

Indian Knowledge Systems and the History of Science: Knowledge, Methods and Scientific Traditions

Somenath Chatterjee, Sayantan Roy, Kushal Chakraborty, Tuhin Chatterjee

Swami Vivekananda Centre for Multidisciplinary Research in Basic Sciences and Social Sciences,
Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Centenary College, Rahara, Kolkata- 700118, West Bengal, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11090153>

Received: 04 October 2026; Accepted: 09 October 2026; Published: 23 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS) encompass a wide and historically layered range of intellectual traditions that developed across the Indian subcontinent. They include astronomy, mathematics, medicine, linguistics, philosophy, logic, metallurgy, architecture and other forms of technical and practical knowledge. These traditions were shaped through observation, calculation, reasoning, textual composition, oral instruction, commentary and sustained processes of transmission.

This paper examines selected scientific traditions within the broader framework of IKS and asks how knowledge was produced, transmitted, assessed and transformed in pre-modern India. Particular attention is given to astronomy and mathematics, where systematic observation, numerical computation, geometrical reasoning, calendrical practice and the construction of astronomical models provide valuable evidence for the study of historical scientific activity. The paper also considers the importance of Sanskrit and other intellectual languages, manuscript cultures, and teacher–student relationships in preserving and developing technical knowledge. It argues that a critical engagement with Indian scientific traditions can enrich the global history of science by bringing different historical cultures of inquiry into conversation, while maintaining a clear distinction between pre-modern knowledge traditions and the methods and institutions of modern science.

Keywords: Indian Knowledge Systems; History of Science; Indian Scientific Traditions; Sanskrit Scientific Literature; Manuscripts; Scientific Method

INTRODUCTION

The expression “Indian Knowledge Systems” may be used broadly to describe the diverse intellectual traditions that developed and evolved across the Indian subcontinent over a long period of time. These traditions encompassed theoretical, practical, philosophical and technical forms of knowledge, including astronomy, mathematics, medicine, linguistics, grammar, logic, philosophy, metallurgy, architecture, agriculture and environmental knowledge. They were articulated and transmitted through several languages and media, including written texts, oral traditions, commentaries, pedagogical practices and material forms of knowledge.

The Indian intellectual landscape was never a single, uniform tradition. Different schools and communities worked with distinct philosophical assumptions, epistemological principles, technical vocabularies, methods and objectives. The term “knowledge systems” is useful precisely because it directs attention away from isolated achievements and towards the processes by which knowledge was produced, organized, taught and transmitted. A mathematical procedure, an astronomical calculation or a medical classification therefore needs to be studied within the intellectual and historical setting in which it was formulated and used.

A striking feature of many Indian knowledge traditions is their multidimensional and interdisciplinary character. Astronomy, for example, was closely connected with mathematics, calendrical computation and observation. Architectural and related technical traditions drew upon geometry, measurement and practical knowledge of materials and construction. Yet recognizing these connections should not lead to the assumption that all forms of knowledge belonged to a single unified framework. Historical distinctions among disciplines, schools and intellectual traditions remain essential to responsible scholarship.

The relationship between traditional knowledge and science is one of the central methodological questions in the study of IKS. Traditional knowledge is often associated with knowledge transmitted across generations through cultural practices, texts and instruction, whereas modern science is associated with specialized institutions, systematic observation, experimentation, mathematical formulation, critical scrutiny and reproducibility. Historically, however, the boundary is more complicated. Not every traditional practice should be classified as science in the modern sense, but neither should a body of knowledge be dismissed as non-scientific simply because it developed before modern scientific institutions emerged. An astronomical computation, for instance, should first be understood within the conceptual and mathematical framework of its own period before it is compared with modern astronomy.

The study of IKS is significant for the history of science because scientific knowledge has never developed along a single geographical or civilizational trajectory. A history of science confined to one historical pathway cannot adequately represent the diversity of human practices of inquiry. Indian astronomy and mathematics provide substantial material for a more geographically inclusive history, while manuscripts and commentarial traditions offer evidence for the ways in which technical knowledge was preserved, interpreted and transformed.

At the same time, contemporary discussions of IKS face an important danger: retrospective interpretation. Modern scientific concepts are sometimes projected onto historical texts, and isolated statements are treated as direct equivalents of modern theories. Such readings can obscure the terminology, conceptual framework and purpose of the original work.

