

CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant features that distinguishes man from rest of the nature is his possession of mind. The nature of mind and the nature of its constituents have been agitating the minds of people from a long time. “What is mind?” is an important question in philosophy. There have been various explanations regarding this question. In different times, different philosophers try to give the definition about mind. According to some thinkers, mind is a thing, a substance. But according to others, mind is merely a complete states, attributes and dispositions of living bodies. On the other hand some philosophers claim that mind is a form of energy, it is a kind of force. In western philosophy, diverse points of view have been provided but they are in conflict with each other. The basic difficulty arises because of the fact that all these thinkers differentiate mind from body on the one hand, and equate mind with self on the other hand.

. According to Oxford Dictionary, “mind means a seat of consciousness, thought, volition, feelings, attention and concentration.”

According to the Encyclopedia Dictionary of Psychology, ‘mind’ is taken to include everything and that is inclined to call ‘mental.’

According to Dictionary of philosophy, mind is used two principal senses–

1. The individual mind is the self or subject which perceives, remembers, imagines, feels, conceives, makes reason etc. and is functionally related to an individual bodily organism.

2. Mind is generally considered as a metaphysical substance which pervades all individual minds and which is contrasted with matter or material substance.

Historically the term 'mind' succeeded and supplanted the Aristotelian notion of psyche, which denotes all the functions that distinguish the animate from the inanimate. Hence psyche includes metabolism, nutrition, growth and locomotion as well as the mental phenomena implying the thoughts, feelings, emotions, perceptions, sensations, moods, etc. but intellectual activity has always been the most central element.

The principal task of the philosophy of mind is to make an attempt to provide an account of what mind is. The central philosophy of mind occurs throughout metaphysics, epistemology, logic, aesthetic and particularly in the contexts of the philosophy of psychology and which is called the mind-body problem. In the same way the activities of mind do correspond to those found in nature and the forces continue to operate in the consciousness of man. Therefore we say, the 'mind' makes decisions and rules, the 'will' fulfils its orders and the 'desires' comply with the rule of temperance and obey.

1.1 Philosophy of Mind:

Philosophy of mind is that branch of philosophy which deals with the various problems of mind like what is 'mind', What are mental concepts?, How is one mental concept related to other mental concept or what is the relation between a mental concept and a physical concept? and so on. The problem of the philosophy of mind is to discuss the nature and structure of the mind. It is related with the different concepts of mental states and events and their relationship to one another. The most important problem of the philosophy of mind is the problem concerning the relation between

mental and physical properties. It is known as mind body problem and this problem is the central point of the discussion about the nature of mind.

The Philosophy of mind tries to study the following mental functions–

1. Emotion: It is a function of mind. Every normal human being has emotion. We may mention the different kinds of emotions like these – fear, jealousy, ever anger, grief, indignation, enjoyment etc.
2. Perception: Perception is a source of knowledge and it is of two kinds – external and internal. The external perceptions are seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, touching etc. these come from five sense organs.
3. Quasi perception: It is internal perception and it is related with mind. For example, dreaming, imagining, seeing mind eye, hallucination, seeing after images etc. are known as quasi perception.
4. Cognition: It is the faculty of knowing perception of knowledge. Believing, knowing, understanding, conceiving, thinking and reasoning are related with cognitions.
5. Sensation: It is the simplest form of cognition. It is a simple impression produced in the mind by a stimulus. Pains, aches, tickles, itches, throbs, tingles etc. are the different types of sensation.
6. Conative state: It is an important state of mind. Acting, trying, wanting, intending, willing etc. belongs to this state.

There are different theories of mind, viz. materialist theories of mind and the idealist theories of mind.

1.2 The Materialistic Theory of Mind:

The materialists hold that only physical matter exists and therefore if mind exists then it must exist in the form of matter. Materialism has many variants, but it always holds that the matter is fundamental and that whatever else exists depends on matter. This view is found in early Greek philosophers. Thales of Miletus of 6th century B.C. believed that all things are composed of water in some form or other. Thales opined that there are many different kinds of things, such as earth, clouds and oceans and that some of these things change from time to time into something else. In spite of some differences among the things, there are some great similarities among them. He assumed that water is the basic foundation of all physical reality.

According to Thales, the universe is fundamentally water because water admits of being vaporous, liquid and solid. In the thought of Aristotle, Thales chooses the water as basic element because food is always wet and this liquid food nourishes the body. Even the generating seeds are wet. Therefore Thales gives importance in water.

Thales gives us a scientific way to think about the creation of the world. According to Bertrand Russell, Thales discovered how to calculate the distance of a ship at sea with the help of observation taken at two points and how to calculate the height of a tree or pyramid from the length of its shadow.¹ However, Thales has great role in materialistic theory in philosophy.

Materialist philosophy was developed in a most profound way by Greek philosopher Democritus in 5th century B.C. Democritus formulated the atomic theory of the structure of matter. The world he said consisted of atoms and space through which they moved. Moving in that void, the atoms met and clung together to form

various bodies. All that existed was made of atoms. He shows that the human soul was also a combination of definite atoms and disappeared with the death of the body. The death of the body and soul was a disintegration of the constituent's atoms.

For Democritus even the soul is nothing but an aggregate of atoms. However, the soul consists of those atoms which have the essence of fire. These fiery atoms are the finest, smoothest and most mobile. Atoms are distributed throughout the whole universe including animals, plants and other things, but these fiery atoms are found in the largest number in man. According to atomist theory of Democritus, even the soul of man consists of atoms alone. Even thought and sensation are explained through the impact of one atom on another. In the atomist the scientific world view of the Greek has become fully articulate. Its insistence on mechanism was fully rewarded by the pursuit of the scientists in the west.

