CHAPTER 3

COGNITIVE SCIENCE IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

Introduction

Modern psychology is scientific which makes its scope very limited. Human behavior is varied in its nature to a very high degree. Therefore it is not sufficient to fit it only in the framework of scientific approach. This gives rise to the necessity of studying indigenous psychology. The study of mind was always a concern of the Indian philosophy and psychology. Though the quest about mind has long been in India, but no interdisciplinary effort took place in Indian context. However, we can trace back the roots of cognitive science in the rich history of Indian culture, knowledge, philosophy and psychology. Indian philosophical ideas and theories play a crucial role in cognitive science. Various philosophical theories represent different traditions of exploring the mind. The ancient Indian texts are evident of the gradual development of mathematical, physical, linguistic, and psychological ideas. We find that the ancient Indians were greatly interested in cognitive science where they were so advanced that their insights may yet be useful to modern science.

Indian Philosophy

India has been a home for many diverse groups of people from all over the world from ancient times. Therefore Indian psyche is constituted of heterogeneous elements. It comprises of a mixture of beliefs and cultures. In Indian tradition, the four *Vedas*; 108 principal *Upanishads*; the six orthodox systems such as *Pûrva-Mîmânsâ, Uttara Mîmânsâ (Vedânta), Sâmkhya, Yoga, Nyâya, and Vaisesika*; the two heterodox systems—Jainism and Buddhism; *Dharma Sastra, Puranas, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Samhitas* and others are the repertoire of indigenous knowledge and constitute indigenous psychologies. These can be said as Wundt‘s ‒mental products‖, created by the ancient seers and sages, which serve as valuable lenses to understand the Indian psyche.

It is believed that the Vedas contain source of all knowledge—physical or metaphysical. They are the absolute mine containing knowledge repositories transcending time and space. They are considered as the supreme authority. Therefore, they had a profound influence upon one of the greatest and most ancient civilizations of the world. The word _Veda‘ literally, means knowledge or the ultimate

knowledge. The Vedic literature comprises of *Samhitas, Brahmanas, Aranyakas* and *Upanishads*. These literatures are considered to be direct revelations from God, embodying the supreme truth that could not be gained by any efforts of the human mind. Broadly, the Vedic scriptures comprise four great works, viz. *Rig Veda, Yajur Veda, Sama Veda* and *Atharava Veda*. *Upanishads* or *Vedanta* may be considered as the concluding parts of the Vedas. The philosophy of this school arose from where the Vedas ended, i.e., from the Upanishads. Sri Samkara's interpretation of it is considered to be the most powerful one, and his philosophy of *Advaitavada* is considered to be the representative of the Vedanta Philosophy. Vedanta believes in monism and its metaphysics is in accordance with this principle. They do not consider the world to be ultimately real.

The Buddhist school of philosophy came into being as a result of the enlightenment attained by Gautam Buddha. There are three central doctrines of the Buddhist philosophy which are well-recognized. The first doctrine is ‗the four Noble Truths'. The four noble truths are that there is misery, that there is a cause of misery, that there is cessation of misery, and that there is a path leading to the cessation of misery. The second doctrine is that of ‗*Pratityasamutpada'* or dependent origination. It says that everything in this world arises depending on the cause and is, therefore, impermanent. It is contained in the second noble truth. Buddha believed that suffering, which resulted due to ignorance, led to the endless cycles of birth and death. Only knowledge can break this cycle and liberate us. The third doctrine is well known as the Eight-fold Noble Path. It prescribes the following eight steps, which lead to enlightenment—right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration. This theory is contained in the fourth noble truth.

Jaina philosophy comes under the heterodox class of Indian philosophy, in the sense that it does not confirm *Vedas* as the ultimate authority. Realistic, relativistic, pluralistic, and atheistic are the qualities of the Jaina philosophy. It believes in the validity of perception, inference, and testimony as means of knowledge. It believes in *Syadavada*, or the theory of relativity of knowledge. They believe that reality has innumerable aspects. Human knowledge is finite and cannot comprehend them all. Therefore, our judgements can never be absolutely affirmative or negative but only relative, i.e., as viewed from a particular viewpoint out of the infinite possible ones.

