


IDEA OF PERSONALITY

BY

P. N. SRINIVASACHARI



THE ADYAR LIBRARY AND RESEARCH CENTRE

IDEA OF PERSONALITY

BY

P. N. SRINIVASACHARI



THE ADYAR LIBRARY AND RESEARCH CENTRE

The Adyar Library Series—No. 77

GENERAL EDITOR :

G. SRINIVASA MURTI, B.A., B.L., M.B. & C.M., VAIDYARATNA

Director, Adyar Library

IDEA OF PERSONALITY

IDEA OF PERSONALITY

DR. ANNIE BESANT MEMORIAL ENDOWMENT
LECTURES, UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

BY

P. N. SRINIVASACHARI, M.A.

(Retired Principal, Pachayappa's College, Madras)

THE ADYAR LIBRARY

1951

PREFACE

THE Dr. Annie Besant Memorial Lectureship was established at the Madras University in 1939 and it was kindly offered to me by the Syndicate for the year 1949-50. I gratefully accepted the offer and chose as the subject of my lectures the *Idea of Personality* from out of a wide group of subjects connected with Politics, Civics, Sociology, Religion, Philosophy, Ethics, Education, and Fine Arts. I felt that the subject of my choice was in a way suited to the dynamic and synthetic genius of Dr. Besant who, with her amazing energy and erudition, galvanized the life of India, her adopted country, and contributed so much to the Renaissance. The effect of her many-sided activities covers a wide field like the Home Rule Movement, Banaras Hindu University, the revival of Sanātana Dharma, in addition to her theosophic work in India and elsewhere. I feel that my lectures may be a humble tribute to her ideals of life.

The "Vedāntic View of Personality : Human and Divine" is added as it sums up the conclusions of my previous lectures on Personality and is an extension of the first lecture in its religious aspect.

I offer my grateful thanks to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for allowing me to publish the

work through the Adyar Library. To Dr. G. Srinivasa Murti, Honorary Director, Adyar Library, I am very grateful for his accepting the publication and including it in the Library Series. Sri A. N. Krishna Aiyangar of the Adyar Library and Sri R. C. Srinivasaraghavan have corrected the proofs and assisted me in the preparation of the press copy of the work. Sri G. K. Rangaswami Aiyangar, has taken the onerous task of furnishing the Index. The Vasanta Press has overlooked the many difficulties that arose during the course of printing, maintaining its standard of excellence as usual. I record my most grateful thanks to all of them.

Sri Krishna Library

Mylapore

10-2-51

P. N. SRINIVASACHARI

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
PART I	
LECTURE I :	
Idea of Personality	1
LECTURE II :	
The Socialistic View of Personality	28
PART II	
• Vedāntic View of Personality : Human and Divine	56
INDEX	83

PART I

IDEA OF PERSONALITY

LECTURE I

INTRODUCTION

THE importance of the study of personality cannot be over-estimated, as it is the presupposition of all knowledge derived through sense-perception, reasoning or revelation. Hence the sayings 'Know Thyself'; 'Man is the measure of all things.' Personality is the keyword of all knowledge and it has a fascination, all its own, on account of its paradoxical nature, of mysteriousness and universal experience. It is not a thing-in-itself, which is unknown and unknowable, leading to scepticism, but it is a fundamental postulate of knowledge, namely, that it can be both apprehended as a self and comprehended as a self with distinctive qualities. The problem has a dual aspect, namely, the idea of the person as he knows himself and as others know him. Thus, it includes the individual and social aspects and, though they can be distinguished, they cannot be separated. The first lecture is an enquiry into its individual aspect, in its empirical and spiritual aspect and the essential qualities of the self, namely, knowing, willing and feeling, and the spiritual values of truth,

goodness and beauty. The second lecture is an attempt to expound social personality, as expressed in the institutions of the family, education, economics, politics and religion. It also brings out the nature of super-personality and the goal of life, as service to all persons and as unitive life. The four empirical views of the self namely—matter, life, sensation and reason are considered first.

I. THE MATERIALISTIC VIEW OF PERSONALITY

According to the Indian materialist or *Cārvāka*, personality is the product of the four elements, earth, water, fire and air, just as red colour is the product of betel, arecanut and lime. All knowledge comes from sense-perception and such perceptual knowledge is the only test of Truth. The sole end of conduct is the enjoyment of the pleasures of sensibility; and expediency is the only rule of conduct. Since we do not perceive any disembodied spirit, there is no soul apart from the body. The western materialist also denies the existence of the soul, when he explains personality as matter conscious of itself or as an offshoot of matter. Matter alone is real and it exists in its own right. Personality is an aggregate or collection of atoms and they alone have the promise and potency of life and consciousness. Naturalism as a more refined kind of materialism explains the higher by the lower and describes the self or personality in terms of sensation, cellular process and physico-chemical changes. Personality is a by-product of natural changes and is

only an epi-phenomenon. The brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile. What is called appetite or desire comes from chemical affinities and human life can be traced to the chemical attraction of hydrogen and oxygen. Attention as a mental process is the result of tension in matter and personality is only an item in a programme and it is all *svabhāva* or a law of nature. Behaviourism is the modern type of materialism as it regards life as a mechanical response to external stimulus. Personality is only a behaviour due to bodily reflexes and is not a spiritual entity. The so-called spiritual personality is only an emergence of animal behaviour. To the behaviourist, physiology and physics are more important than psychology and ethics and he rejects the primacy and priority of consciousness. Personality is naturalized and is only a muscular activity due to the dynamic activity of electrons and protons. Modern science has dematerialized static matter and changed it into dynamic energy and radio-activity. Personality is due to radio-activity or more strictly an emergence of space-time or an offshoot of atomic energy. It is the ceaseless flow of cortical changes that causes correct sense. The so-called *ātman* of the philosopher is the aggregate of atomic changes and the flow of electrons and protons. Personality can be measured and counted and in this way, the so-called metaphysical entity is only a mathematical unit which is so valuable to man in his science of statistics. The materialistic view of personality is a corrective to subjective idealism and

the acosmism of the extreme idealists, who deny the reality of matter and the physical and tangible universe. It stresses the unity of the universe of matter, the physical well-being of man and, aided by modern science, it ministers to his comforts; it serves as an environment for the growing self. But materialism as such is a closed system which excludes the reality of moral and spiritual values. In its zeal for objectivity, it forgets the subject and it is like the play of *Hamlet* without Hamlet. Naturalism denies purpose, traces human nature to inanimate nature and thus naturalizes personality; in explaining the higher by the lower, it puts the cart before the horse. Personality cannot be put into the test tube and measured quantitatively, as the moment it is dissected and analysed, it becomes a dull dead inert thing. In this way, materialism which results in the absolute reality of matter or energy or *prakṛti* has its logical conclusion in agnosticism and atheism and it sterilizes social stability.

II. VITALISM

The inadequacy of the category of matter as a machine theory of man to serve the needs of personality prepares the way for its reinterpretation in terms of life. Personality is *prāṇa maya* or a living unity and not a mechanical addition of bits of matter. It is self-creative and self-sustaining and is not something determined from without. Biology is more competent to explain personality than materialism or mechanism;

it is a living creative and spontaneous novelty; and life distinguishes plants, animals and man from all inanimate things and it can produce and reproduce itself. • It is not mere existence but is a living entity and no laboratory can create life. Life is what is lived and self-evolved; it unfolds itself and is not created out of nothing. But life does not move matter to subserve its own ends and matter is not deposited by the intellect in the onward flow of creative impulse of life. Life is action and reaction between the organism and the environment. It consists in self-preservation, self-multiplication and self-adaptation and not in self-repetition. Life is a fleeting flux and yet a fixity with its own integrity. It breaks down and builds up continuously and the process is called catabolism and anabolism. There is individuality in each kind of life, one kind of flesh in birds, another, in beasts and another, in man. The organism is a persistent activity and is a self-winding clock; there is self-renewal of life and self-repair. When there is the first breathing-in, there is life and • when there is the last breathing-out, there is death. Then all surplus energy is used up. In the human organism, life can go on for hundred years but there may be some whose life lasts for a few minutes. Life grows by self-division which later on becomes self-destruction and it is one, though it is variable and self-creative. Living creatures are apart and have a uniqueness which may be due to their peculiar vital force or autonomous entelechy or animism. In Buddhism • and Jainism, respect for animal life is very

great. From a higher point of view, life is real and earnest and even abiding and eternal and death is no dread, as it is a doorway to higher life in creative evolution.

III. SENSATIONALISM

Personality is a group or cluster of sense impressions, imprinted on the mind from outside and the ideas which are copies of these sense impressions. It is an association of ideas. Says Hume: "When I enter into myself intimately, I stumble on a sense-perception. I can never catch myself at any time without a perception and there are no prior assumptions. Personality is what is perceived by the senses. The mind is only a *tabula rasa* or an empty white sheet of paper, void of all character, which receives knowledge passively from sense experience. There is no mind without sense impressions and their copies. Personality is thus built up by association of sensations and their ideas. Modern psychology, whether it is behaviourism, hormic psychology or psycho-analysis, has parted with metaphysics and allied itself with the experimental and other empirical sciences and it explains personality by intelligence tests and by measurement of abilities. Behaviourism traces it to bodily response to external stimulus. Hormic psychology deals with instincts as the driving forces of the mind, leading to the chief sentiments of self-love or self-regard; psycho-analysis translates

all action and wishes to the unconscious and to libido. Buddhism also employs empirical psychology to deny personality and trace the self to sensation and perception. • The self is only a fleeting flux of atomic sensations without any stability and is made of the five *skandhas* of the flesh. What is called personality is a causal series or succession of cause and effect without any substantiality. But the view of empirical psychology that the self is only a psychic process cuts at the very root of personality; no sensation can transcend itself and know itself. Intelligence cannot be measured and experimented upon; succession in experience is different from the experience of succession and experience presupposes an experiencing subject. • The crass realist and the empirical psychologist who rely so much on the evidence of sense-perception ignore the perceiving self which is more than perception. There is a perceptual theory of the self which describes it as an immediate perception but it is different from the real mystic view that it is an intuition.

IV. RATIONALISM

Personality is a rational being. Reason or *vijñāna* is more than matter, life and consciousness and it is reason that distinguishes man from the plants and animals. Personality may, therefore, be defined as a rational being. It is thinking on things and reflecting on what is thought. Personality is the thinking principle that operates on sensations and

every person has a notion of himself which is different from perception. It is rationally posited as 'in the experience, 'I think, therefore I am.' In the example, 'I know it,' the 'I' is the subject of knowledge and it is due to reason or *viveka*. Reason is self-imposed and it is not externally determined. Reason cannot dethrone itself or be dethroned, as it is presupposed in the very act of dethroning reason. Personality is the subject of experience and it is not a particular, as a part of the universal. It is not a person or this person but is person as such. This is due to the act of generalization which belongs to reason and it is the prerogative of personality as contra-distinguished from the animal, the child and the savage and it is almost the same as the dictum that the real is *vijñānamaya* and that the real is rational and this is the view of the idealist as opposed to that of the realist. While the realist gives primacy to things and makes them real, the idealist gives primacy and priority to reason and it is by *a priori* knowledge that personality is posited. While the *Cārvāka* or the materialist traces knowledge to the evidence of sense-perception which confines man to the world of animality and savage life, the rationalist accepts the *pramāṇa* of reasoning or *anumāna* and proves that personality is a rational being and is established by *buddhi* and not by mere *pratyakṣa* (sense perception) or the test of *pratyakṣa*. *Buddhi* is not an emergence from space-time nor an evolution from the animal stage but it exists in its own right and it is the trustworthiness of reason that invests man with the

supreme right of freedom. There is a conceptual theory of personality different from the perceptual kind, which says that it is a monad which is independent of other monads.

V. PERSONALITY AS PURUṢA

Personality may be defined negatively in the light of *sāṅkhya buddhi*, *viññāna* or *viveka* as *puruṣa* different from the categories of matter, namely, the five elements, the five *prāṇas*, the 11 sense organs, *buddhi*, *citta*, and *ahaṅkāra* and *mūlaprakṛti* itself. *Prakṛti* is the primordial cosmic stuff or matter out of which the visible and tangible universe is made. It is not the aggregate or *saṅghata* of the five elements, earth, water, fire, air and ether, as they lack life and consciousness and cannot reflect on themselves. It is not *prāṇa* or the living being or entelechy made of the five *prāṇas*: *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *samāna* and *udāna*, which vitalize the body, as life in the plant is devoid of consciousness. It is not due to the association or cluster of sensations, cognitive and conative, and *manas*, the inner sense organ, which is their unifying centre or the synthetic unity of apperception, as it is a fleeting psycho-physical process without self-consciousness or reason. It is not *ahaṅkāra* or the principle of egoity which causes the exclusive feeling of 'I' and 'mine' or *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra*. It is not even *buddhi* as it is itself produced by *prakṛti* and is different from the spiritual quality of *jñāna*. *Prakṛti* is also called *kṣetra* as it is the field for the spiritual development of the *jīva* or the

soul called *kṣetrajña*. Personality is, now, owing to *avidyā* or ignorance, conjoined with *prakṛti* and it appears as the bodily life. As the name itself implies, it is a mask or appearance, as is exemplified in the *dramatis personae*. This appearance is traceable to the false identification of the *puruṣa* with *prakṛti* and its component parts. *Puruṣa* is dressed in the garb of *prakṛti* and when it is unveiled or removed by *jñāna*, it reveals itself as a true *ātman*. *Puruṣa* is now imprisoned in the body or *śarīra* constituted by the mind-body or the psycho-physical changes caused by the variations of *prakṛti* according to the law of *pari-nāma* or emanation. *Mūlaprakṛti* evolves gradually from the subtle state to the gross state; it first changes into the psychical stuff of *citta* or *buddhi* and *manas* and then the physical categories of *indriyas* and *prāṇa* and the gross stuff of matter. *Manas* is itself an evolute of *prakṛti* and is *sensé commune* and *citta* is ever fleeting without any stability. *Buddhi* is the psychic state that makes for determination or fixity of purpose. The sense organs enable the *jīva* or soul to come into contact with the external world and it experiences the pleasures and pains that arise from such contact. The gross body is the materialized condition of the *jīva* and when it is dissolved at death, the *jīva* with the subtle body conserving its moral experiences wears a new body and in this way the evolution goes on. But the *puruṣa* is different from the evolutes of *prakṛti* and it can be positively realized by intuiting its nature by *yogic* or spiritual practice.

