CHAPTER V

WOMAN CHARACTERS OF THE SAPTA KĀNDĀ
KĀMĀYANA & THE KĀMCHARIT MĀNAS;
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THEM
5.1 INTRODUCTION:

The scope and limits of the imagination of the poets mainly depend upon the environment in which they live. The ideals and imaginations in them grow in accordance with the impact of the age. In most cases, it is found that differences in their emotions and expressions are due to the differences in their age.

The two poets under considerations here are from two different regions. Therefore, the impact of the environment of their places is quite different. Due to the impact of the environment, it is natural that the economic, social and political influences over them are quite different. Shri Madhab Kandali was under a justice-loving ruler of the Barahi dynasty of the easternmost part of India while Tulsidas was a subject of a tyrant of the Muslim dynasty. So, it is natural that some impact of their contemporary age would fall upon their Kāvyas. Under such circumstances, differences would naturally arise as regards to their illustration of the story and characterisation.

The present monograph is the study of the woman characters of the two Kāvyas - the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana of Shri Madhab Kandali and the Rāmcharit Mānas of Tulsidas. It is, therefore,
necessary to make a comparative analysis of these characters in both the Kāvyas. Here in this chapter we try to make an analytical study of the woman characters in these Kāvyas under consideration, by finding out the similarities and dissimilarities between them.

5.2 THE MAIN BASIS OF SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE WOMAN CHARACTERS IN THE TWO VERSIONS OF RĀMĀYANA

The whole of India is consisted of one culture. Unity in diversity is the main feature of Indian culture. It is natural that there would be some similarities between these two poets since both of them are Indians. The Saptā Kānda Rāmāyana of Shri Kandali and the Rāmcharit Mānas of Goswamī Tulsīdās constitute one invaluable treasure of the Indian culture. Both of them are the patrons of Indian culture as well as the protectors and benefactors of it. Therefore, Indian ideals and culture have been reflected in both the Kāvyas. The poets depicted the female characters closely on the basis of such society and therefore, similarities are evident among them. Kaushalyā, Śītā, Sumitā and such other characters are the symbol of Indian culture and ideal Indian women.
Moreover, another reason of such similarity is the viewpoint of the two poets on women. There is a strange similarity of view points of the two poets on women. Both Shri Kandali and Shri Tulsidas are found depreciating women who disregard Indian culture and are against the Vedas. The women are depicted as the symbol of ignorance and as very simple. Besides, both the poets regard the virtuous and chaste women as praise-worthy and respectable and they were very liberal towards such women.

Another reason of their similarity is that they had the one and the same aim. It was the aim for both of them to reveal the greatness of lord Rām through the woman characters. So, through the characters of Tārā, Shabarī, Trijata, Ahalyā and such other female characters, they wanted to ascribe Rām as the incarnation of the Lord. This was why one can find similarity between the views of Shri Kandali and Goswami Tulsidas.

---

7. ibid ; 1/1066 & 1/210/2.
There was another aim for composition of the Rāmāyana in the mind of both the poets. It was human welfare. By accepting the human welfare Bhakti as the ideal of life, they tried to solve all the problems of the society. It is another reason as to why one can find similarity between the views of Shri Kandali and Tulsīdās on women. The main reason behind the similarity in cases of killing of Tārakā, troubles of Shurpanakhā, killing of Rāvana for abduction of Sītā etc. was the idea of human welfare in both the poets.

Therefore, the similarities found in the depiction of woman characters by Shri Kandali and Tulsīdās were obvious.

5.3 SIMILARITY IN WOMAN CHARACTERS

Sītā:

Both the poets projected Sītā as the main heroine of Rāmāyana. They find Sītā as the most beautiful and in several places they describe her beauty:

- Rājdhānsa Dekhā Sītā Tomar Gaman,
  Chakrabāk Jugal Tomar Dui Ton
  Janakar Jīva Dekh Nadi Mandākīni,
  Tomār Sadrish Sushobhita Madhyakhinī.