Related to this doctrine is their theory of *Anekantavada*, i.e., the theory of plurality of reality, which asserted that reality is neither absolutely permanent nor constantly changing. It is permanent with respect to substance since matter exists forever, but qualities are its accidental features, which come into being and perish. The Jaina metaphysics is pluralistic and divides all substances into souls (*jiva*) and non-soul (*ajiva*), and both are separately and independently real. It lays great emphasis upon the principle and practice of equality. It has found expression in non-violence. Non-violence received supreme importance and wide and practical application in Jainism. Non violence consists in sincere and earnest exertion of oneself for the application of the principle of equality as far as possible in every field of life. It also deduced the law of *Karma* from the doctrine of equality of selves. The law of *karma* holds that all physical, mental and other distinctions between oneself and another are only adventitious, that is, due to karma, and not intrinsic. It maintains that the present is created in accordance with the past and that the future is created on the basis of the present.

The Samkhya School of philosophy was founded by Kapila. It believes in dualistic realism—the existence of two mutually independent ultimate realities, viz. *Prakrti* and *Purusa*. The essentially conscious *Purusa* is intelligent. It is the self, which is other than the body, the senses and the mind. It is a witness to the change going on in the world, but is itself eternal and not subject to change. Samkhya advocates the multiplicity of *Purusa. Prakrti* is unconscious and eternal. It is the first principle of the world. It is always changing and is meant to be enjoyed by the *Purusa*. It is constituted of the three *gunas* of *sattva, rajas,* and *tamas*, which are held in perfect equilibrium at the beginning of evolution. They consider earthly life as painful and liberation as cessation of all pain. Knowledge of distinction between the self and the not-self does not itself liberate us, but send us on the path of liberation, which is achieved through the spiritual training gained by the practice of Yoga.

Nyaya and Vaisesika schools are allied systems of philosophy. Both the schools have similar views on causation, God, and liberation, while differing on a few. Nyaya school of philosophy is believed to be founded by Gotama while Vaiseshika was founded by Kanada. Nyaya subscribes to atomistic pluralism and logical realism. It asserts that there is suffering because the soul is in bondage due to ignorance of reality. The only way to end this suffering is by attaining liberation through

knowledge. Therefore, Nyaya undertakes to establish the right ways of knowing. Vaiseshika is devoted primarily to metaphysics and ontology. It found its epistemological and logical counterpart in Nyaya. Considering how important the right knowledge of reality is for liberation, Vaiseshika devotes itself to the exposition of reality.

Mimansa school of philosophy was founded by Jaimini. It aimed at providing reasons in defense and favour of the ritualism prescribed by the *Vedas*. Their entire epistemology and metaphysics is formed to support this aim. They contend that the *Vedas* are self-existing and eternal. They are free of error and we should submit to their authority without questions. They claim that the rituals mentioned in the *Vedas*, when performed without prejudice, destroy the *karmas* and lead to liberation after death. Apart from the reality of the physical world, they also insist on the reality of the souls. The soul is considered to be immortal. There is no place for God in the Mimamsa philosophy. There is a shift from their idea of liberation as attainment of bliss to liberation as cessation of suffering.

Yoga School of philosophy was founded by Patanjali. It was closely allied with Samkhya, and accepts its epistemology and metaphysics. Yoga may be regarded as the practical side of Samkhya philosophy. It believes that discriminative knowledge (i.e. *vivekajnana*) is necessary for liberation and it can be attained through the practice of Yoga. There are eight steps prescribed for its practice, which emphasize internal and external cleansing, self-discipline physical fitness, and meditation, which result in alertness and mental strength.

