

“Life of Padma” Times Three: Telling the same Story in Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Apabhramsha

Eva De Clercq

No Jain narrative tradition has received more scholarly attention in recent decades as that of Padma or Rāma, whose story in India is better known as the Sanskrit epic *Rāmāyaṇa*. Most recently, two studies have explored reworkings in Classical Hindi: Adrian Plau's 2018 dissertation focuses on a Classical Hindi version of Rāmcand Bālak around the character of Sītā as a Jain *satī*, and in 2022 Gregory Clines's book focuses on an adaptation in Classical Hindi (or *bhāṣā*) by Brahma Jinadāsa of the seventh century Sanskrit version of Raviṣeṇa, the *Padmapurāṇa* or *Padmacarita* (Plau 2018; Clines 2018 & 2022). I have been working on the Apabhramsha version *Paūmacariu* by Svayambhūdeva since 1999, defending my doctoral thesis in 2003, and with volumes of an English translation appearing since 2018 (De Clercq 2003, 2018 & 2023).

The most notable studies of Jain *Rāmāyaṇas* from the previous century, those of K.R. Chandra (1970) and V.M. Kulkarni (1990), took Vimalasūri's *Paūmacariyam* as their focal point, the first extant Jain *Rāmāyaṇa*. About Vimalasūri very little is known: even his sectarian affiliation remains vague as some elements in his text seem to connect it to Śvetāmbara specifics whereas in others he connects to the Digambaras. He probably composed his work in the fourth or fifth century in Maharashtri Prakrit, which is very much a literary language of *kāvya*.¹ The work is a Jain *carita* or *purāṇa*, with (*mahā*)*kāvya* characteristics. It is often called an epic poem: epic in its theatics — dealing with heroes, warriors, and great battles — and poem in its form — distinguished from “plain” text in that it is versified (*padya*) and features poetic embellishments (*alaṃkāras*). Scholars like Kulkarni and Chandra favoured the early versions, especially that of Vimalasūri, over the later texts. Infamous is, for instance, the assertion of Kulkarni that the later Jain *Rāmāyaṇas* he found in Velankar's (1944) seminal manuscript catalogue *Jinaratnakosa* “probably do not contain any new

¹ See Brockington and Brockington in this volume on the date of Vimalasūri. Ollett briefly discusses Vimala's work (2017: 50, 74-75) and stresses its importance as a literary rather than a religious text.

remarkable features but repeat in their own language what the older Jain writers have already said" (Kulkarni 1990: 14). Discussing Raviṣeṇa's Sanskrit *Padmacarita*, he stresses that he "closely follows Vimalasūri and reproduces his Rāma story without effecting any remarkable changes" (Kulkarni 1990: 103). K.R. Chandra too believes that the text of Raviṣeṇa is a "mere translation of the other [= Vimalasūri's *Paūmacariyam*]" (Chandra 1970: 280). However, when later authors of Jain Rāmāyaṇas, including Svayambhūdeva, Rāmcand Bālak and Brahma Jinadāsa, refer to a source or predecessor, they name Raviṣeṇa — not Vimalasūri, suggesting that Raviṣeṇa's Sanskrit poem surpassed that of Vimalasūri in reputation and authority, at least among Digambaras. Nevertheless, modern scholars have internalised such statements resulting in none taking up Raviṣeṇa's *Padmacarita* as a primary study subject, until Clines recently gave a much more positive evaluation of its qualities (Clines 2018 & 2022). The Apabhramsha *Paūmacariu* by Svayambhūdeva was not included in Kulkarni's study. Chandra is more favourable about it than Raviṣeṇa's version, describing it as "more poetic and attractive in style" (Chandra 1990: 285). Svayambhūdeva's renown as one of the three great poets of Apabhramsha may have guided this attitude (Bhayani 1953: Introduction, 29–30).

As part of my doctoral research which focused on the *Paūmacariu*, I compared its narrative with that of its two precursors, the *Padmacarita* and *Paūmacariyam*, resulting in a comparative table that highlights wherever Svayambhū's text is markedly different in terms of narrative content and structure. Overall, my observations concurred with those of Kulkarni and Chandra in that the narrative of Vimalasūri's and Raviṣeṇa's texts, at least in structure and content, are indeed very close. Svayambhū on a few occasions deviates from the other two in a noteworthy way: there are omissions, most notably the story of Munisuvrata and the proximate ancestors of Daśaratha and Janaka in chapters 21 and 22 of Vimalasūri and Raviṣeṇa is dropped completely by Svayambhū. On the other hand, Svayambhū sometimes adds parts, such as his lengthy sermon of Hanumān to Rāvaṇa on the twelve *anuprekṣās*, subjects of meditation, which is absent from Vimalasūri and Raviṣeṇa. But despite these and some other digressions, one can say that the narrative is the same overall (De Clercq 2003: 1730–2048). In this paper I take a more detailed look at what I have previously identified as a typical example of similar content in these three texts, to explore in more detail what it means for the latter two to be transcreations or translations: Raviṣeṇa's of Vimalasūri's text, and Svayambhū's of Raviṣeṇa's. Through close reading, I analyse a — due to the constraints of space — short selected

passage that is exemplary of this similarity and set the Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Apabhramsha words and verses conveying this parallel content side by side, revealing the exact words the authors used to transpose the verses of their predecessor, and what changes, additions, omissions, abridgements, etc. the individual poets chose to make. This comparison will show that each of these three texts recounts the episode, however similarly, in their own way with their own aesthetic effect. In addition to the narrative content and meaning, the differences in language and corresponding prosody also have a significant bearing on the aesthetic experience. Prakrit is generally described as phonologically more musical, and “smooth”, “soft”, and “easy” compared to Sanskrit (Ollet 2017: 85–92). This corresponds to a somewhat “heavier” and “slower” (longer, 18,000 *granthāgras*) Sanskrit version of Raviṣeṇa, mostly composed in *śloka* or other recitative syllabic verses, compared to the “smoother” (shorter, 10,000 *granthāgras*) Prakrit one of Vimalasūri in moraic meters such as the *gāthā*, which are more rhythmic and inherently more musical.² The characteristics ascribed to Prakrit phonology and meter hold for Apabhramsha as well, which is phonologically close to Prakrit and for the most part employs moraic meters, and its musicality is further enhanced by the consistent use of end rhyme. With 12,000 *granthāgras* the *Paümacariu* is in length also closer to Vimalasūri’s text. Apart from this, the comparison will show that there does not appear to be a distinct way in which the same content is told in either Prakrit, Sanskrit, or Apabhramsha, at least for this case. Of central importance seems to be the poetic genius of the individual poet that stimulates them to make the choices they make in how they present a narrative: the same story told by two different poets in Sanskrit may also be very similar or very different. Different audiences, moreover, have different preferences. It is important to keep in mind that all three poems have their merit, as they have survived and continued to circulate for many centuries.³

² See Gerow 1989: 536; also Jacobi’s assessment of the *āryā* in Jacobi 1886: 595–602.

³ The *Jinaratnakosa* refers to over twenty attestations of manuscripts for both Vimala’s and Raviṣeṇa’s texts. Svayambhu’s text only has three surviving manuscripts. Out of the three, Raviṣeṇa’s text is referred to most often as a source and authority, at least for Digambara authors. The reason for this is most likely the greater accessibility of Sanskrit compared to Prakrit and Apabhramsha, and the clear Digambara stamp of his work.

Analysis of the Selected Passage

The selected text recounts events shortly after Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā and corresponds to roughly the first half of chapter 46 in Vimalasūri's and Raviṣeṇa's texts, both of which are divided in an identical way, and for the most part to chapter 41 in Svayambhū's text. In Vimalasūri's chapter, the passage is 29 verses, in Raviṣeṇa's 53 verses and in Svayambhū's it is roughly 10 *kaṭavakas* or 80 verses of varying length. The table below presents a slightly enlarged conversion in English of the comparative table of this chapter from my dissertation with Vimalasūri represented in the first column, Raviṣeṇa and Svayambhū as the second and third, respectively. It makes it quite clear that Vimalasūri and Raviṣeṇa are closer than the *Paūmacariu* is to either.⁴

Vimalasūri 46	Raviṣeṇa 46	Svayambhūdeva 38 & 41
Rāvaṇa standing in his chariot, beholds Sītā (46.1).	Rāvaṇa standing in his chariot, beholds Sītā (46.1–3).	{Rāvaṇa standing in his chariot, beholds Sītā 38.18.3–4}
He addresses her and tries to seduce her (46.2–5)	He addresses her and tries to seduce her (46.4–10)	{He addresses her and tries to seduce her 38.18.5–7}
Sītā rejects him (46.6–8)	Sītā rejects him (46.11–16)	{Sītā rejects him 38.18.8–9}
Rāvaṇa's persists (46.9–10)	Rāvaṇa's persists (46.17, 20–22)	{Rāvaṇa's persists 38.19.1–4}
As Rāvaṇa enters Laṅkā, the soldiers return from the war in the Dandaka forest (46.11–12)	As Rāvaṇa enters Laṅkā, the soldiers return from the war in the Dandaka forest (46.18–19, 23–24)	{Rāvaṇa enters Laṅkā 38.19.5}
Sītā goes on a hunger strike (46.13–14)	Sītā goes on a hunger strike (46.25–26)	{Sītā goes on a hunger strike 38.19.7}
Rāvaṇa abandons her in a park and goes home (46.15–16).	Rāvaṇa abandons her in a park and goes home (46.27–28).	{Rāvaṇa abandons her in a park and goes home 39.19.6, 8–9}
The queens and Candranakhā mourn the death of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.17–18)	The queens and Candranakhā mourn the death of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.29–31)	Candranakhī seeks revenge and goes to Rāvaṇa (introductory <i>ghattā</i>) Summary of previous two chapters (1.1–7)

⁴ See De Clercq 2003: 1886–1888 for the original comparative table. For convenience's sake, I use the Sanskrit cognates of names as they appear in the Prakrit and Apabhramsha versions, e.g. Candranakhā for Vimalasūri's Candaṇahā and Candranakhī for Svayambhūdeva's Candaṇahī. The numbers between round brackets refer to chapter and verses. The use of curly brackets in Svayambhū's column indicates that this content is found in another position compared to the earlier texts.

