Rational Psychology, Cognitive Popular Psychology and Esoteric Psychology; A Comparative Study

Aurel Pera
Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Romania

Summary:

Exposure of a comparative approach aims rational psychology, cognitive popular psychology and the esoteric psychology concepts from M. Devitt, K. Sterelny and the four theses of D. Dennett and D. Davidson, with on popular psychology, on the foundations of rational psychology and its relationship with language theory.

Bringing into question the esoteric psychology has clear merit in ontologically and cognitive aspects not only deep in the psyche of the Indian conception, but also need to address in terms of its comparative three viewpoints, enlightening both for ontology thought, as well as ontology language.

The way human psychology esoteric highlights divisions, and divisions of mind, helps us to better understand the concepts of Rudolf Suwichi, Michael Golu, Hugo Gauding, G. Kerschensteiner and C. Narly the relationship between personality and individuality, on the one hand and experience of the three-dimensional sphere.

Keywords: rational psychology, cognitive psychology, popular esoteric psychology, personality, ontology language.

1. Introduction

The literature that justifies the use of popular psychology is acquired usually early age in different ways. On the one hand, is used to give explanations about the behavior, to explain the non-cognitive mental states or, conversely, to explain the cognitive mental states.

M. Devitt and K. Sterelny offer two answers to the question on the status of popular psychology. First, popular psychology, like all popular theories, is a *proto-science* and science itself differs in that it is immature, inaccurate, unexplained and unsystematic; uncritically adopted and is not associated with a methodology to develop. However, it has the same general characteristics as science. It is open to scientific review and empirical generalizations contain type law allowing the explanation and prediction (1).

The answer does not consider alternative popular psychology as a science, but a different category of knowledge incompatible with science, an idea supported by Daniel Denett and Donald Davidson, who argues in favor of what is called *rational psychology*-psychology approach.

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

It is necessary, considers M. Devitt and K. Sterelny, psychology rational approach to distinguish the two concepts: the first is that the subject of popular cognitive psychology does not exist in reality; such a view is behaviorism, vision «anti-realistic or eliminativistic", that popular psychology is "a proto-science completely false", aspect that the two do not agree.

On the other hand, the same vision, antirealism can be combined with *instrumentalism*, conception according to which "a theory is not adequately understood as describing any underlying reality, but rather as a useful tool for prediction of observations based on Past observations "(p. 265). In other news, rational psychology needs to be distinguished from behaviorism "philosophical" that "is realistic about thoughts," but it takes simply as "rules of conduct". The classic work in this regard is *The concept of Mind* by Gilbert Ryle.

In turn, Daniel Denett and Donald Davidson write about popular psychology in an antirealistic spirit. And K. M. Devitt's opinion is that the two advocates Sterelny actually addressing of rational psychology perspective. Antirealism denies the idea that there actually any mental or otherwise, he «rejects the *existence size* on mental realism". Rational psychology denies "the size of independence": there are mental facts, but are a special kind *imposed by us* and unopened scientific explanation. In this way, the rational psychology is in conflict with *metaphysical side* of naturalism promoted by M. Devitt and K. Sterelny, which requires that all acts are not only *scientifically explainable*, but also *physically explainable*. In the vision of two rational psychology is in conflict with the epistemological side of rationalism promoted them, saying our way of talking about mental facts are outside of empirical science.

Rational psychology seems to be represented in the four theses of D. Dennett and D. Davidson:

 non-replacing phrase: popular psychology can not be replaced by science or scientific psychology; First, the fact that science has no way to prove that popular psychology is wrong or make mistakes that deep human nature; on the other hand, popular psychology task is to rationalize human behavior; to understand people somehow unscientific; to impose an interpretation (2);

 non reform phrase: popular psychology can also become science. Popular explanations are inaccurate, say D. Davidson, and are different from those of science (3). But D. Denett seems to believe that he can be brought into shape by reforming mathematics in decision theory (op. Cit., Ch. 3);

 non integration phrase: popular psychology can be integrated into science, but neither can be joined to form a theory, unabashed, people. D. Davidson rejects the possibility of reduction popular psychology to physics, and D. Denett made a clear distinction between "intentional position" (popular psychology) and "design position" ("project") - scientific psychology province. In his 1995 (4) the distinction is less clear, popular psychology is in his opinion "a theory of the neurophysiology of vision";

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

 principles of tolerance: popular psychology involves not related to science principles - the award beliefs and desires must see people as rational.

