

Włodzimierz Majewski

Integral psychology implications in linguistics

Lingwistyka Stosowana / Applied Linguistics / Angewandte Linguistik nr 7,
69-83

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Włodzimierz MAJEWSKI
Uniwersytet Warszawski

Integral Psychology Implications in Linguistics

Abstract:

The author of this paper discusses the origins and development of integral psychology. He emphasises the fact that integral psychology creates a specific bridge between individual currents in psychology, offers the possibility to analyse their mutual relations, and provides the basis for more fruitful interaction. One of the assumptions of integral psychology is that conscience is material, meaning that it is inseparable from material processes and that conscience and matter constitute the interior and the exterior of each holon, respectively, always appearing together. Making such assumptions may not solve the body-mind problem, but it makes the reader look through contemporary paradigms again, including those in the field of linguistics. The assumptions of integral psychology provide modern research with new tasks, such as beginning to consider not just the worlds perceived by the senses and the mind, but now also those of the spiritual realm.

Current linguistic research focuses on mental and sensual cognition passing over spiritual cognition from trans-personal levels. The author postulates that to broaden the linguistic research perspective, i.e. going on to empirical issues in a broad sense, one must begin by covering trans-personal areas (areas between mental and existential level). Furthermore, the development of all research, including linguistic research, results from the ability to deal with problems at various cognitive levels that, among others, originate from seriously considering various notions, such as by studying transpersonal levels.

Integral Theory constitutes one of the most important theoretical elaborations by K. Wilber (2000b). The core of Wilber's (2000b) model is a concept stating that reality consists of layers – the Great Chain of Being can be understood as a series of spheres reaching from matter through numerous intermediary levels to the level of universal consciousness. The idea of layers in reality provides the foundation for Wilber's vision of human development. K. Wilber (2008) understands the development as gradual progression through all the aforementioned spheres, starting at the material level (in the physics of the body), proceeding into the psychic plane, continuing through the existential level, and then possibly entering the transpersonal levels. However, it needs to be clear that there is a significant difference between Wilber's model and eternal philosophy. The difference lies in a different understanding of evolution. According to K. Wilber (2008), the East contributes the recognition that reality has many layers and is not restricted to physical conditions that can be perceived with the senses, while the West is

convinced that the human being does not exist in isolation but is set in material, social, and cultural contexts. K. Wilber (2000b) formulated the integral approach by combining the two schemes. In his theory, the material world is not the lowest level of reality but rather an aspect that functions as a true parallel on all levels. At the same time, Wilber denies the recognition of reality levels as separated ontologically: levels of reality have to be perceived in the post-Kantian, post-metaphysical sense as integrated with the consciousness that enables their perception. Consciousness is recognized not by means of metaphysical divagations but rather by means of empirical and phenomenological studies (K. Wilber 2000b).

The core of integral psychology is the fact that it exceeds and incorporates all the key trends in psychology. These are known as the behaviorist, psychoanalytical, humanistic, and transpersonal approaches. It supersedes them by applying a broader perspective of description while approaching the issues in a more comprehensive way, revealing interdependencies that cannot be captured by any perspective from a single psychological approach. It also combines them together by accepting and incorporating all the crucial achievements coming from each approach. In this manner, integral psychology creates a bridge joining all the individual psychological approaches, creating a foundation for more successful cooperation and allowing one to follow interdependencies. In integral psychology, it is assumed that consciousness is material, meaning that it is integrally connected to material processes, and that consciousness and the material world form internal and external aspects of each holon, which always co-exist. The adoption of such assumptions probably does not solve the problem of mind-body, but it provides us with a review of valid paradigms. The dualism of matter-consciousness actually exists, but only and exclusively at the rational and pre-rational stages of development. In order to exceed it, one must reach the trans-rational level of consciousness (K. Wilber 2000b: 213–218).