But though atomist theory is significant in materialism, it has some drawbacks which cannot be ignored. The materialism of the atomists has not explained the nature of consciousness. It never occurred to them that the psychical aspect of life is very different from lifeless atoms. This is a problem which is still very much alive in modern times in the form of values and current ideologies and in the problem concerning mind – body relationship. Therefore the atomist theory is one sided.

Among medieval philosophers of 13th century Thomas Aquinas is a materialist philosopher. Thomas Aquinas asserted in his doctrine of being that all being both actual and potential could only be the being of separate individual things. He called such things as substance. According to him, matter cannot exist independently of form while form exists independently of matter. Corporeal things of the natural world were always a conjugation of form with matter. The material could not exist independently

of the supreme form. Aquinas said, reason was connected with the sensations. So that it was possible to know only the corporeal world, while the super corporeal world was unknowable and the essence of things was beyond human understanding. There could be no adequate correspondence between thought and reality.

In the British empiricism of modern western philosophy Francis Bacon sharply criticized the idealist philosophy and the speculative nature of the reasoning. His purpose was to establish truths that would assist men in their practical life and guide their activities in creating material values. Bacon says that the material world had no the beginning or the end. It had existed and would exist forever. He declared that motion was one of the main properties of eternally existing matter, even though he limited it to a member of forms. Bacon shows that in our method of cognition, knowledge was also metaphysical and mechanistic, we understand of the fact that objects are not just a mechanical combination of some constant qualities, but an organic whole, where the various qualities and aspects are interconnected and transmuted in to each other. For Bacon, mind is a passive thing because he points out that our mind should as receptive as that of a child. Some take Bacon as the father of pragmatism for he emphasizes the usefulness of knowledge. However, Bacon's thoughts are significant in materialistic theory about mind.

The contemporary materialist philosophers like Paul and Patricia, Churchland, Daniel Dennett, Georges Rey etc. hold that nothing but matter exists. Materialist philosopher hold that there is no such thing as sensation, imagination, feeling, desire, and so on and these must be eliminated from language. It is meaningless. Such a view is called eliminative materialism. Eliminative materialism is the relatively new (1960s-1970s) idea that certain classes of mental entities that common sense takes for granted, such as beliefs, and the subject sensation of pain, do not exist. According to J.

R. Searle, “eliminative materialism simply is a version of materialism that eliminates mental states all together.”²

There is another group of materialistic philosophers who believe that to talk about sensation, images desires intention is no to talk about something meaningless. Because these are such things as sensation, images, intention and so on. They can be explained by holding that they are the complicated form of matter in motion and in that senses they are not meaningless. This view is called reductive materialism.

Behaviorism and the central state theory are two kinds of productive materialism. Behaviorism dominated philosophy of mind for much of the 20th century, especially the first half. In psychology behaviorism developed as a reaction to the inadequacies of introspectionism. For behaviorism mind is the sum total of behavior or responses of the physical body to physical stimuli, Behaviorism is a term with many meanings within the field of psychology. We find that there are different varieties of behaviorism stretching from J. B. Watson to B.F. Skinner and others. Originally the word ‘behaviorism’ is formulated by J. B. Watson who attracted widespread interest and considerable support from scientifically oriented philosophers. Behaviorism is divided into two types– Methodological behaviorism and Logical Behaviorism.

Behaviorism in psychology is often thought or counterpart of materialism. A methodological doctrine in early 20th century held that psychology is a reductionist solution to the other mind problem in philosophy. The methodological doctrine in the proper kind of observation to employ in psychology is not inward observation of private happenings but the outward observation of public happenings. It is called

behaviorism on the assumptions how someone behaves in something that is the principle for open to anyone to observe.

J. B. Watson, the founder of behaviorism holds that psychology is a science of behaviorism. He regards observation and experiment as the only psychological methods. Behavior alone is the proper subject matter of psychology. It is the response of the whole organism to a stimulus or a stimulus pattern. Psychology is the science of stimulus-response. Behaviorism rejects the mind as an entity. According to Professor J. B. Watson, the sole task of psychology is the prediction and control of behavior. Watson thinks that the time has come when psychology should discard all reference to consciousness, and no longer delude itself into thinking that it can make mental states as objects of observation.³ Watson says that, when we claim to describe our mental states, and assure us that we have experienced this or that sensation, we cannot possibly verify our assertions, for our sensations and our thoughts are private and precaution to me, and science can deal only with what is public and general.

Sensation is response of the receptors or sense organs to stimuli. Thinking is sub vocal speech or implicit speech movements. Personality is a behavior pattern; it is a totality of reactions as asserts and liabilities. These are not inherited tendencies. The organism is entirely moulded by the environment.⁴ Psychological behaviorism is not free from criticism. Men are conscious of mental processes. Mental process is subjective, and cannot be reduced to objective behavior. Experience is not more response of the organism. Behaviorism reduces the mind to the organism which is entirely molded by the environment. After all behaviorism does not give us a theory of mind. All mental states cannot be expressed only through behavior.

Another kind of behaviorism is logical/philosophical/analytical behaviorism. Philosophical behaviorism was notably held by Ludwig Wittgenstein, in the latter half of the 20th century in his two great works *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* and *Philosophical Investigations*.