		As Rāvaṇa enters Laṅkā with Sītā, Candraṇakhi brings the news that Khara and Dūṣaṇa are also dead (1.8–9).
Rāvaṇa responds and promises to kill the slayer of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.19–20).	Rāvaṇa responds and promises to kill the slayer of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.32–36).	Rāvaṇa responds and promises to kill the slayer of Kharadūṣaṇa (2.1–9).
Rāvaṇa goes to his chambers (46.21).	Rāvaṇa goes to his chambers (46.37).	Rāvaṇa goes to his chambers (3.1).
		Description of Rāvaṇa (3.2–9).
Mandodarī sees him (46.22)	Mandodarī sees him (46.38–39)	Mandodarī approaches (4.1–9).
...and addresses him about his sorrow for the death of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.22–23).	...and addresses him about his sorrow for the death of Kharadūṣaṇa (46.40–43).	...and addresses him about his sorrow for the death of Khara and Dūṣaṇa (5.1–7).
Rāvaṇa confesses that his sadness is due to Sītā not wanting him (46.24–26).	Rāvaṇa confesses that his sadness is due to Sītā not wanting him (46.44–49).	Rāvaṇa confesses that his sadness is due to Sītā not wanting him (5.8–9).
Mandodarī asks why he does not take her by force (46.27–29)	Mandodarī asks why he does not take her by force (46.50–53)	Mandodarī asks why he does not take her by force (6.1–7.9)

In what follows, each of the corresponding scenes are analysed more closely. The chapter starts with Rāvaṇa in his celestial chariot flying Sītā to Laṅkā, their arrival in Laṅkā, and then focuses on exchanges at the court of Laṅkā following the defeat of the Rākṣasas by Lakṣmaṇa. Words in italics indicate correspondence — in content and sometimes *verbatim* — with at least one of the other texts; words in bold indicate innovations.

1. *Rāvaṇa standing in his chariot, beholds Sītā.*

Vimalasūri 46	Raviṣeṇa 46	Svayambhūdeva 38
so tathā vimāṇatho vacan- to rāvaṇo jaṇayadūhyāṁ datthum milāṇavayaṇāṁ jaṇpaī mahurāṇi vayaṇāṇi ..1..	tatrāśāv uttame tuṅge vimāṇaśikhae sthitāḥ svaīraṁ svaīraṁ vrajan reje rāvaṇo divi bhānuvat..1.. sītāyāḥ sōkataptāyā mlāṇāṁ vikṣyāsyapāṇkajāṁ ratirāgavimūḍhātmā dad- hyau kim api rāvaṇāḥ..2.. asṛudurdinavaktrāyāḥ sītāyāḥ kṛpaṇāṁ param nānāpriyaśatāny ūc pr̄ṣṭha- taḥ pārśvato' grataḥ..3..	puṇu dasasiru saṇcallu sasiyāū; nahayalē nāī divāyaru vīyāū..18.3.. majjhē samuddahō jayasir- imāṇāpu; puṇu vollevaē laggu dasāṇāṇu.. 18.4..

What Vimala conveys in one verse, Raviṣeṇa does in three. All of the words from Vimalasūri's text are also present in Raviṣeṇa's, either in cognates or in words with the same meaning. Raviṣeṇa's innovations (in bold) describe the characters in more detail. In verse 1, he specifies where precisely Rāvaṇa is standing in his chariot ("in the top"), and he marks it as very lofty. He further indicates how Rāvaṇa is advancing ("at his own pace") and adds a simile. In verse 2 Raviṣeṇa adds information on Rāvaṇa's state of mind, namely his bewilderment due to his feelings of lust. He is more elaborate on the sad state of Sītā, tormented by grief, her face covered in tears, and he uses the metaphor of a withered lotus for her face. Finally, Rāvaṇa addresses Sītā with loving words, as does Vimala's Rāvaṇa, but Raviṣeṇa is suggestive of the way in which he does so: "from the back, from the side, and from the front", on the one hand implying that he is overwhelming Sītā, but also with comedic effect, popping up on all sides of her. Svayambhū has chosen to defer this passage, up to Candranakhī's approaching Rāvaṇa, to the earlier chapter 38, immediately following Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā.⁵ Nevertheless, there is agreement in the description of the events. In these verses, Svayambhū's focus is on Rāvaṇa and his behaviour. He is described as flying in the sky like the sun, an image taken from Raviṣeṇa, and in addition, he specifies they are in the middle of the ocean, and names Rāvaṇa "the lover of Lady Victory", alluding to the direct sexual advances he will make in subsequent verses.

2. *He addresses her and tries to seduce her.*

<p><i>hohi pasannā sundari maṇi diṭṭhi dehi somasasivayaṇe jeṇa mayaṇānalo me pasamaī tuha cakkhusalileṇaī ..2.. jai diṭṭhipasāyaṇi me na kuṇaī varakamalapat- tadalanayane to pahaṇasuttimaṅgam imeṇa calanāravindeṇam..3.. avaloiūṇa pecchusa sasela- vaṇa-kāṇaṇaī imāṇi puhaīṇ bhamaī jaso paṇavo iva majjha aṇakkhaliya- gaīpasaro..4..</i></p>	<p><i>mārasyātyātyantamṛdubhir hato'haṇi kusumeṣubhiḥ mriye yadi tataḥ sādhvi narahatyā bhavet tava..4.. vaktrāravindam etat te sakopam iva sundari rājate cārubhāvāṇām sar- vathaiva hi cārūṭā..5.. prasīda devi bhṛtyāsyē sakṛc cakṣur vidhiyatām tvaccaksukāntityena snāta- syāpaiti me śramaṇi..6.. yadi drṣṭiprāsādaṇi me na karoṣi varānane etena pāḍapadmena sakṛt tāḍaya mastake..7.. bhavatyā ramaṇodyāne kim na jāto 'smy aśokakah</i></p>	<p><i>kāī gahilliē maī ṇa samic- chahi; kim mahaevipāṭṭu ṇa samic- chahi..18.5.. kim ṇikkanṭaū rājju ṇa bhuñjahi; kim ṇa vi surayasokkhu aṇuhujjahi..18.6.. kim mahu keṇa vi bhaggu maḍappharu; kim dūhaū kim kahi mi asundaru..18.7..</i></p>
---	--	--

⁵ Svayambhū's choice of changing the sequence of events is addressed below.

icchasu mae kisoyeri māṇahi jahicchiyām mahābhoyam ābharaṇabhusiyanīgī devi vva samāṇ surindeṇam..5..	sulabhā yasya te ślāghyā pādapadmatalāhatih..8.. kr̄ṣodari gavākṣeṇa vīmānaśikharasthitā diśah paśya prayāto 'smi viyad ūrdhvam raver api..9.. kulaparvatasamyuktām samerūp sahasāgarām paśya kṣoṇīm imām devi śilpineva vinirmitā..10..	
---	---	--

Vimala’s Rāvaṇa here attempts to initiate a play of seduction, expressing his desire for Sītā by requesting her to look at him and by suggesting that her glance would meet his desire. He recognises that she may be angry — though undoubtedly considering it more an expression of a coquettish, perhaps feigned, anger — and he tries to cater to her anger by implying that he accepts it suggesting she should express her anger by kicking him in the head with her lotus-like feet, likely on the understanding that after expressing her anger, Sītā would eventually subject herself to his play of seduction. If his impressive stature and character alone were not enough, he then boasts of the wide territories he has conquered and offers her the wealth and enjoyment of a goddess. In Raviṣeṇa’s text, Rāvaṇa’s attempts at seduction are amplified, portraying him as a man subject to his passion. Whereas Vimala’s Rāvaṇa admits his feelings for Sītā, he remains confident and cool. Raviṣeṇa’s Rāvaṇa, on the other hand, is erratic and out of control. He begins his attempt at seduction with a Sanskrit equivalent of a suitor’s “opening line” (“I am struck by the most delicate arrows of Kāma; if I die, then you are guilty of murder.”) to express his feelings for Sītā. This Rāvaṇa too recognises her anger, but dismisses it as unimportant: something beautiful is always beautiful, no matter what, nevertheless later on suggesting she should kick him. Then he requests her to look at him, describing himself as her subordinate (*bhr̄tya*). Whereas Vimala’s Rāvaṇa proclaims that her eyes would calm the fire of his passion like water, Raviṣeṇa adjusts the metaphor: bathing in the water of the beauty of her eyes would take away his weariness, again emphasising Rāvaṇa’s suffering under his emotions. If she does not want to look at him, he suggests she kicks him in the head with her lotus-like feet, adding the desire that he be born as an *āsoka* tree in Sītā’s garden, hinting at the topos of a young woman kicking an *āsoka* tree to make it blossom. He again asks her to look, this time at their surroundings, detailing that she should look through an airhole of the celestial chariot, and just as he is starting to boast about his territory, he is cut off by Sītā’s harsh response. Raviṣeṇa’s Rāvaṇa is far from cool and confident, but a man overcome by passion.