THE DIRECT INTUITION OF PERSONALITY OR ĀTMAN

The theoretical acquaintance with personality as *puruṣa* leads to the practical appreciation of its nature by direct cognition or *yoga*. The person who seeks to know his self should equip himself with physical, mental and moral disciplines as prerequisites of such personal realization. They may be summed up (1) as the purification of the body which is the living temple of God, by taking nourishing food and proper exercise, by breath-control, as a means to mind-control, and by introversion. It is symbolized in the word *tapas-vin* who, according to the *Gītā*, cultivates the virtues of *satya* (truthfulness), *ahiṃsā* (non-violence), *prāṇāyāma* (breath-control), *asteya* (non-stealing), *śauca* (self-purification), *vairāgya* (self-renunciation), introspective *samādhi* and *ātma nirvāṇa*. *Yoga* is the middle course between the extremes of introversion and extroversion, between the repression of the instincts and their uncontrolled expression. As the result of this practice, personality or *puruṣa* is intuited as the *ātman* different from *prakṛti*. The views of the materialist, the vitalist, the sensationalist and the rationalist are not entirely rejected as false but are restated as the means or instruments of personality or soul-making. The body now acquires a new glow and a bright complexion and the eyes reveal the shining self within. Owing to breath-control, life is made healthy and prolonged. The mind is balanced by the avoiding of the pairs of

opposites like pleasure and pain, success and failure and the intellect is illuminated. Personality is no longer depersonalized but it shines in its own self-effulgence as *svayamprakāśa*. The spiritual 'I' is different from the empirical 'me.' The experience is not inferred by means of *tarka* but is immediately intuited as *tatvānubhava*. The terms, individuality, soul, spirit and self do not bring out the full implications of personality as *puruṣa* or *ātman*. Individuality is largely the self of sensibility and is empirical and not *a priori* and the terms, soul and spirit, are not free from animistic associations and the word self is more metaphysical than intuitional in its connotation. But the word personality is free from ambiguity and obscurity and it reveals the nature of *puruṣa* (or *ātman*) different from *prakṛti*, of the *kṣetrajña* or the subject of knowledge as contrasted with *kṣetra* or the object of knowledge or non-self. The perceptual and the conceptual self is now transfigured into a self-radiating personality which is its own evidence. But this should not lapse into the defect of intuitionism called subjectivism, as every one can intuit the self, by following the principles and percepts of self-experimentation.

SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS AS THE ESSENTIAL

QUALITY OF THE SELF

Self-consciousness is different from the consciousness of the self or personality which is self-intuited. Consciousness admits of infinite variations from the

unconscious and the sub-conscious to the pathological or abnormal states and super-consciousness; it cannot be exhausted by a catalogue of adjectives or labels. The self as personality may be a monad as an atomic mathematical point but its quality of consciousness is expansive; while the self may be infinitesimal, its self-consciousness is infinite. In spite of the modifications of the self, it has its own uniqueness and it perseveres in its being as a pervading or personal identity. Personal unity is irreducible, amidst all its modifications as is evidenced very often by the fact of recognition or memory. In the three states of sleep, dream and waking consciousness, the self undergoes so many modifications that its identity is scarcely noticeable. The dream states are extraordinary and are often supernatural happenings, having prophetic character. They are very vivid when they are experienced but the time is shortened. The sleep state is said to be a period of rest or repose. According to Freud, the unconscious is the reservoir of all repressed impulses of which the chief is sex. Dreams are wish-fulfilments. The unconscious can, however, be culturally directed and sublimated. In the pathology of personality, various psychic phenomena occur, disrupting and even destroying unity. There is a variety of illusions, hallucinations, somnambulisms; and cases of double personality, multiple personality, alternating personalities, divided and dispersed personalities are recorded. In illusion, one thing is mistaken for another; hallucinations are self-projections and somnambulisms are often

cases of sleep walking and sleep awareness. In double personality, two conflicting selves coexist or exist alternately. Multiple personality consists of two or more split selves. In dispersal of personality, it is divided and even dissociated. The variety of these under-currents, cross-currents and self-contradictions is so baffling as to undermine the unity of personality. But metapsychics, as different from psychology, postulates the truth of personal identity and it assumes that the more divided and dissipated the self, the more coherent and harmonized it really is and the highest personality is the most unified and integrated. The phenomena of telepathy, television and clairvoyance may be cited as cases of personality enriched by seemingly impersonal occurrences. The *siddhis* recorded in *yogic* psychology are worthy of psychic experimentation and if they are verified, they prove the possibility of infinitizing consciousness in the supra-mental plane. The *yogi* may sit in one place but his thoughts cross mountains and attain the level of cosmic awareness and omniscience.

THE ETERNITY OF PERSONALITY

When *puruṣa* realizes his nature, as different from *prakṛti*, he knows that he is immutable, unborn and eternal. Matter is mutable and it is only the body or *śarīra* made of matter that is subject to birth and death. *Śarīra* is only a psycho-physical complex and whatever is composed of parts is also decomposed.

Sarira is subject to the six-fold changes of birth, youth, manhood, age, decay and death, but *puruṣa* is beyond the *pariṇāmic* changes of *prakṛti* and is therefore birthless and deathless. As the *Gītā* says, at birth, the self puts on a new garment woven out of *prakṛti* and at death, he puts off the garment as it is worn out. Birth and death belong to the phenomenal flux or the psycho-physical series of the empirical self and not to *puruṣa*. The immortality of the self is sought to be proved in the West by the moral argument, thus : Existence and value go together and every virtue should be crowned with happiness. But, in this life, the virtuous man is not happy and therefore a future life is posited and the self is proved to be immortal. But this argument has no finality as there is no reason why a virtuous man should be happy as suffering is divinized by some as joy in disguise. The metaphysical proof based on the idea that what exists, exists for ever, is applied to the self which exists and therefore exists eternally and it is then inferred that the self is not only immortal but is also eternal. But the word eternity itself may mean the continuity of time as an endless series of the past, present and future or what is beyond them. According to the theory of *karma* as causality raised to the moral level, the cause becomes the effect and the effect again causes a new change and so on *ad infinitum* and so the *jīva* as a moral self has continuous births and deaths. But the argument has no finality and it is spiritually futile, as such a continuity is a bad infinite and as the cause

is different from the effect and yet continuous with it ; and endless life involving prenatal existence, present life and future life may be a life of endless misery. But the chief argument for the existence of *puruṣa* as an eternal entity beyond the time series is its intuitional experience of the sense of deathlessness. As was shown already, if the *puruṣa* sheds its materialistic and empirical outlook that it is made of *prakṛti* and intuits its spiritual nature, it realizes its eternity ; then it can say with the *Gītā* that it can neither kill the self nor be killed by it, as it is by nature indestructible. Thus intuition gives the *puruṣa* a sense of immortality and fearlessness and personality is then realized as the eternal *ātman* that is ever self-shining and perfect.

PERSONALITY AS THE IDEAL OF LIFE

Personality is called a substance that has qualities. But a thing is known only by its qualities and what is apart from the qualities as a substratum or somewhat may become a thing in itself which we do not and cannot know. Personality is, therefore, restated as the subject of knowledge, as different from the object of knowledge. But when we know the subject, it becomes an object and ceases to be the subject. Personality is again redefined as the self, distinguished from the non-self. But the moment we think of the self, it becomes an object or the non-self. Personality may be described as the agent that is the doer of an action ; but when we know the agent, it becomes the passive

thing as a mode of our thinking activity. The self is thus strictly speaking not a substance, not a subject, not a self, nor an agent but may finally be called the 'I' as the root of all knowledge. But the difficulty is not overcome because when I think of the 'I' as myself, it becomes the 'me' as the known object. Therefore, the logical intellect fails to form a correct notion of what personality is. It is beyond the logical way of thinking and it can only be intuitively known, as was already shown. But as the subject of our enquiry is the *idea* of personality, it may include the Platonic view of the archetype and the modern view of concept. It is thus both an *ideal and an idea* and it is the ideal which can be actualized. If it is a mere ideal, it is a chimera, an airy nothing and if it is a mere concept, it is an abstraction, empty and idle. But as it includes both, we can know what personality means for us actually in practical empirical life as *dehātma* and try to idealize and say what it ought to be, as *atman*. We idealize and essentialize and seek to know the very essence of personality, as personal idealists and yet, as empirical realists, we try to know psychologically what personality is and does. In this way we collect and collate the psychological data and also aim at a full integral knowledge of personality as the highest end of our present personal life.

THE INFLUENCES ON PERSONALITY

Though personality as such is eternal and a unique spiritual reality which only very few men realize, it is

in practical life empirical and is often identified with the mind-body. It is conditioned by the three determining factors, namely, endowment, environment and education. Every person is born in a certain family which has its own heredity and tradition and his previous experiences are conserved *a priori* as innate *guṇas* or *samskāras*. Each person evolves from immemorial time and has inherited the experience of the past registered in the inner mind-body. The determinist is somewhat justified when he traces the present conditions of a man to his fate which is only the operation of the causal law on the moral plane. A man's character is so largely conditioned by the environment that some psychologists explain it as response to stimulus and externally determined by the particular place where he is born and its climate. A person born in an island is more patriotic than one born in a continent, though insular life lapses into the feeling of insularity. A person born in a hilly tract is more adventurous than one born in a plain. Likewise, people living in temperate climates are said to have more sustained character than people in torrid zones and the sound, saving common sense of some races is contrasted with the impractical or other-worldly mind of other races who are alleged to spend much of their time in airy nothings or day-dreams. Education has more deep influence on personality than environment and endowment and the educated man is a shining example to the community as a self-made man. Though it aims at the removal of man's ignorance and illiteracy, it is

deeply interested in the creation of experts and leaders who have their own peculiar qualities as specialists in their field. The scientists specialize in particular branches of knowledge which have on the whole more practical than cultural values and they add to the wonders of knowledge and the comforts of life. The humanists delight in the academic and cultural appreciations of life. *Vidyā* (learning) deepens into *vinaya* or sweet reasonableness, the chief end of culture. It is the result of self-renouncement, inwardness and sweet mellowed reasonableness. In this way it is found that a person is mostly moulded by these internal and external circumstances and it justifies the view of the fatalists or the determinists who explain away personality as a creature of conditions. The study of the three *guṇas* in this context may throw light on this interesting problem, as deduced from the *Gītā*.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE GUṆAS

Of the three influences on personality, it is the inner disposition of the man that has a vital relation to him in shaping his character including his instincts and purposes, fancies and thought, feeling and will. The mediæval classification of temperaments in Europe was fourfold, namely, the mercurial, phlegmatic, melancholy and sanguine. Some are irritable, impulsive and impetuous ; others sluggish-minded and dull ; still others, gloomy and moody and still others are

warm-blooded, witty and vigorous. While some are optimistic by nature and have a rosy view of life, others are pessimistic; they are depressed by misfortune and a feeling of unmerited misery. While some are excitable, others preserve their equanimity or balanced outlook. According to Jung, men are either extroverts or introverts; the former turn to the outer world and have an objective outlook, but the latter turn to the inward life and have insight. James thinks that the will of a man may be healthy and normal, or precipitate or perverse. In the case of the precipitate variety action follows the stimulus at once, but perversity is obstructive or explosive. The *Gītā* view of the psychology of conduct is more comprehensive; it takes into account his *svabhāva* as the moods, tendencies and feelings and desires, in its differentiation of the *guṇas* into *satva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. Each has its own specific nature or psycho-physical function. *Satva* is *prakāśa* in a wide sense and it illumines thought, harmonizes the will and conduces to happiness. Virtue is reason followed by happiness. *Rajas* is *pravṛtti* in the wide sense of restless activity delighting in adventure and display and the wants of life increase with satisfaction. *Tamas* is *ālasya* and it includes ignorance, sluggishness and sleepishness; the mind is confused, the will is perverted and the result is inertia. *Satva* lights the way to perfection by its *prakāśatva*; *rajas* is impetuous longing for the pursuits and pleasures of life; and in *tamas* the self sinks down into the lowest stage of life. But the *guṇas* in practice

are inter-dependent and the man's character is largely determined by the dominance of one *guṇa*. The *Gītā* applies this psychology to every aspect of a man's life—his food, his discrimination, determination and happiness. The general conclusion is helpful in moral and spiritual progress and in the soul-making process. The man of *tamas* is steeped in indecision, slothful and animistic ways of thinking and he subjects himself to fear and misery. The *rājasika* is restless, runs after the pleasures of the sense, and is full of self-love or egoity. The *sātvika* pursues the way of truth, virtue and real happiness. He distinguishes truth from falsity, virtue from falsehood and happiness from misery and after calm deliberation decides on the right course of life. By means of *viveka* and *vairāgya* and inwardness and self-renouncement, the person frees himself from the limitations of matter or *prakṛti* and attains his true personality (*ātmānubhava*).

PERSONALITY OR VIVEKI OR JÑĀNĪ

Existence and value go together and values are feelings of approval by persons. The science of values recognizes the worth of personality and there are judgments of values, namely, the cognitive, conative and affective; or thinking, willing and feeling, and the fundamental kinds, namely, *truth*, *goodness* and *beauty*. They are specifically dealt with by the three normative sciences, Logic, Ethics and Aesthetics. These values are intrinsic, objective, eternal and spiritual and

they satisfy the highest aspirations of personality. They are not abstractions emptied of content and character. They are patterns which can be realized and are perfect of their kind. The values are ultimately one and indivisible. They are constitutive factors of a well-developed personality and are not contradictory alternatives that are dissolved in the absolute and destroyed. To exalt the intellect at the expense of the moral consciousness and artistic appreciation is as one-sided as to elevate the moral or the aesthetic aspect. In a well-rounded personality, the three are welded together and form a unity in trinity. But, in actual life different persons cultivate different values and the man of intellect or the *viveki*, like the scientist and the logical thinker, seeks to arrive at truth by freeing his mind from all prejudices due to birth, community and religion. Open-mindedness, disinterestedness and pursuit of the ideal irrespective of consequences form the chief qualities of the lover of truth. Owing to the intrinsic value of truth, it is sometimes observed that its pursuit is more valuable than its possession or attainment. Pursuit consists in progression of knowledge from sense-perception and reasoning to scientific intuition or intuitive apprehension of Reality. In the growth of knowledge, sense-perception is prior to rational and self-knowledge, but really speaking the self or personality is prior to all perceptual processes. In sense-perception, knowledge is fragmentary or piecemeal. Reasoning collates the isolated facts and systematizes them into a whole. But the self is more

than a system of connected ideas as it is a knowing subject different from the known object and knowledge itself. It is the special province of the scientist and the philosopher to collate them into a system partially unified or fully unified and then the *viveki* became a *jñāni*.

