CHAPTER 02

The Adhyātmarāmāyaṇam
(Its authorship, style and its place in the Sanskrit Literature)

(pp. 37-76)
In fact there is no question regarding the authorship of the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇam* (=AdhR), yet the modern trend of the intellectual researchers has created the direction of the research. This band of novice scholars is inclined to build a castle on an airy, yet illogical ground.

This chapter will prove itself to be an indirect reply to those so called creators of such research.

**Authorship**

The Marathi commentator\(^1\) writes in his commentary *Sārtha-srīmadadhyātmarāmāyaṇam*, "Sage Vyāsa has composed the AdhR for the well-being of the people."\(^2\)

*Adhyātmarāmāyaṇam*\(^3\) writes in the Introduction\(^4\) the tradition of devoted scholars ascribe the authorship of the AdhR to *Maharṣi*

---

1. The book preserved in the Printed Section of the Oriental Institute (MSU, Baroda) is very old and some of the pages of the beginning are torn, so commentator's name is not traceable.
2. भगवान व्यास हे लोकांचा उद्दार होण्या साधी रामायण कथन करताने ——पृ. १.
4. इत्यादिस्य रचितार् महर्षिविद्यास्यः इति विचारात्तार श्रद्धारुक्ततानां समुदाये प्रचलिता संबन्धता।
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Veda Vyāsa.” The renowned German scholar Aufrecht⁵ and even the Italian scholar Tesiterry L. P. in the preface of his book Rāmacarita-mānasā aur Vālmikirāmāyana⁶ establish that Veda Vyāsa is the author of the AdhR.

Dr. Rāghavan in his New Catalogues Catalogorum⁷ declares that AdhR is a part of Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam.

Śrīrāma Varman⁸ (18th Cent.), the king of Śrīṅgaverapura writes in his Sanskrit commentary called Setu⁹ on the AdhR that the author of the AdhR is great sage Veda Vyāsa.
Rai Bahadur Lala Baijanatha, the English translator of the AdhR\textsuperscript{10} holds the same opinion.

Great poet Kambana (12\textsuperscript{th} Cent.)\textsuperscript{11} discusses the three Rāmāyana\textsuperscript{3}es as the source of inspiration for his i.e. Kambana’s Rāmāyana. Among these, one is Vālmīkirāmāyana and the rest two are the Yogavāsiṣṭha-rāmāyaṇam and the AdhR.\textsuperscript{12}

Pande Rajabali notes in his Hindu dharmakosa,\textsuperscript{13} “AdhR: Besides the Vālmīkirāmāyana, there is another famous Rāmāyaṇa named AdhR which is said to have been composed by Lord Śiva (Mahādeva). The scholars ascribe it to sage Veda Vyāsa. The Rāmasaga is narrated in all the 18 Purāṇas. It is said that the Rāmasaga found in the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam is published separately under the title of the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇam.”\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{10} Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, Introduction P i, ‘The Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa is a canonical book of Vaishnavas and is a part of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa’.

\textsuperscript{11} कामिल बुल्ने: रामकथा, “द्रविडभाषाओं का रामकथा संबंधी सबसे प्राचीन काव्यगृथ वैद्यवकृत रामायण है जिसकी रचना बारहवीं शताब्दी में हुई थी ”

\textsuperscript{12} Kambaramayana, Tr: Rajagopan N. V., Ed. G. Avadhanaanda, Bihar Rashtrabhasa Parishad, 1963, P2, देवसचिव (संस्कृत) में जिन तीन महामुखों (वाल्मीकि, वरिष्ठ और व्यास) ने रामायण की रचना की है, उनमें प्रथम कवि महर्षि वाल्मीकि की रचना के अनुसार ही मैंने तमिल पदों में यह रामायण रची है। …… कमब ने भी भी कई स्थानों में अध्यात्मरामायण का अनुसरण किया है।

\textsuperscript{13} Hindu Dharmakosa, अध्यात्मरामायण : वाल्मीकित्रित्रामायण के अतिरिक्त एक अध्यात्मरामायण भी प्रस्तुत है, जो विष्णुजी की रचना कहीं जाती है। विष्णु उसे वेदवासीजी की रचना मानते हैं। अधार पुराणों में रामायण की कथा आयी है। कहा जाता है कि ब्रह्माण्डपुराण में जो रामायण की कथा है वही अलग कक्षे अध्यात्मरामायण के नाम से प्रकाशित की गयी है। (पृ. 2५).