More recently Professor Gilbert Ryle in his celebrated book, “The Concept of Mind” explored the Cartesian dualism as a “myth of the ghost (soul)” in the machine. According to Rene Descartes, soul and body are polar opposite. Ryle thinks that Descartes theory is not defective in details, but is a whole sale mistake, a fundamental error. He explores this myth by the method of ordinary language analysis. In rejecting the Cartesian dualism Wittgenstein is agreed with Ryle and both of them said that mind is not such type of entity as Descartes thought. Wittgenstein thinks that mental states are nothing over and above certain behavior. It is found that Ryle’s concept of mind is similar with Wittgenstein’s concept of mind.

In analytic behaviorism the basic philosophical question about mind or mental states can be put as follows ‘what does it mean to ascribe a mind or mental states to anybody or how are we to understand the meaning of psychological statement. The difficulty is answering these questions. Behaviorism as theory of philosophy of mind developed as a consequence of the rejection of Descartes mental substance theory.

Materialistic theory regarding the mind is not free from criticism. According to materialism, matter is only real. All things of this universe are composed with matter even in the creation of mind. But it cannot be accepted since in this harmonious world only matter is not sufficient for all. The mind is conscious, incorporeal, and subjective. It cannot be composed of material atoms. The function of an organ is of the nature of motion. But mind is not experience as motion. The

secretion of a material thing is material. Bile which is secreted by the liver is material. But consciousness cannot be regarded as a secretion of the brain. Mind or consciousness cannot be regarded as an epiphenomenon of the brain, because it is a centre of free activity. Mind can control regulate and influence the organism. But a mere epiphenomenon cannot have any power or activity. Mind is an active of values. So it cannot be an epiphenomenon of the brain. The subject cannot spring out of objects.

1.3 The Idealistic Theory of Mind:

The idealistic theory of mind has a significant role in the philosophy of mind. The mind is not an abstract nominal principle of unity, above and beyond mental phenomenon, nor an aggregate of mental states or phenomena, but a concrete spiritual principle of unity in plurality. In other words, it is a simple abiding subject manifesting itself in a plurality of states and activities, and through them it realizes itself as a self-conscious and self-determining spirit. According to this theory, self-consciousness and self-determination are the characteristic features of the mind. It is a unity in difference.

The idealistic view of the mind gives an adequate explanation of self-consciousness and self-determination. Memory and expectation, personal identity, unity and continuity of consciousness, and the interpretation of sensation by assimilation, are explained by idealistic theory of mind.

Among the western traditional philosophers Plato was the first to view that mind is a non-material entity. Plato's famous book "The Republic", gives us a detail description of the human soul. According to him, the soul is a spiritual substance, which expresses itself in three fundamental types of experience and these are

thinking, feeling and willing and they are the three functions of the soul. Human soul has an intuitive knowledge of the world ideas. The soul is self moved and the primary source of motion. According to Plato, motion is the essence of soul and the soul is prior to the body, which is its vehicle and imparts of motion. "Plato's explanation of the connection between soul and body is never precise. He expounds it almost invariable in the form of myth, indicating that he did not believe it possible to give any exact account of it but only pictorial one, ' something like' the actual truth."⁵

Plato recognized the pre-existence and immortality of the soul. Its dignity is that the world of ideas and reason is an essential part of the soul. He said that man's inherent notion of beauty, goodness, justice, equality etc. cannot be obtained through senses. Testify to the fact that learning is nothing but the recollection of what the soul knew previously. Plato cannot completely discard the notion of necessity and find the way out in subjecting necessity to the mind. For the creation of this world is the combined work of necessity and mind. Therefore, according to Plato, mind the ruling power, persuaded necessity to bring the greater part of created things to perfection. The individual soul, according to Plato, consists of three parts and these are Rational, Forceful and Desire. The common virtue of the soul is harmonious and all the three faculties are called justice. It consists in the right co-ordination of the soul. The mind makes decisions and rules, the will fulfils its orders.

Plato has separated the soul from body and this has led to the dualism of soul and body, but he has not clarified the relationship between them. Their nature is quite opposed. The soul is immortal, the body is perishable. The soul is simple; the body is composite of the four elements of fire, air, earth and water. In a crude way, Plato has explained the interaction between the body and the soul. It can be said that Plato has

raised the important issue of soul-body relationship without any clear solution. “Plato’s explanations of the connection between soul and body are never precise. He expounds it almost invariably in the form of myth, indicating that he didn’t believe it possible to give an exact account of it but only pictorial one”.⁶

Aristotle has been regarded as an encyclopedic genius. There is nothing even in the modern world which Aristotle has not touched and in relation to which he has not presented his master full insight. Aristotle, no less than Plato, emphasized the reality and essential character of the souls but he brings it into much closer relation to the body. Aristotle considers the soul to be a sort of vital principle, almost identical with life – the source of movement and growth as well as thought and reason. Aristotle ascribes to the soul an active or creative reason, which is of the very nature of the divine, and is immortal. According to Aristotle, the soul is the purpose and perfection of the body, that for which the body exists and in which it finds its realization. Aristotle tried to explain a closer and more vital connection between soul and body what Plato did. He says that the soul is the organization of the body. In his own terminology, the soul is “form” to the body which is its “matter”. For him the soul is the organizing principle of the body. But though it is the organizing principle of the body yet he forbids us to identify the soul with bodily organization. He says that the soul is non-bodily principle within the body. It is the ‘form’ within the ‘matter’.

