CHAPTER SIX

MĪMĀṂŚĀ – VIEWS IN THE NAISADHA-CARITA

Sage Jaimini, the author of the Mīmāṃsā Sūtra is the founder of the Mīmāṃsā system. The system of Mīmāṃsā is concerned with a clarification of the liturgical aspect of the Vedas. Indeed, the term 'Mīmāṃsā' literary means deep thought, reflection, consideration and exposition and when applied to philosophy, it means reflection on or exposition of the Vedas. The Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Karmamīmāṃsā or simply Mīmāṃsā is a kind of scholastic, priestly science. The system of Pūrvamīmāṃsā is closely related to Indian Law. It deals with the sacrificial rites than the civil obligations. Šabaravāmin in his Bhāṣya on the Mīmāṃsā Sūtra enhances the practical formulas of the Vedic injunctive rules. After him, there are a lot of commentators and dependent writers who wrote their commentaries on it. Amongst them, Mīmāṃsā scholars like Kumārila and Prabhākara, (also known as Guru) are important and popular. They established their own views from different angles of philosophical speculations.

In the Naiṣadha-carita, several doctrines of the Mīmāṃsā philosophy have been referred to. In this epic, the theory of self-validity of knowledge (svataḥ prāmāṇya-vāda) occupies a significant place in respect
of the epistemology. Akhyāti-vāda of Prabhākara, also finds a place of honour in this epic. The theory of Karma and the problem of God have also been referred to by Śrīharṣa in his work Naiṣadha-carita. Moreover, some ritualistic and sacrificial conceptions of the Mīmāṃsā thought are found to be referred to in the epic of Śrīharṣa. Therefore, the present dissertation aims at discussing how the doctrines of Mīmāṃsā have been reflected in the Naiṣadha-carita.

Of the several doctrines of the Mīmāṃsā system, mention may be made of the theory of the self validity of knowledge (svataḥ-prāmāṇyavāda) as Śrīharṣa refers to it in the 2nd Canto of his work. Knowledge is self-valid which the validity of knowledge arises from the very causes which generate that knowledge and not from any external factors. Thus validity originates intrinsically (prāmāṇyaṁ svataḥ utpadyate). In this case, as soon as the knowledge arises, the validity of knowledge is known. Therefore, ascertainment of knowledge does not depend on any other knowledge. So, validity is also known intrinsically (prāmāṇyam svataḥ jñāyate ca). This view of Mīmāṃsā, in its two-fold aspect, i.e. origination and ascertainment is regarded as the theory of self-validity of cognition (Svataḥ-prāmāṇyavāda).

Regarding the self-validity of knowledge, there are different views advocated by the Mīmāṃsā scholars. Prabhaṅkara maintains that
knowledge is self-luminous and every knowledge has triple manifestation. In every perception, Meya (object of knowledge), Mātā (cognizer) and Miti (knowledge) – these three are manifested simultaneously.\(^1\) When knowledge occurs, it reveals itself and also reveals its object and the subject. This theory of triple-perception is called Tripūḷīpratyakṣa-vāda. Knowledge and validity are, therefore, brought about simultaneously from the same source. Thus, knowledge is self-luminous.\(^2\)

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa also maintains that knowledge is valid in itself. He maintains the view that every perception, validity of cognition arises from the same factor from which the cognition arises. Thus knowledge ascertained by itself does not depend on any other knowledge. So, knowledge is self-evident.\(^3\)

This theory of self-validity of knowledge of the Mīmāṁsakas is reflected in verse No.61 of the 2\(^{nd}\) Canto of the Naiṣadha-carita wherein it is found that king Nala requests the golden swan to inspire Damayantī to love-affairs. He says that his urge for action might be like crushing a thing already crushed. For the generosity of the noble is spontaneous, just as cognitions are evident by themselves.\(^4\) Commentator Cāṇḍūpanḍita interprets this verse in a four-fold manner. He makes a reference to the self-validity of knowledge of the Mīmāṁsakas by way of quoting...
Kumārila’s view on it and illustrates an inference viz., “All cognitions are self-valid and true; for they are cognitions, like the cognition of a pot.”

