CHAPTER - I
INTRODUCTION
TOWARD A METAPHYSICAL UNDERSTANDING OF PERSON

The introductory chapter of the present thesis attempts to re-consider the sense of the person from a historical perspective. In this chapter, we intend to scan the trajectory of literature that pertains to the notion of person and her/his relation with the society. This chapter, while dealing with the theoretical background, also criticizes the rationalist and empiricist ideologies inherited from the last centuries. Accordingly, the chapter deals with answers to such questions such as the paradoxicality of the human person, her/his role in a given society, and the way a person is understood in different systems of philosophies as well as in different religions. Also this chapter is concerned about the issues such as general statement of the problem, background, review of literature, methodology and significance of the present study. In brief, the introductory chapter purports to comprehend the human person in traditional and modern societies in a general way.

We are living through what many people call “world revolution.” Changes are occurring which reach to the very foundations of human life and society. There has recently been a “shortening of the time-span between notable changes” in a society. In the past, men could expect to live under relatively fixed conditions; the time-span of significant changes was considerably longer than that of a human life. Now great changes are taking place within a fraction of the life span of single individuals and this situation creates unprecedented problems in both human living conditions and human thinking. We are living in a period, which resembles the last stages of the Greco-Roman civilization, the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Industrial Revolution, when basic shifts took place in the thinking patterns, values, and practices of men. But in our age the changes are worldwide and they are happening at a greatly accelerated rate. In spite of our amazing advances, many thoughtful people are disturbed and anxious. Knowledge seems divorced from values; it is possible to have great power without insight. With few exceptions, the many books on the philosophy of history and civilization are making progress in science and technology; in other areas, including the ethical and nonmaterial, there
is widespread confusion and possibly disintegration. While these are the human situations today, yet, most of us believe that revival is possible and that dangerous trends can be discovered and controlled if men have vision, courage, and determination.¹

The Human Subject: An Apparent Paradox

Nature stands as a mystery before the human subject. On the one hand he is within the ambit of nature together with other beings. He shares in the activities of the plant and animal world. Needless to say that man remains essentially above the animal and the plant kingdom. Unlike the animal and the plant, he has language, ideas, ideals, codes of right conduct and the ability to choose what he thinks to be right. He has self-consciousness, aesthetic consciousness and power to transcend the particular conditions in which he lives. He has the ability not only to accept nature passively but also unveils, creates and objectifies it through his intelligence and creativity. Man is thus more than an animal. He, as Aristotle said in echoing Plato, could be God-like. Nay, man having an intellect, a soul capable of contemplating the One, the True and the Good is God-like.

Man is thus an apparent paradox. He is included in the nature; yet he transcends it. Nature is thus man’s first enigma, which makes him wonder at it. This wonder prompts him to raise questions about nature, which is the beginning of philosophy. “For it is owing to their wonder”, says Aristotle, “that men both now begin at first and began to philosophize; they wondered originally at the obvious difficulties about the greater matters, e.g., about phenomenon of moon and those of the sun and the stars about the genesis of the universe. And a man who is puzzled and wonders, thinks himself ignorant (whence even the lover of myth is in a sense the lover of wisdom. For the myth is composed of wonders); therefore since they philosophized in order to escape from ignorance, evidently they were pursuing science in order to know, and not for any utilitarian end.”²

This wonder and the consequent desire for knowing more and more of the nature carried with them naturally certain epistemological questions. In close analysis, it may be seen that all such questions revolve on the pivot of the relation between the knower and the known; it is true that it took much time for the
philosophers to formulate these questions and their answers philosophically. Nevertheless, they have been always presupposed in lesser or higher degrees at every stage of human philosophic thought.

**Paradoxicality of the Human Subject**

The study of philosophy of person is an invitation as well as an opportunity to explore what some of the most innovative thinkers have said about the most fundamental questions of all and an opportunity for us to cultivate and develop our own answers to these questions. From the point of view of both the inner structure and the outer expression, there is nothing more enigmatic in the world than the human person. No theory about the nature of human person has ever claimed to be complete. There is something basically paradoxical regarding man's knowledge of himself: he finds himself to be there as a knowing consciousness and at the same time discovers, while he is in the knowledge situation, that there is an expanse of the unknown spread around what is known to him. Man's knowledge of himself and the world, is shrouded in an ocean of ignorance. Man's pursuit of self-knowledge is a sort of dog-running-to-catch-its-own-tail game. He is a being who escapes from his own act of knowing. He knows a thing and yet do not know enough what he knows of it. Somewhere our knowledge retains an eternal shortcoming. Whether it is directed outward or inward, the knowing mind makes certain things stand out under its flash light as it were, but an infinite number of other things linger as unclear along the borders of the known, waiting to enter the zone of knowledge. These later things, however, may never enter the region of clarity but may fleetingly disappear into total obscurity into some unfathomable primordial darkness.

**Rootlessness of Human Person**

It has been peculiarly evident in the present era that many older ethical standards as well as interpretations of life and the universe have been weakened or destroyed; many people find it difficult to establish new and stable foundations for living. There is in the climate of the modern world a sense of impending disaster, a rootlessness of the person, a pervasive tenseness which points to certainties dissolved and emotional centers displaced. We have been living half a life. We
have been developing our appetites—but we have been starving our purposes. We have been concerned with bigger salaries, bigger television screen, and bigger cars—and now with bigger missiles—instead of with the big ideas on which our lives and freedoms depend."  

The concern of our time is not only about what is happening to many individuals, but also about the very future of our type of civilization and perhaps of civilization itself. Somehow we have lost the concept of justice, which was a part of Jewish culture; we have lost the Greek understanding of rational thought and behavior; we have increasingly lost the spiritual nature of man which is said to be of Indian culture and civilization and we have also lost the Christian teaching of love, compassion, and human brotherhood. In other words, what we see today is an invisible break-down in our civilization coupled with the erosion of values, the dissipation of humane purposes, the denial of any distinction between good and bad, right and wrong and the reversion to sub-human levels of conduct.

The events of recent decades have made it clear that something has indeed gone tragically wrong with human subject and human affairs. Man has gained great new powers in science and technology, but too frequently these powers have been used for destructive purposes. Man has rapidly extended the range and quantity of his knowledge, but he has advanced little if at all toward happiness and well-being. He has devised numerous plans and organizations for gaining greater security and comfort, yet he suffers from intellectual and emotional insecurity because he is uncertain about the meaning of life, the nature of the world in which he lives, and the kind of life he wants to live with his fellows.

Person

It was regarded in the earlier days that the essential core of what a person was nothing but his soul. This belief in the separation of mind and body is known as dualism. Bodies are viewed as complex biological entities responsible for all behaviour and thought processes they express. But the human person is more than his body which is extended in the space. He is compound of such a body together with a knowing and planning agency. Person is an entity that has the moral right of
self determination. Now the question is as to what properties must an entity possess to be a person? During the course of time, many properties/qualities have been suggested such as intelligence, capacity to speak language, creativity, ability to make moral judgments, consciousness, free will and self awareness. From a strictly ontological perspective, the entity that we call person and which is unique in its independence possesses a spiritual nature (Boethius). Spiritual nature simply defines that entity in which the all-encompassing or infinite being shines forth and which in turn grounds each finite being and grants participation in its own fullness.

**Person and Individual**

The terms person and individual overlap each other. The term individual is generally used as the sense of belonging to a group without involving any specific identity. It is specified in philosophical literature as non-relational. The individual is understood not merely as possessing a complete nature of a particular kind, but as having a particular existence too. There is an innate tendency for the individual to assert oneself and to strive towards one's own fulfillment. As an individual, one stands 'separate' or distinct from others. One asserts one's independence, even if in a limited manner, and cannot be absorbed or subsumed under another. Further, the notion of self-consciousness, creativity, believing in a supernatural power, aesthetic capacities etc. are added to the individual; indeed, some consider these as the special characteristic features of 'person'. But, the notions person and individual overlap in such a way that it is difficult to think of either individuals or persons exclusively without involving either.  

**Form**

Man is understood as a unity of consciousness. The next layer is man's individuality which may be considered as a close unit from the point of view of both his structure and function. Man is not merely a living thing like other creatures. Man as a living thing is distinguishable as he is endowed with certain qualities and characteristics which are distinctly attributed to him. Man as a living being is determined by his Centrum which is not only spatial but also described as interiority. The interaction between interiority of the living human being and the
outside world which is related to him is realized through the perception of meaning and by spontaneous activity.

**Personality**

Human beings differ basically from animal because of his self-consciousness as well as his depth of will in acting and creating. Man is endowed with appropriate consciousness and will which enables him to act and react in a particular way. To be person means that he cannot be used or manipulated by any other, so to say, he is an end in itself. It also amounts to saying that he cannot be possessed by another nor can be represented by any other. In other words, he fills a space that is created by him or even his surroundings. That is why person in Greek, Pro-so-pon means that the person has its own form and is at the same time oriented towards the other. Hence, ontologically the human person cannot exist as a separate unit, but is dependent on the existence of other persons. It implies that man is relational in his character and attitude.