A critical historical approach is therefore necessary. Primary texts should be read in their linguistic and historical contexts, and their terminology should not automatically be equated with modern scientific concepts. Developments should be traced chronologically rather than treating earlier and later texts as parts of a single undifferentiated tradition. The methods by which knowledge was generated—observation, measurement, calculation, inference, classification and prediction—deserve as much attention as the conclusions themselves. Claims of intellectual influence or transmission between cultures should rest on chronological, textual and historical evidence rather than on resemblance alone. Finally, both achievements and limitations should be acknowledged. Such critical scrutiny does not diminish Indian traditions; it allows their historical significance to be understood more precisely.

The central problem addressed in this paper is therefore how IKS can be studied as historically situated traditions of knowledge without either glorifying the past retrospectively or dismissing it through inappropriate modern categories. The significance of these traditions lies not simply in the antiquity of particular texts or in claims about isolated discoveries. It also lies in the processes through which knowledge was observed, organized, calculated, transmitted, debated, revised and transformed. Studied in this way, Indian scientific traditions become part of a broader comparative history of human knowledge while retaining their distinctive historical contexts.

KNOWLEDGE AND SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

Knowledge is a broader category than scientific knowledge. It may include ways of understanding the natural world, human society, language, ethics, philosophy, health, technology and lived experience. Scientific knowledge represents one particular mode of inquiry, generally characterized by systematic investigation, observation, measurement, logical reasoning, explanatory models and critical evaluation. This distinction is important when historical knowledge traditions are examined, because not every form of knowledge can—or should—be classified as science.

Within the Indian intellectual world, knowledge extended well beyond the investigation of physical phenomena. Philosophical reflection, linguistic analysis, ethical reasoning, spiritual disciplines, medicine, astronomy, mathematics and practical technologies all formed part of the wider landscape of learning. Consequently, the sharp division between the sciences and the humanities familiar in modern universities does not always provide an adequate framework for interpreting pre-modern Indian intellectual life.

Recognizing the breadth of Indian knowledge traditions, however, does not mean that every traditional practice should be described as scientific. This distinction is especially important in astronomy and mathematics.

Astronomical knowledge involved the observation of celestial phenomena, the measurement of time, mathematical computation and the construction of predictive schemes. These activities can be studied as historical forms of scientific inquiry without claiming that they were identical to modern astronomy.

The more productive historical question is therefore not simply whether an ancient Indian text can be labelled “scientific” by contemporary standards. We should instead ask what counted as reliable knowledge within a particular intellectual tradition, which methods were used to obtain it, and how claims were transmitted, tested, modified and applied.

TRADITIONAL CATEGORIES OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

Indian intellectual traditions developed a variety of classifications of knowledge. These classifications differed across texts, philosophical schools and historical periods and should not be reduced to a single universal scheme.

One significant distinction appears in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, which differentiates between parā vidyā and aparā vidyā. Aparā vidyā includes the Vedas and associated disciplines, while parā vidyā concerns knowledge of the imperishable (akṣara). This distinction expresses a philosophical conception of knowledge rather than a modern division between science and non-science.

The classical Indian tradition also used the term vidyā in the broad sense of knowledge, learning or a field of study. Different textual traditions enumerate different vidyās. Terms such as śāstra, vidyā, kalā and śilpa likewise appear in different contexts to denote organized bodies of knowledge, disciplines and skilled practices.

3.1 A Working Definition of IKS

For the purposes of this study, Indian Knowledge Systems may be understood as historically evolving and internally diverse traditions of knowledge that developed in the Indian subcontinent through observation, reasoning, classification, textual composition, oral transmission, practical application, commentary and intergenerational transmission.

This definition deliberately avoids treating IKS as a single homogeneous system. It also avoids equating every form of traditional knowledge with modern science. Instead, it permits individual traditions to be examined through their own historical categories while still asking questions that are central to the history of knowledge and science: How was knowledge produced? How was it organized? What counted as evidence? How were claims validated? How were texts transmitted? And how did later scholars preserve, criticize or transform earlier knowledge?

ORAL AND TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE

A defining feature of Indian Knowledge Systems is the coexistence and interaction of oral and textual modes of transmission. Knowledge was not preserved exclusively in written texts. Oral instruction, memorization, recitation, teacher–student relationships and practical training played important roles in sustaining intellectual and technical traditions.

Oral transmission was especially important in linguistic, philosophical and ritual learning. Carefully structured practices of recitation and memorization made it possible for substantial bodies of material to pass across generations. At the same time, textual composition offered a way of organizing increasingly specialized forms of knowledge.

The relationship between oral and textual transmission was not necessarily oppositional. A text could serve as a condensed repository of knowledge that required explanation and interpretation through oral teaching. Conversely, oral traditions could influence the preservation and interpretation of written works.

