RESEARCH PAPER

Reassessing Jñāna: A Sanskrit Philosophical Standpoint on Knowledge in Contemporary Society

Devhooti Mishra[1]

[1]*Research Scholar, Department of Dharmaagam, Faculty of S.V.D.V., Banaras Hindu University,Varanasi -221005, Email- Mishradevhooti@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT:
The presented paper" Reassessing *Jñāna*: A Sanskrit Philosophical Standpoint on Knowledge in Contemporary Society" presents a philosophical and analytical reassessment of Sanskrit knowledge system through various standpoints and its relevance incontemporary learning system and society.Knowledge and learning have always been a central idea of Indian philosophical thoughtswhere its nature, foundations, legitimacy, purpose and relationship with human existence have been studied through diverse intellectual traditions. The Vedas are the vital and foundational pillars of the Indian culture i.e., Sanatan that encompass more than just the Vedicand spiritual ritual practices and throw light on the various perceptions for the overall development of human and the society.

The philosophical schools and various textsbroaden the practices and pathways for the holistic study of various ideologies in the Indian knowledge systems.The Sanskritic concepts of *jñāna* (knowledge), *vidyā* (learning or knowledge), *pramā* (valid cognition) and *pramāṇa* (means of valid cognition) divulge that knowledge and learning cannot always be abridged to the accumulation of information. Various Sanskrit traditions examine knowledge through diverse standpoints like- epistemological, metaphysical, ethical and spiritual perspectives etc. The discrepancy between *parāvidyā* and *aparāvidyā* in the *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad*, the scrutiny of valid cognition in *Nyāya* philosophy, and the transformative significance of knowledge in the *Bhagavadgītā* etc. offer imperative foundations for reassessment of the concept in contemporary society.

The present article undertakes a conceptual, philosophical and textual analysis of certain selected Sanskrit sources and scrutinizes their relevance to the contemporary queries concerning education, information surplus, misinformation, self-understanding and ethical accountability. It discusses that Sanskrit philosophical traditions and concepts can contribute to a more differentiated understanding of knowledge by distinguishing the possession of information from its validity, comprehension, resolution and transformative potential. At the same time, the article recognises the historical and philosophical differences among Sanskrit traditions and evades treating them as a single, uniform arrangement. The study proposes that ananalytical participation between Sanskrit epistemology and contemporary knowledge practices can enrich present-day deliberationsby maintaining that ancient categories may not automatically resolve modern problems.

Keywords: *Jñāna*, *Vidyā*, *Pramāṇa*, *ParāVidyā*, *AparāVidyā*, Sanskrit philosophy, epistemology, contemporary society, knowledge systems, Indian philosophy.

How to cite this article: Devhooti Mishra ,"Reassessing Jñāna: A Sanskrit Philosophical Standpoint on Knowledge in Contemporary Society". Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(89s): 1338-1346; DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.89s.140

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge occupies a central and indispensable role within human civilization. It shapes and informs how individuals interpret circumstances, perceive reality, formulate consequential decisions, structure communities, advance technological innovation, enhance quality of life, and comprehend their own nature and purpose. Spanning from the transmission of conventional wisdom and established practices to the expansion of empirical scientific investigation and contemporary digital and technological progress, the mechanisms by which humans acquire and critically assess knowledge have experienced profound transformations. Modern civilization is distinguished not solely by the abundance or ease of access to information, but equally by the necessity of evaluating its credibility, significance, and judicious application. The proliferation of digital technologies has rendered information accessible at an unprecedented magnitude. A learner may access diverse educational materials within moments, whereas an individual may simultaneously encounter empirical research, theoretical arguments, subjective perspectives, and erroneous information across identical digital platforms. Nevertheless, the mere availability of information does not inherently ensure its accurate interpretation. Furthermore, the capacity to retrieve or recite information does not necessarily signify that an individual has subjected it to rigorous critical analysis. This circumstance presents a fundamental inquiry: how should knowledge be defined, and what constitutes the essential distinction between authentic understanding and the simple accumulation of information?

Inquiries into the nature and validity of cognition, the mechanisms through which knowledge is obtained, the

demarcation between knowledge and misconception, and the interconnection between knowledge and human existential purposes are not phenomena restricted to modern philosophical discourse. Sanskrit intellectual traditions have systematically examined these fundamental questions, with Indian philosophical schools formulating diverse methodological approaches encompassing the epistemological analysis characteristic of Nyāya, the metaphysical investigations undertaken by the Upanishads, and the ethical and spiritual considerations presented in the Bhagavadgītā.

