CHAPTER - I
AN ATTEMPT OF COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION ON THE BASIC SIMILARITY WITH THE ORIGINAL VALMIKI RĀMĀYANA ON THE PART OF BOTH THE POETS

In this Chapter we would like to see how both Mādhava Kandali and Krittivāsa were close to the original text of Vālmiki, in their rendering of the epic in their own. We may now take Mādhava Kandali at first. As said in earlier chapter, Mādhava Kandali composed. Mādhava Kandali composed Rāmāyana based on Vālmiki’s version during the Kachāri Rule of Barāhi Naresh, Sri Maha Mānikya in 14th Century A.D. Mādhava Kandali also follows Vālmiki in places, also sometime he added his own. Though a composition is meant for the Royalists yet, this version enjoyed wilde popularity among the common people.

This version is available in five volums. Of course in comparison to Vālmiki, this is rather an abridged version. To make it accessible to common people it is written in every simple language and style. We have some examples of it.

In Vālmiki in Lankā Kāndo there is a sloka ---

"Deshe - deshe Kalatrāni deshe-deshe cha - bāndhabā
Tang-tu-desang pashyāmi jatro Vrata Sahodaro"

Mādhava Kandali’s, translation of the above verse are as follows. “Bhāryā-putra, bandhu-jata pāi jathātathā. Henanatu dekha ho sodar-pai Kathā”. In the Rāmāyana, Mādhava Kandali’s Rām is the incarnation of Lord Bishnu, and as such many believe that Mādhava Kandali’s version is influeneed by Adhyātma Rāmāyana. It was due to the influence of king Mahā Mānikya this excess of spritualty.

When Rām was preparing for banishment (banavās) Sītā said ----
'what have I done that you are avoiding me? just as the day cannot be without sun, the night cannot be without moon, spring cannot be without cuckoo, in the same way I cannot be without you'.

Mādhava Kandali has followed the version of Vālmiki that was available in North India. He never took recourse to any other version of Rāmāyana except Vālmiki, although he had added himself many times; to amuse the common people Kandali aimed at to present things in a poetic way and he compressed two or more cantos of Vālmiki in one.

He completed 119 cantos of Ayodhya Kānda in 41, 75 cantos of Aranya Kānda in 22, and 128 cantos of Lanka Kānda in 56 cantos. Of course for shortening, Mādhava Kandali never dropped any important portion. In translation portions of Kiskindhya Kānda Mādhava Kandali not only clearly followed Vālmiki but also added his original touch....

"Suni-lāhā-sāmājik Rāmor-Charitra
Nānā-rashe Rasabanta-param-pabitra
Āsuni huiyo-sabe-manat santosh
Kintu-bara-tuti na-dhoribā Gun-dosh
Vālmiki Rachitā-sāstro-Gaidya-paidya chhande
Tāhāk-bicharo-āmi Kariyā-prabandhe
Apanār-buddhi-arthā jimate Bujhilu
Sankshep-Koriā-tāk pad-biracchlu
Samasta-rashak-kuna Jāni-bāk-pāre
Pakhi-Sab-uroi. jen pakhā-anushāre
Karisanibandhya Lok byabohare
Kata-nij-kata-lambhyā Kathā-anushāre
Deba-bani nuhi ito laukik se kathā
Etek ihār dosh na-laiba Sarbahā”

In the above lines Kandali put a member of informations, for example, the work of Rām, the shortening of the episode to fit to the task of the readers; he also followed Vālmiki’s; In Vālmikis Aranya Kānda we have the lines ...........

*Tota shishye paribrito munira pyavinishpatat*
*Tong dadarsha grato Ramo muninung deepa tejasama.*

In this verse there is description of the sage. Agstya. He is described as “Dipta Tejaswi, i.e. a powerful resort of booming energy among the sages. There is great similarity of this lines with Kandalis description in Agastya’s episode.

Surpanakha in Vālmiki appeared in a grotesque halo and sought the hands of Rām and Laxmana’ but although Kandali let his Surpanakha appear rather as a beautiful woman in the beginning yet, as if in honour of Vālmiki, again, changed her to an ugly woman.

For example ----

“Rāmar Vārjāk-tai bhunjivāk mane
Rākhyas-ir-Vesak dhorilā-tetikhane
Bhnkar-vesh voilo pet-got khāl
Loho-loho Jibbā-khān dekhite bishāl
Ākat-bikat danta uccha nākh-got
Kesh-pāsh bikrita leruā-dui hot.
Dimbo-rur path jen Khos-mos gāi
Lum-chāi ubhata vengurā-dui pāo
Dui chhaku jole Jen aganir-thān
Kuri - got nouk-tāir bajrar samān”

In the above lines the tone of Kandali is close to the tone of Vālmiki. Surpanakha in both the versions is ‘Bhairabasana, Katubhāshini, Daruna etc. again in Sundar Kānda we have description of Hanumāna in his way to Lankā in the following -----

“Sā-tu-tena prahārena bibha-langgee nisāchari
Papāta-sahasa bhumau bikritā nana darshanā”

2. Ibid, Aranya Kānda, p.173
3. Foot note No. 1, Lanka Kānda, p. 102
Here Mādhava Kandali, although retained the main tone, yet, he is slightly different in the description of Surpanakāha.