Both Rāvaṇas, the one of Vimala and the one of Raviṣeṇa, are true to his traditional Jain portrayal: as a *prativāsudeva*, Rāvaṇa is first and foremost a mighty warrior, the *ardhacakraṭavartin*, “half-universal emperor”, who conquers half of Bharatavarṣa, and seduces a great many women, hence cool and confident. On the other hand, he has no control over his passion for Sītā, which as we read at the end of the story is karmically determined and will lead to his downfall, corresponding to Raviṣeṇa’s portrayal. Although Svayambhū did not mention Sītā’s demeanour in the previous line, her reaction is implied from how Rāvaṇa addresses her. Svayambhū’s Rāvana’s is far from subtle, but crude and even denigrating, calling her a “silly girl” (*gahilli*), and straight out asking her why she does not desire him, whether she thinks he is ugly or repulsive. Without further ado, he offers her the position of chief queen and rule over the kingdom, and is very forward in asking her whether she “enjoys the pleasure of lovemaking”.

3. Sītā rejects Rāvaṇa.

<p>jam rāvaṇena bhaniyā vi- varīyamuḥi thiya ya tam siyā jam paraloyaviruddhaṁ kaha jampasi erisaṁ vayaṇaṁ..6..</p> <p>avasara dīṭhipahāṁ mā me aṅgāni chivasu hattheṇaṁ paramahiliyāṇalasihāpaḍiyo salaho vva nāsihisi...7..</p> <p>paranāriṇi pecchanto pāvam ajesi ayasasāṇjuttam narayam pi vañjasi mao dukkhasahassāulaṁ ghoram..8..</p>	<p>evam uktā satī sītā parācīnayavasthitā antare tṛṇam ādhāya jagādārūcītākṣaram..11..</p> <p>avasarpa mamāṅgāni mā sprśaḥ puruṣādhama nindyākṣarām imāṇi vāṇīm īdṛśīṁ bhāṣase katham..12..</p> <p>pāpātmakam āyuṣyam as- vargyam ayaśkaram asadihitam etat de virud- dhaṁ bhayakāri va..13..</p> <p>paradārān samākāṅṣan mahāduḍikkham avāpsyasi paścāt tāpaparītāṅgo bhas- macchannānalopamam..14..</p> <p>mahatā mohapañkena tavopacitacetasah mudhā dharmopadeśo ‘yam andhe nṛtyavilāsavat..15..</p> <p>icchāmātrād api kṣudra bad- dhvā pāpam anuttamam narake vāsam āsādya kaṣṭaṁ varttanam āpsyasi..16..</p>	<p>ema bhanēvi āliṅgāi jāvēhī; janayasuyač nībbhacchī tāvēhī..18.8..</p> <p>divasēhī thovaēhī tuhū rāvaṇa samarē jiñevaü; amhahū vāriyaē rāmasarēhī āliṅgevaü..18.9..</p>
---	---	---

Vimala’s Sītā’s response is brief and direct. With her back turned towards him, she asks him why he says such things that will ultimately work against him in his next life. After ordering him not to come within her sight nor to touch her, she continues that he will perish because of his

desire for other men's wives, like a moth attracted by a flame, and repeats that desiring another man's wife leads to bad karma, disgrace and ultimately to a stay in hell. Raviṣeṇa's Sītā, also with her back towards him, “placed grass between them”, i.e. objected, and first and foremost tells Rāvaṇa, whom she calls the “vilest of men” (*puruṣādhama*), not to touch her. Similar to Vimala, she asks him why he says such awful things, before explaining what a life devoted to sin will lead to. Of note here is the use of the word *viruddha*, as did Vimala, albeit in a slightly different context. Only then does she explain that desiring the wife of another — even just desiring, i.e. without acting on it, as reiterated two verses down — causes bad karma and will lead to all kinds of great sorrow in hell. Between these two verses describing Rāvaṇa's certain future in hell, she interjects that her devout words are in vain because Rāvaṇa's mind is too muddled by desire. Compared to Vimala, Raviṣeṇa's Sītā comes across as more fierce. Both texts emphasise her morality. Raviṣeṇa's elaborations concern Sītā's words on committing sin. Svayambhū's account is completely different from that of Vimala and Raviṣeṇa. He adds that Rāvaṇa, after his attempt at seduction, tries to embrace her, and Sītā rejects him, albeit poetically, saying that her husband will kill him: “In a few days, Rāvaṇa, you will be vanquished in battle. In due course, you will be embraced by Rāma's arrows because of me.” The emphasis is here not on morally righteous Sītā, concerned with the karmic consequences of Rāvaṇa's action. In Svayambhū's version, in all its brevity the exchange between Rāvaṇa and Sītā is down to earth, resembling a more mundane situation of a chauvinistic male approaching a married woman and being rebuked by her. At the same time, Svayambhū's Sītā is more reminiscent of Sītā's fierce address of Rāvaṇa at this point in the narrative in the Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa (*Aranyakāṇḍa*, 51 esp.), than of the Sītā of Vimala or Raviṣeṇa.

4. Rāvaṇa persists.

<p><i>pharusavayanehi evam ahiyan nibbucchio ya siyāe mayaṇaparitāviyaṇgo taha vi ḥa chaddei pemmaṇ so..9.. tāhe lañkāhivaī niyayasire vi- raiūṇa karakamalam pāesu tīe pađio taṇam iva ganio videhāe..10..</i></p>	<p><i>rūkṣākṣarābhidhānābhiḥ paraṇi vāñibhir ity api madanāhatacittasya premāsyā na nivarttate (nyavarttata)..17.. [...]</i></p> <p><i>pradānair divyavastūnām sammānāś cātubhiḥ paraīh tābhiś ca bhṛtyasāmpadbhīr agrāhyā janakātmajā..20..</i></p>	<p><i>ṇīṭhuravayaṇēhī docchiu jāvēhī; dahamuhu huaū vilakkhaū tāvēhī..19.1.. jāi mārami to eha ḥa pec- chami; vollai savvu haseppiṇu ac- chami..19.2.. avasem kam divasu i icch- esai; sarahasu kanṭhaggahaṇu kareṣai..19.3..</i></p>
---	--	---

	<p>śaknoti sukhadhīḥ pātum kaḥ śikhām āśuśukṣaṇeḥ ko vā nāgavadhūmūrdhni sprśed ratnaśalakākikām..21.. kṛtvā karapuṭam mūrdhni daśāngulismāhitam nanāma rāvaṇaḥ sītāḥ nin- dito 'pi tṛṇāgravat..22..</p>	<p>aṇṇu vi maī ṣiṇyavaū pālev- vaū; maṇḍaē parakalattu ṣa laevvaū..19.4..</p>
--	--	---

In Vimala's text, after Sītā's harsh words, Rāvaṇa is in no way deterred and even throws himself at Sītā's feet, though Sītā is not interested. This is contrary to Vimala's previous depiction of Rāvaṇa being cool and confident. Raviṣeṇa stretches the paradox in his portrayal of Rāvaṇa as the great warrior on the one hand, yet completely subjected to his passion for Sītā: in verse 17 and 22, he repeats Vimala's description of Rāvaṇa's love not waning despite Sītā's harsh words and him bowing to her feet. This part is however broken up with two interrupting verses (18–19) announcing the other Rākṣasa soldiers' return, emphasising the high esteem and devotion these warriors have for Rāvaṇa. Then Raviṣeṇa reiterates that he is unable to seduce Sītā with anything he has to offer (20), and concludes with two *subhāṣitas* on the unapproachability of angry women: "Who, desiring happiness, is able to master the flame of a fire? Or who may touch even a splinter of the gem in the head of a female snake?", before Raviṣeṇa's Rāvaṇa bows before Sītā, who nevertheless considers him like grass. Svayambhū, again, is very different in Rāvaṇa's reaction. There is no explicit mention of his love persisting. His first impulse is to kill Sītā, because of her insult, but he refrains because then he would never see her again. The hint at killing Sītā again echoes Vālmīki's Rāvaṇa, threatening to cook and eat Sītā if she does not accept him (*Araṇyakāṇḍa*, 54.22–23). He decides to laugh it off, convinced that one day she will change her mind and fall for him. He moreover reminds himself of the vow he once took to not take any woman by force.