\textsuperscript{14} Though Dr. Pande specifically writes ‘It is said’ (कहा जाता है), but it is a fact that like the other texts viz. Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā, Sanssūrūtāgītā or mṛtyumīnāmśa and Viṣṇusahasranāma are separately published and regarded as the treatises independent of Mahābhārata and just like the Sundarakāṇḍa of both the Vālmikirāmāyaṇa and Rāmacarita-mānas are regarded as the independent treatises.
Dr. Dubey Bindoo notes in her *Srīnāma-cāritamānasā-bṛhad-antarakathākośa*, section on History of Secondary Narratives,15 “Great Sage Veda Vyāsa is the author of AdhR. Besides Śrī Rāma Saga it delineates the topics like devotion, knowledge, worship, ethics and good conduct. It is named AdhR, as it deals mainly with spirituality. Apart from the preaching, it is important and interweaves the episodes like Ahalyā’s release, Śūrpaṅakhā, Jaṭāyu, Sage Vālmīki, Śabarī and others.”

A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology & Religion (P 261) notes, “*Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*: Besides the ancient Rāmāyaṇa, there is other popular work called AdhR. The authorship is ascribed to Vyāsa. It is generally considered to be a part of Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa. It is a sort of spiritual version of the (Vālmīki) Rāmāyaṇa, in which Rāma is depicted as a saviour and deliverer as a god rather than a man. It is divided into seven books which bear the same names as those of the original poem, but it is not so long.”

Walker Benjamin in his Hindu World notes, “*Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*: Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa expounds the magnificence of the egg (*anda*) of Brahmā, and describes the future aeons. Like the *Skandapurāṇa* this does not exist as a composite work, but only in parts and fragments. The popular AdhR is one such part of this Purāṇa. The authorship of the AdhR is ascribed on Veda Vyāsa and in it Rāma is described as a savior god and deliverer rather than a mortal hero.” (P 256)

Garg Gaṅgārāma in his An Encyclopedia of Indian Literature notes, “AdhR: A Sanskrit Rāmāyaṇa in which Śrī Rāma is the Supreme Ātman. It consists of about 400016 verses, and is attributed

15 अध्यात्मरामायण के रचिता महामुनि वेदवाच्य ज्ञान, उपासना, नीति एवं सदाचार होने के कारण यह ग्रन्थ ‘अध्यात्मरामायण’ कहलाता हैं। उपदेश के साथ साथ इस ग्रन्थ की कथा भी अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण है और अपने भीतर अहत्योद्धार, शुरुणाखा कथा, जटायुकी कथा, वाच्यकी कथा, शब्दै कथा आदि अनेक अन्तर्कथाएं संजोए हुए हैं।

16 The exact number of verses calculated by the researcher coes to 4224.
to the sage Vyāsa considered as a part of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. It prescribes Vedantic monism (Advaita) and Rāmabhakti as path to salvation. Like the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, it is divided into seven books having the same titles. Though epic in its termal form, is a manual of devotion and *tāntrika* in character. Like *tantra*, it is in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī."

It seems that the form as Garg Gaṅgārāma mentions, is a manual of devotion and *tāntrika* in character, he wants to adhere the authorship to Lord Śiva answering the question of mother Pārvatī, as is the fact with almost all the *tāntrika* texts like *Rudrayāmala* etc. It must be borne in mind that some of the texts of Yogic practices like *Śivasamāhitā, Gheraṇḍasamāhitā* etc. also have the similar form of the Śiva-Pārvatī dialogue.

According to this Śrī Rāma is essentially the God Viṣṇu, Śītā abducted by Rāvana is only an illusion and the real Śītā Lakṣmī or Prakṛti emerges after the fire ordeal at the end of the book.

Sharma Deva Narayana writes in his *Paumacariu tathā Rāmacaritamānasā – Eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, "Next to the *Vālmikirāmāyaṇa* the AdhR has the foremost impact on the *Rāmacaritamānasā*. The AdhR is not a mere independent treatise, yet it is the portion of *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.