Thereafter, at the time of ‘Agni pariksha’ and incident following it Vālmiki indulged in ‘Hāsya Rāsha’. When Sītā, was brought near Rāma the wild bear came forward to have a peep at her. Bibhishan then came forward to remove it. Rāma said

"Ki-marṭhant mamānā-drīya kliśa hategān tāyā janah
Nibarta aino-mudbegāṅ Jana-hoiōng Saïana-mama."

"Why are you inflicting pain on me this way? these are all my own close fellows, let them satisfy their curiosity" In this context Kandali has written:

"Rāma-dekhiłonto palāi bhāluk-bānor
Hebotī-kubāi Kārilā Durāntor;
Krodīya-boloi-bānār dar kō jāni
Oh-bā Bibhishon mitra - heno Laghu - prāni
Bānarese bandhu - mor pitri-pitāmaha
Jāt-hante erāilo-durgati aneka
Bānarak-māribār Kaman prastāb
Ashambāk-māri-mor prāne desh Jāi
Ehi Kāryye moharā Korīla Ashantosh
Putra-saba mātrik dekhib Kibā doṣh
Sabāk -aniā jhānte Awās Koriā
Sitāk-chāhak Sobe nayan bhorā." 4

(Here Mādhava Kandali described the attachment and gratefulness of Rām towards the Vānaras i.e the monkeys as they helped him in rescuing Sītā. He requested the Bibhīsan and other administrations not to disposes the monkeys coming to see Sītā to satisfy this curiosity. Rather he expressed and considers to Sītā they are as good as her sons. So in there attempt to see Sītā there should not be any attempt of fault finding rather they should happily be allowed to see Sītā.)

Besides that, we can refer to many more extracts to prove that Mādhava Kandali is true to Vālmiki version’s. Examples -- when Sumantra brought Rāma in Dasaratha’s Court, Vālmiki described The Court in following lines:

“De-desh Rāja Ruchirang Rāmāya paramā-sanam
Tadasanang-baram prāpya byepa-diyota-Rāghaba
Sa-aiba prabhayā merumudaye Bimala-Rabi
Tena-bibhrājāta - tatra-sā-sābhapi-birajita
Bimalo-graha Nakshatrā.sāradi dauri-rendunā
Tat-pashya-māno Nipotista-toso priya-mātmajam”.

(Here Vālmiki described the aura created due to appearance of Rāma, advanced by Sumantra, in the meeting hall of Dasaratha.)

Again, there is an imagery in Vālmiki -- Dasaratha speaking to Kaikeyee.....

“Daridra-ka Bhavet īdhyadhana-bāna Bapya-Kinehano
Jadasti -me-dhanang Kinchit-taishya debiamishwari”.

(Dasaratha uttered the above verse to satisfy Kaikeyee being the angry mood.)

Mādhava Kandali rendered the lines as such ....

“Nir-dhani haihek dhani dhani-je-nirdhon
Kāhāk-dandibā-bala tor-jak man
jata-rotna bhandār āchayahethā
jei-lāga latyuk harish - mone tor”

( Here Dasaratha assured Kaikeyee to make her the queen of all the wealth he possessed.)

5. Foot note No. 1, Adi Kanda, p. 56
Again, following Vālmiki he wrote:

\(Biklaba hinabirja jo sa daibamanubartate.\)
\(Birā Samvabitatatmana no daivang parjupāsate\)
\(Daiva purusakārena jasamarthar probadhi tum\)
\(No daibena bipannārthe purusha abashidati\)
\(Drakshanti Taishyo daibashya paurushong purusaishyacha\)
\(Daivamanusha yorodya baktabyo bekti Vabisyati\)
\(Adya mot paurushahatang daibang pashynto bai jona\)
\(Taba rājya beghatayo protipong samupāgatam\)
\(Atynkushomi baddamang gajang majalatdhatam.\)
\(Prodhābita mahang daivong paurusheno nibartaye".\)

(The person who is week, feeble is the one who believes in fate and in divine will, and the one who is respected for his manliness does not worship divine. One who is capable of resisting the divine even if, he is overawed by the divine force, yet he never succumbs to it .........)

When, after returning from the abode of Kaikeyee, Rām told Kaushalyā of his Vanabāsha Laxmana spoke the above with anger. Mādhava Kandali continued again in the following way ....