Manuscript culture adds another layer to this history. A manuscript is not merely a physical copy of a text; it can preserve evidence of how knowledge was transmitted and transformed. Copyists, commentators and later scholars could introduce corrections, explanations, additions or alternative readings. In technical literature, such

interventions may be especially significant for tracing changes in mathematical procedures, astronomical parameters or medical classifications.

The history of an Indian scientific text therefore cannot always be reduced to the biography of its putative author. Its subsequent history of copying, commentary, interpretation, adaptation and pedagogical use may be equally important.

THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CHARACTER OF INDIAN KNOWLEDGE SYSTEMS

Modern academic institutions divide knowledge into specialized disciplines such as physics, mathematics, medicine, linguistics, philosophy and astronomy. These divisions are useful for contemporary research, but they cannot always be projected directly onto historical Indian intellectual traditions. In pre-modern India, astronomy and mathematics were closely related, as were grammar and logic, and philosophy and epistemology.

This interdisciplinary character suggests that IKS should be approached not merely as a collection of ancient texts or traditional practices, but as a historically situated culture of knowledge. Its epistemological reflections, patterns of transmission and continuity, and interactions among disciplines provide an important foundation for examining scientific traditions.

The study of IKS can therefore contribute to the history of science in more than one way. It can identify particular achievements, but it can also illuminate the broader ways in which human communities have constructed, justified, preserved, communicated and transformed knowledge.

KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AND VALIDATION IN INDIAN TRADITIONS

The study of IKS requires attention not only to the bodies of knowledge preserved in texts and traditions, but also to the processes through which knowledge was produced, justified and validated. Indian intellectual traditions developed sophisticated discussions of valid knowledge, reasoning, perception, inference and reliable testimony. For historians of science, these questions are especially important. A scientific tradition cannot be understood adequately by listing its conclusions; we must also examine the practices of observation, measurement, calculation, inference, prediction and transmission through which those conclusions were reached and maintained.

Validation was not uniform across Indian traditions. Perception, inference, comparison, testimony, reasoning, calculation, observation, practical experience and textual interpretation could perform different roles in different intellectual settings. It would therefore be misleading to search for a single “Indian scientific method.” A more fruitful approach is to reconstruct the particular epistemic practices associated with a given discipline, school and period.

This approach allows us to distinguish among knowledge understood as inherited authority, knowledge reached through reasoned inference, knowledge grounded in observation, knowledge expressed through mathematical computation, knowledge acquired through practical experience, and conclusions subjected to later scrutiny. The importance of IKS for the history of science thus lies not simply in the sophistication of particular bodies of knowledge, but in the historical processes through which knowledge claims acquired authority, were transmitted, questioned, modified and, in some cases, replaced.

MANUSCRIPTS, COMMENTARIES AND THE TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE

The history of Indian knowledge traditions cannot be reconstructed solely from the works attributed to individual authors or from the standardized forms in which texts appear in modern editions. Knowledge was preserved, transmitted, interpreted and transformed through a complex manuscript culture involving copying, recitation, teaching, commentary, glossing, correction and practical instruction. Manuscripts were therefore not passive containers of information. They participated in an active intellectual process through which technical, philosophical, mathematical, astronomical, medical and linguistic knowledge was maintained across generations.

For the history of science, this point is particularly important. A scientific or technical work may survive in several manuscripts that differ in wording, notation, numerical values, chapter arrangement or explanatory material. Before the widespread adoption of printing, manuscripts were among the principal material forms through which specialized knowledge was preserved and circulated in India. They were produced on different materials, including palm leaf, birch bark and, in later periods, paper, and their physical characteristics varied according to region, period and scribal practice.

Copying was therefore an essential mechanism of intellectual continuity, but copying did not necessarily mean mechanical reproduction. A useful historical model is: Original composition → copying → interpretation → correction/addition → further copying → commentary → new transmission.

Studying manuscripts, commentaries and transmission change the way Indian scientific traditions can be understood. Instead of presenting scientific knowledge as a succession of isolated “discoveries” associated with famous individuals, it becomes possible to reconstruct a longer intellectual process involving authors, scribes, teachers, commentators, students and practitioners.

The process can be represented more broadly as: Observation → textual formulation → manuscript transmission → commentary → teaching → practical application → correction → adaptation → further transmission.

INDIAN SCIENTIFIC TRADITIONS AND THE MODERN HISTORY OF SCIENCE

The relationship between Indian scientific traditions and the modern history of science requires careful historical analysis. Premodern traditions of astronomy, mathematics, medicine, metallurgy, architecture, agriculture and other technical disciplines developed distinctive practices of observation, classification, calculation, reasoning and transmission. At the same time, they emerged within intellectual, social and institutional environments that differed substantially from those of modern science.