The Sanskrit lexeme jñāna holds particular significance within this analytical framework. Although conventionally rendered in English as "knowledge," its semantic content demonstrates considerable variation contingent upon textual and philosophical context. It may denote cognition, comprehension, consciousness, or a distinctive category of spiritual illumination. The cognate term vidyā functions to designate learning, knowledge, or a systematic discipline of intellectual understanding. The notion of pramā assumes paramount importance in epistemological investigations, as it designates valid cognition, whereas pramāṇa refers to a mechanism or foundation of valid knowledge within philosophical discourse.

This examination endeavours to reconsider the conceptualization of jñāna through authoritative Sanskrit philosophical texts and to establish a substantive dialogue between these traditional sources and contemporary intellectual contexts. The undertaking neither seeks to establish the categorical superiority of traditional epistemology nor to transpose every classical philosophical category onto present-day circumstances. Rather, the purpose is to elucidate the manner in which the theoretical and traditional frameworks of Sanskrit philosophy may contribute meaningfully to current scholarly deliberations concerning the nature of knowledge.

The principal thesis presented in this scholarly work posits that knowledge constitutes a multifaceted phenomenon encompassing several interconnected dimensions: the acquisition of information, the soundness of logical processes, the comprehension of ontological reality, the cultivation of self-reflexive consciousness, and the judicious utilization of acquired understanding. Particular Sanskrit philosophical traditions furnish distinct analytical frameworks through which these dimensions may be systematically examined, thereby establishing a foundation for a more holistic philosophical reconsideration of the nature and scope of knowledge.

OBJECTIVES:

The principal aim of this investigation is to analyse the conception of jñāna as presented in selected Sanskrit philosophical texts and to appraise its applicability and relevance for contemporary society.

The specific objectives are:

1. To analyse the philosophical concepts of *jñāna*, *vidyā*, *pramā* and *pramāṇa*, *parāvidyā* and *aparāvidyā*, and related epistemological categories.

2. To examine the epistemological contributions of *Nyāya* philosophy, with particular emphasis on its theoretical framework regarding valid knowledge and the mechanisms of knowing, and to investigate the transformative and ethical dimensions of knowledge as articulated in the *Bhagavadgītā* and selected *Upaniṣadic* passages.

3. To evaluate the contemporary applicability and inherent limitations of these philosophical concepts in relation to modern educational frameworks, the phenomenon of misinformation, processes of self-understanding, and the establishment of responsible knowledge practices.

The study employs conceptual analysis to distinguish the meanings and functions of selected Sanskrit terms. Comparative interpretation is then used to examine possible connections between these concepts and contemporary issues concerning the acquisition, evaluation and application of knowledge.

Contemporary examples are illustrative rather than the results of apragmatic investigation. The article does not claim to amount the effectiveness of Sanskrit philosophical ideas in modern educational or technological systems. Its resolution is to establish a philosophical framework for further research.

2. *Jñāna* and *Vidyā*: Two dimensions of knowing

The most theoretically productive way to differentiate the terms *Jñāna* and *Vidyā* is not to treat them as two synonyms with slightly different connotations, nor to assume that *vidyā* means bookish knowledge while *jñāna* means spiritual or higher knowledge. The Sanskrit knowledge system is much more affluent than that. To establish a philosophical distinction without imposing a rigid definition that all Sanskrit philosophical schools would reject. It can be said-

Vidyā refers to any kind of intellectual or spiritual understanding, knowledge or learning. In different philosophical contexts, it may refer to a kind of liberating or contemplative knowledge.

Jñāna can refer to knowing, cognition or understanding of an object. In some cases, it may also refer to knowing or understanding a principle. In a particular school of Indian philosophy, it refers to knowing the reality.

Their relationship, however, is not fixed: both terms may refer to knowledge of the highest reality in specific philosophical contexts. . In an epistemological discussion, the central question may concern whether a particular cognition is valid. In a metaphysical inquiry, the question may concern the nature of reality and the possibility of knowing it. In an ethical discussion, the question may concern whether understanding leads to appropriate action. Consequently, a comprehensive reassessment of jñāna must begin by recognising that knowledge is not a concept with

one universally accepted meaning across all Sanskrit traditions.