In his second interpretation, he states that the word ‘grahaṇa’ in the verse means ‘sense-organ’ (indriya) and by means of the sense-organs, all objects like pot, cloth, etc. are perceived. These sense-organs spontaneously and independently perceive their respective objects and do not rely on any external inducement in respect of perceiving objects. Hence, sense-organs are taken to be self-efficient. The third interpretation reveals that cognitions are said to be self-illuminating. So, the authoritative nature of knowledge is here corroborated with its self-illuminosity.

According to the fourth interpretation, the word ‘grahaṇa’ in the verse means ‘śabda’ (word). The acts of implicating of the words are spontaneous and independent of any extraneous inducement. So, knowledge is self-valid.

Śrīharṣa, in the present verse above under discussion, has mentioned the word ‘yathārtha’ which means ‘true’. The system of Mīmāṃsā upholds that knowledge is true or valid by itself. Both knowledge and the validity of knowledge arise from the same factors. This theory of self-validity of knowledge of the Mīmāṃsakas thus finds a place in the Naiṣadha-carita.
Another doctrine that has been referred to by Śrīharṣa in his work is the theory of error known as Akhyātivāda of the Prabhākara school of Mīmāṃsā. A rightly observed by Prof. K.K. Handiqui, the theory of the Prabhākaras that all cognitions are correct has led them to propound a theory of error known as Akhyātivāda. In the typical instance of mistaking a shell for silver in the expression ‘this is silver’ (idaṁ rajatam), there is a dual conception. The idea of ‘this’ is occasioned by the direct perception of the shell. Secondly, the idea of silver is brought about by the similarity in colour between the shell and silver. The so-called mistake is due to a lack of discrimination between the perceived shell and the remembered silver.9

It may be contended that according to the Akhyātivāda, every cognition is real.10 In case of illusion also, perception collaborated with remembrance accounts for the real cognition, as in the case of nacre and silver. But no difference is traced out between perceptual cognition and cognition of remembrance. Such is the conception held by Prabhākara.

Akhyātivāda is reflected in a verse of the Naiṣadha-carita. According to Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita, Śrīharṣa refers to this view of the Prabhākaras in his Naiṣadha-carita. It is described that king Nala being overwhelmed with illusion, sees Damayantī around him. Damayantī also sees Nala in front of her. Both of them are present together in the same place. Yet they
think that they are away from each other. Both embrace each other's illusory self and think their embraces to be real.\textsuperscript{11} According to the theory of Prābhākaras on error, it may be stated here that the embraces of Nala and Damayantī are real amidst the embraces of their illusory selves. Though there was no reality in a sense, yet it is possible that the illusory embraces were real in a sense.

In the present verse, the words "\textit{anyonyam anyatrayad ikṣamāṇau}" is laid to be emphasized. In the past, king Nala may have had experience of real embrace among his comrades. In the same way, Damayantī may also have experienced real embrace among her friends. The remembrance of their previous embraces occurs in the present case. Therefore, both the knowledge of remembrance and perception are true and not illusory. In the same way, the embrace of king Nala and Damayantī is real. Therefore, in every aspect, the embrace of Nala and Damayantī, is considered to be real and not erroneous. There is no room for misconception in the Prābhākara theory of cognition. In this way, in a single verse of the present epic, this view has been maintained precisely.

According to the \textit{Mīmāṁsā} system, intellect undergoes various changes owing to actions and not to the will of God. Kumārila remarks, while establishing the importance of God, that if God's will or any intelligent agency is admitted as the root-cause of world-process, then this
process is well possible by the activities of living beings who are also intelligent agents. Thus the Mīmāṃsā system advocates the doctrine of Karma which is autonomous in regulating the eternal world-process.