Discoveries in contemporary physics prove that at the deeper level of matter, it is impossible to maintain polarity and that the subject-object paradigm is disturbed. It forced physics to search for other ways of cognition. A similar step should be undertaken with respect to the social sciences, including linguistics, one that starts considering not only conceptual but also internal and highly subjective cognitive styles. With the increase of the significance of physics and the natural sciences, the significance of the entire internal sphere decreased. It is often emphasized that the Cartesian-Newtonian approach is atomic, mechanical, and divided. However, Relativistic Quantum Theory and Systems Theory reveal that the world is an inseparable network of interrelations. This indicates that the life network approach is consistent with the spiritual perspective. However, the root of the problem does not lie in the fact that science is atomic or holistic, Newtonian or Einsteinian, but in the fact that the evidence is provided by the

senses or their instrumental representations, and that higher methods of cognition are degraded to monological and empirical science. Many researchers claim that Western physicists came to similar conclusions as to the nature of reality – that everything is oneness – as the philosophies of the East assume. According to Ken Wilber (2008), it is an unacceptable simplification. Physicists discovered just the one-dimensional interaction of non-living mass and energy, which is not comparable to the phenomenon of multi-dimensional interrelations as described by mystics. Physicists are not able to say much about the interaction of the non-living matter with the living world, and even less about the interaction of this level with the mental level. Even though the universe consists of a series of worlds, contemporary physics-related studies only address an experimental world of matter and energy, which is only a minute part of reality. The material plane is the least fundamental one. The universe is not ultimately composed of subatomic particles – it is comprised of the universal state of consciousness. One should not conclude that, although everything is composed of mutually related subatomic particles, all things constitute unity (F. Visser 2003 *passim*). According to K. Wilber (2008), F. Capra's (2001) assumption that physics and mysticism exist in the same area of reality, and that everything is ultimately composed of matter or energy, is wrong. According to K. Wilber (2008), a similar mistake lies in the claim that, based on the above assumption, contemporary physics proved the unity of reality.

[Physics and mysticism] are different approaches to two quite different levels of reality, the latter of which transcends but includes the former. [...] What is new about the new physics is not that it has anything to do with higher levels of reality. [...] Rather, in pushing to the extremes of the material dimensions, it has apparently discovered the basic holography of level-1, and that, indeed, is novel. There, at least, physics and mysticism agree (F. Visser 2003: 152).

The Western world's cultural perspective is biased towards the reality of the external world, and does not ponder the validity of the internal world. Consciousness is frequently asserted as a side product of mental processes and, in the opinion of many contemporary scientists, it can be entirely reduced to a process that takes place in the brain. Nevertheless, the scientists that make these assertions do not take into account the fact that mental processes belong to a completely different order than subjective experiences. In the article entitled "The Problem of Conscious Experience," Chalmers points out that no materialistic theory of consciousness sufficiently explains how physical processes can create subjective experiences or how adopting a materialistic approach means acknowledging the fact that mental processes can continue without consciousness. According to Chalmers, it is relatively easy to account for the query exploring the transformation of signals by outer senses, while the problem of creating subjective consciousness by mental processes is a much more sophisticated issue and, as of

now, no cognitive theory addressed the matter in a satisfactory way. According to Ken Wilber (2000a, 2008), current divagations concerning consciousness are too limited because they focus on searching for the answer to the question: can consciousness be studied solely as an object? Instead, what should be explored is another question: can the study of consciousness be based on introspective experience? A long time ago, Eastern cultures developed methods of studying consciousness, such as yoga, and gained vast knowledge of the internal world of the human being. With regards to this approach, contemporary science deals with only one half of reality. Recognizing that scientific methodology is rooted in the senses, it is clear that science too hastily limited its scope of study. Even though for physics it is completely justified because as it studies experimental matter), in humanistic studies such a choice should not take place as the purpose of the fields of science is studying subjective experiences. We should also consider the fact that “no discovery in physics contradicts the existence of the internal dimension as the internal dimension exists entirely outside the physics domain – reality incorporates much more than is registered by this field of science” (H. Smith 1976: 17).

Mind and transpersonal areas can still be neglected by empirical science; they remain the “black box” – reality that is not available to the scientific research. One cannot further catalyze higher ways of cognition to empirical experience by maintaining that if something does not exist in senses it does not exist in the mind, either. It is not possible to obtain introspective knowledge by studying only the mind and its empirical processes, i.e. for example instead of studying inner peace to analyze the quantity of acetylcholine in hippocampus; instead of studying depression to calculate the content of serotonin in synapses. Admittedly, such an approach is much simpler as the values can be empirically perceived and measured. Mind and brain are certainly closely related; however, they also have different features that do not allow the one aspect of consciousness to be simplified to the other. Empirical science disregards internal dimensions due to the fact that it assumes that all the transcendental/mystic states are rooted in the natural, objective and empirical processes going on in the brain and that external dimensions do not have any own reality and, therefore, internal ways of cognition are not necessary. Thus, they are only and exclusively other sorts of biomaterial events in the biomaterial brain and in order to account for them only the sensory-motor level is required. Accordingly, in empirical science, even if we acknowledge the assumption that cognitive ways other than sensory-motor ones may exist, they are devoid of cognitive significance and are not in position to prove their rationale. Reducing the translogical spirit and dialogic mind to monologic, sensory cognition is catastrophic for modernism. Internal states become in this way devoid of their real content as the designates of mental and spiritual theses are no the actual spiritual realities (i.e. such as perceived in the state of meditation), but

simple, sensory equivalents perceived with the sensual eye or their instrumental representations.