The distinction becomes philosophically significant when examined alongside *Pramāṇa*, *Prameya*, and the distinction between *Parā* and *AparāVidyā*. This approach allows us to investigate not merely what knowledge is called, but how knowledge is constituted, what it discloses, and whether it culminates in a transformation of understanding.
The significance of this distinction becomes apparent when knowledge is considered from different philosophical perspectives

3) The Theoretical Foundations of *Jñāna* in Sanskrit Thought

The Sanskrit word*jñāna* is derived from the verbal root *jñā*, which means 'to cognize,' or understand. Thus, the denotative meaning of the word *jñāna* would be to know, experience or realize. The meaning of the term *jñāna* depends on the context in which it is used. In Sanskrit intellectual traditions, the term *jñāna* is used to signify knowing or understanding, to investigate the nature of cognition and also consider the questions relating to the validity of cognition. Such considerations raise an important epistemological question: How does one make out the valid knowledge from the knowledge that is erroneous or uncertain? The various Sanskrit philosophical systems have suggestions to the above question by means of *Pramā* and Pramāṇa. While Pramā is concerned with the validity of the knowledge obtained, the means of such valid knowledge is explained by Pramāṇa. *Prameya* is the object of such cognition. The terms Pramā and Pramāṇa, Prameya and so on, help to conceptualize the theoretical aspects of cognition in the Sanskrit philosophical traditions, and how to determine the validity and understand the nature of such knowledge.

***Pramā* and *Pramāṇa*: The Epistemological Status of Knowledge**

The *Nyāya* philosophical system furnishes a particularly illuminating analytical apparatus for investigating the epistemic validity of cognition.

The *Nyāyasūtra* articulates:

"Pratyakṣānumānopamānaśabdāḥ pramāṇāni."*(Nyāyasūtra 1.1.3.)*

The idea is that knowledge is gained in different ways. It is important to understand that knowing through inference is different than knowing through the testimony of a trusted source. Also important is the understanding that knowing through inference is not the same as knowing through perception. There are varying relationships between the knower, the object of knowledge and the process that brings about the cognition.

Another important distinction is between pramā and pramāṇa. Pramā refers to cognition whereas pramāṇa denotes the means of that cognition. This distinction is related to epistemology of Indian Philosophy and therefore should not be equated with modern theories of knowledge.

As an illustration, we can suppose a person sees smoke on a distant hill and assumes that there is a fire there. The smoke is perceived but the cognition of fire is not directly perceived. Rather, that cognition is gained through inference from the person's experience of fire and smoke being linked together by a logical relationship.

It is also important to note, that, that cognition is not perceived from a trusted source. Knowing through inference is valid and its validity relies on the logical connection of the relationship and the appropriateness of the reasoning.What this is showing is that knowing and believing are distinguishable; this is the contribution of *Nyāya*.

Knowledge, Ignorance and Possibility of Error

A discussion of knowledge remains incomplete in the absence of consideration for the role of error.

There are numerous ways humans can err. People frequently take things at face value, accept and work with unreliable testimonies, and draw hasty conclusions from flimsy and scanty evidence.Sometimes, one may be certain of the veracity of a cognition; it doesn't necessarily imply it is actually verified.

There are different Sanskrit schools of philosophy that dealt with the role of error in philosophy, and there are significant disagreements regarding the nature of valid cognition. These disagreements are evidence of critical thinking, and an attempt to move beyond describing the nature of cognition, and deal with how erroneous cognition is.Misinformation and the belief in erroneous cognitions is rampant in current times. People come to believe falsehoods due to numerous reasons. People can become believers of erroneous claims because they are told by people they consider trustworthy, etc.One can be certain of something without it being verified, and vice versa. Sometimes one just has to feel certain of the truth of a claim, and feel a belief to be justifiable.

A careful examination of the nature of belief and cognition leads one to recognize that feeling certain and being certain are two very different things. Also, one can have a belief and not have adequate grounds for believing it to be true.

4) the conceptual foundation of *vidyā* in Sanskrit thought

Similarly, *vidyā*, associated with the root *vid*, meaning to know, that can denote knowledge, learning or a field of study. However, the verbal root *vid*has various other meanings like- to be real, to acquire to contemplate. Again, the precise philosophical meaning depends on the context of the usage of the word. In the Sanskrit traditional system, there are certain Classifications of *vidyā* that can be studied.

***ParāVidyā* and *AparāVidyā*:**

One of the most significant Sanskrit passages for exploratory purpose and classification of knowledge appears in the *MuṇḍakaUpaniṣad*.The text introduces the distinction

as follows: ***"Dve vidye veditavye iti ha sma yad brahmavido vadanti, parā caivāparā ca"*** *(Muṇḍakopaniṣad ,1.1.4.)*

It saysThe knowers of Brahman declare that two kinds of knowledge are to be known: the higher(*ParāVidyā)* and the lower*(AparāVidyā)*.The very next mantra specifies the meaning of aparā vidyā: ***"Tatrāparā ṛgvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo'tharvavedaḥ śikṣā kalpo vyākaraṇaṃ niruktaṃ chando jyotiṣam iti; atha parā yayā tad akṣaram adhigamyate.*"** *(Muṇḍakopaniṣad,* 1.1.5)

It means that The lower knowledge encompasses the *Ṛgveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda* and *Atharvaveda*, together with phonetics, ritual, grammar, etymology, metre and astronomy. The higher knowledge is that through which the imperishable is realised.