Poet Śrīharṣa gives a hint to *Karma* and *Īśvara* in his *Naiṣadha-carita*. Princess Damayantī interrupting her answer to the female messenger of Indra, tells her friends that she is not dependent on herself. She has great aspiration to choose Nala as her life companion. She has inclination towards him, because of the inducement of God or of her *Adṛṣṭa*. Hence she should not be questioned why she is going to choose Nala as her consort. So, in a verse of the epic, she speaks of her dependence on *Karma* or *Īśvara* (God). In this world, a person’s mind is always controlled by *Īśvara* (God) or by the current of the concatenation of cause of the succession of individual souls. In whatever way God or *Adṛṣṭa* regulates one, one’s mind stick to that path. So one cannot do anything according to one’s own good will.¹²

Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita, in his commentary, takes about the Mīmāṃsā concept of *Karma* which regulates the beginningless cycle of worldly existence. According to Mīmāṃsakas and the Naturalists (Svabhāvavādins), *Karma* is the controller of all human minds.

In another verse, poet Śrīharṣa has given stress on the doctrine of *Karma*. All beings are always dependent on destiny. Even a man who acts
deliberately does not deserve any sort of denunciation. Nor should the
destiny which is inanimate, be an object of rebuke. He who speaks of
words of reproach for them, only suffers from the affliction of mouth.\(^\text{13}\)
According to \textit{Mīmāṃsā}, the world is neither created nor destroyed but
regulated by \textit{Karma}. The system of \textit{Mīmāṃsā} adheres only to \textit{Karma} and
not to God.

The doctrine of God of the \textit{Mīmāṃsakas} is also referred to by
Śrīharṣa in the \textit{Naiṣadha-carita}. It may be pointed out that the system of
\textit{Mīmāṃsā} does not admit God as the creator of the universe. Jaimini in his
\textit{Mīmāṃsā-sūtra} does not ordain any sūtra in support of God. God as the
author of Vedas is rejected. Śabara also nowhere in his \textit{Bhāsyā} speaks of
God. Kumārila denies the existence of God. Pārthaśārathi Miśra contends
that God being formless would have no will to create the world. So, God
can never be the cause of world-process.

In verse no.64 of the 11\textsuperscript{th} Canto of the \textit{Naiṣadha-carita}\(^\text{14}\)
Śrīharṣa has obviously in view the controversy about the existence of God
which was carried on by the \textit{Nyāya} and \textit{Mīmāṃsā} thinkers. Some of the
commentators in their gloss on the same, hint that the \textit{Mīmāṃsakas} do not
entirely reject the existence of God.

Cāṇḍīpaṇḍita says in his gloss on the verse under discussion that
the \textit{Mīmāṃsā} system does not recognize the existence of God, for if it does
so, He will have to be regarded as the author of the Vedas and that will
destroy the eternal or non-originated character of the Veda advocated by
the *Mīmāṃsā* school.\(^{15}\) It is depicted that Damayantī does not accept that
king, the jewel of whose reputation is enshrined will all words true as the
Vedas, and who ever exerts himself for the sake of others just as the
*Mīmāṃsā* system does not accept the moon-created God Śiva. According
to the interpretation of Viśveśvara, the *Mīmāṃsā* does not confined in the
physical existence of God.\(^{16}\)

According to *Mīmāṃsā* philosophy, the deities have no existence
apart from incantations with which they are invoked in sacrificial
performances. It rejects the corporeal feature of deities and admits that
every deity is verbal. It holds the view that every god dwells in
incantations.

As propounded by the *Mīmāṃsā* system, poet Śrīharṣa refers to
the verbal feature of deities in his epic, *Naiṣadha-carita*. In a verse, the
universal form (*viśvarūpa*) of Viṣṇu has been described by Indra in front of
sage Nārada. When Viṣṇu assumed the form of universe, his identity with
sage Jaimini becomes significant. Therefore, being unable to put up with
any *vigraha* (battle or physique) of Gods, the sage makes Indra’s
thunderbolt meaningless.\(^{17}\) According to the *Mīmāṃsā*, physical form of
deity is contrary to the Vedic scripture. By assuming the corporeal form a
god is incapable of taking oblations in several sacrifices performed at the same time. No physical form can be ascribed to that god, when incantation feature of a god is admitted. In the incantations such as ‘idam agnaye’ (this is for Agni), ‘idam indrāya’ (this is for Indra) etc., the words with fourth case-ending signify the deities concerned. Everywhere the class-character (jāti) of a deity is one and the same. So its relations with many a sacrifice is not insignificant.