These principles are essential for rational psychology and they seem to underpin other ways in which popular psychology is defined.

Rightly, however, Sterelny K. M. Devitt and asks what are the consequences for the theory of rational psychology of language? Regarding the work of D. Dennett, it does not include a systematic debate on language, hence a number of conclusions drawn by the two authors:

- After almost any plausible conception, theory of language will have close links with cognitive psychology;

- According to HP Grice's conception, meaning that a speaker gives a linguistic symbol to be identified with the content of thought;

- Rational psychology puts out the popular conception of science content and thus should put off science and popular semantics (p. 266).

It seems that D. Dennett and D. Davidson bears no resemblance to the philosophical point of view. D. Dennett believes humans as biological machines evolved and fight fairly widespread idea that consciousness is a mystery. But the fact that he sees psychology as a proto science popular causes, as remarked M. Devitt and K. Sterelny, perplexity, although it appreciated the idea that popular psychology is too valuable to be rejected.

D. Dennett distinguish two positions: *intentional position*, the popular cognitive psychology, which is not realistic, but instrumentalist on the beliefs and desires that are simple prediction tools; and *design position*, the scientific cognitive psychology, which is entirely realistic.

Intentional position is concerned what is really happening in the object causing the behavior, but says nothing about "theoretical entities" causing the behavior. M. Devitt and K. Sterelny adopt another way of interpreting intentional position: bodies really have beliefs and desires, and the sentences they receive are literally true, but they do not target the causes of behavior, but behavior patterns. Herein lies the fact behaviorist size D. Dennett's thought (5).

In other words, philosophical behaviorism accepts that there are thoughts - which is the size of realism mental existence, but rejects the principles of tolerance: thoughts are not imposed by us, they have discovered us. To suppose otherwise, and K. Sterelny comment M. Devitt, is to adopt rational psychology which claims that thoughts depend, in terms of existence, our decision lenient. "To the extent that intentional position is a version of rational psychology, it is compatible with rationalism" (p. 269).

In conclusion, it could be said that D. Dennett is an instrumentalist consistent, as often it seems fond of philosophical behaviorism. This prompted the two above commentators assert that the thought of realistic size can not be combined with principles of tolerance. It seems that there is a third dimension, namely *rational psychology*: *there are* thoughts, contrary to instrumentalism, but they are dependent on our decisions lenient, contrary philosophical

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

conception of behaviorism. This situation prompted M. Devitt and K. Sterelny to draw a final conclusion in their comments about the point of view of D. Dennett: size revealed it "poses a problem for Devitt's naturalism" namely that "it generates a *priori* statements and observer dependent on intentional agents" (p. 270).

Criticisms about the mind's conception D. Davidson (6) are malicious, it is considered *obscure*. Its location is known as *anomalous monism*: "There is no deterministic law under which it can be predicted and explained mental events". There are laws to the psychological law of physical (p. 209, p. 224).

Very harsh in criticism, M. Devitt and K. Sterelny argue that D. Davidson has much to say, especially about what they are not psychological states, "but is rather shy in saying what they are not."

A psychological phenomenon is not a closed system and therefore no psychological field is a closed area, says D. Davidson. These factors militate against the existence of laws but genuine psychological, as remarked M. Devitt and K. Sterelny (p. 270).

According to D. Davidson, it is impossible to specify all the factors that can lead to the idea that anyone would have thought that a complex X to vote for US president. The best thing you can expect, says the author, are generalizations that embody "practical wisdom" and "counterexamples are protected by generous *escape clauses*" (7). D. Davidson believed to be qualified as scientific laws; generalizations must be sufficiently precise and deterministic. To do this, the conditions are fulfilled only "closed comprehensive system" (p. 219), which is not the case of the psychological domain, which is not a closed system.

Psychological processes are established and in other biological processes and neural processes so dependent. Prediction invoice psychological explanation assumes normal operation of our internal *machinery.* One explanation may fail not because of psychological errors, but because the machine is not functioning normally. "It happens too many things that affect the mind, wrote D. Davidson, without being themselves part systematic mind" (p. 224).