Aristotle’s theory of the evolution of mind made a really great contribution to the philosophy of the ancient Greece and in doing so he remind a very influential philosopher for many centuries. Prof. E. Harris aptly writes: “Aristotle is, indeed, one of the great figures in the history of philosophy whose thought, though inevitable of the time, and comes nearer to grasping the internal truth which is the goal of the

whole historical development.”⁷ Being a metaphysician Aristotle says that in addition to the vital powers of the living individual organism, there is a spiritual being in man which thinks and conceives. Thinking cannot belong to a corporeal entity because, it is found from observation that many bodies are devoid of consciousness.

Rene Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, as a non-materialist philosopher regards matter and mind as two heterogeneous substances. He states that matter and mind are opposite in its nature. Matter is extended, and unconscious while mind is un extended and conscious. Matter including body, is subject to mechanical law, while mind is subject to purpose and teleology. Mind and body have nothing in common. Descartes regards God as the creative, independent substance, and body and mind as independent of each other. So he is regarded as an advocate of dualism. It is said that in the seventeenth century the dualistic conception was crystallized into a distinct philosophical system by Descartes attempts to show once and that mind and matter are two distinct, separate and independent substances. Descartes was the most significant dualistic philosopher. His concept of mind and its relation to body is a revolutionary one. Substance according to him, is a thing that exists. It exists by itself and requires nothing for its existence. Descartes believes in the existence of three substances, namely God, mind and body. He defines these three substances in which thought immediately resides. According to Descartes, “I call mind that substances which is the immediate subject of extension in space and of the accident and presuppose extension, movement in space, etc. is called body that substance which we understand to be supremely perfect and in which we conceive absolutely nothing involving defect or limitation of its perfection is called God.”⁸ In his meditation Descartes says, “God can effect whatever we clearly perceive just as we perceive it. But we clearly perceive the mind, i.e., a thinking substance, apart from the body, i.e.

apart from any extended substance and vice-versa, we can perceive body apart from mind.”⁹ Descartes takes a significant position providing his concept of mind and body which is well known as dualism yet, he has some difficulties in his concept. In real sense, body and mind cannot be separated. The difficulty of mind and body dualism arises from an artificial division of the concrete reality. We never experience ourselves as mind and body but always as embodied mind or spiritualized body. Therefore it can be said that dualism is not scientific explanation about mind body relation.

Spinoza, a notable philosopher of modern philosophy, calls the human mind the idea of the human body. A body is an object or process in space corresponding to an idea. The human body is made up of any parts. So, too, the human mind is composed of many ideas. Human mind is not only the idea of the body, but is at the same time conscious of its own actions, or self conscious, hence Spinoza calls it ‘the idea of the body’ or an ‘idea of the mind.’ The mind, however, knows itself only in so far as it perceives the ideas of the modification of the body. The mind can return to itself. This self activity has no parallel in the material series. In his doctrine of the human mind Spinoza was virtually become an idealist in spite of his parallelism.

Leibnitz, another important philosopher of Medieval Philosophy says that body is nothing but only an aggregate of bare monads. In this sense the human body is a machine of infinite complexity. Unlike ordinary machine, its every part is itself a complete machine. In this aggregate of bare monads, there is a queen monad which is the first instance mirrors the activity of the surrounding. Monads, through the aggregate mirrors, change of all other monads of the universe, more clearly than others. This queen monad by virtue of its superiority in the aggregate may be turned

as soul. Volition and actions are the functions of the mind or soul. According to Leibnitz, the relation between mind and body can be compared with two harmonious clocks. He states that soul or mind is the highest monads of all. It can move the other monads even body also. Leibnitz, with the doctrine of pre-established harmony explains the relation between mind and body. The doctrine of pre-established harmony teaches that the bodies act as if there were no souls, and souls act as if there were no bodies and both act as if each influenced other. The name of Leibnitz, will remain significant for the theory of pre-established harmony.

John Locke, argues that besides material substances, there exist spiritual substance, or souls. The soul is a real being, its qualities are thinking or the power of perception. Human soul is both active and passive. It has the power to move the body and it is passive in relation to the bodies outside which produce changes in to the soul. Indeed, all our ideas are due to the action of the body on the mind. According to Locke, the mind is passive. All ideas originate from experience. In the time of birth, mind is a clean state or tabularasa and all the character of knowledge are acquired through experience. Experiences are found in two forms i.e. sensation and reflection. By sensation the mind acquires all knowledge about the determinations of the external world and by reflection it receives information about the operations of its own process. Thus Locke provided his concept of mind which is notable in philosophy of mind. It may be said that Locke is a father of psychology and father of the criticism of knowledge. After criticize Descartes' innate ideas, Locke puts his empiricism where 'mind' is regarded as source of knowledge. According to Locke, the self is conscious of its own existence. Locke writes "we have incentive knowledge of our own existence, a demonstrative knowledge of the existence of god, of the existence of anything else, we have no other but a sensitive knowledge."¹⁰

David Hume, a greatest empiricist philosopher does not believe in a soul substance or a permanent self, which is the substratum of all our feelings of mental states. The explanation of the illusion of personal identity is the same as in the case of the material substance: people claim that they have knowledge of 'soul' or self as an identical and permanent entity and that they are immediately conscious of self. But according to Hume there is no such impression which is constant and invariable. It cannot be formed any of these impressions that 'idea' of self is derived and consequently it is not a true idea. Hume says that all our ideas are derived from impression. We have no impression of the idea of permanent self. According to Hume, "when I enter most intimately into what I call myself, I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure, I never can catch myself at any time without a perception."¹¹ Thus, Hume wanted to prove that there is no special entity such as mind. Here, it is found that Hume's fundamental mistake lies in thinking that self is a particular impression, but self is rather the principle of organization of impressions. It is the very pre-supposition of impressions. Human wanted to find this self from among the impressions where it could not be found.