The Mīmāṃsā system specially deals with the sacrificial performances enumerated by the Vedas and that is called Dharma. There are many allusions to the rituals of Mīmāṃsā found in the Naiṣadha-carita. Poet Śrīharṣa refers to ‘dharma’, the Vedic performances, heaven as well as to the three accents and some sacrificial formulas.

After long solicitation, king Nala consents to accomplish messengership of the four Gods. Addressing him, the gods utter a benedictive statement for his well-being. In this context, the poet refers to the Vedic scripture. The first half of the verse is associated with the rituals of Mīmāṃsā, while the second half with the non-dualistic doctrine of Vedānta. Here the Mīmāṃsā view is explained.

The four gods declare that Nala’s pious promise is delightful with its accents aiming at the desired object of the gods. So he may make
his promise (pratisruti) true to its literary meaning in rivalry with the Vedic scripture (śruti).\textsuperscript{19}

Nārāyaṇa in his commentary on the said verse explains the Mīmāṃsā concept. Cāṇḍūpanḍita gives a systematic interpretation regarding the Vedic rituals in the said verse. Narahari also gives an elaborate explanation of the Mīmāṃsā rituals. He said that ‘śruti’ (vedic scripture) prescribes the performance of rites such as ‘dārsā-pūrṇamāsa’ meant for gods and that the scripture has ‘om’ as its first vowel. He also mentions the three Vedic accents. Explaining the second implication of the said verse, Narahari says that the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā is the representative of the Vedic scripture. In this way, especially Pūrva Mīmāṃsā treats of sacrificial formulas and represents the Vedic scripture in connection with performance or action.

The Vedānta philosophy, which deals with the Absolute (Brahman) in a metaphysical perspective is known as Uttara-Mīmāṃsā. On the other hand, Pūrva Mīmāṃsā deals with the sacrificial rites. The former is called Jñānakāṇḍa, while the latter is called Karmakāṇḍa. Therefore, the Mīmāṃsā philosophy which is also known as Pūrva Mīmāṃsā has the sole purport of sacrificial performance, and forms a part of the Veda and hence it is also called Karma-Mīmāṃsā. In addition to that, several ritualistic conceptions of Mīmāṃsā have been referred to in
the *Naiṣadha-carita*. The salient phases of the rituals are Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice, Sārvakamika sacrifice, Cow sacrifice, Sarvamedha sacrifice, Rājasūya sacrifice, Sarvasvāra sacrifice, Mahāvrata sacrifice, Aśvamedha sacrifice, Putreṣṭi sacrifice, Śyena sacrifice, Karaṇi sacrifice and Sautrāmaṇī rite. These are now assessed in the following manner:

It is said that, someone being desirous of heaven, should perform Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice.²⁰

In a verse of the *Naiṣadha-carita*, Nārada describes before Indra the achievement of the latter. Indra has already accomplished a hundred sacrifices and has experienced toil in acquiring religious merit resulting from sacrifices. The fruits of that virtue are the wealth of sovereignty in heaven. Indra is the only person who shows disregard for the fruit, though it is obtained through much perseverance and effort.²¹ Here the greatness and modesty of Indra has been described by sage Nārada and says that though Indra has the virtue of a hundred sacrifices duly performed, yet he has no propensity towards Lordship. Because of his humble and friendly treatment towards the sage, Indra is recognized here. Explaining the present verse, Nārāyaṇa refers to the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice as well as to its fruit, i.e. sovereignty.

In another verse, poet Śrīharṣa has referred to the Jotiṣṭoma sacrifice. The women of Vidarbha had a glance at Nala who seems to be
enveloped in clusters of ornamental gems up to the crown of his head. As such, he is mistaken for Indra, the sovereign lord of the region that is the fruit of Jyotiṣṭoma and like other performances. Some of the ladies think in their simplicity and doubt whether Nala is encircled with a thousand-eyed Indra.22 While going to explain the sovereignty and the lordship of heaven, Nārāyaṇa refers to the sacrifices such as the fruit of the Jyotiṣṭoma and other sacrifices of the same type enjoyed in the Vedic scriptures.