(Madhāb Kandali)

8 S.K. Rāmāyana ; 2/2081-3.
In both the versions, Sītā has been depicted as ideally devoted wife, virtuous, with firm conviction, wise, and 'Tyāg-moyee' as well as a 'Kshatriya lady'. Moreover, both of them show the 'PurvaRag' i.e. love at first sight in case of Sītā for Rām:

Mādhav Kandali -

"Rāmar Rupata Nimajila Man
`Bhaigoila Debi Mohit".¹¹

Tulsīdās -

"Dekhi Siyā Sobhā Sukhu Pawā,
Hriday Sarāhati Vachanu Na Āwa".¹²

Sītā was shown as possessing super-human qualities; and yet she has been depicted as a common woman. For example -

---

⁹R. Mānas ; 1/230/1-2.
¹¹S.K. Rāmāyana ; 1/1176.
¹²R. Mānas ; 1/229.
the impatience shown by Sītā at the appearance of the 'Suarna Mriga' (Deer of Gold), the misbehaviour towards Laxmana and the misbehaviour shown to Rāvana when 'Māyāshir' was presented to Sītā etc. show the common womanly nature in Sītā.13

Finally it can be said that both these two poets depicted Sītā as a lady with high qualities.14 They also projected Sītā as the ideal woman.

Māndodarī;

Both the poets give equal status to Māndodarī, the wife of Rāvana. She has been depicted as chaste, devoted, virtuous, liberal and just. In both the versions, Māndodarī is found advising her husband Rāvana to safeguard him from imminent danger:

"Agabārhi Māndodarī Karīl Prabodh Strisakalak Prabhu Nūjuwāi Krodh".15

(Mādhab Kandali)


15 S.K. Rāmāyana; 5/4214.
Mandodari is also depicted as a woman with high morality. Her advice to Rāvana proved this enormously. Both the poets painted her equally one who understood the greatness of Rām and who had complete faith in Rām.

Kandali - "Taisaniye Jāno Rām Nahanta Mānush".

Tulsīdās - "Rām Vibhurat As Hāl Tumhārā, Haṁ Na Koi Kul Rowa Nihārā".

Even after the death of Rāvana, Mandodari did not abuse Rām in both the Kāvyas. She rather wept bitterly saying about the qualities of her deceased husband.

KAUSHALYĀ:

Much similarity is evidenced between Shri Kandali and Tulsījī in case the case of illustration of Kaushalīyā.

---

16 R. Mānas ; 5/36/3.
19 R. Mānas ; 6/103/5 & 6/104.
The character of this first queen of king Dasaratha is very brief in both the Kāvyas. But within that limitation even both the poets successfully depicted her as an ideal mother, impartial, wise, chaste and the best house-wife.

It is natural on the part of Kaushalyā to seek for the good of her daughter-in-law. Both the poets depicted the picture of Kaushalyā as an ideal mother through the delight she received from the news of Rām's coronation and at the same time, the distress from the news of Rām's 'Vanavās'. Moreover both the poets described that Kaushalyā was with love for children and had equal affection for both Bharat and Rām. Even in Kandali's version she is found to speak of Rām and Bharat as one

- "Sharato Rāmat Tene Ekses Sharir".22

The same idea has also been found in the Rāmcharit Mānas:

- "Śaral Subhāy Māy Hia Lāye,
  Ati Hit Manahu Rām Firi Āye".23

22 S.K. Rāmāyana ; 2/2205.
23 R. Mānas ; 2/164/1.
"As Kahi Mātu Bharatu Hiye Lāy,
Than Pay Strawahi Nayan Jal Chhāy".  

Both the poets depicted her as

"Karyeshu Dasi, Karaneshu Māntri,
Sharyeshu Ramōhā".

SUMITRĀ:

In case of depiction of the character of Sumitrā, there is also similarity between Shri Kandali and Tulsidas. Sumitrā has been depicted as an ideal wife, ideal co-wife, ideal mother and ideal step-mother.

The description of Sumitrā is quite brief in both the Kāvyas. But she remains to be ideal in all respects and is free from all human weaknesses. For her, following of religious principles is the highest duty of a man:

MĀDHĀRA KANDALI:

"Sāfal Jīvan Mor Kalyān Sādhilo,
Abhīrode Chal Āp Kalyānar Path".  

\[\text{24}^{\text{ibid}}; 2/168/3.\]

\[\text{25}^{\text{S.K. Rāmāyana}}; 2/1955-7.\]
Tulsidas;

- "Bhuri Bhāg Bhājanu Bhayau
  Mohi Samet Bali Jāoo,
  Tyou Tumhare Man Chhāri
  Chhalu Kinha Ram Pad Thāoo". 26

The poets wanted to reveal the greatness of Rāma through the advice rendered to Lāxmana by Sumitra. 27 She is also found to very patient. 28 Finally it can be said that both the poets successfully painted the character of Sumitra equally as honourable and praise worthy.

KAÍKEYEE;

The picture of Kaikayee has been depicted equally by both the poets as very beautiful and a woman of all virtues. 29 She is also adorned with several good qualities and has been described as the best woman. 30

In both the Kāvyas, she is found to love Rāma very

26 R. Mānas; 2/74.
28 ibid; 2/1955 and 2/73/1.
29 ibid; 1/135-8 & 2/25.
30 ibid; 2/1581 & 2/12/4, 2/13/4.
very much. Even she rebuked Manthara first when the latter was found scheming against Rām.