The whole of Śrī Rāma narrative in it, is in the form of the dialogue between Umā (Pārvatī) and Maheśvara (Mahādeva). Besides its dialogue style, Gosvāmī (Tulsīdāsa) has adopted Śrī Rāma fully as the Supreme Brahman (परात्मा)." (P 45)

---

17 वाल्मीकिरिमायण के बाद सर्वप्रथम मानस पर हमें अध्यात्मरामायण का ही प्रभाव दीखता है। अध्यात्मरामायण कोई स्वतंत्र रचना नहीं है। यह ब्रह्माण्डुराण का अंश है। इसमें रामकथा उमा-महेश्वर संवाद के रूप में कही गई है।

अध्यात्मरामायण से गोस्वामीजी ने कुछ अंश में संवाद प्रणाली तो प्रणाली की ही, साथ ही सबसे बड़ी वात उन्होंने उससे यह लिया कि ‘राम पूर्ण परात्म प्रकाश है’। (पृ. ४५)।...। अध्यात्म की कव्या में वाल्मीकिरिमायण की कव्या ही बोले परिवर्तनों के साथ में उपस्थित की गई हैं। उसका आधार है अध्यात्मज्ञान अथवा रामसीतात्त्वकीमांस। (पृ. ४९)
“...Vālmīkirāmāyaṇa is presented concisely with minor changes based on spiritual knowledge and exposition of the philosophy of Śrī Rāma and Sītā.” (P 49)

Winternitz M. in the History of Indian Literature (Trans. Mrs. Ketkar S.) under the topic of Epics & Purāṇas (P 575), writes, “AdhR, the Rāmāyaṇa in which Rāma is the Supreme Ātman. In which Advaita (the monism of the Vedanta) and Rāmabhakti are taught as path to salvation; is a very well known book, which is considered as a part of the Bhramāṇḍapurāṇa. As in the case of Vālmiki’s poem, the work is divided into seven books bearing the same titles as in the ancient epic.”

Krishnamachariar M. writes in the History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, “The AdhR is an extract from the Bhramāṇḍapurāṇa. It is divided into seven books, bearing the same names as the Rāmāyaṇa and its object is to show that Rāma was a manifestation of the Supreme Spirit and Sītā is identified with Lakṣmī, a type of Nature. It is in the form of dialogue between Umā (पार्वती) and Śiva (महादेव).

In the 1st chapter, the Rāmahrdaya, the inner nature of Rāma is explained and his identification with Viṣṇu as the Supreme Spirit is asserted. The 5th chapter of the 7th Book, the Rāmagītā explains the advantage of giving up all works in order to meditate upon and become united with the Supreme Spirit.

Bulke Kamil in his book Prācīna Rāmakathā Sāhitya – Utpatti aur Vikāsa (P 152) and Chitrav Siddheshvara Shastri in his Prācīna Caritra Kośa very specifically adhere the authorship of the AdhR to Rāmānanda, the founder of the Rāmānandī sect of 14th Cent. AD. The reason seems to be a cursory reference of the Viṣistādvaita philosophy in the statement of Tara after the death of her husband Vāli. She asks about the cause of pleasure and pain, as the body is insentient (अचित्त) and the soul is sentient (चित्त).18 but both of them

18 देशोचिकाचवम्ब्रम जीवो निष्किरदात्तकः।
सुखदुःखादिसंमन्धः कस्म स्याद्व्रम मे वद।५/३/१७॥
have used the *double entendre* expressing the words “possibly (सम्भवतः)” and “unidentified (अनिश्चित).” Even an iota of the philosophical tenets and the spiritual practices followed by the Rāmānandī sect is not visible in any corner of the AdhR.

Some scholars believe that Ādi Śaṅkarācārya is the author of the AdhR.¹⁹

This argument is not tenable.

The AdhR deals with Śrī Rāma Saga on the line of Absolute Monism and hence impels one to ascribe the authorship to Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, but the AdhR is unanimously considered to be a part of *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam* and the word Purāṇa itself means ancient.

Panchigar Ganapatālāla T.²⁰ writes, “The original *Rāmāyaṇa* written by sage Vālmīki is an ancient (पौराणिक i.e. belonging to Purāṇa represents the history before Kali Era) historical life story (सत्यकाल) that was composed during the Tretā Era in which Śrī Rāma took incarnation and played His Divine Sport.”

Thus the above given statement fully nullifies the fake supposition that Ādi Śaṅkarācārya (788 - 820 AD) composed the AdhR. Over and above the explanation of the name Rāma²¹ given by

---

¹⁹ The researcher of this thesis was questioned regarding the all-accepted opinion that Ādi Śaṅkarācārya is the author of the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* but till the date of the submission of the thesis the researcher has not found any trace thereof.