"Khatrakule upajilā Vailā budhināsh
Priyabākya buliyā bairik dilā āsh
Paurush ariyā daive Karilāhā Sār
Napungsak brittsab Vaigoilā tomār
Vailo daiba tomār kunjar madamatto
Paurush ankushe āji kara paribarta
Tumi rājā haibāk jāhār nāhi mān
Māriyā pāthāilba tāk yamar karan
Rājdharmo ri vailā tapashir besh
Kaman mugudhe hena dilā upadesh".\[9\]

\[8\] Sharma, Sri Saityendra, Rāmāyanaer Etihritya, Pub. Bina Library, Ayodhya Kanda, p.284
\[9\] Foot note No.40, Ayodhya Kanda, p.107
(Assamese poet Mādhava Kandali narrated the above keeping parity with the main concept of Vālmiki. Here Lakshman pressed his anguish against those who are cause of the discomfiture of Rāma who treated his opponents who want to outdo his claim to become king with compassion Laxman treated this aspect of Rāma as a mark of weakness. Even Laxman wanted to kill those who does not want Rāma to be the king of Ayodhyā. But Rām for sook every thing and adorned to the attire of a sage inpite of he being a Kshariya which Laxmana condemned as Rāma preferred ‘Daiva’ in place of his valour.)

In another portion where Kaushalyā, unwilling to accept Rāma’s banabasha expressed her anguish condemning herfate.

Vālmiki in following lines --

"Upabāsīscha yogaischa bahubischa parisrami
Dukha Sangbardhito moghangtong he durgatoyā mayā
Nityakālong sapatnivivrishong - biprakritā sati
Putrachāyāng samsaritya Vobami susthamānosā
Sahamadyana sakyāmi jibitung sarbarimimām
Falina padada panaibo falakāle biyojitā".10

(After heavy labour through fasting yoga and other efforts son like Rāma was obtained. But now due the conspiracy of ‘Sāpatni’ She is going to be immune of the shelter of the son in this old age. At the time of getting fruit the true is getting seperated form the fruit.)

Mādhava Kandali renderd the same in his own style :

Without any change in meaning :

"Jape tape pāilaho tomāk garve dhari
Param āshāye tulilaha bara kari
Kaikeyee prachanda surjo jānilo tarāsh
putrachāyā tarut karilo bar āsh
fal dharibār jebe Vaigaila samoy.

Thereafter, in the episode of Sitāharana Vālmiki used all the alāṅkar Rūpak, Utprekṣā, and Nidarshana. It is to be noted that Mādhava Kandali was close to Vālmiki in this respect. In Vālmiki we have the following presentation containing the clankaras.


Jadantarng Syandandika-Samudrayoh-Mādhava Kandali rendared the same in the following way.

“Hāwre Rāvon barbar nisāchar Abilambe jaibāk Chāho Yamaghar Rāmor ghariñoik Vajibāk chāsh Maribāk lāgi Kalkut bish Khāsh Trisular Uparat nāchibāk chāsh

In consideration of the above it could be said that, Mādhava Kandali's Rāmāyan is rather faithful Assamese rendering of Vālmiki. Many poets, however, had made interpolations in, Rāmāyana Text; but Mādhava Kandali was more or less true to Vālmiki. Of course, there are some interpolaion in Mādhava Kandali too. A very inteligent and resourceful poet like him could not but take recourse to interpolations, but the portion following the death of Dasharath and the last rites performed by Bhārata, Satrughna and the torture inflicted upon Manthara is very much close to the description given by Vālmiki.

In the Vālmiki Rāmāyan, version editied by Pandit Panchānan Tarkaratna there is a description that Bibliśhan sought shelter before Rām after being insulted and assaulted by Rāvana. Kandali adopted the same in his version. It may be noted that, the Rām of Kandali, unlike the Vaisnavite conception, is not the all knowing divine being. But he was needed to be remineded the Mrityubāna

of Rāvana of the Brāhmāstra by Mātali, the charioteer of Indra. Here Vālmiki and Kandali have similarity. Sītā of Kandali is very much close to Vālmiki’s Sītā.

In Rāmāyana there is a tendency to support the ‘Brāhmaṇical religious rigidity. Mādhava Kandali also reflected the same in his work.

Kandali was however conscious of the fact that folk belief and folk traditions in the determining factors in human life, and he tried to reflect them in his work. The question of good and evil and the belief regarding it is not worthy. We may sight example from the portion where Sugrib was challenging Bāli and invited him to a tussle ----

"Māthār upare Kāk sogun bonāi
Bampāse sarpo jai dāhina srigāl
Kāk gridho pakhir ākāshe kolāhal
Chandabāyu bahe kholā khāparar jāk
Kiskindhāt rudhire bortishe jāke jāk".14

(On the head flies crow vulture. The Snake passes by the left and the fox on the right. crows vultures and the birds creates noise pollution in the sky. A group of Khas pollution passes gently whereas at Kiskandhyā there is blood bath.)

In this portion also Kandali follows Vālmiki rather faithfully. We may say that Mādhava Kandali has taken recourse to literal translation of the maximum portion of Vālmiki’s version; but added some personal touches in places; the main principles of Mādhava Kandali was “Lambhā Parihari Saradriti”. form; of course, he also deviated in many places. Some examples are as follows ---- In Vālmiki’s Sundar Kānda, canto one, sloke number 205: but in Kandali, the same is compressed in 55 lines.