Cognitive Science in Indian Philosophy

Cognitive science was born in the western countries as a well-established discipline in the 1950s, but we can surely find its traces in the Indian knowledge system long back. The ancient Indian texts are evident that the study of mind has always been interesting for the Indian philosophers and psychologists. The pillars of the Indian philosophy such as the *Vedas* and the Indian schools of philosophy have interpreted about mind in various ways. Therefore, an attempt to trace the roots of cognitive science in the Indian philosophical system and the way they have described about the role, place and importance of our mind is inevitable in discussing the history of cognitive science.

In traditional Indian thought, psychology was never a subject independent of philosophy. Jadunath Sinha was the first scholar to attempt a constructive survey of Indian psychology. According to him, Indian psychology was based on introspection and observation. It was not empirical or experimental, but was based on metaphysics. He discussed the nature of cognition, perception and emotion in the light of various schools of Indian philosophy like Buddhism, Jainism, Samkhya, Vedanta, etc. He regarded cognition to be one of the three fundamental modes of consciousness, the other two being affection and conation. Sensation, perception, memory, imagination and thinking are the kinds of cognition.

Indian psychology regards mind to be very powerful. But difference lies among individuals in using the powers of mind. It is because some individuals are not aware of their power of mind. Some people are aware of it but are not able to express their power of mind, because of weak will power and disintegrated emotions. Thus, it relates mind with emotions. Swami Vivekananda was one of those philosophers who regarded mind as an important factor of an individual‘s life. He considered mind to be an infinite library of the universe, as the source of all knowledge in the world is the mind. But sometimes it is covered, and when it is slowly discovered, it is called as the process of learning. According to him, the mind is the subtle part of the body.

According to Indian psychology, the mind is the instrument of perception. It believes that an unstable and unsteady mind cannot perceive things correctly. The behavior patterns of an individual are affected by their mental conditions. To realize the ultimate truth, a stronger mental development than the ordinary mental health is required. A transparent mind is required to see the reflection of our soul or the real or higher self. An idealistic civilization is possible only when the mind is focused on the permanent reality within us. Indian psychologists say that the primary objective of life is the ultimate realization of the divinity of man, or the manifestation of the divinity that is already in him (as said by Swami Vivekananda). According to Patanjali, there are five states of mind: *kshipta* (extreme restless state when the mind has tension and many emotional conflicts and longings); *mura* (inert stage in which the mind has lower conscious and unconscious passions, such as anger, lust and so forth); *vikshipta* (state in which the mind is partly concentrated at times); *ekagra* (concentrated state); niruddha (superconscious state). These states of mind have been explained by Swami Vivekananda as (Akhilananda, 1952):

> *The Chitta (mind) manifests itself in the following forms—scattering, darkening, gathering, one-pointed and concentrated. The scattering form is activity. Its tendency is to manifest in the form of pleasure or pain. The "darkening" form is dullness which tends to injury… The "gathering" form is when it struggles to centre itself. The "one-pointed" form is when it tries to concentrate and the concentrated form is what brings us to Samadhi*.

Indian psychologists recognize that although the present condition of mind is created by the past thoughts and actions, the present changed mode of living and thinking effectively transforms the mind.

Though there are differences of opinion among the different schools of Indian philosophy regarding the sources of cognition or knowledge, all the systems of Indian philosophy have emphasized perception as the source of valid cognition or knowledge. For the Charvaka philosophy, perception is regarded as the only source of valid cognition. The Buddhist and the Vaisesika philosophy accept both perception and inference as sources of knowledge. The Samkhya philosophy accepts perception, inference, and verbal testimony; the Nyāya accepts perception, inference, comparison, and verbal testimony. The Mimansa philosophy accepts presumption in addition to the four sources accepted by the Nyāya. Another school of Mimansa and the Advaita Vedanta accept non-apprehension (*anupalabdhi*) in addition to the previous five sources of knowledge. The Jaina philosophy accepts two more sources of valid cognition, namely, the use of a type of counterfactual conditional, and memory (Shaw, n.d.).