²⁰ Panchigar Ganapatālāla T., *Kāgabhusunḍirāmāyaṇa*, Gujarat Samachar, 7/6/06 Thursday, pp 4-5, 

²¹ रामो विरामो विरोधी मागो नेष्यो नयोजनः || महाद अनुः विष्णुसहस्रनमस्तोऽत्र ५६ ||
Adi Śaṅkarācārya in his commentary on Viṣṇusahasranāṁ establishes firmly that Śrī Rāma has already been believed, considered, respected and has been worshiped as the Supreme Person in the time of Anuśāsanaparva itself of the Mahābhārata. This evidence is enough to prove that Śrī Rāma was worshiped long before the time of the Mahābhārata and for this reason Sage Veda Vyāsa, the historian (living at the time of the Mahābhārata) authored and not compiled (like other Purāṇas) the present text of the AdhR. Thus Adi Śaṅkarācārya can not be ascribed the authorship of the AdhR, though his relation with the AdhR can not be rejected if at all, one can safely establish that the AdhR (the portion of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam) must have been one of the source texts for the systematization of his doctrine of the Absolute Monism (केवलवैदिस्रत्र).

The thing can never be judged only from external appearance. On the other hand, the internal evidence is more important rather than the external evidence.

The text itself gives some (solid) proofs which help to prove sage Veda Vyāsa to be the author of the AdhR.

1) The idea, “Just as the artificial dolls dance at the will of the puppet-master (कुक्कुलक)”23 has extreme similarity with the verse of the Śrīmadbhagavadgītā24, "O Arjuna! The lord dwells in the heart of all beings revolving them all by His mysterious Power Māyā, as if they were objects mounted on a machine.”

2) The words of Mālyavān advising Rāvaṇa(6/5/36) that devotion to Śrī Rāma would purify even the wicked like Rāvaṇa has extreme

22 विष्णुसहस्नामस्तोत्रम्, गीताप्रेस गोरखपुर, १९३४,”नित्यानन्दलक्षणोऽस्मिन् योगिनो रमण इति रामेः; रमणे योगिनो यर्मिन् नित्यानन्दे चिन्दैवस्मि। इति रामदेवेतत संब्रह्माभिषीयते ॥ पदवर्णोऽस्मिन् स्वेच्छेऽय रमणीयं युयुष्मान्यादिराह्य ॥
23 यथा कृष्णमन्तात्क्षो नृपति कृष्णेऽच्छेद्यः ॥२/९७८कड॥
24 ईश्वर: सर्वं भूतानां हृदेशोहृद्वृत्तिः।।
ब्राह्मणस्यस्मृतिः यन्त्राद्वृत्तिः मायेः ॥गीताः ९८/६१॥
similarity with the verse of the Śrīmadbhagavadvītā, "Even a confirmed sinner, if he worships Me with unwavering faith and devotion, must verily be considered as righteous; for he has indeed taken right resolve."

(3) The statement of gods (3/7/20--24) that Śrī Rāma’s greatness (महिमा) is such that any being remembers Him while leaving the body (कलेवरम्) attains His highest abode (परमपदम्), bears wonderful similarity of expression present in the Śrīmadbhagavadvītā.

(4) The statement of the gods eulogizing Lord Śrī Rāma that He is the 8th (i.e. Fire) among the Vasus and Lord Siva among the eleven Rudras has striking similarity with the statement of the Vibhutiyoga of the Śrīmad Bhagavadvītā.

(5) The phraseology of “I would be claimed to expiate on abandoning the actions. This is the misconception of ignorant only and not of the wise,” is identical with the Śrīmad Bhagavadvītā. Similarly it is also found in the dialogue of Uparicara Vasu of Mahābhārata as well as Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 143)

(6) Sage Veda Vyāsa the author of the Purāṇa reveals here in 7/9/68 which runs “Lord Mahādeva has narrated the Śrī Rāma Saga
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of the *Uttarakānda* till here (i.e. 7/9/67)” which annihilates the fake argument ascribing this work to Lord Śiva. Though the whole text is in the form of a dialogue between Lord Mahādeva and Pārvatī where Lord Mahādeva is the narrator and Mother goddess Pārvatī is the listener, but it does not also state that Sage VedaVyāsa is not the author of the AdhR. Hence the author is undoubtedly sage VedaVyāsa and none else.

(7) The last but not the least evidence is that no atheist systems like the common folk (लेकायत) and nowhere as an established system of Bṛhaspati or any important tenets of Buddhism and Jainism are even referred to directly or indirectly in the whole of the text of the AdhR containing 4224 verses. In this way the AdhR is composed before the established systems of Buddhism and Jainism.

Thus revered sage Veda Vyāsa is undoubtedly the author of the AdhR and none else.