At the time of the crossing the sees Hanumāṇa, in Vālmiki’s versions was encountered by Singhikā rakshashi. But in Kandali this rākshashi is Asharica, of course the story remains the same.


“The written tradition of Rāmakathā in Assamese language begins as soon as Mādhava Kandali rendered the Rāmāyana of Vālmiki into Assamese Language”

A) Versions based on Vālmiki --

“There are several versions of the Rāmāyana in Assamese based on Vālmiki. Although Vālmiki’s Rāmāyana has three recensions today, the Assamese poets seem to have selected the Gandhiji recension for their works.”

(i) Mādhava Kandali, we know that is known as Kavirāja Kandali, he is the first translator of the Rāmāyana in to a regional language in Northern India.

Kandali said --

"Vālmiki rachilā sāstra sloka Paidya chhande
Tādhāka Bichār Āmi Kariā Prabandhe
Apanāra buddhi artha Yenata bujhila
Somksep Kariyā tāk pad birachilo".

“Vālmiki composes his Sāstra (i.e. Rāmāyana) in Slokas. I, too, compose verses depending on these slokas after a painstaking study. I have rendered the slokas as I could understand the meaning of the slokas in an abridged form.”

15. Sharma, S.N.: Rāmāyana Itibritta, p.278
16. Loc-cit, W, 3989-90, Rāmāyan, p.156
So, in the context of rendering the Rāmāyana of Vālmiki into Assamese Mādhava Kandali constantly keeps two things before him. (i) Literary beauty and (2) popular taste.

With his eye on the king and society of the time Mādhava Kandali always tries to remain faithful to the original Rāmāyana in respect of characterisation and depiction of situations, never the less he did not forget to narrate popular taste in to his artistic web and dye in local colour.

"It may be concluded that poet Mādhava Kandali was true to the versions to the Vālmiki in his rendering of the epic in Assamese, but still there are some alteration of order in Mādhava Kandali although interpolations are evident in Krittivās. The version of Mādhava Kandali however is rather free from it. Of course both the poets Krittivās and Mādhava Kandali stand unique for their artistic rendering and for their attempt to reflect the spirit of original version of Vālmiki rather faithfully.

Now, let us come to Krittivāsa:

The number of ancient text of Krittivāsa Rāmāyana is very scanty. Most of the translated copies collected are chiefly of 18th century. Of course, some of them are of 17th century which were preserved by the professional singers/minstrels. It is probable that these performers copied out the old text and threw away the old ones and this way the valuable texts had gone in to oblivion.

The Rāmāyana by Krittivāsa has been categorised by scholars as Pāñchālieś, (folk narrative). Even though Krittivāsa did not make a literal translation of Vālmiki, yet he has followed Vālmiki rather earnestly.
There has been a remarkable change in the original text of Krittivāsa during the last one and half century through interference of interpolations. Krittivāsa had rearranged the sequence of the text of Vālmiki. He brought many anecdotes of Uttar Kānda to Bāl Kāndas, also restructured many episodes, but still he maintained the order of the storyline as framed by Vālmiki. It was Vālmiki who was the main inspiration before Krittivāsa when he undertook the task of composing the Bengali version of Rāmāyana. The Rām of Vālmiki is more of a divine figure whereas the Rām of Krittivāsa is an elevated human figure. His Rāma has acquired some traits of a Bengali folk hero. Krittivāsa was willing to bring the epic close to the common people of Bengal in a language which is down to the earth and is accessible to the ordinary people. It is the human nature of Rāma rendered by Krittivāsa which has brought this epic hero close to the ordinary people of Bengal.

Although Krittivāsa followed Vālmiki, yet he never intended to follow him in totality. He sometimes made exact translation, but also very often he changed the original text of Vālmiki even omitted portions of it. Even he had followed texts by authors other than Vālmiki and also consulted mythologies or Folk Purāṇs.

If we take both the text to account we will note where Krittivāsa has followed Vālmiki in many ways. In Aranya Kānda, in one fine autumn morning (Hemanta) in Panchābati Ban Rāmchandra is seen to be on his way to the Godāvari. Laxman and Jānaki were also following him with a pitcher. Vālmiki describes it in the following sloke.

"Prāhah kalashahastāstu sitayā saha Birjān
Pristhato hanubrojan bhrātā soumitrilamabrabit."18

Here pitcher is the symbol of austerity. This pitcher has been retained by Krittivās bearing the same implication ---

Besides the pitcher’ Krittivāsa has also taken more objects which has figured in the original text of Vālmiki. In Sundar Kanda, when Rāvana was making a desperate move towards Sīta the women following him were holding ‘Chamar’ ‘Talvrinta’. The lines in Sanskrit reads thus.