ETHICAL PERSONALITY OR STHITHAPRAJÑA

It is the ethical personality that brings out the inner worth and dignity of man more than any other quality. To every man, his mind consisting of subjective inclinations is a kingdom and he can attain self-sovereignty or *svarājya*. Personality is different from the self of sensibility and reason. The pleasures of sensibility like riches, long life, and health have no stability nor universality. They are trivial and transitory and they make man the slave of sensibility or animal instincts. In the same way, a rational man who seeks to derive by prudence the advantages of life like power and position does not necessarily secure success. Success and failure are inseparable in empirical life and if there is attachment to a thing due to *kāma*, it is followed by aversion to it and *krodha* if the attempt is futile. But man has will and is morally free and he can acquire mastery over his inclinations and empirical desires. By *viveka* or discrimination, he knows that he is not the animal or empirical self and that he should not be a victim of *viśaya rāga* or sensual desire. Morality should be stripped of self-love and self-esteem and the will should be good in itself and not

a means to an end. Conduct is self-determined and not influenced by any external circumstance. * Desire for sense objects based on self-love makes conduct commercial. But virtue as such like goodness has no such market value or even fancy value. Moral life is very complex owing to the conflict of motives and the absence of a clear and distinct moral consciousness. In the act of deliberation the person may be drawn this side and that side and may begin to vacillate or if the man is impulsive or impetuous, he may rush into action precipitately. But moral autonomy consists in avoiding the extremes as all thought and no action may make a man a Hamlet and all action and no reflection may make him a Macbeth. When the man thinks clearly and acts with decision, he has become a moral victor, but it is not his strongest desire. Then his virtue shines like a jewel in its own light and the moral man is neither elated by success nor depressed by failure. Not even the gods can conquer a man who has conquered his animal self, attain *svarājya* and he is a true victor or *jitatmā* and is superior to a man who has conquered the world like Rāvaṇa and is yet a victim of his *kāma*.

AESTHETIC PERSONALITY OR ĀTMĀRĀMA AND RASIKA

Art has more attractiveness than logic and ethics on account of its appeal to the heart more than to the head and the centre of action and it is sometimes said

that *beauty* is a synthesis of truth and goodness. But the critics of aesthetics do not recognize its autonomous character. Some pessimists think that art is an escape from the weary weight of life. The ascetic idea of self-mortification and repression of instincts is fatal to the growth of art. The theory that philosophy based on reason is superior to art which is said to represent sensible knowledge, condemns aesthetics as the lowest scale of knowledge. Finally the view that beauty is a semblance of reality and only a make-believe leads art away from reality and not to reality and it is an epitaph on art itself. All these criticisms bring out the narrow-mindedness of false metaphysics, asceticism and pessimism. But it is art that reveals the riches of creative imagination and the supreme value of beauty and love which links truth and goodness. An aesthetic personality has a magnetic charm which the mere logician and the moralist do not feel or cannot claim. Beauty cannot be mapped or measured quantitatively, nor analysed by the logical intellect. The beauty of the rose is lost when it is dissected anatomically. The springs of beauty cannot be traced to mere vital impulses and the glow of animal life. That it is the expression of sexual demand and sexual selection is equally one-sided. Spiritual beauty is not due to the harmony of things. Some psychologists explain it in terms of agreeable sensations like softness, symmetry and harmony. To the hedonist what gives pleasure is beautiful; but to the moralist virtue is beauty and it shines through. Beauty is felt and not thought and

its appreciation is not innate as it can be acquired by aesthetic training and there is a ladder of beauty as it were from the beauty of nature to supernature. Human personality is the expression of supersensuous beauty 'that is not on sea or land' and man can rise in the scale of spiritual attractiveness by imitating the highest Beauty. Aesthetics is more suggestive than explanatory and it can bridge the gulf between the finite and the infinite. To the mystic poet with a beautiful vision, the boundary line between the finite and the infinite disappears and he intuits the unity of life in all its Beauty.

INTEGRAL PERSONALITY OR UTTAMA PURUṢA

Man is now a dual personality, the bodily and the spiritual. The bodily self is made of matter or a mode of *prakṛti*. It is *dehātmā* and not *pratyagātmā*. It is possible for him to renounce the pseudo-self or *ahaṅkāra* and realize his own nature or *aham*. By withdrawing the mind from its outgoing tendencies, the spiritual philosopher can introspect on the inner self and discover it. A study of psychology enables him to distinguish between the fleeting flux of *vṛttis* and *vāsanās* and the immutable self behind them. By rational insight afforded by logical training, he knows the truths of *ātman* as different from the perishing values of matter, life and mind. His character is steadied by ethical discipline and practice of virtue and he becomes a virtuoso. It is not merely a harmonious blending of

wisdom, courage and temperance acquired by developing the animal, the human and the spiritual side of life, but it is full autonomy or *svarājya* where soul power is supreme over brute power and no one, not even a god, can subdue him who has subdued himself. By fully developing the beauty of the soul by creative imagination, the *ātman* now shines through, in its own inner effulgence. In this way, his personality is fully developed and when he intuitively himself as *ātmā*, he attains the integral knowledge of wisdom. But he is yet on the path to perfection which is complete in all its parts and is fulfilled only in love. Man can become perfect like God by perfect love and it is the complete expression of the whole personality and not merely of feeling ; it is righteousness fulfilled in love. It consists in the renunciation of egoity or self-love and the abolition of the sense of separateness between man and man. *karma* is done without *kāma*. It is an attainable end and the man who attains it is a perfect man whose only *dharma* or duty is benevolence to all beings. He is the spectator of all time and existence and the master of those that know. He has the intuitive knowledge that he is the eternal *ātman* and not the body and that others also are *ātman*. He is no longer the slave of sensibility nor a creature of the circumstances but has attained self-rule which is more than gaining the whole world. Spiritual kinship leads to the socialistic view.

LECTURE II

THE SOCIALISTIC VIEW OF PERSONALITY

INDIVIDUALISTIC theories deal with the promotion of self-love, self-culture and self-perfection as the highest ends of life but they are opposed to the true ideas of personality. According to some, self-love is the ultimate object of all human action. Each man should desire his own happiness and gratify it as the supreme object of life is self-preservation. Everywhere in nature there is struggle for existence and the fittest alone survives. Every man is the enemy of the other and all are at arms' length. Persons who are able to adjust themselves to the environment and follow the rule of expediency come out successful and their goal of life is the attainment of maximum pleasure and minimum misery. There is another school of individualists who assert the supremacy of super men who exercise their will to power and rule over others. Their motto is "Might is right" and it is their master morality and they become autocrats by reducing others to slavery. Still others aim at individual perfection and all their actions subserve that end. The highest good of man is individual blessedness and it is secured by being

good and not doing good. They retire into the cell of self-knowledge and attain inner quiet or aloneness. The highest virtue of a man is to be a virtuoso and he thrives only in an atmosphere of peace and aloneness. But they ignore or neglect the social side of personality or the gregarious or herd instinct of man. Atomic or monadistic individualism leads in the end to the disruption of society by promoting the unsocial and anti-social tendencies of man. But true personality is the fostering of the social side of life and the development of social solidarity. Individual perfection is not incompatible with social unity and it is essential to enquire into the nature of this ideal and the means of realizing it.

• • THE PLURALISTIC VIEW

The pluralist says there is a plurality of independent persons, who are external to one another without any inner relation. Each person exists in himself and by himself in isolation as his own end and it is due to the exercise of the master instincts of self-preservation or the self-regarding instinct. But such egoism cuts at the very root of social sympathy and inter-subjective intercourse. As is commonly observed, nothing in the world is single and all things mingle in each others' being by a divine law. True culture does not consist in solitary self-centredness and if culture is emptied of sympathy, it ends in selfishness. Mutualness is more valuable than single meritoriousness and it is the fundamental axiom of sociology. It

shows rapprochement between psychology and ethics as it insists on the development of social personality by the utilization of the gregarious instinct. Ethics stresses the need for mutual co-operation in cultivating the social self. Sociology studies persons in their togetherness and not as exclusive atomistic individuals who live perpetually in mutual hostility and drift towards anarchy. To the physical scientist, a cyclone is as natural as human sympathy; to the psychologist, morbidity is as much a datum of study as mercy; but to the moral man as a social personality, the quality of mercy is a spiritual excellence and it has intrinsic and eternal value. Even in the animal world, the motherly instinct and the herd instinct serve as the essential factors of the preservation of the species. Animal life thus provides enough scope for mutual protection and is a promise of the social consciousness which comes to fruition in the more developed rational life of man. It is only in human society that the idea of personality becomes articulate as a social self, which learns to free itself from the barriers of isolation and exclusiveness and feel the unity of life as a whole. The person who does not live in society is either a beast or god. And even then he cannot be anti-social. Gods live in a society of gods at least to establish their quality as gods.

NATURE OF SOCIETY

Society is easily contrasted with a crowd or mob in which there is no order or understanding. It is

not an aggregate of atoms or isolated individuals, a mechanical whole made of parts which are indifferent to one another. It is an arithmetical view which fails to do justice to the dignity of personality. In statistics, for example, each person is counted as one, as a unit among other units and it is soulless and abstract. The view of social contract introduces commercial ideas in corporate life and it fails to bring out inner cohesion and intimacy. In the idea of society as an organization, personality is treated as a part and is depersonalized. Society as an organism brings out the unity of the members and is therefore more adequate than the concepts of aggregation or organization; but it also suffers from a defect, namely, the fact that in an organism consciousness is in the whole and not in the parts; but in society it is in the individual members and social consciousness as such is an abstraction. In the absolutistic conception of society as a totality or system of selves in which each individual is merged or absorbed in the all-inclusive goal, the idea of personality is swallowed up in the absolute and is therefore abolished. A true conception of society should, then, avoid the Scylla of monadic or atomic individualism and the Charybdis of absolutism. The former may lead to anarchy or chaos and the latter to the abolition of the self itself. Society is a kingdom of ends in which each person is a person and not a thing and is both sovereign and subject. He is sovereign in so far as his freedom is self-determined and subject in so far

as he follows the rules or dictates of reason. Society is a realm of ends in which each person is a person and therefore an end unto himself and is a means conducive to the attainment of the intrinsic ends. Personality is the realization of humanity in the concrete life of man and it is therefore not the universal man as such abstracted from the particular men nor the particular man encased in his particularity. The dignity and integrity of man as man is realized only in the world of men in concrete circumstances. Likewise, society as such is a soulless abstraction emptied of the riches of concrete life and self-centred individualism as such leads to selfishness. A true society is therefore a realm of ends in which each man is a person or *ātman* and treats others as persons or *ātmas*. Selfhood and otherness are correlative and not self-contradictory and otherness is an axiom of social philosophy contributing to the spiritual solidarity of society.

PERSONALITY AND COMMUNITY

People are bound together by ties of birth, tradition, language and religion and form particular communities united by the common affinities. The science of Sociology describes the details of these circumstances as essential factors in shaping personality. But a distinction may be drawn between individuality and personality. The individual as a member of a particular community owes his existence and life to the habitudes of the community and develops strong

racial traits which form his peculiar characteristics. His self is built on his *samskāras* which form his psycho-physically organized prenatal dispositions. If his education is a process of drawing out and developing these dispositions, it leaves a permanent impression on his character and leads him to form an exclusive impression of his own, on all matters relating to his social position. From exclusiveness to fanaticism and hatred of others differing from him is a natural transition and the result is baneful and demoralizing as the individual is then a victim of communalism. Communities may grow but communalism should go as it is a disease that deeply affects the social individual. When sociology describes the individual thus shaped by the circumstances, ethics and spiritual science refer to him not as he is but as he ought to be as a master of his circumstances and as a true social personality. As a person or member of society, he has his own station in life and his relation to others is psychologically determined by his position in life. But social life is lived from within and not imposed on him from the outside and the chief social institutions are the family, the school or the college, the workshop, the State and religion. These institutions are designed to serve as a training ground for his moral and spiritual uplift and not make him a slave of the environment. Every individual is born in an institution and brought up in it; but he should as a social personality rise above the narrow confines of individualism and expand into a social personality and

promote social solidarity. The family is the earliest nursery of such social life and its influence on the individual may be considered first in the realistic way as a given factor of society or unique individual and then in the idealistic way as a unique individual universalized. The family, the college, the workshop, the State and the church are meant respectively to be opportunities for avoiding the evils respectively of adultery, standardization, mechanization, militarization and sectarianism. They bring out the ethics of *dharma* or righteousness involving mutualness and kinship. Society serves as a medium for soul-making and spiritual service.

