



Impact Factor: 4.081

Post colonial Perspective on Raavan in Amish Tripathi's *Scion of Ikshvaku and Sita: Warrior of Mithila*

PRABU S

Ph.D., Research Scholar, Department of English, Annamalai University,
sprabu97@gmail.com

Abstract

Myth teaches the philosophical and the moral values to the people. The myths connect the modern men with the ancients. The myths have the same concept in all the languages and it has a protagonist and a villain. A man who did the good things to the people presented as Vishu or God and the man who did bad things to the human portrayed as the demon or Asura. The Vedic literature argues that each and every soul bears the good characters and a man can be forgivable if he surrenders himself totally to the Gods. If Vedic literature is right then Raavan would have been portrayed as the good man because he surrendered himself to Lord Shiva. The valour of Raava revealed when he defeated the king of Saptha Sindhu, Dashrath even the seventh Vishnu Rama found difficult to defeat Raavan. Valmiki presented Ram as Vishnu even though he was weaker than Raavan. Ram was saved three times by Lakshman. Amish Tripathi has portrayed Raavan as the strongest man than Lord Ram. Further, he presented Ram had born when Raavan had defeated the armies of his father. The armies of Dhasrath won all the dynasties of India by his immense power but being an ordinary man in Dhasrath's dynasty Raavan won the armies of unconquerable Dhasrath.

Keywords: Devotion, Dynasty, Gods, Sapta Sindhu, Vedic literature, and Vishu.

Introduction

Amish Tripathi is an eminent novelist in Indian English literature. He retold the great epics named *The Ramayana* and *Shiva Smiriti*. The Ram Chanra series begins with the book *Scion of Ikshvaku* and the second book of the Ram Chandra Serious is *Sita: Warrior of Mithila*. Amish Tripathi has given the reason for enmity between Lord Ram and Lord Raavan in detail in the Ram Chandra Serious. Valmiki's Ramayana presented Raavan as the evil man even though he had been ruling his dynasty peacefully. The ruling period of Raavan was the golden period of Srilanka. On the other hand, Ram presented as the good man. He has won the demons like Raavan for having desire on his wife Sita but the valour of lord Raavan expressed well even in the *Ramayana*.

Lord Ram took nearly thirteen days to conquer Lord Raavan. It shows Raavan was too much stronger than Ram. Amish Tripathi's Ram Chander series also present Raavan as the strongest person than Ram's father Dashrath. All the kingdoms in India were afraid to oppose lord Raavan. Amish presented Raavan as an ordinary man, who had been working under Kuberan. Kuberan presented as the Vaishya man, who involved himself in trading. Raavan was one of the chief workers in Srilanka. Raavan hated Dashrath for dividing the people based on the cast. The kingdom made the

people to believe that the Bhramins were the highest people than others. They were only allowed to do the works related to knowledge. The second category of the people was Khastrias. They were allowed to rule the countries. The third category of the people was Vaishya. They were allowed to do the trading in the county. The fourth category of the people was Sudhras. They were allowed to help the kings and queens. The people who opposed the caste system were seriously punished by Dharath. Raavan wanted to destroy these kinds of unfair division of the people and laid heavy taxes on the dynasty of Dashrath. It indirectly forced Dasrath to make a war with Kuberan. Finally, the troops of Raavan won in the battle and became the king of Srilanka after Kubera's death. (RSI)

The Post colonial perspective on Raavan

The present study has been trying to bring out the sufferings of the low class people to the world. The western writers had presented the East people as ghost, ugliness, brutal etc and presented themselves as supreme. The writings of the west reveal that they had arrived to rule the East and civilize them but the truth was that they made the people slaves. They had given the permanent imagery to the people belonged to the East as uncivilized. Hamadi stated that by using the theory of Edward Said as:

He (Said) considers the false image of the Orient or the East that has been fabricated by Western explores poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrator since Nepoleon's occupation of Egypt in 1798.