The AdhR which is the portion of *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam*, contains 07 Books bearing the same titles as in the *Vālmīkirāmāyana* though its form is concise. It contains 64 cantos and 4224 verses. It deals with the *Sri Rāmahrdaya*, *Sri Rāmagītā*, episodes like Ahalyā’s release, Sage Vālmīki, Šabarī etc. Śrī Rāma is the Supreme Person, Śītā is goddess Lākṣmī and the Primordial Matter.

**Date:**

The date of the AdhR is a hard nut to crack, because as in most of the cases the problem of date remains permanently unsolved. Here below an attempt is made to arrive at tentative time period of the
composition of the AdhR from the 14th Cent. AD as the lowest limit and 3000 BC (the beginning of Kali Era) as the uppermost limit.

Different views are prevalent regarding the date of the AdhR. The attempt is made on the basis of its impact on the other Rāmāyanas composed in Sanskrit as well as in the other regional languages.

The AdhR has its impact on Saint Ekanātha’s Bhāvārtha-rāmāyana composed in 16th Cent. 33

Gosvāmī Tulasidāsa (15th Cent.) 35 the author of Rāmacaritamānasā accepts the AdhR as one of the source-texts for his composition and tributes the ancient sages and authors by the outpouring words,

ब्यास आदि कवि पुङ्गवानान। जिन्ह सादर हरि सुजस ब्रह्मान।
चरन कमल बंदौल तिन्ह कैँगे। पुरवहु सुकल मनोरथ मेरे।

The scholars like Bulke Kamil, Chitrao Siddheswar Śāstrī and Purshottamalal Bhārgava opine about the statement as below:

(1) Bulke Kamil in His Prācīna Rāmakathāsāhitya writes, 36 “The AdhR is possibly has been composed in the Rāmānandi Sect (P 152).

33 Bulke Kamil : Prāchīn Rāmakathāsāhitya.- Utpatti aur Vikāsa, P 164.
34 Chitrao Siddheswar Shastri: Madhyayungkinā Caritrakośa, P 171, Col. 11: ओकानाथ (१५३३ - १५९९)।
35 Rāmacaritamānasā kalyānāṅka, Gita Press Gorakhpur, August 1938, P 22, “संवत् १५५४ श्रावण शुक्ल संवत्तमी के दिन उन्ही उपलक्षित राज्यमें रहनेके पश्चात् श्रीतुलसीदासजी का जन्म हुआ (पंद्रह से चौरंजिव बिखे कालिन्दीके तीर।..."
36 रामानन्द के संप्रदाय में सम्बन्ध: अध्यात्मरामायणकी सृजन हुई थी। पृ. १५२। सामान्याविक रामायण में अध्यात्मरामायण निपतितसे सबसे महत्त्वपूर्ण है। इसके रचनाकाल तथा रचितता के विषय ही अपेक्षा हैं। इस ग्रन्थ की रामानन्द सम्प्रदाय में बहुत प्रतिष्ठा है और इसका प्रभाव आनंदमायण, रामचरितमानस तथा एकात्म के मराठी रामायण आदि पर प्रभाव है। रामानन्द को भी इसके रचितता सिद्ध करने का प्रयत्न किया गया है। इसका मुख्य उद्देश्य हैं वेदान्तदर्शन के आधार पर रामभक्ति का प्रतिपादन पृ. १६४.
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The founder of the Rāmānandi sect is believed to be a Rāmānanda who flourished in 14th Cent. AD

(2) Chitrav Siddheshwar Shastri notes in his Prācīna Caritrakośa,37 Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa : The author unidentified, but Rāmānanda is its author according to many researchers. Time : 14th Cent. Importance : This is one of the most important treatises on the sectarian Rāmāyaṇas. The theory of Combination of Knowledge and Action (ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चय) propounded by Śrī Rāmānujacārya is strongly refuted. It has its impact on Anandarāmāyaṇa, Rāmacaritamānasas and Ekaṇātha’s Bhāvartharāmāyaṇa in Marathi. It presents allegory of Śrī Rāma as the Supreme Person and Sītā as the Divine Power (माया) on the line of which the Absolute Monism (the topic of the present thesis) of Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, is propounded. It is considered to be highly respected because of its simple explanations, profound devotion, the philosophy of Absolute Monism and the concise form.

(3) Purshottamalal Bhargav notes in his Sāhitya Vimarśa38 that the AdhR possibly has been composed in the 14th Cent. to propagate Śrī Rāma devotion.