THE FAMILY

The family is the nursery of work for the common good of man and mutual sympathy. It is the training ground of mutual love and harmony. Love is two-sided and it loathes self-love. It removes the self-feeling pleasingly and fosters the spirit of togetherness and reciprocity. It is the family that provides the vocabulary of social love and the deepest sentiment of affection. The parent-child relation draws out spontaneously the feeling of affectionate tenderness which is spiritually expressed in the twin ideals of the fatherhood and motherhood of God. The ideal of social brotherhood is also an extension of the domestic sentiment of kinship raised to the spiritual level. Marriage sublimates lust into love ; it familizes sex and promotes monogamous affection and loyalty. It is the social

basis for the spiritual affinities of two persons and their conjugal at-one-ment is essential to social stability. It is, therefore, praised as a sacrament, and it elevates animal behaviour into a spiritual bond. The *pati-patnī* ideal of Rāma-Sītā is an eternal virtue of dual-non-dual personality functioning on the religious level as Lord and S'rī or the divine pair in the interests of soul-making. The family is thus a natural institution or co-operative service society and the consciousness of kinship is a moral and spiritual factor as kindly feeling consummates in kinly feeling and corporate responsibility. It is the family that is the foundation of *dharma* or righteousness, as it alone stresses the sense of dutifulness as opposed to the egoistic tendency of the assertion of individual personal rights. The law of righteousness is preferable to the legal theory of rights, and righteousness itself is grounded in love. Law has its fulfilment only in love and it is the institution of family that is the foundation of love for the formation of social personality. Modern life has given many artificial substitutes for the family feeling and to that extent has undermined the basis for the development of true social personality. The child is a "trailing cloud of glory" from the divine Home. It is a spark of God and as "the father of man" it can develop its infinite spiritual potentiality and virtually become the son of God. Brotherhood is both physical and spiritual kinship as all men are sons of God. Married love not only sublimates sex but is the expression of the two-sidedness of Divine creative love. Psycho-analysis

only brings out the nastiness of naked lust in action and misses the spiritual side of love. Earthly parentage is a partial reflection of the tender love of the divine parents, symbolizing the unity of law and love.

EDUCATION

Education is not a trade union or industry whose object is the mass production of finished articles like graduates. Life is more valuable than livelihood. Education aims at soul-making or the moulding of the social personality and is obligatory. Though in the general sense it seeks to remove mass illiteracy and the promotion of physical health, economic betterment, and the political well-being of the individual, in a higher sense it is spiritual and consists in soul-making or *ātman*-making. As the *Gītā* says, it is the aim of *vidyā* or education to promote *vinaya* or sweet reasonableness and as was indicated in the previous lecture, it consists in self-renouncement, inwardness and their fruition in sweet reasonableness or *vinaya*. It includes the knowledge of *dharma* and Brahman. *Vairāgya* is the abandonment of the evils of prejudice and partisanship arising from birth, breeding and narrow-mindedness. Dogmatism is the deadly enemy of a truly dynamic personality; departmental thinking is opposed to the principles of synthetic thinking, and the true integration of personality. *Vairāgya* or self-renouncement is the giving up of egoism and the

acquisitive instinct and it consists in the practice of sexual purity by avoiding the dangers and disasters of Freudian sex mentality. *Vairāgya* leads to inwardness or introspection or *īñāna*; it is by inwardness that a man can analyse and criticise himself and rise to a higher level. It is going from animality to humanity whose chief value is the cultivation of the spirit of appreciation and humaneness. Appreciation is the very flower of culture and appraisal. There is a soul of good in all things and when the cultured man practises this idea, he becomes humane. Hatred creates confusion and chaos in the inner world of individuality, but love and tolerance lead to spiritual and social concord. While talent thrives in solitude, tolerance thrives in social life and it may be defined as the perception and practice of unity in variety. It is not mere acquiescence in things as they happen, but the acceptance of the higher values of life. Individuals may differ in birth, sex, profession, class and creed; their starting points in life may vary, but the goal ought to be the same. Persons may vary, but their spiritual personality is the same. Divergencies may be presented by temperaments, professions and skills in particular types of social activity, but true personality accepts these variations and appreciates their underlying unity. All persons are radiations from the same divine centre and true culture consists in the discovery of spiritual personality and similarity. It thus avoids the evils of uniformity or standardization and individualism and promotes the ends of inner growth and mutual understanding.

summed up in the twin ideals of social personality, namely, "speak the truth or *satyam* and do *dhārma*."

ECONOMIC PERSONALITY

Economics as the science of wealth and welfare deals with the material well-being of man called *artha*. It is concerned with the production and the distribution of the goods of life like vegetable, mineral and animal productions, which are essential for the being and well-being of man. Every man ekes out his livelihood for the maintenance of his life. But in addition to the necessities of life, like food, clothing and medicine, he has developed luxuries as well. Civilized life often consists in wanting to want or the multiplication of wants. Modern science has unravelled the secrets of nature for the benefit of man and by conquering distance, shortening labour, multiplying industries and increasing their efficiency, man has created a vast machinery which ministers to his needs and luxuries. But industrialism generates greed, breeds covetousness and widens the gulf between the propertied and the propertyless or the capitalist and the labourer. By exercising the acquisitive instinct the love of property in man has become his second nature and it has aroused the spirit of rivalry and competition so furiously that it has in the name of enterprise set free the evils and miseries of cut-throat competitionism and exploiting capitalism. The warfare for markets has degenerated into the dangers of parasitism

and predatism and the dilemmas of commercialism, namely, capitalism and communism. It encourages the growth of the captains of industry and the capitalists who thrive by exploiting the weak and the poor. Capitalism reacts and gives rise to the discontentment of the proletariat. This follows the logic of dialectical materialism and then results in the creation of communism and the regimentation of man and the equal distribution of the necessities of life. The only solution for the twin evils of capitalism and communism is to retrace the steps of false economics and found economics on the ethics of spiritual personality. Commercialism dehumanizes man and makes him a thing. But man should dominate the machine and acquire sovereignty over the acquisitive instinct. The goods of life are to be equitably distributed to all according to their needs, but equity is different from equalitarianism and standardizing life. The evils of property should be avoided not by abolishing property, but the property feeling based on the acquisitive instinct leading to covetousness. Then money becomes portable personality and is a means to the development of intrinsic worth and the free gift of the goods of life to the poor and the needy. Then true exchange is the exchange of ideas and ideals. Then worth and work become one. When the worker realizes his inner worth, he becomes a true *karmayogī* like the butcher of Mithila. The idea of bafter is then destroyed at the altar of self-sacrifice and social service and science is perfected in the service of humanity. New India has an opportunity of avoiding

the extremes of capitalism and communism which threaten a third world war, by spiritualizing politics and economics.

POLITICAL PERSONALITY

Man is sometimes defined as a political animal who insists on the promotion of law and order as the essential conditions for social well-being and the attainment of liberty and justice. The state is society politically organized to enforce the ends of justice or righteousness and a true state exists not for power or wealth but to provide full opportunities for the development of social personality. The theory of social contract to avoid mutual warfare is based on calculating self-interest or egoism and it omits the common interests of man. Contract should give place to compact and co-operation. The theory of government by force and fraud which is not for the good of the governed leads to despotism allied to opportunism either by a single individual or by a group. The democratic or republican view of the state as the government of the people, by the people, for the people, is no doubt an answer to Totalitarianism or Fascism, or Communism. It aims at the greatest good of the greatest number and avoids the twin evils of the ruler complex and the communistic complex. But democracy itself may lead to the tyranny of the majority and may suffer from the evils of the ruler complex and the communistic complex. Whatever the form of government, it should create a true leader and should be administered by the best

men or the wisest who work for others in a spirit of disinterestedness and it should provide facilities for the realization of what is best in man. There are four views of the state, namely, the economic, the biological, the psychological and the absolutist, and they are all defective. The first creates and promotes the conflict between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'; the second cannot solve the problem of the unfit. The third tends to multiply sense-desires instead of minimizing them and the fourth makes the state an end in itself and abolishes personality. But it is the moral view of man as a person and not a thing that furnishes the highest ideal of the state and it is based on soul-Power. Politics should be moralized and spiritualized by the substitution of freedom for force, of co-operation for coercion and of soul force for brute force. Freedom is political and ultra political and is won morally and spiritually. All persons are spiritually akin and not at arms' length, and even the idea of the United Nations will work well only if it is based on this idea of spiritual kinship or union. The possession of fundamental rights, like the liberty of person, property, free association and religious worship is beneficial only when the assertion of rights is rooted in righteousness. The method of propaganda by force and fraud should be replaced by that of the propagation of the ideals of international thinking and love. A good state should fulfil the ideas of security and loyalty to the highest ideals of life and it is only then that the evils of collectivism and individualism will be avoided. Then, all will live for each and each

will live for all and the idea of social personality and spiritual federation will satisfy the needs of the individual and society. The true politician as a wise man like Janaka relies not on brute force or opportunism but on *ātma śakti* or soul power, and it should manifest itself in righteousness and loving kindness to all. Even the most ardent criminal is not so callous as to resist the call of *kṛpā* or generosity by the rulers whose aim is not punishment but the reformation of the individual.

SPIRITUAL PERSONALITY

The spiritual side of social life seeks to reconcile egoism and altruism, and it exceeds the realistic, the pragmatic and the idealistic views, and approaches personalism. The *realist*, as an evolutionist, traces the ascent of man from primitivity to perfectability, from egoism to altruism ; but his account is only a natural history of human growth, and no reason is given for the advance. The theory of the ages of history like gold, silver, bronze and iron are stories of descent from a higher to a lower level and they reverse the process as they describe the gradual degeneration of life. The *pragmatist* has the will to believe in the development of social personality but the will to believe may end in the will to make-believe. The *idealist* looks ahead optimistically and hopes that in the future, existence and value will coincide, and thus works for the golden age. Humanism insists on the need for humanizing

the animality of man and for devotion to the religion of humanity but it does not rise to the conception of the sacredness and dignity of personality in its individual and collective aspect. To the *personalist*, the universe is friendly to man and not hostile to him and in all levels of life, persuasion and love should take the place of persecution. There should be a growing transition from self-realization to social service. Spirituality is entry into the inner quiet or *sānti* but it lacks social expansiveness. The *spiritual humanist* has faith in righteousness and fellowship, and in the promotion of the welfare of man as man. It is not merely in giving redress to suffering humanity but in sharing his spirituality with others. Every one is a person different from *prakṛti* and he should regard others also as persons. This view is an improvement on scientific determinism which depersonalizes man and it lays stress on human freedom and the attainment of the spiritual kingdom of ends in which each man has self-sovereignty and at the same time works for others attaining the same ideal. Man is not a unit or citizen in a world of competing claims and counter-claims. The merely political idea of fundamental rights not rooted in righteousness leads often to fratricidal fights as the legalism on which it is based enables a man as a legal entity to make laws and to break laws and thus promote endless litigation. In true social life, otherness is vital to fellowship and self-feeling is then abandoned and the wall between the individual and the group is then demolished. Exclusiveness

which is encased in egoism is replaced or displaced by expansiveness.

SOCIAL SPIRITUAL PERSONALITY

The ideal of social spiritual personality solves the conflict between individualism and collectivism. The individual desires freedom to acquire eternal autonomy and also social peace and security. But this can be done only by harmonizing individual freedom and social stability. If the individual asserts his rights to life, freedom, education and religious worship without recognizing his corresponding obligations to others, society will lapse into individualism and result in amorphous chaos. But if society is treated as an end in itself, then the individual withers away and society drifts into the evils of super-individualism and totalitarianism. The two sides are to be well balanced in the idea of society as a community of social selves or persons seeking perfection. Each man works with his kind and comes to himself only through fellowship with fellows. Self-satisfaction then means the satisfaction of the social self. When the feeling of isolation due to the ideas of 'I' and 'mine' is overcome, the artificial distinction between self-regarding and social duties, between egoism and altruism is destroyed as all duties are owed to the moral and spiritual society consisting of similar persons. Otherness is essential to friendship and fellowship. Modern life with its annihilation of space and time or distance and duration, diffusion of power,

and levelling tendencies does not conduce to the growth of personal life. It does not foster personal intimacy based on like-mindedness, soul to soul relationship, platonic friendship and *guru-siṣya* intimacy, owing to the spread of democratic and impersonal tendencies in all social activities. But though the forms of social affinities have changed with time, the facilities for co-operation have enormously increased with the increase in inter-communal, international and inter-religious understanding. Social personality is no longer limited by consideration of group loyalties, parochial patriotism or theological dogmatism. Men not only are but they belong together and the more personal a man is, the more social he becomes; by losing himself in the service of humanity, his personal worth is enriched. While the self is perfected by culture and spiritual discipline, its self-consciousness becomes more and more expansive and it can grow into cosmic or global dimensions leading to universal love. The wisdom of the social person with his extended knowledge no longer lingers on the shore but is immersed in the immensity of cosmic love.

UNITY IN VARIETY

The social philosopher follows the golden mean between absolutism and pluralism, by adopting the principle of unity in variety. Society will become impossible if it is guided by the motto of uniformity or sameness without providing for variations; it will

become chaotic if it is individualistic and not based on some unifying principle or formula. The theory of unity in variety reconciles these extremes and it is preferable to the idea of uniformity. No two individuals are alike in temperament, character, or in the mode of behaviour; they have their own monadic individuality or uniqueness. It enables them to maintain their personal identity. Standardization or regimentation by social legislation consists in abolishing all distinctions due to birth, sex, caste and creed, by establishing a classless, sexless regimented society and abolishing landlordism and beggary. Such a state is, however, psychologically impossible at present owing to inherent differences in actual life; it is desirable ethically but not desired actually and psychologically. A highly suggestive social formula says: "*Kriyādvaitam nakartavyam bhāvadvaitam sadā kuru.*" The former is regimented life or uniformity in *action* or mode of behaviour; by removing all differences and ignoring all variations, life is impoverished and becomes dead and abstract. The social idealist should develop the *attitude* of equality or *bhāvadvaitam* and shed his sense of separatism or egoistic feeling. Society is at present compartmentalised or shut up in separate divisions caused by prejudices, misunderstandings, and pugnacious tendencies; but these misunderstandings will cease only if there is proper understanding. Communities do grow but communalism ought to go, and it is the abolition of the communalistic mentality by developing *bhāvadvaita* or the attitude of *amatva*. With the

disappearance of communalistic outlook, communalism will also disappear. The outlook may vary with varying conditions but the spiritual insight is the same, owing to the similarity of all selves in their spiritual nature; sects will vary but sectarianism ought not to be. This is an ideal which ought to be practised by the leaders or wisemen of all communities. Then they become exemplars of ideal society which may be ushered in the future by millennial workers who feel that the physical, vital and psychical aspects of life can be completely transformed by *yoga*, into the divine or supra-mental level.