We should also remember that the two commentators, M. Devitt and K. Sterelny, subscribe to the premises of D. Davidson, but denies conclusions, revealing another important dimension to his thinking: his vision about the nature of science is deeply conditioned by physics model. He argues that intentional explanation is weak and any psychological explanation must be "holistic" in that it involves implicit reference to the entire belief system - desires of the agent (p. 217).

Such considerations physics model and Davidson vision marks the laws: *the only laws of physics as physics and chemistry.*

He wrote about semantics without saying something about the relationship between *anomalous monism* and its semantic concepts. Probably

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

does not exist or sub-let to understand that *tolerance principle* is fundamental for both.

Critics see at first glance semantics is a curious combination theory is truth-conditional and based on the Tarsky truth theories. D. Davidson's conception differs from naturalistic conception of M. Devitt and K. Sterelny in that it denies the need and possibility of theories of reference. His attitude on the reference seems to be instrumentalist; truth is not *explained* in the terms of reference. He "seems to treat the truth as primitive unexplained" and so would be against physicalism, but there physicalistic inflections Davidson's presentation, including many references approving the arch-physicalistic Quine (8).

M. Devitt and K. Sterelny stresses that the question how such a combination is possible to be sought in view of "interpretative" anomalous monism required. D. Davidson considers that the burden of semantics would be to tell you how to build a "radical interpretation" for a language perspective regarded as not sufficiently two fundamental: it is based on semantic concepts of meaning, *truth and reference*, which self-explanatory.

D. Davidson believes that one can no longer say anything more about these concepts to what would be revealed through his accomplishments, which say the performers, "reflects his anomalous monism." He does not consider thoughts as state objectives, postulates independent of language, which can be used in explaining language expressing them. D. Davidson apparently under the influence of Quine, starts explaining language to a *behaviorist assumption* (p. 272): "the meaning is entirely determined by observable behavior, even immediately observable behavior" (9), as distinguished and Quine (10).

Antirealism D. Davidson is special: in his view, the meanings are not sentences objectives whose nature waiting to be discovered by us. The only real debate on the significance of co-opted independent is a lot of verbal provisions. Beyond this practice is not only *its own new interpretation* using the principles of mutual tolerance, practice that should see it more as imposing a reality as discovered one semantic than nine (p. 316).

D. Davidson thinks that the *principle of tolerance* demarcates the *physical mind*. In this regard, he writes: "The insertion of this system (beliefs and desires) of new evidence that must impose conditions of coherence, rationality and consistency. The conditions do not translate into physical theory, which is why we can not only search for correlations between the coarse physical and physiological phenomena "(p. 231).

Clearly finding M. Devitt and K. D. Davidson Sterelny that goes directly to the statement that the mind has a different physical nature or essence denial psychophysical laws. The two actually finds that there is a single principle of indulgence, but a bundle of related principles (11).

The first dimension concerns the principles indulgence *subject (topic)*: the principles of persuasion may be true, rational persuasion or rational action.

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

The second dimension concerns the principles of tolerance *strength*; indulgence as a true conviction claims, for D. Davidson, only *majority* opinion to be correct opinion that it has and D. Dennett (p. 18). Both philosophers but seem to accept deviation from perfect rationality (D. Dennett, 1978, p. 11; D. Davidson, op. Cit., P. 159).

D. Davidson suggests, however, that we can be impatient, provided that we assign error to be *explained* (p. 196). This additional condition of intelligibility of the principles of tolerance is an important feature that applies only in cases of error: *falsehood* and *irrationality* require explanations, *truth* and *rationality* do not ask.

As expected, M. Devitt and K. Sterelny D. Davidson's claims that the possibility of error and misunderstanding depends on the accuracy and general understanding. They argue that as the principle of truth as there is no threat indulgence for naturalism. In their view, popular psychology is inaccurate and unsystematic, but there is no reason to suppose that there can be suitably modified and developed a scientific theory (p. 277).

This does not mean that *popular psychology* is not its purpose and employs it as implausible; it's D. Dennett and D. Davidson, against any principle that knowledge demarcates the rest.

Analyses revealed so far relate only to the world of interpretation. If this world is unique (that is only known in its own way), it should like to be unified knowledge about it? Why so many viewpoints and many explanations why? Why is not there a single science to explain the world as a whole, living as subsistence? Human spirit, like thinking, is dissipated in the many science and theories. "It should be possible to construct only one painting of integrated nature, including our place in it" (12).

