**Redemption or Death: Jain Reinterpretations of the Slaying of Kīcaka**

With its vast cast of characters, it should come as no surprise that the narrative of *Mahābhārata* inspired and even invited later Sanskrit authors to interpret and reimagine characters in radically different ways. One need only think of the very different Śakuntalā found in Kālidāsa’s Abhijñānaśakuntalā, or Duryodhana in Bhāsa’s *Urubhaṅga*, compared to their portrayal in the *Mahābhārata*. Reimagining characters from the *Mahābhārata* even crossed religious lines as Jains, adherents of the other major Dharmic traditions besides Buddhism, Sikhism, and the variegated constellations of Hindu traditions, refashioned characters of *Mahābhārata*, most notably Kṛṣṇa[[1]](#footnote-1), in their adaptations of the *Mahābhārata* narrative[[2]](#footnote-2).

In this article, I seek to explore one particularly unusual reimagining of a well-known character by a Jain author and its failure[[3]](#footnote-3) to propagate itself throughout later Jain *Mahābhārata* narratives in Sanskrit: that of the character Kīcaka. The sexual predator who is brutally slaughtered by Bhīma for his attempt to violate Draupadī in the *Virāṭaparvan* is redeemed as a Jain renouncer in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (783 CE) by Jinasena Punnāṭa, the first Jain narrative work in Sanskrit to contain an entire *Mahābhārata* narrative. Despite the lingering influence of Jinasena Punnāṭa’s work in later Jain *Mahābhārata* Narratives in Sanskrit, nearly all subsequent Jain authors depict Kīcaka’s demise as opposed to his redemption. Through a comparison of various Jain adaptations in Sanskrit of the Kīcaka-episode, I will demonstrate how the ‘Slaying of Kīcaka’ became ossified so as to exclude any possible redemption of Kīcaka. Many readers or listeners of these Jain MBhs, regardless of their religious affiliation, would have come to expect Kīcaka’s death, likely because of the dominant depiction of his demise in other *Mahābhārata* narratives.

The Jain adaptations of the Kīcaka-episode I will discuss are found in: (1) Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (783 CE); (2) Devaprabhasūri’s *Pāṇḍavacarita* (1213 CE); (3) Dhaneśvarasūri’s *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* (14th-15th century CE); (4) Śubhaśīla’s *Pāṇḍavacarita* from the *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* (1462 CE); (5) Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (1552); (6) Vādicandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (1598 CE).

The attentive reader will notice the significant interval of over four centuries between the first text and the other five texts, whereas the *Pāṇḍavacarita* (2) and the Vādicandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (6) have only slightly less than four centuries between them. This interval does not indicate that there are no Jain *Mahābhārata* adaptations between the ninth and the twelfth century, but that the Kīcaka-episodes in these Jain *Mahābhārata* either consist of a single verse, i.e. Guṇabhadra’s *Uttarapurāṇa* (9th century CE), or are non-existent, i.e. Hariṣeṇa’s *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam* in the *Bṛhatkathākośa* (931 CE) and Hemacandra’s *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* (12th century CE). I will address this silence on the Kīcaka-episode after discussing the unusual redemption of Kīcaka in Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*.

**Redeeming a villain in Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa***

Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* is a voluminous work divided in 66 *sargas* and consists of around 9650 verses*.* The Digambara monk, a native to Saurāṣṭra, composed the work in 783 CE. Although it shares an almost identical[[4]](#footnote-4) title with the more famous *khila* to the *Mahābhārata* which chronicles the life and deeds of Kṛṣṇa[[5]](#footnote-5), this Jain Harivaṃśa covers much more narrative ground. As an instance of what Jain scholars often label as ‘Jain Universal History’, Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* covers the lives of 63 great men who occupy a central place within Jain cosmology. Included in this group of great men, generally designated as *mahāpuruṣas* or *śalākāpuruṣas*, are the 24 *tīrthaṅkaras*, 12 *cakravartins* and 9 triads of a *Baladeva*, a *Vāsudeva*, and a *Prativāsudeva*. One such a triad consists of Balārāma, Kṛṣṇa, and Jarāsaṃdha, the very same characters who appear in the Vyāsa *Mahābhārata*, but here reimagined in function of the Jain worldview[[6]](#footnote-6). According to Jains, Balārāma and Kṛṣṇa are the cousins of the 22nd tīrthaṅkara Nemi; these three *śalākāpuruṣas* are related to the Pāṇḍavas. Hence the narrative of the Pāṇḍavas is included as a subnarrative of Nemi’s biography, which in turn is an important and privileged narrative within the Jain genre of ‘Jain Universal History’.

The Nemi biography in Jinasena’s Harivaṃśapurāṇa, albeit occasionally interrupted by brief narrative diversions, spans from the 37th *sarga* until the 66th and final *sarga*. The Pāṇḍavas appear in *sarga*s 45-47, 51-54, and 61-65. The famous episodes of the fatal dice game between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, the Pāṇḍavas’ subsequent exile in the forest, and their last year of exile at the court of king Virāṭa, are all depicted in the 46th *sarga* in no more than 61 verses. It is here that we find the Kīcaka’s unusual redemption.

The 46th sarga starts off by condensing the events of the dice game to a paltry five ślokas: the Kauravas collectively grew jealous of the Pāṇḍavas’ ascendance; Duryodhana defeats Yudhiṣṭhira with Śakuni’s help and orders the five Pāṇdavas to go into exile (HVP 46.1-5). Jinasena does not describe the successive raising of the stakes after each losing throw by Yudhiṣṭhira, nor does he describe Yudhiṣṭhira staking and then losing Draupadī. Gone are the humiliation of Draupadī by Duḥśāsana and the ensuing legal quandary surrounding the legality of Yudhiṣṭhira staking her. Since Digambara Jains, unlike their Śvetāmbara brethren, refute Draupadī’s polyandry and assert that she is married to Arjuna alone[[7]](#footnote-7), Draupadī is not Yudhiṣṭhira’s to stake.

Jinasena is also rather brief when it comes to depicting the Pāṇḍavas’ exile in the forest. The Jain adaptation describes a short, non-lethal quarrel between Arjuna and an *asura* Sutāra disguised as a kirāta[[8]](#footnote-8), Bhīma’s marriage to Kanakavartā, the daughter of king Siṃha and queen Kanakamekhala of Meghadala, a brief incursion in Kauśala, and their twelve-year stay in Rāmagiri (HVP 46.7-22). The rest of 46th *sarga*, however, is devoted to a radically reimagined version of the events found in Virāṭaparvan. The Jain author unceremoniously describes how the Pāṇḍavas arrive in the realm of king Virāṭa and enter in service of the king and his wife, here called Sudarśanā (HVP 46.23) instead of Sudeṣṇā (IV.3.18).[[9]](#footnote-9) Jinasena skips entirely over the elaborate disguises the Pāṇḍavas assume during their stay in the Matsya kingdom: the Pāṇḍavas do not discuss their disguises among themselves (IV.1.20; 2.1-27; 3.1-19), nor are their individual entrances at Virāṭa’s court described (IV.6-11).