If we attempt to trace cognitive science in Indian psychology, we have to take hold of its roots in the diverse traditions of knowledge deliberated upon in various texts (*Shastra*), as well as the practices, artifacts and meanings embodied in various forms (Dalal & Misra, 2010). It is a result of rigorous observation, experimentation and reflection, continuous contemplation and sharing of personal accounts of inner experiences. It is dynamic, progressive and self-determined.

Cognitive science in Vedic Philosophy

The *Vedas* deal with the knowledge framework from a holistic perspective with universal application. The *Vedas* present different dimensions of knowledge encompassing *Jnana, Vijnana, Samjnana and Prajnana.* In Vedic view, the mind and the outer world is complementary in nature. This complementary nature makes it possible for our minds to comprehend the universe. In the *Katha Upanishad* and the *Bhagavad Gita*, the mind is called as the driver who holds the reins to the horses (senses), but next to the mind sits the true observer, the self (Kak, 1997). Yajnavalakya estimated long before Plato the importance of intuition. Intuition may be distinguished as pre-reflective and post-reflective, sub-conceptual and supra-conceptual, and sub-mental and supra-mental. The *Upanishads* throw much light on the development of vital and higher mental intuition, but their great services lie in going beyond them and in emphasizing supra-mental intuitions. According to *Samkara Vedanta*, cognition is not perceived by another cognition but by itself. Thus, it is self-luminous. A mental mode may either apprehend an external object, when it is modified into the object, or it may apprehend itself. There is direct and immediate consciousness of a cognition; a cognition is directly apprehended by itself. Moreover, a cognition cannot be the object of another cognition as a cognition is not of the nature of an unconscious object. A cognition is conscious, while an object is unconscious. They believe in six means of valid knowledge, viz. perception, inference, comparison, testimony, presumption, and non-cognition. As the Vedas cover extensively the various dimensions of mind, knowledge and intellect, they are of vital importance for proper research in the domain of cognitive science.

Cognitive science in Buddhist Philosophy

The Buddhist tradition has throughout its history given attention to the workings of mind. For example, the *Dhammapada*, discusses about the power one‘s perception of a situation has in determining the emotional quality one experiences in that situation. Understanding the working of mind is considered important to progress on the path and the achievement of awakening (*bodhi*) (Payne, 2002). Throughout Buddhist thought, one frequently finds the phrase ‒body, speech, and mind‖ which describes the existential totality of human beings. This view can be understood as emphasizing the embodied nature of human existence, establishing at least a prima facie similarity

with the embodied-enactive approach to cognitive science. Buddhism believes in perception and inference as the means of valid knowledge. It also believes in testimony, but reduces it to inference. Buddha recommended avoiding extremes and following the middle path, which leads to knowledge, enlightenment, and, consequently, nirvana or liberation.

Nagarjuna, the famous Buddhist monk believes in the acquisition of knowledge through the six sensory organs—eye, ear, tongue, skin, nose and the mind. The first five senses are the gates of our knowledge of the outside world. These senses strictly confine themselves to their own particular spheres and do not overlap each other. The *Abhidhamma Pitaka* upholds the view that pure sensation is vague and hazy. To have a correct knowledge of the world around us, the mind must be active. Boundary line for the things perceived must be set resulting in perception followed by imagination. The Buddhist philosophy believes that cognition is self-luminous; it apprehends itself but not an external object as there is no such object. Cognition is not apprehended by the self because there is no self at all.

Cognitive science in Jain Philosophy

In Jaina philosophy, *jnana* is an intrinsic property of the *Jiva*. As such the process of knowing must be interpreted to be the process of the manifestation of the intrinsic nature of the *Jiva. Jnana* or knowledge is of five different kinds according to the stages of the spiritual development of the soul, viz. *mati, sruta, avadhi, manah-paryaya and kevala*. *Mati jnana* refers to the ordinary process of sense experience. *Sruta jnana* is the knowledge revealed by the scripture. *Avadhi jnana* corresponds to what is known as clairvoyance. It is a kind of extra sensory perception, not ordinarily available to all persons, though it is latent in everyone. *Manah-paryaya jnana* refers to the knowledge of thoughts in other minds. *Kevala jnana* refers to the infinite knowledge which the soul attains as the result of complete liberation or *moksa* (Chakravarti, 1958).

