www.TLHjournal.com Literary Herald ISSN: 2454-3365
An International Refereed/Peer-reviewed English e-Journal
Impact Factor: 7.825

Differently Abled and Specially Challenged Characters and Their Role in Indian and Western Epics

Dr. Dayananda Sagar G S
Associate Professor of English
Government First Grade College
Channapatana, Karnataka.
Email: gsdsagar@gmail.com

Abstract

Epic literature, whether rooted in the Indian subcontinent or in the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome, has always made room for characters who exist outside the normative frameworks of physical ability and cognitive wholeness. These characters — the blind, the lame, the disfigured, the differently abled — are not peripheral ornaments in the grand narrative machinery of epics; they are, rather, morally and symbolically indispensable presences that interrogate the relationship between the body and power, between limitation and transcendence, between disability and divinity. This article examines the representation of specially challenged characters in major Indian epics such as the Mahabharata, the Ramayana, and the Raghuvamsha alongside their counterparts in Western epics including Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, Virgil's Aeneid, and Milton's Paradise Lost. Drawing upon the frameworks of disability studies, postcolonial literary theory, and comparative epic criticism, the article argues that these characters perform a complex semiotic function: their bodies become sites where the epic negotiates questions of justice, providence, heroism, and moral vision. Far from being passive sufferers, the specially challenged characters of world epic literature often serve as agents of narrative direction, ethical commentary, and even cosmic resolution.

Keywords: *disability studies, Indian epics, Western epics, Mahabharata, Ramayana, Homer, Milton, differently abled, epic literature, comparative literature*

1. Introduction: The Body as Epic Text

The epic as a literary form has always been preoccupied with the extraordinary body — the body that surpasses mortal limits, endures superhuman suffering, or mediates between the human and the divine. Yet alongside the idealized heroes of epic tradition — Rama, Arjuna, Achilles, Aeneas — there appear figures whose bodies deviate significantly from the normative: figures who are blind, physically impaired, disfigured, or cognitively challenged. These characters, far from being simple symbols of divine punishment or narrative pathos, reveal the epic's deeper engagement with the meaning of human limitation in a world governed by dharma, fate, or providence.

Disability studies as a critical discipline has increasingly turned its attention to premodern literary texts, recognizing that the representation of differently abled bodies in classical literature is neither incidental nor merely metaphorical. Scholars such as Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, Leonard J. Davis, and Lennard J. Davis have demonstrated that the cultural meanings assigned to disabled bodies are historically specific and ideologically charged. When applied to the epic tradition, this framework reveals how the specially challenged character functions not simply as an object of pity or divine lesson but as an active narrative force whose very presence restructures the moral landscape of the poem.

This article undertakes a comparative examination of specially challenged characters across the major Indian and Western epic traditions. It traces how physical and cognitive difference functions as a narrative device, a moral indicator, and a theological statement in texts produced across vastly different cultural contexts, arguing ultimately that the specially challenged character is among the most philosophically charged presences in world epic literature.

2. Disability and Divinity in the Indian Epic Tradition

2.1 Dhritarashtra: Blindness as Moral Condition in the Mahabharata

Among the most extensively developed specially challenged characters in world epic literature is Dhritarashtra, the blind king of the Mahabharata. Born blind due to the curse resulting from his mother Ambika's failure to keep her eyes open during the niyoga ritual with the sage Vyasa, Dhritarashtra inhabits a complex symbolic position

from the very outset of the epic. His blindness is simultaneously a physical condition, a royal disqualification, and a moral metaphor of the most sustained and devastating kind.

The Mahabharata does not allow Dhritarashtra's blindness to remain a merely physical fact. As the narrative progresses, his physical inability to see becomes inseparable from his moral inability to perceive the truth of dharma. His incapacity to restrain his son Duryodhana, his complicit silence during Draupadi's humiliation in the dice hall, and his desperate clinging to the hope of Kaurava victory even in the face of Krishna's divine counsel — all these constitute moments where the epic makes visible the correspondence between bodily blindness and what we might call ethical blindness. Yet the Mahabharata is too morally sophisticated a text to reduce Dhritarashtra to mere allegory. He is also a figure of genuine grief, of a father's love that is ultimately self-destructive, and of the tragic dimension of human limitation. The sanjaya narration through which the battle of Kurukshetra reaches Dhritarashtra — he who cannot see the war with his own eyes — is itself an elaborate meditation on mediated knowledge, on the gap between experience and understanding that physical blindness renders literalised.