This passage entails careful interpretation. The text does not simply categorize knowledge into "modern or quantifiable knowledge" and "spiritual knowledge." It recognizes the Vedas and their allied disciplines as *aparāvidyā* and defines *parāvidyā* in relation to knowing the imperishable.The classification is rooted in the Upaniṣadic analysis into ultimate reality. It should not be detached from that context or converted into a universal grading that every Sanskrit philosophical school essentially accepts.

The *MuṇḍakaUpaniṣad's* list of *aparāvidyā*comprises of substantial bodies of learning. The practicing of Vedic texts, phonetics, grammar, etymology, metre and astronomy require disciplined study and the transmission of specialised knowledge.
Now, The *MuṇḍakaUpaniṣad* defines *parāvidyā* through its relation to *akṣara*i.e., the imperishable. Hence, Its significance lies within a metaphysical and spiritual inquiry rather than simply in the acquisition of religious material.This doesn't imply that textual learning is without value instead, the distinction gives a foundation to examine whether the significance of knowledge lies exclusively in what is being acquired or is also in the depth and purpose of understanding.

Vidyā and Avidyā:

When on one hand,*MuṇḍakaUpaniṣad's*passage explicitly classifies two types of *Vidyā, Īśā defines Vidyā and Avidyā* in rather complex form, particularly concerning their distinct results and relationship to death and immorality. Talking about the relation between the two, mantra says-
"Anyad evāhur vidyayānyad āhur avidyayā,iti śuśruma dhīrāṇāṃ ye nas tad vicacakṣire.

Vidyāṃ cāvidyāṃ ca yas tad vedobhayaṃ saha,avidyayā mṛtyuṃ tīrtvā vidyayāmṛtam aśnute"(Gītā prabodhanī) *(īśāvāsyopaniṣad, 10,11)*

Various commentarieshave offered various interpretations of these terms, including readings that emphasize the relationship between knowledge and ignorance, unity and multiplicity, or different dimensions of existence. For instance, In Shankara's commentary, *Avidyā* refers to ritual action and *Vidyā* to meditation or worship of deities. The simple point is that the verses examine relation, and difference between the two rather than giving a definite dictionarydefinition of either term.

5) Can all Knowledge systems Be Reduced to Three Categories?

The classificationof knowledge in three broad categories is appealing i.e.,material knowledge, spiritual knowledge and Divine knowledge andsuch anarrangement may be useful for an analytical framework, on condition that its source and intended meaning are clearly recognized.

However, it should not be offered as the universally recognized classification for all Sanskrit philosophy. DifferentSanskrit texts and schools classify the knowledge according to different resolutions and settings. The *MuṇḍakaUpaniṣad* presents the precise distinction between *parāvidyā* and *aparāvidyā*. While *Nyāya* investigates valid cognition and its means. *Vedāntic*backgrounds examine knowledge in relation to Brahman(the ultimate) and the self, while other traditions develop their own ideologies of reality and liberation.
The Bhagavadgītā offers additionalimperativestandpoint on knowledge by connecting it with human action, chastisement and transformation.

"Na hi jñānena sadṛśaṃ pavitram iha vidyate; tat svayaṃ yogasaṃsiddhaḥ kālenātmani vindati.

Śraddhāvāṃl labhate jñānaṃ tatparaḥ saṃyatendriyaḥ,jñānaṃ labdhvā."(Bhagavadgītā 4.38,39)

These verses simply say that there is nothing here that is equivalent to knowledge and its purifying power. One who has become perfect through yoga practices finds this knowledge within oneself in due passage of time. And also, that knowledge is not simply linked with intellectual enlightenment but is also about inner transformation as in the second verse it is implied that knowledge also leads the path towards peace and contentment.

Talking about the attainment of knowledge and its significance,the following verse sites that how with the destruction of ignorance through knowledge, the ultimate reality is illuminated like Sun.

"Jñānena tu tad ajñānaṃ yeṣāṃ nāśitam ātmanaḥ, teṣām ādityavaj jñānaṃ prakāśayati tatparam" (Bhagavadgītā,5.16)

The explanation of these verses depends on the wider philosophical setting and the commentary espoused.The verse does not infer that every kind of information automatically produces ethical improvement. Rather, it presents knowledge within a framework in which disciplined practice and understanding are important.

This relationship between knowledge and transformation offers a useful point of comparison with contemporary society.
The *Gītā's* philosophical perspective offers a distinction between knowing something as a proposal and allowing an understanding to influence one's conduct. This distinction is

not exclusive to Indian philosophy, but the Sanskrit text provides its own principles of the relationship between knowledge, disciplined practice and inner transformation. Nevertheless, the *Gītā* offers a context for examining the personal dimension of knowledge: what does it mean to recognize something deeply enough that it influences one's choices?