The same concept prevailed in India before the British colony. The western writers presented Indians as uncivilized, ugly, poor and ect like that the ancient people belong to Vedic age presented a particular group of people as uncivilized, ugly, poor and ect. They had been used to clean the latrine of the kings, queens and the wealthy people. These people were not allowed to do other works in the countries. The concept of making the knowledgably poor as slaves prevailed from the Vedic period. The Vedic literature argues that every man is a God then why did the Vedic literature allow the people to follow the castes. The permanent imagery has been given to the people of India that a particular group of people were highest, and some were higher and some people were lower than others. The literature has failed to defend their arguments.

The literature argues that Manu was the first man of the Vedic period and he created *Manu Smriti*. If he would be a first generation of our people then he bears the sins of carrying the caste system to this generation through his work. God created the people equally. He did not crate the highest class people differently from the lower class people. Nobody has the different types of flesh and blood.

Raavan was the Bhramin and wanted to become as the Kashthria in that case where he got the strength to win a powerful king Dhasrath. It shows that the God created the people with same power if the man makes use of that power he can easily over come troubles. He understood the philosophy. Raavan never mind about his status in the society. He concentrated his strengths to conquer the cruel king Dhasrath. (RSI)

Chit Nyo stated about the valour of lord Raavan as:

The followers' acclaim from downhill echoed in the air and could be heard uphill, "Ravana the Brave" "Our Dravidian Warrior" "The Heart of Hindu." The followers at the foot of the hill were throwing turban into the air (Chit Nyo: 1977, 1).

Chit Nyo argues that lord Raavan belonged to the Dravidan kingdom. The Aryans presented him as the demons. Kumari Kandam (country) had been considered as the oldest land of the Tamil people. At present it is existed under the water. It is proved that Kumari Kandam (country) was existed during the Ice age. It drowned when the sea level rose. The people of Sangam Tamil, Kumari Kandam and Srilanka had lived as brothers and sisters. Lord Raavan is considered as the Tamil king.

Later, the people from north side of India were entered India and started to rule the minds of Indian kings. The majority parts of India accepted Aryans but the Tamil kings neglected them and later they were started to capture the minds of the kings by giving royal advices to them. The people who had been living in the upper parts of India always looked the people who had been in the lower parts of India as low. So, they thought the God has created them as high and the others as low. This made them to create Ram as the good man and Lord Raavan as the demon, who lived in the lower parts of India. Chit Nyo explained that the war between India and Srilanka rose of the tussle between the thoughts of the Dravidian and Aryans. Chit Nyo stated that as "No... it is not. Sita is not the main problem. Love between Lin-gar Di Pa King and Aryan prince is also not a problem. But, it is a war between Dravidian and Aryan, isn't it, Brother? "

Amish Tripathi presented Sita's kidnap by Raavan in the first chapter of the book and he defends Raavan by stating that Lakshman had cut down the nose of Shurpanaka because of that only Ram was hurry to leave to the safest place in the forest. It shows Lord Ram too had afraid of Raavan. Ram was accused for his father's defeat against Raavan because he was born on the day Raavan conquered Ayothya. Ram's father did never pay attention on the betterment of Ram. It naturally made the hatred on Raavan. When Vashista asked the question regarding the king of India Ram hesitated to answer but Lakshman boldly answered that the king who forgets the betterment of his people was merely demon to his dynasty. Dashrath kept himself quite after him defeat. The war tactics that were followed by Lord Raavan made a great impression on Dhasrath.

Dhasrath's second son Bharath himself accepted that Lord Raavan was a good man and stated that as:

"Bharath finally spoke. We may not want to admit it, but Raavan is a good king, loved by his people. He is an able administrator who has brought prosperity through maritime trade, and he even runs the seaports under his control efficiently. It is fabled that the streets of his capital are paved with gold, thus earning his kingdom the name "Golden Lanka". Yes, he is a good king"

Raavan had laid the foundation to break the traditional behaviors. He wanted his people to be free from the king of Ayodhya because Dasrath was known as the king of Sapta Sindhu. The literature always gave important to the protagonist Ram and antagonist Raavan but it failed to present the king of Dhasrath. How did he rule the people? Did the people of India really enjoy Dhasrath's kingdom? These questions were kept unanswered. Raavan made his people to live happily then what made him to hate Ayodhyan king. The secret is unrevealed. The literature shows that Raavan was wise and brave man. Even Lord Ram took thirteen days to kill Raavan that shows his valour.