Instead, the narrative shifts to an introduction of Kīcaka. Unlike in the *Mahābhārata*, where Kīcaka’s descent is left vague[[10]](#footnote-10) beyond his relationship with his sister Sudeṣṇā, the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* briefly sketches his parentage:

There was a city Cūlikā ruled by king Cūlika. His wife was Vikacā, splendid like a lotus, and she was blessed with hundred sons. Kīcaka was the eldest among them and first among them in fiery deeds. He was handsome, youthful, clever, brave, affluent and lascivious.”(HVP 46.26-27)[[11]](#footnote-11)

During a visit to his sister, Kīcaka chances upon Draupadī in Virāṭa’s palace and instantly becomes smitten with her. All attempts by the lust-crazed Kīcaka to woo her are in vain, however, as Draupadī quickly informs Bhīma about his unwanted advances. The indignant Bhīma disguises himself by crossdressing[[12]](#footnote-12) as a śailandhrī-maidservant[[13]](#footnote-13) and waits upon Kīcaka that very night. As soon as Kīcaka arrives, Bhīma seizes the lecher, throws the lecher to the ground and starts to beat him up. It is here in the narrative that the Jain *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* wildly diverges from the *Mahābhārata*:

After he [Bhīma] had satisfied his [Kīcaka’s] desire for another’s wife, that great mind took mercy and let him go with the words “go away, you miscreant!” (HVP 46.36)[[14]](#footnote-14)

Upon being spared by Bhīma, Kīcaka starts to feel aversion from the material world and takes initiation from the muni Rativardhana, from whom he learns the *ratnatraya*[[15]](#footnote-15) espoused by Jainism (HVP 46.37-38). The narrative then briefly cuts to the hundred brothers of Kīcaka who, after finding their eldest brother missing, decide to build a funeral pyre and to burn Draupadī on it. They abduct Draupadī, but are killed by Bhīma (HVP 46.39-41). After this, the Jain author fully focuses on Kīcaka until the very last verse of the 46th *sarga*. After an unspecified[[16]](#footnote-16) amount of time has passed, we find Kīcaka, a *sādhu* by now, all alone by himself in a garden sunk in deep meditation. A yakṣa, who just happens to be there, spots Kīcaka and decides to test Kīcaka’s concentration by shapeshifting into Draupadī. The yakṣa’s attempts to seduce Kīcaka into giving up his asceticism are unsuccessful. Indeed, his meditation is so powerful that Kīcaka attains the rare feat of *avadhijñāna*[[17]](#footnote-17)(HVP 46.42-45).

Impressed by Kīcaka’s genuine renunciation, the yakṣa asks him why he was infatuated, or deluded ‘moha’ in the texts, with Draupadī in the first place. Apparently, the yakṣa is clairvoyant enough to know about Kīcaka’s former obsession with Draupadī, but not clairvoyant enough to why it occurred in the first place. In an instance of a beloved topos in Jain literature[[18]](#footnote-18), Kīcaka explains his former infatuation with Draupadī by recalling his and Draupadī’s past lives; their lives are karmically intertwined. In the first of his series of former births, Kīcaka was a lowly *mleccha*[[19]](#footnote-19) living around the confluence of Taraṅginī and the Vegavatī. His next rebirth was slightly more auspicious as an *ārya* person named Kumāradeva, son of Dhanadeva and Sukumārikā, the latter a former birth of Draupadī. Unfortunately, Sukumārikā killed a sādhu by serving him poisoned food, causing herself and Kumāradeva to be reborn in hell and spending several successive rebirths as animals. Eventually, Kīcaka was reborn as Madhu, renounced and attained an unspecified heavenly rebirth, before finally being born as Kīcaka (HVP 46.48-55).

Likewise, Sukumārikā attained a rebirth as Anumātikā and deliberately practiced asceticism in the hope to attain an even better rebirth, resulting in being reborn as Draupadī (HVP 46.56-57). Upon hearing the karmic connection between Draupadī and Kīcaka, the yakṣa thanks Kīcaka. The 46th *sarga* then narratively ends with Kīcaka attaining final liberation (paraṃ padam). The chapter even concludes with labelling itself as ‘*Kīcakanirvāṇagamano nāma ṣaṭcatvāriṃśaḥ sargaḥ*’, the 46th sarga titled Kīcaka attaining *nirvāṇa*.

However unusual this redemption of Kīcaka may appear prima facie, nothing in this narrative precludes Kīcaka from attaining final liberation from a Jain perspective. Partly because of its brevity compared to the *Mahābhārata*, the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* remains vague about Kīcaka’s unwanted advances towards Draupadī, removing the more outrageous instances of his sexual harassment found in the *Mahābhārata*, acts that will accrue karmic consequences. The Jain narrative does not include Kīcaka’s indecent proposals and Draupadī’s rebuttal in direct speech (IV.13.10-21), nor does it include Kīcaka’s grabbing Draupadī’s right hand in private and kicking her in the *sabhā* of Virāṭa (IV.15.1-35). His advances are described in no more detail than ‘various tricks and ploys’[[20]](#footnote-20)

Moreover, Jains rarely shied away from describing the less-than-exemplary former lives of some illustrious figures, e.g. Mahāvīra’s heresies in his past life as Marīci[[21]](#footnote-21). Similarly, Jains depicted ‘villainous’ characters such as the heretic Jamāli as eventually attaining liberation.[[22]](#footnote-22) While Jains hKīcaka’s final liberation is hence not out of the question, likely serving to stress the soteriological efficacy of Jainism.

**The Curious Silence in the *Uttarapurāṇa*, the *Bṛhatkathākośa*, and the*****Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra***

After the relatively central position of the Kīcaka-episode in the MBh narrative of Jinasena’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (783 CE) —after all, 41 out of the 64 verses of the 46th *sarga* either directly with the Kīcaka-episode or serve to establish the narrative framework for the Kīcaka-episode—, there is an almost conspicuous silence on the Kīcaka-episode in the Jain MBh narratives composed in Sanskrit between the 9th and the 12th century.[[23]](#footnote-23) I will discuss in chronological order how the Jain MBh narratives in Sanskrit deal, or rather, do not deal with the Kīcaka-episode during these centuries.