**Person: Etymological Features**

Etymologically, we can trace the meaning of the term Person to the Etruscan Phersu, which evidently denoted a mask, or the wearer of the mask at festivals in honour of P (h) Persephone. As the Etruscans were influential in the development of the Roman theatre, Persephone's mask came to be known among the Romans by the adjective as persona. Later this came to signify any mask, especially those used in theatres. To this Etruscan word the Romans fused one of their own words, personare, which means "sounding" or speaking through", because the mask was that through which the voice of the goddess or the character was heard. Thus from the very beginning, the mask not only had visual and acoustic functions or properties, but was used also to represent a personage. The term was easily transferred from the device to the theatrical role of dramatic character represented through it. Gradually the term was used to indicate the concrete character of a real personage, and not merely as the dramatic role that one plays. In the philosophical sense, it came to mean a human substance in its properly and distinctively human individuality.
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The Greeks had a word with a meaning similar to that of the Latin persona, meaning, the word prosopon (pro-sop-on), whose central part meant ‘to see’ and ‘to be seen’. The Greek term easily passes over into the “look” or “countenance” of someone, which is also ambiguous. Here the element of difference comes forward, for we recognize each other most easily by our countenances or faces. This aspect of distinctiveness points to the uniqueness already associated with the Latin notion of a dramatic character (dramatis personae); there is, indeed, a variant of the Greek word: ‘prosopeion’ which means “mask”. More importantly, the Greeks used the word prosopon periphrastically (to son prosopon), i.e. as a roundabout way of speaking in the second person: to say “person” is to say “thou”. It is a form of addressing which accounts for the meaning “I and Thou”, “you and me”. It means: “face to face” (kata prosopon), or a direct encounter with nothing between, just as the usual setting for intimacy is a tele-a-tete.

The Greeks attached great importance to the face, which according to Aristotle is had only by humans and no other animal. Thus, hidden within the Greek term for person (prosopon) is the sense that only human beings have faces or structures that shows forth its meaning. It is transparent with the innocent, concealing with the devious, glowing with the joyful, grieving with the sad, indifferent with the bored. A person’s face is a signature of the character within; one cannot disengage the face from a certain interiority.

Pre-Socratic Thinking about Person

Souls distinguish the animate from the inanimate; it is not restricted to humans. It is not limited to animals but plants also have souls. Empedocles thought that plants have souls and that human souls can come to animate plants. He in fact claims to have been a bush in previous incarnation, as well as a bird, and a fish.

Pythagoreans was concerned with the continual existence of the person after death. Some of the states, activities, operations crucial to the identity of the person were attributed to soul. Heraclitus attributes wisdom to the soul provided that it is in the right state, ‘A dry soul is wisest and best’. He is first thinker to
articulate a connection between soul and motor functions. He says that a drunken person stumbles because his perceptual abilities have been impaired due to moisture of soul. He thought the soul was bodily but composed of an unduly fine or rare kind of matter e.g. air or fire. Soul and body were not thought to be radically different in kind; these differences seem just to consist in the difference of properties such as fineness and mobility.

Socrates

According to Socrates, soul is not only immaterial but also that it contemplates truth after its separation from the body at the time of death. He distinguishes two kinds of things that are perceptible, composed of parts and subject to dissolution and destruction. On the other hand are things that are not perceptible but intelligible not composed of parts and exempt from dissolution and destruction. These two categories are mutually exclusive. Intelligible beings include divine, whose nature it is to rule and to lead. These souls are intelligible, part less and imperishable. Soul is intelligible being and body is like perceptible perishable being. Soul is immaterial since life belongs to soul essentially the soul must be deathless that is immortal. Soul is characterized by cognitive and intellectual features. It is something that reasons more or less depending on the extent to which it is disturbed by body and the senses; something that regulates and controls the body and its desires and affections ‘especially if it is a wise soul’, which has the virtues of temperance, justice and courage. Soul is immaterial because it has life essentially, the way fire has heat essentially. It is bearer of moral qualities such as justice and courage. It is the soul that animates body of living things. Soul is not responsible for all of a person’s mental or psychological activities and responses but only for limited subset of them. He attributes large variety of mental states to the body such as beliefs and pleasures and desires and fears. At the same time soul is not merely intellectual it too has desires and pleasures such as the pleasure of reasoning. Soul’s function are not limited to grasping and appreciating truth, but include regulating and controlling the body and its affections such as beliefs, pleasures, desires and fears.9
Plato

According to Plato, human knowledge is not simply matter of mere passive observation of things and events in the World. Our knowledge involves understanding in that we actively interpret the stimulation we receive through our sense organs, we apply concepts to organize and classify what we perceive, using our mental powers as well as our sense organs. Plato’s Forms can be identified with concepts. There are four main aspects of Forms:

1. Logical (to do with meanings and concepts).
2. Metaphysical (what is ultimately real)
3. Epistemological (what we can know)
4. Moral (how we ought to live)

It is the moral application of the theory of Forms that plays the most important role in Plato’s conception of Human person. We can distinguish many particular courageous action or just dealings from the general concept or Forms of courage and justice. He seeks an adequate general definition of such virtues. We have to distinguish these ideals from the reality of particular Human beings in real life situation. Often an action or person may be right, just or admirable in one way but not in others. Plato holds that the ethical Form sets absolute standards of value for us. For Plato the Form of goodness is pre-eminent in the World of Forms, it plays an almost God like role in his system, being described as the source of all reality, truth, goodness. For Plato, by the proper care of our faculty of reason we can come to know what is good and actually become good. To be virtuous, to be a good Human being, it is enough to know what Human virtue is. All the virtues are set to be identical at root in that one cannot pursue any one of them without having the others and this unique Human goodness is identified with knowledge in the wide sense of wisdom not mere store of information or intellectual virtuosity. Theory of Forms is Plato’s answer to the intellectual and moral skepticism of his time. It is one of the first and greatest expressions of the hope that we can attain reliable knowledge both about the world as a whole and about the proper conduct of human life and society. He makes a good case in advocating that we all need
to use our reason in exercising prudent self control, moderating our emotions and desires, their expression and fulfillment.

Plato is one of the main sources for the dualist view, according to which the Human soul or mind is a non material entity that can exist apart from the body. He is of the view that soul exists before birth, it is indestructible and will exist eternally after death. He says that mental ability to recognize the validity of inferential steps and the necessity of conclusion must be innate. Plato presents a number of other arguments that the Human soul must persist after the death of the body. He tries to disprove the materialistic theory of the early Greek Atomists that the soul is composed of tiny particles that dissipate into air at death. He also argues against the conception that soul is a kind of ‘Harmony’ of the living Human Body with brain, like the music made by an instrument when properly tuned and played. Plato held that it is the material soul not the bodily senses that attain knowledge of the Forms. He compares the soul to the divine, the rational, the immortal, indissoluble and unchangeable. The soul is the higher element in human nature and the body the lower. In Platonic thought, there are three parts of soul:

1. **Appetite:** All the physical urges, such as hunger, thirst and sexual desire,
2. **Reason:** This controls the appetite.
3. **Spirit or Passion:** There is an emotion of self disgust involved, not just an intellectual recognition of the irrationality or undesirability of the desire; spirit must be distinct from reason. Emotion is different both from bodily desires and from rational or moral judgment. Love is not the same as lust but on the other hand it is more than a mere intellectual judgment about admirable qualities of the beloved. Hunger, indignation ambition, aggression and the desire for power neither are not bodily desires nor are they mere judgments about the value, disvalue of things although they involve such judgments. Plato remarks that children show spirit before they display reason. He asserts that spirit is usually on the side of reason when inner conflict occurs. But if it is a genuinely distinct element in the
mind there must be cases where it can conflict with Reason. He compares the soul to the chariot pulled by a white horse (Spirit) and dark horse (Appetite) driven by a Charioteer (Reason) who struggles to keep control. This tripartite anatomy of soul can be in modern times compared to intellect, emotion and bodily desires. Emotions are part of our Human nature but Plato had in mind Human desires and drives that are not bodily appetite but not exactly emotions such as self assertion, ambition, desire for money, status, power. Where does the will come into play? It is one thing to judge with ones reason what one ought to do, and another to do or try to do. A different tripartite distinction of mental faculties has been used and is as follows, reason, emotion and will. We need to distinguish five factors in Human nature such as reason, will, nonbodily motivation (drives), emotions and bodily appetite. Much of Plato’s discussion seems to be conducted with men, rather than women in mind. In Greek society women played almost no part in public life and were confined to their reproductive roles and house hold duties. However, Plato argues that there is no role in society that needs to be restricted to either sex. He allows that some women are athletic, musical, philosophical and even high spirited. But he also assumes that men are on average better than women at everything what he thinks that the only absolute distinction is biological and that any other differences are only matter of degree. He is, therefore prepared to admit women of appropriate talent to the ruling class. He also explains that we are social creatures i.e, to live in a society is natural to human beings. Human individuals are not self sufficient we each have many needs that we cannot meet by ourselves. Food, shelter and clothing can hardly be obtained without the help of others. Different people have different aptitudes and interests, each fitted by nature, training and experience to specialize in one kind of task, division of labour is therefore essential in society. Reason, Appetite and Spirit are present to some degree in every person. He has a clear view about which of the three elements should rule,
it is reason that ought to control both Spirit and Appetite. Each has its proper role to play and there should ideally be harmonious agreement between the three aspects of our nature, with reason in overall command.

Aristotle

Aristotle sees human beings as one kind of animal, albeit a very special kind, uniquely capable of rational thought; he sees animals as one class of living things, plants being the other class of living things. All life thus forms an enormous family of orders, genera and species each with its own distinguishing features. Aristotle outlines his approach in his treatise known as De-Anima (of the soul). In the Aristotelian conception soul is not thought of as a thing or a substance at all. His view would be best expressed by not using any noun to translate, 'psyche' but to say instead that living things are ensued i.e. they have certain distinctive ways of existing and functioning and says that soul is the form of a living thing. Animals have the faculty of sense perception, desire and self-movement. Human beings have faculty of thought and intellect. It must be a kind of thought that other animals do not have presumably thought that can be expressed in language and for which reasons for and against can be given. Human soul should be understood not as a thing, but as a distinctive cluster of faculties, including reasoning that are fundamental to human way of living and functioning. It is better to say that man pities, learns and thinks using his mental faculties.