Mādhab Kandali:

- "Kaikeyee Bolanta Kuji Henase Dārun,
  Mohor Āgat Āsi Sola Nikārun".\(^{32}\)

Tulsīdās:

- "Puni As Kabahun Kahasi Ghārfori,
  Tāba Dhari Tibh Katāon Tori".\(^{33}\)

But, later, her mind was poisoned by Manthara. Such a picture of Kaikeyee has been depicted equally by both the poets.\(^{34}\)

In both the versions of Rāmāyana, Kaikeyee begged the two boons from king Dasaratha with the advice of Manthara.\(^{35}\) Moreover, Bharata rebuked strongly his mother, Kaikeyee for committing acts against Rām.\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{31}\)ibid : 2/1581-3 & 2/14/4.

\(^{32}\)S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1581.

\(^{33}\)R. Mānas : 2/13/4.


\(^{36}\)ibid : 2/2276-81 & 2/160-2.
It is found that Kaikayee is the only female character in these two versions of Rāmāyana, who was praised and rebuked for her activities.

Tārakā:

Both the poets depicted the character of Tārakā on equal footings. Both of them painted this character only to show that Rām could grant salvation. 37

It was the sage Vishwamitra who took Rām from Ayodhya only to get these good works done by him.

Mādhab Kandali:

- "Jātra Laiya Bāj Bhailā Shriram Laxman,
  Puiko Laiya Sishwamitra Karilā Gaman." 38

Tulsidās:

- "Purushasingha Doyo dir Harasi Chale Muni
  Bhoj Haran." 39

- "Anuja Samet Dehu Raghunathā,
  Nisichara Badh Main Hoba Sanathā." 40

37 ibid : 1/1088 & 1/208/3.
38 S.K. Rāmāyana : 1/857.
40 ibid : 1/206/5.
Ahalyā:
The character of Ahalyā, the wife of the sage Gautam, has been introduced by both the poets only to express the greatness of Rām.

Madhāb Kandālī:
- "Suni Rāma Shile Mētra Parashil Pāw,
  Shēp Arāi Ahalyā Bhailanta Suddh Bhāw". 41

Tulsīdās:
- "Main Nāri Apāwan Prahu Jag Pāwan
  Rāvana Ripu Jan Sukhdāi". 42

Anusuyā:
Anusuyā has been depicted equally by both the poets from the point of fulfilling the objectives although there are minor differences from the point of characterisation. Really speaking there was no need for Sītā to take advice from a woman like Anusuyā. But the intention of both the poets is to give publicity of the 'Naari Dharma' (virtues of a woman) and the greatness of Rām through the conversation...

41 S.K. Rāmāyana: 1/1060, 1067.
42 R. Mānas: 1/210/Chand 1,2.
of these two devoted and chaste women and thereby to advise the common people.  

Here mention may be made that Vālmiki introduced this conversation between Anusuyā and Sītā in the Ayodhya Kānda while Shri Kandali as well as Tulsījeś in the Aranya Kānda only.

Mantharā:

Similarities in depicting the character of Mantharā are found in both the versions of Rāmāyana under consideration.

Mādhab Kandali:

- "Kaikeyee Kubuji Mantharā Tār Nām".

Tulsidas:

- "Namu Manthara Mandamati Cheri Kaikeyee Keri".

Although Mantharā was a maid servant yet she was not an ordinary servant. She behaved friendly with Kaikeyee; 

---

45 S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1567.
46 R. Mānas : 2/12.
and that was why she could demand something from her. In both the Kāvyas she is found to rebuke Kaikeyee in an arrogant tune. 48

It is seen therefore, that both the poets depicted the character of Mantharā as evil and cunning. 49

Shurpanakhā:

Both the poets depicted Shurpanakhā as a symbol of 'unrestrained woman'. The lust of an unrestrained woman has been illustrated through Shurpanakhā.

Shri Kandali:

- "Dandakār Ban Tini Bhubanat Sār,
Ehāt Raman Hok Tomār Āmār". 50

Tulsījīśe:

- "Tumha Sam Purush, Na Mo Sama Naari
Yah Sanyog Bidhi Rachā Bichāri". 51

---

48 ibid : 2/1572-4 & 2/15/1-4.
49 ibid : 2/1578, 84 & 2/15/3.
51 R. Mānas : 3/16/4-5.
Shurpanakhā was very much angry at the non-fulfilment of her lust and the chopping off her nose and ears, and wept bitterly before Khar and Dushan, her brothers and asked them to take revenge for it.  