It seems that from D. Davidson remained something eternal: "What makes possible interpretation ... is that we reject a priori opportunity massive error" (13).

2. Esoteric psychology - personality and soul

We want to go over two different views on personality, on the one hand and esoteric vision about the personality and soul, on the other hand.

As shown in another study (14), colloquially, the terms of *person* and *personality* are used so that each has their correct OF USE feeling in various situations. Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate the two concepts: the term *person* shall, in the light of scientific psychology, concrete human individual, while the *personality* term is a theoretical construct elaborate psychology for understanding and explaining, to the scientific theory, a the way of being and psychological functioning that characterize body called the *human person*.

Most definitions highlight some features of its personality: *globality, temporal stability and consistency*. Not everyone understands the same thing by

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

personality. Some identify with *individuality*, the person, others understand the individual personality devoted a certain moral and cultural concerns.

Rudolf personality Suwicki considers a "self-conscious being and self-control"; «Self-awareness, self-control and self-power of the spirit". Richard Muller-Freienfels believes that the personality of a man is "his ego seen in terms of its difference to other people I's", and H. Gauding personality meant by "ego ideal, the totality of our being, our body and soul thinking, feeling and our will "(15).

Michael Golu reveals personality explanations - from different theoretical positions - and stresses that are often built in terms of biological or psychosocial. From the perspective of the methodological principles and explanatory theories of personality can be circumscribed guidelines biologist, experimentalist, psychometric, socio-cultural and anthropological (16).

For Hugo Gauding personality is not a product of nature, but is a work of human freedom that it shows the man as standing face to face with himself in self-training report. In his view, "self-training" requires *originality, deeply original appropriation*, the individual "feels towards its original conception about life and the world". Originality is "kernel of individuality". Personality finds itself purposes. The ultimate goal of any individuals in its process of becoming for personality, is "ideal self", it is "ideal individuality".

For H. Gauding, "personality", "ideal self", "ideal individuality" are identical concepts (A. Pera, p. 147).

In conclusion, both Gauding H. and G. Kerschensteiner, personality is a product of two factors: one *individual, inner and external*, connected with education, although *individuality* remains "basic axiom of the process of perfection". Trying to avoid the *individual and social* opposition somewhat, C. Narly, postulating an ideal permanent and complete, states that "personality is a maximum of perfection in a human, the originality of its specific social principle, a principle by which we understand productive harmony with environment "(C.Narly, p. 122).

The issues highlighted above seem insufficient and unsatisfactory. Opinions in question cover only the elements that fall within the three-dimensional human being. Some thinkers have envisioned the role of *individuality* in the formation of personality, but could not overcome the lack of a simple causal dialectic, which aims to limit other current psychology, unable to explain the relationship between *personality and soul*.

From the perspective of esoteric psychology, things seem a bit deeper. Personality consists of transient vehicles through which the real man, the Thinker, the world is expressed in physical, astral and the so-called *lower astral*.

In this vision, the Soul is the Thinker himself, the Self in the causal body, as explained Indian psychology. Self, identifying the human being produces personalities that lasts a life on physical plans, astral and lower

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

mental. Each personality gather experiences and submit them individuality (Self), then separate it and dies. Personality disappears with human beings, not individuality. Self embodies a personality to gain *precision* in terms of three-dimensionality, as it educates you towards his own spiritual perfection.

Experience gained dimensional, gives individuality (Self) unique ontological value, which can use the path of spiritual evolution. This development dimensional plane has a psycho-moral and cultural value eminent manifesting as creative genius in various fields.

The way that esoteric psychology highlights divisions of human and mental divisions (four in number) should give pause:

• *Manas-taijasi*, which in reality is *buddhi* - that level of the human *manas* immersed in *buddhi*, leaving no will of its own;

• Higher *Manas* or *mental abstract thinking*;

• *antah-karana* or the link between higher *manas* and *kama-manas* during an existence in the physical, so dominated by the laws of three-dimensionality; it means the broad mind; instrument between the innermost self and the outside world;

• *Kama-Manas* actual personality.