5. *The soldiers have returned from the war in the Dandaka forest, just as Rāvaṇa enters Laṅkā.*

<p>kharadūṣaṇasamgāme niv- vatte tāva āgaya suhādā suyasāraṇamāīyā jayasad- dām̄ ceva kuṇamāñā..11.. paḍupadahagīyavāiyar- aveṇa ahiṇandio saha baleṇa</p>	<p>tatra dūṣaṇasamgrāme nivṛtte paramapriyāḥ śukhaṭaprahaṭādyāḥ sod- vegāḥ svāmyadarśanāt..18.. calatketumahākhaṇḍam kumārārkasamaprabham</p>	<p>ema bhaṇeṇi caliu suraḍāmaru; laṅka parāiu lad- dhamahāvaru..19.5..</p>
--	---	--

<p>pavisai laṅkānayariṁ dasāṇaṇo indasamavibha- vo..12..</p>	<p>vimānam vīkṣya dāśāsyam muditās tam duḍhaukire..19.. [...] mahendrasadṛśais tāvad- vibhavaiḥ sacivair bhṛśam nānādigbhyah samāyātair āvṛtto rāksasām patiḥ..23.. jaya vardhasva nandeti śab- daiḥ śravaṇahāribhiḥ upagītah pariprāpto laṅkām ākhaṇḍalopamah..24..</p>	
--	--	--

Vimala here reverts to describing Rāvaṇa as the great *vidyādhara* king, greeted with his devoted army by the people of Laṅkā, entering Laṅkā with all the pomp and glory of Indra, the king of the gods. In Raviṣeṇa’s text, the paradox of the depiction of Rāvaṇa is amplified by interweaving this scene with descriptions of his being completely subjected to Sītā and his passion for her. Verse 18 resembles Vimala’s verse 11, but changes the names of some of the Rāksasas (Hasta and Prahasta for Sāraṇa), and stresses the devotion of Rāvaṇa’s warriors to their king (“anxious from not seeing their lord”). This is followed by an image of the soldiers approaching the majestic celestial chariot, which looked like the sun. It is then contrasted by repeating all of Rāvaṇa’s vain attempts to seduce Sītā as analysed above, before Raviṣeṇa again repeats Rāvaṇa’s glorious kingship as he enters Laṅkā, surrounded and lauded by his followers, likening him to Indra not once, but twice. Svayambhū leaves out any mention of the return of the warriors and only describes Rāvaṇa entering Laṅkā, adding as descriptors, “the scourge of the Gods”, and “he who had received great rewards”, reminiscent of his great successes.

6. Sītā goes on a hunger strike.

<p>cintei janayataṇayā havaī ‘ha vijjāhārāhivo eso āyaraī amajjāyam kam saraṇam to pavajjāmi..13.. jāva ya na ei vattā kusalā daiyassa bandhusahiyassa tāva na bhuñjāmi ahaṁ āhāraṇam bhaṇā jāṇaya- suyā..14..</p>	<p>acintayac ca rāmastrī so ‘yam vidyādhharādhipah yatrācaraty amaryādām tatra kiṁ śaraṇam bhavet..25.. yāvat prāpnomi no vārtām bhartuḥ kuśalavartinaḥ tāvad āhārakāryasya pratyākhyānam idam ma- ma..26..</p>	<p>jāva ḡa sunāmi vatta bhattārahō; tāva ḡivitti majjhū āhārahō..19.7..</p>
---	---	---

Sītā now sees that her abductor is an important man, a *vidyādhara* king, and estimates that there is no hope for her to find anyone sympathetic to her cause among his subjects. Thinking all is lost, she therefore decides

to abstain from food, unless and until she hears from Rāma. Raviṣeṇa's verses are nearly identical to those of Vimala. In Svayambhū's text, Sītā makes a very similar statement after she has been installed in the park, switching the sequence of events slightly.

7. Rāvaṇa abandons her in a park and goes home.

<p><i>devaramaṇam̄ ti nāmam̄ ujjāṇam̄ puravarie puvveṇam̄thaviūṇa tattha sīyā niyayagharam̄ patthio tāhe..15.. sīhāṣaṇe ṇivīṭhō nānāvi- hamanīmaūhapajjalie sīyāvammahaṇdīo na lahaū nimisam̄ pi nivvāṇam̄..16..</i></p>	<p><i>udīcīnam̄ pratīcīnam̄ tatrāsti paramojjivalam̄ gīrvāṇaramaṇam̄ khyātam̄ udyānam̄ svargasam̄nib- ham..27.. tatra kalpatarucchāyamahāpāda- pasam̄kule sthāpavītā rahaḥ sītām̄ viveśa svaniketanam..28..</i></p>	<p><i>sīyaē vuttu ṇa paīsami paṭṭanē; acchami etthu viulē ṇan- daṇavanę..19.6.. [...] tam̄ ṇisunęvī uvavanę paīsāriya; sīsavarukkhamūlę vaīsāriya..19.8.. mellēvi sīya vanę gaū rāvaṇu gharahō tu- rantaü; dhavalēhī maṅgalēhī thiu rajju saīm bhuñjan- taü..19.9..</i></p>
--	---	---

Rāvaṇa leaves Sītā in a park called “Gladdening the gods” (*devaramaṇa*, Raviṣeṇa: *gīrvāṇaramaṇa*). Raviṣeṇa exploits the implied divine nature of the park, by likening it to heaven, and specifying that the trees he leaves her near resemble wishing trees. Curiously, Raviṣeṇa situates the park in a different area compared to Vimala: according to Vimala, the park is to the east of the city, whereas in Raviṣeṇa's text it is in the north-west. Hereafter Vimala adds a concluding verse to summarise Rāvaṇa's condition: outwardly sitting on his majestic, magnificent throne, yet inwardly completely restless and subjected to his love for Sītā. Raviṣeṇa skips this verse and immediately goes to the next scene, probably feeling he has made the paradox of Rāvaṇa's condition more than clear already in the previous passage. In Svayambhū's text, Sītā herself requests to be left in the pleasure grove, as she does not want to enter the city. Rāvaṇa brings her to the unnamed park without details about its location and installs her under an *asoka* tree (*sīsava*). He then enters his abode. Svayambhū concludes chapter 38 describing Rāvaṇa as follows: “He continued to rule over his kingdom, to the praises of heroic and benedictory songs”, with *saīm bhuñjantaü* (*Svayam bhujanta-*) as the author's *nāma-mudrā*, “name stamp”, standard at the end of each chapter. Chapters 39 and 40 revert to the Dāṇḍaka forest, where Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa discover Sītā has been abducted and team up with Virādhita.

8. *Lamentations for Kharadūṣaṇa from the wives and Candranakhā*

<p>kharadūṣaṇammi vahie tāva palāvaṇi kuṇanti ju- vaio</p> <p>mandoyaripamuhāo lañkāhivaissa ghariṇo..17..</p> <p>ekkoyarassa calaṇe can- daṇahā genhiūṇa rovanti bhaṇai hayasā</p> <p>pāvā ahayam paiputta- parimukkā..18..</p>	<p>tāvad dūṣanapañcatvād agrato 'sya mahāśucā aṣṭādaśa sahasrāṇi vipralepur mahāsvaram..29..</p> <p>bhrātuś candranakhā pādau saṃsṛtyonmuktakāñṭhakam abhägyā hā hatāsmīti vi- lalāpāstadurdinam..30..</p>	<p>kharadūṣaṇa gilēvi can- daṇahihē titti ṣa jāiyā ṇaṇi khayakālachuha rāvaṇahō paḍīvī dhāiyā (introductory ghattā of 41) [saṃvukumāravīrē atthantaē; kharadūṣaṇasamṛgāmē samat- taē..1.1..</p> <p>dūrosāriē sundamahavvalē; tamalañkāraṇayaru gaē hari- valē..1.2..</p> <p>ettha ē asuramallē surañāmarē;</p> <p>lañkāhivē vahulad- dhamahāvarē ..1.3..</p> <p>paravalavalapavaṇāhindolaṇē; vaīrisamuddaraüddaviro- laṇē ..1.4..</p> <p>mukkañkusamayagala- galathallaṇē; dāñaraṇaṅgaṇe hatthutthallaṇē..1.5..</p> <p>vihaṇiyabhaḍathādañakiya- kaḍamaddaṇē;</p> <p>kāmiñijaṇamaṇaṇayaṇaṇa- daṇē..1.6..</p> <p>sīyaē sahu suravarasamptāvaṇē; chuḍu chuḍu lañka pañṭhaē rāvaṇē] ..1.7..</p> <p>tahī avasarē candaṇahī parāiyā; ḥiṇaḍiya kamaka- malēhī duhaghāiyā ..1.8..</p> <p>saṃvukumārū muu;</p> <p>kharadūṣaṇa jaṇapahē lāiyā pañjīvantaēṇa; ehī avattha haū pāiyā..1.9..</p>
---	---	---