First, there is the *Uttarapurāṇa* (897 CE), composed by the Digambara author Guṇabhadra. Written more than a century after Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, the *Uttarapurāṇa*, as its very name suggests, was composed as a follow-up part, sequel if you will, to the Ādipurāṇa written by a different Jinasena[[24]](#footnote-24). Jinasena died before he could chronicle all the 63 lives of the *mahapuruṣas*, as he initially set out to do. His pupil Guṇabhadra took it upon himself to follow through on his preceptor’s ambition.[[25]](#footnote-25)

In the 72th book of the *Uttarapurāṇa*, Guṇabhadra chronicles the latter part of the Nemi-biography, and hence includes a MBh narrative. The *Uttarapurāṇa* is even briefer than Jinasena’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* when it comes to the dice game between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas; the dice game and the Kīcaka-episode are condensed to a single śloka:

‘There was a dice game between Yudhiṣṭhira and king Duryodhana, which was the downfall of the Kīcakas (plural!) in Bhujaṅgaśailapurī’. (UP. 72.21)[[26]](#footnote-26)

There is a certain ambiguity in the above verse, for one can interpret the Kīcakas as a group including as well as excluding the eldest Kīcaka who attempts to molest Draupadī. When examining the Critical Edition, we find both interpretations.[[27]](#footnote-27)

Secondly, there is the *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam* in Hariṣeṇa’s *Bṛhatkathākośa* (931 CE). According to Upadhye, Hariṣeṇa supposedly composed this text near Vardhamānapura in Kathiawar. Interestingly, the Jain author also belonged to the Punnāṭa-saṃgha, the very same saṃgha[[28]](#footnote-28) Jinasena Punnāṭa hailed from and derived his name from.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Unlike all the other *Mahābhārata* narratives discussed so far, this *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam* is neither narratively embedded within nor narratively intertwined with a Nemi biography, but is a narrative within an anthology of stories, as the Sanskrit term *kathākośa* implies. While this *Mahābhārata* narrative might thus not satisfy what is arguably one of the most salient characteristics of Jain MBhs, i.e. the Pāṇḍava-narrative being connected with the Nemi-biography, the *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam*’sposition next to other Jain narratives in the anthology, the Jain identity of the author Hariṣeṇa, and the refutation of the Pāṇḍavas’ birth story[[30]](#footnote-30) give us sufficient reasons to categorise the *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam* as a Jain MBh narrative.

In the 112 verses of Hariṣeṇa’s *Pāṇḍavakauravakathānakam*, we find a MBh narrative which depicts the Pāṇḍavas’ exile at Virāṭa’s court without even a single mention of Kīcaka. Unlike Jinasena’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* and Gunabhadra’s *Uttarapurāṇa*, the disguises the Pāṇdavas adopt are depicted in four consecutive verses: Yudhiṣṭhira disguises himself as brahmin; Bhīma as a cook; Arjuna as a dance teacher called Bṛhamdala[[31]](#footnote-31); Nakula as horsekeeper; Sahadeva as a cowherd; Draupadī as a sairandhrī (BKK 83.93-97). The narrative completely skips over the Kīcaka-episode, instead immediately segueing into the Kaurava cattle raid (BKK 83.98-99).

Similarly, the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* (12th century CE) by the Śvetāmbara Jain polymath Hemacandra, also a native from Gujarāt[[32]](#footnote-32), which does contain a *Mahābhārata* narrative embedded in a Nemi-biography, does not mention Kīcaka at all. After a brief depiction of the dice game between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, the narrative briefly describes how the Pāṇḍavas go into exile in the forest before finally arriving in Dvārāvatī (TŚPC 8.6.361-365).

I cannot help but wonder if this silence on the Kicaka-episode in the above three works might be explained by a lukewarm or even hostile reception of Kīcaka’s redemption in Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*. Perhaps some audiences used to a Kīcakavadha had reacted with hostility or ridicule to Kīcaka’s redemption in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, yet Guṇabhadra and Hariṣeṇa, both Digambara authors, may not have wanted to explicitly contradict Jinasena Punnāṭa’s Kīcaka-episode. As I will demonstrate later, Jinasena’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* remained a powerful inspiration for later Digambara authors. Hence, Guṇabhadra ambiguously refers to ‘the downfall of the Kīcakas’, which a Jain audience can interpret as referring to the brothers of Kīcaka, while Hariṣeṇa does not even mention Kīcaka at all, even though he elaborates upon the individual disguises of the Pāṇḍavas. Unfortunately, historical sources about how non-Jains responded to Jain *Mahābhārata* adaptations are scant[[33]](#footnote-33), so the above conjecture remains confined to the realm of speculation.

**The Kicakavadhas in the Śvetāmbara Jain *Mahābhāratas***

So far I have discussed rather brief Jain MBh narratives embedded within larger works. As such, the Pāṇḍavas’ exploits in these works tend to be sketched in brief; the same holds true for depictions of the Kīcaka-episode. However, from the 13th century onwards, Jain authors start to expand on the *Mahābhārata* narrative in their works. Moreover, ‘true’ Jain *Mahābhāratas* begin to appear, ‘true’ in the sense that these compositions treat the Pāṇḍava-narrative as their main narrative. While the Nemi-biography is still present in these texts, it has become the subnarrative embedded in the Pāṇḍava-narrative instead of the other way around. Śvetāmbara Jains in particular began to compose more elaborate and expanded Pāṇdava-narrative. In this section, I will discuss three Kīcaka-episodes in Śvetāmbara Jain *Mahābhārata* narratives.

The first Kīcaka-episode I will discuss is found is found in the earliest ‘true’ Jain *Mahābhārata*, which also happens to be the most extensive one, namely the *Pāṇḍavacarita* (1213 CE) composed by Devaprabhasūri. As a Śvetāmbara Jain, Devaprabhasūri was associated with the court of the Gujarāt-based Caulukyas and their successors, the Vāghelas.[[34]](#footnote-34) Among all the Jain *Mahābhārata* adaptations, Devaprabhasūri’s *Pāṇḍavacarita* stands out as arguably the most faithful to the Vyāsa *Bhārata*. The work is deliberately divided into 18 *sargas* so as to mirror the *Mahābhārata*’s 18 *parvans*.[[35]](#footnote-35) Its Kīcaka-episode is much more elaborate than all the Kīcaka-episodes discussed so far, as it often directly mirrors the Kīcaka-episode found in the *Mahābhārata*, even down to minute details.