Manas in Sanskrit also mean *thinking*. Higher *Manas* (thinking top) is divine because it has that attribute positive thinking or *Kriva-shakti,* power to create any work actually being accomplished by the power of thought. Word *Divine* comes from the root *div*, which means *to shine*, and refers to the quality of its own divine life that shines inside of *Manas* (thinking pure, superior, thinking that shines like the sun). The mind does not lower its own light, it does not shine by itself.

According to the Indian psychology, mentality is broadly divided into four:

• *ahamkāra*: individuality creator;

• *buddhi:* intuition or pure reason;

• *Manas*: thinking;

• *città*: discrimination objects subconscious thinking.

Manas and *Citta* together what we Westerners commonly call "mind", having the power to create concrete and abstract thoughts (17).

To avoid conceptual confusions, we quote below Romanian correspondences of terms in Sanskrit:

• *Atman* means divine will, the individual soul, part of the divine (universal) - *Brahman*;

• *Buddhi* means intellect, intuition, illumination. *Buddhi* is the first of *Prakriti* evolves and underlying individual intelligence. The faculty decisive in choosing the course of action. Indian Ontology (*Nyāya-Vaişeşika* philosophy) believes that *Buddhi* is of two kinds: remembrance (*smŗti*) and experience (*anubhava*).

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

• *Higher Manas* means higher mind, thinking superior morality which respects universal laws;

• *Lower Manas* means inferior mind;

• *Kama* means desire, emotions, feelings;

• *Liṅga śarīra* means vitality; Double etheric body;

• *Sthūla śarīra* means physical body subject to the laws transience.

As I said, *Ahamkāra* is the expression of selfishness and defines the concept of individuality. Indian psychology and ontology believes that evolutionary process, *Ahamkāra* is developing from the intellect (*buddhi*) and subsequently lead to the evolution of the senses (*indriya*) and the subtle essence of the elements (*tanmātra*). Its function is asserting itself and is an aspect of internal organ (*antah-karana*), equipped with three issues: *vaikārika* or *sattva*, rajas and *taijasa* or *bhutādi* or *Tamas*.

Manas means mind and is one of the aspects of internal organ. Mind stimulate other senses to orient each object to his becoming an instrument of knowledge and, like all other senses, it is inert. The collaboration is necessary in any cognitive process. The mind has a dual function: it helps to know and rails narrows field, focusing it on a single object or group of objects. The association with *Manas* is the main cause handcuffed.

Jainism psychology does not believe that the mind is a sense organ, but cognitively body and all objects of all senses. It is of two kinds: mental mind (*bhava*), performing mental functions themselves, and material mind (*dravya*), which is mixed in mind subtle matter physics.

Dvaita and *Sankhya* philosophy believes that the mind is one of the sense organs (*indriya*). *Mimāmsa* philosophy argues that cognitive processes depend on a particular atom called *Manas*. The mind alone performs knowledge, aversion, effort, and it itself lacks qualities such as color, odor, etc. Therefore needs the help of other senses to know these qualities.

Liṅga-śarīra means *subtle* body. According to *Sāmkhya-Yoga* psychology, transmigration of the subtle body consists of eleven sense organs, together with the intellect, ego and the five subtle essences of elements.

Sthula-śarīra body is skipping the physical body. In *Sāmkhya* ontology it consists of twenty-five fundamental principles: the five *Jnana-indriya* (sense organs, hearing, touch, sight, taste and smell), five *karma-indriya* (organs of speech, grasping, movement, excretion and breeding), five *tanmātra* (subtle essence of sound, touch, sight, taste and smell), five *mahābhuta* (ether, air, fire, water and earth) and the five vital airs (*Prana, Apana, Samana, Udana and Vyana*).

Here, then, that psychology or esoteric oriental, how are often called, has a supporting ontological support and much more explanatory than scientific psychology, aimed in particular side neurophysiological, behavioral human being, that what happens on this side of thinking and mind; ie, not targeted, methodological ignorance, we believe, than strict dimensional aspect of

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

existence. Do not tell us anything about the human soul than vague psychoanalytic explanations nor did they accept in full, due to the dialectical methods of reporting to a single pole, *environment, education* etc.