A Vedic performance which is performed to fulfill all the ambitions, is called Sārvakāmika sacrifice. Gārhapatyā, Āhavanīya and Dakṣiṇa are the three sacrificial fires. All oblations offered in sacrifices are shared amongst all the Gods. Agni has prominent share amongst them. He is said to be the mouth of Gods, as he carries respective shares to respective gods. So through Agni, all gods get their sacrificial shares. Normally, in a sacrifice, oblation is offered to Agni by the sacrificer. But in a sacrifice performed by Agni (fire-god) himself, he would have to offer oblation to himself in his own manifestations.

In the Naiṣadha-carita, a reference to the Sārvakāmika sacrifice is seen. In a verse, the statement of disguised Nala, the messenger of the four gods, is explained. In front of princesses Damayantī, king Nala argues that Agni, the fire-god, is desirous of winning her. If Agni himself performs Sārvakāmika sacrifice offering oblation of his own share in his
own forms, it is true that he would obtain her. For, the Vedic formula can never prove futile.\textsuperscript{23}

Cāṇḍūpaṇḍīta gives an explanation that a part of Agni forms oblation. In this case, oblation such as animal, paddy and wheat etc. are the share of Agni. Here, Agni himself is depicted as the sacrificer and oblation is described to be his part, as it emerges from him. Nārāyaṇa explains the Sārvakāmika sacrifice with reference to the incantation of Agni and oblation meant for the God. According to Mallināṭha, the word ‘sva’ is used thrice in the present verse of the epic. This indicates that Agni is simultaneously the performer, God and oblation of sacrifice and as such the sacrificial formula is unfailing. Thus the poet glorifies the Mīmāṁsā doctrine and declares the infallibility of the Vedic sacrifices. In another verse, the poet Śrīharṣa refers to the fire-god (Agni) as the mouth of gods, while speaking of the wedding oblation offered by Nala and Damayantī.\textsuperscript{24} Here also a gist of sacrificial formula has been given by the author of the Naiṣadha-carita.

Cow-sacrifice is also one of the important sacrifices that took place in the Mīmāṁsā philosophy. This cow-sacrifice is also seen adduced to in a verse of the present epic. While roaming in the capital of king Nala, Kali rushes forward and becomes enraptured to hold a cow for the purpose of offering in the sacrifice. But the cow related to the religious virtue of
Soma sacrifice ousts him from a distance. In this present verse, Kali thinks that cow-slaughter is a means of vice, as it incurs destruction of life. Slaughter of beings in general is prohibited in the Vedic scriptures. But cow slaughter in sacrifice is formulated, in view of religious merit. The word ‘saumya-vṛṣāsaktā’ used in the verse may mean “inclined to religious virtue of Soma sacrifice” or may imply “attached to a gentle ox”. Cow is united with an ox in this rite.

In the Naiṣadha-carita, Soma sacrifice is also reflected. Darśa and Paurṇamāsa sacrifices are referred to in this epic. In verse no. 196 of the 17th Canto, it is said that Kali becomes afflicted to see the New Moon and Agniṣṭoma sacrifice. He became faint after seeing the Full-Moon sacrifice and considers Soma sacrifice to be Death for himself. In the same way, Kali becomes happy to see Brahmins eating in contact with one another. But after seeing them taking Soma juice after oblations in the fire, he becomes very sad. On the sacrificial occasion, indiscriminate eating is not regarded as an infringement of caste rules.

In another verse of the Naiṣadha-carita, Soma is explained as the enemy of fire-god (Agni). As the disguised messenger of gods, Nala narrates before Damayantī the forlorn condition of Agni. Agni pining for Damayantī seems to be angry with Soma (i.e. Moon). Therefore, Agni, in vengeance with one ‘Soma’ gulps another ‘Soma’ (juice of Soma plant)
offered as an oblation in sacrifices. Soma (Moon) afflicts Agni in the latter’s lovelorn state. So Agni is fancied as the god drinking up Soma juice as a punishment for its bearing the same name as Agni’s foe. The mighty ones cannot bear with a fellow with whom even the name of an enemy is associated.\textsuperscript{28} Here the sacrificial oblation of Soma juice meant for Agni has found a place of discussion.