Soul as any living thing 'X' is not a substance, an entity, an extra thing, it is rather the way that 'X' lives, operates, functions and that may be analyzable as a set of faculties. In this there is no sense to talk of a soul without a body, for if there is no body then there can be no way that the body is functioning. He draws the conclusion that soul cannot exist without a body not because itself a kind of body but because the soul is not a thing of any kind, rather a complex property of living bodies. He suggests that there is something especially different about the human intellect namely our faculty for purely theoretical thoughts. And he seems to suggest that this faculty can exist separately from body. The notion of totally disembodied thought remains conceptually problematic, for Aristotle soul is not a
body, but a set of capacities of the living body. A part of soul has to be understood as one such capacity, distinct from others in the set. He does not follow the tripartite division of Plato. He usually contrasts two elements one possessing reason (The bit that does the thinking) and the other possessing reason only in the sense that it can obey reason, though it can also be disobedient. Elsewhere he talks of rational and non-rational aspects of the soul. He sees both emotions and desires being potentially obedient to reason, in the sense that how one feels and what one wants can be affected by one’s considered judgment about what is best. He makes a distinction within the rational part between our capacity for reasoning about necessary propositions and our ability to deliberate about what to do. This is the distinction between theoretical and practical reason. Another aspect of human nature is that we are social beings. What is distinctive of human social life is our awareness of justice and injustice. He believes that our human nature reaches its full development only when we live as members of an organized society. But who counts as rational beings? He assumes that women although human are innately different in mental capacity from men and less fitted for rational thought, so they should stick to their reproductive and domestic roles. With respect to women Aristotle was conservative where as Plato was ahead of his times. Aristotle also assumes that there are innate differences between individuals in their ability to think and reason. He takes for granted that there will be social classes based on the division of labour, with large number of workers who will not for the most part we capable of the higher form of thought. Aristotle sees no general objection to slavery for he believes that some people are slaves by nature. However, he admits that sometimes it so happens that slaves have the bodies of free-men. Aristotle’s analysis of mind as a set of capacities of the living body and idea of human fulfillment while insisting that the distinctively rational capacities are on average equally present in every person irrespective of sex, class, race and nationality and that human needs, aspiration and rights are correspondingly universal.11

Self-reflection and the verification of truth

The Pre-Socratic philosophers had made no sharp distinction between soul and body. Life and consciousness were thought to be active manifestations of
physical parts. The atomists held that soul consisted of finer material atoms, and Heraclitus had identified soul with fire. Anaxagoras had boldly asserted that mind was something unmixed with matter and capable of independent purposive action. But he failed to sustain this position, and finally identified the causes of human action with air, ether and water leaving no real place for mind. Socrates introduced a novel conception of the soul quite distinct from all the preceding theories which has exercised an important influence on the western view of man ever since. The soul is neither an arrangement of atoms nor a super personal agency endowed with super-human knowledge and capacities. It is rather the primary guiding part of the human subject, which consciously directs his life. The human subject is more than an organized body, which is extended in space. He is compound of such a body, together with a knowing, planning agency. This has given rise to look at the problem of human body and soul in a novel way and has played an important role in western thought from the time of Socrates.

Even though the earliest phase of the Greek thought was cosmological, the problem of the “One and Many” in its ontical and logical aspects has appeared there already at its very start. Thus the cosmological and the mathematical philosophies of the early Ionians (Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes etc) and Pythagoreans were soon replaced by a more logical and anthropological philosophy in the form of the Heraclitic-Eleatic anatomy; it was the anatomy between the philosophy of change (Heraclitus) and the philosophy of permanence (Parmenides).

What is interesting here is that the champions of both of these antinomies equally found it impossible to penetrate into the secret of nature without having first studied the secret of man. One must first fulfill the demand of self-reflection, if one wishes to keep hold of reality and to understand its meaning. This becomes essential even on practical levels when differences are found to exist between the popular experiences and their theoretical formulations. It is not enough to believe in the primacy of the objective truth. It is essential that one must be certain of one’s possession of it, which requires process of analysis and synthesis, of reflection and presentation. It is in this spirit that Heraclitus characterized his
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philosophy in the trends “edizesamen amauton” (I have sought for myself) Parmenides in his poem On Nature speaks on “truth” and on “opinion”.

Self-reflection and the verification of truth require the mercy of one’s knowing powers. The difference between the kinds of knowledge obtained through sense and intellect has to be clearly fixed. For the cosmological philosophers of Greece this was done through a distinction between “opinion” and reflection or thinking (episteme, pronein, noein, Logus.) Thus Anaxagoras, for instance, speaks of the participation of the Nous (Universal Mind) in man whereby he is distinguished from the rest of the animal kingdom. Though knowledge enters into man “through the door of the senses” (as Heraclitus puts it) intellectual knowledge is essentially distinct from sense perception. The reason in which the individual participates through his knowledge is everywhere the same. The Logos (Heraclitus) or Nous (Anaxagoras) as homogenous reason is distributed through the whole universe as its moving force. Knowing, then, is a property “common” (sunon) to all, unlike dreams and to conform himself. In other words, knowledge has a normative significance, which philosophy as a discipline is chiefly empowered to delve.

These reflections on the human subject within a society/culture provide certain characteristic features that make the meaningfulness of person and his relationship with the society. The question is desirable because the notions of person and society have become privileged issues of recent times, for they are consciously serving as the fundamental ground for the interaction and conflicts, large and small, around the world. Like planning to begin human life on a new planet, this gives occasion to ask what is of truly important to the understandings on person and society as well as the relation between the individual and the collective.

St. Augustine

In philosophy the chief influence on him was Platonist. He believed that true God is at once the author of things, the illuminator of truth and the giver of happiness. He believed that there are three kinds of substances.

1. Bodies mutable in time and place.
2. Souls incorporeal but mutable in time.

God makes everything and all that he makes is good. Badness arises from the tendency of things to decay. The ordinary course of nature is the regular and planned unfolding of causal reasons, which date from the creation when God completed his work. God is not only the cause of thing’s being but the cause of our knowing them. God illuminates truth as sun illuminates visible things. The senses do not supply knowledge because these objects are mutable. But understanding can be compared to vision as the successful exercise of faculty of reason, which is like sight, in the presence of God or wisdom, which is like light. Knowledge is enlightenment by God, the only teacher who can do more than provide an occasion for learning. Soul for him was a substance and until general resurrection the souls of dead will ‘live’ without bodies. Man is both body and soul. He accepted language as both indicating thoughts and also representing the structure of thoughts in its own verbal structure. He saw humans' free will as essential to Catholic theology because otherwise an almighty God could not be justified in tolerating ill deeds and punishing ill doers. The sin we inherit from Adam must be penal because of original guilt. It requires two way power of acting and not acting, a movement of the mind free both for doing and for not doing. He reconciled freedom of decision with divine foreknowledge. He believed that men are not able to fulfil the divine commands without God’s aid, nor even to will and believe without God’s ‘acting’. In the free decision of human will the grace of God was victorious. The fundamental religious duty is to love and serve the God. According to him, by doing such action we will choose the good and avoid the evil. God selects only a few people to receive grace and be saved. The rest of humanity will continue to sin and not repent and they will be punished for it after death.

Thomas Aquinas

He allows that natural power of Human reason has a legitimate, if limited, place in the defence of Christian faith. Aquinas held the Aristotelian view that all human knowledge starts with perception through the senses, but we have to view
our intellect to recognize types and forms of things and to attain systematic scientific knowledge of the world. He distinguishes between rational theology and revealed theology in the former we can use un-aided human reason, to prove the existence of God, in the latter we receive in faith the revelation of God through the Bible and the Church. But faith is not something under the control of our will rather it is inferred by the grace of God. He basically follows analyses of rational soul as consisting in our capacities for perception, intellectual conception, theoretical reasoning and practical deliberation resulting in exercising of our free will in action. He supplements the four classical Greek virtues of courage, temperance, prudence and justice with three theological virtues of faith, hope and divine love for which we need to receive divine illumination. On the question of immortality he retained an element of Platonism saying that although resurrection involves the recreation of human being as living body, nonetheless soul has a separate existence between death and resurrection. His appeal to reason was real but limited. The authority of the Catholic Church remained paramount for him in all matters of faith.

_Homo-socialis_ is understood as a manifestation of man in his person to person relations. At the same time man is part of nature. Nature is a component of man himself in as much as he comes into and lives in nature which he appropriates in and through his life. That is why we cannot divide the human world into two self sufficient, substantial worlds namely, the world of the relations of men to nature and the world of man's relation to society. Just as there is undivided unity between the natural and the social worlds, there is also a unity that may be made possible through the specific unity of man as a symbiosis of the objective and the subjective. Correspondingly, there is a unity in the historical development of the human species. The biological evolution has prepared the pre-conditions for the emergence of the human beings. Altogether, natural being has been sublated by another type of being which may be named as the social being.

It is commonly understood that socialization occurs most easily between persons of similar physical and psychic-constitution. Common behavioral patterns are a typical human phenomenon, which is found in the human groups. These
patterns are slowly subject to change but show great durability. They provide great cohesion and ensure each member his proper place. The durability stems from the recognition of the value of these patterns which integrate the human community and adapt it to a changing environment.