The statements of the above mentioned scholars can be summed up simply in the following words:

Rāmānanda (14th Cent. AD), the founder of the Rāmānandi Sect has composed the AdhR to propagate the path of devotion to Śrī Rāma and (as Citrav Shastri states) the theory of the Combination of

---

37 अध्यात्मरामायण: ग्रन्थकारों अनिश्चित किन्तु कई अभ्यासको के अनुसार रामानन्द इस ग्रन्थ के रचयिता हैं। काल - १४ वीं शताब्दी, महत्वपूर्ण माना जाता है। इस ग्रन्थ में रामानुज समर्थित समुच्चयवाद का स्पष्ट शब्दों में विरोध किया गया है, विशिष्टताही का कहीं भी समर्थन नहीं हुआ।

आनन्दरामायण, रामचरितमानस एवं एकनाथ के मराठी भावार्थरामायण पर इसका काफी प्रभाव है। इस ग्रन्थ में राम एवं सीता को क्रमशः परम्पुर्य एवं माया माना गया है, ------ यह ग्रन्थ भारतीय राममलकों में विशिष्ट आदरण माना जाता है। पृ. ७४१.

Knowledge and Action firmly established by Rāmānuja-cārya is refuted here in the AdhR.

These views are not acceptable.

Though the AdhR being one of the source-texts of Rāmacaritamānasā is former to it, it doesn’t prove that it has been composed in 14th Cent. On the other hand it is also the source-text of other Rāmāyaṇas composed in or before 14th Cent. and that can not be ignored.

Pt. Avasthi Nanda Kumar writes in the Introduction of his translation of Kṛttivāsarāmāyaṇa, It is to be noted that the Kṛttivāsarāmāyaṇam came into being nearly hundred years before the Rāmacaritamānasā of Gosvami (Tulsīdāsa). It’s source-texts are (Vālmīki) Rāmāyaṇa, Śrīmad Bhāgavata, Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa as well as other Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas.

There is also another Adhyātmarāmāyaṇam. Shri Edutchtchan wrote it in Malyalam in 1375 AD. It is based on the AdhR of Sanskrit. Dr Pandya Vijay in his article on Canonization of

---

39 सा तैत्तिरीयश्चूतिप्राद्याच न यास रसस्ताधिक्षिलमिण्यां स्वतः ।
एतावतित्वाच च वाजिनां श्रुतिज्ञानी विस्मोक्ष्य न तं साधनम् ॥
विद्यासमथवनृ सु देशस्तव्यक्रन्तु दृष्टां उदाहरत: सम: ।
फैल: पृथ्वीस्वादुवहकरकेकः क्रन्तु: संसाधिते ज्ञानमती विशेष्यम् ॥
सप्रत्येकः स्वमित्वात्मयात्मारुपप्रसीष्ठानं न तं तत्वदर्शिन: ।
तत्स्मादु तुच्छस्वाच्छिन्नविक्रियात्मधिवधिज्ञ: तम विद्याकार्यतम् ॥७/५/२९ - ३१॥
40 उद्देश्यन्य हैं कि गोस्वामीजी के ‘रामचरितमाणस’ के रचनाकाल से लगभग सो वर्ष पूर्व कृतिवासी रामायण का आविष्कार हुआ। कृतिवास के शोत-उपन्यासों में रामायण, श्रीमद्भागवत, आध्यातम-रामायण तथा अन्य पुराण और उपपुराण पुराण हैं, जिनका विश्लेषण उपयोग कवियों ने किया हैं।
प्रस्तावना - पृ. ३.
41 Rāmāyaṇa, Its Universal Appeal And Global Role, Ed. Lallanprasad Vyas, 1992, P 13
42 I am extremely thankful to Dr. Pandya Vijay for providing a Xerox copy of this article published in Vāmana Virama, Research in Índological Studies (Prof. V. M, Kulkarni Feli. Vol) Ed. Dr. S. Y, Wakankar, Bharatiya Kala Prakashan, New Delhi, 2006.
Rāmakathā as apotheosized in the character of Sītā writes, “The *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* (of the 13th Century AD circa) ...... to maintain Sītā’s purity and to believe in it.”

The above given date has not been proved by the author of the said research article either by any reference to the other author or by mentioning any scholar who worked on it and hence it is not acceptable.

Besides in his (i.e. Prof. Pandya’s) another article on Rāmāyaṇa Connection in the post-classical *Upaniṣads*, he describes, “The gradual development of Rāmakathā. Such a development of the neo upaniṣad (as Gajendragadkar K. V. names) is not at all cursorily referred to nor mentioned anywhere in the text of the AdhR which also proves the antiquity of the AdhR, though Vijay Pandya affords to correlate the above ideology with the AdhR thus ‘This symbolism hinting at the story has a parallel idea in the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*.”