AESTHETIC PERSONALITY

The personal ideal is ultimately explained more as a beautiful and loving soul aesthetically than as what is supremely true and good. The bodily self is now bounded by the limitations of space, time and causality and is uglified by self-love. The scientist, the scholar and the philosopher are more interested in dissecting things and analysing thoughts than in discovering their soul. The scientist seeks to know a flower by dissecting it into parts and putting it into the test tube. The scholar studies only the grammar and prosody of a poem and misses its creative joy. The philosopher thinks on all things, begins with doubt and ends with doubt. Even the theologian who believes in religion is shut up in dogmatism and sectarianism and cannot catch a glimpse of the self-effulgent beauty beyond.

But when he turns into an aesthetician as poet, musician and mystic, his view is changed into a vision and life acquires a new meaning and value. The body then becomes a living temple of beauty and it is no longer the seat of the lusts of the flesh. Nature is alive and aglow with a Beauty that is visible to the eye of the poet and the nature mystic: Beauty sleeps in the stone below and stars above and wakes up in man. A poem is a work of art and it is appreciated not by counting the pages and verbal analysis but by entering by means of creative imagination into its living unity and beauty. To the mystic, artist experience is not a mechanical whole, nor even a philosophic synthesis but is an immediate vision of the inner love that pulsates through all things. He sees no wall of separation between the finite and the infinite, as the two are blended into one as finite-infinite. The formless is ensouled in the form. The infinite flows into the finite and the finite outgrows into the infinite. They are inseparable like song and singing, like music and its melodies, like light and its luminosity. When personality is thus inspired by mystic art, it is vivified, illumined and enthusiastically exalted. Society is then exalted and reaches a higher level of progress than before. The social problem is a problem of value and not of power and its chief value is cementing society by loving fellowship and by laughing away seriously the fancied ills of social life in a spirit of the cosmic *lila* of love. True art is then different from artificiality and it is universal art that appeals to

universal love and it unites all persons by its very suggestibility and attractiveness.

THE PERSONAL AND THE SUPRA-PERSONAL

It is the religious faith in God as the supra-personal or *Puruṣottama* that is the consummation or fulfilment of the ideals of logic, ethics and aesthetics in their individual and social aspects. The idea of God as the supra-personal is not that He is an extra-cosmic deity or Father in Heaven transcending the world of space and time and the world of souls, nor is He the impersonal devoid of attributes and emptied of name and form and self-consciousness. Personality has its full meaning and value only in the supra-personal as the ground of existence and the home of the eternal values of truth, goodness, beauty and love (*satyam*, *sāntam* and *sundaram*). God or *Paramātmā* is the life of our life and the true of the true and in him all finite beings live, move and have their being. He is the light of all lights, who knows no night or darkness and the finite self is a divine spark like a ray of the sun. He is the beauty of beauties that lends beauty to nature without and the soul within. Existence and value are one in the absolute as the God of religion and He is the supreme real of reals as the all-person beyond perishing *prakṛti* and changing *puruṣa*, in whom all values are eternally self-realized. God as truth satisfies the highest ideals of science and philosophy and is the cognitional highest as the self and not a system. God is the supreme good and the fulfilment of the

ethical and sociological ideals, and goodness and godliness are one. God is beauty and love and He beautifies the soul by freeing it from the soilure of evil and ugliness by contacting Him as the intuitional highest. There is no contradiction between finite and infinite personality due to any collision or fissure as the limitless love of God is poured into the self and pulsates through it. *Puruṣottama* makes the soul into His own image as the Creator of creators, and soul-making is His chief purpose. In this process, there is loss not of personality but loss in personality. *Puruṣottama* is not a potter God or a magnified man made in the image of man anthropomorphically but is pure and perfect; He imparts His perfection to the *puruṣa* and makes him *uttama-puruṣa* or fully integrated personality. Divine love utilizes and deifies the finite self and this ideal is fully illustrated in the life of Rāma as *uttamapuruṣa* and *Puruṣottama*. He is the pattern of monogamy, monarchy and monotheism and therefore the epic portrayal of *Rāmarājya* approximates to the Kingdom of God on earth in which God, as infinite love, descends into humanity and humanity ascends to divine life and the two then become glued together as one entity. They are distinct but not separate. Human personality attunes itself to divine love and attains at-one-ment with Him.

SERVICE TO HUMANITY

Personality is enriched by the more of itself when it is realized in social service. It is not the sentiment

of solitariness or *sānti* that makes for spiritual personality but that of sociability. It is cruel to say that nature is red in tooth and claw and that society is a gladiatorial show and should be shunned as evil. The universe is friendly to man, and there is a kinship between nature and human nature on account of the indwelling of Divine love in all beings. The theory of *ahimsa* on which benevolence is based is negative in form but it has acquired a positive meaning. It is not merely the feeling of non-injury to others in thought, word and deed but is the practice of universal love. Buddhists and Jainas have specialized in the practice of *ahimsā* as *jīvakārunya* or sympathy to all living beings or *jīvas* including the lower animals. But Buddhism in its practice of *jīvakārunya* affirms the need for *kārunya* or kindness but denies the existence of *jīvas*. The Jainas extend extraordinary sympathy to all *jīvas* but they are unable to give a reason for their universal kindness. Christianity insists on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man but the reason for brotherliness is not fully brought out. Besides, according to it, the heathen is separated from the believer and is sent to eternal hell on the Judgment Day. The idea of the brotherhood of man is not so significant or valuable as the *Gītā* view of unity or similarity of all *jīvas*. The Kantian formula, "be a person and treat others as persons" is made clear by the *Gītā* idea that *puruṣa* is an eternal spiritual entity different from *prakṛti* and that all *puruṣas* are alike on account of their common spiritual consciousness.

This sense of equality is called *sarvatra samadarsana*. In a higher state of spirituality, the *ātman* transcends all distinctions as he sees God in all beings and all beings in God. In a still higher state of *sāmyam* or sense of similarity, the *ātman* intuitively *Paramātman* in all beings and all beings in *Paramātman* on account of His being the indwelling love in the heart of all beings. In this way, altruism or philanthropy may be shown to be a species of benevolent activity in a secular form. Benevolence may be said to follow the ideal of human brotherhood, and human brotherhood may be traced to the immanence of divine love in all beings. Then the barriers of egoism or *ahaṅkāra* are removed and there is a deepening and widening of love ranging from group-love, patriotism and international love to universal love to all *jīvas*. Then love to God and love to man are alike. They can be traced to the same divine source. Love to God stresses the vertical side when man mounts from the finite side to the infinite. The horizontal side brings out the love between one *jīva* and another. Then spirituality and service go together as the spiritual social aspect of the same *Brahmajñāna* or God-realization.

The *Upaniṣad* beautifully describes the nature of *Puruṣottama* and *puruṣa* by the analogy of two inseparable birds sitting on the same tree; one of them sits on the top with brilliant plumage ever shining, serene and blissful. The other bird is below, tasting the sweet and bitter fruits and immersed in grief, it sees above and is drawn to it and becomes one with

it. Likewise in this body or *kṣetra*, there shines the ever-luminous and blissful Superperson ; but the *jīva* is subject to *avidyā*, *kāma* and *karma* and when it frees itself from these imperfections by turning its vision Godward, it shakes off all ignorance, evil and ugliness and it becomes one with the Self, the Divine Person and becomes immortal. Immortality follows from eternity as the *ātman* is beyond birth and death. It is not mere survival in time and the conservation of values in the impersonal sense. Duration implies a self that endures and survives birth and death which belong only to the body. The eternal values of truth, goodness and beauty are conserved in personality.

• Then *•puruṣa* and *Puruṣottama* become one and *•puruṣa* manifests his inner divinity and is deified or *Brahmanized*. There is strife in *•puruṣa* between *viveka* aided by truth, goodness and beauty in the individual and social aspects in the domestic, educational, economic and political spheres and *mahāmoha* or the wicked superman, aided by ignorance, falsehood and ugliness, on all fronts. It is the war between love and hatred and, owing to the aid given by the indwelling love for *Puruṣottama*, wickedness is destroyed and *•puruṣa* regains *svarājya* and *sānti*^o and is filled and infinitized. *Uttamapuruṣa* as the pattern of perfection is one with *Puruṣottama*, the Perfect or *Pūrṇa*.

The idea of personality is thus developed negatively by saying that the *ātman* is not matter, life,

sensation or even reason. It is realized by self-renouncement and introspection, that it is a spiritual self-conscious entity which is morally free, eternal and a monad having windows and a mode of God. It attains self-sovereignty and realizes that all *ātman*s are alike. In the social sense humanity is a kingdom of ends in which each monad is treated as a person or *ātman* and not as a thing or mode of *prakṛti*. This ideal is realized in the five social spheres, namely, the family, the school or college, the workshop, the state and spiritual *saṅga*. Existence and value are one, and the highest values of personality, truth, goodness, beauty and love are then attained by the training of the intellect, will and feeling. The finite self is finite-infinite as a spark of God, who is the Inner Love of all beings and at the same time transcendental. When the *ātman* seeks the Self and sees Him directly as the all-pervading Presence or Vāsudeva, it is united with it. Self-realization and service go together and the self is one with God, the higher Self, vertically and one with all the *jīvas* horizontally. Then it dies to itself and lives eternally.

The idea of personality, human and divine, thus furnishes the key to the understanding of reality in its integral sense. It reconciles pluralism and monism, individualism and universalism and existence and value. It satisfies the highest ends of logic, ethics and aesthetics and unites the contemplative and active aspects of life. It has its completion in the unitive state of mysticism in which the self is oned with

God without losing its distinctiveness. May India ever uphold the idea and ideals of personality as truth, goodness and beauty, which have their eternal home in the absolute as *Puruṣottama* and set the pattern of *sānti* or spirituality and service as the twin ideals to the other nations as well.

PART II

A VEDĀNTIC VIEW OF PERSONALITY : HUMAN AND DIVINE

THERE is a Vedāntic view of 'Personality: Human and Divine' which is allied to the two lectures on personality described earlier and amplified.

In my presidential address at the Metaphysics Section of the Indian Philosophical Congress held in Mysore in 1932, I developed the Vedāntic theme or thesis called *Ātmanism* which expounds the Truth of the philosophy of Religion that the *ātman* as the Supreme Self is the beginning and end of knowledge. *Ātman* is that by knowing which everything else is known ; it is the presupposition of knowledge and the spiritual and religious consummation of life. It is stated in a variety of ways as follows : Reality is realizable by purified *jñāna*. It is the ground of existence, and is the goal of experience. It is philosophically satisfactory and spiritually or mystically satisfying. The absolute of *jñāna* is the personal god of *bhakti* and by apprehending Brahman or the All-Self, eternal bliss is attained. This Vedāntic wisdom is progressively attained by ascending, from

matter, life, consciousness and reason or *annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya* and *vijñānamaya* to the realization of *ātman*. There are four sectional views known as materialism or naturalism, vitalism, phenomenalism or sensationalism and rationalism and four corresponding faiths opposed to them. The philosophy of *ātmanism* corrects the partial views and completes them from a higher standpoint. True science aims at cultural synthesis and the growth of personality and religion also aims at unity and in *ātmanism* science and religion are harmonized and existence and value become one.

Materialism is the systematic theory of the scientific concept of matter and it is the philosophy of nature which gives a physico-chemical view of life and treats consciousness as an epiphenomenon or by-product of matter. According to the materialist or *Dehātmavādin*, brain secretes consciousness as the liver secretes the bile. The visible and tangible world made of perceptual objects is an aggregate or collection of atomic sensations or holistic activity. The Self is explained in terms of sensation and cellular activity and tension in matter changes into psychical attention. But the materialist puts the cart before the horse and derives logical priority from temporal priority. Matter is real but the materialistic theory is wrong as it identifies space-time with the *ātman* or self, which is different from it. Naturalism is therefore superseded by supernaturalism or the faith in myths and miracles which dispense with the law

of causation by tracing every event to supernatural causes as gods. The world is ruled by a plurality of gods or *devas* and their votaries seek to propitiate them by a system of prayers and praise and obtain suitable rewards. The Vedavādins are swayed by desire for power, progeny and wealth and these desires are satisfied by *yāgas* and *yajñas* or sacrifices offered to benevolent deities like Indra, Varuṇa or Agni. But a pluralistic faith in a polytheistic heaven does not satisfy the rational demand for unity and the ethical demand for inner purity freed from all animal inclinations.

Dissatisfaction with materialism and supernaturalism prepares the way for the biological view of life or vitalism and faith in animism. While the mechanical view explains reality in terms of electrons and protons or space-time cause, biology refers to it as life or cellular activity as an inner growth from within and not as an external determination. Life is self-originated and spontaneous and when the biologist explains reality in terms of *elan vital* or *vital entelechy*, he becomes a vitalist philosopher or *Prāṇātmaavādin*. The intellect spatializes Reality but it is intuition that sees the whole of it and regards it as creative evolution. Life is more real than the logical intellect which spatializes it and therefore vitalism is a better view of reality than naturalism. Animism is the counterpart of vitalism on the religious side and it is the faith in the working of *prāṇa* as different from matter. Animism attributes life and divinity to nature and leads to ancestral worship and fetichism. The

animist worships the deities presiding over life and health and seeks long life vitality and even physical immortality. He believes that the body can be spiritualized and immortalized.

Dissatisfaction with vitalism and animism prepares the way for sensationalism or mentalism and anthropomorphism. Sensation is *sui generis* and is more comprehensive than matter or life or *anna* or *prāṇa*. Sensation is not a response to stimulus but a psychic continuum and *manas* is itself an inner sense-organ. When the empirical psychologist explains reality in terms of sensations, he may be called *Indriyātmavādin*. There is no object apart from what is perceived by the senses. It is only a collocation of sensations and there is no self beyond the series. The mind is a complex admitting of variations from the sub-conscious and super-conscious states including pathological experience. Religion reacts against this mentalism and is called anthropomorphism. It is the faith in God on the analogy of human experience. God is described as a person with a body and mind like our own. But this is not true faith as it makes God in the image of man and not man in the image of God. Therefore, philosophy and religion have to transcend even this level of mentalism and anthropomorphism.