“Bālabya Jana Hasthascha Tālbrintani Chāporā”

Similarly Krittivās also describes

“Rābaner Sange Chale Dos Hājār Nāri
Rupe Alo Kare Rājār Kanak Lankāpuri
Chāmar Dulāy Keho Hāte Jaler Jhārī”

Rāvana is accompanied by tue two thousand beautiful owmen at Lanka. Some taus with chamar and some sprinkles watu him water pitcher.

Here Chāmar and Tālvrinta are nothing but the things which people use in their everyday life.

In the poem of Vālmiki we have the Rāksha as carrying garland, Sandal, incense, also conches along with many other things when they were out to wake up Kumvakarna

“Lilipushcha Paradhvaina Chandanena Parantapām,
Dibhyarashwasayamasa Sumalyai gandhai Sugandivi
Dhupagandhānscha sasri jastubuschha parantapām

The matter was rendered in prose by Hemchandra in the following way — ‘then they smeared his body with paste of sandals and decorated him with garlands and made him small the beautiful odour. The smoke from the burnt incenseblew and then many of them started singing praise of him, many of them uttered loud voice and many of them blew conches ......23

In the poem of Krittivasa also we have same thing ......

Bājāilo Laksha Dhāk Chāridike bere
Nidrājāi kumbhokarna Kan Nāhi Nare,
Gharā Gharā Chandan Dhāliā Dilā Buke
Sugandhi Sital aro Nidrā Jāi Sukhe
Bājāi Karner Kāche tin Lakhha Shānhkh
Digun Bārilo Aro nāsikar Dak.24

lacs of drums were beaten around Kumbakarna for awaking him but even then his ear did not move. Sandal paste in several pitchers are put in his breast. Due to this his sleep increases.

During that period boat, bullockc carts, palanquins etc. were used as main transport. In the text of Valmiki. We have Bharadwaj Muni giving direction to Rāma to Chitrakut on the eve of his Banavās Yātra in the following lines :

“ Tatrayuyang plabang Kritvya Tārātangsumating Nadim
Tato Nagrudh emashadya mohyantang

harit-chhadam”25

Here ‘plab’ means something which could be used as a boat, (generally made of banana trees)

In the Krittivās version also Bharadwaja Muni is saying ----

“Ei Deshe Nāi Rām Naukar Sanchār
Bhela Bāndhiā Rām Jamunā hase pār”26

This ‘vela’ or plab occurs here as, a queer sort of water transport made of bamboo and banana tree. We know folk life produced innumerable proverbs, aphorisms or special ornate expression which springs out of the multifarious experiences of rural folks. One such proverb is found both in the texts which seeks to establish the fact that, a dying patient refuses medicine. We have in Vālmiki in following lines:

“Mārichashya tu todbākyang khamang
Juktyancha Rāvana ;
UktōCha Prati Jagrāha MartuKāma ibauSadham
Tat Pathyahita Baktārang Mārichng, Rākhyasadhipah
Abrabit parasong Bākyama juktang Kālachoditah.”27

Paraphrase reads thus-------- As a dying patient refuses medicine, Rāvana too refuses reasonable advice, his doom appears impending ......

Krittivāsa following Vālmiki wrote this --

“Marankāle Rogi Jeno Nā Khāipāchan ;
Mārich Jata Bale Nā Sune Rāvan”28

The widely used statement, a threat of very ancient origin ....... ‘ I will send you to Yama’s house.’ ---- This occurs both in Vālmiki and in Krittivāsa. In the Lankā Kānda

Indrajit, after binding Rām and Laxmana with Nāgāstra says ---

27. Ed. Debasharmana, Bhattāpalli, Sri Panchānan, Maharshi Vālmiki birachita Rāmāyaṇa, Aranyā Kānda, p.57
In paraphrase — ‘................Now I have hit you with arrows decorated with leaves of Kanka, there after I will have you sent to Yama’s house:

In the Lankā Kānda of Kritivāsa we have the lines:

“Dāk Diyā Śrī Rāme re Bale Megnād;
jiyante Jāite Deshe na Kario Sādh,
Nirbāl Rākshas Māri harisha antar
pāthāibo Ajikār Judhye Jamghor ”.30

These lines exhibit great anger of Meghnad for Rāma. Earlier Rāma and Laxmana killed some of the Rākhasa at the forest dwelt by Tāraka as well as in Panchavatī where surpanakhās’ nose was cut by Laxmana. The use of myth and scriptures are exhuberant both in Vālmiki and in Kritivāsa. The myth relating to Rāhu and Chandra is to be found in both. When all the people of Oudh are gloomy and unable to bear the separation of Rām - Laxman- Sitā who were proceeding towards banishment, Vālmiki describes it in the following way - (Paraphrases - ‘........... meantime Maharāj Dasaratha, along with his queen came to see Rām off ---- the king looked as if he has been devoured by Rāhu in Lunar eclipse, he was totally dejected.”