We find the adaptation of the Kīcaka-episode in the 10th sarga of the *Pāṇḍavacarita*, which starts with the Pāṇḍavas travelling to the Matsya kingdom ruled by king Virāṭa. Upon their arrival, Yudhiṣṭhira lectures his brothers on how to behave at a king’s court.[[36]](#footnote-36) After Yudhiṣṭhira’s instructions, the Pāṇḍavas hid their weapons in the śamī tree near the burning grounds of the Matsya capital (DPC 10.1-26). Although Devaprabhasūri does not have the Pāṇḍavas discuss their disguises among each other, the Jain author describes each individual entrance of the disguised Pāṇḍavas and Draupadī at Virāṭa’s court in great detail. First, Yudhiṣṭhira enters disguised as the gambling brahmin Kaṅka. Just as in the *Mahābhārata* (IV.6.4-9), king Virāṭa, who is greatly impressed with Yudhiṣṭhira’s appearance, inquires after the newly arrived stranger’s identity. When ‘Kaṅka’ answers that he used to serve Yudhiṣṭhira before the Pāṇḍavas’ disappearance, Virāṭa gladly accepts him into his service (DPC 10.26-41).

Virāṭa is equally impressed with Bhīma, when the second eldest Pāṇḍava makes his entrance as the cook Ballava. Though initially incredulous about Ballava being but a mere cook, the Matsya king gladly employs him as a cook (DPC 10.42-50). Then Arjuna arrives as Bṛhannaṭa, a dancer and member of the third sex[[37]](#footnote-37), who is warmly welcomed by king Virāṭa and queen Sudeṣṇā and put to work as a dance teacher to Virāṭa’s daughter Uttarā (DPC 10.51-60). Next are Nakula as the horse master Tantrapāla (DPC 10.61-67), and Sahadeva as the cowherd Granthika[[38]](#footnote-38) (DPC 10.68-74); Virāṭa decides to employ both of them.

Last[[39]](#footnote-39) to enter into the service of the Matsya court is Draupadī. When Draupadī is noticed by queen Sudeṣṇā, Virāṭa’s consort asks her as to why such as strange, beautiful woman should have come here in this ragged state. After Draupadī identifies herself as Mālinī the sairandhrī to Sudeṣṇā and asks for employment, Virāta’s wife expresses her fear that Virāṭa’s eyes might start wandering if she accepts the sairandhrī in her service. Draupadī assuages Sudeṣṇā’s doubts: she has five hidden gandharva husbands who will quickly put an end to any roving hands. Sudeṣṇā accepts Draupadī into her service (DPC 10.75-91).

After the Pāṇḍavas’ acceptance into Virāṭa’s service, the *Pāṇḍavacarita* introduces Kīcaka, who is introduced in a similar way to the one found in the *Mahābhārata*. In Devaprabhasūri’s adaptation, Kīcaka is only referred to as Sudeṣṇā’s brother; the lineage found in Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (46.26-27) is completely absent here. Upon seeing Draupadī, Kīcaka is instantly besotted with her and he sends a female go-between to proposition her. Draupadī does not take too well to Kīcaka’s words relayed by the messenger and harshly scolds her (DPC.97-112). However, Kīcaka does not relent.

The *Pāṇḍavacarita* does not feature the scene from *Mahābhārata*, in which Kīcaka enlists his reluctant sister Sudeṣṇā in his scheme to get Draupadī alone in his private chambers (IV.14.1-21). Instead, the Jain adaptation describes how Kīcaka grabs Draupadī’s in hand after his various ploys to persuade her have failed. Draupadī shoves his hands away. While she flees to Virāṭa’s royal hall for protection, Kīcaka kicks her from behind. Once she has arrived before Virāṭa, who is accompanied by the disguised Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma, Draupadī rebukes Virāṭa for his failure to uphold justice, and, in an instance of thinly veiled criticism towards Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma, she laments that if the five hidden *gandharva* husbands she has as a sairandhrī had been there to witness Kīcaka kicking her, they would have killed him on the spot. Bhīma instantly gets up intent on killing Kīcaka, but is restrained by Yudhiṣṭhira. While king Virāṭa remains silent, Yudhiṣṭhira, still disguised as Kaṅka, addresses Draupadī, telling her to go home and wait for her husbands to take action (DPC.10.113-131).

That very night, Draupadī sneaks into the kitchen of the palace, where she wakes the sleeping Bhīma. She reproaches him for not taking action against Kīcaka. Bhīma comes up with a plan to get rid of Kīcaka: Draupadī is to pretend she reciprocates Kīcaka’s lustful feelings and to invite him to a nightly rendezvous in the dance hall where Arjuna teaches as Bṛhannaṭa. There, Bhīma will wait upon him:

‘After I will have gone there in advance wearing your clothes, I will take his life under the guise of a tight embrace.’ (DPC.10.145).[[40]](#footnote-40)

Draupadī agrees to Bhīma’s plot and waits the next morning upon Kīcaka. She so convincingly feigns interest in Kīcaka through her body language and glances that he is dumbstruck. They both agree to meet at night in the dance hall. When the sun sets, Bhīma disguises himself and goes to the dance hall. Once there, the Pāṇḍava waits for Kīcaka to arrive (DPC 10.132-159). Kīcaka eventually shows up and enters the dance hall, mistaking Bhīma for Draupadī. While he invites the ‘sairandhrī’ to embrace him, he unknowingly brings his doom upon him:

‘While he was saying this, Wolf-belly came up to him and he embraced him so passionately that he died. The son of the wind then threw Kīcaka, his body reduced to a lump of flesh, through the window out of the dance hall on the ground.’ (DPC.10.145)[[41]](#footnote-41)

While the *Pāṇḍavacarita* might not depict the extended wrestling duel between Bhīma and Kīcaka[[42]](#footnote-42), the Jain adaptation very clearly depicts a *Kīcakavadha*. Pleased with killing Kīcaka, Bhīma returns to the kitchen to sleep. The next morning, Kīcaka’s brothers find out what happened to Kīcaka and are overcome by grief. However, their sorrow soon turns into anger. Knowing that their brother lusted after the *sairandhrī*, they reason that Kīcaka must have been slain by one of her husbands. To exact vengeance and to honour their fallen brother, they decide to burn her together with Kīcaka’s corpse. They abduct her, but Draupadī’s screams alert Bhīma, who promptly comes to her rescue. Just as in the *Mahābhārata* and Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, all the Kīcakas die by Bhīma’s hand (DPC 10.167-187).

Devaprabhasūri’s adaptation of the Kīcaka-episode is much more elaborate and closer[[43]](#footnote-43) to the Vyāsa Bhārata than all the preceding Jain adaptations. The next Jain adaptation of the Kīcaka-episode I will discuss is found in the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* by the Śvetāmbara Jain Dhaneśvarasūri. This sizeable work consists of 8695 verses divided into 14 *sargas* and, as its name indicates, centers around the mountain Śatruñjaya, which is held sacred by Jains and which is to this very day a popular pilgrimage place for Jains.