Here also in this case, the two poets treated this character similarly, and expressed the revengful mind etc. through Shurpanakhā.

Shabari:  
Shabari has been depicted as a devotee of Rām. She welcomed Rām with love and offered fruits to him. She has been treated by both Shri Kandali and Tulsīcās in a similar way.

Trijatā:  
Trijatā has been depicted as a devotee of Rām, who aided Sītā while she was in the 'Ashok Ban'. She is also depicted as very liberal minded and kind. She also consolated...
Sita with timely advice.\textsuperscript{56}

She has also been treated by both the poets in a similar way.

\textbf{Tārā}:

In both the Kāvyas, Tārā has been found knowing the greatness and valour of Rām. She also knew that Rām was none but an incarnation of the Lord.\textsuperscript{57}

Both the poets show that Tārā advised Śāli not to fight with Sugriiva again.\textsuperscript{58} But Śāli did not care to pay heed to the advice of Tārā and went to fight, which ultimately caused his death;

Shri Kandali.

- "Gādhāk Nushuni Śāli Samarak Jāy".\textsuperscript{59}

Tulsīdās;

- "Naari Sikhāwat Karasi Na Kānā".\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} ibid : 5/4252 & 5/12/3.
\item \textsuperscript{57} ibid : 4/3597 & 4/6/14.
\item \textsuperscript{58} ibid : 4/3589 & 4/6/14.
\item \textsuperscript{59} S.K. Rāmāyana : 4/3597.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Rāmas : 4/8/5.
\end{itemize}
Urmila, Māndavī & Shrutakirti:

Urmila Māndavī and Shrutakirti are three minor characters in both the versions of Rāmāyana under consideration. They are depicted very briefly by both the poets. Since the intention of the poets was to show the greatness of Rām, they did not elaborate the minor characters which were not found useful for their purpose.

5.4 MAİN DRÀSIS OF DISSIMILARITIES:

Certain dissimilarities are also seen between the descriptions of Shri Kandali and Goswami Tulsidas as regards to their depiction of woman characters in their Kāvyas; although they bear much similarities. These differences are due to certain basic facts.

Both the Kāvyas, the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana and the Rāmcharit Mānas are 'Paurāṇik Kāvyas' (Ancient Epics) and as such difference in description, style, preparation and ideas naturally comes.

Moreover, the environments in which the poets lived differ substantially. The social environment during the

---

Kandali days was rich and respectable while the days of Tulsīdās were full of troubles and disaster. In his own words:

- "Kali Bārhi Bār Dukāl Parai
  Binu Anna Dukhi Sab Log Maraɪ". 62

During the Kandali era, all works were accomplished in accordance with the Vedic tenets; and as such morality of the society was high. But during the days of Tulsīdās there was downfall of morality to such an extent that differences between a daughter and a sister collapsed. In his words:

- "Nahin Mānata Kwau Anujā Tenujā". 63

Another reason for such differences between the two poets is the status of women in the society during their time. In Kandali's society a woman was very honourable and adorable and she is found devoted to virtuous activities. 64 On the other hand a woman of the Tulsī era was very humble

---

62 Ramcharit Manas; 7/100/5.
63 Ibid; 7/102/3.
64 Ibid; 2/1714, 15
and pitiable. 65

There was no 'purdā' system during Kandali's time while it was prevalent during the latter's time, which have been found in the description of the Rāmcharit Mānas. 66

Adding to these, differences came due to their descriptions of toilets of women. Although the toilets of women were not elaborately illustrated in both the versions, yet whatever was illustrated, differences lie in them. Comparatively, the toiletting materials in the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana out-numbered those in the Rāmcharit Mānas. In the former version there are the references to vermillion, Kāzal, Agar, Chandan, Kasturi, Kumkum 67 etc. while in the latter, references were made only to chandan, Agar, Kasturi sendur and Kāzal. 68

In the version of Tulsīdās, the widows are found to use more of toilets than a woman with a living husband. 69 But in the society of Shri Kandali, a widow led a very

65 ibid : 7/98/2.
66 ibid : 1/220/2, 2/117/3.
67 Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana : 7/1351.
68 Rāmcharit Mānas : 1/335/2.
69
different type of life without any form of toilet. The best examples of it, are Tārā and Mandodarī. 70

From the point of reformatory descriptions also, differences are found in the versions of both the poets. As regards to the reformations of the marriage system, similarity is not found in them. Most probably due to the distance between, the place of birth and living of the two poets and due to the impact of the regional circumstances, such differences are natural. So, different description of marriages are evident in case of these two writers.