In his own words 'The mind is a kind of theatre, where several perceptions successively make their appearances, pass, re-pass, glide away and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations. There is properly no simplicity in it at one time, nor identity at different, whatever natural pretensions we have to imagine that simplicity and identity. The comparison of the theatre must not mislead us. They are the successive perceptions only that constitute the mind.'¹²

Immanuel Kant holds that self is not a substance but a principle of unity, which remains unknown and unknowable. Self consciousness relates isolated sensations with each other and thereby converts them into cognizable objects forming parts of a single system which we call nature. The co-relative of nature therefore as an orderly whole of parts necessarily related to each other, is mind. This is what Kant means by saying 'understanding makes nature.' The manifold of sensation must be combined (otherwise they would not be known at all) and the categories are the modes of combination. In his critique of Pure Reason, Kant refers to this unifying function as the transcendental unity of apperception. Kant emphasizes the essential unitary spiritual character of the mind of which nature is hardly more than the phenomenal product.

Inmanuel Kant holds that self or mind is not a substance but a principle of unity, which remains unknown and unknowable. Self consciousness relates isolated sensations with each other and thereby converts them into cognizable objects forming parts of a single system which we call nature. The co-relative of nature therefore as an orderly whole of parts necessarily related to each other, is mind. This is what Kant means by saying 'understanding makes nature.' The manifold of sensation must be combined (otherwise they would not be known at all) and the categories are the modes of combination. In his critique of Pure Reason, Kant refers to this unifying function as the transcendental unity of apperception, Kant emphasizes the essential unitary spiritual character of the mind of which nature is hardly more than the phenomenal product.

The idealistic views of mind have a great importance because unlike materialist, it advocates mind as a spiritual entity.

In contemporary analytical philosophy Ludwig Wittgenstein is a dominant character. He provides a significant concept about mind from a new perspective. He is a linguistic philosopher and opposes the dualism of Descartes. The aim of this present work is to carry out a study of Wittgenstein's philosophy of mind.

1.4 Different theories regarding the relation between mind and body:

The problem of mind-body is the central issue in philosophy of mind. According to Bruce Anne, "the mind body problem has been called a world knot, where all the problems of philosophy ultimately came together."¹³ It is obvious that there is a correspondence between mind and body. But there is no any certain solution about the problem of what is this correspondence? As answer of this question we get several theories like Interactionism, Occasionalism, Pre-established harmony, Parallelism, Epiphenomenalism, Functionalism, Behaviorism etc.

a. Dualism:

In western philosophy dualism can be traced back to great philosopher Plato. But it was most precisely formulated by Rene Descartes in the 17th century. It is said that Descartes is an exponent of dualism.

Descartes regards matter and mind as two heterogeneous substances. Dualism begins with the claim that mental phenomena are, in some respects, non-physical. One of the earliest known formulations of mind body dualism was expressed in the eastern Sankhya and yoga schools of Indian philosophy (650 BC). This concept is divided the world into purusa (mind/spirit) and prakriti (material substance). Among the schools of Indian philosophy Yoga Shastra of Patanjali presents an analytical approach to the nature of the mind. According to dualism, for different reasons human intelligence (a

faculty of the mind or soul) could not be identified with, or explained in terms of, their physical body. Descartes said that the mind is a non extended and non physical substance. Rene Descartes was the first philosopher to clearly identify the mind with consciousness and self -awareness and distinguish it from the brain which was the seat of intelligence. Therefore he was the first to formulate the mind body problem as the form in which it still exists today. Descartes was greatly influenced by his assumption with regards to the doctrine of 'substance' and its unchangeable attribute.¹⁴

According to Descartes matter, including body is subject to mechanical law, while mind is subject to purpose and teleology. Body and mind have nothing in common. Descartes holds that body and mind interact upon each other in the pineal gland of the brain, which is the seat of the mind and the animal spirits. Mind is the guide of the body. Descartes theory is known as interaction or interactionism. According to this theory, the body acts upon the mind in decision and that the mind acts upon the body in volitions. The body and the mind act upon each other, J.R. Searle writes – “It is important to emphasize this point, we tend to think, even the dualists among us, that our bodies with their brains are conscious. Descartes did not think that. He thought bodies and brains could no more be conscious than tables or chairs or houses, or any other hunk, of Junk. Conscious souls are separate though somehow attached to human bodies. But no material object living or dead is conscious.”¹⁵

It is seen that, interactionism is not free from criticism. First, Interactionism holds that cerebral processes affect mental processes and that mental processes effect cerebral process. But critics say that these two quite heterogeneous substances cannot

act and react upon each other. If mind is complete opposite of body or body is differ from the mind then how they can meet together. In our general view points, it can be said that two opposite thing cannot make anything. Another criticism of dualism is that, dualism contradicts the law of conservation of energy. According to this law, the total amount of physical energy in the universe is constant and one kind of physical energy can be transformed into another kind of physical energy without any loss of quantity, but no physical energy can be transformed into non-physical or mental energy and vice versa as dualism suppose. Therefore, from this view interactionism cannot be supported as a strong solution of mind body problem.

In a famous passage, Descartes said, we should not think of the mind as lodge in the body like a pilot in a ship, but we should really think that it is somehow suffused through the body. If I bump in to something I do not observe my body hanging into another object in a way that the pilot of a ship might observe that ship hanging into the wharf, but rather I feel a pain in the part of my body that comes into contact with the objects.”¹⁶ Descartes says that we should think of our mind as if it were somehow suffused throughout the body.

