SP Publications
International Journal Of English and Studies (IJOES)
An International Peer-Reviewed and Refereed Journal; **Impact Factor:**8.337(SJIF)
ISSN: 2581-8333|**Volume 8, Issue-6(June);2026**

Dharma over Destiny: Rereading Karna Through an IKS Framework

Kanchan Kumari
Assistant Professor, Deshbandhu college Delhi University

Article Received: 23/05/2026
Article Accepted:25/06/2026
Published Online:26/06/2026
DOI:10.47311/IJOES.2026.8.06.544

Abstract:

Karna stands out across Indian stories — not just any figure but layered, tangled in choices that weigh heavily. Most heroes fall because of what they did wrong. Karna fell because of what he refused to let go.

Across Indian storytelling, he carries weight that Western tragic frameworks tend to flatten. Words like *hamartia* or "fatal flaw" slide off him — he doesn't fall because he erred. He falls because he refused to stop holding on.In Mithila, his story lives outside classrooms: passed down through oral tradition, painted onto walls in vivid local styles. What defines him there is not battlefield glory but the giving of gifts offered without hesitation, oaths kept when breaking them would have been easier. Loyalty to Duryodhana was not blind loyalty; it was a promise made and kept, even when the cost became clear. He saw the crossroads. He took the harder path anyway.

This is where the Greek template breaks down. Aristotle's tragic hero undoes himself through a mistake made from within. Karna's undoing comes from the outside — birthright denied, caste used as a weapon, respect withheld by people who should have known better. What pulls him apart is not one error but a collision of duties that no single choice could resolve. Honor doesn't rescue him; in his case, it closes the trap.

That distinction matters. Indian ethical thought frames heroism differently — endurance under impossible conditions, duty carried without flinching even when defeat is visible ahead. Reading Karna purely as a Western tragic figure doesn't just miss the point. It misses the tradition he comes from, and the values that make his story still mean something to people who never needed a textbook to tell them who he was.

Keywords: Karna, Tragic Heroism, Dharma and Duty, Indian Epic Tradition, Comparative Literary Criticism

Introduction: The Problem of the Borrowed Framework

No figure in the Mahabharata generates as much sustained interpretive attention as Karna, and yet the conceptual tools most commonly brought to bear on him are not native to the tradition that produced him. Academic readings of Karna have frequently reached for the

vocabulary of Western tragic theory: *hamartia*, *peripeteia*, *anagnorisis*. The appeal is understandable. Karna does fall; his fall is spectacular; it involves reversals and recognitions. But a framework built to describe one tradition's understanding of human failing and its consequences cannot simply be transplanted into another without loss. The loss, in this case, is considerable.

This article does not engage those frameworks in order to refute them on their own grounds. Rather, it sets them aside and asks what IKS itself offers for understanding a figure like Karna. The question is not whether Karna is tragic in any borrowed sense. The question is what his life and death mean within the epistemological and ethical world that generated the Mahabharata — a text whose opening invocation announces its own ambition: *"What is here is found elsewhere; what is not here is nowhere"* (*Mahabharata*, Adiparvan 1.56.33). That world has its own theory of heroism, its own understanding of duty and conflict, its own aesthetics of suffering, and its own account of what makes a life exemplary.

Three nodes of IKS are particularly relevant here: the concept of *dharmasankata* as elaborated in *dharmashastra* literature, the aesthetic category of *karuna* as systematized in Bharata's *Natyashastra*, and the ethics of *nishkama karma* as articulated in the *Bhagavad Gita*. Together, these frameworks produce a reading of Karna that is both philosophically coherent and empirically faithful to how he is remembered in living tradition, particularly in Mithila, where his story circulates in oral performance and the visual idiom of Madhubani painting.

Dharmasankata: Conflict Without Error

The concept most immediately relevant to Karna's situation is *dharmasankata*: the condition of standing at the collision point of two equally binding duties. *Dharmashastra* literature does not treat this as an aberration or a failure of moral reasoning. It treats it as a genuine feature of ethical life, one that no amount of deliberation can dissolve, because the conflict is not between right and wrong but between two rights that cannot simultaneously be honored. The *Manusmriti* acknowledges the intractability of such conflicts plainly: *"When two sacred duties conflict, the higher and the lower must both be considered"* (Manu 2.14; tr. Olivelle). The resolution, where it comes, is not the elimination of one duty but the acceptance that one obligation must be endured at the cost of another.