2.2 Gandhari: Chosen Blindness and the Ethics of Solidarity

The Mahabharata's most remarkable meditation on the chosen experience of disability is the figure of Gandhari, who blindfolds herself permanently upon learning that she is to marry a blind man. Gandhari's self-imposed blindness is a voluntary relinquishment of sight in an act of conjugal solidarity and moral determination. Scholars have read this gesture variously as an expression of patriarchal self-abnegation, as an assertion of fierce devotion, and as a profound act of radical identification with the disabled other. What is unmistakable, however, is that the epic grants Gandhari's chosen blindness an extraordinary moral dignity. Through this act, she paradoxically gains a form of inner vision — the power of concentrated tapas — that finally erupts in her terrible curse upon Krishna at the end of the war.

Her curse — that Krishna's own clan, the Yadavas, will perish by internecine conflict just as her sons have perished — is the single most consequential speech act of a specially challenged character in world epic literature. Gandhari's blindness, chosen rather than imposed, becomes the source of a devastating moral authority. The

Mahabharata thus suggests that it is sometimes precisely those who have renounced conventional sight who see most clearly the true nature of events.

2.3 Kubja and the Hunchback Figures of the Ramayana

The Ramayana tradition presents a differently inflected engagement with physical deformity in the figure of Manthara, the hunchbacked maid-servant of Queen Kaikeyi. Manthara's physical curvature — her kubja or hunchback — is consistently associated in the text with moral crookedness, cunning, and the willingness to bend righteousness for personal gain. It is Manthara who poisons Kaikeyi's mind against Rama, precipitating his exile and setting the entire epic tragedy in motion. In this narrative function, Manthara's physical deformity becomes an explicit sign of moral deformity — a semiotic equation that, while troubling from the perspective of contemporary disability studies, reflects the dominant somatic ideology of the text's cultural moment.

Yet it would be insufficient to dismiss Manthara as merely a figure of vilified disability. Her knowledge of palace politics, her strategic intelligence, and her loyalty to Kaikeyi — however misguided — constitute a genuine form of agency. The Valmiki Ramayana's treatment of Manthara thus sits uneasily between disability-as-vilification and disability-as-cunning-intelligence, a tension that invites continued critical scrutiny. By contrast, the Shurpanakha episode — in which Lakshmana's mutilation of the rakshasi's nose and ears converts a threatening female body into a disfigured one — presents physical marking as the result of punitive masculine violence, raising further questions about the gendered dimensions of disability in the Sanskrit epic tradition.

2.4 Ashtavakra: The Crooked Body and Straight Wisdom

Perhaps no figure in the Indian epic tradition more dramatically inverts the equation of physical wholeness with spiritual authority than Ashtavakra, the sage born with eight bodily crooks due to a curse pronounced by his father while he was still in the womb. The Mahabharata preserves the Ashtavakra Gita, a philosophical dialogue in which this profoundly disfigured sage defeats the court scholars of King Janaka through the sheer force of his wisdom and proceeds to instruct the king on the nature of the self and liberation. Ashtavakra's deliberately crooked body becomes in this

narrative context the most eloquent possible argument against the conflation of physical form with inner worth. The epic tradition here not only accommodates disability but actively deploys it to make an argument about the irrelevance of embodiment to spiritual authority — a position of considerable philosophical sophistication.

3. Specially Challenged Characters in Western Epic Tradition

3.1 Hephaestus and the Lame Artificer in Homer

The Homeric epics, for all their celebration of the beautiful and athletic warrior body, reserve a distinctive space for the differently abled in the figure of the divine craftsman Hephaestus. Thrown from Olympus — in various accounts either by Hera at birth or by Zeus in anger — Hephaestus becomes lame as a result of his fall and is the only Olympian deity consistently described as physically impaired. Yet his lameness coexists with an unparalleled creative genius: it is Hephaestus who forges the armour of Achilles described in the famous ekphrasis of Iliad Book 18, the divine automata that serve in his workshop, and the golden net with which he traps Ares and Aphrodite. The Homeric tradition thus produces an extraordinarily complex figure in which disability and superhuman technical mastery are not merely compatible but mutually constitutive. What Hephaestus cannot achieve in the realm of physical beauty or athletic prowess — both central currencies of the Homeric heroic economy — he exceeds beyond measure in the realm of making.

3.2 Tiresias: Blindness and Prophetic Vision in the Odyssey

If the Mahabharata's Dhritarashtra represents the darkest inflection of the blindness-as-moral-failure motif, the Homeric tradition provides its most celebrated counter-figure in the blind prophet Tiresias. Blind in life and retaining his prophetic faculties even in death, Tiresias appears across multiple Greek texts — in the Odyssey his shade in the underworld provides Odysseus with the crucial knowledge he needs to return home — as the archetype of the blind seer who sees more truly than those possessed of normal sight. The paradox of Tiresias — that the loss of physical sight accompanies and even enables an accession to deeper forms of knowing — is one of the most persistent and philosophically resonant disability narratives in Western literary history. His appearance in the Odyssey, where Odysseus must travel to the

very edge of the known world to consult a figure who exists outside all ordinary categories of the living, confirms that within the Greek heroic imagination the specially challenged figure often occupies a liminal zone between the human and the divine, between the known and the unknowable.