Sarvamedha sacrifice is one of the sacrifices took place in the \textit{Mīmāṁsā} philosophy. In this sacrifice, a Brahmin is prescribed to be slain. In the \textit{Naiṣadha-carita}, poet Śrīharsa speaks of Sarvamedha sacrifice in a verse. Kali rejoices to see a man killing a Brahmin, but feels feverish to notice that the man is engaged in Sarvamedha sacrifice.\textsuperscript{29} Nārāyaṇa refers to the Vedic injunction in this respect. According to \textit{Mallinātha}, the slaughter of \textit{Brahmin} in Sarvamedha sacrifice yields ‘dharma’.

On the other hand, another sacrifice named \textit{Rājasūya} sacrifice, is formulated to enjoy the sovereignty of heaven. In the performance of this sacrifice is allowed to play cards. In this present epic, a reference to this Vedic rite is found. Looking for a Jaina (jina), Kali sees deer-skin (ajino) used by religious students. And looking for a Buddhist (kṣapana), Kali sees gambling (akṣapana) as sacrificial discipline observed by the sacrificer.\textsuperscript{30} Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita explains that on the occasion of consecrating sacrificial fire, sacrificer enjoys gambling with priests. Nārāyaṇa cites the
scriptural injunction while explaining the relevance of gambling. In this way in the Vedic performance, gambling occupies a prominent position.

Another sacrifice is Sarvasvāra sacrifice, which is also a Vedic performance in which the sacrificer commits suicide. It leads to the attainment of heaven. Normally a person suffering from some incurable disease with little hope of life performs this rite.

This sacrifice is adduced to in a verse of the *Naṣadha-carita*. Kali becomes enraptured to behold in the city, a man committing suicide. But he feels distressed to find that the man is performing Sarvasvāra sacrifice. Nārāyaṇa explains that since this sacrifice is enjoyed by the scripture, suicide in this rite does not incur any sin.

Mahāvrata sacrifice is a Vedic performance in which amorous dalliance is carried on between a religious student and a prostitute. At the winter solstice, when Gavāmayana sacrifice lasting for one year is accomplished, than this sacrifice is performed. In this sacrifice, the performer is to retain the vow of chastity. This is supposed to restore the power to lead house-holder's life. As such, a prostitute and a religious observer are brought together on the sacrificial altar. Thus this rite involves erotic dealings between them.
An allusion to this sacrifice is found in a verse of the epic. Kali sees the dalliance of a religious student and a whore in the sacrifice called Mahāvrata. He considers the rite to be rustic dance of buffoons.\(^{32}\)

In a sacrifice where the sacrificer’s spouse embrace the sex-organ of horse meant for the oblation is called Āsvamedha sacrifice. In the *Naiṣadha-carita*, such an allusion has been made. In the capital king Nala, Kali sees the (obscene) act performed in Āśvamedha-sacrifice and foolishly considers the composer of the Veda a buffon.\(^{33}\)

Putreṣṭi is a sacrificial rite prescribed by the scripture. The result of this Vedic performance is the birth of offspring. So, it is a kind of ‘iṣṭi’ (sacrifice) in order to beget a son. Śyena sacrifice is meant to destroy all the enemies completely. It is employed for malevolent purpose (abhicāra). Kārī sacrific\(^{34}\) is prescribed for the coming of rain. The performer obtains his desired rain when this sacrifice is duly accomplished. In the *Naiṣadha-carita*, the poet refers to these sacrifices in a verse. All these Vedic performance are said to be prolific and infallible.\(^{35}\) The poet has adverted to Soma sacrifices only to convince the Cārvāka regarding unfailing fruit of sacrificial observances.