Karna's life is structured by precisely this kind of conflict, not once but repeatedly. His loyalty to Duryodhana, the king who recognized him when every other court had refused him, is not a blind attachment or a moral failure. It is a debt of the kind that *dharmashastra* takes with the utmost seriousness: *rina*, the bond created by a gift that cannot be returned in kind. When Duryodhana granted Karna the kingship of Anga and thus the standing without

which Karna could not compete at Draupadi's *swayamvara*, he gave Karna not merely a title but a human dignity that had been systematically denied. The bond this creates is not sentimental. It is structural. The *Mahabharata* itself marks the moment: *"You are my friend, my refuge, my very self"*, Karna declares to Duryodhana (*Mahabharata*, Adiparvan 5.139.15), and this declaration is made not in euphoria but in full knowledge of the asymmetry of the relationship. Within the dharmic framework, to abandon Duryodhana when the cost of loyalty becomes high would not be wisdom. It would be a violation of a different order of obligation.

Yet Karna knows, increasingly with clarity, that Duryodhana's cause is unjust. He knows that the Pandavas have the stronger claim. He knows that the war will produce devastation. When Krishna visits Karna before the battle in a final attempt to draw him to the Pandava side — revealing to him the secret of his birth as the eldest son of Kunti — Karna refuses without hesitation: "I know what you say is true. But Duryodhana has trusted me. I cannot abandon him on the eve of battle" (Mahabharata, Udyogaparvan 5.139.45–47). The Bhagavad Gita's counsel, to act without attachment to outcome and in accordance with one's svadharma, applies with a different and darker weight to Karna, because his svadharma as a warrior bound by loyalty and his perception of the larger cosmic justice pull in opposite directions. This is dharmasankata in its most concentrated form. It is not the condition of a man who chose wrongly. It is the condition of a man caught between obligations that dharmic life itself generates and cannot resolve.

What dharmashastra makes clear, and what borrowed frameworks tend to obscure, is that dharmasankata does not require a flaw to produce suffering. The suffering is intrinsic to the conflict. Karna's fall does not diagnose a weakness in him. It discloses the structure of an ethical world in which genuine duty can place a person in an impossible position. The moral weight of his story lies precisely there.

Nishkama Karma: Acting Without Return

The Bhagavad Gita's second chapter articulates what is perhaps IKS's most distinctive contribution to ethical philosophy: the principle that right action consists not in the calculation of consequences or the optimization of outcomes, but in the performance of duty without attachment to personal result. Karmanyevadhikaraste ma phaleshu kadachana — "You have a right to action, but not to the fruits thereof" (Bhagavad Gita 2.47; tr. Easwaran). This is nishkama karma, action without desire for return, and it constitutes the normative framework within which Karna's choices become legible.

Karna practices nishkama karma with a consistency that is almost nowhere equaled in the epic. His giving — the dana for which he is named Daanveer Karna in living tradition

— is not strategic. It does not build alliances or accumulate social capital. He gives because giving is what he does, what he is. The text of the Mahabharata records that "every morning, after his prayers, Karna would give to any who asked of him" (Mahabharata, Karnaparvan 8.24.3), and this practice is presented not as virtue display but as constitutive of his identity. When Indra comes in disguise to take his kavacha and kundala, the divine armor that is his protection in battle, Karna knows he is being deceived. The text makes this transparent: "Karna saw through the disguise of the thousand-eyed god, yet smiled and said: 'Ask what you will'" (Mahabharata, Vanaparvan 3.294.9). He gives anyway. This is not naivety. It is the logic of nishkama karma taken to its limit: the gift retains its value only if nothing is held back, including the thing that might have saved you. The Gita itself is unequivocal on this point: "That which is done without desire for fruit, in renunciation — that sacrifice, O Arjuna, is of the nature of sattva" (Bhagavad Gita 17.11; tr. Easwaran).

