CHAPTER - IV
Both Madhava Kandali and Krittivasa composed Rāmāyana taking Vālmiki Rāmāyana as the basis. In doing so both have shown their originality. Madhava Kandali followed Vālmiki in to to but in places abridged. But Krittibāsa made addition here and there as necessary by him. Besides Madhava Kandali, Sankardeva, Madhavdeva, Ananta Kandali, Durgābar, Raghgunāth Mahanta, Sistha Bhattacharya and others also composed Rāmāyana in Assamese literature. But among all these the Rāmāyana of Madhava Kandali is important and special for very many reasons. The special characteristic of Madhava Kandali Rāmāyana is that it was translated into Assamese from original Vālmiki Rāmāyana. Other Rāmāyana writers added to their own Rāmāyana composition some additional stories which Madhava Kandali did not. But he could grasp and narrate the kernal of truth in his Rāmāyana. “Lambha Parihari Sarodhrite” the unnecessary details is to be left out and there is an attempt to put the Kernal of poetic terms in the composition of Rāmāyana in Assamese. He declared that he retained the originality without any additions (Prakshipta) But in some places there were some unavoidable additions. But it did not distort the original Rāmāyana in any way; but placement of stories were changed by him e.g. ‘Kuji Manthara Niryātan’ of Ayodhyā Kānda, Insulting of Bibhīsan by Rāvana was shown in Sundarkānda in place of Lankā Kānda of Vālmiki Rāmāyana edited by Pandit Panchānan Tararatna.
It is noticed that the Bengali poet Krittibāsa also followed Gaudiya text. Possibly poet Kandali also followed Gaudiya text in the composition of Assamese Rāmāyana. Owing to this with the stories of other texts in a number of places position of events were changed. God deal of similarities are noticed between Kandali Rāmāyana and the Gaudiya text.

Further the best literature of Krittibāsa’s Rāmāyana is the Gaudiya text. Owing to this good deal of similarities are noticed between the Rāmāyana of Mādhava Kandali and that of Krittibāsa. But the dissimilarities are also not less between the two. Mādhava Kandali’s Rāmāyana is basically ‘worldly’. But the Rāmāyana of Krittibāsa was basically ‘unworldly’ full of Vaishnab idealism. Rāma of Kandali Rāmāyana was an ideal man. But Rāma of Krittibāsa was God incarnate. However the character of Rāma of Kandali in a number of places there are traces of qualities of Avatārapurusha. Not only this Rāma himself was conscious on this aspect of his character. Sad and morosed Bibhīsana was consoled by Rāma, after the death of Rāvana, stating “sadgati bhaila haite parila amar. (Lanka Kanda, 6415)”. Rāma of Kandali was not the omniscient God of the Vaishnab poet. Not only that, the secret information about the ‘death-arrow’ for Rāvana was disclosed by Mtali, the charioteer of Indra, to Rāma. Had Rāma been God he would have known the information of death-arrow well ahead of time. In this respect deities, Brāhmanas, sages, monkeys etc. accepted Rāma as Avatara and became devoted to him. Kandali’s Sitā is similar to Vālmiki. But in many respects she is more out spoken than Vālmiki’s Sitā.

Many additional stories are found in Krittibāsa’s Rāmāyana and the same are not present in that of Kālidās’s. In this respect Kandali’s Rāmāyana
is more attached to original Rāmāyana being the earliest of the Rāmāyana translations in India. But both represented their composition of Rāmāyana basing on Vālmiki Rāmāyana.

Not only that it gives immense pleasure to us to think that the society that Kandali represents appears more advanced as the then literary society of Brahmaputra Valley represented by Kandali could even think of translating the Vālmiki Rāmāyana. Not only that for very many reasons even there are abridgements of the details of descriptions of original Vālmiki Rāmāyana.

Further it will be travesty of truth if it is not mentioned that Krittibāsa added very many stories in his translations of original Vālmiki Rāmāyana keeping pace with the morals of the facts described by Vālmiki. In his attempt of expansion of morals by additional stories the purpose appears to increase moral values and devotion in the society.

If we look in to the then history of Mādhava Kandalī's period and that of Krittibāsa attempts of both to translate particularly Rāmāyana was only to stem the tide of anti Hindu idealism and anti religionists. Their emphasis was more on moral values faced to inspire the general people with the heroism and godliness that Rāma possessed.