Amish Tripathi presents that Raavan had war with Mithila. He went to Mithila for participating in Sita's Swayamvar. There he boldly got into the hall of the Dharma and placed his foot on the chair before the king of Mithila. When Maharishi Vishwamitra was intruding he took the pinaka (Lord Rudra's arrow) and boldly aimed at the Maharishi not only that but also he shot ancient statue of Mithila. No one would have not spoken boldly and disrespected the Maharishi before Raavan did that because Maharishi Vishwamitra was known for his anger even Dhasrath never raised his voice against him. (SWM)

Vedic literature presents about the concept of the survival of the fittest. The weak must have to die and the strong should survive. If the Vedic literature is right then Raavan was a brave man. He had defeated the weak man Dhasrath, who was the strong believer of the Varna Smiriti. Some of the post colonial critics criticize the Aryan based texts where the Aryans had been presented as the dominant and Dravidan presented as the weak and demon. Dhasrath and Ram belong to Aryan category whereas Raavan belong to Dravidian category.

Amish Tripathi presented Sati's close friend Samichi had been spying her and further, he presented that when Raavan came to attend the Swayamvar, Samichi secretly met Raavan. It makes suspicion on Samichi. The famous Tamil director Manirathnam had presented Raavan as the Brave and good man in his one of movies called Raavan. Jatayu was one of the main characters in the *Ramayana*. He told about the main victim of Sati's kidnap to Ram. But, Amish presented Jatayu as one of the Malayaputra. He worked in the army of Raavan. There he was admired the generosity of Raavan. Once Jatayu was insulted by the Indian for born with deformities (Naga), Raavan's kingdom gave the shelter to Jatayu and appointed in his army. These shows Raavan was the man who won Ram's father and rose against the injustice in Ayodhya. (SWM)

Conclusion

Raavan was the brave man who raised the questions against the *Manu Smiriti* that made our ancient writers to present him as demon because majority of the writers those days belonged to higher class. They supported their people through writing well about their category people. Raavan became as the Vaishya even though he belonged to Bhramin category. Further, he became as Kshtria after the death of Kubera. He had the guts to raise hands against the king of Sapt Sindhu and defeated him. When he did not get the respect at Sita's Swamvar he boldly took the Arrow and aimed at the great sage Vishwamitra and even cut down the statue of Mithila bravely. He fought with

Mithilans, Ram, Lakshman and Malayaputras by having small army. Ram and the Malayaputras found difficult to fight with Raavan. The Malayaputras had broken the law of the lord Rudra and won the army of Raavan. The lord Rudra prohibited the launching of the astras in India after destroying Asuras but Ram broke the law and launched the Deivastras against Raavan's army. The Malayaputras too knew that they would not win the army of Raavan until they break the law. The postcolonial researchers have been raising the question that if Raavan was evil for breaking the rules of the war then what about Rama and Malayaputras. Raavan never intended to touch Sita but he received the news that the Malayaputras had been making Sita as the Vishnu and planned to kill Raavan because of that only when the armies of Raavan entered the forest to kidnap Sita they called her as Vishnu and Kumbakarna ordered the soldiers to catch the Vishnu alive. The third book of Ram Chandra series may present Raavan with logic and reasonably (*Raavan: Orphan of Aryavarta*).

Reference

1. Chit Oo Nyo. 1977. Lin-gar Di Pa Chit Thu (online). Retrieved January 10, 2018, from <http://www.burmeseclassic.com>
2. Hamadi, Lufti. *Edward Said: The Postcolonial Theory and the Literature of Decolonization*. European Scientific Journal. June 2014. 2. Pag. 40. Print.
3. Tripathi, Amish. *Scion of Ikshvaku*. West land ltd. 2015. Print.
4. ---. *Sita: Warrior of Mithila*. West land ltd. 2015. Print.
5. Vettan, Mani. *Puranic Encyclopedia: A comprehensive Dictionary with Special Reference to the Epic and Puranic Literature*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas. 354. Print.
6. <https://www.outlookindia.com/magazine/story/good-or-evil-the-politics-of-ravana/206444>.