Prof Gilbert Ryle, offered a well known criticism against Descarte’s dualistic theory of mind. His famous book “The Concept of Mind” presents a criticism of Descartes dualistic theory. In the 1st chapter of his book named “Descartes’ Myths” he holds that Descartes theory of mind can be named as a theory of “Ghost in the Machine.” According to Ryle, Descartes present mind as if it is something inner, private and therefore unknowable. Though mind is something private yet it can be cause of some of the bodily movements. Therefore Ryle holds that it acts as a ghost on the body.¹⁷ Though mind cannot be seen, its presence can be felt because of its

effects on the body, according to Ryle, Descartes' dualistic theory commits a very big mistake known as category mistake. The basis of Descartes theory is mistaken as it assumes that the body and mind are independent substances. Ryle states that his aim is to determine the logical cross bearing of the mental concepts. Ryle aims to demolish the Cartesian conception of the mind as a ghostly non-physical entity existing ever and above the familiar flesh and blood of living human being, an entity whose states are supposed to be logically private. Dualism, Ryle says embodies a category mistake. Ryle argues that mistakes about the mind come from wrongly believing that mind like matter belongs in the category substances. In Ryle's view, the Cartesian concept of the mind is essentially private. He strongly rejected the notion that there exists two kinds of realities, for example the physical and the mental. He writes 'to talk of a person's mind is not to talk of a repository which is permitted to house objects that, something called the physical words is forbidden to house, it is to talk of the persons abilities, liabilities and inclinations to do and undergo certain sorts of things and of the doing and undergoing of these things in the ordinary world.'¹⁸

To overcome dualism, Ryle presents a theory known as dispositional theory of mind. According to him, just as body is a substance, mind is not a substance. But mind is simply the disposition of the body. To possess mind is not to possess a substance but to possess certain capacities, liabilities, inclinations to do certain sorts of things in the ordinary physical world. It can be understood by the following example to say that sugar is soluble is to say that if we put sugar in water it will dissolve in water. Likewise to describe mental predicate as intelligent, honest, stupid etc. to a person is to say that the person is disposed to behave in such and such a way, if he is put in such and such a situation. Thus for Ryle mind is not substance but it is simply a disposition of the body.

Though dualism has some drawbacks, from different points of view, there are some arguments in favour of it. The most frequently used argument in favour of dualism is that it appeals to the common sense intuition that conscious experiences are distinct from inanimate matter. If asked, “what the mind is?” the majority of people’s world usually response by identifying it with their self, their personality, their soul, or some other such entity. They would almost deny that the mind simply is the brain, or vice-versa, finding the idea that there is just one into logical entity at play to be too mechanistic, or simply unintelligible. Many modern philosophers think that these intuitions are misleading and that we should use our critical faculties, along with empirical evidence from the sciences to examine whether there is any real basis to them.

Another important argument in favour of dualism is that naturally the mind is not same with the body. Mental events have subjective quality, whereas physical events do not. So, for example one can reasonably ask what a burnt finger feels like, or what a blue sky looks like, or what nice music sounds like to a person.

Again, it can be said that the argument from reason holds that if, as monism implies, all of our thoughts are the effects of physical causes, then we have no reason for assuming that they are also the consequent of a reasonable ground. Therefore interactionism or dualism is a theory by which the relation between mind and body could be established.

Thus, dualism takes an important role in the concept of mind body problem. Actually, a dualist does not have to believe that the immaterial mind and the material body interact, but most dualists do, so when we talk about dualism here, we mean interactionist dualism.¹⁹

b. Occasionalism :

Occasionalism is an important theory of mind body problem. Melebrance and Geulinox, the followers of Descartes have to avoid the difficulties of the theory of interaction resorted to the hypothesis of occasional cause or occasionalism. According to this theory, mind and body are opposed to each other and consequently cannot interact upon each other, but still there is a correspondence between the two, and this correspondence is brought by the God, who upon the occasion of certain changes in the one, intervenes to bring about corresponding changes in the other. Wherever changes arise in the body God invents and produces corresponding sensations in the mind, and wherever there are volitions in the mind to move the body. He produces corresponding movements in the body.

Though occasionalism tries to give a solution of mind body problem, this theory is not a scientific one. It makes too large demands upon pious credulity. To bring down God at every moment to produce changes in the one on the occasion of the corresponding changes in the other is quite absurd. It reduces God as a Deus ex Machina.

c. The Pre Established Harmony:

This theory is produced by Leibnitz. He tried to explain the relation between mind and body by the theory of pre-established harmony. According to this theory, at the time of creation, God established such a harmony between mind and body. Body and mind thus may be regarded as two clocks which was constructed and set the same time and keeping the same time without either of them acting upon the other. According to Leibnitz, 'Each living body has a dominant entelechy, which in the case of an animal is the soul. The soul follows it own laws, and the body, by the virtue of

the harmony pre-established among all substances, since they are all, representations of one and the same universe.’ There is a perfect harmony between the perceptions of the monad and the motions of the bodies,

Leibnitz spiritualizes body and mind and considers them to be composed of monads. Monads are spiritual atoms or active perceiving forces. Monads are self centered, self-contained, self-active substances of different degrees of complexity. The body and the mind correspond to each other, because God established a harmony between them, adjusted them to each other after creation. Their correspondence is due to pre-established harmony.