The next higher stage is reached when reason or *vijñāna* supersedes matter, life and sensation and reality is explained in terms of rationalism and its counterpart, namely, theology. Reason changes sequence

into consequence and makes reality rational or *vijñānamaya*. The Naiyāyika, for example, takes his stand on *buddhi* and evolves the science of reasoning or *Nyāya Śāstra*. Reason seeks to explain experience in terms of antecedent and consequent and prove the existence of God as the First Cause. The Infinite as the Cosmic Designer is inferred from the finite design. But reason cannot transcend itself and go from the finite to the Infinite and its proof of God does not admit of finality. Religion, therefore, rejects rationalism and accepts faith in scripture or Veda as the only *pramāṇa* or proof for the existence of God. As the word of God, it is the only source of spiritual faith and is extolled as impersonal, infallible and eternal. But, faith in scripture is often blind and it leads to dogmatism.

Reason and faith are contradictory and point to a higher stage of philosophy and religion. Reason gives only diagrams of reality and sectional views of truth and it cannot afford a direct vision of Reality and truth. Likewise religion as theology substitutes dogma and ritual for the creative urge and glow of *bhakti*. In the higher state of *ātmanism* or personalism, the self or *ātman* is recognized as the prius and presupposition of all finite experiences and therefore as the pivot of philosophy and religion. The self is its own evidence and intuitively experienced as the result of self-renouncement and introversion. The *ātman* as embodied *jīva* mistakes itself for mind-body owing to some unaccountable *avidyā* or ignorance, suffers from the

hazards of empirical life and subjects itself to the cycle of births and deaths. But at long last it realizes its folly, renounces its *ahankāra* or egoity and intuitis its own shining eternal nature or *kaivalya*. The *ātman* is different from space-time and mind-body and abides as a person and not a thing in its own self-effulgence and eternal peace and joy. But as a religion of intuitionism, *ātmanism* may lapse into subjectivism and be stranded in *kaivalya* or the state of aloneness. Self-realization or *ātmanubhava* is a state of *mukti* or spiritual freedom as it is no longer fettered by *prakṛti* and the psycho-physical conditions of the embodied life. But it is devoid of the glow of God-consciousness. *Ātmanism* is, therefore, restated or reorientated as *Paramātmanism* or Supra-personalism.

In *Paramātmanism* or Supra-personalism, philosophy and religion shed their one-sidedness or sectional view-points and become unified as philosophy of religion or Vedānta. Philosophy is not speculative and secular and religion is not a footnote to philosophy. The two are vitally related. In the philosophy of religion, religion deals with the direct realization of God and philosophy justifies the verities of life as verifiable experiences; it makes intuition intelligible and consistent. Revelation is a body of spiritual truths spiritually discernible. Revelation and reason are therefore reconciled in the direct realization of the mystics. Both the dogmatism of the former and the intellectualism of the latter are then removed. The chief assumption of the philosophy of religion is the

knowability of the Absolute as the God of religion and the attainment of the eternal values of truth, goodness and beauty. The Absolute transcends the limitations of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* or the world of nature and self and is therefore beyond the province of materialism and monadism. Though transcendent, it is the indwelling self that imparts substantiality to *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* and makes them eternal. Though *ātman* is an eternal entity, it is not external to *Paramātman* and it is the chief problem of the Vedānta or philosophy of religion to determine the exact relation between the two and discover the final destiny and value of the *jīvātman* or the individual self.

The Vedāntic philosophy of religion posits the co-existence of the judgments of existence and value and their co-operative identity. A contrast is made between the facts of science and the values of religion or *puruṣārthas*. The proposition 'the sun shines' describes a fact as it is; but the proposition 'God ought to be attained as a supreme good' refers to value. But really speaking there is no antagonism between 'what is' and 'what ought to be' at least in the Vedāntic system. Its fundamental assumption is that Brahman or *sat* is the ground of all existents and as *Paramātman* He is the goal of all experience. *Paramātman* is thus the beginning and end of knowledge. He is apprehended as the That that is real and comprehended as the 'what' or the meaning of experience. The *Vedānta Sūtras* that sum up the essentials of the *Upaniṣads* start with the enquiry into Brahman as the whole of knowledge

and end with the attainment of Brahman as the goal of spiritual endeavour. What exists is eternal and blissful and the Vedānta alone frames the fundamental problems of life and solves them satisfactorily. Brahman is the only Real of reals and is the supreme good. The *Upaniṣad* posits the truth that the knower of Brahman attains the Highest end and the *Sūtras* prove its trueness by the theme that the enquiry into Brahman leads to eternal life and its values.

•Cosmology occupies only the outskirts of *Paramātmanism* or Pan-*Ātmanism* and its solutions have no finality or spiritual value. Among the theories of the evolution of the universe may be mentioned the empirical and the absolutist accounts of the cosmos which are called the emergent and the emanationary. The former views matter as an inner activity having the promise and potency of soul-making. But the naturalistic method does not recognize the primacy of spirituality. Another view makes the Deity the goal of the emergence of space-time but also puts the cart before the horse. Absolutism has the merit of explaining the lower by the higher by a process of emanation or *pariṇāma*. But it is open to the charge of predicating imperfections to Reality or the Absolute. How the Absolute divides itself into finite beings is really inexplicable. The problem of the many evolving into the one or the one emanating into the many is a riddle of thought. But *Paramātmanism* stresses moral and spiritual integrity and it makes the finite self accountable to the ills and evils of life and it defines the

ātman as ever pure and perfect. Valuation is more important than genesis and the attainment of *Param-ātman* is more relevant to the spiritual man than the natural history of its origin and growth. When the self is attained, the cosmic problem is dissolved and thus solved.

Pan-*Ātmanism* seeks to discover and determine the exact relation between the finite self and the Infinite. The idea of the Self as a monad and mode of God satisfies the tests of scriptural validity as well as logical coherence. The conclusions reached by theism, pantheism and absolute Idealism are self-contradictory and they do not fit in with the demands of the three *pramāṇas*, namely, the *Upaniṣads*, the *Sūtras* and the *Gītā*. The view of the Dvaitavādins and the theists that the *jīvas* form a plurality of independent reals fails to establish real unity between them. The absolute idealism of Spinoza and Hegel and the Bhedābhedavādins suffers from the defect of attributing imperfections to God and making Him less real than the Absolute. Monism fails to explain the reality of the visible and tangible world and evolve the many out of the One. But the theistic monism of Vedānta like that of Viśiṣṭādvaita provides for the logical need for unity and the moral and the spiritual need for mystic union and reconciles the apparent discord between the self as a mode of the Absolute and the self as a distinct monad or entity. The monad has open windows and can mirror the universe. *Paramātman* and *jīvātman* are distinguishable but not divisible ; they are one in

connotation but are two in denotation. *Paramātman* is logically immanent in the *jīva* as the monad of monads but is ethically transcendent and is both in their mystic union. This view is elaborated in my earlier works like *The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita*, and *Rāmānuja's Idea of the Finite Self*, but here it is summarised by distinguishing between the logical, the ethical and the æsthetic stand-points of personality.

Vedāntic experiences form a unity in variety; they are varied in extent but unified in intent. The logical self enquires into the nature of the *Paramātman* as the supreme ground of all beings in the light of the *Sadvidyā* of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. The nature of the ethical self and its relation to *ātman* is expounded in the second chapter of the *Sūtras* dealing with the nature of personality. The æsthetic view of God as the Beautiful and the Blissful is developed in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, the *Gītā* and the *Bhāgavata*. The integral relation between *ātman* and the *jīva* is dealt with in the *Upaniṣadic* definition of Brahman as *satyam*, *jñānam*, *ānandam* and *anantam* and in the intuitional experiences of the *ṛṣis* as expounded in the *Sūtras*. *Paramātman* is Brahman the absolute as *saguṇa* and as the home of the eternal values of truth, goodness and beauty as realized by the *Brahmavādins* with logical, ethical and æsthetic perfections. Each of these experiences is described in some detail in the following sections and they all agree in the conclusion that *Paramātman* is the suprapersonal and the *ātman* is a finite person and in the unitive experience of the

two, they are two as *tatvas* existentially but are one experientially.

The enquiry into the logical self brings out the ontological relation between *Paramātman* and *jīvātman* by employing the principles of *kāranatva*, *viśiṣṭaika* and *amsatva* as revealed in the *Sadvidyā* of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. Brahman is the *sat* without a second and is the unity of composition and self-manifestation in *pralaya* and *sṛṣṭi*. Brahman is immanent in *cit* and *acit*, both in the causal state of *pralaya* and the effect state of *sṛṣṭi*. The One is in the many and therefore the One becomes the many: the potential becomes the actual. Creation is not a case of illusory manifestation or creation out of nothing but it is one of self-manifestation. By knowing the cause or the One, we know the effect or the many also and by knowing Brahman the One, we also know the many or the pluralistic universe; Brahman is *sat* and the world is therefore *satya*. The identity of causality is not bare identity in which the cause alone is true and the effect is false, but is the dynamic identity in which the cause becomes the effect. Creation is the moulding of matter for the making of souls and the soul is made when it realizes its unity with Brahman as its inner ground. Causality is not thus the mechanised principle of *prakṛti* nor the teleological view of the finite will but is the one increasing redeeming purpose of the Divine Nature implying unity, continuity and dynamic activity. In this way Brahman the secondless *sat* is revealed as *satyasya satya* or Real

Reality in the sense that while the self is a real entity which is ever true, Brahman is the Self of the self or the Being of beings and all selves live, move and have their beings in Him. As the *Upaniṣad* says, *Īśa* is in all beings as their self but *Īśa* is not all beings, as false pantheism explains it.

The *sat* is the substance which has the self as its inseparable or essential attribute. Knowledge, sensuous and supersensuous, is in the form of a judgment or proposition and is always determinate and not indeterminate or contentless. Substance as the subject of a quality in a proposition is not itself a quality. In the logic of religion, every quality or attribute connotes the subject or the whole of Reality which is Brahman itself. The finite self is an essential quality of the *ātman* which is its real self and is inseparable from it. The two differ in denotation or application but are one in connotation or implication. In the same way it may be shown that, in the grammar of religion, every term or word ultimately refers according to the principle of co-ordination only to one word or *śabda* that is God or Brahman. In the beginning was the 'word' and the 'word' is God. All things come from God and connote Him as their *sat*. Every *nāma-rūpa* in the universe is the creative self-differentiation of the *sat* or Brahman and all terms, thoughts and things connote ultimately Brahman only. The *ātman* is the quality of *Paramātman*, derives its substantiality and meaning from it and the seers of Brahman intuit Brahman as the only *sat*, substance and Self. The

mahāvākya "Thou art that" and the *Jabāla Upaniṣad* "I am Thou, Holy Divinity" refer to the experience of sages like S'vetaketu and Vāmadeva who realized Brahman as the real meaning of their self or their real 'I'. Spiritually the 'I' is the *ātman*; but mystically it is *Paramātman*.

As the *ātman*, the finite self, cannot be separated from Brahman, the Infinite, it is called its mode or *ams'a*. It is a speck of the absolute, a spark of the shining Self. There is an apparent contradiction between the *ātman* as a separate entity or monad and the *ātman* as a mode of the absolute and it is like the disparity between the pluralism of Leibniz and the monism of Spinoza. This is reconciled by the idea that the *jīva* is monadic in substance but infinite in its attributive intelligence or *jñāna*. The monad is not exclusive or windowless but has open windows and it can mirror forth the whole universe from its own point of view. The distinction between the finite (*ams'a*) and the Infinite (*vibhu*) is not qualitative or spatial but is spiritual and at the same time real. The Self is not born of matter nor is it a reflection of Brahman in *avidyā* nor is it an element absorbed in the Absolute. It exists eternally but is not external to Brahman and though its consciousness is now cribbed and cabined by ignorance, it can expand into infinity in *mukti*. It is itself finite or infinitesimal like the atom. As a monad it perseveres in its own atomic existence; but as a mode of the Absolute, it derives its substantiality from Brahman and depends on Him for its functioning.

Modern psychology as metapsychics tries to discover the infinite possibility of finite consciousness and if it is fully discovered, it throws a flood of light on the omniscient nature of the self. The infinitesimal and the infinite are one as *anu* and *mahat*.

While the logical self stresses divine immanence and strives for intimacy, the ethical self dwells on its littleness and unworthiness and the transcendence of Divine purity and perfection. *Niyoga* of *Karma Mīmāṃsā* changes into *niyantā* or the moral ruler of the universe and *svāmin*. The self as *viśeṣaṇa* or logical attribute is transformed into the ethical ego with a sense of responsibility. The *Vedānta Sūtras* dwelling on the nature of the *jīva* in the second chapter recognise its moral freedom and eternity and the spiritual relation to *Paramātman*. *Karma Mīmāṃsā* has specialised in the determination of the values of the Vedic imperatives of duty or *dharma* and it exhorts man to have the moral respect for *karma* Brahman or *niyoga*. But ethics has no meaning apart from religion and the mere law of *karma* is mechanical and blind. There can be no endeavour without an end, implied or explicit, and the supreme end of conduct or the supreme good is God, the moral ruler of the universe; duty has its meaning only in the Deity. There is thus a transition from the ethics of *niyoga* to the ethical religion of *niyantā* or *Īśvara* who dispenses justice according to the *karma* of the individual. The ultimate subject of every moral judgment is, as the *Gītā* says, *Daivam* or the Deity; there is none good but God.

The *jīva* is morally free by nature but somehow it has identified itself with *prakṛti* and the body made of *prakṛti* and becomes the slave of animal inclinations like *kāma* and *krodha*. The *puruṣa* seeks the pleasures of the senses and when the desire or *kāma* is frustrated, anger is generated; anger or *krodha* confounds the logical intellect and leads to moral collapse or *buddhi nāśa*. But man is morally free but for himself and he can control his passion by reason and attain moral sovereignty. The *aham* as the true self belongs to God, its true *Aham*; but owing to its false identity with the body and the senses, it has lapsed into *ahaṅkāra* or egoity. The conceit of *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra* or 'I' and 'mine' is the root cause of all the ills of life. It is only by renouncing this conceit and resigning oneself to the will of God, who is the only *kartā* or actor in moral and religious life, that the true freedom of the *jīva* is attained. Says the poet "Our wills are ours. We know not how; our wills are ours to make them thine." Self-will leads a man downward and lands him in the ills of *samsāra* or worldliness and the cycle of births and deaths. But if selfishness is conquered by subjugating the will to the divine purpose, the self shakes off the shackles of sensibility and attunes itself to the Divine will. It is the *jīva* that is responsible for the errors, evils and other imperfections of life and it is the *jīva* alone that can free itself from these imperfections and attain the redemptive grace of God. Goodness merits grace and is fulfilled in it owing to the organic relation between the two.