According to K. Wilber (2000b, 2008), not only the world of matter and energy can be strictly researched but also the world of mind and spiritual experiences; therefore, the studies can be incorporated into the “widely interpreted science”. K. Wilber (2000b, 2008) notices that the same principles should be applied to the scientific studies of matter but also to the studies of mind and spirit. According to K. Wilber (2000b), it is a mistake not to notice that apart from sensory experience there exist also mental and spiritual experiences. A meditating person, independent of the specifics, abides by an orderly procedure and is able to recognize the nature of the spirit; therefore, there is a possibility of verification of the authenticity of the experience. Although, presumably, it is not possible to achieve the same level of precision as is reached in natural sciences, it does not have to imply that the results of meditation are entirely accidental and that everybody can say whatever they want to.

Experiences originating from meditation can be additionally verified by spiritual traditions and descriptions of persons who reached enlightenment. In this case there is also a possibility of verification of experiences by other researchers. It can be concluded that spiritual sciences are governed by the same principles and abide by the same procedures as the conventional science. Zen, yoga, Christian Gnosis, Vajrayana Buddhism or Vedanta use three sequences of scientific cognition: recommendation, understanding and confirmation/rejection of data. The three sequences are fundamental elements of the scientific method but they are also applied in authentic internal cognition styles. Therefore, it is possible to determine whether the internal experience is the carrier of authentic knowledge and cognitive content or whether it is false, dogmatic and expresses only the personal preferences of the researcher. Science has to abandon the limited empiricism, i.e. to cease being limited only to sensory experiences and include direct experiences to the studies. The science of the 21st century has to complete the sensory and mental experiences with spiritual experiences – spiritual practices and data deriving from the experience. The confirmation of truth in each of the areas always has to include the aforementioned three sequences. The rejection/confirmation means the comparison of results with data obtained by other researchers who applied similar sequences and has to be observed in all the areas: sensory, mental and spiritual ones; the restriction of falsification exclusively to sensory data automatically voids the mental and spiritual experience of the authentic knowledge status.

K. Wilber (2000b, 2008) favors a widely understood empiricism, i.e. not being restricted to the application of the aforementioned three sequences exclusively to sensory experience but applying them to all the direct experiences, evidences and data. There are already many disciplines that incorporate the internal, individual

zone, that are governed by the three sequences of collecting knowledge; to mention only transpersonal psychology, psychotronics or TM (Transcendental Meditation). The inner life of human beings can be studied via introspection, but one should also remember that it incorporates many levels that can be reached by following the contemplative path. Neither exact science nor philosophy can prove spiritual truths because spirituality remains in another area of experiences and, therefore, requires different research methods. The world of values cannot be understood with the eye of flesh but rather through the mind's eye. Spiritual truths, on the other hand, cannot be understood with the intellect but rather with the eye of contemplation. In his "Eye to Eye" work, K. Wilber (1990: 75–91) presents his model, which includes the description of the entire spectrum of consciousness, from the epistemological point of view. According to Wilber, each of the component areas of the consciousness spectrum (body, mind, and spirit) can be studied in compliance with their own nature, such as by applying methods adequate to a given sphere. Exploring a specific level of consciousness with the use of methods not adequate to its nature can lead to arriving at non-representative conclusions and to the occurrence of, as Wilber (1990: 35–74, 2008: 50) calls it, the "category mistake." Wilber claims that by following the appropriate rules for each sphere, it is possible to study each of the components of the entire spectrum of consciousness, and that the values gathered can be verified by applying the scientific criteria determined within the framework of a given cognitive sphere.