The memories of unique events and action which are transmitted by successive generations have a great role in determining the durability of the above mentioned groups. Each person possesses his own history independent of the repeated behavioral patterns of the group and obtains a certain amount of individual experience. The relations of these unique experiences of the group create the group history. On the basis of history, clans and nations develop consciousness of their identity.

Material goods gathered by the groups are passed on to the next generation. As a result of differing forms of social inheritance, values gathered in this unit accumulate and form an environment developed by man. Inheritance of property often becomes the perfect way of bolstering group’s fellowship, durability and prestige.

Social relations between groups shape interactions among persons belonging to different social groups. These interactions occur in what can be termed the social space. Language is the basic instrument of personal relations among people raised in the tradition of different cultural patterns. The long term process of the need for contact causes a language’s range of usage to be much wider than the tradition of its primary clans or nationalities. Despite the feeling of separateness, people find means of communicating.

The desire to know what is individual, unique and unknown in the group causes the observation of certain forms of behaviour with respect to strangers. We expect certain behaviour from people whom we meet, and in return we feel obliged to behave similarly. Scale of value emerges when value judgments of some people can be empirically confirmed by others. One needs common criteria of truth to judge the reliability and accuracy of information. The surmounting of the social space which separates people raised under the influence of different
cultural patterns is thus a permanent human aspiration. This aspiration leads to the creation of social bonds. The most important bond is regarded as the means of communication, the language, positive law and common system of valuation.

**Person and his Roles**

The human subject who is acting in space and time set off forces within person-to-person relations. These forces bring people together or draw them apart. They cause the creation and disintegration of social groups. A conscious control over forces acting within inter-personal relations begins with an individual who has passed through the elementary process of up-bringing by his family who is aspiring for ideals and values. An individual confronts his personal opportunities and desires with his appreciation of the social value of chosen undertakings in terms of anticipated results. Every person forms many roles in various groups without breaking one’s bonds to the parent group and undertakes other social roles. Behaviour patterns according to social roles create a relatively stable and coherent intra-group system. The general social structure contains many old and new groups. The interaction of existing forces may result in the strengthening of fellowship of existing groups or in their disintegration and the creation of new groups resulting into changes in the social structure. Society provides the freedom of choice but at the same time individuals are expected to contribute so as to serve the common good. Homo-Socialis, philosophers say, are subjected to society is a component of it. Homo-Faber, on the other hand, is superior to nature. It is the growth of the range of freedom of human beings in relation to nature. The ability to guide one’s imagination independent from the input of outside sensation enabled the human subject to master his movements as his own. Accordingly, it may be understood that man learned how to master himself and simultaneously observed the external results of events taking place in his environment which is independent of his internal process. Thus man mastered the activities of other beings too. Consequently, there was the period of animal domestication and plant cultivation. It has made man to master his external environment and was able to understand and master within himself. He became the measure of things and of other people.
too. He became an engineer directing the energy of action, mastering the psychic, water, steam, electric and nuclear energies. As a result, cybernetics, computers and automation epitomize contemporary achievements.

**Homo Socialis to Homo Faber**

The history of the human subject is a fabric on which reflections about the development of homo Faber has been weaved. It could have been done much the same way on the fabric of psychological development of an individual. A child starts his role of life by separating himself from his environment, mastering his uncoordinated movements and directing the flow of his imagination. Later comes the period of greater objectivity when his relation to the surrounding world is firmed and perfected. The development of inter-personal relations from the maintenance of groups and authority through universality and material truthfulness of information leads to the ability to co-ordinate and implement energies directed to the common good. Therefore, the human subject is a thinking subject who is not only an inquirer but also a problem solver too because he is pre-consciously conscious of his determinations and alternative modes of self-determining.

**The Ontological Structure of the Human Subject: Two Approaches**

There are several structural characteristics that denote the meaning of man as a person. It has been noted by thinkers and philosophers that personhood implies self-consciousness, freedom, creativity, and aesthetic sensibility apart from the several layers that constitute the concrete personal existence of man such as form, individuality, personality and person in the proper sense. Philosophy tries to understand the meaning of person in two ways: (1) outside-in-approach and (2) inside-out-approach. The outside-in approach is the basis of all empirical studies and rational analyses and the inside-out approach is centered on man's consciousness and brings out the ontological structure of man. To the inside-out approach, man's experience of the world manifests his intentionality. In other words, inside-out approach of the person is directed toward the human subject in his totality as a meaning-giving subject.
To understand the human subject is to be able to encompass through thought and words the entire field of his consciousness. As Prof. Ramakant Sinari\textsuperscript{13} opines there can be, and indeed are, two distinct approaches to the understanding of human reality: one outside-in and the other inside-out. Although ultimately the answer to the question what is man? Will have to comprehend explanations of all the factors that go to constitute the entire human reality, the outside-in approach is the basis of all empirical studies and rational analyses and the inside-out approach is crystallized in ontologies. The empirical studies of human phenomena begin with the consideration of man as an object, an incarnate and observable thing, i.e., one that can be dissected, experimented on, manipulated with instruments, measured and X-rayed. The empirical view of man, therefore, tries to avoid every reference to his inside, his feeling self. It is the basic requirement of this view to objectify man, to investigate him by divorcing him from his inwardness to attempt not to state the un-satiable existential meaning of “being human”. For this view, man must be explained outside-in, i.e., he must be regarded as a specimen of the behavioural set and brought under scientific laws. According to the outside-in approach, man as a biological, physiological, psychological, chemical and social entity, is a fully analyzable system.

The outside-in explanation for the phenomenon of man, so far as their logical character is concerned, is invariably flawless because they make it a point not to construct unwarranted or trans-empirical hypotheses. They try to strictly adhere to the principle of stating only what is observed or observable, of establishing the truth of every proposition strictly empirically. Hence, in many of the scientific philosophers today, where solutions to problems seek to be outside-in, every statement referring to man’s inside is translated into the statement of behavior. Statements about mental acts, about consciousness or ego, existential experiences, statements of private meanings, are all reached through the behavioural and physical formulations. In the process, man’s subjectivity—his “inner space”—one of the eternal mysteries into which our inward-seeking sensibility continually runs, is lost.
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Gilbert Ryle and the Behaviorist Approach

One of the most eminent scientific philosophers in which this has happened is Gilbert Ryle’s theory of the human mind. Ryle’s method of accounting for the nature of mind is behaviorist. By approaching the “mental”, outside-in, he discards the classical notions regarding the inside of man, such as the notions like non-materiality, self-luminosity, intentionality, introspection and self-consciousness. Statements about them, he held, can be explicated by means of their equivalents in the category of physical behavior. Thus, for instance, statement such as “I am thinking what I am doing”, “I must heed what the others say or do” was usually taken as referring to particular frames of mind.

The Inside-out Approach and the Structure of Consciousness

The design of the inside-out study of man centers on man’s consciousness and hence is intended to bring out the ontological structure of man. In fact this study is more than scientific, for, it proceeds from the “roots” of consciousness’s very act of experiencing. To the inside-out view, man’s experience of the world manifests his intensionality. Man sees his own life and his presence in the world as significant realities. His sense of being in the world, of having a body extended in space and “open” toward various impressions about the physical world, his awareness of occupying a certain locus amidst things and along flow of time, his being conscious and alive, are fundamental to his ontological being. Man is directed toward some meaning or other, some impression or other-he not only perceives himself as experiencing but also registers what he experiences as his.

The Intentionality Thesis and the Inside-Out Approach

The thesis that human consciousness is intentional–originally put forward by Edmund Husserl and now unhesitatingly accepted by phenomenologist and existentialists– suggest that it is perhaps the most primordial quality of man’s existence. Consciousness is always the “consciousness-of”. The awareness I have of the physical world and of myself as an embodied mind cannot be separated from my being. To be conscious as man is to be worldly, i.e., to have a psychic structure directed towards objects, to contain and know that the world is there.
Thus ‘being intentional’ is ‘being directed towards the world’: both the expressions point out what can be termed the arrow-head character of man’s entire psycho-physical existence.

One of the most puzzling constituents of our inside is that our sense of being conscious is uninterruptedly fastened, so to say, to the process of our meaning-intuiting. Existence itself is a meaning. That I am here and now, that the world is there as a sort of abode of mine, that the objects and persons around me engage my senses and attentions, are all expressions of certain basic meaning-experiences. How these meaning-experiences or meaning-intuitions arise in consciousness is one of the perennial problems in metaphysics. We know, for instance, that our awareness of existing in the world is the residual meaning behind all meanings as such, that even if we succeed in annulling all other meaning, the “meaningfulness” of our being worldly cannot be annulled.

In a sense nominalists are right when they say that the ultimate constituents of the universe are names. However, the word ‘name’ must be understood in a broad sense- it must refer to that fundamental import which consciousness runs into by its position in the world. The very bodily being of mine, the fact of my living in space and time, objects around me – the books, pencils, the walls, the trees and roads and houses outside my window-are all meanings in the sense that they are intuited by me as definite “spots” through which my awareness journeys. There is no experience which is totally devoid of meaning.

The intentionality of consciousness and the emergence of meaning are thus strangely inter-connected. Both display a kind of inside-out directedness of the human self: they point at something and leave the consciousness as its experiencer, it’s “meaner”. Just as every meaning situation implies the presence of a mind, a cognitive being; it also shows itself as a meeting-point of the latter with something. It is impossible to conceive of a context where an absolutely meaningless experience prevails. In this sense, to be is to be meant for someone-to a ego that posits itself as an I –locus. This chair, for instance, is “caught” by my consciousness as a meant thing; it is, so to say, a “prey” to my meaning.
consciousness. Indeed, the world that is perceived as a meaning or assembly of meanings can be analyzed into simple individual nuances, somewhat like noesis-Noema structures; but even when so analyzed, meanings still remain the basic constituents of our existence in the world. One is then, inclined to say that man is the origin of all meanings.

