



ISSN: 2454-9177

NJHSR 2026; 1(64): 108-110

© 2026 NJHSR

www.sanskritarticle.com

Prabhat Mondal

Ph.D. Research Scholar,
Department of Sanskrit,
The University of Burdwan,
West Bengal, India

The Architecture of Ritual: A Critical Analysis of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā Philosophy

Prabhat Mondal

Abstract: This study examines the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā school of Indian philosophy, focusing on its foundational objective: the systematic investigation of *Dharma* through Vedic exegesis. Unlike other systems that prioritize metaphysical liberation (*mokṣa*), Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā emphasizes the potency of the ritual act and the inherent authority of the Word (*Śabda*). By analyzing its unique epistemological framework, specifically the theory of *Svataḥ-prāmāṇya* (intrinsic validity), and its linguistic realism, this article illustrates how the school transitioned from a manual for ritualists into a robust philosophical defense of Vedic eternalism. The research further explores the concept of *Apūrva*—the "unseen force"—as the causal link between action and result, effectively sidelining the necessity of a creator deity.

Keywords: Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, Dharma, Jaimini, Apūrva, Śabda, Epistemology, Vedic Hermeneutics.

Introduction: The Philosophy of Action

Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, or "Earlier Inquiry," stands as one of the six orthodox (*āstika*) schools of Indian philosophy. While its counterpart, Uttara-Mīmāṃsā (*Vedānta*), focuses on the knowledge of Brahman, Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā is rooted in the *Karma-kāṇḍa*—the section of the Vedas dealing with rituals.¹ Founded by Jaimini through his *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras* (c. 200 BCE), the school seeks to provide a rational basis for Vedic injunctions, asserting that the primary purpose of the Vedas is to impel humans toward righteous action, or *Dharma*.²

Epistemological Foundations: How We Know

The Mīmāṃsā school is renowned for its sophisticated epistemology. It posits that knowledge is valid in itself (*Svataḥ-prāmāṇya*) and only becomes invalid if a subsequent cognition contradicts it or if the source is proven defective.³ This "presumption of truth" is crucial for their defense of the Vedas; since the Vedas are considered "authorless" (*apauruṣeyatva*), they are free from the defects of human error.⁴

To validate its claims, the school recognizes several *pramāṇas* (sources of knowledge):

1. **Pratyakṣa** (Perception)
2. **Anumāṇa** (Inference)
3. **Upamāna** (Comparison)
4. **Śabda** (Verbal Testimony)
5. **Arthāpatti** (Postulation)
6. **Anupalabdhi** (Non-apprehension) – primarily accepted by the Bhāṭṭa school.⁵

Linguistic Realism and the Eternity of Sound

A central pillar of Mīmāṃsā is the relationship between the word (*śabda*) and its meaning (*artha*). Jaimini argued that this relationship is not conventional or man-made but innate and eternal.⁶ This leads to the doctrine of *Veda-apauruṣeyatva*, which suggests that the Vedas were not composed by any being, including God, but have existed eternally as a body of sound and truth.⁷ By removing a divine author, Mīmāṃsā elevates the text itself to the status of ultimate reality.

Correspondence:

Prabhat Mondal

Ph.D. Research Scholar,
Department of Sanskrit,
The University of Burdwan,
West Bengal, India

The Concept of Apūrva: The Ritual Mechanism

One of the most significant challenges for Mīmāṃsā was explaining how a ritual performed today could yield results in a distant future (e.g., entry into heaven). To solve this, they introduced Apūrva.⁸

"Apūrva is the 'unseen potency' generated by the performance of a ritual. It acts as a causal link that resides in the soul of the practitioner, maturing over time until the promised fruit of the action is realized."⁹

This mechanism allowed the school to maintain a purely "deed-centric" universe. In early Mīmāṃsā, God is notably absent or deemed unnecessary, as the laws of *Dharma* and *Apūrva* are sufficient to govern the moral and physical order of the world.¹⁰

The Two Schools: Bhāṭṭa and Prābhākara

As the system matured, two distinct sub-schools emerged, named after their respective leaders, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara (c. 7th century CE). Their differences provide a rich ground for philosophical debate:

Knowledge of Knowledge: Prabhākara argued that every act of knowing reveals the knower, the known, and the knowledge itself simultaneously (*Tripuṭī-pratyakṣa*). Kumārila, conversely, held that knowledge is inferred from the "known-ness" of the object.¹¹