Discoveries within the scope of TM (R.K. Wallace, H. Benson 1972, R. Jevning, R. K. Wallace, M. Beidebach 1992) and transpersonal psychology (N. Drury 1995, V. Kozlov, V. Majkov 2007), the reports of contemplative traditions (R. Otto 2000) and experiments of theosophy and anthroposophy representatives (J. Prokopiuk 2003), as well as mystics (T. Freke, P. Gandy 2002), reveal that there are at least four higher stages of the consciousness development, stages that Ken Wilber refers to as supra-psychic, subtle, causal, and non-dual. Each of these stages is characterized by different types of spiritual experiences (K. Wilber 2008: 187). In most sources, transpersonal areas consist of at least four major stages of spiritual development, and each of the stages reveals yet more types of data and experiences. Each area is a different type of truth – the same science applied to a different area is another type of truth each time: the objective truth (behavioral), the subjective truth (intentional), the inter-objective truth (social systems), or the inter-subjective truth (cultural justice). The level of objective, external, sensory-empirical science assumes that all the internal events possess their external equivalents and, although sensory-empirical science cannot find the insight to higher and internal spheres, it can register their empirical representations. Sensory-empirical science can access external representations of all higher levels. However, it is not true that empirical science is not able to say

nothing about higher levels, although it may not reflect the level in its entirety. Higher levels are not found above the empirical ones, but inside them – the Spirit does not rise above nature but rather the Spirit *is* the inner part of nature. In a certain way, sensory-empirical science does not have any levels – it simply registers sensory and motor facts – but one must remember that the facts are external representations of internal spheres that have different values and different meanings.

According to K. Wilber (1996, 2000b) and H. Smith (1976), the history of the concept developed from differentiation (science of spheres), through materialism, which recognizes only one world, until finally leading to the multi-dimensional perspective of reality. This view is the core of eternal philosophy. However, it does not imply that each religion follows the same format of matter, body, mind, soul, and spirit. Some traditions, such as Hinduism and Buddhism, recognize only three levels of the Great Chain of Being – the body, the mind, and the spirit, while others believe the Chain to be much more sophisticated, containing five, seven, twelve, or even more levels and sublevels. Nevertheless, the fundamental point of view is the same: that reality is a series of nests in larger nests, reaching from matter through the mind to the spirit. Huston Smith indicates that practically all the great traditions of wisdom believe in the Great Chain of Being consisting of the body, mind, soul, and spirit levels, and that each higher level incorporates the lower levels, all of which are embraced and encompassed by the Spirit/ God/ Brahman/ Absolute. The physical world is only one of the layers, and is not more real or interesting than the other ones. If we assume that the Great Chain of Being consists of the body, mind, soul, and spirit levels, then one must have appropriate methods for exploring each one of them, methods otherwise known as empiricism, rationalism, and contemplation. By using empiricism, it is possible to collect plenty of information related to the senses, but much less mental information and practically no information on contemplation. New paradigms do not offer opportunities for spiritual cognition. Quantum Theories or System Theories do not require researchers carrying out the experiments to deal with meditation and contemplation because contemplation is replaced with mental and sensory cognition. It has to be remembered that each level of reality is related to a specific branch of science: physics deals with matter, biology with living beings, psychology and philosophy with the mind, and theology with the soul and its relation to God. The esoteric core of the well-recognized, great, pre-modernist religions does not consist of mythical and non-falsifiable beliefs but from genuinely exploring consciousness through personal experiences. Contemplation prayer, yoga, zazen, and Shikantaza are paradigms, or patterns, that check whether the specific internal experiences are real, whether they can be regarded as genuine. The insight resulting from deep meditation can exceed both the sensory and the intellectual spheres.

One of the most important issues concerning science together with spirituality is the relationship between internal realities and external ones. By denying the reality of internal spheres, science disregards the entire Great Chain of Being. The entire internal sphere is reduced to the external sphere – all subjects to objects, qualitative data to quantitative data, and all that is translogical and dialogical to monological – and, therefore, only sensory data are asserted to be real. It should be underlined that K. Wilber (2000b) does not attempt to represent partial truth as the only truth – it is much more important for him to integrate all the partial truths into evidence of the Truth. Furthermore, he does not present his model as closed or final. He appreciates the achievements of the West, but he believes the disregard for and denial of the entire subjective sphere is non-scientific. He is against the reduction of human subjectivity to neurological mechanisms, which is what happens in the materialistic philosophy of consciousness, in this way reducing human consciousness to neuron processes in the brain. In Wilber's model, subjective and external experiences are separate spheres that should not be treated as one, even though they are closely related to each other (K. Wilber 2000b *passim*).