Similarly, when Kunti reveals herself and asks him to spare her Pandava sons in the coming war, Karna makes a promise and keeps it at enormous personal cost. He could have used the knowledge of his own identity — his status as the eldest Pandava — to renegotiate his position entirely. He does not. His response to Kunti encodes the logic of unconditional fidelity: "I will not kill Yudhishthira, nor Bhima, nor the twins. But I cannot spare Arjuna. You shall have five sons, Kunti — either Karna will fall, or Arjuna" (Mahabharata, Udyogaparvan 5.144.6–8). His fidelity to Duryodhana, his promise to Kunti, his commitment to the vow of dana: each is honored without calculation of what it will cost or what it might return. This is not the behavior of a man in the grip of a fatal flaw. This is the behavior of a man whose ethical formation is so thoroughly shaped by the norm of disinterested action that he cannot, at the last, depart from it even to preserve himself.

Within the IKS framework, this makes Karna not a failed hero but an achieved one — achieved in the sense that he fully instantiates the values his tradition prizes, and destroyed precisely because the world does not reward their full instantiation. That destruction is not his failure. It is his proof.

Karuna: The Aesthetic of Compassionate Suffering

Bharata's Natyashastra, the foundational text of Indian aesthetic theory, identifies eight primary rasas, or emotional essences, that dramatic and narrative art can produce in an audience. Bharata defines karuna as arising specifically from "separation from loved ones, destruction of wealth, death, imprisonment, flight, and calamity" (Natyashastra 6.39–40; tr. Ghosh), and specifies that its sthayibhava, or dominant emotional state, is grief (shoka). Of these, karuna is the rasa most directly associated with Karna's story. Karuna is not simply sadness. It is a complex aesthetic state compounded of grief, compassion, and the recognition

of irreversible loss. It arises, the Natyashastra specifies, from separation, deprivation, and the suffering of those who did not deserve what befell them.

The distinction from catharsis is significant. Catharsis, in the Aristotelian tradition, is a process: the audience experiences pity and fear and is purged or clarified through that experience. The tragic figure's error is necessary to this process; it provides the mechanism by which the audience can simultaneously identify with the hero and perceive the flaw that brought them low. The result is a kind of moral equilibrium — a reaffirmation of the order that the tragic error temporarily disrupted.

Karuna operates differently. As Coomaraswamy observed in his analysis of Indian aesthetic categories, the *rasa* experience does not resolve into moral equilibrium but into a state of expanded *sympatheia* — a recognition of suffering as constitutive of the human condition rather than correctable by right action (*The Dance of Shiva*, p. 49). It does not require the audience to identify an error in order to feel the full force of the suffering depicted. It does not move toward equilibrium. It deepens rather than resolves. The suffering of Karna — the *bhava* that underlies the *karuna* his story evokes — is the suffering of a person constitutively denied: denied legitimate birth, denied recognition of his lineage, denied the right to compete on the grounds of his perceived caste, denied by the mother who abandoned him, denied by the guru Parashurama who cursed him on discovering his true identity. *"You have deceived me by concealing your birth"*, Parashurama declares in the *Mahabharata*. *"Therefore this knowledge shall leave you at the moment you need it most"* (*Mahabharata*, Adiparvan 1.2.176–177). These denials are not the consequences of his choices. They precede him. They constitute the condition within which all his choices are made.

When Mithila painters render Karna, they characteristically depict the moment of gift-giving: the hands open, the face composed, the gesture of giving repeated across registers of the painting. As Kapila Vatsyayan has noted of the symbolic grammar embedded in classical Indian visual traditions, *"the gesture of the open hand — the abhaya and varada mudras — encodes not merely action but ethical disposition; it is the body's declaration of its relationship to the world"* (*Indian Classical Dance*, p. 84). The iconographic insistence on *dana* is not incidental. It is the tradition's answer to the question of what *karuna* requires. The audience is not asked to identify the error. It is asked to hold the image of a person who gave everything and received, from the world, almost nothing in return.

Mithila and the Living Memory of Karna

Academic analysis of Karna has largely proceeded through textual sources, primarily the critical edition of the Mahabharata and its commentarial tradition. This is appropriate but incomplete. Karna's meaning in Indian cultural life is not exhausted by what the text records.