According to the Jaina philosophy, cognition is perceived by itself in apprehending its object; it is not perceived by any other cognition. Manikya Nandi defines valid knowledge as the determinate cognition of itself and an object, which has been known before. It has practical efficiency and pragmatic utility. It apprehends itself and an object as it really is. It believes that cognition in itself is valid, since it cannot

contradict itself. It is valid or invalid in relation to its object. Valid knowledge is of two kinds—immediate knowledge and mediate knowledge. Immediate knowledge is distinct consisting apprehension of an object with its specific qualities without the mediation of any other knowledge. Mediate knowledge is indistinct, devoid of perceptual vividness.

Cognitive science in Samkhya Philosophy

According to Samkhya, knowledge involves four factors: the knower (*pramatr*), the known (*prameya*), the means of knowledge (*pramana*) and the valid knowledge (*prama*). Kapila defines valid knowledge as determinate knowledge of an object not known before. According to Vijnanabikshu, the pure self is the knower (*pramatr*); the mode of *buddhi* modified into the form of the object is the means of knowledge (*pramana*); relfection of the mode of *buddhi* with the form of the object in the self is valid knowledge (*prama*); the object apprehended by the mode of *buddhi* reflected in the self is the known (*prameya*). The knowledge of the self, which is the result of the mode of *buddhi*, is valid knowledge.

The organs of sight, hearing, touch, taste and smell are the gates of our knowledge. Samkhya accepts three sources of valid knowledge: Perception, inference and scriptural testimony. It believes that the *manas* (mind), the *Mahat* (intellect=*buddhi*) and the *purusha* play a role in _producing' knowledge. *Mahat* evolves as a result of predominance of *sattva*. Since it is an evolute of *Prakriti*, it is made of matter. But it has psychological, intellectual aspect known as *buddhi* or intellect. *Mahat* or intellect helps man in judgment and discrimination. It helps to distinguish between the subject and the object. *Mahat*, by its inherent association with *sattva*, possesses qualities like luminosity and reflectivity. *Manas* or the mind in co-ordination with the sense-organs, receives impressions from the external world, transforms them into determinate perceptions and conveys them to the experiencer or the ego. These percepts are carried to the *Mahat*. By its own applications, *Mahat* gets modified. *Mahat* takes the form of the particular object. This transformation of *Mahat* is known as *vritti* or modification of *buddhi*. A cognition is considered as a psychic function or a function of the psyche or *buddhi*. Therefore, a cognition cannot apprehend itself; nor can it apprehend an object. It is apprehended by the self. It is the self that apprehends an object, and apprehends the cognition of the object.

Cognitive science in Nyaya-Vaisesika Philosophy

According to the Nyaya-Vaisesika philosophy, cognition is an object of perception; but it is not perceived by itself but by another cognition through the internal organ mind, just as we perceive an external perception through the external senses. Gautama holds in his *Nyayasutra* that we derive particular knowledge of things through perceptions arising from specific organs (Dasgupta, 1949). The *pramanas* are the means by which individuals attain accurate cognition. The four *pramanas* are perception, inference, analogical reasoning, and testimony (Dasti, 2012). Perceptual cognition arises by means of the connection between sense faculty and object, is not dependent on words, is non-deviating, and is determinate. The absence of simultaneous cognition from all of the senses indicates the presence of a faculty—the *manas*—which governs selective attention. It processes the information of the senses and governs mnemonic retrieval and apperceptive awareness of mental states. An inferential cognition is preceded by perception. The fundamental characteristic of inferential cognition is that it is a cognition which follows from another cognition owing to their being conceptually connected in some way. Analogy makes an object known by similarity with something already known. Testimony is the assertion of a qualified speaker of information apprehended by the initial cognition to an epistemically responsible hearer. Nyaya epistemologists speak of cognition (*jnana*, *buddhi*, *upalabdhi*, *pratyaya*) as generally immediate awareness states of a mind-independent (according to Nyaya) external reality. Ontologically, cognitions are considered properties (*gunas*) of individual selves (*atmans*). Memory dispositions, when triggered, generate cognition about the past.