If one assumes the views of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay (1974: 159), that “language cannot exist independent of human being, and that, which is more, language as such physically does not exist, actually,” and that

Language exists only in individual brains, only in souls, and only in the psyche of individuals or, in other words, in persons that form a given language-society. National language is an abstract construction that generalizes facts, formed from a whole range of individual languages. It is the sum of language-related and non-language-related associations characteristic to given individuals and to, on average, nations and tribes in an abstract way (J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay 1903: 266–296; translated by P.M.¹).

and if one also assumes the views of Franciszek Grucza on the understanding of language:

Human languages do not exist outside specific persons at all [...]. Actual human languages are constitutive coefficients of specific persons and their mental and spiritual spheres [...]. Actual human languages fulfill not only determined communicate functions, but also significant constitutive and cognitive functions, as well as identifying and distinctive functions. The functions are not restricted to the sphere of human interpersonal activities, because they also affect their inner spheres, especially their mental and spiritual sphere, their way of perception of the world, etc. (F. Grucza 2002: 45; translated by P.M.)

then one certainly has to agree with the statement that if language is a phenomenon included only in speakers and listeners, as an inherent quality, it is not and cannot

¹ In this paper all the translations have been done by Piotr Majewski, P.M. for short.

be accessed only by external observation. Therefore, a linguist that desires to learn the language of a given speaker/listener has to observe his or her utterances, and he cannot be restricted to just external observation but has to include internal observation. Naturally, he can describe what is perceived on the surface of the language phenomena, such as utterances and behaviors of speakers/listeners, but because they are not the language, their description is not a description of the language. As F. Grucza states, “if the linguist has access only to utterances but he does not gain access to their natural users it is evident that in such a situation he cannot reconstruct their language in a comprehensive way.” (F. Grucza 1983: 319; translated by P.M.) Therefore, the area of linguistic research must be broadened, abandoning the limited empiricism and proceeding to analyze the problems within a wider scope, to incorporate transpersonal spheres into the studies (bands between the level of the mind and the existential level). Furthermore, the development of science, including linguistics, depends on the ability to approach problems on various levels of consciousness, which, among others, refers to the necessary skills and even simply the decision to undertake the research of transpersonal levels in the first place. This applies especially to the first stage of the transpersonal phase – the subtle one, where consciousness starts to exceed the personal area of language, thought, and ego. Contemporary research in linguistics focuses on mental and sensory cognition, eliminating spiritual cognition from transpersonal levels.

Transcendental language is generated by the Absolute, and constitutes the foundation for the being, guaranteeing its intelligibility. Language can also be treated as a medium that joins the Absolute and the being, which, in its unity, incorporates the multitude of contingent beings. [...] The scope and the depth of language can be compared to the scope and depth of existence of the I-being. As the answer to the following question, “What is the human being?” is constantly modified, the answer to the question, “What is language?” cannot be answered in a satisfactory manner because language incorporates transcendental (spiritual), natural (inborn), and socially-established (cultural) elements (A. Szoflysek 1992: 19–93; translated by P.M.).

The extent to which a linguist manages to perform a cognitive task and answer sophisticated research problems, like whether thought or language can be reduced to a being or does the being generate thoughts and language, depends to large extent on changes in the methodology of linguistic studies. In a situation where the linguist is limited to observing only the external sphere, one should not consider these as optimum conditions for studying linguistics because he is not able to fully execute his research tasks. It is obvious that in certain situations research can be limited to the study of externalized utterances, but then it must be remembered that there are restrictions resulting from the adopted methodology.

Still yet, a controversial issue about linguistic methodology is whether or not, and to what extent, linguistic cognition can rely on introspection. *Many*

researchers maintain that thinking based on introspection is neither concrete nor trustworthy. It is believed that introspection is not a highly reliable source of knowledge about the mind. This perspective probably stems from the assumption that knowledge derived from the observation of external objects' behavior, with respect to the cognitive subject, is more reliable and, therefore, more scientific than knowledge based on information originating from introspection. According to F. Grucza,