The contemporary system should not undertake that every modern problem can be fixed through personal wisdom alone. Environmental degradation, educational struggles and inequality and the circulation and acceptance of misinformation also involve established, economic and technological factors.

Another dimension of knowledge arises from the Upaniṣadic investigation of the self. An additional epistemological dimension emerges from the Upaniṣadic examination of the self.

The Kaṭha Upaniṣad articulates:

"Nāyam ātmā pravacanena labhyo na medhayā na bahunā śrutena; yam evaiṣa vṛṇute tena labhyas tasyaiṣa ātmā vivṛṇute tanūṃ svām."(Kaṭha Upaniṣad 1.2.23)

Translation: The self cannot be obtained through argumentation, rational faculty, or abundant scriptural study alone. It is obtained by the one whom it selects; to such a person the self discloses its authentic form.

The rigorous exegesis of this passage constitutes part of the Upaniṣadic inquiry into the self and has undergone varied development across subsequent interpretive schools. It must not be reduced to the reductive assertion that scholarly investigation and cognitive capacity lack significance.

Its pertinence to the current analysis resides in the differentiation between accumulating comprehensive knowledge and achieving the particular insight that the text endeavours to convey.

An individual may possess considerable erudition yet experience ambiguity regarding personal principles, underlying drives, or the correlation between external accomplishment and internal satisfaction. Similarly, a person may command substantial specialized expertise while lacking the occasion to scrutinize the foundational premises informing their conduct.

These considerations do not demonstrate that systematic education proves ineffectual or that introspective self-awareness constitutes a sufficient condition for a purposeful existence. Rather, they indicate that cognitive attainment and contemplative self-examination represent distinct trajectories of human maturation.

Within modern contexts, scholastic and occupational achievement are customarily evaluated through quantifiable metrics including examination scores, credentials, remuneration, or output efficiency. Such metrics may fulfil legitimate functions, yet they do not encompass the totality of conceivable modes of comprehension.

The philosophical framework of *ātmajñāna* consequently furnishes grounds for investigating whether educational systems ought to incorporate space for deliberation concerning selfhood, ethical principles, psychological motivations, and the significance embedded within one's endeavours.

The philosophical framework of ātmajñāna thus establishes a foundation for examining whether educational systems ought to incorporate deliberation regarding selfhood, ethical principles, personal motivations, and the significance embedded within one's conduct.

This analytical application must preserve conceptual rigor. The Upaniṣadic understanding of the self-constitutes a metaphysical doctrine rather than merely a contemporary psychological designation for personality or self-regard. The analytical parallel addresses the fundamental inquiry into self-comprehension, rather than proposing that these two frameworks are equivalent.

It establishes that perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony constitute the instruments through which valid knowledge is obtained.

This aphorism delineates four *pramāṇas* acknowledged within classical Nyāya philosophy: *pratyakṣa* (sensory perception), *anumāna* (logical inference), *upamāna* (comparative reasoning or analogical method) and *śabda* (authoritative testimony).

6. Knowledge in Contemporary Society: A Critical Reassessment

6.1 From Information Accumulation to Understanding

Modern digital infrastructures facilitate the expeditious acquisition of information. Search engines, digital repositories, virtual educational platforms, and artificial intelligence-mediated systems enable users to access and synthesize explanations across diverse domains.

Nevertheless, the retrieval of information and the development of knowledge constitute fundamentally distinct processes. Consider, for instance, a student who commits to memory a definition of climate change while remaining unfamiliar with the empirical evidence substantiating it, the underlying mechanisms, or the constraints inherent in particular theoretical frameworks. Similarly, another student may articulate a philosophical argument with precision while lacking comprehension of its foundational premises or failing to recognize potential counterarguments.

In both scenarios, information has been obtained, yet the substantive quality of understanding remains indeterminate. The Nyāya philosophical tradition's differentiation between an instrument of knowledge and authentic cognition provides a valuable analytical framework. It prompts the scholar to examine not simply whether information has been transmitted but whether the resulting cognitive state is sufficiently justified.

Contemporary revaluation of knowledge must therefore incorporate systematic inquiry into evidentiary foundations, interpretive comprehension, and rigorous analytical assessment.

This does not necessitate that all learning endeavours entail autonomous verification of each individual fact. Humans necessarily rely upon educators, subject matter specialists, institutional structures, and authoritative accounts. Rather, it signifies that judicious engagement with information demands careful consideration of source credibility and the epistemological character of the proposition in question.

A philosophical framework for understanding knowledge can therefore enhance contemporary information literacy practices by fostering deliberation regarding the justification for accepting a claim, the supporting evidence, and the circumstances under which modification may become necessary.

