

Q₁: How knowledge different from understanding?

Ans: Knowledge is completely/entirely different from understanding. Knowledge is in finished form which can be transfer from one to another. On the other hand, understanding is in raw-form and cannot transfer to anyone. Therefore, both the terms differ from one another.

Q₂: Explain why understanding cannot be passed on.

Ans: Understanding cannot be passed on from one to another. Understanding is a raw form not in a finish form. It cannot be shared with anyone as it is not in concrete form. Understanding is an instant experience of anyone which other cannot feel or take. As joy, happiness can feel but cannot transfer in the same way, understanding too is same.

Q3:

Ans: Yes, knowledge of understanding is possible. It can be passed on in form of words or speeches.

Q4:

Ans. Author explains that knowledge of understanding is not the same thing as understanding. One can may has knowledge about someone's pain or happiness but cannot understand those emotions in same way. Moreover, the other important difference is the raw form and finished form ^{which} cannot be same. So both are not the same thing.

As: I completely agree with author's definition of knowledge and understanding. knowledge can be same but understanding cannot. One may pass the knowledge on has

but understanding cannot. Understanding may vary person to person nature. As a teacher can share the knowledge he has but cannot make students to understand to ^{his} ~~her~~ students in the same manner.

PART-II

**NOTE: (i) PART-II is to be attempted on separate Answer Book.
(ii) Attempt all questions from PART-II.**

Q.2. Make a précis of the given passage and suggest a suitable heading: (20 + 5 = 25)

The Psychological causes of unhappiness, it is clear, are many and various. But all have something in common. The typical unhappy man is one who having been deprived in youth of some normal satisfaction, has come to value this one kind of satisfaction more than any other, and has, therefore, given to his life a one-sided direction, together with a quite undue emphasis upon the achievement as opposed to the activities connected with it. There is, however, a further development which is very common in the present day. A man may feel so completely thwarted that he seeks no form of satisfaction, but only distraction and oblivion. He then becomes a devotee of "Pleasure". That is to say, he seeks to make life bearable by becoming less alive. Drunkenness, for example, is temporary suicide; the happiness that it brings is merely negative, a momentary cessation of unhappiness. The narcissist and the megalomaniac believe that happiness is possible, though they may adopt mistaken means of achieving it; but the man who seeks intoxication, in whatever form, has given up hope except in oblivion. In his case the first thing to be done is to persuade him that happiness is desirable. Men, who are unhappy, like men who sleep badly, are always proud of the fact. Perhaps their pride is like that of the fox who had lost his tail; if so, the way to cure it is to point out to them how they can grow a new tail. Very few men, I believe, will deliberately choose unhappiness if they see a way of being happy. I do not deny that such men exist, but they are not sufficiently numerous to be important. It is common in our day, as it has been in many other periods of the world's history, to suppose that those among us who are wise have seen through all the enthusiasms of earlier times and have become aware that there is nothing left to live for. The man who hold this view are genuinely unhappy, but they are proud of their unhappiness, which they attribute to the nature of the universe and consider to be the only rational attitude for an enlightened man. Their pride in their unhappiness makes **less sophisticated people suspicious** of its genuineness; they think that the man who enjoys being miserable is **not miserable**.

Q.3. Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow: (5 x 4 = 20)

Knowledge is acquired when we succeed in fitting a new experience in the system of concepts based upon our old experiences. Understanding comes when we liberate ourselves from the old and so make possible a direct, unmediated contact with the new, the mystery, moment by moment, of our existence. The new is the given on every level of experience – given perceptions, given emotions and thoughts, given states of unstructured awareness, given relationships with things and persons. The old is our home-made system of ideas and word patterns. It is the stock of finished articles fabricated out of the given mystery by memory and analytical reasoning, by habit and automatic associations of accepted notions. Knowledge is primarily a knowledge of these finished articles. Understanding is primarily direct awareness of the raw material.

Knowledge is always in terms of concepts and can be passed on by means of words or other symbols. Understanding is not conceptual and therefore cannot be passed on. It is an immediate experience, and immediate experience can only be talked about (very inadequately), never shared. Nobody can actually feel another's pain or grief, another's love or joy, or hunger. And similarly no body can experience another's understanding of a given event or situation. There can, of course, be knowledge of such an understanding, and this knowledge may be passed on in speech or writing, or by means of other symbols. Such communicable knowledge is useful as a reminder that there have been specific understandings in the past, and that understanding is at all times possible. But we must always remember that knowledge of understanding is not the same thing as the understanding which is the raw material of that knowledge. It is as different from understanding as the doctor's prescription for pencitin is different from penicillin.

Questions:

- (i) How is knowledge different from understanding?
- (ii) Explain why understanding cannot be passed on.
- (iii) Is the knowledge of understanding possible? If it is, how may it be passed on?
- (iv) How does the author explain that knowledge of understanding is not the same thing as the understanding?
- (v) How far do you agree with the author in his definitions of knowledge and understanding? Give reasons for your answer.