In empirical science, there are no methods or requirements to meet that would in-themselves make cognitive studies scientific. Nevertheless, the scientific field uses methods that are categorized either as superior or inferior. Usually, the methods that are deemed scientific in the different scientific fields are divided into obligatory and optional. Obligatory methods are ones that must be met to assert the cognitive work as scientific. However, in no aspect above does there exist any unanimity. The same applies to linguistics. Not only different schools or groups of linguists, but also often even particular linguists, approach various methodological issues in different ways. Methods that some of them assert as scientific by others are asserted as non-scientific, while methods treated by some as obligatory are treated by others as optional, etc. ... The scientific dimension of each field of science, both in the aspect of its cognitive work and in the knowledge it presents, needs to consider the nature of the subject with which it is involved. However, the scientific dimension of each subfield, each element of the field, and each layer of the element should be considered with respect to the position of the layer (or element or subfield) in the internal structure of the entire field, its part, etc. The point is that, although there undoubtedly are methods that need to be respected by each empirical science and its elements, including each sublevel of the element, which can therefore be treated as methodological norms, there still exist such methods that should not and do not have to be respected by linguistics, even though they are applied in other fields of science as respective obligatory norms. The problem is addressed accordingly for various parts, subfields, and layers of linguistics (F. Grucza 1983: 400; translated by P.M.).

Eliminating introspective methods and defining psychology as the science of behavior, as opposed to the science of consciousness or psychic phenomena, changed its status to that of empirical science. With the occurrence of cognitive psychology in the 1960's, subjective experiences were brought back to the world of scientific research, although introspection was marginalized in the studies. This approach still exists in rapidly developing neuroscience, although now cognitive psychology and neuroscience do not equalize mental processes with behavioral tendencies but rather with neuron interactions. Antonio R. Damasio (2002), one of the leading representatives of behavioral neurology, regards mental and neuron processes as equal, claiming that the mind is simply a complete representation of brain activity. In his publication "How the Brain Creates the Mind," he maintains that biological processes correspond to mental processes, or that they are actually the mental processes themselves, and will be generally understood as such when the understanding of the subject matter reaches a certain level of detail.

Modern science did not develop any methods for observing conscious processes or states of mind. There are no reliable ways of improving one's focus so that the mind can be a trustworthy instrument used to observe what happens in the brain. Descartes, for example, believed that everything that was clearly and vividly observed during introspection was inevitably true. It took until the end of the 19th century for this assumption to be disproven by William James, an American philosopher and psychologist who was also the precursor of humanistic psychology and phenomenology and who's research on behavioral and neuron correlates of mental processes focused largely on introspection. He asserted that the non-trained mind was a significant obstacle, as it did not constitute a trustworthy cognitive tool. He continued by also claiming that, if the mind was to become an efficient research tool, concentration skills needed to be improved. At the same time, he admitted that he did not know how to improve concentration (B. Wallace 2002: 15–31).

In 1913 an American psychologist, John B. Watson, the founder of behaviorism, radically denied the possibility of dealing with consciousness, the psyche, and introspection as a subjective and non-scientific method, recommending that the focus rather be on behavior and factors that shape them: their environment. He also asserted that psychic phenomena, which cannot be observed or measured, should not be part of science. According to him, the psychologist has to avoid any subjective terms such as perception, picture, feeling, desire, cause, or even thinking and emotions because they are defined as subjective. Forty years later, Burrhus F. Skinner (2013) proposed reducing the definition of psychology to only studies of behavior, at the same time rejecting all the psychological trends that recognized the justification of studying personality. According to F. Skinner (1987, 2013), the reasons for human behavior should be found in the external environment. He maintained that the content of the mind could not be studied in an objective way, in accordance with the standards of scientific methodology, because the mind as such does not exist at all – there exist only dispositions of behavior. According to F. Skinner (1987), only the study of behavior meets the objectivity requirements. Therefore, the behavioral approach reduced subjective phenomena to the category of objective processes, which can be studied with scientific tools available to psychologists.

Modern science developed research methods for behavioral and neural consciousness correlates, but did not develop methods of studying the consciousness itself. There are no precise or reliable tools for direct cognition of consciousness. In contemporary science, there are no elaborations that would explain the nature, sources, or potentials of consciousness, nor information on the concentration and mind mastering techniques. However, that does not mean that there are no sources from where the information can be derived. One of the possibilities is to turn to the philosophies of the East, especially to

Buddhism, which developed methods for mastering concentration and using it to study the sources and nature of consciousness. The empirical findings and rational self-inquiries of Hindus that mastered contemplation challenge many assumptions of the modern West, including scientific materialism. In 21st century Western science, as compared to Buddhism and Eastern science, the nature and sources of human consciousness are still a field that requires a large amount of research.