-- in the words of Vālmiki

“Pitā hi Rājā Kakutsa Srīman Sannastādā Bavu
Paripurna Sashi Kālē Grahenapāpluta Jathā” 31

Kritivāsa describes the situation in the following lines

“Chandre gilite Rāhu Jena hay āpan murti
Krishna barna haila Rājā akriti prakriti”.32

29. Ed.Debashamana, Bhattapalli, Sri Panchanan, Mahārshi Vālmiki birachita Rāmāyana, Lankā Kānda, p.79
32. Foot note No.2, Ayodhyā Kānda, p.78
Besides, in Kiskinda Kanda where we have descriptions of the burning of the wings of Sampāti, the bird king, where Krittivās has followed the description of Vālmiki. Again in Sundar Kanda the Mountain Mainak tells about his wings to Hanumāna. In the works of Vālmiki and Krittivās the same application of animism is evident. In Vālmiki Maināk says

"Purbang krita juge Tāta Parbatāh pakhinah Bhavan
Teapi Jagmurdisha sarbā Garurā Ibabeginah".

tāta stēshu prayātesu Devasanghāsaharsivi
Samamupagatah Krudhya bajramudyamya debarāt
Tatah hong Sasasā khipta Sasanena Mahatmana
Ashmin lobonoto ye cha prokhipta Plabagottam
Gupta Pakhsa Sama graschtaba pitrābhi rakshitah" 33

That means “In the Satya Yuga the Mountains had wings, they used to travel in great speed like Garuda. The gods as well as the saints feared the possibility of Mountain, fall (Parbat Pat). Thereafter, the emperor of the Gods Indra set out to sever the wings of Mayināk. With risen arms he came near me but your father Pavana picked me up instantly and threw me on the Salt sea. I have my wings because your father could hide me that way.”

In Krittivāsa Maināk answering the queries of Hanumāna said in the following.

"Hanu bole Parbat thāka prethivi mandale?
Tumi heno parbat keno sāgorer jale.
Maināk balen sobār purbe chila pākhā.
Jei rāije parila tāhār nāi rakshā.
Srishti nāsh haiyā āise parbater dere
Bajra hāte pakha kaie devapurandare
"Pakha Kāti parbater Sab Karilo Achal
Āmar Pakha Kātite Āilo Indra Mahābali;

33. Foot note No.1, Sundar Kānda, first sargah, p. 6
Here Krittivāsa has followed rather truly the text of Vālmiki without making any addition or alteration.

Snakes and Guruda are always strong contenders of each other. There is a mythical story behind it. This story finds its place both in Vālmiki and Krittivāsa. In Vālmiki’s Lankā Kānda. Trishirā Rakshas said to Rāvana when he was in a sad state .......

“Kāman tishtha mahārāja Nirgo misyā myahang rane
Udhhariswāmi Te Satrun garuda pannagāniba
Sambara Deba rājena Naraka Bishmunā Jathā
Tathādyā Sajitā Rāma maya Judhi Nipātita”

Meaning, “ .............. My king ! rather you stay back, I am going to war ; I am going to destroy your enemies the way the bird king Guruda destroys the snakes. Like Sambarāsura by Indra and Narakāsura by Bishnu, Rāma too would be destroyed by me in the war field. In Krittivāsa Trishira starts ..”

“Garura Samukhe Jena Nāi Jāy Sāp
Rām Lakshman māriba Dekha pratāp”

In Vālmiki’s Ayodhyā Kānda when queen Kaushalyā heard from the mouth of Rāmachandrapūtra the information of Rām’s banishment and Bhārata’s inheriting the

35. Foot note No. 1, Lanka Kānda, p. 130
throne she fell down on earth like on axe severed Sāljasthitree as if a devine Women falling on warth from the Haven, Rāma found her faint due to fall onground like a benana tree.

"Sā Nikritteba Sālashya Jasthi parasunā bane
Papāta Sahasa Debi Debateba Dibashutā ;
Tamadukhachitāng Drishtyba patitam Kadālimiba
Rāmastu Thāpayamāsa mātarnggata Chetasam"\textsuperscript{37}

Here Krittivās retaining the sprit of Vālmiki’s text describes ..... 

"Kātile Kadali Jeno Lutāy Bhumi tale
Hā putro ballā Rāni Rām Kaila Kole".\textsuperscript{38}

(Here queen Kausalyā in grief, due to immediate likelihoo of departure of Rām, fell downin ground as a benana true and took Rām in her lap.)

Ancient people had a deep faith in divine providence and in fate, (The future written on forehead). In Vālmikis Ayodhyā Kānda Sītā is saying to Rāma.

"Athāpi cha mahapṛāga Brahmanānāng maya Srutam
Purā pitri Grihe Satyang bastabyang Kila me bane
Lakshanevyā Dwijātībhyā Srutwahang bachanam grihe
Bonobāsa Kritā Sāhā Nitya meba mahābala"\textsuperscript{39}

In paraphrase........... “I heard long days ago in my parental house, the foretellers and sages said that I am destined to go on banishment. Since then I am curious about it In Krittivās where Rām Chandra denied permission to Sītā to accompany him in banabāsa she said as under.