Or, personality is something more than that. It must be sought beyond the simple stage of life that his plays simply the role of the spirit in us, to gain experience. Everyday human confusions of *personality* consciousness and *I* threw a conceptual uncertainty grafted words, already outdated, *man-world individual - society*. Even superficial psychiatric analyzes, moreover, are negatively affected by this double phrase. Too many metaphors uncovered ontic and have appeared in the area of thought and communication within the interpretation of tests, including personality.

It is true that there is a common language to facilitate explanation of the two psychologists: the scientific, western, and the esoteric oriental.

We believe that through this effort compared, which involves many utterances, we elucidate the conception of *personal awareness of self*, known as *Ahamkara*. We approach the relationship between personality and soul from the perspective of "creator self", the Thinker of Brancusi, beneficial energies emanating quasi-independent entity that personality, feelings, desires, passions and thoughts.

Conceptual and we feel emotionally tied to psychology Oriental, which seems more explicit, reasoned and comprehensive than Western. And it points out that personality develops in the course of life and becomes a well-defined physical forms pertaining to three-dimensionality, astral and mental clearly expressed, but they say that on some axioms, but they argue that based on an ontology we in the West, I demonstrated viable alternatives.

If you would happen as *inner being*, that scientific psychology has not demonstrated that it would have any access, to identify with this personality, it would begin to serve its interests, rather than use it as an instrument of spiritual progress. This error generates great looking everything is ephemeral: *the great good fortune, wealth, limitless power, fame* etc. Arthur Powell was absolutely right when he noted, "this self-personality is the greatest obstacle to substitution by Divine Self personality, ego true to spiritual progress" (18).

I have seen attempts, over history, to locate the soul, the spirit, the human being; I deduced risks, not only ontologically, but also in terms of comprehensibility. Well, the soul, as to speak, aims to develop latent powers under lump moral thinking, and doing so putting himself in the shoes of different personalities. Those who, for some reason, do not understand this (and most people do not do), considers himself a true personality and living only for her, savoring the momentary advantage. It has thus been an exacerbation of personality at the expense of the soul, which generates an enormous error, permanent source of selfishness. The persistence of the defect selfishness is the biggest obstacle to progress fatal mental, intellectual and spiritual. And nature

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

always punished with deprivation of opportunities to *progress*. And progress is not immediate advantage, whether it cognitive, material or moral.

If an individual has as a main activity, mental activity can identify with the mind. If it becomes aware of this aspect, it should strive to identify with the *soul*, to allow personality to serve to individuality.

Not the mind is the Knower, Indian psychology teaches us, but the means by which knowledge acquires Knower. Aware limit him in mind. As self-consciousness develops, it will be able to control the increasingly better mentality. The knower is present in the mind, but his powers are limited in expression, it's A. Powell (p. 191).

We do not know never a specific object, but the object image in our own mental body. Immanuel Kant was absolutely right when he said that the *thing itself* can not be known, because we know only our mental body image of this work produced in our consciousness. It follows that the individual who will meditate respecting Oriental techniques will understand that it is *this personality*, dressed temporal; there is a difference between personality (as an expression of the union of two points and the three-dimensional triadial world) and the *ego* or *self*, belonging dimension beyond the three-dimensionality.

Esoteric psychology shows that we lived life to evil is manifested in the causal body by a certain inability to get "good impression". We see then the paralysis caused material. True personalities can be affected by opposing vices.

There seems to be a common point between the two psychologists: to get rid of a defect (fault) so that it can not appear to be filled the gap created by the "lack of quality polar-opposite". Modern schools of psychology recommend this method, instead of frontal attack defect. Both views seem to respect the law complementarily effect, so obviously beneficial in contemporary approaches.

When ego does not need to act directly on the personality instruments we are witnessing the destruction mental body. In this regard, Eastern old psychology was trying for thousands of years to reveal an axiom: *soul belongs to a different ontological plane and can not ever fully express the lower planes.*

Nobody can communicate with the *soul* without opening the field. Without knowing the secrets, any idea is only an impression. An undocumented and undeveloped spiritual man has no way to communicate with the *soul*. Who does not pay attention to life, you can not use any higher mental body nor the brain. If the soul does not give him proper conditions, it will not develop affection. If personality will take care of the soul, the soul will take care of personality (19).