Since all meanings are intended, so to say, apprehended by consciousness, and since there is no possibility of their being self-subsistent, it is the intentional character of consciousness that seems to generate them. To say that man is the creator of the world, that the world comprises a pattern of meanings secreted by the I-loci, contains, therefore, greater truth than might appear. Ontologically i.e., looking at the inside-out direction of it, human consciousness is both worldly and non-worldly. The worldliness is not something extraneous to us—it is a natural habitat of our existence. As Heidegger says, temporality or being-in-the-world belongs to the very structure of man. It is by being-in-the-world, or rather because of it, that our sense of existence becomes a reality, an impregnable truth. Unless therefore a special endeavor is made to disconnect our inside from its environing outside, i.e. the world of psychic impressions as such, we necessarily remain world-conscious, world oriented, world based. But while living as world based we do not succumb to the world. Nothing that is given to consciousness is such that it holds on to it rigidly. Different horizons of meaning arise in consciousness as clear, semi-clear and unclear are nuances of what stands out as prominent. The self escaping disposition seems to be innate to the very essence of man.

Phenomenological Method and the Primordial State of Consciousness

Husserl’s famous phenomenological method, which is a self-explorative technique in modern existentialist philosophers, has for its aim the withdrawal of consciousness from its world-experience. Husserl’s plan, like that of the Yoga philosophy and Advait Vedanta, was to “catch” the primordial state of consciousness i.e., the state at which consciousness is pure and immune from all presuppositions. While phenomenologist is following Husserl and support the possibility of consciousness attaining what have been called the “essential” or “eidetic” meanings, the existentialists at no stage alienate the phenomenon of
being-conscious from that of being-in-the-world. According to them, "worldliness" belongs to the very structure of consciousness. It is the expression of its basic disposition. All meaning – intuitions or meanings-experiences form the very way consciousness is in the world. Had there been a region in which consciousness could realize total absence of the world impressions, the whole outside could be regarded as a superimposition which may be an accident in relation to consciousness. But the very fact that we do not perceive the world as "unnatural" do not want to vanish from it (by dying, for examples), shows that being-in-the-world defines the fundamental structure of the human subject.

However, our inside has dimensions that cannot be exhaustively fathomed. We reach them by an act of transcendence. In its inward journeys, consciousness can see itself running into a volley of meanings, nuances, perspectives, each of which appears like a creation, an occurrence from nowhere. Actually the unfolding of the archaeology of these meanings is one of the most interesting but difficult-tasks in the ontological studies of consciousness. Creativity is the very core of our inner life; it is the very spirit of man.

Self transcendence is said to be the essence of human consciousness. In every experience or act of oneself, the human subject surpasses himself-as –given, figures as something more than his cognitive self. It amounts to saying that human consciousness does not contain itself like an object. Being a ceaseless flux, its inward movement is without any boundaries. This is why its precise characterization is not possible. It constantly creates its views toward the given, generates and re-constructs meanings and throws them on to the given. There is thus no preconceived rational scheme which our inside adheres to. It is a passion, an urge, a pure spontaneity, so to say, freedom. Unless our view of the inside of man is complete, we cannot claim to know human life and human behavior fully. The elementary pre-conscious sphere which borders on a void or nothing impinges on our notion of the empirical reality and becomes the subjectivity-stuff that we basically are. It is the sphere of freedom, creativity and Being of which we are ordinarily unaware, or only intermittently aware.
Consciousness, as it is directed toward something or other, figures as a kind of gleam discovering whatever it falls upon. It is a capacity to radiate meanings, to present itself to itself. It is this activity of discovering by radiation concerning man’s inside that was most perspicuously suggested by characterizing the self as light. It is the very nature of human reality to discover itself by discovering the world, to find itself to be there as a watchful witness of itself, to reveal itself by revealing itself –in-the-world. If we are able to define the exact nexus between consciousness’s act of experiencing and that toward which this act is directed the noesis and the Noema, we will have found and answer to the question why the world is there as it is. Indeed, the Noesis –Noema structure is epistemically positive; it has an experimental purview, a colligation of meanings grasped as present in time, a solid nucleus around which the meaning-consciousness keeps on hovering. This meaning-consciousness need not express itself in a linguistic behaviour; its manifestation in language is something contingent, and very often directed toward a social purpose.

Human Subject and its Primordial Nature

Understanding the human subject, then, understands him/her in his/her primordial nature. This may be one of the reasons why Merleau- Ponty speaks of the three strata of human behavior as consisting of a) the physical b) the organic or the vital or the physiological and c) the symbolic. These are not three aspects of human existence, but only three attitudes with which we approach the study of man from the phenomenological point of view, they are in a sense only paradigms. The investigations by phenomenologist have shown that man’s nature cannot be exhausted by the first two. They take the study of man into the realm of creativity. Phenomenology then must probe into the inner life of man, in the sense that it is concerned with the modes of his inner life; perceiving, imagining, feeling, willing, thinking, striving etc. it is these inner modes of human consciousness that give meaning and value to experience. This is the significance of the phenomenologist interest in subjectivity, though metaphysically the phenomenologist steers clear of the subjective and objective distinctions in reality as they are not ontologically committed. The phenomenologist is also interested in things in which the scientist
(Scientifically-oriented positivist) is not interested in questions of value and meaning.

On the basis of this characterization of consciousness as intentionality, it is now possible to re-characterize the sense in which consciousness is self-knowing, is Being-for-itself. Consciousness is essentially aware of itself, but not as an ego. Consciousness is necessarily conscious of itself as consciousness (of) an object. According to Sartre, this is even a necessary feature of consciousness. It is not to be confused with the reflexivity of the Cartesian cogito. There is no self in this consciousness (of) an object, and all of this is still pre-reflective. The cogito is based on this "second-order" consciousness (the term comes from Merleau Ponty) but it is only a "necessary possibility". Consciousness can then be characterized as "being-for-itself" because its existence consists in its dependency on objects, its knowledge of its own dependency on objects, and the possibility of explicit recognition of itself in the Cartesian cogito.

Person in Existentialist Philosophies

When we reflect on the human subject, predominantly what comes before sober evidence is the quality of man as an existent. The existentialists in general and Jean Paul Sartre in particular emphasized this dimension of personhood. Accordingly, the existentialist philosophy is based on the theme of existence precedes essence. In other words, one should think of man's existence as a feature of his life, which one can just take for granted. Kierkegaard affirms that it is an aspect of our lives that necessitate to be developed if we are to achieve our full potential as individuals. The fact of our existence implies that we cannot avoid first person practical questions. How is one to become a person? Not certainly by acquiring more knowledge of the world. Instead, we have to engage the will; it is by making choices and commitments that one progresses towards personhood. It is only by entering into engagements where we gain a sense of our own identities which in turn is responsible to become an existing individual. Heidegger terms existence as the mode of being that is distinctive of human life. Thus, the distinctive feature of human existence arises from the irreducibility of the practical concerns. Every person has to face the issue that determines the nature of his
existence. There is no fixed human essence which gives a structure to human life that is independent of the engagements and goals which provide us a sense of our own practical identity that fills our own existence as being-in-the-world. Accordingly, existential philosophy accords proper importance to commitment, involvement and action. Existential space of every day life is understood as the spatiality which is conceived in essentially ego centric and practical concerns. Heidegger argues that our emotions characteristically reflect cases and concerns which we have not chosen, since they arise from involvement which we just find ourselves as thrown. These involvements provide an essential back-ground for the practical undertakings of every day life whereby we seek to meet our needs and answer the demands that arise from our un-chosen involvements. This kind of existential structure of human life is basically worked out at an un-conscious level which is also fundamental to the conception of the lived world implied by one's existential projections. For Sartre, role of choice in human life is absolutely fundamental. We choose our emotions as much as any other aspect of our life and those basic goals of our life cohere around a fundamental project which is itself the product of an original choice; it is a choice which provides us with all the motivation that we have and which itself is unmotivated. The general view is an emphasis on the irreducibility of the perspective of human agents, whose activities like emotions and thoughts are to be understood in terms of their aspirations to become a person.