6.2 Misinformation and the Evaluation of Claims

Misinformation demonstrates the distinction between the dissemination of a proposition and the verification of its accuracy.

Consider a statement distributed across social media platforms claiming that a specific food provides a cure for a severe medical condition. Numerous individuals propagate this message, and various users indicate that they regard it as factually correct.

The quantity of individuals disseminating the message does not validate the medical assertion. Anecdotal evidence may contribute to comprehending a particular person's circumstances, but it cannot independently substantiate the efficacy or safety of a therapeutic intervention.

An examination informed by Nyāya philosophy would separate the proposition from the justifications presented in support of it. It would investigate whether the assertion is grounded in suitable evidence, whether the logical reasoning is valid, and whether the testimony demonstrates dependability for the specific context.

The four pramāṇas acknowledged by Nyāya should not be directly transposed onto contemporary scientific methodologies. Nonetheless, their framework offers a historical precedent for systematic investigation into the various mechanisms through which individuals obtain knowledge.

In modern contexts, this approach can foster a rigorous methodology for assessing information: determine the origin, scrutinize the evidence, separate empirical observation from logical deduction, and evaluate whether the inference is supported by the accessible information.

The significance of this relationship resides not in asserting that Nyāya furnishes a comprehensive contemporary verification mechanism, but in illustrating that the philosophical inquiry into reliable knowledge acquisition maintains pertinence to the critical assessment of propositions.

6.3 Education Beyond Examination and Employment

The distinction between parā vidyā and aparā vidyā generates significant considerations regarding the fundamental objectives of educational initiatives. Contemporary educational institutions serve numerous critical functions. They disseminate specialized knowledge, cultivate professional competencies, prepare individuals for occupational pursuits, and facilitate scientific, technological, and cultural advancement. A society necessitates trained professionals, rigorous scholarship, and the dependable transmission of disciplinary knowledge.

Nevertheless, education also raises more expansive inquiries. What should learners accomplish with the knowledge they obtain? How should they evaluate competing assertions? How should they comprehend the ethical ramifications of their actions? What connection should subsist between technical proficiency and the overarching purposes of human existence?

The Upaniṣadic distinction provides one philosophical avenue into these inquiries. It emphasizes the possibility that specialized learning and investigation into ultimate reality represent distinct dimensions of knowledge.

In a contemporary educational framework, this comparison may prompt institutions and scholars to contemplate the interconnection between professional competence, intellectual development, ethical reasoning, and philosophical investigation.It would be misleading to assert that the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad furnishes a preformulated curriculum for modern universities. Its categorization emerges within a particular religious and metaphysical framework. Its relevance to contemporary discourse is hermeneutical: it furnishes a historical lens through which the purposes and boundaries of specialized learning can be scrutinized.

6.4 Knowledge, Ethical Responsibility and Human Conduct

Knowledge is frequently assessed according to its tangible consequences. A technological innovation may be deemed effective because it enhances operational efficiency, whereas a scientific breakthrough may be valued because it expands the scope of human capability.

However, the capacity to perform an action does not inherently establish whether that action ought to be performed.Technical knowledge admits application toward constructive or destructive ends. Specialized competence may advance collective welfare, yet it may equally be deployed with disregard for consequences. Scientific and professional expertise consequently engenders inquiries concerning the nexus between knowledge acquisition and its application.

The Bhagavadgītā's examination of knowledge in conjunction with disciplined practice and personal

transformation furnishes a philosophical framework for understanding this relationship.

Should knowledge be construed exclusively as information possession or task execution capability, its moral significance risks being disregarded. Should knowledge be simultaneously analysed in relation

to judgment and behavioural choices, then considerations of accountability become integral to the inquiry. Consider a specialist possessing comprehension of digital system manipulation who confronts the determination of whether a specific application would transgress privacy protections or inflict injury. Technical proficiency delineates what is feasible; ethical deliberation facilitates assessment of what is morally appropriate. These two investigative approaches maintain correlation yet remain conceptually distinct.

Sanskrit philosophical examination can offer substantive contribution by investigating the proper alignment of knowledge with discernment, accountability, and the fundamental objectives of human endeavour. Such contribution requires development via rigorous textual examination rather than through presumption that all Sanskrit philosophical texts advance identical ethical frameworks.

6.5 Metaphysical Knowledge and the Limits of Reductionism

Contemporary epistemological practices are frequently organized around inquiries that can be quantified, empirically validated, or operationalized within circumscribed fields of study. Such methodologies have generated considerable progress in scientific and technological comprehension.

Nevertheless, human inquiry extends to fundamental questions regarding consciousness, being, selfhood, and the nature of ultimate reality. These inquiries have been pursued through diverse approaches by philosophical traditions, empirical researchers, and religious frameworks.