The *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* arguably belongs to the genre of Jain Universal History, as it devotes most of its narrative contents to the biographies of the *śalākāpuruṣas* or *mahāpuruṣas*. As such, it also contains a Nemi-biography with its concomitant Pāṇḍava-narrative. The main difference between the prototypical Jain Universal History and the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* is found in the narrative framing: the latter distinguishes itself from the prototype by its frame narrative, in which the 24th *tīrthaṅkara* Mahāvīra narrates the various legends connected with Mount Śatruñjaya at an assembly on the holy mountain itself.[[44]](#footnote-44) Though *Śatruñjayamāhātmya’s* date of composition of is unclear, it must have been composed around the middle of the 14th century at the earliest, since Dhaneśvarasūri himself makes mention of historical events up to 1329 CE throughout his work.[[45]](#footnote-45)

Some granular details in the Kīcaka-episode in the*Śatruñjayamāhātmya* seem to suggest Dhaneśvarasūri might have partly based himself on Devaprabhasūri’s Kīcaka-episode. However, Dhaneśvarasūri generally deviates less from the narrative outline of the Kīcaka-episode found in the *Mahābhārata* than Devaprabhasūri does. Dhaneśvarasūri rarely includes any plot elements of his invention in his Kīcaka-episode, whereas Devaprabhasūri often appears to do so, for instance the female go-between sent by Kīcaka to Draupadī (DPC.10.102-112).

The Kīcaka-episode in the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* starts with the Pāṇḍavas discussing the disguises they intend to adopt during their stay in the Matsya-kingdom, an element absent from the *Pāṇḍavacarita* as mentioned before. Each Pāṇḍava announces their individual disguise in direct speech. Yudhiṣṭhira announces he will be Kaṅka the brahmin; Bhīma will be the cook Vallava; Arjuna will be Bṛhannaḍa[[46]](#footnote-46); Nakula will be Gandhika[[47]](#footnote-47) the horse keeper; Sahadeva will be Tantrapāla[[48]](#footnote-48) the cowherd; Draupadī will a sairaṃdhrī[[49]](#footnote-49) (ŚM 12.95-99). They then travel to the Matsya kingdom, hide their weapons in the śamī-tree, and enter into king Virāṭa’s service. Unlike the *Pāṇḍavacarita* (10.26-89), the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* does not depict the entrance of each individual Pāṇḍava. However, there is a detail shared by the 2 Jain adaptations: both texts mention how the Pāṇḍavas honour their mother Kuntī, who is hidden nearby the palace, during their stay (DPC 10.93; ŚM 12.103), a detail absent from the *Mahābhārata*.

The *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* explicitly introduces Kīcaka as the eldest of queen Sudeṣṇā’s 106 brothers[[50]](#footnote-50), a narrative element which stems from the *Mahābhārata[[51]](#footnote-51)*, whereas the *Pāṇḍavacarita* only makes mention of Kīcaka having hundred brothers (DPC.10.167;185). When Kīcaka sees Draupadī, he instantly lusts after her, which is described with the same poetic image found in the MBh (IV.13.4), being pierced by Kāma’s arrows (ŚM 12.107). The *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* agrees with the general outline of the *Mahābhārata* in what follows. Upon being rejected by Draupadī, he complains to Sudeṣṇa and asks his sister for help. Sudeṣṇā agrees to help him and sends Draupadī to Kīcaka’s chambers on a false pretext. Once she has arrived there, Kīcaka sexually propositions her (ŚM 12.108-114). As expected, Draupadī rejects him. It is here that Draupadī threatens Kīcaka with her five hidden husbands (ŚM 12.116) , unlike in the *Mahābhārata*, where she warns Kīcaka about her five hidden husbands (IV.13.18-21) before Kīcaka enlists Sudeṣṇā’s help. In the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, Kīcaka violently responds to Draupadī’s threats; he grabs her by hair and kicks her. Draupadī manages to free herself from Kīcaka’s grasp and flees to the court of the Matsya king, where Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma are (ŚM 12.117-119). Then*,* in a narrative invention unique to the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, Draupadī indirectly reproaches her husbands Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma for their failure to protect her by means of double entendre (sleṣa), as she directly addresses Virāṭa:

There the thin-waisted woman, her hair dishevelled, saw the son of Dharma and lamented to her husbands, calling them by their secret names: ‘Oh king, I have been slighted by those good men who are firm in war and who bear the formidable marks of victory, as well as by Kīcaka.” (ŚM 12.109-110).[[52]](#footnote-52)

‘Firm in war’ (Ye sthirā yudhi) is obviously a thinly-veiled reproach directed at Yudhiṣṭhira; formidable (bhīmāḥ) is even less subtle. Yudhiṣṭhira, still disguised as Kaṅka, obviously picks up on her hidden meaning and replies with some *sleṣa* of his own: ‘if you have any formidable/Bhīma [husband], he will always protect you’.[[53]](#footnote-53) Draupadī instantly understands Yudhiṣṭhira’s hint and goes to Bhīma the same night. Remembering the humiliation Duryodhana caused her during the dice game, Bhīma is determined to kill Kīcaka and hatches the plan of inviting Kīcaka to a nightly rendezvous. Draupadī carries out Bhīma’s instructions and, like in the Pāṇḍavacarita, Bhīma, dressed as a woman, waits upon Kīcaka. Bhīma instantly kills Kīcaka as soon as the lecherous man touches Bhīma (ŚM 12.123-128). The next morning, Kīcaka’s brothers, referred to as ‘bāndhava’ as in the *Pāṇḍavacarita*, discover Kīcaka’s corpse and see ‘Mālinī the sairandhrī’ close by. Note that this is the first time in the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, the disguised Draupadī is referred to by her the alter ego name she adopts. Dhaneśvarasūri seems to assume the reader is already familiar with the narrative.