Ethics is fulfilled in religion and self-sovereignty is fulfilled in self-surrender to the holy will of God. The *jīva* is no longer a mode of matter as it has now become a mode of *Īśvara*. The chief quality of Brahman as *vibhu* is cosmic Lordship and the chief quality of the *jīva* is its monadic littleness or *anutva*. Holism contrasts the almightiness of God with the littleness of the *jīva* and leads to the religion of fear and reverence. Arjuna was so much frightened by the cosmic power of God as revealed in the *Vibhūti Yoga* that he was overawed and reduced to nothingness. In such critical moments which come to every religious man, in a less intense form, he is seized with a sense of unworthiness and sinfulness and seeks the forgiveness of God. No sin is so sinful as not to merit the mercy of the redeemer and He redeems him from all his sins and offers him the stability and security of salvation. Self-surrender and salvation go together in ethical religion as its two sides; the ethical side is the self-gift of the self and the religious side is the offer of *mukti* or salvation by the All-Self or Vāsudeva. This view is the key thought of the *Gītā* as the essence of the *Upaniṣads* and it satisfies the supreme need of ethical religion by guaranteeing to the good man the eternal value of godliness.

ETHICAL MONISM

The idea of *Paramātman* as *Sarvalokasāranya* or universal Saviour follows from that of God as

Righteous Ruler and Redeemer. As Righteous Ruler He metes out justice to all *jīvas*, according to their *karma*, and there is really no caprice nor cruelty in Divine Rule. What looks like injustice or unmerited suffering is the result of narrow moral vision as man alone and not God is responsible for every *karma* arising out of thought, word and deed. This view is the essence of Vedānta as absolutism or pantheism reinterpreted as ethical religion. Though the *jīva* has no separate existence from Brahman, the secondless *sat*, ontologically, he is still distinct from Him as he alone is responsible for the existence of *avidyā*, *kāma* and *karma* and not Brahman as held by the illusionistic and emanational theorists. The rule of righteousness is rigorous and relentless and provides no hope of or scope for *mukti* or release from evil and sinfulness; it is therefore reinterpreted in terms of redemptive love. God as the creator of creators is in the *jīva* as its Inner Ruler in order that the *jīva* may grow into His likeness and become godly. Every *jīva* merits mercy and mercy removes evil and changes goodness into godliness. The soul comes from God and goes back to Him and this is due to its recognition that God alone is the ultimate good and human effort consists in knowing that He alone is the endeavour and the end, the *upāya* and the *upeya*. Every act is an adoration of Kṛṣṇa and He Himself is the actor and the act as the ultimate subject and object of the moral judgment transformed in mystic experience.

THE UNITIVE ASPECT OF MONOTHEISM

The relation between *Paramātmān* and *jīvātman* is fully brought out in the idea of God as Lord, Master or *Svāmin*. While *acit* also belongs to God and is a means to His satisfaction, *cit* as a rational self is conscious of this relation and freely surrenders itself to Him as His *dāsa* or servant. The mood of utter self-surrender to God is expressed in classical ways by all theistic religions as follows: "Not I, but Thou, oh Lord! I have nothing, I can do nothing and I am nothing." The *jīva* makes a gift of itself to God, its real owner. But even such self-gift should not smack of *svatantra* or egoism as He is the giver and the gift. The best way of selflessness is the abandonment of egoity by becoming a thing as it were, like a step to God.¹ Thus the highest end of human personality is to realize that our wills are ours to make them His, as means to His satisfaction. Thus monotheism with its eternal distinction between the finite self and the Infinite Self tends to become monistic, and self-renunciation has its full fruition in the experience 'Not I, but Thou, oh Lord! You are the *kartā* or subject of all actions, the endeavour as well as the end.' Monism refers to the absolute as the self without a second, and monotheism, to the absolute as the only independent Cosmic Ruler on whom all other beings depend for their very life and function.

BEAUTY

The logical self thinks of the *sat* as the immanent One without a second. Logic as the life of thought elicits

¹ e.g., Kulas'ekhara.

the whole of reality and transcends itself. The whole truth is wholly true. Like seeing the wood in the trees, the logical ego sees the All-Self in the self. The ethical ego, refers to the transcendental Good or *Amala* beyond ignorance and evil. It has intrinsic value and religion transforms its value by making the All-Self the creator of creators. Ethical life is not co-operation with the Divine will but is service to God and all *jīvas*. By mutual responsiveness and co-consciousness there grows a community of individuals which steers clear of the life of individualism and collectivism. The aesthetic ego combines immanence and transcendence by going to the heart of Reality and describing *Paramātman* as Beauty, Love and Bliss. Beauty is not the result of the physical harmony of things or the agreeable sensation of pleasure or the synthetic unity of thought. It is not a subjective feeling or an objective correspondence to what is fair in the outside world, but is a spiritual intuition of what is an essential and intrinsic quality of Reality as *Bhuvana Sundara*. The beauty of God transcends the beauties of nature and the *ātman* and it has a formless form of its own not made of *prakṛti* and it is revealed as an enchanting spiritual vision in mystic experience. He is the light that lights suns and stars without and the self within and is supersensuous and superrational. He has a bewitching form of Beauty or *saundarya* with a view to removing the ugliness of *kāma* and the lusts of the flesh, alchemise the soul and divinise it. Each *ātman* is like a note in the divine flute and it pulsates with creative or

recreative joy. Owing to the Indwelling Beauty in the lotus heart of the soul, the body itself becomes a living temple or *Brahmapurī* without the ugliness of sensuality or *viṣayakāma*, and the ego is *Brahmanized*. Its *ātmabhāva* is transformed into *Brahmabhāva*.

GOD AS LOVE

If a thing of beauty is attractive, divine beauty is ineffably entrancing and seductive. God Himself is Love and love is for love's sake and not a means to an end. Love is unconditional, absolute and eternal. Love as *bhakti* is not a means to *mukti*, but is itself *mukti*. Love is not aware of the barriers of space-time or the distinction of creature-creator. The *bhakta* renounces the pleasures of *aiśvarya* and the cosmic glories of *Īśvara* and the peace or *sānti* or *kaivalya* arising from self-knowledge. He does not seek attunement with the will of God but longs for at-one ment with Him. He seeks not the gifts of God, however glorious they may be, but seeks the giver Himself. He becomes God-intoxicated and such divine madness is not a disease due to abnormality, but it is the most stable and satisfactory state of the soul. God is also seized with soul-hunger and He descends from His transcendence and assumes human forms in order that He may be easily accessible to the *bhakta* and acceptable to him. In the communion that follows the finite-infinite contact, each flows into the other and self-consciousness is lost in the irresistibility of enjoyment.

This state is known as unio-mystico in mystic experience and it is shared by mystics of all ages, cults and countries.

THE PROBLEM OF UNITIVE LIFE

The precise nature of this union is difficult to determine by the mere logical intellect and the various analogies and symbols employed by the mystics are vague. It is called mergence, absorption, coalescence of content or self-loss and it conveys no definite meaning. Is it like the river losing itself in the ocean and getting merged in it? Is it like lamplight fading away when it is exposed to sunlight? Is it like the ether in the jar merging in the continuum, or all-pervasive ether outside, when it is broken? Is it like the confluence of two rivers like the Ganges and the Jumna meeting in Prayag? Is personality lost in the emptiness of the absolute and does it sink into blank nothingness or *sūnyatva*? Is it identical with pure consciousness without any relation, internal or external, without any connexion of content? Is it fellowship, or equality, as in the various social relations at home and abroad? The problem may be analysed thus, but the solution is hard. But a critical and comparative study of the varieties of Vedāntic and religious experience can be made in the light of a sympathetic and synthetic attitude based on the principle of their underlying unity. Religious quest is a personal experimentation of the soul and its relation to God and it is

fulfilled in the unitive experience of the soul or *ātman* oned with *Paramātman*.

UNION

Spiritual union with God is described as loss in Divine Personality and not loss of personality. Divine Personality is *ātman* freed from all anthropomorphic association. In this state, there is self-loss in the sense that the self dies to live; its egoistic conceit perishes, but the ego remains. The seer does not vanish in the abyss of the absolute as salt vanishes in water and as the river is merged in the sea. The *ātman* is not identical with the *Paramātman* as in the mathematical identity $a = a$; but it identifies itself with the *Paramātman* by abandoning the false identity with the body made of matter. The *ātman* has its meaning and value only in the *Paramātman* who is its real self. Its sense of separateness goes, but it exists as a distinct entity. In this dual-non-dual state, the finite self is infinitised or *Brahmanized* by a process of Divine alchemy. This view of the destiny of the individual is not personalism or impersonalism, but it is midway between the two and is called supra-personalism. The supra-person is the All-Self or Vāśudeva who is in all beings and not as all beings as defined by pseudo-pantheism. The presence of Vāśudeva is spiritual and not spatial and is all-pervading like the air and is more an atmosphere of love than

a concrete entity. Mystic union is spiritually felt and is different from logical unity.

UNITY

From the experience of mystical union can be deduced the philosophic unity of absolutism or supra-personalism. It is a kind of theistic monism which avoids the extremes of theism and deism and monism. It is not the view which says that God is extra-cosmic who creates the world out of nothing and lets it go till the Day of Judgment. It is not the theism which affirms difference between the finite self and God and at the same time makes the self absolutely depend on His omnipotence. It is also different from the extreme monistic view that denies difference and distinction and affirms the identity of the *jīva* and *Īśvara*. The theory that the *jīva* is one with Brahman and yet different from it is self-contradictory. But theistic monism is free from the defects of deism, theism, monism and Bhedābheda as it satisfies the demands of religion and philosophy. It affirms the existence of the distinct beings, namely, *atman* and *Paramātmān*, but denies their separateness. Every *atman* lives, moves and has its being in *Paramātmān* as its real Self and He is as the life of our life, the all-inclusive and the all-sustaining person who is at once a living Person and all-pervasive Presence. This view satisfies the needs of Personality and absolute unity as the Personal God of religion or *bhakti* is the absolute of philosophy or *jñāna*.

BLISS OF UNION

Brahman is *ānanda* and *rasa* and as the æsthetic Highest He fulfils the logic of the heart. He alone satisfies the spiritual hunger and thirst of the *ātman*; the Infinite alone can satisfy the infinite love and longing liberated by *prema bhakti*. The bliss that results from the unitive state is beyond definition and description and it cannot be clothed in sensuous language and symbolic imagery. The pleasures of the senses are trivial and transient and even the happiness that results from the life of reason has no stability. In the orison of quiet or *kaivalya*, the self is stranded in singleness and passivity and its self-feeling does not expire in positive ecstasy. But *Brahmānanda* is, as the *Upaniṣad* describes it, beyond all hedonistic calculus, and thought itself is swallowed up in absolute bliss. It cannot be called rapture as rapture is the sudden onrush of joy, nor ecstasy in which the sense-organs stop functioning. The self emerges from *ānanda* which is centrally aroused, is sustained by *ānanda* and merges into *ānanda*. *Ānanda* is ineffable, incommunicable and eternal. In that state, the self is ravished out of all fleshly feeling and the delight of divine communion increases with enjoyment and is ever fecunditive. In the stability of *Brahmānanda*, space-time has no place and mind-body has no function and pleasure-pain with its relativity has no influence. Brahman is absolute and its bliss is absolute and *Brahmānanda* is dynamic, fecunditive and it increases with satisfaction and without satiety.

SOCIAL LIFE

Love is made infinite by the extension of *maitri* or compassion to all *jīvas* and by the practice of social service to suffering humanity. Universal *maitri* is meaningless if there is no universe and living beings or *jīvas* in it. Likewise, the theory of helping humanity in the name of the religion of humanity without God as its unifying love is like the body without a soul. The view that all men are creatures of God and therefore brothers is more elevating than the above two; but such a brotherhood does not bring out spiritual intimacy which is essential for social service. But the philosophy of Pan-*ātmanism* or cosmic personalism furnishes an inspiring motive for universal love. According to Pan-*ātmanism*, the *ātman* is in all *jīvas* as their very life and love and all the *jīvas* are in the *ātman* as His very body or *śarīra* and if this truth is realized and incorporated in social life, there is reciprocal love between individual and individual as limbs of the body cosmic of the cosmic Person as the Person of persons. Mystic love to God and social love to the *jīvas* are not different as love destroys all barriers that divide one *jīva* from another and the *jīvas* from God, their *jīva-jīva*. *Paramātman* is in all *ātman*s and all *ātman*s are in *Paramātman* and the realization of such reciprocal or Divine love affords the most inspiring motive for spirituality and service. *Mukti* is not selfish salvationism nor is service, secular humanism. *Brahmanization* and benevolence go together as

the mystic and social aspects of the same experience enshrined in *ātmanism*.