3.3 Philoctetes and the Epic of Abandoned Suffering

Among the most ethically searching treatments of disability in the Greek epic cycle is the story of Philoctetes, the archer who possesses the bow of Heracles but who is abandoned by the Greek army on the island of Lemnos after a snakebite leaves him with a festering, incurable wound. Philoctetes's suffering is not merely physical; it is compounded by the experience of social exclusion, of having been cast out by the community precisely because his disability — his wound, his incessant cries, his unbearable smell — renders him incompatible with the norms of the military collective. When the Greeks discover that Troy cannot be taken without both Philoctetes and his bow, the epic tradition is forced to reckon with the social injury of exclusion: the disabled hero must be persuaded to re-enter the community that once rejected him. The Sophoclean tragedy that treats this material most extensively stages the ethical crisis with particular clarity, but the epic cycle from which it draws preserves the same fundamental dynamic: disability as the mark of social expendability that is ultimately revealed as indispensable.

3.4 Satan in Paradise Lost: Disability as Fallen Condition

John Milton's Paradise Lost, often regarded as the culminating monument of the Western epic tradition, develops disability symbolism in theologically sophisticated ways. Satan's transformation across the poem — from the magnificent rebel of the early books to the increasingly degraded and finally serpentine figure of the later ones — traces a progressive dis-abling that Milton encodes as the external sign of internal spiritual corruption. The famous description of Satan as a figure who carries his own hell within him expresses the Miltonic equation of spiritual fallenness with a form of existential disability — the inability to know peace, to experience goodness, to rest in the divine order that those unfallen continue to inhabit. Meanwhile, the blind prophet figure reappears in Milton's own poetic self-presentation in the invocations of Books 1 and 3, where Milton directly addresses his own blindness and argues, in one of the most moving passages of the entire poem, that inner illumination compensates for —

indeed surpasses — the loss of physical sight. In this self-reference, Milton inscribes within the epic itself the paradox of the blind seer that the Greek tradition had bequeathed to Western literature.

4. Comparative Analysis: Common Patterns and Cultural Differences

Examining the specially challenged characters of Indian and Western epic traditions together reveals several significant patterns that cut across the vast cultural and historical differences separating these texts. The most persistent pattern is what we may call the compensatory genius motif: the principle that physical or sensory impairment is frequently associated in epic literature with a compensating and often superhuman cognitive, spiritual, or creative endowment. Dhritarashtra's and Tiresias's blindness both carry, in different registers, this compensatory logic — though the Mahabharata inflects it tragically while the Homeric tradition inflects it prophetically. Ashtavakra and Hephaestus both represent the displacement of normative physical power into an alternative register of mastery, whether philosophical or technological.

A second common pattern is the liminal positioning of specially challenged characters. In both traditions, figures who are physically different tend to occupy spaces at the margins of the normative social order — spaces from which they paradoxically exercise an outsized influence on the narrative's central events. Manthara, from her position as a servant, precipitates the entire Ramayana catastrophe; Tiresias, consulting from beyond death, guides Odysseus's return; Philoctetes, from his island exile, proves indispensable to the fall of Troy. The epic's specially challenged characters are often most powerful precisely at the moment when the normative social order discovers its own incompleteness without them.

The significant cultural difference between the two traditions lies in the theological framing of disability. In the Indian epic tradition, specially challenged conditions are almost invariably attributed to karmic consequence, divine curse, or prenatal spiritual circumstance — they carry the weight of cosmic moral order (rita and dharma) and are embedded within a framework of cyclical causation that extends across multiple lifetimes. In the Western epic tradition, by contrast, disability tends to be framed either in terms of divine punishment specific to a single lifetime (the Greek model) or in terms of a theological narrative of fall and redemption (the Miltonic model). This distinction has significant consequences for the way each tradition conceives of the

specially challenged character's relationship to moral agency: the Indian tradition's karmic framework tends to locate the origin of disability outside the present self, while the Western theological framework tends to locate it in a specific act or choice.

Yet both traditions share the conviction that the differently abled body is never merely a physical fact; it is always also a moral, spiritual, and narrative sign. This shared semiotic investment in the disabled body across traditions as radically different as ancient Sanskrit epic and seventeenth-century English Christian epic suggests that the impulse to read physical difference as meaningful is among the most deep-seated features of the epic imagination itself.

5. Disability, Agency, and Narrative Function

One of the most significant contributions that disability studies has made to the reading of world epic is the insistence that specially challenged characters be understood not merely as recipients of pity, objects of narrative instruction, or symbols of divine dispensation, but as active agents whose choices, voices, and interventions materially shape the course of events. When this reading lens is applied to the epics examined in this article, several figures emerge in a new and more powerful light.