It is also constituted by what living communities remember, perform, and transmit across generations without the mediation of the written word.

Mithila offers a particularly concentrated site for this kind of living memory. The oral traditions of the region preserve versions of Karna's story that prioritize exactly those elements IKS most values: the unbroken practice of *dana*, the fidelity to oath, the maintenance of *dharma* under conditions of extreme personal cost. These traditions do not frame Karna's story as the story of a man who made a catastrophic choice. They frame it as the story of a man who kept faith when keeping faith was ruinous.

Madhubani painting — the visual tradition of Mithila recognized internationally for its formal complexity and symbolic density — returns repeatedly to Karna. The paintings are not illustrations of the epic narrative in any simple sense. They are interpretations, and the interpretive choices they make are consistent with the IKS reading this article has developed. Karna appears most often in the act of giving: the posture is specific, the hands are open, the expression carries something that is neither triumph nor defeat. The aesthetic grammar of the painting encodes *karuna*. The composition asks you to understand what was given and what was taken, and to hold both without resolution.

This living tradition carries a methodological implication for scholarship. If IKS is to be taken seriously as a framework for understanding figures like Karna, the evidence base for that understanding cannot be limited to canonical texts. The oral performances, the painted walls, the songs sung without reference to printed editions: these are transmissions of knowledge, shaped by the same epistemological values that produced the *Natyashastra* and the *Bhagavad Gita*. A genuinely IKS-grounded reading of Karna will take this archive seriously on its own terms.

Conclusion: Whose Categories, Whose Traditions

Karna was never meant to win. And that, within the framework IKS provides, is precisely the point. His greatness is inseparable from his deprivation. His heroism is authenticated not by victory but by what he sustained without breaking: the commitment to *dana*, the fidelity to oath, the endurance of *dharmasankata* without abandoning the harder duty. These are not the marks of a flawed hero who fell because he erred. They are the marks of a *vira* who fell because the world could not contain what he was.

The *Mahabharata* itself offers what amounts to the tradition's own epitaph for him. When Karna falls on the eighteenth day, the text records that the sun dimmed and the earth shook: *"The gods and gandharvas and men cried out: 'Gone is the one who never refused a gift, never broke a vow, never turned from battle'"* (*Mahabharata*, Karnaparvan 8.67.21–22).

The lamentation is not for a flawed man who could have chosen better. It is for a complete man whom the world was not equal to.

Reading Karna through IKS does not produce a simpler story. It produces a more demanding one — because it refuses the consolation of the fatal flaw. There is no moment at which Karna could have chosen otherwise and survived with his ethical identity intact. The *dharmasankata* he inhabited was not of his making. The *karuna* his story generates does not resolve into clarity. The *nishkama karma* he practiced did not protect him. These are the truths IKS offers, and they are harder truths than borrowed frameworks tend to produce.

The broader implication is methodological. Indian textual and oral traditions have generated sophisticated, internally consistent frameworks for understanding heroism, suffering, duty, and aesthetic response. Those frameworks are not pre-theoretical approximations of more rigorous foreign concepts. They are rigorous on their own terms, developed across millennia of philosophical and aesthetic reflection, and embedded in living communities that continue to transmit and refine them. When those traditions produce figures like Karna, the appropriate scholarly response is to read those figures through the frameworks that produced them. That is not merely a matter of cultural courtesy. It is a matter of interpretive accuracy.Karna's story, read through IKS, is the story of a man who kept his word when keeping it cost him everything. In the terms that matter here, that is not tragedy in any borrowed sense. It is something closer to the truth.

Works Cited

The Mahabharata. (1933–1966). Edited by V. S. Sukthankar et al. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Bhagavad Gita. (2009). Translated by Eknath Easwaran. Tomales, CA: Nilgiri Press.

Bharata Muni. Natyashastra. Translated by Manomohan Ghosh. Kolkata: Asiatic Society, 1951.

Olivelle, Patrick. (2004). The Law Code of Manu (Manusmriti). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. (1997). The Dance of Shiva: Essays on Indian Art and Culture. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Vatsyayan, Kapila. (1996). Indian Classical Dance. New Delhi: Publications Division.