**Gabriel Marcel**

What defines man are his exigencies claims Marcel. Ontological exigency is a need and demand for some level of coherence in the cosmos and for some understanding our place and role within this coherence. It is the combination of wonder and attendant desire to not to understand the entire cosmos what to understand something of one’s place in it. Ontological exigency is not reducible to some psychological state, mood, or attitude a person has, it is rather a movement of human spirit that is inseparable from being human. He discusses being in a variety of contexts. One is the distinction between being and having. Marcel's, hall mark illustration of being and having is one that actually straddles the
distinctions between them. My body in so far as it is my body is both something that I have and something that I am, and cannot be adequately accounted for using either of these descriptions alone. I can look at my body in a dissociation manner and see it instrumentally. However, in doing so, in distanced from it, in order to grasp it, qua object, qua something I have, it ceases to be my body. I can have “a” body but not my body. I can dispose of my body in certain circumstances by treating it instrumentally. The ambiguous role played by my body not only points at the distinctions between being and having but also shows that we relate to other beings and persons differently in these two modes. Having corresponds to things that are completely external to me. I have things that I possess that I can dispose of and this should make it clear that I cannot “have” for example another person. Having implies this possession because “having” always implies an obscure notion of assimilation. While the encounter with otherness takes place in terms of assimilation when speaking of having the counter with otherness can also take place at the level of being. Both being and having are legitimate ways to encounter things in the world. There are two different kinds of thinking as reflection. Primary reflection examines its objects by abstraction, by analytically breaking down into its constituent parts. Secondary reflection is synthetic. It unifies rather than divides. Primary reflection tends to dissolve the unity of experience, the secondary reflection is essentially recuperating. Primary reflection is directed at that which is outside me or “before me” While secondary reflection is directed at that which is not merely before me that is either that which is in me, which I am. Secondary reflection is an important aspect of our access to the self. It is the properly philosophical mode of reflection, as they lead to more truthful more intimate, communication with both myself and with any other person whom these reflections include. Marcel emphasizes two general ways of comporting ourselves towards other that can be used as barometer of intersubjective relationship, availability and unavailability. Availability refers to measure in which I am available to someone, the state of having my resources (material, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual) at hand to offer. While it may appear that there is the possibility of a selfish allocation of one’s resources, the truth is that when resources are not available, there inaccessibility affects both the other and the self.
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Unavailability can manifest itself in any number of ways; pride is an example of being unavailable. Pride is not an exaggerated opinion of oneself arising from self love, but pride consists in believing that one is self sufficient. It consists in drawing one's strength solely from oneself. The proud man is cut off from a certain kind of communion with his fellow men. For a person who is unavailable other people are reduced to "other Person" rather being encountered as a unique individual. The person who is available has an entirely different experience of the place in the world. He acknowledges his interdependence with other people. To be available to other is to be present to and for her to put one's resources at her disposal and to be open and permeable to her.

Person as Relational

Just as a human person cannot be understood in isolation, a person's existence cannot be assured except in a human community. The very value of the human person lies in his relations, i.e. there should be somebody to recognize his worth and individuality. If one's own inherent qualities are such that one is good for others and brings out the best in them, then one is good in oneself. Although a hypocrite or a fake may occasionally spark a response, in the long run his/her artificial qualities are laid bare; only a person of genuine worth evokes consistent responses from others.

It is generally estimated that a person should not be appreciated and valued purely on utilitarian grounds. One is of value because one is good not for others but in himself/herself. Doctors or rescuers struggle to save a person's life not for remuneration or fame, but because of a conviction that a human being is worth keeping alive. The value of human life is measured in terms not on productivity, but of the potential of each person to become whatever one may make of oneself; yet in this process one both uses and is useful to others. Deep in the heart of every human being there is a feeling of intrinsic dignity. Although often obscured by slavery, caste inferiorities, neglect, war and poverty, every person has rights which are inalienable and the constitution of every country, at least in papers, vows to protect these rights of citizens.
Persons stand in a hierarchy of relations. To the physical universe the person is related as a master, predicting and controlling through scientific understanding, and making it serve one's pursuit of other goals. To one's fellowman the person is regarded as a fellow voyager on life's sea engaged in cooperative pursuit of mutual goals. To oneself the person is an identical subject, integrated within oneself, the author of one's own activities, with a sense of one's own history, responsibility creative pursuits, and destiny. Lastly, one is related to the Supreme Being in ways, which manifest themselves in the diverse phenomena of religion as human experience. Moreover, one is constantly adjusting to a changing universe so that this integration is not static, mosaic, but an orderly series of dynamic processes. A perfect person would have well ordered relationship with all reality, and would be able habitually to respond to each being in proper proportion with due regard to others and to oneself. Indeed, one can only approach such perfection to this life; no person can encompass all possible relations, whether of knowledge, dominance or aesthetic appreciation. One mark of greatness is the ability to accept one's limitations while striving to maximize one's potentialities to the fullest.

Gabriel Marcel has expressed this aspect of personality in his philosophy as the richly real "presence of persons". So long as one remains shut up in one's own self, whether through philosophical abstraction or pathological egotism, the self remains unattended to the real presence of the other and is un-awakened to the full presence of reality. This is the reason why Marcel says that the essential characteristic of the person is openness or availability (disponsibilite). We must "avail" ourselves of the full rich presence of persons and allow that presence into our thoughts. For Marcel, existence is always intersubjective and it is in intersubjectivity (intersubjectivite) that a person reaches his full development. "To encounter someone is not merely to cross his path but to be, for the moment at least, near to or with him. To use the term I have often used before, it means a being co-present."
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Person as Availability and Unavailability

A person can have two attitudes: availability (dispensibilite) and unavailability (indispensibilite), which Marcel prefers to translate as "handy" and "unhandy". The unavailable person is incapable of responding to calls made upon him/her by life—unable to sympathize with other people or imagine their situation. The person remains shut up in the petty circle of his private experience, which forms a kind of hard shell round him through which he is incapable of breaking. They are 'unhandy' from this point of view and unavailable from the point of view of others. For the second person though there is a presence of persons, a being with and belonging to each other does not occupy his self. Cultivating in fidelity the "we" whom thou and I create implies disposability (disponibilite). This is characterized by a readiness to respond, an openness, a kind of 'being at hand" or at the service of others, a welcome. One who possesses this quality makes oneself available to others for instant communion because he or she is "uncluttered by a sense of his/her own importance.18

Phenomenology of Person

The existentialists emphasize on the given possibility of self-determination and freedom as the expressive characters of man as a person. Our knowledge of things divides into direct and indirect knowledge. Essences are known directly, but perceptual objects are known through their aspects. On the other hand, in addition to perceptual things, there are also mental things and selves. Consciousness is known like essences directly. There is thus fundamental difference between the objects of the outside perceptual world and the objects of the world of consciousness. Former are never given to us wholly and completely. But the self of the person who is instrumental in all mental activities are presented to us indirectly. The realm of individual things thus divides into as immanent and transcendent, so to say, the objects that are given to my consciousness and the consciousness that constitute the objects. In other words, there is a constituted self-the objects that I perceive- and the constituting self- the consciousness that constitutes. This makes consciousness unique because what we truly and directly know is the manifested consciousness. It makes us eventually turn away from the
outside world and concentrate exclusively on the acts of consciousness. Phenomenology has its own method—reflection on the essences of mental acts—and has its own subject matter consciousness. Object of phenomenological investigations are the essential structure of consciousness. One standard way to account for the source of first person knowledge is by appealing to a kind of inner observation of the passing contents of one’s own mind and phenomenology is often thought to rely on such introspections.19

**Person as Social Being**

Human person can be both dependent on society and still autonomous while pursuing his own powers and purposes. The person is a social being with a capacity of transformative reflection and action that brings to their social context, so to say; there are powers and capabilities that are independent of social mediation. Sociological predicament in conceptualizing the personhood is centered on the issue of as to how to incarcerate someone who is both partly formed by his sociality, yet have the capacity to transform his societal control in partially. On one hand, there is a partially loaded view of man which is said to be sociological whose constitution owed nothing to society and thus man is a self who simply operates in a social environment. But, there is another over-socialized analysis of man which expounds the features that go beyond biological characteristics and are shaped and molded by man's social context. What may be understood as the balanced view of man is the view that the human person can be both depending on society and autonomous and possessing his own capabilities. Thus, we are left with the task of rescuing the singularity of each human person, his dignity which is irreducible and at the same time considering person as the embodiment in a social reality without confusing or separating the faces of singularity and sociality. This can be done by granting human kind (i) temporal priority (ii) relative autonomy and (iii) causal efficacy. In relation to his social being, man becomes the repository of the powers of transformation, reflection and action which may bring to their social context the desired powers that are independent of social mediation. From the perspective of social realism, we may
see the pre-social and meta-social reality of the human person who can be reduced neither to a social product nor to an idealistic concept. This may facilitate to examine the identity of the self, its continuity and capacity that get grown-up within and through social interactions and exchanges. It will necessitate in appropriating the singularity of the human person as an entity in its unique and necessary combinations of four-fold orders of natural, practical, social and spiritual reality.

Two strands of modern social sciences are conflicting in a particular account, where the human person and the immediate society are mutually interacting and generating each other. To start with, person is a subject or a self, who through experiences gets out of nature and become a primary agent as well as a corporate agent. Personal identity emerges as distinct from social identity because of constant interaction in the field of human subject. Social identity is the capacity to express what we care about in social roles. There is a dialectical relationship between social and personal identity which culminates in a synthesis such that both the personal and social identity is emergent and distinctive though they contribute to one another’s materialization and distinctiveness. Personal knowledge is the product of complex series of operations done by the self through a reflexive activity in relation to the reality to be known in which the knowledge already existing in society is only a given environment. It amounts to saying that only the epistemic triangle of knower, known and knowledge can valorize person as subject and at the same time the object of his own activities.

Person in Psychology

Psychology is the science of nature that is purported to approximate the functioning and development of human self/mind including the faculties of reason, emotion, perception, and communication. Any account of the functioning of mind must accommodate as non-material. The subjectivity of consciousness also poses additional difficulties. The issue is centered on the emphasis/meaning of person so as to construct a coherent picture of person and the major psychological processes that demarcate the human person from other species and other entities. Personality
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is defined as a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influence his cognition, motivation and behaviour in various situations. The major theories of personality are trait perspectives, psychodynamics, humanistic, biological, behavioral and social learning perspectives. Critics of personality theories claim that personality is synthetic, transversely timed and place, moods and situations. Psychoanalytic theory explains human behaviour in terms of the interaction of the various components of personality. There are three components of personality. 1. Id. It acts according to pleasure principal, 2. Ego, which acts according to reality principle, and 3. Super-ego that inculcates moral judgment and societal rules upon the ego; thus forcing the demands of the Id to be met not only realistically but also morally. The super-ego is the last component of the personality to develop. In other words, personality is based on the dynamic interaction of these three components.