Sautrāmaṇi rite is a Vedic performance involving the use of wine. This is named after god Sutrāman (Indra). According to Pārthasārathī Miśra, drinking of wine is prescribed in this rite. Sautrāmaṇi
rite is adduced to in the present epic. Kali becomes happy to glance at the handling of wine by a Brahmin. But he becomes sad also to see that the Brahmin is performing the sacrifice called Sautrāmaṇī. Therefore, this is such type of rite which is involving the use of wine.

In various sacrificial performances, various gifts are prescribed to be offered to the priests. A Vedic scripture enjoins: "Yūpahastino dānam ācaranti." These words of the Vedic injunction are cited by the priest to the performer, when the priest comes to know that the performer is pleased with sacrifice which is to be accomplished shortly. Being gratified, the performer of sacrifice offers the priest the gift ordained by the scripture.

The problem of 'Yūpadvipa' has been traced out in a verse of the epic. Here the Carvāka criticises the Mīmāṃsā doctrine. The Carvāka addresses the Mīmāṃsakas as the scholars whose intellects are fattened of Mīmāṃsā philosophy and alleges that when they are misguided, they regard the Vedic injunction which declares the gift of ‘Yūpadvipa’ (elephant tied in the sacrificial post ox cloth wrapped round the sacrificial post) an interpolation, though they have great faith in scriptures.

Another rite named Agnihotra rite is also found in the Naiṣadha-carita. Āhavanīya, Gārhapatya and Dakṣīṇa – these three are known as sacrificial fires. It is a oblation which is performed by every householder everyday as the scripture prescribes. It is said that one who desirous of
heaven should perform Agnihotra rite. If this rite is not duty performed, it can accrue to impediment in several ways. This rite of Agni is observed with the incantation “Agnir jyotir jyotir agnih svāhā, sūryo jyotir jyotir sūryah svāhā.”

In verse no 10 of Canto No. 20 of the Naiṣadha-carita, the reference of this rite is found. Nala performs daily oblations and worships three fires. The word ‘treta’ in the verse signifies ‘three sacrificial fires’. In another verse, i.e. verse No. 44 of Canto No. 19 of this epic, a hint is given to Agnihotra rite. Just after the day is elapsed, Sun enters into Fire. In this context, this ritual is reflected here. Sun is believed to set in the evening, leaving its light in the fire. Light (dīpti) is supposed to be Sun’s devoted wife. She on the death of her husband commits suicide by entering into the fire, and brings about his resurrection next morning by virtue of her religious merit. Agnihotra incantation is reflected in this verse. The daily worship of Agnihotra is suggested here. According to Nārāyaṇa, Sun is assumed to enter into Fire with the scriptural evidence.

In another verse, an allusion to sacrificial rite is seen. Kali beholds in Nala’s capital men who killed heroes (vīraghna) in battle, but sees none who killed the sacred fire, and sees nobody who slept at the time of sun-set. It is implied that nobody in that city allows the sacrificial fire to expire.
Nārāyana says that fire-oblation is observed by every householder in that city. Jinarāja alternatively explains that the word 'vīraghna' implies 'a sacrificer who with the help of Kuśa grass sprinkles milk on the extremely hot ghee in sacrificial performance'. So here it is suggested that Kali sees men who are engaged in observing the sacred fire and finds nobody who avoids this domestic ritual. Hence a gist of Mīmāṁsā rituals happens to be found here.

A sacrificer is said to be under special rules and temporarily exempted from his ordinary religious duties. In the Naiṣadha-carita, poet Śrīharṣa speaks of the performance generally held on the occasion of sacrifice. Kali becomes happy to see Brahmin renouncing his daily and occasional religious duties, but flees far away with a dejected face, when he knows that the man is engaged in performing Vedic sacrifice.42 Nārāyaṇa explains the verse with reference to the scriptural injunction that sacrificer being taken a vow does not give any offering and does not make any oblation. According to Mallinātha, the abandonment of daily oblation is not contrary to the religious virtue. So, sacrificer maintains the ritual discipline in observing the religious formula. Thus some allusions to the sacrifices and religious rites are seen in the Naiṣadha-carita. To recapitulate, various aspects of Mīmāṁsā as reflected in the epic have been presented with a philosophical point of view.
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