Error Theory: Prabhākara's *Akhyāti* theory suggests that error is merely an omission of memory, while Kumārila's *Viparīta-khyāti* posits that error is a positive misapprehension of an object as something else.¹²

Remarks : Intellectual Legacy of Mīmāṃsā

Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā's legacy is not merely in its ritualistic origins but in its profound impact on Indian logic and linguistics. By prioritizing the "Injunction" (*Vidhi*) as the primary linguistic unit, it created a framework for legal and ethical interpretation that influenced Hindu law for centuries. Its insistence on the self-validity of knowledge and the eternity of the word remains a landmark in the global history of hermeneutics.

The trajectory of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā represents one of the most rigorous attempts in global intellectual history to ground ethics and social order in a linguistic absolute. While often pigeonholed as a mere manual for Vedic ritualists, the school's deeper project was the "secularization" of the divine into the grammatical. By asserting that the universe is governed by the eternal laws of sound and action rather than the whims of a creator deity, Mīmāṃsā established a philosophy of radical self-responsibility.¹³ If the result of a ritual is certain, then human agency—properly aligned with the **Vidhi** (Injunction)—becomes the primary mover of destiny.

The hermeneutical tools developed by Jaimini and refined by Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara transcended

the sacrificial grounds, providing the foundational logic for the **Dharmaśāstra** (Hindu legal codes).¹⁴ Their methods of resolving textual contradictions, determining the hierarchy of commands, and analyzing the intent of a sentence remain standard in Indian legal interpretation to this day. In a sense, the Mīmāṃsākas were the original "linguistic realists," arguing that language does not just describe the world; it commands it into being.

Furthermore, the Mīmāṃsā insistence on **Svataḥ-prāmāṇya** (intrinsic validity) provided a necessary epistemological counterweight to the skepticism of the Buddhist logicians. By defending the reliability of perception and testimony, they preserved a common-sense realism that allowed Indian society to maintain its traditional structures during periods of intense philosophical upheaval.¹⁵

Ultimately, Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā's legacy is found in its transition from the specificities of the fire-sacrifice to the generalities of social duty. It taught that meaning is not found in silent contemplation alone, but in the active, precise execution of one's role within the cosmic order. Even as the popularity of elaborate Vedic rituals waned in favor of devotional (*Bhakti*) movements, the Mīmāṃsā spirit of rigorous inquiry and textual reverence continued to provide the structural scaffolding for the house of Indian philosophy.

References :

1. Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *Indian Philosophy: Volume II*. Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 374-376.
2. Jaimini. *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* 1.1.2: "codanā-lakṣaṇo'rtho dharmah" (Dharma is that which is indicated by the Vedic injunctions).
3. Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2000, p. 213.
4. Bhatt, Govardhan P. *The Basic Ways of Knowing*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1989, pp. 32-35.
5. Hiriyanna, Mysore. *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin, 1932, pp. 298-301.
6. Jaimini. *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* 1.1.5 regarding the *autpat-tika* (innate) relation between word and object.
7. Clooney, Francis X. *Thinking Through Rituals: Philosophical Perspectives on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*. SUNY Press, 1990, pp. 48-52.
8. Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, p. 235.
9. Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *Indian Philosophy: Volume II*, p. 422.
10. Jha, Ganganatha. *The Prabhākara School of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*. Indian Press, 1911, pp. 85-88.
11. Bhatt, Govardhan P. *The Basic Ways of Knowing*, pp. 164-168.

12. Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, pp. 220-222.
13. Clooney, Francis X. *Thinking Through Rituals*, 1990, pp. 156-160.
14. Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *Indian Philosophy: Volume II*, 2008, pp. 430-432.
15. Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, 2000, pp. 238-240.

Bibliography:

1. Bhatt, Govardhan P. *The Basic Ways of Knowing: An In-depth Study of Kumarila's Contribution to Indian Epistemology*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
2. Clooney, Francis X. *Thinking Through Rituals: Philosophical Perspectives on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*. State University of New York Press, 1990.
3. Hiriyanna, Mysore. *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin, 1932.
4. Jha, Ganganatha. *The Prabhākara School of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*. Indian Press, 1911.
5. Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *Indian Philosophy: Volume II*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
6. Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2000