Kīcaka’s brothers decide to abuct her and — just as we have come to expect— Bhīma, alerted by Draupadī’s cries for help, shows up and kill all the Kīcakas. The *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*’s Kīcakavadha ends with King Virāṭa consoling his wife Sudeṣṇā, who is saddened by the death of her brothers, unlike in the *Mahābhārata*, where her emotional reaction to the death of Kīcaka and the other brothers is not mentioned at all.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Another Śvetāmbara adaptation of the Kīcakavadha is found in the *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* (1462 CE) composed by Śubhaśīla. As its name suggests, this work is a commentary on a prior work, the *Śatruñjayakalpa* by Dharmaghoṣa, and shares a similar narrative conceit with the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, namely connecting Mount Śatruñjaya with various Jain legends.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Śubhaśīla’s *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* contains a *Pāṇḍavacarita* and hence features a Kīcaka-episode largely based on the adaptation from the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*. Śubhaśīla begins his adaptation of the *Virāṭaparvan* with the Pāṇḍavas deciding which disguise they will adopt during their stay in the Matsya kingdom: Yudhiṣṭhira will be a brahmin named Kaṅka; Bhīma will be a cook named Valla; Arjuna will Bṛhannaṭa, who is skilled at dancing; Nakula will be Gandhika the horse master; Sahadeva Sutapāla the cowherd; Draupadī will be a sairandhrī (ŚKV 25.661-665). While some of the names are slightly different compared to the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, e.g. Valla, Bṛhannaṭa, and Sutapāla, Śubhaśīla seems to base these verses on the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* (ŚM 12.95-99), only scrambling the word order and changing some of the phrasing.[[56]](#footnote-56) The Pāṇḍavas then hide their weapons in a śamī-tree near a burial ground before entering the Matsya capital.

In a departure from the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, Śubhaśīla briefly depicts each Pāṇḍava’s entrance at Virāṭa’s court (ŚKV 25.667-671). Curiously, Śubhaśīla mixes up Sahadeva’s and Nakula’s disguises here; Sahadeva is described as a horse master and Nakula as a cow herd. After the Pāṇḍavas’ acceptance into Virāṭa’s service, the *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* even explicitly quotes the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* between verse 671 and 672 by invoking ‘uktam ca‘.[[57]](#footnote-57) Śubhaśīla also makes mention of the Pāṇḍavas honouring their mother in secret (ŚKP 25.672), an element shared by Devaprabhasūri’s *Pāṇḍavacarita* and Dhaneśvarasūri’s *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* (DPC 10.93; ŚM 12.103).

Next is the introduction of Kīcaka, which echoes the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*. He is described as the eldest of the 106 brothers of Virāṭa’s wife, who is called ‘Sudepsā’ throughout the *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* instead of Sudeṣṇā. One day Kīcaka sees Draupadī and begin to covet her. After his rejection by Draupadī, Kīcaka goes to his sister Sudepsā for help. At first, Sudepsā tries to dissuade Kīcaka, but her brother emotionally blackmails her. He would die if he does not get to sleep with the sairandhrī and won’t Sudepsā be sorry then? Sudepsā relents and one night she sends Draupadī to Kīcaka’s house (ŚKP 25.674-683). Once Draupadī arrives, Kīcaka sexually propositions her. Of course, she rejects him and threatens him with her five husbands. Between her rejection (ŚKV 25.683) and (ŚKV 25.684), the narrative inserts a quote which serves as a gnomic comment how vice and lack of care can destroy anything.[[58]](#footnote-58)

Kīcaka does not well deal well with the second rejection; he grabs Draupadī by her hair and kicks her. Draupadī, still covered with dust, then goes to the king’s court where she sees Yudhiṣṭhira. There she tells how Kīcaka assaulted her.[[59]](#footnote-59) Unlike in Devaprabhasūri’s *Pāṇḍavacarita* and Dhaneśvarasūri’s *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, Bhīma is absent, for the *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* only explicitly mentions Virāṭa and Yudhiṣṭhira. When the Matsya king remains silent in the face of Draupadī’s accusations, Yudhiṣthira tells her to go and tell ‘Pāvaka’, alluding to Bhīma. Draupadī understands his hint and visits Bhīma that night to tell him about the humiliation she suffered at Kīcaka’s hands. Like in the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*, Bhīma remembers Draupadī’s humiliation in the sabhā by the Kauravas and vows to kill Kīcaka. The Pāṇḍava ask Draupadī to pretend to fall for Kīcaka’s charms and invite him to a nightly rendezvous (ŚKV 25.685-696).

It is here that *Śatruñjayakalpavṛtti* begins to diverge from the *Śatruñjayamāhātmya*’s treatment of the episode. Śubhaśīla introduces additional comedic elements, driving the original latent comedy contained in the episode well into the realm of the farcical. Taking exquisite vittles with him, Kīcaka goes to the agreed-upon place and waits upon his date. Bhīma shows up dressed as Draupadī and wolfs down the delicacies Kīcaka brought. He even devours the camphor, musk, and oil of cloves Kīcaka brought. When Kīcaka offers Bhīma a bed, the Pāṇḍava embraces him, telling Kīcaka that he will kill him. After killing Kīcaka, Bhīma takes out a writing slab[[60]](#footnote-60) and writes ‘I killed him’ on it with Kīcaka’s blood before leaving (ŚKV 25.697-705).

The next morning, Kīcaka’s brothers find their brother’s corpse after a short search. Their loud wails attract most of the palace’s inhabitants. Soon Bhīma’s writing slab is discovered, but no one present at the crime scene dares to read Bhīma’s message out loud out of fear for the king Virāṭa’s reaction.

Suddenly, Bhīma yells out in his sleep for all the palace to hear that the one who wrote on the writing slab killed Kīcaka and that he is the one to kill Kīcaka. When people realise Valla, the disguised Bhīma, is responsible, Sudepsā arrives at the crime scene and sees the corpse of her brother. The enraged Sudepsā blames the sairandhrī for luring Kīcaka to his death and her surviving brothers seize Draupadī on Virāṭa’s orders. Intent on burning her alive together with Kīcaka’s corpse, they scold her as they drag her to the burning grounds. Just when Kīcaka’s brothers are about to throw her into the fire, Bhīma shows up and frees Draupadī. After killing all the Kīcakas except for one, Bhīma cuts off the tongue of the sole survivor and takes him to king Virāṭa. Bhīma then brazenly lies to the Matsya king, telling Virāṭa that Kīcaka’s brothers all committed suicide by jumping into the fire and that he only managed to save one Kīcaka from the fire. However, the surviving brother just so happened to bite off his own tongue, rendering himself mute. The Kīcaka-episode ends with Virāṭa urging his wife Sudepsā not to grieve and to abandon her enmity towards the sairandhrī (ŚKV 25.706-737). All in all, Śubhaśīla must have used Dhaneśvarasūri’s *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* as an inspiration, but he also introduces narrative inventions of his own, such as Bhīma’s gluttony dressed as Draupadī, Bhīma’s unwitting confession while asleep, and Bhīma’s outrageous lies about the deaths of Kīcaka’s brothers. No doubt Śubhaśīla must have intended to add some hilarity to the episode.