Rāvaṇa’s wives mourn the death of Kharadūṣaṇa. Vimala specifies that they are headed by Mandodarī. Raviṣeṇa does not mention the wives but calls them “the 18,000”, indicating their number. Thereupon, his sister Candranakhā falls at his feet, lamenting her fate. Vimala and Raviṣeṇa only differ in small details: Vimala’s Candranakhā seems to recognise her karmic responsibility in the loss of her husband and son, saying: “I am a wretched sinner, having lost my husband and son.” Raviṣeṇa’s Candranakhā, her voice unrestrained, bewails his sad day of death, saying: “Unfortunate, ha, and wretched am I.” Svayambhū’s chapter 41 begins at this stage, with an introductory verse parallelling Candranakhī’s going to Rāvaṇa: “Having devoured Khara and Dūṣaṇa, Candranakhī did not feel satisfied. Like the hunger of the time of destruction, she rushed

back to Rāvaṇa.” In addition to her approaching Rāvaṇa, the verse implies that Candranakhī was ultimately the cause of Khara and Dūṣaṇa’s death, as she will be the cause of Rāvaṇa’s death, instigating them to fight Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.⁶ As chapters 39 and 40 described events in the Daṇḍaka forest, and the author now brings us back to Laṅkā, the first *kaṭavaka* of this chapter summarises the events from the previous chapters, from the death of prince Śambūka up to Rāvaṇa’s return with Sītā to Laṅkā, describing Rāvaṇa as the mighty warrior and ladies’ man. Like in Vimala’s and Raviṣeṇa’s texts, Candranakhī falls at Rāvaṇa’s feet and laments the death of her son and Khara and Dūṣaṇa. Different here is that Candranakhī suggests Rāvaṇa is at least in part responsible for her situation, and should rectify it: “Though you still are alive, I have been brought to this state.”

9. *Rāvaṇa responds.*

<p><i>vilavanti bhaṇaī</i> <i>tao laṅkāpura-</i> <i>paramesaro alaṁ</i> <i>vacche</i> <i>runṇeṇa kiṁ va kīraī</i> <i>puvvakayam āgayaṇi</i> <i>kammaṇi..19..</i> <i>vacche jena raṇamuhu</i> <i>nihaō kharadūṣaṇo</i> <i>tuha suo ya</i> <i>taṁ peccha vahijjan-</i> <i>taṁ sahāyasahiyam</i> <i>tu acireṇam..20..</i></p>	<p><i>ramanātmajaprapāñcatvavah-</i> <i>ninirdagdhamānasām</i> <i>vilapantim imāṇi bhūri jagādaivam sa-</i> <i>hoodaraḥ..31..</i> <i>alaṁ vatse ruditvā te prasiddham kiṁ na</i> <i>vidyate</i> <i>jagat prāgvihitam sarvam prāpnoty atra</i> <i>na samśayah..32..</i> <i>anyathā kva mahicārā janāḥ kṣudra-</i> <i>kaśktayah</i> <i>kvāyam evaṇvidho bhartā bhavatyā vy-</i> <i>omagocarah..33..</i> <i>mayedam arjitaṁ pūrvam vyaktam</i> <i>nyāyāgataṁ phalam</i> <i>iti jñātvā śucam kartum kasya</i> <i>marthyasya yujyate..34..</i> <i>nākale mriyate kaścid vajrenāpi</i> <i>samāhataḥ</i> <i>mṛtyukāle ‘mṛtaṁ jantor viṣatāṁ prati-</i> <i>padyate..35..</i> <i>yena vyāpādito vatsē samare</i> <i>kharadūṣanah</i> <i>anyeṣāṁ vāhitecchānāṇi mṛtyur eṣā</i> <i>bhavāmy aham..36..</i></p>	<p><i>taṁ candaṇahihē</i> <i>vayānu dayāvānu;</i> <i>niṣuṇevi thiū</i> <i>heṭṭhāmuḥu</i> <i>rāvaṇu..2.1..</i> <i>ṇam̄ mayalañchaṇu</i> <i>nippahu jāyāu;</i> <i>giri va davaṇgidaḍḍhu</i> <i>vicchāyāu..2.2..</i> <i>ṇam̄ muṇivaru cārī-</i> <i>tavibhaṭṭhaū;</i> <i>bhaviu va</i> <i>bhavasamṣāraḥo</i> <i>taṭṭhaū..2.3..</i> <i>vāhabharantaṇayaṇu</i> <i>muḥakāyaru;</i> <i>gahēṇa gahiu ḡam̄ hū</i> <i>divāyaru..2.4..</i> <i>dukkhu dukkhu</i> <i>dukkheṇāmelliū;</i> <i>sayaṇaṣeṇu sarantu</i> <i>pavolliu..2.5..</i> <i>ghāiu jena samvu kharu</i> <i>dūṣanu;</i> <i>taṁ paṭṭhavami aju ja-</i> <i>masāṣanu..2.6..</i> <i>ahavaī eṇa kāī</i> <i>māhappem;</i> <i>ko vi ḡa maraī apūrem</i> <i>mappem..2.7..</i></p>
--	---	---

⁶ In the *Paūmacariu* Kharadūṣaṇa are two individuals Khara and Dūṣaṇa, as in the *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa*.

		dhīrī hohi pamāyahi soo; kāsu ḥa jammaṇama- raṇavioo..2.8.. ko vi ḥa vajjamaü jāem jīvem marievaü; amhēhī tumhēhī mi kharadūsaṇapahē jāevaü..2.9..
--	--	---

Rāvaṇa tells Candranakhā to stop crying. Raviṣeṇa here adds a description of Candranakhā as “one whose mind was scorched by the fire of the death of her son and husband.” Vimala’s Rāvaṇa reminds Candranakhā of the fact that this must be the result of some karma, being the typical Jain answer to sorrow and which Candranakhā already alluded to some verses up. Raviṣeṇa’s Candranakhā does not display this awareness, as Rāvaṇa points out: “Do you not know the famous [truth]? All of mankind obtains what has been done before. There is no doubt there.” In Raviṣeṇa’s text Rāvaṇa then gives her some general instruction on the workings of karma and the inevitability of death: “In another way: how do the people possessing little power and walking the earth correspond with that husband of yours, of such quality, who travelled the sky? ‘I clearly rightfully obtained this fruit in the past’, if one knows this, for what mortal would it be suitable to grieve? No one dies at the wrong time, even when struck by lightning. At the time of death, even ambrosia becomes poison for a living being.” In both texts, Rāvaṇa then promises Candranakhā that he will kill the one who killed her husband, and, according to Vimala, her son. Svayambhū again takes more liberty, by inserting the effect of Candranakhī’s words on Rāvaṇa, suggestive of his own grief at the loss of his brothers-in-law and nephew: “Hearing those lamentable words of Candranakhī, Rāvaṇa stood there, his face turned towards the ground, like the moon that had lost its lustre, like a gloomy mountain burned by forest fires, like a great sage strayed from good behaviour like a man capable of salvation yet frightened of the cycle of rebirth. His eyes filled with tears and his face perplexed, he was like the sun seized by Rahu the eclipsing. With great difficulty, sorrow let go of him.” He then collects himself and makes the same vow to Candranakhī as Vimala’s and Raviṣeṇa’s Rāvaṇa did, to kill the one who killed Śambūka, Khara, and Dūṣaṇa, adding thoughts on the inevitability of death, similar to Raviṣeṇa’s Rāvaṇa, though using different phrasings.

10. Rāvaṇa goes to his chambers

<p>saṁthāviūṇa bahiṇī āesam jiṇaharaccaṇe dāum pavisaraī niyayabhavaṇam dasāṇaṇo mayaṇajara- gahio..21..</p>	<p>svasāram evam āśvāsyā dattādeśo jinārcane dahyamānamānā yāsabha- vanaṇi rāvaṇo ‘viśat..37..</p>	<p>dhīrēvi ḥiyaya vahiṇi siyamāṇaṇu; rayaṇihī gaū sovaṇaē dasāṇaṇu..3.1..</p>
--	--	---

In almost identical verses, Vimala and Raviṣeṇa describe that Rāvaṇa gives an order for a homage to the Jina, after which he retreats to his chambers. Svayambhū does not mention the homage and specifies that he goes to bed at night.