Dr. Kuttan Pillai N. P. in his Purānic Sandarbhakosa notes, “*Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*: It is an excellent spiritual treatise in Sanskrit in which Śrī Rāma’s life and exploits (अवदान) are narrated. Many *Rāmāyaṇas* composed in regional languages are based on it.”

Great poet Kamban declares the three *Rāmāyaṇas* as the source-texts of inspiration for his *Rāmāyaṇa*. The AdhR is one among these three.

---

44 But there is one more Upaniṣad Tārasāra which contains a hint about the development of the Rāmakathā. There is a reference to the *Aum* a Tāraka which ferries the Jīva across the empirical existence. *Aum* has been symbolised in the term of Rāmaka is the Parmātman who become Rāma. (P 193).
45 Dr. Kuttanpille N. P., Puranic Sandarbhakosa, 1984: अध्यात्मरामायण: संस्कृत में रचित एक श्रेष्ठ आध्यात्मिक ग्रन्थ जिसमें भगवान राम के ज्ञम एवं अवदानों का वर्णन आया है | भारतीय कई प्राचीन भाषाओं में इसी आधार पर रामायणोंकी रचना हुई है । पृ. ३१.
46 Vide Above Fn. No. 12.
Regarding the date of Kambaramayanam, Bulke Kamil in his Rāmakathā writes, ‘Kamban’s Rāmāyaṇa is the foremost ancient poem of Dravidian language composed in 12th Cent.

On the contrary, Dr. Rajgopalan N. V. remarks in the Preface of Kambaramayanam, "Though the date of Kamban is not decided, some scholars consider him to be in 9th Cent."

So the AdhR must have been composed before 9th Cent. AD or at least before 12th Cent.

Dr. Asha Bharti in her Hindi Rāmakāvyā paramparā, vikāsa aur prabhāva writes, "Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa : According to Mātsyapurāṇa lord Brahma has narrated it. The AdhR is its portion. Its special feature is that that in this narrative Śrī Rāma is considered to be the Highest Brahman."

Thus the AdhR is undoubtedly the portion of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam. The scholars like Pargiter F. E., Kane P. V. and Hazara R. C. have tried to fix by the compilation period of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam.

Pargiter F. E. in his Ancient Indian historical tradition writes that Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa are two of the oldest Purāṇas and were one originally (P 23).

“The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa have the best text of genealogies. Their accounts agree closely, so that they are really only two versions of the same text. Nearly all mention the Brahmāṇḍa putting

47 अधरण सम्बन्धी सबसे प्राचीन काव्यस्रोत कम्बनकृत रामायण है जिसकी रचना बारहवीं शताब्दी में हुई थी।
48 कम्बन का निधित्व नहीं है, कुछ विद्वान उन्हें इसकी नवीं शताब्दि मानते हैं। भूमिका. पृ. ६।
49 डॉ. आशा भारती : हिन्दी मारात्मक परम्परा, विकास और प्रभाव, ब्रह्माण्डपुराण : मत्स्यपुराण-नुसार ब्रह्माने इसका उद्देश दिया। अध्यात्मरामायण इसका एक भाग हैं। इसकी रामकथा की विशेषता यह है कि यह ऋषि को प्रजात्मा माना गया है। पृ. ५६।
it last and omit the Vāyu, though it was one of the best known. The Kūrma also mentions it last and calls the Vāyaviya Brahmanda (P 77). The Brahmanda has unfortunately one very serious lacuna in its account after III.74.103.............. These two appear to be the oldest of the Purāṇas that we possess now and are on the whole the most valuable in all matters of traditional history.” (P 78)

“As the collective terms Itihasa and Purāṇa are often mentioned as distinct and yet are sometimes treated as much the same; thus the Vāyu calls itself both a Purāṇa and Itihasa and so also the Brahmanda.” (P 193)

The Vāyupurāṇa existed before 620 AD, because it is referred to by Bāṇa in his Harśacaritam.

In this way Brahmanda purāṇam is compiled at least before 6th Cent. AD.