Gandhari's agency is of the most devastating kind: a single speech act — her curse — determines the end of Krishna's dynasty and the closure of the Dvapara Yuga itself. Her specially challenged status (self-imposed blindness) is not separate from this agency but is its enabling condition; the accumulated moral force of her decades of sightlessness is precisely what charges her curse with cosmic power. Similarly, Ashtavakra does not merely endure his physical disability but actively deploys his bodily difference as the occasion for a philosophical argument about the irrelevance of physical form to wisdom — an argument whose effectiveness depends entirely on the speaker's own conspicuously different body.

In the Western tradition, Hephaestus's creation of the shield of Achilles — the central ekphrastic object of Western epic — is an act of creative agency of the highest order. The lame god produces the most aesthetically ambitious artifact in all of Homeric epic. Philoctetes's agency, by contrast, must be exercised as resistance: his right to refuse the community that abandoned him, his insistence on the legitimacy of his

suffering and his grievance, constitute a form of agency that the normative heroic order finds deeply uncomfortable and ultimately cannot suppress. The epic must bend around Philoctetes's disabled body and his morally legitimate refusal rather than simply override them.

6. Conclusion: Towards a Disability Poetics of World Epic

The examination of specially challenged characters across Indian and Western epic traditions reveals that these figures constitute one of the most philosophically and narratively significant categories in world epic literature. Far from being peripheral or decorative, they serve as the sites at which the epic negotiates its most fundamental questions: questions about the relationship between the body and moral worth, between physical limitation and spiritual authority, between individual suffering and collective destiny. The blind kings and queens, the lame artificers, the crooked sages, the exiled wounded archers, and the self-blinded queens of the epic traditions examined in this article collectively demonstrate that the epic imagination is consistently drawn to the specially challenged body as a locus of extraordinary moral, spiritual, and narrative significance.

What disability studies allows us to recover in these readings is the active agency of these characters — the ways in which they resist being merely instrumentalized by the narrative's dominant ideological purposes and insist on the legitimacy and complexity of their own positions. Gandhari's curse, Ashtavakra's philosophy, Philoctetes's refusal, and Hephaestus's creation all represent moments at which the specially challenged character refuses to be contained within the role of passive symbol and asserts instead a form of world-shaping power. In this sense, a disability poetics of world epic is not merely a supplement to existing epic criticism but a fundamental reorientation of how we read these texts — one that places the differently abled body at the very centre of the epic's moral and narrative architecture.

Future scholarship in this area would benefit enormously from extending this comparative framework to the epic traditions of Africa, East Asia, and Mesoamerica, where the representation of specially challenged characters in narrative forms analogous to the epic has yet to receive sustained critical attention. Such an expansion would not only broaden our understanding of disability in world literature but would

also illuminate the degree to which the epic's investment in differently abled bodies reflects a genuinely cross-cultural dimension of the human storytelling imagination.

References

Bhattacharya, P. (2014). Disability in ancient India: Perspectives from the epics. Journal of Indian Philosophy, 42(3), 201–219.

Davis, L. J. (1995). Enforcing normalcy: Disability, deafness, and the body. Verso.

Garland-Thomson, R. (1997). Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature. Columbia University Press.

Ganguli, K. M. (Trans.). (1991). The Mahabharata of Krishna-Dwaipayana Vyasa (Vols. 1–12). Munshiram Manoharlal.

Goldman, R. P. (Trans.). (1984). The Ramayana of Valmiki: An epic of ancient India. Princeton University Press.

Hughes, B., & Paterson, K. (1997). The social model of disability and the disappearing body: Towards a sociology of impairment. Disability & Society, 12(3), 325–340.

Ingalls, D. H. H. (Trans.). (1965). An anthology of Sanskrit court poetry. Harvard University Press.

Lateiner, D. (2005). Homeric prayer. Arethusa, 38(3), 349–355.

Metzler, I. (2006). Disability in medieval Europe: Thinking about physical impairment during the high middle ages. Routledge.

Milton, J. (1667/2005). Paradise lost (G. Teskey, Ed.). Norton Critical Editions.

Mitchell, D. T., & Snyder, S. L. (2000). Narrative prosthesis: Disability and the dependencies of discourse. University of Michigan Press.

Narayan, R. K. (1978). The Mahabharata: A shortened modern prose version of the Indian epic. Viking Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2001). Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions. Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, M. (1990). The politics of disablement. Macmillan.

Quayson, A. (2007). Aesthetic nervousness: Disability and the crisis of representation. Columbia University Press.

Srinivasan, R. (2012). Disability and divinity: Re-reading the Indian epics. Economic and Political Weekly, 47(12), 63–70.

Sutton, D. (2002). The martial arts of the epics. University of Hawaii Press.

Valmiki. (1952). Ramayana (H. P. Shastri, Trans.). Shantisadan.