**The Kicakavadhas in Digambara Jain *Mahābhāratas***

Now we have come to the last two adaptations of the Kīcaka-episode in two Digambara Jain adaptations, the *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (1552 CE) by Śubhacandra and another *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (1598 CE) by Vādicandra. As their name indicates, both works focus on the Pāṇḍava-narrative and can rightfully be called ‘true’ Jain *Mahābhāratas*. They are similar in content and share the same frame narrative of Mahāvīra’s disciple Indrabhūti Gautama narrating the ‘true’ events of *Mahābhārata*, i.e. the Jain version, to king Śreṇika at Mahāvīra’s *samavasaraṇa*.[[61]](#footnote-61) As such, these *Pāṇḍavapurāṇas* are highly polemical towards the dominant Hindu interpretation of the *Mahābhārata* narrative; Vādicandra even seems to fabricate a defamatory version of the *Mahābhārata* narrative found in a Śaiva texts to attack Śaivites for their scandalous beliefs.[[62]](#footnote-62) In that light, a Kīcakanirvāṇa instead of a Kīcakavadha would make sense. However, both *Pāṇḍavapurāṇas*, both somewhat indebted to the Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, depict a Kīcakavadha. First I will discuss Śubhacandra’s depiction of the Kīcaka-episode before moving on to Vādicandra’s version.

While Śubhacandra draws on a wide variety of *Mahābhārata* narratives for his *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, one of which being Devaprabhasūri’s *Pāṇḍavacarita*, he undeniably bases himself on Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* for his Kīcaka-episode. For instance, Śubhacandra’s description of the final years of the Pāṇḍavas’ exile before they travel is clearly inspired by Jinasena Punnāṭa: after the Pāṇḍavas reach the city Meghadāla ruled by king Siṃha and queen Kāñcanā, Bhīma marries their daughter Kanakamekhalā. The five brothers and Draupadī then travel to Kauśala to Rāmagiri before they end up in Virāṭa’s realm (ŚPP 17.226-230). Here Śubhacandra clearly echoes Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (46.14-22), which depict the same sequence of events. Only the names of king Siṃha’s wife and daughter are different in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa:* his wife is called Kanakamekhala and his daughter Kanakavartā.

However, unlike Jinasena’s adaptation, Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* does depict the Pāṇḍavas discussing the professions they will assume during their stay at Virāṭa’s court: Yudhiṣṭhira will be a priest; Bhīma will be Ballava the cook; Arjuna will be Bṛhannaḍa[[63]](#footnote-63) the dance teacher; Nakula will take care of horses; Sahadeva will take care of cows; Draupadī will be a garland maker (ŚPP 17.231-239). Śubhacandra does not depict the entrance of each individual Pāṇḍava; instead, Virāṭa accepts the five brothers and Draupadī collectively into his service. Just like in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, Virāṭa’s consort is called Sudarśanā as opposed to Sudeṣṇā. The same goes for Kīcaka’s parentage: he is the eldest son among the 100 sons of King Culika and Vikacā, rulers of the city Cūlikā (ŚPP 17.245). The names are identical as the ones found in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (46.245), except for one minor change: Culika is called Cūlika.

What follows in Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* is familiar: Kīcaka sees Draupadī, becomes smitten with her and sexually propositions her. Of course, Draupadī rejects him, threatening him with five gandharvas (ŚPP 17.247-255). Although Draupadī does not explicitly call these gandharvas[[64]](#footnote-64) her husbands in this Digambara Jain adaptation, her threat inadvertently showcases Śubhacandra’s inability as a Digambara author to completely erase all traces of Draupadī’s polyandry. Kīcaka’s response to Draupadī’s threat also contains a narrative oversight on Śubhacandra’s part, since Kīcaka addresses her as ‘Draupadī’[[65]](#footnote-65), whereas Kīcaka in the *Mahābhārata* thinks that she is but a hair-dressing servant easily cajoled into sexual intercourse. Draupadī’s vulnerability as a lowly servant instead of a *kṣatriya* queen is a major theme in the *Virāṭaparvan* in the *Mahābhārata[[66]](#footnote-66)*. Indeed, much of the humour and tension in the Virāṭaparvan stems from the Pāṇḍavas and Draupadī having to navigate the court of Virāṭa without the social power they enjoy as their true selves. Regardless of Śubhacandra deliberately or inadvertently having Kīcaka address Draupadī with her real name,

Inevitably, Kīcaka one day tries to molest Draupadī, grabbing her hand in private. After managing to escape Kīcaka’s clutches, Draupadī directly goes to Yudhiṣṭhira. Although the eldest Pāṇḍava is indignant at Virāṭa’s inability to discipline Kīcaka, he advises Draupadī to ‘remain virtuous’, invoking female paragons of virtue like Sītā and Mandodarī. In Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, it is Arjuna rather than Bhīma who has to be restrained by Yudhiṣṭhira, because Digambara Jains hold that Draupadī is married to Arjuna alone. Despite Arjuna’s implicit willingness to punish Kīcaka, Draupadī still choses Bhīma as her avenger. Upon hearing about Kīcaka’s abuse, Bhīma comes up with the plan to lure Kīcaka to his death. After Draupadī has arranged the nightly rendezvous with Kīcaka, Bhīma dresses up as a woman, which is elaborately described over the span of several verses, and goes to the place of the rendezvous to wait upon Kīcaka (ŚPP 17.256-282).

When Kīcaka finally arrives in the dark, he takes the shadowy shape of Bhīma for Draupadī until he grabs Bhīma’s rough hand and realises he has been deceived. The two men began to fight each other, but it is not long until Bhīma gains the upper hand, pinning Kīcaka to the floor with his foot. The Pāṇḍava rebukes him for coveting another’s wife before killing him (ŚPP 17.283-295). Draupadī then informs Virāṭa that Kīcaka has been slain by a gandharva. In an interesting departure from all other Jain adaptations of the Kīcaka-episode, Śubhacandra doubles Draupadī’s abduction. First Virāṭa’s servants abduct Draupadī to burn her together with Kīcaka’s corpse, but Bhīma comes to her rescue and chases Virāṭa’s servants away. Then Kīcaka’s brothers find out about Kīcaka’s death from Draupadī and immediately abduct her, again with the same intent as the servants earlier. This time Bhīma shows no mercy and throws the Kīcakas into the fire. Śubhacandra’s Kīcaka-episode ends with Bhīma informing Yudhiṣṭhira’s of Kīcaka’s death (17.296-318). All in all, Śubhacandra appears to have felt the need to incorporate elements from Jinasena’s Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* such as the Pāṇḍavas’ travels before arriving in the Matsya kingdom and Kīcaka’s genealogy despite their narrative triviality in the episode. However, Śubhacandra still depicts a Kīcakavadha instead of his redemption.