The fundamental challenge that modern researchers have to face is to understand and account for the relations between scientific theories and the objective states of what they represent, and to develop an accurate, scientific understanding of the mind. A direct observation of mental phenomena is possible by the mind – it is the only tool that offers such a possibility. The idea of observing the mind with the mind itself shall certainly prove problematic for many researchers because it does not allow the separation of the subject from the object of research, which is a prerequisite in most other kinds of scientific cognition. However, the non-existing division into the cognitive tool and the studied phenomena does not necessarily imply that the entire procedure is non-scientific. It must be pointed out that, like yoga, quantum physics does not separate the cognitive system from the studied objects, which in no way excludes it from being part of physical science.

In Buddhist contemplation practices, the utmost significance is assigned to experimental studies of the mind pertaining to the nature of consciousness, its sources, and potential. Buddhists treat meditative states on the same level as sensory evidence when talking about empirical experiences. In Buddhism and modern science, lots of attention is paid to empiricism and reasoning; however, the two systems contain significant differences and adopt different forms of reasoning. Cognition is usually understood as the process taking place in the cognitive subject-object relation. Distinguishing the cognitive subject in scientific cognition is of fundamental significance because, without it, it is difficult to think about any cognition whatsoever. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the distinguishing of the cognitive subject and object in yoga is different from doing so in conventional science. In yoga, the subject is unified with the object during the process of meditation and contemplation and, therefore, the consideration of cognition in the subject-object relation is meaningless. The information concerning the objects of reality is collected as a result of the interaction between the subject and object. A Hindu philosopher living around the 2nd century A.D., and the author of one of the most important treatises on yoga Patanjali (I. Tjajmni 2005, L. Cyboran 1986), identified three levels of cognition: the direct, the indirect (mental), and the acquired. Direct cognition is the contact of the subject with the object without any medium and limitations resulting from, for example, language system usage. Such cognition exists during an experience of unity with

the object occurring without a general analysis; it is related to an experience not limited by the mind and intellectual concepts. The object of cognition is seen in its true form, without any limitations imposed by the subject. Indirect cognition is the analysis of sensory and non-sensory experiences with the help of general concepts that are adapted to the analyzed experience. In this case, the mind that analyzes experiences coming from external objects can be treated as the cognitive operating system. However, the structure of the cognitive system restricts the scope of the object's cognition – objects can be recognized only when their existence is possible in the conceptual system of the cognitive system. In the case of the occurrence of sensory or extra-sensory experience stemming from objects that do not exist in the subject's conceptual system, the mind of the subject can interpret them in an incorrect way, concluding that they are either hallucinations or an impossibility. Acquired cognition consists of collecting information by means of a language. It resembles indirect cognition in the sense that all information expressed by language is limited by its linguistic structure. Verbal perception, like any other perception, depends on identifying triggers, in this case verbal ones, as elements of language, and depends on the worldview and flexibility of the subject.

If we consider these aforementioned levels of cognition, we come to the conclusion that one mostly uses indirect cognition and acquired cognition, even though one should pay equal attention to direct cognition. Such a change could lead us to pure existence – the being of the transcendental language that can be reached only and exclusively by means of a purely spiritual experience. Cognition during the contemplative and meditative states can enrich rational scientific knowledge, as well as help use it in a more efficient way. Thanks to meditation, two aspects of the human experience, the rational and the spiritual ones, that have been artificially separated can become reunited. It is unjustified to ignore certain areas of reality and certain phenomena simply because it is too difficult to approach them with traditional scientific tools. The purpose of research is the cognition of the world and the role of human beings in this world. If present scientific tools are useful in reaching this goal, they are used, but if they turn out to be outdated, it is necessary to develop new ones or improve the old ones. As A. Szoltysek claims,

Meditation directed to pursuing the depth of the being leads us to not only reach beyond the borders defined by European language studies and American linguistics, but also to reevaluate the concept of symbol-forming characteristics of language, so distinctive for semiotics or semiology. Discovering the depth of logos-language leads also to the reevaluation of metaphysical perspectives, finding roots in the hermeneutics of Aristotle, and asserting the being, human thought, and human language as a trichotomous unity. In this transcendental-like meditation, we can find the absolute substrate from which the being is generated as being, thought as thought, and language as language (A. Szoltysek 1992: 105; translated by P.M.).

In his publications, K. Wilber (1980, 1987, 2000a, 2008) oftentimes emphasizes that we live in a world shaped by enlightenment paradigms whose drawbacks are the reduction of all the spheres of human life such as morality, consciousness, meaningfulness, and value, to simple empirical representations. In such representations, the entire internal depth of existence is lost, replaced with logical and mathematical descriptions characteristic of the physical world. The assumptions of integral psychology bring about new challenges in modern science, such as considering not only the world that is revealed through the perception of senses and the mental world, but also the spiritual one. Like transpersonal psychology, linguistics should penetrate deeper into the internal spheres. There is an urgent need to combine studies of the higher states of consciousness with the achievements of traditional science.