Ātmanism thus solves the problem of personality by reconciling the extremes of theism and monism or Dvaita and Advaita and it is thus the meeting of the opposites like realism and idealism, intellectualism and voluntarism, materialism and absolutism. It is preferable to the term suprapersonalism used in western philosophy owing to the self-contradictions involved in its categories like substance and attribute, self and the not self, the universal and the particular and the personal and the impersonal. The *Ātman* is the *sat* without a second which is self-conscious, self-active, blissful and eternal. It is the One in the many including persons and things and is yet beyond their limitations. It is the absolute as *Pūrṇa* which with its substantiality pervades all beings without being perverted by them; it is not the unrelated but the perfect. All persons and things live, move and have their being in *Ātman* or Vāsudeva. Just as in the living organism, the whole is the part and not the sum of parts, *Paramātman* is the life of the *Jīvātman* and is its ultimate meaning and value. Personality in its highest aspect is expansive and not exclusive, modal and not monadic and in its all inclusive love it avoids all barriers and frontiers. Instead of the absolute becoming depersonalised, personality is infinitised and enriched. Though personality exists as a distinct being, it is impersonal in its essence. It can shed its egoistic outlook, realise its unity with

all beings as a spiritual community with a common but not identical contents. The absolute is the suprapersonal and is pure and perfect. The value and destiny of the individual *ātman* have their full fruition in the unitive experience. The *ātman* can shed its feeling of embodiedness and exclusiveness and become fully *ātmanised*. Its eternal values have their stability and security in the absolute and its destiny is divine union. Human personality or the *ātman* is then fully enriched by becoming one with divinity or the *Paramātmān*. It is then deified in a sense though it is distinct from Him existentially.

INDEX

A

ABSOLUTE, 62, 68
 Absolute Idealism, 64
 Absolutist view of states, 41
 " Cosmos, 63
 Acit, 73
 Acosmism, 4
 Acquisitive instinct, 38
 Aesthetic ego, 74
 Aesthetician as poet, mystic and
 musician, 48
 Aesthetics, 21, 26
 Aesthetic personality, 24-26,
 47-49
 Affective value, 21
 Agni, 58
 Aham, 26, 70
 Ahaṅkāra, 9, 26, 52, 61, 70
 Ahimsā, 11, 51
 Ais'varya, 75
 Ālasya, 20
 Altruism, 52
 Amala, 74
 Amsa, 68
 Ānanda, 79
 Animism, 5, 58
 Annamaya, 57
 Anthropomorphism, 59
 Aṇu, 69
 Anumāna, 8
 Anutva, 71
 Apāna, 9
 Apperception, unity of, 9
 Art, 25
 Artha, 38
 Asteya, 11
 Ātmabhāva, 75

Ātman, 3, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 26,
 27, 32, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 60,
 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 77, 78,
 79, 80, 81, 82
 Ātmanism, 56, 57, 60, 61, 81
 Ātmanirvāṇa, 11
 Ātman-making, 35
 Ātmānubhava, 21, 61
 Ātmārāma, 24
 Ātmasakti, 42
 Attention, 3
 Avidyā, 10, 53, 60, 72

B

BEAUTY, 21, 25, 26, 48, 73, 74
 Beauty of beauties, 49
 Behaviourism, 3, 6
 Benevolence, 52
 Bhāgavata, 65
 Bhakti, 56, 60, 75, 78
 Bhāvādvaitam, 46
 Bhedābheda, 64
 Bhuvanasundara, 75
 Biological view of the state, 41
 Bliss of Union, 79
 Bodily self, 26
 Brahmajñāna, 52
 Brahmapuri, 75
 Brahman, 56
 Brahmānanda, 79
 Brahmanisation, 53, 75, 77, 80
 Brahmānubhava, 75
 Breath control, 11
 Buddhi, 8, 9, 10, 60
 Buddhināsa, 70
 Buddhism, 7, 51
 Buddhists, 51

C

CAPITALISM, 39
 Cārvāka, 2, 8
 Causality, 66
 Cit, 73
 Citta, 9, 10
 Civilised life, 38
 Clairvoyance, 14
 Cognitive value, 21
 Collectivism, 41
 Communalism, 33, 46
 Conative, 21
 Conceptional self, 9, 12
 Conduct, 24
 Cosmic designer, 60
 Cosmic līlā of love, 48
 Cosmic rule, 73
 Culture, 19, 29
 Cycle of births and deaths, 61

D

DAIVAM, 69
 Dāsa, 73
 Dehātma, 17, 26, 57
 Deification of ātman, 82
 Deliberation, 21
 Delusion, 24
 Democracy, 40
 Desire, 24
 Despotism, 40
 Devas, 58
 Dharma, 27, 36, 38, 69
 Direct intuition of ātman, 11
 Dispersal of personality, 14
 Divine destiny, 82
 Dogmatism, 60
 Dream, 13
 Dvaitavādin, 64

E

ECONOMIC view of state, 41
 Education. 18. 36-38

Egoism, egoity, 52, 61
 Elan Vital, 58
 Emanationism and emergent evolution 63
 Endowment, 18
 Entelechy, 5, 9, 58
 Environment, 18
 Ethical religion or ethical monism, 71, 72
 Ethical ego or self, 69, 74
 Ethics, 21
 Experience of the past, 18
 Experiencing the subject, 7
 Extrovert, 20

F

FAITH in scripture 60
 Family, 33, 34-36
 Fanaticism, 33
 Fascism, 40
 Fate, 18

G

Gītā, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 36, 51, 64, 65
 God as love, 75
 God-realisation, 52
 Goodness, 21, 50
 Goodness and Grace 70
 Grammar of Religion, 67
 Gregarious instinct, 30
 Guṇas, 18, 20, 21
 „ influence of, 19-21
 Guru-s'isya intimacy, 45

H

HALLUCINATIONS, 13
 Hamlet, 24
 Hegel, 64
 Herd instinct, 29, 30
 Holism, 71
 Hormic psychology, 6
 Humanism. 42

Humanity as kingdom of
ends, 54

I

IDEA, 14
Ideal, 14
Ideal of state, 41
Idealism, 3, 17
Idealist, 42
Illusion, 19
Individualism, 41
Individuality distinguished
from personality, 32
Indra, 58
Indriyātmavādin, 59
Industrialism, 38
Inner disposition, 19
Insight, 20
Integral personality, 26
Introversion, 11
Introvert, 20
Intuition, direct, of ātman, 11
Inwardness, 21
Īś'a, 67
Īś'vara, 69

J

JAINAS, 51
Jābāla Upaniṣad, 68
Janaka, 42
Jīva, 9, 10, 15, 51, 52, 53, 54,
60, 64, 65, 69, 70, 72, 78, 80
Jīvakāpuṇya, 51
Jīvātmā, 24, 62, 73
Jñāna, 9, 10, 37, 56, 78
Jñāna as attributive intelli-
gence, 68
Jñāni, 21
Jung, 20

K

KĀIVALYA, 61, 75, 79
Kāma, 24, 27, 53, 70, 72, 74
Kantian formula, 51
Karma, 15, 27, 53, 69, 72

Karmamimāṃsā, 69
Karmayoga, 39
Kartā 70, 73
Kāruṇya, 51
Kingdom of ends, 32, 34, 54
Kṛṣṇa, 72
Krodha, 70
Kṛpā, 42
Kṣetra, 9, 12, 53
Kṣetrajña, 10, 12

L

LAW and Order, 40
Leibnitz, 68
Libido, 7
Logic, 21
Logical self, 66

M

MACBETH, 24
Mahāmoha, 53
Mahat, 69
Mahāvākya, 68
Maitrī or compassion, 80
Mamakāra, 9, 70
Manas, 9, 10, 59
Manomaya, 57
Marriage, 34
Materialism, 2-4, 57
Material well-being, 38
Mentalism, 58
Mind control, 11
Monism, 64, 73
Monotheism, 73
Moral autonomy, 24
Motherly instinct, 30
Mukti, 61, 68, 71, 72, 75, 80
Mūlaprakṛti, 9, 10
Multiple personality, 13
Mutualness, 29, 34,
Mystic poet, 26
Mystic union, 78
Mystic view, 7

N

NAIYĀYIKA, 60
 Nāmarūpa, 67
 Naturalism, 2-4, 57, 63
 Nature of society, 30-32
 Niyantā and Niyoga, 69
 Nyāyasāstra, 60

O

OBJECTIVE outlook, 20
 Orison at quiet, 79
 Otherness, 32, 43, 44

P

PANĀTMANISM, 63, 64
 Pantheism, 64
 Paramātmān, 49, 52, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 73, 77, 78, 81, 82
 Paramātmanism, 61, 63, 80
 Parent-child relation, 34
 Parīṇāma, 10, 63
 Path to perfection, 27
 Pathology of Personality, 13
 Pati-patni relation, 35
 Perceiving self, 12
 Perfect, the, 54
 Perfection, 20; of individual, 28, 29
 Personal and Supra-personal, 49
 Personalism, 29
 Personality and community, 32; aesthetic, 24, 47; ātman or puruṣa, 9; ethical or *sthita-prajñā*, 23; highest aspect of, 81; human and divine, 54, 56; idea and ideal of, 17; integral or *uttamapuruṣa*, 26; life and, 4; Logical, ethical and aesthetic standpoint of, 65; and mere body, 2; reason and, 7; sense impression, 6; viveki or jñāni, 2; direct intuitions

of, 11; economic, 38; eternity of, 14; ethical importance of the study of, 1; in education, 36; and family life, 34; perceptual theory of, 7; political, 40; pluralistic view of, 29; self conscious as essential quality of, 12; social, 30, 35; socialistic view of, 28; social and spiritual, 44; spiritual, 42; Vedāntic view of, 56

Philosophy of Religion, 61
 Pragmatist, 42
 Prakāśa, 20
 Prakṛti, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21, 26, 43, 49, 54, 70
 Pramāṇa, 8
 Prāṇamāya, 4, 11, 57
 Prāṇas, 9, 58
 Prāṇātmanavāda, 58
 Pratyakṣa, 8
 Pratyagātman, 26
 Pravṛtti, 20
 Prayāga, 76
 Premabhakti, 79
 Property feeling, 39
 Psycho-analysis, 6
 Psychological view of state, 41
 Puruṣa, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 41, 49, 50, 52, 53, 70
 Puruṣārthas, 62
 Puruṣottama, 4, 9, 50, 52, 53, 55
 Pūrva, 53, 81

R

Rajas, 20, 21
 Rāmarājya, 50
 Rasa, 79
 Rasika, 24
 Rationalism, 7, 8, 59, 60
 Realist, 42
 Real of Reals, 49, 63
 Reality, integral, 54
 Reason, 7, 60, 61

Regimented life, 46
 Religion, 33
 Religion of humanity, 80
 Religious quest, 76
 Revelation, 61
 Righteousness the root of fundamental rights, 41

S

SAD VIDYĀ, 65
 Saguna, 65
Samādhī, 11
 Samāna, 9
 Samsāra, 70
 Samskāra, 28, 33
Sāmyam, 52
Saṅga, 54,
Saṅghāta, 9
Sāṅkhyabuddhi, 9
Sāntam, 49
Sānti, 43, 53, 55, 75.
Sārīra, 10, 14, 15, 80
 Sarvaloka-saṛaṇya, 71
Sarvatra-samadarsana, 52
 Sat 62, 66, 67; 72, 73, 81
Satva, 20, 21
Satya, 11, 38, 66
Satyam, 49, 65
Sauca, 11
 Saundarya, 74
 School, 33
 Scripture, 60
 Sects and sectarianism, 47
 Self-knowledge, 29
 Self-love, 28
 Self-realisation, 54
 Self-regarding instinct, 29
 Self-renouncement, 21
 Self-rule 27
 Self-sovereignty, 54
 Sensationalism, 6, 7, 59
 Sentiment of *sānti*, 51
 Service to humanity, 50-52
Siddhis, 14

Similarity of all jivas, 51
Skandhas, 7
 Sleep, 13
 Sociability, 51
 Social contract, 31, 40
 Social institutions, 33
 Social life and service, 80
 Sociology, 32
 Social problems, 48
 Social self, 30
 Society as a realm of ends, 32, 34, 54
 Society as Organism, 31
 „ in absolutist conception, 31
 Somnambulism, 13
 Soul-hunger of God, 75
 Soul-making, 35
 Soul power, 42
 Spinoza, 64, 68
 Spiritual humanist, 43
 Sprituality, 43
 Spiritual kingdom of ends, 43
 State, the, 33; different views of, 41
 Statistics, 3
 Subconscious, 13
 Subjectivism, 12
 Substance and quality, 67
 Sundaram, 49
Sūnyatva, 76
 Super-conscious, 13
 Supermen, 33
 Supernaturalism, 57
 Supreme good, 63
 Suprapersonal, 49
 Suprapersonalism, 61, 77, 78, 81
Svabhāva, 3, 20
Svāmin, 69, 73
Svatantra, 73
Svayamprakāśa, 12
Svetaketu, 68

T

TAITTĪRIYA Upanisad, 65
 Talent, 37

Tamas, 20, 21
Tapasvin, 11
Tarka, 12
Tatvabhāva, 12
 Telepathy, 14
 Theism and theistic monism,
 64, 78
 Theology, 59, 60
 Television, 14
 Tolerance, 37
 Totalitarianism, 40
 Truth goodness beauty etc. of
 divine love, 35

U

UDĀNA, 9
 Ultimate good, 72
 Unconscious, 7, 13
 Uniformity, 46
 Union, 77, 79
 Unitive state, 54, 76, 79, 82
 Unity, 78
 Unity in variety, 45, 47
 Universal love, 52
 Upaniṣad, 62, 63, 64, 79
 Upāya and upeya, 72
Uttamapurusa, 26, 50, 53

V

Vairāgya, 11, 21, 36, 37
 Value, 21
 Values, eternal, 53, 82
Vāmadeva, 68
Varuna, 58

Vāsanā, 26
Vāsudeva, 54, 71, 72, 81
 Veda, as scripture, 60
 Vedānta as philosophy of
 religion, 61
Vedānta Sūtras, 62, 63, 64,
 65, 69
 Vedavādins, 58
 Vibhu, 68, 71
 Vibhūti yoga, 71
 Vidyā, 19, 36
Vijnāna, 7, 9, 59
Vijñānamaya, 8, 57, 60
Vinaya, 19, 36
 Virtue, 24
 Viśaya Kāma or sensuality, 75
 Viśiṣṭādvaita, 64
 Vital force, 5, 58
 Vitalism, 4, 5, 58
Viveka, 8, 9, 21, 53
Viveki, 21
Vṛtti, 26
Vyoma, 9
 „ making consciousness, 13

W

WORD, term or Śabda, 67
 Workshop, 33

Y

Yāgas, yajñas, 58
 Yoga, 11, 47
 Yogic practice, 10
 Yogic psychology, 14