Modern science itself is not reducible to a single method. It is characterized by a complex combination of empirical investigation, mathematical reasoning, theoretical modelling, experimentation, measurement, prediction, criticism, communication and institutional organization.

Several of these characteristics are particularly useful when comparing modern science with historical Indian traditions. Modern science places strong emphasis on systematic empirical investigation: observations are organized around explicit questions, methods and conceptual frameworks. It also makes extensive use of mathematical and theoretical models, including equations, statistical models and computational simulations, to represent relationships among observable phenomena and to generate consequences that can be tested.

Prediction is another important feature. A scientific model gains credibility when it generates predictions that can be compared with observations or experimental results. Modern science also places considerable emphasis on reproducibility and independent verification: claims should, in principle, be open to examination by other investigators using sufficiently specified methods, data and procedures.

Finally, modern science operates within an extensive institutional environment that includes universities, laboratories, observatories, academies, professional societies, journals and research-funding structures. It also rests on philosophical and epistemological assumptions concerning the possibility of obtaining reliable knowledge through systematic investigation, evidence and criticism. These assumptions themselves have a history; they did not emerge fully formed at a single moment.

These characteristics are useful analytical categories, but they should not be treated as a checklist for deciding automatically whether a premodern tradition was “science.” Historical comparison requires attention to differences in aims, concepts, institutions and standards of validation.

INDIAN SCIENTIFIC TRADITIONS WITHIN THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Indian scientific traditions should be situated within the long and geographically diverse history of human knowledge production. The history of science should not be written as though it began only with modern Europe.

At the same time, the study of Indian knowledge should not seek to demonstrate that modern science already existed in complete form in ancient India. Both positions flatten historical development.

Indian traditions provide substantial evidence of empirical observation, mathematical calculation, modelling, prediction, technical procedures and systematic transmission. Yet their epistemological assumptions, institutional structures, modes of validation and forms of social organization were not identical to those of modern science. These differences are not obstacles to comparison; they are precisely what make comparative history intellectually valuable.

The term “Indian Knowledge Systems” itself therefore requires historical qualification. India did not possess one uniform system of knowledge. Its intellectual landscape included Vedic and Brahmanical scholarship; Buddhist and Jain traditions; philosophical schools such as Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya and Mīmāṃsā; mathematical and astronomical schools; Āyurvedic traditions; grammatical and linguistic scholarship; architectural and technological traditions; and a wide range of regional and vernacular knowledge systems.

CONCLUSION

Indian Knowledge Systems have an important place in the global history of science because they demonstrate that systematic engagement with nature and with practical problems developed through multiple historical pathways. Indian traditions of astronomy, mathematics, medicine, linguistics, metallurgy and other technical disciplines reveal long histories of observation, classification, reasoning, calculation, textual transmission and practical application.

Their histories also show that knowledge was never entirely static. It was commented upon, debated, corrected, translated, adapted and incorporated into changing intellectual environments. This continuing process is particularly visible in the manuscript and commentarial traditions, where the transmission of a work could also become an occasion for interpretation and modification.

The global significance of IKS therefore lies not simply in identifying isolated ancient “discoveries.” Its deeper value lies in understanding how knowledge was produced, preserved, transmitted and transformed within and beyond the Indian subcontinent. Approached critically and historically, Indian scientific traditions can enrich the global history of science while resisting both uncritical glorification and the imposition of modern categories upon the past.

REFERENCES

1. Āryabhaṭa. Āryabhaṭīya. Edited and translated by K. S. Shukla and K. V. Sarma. New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy, 1976.
2. Brahmagupta. Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta. Translations and studies in the history of Indian mathematics and astronomy.
3. Varāhamihira. Pañcasiddhāntikā. Various critical editions and translations.
4. Bag, Amulya Kumar. Mathematics in Ancient and Medieval India. Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1979.
5. Pingree, David. “The Recovery of Early Greek Astronomy from India.” *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 7 (1976): 109–123.
6. Pingree, David. “History of Mathematical Astronomy in India.” In *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, edited by Charles C. Gillispie, vol. 15, 533–633. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
7. Pingree, David. “Two Treatises on Indian Astronomy.” *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 11 (1980): 58–62.
8. Pingree, David. *Census of the Exact Sciences in Sanskrit*. 5 vols. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1970–1994.
9. Pingree, David. “The Logic of Non-Western Science: Mathematical Discoveries in Medieval India.” *Daedalus* 132, no. 4 (2003): 45–53.
10. Shukla, K. S., and K. V. Sarma, eds. *Āryabhaṭīya of Āryabhaṭa: Critical Edition with English Translation*. New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy, 1976.