REFERENCES

- BAUDOIN DE COURTENAY, J. (1903), *Język i języki. Językoznawstwo*. In: Wielka Powszechna Encyklopedia Ilustrowana, vol. 33. 266–296.
- BAUDOIN DE COURTENAY, J. (1974), *Językoznawstwo czyli lingwistyka w wieku XIX–ym*. In: *Dzieła wybrane*, vol. 1. Warszawa. 153–175.
- CAPRA F. (2001), *Tao fizyki*. Poznań.
- CHALMERS, D. (1988), *The Problems of Consciousness*. Montreal symposium on “Consciousness: At the Frontiers of Neuroscience”. *Advances in Neurology*, vol. 77.
- CYBORAN, L. (1986), *Klasyczna Joga indyjska*. Warszawa.
- DAMASIO, A. (2002), *How the Brain Creates the Mind*. In: *Scientific American* 12, no. 1. 7.
- DRURY, N. (1995), *Psychologia transpersonalna. Ludzki potencjał*. Poznań.
- FREKE, T./ P. GANDY (2002), *Mistycyzm a religie świata*. Warszawa.
- GRUCZA, F. (1983), *Zagadnienia metalingwistyki. Lingwistyka – jej przedmiot, lingwistyka stosowana*. Warszawa.
- GRUCZA, F. (2002), *Język (Narodowy) – Tożsamość (Narodowa) Integracja Europejska*. In: E. Jeleń (ed.), *Zmiany i rozwój języka oraz tożsamości narodowej – trendy w procesie integracji europejskiej. Referaty z konferencji. Kraków, 11–13 października 2001*. Kraków. 25–49.
- JEVNING, R./ R.K. WALLACE/ M. BEIDEBACH (1992), *The Physiology of Meditation: A Wakeful Hypometabolic Integrated Response*. In: *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 16(3). 415–424.
- KOZLOV, V./ V. MAJKOV (2007), *Transpersonal’nyj proekt: Psihologiâ, antropologiâ, duhovnye tradicii*. Moskva.
- MASLOW, A. (1980), *A Theory of Metamotivation: The Biological Rooting of the Value-Life*. In: R. Walsh/ F. Vaughan (eds), *Beyond ego: Transpersonal dimensions in psychology*. Los Angeles. 93–127.
- OTTO, R. (2000), *Mistyka Wschodu i Zachodu. Analogie i różnice wyjaśniające jej istotę*. Warszawa.
- PROKOPIUK, J. (2003), *Szkice antropozoficzne. Chrześcijańska droga poznania świata duchowego*. Białystok.
- SKINNER, B.F. (1987), *Pół wieku behawioryzmu*. In: *Przegląd Psychologiczny* 1.12–33.
- SKINNER, B.F. (2013), *Behawioryzm*. Sopot.
- SMITH, H. (1976), *Forgotten Truth: the primordial tradition*. New York.

-
- SZOŁTYSEK, A. (1992), *Metafizyczność języka*. Katowice.
- TAJMI, I. (2005), *Vvedenije v psihologiju jogi*. Šečen.
- VISSER, F. (2003), *Ken Wilber: Pasja myślenia*. Warszawa.
- WALLACE, B. (2002), *A Science of Consciousness: Buddhism (1), the Modern West (0)*." The Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies. Third series, No. 4. 15–31.
- WALLACE, R./ H. BENSON (1972), *The physiology of meditation*. In: Scientific American 226. 84–90.
- WILBER, K. (1980), *The Atman Project: A Transpersonal View of Human Development*. Wheaton, IL. The Theosophical Publishing House.
- WILBER, K. (1990), *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm*, 2nd. edition, Boston.
- WILBER, K. (1996), *Niepodzielone. Wschodnie i zachodnie teorie rozwoju osobowości*. Poznań.
- WILBER, K. (1997), *Eksplozja świadomości*. Kraków.
- WILBER, K. (2000a), *Jeden smak. Przemyslenia nad integralną duchowością*. Warszawa.
- WILBER, K. (2000b), *Psychologia integralna. Świadomość, duch, psychologia, terapia*. Warszawa.
- WILBER, K. (2008), *Małżeństwo rozumu z duszą. Integracja nauki i religii*. Warszawa.