In Kandali's version there is a description of impregnation. It is found that with a view to having a 'son' king Dasaratna made his 'Retah Pātā' (dropping of semen) into his wives;

- "Anu Krame Pradeshila Tiniro Shajyāt,
  Putrākāṁ Bibhāge Karilā Retah Pātā". 71

But such a description is absent in the Rāmcharit Mānas. It is seen therefore, that certain differences

70 Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana ; 4/3658, 6/6426.
71 ibid ; 1/653.
between Shri Kandali and Tulsidās are quite obvious.

5.5 DIFFERENCES IN DEPICTION OF WOMAN CHARACTERS IN THE TWO VERSIONS OF RĀMĀYANA:

Sītā:

Although Sītā is unquestionably the heroine in both the versions of Rāmāyana under consideration, yet there are certain differences in the depiction of Sītā by the poets.

On the first place, there is a difference of opinion between the two poets as regards to the birth of Sītā. In the Rāmcharit Mānas, Sītā's incarnation of goddess Lāmi was mainly due to the curse of drinda and Narada.72 Such an incident is not found in the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana.

In the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana, Sītā decided to marry Rām only when she first saw him in the Sayamvara.73 While Tulsidās illustrated 'Purva-Raag' between Sītā and Rām,74 even in case of the Sayamvara, differences are evidenced between the descriptions of both the poets. In the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyana, Rām had to fight against some odds in the

74 R. Mānas : 1/229/3.
place of Sayamvara while such descriptions are not available in the Mānas.

Thirdly Sītā has been described in the Sapta Kānda Rāmāyaṇa as very tender who even did never touch the soil with her feet and therefore, Kaushalyā was very much anxious about her going for "Vanavās". But such descriptions are absent in the Mānas.

Again in the Rāmcharit Mānas, when Rām set out for destroying the Ḫāṣasas in the Aranya Kānda, in the shape of a man, he kept Sītā with god Agni. He kept only a 'Chhayamurti' in place of Sītā, and not the original one:

- "Tumha Pāwaka Mahu Karahu Niwāsā,
  Jau Lagi Karau Nisāchar Nāsā".

But in case of Shri Kandali's such a description is not available.

During the 'Māyā Mṛiga' episode the treatment, Sītā made to Laxmana is found to be more bitter in the Sapta Kānda than that of the Mānas. In the Mānas, Rāvana touched

---

75 S.K. Rāmāyaṇa : 1/1277.
76 Rāmcharit Mānas : 3/2713.
77 ibid : 3/23/1,2.
while in the Sapta Kānda she was not touched by him. 79

On the sixth place, while in the Ashok Vana, Hanuman wanted to bring Sītā back on his shoulder because he could not tolerate the tortures that Sītā had to bear. But Sītā refused on the ground that she being a chaste woman could never touch a male one except her husband. 80 Such descriptions are absent in the Mānas.

After the death of Rāvana, Sītā was brought on a palanquin - "Ruchir Shiwikā" to Rām 81 according to the Mānas while Sītā was never brought to Rām in that manner according to the Sapta Kānda.

During the time of the 'Agni Parīkṣā' Rām is found to be more severe towards Sītā in the Sapta Kānda than Rām in the Mānas. In this connection, Shri Kandali introduced a very pitiful scene with Sītā. 82 But Tulsidās is found to be more spiritual in this regard. 83

---

79 R. Manas ; 3/28/12.
80 S.K. Ramayana ; 5/4325.
82 S.K. Ramayana ; 6/6498, 6506.
83 R. Manas ; 6/108/3-4.
Finally, the description which is available about the abandonment of Sītā and her entry into the Pātal in the Sapta Kānda is not found in the Mānas. 84

Mandodari;

Mandodari has been depicted as the best chaste woman by both the poets. But some minor differences are also found in their description.

In Kāndali's Rāmāyana, Hanuman, while entered into the palace of Rāvana in disguise in search of Sītā, he took Mandodari for Sītā at first. Because she was found to be very beautiful amongst the queens of Rāvana who were then sleeping. 85 But in the Rāmcharit Mānas, no such references are made.

After the death of Rāvana, the gods were happy when Mandodari lamented deeply for Rāvana in the Rāmcharit Mānas 86 which is not found in the Sapta Kānda.