The theory of pre-established harmony is not free from criticism. It brings God to relate mind with body, besides, body and mind both are self-contained entities. They cannot act upon each other. So God, the monad of monads, cannot act upon other monads and adjust them to one another and establish harmony among them. In order to solve the difficulty of interaction between body and mind, Leibnitz makes the hypothesis of the interaction of God upon monads. This theory also fails to give proper solution of the mind body problem.

d. Parallelism :

Parallelism is a notable theory of mind body problem. To avoid the difficulties of Dualism and Interactionism, Spinoza started the hypothesis of universal parallelism or parallelistic monism according to which mind and matter are not two distinct and independent substances, but only two parallel attributes of the same substance. According to this theory, mind and matter are the correlative aspects. In this context Bertrand Russell says in his book “History of Philosophy” that “the metaphysics of Spinoza is a modification of Descartes”.²⁰

According to Spinoza, the order and collection of ideas is the same as the order and collection of thing. Thinking substances and extended substances are one and the same thing, comprehended now through this, and now through that attribute. Just as thoughts and mental processes are connected and arranged in the mind so in the body of its modifications and the modifications of things are arranged according to their order. In these words, the human mind is the idea of the body. The object of the idea which constitutes the human mind is the body, a definite actual mode of extension.

John Caird remarks that there is no room for intervention or occasional causes or pre-established harmony to explain the relation of body and mind. According to him, body and mind are not two substances. For bodily and mental acts may be referred to God as their cause.

Though Herbert Spencer adopted parallelism, he held that the ultimate substance, which appeared in the two parallel series of mental and material phenomena, was unknown and unknowable. The brain follows its own laws. The mind also follows its own laws. Parallelism has different types.

- i. Psycho-physical parallelism:- There is a kind of parallelism which is known as psycho-physical parallelism. According to this theory there is no causal connection between mental processes and neural processes. There is mere concomitance between them. There is no mental process without neural process. Certain brain processes always accompany with all psychical processes. G. J. Stout advocates psycho-physical parallelism.

- ii.** The mind stuff theory:- It is also a theory of parallelism, formulated by Clifford. He holds that corresponding to every atom of matter stuff, there is an atom of mind – stuff attached to it, so that when the material atoms combine in to an organism, the corresponding atoms of mind stuff combine into mind.

- iii.** The double aspect theory: – The double aspect theory is formulated by Warren. Warren holds that mental processes and material processes constitute one single series of events. They are two aspect of the same thing. Mental processes are the subjective aspect while several processes are the objective aspect. It is known as double aspect theory.

The theory of parallelism has certain advantages over Dualism and Monism. Parallelism asserts that physiological processes and mental processes do not interface with each other but run along in perfect correspondence with each other. It neither reduces matter to mind like spiritualism, nor mind to matter like materialism, but regards both of them as real. Spinoza's doctrine ends in pan-psychism. He holds that wherever there is thought there is extension and that wherever there is extension there is thought. But this is not confirmed by scientific evidence. Consciousness is found in a highly organized nervous system, but it is not found in stocks and stones. It is not found in inorganic matter. It is found in a living organism endowed with a nervous system. Another weakness of parallelism lies in the denial of the efficacy of mind. The mind is not parallel to the body as it supposed. It is a higher reality than the body. It cannot be regarded as on the same level with the body. Again, parallelism contradicts the clear testimony of consciousness. Just as the body acts upon the mind, so the mind also acts upon the body. The mind feels pain when the body is wounded;

when the mind is over whelmed with grief, the body becomes weak and emaciated. For example, a soldier can defy hunger and thirst, cold and heat, and forge ahead in the field of battle. He can control his body. These facts cannot be explained by parallelism. It is observed that in many cases, our will power can control our body where mind is active but body is not. Therefore mind and body do not go parallelly. Thus the theory of parallelism is rejected by critics.

e. Epiphenomenalism :

Epiphenomenalism is a theory that has its own version of the nature of relation between body and mind. The epiphenomenalist holds that the mind is nothing but an epiphenomena of the body. There is a causal connection between the mental and the physical events, but it only goes in one direction from the physical to mental. Therefore, according to this theory, the mental even, always are the effects of physical changes and never are causes of physical changes. In this theory, mind is related to the body like the shadow is related to the person. The motion in the cause of the motion of his shadow, but the motion of the shadow does not cause of the motion of the person. Similarly, the physical causes the mental, but the mental never causes the physical. It is strictly a one way causal relationship. The epiphenomenalist believes that the physical sciences will show a steady increase in the number of physical phenomena which can be explained in purely physical terms. The postulation of non-physical cause of physical phenomena has proved fruitless, where as the postulation of physical causes has produced important results.

In terms of the theory of epiphenomenalism, William James says that our volition is not the cause of the voluntary act, but the symbol of that state of the brain which is the immediate cause of the act.²¹

From the observation of this theory, it can be said that this theory contradicts the clear testimony of consciousness. We are conscious of the reality of mind and its efficacy. It is not a mere halo cast by the brain which cannot influence its activity. The mind can control the body. The mind is a centre of energy which prevents bodily energy from dissipating. It directs, regulates and controls bodily energy. Hence it cannot be an epiphenon of the brain. Thus, epiphenomenalism cannot give the solution of mind body problem.