11. Mandodarī sees him.

<p>mandoyerī pavijjhā daiyam daṭṭhūṇa dihanisāsam bhaṇai[...].22..</p>	<p>tatrādaranirākāmksaṇam tal- pavikṣiptavagraham sonmādakeśaricchāyam niḥśvasantam ivoragam..38.. bhartāraṇ duḥkhayukteva bhūṣaṇādaravarjītā mahādaram uvācaivam upasṛtya mayātmajā..39..</p>	<p>varapallaṇkē caṇḍiu laṇke- saru; ṇam girisiharē maṇdu sake- saru..3.2.. ṇam visaharu ḥiṣāsu muan- taü; ṇam sajjaṇu khalakhejjian- taü..3.3.. sīyāmohēṇ mohiu rāvaṇu; gāyāi vāyāi paḍhaï suhāvaṇu..3.4.. ṇaccaï hasaï viyārēhī bhaj- jaï; ṇiyabhūahū ji paḍīvaü laj- jaï..3.5.. daṁṣaṇaṇaṇacarittaviro- haü; ihaloyahō paraloyahō do- haü..3.6.. mayaṇaparavvasu eu ḥa jānaü; jiha samghāru karesaï jānaü..3.7.. acchaï mayaṇasarēhī jaj- jariyaü; kharadūṣaṇaṇaū mi vīsariyaü..3.8.. cintaï dahavayaṇu dhaṇu dhaṇu suvaṇu samatthaü; raju vi jīvi vi viṇu sīyāe savvu niratthaü..3.9.. tahī avasarē āiya mandovari; sīhahō pāsu va sīhakiso- yari..4.1.. varagaṇiyāri va līlagāminī;</p>
--	--	--

	<p>piyamāhaviya va mahurālāviṇi..4.2.. sāraṅgi va vipphāriyaṇayaṇi; sattāvīsamjōyāṇavayaṇi..4.3</p> <p>.. kalaham̄si va thiraman- tharagamanī; lacchi va tiyarūvem̄ jūra- vanī..4.4.. aha pomāṇihē aṇuharamāṇi; jiha sā tiha eha vi paürāṇi..4.5.. jiha sā tiha eha vi vahujāṇi; jiha sā tiha eha vi vahumāṇi..4.6.. jiha sā tiha eha vi sumāṇohara; jiha sā tiha eha vi piyasun- dara..4.7.. jiha sā tiha eha vi jiṇasāsaṇē; jiha sā tiha eha vi ḡa kusāsaṇē..4.8.. kiṇ vahujampiṇē uvamijjā kāh̄ kisoyari; ṇiyapadīchandaṇē thiya saī jē ḡāī mando- yari..4.9.. tahī pallaṇkē caḍēvi rajje- sari; pabhanīya laṅkāpura- paramesari..5.1..</p>
--	--

Mandodarī sees her husband sighing and addresses him. Raviṣeṇa expands with descriptions and similes indicating both Rāvaṇa’s emotional state and stature and its effect on Mandodarī: he is indifferent to her care and dismisses her attempts at playful quarrelling, looking like a frantic lion and hissing like a snake. This renders Mandodarī sad, as if robbed of her jewels and respect. Svayambhū uses this opportunity to develop more fully his portrayal of Rāvaṇa and Mandodarī and their exchange in the bedroom over several *kaḍavakas*. He starts with an elaborate one-*kaḍavaka* description of Rāvaṇa, echoing Raviṣeṇa’s similes of the hissing snake and a lion, with the added detail that, having climbed upon his bed, he looks like a lion on a mountain. He further elaborates on Rāvaṇa’s complete infatuation with Sītā, and his paradoxical feelings and actions, typical of one struck by love (*kāma*): he is afflicted and ashamed yet sings, plays music, dances, laughs, etc. Nothing matters

to him but Sītā. He even forgets about the fate of Khara and Dūṣaṇa. The poet briefly reflects on love's destructive power for one's spiritual well-being and that Rāvaṇa is unaware that his infatuation will cause his ultimate downfall. The next *kaṭavaka* gives a poetic description of Mandodarī entering the bedroom, comparing her stereotypical attributes to animals, and likening her to Indra's wife Paulomī. She climbs onto the bed and then addresses Rāvaṇa.

12. *Mandodarī addresses Rāvaṇa about his sorrow.*

<p>...visāyam sāmiya mā vacca-su dūṣaṇavahammi..22.. anne vi tujha bandhū ettheva mayā na soiyā tumhe kiṇ puṇa dūṣaṇasogaṁ sāmi apuvvam samuvvahasi..23..</p>	<p>kiṇ nāthākulatāṁ dhatse kharadūṣaṇamṛtyunā na viṣādo 'sti śūrāṇām āpatsu mahatiṣ api..40.. purānekatra samgrāme suhṛdas te kṣayam gatāḥ na ca sōcītā jātu dūṣaṇam kintu sōcasi..41.. āsan mahendrasaṁgrāme śrīmālipramukhāḥ nrpāḥ bāndhavās te kṣayam yātāḥ sōcītā te na jātucit..42.. abhūtarasvāśokas tv amāśid api mahāpadi</p>	<p>śōkam kiṇ vahasīdānīm ji-jñāsāmi vibho vada..43..</p> <p>ahō dahamuha dahavayaṇa dasāṇa; ahō dasasira dasāśa siyamāṇana..5.2.. ahō tāilokka-cakkacūḍāmanī; vāirimahiharakharava-jjāsanī..5.3.. vīsapāṇī nisīyaraṇarakesari; surami-gavāraṇadāraṇaaraikari..5.4.. . paraṇaravarapāyārapa-lotṭaṇa; duddamadāṇavavaladala-vattāṇa..5.5.. jaiyāhū bhiṇṇu ranāiṅgāñē indahō; jāu kulakkhaū saj-jaṇavindahō..5.6.. tahī vi kālē paī dukkhu ṣaṇṇāyāū; jiha kharadūṣaṇama-ranem jāyāū..5.7..</p>
---	---	---

Vimalasūri's and Raviṣeṇa's Mandodarī urges Rāvaṇa to abandon his sadness, which she assumes is caused by the death of Kharadūṣaṇa. She observes that many of Rāvaṇa's relatives have died in the past, but this never upset him that much, and she questions what makes the death of Kharadūṣaṇa different. Raviṣeṇa's Mandodarī elaborates that it is not proper for warriors to be sad, even in great misfortune, and repeats that they have lost many relatives in the past, giving the example of Śrīmālin; Rāvaṇa displayed no sadness then, so she questions what is different now. Svayambhū begins this scene with Mandodarī addressing Rāvaṇa with many of his standard epithets and praises his warrior skills. Contrasting with these qualities she observes that he lost many relatives in the fight with Indra, but never displayed such sadness as he does now at the death of Khara and Dūṣaṇa.

13. *Rāvaṇa* confesses that his sadness is due to *Sītā* not wanting him.

<p>lajjanto bhāṇai tao suṇa sun- dari ettha sārasabbhāvaṇi jai no rūsesi tumaṇi to haṇi sāhemi sasivayaṇe..24..</p> <p>sambukko jeṇa hao vivāio dūṣaṇo ya samgāme sīyā tassa mahiliyā hariūṇa mae ihā”ṇīyā..25..</p> <p>jai nāma sā surūvā na mae icchaī pāiṇi mayaṇatattam to natthi jīviyāṇi me tujjha pie sāhiyāṇi eyāṇi..26..</p>	<p>tato mahodaraḥ svairam niśvasyovāca rāvaṇaḥ talpaṇi kiṇcīt parityajya dhārīto dīrītākṣaram..44..</p> <p>śrīṇu sundari sadbhāvam ekāṇi te kathayāmy aham svāminy asi mamāsūnām sarvadā kṛtavāñchitā..45..</p> <p>yadi vāñchasi jīvantam māṇi tato devi nārhasi kopāṇi kartuṇi nanu prāṇā mūlaṇi sarvasya vas- tunāḥ..46..</p> <p>tatas tayaivam ityukte śapathair viniyamya tām vīlakṣa iva kiṇcīt sa rāvaṇaḥ samabhāṣata..47..</p> <p>yadi sā vedhasaḥ srṣṭir apūrvā duḥkhavarṇanā sītā patiṇi na māṇi vaṣṭi tato me nāsti jīvitam..48..</p> <p>lāvanyaṇi yauvanaṇi rūpam mādhuryam cāruceṣṭitam prāpya tām sundarīm ekāṇi kṛtārthatvam upāgatam..49..</p>	<p>bhāṇai pañīvāū ḡisi- yaraṇāḥo; sundari jai ḡa karaṇi avarāḥo..5.8..</p> <p>to haū kahami tāi; ḡaū kharadūṣaṇadukkhu ‘cchāi ettī dāhu para; jaṇi maī vaiidehi ḡa icchāi..5.9..</p>
--	---	---

Vimalasūri’s *Rāvaṇa* is embarrassed by his condition and explains to Mandodarī, hoping to not make her angry, that he abducted the wife of the man who killed Śambūka and Dūṣaṇa. He is not exactly telling the truth here: it was Lakṣmaṇa who killed Śambūka and Kharadūṣaṇa, not Rāma. Either he deliberately lies because he wants to make Sītā’s abduction a retaliation for the death of his relatives, or he takes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa as a collective. He is very straightforward and dramatic that if Sītā does not want him for a husband, he has no life. Raviṣeṇa as usual adds some more detail to the conversation, especially in specifying *Rāvaṇa*’s condition: *Rāvaṇa* sighs, gets up from the bed and then addresses Mandodarī, carefully selecting his words. In his address he first praises Mandodarī as the mistress of his life’s breath and rather dramatically asks her not to be angry, otherwise, he would not survive. Only after she agrees, embarrassed *Rāvaṇa* tells her that he sees no point to life and everything it encompasses, because Sītā, whom he calls an unparalleled creation of the creator, does not desire him. Svayambhū opts for brevity and directness here: *Rāvaṇa* tells Mandodarī that his sorrow is not for the death of Khara and Dūṣaṇa, but because Sītā rejected him.