In the Sapta Kānda, Mandodari is found leading a life

84 S.K. Rāmāyana ; 7/ 7098-7105.
85 ibid ; 5/ 4137-43.
86 R. Mānas ; 6/ 104/ 1.
of ideal widowhood\textsuperscript{87} while according to Tulsīdās she got married to Rāvana. \textsuperscript{88}

Kaushalyā:

In case of the character of Kaushalyā, although it is equally brief in the two versions of the Rāmāyana yet certain minor differences are found in them.

In the Mānas, Tulsīdās has depicted her as the incarnation of Shatarupā. \textsuperscript{89} But for Kandali she was only the first queen of king Dasaratha.

According to Tulsīdās, she regarded performance of duty as the main virtue. While Rām asked for her permission to go for 'Vanavās' she said:

- "Jau Pitu Mātu Kaheo dan Jāna,
  Tāu Kānān Sat Awadh Samānā".\textsuperscript{90}

Kaushalyā also consoled Rām with patience when he prepared to go to the forest i.e. 'Vanavās';

- "Pitu Vanadev Mātu Vanadevi
  Khagā-Mriga Charan Sararuha Sevi".\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{87}S.K. Rāmāyana ; 6/6429.
\item \textsuperscript{88}R.Mānas ; 6/105/2.
\item \textsuperscript{89}ibid ; 1/149/2.
\item \textsuperscript{90}ibid ; 2/53/1.
\item \textsuperscript{91}ibid ; 2/55/2.
\end{itemize}
But such description is not available in the Sapta Kānda. On the other hand, Kaushalyā got fainted when Rāma came to her for her permission to go for 'vanavās';

- "Achetan Parilanta Rāmar Janani".\(^{92}\)

In Kandali's Rāmāyana, Kaushalyā objected against Rāma's departure for the forest;

- "Strijeeta Pitrir Nakari Tumi ḅāk, Banake Najāice ḅāp More Pāse Thāk".\(^{93}\)

Sumitrā:

In Kandali's Rāmāyana, Sumitrā, although was aggrieved at news of Laxmana's accompaniment with Rāma to the forest, yet did not accuse Kaikeye. But in the Rāmcharit Mānas, she rebuked Kaikeye as 'Pāpini, Nāshini' as soon as she got the news.\(^{94}\)

Kaikeye:

There is no different opinions about the character of

---

\(^{92}\) S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1722, 23.

\(^{93}\) Ibid ; 2/1731, 89.

\(^{94}\) Mānas : 2/73.
Kaikeyee in both the versions of the Rāmāyana under considerations. But there are certain minor differences in them.

About the misapprehension of the firm Kaikeyee, there are different interpretations in both the Kāvyas. Shri Kandali accused Manthara for the misapprehension infused into the mind of Kaikeyee. But Tulsījī made the misapprehension into Kaikeyee's mind by Saraswati through Manthara for the satisfaction of the gods.

In Kandali's version, king Dasaratha was angry upon Kaikeyee who was the ultimate cause of Rām's Vanavāsa:

- "Mahakrodhe Kaikeyeek Jūlī dachhan".

But in Tulsījī's version, king Dasaratha accused himself for the incident rather than accusing Kaushalya.

Again when in the Chitrakut hills the mothers along with other people of Ayodhya met Rām, he saluted Kaikeyee first and told them that 'Jīrṇātā' was responsible all these sad incidents and consoled them.

---

96 R. Mānas : 2/12/2.
97 S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1619.
98 R. Mānas : 2/35.
But in Kanoali's version such incidents did not take place.

In the Râmcharit, Kaikyee is found repenting after being insulted by her son.

- "Garai Galāni Kutil Kaikyee". 100

It is not found in the Sapta Kānda.

Tāraka:

The description of the character of Tāraka in the Sapta Kānda is more elaborate than that in the Mānas.

Tulsidās confined the description very briefly in one Shaupaī only. 101

In Kandali's Rāmāyana, Rām hesitated to kill Tāraka because she was a female one:

- "Stribadh Haide Pāp Kato Kon Kām". 102

---

100 ibid : 2/272/1.
102 S.K. Rāmāyana : 1/877.
But the sage Vishwamitra advised Rām that there is no sin in killing a woman. Such a description is not found in the Mānas.

Ahalyā:

In the case of Ahalyā, there are enough differences between the two poets in their descriptions.

Shri Kandali described the character of Ahalyā deeply and elaborately; while Tulsīdās confined it in only twenty lines. In the description of Shri Kandali, the sage Vishwamitra told Rām and Laxmana how did Ahalyā transformed into stone at the curse of the sage Gautam and how had she been waiting for Rām for her salvation. But in the Tulsīdās, the sage Vishwamitra simply asked Rām to touch stonified Ahalyā with his feet.