The Vaisesika agrees with the Nyaya in its doctrines of valid knowledge (*prama*) and its extrinsic validity and invalidity. It accepts only perception and inference as valid independent pramanas. It reduces comparison and verbal testimony to inference.Valid knowledge is what apprehends the real nature of its object. Invalid knowledge is what apprehends an object as it is not in its real nature. Validity of knowledge is produced by the excellence (*guna*) of its causes and invalidity of knowledge is produced by the defects (*dosa*) of its causes. The Vaisesika, like the Nyaya, adopts the realistic test of correspondence of knowledge with its object and the pragmatic test of practical efficiency.

Cognitive Science in Yoga Philosophy

The Yoga philosophy calls it *citta*, what is called *Mahat* or *Buddhi* in Samkhya. *Citta* stands for all that is psychological in man and is the seat of all experiences and repository of their residual effects (Paranjpe, 1984). It may be generally translated as the mind as it refers to the living principles of human life, the senses, the ego and the intellect.

The Yoga philosophy advocates realism. It holds that external objects are real. They are apprehended as they are in themselves by mental modes. There is correspondence between the mental modes and their object. The modes of *buddhi* are modified into their forms. The forms of cognitions correspond to the forms of their objects. Novelty, correspondence, non-contradiction and serviceability are the marks of truth. The *pramanas* are the means of valid knowledge. Patanjali, like the Samkhya, recognizes three *pramanas*—perception, inference and testimony.

According to the *Yoga Sutras of Patanjali* "the stilling of the changing states of the mind" is Yoga (Bryant, 2009). It is believed that we are essentially an all-perfect entity totally free from any imperfection and not subject to any undesirable, imperfect, negative experience whatsoever. The subject-matter of the science of Yoga is how to give back to us once again that perfect state in which we are always there. The imperfect-experience condition which is distressing, going up and down, arises due to our association with *Prakriti* or Nature that is ever unsteady. *Prakriti* is made up of many things—the five elements, the *Prana*, the senses, and the mind in its different modes, each mode having its own variations. This association with *Prakriti* has to be broken to regain the independent status of everlasting joy. The philosophy of Yoga provides solution for this. The first two steps of Raja Yoga given by Patanjali are clear indications of the emphasis of Indian psychology. *Yama* (ethical observation and mental control) and *niyama* (physical cleansing and dietetic restrictions and some forms of mental training) are purificatory processes for higher mental development (Akhilananda, 1952).

The mind has got many variations—*Vasanas, Samskaras*, imaginations, anger, passion, greed, hatred, envy, jealousy, worry, selfishness, attachment. The intellect has its own variations—clear perception, unclear perception and wrong perception.

According to the Yoga Sutra, varieties in perception of a single object depend upon the varieties of the constitution of minds. The various stresses through which the minds of individuals pass determine the variety in cognition and perception of objects. This may be due to the variety in the nature of the minds themselves. This means the impression formed by the object upon minds is not always uniform on account of the different receptive capacities of the perceiving minds. The moods of the mind – the *vrittis* of the *manas* – influence the reaction which they set up in respect of the impress that the object makes upon them, so that even if the object is the same, the perceptions and cognitions may be variegated.