\textsuperscript{37} Foot note No. 1, Ayodhyā Kānda, p. 49
\textsuperscript{38} Foot note No. 1, Ayodhyā Kānda, p. 48
\textsuperscript{39} Foot note No. 1, Ayodhyā Kānda, p. 69
"Bāper Bārite Jakhan Chilām Sishu kāle
Dekhā Sannyāshi sob bolita Āmāre
Āmār Bāper tore balita Sannyāshi
tomār Kannyare Dekhi hoibe banabāshi
Mahājone Kathā Kabhu nā Hoi Khandan
Banabās Karibā āmār Lalāte Likhon"40

In Lanka Kanda Ramchandra complained against fate. In Vālmiki’s Languages ..........

"Kritang Sugriba tat Sarbang bhabatā dharma bhirunā
Mitra Kāryang Krita midang bhavadvi Bānarar Sabbāh
Anuognāta mayā Sarbe Jathestaṅtamaratha
Susrubustasya Je sarbe Bānarah pari debitam"41

(That is, Rām addressing Sugrib said we may be friend and be religions too; you did what we possible on your part. But that got spoiled due to my ill luck. Oh monkeys! you did as friends. But now I am requesting you to go as you like.)

Some more examples of Vālmiki’s faith in Fate are evident in the following lines -

"No Lakshmanasmira mama Rājya bighne
Mātā Jabiyaṣṭhyaḥi Sankitabya
Dāibābhi panmā na pitā Kathanchi
Jnanaśi dāibong hi tathāprabhabam."42

Paraphrase “Oh brother? Don’t be sorry that we could not gain the Kingdom. In between the Kingdom and wild forest the latter one is more spacious. You have now learnt how powerful is the fate is. So it is not wise on the part of you to accuse our fateful father and Young mother”.

40. Foot note No. 2, Ayodhya Kanda, p. 58-59
41. Foot note No. 1, Lanka Kanda, p. 85
42. Ibid, Ayodhya Kanda, p. 57
Krittivās also speaks in the same line:

"Satārīr doṣh nāī āmār daiba dashā
ej-dīn je habe tāhā Bidhāta sab jāne;
dookha nā bhābio bhāī Khāmā Deha Mane
dookha na bunjile Karma nā hay Khandan
 dowkhā sukh dekha bhāy Lalāt Likhan"⁴³

Jānoki spoke to Hanumān— “under any circumstances or be it in prosperity or in the midst of great danger the powerful Fate binds everybody with a rope. Therefore nobody can overcome fate and therefore we are now in a grip of fate. Following Vālmiki Sītā also speaks in Krittivās—

"Aiswārye Bā Su bistirne byesane bā suddddrune
Rayjje - bā - purushang Baddha Kṛitānto pari Karshati
Bidhir-munoma-sanghārjya Prānīnāing-Plaba-go-ttama
Saumitring-māncha Rāmoncha-Byesa naith pasiya mohitan."⁴⁴

Following Krittibās Sītādevi also said as under:

"Rishi Kule Janmiyā Parilām Surjya Kule
Ai-se āchilo mor Likan - Kapāle"⁴⁵

(Here Sītā found fault in her fate that although she was borne in the faculty of sages but after marriage she came to Suryadynasty.)

"No Kāmakārārah Kāmōn-Bā-tabā Rakshasa punaṃbo
Daibang - Chestayate sarbang hatang daiṃba hannyate.“⁴⁶

“Oh king you are not to be blamed for this. It is fate who is responsible for it. Man never dies unless fate kills him”

---

⁴³. Foot note No. 2, Ayodhya Kanda, p. 52-53
⁴⁴. Foot note No. 1, Sundar Kanda, p. 76
⁴⁵. Foot note No. 2, Sundar Kanda, p. 242
⁴⁶. Foot note No. 1, Lankā Kanda, p. 216
In Krittivās we have

"Eto boli Bivhishan Rāni namaskhāre
Apani Sakal ghata daibe ejata-Kare."

(Here Krittibās also narrated the feeling on the effect of ominus signs people starts moving. People believe in such act of body which foretell future bad effects-

"Bāmo Hasta Spande Bāmo chakku Ghane Ghane
Bipaksha jnanete Bir Kichu Nāhi māne
Prithivite Tolpār Kare Sāgar Utthāl
Gorbhobati Strir pete Kādiche chāwāl
Jātrā Kāle Amangal dekhite Apār
Mār Mār kariā Gela paschim dwār".

Thereafter we have a number of ominus signs before Rām and Laxman when they are proceeding towards war field --

"Ulkā-Sani Jutā-meghā babhurbugardhao bhāruna
Sa sāgaro banā Chaiba Basudā Sama-Kampata
Ghora Rupā-Sībā Neduh sajjāla Kabalairmukheh
Mandalānya pashabyani bo - Banduscha Bihangamāh
Nishpapāta Cha gridhosya-Sule bai-pathi Gachhatah
Prasfuranayanan chāshya sabye bahura Kampata
Nishpapāta Gratassculka Jalanti Bhimanishwana
Āditya nishpravasachinnā - boti-cha-sukhohnilo.