In Kandali's version, Rām addressed Ahalyā as 'Mātā' and bowed to her. But in the version of Tulsīdās, such description is not there. His Rām is the 'Lord Himself' and

103 Ibid : 1/379.
Ahalyā a devotee; and as such, after salvation Ahalyā touched the feet of Shri Rām. 106

In Kandali's Sapta Kānda, the sage Vishwamitra praised the chastity of Ahalyā and asked the sage Gautam to accept her, 107 while in the Mānas, Ahalyā described herself as 'Apauena Naari' and prayed Rām to give her shelter at His feet. 108 So, in Kandali's version the sage Gautam accepted her and took her to his hermitage; 109 while in the version of Tulsidas, she went directly to the 'PatiLok' under the impact of Rām's divine power. 110

Anusuyā;

Differences are evident in case of depicting the character of Anusuyā by both the poets.

In the Sapta Kānda, Anusuyā came to know the life-story of Sītā from her. 111 But in the Mānas, she did not care to know it.

106 R. Mānas : 1/213/I.
108 R. Mānas : 1/210/2.
Anusuyā was satisfied at the devotion of Sita to her husband and asked her to take boon from her. She also offered ornaments, Sindur and Chandan to Sītā on her own account so that the latter might live with eternal youthfulness:

- "Anusuyā Bole Jata Dilo Alankār,
  Sindur, Chandan tor Naguchak Āar". 112

On the other hand, in the Mānas Anusuyā was very glad to meet Sītā and clad her with "Divyā Vastra, Alankaras":

- "Divyā Vasan Bhusan Pahirāya". 113

In the Mānas, Anusuyā gave instructions on "Pati Dharma" 114 while no such advice was rendered to Sītā in the Sapta Kānda.

Māntharā;

Kandali depicted Māntharā as a very cruel woman 115 while Tulsīdās introduced her as a "Mandamati Cheri". 116

112 ibid : 3/2645-6.
114 ibid : 3/4/2-10.
115 S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1581.
116 R. Mānas : 2/12.
In the version of Kandali, when Mantharā went to break the news of Rām's coronation to Kaikeyee, she found Kaikeyee asleep. But in the Mānas, she met her awake and asked the latter about latter's indifference.

Kandali's Mantharā is found to advice Kaikeyee; but Tulsījī's Mantharā could only pray before her. Kandali's Mantharā did not want to be a 'Daasi' while Tulsījī's Mantharā told Kaikeyee that whoever be the king, she had nothing to bother:

"Koyo Nripa Hua Hamahike Hāni."  

In the Sapta Kānda, Mantharā told Kaikeyee that Dasaratha sent Bharata to his maternal uncle on the advice of Kaushalya. But such things are not found in the Mānas.  

Shurpanakhā:  

Certain differences are found between the two poets as regards to the depiction of the character of Shurpanakhā.  

---  

118 R. Mānas : 2/12/3.  
120 R. Mānas : 2/18, 20.  
121 S.K. Rāmāyana : 2/1575.  
122 R. Mānas : 2/15/3.  
123 ibid ; 2/17/1.
In the Sapta Kanda, Shurpanakhā being disappointed when she was rejected by both Rām and Laxman to take her as a wife, wanted to devour Sītā. Then with the advice of Rām, Laxmana chopped the nose and ears of Shurpanakhā. But in the Mānas, it was when Sītā was afraid of the deadly appearance of Shurpanakhā, Laxmana chopped off her nose and ears at the advice of Rām.

In Kandali's version, Laxmana did not kill Shurpanakhā only because she was a woman;

— "Strijāti Kāranese Rāxasi Jilaka".

But it is not there in the Mānas.

Shāvari:

Shāvari is known for her devotion to Rām. The description of the character of Shāvari is more elaborate in the version of Tulsiḍās than that of Shri Kandali.

---

124 S.K. Rāmayana; 3/2354.
125 R. Mānas; 3/17.
In the Mānas, Shabari in course of her hospitality welcomed Ram with fruits:

- "Kand Mul Fal Suras Ati Diye
  Rām Kahun Jaani".  

Such descriptions are absent in the Sapta Kānda.

In the Mānas, Rām furnished the advice of "Navadhā śakti" to Shabari. Such references are not available in the Sapta Kānda.

Trijata;

The depiction of Trijata in the Sapta Kānda is found to be more elaborate than that of the Mānas.

In the Sapta Kānda, that Trijata was devoted to Rām can be known from the description of her dream. He did not depict her as "Rām Charan Rati Nipun Viveka" like that in the Mānas. In the Mānas she is depicted as devoted to Rām and aid to Sītā.

