sciences of ancient India.

The Chitta (mind-stuff) contains the impressions and potencies as unconscious drives of the past lives and undergo transformations (vrttis) in obedience to the abiding cosmic principles (gunas). The unconscious in the Chitta is more pervasive than the unconscious as repressed wishes as maintained by the Psycho-analysts. These innate dispositions are of two forms - natural (Prakrtikāh) and modified (Vaikrtikāh). The Sukma sharira (Subtle body) as the carrier of residues of the past will is supposed to determine at birth the type of organisation or species (Jāti), longevity (Āyuh) and nature of experience (bhoga) of the individual. W. Brown has also given a very prominent place to will in the functional aspect of personality. But Śamkhya-Yoga seems to give still greater priority to will in personality both in its structural and functional aspects.

On the basis of my study and in course of discussion as contained in the foregoing chapters, I have arrived at the following conclusions. I have given below also the definition of personality embodying, as far as practicable and necessary, ideas and concepts advocated by the Systems under my study. I have attempted also side by side to state
the important facts I have come across in course of study and discussions, while their estimates were already given in the foregoing pages.

(A). On the basis of my findings, I define personality, as maintained by Śāmkhya-Yoga, as a pattern of dynamic organisation of psycho-physical constructs of Nature (Prakṛti), having a self or spirit (puruṣa) as inherent principle of consciousness and teleology, working in and responding to the environment in ways peculiar to its own for the experience (bhoga) and realization (apavarga) of the spiritual principle. Etymologically, person (puruṣa) means that which is encased in a body (pūruṣa iti). The body really means the outer cover i.e. the psycho-physical envelope that receives sense-data and displays outward behaviour without fully laying bare its own identity and inner essence.

The psycho-physical organization, according to Śāmkhya-Yoga and the Gītā, is secondary and derivative in its constitution and function. The mind-body is derived from or effect of Nature (Prakṛti) and functions in obedience to cosmic principles (guna), and in the light of Spiritual Consciousness (puruṣa).

(B). The unmanifest (Avyakta) is Absolute consciousness, which is the cause and source of all, evolving the many, in accordance with the three cosmic principles (guna). (1). The evolution takes place in two

---

(1) Śāmkhya - 81.16.
parallel aspects as subjective and objective. The Dualism of Śāmkhya rests with the manifest world made up of the principles of consciousness (cit) and Nature (Prakṛti). The Gītā calls them Kṣetra and Kṣetrajna respectively. Śāmkhya, the Gītā and Vedānta seem to differ only in their fundamental views. Personality, therefore, is an organization of principles of consciousness and products of Nature functioning in accordance with cosmic principles (Gunas).

(C). Personality has two aspects - the Conscious (Purusha) and the Unconscious (Prakṛti), the former is the principle of Knowledge and the latter of activity. But the inactive conscious and the active unconscious appear respectively active and conscious by virtue of their organic conjunction (Samyoga).(1). Mind and other internal organs are not principles of consciousness or knowledge, but of activity only. The mind has dual nature (ubhayatmaka) - organic or sensitive and ideational. This is a great departure from the concept in vogue in modern psychology, which considers mind as central concept in psychology.

(D). The mechanism of experience of personality and its perception derive new meanings in Śāmkhya-Yoga psychology. There are eleven organs of which the mind has dual nature, having the characteristics of both the organ

---

(1) Śām. Sutra. 20.
of sensation and of action. It has also its specific function of discrimination (Samkalpa). The five vital forces (panca vāyavah) supply necessary energies. The eleven organs embody the three cosmic principles giving them the underlying laws of their activity. The forms and individuality of the organs are, therefore, modifications of gunas. (1). The gunas, therefore, explain the harmony and reciprocity of the organs and also the objects they perceive. Mental impressions are necessary for perception. Hallucination, dream etc. are the phenomena that allude to mental impressions.

(E). Consciousness and self-consciousness as essential elements in personality are widely different in Sāmkhya-Yoga psychology. In western psychology, life, consciousness etc. are used almost as synonymous terms. But according to Sāmkhya-Yoga, only Cit or self as unmanifest and inactive is conscious, and all else in nature including the mind are active, manifest and therefore, unconscious. This is, though apparently paradoxical, is held to be true. Activity, change etc. do not belong to the conscious self. Human personality has the duality of the conscious and the unconscious, a synthetic whole of two antitheses - Nature and Spirit. The psycho-physical organism is the product of Nature with a Conscious spiritual Principle as self, experiencing and striving to release itself from the inherent antithesis. Consciousness is not sensitivity or

(1) Sām. Sutra -27.
animæ, it is but the essence of the Self. The Unconscious but the active organs work for the experience of the self. The internal organs - mind, I-feeling and the intellect are more receptive and retentive creating only mental impressions (samskāras), the five organs of knowledge are acquisitive (hāryya). The internal organs associate with the rest in their functions.