Cognitive Science in Mimansa Philosophy

Mimansa philosophy attaches a lot of importance to the verbal testimony. Jaimni accepts the ‗word' or the ‗*shabda'* as the only means of knowledge which is necessarily the Vedic word (according to Jaimini). This system strongly contends that since the Vedas are *apaurusheya* (not authored by an individual), they manifest their own validity. There are two schools of Mimamsa philosophy—the Prabhakara School and the Kumarila school. The Prabhakara School accepts the validity of perception, inference, comparison, testimony, and postulation. Prabhakara also regards apprehension (*anubhuti*) as a means of valid knowledge. He identifies *pramana* with *prama* (valid knowledge), and regards cognition as manifesting itself, and not as inferable from the cognizedness of its object. According to him, all cognitions as cognitions are valid, and their invalidity is due to their disagreement with the nature of their objects. The Kumarila school adds non-cognition to this list of *pramanas*. It regards a cognition as a means of valid knowledge (*pramana*) because it is apprehension. Kumarila regards cognizedness (*jnatata*) produced by a cognitive act as its result (Sinha, 1985). According to him, novelty, non-contradiction and correspondence with the object are the tests of truth. He recognizes the intrinsic validity and the extrinsic invalidity of knowledge. The validity of knowledge arises from the essential nature of its causes unaffected by defects, and is known by the knowledge itself. Savara and Kumarila recognize six *pramanas* viz. perception, inference, comparison, testimony, presumption and non-apprehension.

Conclusion

Thus we can see that the Indian philosophy and psychology have long ago described what cognitive science endeavors to discuss in modern times. The concepts of cognitive science are weaved in the Indian philosophy and psychology. We can find a lot of discussion on cognition, though the term _cognitive science‘ was not in use. The *Vedas* have emphasized on the intuitive knowledge and have elaborate discussions on intuition, mind and intellect. The Buddhist philosophy has also registered mind as the sixth sense which allows us to have correct knowledge of the world. It has emphasized on imagination after perception. The Jaina philosophy has interpreted knowledge as the intrinsic property of the individual. Samkhya philosophy also believes that mind and intellect plays a great role in producing knowledge. The Nyaya philosophy holds that the mind processes the information carried by the senses. The Yoga philosophy believes that different nature and constitution of mind leads to differences in perception of the external world.

The Vedanta, the Buddhist and the Mimamsa philosophy regarded cognition as self-luminous. But according to the Vedanta, a cognition cognizes itself and according to the Buddhist, a cognition is not apprehended by any other cognition and Mimamsa believes that cognition is not inferable from the cognizedness of its object. While Samkhya and Nyaya-Vaisesika believes that cognition is not perceived by itself, according to Jainism, cognition is perceived by itself in apprehending its object. According to Yoga philosophy, our mind cognizes the objects as it really is.

An elaborate study of the Indian philosophy reveals that every major problem in cognitive science, from the nature of subjectivity to the possibility of conscious computers is casted differently in Indian approach to cognitive science. Now the question is to engage with the issue of how Indian philosophy will transform the practice of cognitive science. Indian philosophy based cognitive science should break the co-dependence of cognitive science with syntactic symbolic metaphors as well as mechanical technologies. According to the Indian philosophies, knowledge can be part of our nature and yet be utterly grounded in experience. It can be noted that the basically empiricist attitude of Indian philosophy almost avoids the _rationalist-empiricist divide‘ that prevail in modern western philosophy and cognitive science.

The field of cognitive science can be taken to deeper understanding based on the Indian philosophical concepts.

In Indian philosophical perspective, knowledge is considered as an integrated concept. It is an action or reaction or response to a particular situation with a view to face the challenges of the life. Therefore, knowledge cannot be fragmented or partial. The information can never be considered as knowledge in Indian philosophical perspective. Further, information is converted into knowledge when it is manifested with understanding. Again the level of understanding may vary from individual to individual. The cognitive science deals with that level of understanding. Again, knowledge merges into wisdom. Here the question comes—‗Can wisdom be transformed or transmitted?' Certainly, the answer is no. Logical analysis reveals that if the connotative concept is increased the denotation is decreased. The Indian philosophy looked into knowledge as *vidya* and there are two types of *vidya* such as *apara vidya* and *para vidya*. *Apara vidya* can be equated with knowledge, even with wisdom. But *para vidya* is the highest or supreme knowledge which has neither substitute nor any procedure to measure it. If we look into cognitive science in tune with the development of memory and understanding or image through the light of the Indian philosophy then we think, a comprehensive idea can emerge which can resolve the debates among the various schools of cognitive sciences.