---

128 Mānas: 125, 3/34.
Kandali described the character of Trijata as amiable and sympathetic, but nothing is found relating to her character in the Mānas.

In Kandali's version, Trijātā informed Sītā of her dream and interpreted it:

- "Gosī Dekhilo Moi Swapnar Hante,
  Sasāgara Prithivik Āsay Gilante".  

On the other hand Trijātā told the 'Rāxasis' about her dream and asked them to take shelter at the feet of Sītā:

- "Savanhan doli Sunayesi Sapanā,
  Sitahe sei Karahu Hite Apana".

In the Mānas, Sītā begged Trijātā of fire to get rid of all troubles by setting fire on herself; but Trijātā desisted her from giving fire on trifle excuse that it was

\[\text{131 ibid : 5/11/1.}\]
\[\text{133 ibid : 5/4243.}\]
\[\text{134 ibid : 5/4244.}\]
\[\text{135 R. Mānas : 5/10/1.}\]
\[\text{136 ibid : 5/10/1-4.}\]
night and fire was not available during night. But this incident is not found in the Sapta Kānda.

Tārā;

Tārā is another important female character in the Rāmāyana. Her personality and beauty are elaborately described in the Sapta Kānda. But she has not depicted from this point of view in the Mānas.

In Kandali's version she has been depicted as out spoken and just and one who protested injustice. That was why she could even curse Rām. There is no description of Tārā cursing Rām in the Mānas.

Tārā has been depicted as well-versed in politics and one who takes active interest in political matters, in the Sapta Kānda, but there is no reference to any request of Tārā to Bāli not to fight against Sugriba. According to Kandali, Tārā requested Bāli not to fight against Sugriba because she

137 ibid : 5/11/2.
139 ibid : 4/3665.
140 ibid : 4/3589.
knew the greatness of Rām. In this connection, Kandali spoke of the evil dream of Tārā for which she requested her husband not to fight with Sugrīva then. But there is no such reference in the Māṇas.

In the version of Tulsīdās, Tārā’s illusion has been done away with by the advice of Rām. Finally Tārā fell before the feet of Rām and received the boon of Paramābhakti from Rām. These incidents are absent in the Septa Kānda.

In Shri Kandali’s Rāmāyana, it was Tārā, who could calm the angry Laxmana against Sugrīva. But Tulsījī did not give such prime importance on Tārā.

Urmilā, Māṇḍovī & Shrutiārtrī:

Only one difference can be had about these three characters in the two versions of Rāmāyana under consideration. In the version of Shri Kandali although the marriage of these

\[141\text{ibid} : 4/3664, 3714.\]
\[142\text{ibid} : 4/3587-8.\]
\[143\text{R. Māṇas} : 4/10/2.\]
\[144\text{ibid} : 4/10/3.\]
\[145\text{S.K. Rāmāyana} : 4/3764-5.\]
three women took place along with Laxmana, Bharata and Shatrughna yet it is not distinctly shown with whom they were married;

- "Shuniyoka Rēja Āmār Duikhāni Duhitā Ghar Āchoy,
  Shatrughan, Bharatak Bihā Diu, Ṭaju Ajnā Kibā Hoye." 146

and -

"Chārī Bar, Chārī Kanyāk Karāilā, Adhibās Karma Jata." 147

On the other hand the Mānas has clearly shown with whom these three were married. 148

5.6 CONCLUSION:

Finally, in the conclusion, it can be seen that the cultural impact of our country on the two poets are clearly evident in the description of the female characters of the Rāmāyana. Although Shri Kandali and Tulsīdās were born and brought up in two different regions of India, similarities in their depiction are found since they belong to the same culture.

146 ibid; 1/1336.
147 ibid; 1/1337.
148 R. Mānas; 1/324/3-4.
The equality in their spirit of devotion (Bhakti Bhauna); idea of union and co-ordination among different religions groups, the aims of their Kāvyas and particularly their outlook towards the status of a woman brings forth the equality and similarity in depiction of woman characters in their Kāvyas.

As regards to the minor differences between them, their ideas and ideals can never be accused. A man is, however, compelled by in the influences of time and environment. No individual can get rid of them. As such due to certain environment and influence of their time certain differences may crop up easily. In addition to these, the regional customs, influence of the local languages and culture also had their impacts on both the poets which constitute some powerful factors to bring forth differences between their versions.

Due to the basic aims and the spirit of devotion of the poets, Śrī Kānclāi and Goswāmī Tulsīdās, the similarities out-balance the dissimilarities.