Social cognitive theories explain human behavior guided by cognitions with reference to the world. These theories emphasize cognitive processes such as thinking and judging. Forces of memory and emotion work in conjunction with environmental factors. In humanistic psychology it is emphasized that people have freewill which plays an active role in determining human behavior. However, it focuses on subjective experience of persons as opposed to forced definitive factors that may determine activities and behavior. It emphasizes a view of the person as an active and creative but experiencing subject who lives in the present and subjectively responds to perceptual relationships. It may also be noted here that they disagree with the dark pessimistic outlook of those in the psychoanalytic tradition.

Person and Human Creativity

Creativity is the marvel of human mind. It is the ability to come up with ideas and artifacts that are fresh, surprising and valuable. It is an aspect of human intelligence in general. It is grounded in everyday ability such as conceptual thinking, perception memory and reflective self criticism. Psychological creativity involves impending valuable idea that is innovative to the person who comes up with it. An innovative idea is historically creative so that no one else has had it
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before. It has arisen for the first time in human history. Creativity can happen in three ways; (1) it involves unfamiliar combination of familiar ideas. It requires a rich store of knowledge in the mind and many different ways of moving around with it. (2) It is exploring conceptual spaces within a given conceptual space where many thoughts are possible. Whatever the size of the space, someone who comes up with a new idea within that thinking is called creative. Exploratory creativity is valuable because it can enable someone to see the manifold possibilities that they had not glimpsed before. (3) it transforms the given space. A given style of thinking can render certain thoughts impossible. Thinking style can be changed sometimes in the twinkling of an eye. Looked at from this perspective, it may be said that creativity is a basic faculty of human spirit and social change is an outcome of man's creativity. Where there is creativity there is social change. There ought to be creative capacity of man which he articulates in his life situations in the societies. Man initiates social changes because of the power of human development as well as the mutual dialectical interaction of man and his society. Creativity in human life leads to his fulfillment as human which he realizes in the course of history and exhibited in the evolving civilization. Creativity, therefore, is a capacity of the human mind that results in transforming the existing reality and introducing new elements that can generate and build new social realities as new starting point for new transformations.

Person in Indian Philosophies

Before we proceed further, it may be appropriate to describe in brief the concept of the person in Indian Philosophies.

To understand the human subject from a strictly Indian Philosophical perspective, it may be noted that the image of the human person which is projected in Indian philosophy and especially in the Upanishads is that of a self whose reality is grounded in consciousness which has a directional force sustaining the entire range of perceptual experience. Person and action, choice and situation, person and experience are then closely bound to each other not only in their implications but also in their fundamental structure. Therefore, the approach to the human person adopted in Indian Philosophical system requires something of a
movement, a development and an odyssey of reconstruction. It is only fair, then, to indicate the general itinerary.

Stating openly, we propose to trace the philosophical history of the nature of person vis-a-vis human self in Indian Philosophy in general and more specifically, the most general and abstract features of self in the Upanishads. To put the problem in a more nearly philosophical manner, given a concept of self, what are the factors necessary for accounting for its coherence? Or how does a self/person explained in the Upanishads for which experience (consciousness) is coherent and possible?

Indian Philosophy in general accepts self as an eternal and permanent principle. There is, however, no universal agreement among the different schools of Indian philosophy regarding the noumenal character of the self (atman). The Carvakas adopt the materialistic conception of self. According to them, the self is the living body with the attribute of consciousness. The Buddhists reduce the self to a stream of thought or a series of cognitions, perceptions, feelings, dispositions and consciousness. The Advaita Vedanta takes the self as the unchanging and self-shining intelligence (svapnakasa caitanya), which is neither a subject nor the object, neither the 'I' nor the 'me'. According to Nyaya-Vaisesika School, the self is a unique substance to which all cognitions, feelings, and conations belong as its attributes. It is unconscious in itself. All conscious states arise in the self when it is related to the manas (mind) and the manas are related to the senses and the senses come in contact with the external objects. The Nyaya Vaisesika system regards consciousness as synonymous with buddhi (intellect) and upalabdhi (apprehension). The Samkhya-Yoga regards buddhi as an unconscious modification of prakrti, the root evolvement in which the conscious self (purusa) is reflected. The non-recognition of the identity between self and consciousness constitute an important feature of Nyaya-Vaisesika realism. Accordingly, Nyaya-Vaisesika System regards consciousness as a quality of self. Self is the permanent substance in which consciousness inheres. In other words, self is the inherent cause of consciousness though it is produced by a collection of conditions.
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Enveloped by the human body, the self strains toward the distant and distinct horizons of the imagined, the possible and the future. To that extent, the self organizes the experiential world through the medium of consciousness. Thus there is a bipolar tension in the self between the present and the future, actual and possible. This tension may be considered as an essential feature of self, because it is essentially openness to itself and on to the world. To sum up, we may say that the texture of the person/self is the texture of its openness to itself and the world. This is the phenomenological position in one sentence and this is the phenomenology of person/self in the principal Upanishads.

The transcendent subjectivity of the self is described differently by Indian philosophical systems, depending upon the metaphysical framework of each system. Broadly, there are two views: the first describes transcendent subjectivity as “objectless” or as being its own object; here no duality is experienced. The second view regards itself as capable of being in relation to “an object,” namely, to Brahman or Isvara; here the subject and object remain distinct. The Samkhya, Nyaya-Vaisesika and Advaita systems hold the former view, while the latter view is held by the Visistadvaita and Dvaita systems of philosophy. Even in the latter view, however, this “object” is itself so “united” with the subject as to be its inner ground; hence there can be no strict “dualism” between them. These systems maintain that the transcendent subjectivity of the self is other than the principle of egoity (ahamkara), which is the cause of “exclusive” subjectivity. Ramanuja regards the self as ahampadartha or the spiritual subject of experience. It is not the product of avidya: (ignorance) it is distinct from ahamkara, which is born of avidya connected with the body, and is the set of pride.21

The self is capable of three kinds of subjectivity: the “exclusive,” the “inclusive” and the “transcendent.” The self is egoistic and practical in its exclusive subjectivity; it seeks to rise above the egocentric limitations and becomes altruistic and philosophical in its “inclusive” subjectivity and finally, it seeks to transcend this ethical level of being and becomes “spiritual” in its metaphysical and “transcendent” subjectivity.22
The Samkhya system of Indian Philosophy conceptualised three constituents (guna) of human personality, which are sattva, rajas and tamas. Tamas is the principle of inertia and infatuation (moha); it is predominant over anonymity and passively submissive to others; one gives oneself over to sensory pleasures completely and is dominated by senses (indriyas). Rajas is the principle of activity and of the ego; its domination over the other constituents leads one towards an extreme form to self-assertion and domination over others; the rajasik person dwells in ahamkara (egoity) more than in the senses and is prepared to give up sensory pleasures if such sacrifices are necessary to fulfil the craving for distinction and fame. Sattva (goodness) is the principle of knowledge and equanimity; its predominance over the other two constituents gives proper perspective to one’s relation to the world. The sattvik person acts from the standpoint of buddhi (intellect), which is said to be the course of the action to be pursued for one’s own good as well as for others; the person who dwells in buddhi is not controlled or hindered either by indriyas or by ahamkara.

The movement of the individual from the senses to ahamkara and from ahamkara to buddhi is thus a dialectical movement proceeding through ‘opposites’ towards a synthesis. This dialectical yet psychological movement of human existence receives a cosmic ontological interpretation in the Samkhya system, whereby buddhi, ahamkara and the indriyas are not distinguished from each other depending upon the predominance of one guna over the others, but are regarded as the successive stages of prakritic evolution and involution.

Such a Descriptive picture of the human Self obviates the necessity to regard it as a transcendent entity that constitutes and reveals in consciousness. Human consciousness is not closed in oneself but constantly opens to a reality, which is beyond itself. We may say that we never are what we are because we are always beyond what we actualize in any particular moment. We are more than that what we are because the horizon of our existence extends beyond what we are at any one point.

This aspect of the transcendental dimension of the human person is faced with its metaphysical dimensions, which manifest itself through diverse signs. Not
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only does person raise the question of ultimate meaning; he himself is that question. This ultimate dimension reveals itself to us in the perception of man as a mystery, which does not lend it to being objectified. The Greeks called it as theion and the Indians named it as Purusha. In other words, person means to-be-oneself and to-be-in-relation. That is why person in Greek, prosopon, means that which a form has yet oriented towards 'other'. That is why, in Indian conception of purusha is a partaking of the cosmic Purusha. Such a conception of man as a person inevitably undergirds his existence, which is dependent upon the existence of others as persons. In other words, a person cannot exist without being an 'I' ordered to another who constitutes a 'thou'. Using the language of existential phenomenology, we may say that “co-existence become a constitutive aspect of the being of man” or is it only a consequence of the fact that, without knowing why, another man does exist? 23

So far we have been examining the notion of human person keeping in view of this notion as fundamental to recognize that persons are born only if, and into, a social union, and that their own survival depends upon the concern of others, which indeed must be mutual. Two examples from Indian philosophies, which we have cited, namely, the Vedantic and samkhya system of philosophies, are meant to be indicators to the way the question of human self vis-à-vis person was approached and debated. The Vedic wisdom was predominantly occupied by the person’s attaining moksa or liberation. Such a sense of the personhood implies the understanding that persons are selves whose actions are necessarily directed to attain moksha and whose worth and value do not matter in the social living.