The last adaptation of the Kīcaka-episode discussed in this paper is found in Vādicandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (1598). Vādicandra appears to base himself mainly on Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* for his Kīcakavadha, but adds narrative elements reminiscent of those in the *Virāṭaparvan* of *Vyāsa Bhārata* and removes some narrative elements particular to Śubhacandra. For instance, Vādicandra excises the Pāṇḍavas’ travels to Meghadala, Kauśāla, and Rāmagiri before their arrival in the Matsya realm as depicted in Śubhacandra (17.226-229). Not unlike in the *Mahābhārata* (IV.1.5-14), Vādicandra depicts a brief back-and-forth in direct speech between Yudhiṣṭhira and Arjuna about where they will spend the final year. Arjuna suggests the kingdom of Varāṭa [sic] (VPP 8.52-59). The disguises of the Pāṇḍavas are sketched in two verses: Yudhiṣṭhira will be a brahmin; Bhīma a cook; Arjuna an expert dancer; Sahadeva a horse master; Nakula a cowherd; Draupadī a garland maker (VPP 8.61-62). Note how Vādicandra mixes up Nakula’s and Sahadeva’s disguises here. Before entering the Matsya capital, the Pāṇḍavas hide their weapons in the śamī-tree, an element absent from Śubhacandra. In another departure from Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, Vādicandra describes each Pāṇḍava’s individual entrance and acceptance at Varāta’s [sic] court. King Varāṭa gladly accepts them all into his service (VPP 8.64-84).

The narrative then introduces Kīcaka as the eldest son of king Cūlika and queen Vikacā, rulers of Cūlikā like in Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* (VPP.85-86). Vādicandra describes Kīcaka as Varāṭa’s brother-in-law, but does not mention Kīcaka’s sister at all throughout his adaptation. Predictably, Kīcaka sees Draupadī one day, starts to lust after her, and is rejected by her. Like in Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, Kīcaka grabs Draupadī’s hand. However, Draupadī immediately informs Bhīma, who instructs her to make a nightly rendezvous with Kīcaka. After she has carried out his instructions, Bhīma disguises himself as Draupadī and waits for Kīcaka at the appointed time and place. Just like in Śubhacandra’s *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa*, Kīcaka realises he has been fooled as soon as he grabs Bhīma’s rough hand. A duel between the two men ensues and Bhīma eventually kills Kīcaka in the end (VPP 8.87-119). When Kīcaka fails to make his way home that very night, his 100 kinsmen grow worried. Alerted by a rumour, they venture outside the city to look for Kīcaka and happen upon his corpse in the dance hall. Aware of Kīcaka’s desire towards Mālinī, they decide to abduct Draupadī, intent on burning her. Unsurprisingly, Bhīma comes to her rescue and slays nearly all of Kīcaka’s kinsmen. Only the youngest brother manages to escape unscathed and informs Varāṭa. The Matsya king thinks his brother-in-law slain by a gandharva and decides not to interfere in the matter for the sake of self-interest.

**Conclusion**

Jains did not shy away from radically reimagining characters from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* in their adaptations, even when these interpretations might have met with disapproval; for instance, Kṛṣṇa’s portrayal could have roused the ire of Vaiṣṇava communities.[[67]](#footnote-67) While Kīcaka can hardly be said to enjoy any soteriological significance in the *Mahābhārata* attributed to Vyāsa, Kṛṣṇa obviously does so in the Sanskrit narrative.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Nevertheless, Jinasena Punnāṭa portrays Kīcaka as attaining final liberation in current lifetime before Kṛṣṇa does, who first goes to hell after Jaratkumāra accidentally kills him (HVP 61.56-61). Although Kṛṣṇa is not denied final liberation in the end, Kīcaka’s earlier liberation, which implies greater spiritual achievement compared to Kṛṣṇa, might not have sat well with any potential listeners belonging to Hindu communities fond of Kṛṣṇa in the late 8th century. Granted, Kṛṣṇa’s death in the *Mahābhārata* (16.5), the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (5.37), and the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (11.30-11.31) is portrayed as embarrassing end at odds with Kṛṣṇa’s exalted status in those texts.[[69]](#footnote-69) While direct historical sources on the reception of Kīcaka-episode by other communities have yet to be found, maybe a negative reception from other communities might account for the virtual absence of the Kīcaka-episode in *Uttarapurāṇa* (897 CE), the *Bṛhatkathākośa* (931 CE), and the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* (12th century). Guṇabhadra and Hariṣeṇa lived in the immediate centuries after Jinasena Punnāṭa’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (783 CE), a time when echoes of the reception of Kīcaka’s redemption could still have lingered in the public memory of Jain communities. However speculative this conjecture may be and remain, perhaps, forever, in the case of the *Bṛhatkathākośa*, it appears Hariṣeṇa willfully omitted the Kīcaka-episode. He depicts the Pāṇḍavas’ disguises at Virāṭa’s court and then immediately skips to the cattle raid by the Kauravas. Whatever the reason for its omission may have been, Kīcaka’s absence here is too conspicuous; Hariṣeṇa in all likelihood knew that the character of Kīcaka existed.

Concerning the later Jain *Mahābhāratas*, whether they are Śvetāmbara or Digambara, whether they are ‘true’ Jain Mahābhāratas or embedded narratives, all Jain authors seemed to want echo the Vyāsa Bhārata or a popular interpretation based on that narrative that existed in the public consciousness more closely than their predecessors did. While the later Jain authors could and did add narrative elements of their own invention in their Kīcaka-episodes, e.g. Śubhaśīla’s comedic treatment of the episode, certain elements of the Kīcaka-episode seems to have crystallised and ossified so as to allow only for a limited scope of deviation. For instance, Digambara Jain *Mahābhārata* portray Draupadī as being married to Arjuna alone, yet still single out Bhīma as her avenger and rarely even explore Arjuna’s reaction at Kīcaka’s slight. Bhīma is just too central to the Kīcaka-episode to be substituted by Arjuna.

Furthermore, even the Digambara authors who, whether directly or indirectly, drew on Jinasena Punnāṭa’s Kīcaka-episode, e.g. Kīcaka’s lineage, still depict his death at the hands of Bhīma in their Sanskrit adaptations. The sole exception is found in an work composed in Apabhraṃśa, Raïdhū’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*. Either way, it appears ‘the Slaying of Kīcaka’ was too iconic to be supplanted by the Redemption of Kīcaka.

**References**

Top of Form

Bottom of Form
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