Besides, there are some important theories in contemporary philosophy of mind which can be mentioned as follows-

f. Phenomenalism:

Phenomenalism is a theory that represents of external objects are all that exist. In brief, phenomenalism interests itself in the essential structures are found within the stream of conscious experience – the stream of phenomena – as these structure manifest themselves independently of the assumptions and presuppositions of science.²² This theory was adopted by Bertrand Russell and many of the logical positivist during the early 20th century. It accepts the existence of the basic substance which is neither physical nor mental. Then both physical and mental would be properties of this neutral substance. Such a position was adopted by Baruch Spinoza. This theory may be called as neutral monism and it resembles property dualism.

The phenomenologist argument of mind body problem cannot give the proper solution because they do not support either mind or body. It is controversial and vague. They have to support any one of them (mind or body) so phenomenolism also rejected.

g. Behaviorism :

According to John R. Searle, “The earliest influential form of materialism in the twentieth century was called ‘behaviorism.’²³ Behaviorism says that the mind is just the behavior of the body. There are two types of behaviorism viz. psychological or methodological and logical or analytical or philosophical behaviorism.

In the 1st half of the 20th century, behaviorism dominated in both psychology and philosophy. Behaviorism in psychology, developed as a reaction to the inadequacies of introspectionism. It is known as stimulus response theory in psychology. The main objective of psychological behaviorism is that, there is no such an entity called mind. We realize only behavior. P. F. Skenner, J.B. Watson etc. are the pioneer of psychological behaviorism .Philosophical behaviorism was developed parallely to the development in psychology which is differ from psychological behaviorism. This is characterized by strong verificationism, which generally considers unverifiable statements about interior mental life sensation. For this type of behaviorism, mental states are not interior states on which one can make introspective reports. They are just descriptions of behavior or dispositions to behave in certain ways, made by third parties to explain and predict of others behavior.

Wittgenstein holds that mind and body are not separate entities. Descartes claims that body and mind are two opposite entities. The body is extended but mind is not extended in space. Mind is conscious where as body is not a conscious entity. Wittgenstein does not explain mind and body through essential property. Since Wittgenstein is a linguistic philosopher he gives a linguistic analysis of mind in his *Philosophical Investigation*.

In the analysis of mind given by Wittgenstein we find that his central aim is to explore the traditional as well as the Cartesian account of mind. Wittgenstein observes the misinterpretation of mind by Descartes. According to him, mind is only an expression in certain ways. Wittgenstein did not study the mind in laboratory or it is not based on observation or experiment. It is a study directed towards the re-interpretation what we have already known about the mind. Wittgenstein did not discuss the mind specifically in his philosophy, but one can assume his philosophy of mind in his using the mental predicates in different places of his works. In his works, Wittgenstein tries to establish that there is no private inner life and mind is just a name for typically human behaviors. He states that all the statements referring to mind are reports about current bodily behavior. Behaviorism comes into existence on the rejection of the dualism theory of mind. According to behaviorism, there are not two substances that are body and mind but there is only one substance. The mind is nothing but the behavior of the body. Wittgenstein's dictum that, "*An inner process stands in need of outwards criteria*"²⁴ could be taken as the element to support behaviorism. Wittgenstein's behavioral idea is known as philosophical behaviorism/analytical behaviorism/logical behaviorism. Philosophical behaviorism believes that meaning of the mind predicates must be explained in terms of overt behavior. The statement about a person's mind can be completely analyzed in terms of statement about other people's observe. By the philosophical behaviorism Wittgenstein tries to analyze all mental predicates in terms of language game involving mental terms.

1.5 Conclusion:

From the above discussion it is found that the history of mind-body problem is a long one. The search for the solution of this problem was started in primitive age

and it is going on till today. This problem is of concern in psychology also. In different times philosophers provide different theories about the relation between mind and body. These theories have valuable contributions to the philosophy of mind. With the help of these theories, modern philosophers can improve their views and can contribute many new ideas regarding this issue. Though some analytic philosophers criticize Descartes' concept of mind as inconsistent, it is seen that Descartes has the great role in modern philosophy because for the first time he presented a systematic theory of the mind-body problem.

References:

1. Russell Bertrand, "A History of Western Philosophy", PP: 35-42.
2. Searle J. R., "Mind, A Brief Introduction" P-29.
3. Watson J. B., "An Introduction to Comparative Psychology" P-60.
4. Watson J.B., "Psychology from the Standpoint of A Behaviorist", P-20
5. Errol Harris, "Fundamental of Philosophy", P-91.
6. Ibid, P-91.
7. E. Harris, "Nature, Mind and Modern Science", P-107.
8. Ibid, P-107.
9. Quoted from Holdone and Ross, "The Philosophical Works of Descartes" Vol. II, P-53.
10. John Locke, "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding", Book- IV, chapter II, P-280.
11. Hume David, "Treatise on Human Nature", P-252.
12. Ibid, P-253.
13. Anne Bruce, "Knowledge, Mind and Matter" P-225.
14. Smith N.K., "New Studies in the Philosophy of Descartes", PP-328-329.
15. Searle, J. R. "Mind", A Brief Introduction, P-12.
16. Ibid, P-23.
17. Ryle Gilbert, "The Concept of Mind", P-17.
18. Ibid, P-190.
19. Moore Brooke Noel & Bruder Kenneth (eds.), "Philosophy, The Power Of Ideas", P-226.
20. Russell Bertrand, "History of Philosophy", P-205.
21. James William, "Principles of Psychology", Vol. I, P-131.
22. Moore B. N. & Bruder K, "Philosophy, The Power of Ideas", P-168.
23. Searle J. R, "Mind", A Brief Introduction, P-35.
24. Ludwig Wittgenstein, "Philosophical Investigations", Sec.-580.