All constituent parts of the human being are brought together by very fine lines of energy. When the contact is broken and the other components of the soul of the human being, we are dealing with madness. If this link is perfect, there is a conclusive communication between soul and brain. It claims that:

• every particle of the brain to be linked through a channel of the corresponding astral;

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

• each astral particle to be linked to each particle that caused mental;

Otherwise, communication is interrupted partially or totally.

From the perspective of psychology esoteric, occult *madness* can be classified into four main categories:

• those who have no harmony in the brain, it can be undeveloped or touched any disease;

• those who have a right essential to the brain; ethereal particles do not correspond with dense particles, physical;

• those whose astral body is abnormal channels are not aligned with the ethereal particles and mental;

• those whose mental body is in disarray.

Insiders occult psychology reveals that more than 90% of the first two classes freaks belong, which, paradoxically, in terms of spiritual, are perfectly healthy when they are outside the physical body during sleep or after death.

The third grade level health covers not only the *triadial world* (celestial) and fourth grade does not heal only the causal body, which means that, for them, returning to three-dimensionality is a great failure. Triadial world is benefic for them.

Obsessions, so analyzed, but understood in terms of three-dimensional manifestation in the physical plane, the social area, it may result in expulsion soul by another entity that has a higher vibration power (positive or negative) on vehicles personality. Those who fall prey to obsessions are especially adults, as they are defined by traits that attract and enable entities infernal obsession. They lack the will or she is paralyzed.

Willpower is impossible for obsession. If this is coupled with the awareness that every man is a part of the *divine nature*, we become able to transform our attitude so that we can help others in a manner considered "mysterious" by scientific psychology. This involves maintaining an attitude of mind continued attention, which would allow lower mind to remain calm in order to experience the superior mental consciousness.

The ideas will arise in the mind inferior soul as a blinding light, generating inspiration of genius. That is justifies Indian perspective about *Atman*, the Self individual, about *Buddhi*, intuitive awareness of what is true or false; about higher *Manas* which is the inspiration. When inspiration is continuous, we can talk about genius.

The genius sees and not argues; its main faculty intuition as inferior mind has the faculty of reason. Intuition, the inner vision is the expression of the mind's eye. It sees with certainty, but we can not assign rational evidence for that is beyond and above reason. The voice of the soul can not be clearly recognized only after an extended workout.

Intuition means of esoteric psychology perspective, "opening of a direct channel between causal and astral bodies." It is based on the heart *chackrei* more dynamic than that of the mind.

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)

Some receive intuition as a conviction that requires no previous judgment, even if it can be achieved at lower mind. The main condition is to maintain a perfect harmony in the lower vehicles.

Sometimes mental instability appears to be a favorable condition for the manifestation of inspiration. It's great in this finding W. James: "If there is really inspiration from the higher world can submit as neurotic temperaments very good receptivity to it" (*Religious Experiences*, p. 19).

Temporal instability, almost all of which I speak is generated by spiritual growth and not by any mental disorder. Being in contact with the higher planes without being fully prepared, it may be dominated by deep state of hysteria. That is why we insist so much, Oriental psychology, the need for purification and disciplining the physical body, the mind control training and under the supervision of a spiritually evolved being, missing aspect of contemporary scientific psychology.

References

M. Devitt şi K. Sterelny, *op. cit.*, p. 264

D. Dennett, *The Intentional Stance*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1987, cap. 3

D. Davidson, *Essay on Actions and Events*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1980, p. 221-223

D. Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, Simon and Shuster, New York, 1995

M. Devitt, K. Sterelny, *op. cit.*, p. 268

D. Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 208

Idem, p. 219

M. Devitt şi K. Sterelny, *op. cit.*, p. 271

D. Davidson, *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990, p. 314

W. Quine, *From a Logical Point of View*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1991, p. 272

M. Devitt, K. Sterelny, *op. cit.*, p. 275

D. Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 168-169

A.Pera, *Psihologia şi logica educaţiei,* Craiova, Editura Universitaria, 2011, p.143-148.

C.Narly, *Texte pedagogice,* Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1980, p. 105.

M.Golu, *Dinamica personalităţii,* Bucureşti, Editura Geneza, 1993, p. 114.

A.E.Powell, *Corpul mental,* Bucureşti, Editura Ram, 2001, p. 190.

BDD-V1860 © 2015 Sitech
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:07:17 UTC)