It has been understood that there are different philosophical theories about the nature of the person. According to some philosophers, concept of person is logically prior to the concepts of body and the mind of the person. Some other philosophers argued that person is the combination of the body and the mind. In the case of some other philosophers, person is identified with the mind or the self which is simple, a monad. It is also argued by some thinkers that person is constructed out of what is impersonal. According to philosophers like Hume, Robert Nozick, Derek Parfit as also in Yogcara Buddhism, the reality is a
succession of momentary mental states. In Advaita Vedanta, on the other hand, consciousness is eternal, but universal and impersonal.

In the earlier pages, we have explained satisfactorily that there are two forms of the problem of the emergence of the self. One form is to explain how a permanent self can emerge from fleeting, successive mental states or acts. According to Hume, my awareness of myself as an enduring centre of consciousness is really an illusion. But Hume cannot explain as to how the illusion arises. He uses the method of introspection in order to establish that there is no permanent self. Yet introspection itself is impossible if an enduring self is not already presupposed. A momentary idea cannot introspect itself for it is not yet felt as I. Nozick, too, starts with acts which are to be synthesized into a permanent self. But the acts which are to be synthesized cannot be acts floating in the air. Nozick does not state that these acts are to be obtained from introspection. But Nozick does not explain how one can get these acts which are then synthesized into a permanent self. The Buddhist school or Vijnanavada seems to offer the best theory of this type. According to Vijnanavada, each momentary state knows itself as I, so that we have a succession of I’s—I₁, I₂, I₃... The difference between this Buddhistic theory and those of Hume and Nozick is that while according to this school of Buddhism each mental state by itself is an I, according to Hume and Nozick, no single perception or act is an I. Hence the problem both in Hume and Nozick is to explain the source of the elements which are to be synthesized into a permanent self. Both according to Hume and Yogacara Buddhism the belief in an enduring self is a wrong belief, while according to Nozick this is a construction which is not necessarily unreal. According to Yogacara Buddhism the succession of momentary I’s is mistaken for an enduring self and there is no mystery here except a confusion due to nescience; I₁ mistakes itself as identical with I₂ and so on. When this original nescience is removed the succession of I’s stops and there is nothing thereafter. This is the traditional Indian interpretation of Nirvana.²⁴

The problem of Advaita Vedanta is very different. The reality is not a succession of momentary mental states or acts but is universal impersonal
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consciousness. Consciousness cannot be mine or yours, for consciousness is the ultimate owner of the body-mind complex, but there is no owner of consciousness. The problem here is to explain our common experience of ourselves as persons. This is, of course, a wrong belief which is removed by knowledge of the real nature of consciousness. But this wrong belief which is nescience is beginningles. We do not begin with an awareness of impersonal consciousness and then somehow acquire consciousness of ourselves as persons. Thus the Advaita theory of emergence of the self is neither a historical process nor a logical construction.

Statement of the Problem

One of the understandings of person is that the human subject as such does not have essential human nature; rather he is endowed with certain capacities that are to be molded by society through its economic, political and cultural forces. Thus it is argued that the real nature of man is the totality of his social relations. Therefore, the present study is particularly intended to focus upon the following themes and problematic:

i. How do persons and society mutually interact and affect each other in various ways?

ii. What are the ways in which each person can contribute and participate in the social change?

iii. Situation in which persons make independent decisions amid interdependence.

iv. The significance of communication especially language that makes a unity between persons and society.

v. New technologies that shape the person, society and also the interactions and relations in terms of intellectual, social and moral dimensions.

vi. Standardization and mass culture; modernization and globalization that can lead to alienation, subjugation and depersonalization.

vii. What are the logical/ontological priorities that are predominant in the analyses of person and society?
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viii. What are the implicit and concomitant relations between person and society?

ix. How do we say that person is free in the society? What are the dialectics of freedom in the existential conditions that the person creates in the society?

x. Can we logically say that the change of human person amounts to the change of society? If so, what are the social, political and cultural outcomes that will affect the nature of person?

xi. What is human creativity vis-à-vis human person and how do we explain its nature, sources and dimensions and its contribution to social change?

xii. Can we say that development of each person amounts to the development of a society? How can we account for the social achievement and role conflict?

xiv. How do we explain the moral culture of a person in a highly suffocated and technological society wherein the meaning of personhood is accompanied with its illogical ideologies and pragmatic values?

Review of Literature

The literature review requires one to justify the fundamentals of research by critically evaluating previous studies on the subject under consideration. This is designed to identify related researches on the same topic and to set the current research project within a conceptual and theoretical framework. Thus the aim of literature review is to evaluate and prove relationships between the work already done, and the current work and how the work adds to the already carried out researches. It also involves as to why the research needs to be carried out, how to choose the methodologies or theories to work with. This part of the thesis attempts to explain some key concepts of the subject involved and lay a theoretical background in terms of which thesis will be framed. Accordingly the present thesis intends to scan the literature on the topics such as concept of man, existence, choice, society, authenticity, and the like in the light of philosophical traditions especially in existentialist and phenomenological traditions. The thesis is purported to re-examine and analyze the notion of the human subject from a
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strictly philosophical perspective and his role in the society. We will survey articles, books and other sources (dissertations and conference proceedings) relevant to the particular issues and topics, area of research or theory, providing a description, summary and critical evaluation of work previously done. We will keep ourselves open to what we can learn from other disciplines related to the present topic like psychology, cultural studies, political science and anthropology apart from philosophy. There is a plethora of literature available on the topics of man and freedom, culture and identity, both nationally and abroad. Libraries and archives will be indirect and secondary sources of data. An exposure to scholarly works related to man and freedom from existential and phenomenological perspective will help the present thesis in providing a general orientation, stimulating insight and guiding direction. The best thing about reviewing of literature is that it will help us discover where the present project fit in and how we can contribute through the present project to the richer understanding of the topic under consideration. Accordingly, the thesis attempts to explain some key concepts of the subject involved and lay a theoretical background in terms of which the thesis will be framed. In short, the present thesis scans the available literature on the philosophy of person and the philosophical outlook towards a healthy society. We shall be highly sensitive to those topics such as existentiality of the human subject, authenticity in personal and social life, understanding a realistic image of person, and human person from cultural, social and transcendental perspectives.

Methodology

Working with literature is an essential part of the research process. It involves, inspires, educates and enlightens. It generates ideas and help form significant questions. Research cannot be done in isolation. Invention of new knowledge is fundamentally dependent on past knowledge. The nature of data required for the research determines the type of method to be employed for collecting data. The subject of the present study is person and society, their nature, interactions, inter-relationship and dynamics. The data is primarily qualitative. Sources from which data is gathered are library, archive, internet (worldwide
web). The Researcher will read the published, un-published and other written documents and the materials. Attempt also will be made to make the study objective, consistent, coherent and well developed.

Significance of the Present Study

The present study intends to understand the nature of human person from a critical-creative standpoint and thereby analyze the implications of the human subject as a person. Accordingly, this study specifically attempts to explain that man is the only moral being (homo moralis) whose intimate world, consciousness and conduct function in terms not only of utility, but also of beauty and good. Therefore, our approach in this study criticizes the modem approaches which are tend to identify the human person primarily with his or her ego functioning with what may be called the inauthentic mode of the person. We wish to state in the present study that there is a whole range of authentic human experiences like hope, will, sense of purpose, competence, commitment, fidelity, love, care, wisdom etc. which are omitted from scientific study as they do not meet the requirement of easily being measured, and which requires a philosophical scrutiny. In other words, the significance of the present study is centered on its enquiry into the recovering of the sense of self. The self which is both the discoverer and co-creator of meaning needs to be recovered and given a central place in the analysis of man as a person.

By way of a Conclusion

The introductory chapter of the thesis, as stated earlier, is a philosophical trajectory towards the understanding of the human person from different perspectives. We understand that the human subject has been accorded different understandings about the personhood given the culture/society that she/he is born into. In Western culture, the human subject/person is composed of a conscious subjectivity and a perception of difference vis a vis the other. It is clearly one of otherness or contrast between the ego and the 'alter'. This is a tragic opposition because the other, whether person or community, appears as a menace which
blocks the ego’s path and whose stare reduces one to a mere thing: if we recall the famous Sartrean term ‘the other is hell’.

In the foregoing pages, we have been arguing that the person is first and foremost in necessary relationship with the world. Along with Heidegger, we may say that one is not a static reality; rather person is a dynamic project which is both unfolding and achieving oneself. Man is not simply outside of the world, but rather is woven, as it were, of materials which come from the world which they constitute. The world is also other persons, those of one’s society of living people. Further, it is the tradition that which preceded us, notably our ancestors and with them all that is of an absolute or transcendent order. Understanding on these lines, we may say that human person is woven of three factors:

1. The phylogenetic, which places one in relation to the Absolute, represented in a dominant manner by the ancestors who instantiated the law: all this constitute a vertical order.

2. The anthropological, which constitutes the person as relation with others, first of all with one’s family, lineage and associates. This is the “I” in its relation with the human environment as the milieu of one’s life. All this constitutes a system of social relations.

3. The cosmic as related to the above: the person is situated in a context of spirits and genies, invisible forces that seem to be of human origin like ancestors, but are bound to nature. In short, the person is in a close interplay of phylogenetic, cosmic and anthropological connections. With the members of a society, person is involved in a multitude of relations or structures: family, neighborhood, village, ethnic groups and the like. One cannot conceive of oneself outside of that community which basically constitutes oneself as a person. Therefore, our next chapter shall be concerned about person and the social structure which is focal point of every kind of humanization debate.
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