"The Sky assumes the hue of the skin of an ass, thunder and meteor began to descend, the entire earth with all its oceans and forests were shaken, the ferocious jackels

47. Foot note No. 7, Lankā Kānda, p. 397.
49. Foot note No. 1, Lankā Kānda, p. 120
began to scream with their mouth widened, the birds began to fly anti clock wise, 
valture doshed against a spear on the path taken by Kumvakarna, left eye and left 
hand began to stir, the sun is dimmed and gentle breege began to move.”

In Krittivāś have the lines:

“Jujiāre Kumbhakarna cholilo Ekeshwar
Jātrakāle amangal dekhila bistar
Chandra, Surjya dare Palay Bayu Chāre goti
Meghe Rakta barishe Kape- Basumati ;
Ulkāpāt bajrāghāt Pariche sammukhe
Biparit dak suni Srīgāler mukhe”50

Besides that we have the role of fate and also of supernatural forces both in Vālmiki 
as well as in Krittivāsa.

We have different tabooes both in Vālmiki and Krittvāsa. After hitting 
Jatayu Rāvana, as if to invite his doom, holds Sītā on her tuff of lock and flies 
upwards.

In the pom of Vālmiki the lines read..

“Kroshoting-Rāma Rāmeti Rāmena Rahitān Bane
Jibitāntaya Kesheshu - Jograhāntokesannibha
Pradarhitayān baidehyang babhuba sacharāharam
Jagat - sarba - morjodang tamasandhena Sang - britam
Na bāti māruta-statra nish-pra-voh vuddhi- bākarah”51

(Nosonner Locks of Sītā was caught by Rāvana the many acceptional bad effect 
started eg. darkness enguled the earth, an stopped blowing the sun lost its aoura 
etc. people have faith on such bad effects if a women is cauht by her lock of hair 
with an evil motive.

50. Foot note No. 2, Lankā Kānda, p. 153-154
51. Footnote No. 1, Ayodhyā Kānda, p. 77-78
Having pulled Sītā by her tuft of locke Rāvana committed a great evil deed —

"The moment that had happened there occurred great turmoil in the world, as described above."

We have the same taboo in Krittivāsa -- regarding the activities of Rāvana it records --

"Roth-Khān laiya-jāy Sīta-tulibāre
Rothe-na-uthen Sītā gācch chapiā - dhare
Pātā-latā. dhoren sitā rahibār-māne
Era-baliā Rāvan Chul dharīyā tāne
Sītā-Rathe tule Rāvan dharia-mātār Chul
Hāt-pā-achāre Sītā Kāndiya ākul."\(^{52}\)

Also in another portion we have the ill effects of touching the lack of hair of Sītā by Rāvana with an evil motive...

"Daiba-nir-bandha Rāvaner nā-jāy Khandan
Sītār - chul dhori Rāboner akāl Maran
Ar-chaurādyya Yug chilo Rābaner Paramāyu
Sītār Chule - dhariā hāilaalpāyu."\(^{53}\)

The matter of holding a women by the hair occurs in Vālmiki too (Lanka Kānda) when Indrajit holds Sītā (her illusive image) Hanumān rebukes him in the following words -

"Durātmana-nāshāyo Kesha-pakkhe parāmrisha
Brahmrashinang-kule Jāta-rākhahing Joni-māsritah."\(^{54}\)

\(^{52}\) Foot note No. 2, Aranya Kānda, pp. 234-235
\(^{53}\) Ibid, p. 227
\(^{54}\) Foot note No. 1, Lanka Kānda, p. 159
(That is, the result of touching the locks of hair of Janaki i.e. Sita will be your self destruction. Although you were borne in the families of a sage but you were borne under a Rakshasa Women.

In Krittivāsa we have:

"Rām-Lakhoon baliā Sītā hoi-utaroli
Hāte-Khānday Indrajit dhare tār - chuli" 55

So we see Krittivāsa is very much true to Vālmiki in this regard.

Krittivāsa as a matter of fact, is a mediaeval poet. He could not shake off the influence of contemporary society. He was, of course, well versed in Sanskrit. Even though, he follows the story line of Vālmiki yet very often omitted a number of episode. In addition to it he has adopted enecdotes from different sources. All though Krittivāsa gave more importance to story telling yet he has dropped the episode of Tādakā, Basistha, Bishwāmitra, or the Yagna (sacrifice performed by Ambarish. There has been rendom interpoletion of human elements in Krittivāsa's description of killing of Sindhu by Dasharatha, the exile of Rām, his union of Bhārata, wailing of Rām after having lost Sītā, the wounded Laxman, the greate test of Sītā, her banishment, and her exit into the earth's bowel.

55. Foot note No. 1, Lanka Kanda, p. 144-245