14. *Mandodarī responds, asking why he does not take her by force.*

<p>daīyam eyāvattham̄ dat̄thum̄ <i>mandoyerī samullavaī;</i> <i>mahilā sā akayatthā jā deva</i> <i>tuman̄ na icchei..27..</i> <i>ahavā sayalatihuyaṇe sā ekkā</i> <i>rūvajovvaṇaguṇaddhā..</i> <i>aīmāṇagavvienam̄ joijjaijā jā</i> <i>tume sāmi..28..</i> <i>keūrabhūsiyāsū imāsū</i> <i>bāhāsu karikarasamāsū</i> <i>kiha na 'vagūhasi</i> <i>sāmiya tam̄ vilayam̄ sabal-</i> <i>akārenam̄..29..</i></p>	<p>tato mandodari kaṣṭām̄ <i>jñātvā tasya daśam̄ imām̄</i> <i>vihasanti jagādaivam̄ vis-</i> <i>phuraddantacandrikā..50..</i> <i>īdaṃ nātha mahāścaryam̄</i> <i>varo yat kurute 'rthanam̄</i> <i>apuṇyā sābalā nūnam̄ yā</i> <i>tvām̄ nārthayate svayam̄..51..</i> <i>athavā nikhile loke saivaikā</i> <i>paramodayā</i> <i>yā tvayā mānakūṭena yācyate</i> <i>paramāpadā..52..</i> <i>keyūraratnajāṭilair imaih</i> <i>karikaropamaih</i> <i>āliṅga bāhubhil̄ kasmād</i> <i>balāt kāmayase na tām..53..</i></p>	<p>6 <i>taṃ ṇisuṇevi vayaṇu sasi-</i> <i>vayaṇāe;</i> <i>puṇu vi hasevi vuttu mi-</i> <i>gaṇayaṇāe..1..</i> <i>ahō dahagīva</i> <i>jīvasamtāvāṇa;</i> <i>eu ajuttu vuttu paī</i> <i>rāvana..2..</i> <i>kim̄ jagē ayasapaḍahu</i> <i>apphālahi;</i> <i>ubhaya visuddha vāṃsa kim̄</i> <i>maīlahi..3..</i> <i>kim̄ ṇāraīyahō ṇārae ṇā</i> <i>vīhahi;</i> <i>paradhaṇu parakalattu jaṃ</i> <i>īhahi..4..</i> <i>jiṇavarasāṣāṇe pañca virud-</i> <i>dhaī;</i> <i>duggājāi ṇinti avisud-</i> <i>dhaī..5..</i> <i>pahilaü vahu cha-</i> <i>jjīvanikāyahū;</i> <i>vīyaü gammaï</i> <i>micchāvāyahū..6..</i> <i>taīyaü jaṃ paradavvu</i> <i>laijjaī;</i> <i>caūthāü parakalattu sevij-</i> <i>jai..7..</i> <i>pañcamu ṇaü pamāṇu ghar-</i> <i>avārahō;</i> <i>āyahī gammaï</i> <i>bhavasam̄sārahō..8..</i> <i>paraloē vi ṇa suhu</i> <i>ihaloē vi ayasapaḍāiyā;</i> <i>sundara hoi ṇa tiya</i> <i>čyavesem̄ jamaūri āiya..9..</i> 7 <i>puṇu puṇu pihulaṇiyamva</i> <i>kisoyari;</i> <i>bhaṇai hiyattaṇeṇa mando-</i> <i>yari..1..</i> <i>jaṃ suhu kālakūḍu visu</i> <i>khantahū;</i> <i>jaṃ suhu palayāṇalu</i> <i>paīsantahū..2..</i> <i>jaṃ suhu bhavasam̄sārē</i> <i>bhamantahū;</i> <i>jaṃ suhu ṇāraīyahū ṇivas-</i> <i>antahū..3..</i></p>
--	---	--

	jam suhu jamasāsaṇu pec- chantahū; jam suhu asipañjarē accha- ntahū..4.. jam suhu palayāṇala- muhakandarē; jam suhu pañcāṇaṇadāḍhantarē..5.. jam suhu phaṇimāṇikku khuḍantahū; tam suhu eha ḡāri bhuñjan- tahū..6.. jāṇanto vi to vi jaī vañ- chahi; to kajjeṇa keṇa maī puccha- hi..7.. taū pāsiu kiṁ koi vi valiyaü; jeṇa purandaro vi paḍikhaliyaü..8.. jam jasu āvaḍā tahō tam anurāu ḡa bhajjaü; jaī vi asundaraü jam pahu karei tam chaj- ja..9..
--	--

Vimala’s Mandodarī answers Rāvaṇa that a woman who does not long for him is “unsuccessful”, i.e. a loser and that a woman’s qualities depend on her being seen by Rāvaṇa. She then asks why he does not force himself upon her. Raviṣeṇa describes Mandodarī here as laughing with shiny white teeth while she speaks. He further elaborates her speech, calling it a great wonder that the groom (also “eminent one”, *vara*) is the one supplicating, and repeating that the woman who does not want him, is wicked and that a woman is only successful if Rāvaṇa desires her, and asking why he does not take her by force. Svayambhū, in a much lengthier passage, depicts a completely different Mandodarī: though she laughs, she sums up the things that a person should avoid according to the teachings of the Jina, corresponding to the lay vows. By emphasising the possible consequences of betraying the vow of brahmacarya in pursuing another man’s wife, she tries to get Rāvaṇa to distance himself from Sītā. Eventually accepting Rāvaṇa’s desire for Sītā, despite all this, she asks how Sītā could stop a powerful man like Rāvaṇa, if he wanted her, suggesting he could take her by force.

Discussion: Transcreating Rāma

from Vimala to Raviṣeṇa...

It is evident that Vimalasūri's version to a large degree was the blueprint for Raviṣeṇa. Very often all of Vimala's words have been incorporated in Raviṣeṇa's verses. To be clear, Vimalasūri's text is fine in and of itself and is a pleasure to read. It does not give the impression of lacking anything, properly balancing action and dialogue, tension and pace. Raviṣeṇa's amplifications tend to make the scenes more intense, often making explicit what in Vimalasūri's text the audience members would fill for themselves. By adding detail and expanding, the pace of the narrative is naturally slower and more time is taken to evoke audience responses and to allow these to settle. In this passage, Raviṣeṇa's additions result in a different, more thorough, development of the characters and their state of mind. For instance, where Vimalasūri's Rāvaṇa is at first cool and in control and only reveals his weakness after Sītā rejects him, Raviṣeṇa's version amplifies the incongruity of his stature, character and behaviour: on the one hand he is one of the most powerful and respected men in the world, on the other he is completely powerless and subjected to a woman who rejects him, rendering him a comical fool, who in slapstick-fashion pops up on all sides of her.⁷ So too in his exchange with Candranakhā, who according to Vimala herself seems to suggest that her misfortune is the result of past bad karma. Raviṣeṇa's Candranakhā lacks such awareness, and it is Rāvaṇa, the sinner who just abducted another man's wife after seeing her for the first time, who ironically and tragically suggests his sister's past deeds are to blame and lectures her on the workings of karma, clearly not taking heed of his own advice. Similarly, in the dialogue with Mandodarī, Raviṣeṇa gives detail to both her and Rāvaṇa's state of mind and behaviour, allowing the audience to dwell at length on their condition. We see a similar treatment of the character of Sītā in this passage. Whereas Vimala's Sītā, her back turned towards him implying disrespect and possibly anger, rejects Rāvaṇa and warns him that his behaviour will have bad karmic consequences, Raviṣeṇa's Sītā is portrayed as explicitly angry, not just having her back toward him, but insulting him and claiming her words of wisdom are fruitless for men like him.

⁷ On Raviṣeṇa's use of humor in his portrayal of Rāvaṇa, see Clines 2019. On the use of *hāsyā* in Jain texts, cf. Monius 2015.

...to Svayambhūdeva

Though he explicitly names Raviṣeṇa as his source and there are many clear elements that show correspondence, Svayambhū, at least in this selected passage, does not follow Raviṣeṇa’s text as closely as Raviṣeṇa follows Vimala. One significant change concerns the order of the scenes. The interactions between Rāvaṇa and Sītā in the chariot, depicted by Vimala and Raviṣeṇa in chapter 46, are presented by Svayambhū at an earlier point in the narrative. Though Svayambhū overall follows the order of events in Raviṣeṇa’s text faithfully, an alteration such as this one, albeit not very common, is also not unique. Being a deliberate choice, it deserves discussion. The episodes surrounding this scene depict Sītā’s abduction, one of the major turning points in the narrative. The abduction occurs simultaneously with other events involving Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, and others. Vimalasūri (PCV) and Raviṣeṇa (PCR) increase the tension of this episode by switching scenes at a higher pace: after Rāvaṇa grabs Sītā and kills Jatāyu (PCV 44.39–46; PCR 44.83–100), we switch to Rāma arriving on the battlefield, and immediately being sent back by Lakṣmaṇa (PCV 44.47–51; PCR 44.101–104). The scene then shifts with Rāma’s return to the hut where he finds Sītā missing and Jatāyu dead. He faints and loses his mind, and the chapter ends with Rāma pitifully addressing the trees and mountains in the forest for her whereabouts (PCV 44.52–67; PCR 44.105–151). At the beginning of the next chapter, we switch back to the battlefield where Virādhita, an enemy of the Rākṣasas, arrives and joins Lakṣmaṇa in fighting the Rākṣasas (PCV 45.1–16; PCR 45.1–31). When the fight is over, they head back to Rāma’s hut and find him there without Sītā. Virādhita sends his troops to find news of Sītā (PCV 45.17–27; PCR 45.32–57). At this point we switch to Rāvaṇa, who on his return to Laṅkā with Sītā is unsuccessfully confronted by an ally of Sītā’s twin brother Bhāmaṇḍala (PCV 45.28–32; PCR 45.58–71), then reverting to the Dandaka forest where Virādhita’s armies return without any news of Sītā and Rāma falls to mourning (PCV 45.31–35; PCR 45.72–78). Virādhita, Lakṣmaṇa, and Rāma then head to Pātālalaṅkā, defeat the Rākṣasa Sunda there, who flees with his mother Candranakhā to Laṅkā. The chapter ends with Rāma visiting the Jina temple (PCV 45.36–46; PCR 45.79–105). It is at this point that chapter 46 starts with the exchange between Rāvaṇa and Sītā analysed above. Svayambhū, on the other hand, chooses to keep the focus on Rāvaṇa and Sītā from the moment of the abduction, immediately followed by the death of Jatāyin, Rāvaṇa’s fight with Bhāmaṇḍala’s ally, Rāvaṇa’s and Sītā’s exchange up to their arrival in Laṅka, covering