The metaphysical dimensions inherent in Sanskrit philosophical systems offer valuable perspectives for addressing such fundamental questions.

Consider, for instance, the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad's articulation of parā vidyā as knowledge of the imperishable. This constitutes not merely an alternative category of empirical data; rather, it participates in a comprehensive examination of reality's fundamental character.

A contemporary critical evaluation may therefore examine whether all meaningful epistemological inquiries should be subsumed within the paradigm of accumulating quantifiable data.

This assessment demands intellectual rigor. Not all metaphysical propositions merit acceptance solely by virtue of their antiquity within established traditions, nor should scientific frameworks be rejected simply because they do not address every existential concern.

The more philosophically defensible position maintains that distinct categories of inquiry may necessitate distinct analytical methodologies. Empirical observation remains essential for assertions concerning measurable phenomena, whereas metaphysical claims demand rigorous philosophical scrutiny of their foundational premises, conceptual frameworks, and logical structures.

Sanskrit philosophical traditions exemplify such rigorous metaphysical investigation. Their contemporary relevance derives from the investigative questions they enable scholars to formulate and examine, rather than from an inherent capacity to definitively resolve contemporary intellectual disputes.

7. Toward a Multidimensional Understanding of Knowledge

The foregoing analysis indicates that contemporary conceptualizations of knowledge warrant reconsideration through multiple dimensions derived from significant Sanskrit philosophical traditions.

For purposes of systematic examination, these dimensions may be organized as follows-

- Dimension| Sanskrit concept or framework| Contemporary question
- Acquisition of knowledge| Pramāṇa| How do we substantiate our epistemic claims?
- Validity of cognition| Pramā and theories of error| What constitutes the distinction between warranted inference and erroneous perception?
- Structured learning| Aparā vidyā in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad| What are the capacities and constraints of specialized instruction?
- Metaphysical inquiry| Parā vidyā in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad| What methodological approach should govern investigations into fundamental reality?
- Self-understanding| Ātmajñāna in selected Upaniṣadic contexts| Does intellectual accomplishment suffice without introspective examination of one's own nature?
- Transformation and conduct| Knowledge in the Bhagavadgītā| In what manner should comprehension inform deliberation and behaviour?

This represents an analytical construction developed for this scholarly work. It neither constitutes a traditional Sanskrit epistemological taxonomy nor suggests that the constituent concepts derive from a unified philosophical tradition.

8. CRITICAL DISCUSSION: POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS

The re-examination of jñāna within Sanskrit philosophical traditions presents multiple avenues for contemporary scholarly investigation.

First, it furnishes historical context to ongoing debates regarding the nature of knowledge. Contemporary concerns about epistemic validity, the trustworthiness of authoritative

sources, and the demarcation between knowledge and ignorance possess substantial historical precedent in classical philosophical discourse.

Second, it promotes a more nuanced conceptualization of intellectual development. The philosophical differentiation between domain-specific knowledge and knowledge pertaining to ultimate reality demonstrates how a comprehensive philosophical system may examine distinct epistemological objectives.

Third, it highlights the interconnection between knowledge acquisition and the knowing subject. Pertinent passages from the Upanishads and the Bhagavadgītā encourage examination of whether knowledge constitutes merely an intellectual asset or whether it encompasses dimensions of self-awareness and personal transformation.

Fourth, it facilitates possibilities for cross-disciplinary engagement. Sanskrit philosophical systems warrant comparative analysis with contemporary epistemology, pedagogical theory, information science, and moral philosophy, contingent upon rigorous conceptual clarification.

Conversely, significant constraints warrant recognition.

The initial constraint pertains to the heterogeneity of Sanskrit philosophical schools. Nyāya, Vedānta, and analogous philosophical systems present divergent formulations concerning knowledge, ontology, and liberation. Their respective conceptual frameworks cannot be synthesized without rigorous examination of their fundamental divergences.

The subsequent constraint involves temporal and cultural specificity. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad's categorization of parā vidyā and aparā vidyā emerges from a distinctive metaphysical and soteriological context. Direct equivalence with the contemporary dichotomy between professional training and general education in modern academic institutions remains problematic.

The tertiary constraint addresses the philosophical status of metaphysical propositions. The articulation of ultimate reality within a traditional philosophical framework does not acquire empirical validation solely through its formulation in Sanskrit textual sources. Its philosophical

The third limitation pertains to the analysis of metaphysical propositions. The mere articulation of traditional metaphysical framework within a Sanskrit textual source does not confer empirical validation upon it. One must carefully separate its philosophical relevance from the distinct question of whether a given assertion can substantiated through empirical investigation.