(F). How to distinguish between the Conscious and the Unconscious? According to Sāmkhya, activity and unconscious belong to Prakṛti (Nature) and consciousness belongs only to Puruṣa (Spirit). But in the manifest world, it is not correct to say that an evolute is totally unconscious or fully conscious. The principle of evolution being a conjunction (Samyoga) of the conscious and the unconscious. (1). In the world evolved, consciousness is present in varying degree in all things and beings.

(G). The unconscious is not a negative concept in Sāmkhya-Yoga psychology. The Unconscious is primarily a personal heritage from the past lives brought forward through the medium of the Linga sharira (Merged body). It differs from the conscious not in kind but in degree of clearness. The Unconscious is the reservoir of what are called impressions (Samskāras) and potencies (Karmaśhayas). It includes the so-called instincts, inborn drives and aptitudes. The Chitta is used to undergo transformations (Vṛttis) as a result of the principles of nature and

(1) Sāmkhya Sutra –21.
impressions. Yoga accessories are meant for the arrest and sublimation of these psychic dispositions causing transformations of the mind-stuff.

(H). To Freudians, dreams are always retrospective, and ways of fulfilment of the unconscious repressed wishes. But Śāmkhya-Yoga considers dreams to be retrospective as well as prospective and constructive. It is the result of the Chitta - transformation during sleep even in absence of any presentation.

(I). Physical basis of personality is given an important place in the Yoga, and definite practices and rules have been prescribed for its training and development. Sound dietary was also prescribed for the purpose. Śāmkhya and the Gītā lay due emphasis on the physical aspect of personality as well. Regarding the physiological mechanism of the human individual, these systems lay greater stress on the nervous system. The Spinal-sympathetic system including the plexuses and ganglia received greater attention in Yoga, because mind-functions were thought to be closely connected with them. These thinker also considered in detail the nature and functions of different vital forces called vāyus. Their functions were thought to be responsible for distribution and circulation of vital elements, organic reflexes and automatic actions, anabolic, metabolic, and ketogenic actions within the body. The whole body seems to be regarded by them as an assemblage
of molecular thrills subject to the influences of the five chief vital forces (Vayavah).

(J). Yoga psychology mentions only a few so-called instincts of comprehensive character. These instincts include basic emotional and instinctive nature of men. These were, however, included under the terms Samskaras (impressions) and Karmasayas (psychic dispositions) based upon the Law of Karma. The instincts were not regarded as untaught abilities of hereditary origin, but as impressions and subconscious reminiscences of prior lives. Character was regarded as a present phase in the infinite continuum of personality.

(K). Sāmkhya-Yoga and the Gītā recognized both heredity and environment as factors in the constitution and development of personality. But heredity meant personal heredity of prior lives, not ancestral or racial heritage. This fact was also based upon the theory of Sat Kārya Vāda and the law of karma. Environment or nurture included family, training, customs, socio-cultural relationships etc. The cardinal virtues mentioned both in the Yoga and the Gītā are practicable only in a social setting, and these are highly eloquent of the importance of environment in development of personality.

(L). The question of defining and classifying traits and types of personality was not so much considered
in these systems. The Gitā devotes a chapter on types of personality with their specific characteristics. These three types mentioned were derived from the workings of three cosmic principles (gunas). There were six broad types of personality—Sattvika, Rajasika, Tamasika, Sattvika-rajasika, Sattvika-tamasika and Rajasika-tamasika, according to some writers. It is hardly practicable even today to define and classify types, because of depth, richness and dynamic nature of human personality.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that personality is as yet a term that lacks scientific definition. Personality as applied to human beings is comprehensive and abstract, and psychology of personality has as yet much unexplored field ahead. In view of the psychological interpretations of personality by modern writers on the subject, the definitions and concepts pertaining to personality as propounded by Sañkhya-Yoga and the Gitā deserve careful attention. The contributions of these systems, I feel convinced, will throw much light on many a burning problem pertaining to the subject, and are expected to furnish enough materials for future study of the subject. My findings included in this chapter are supported by elaborate discussions contained in the foregoing chapters. The facts noted above are attempted to be duly supported by cogent reasons embodied in different sections of this work.