the second half of chapter 38. It is only after this, in chapter 39, that Rāma finds Sītā abducted and Jatāyin dead. Chapter 40 switches to the battlefield where Virādhita arrives, and he and Lakṣmaṇa kill Khara and Dūṣaṇa. After the battle, Lakṣmaṇa and Virādhita find that Sītā has been abducted and Rāma is in despair. All head to Tamalaṅkāra where they chase away Sunda, who flees to Rāvaṇa. At this point, chapter 41 commences with the return of Candranakhī and her grief. By choosing to switch less frequently between the scenes, Svayambhū is able to focus more on the characters and to allow sentiments evoked to work deeper and linger for longer. By narrating Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā, his killing of Jatāyin, and defeat of Bhāmanḍala's ally in one sequence of half a chapter, his crude and violent nature is very prominent in the audience's mind and may explain the poet's choice of portraying Rāvaṇa as rather a violent, overconfident brute in his verbal exchange with Sītā, devoid of any kind of karmically determined submissiveness to passion as we find in Vimala's and Raviṣeṇa's depiction. The violence and fierceness of the scene is also present in Sītā's response, which is devoid of any concern for Rāvaṇa's karmic condition. The subsequent chapter 39 balances this lack of reference to Jain ideology, when compared to Vimala's and Raviṣeṇa's texts, by allowing an entire chapter for Rāma's despair at the abduction of Sītā and the death of Jatāyin. Most of chapter 39 is taken up by a visit of *cāraṇa* seers who provide Rāma with some temporary relief of Jain instruction in the impermanence of human existence, an episode which is absent in Vimala's and Raviṣeṇa's texts and hence a deliberate innovation by Svayambhū. In chapter 40, the battle of Lakṣmaṇa and Virādhita with Khara and Dūṣaṇa is narrated, followed by the retrieval of Virādhita's ancestral city Tamalaṅkāra from the Rākṣasas. In the end, Rāma finds some relief in the Jina temple in the city. An additional effect of the absence of Rāvaṇa and Sītā from chapters 39 and 40, and the many events that take place after Sītā's abduction is the experience of distance, both in space and time, between Sītā and Rāvaṇa on the one hand and Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa on the other. The longer the sole focus is on Rāma and his situation in the Daṇḍaka forest, the more tangible Sītā's absence becomes. Rāma has no clue what happened to his beloved, and the longer the audience is without an update on her whereabouts, the more it can empathise with Rāma's despair. In the next scene, Svayambhū's choice of portraying Rāvaṇa, in his exchange with Sītā in the celestial chariot, as a violent, lascivious brute, followed by Sītā's fierce response threatening his life, after which Rāvaṇa's first

instinct is to kill her, strikingly echoes Vālmīki’s parallel episodes.⁸ This may very well be a deliberate attempt to approximate Vālmīki’s account, perhaps to accommodate audience expectations or preferences, but Svayambhū’s reordering of the scenes may also be a factor here: as it is, the harsh tone of this scene is more in line with the string of violent scenes immediately preceding it, starting with the abduction and slaying of Jaṭayin. However, Svayambhū counters this representation of a crude and violent Rāvaṇa, by describing his sadness when Candranakhī brings him the news of the death of Khara and Dūṣaṇa. Next, in his description of Rāvaṇa’s and Mandodari’s encounter, Svayambhū for the first time, and at much greater length than his predecessors, dwells on Rāvaṇa’s state of mind in his blinding, all-consuming passion for Sītā, and the dangers it represents for his karmic condition. Also much longer and more detailed is Svayambhū’s description of Mandodari as she enters the bedroom and addresses Rāvaṇa, and a complete change is her attempt to dissuade Rāvaṇa from pursuing Sītā, portraying her as a devout Jain woman, in a way parallel to Sītā’s words in her exchange with Rāvaṇa in Vimalasūri’s and Raviṣeṇa’s accounts, albeit much longer. Svayambhū’s Mandodari is here a very different Mandodari from that of Vimala and Raviṣeṇa who suggests her husband should take Sītā by force.⁹ This portrayal corresponds to several Jain and non-Jain accounts of a benign Mandodari, mediating the release of Sītā, and may be inspired by the prominent motif found in the other Jain narrative tradition, of Guṇabhadra’s *Uttarapurāṇa*, where Sītā is the daughter of Rāvaṇa and Mandodari, and Mandodari is portrayed as equally benign.¹⁰

Bibliography

Primary sources

Guṇabhadra. *Mahāpurāṇa* (Vol. II); *Uttar Purāṇa of Acārya Gunbhadra*. Edited by Pannalal Jain. Kāshī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1954.

Raviṣeṇa. *Padma Purāṇa of Raviṣeṇācārya* : With Hindi Translation, 3 vols. Edited and translated by Pannalal Jain. Kāshī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1958–1959.

⁸ Svayambhūdeva’s choice of separating Kharadūṣaṇa into two individuals corresponds to Vālmiki.

⁹ Note that later on in the narrative, Raviṣeṇa’s (ch. 73) and Vimalasūri’s (ch. 70) Mandodari does try to persuade Rāvaṇa to give back Sītā after evil portents appeared.

¹⁰ See *Uttarapurāṇa* 68.340–362. See also John and Mary Brockington’s database: Brockington and Brockington 2022: cumulative L-2, 74–76.

Svayambhūdeva. *Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva*, 3 vols. Edited by Harivallabh Chunilal Bhayani. Bombay: Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavana, 1953–1960.

Vālmīki. *The Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa*, 7 vols. Edited by Govindlal Hargovind Bhatt. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1960–1975.

Vimalasūri. Ācārya Vimalasūri's *Paumacariyam* with Hindi Translation, 2 vols. Edited by Hermann Jacobi, Shantilal M Vora, and Muni Shri Punyavijayaji. Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society, 1962–1968.

Secondary sources

Brockington, John & Mary Brockington, *Development and spread of the Rāma narrative*. University of Oxford 2022. (<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:8df9647a-8002-45ff-b37e-7effb669768b>)

Chandra, K. Rishabh. *A Critical Study of Paumacariyam*. Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa, 1970.

Clines, Gregory M. *The Lotus' New Bloom: Literary Innovation in Early Modern North India*. PhD thesis, Study of Religion, Harvard University, 2018.

—. *Jain Rāmāyaṇa Narratives: Moral Vision and Literary Innovation*. Oxford and New York: Routledge, 2022.

De Clercq, Eva. *Kritische Studie van Svayambhūdeva's Paūmacariu*. PhD thesis, Oriental languages and cultures, Ghent University, 2003.

—. *The Life of Padma*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2018–2023.

Gerow, Edwin. "Jayadeva's Poetics and the Classical Style." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109.4 (1989): 533–544.

Jacobi, Hermann. "Ueber die Entwicklung d. indischen Metrik in nachvedischer Zeit." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 38.3/4 (1884): 590–619.

Kulkarni, Vaman Mahadeo. *The Story of Rama in Jain Literature : As Presented by the Śvetāmbara and Digambara Poets in the Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Apabhraṃśa Languages*. 1st ed. Ahmedabad: Saraswati Pustak Bhandar, 1990.

Monius, Anne. "And We Shall Compose a Poem to Establish These Truths": The Power of Narrative Art in South Asian Literary Cultures." *Narrative, Philosophy and Life*. Ed. Allan Speight, 151–165. Dordrecht: Springer, 2015.

Ollett, Andrew. *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2017.

Plau, Adrian. *The Deeds of Sītā: A Critical Edition and Literary Contextual Analysis of the Sītācarit of Rāmcand Bālak*. PhD thesis, South Asia Section, SOAS, University of London, 2018.

Velankar, Hari Dāmodara. *Jinaratnakosa: An Alphabetical Register of Jain Works and Authors*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1944.