The fourth constraint addresses contemporary relevance and applicability. This examination offers conceptual parallels and theoretical comparisons; however, it does not furnish empirical data demonstrating that the incorporation of Sanskrit epistemological frameworks enhances pedagogical achievement or mitigates the dissemination of false information. Such assertions would necessitate independent investigative methodologies and corresponding empirical substantiation.

Finally, the process of translation constitutes a significant methodological obstacle. Terminology including jñāna, vidyā, pramā and pramāṇa frequently lack precise linguistic counterparts in the English language. Their semantic content must be ascertained through examination of textual contexts, philosophical applications and interpretive traditions rather than derived from isolated translation choices.Acknowledging these constraints reinforces the overall thesis. The objective of this reassessment is not to demonstrate that Sanskrit philosophical traditions possess universal applicability, but rather to delineate their specific contributions, define their analytical boundaries and specify the prerequisites for conducting rigorous comparative analysis.

9.CONCLUSION

The notion of jñāna constitutes a foundational framework for investigating the interconnections between Sanskrit philosophical traditions and modern society. The examined texts illustrate that epistemological inquiries transcend mere information gathering. Rather, they encompass the mechanisms by which knowledge is procured, the prerequisites for its legitimacy, the ontological status of reality, the conceptualization of consciousness, and the nexus between knowledge and ethical conduct.

The Nyāyasūtra's taxonomy of pramāṇas furnishes an analytical apparatus for understanding the establishment of knowledge. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad's dichotomy between parā vidyā and aparā vidyā prompts examination of divergent educational objectives and the interrelationship between disciplinary specialization and transcendent inquiry. The Bhagavadgītā's treatment of knowledge and the Upaniṣadic exploration of consciousness encourage deeper consideration of the epistemological transformation inherent in the knowing process.

These philosophical frameworks acquire contemporary significance when systematically applied to substantive contemporary challenges. The proliferation of false information necessitates critical evaluation of epistemic validity. Contemporary educational systems prompt reconsideration of the relationship between specialized expertise and comprehensive intellectual cultivation. Technological and professional advancement raises fundamental questions regarding moral accountability. The emphasis on external accomplishment necessitates reassessment of introspective development's role in human flourishing.

Such applications require rigorous philosophical scrutiny. Historical texts must not function as replacements for empirical scientific methodology, nor should heterogeneous Sanskrit philosophical schools be conflated into a homogeneous epistemological framework. Their significance resides in the philosophical inquiries, conceptual distinctions, and argumentative structures they provide for sustained intellectual examination. The principal

contribution of this reconsideration is thus the assertion that knowledge ought to be examined across multiple dimensions rather than construed exclusively as the accumulation of information. The substance of knowledge, the mechanisms through which it is acquired, the grounds for its acceptance, and the applications to which it is put constitute interconnected yet analytically distinct inquiries. A substantive dialogue between Sanskrit philosophical traditions and contemporary epistemological practices possesses considerable potential to advance understanding of these inquiries. Such dialogue neither necessitates the abandonment of modern knowledge systems nor the uncritical adoption of historical philosophical authority. Rather, it demands rigorous textual analysis, conceptual precision, and systematic comparative examination. In essence, reconsidering jñāna transcends the mere restoration of an historical definition. It constitutes an investigation into the enduring philosophical question of what constitutes knowledge—and whether the pursuit of knowledge acquires enhanced significance when its epistemic validity, instrumental purpose, and broader implications are evaluated in concert.

REFERENCES

1. Dasgupta, S. (1922–1955). *A History of Indian Philosophy. 5 vols.* Cambridge University Press.
2. *Gītā prabodhanī.* (n.d.). Gorakhpur: Gita press .
3. GOTAMA. (n.d.). *THE NYÂYA SUTRÂS OF GOTAMA.* Allahabad: THE PANINI OFFICE.
4. *īśāvāsyopaniṣad (sānuvāda śāṅkarabhāṣyasahita).* (n.d.). Gorakhpur: gita press.
5. kapoor, k., & Singh , A. K. (2003). *Indian Knowledge Systems (Volume-1).* Delhi: D.K. PRINTWORLD (P) LTD.
6. *kaṭhopaniṣad (sānuvada śāṅkarabhāṣyasahita).* (n.d.). Gorakhpur: Gita press.
7. Matilal, B. K. (n.d.). *An Essay on Classical Indian Theories of Knowledge.* . 1986.: Oxford University Press.
8. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad.* (n.d.). Gorakhpur: Gita presss.
9. Radhakrishnan, S. (1913). *trans. The Principal Upaniṣads.* london: George Allen & Unwin.
10. *THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ or The Song Divine.* (1956). Gorakhpur: Gita Press.