Kane P. V. in his History of Dharmasāstra51 writes, that the Skanda (Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 2/8-9) states there was formerly only one Purāṇa called Brahmanda containing one hundred crores of verses and that later it was distributed into 18 parts. It was probably composed near the rise of Godāvari. (P 895) It may be placed between the 4th and 6th cent. AD. (P 896)

Hazara R. C. writes, “The Brahmanda though one of the oldest of the extant Purāṇas, is assigned the 18th place in almost all the lists of Māhāpurāṇas from the facts that it has sometimes been called ‘Vāyaviya Brahmanda’ that it also like the Vāyupurāṇa is said to have been proclaimed by Vāyu and that its chapters often agree almost literally with those of the Vāyu.......... It is not known definitely when and why the same original Purāṇa, which was named most probably after Vāyu, come to have a second version with a different title............. The cause of separation may be

sectarian because in the *Brahmāṇḍa* there are few chapters (*viz.* III 21 ff) which smack of *Vaiṣṇavism*.

“The numerous large extracts\(^{52}\) and isolated verses, quoted from the *Brahmāṇḍa* not found in the present *Brahmāṇḍa* show that the text of the *Brahmāṇḍa* was in many respects different from that of the *Brahmāṇḍa* known to Ballālasena.” (P 17)

Further Hazra R. C. dates the chapters as follows:\(^{53}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 29-32</td>
<td>On Yugadharma</td>
<td>-C between 200 and 275 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 10 (vv. 52 ff.) to III, 20</td>
<td>On Funeral sacrifice, impurity and purification of things</td>
<td>-C 200 – 300 AD probably in the middle of 3rd Cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, 2</td>
<td>On hells and results of actions done</td>
<td>Not known. May belong to 200 – 275 AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus he places *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* between 200-275AD.

This view is though authentic and acceptable, it requires an additional suggestion regarding still higher ancient nature of the *Brahmāṇḍa* and consequently of the AdhR on the basis of the following facts.

**Internal evidence**

There are also some internal evidences which support to decide the date of the AdhR.

\(^{52}\) Hazara R.C.: *Studies in the Purānic records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, The University of Dacca.

\(^{53}\) Ibid. P 175.
The posteriority of the AdhR (i.e. by Veda Vyāsa) than the \textit{Vālmikīrāmāyaṇam} clearly pointed out, is referred to expressively with the words,\footnote{पुरा रामायणे रामो रावणे देवकण्डकम्। हत्वा रणे रणश्लायी सुपुर्णवलवाहनम्। १/१/२६॥} “formerly (i.e. in ancient time) in the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} (पुरा रामायणे 1/1/26A).”

The usage ‘with the hymns of yore’ (स्तोत्रेः पुराणोद्वै)\footnote{अस्तोत्रीच्छृतसिद्धनिर्मित्यद्वैः स्तोत्रेः पुराणोद्वै। भक्त्या गद्यव्यथा गिरितिबिमलैरामयनदसापैवैः। १/२/७॥} indicates that the hymns of the Purāṇa text (available now) were not popular that much in the time of the composition of the AdhR (the portion of the \textit{Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa}).

Besides the usage the statements i.e. stories or narratives of the \textit{Purāṇa} texts (पुराणान्तः -1/5/11C), refers to the Vedic narratives and not the narratives of the \textit{Purāṇa} text and the epics (which are too posterior).\footnote{Pt. Munilal translates here, ‘beautiful narratives of the \textit{purānas} and epics’ (पुराण और ईतिहासिकी महृद सुनाते हुए... \textit{पु.} \ ३८), though he has himself translated (1/2/7) स्तोत्रेः पुराणोद्वै (as the hymns of the Vedas) ‘स्त्रितिसिद्ध विमलपक्षोऽ.. \textit{पु.} \ २६’।}

\underline{Style}

Now when it is proved that the AdhR is the portion of the \textit{Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa} and revered sage Veda Vyāsa is undoubtedly the author, it is essential here to discuss the word ‘Purāṇa’. The \textit{Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa} itself defines the term ‘Purāṇa’ as,

\textit{पुरा एवम् अभूत्} (It was before as it is.) Though it is ancient, it seems new.\footnote{‘पुरा नवं भवति’(Nirukta 3/19)} \textit{Śivamahāpurāṇa} explains the characteristics\footnote{सर्वस्म प्रतिसर्गमं बंशो मन्त्रतराणि च। \ बंशानुचारितः चैव पुराणं पद्धतिप्राणम्॥शिव० ७/१/४९॥} as,
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“The five characteristics of the Purāṇa are: (1) the Creation (सृणम्), (ii) Dissolution (प्रतिसर्गम्), (iii) Dynasty (वंश), (iv) the Age of Manu (मन्वन्तरणिः) and (v) the genealogies of the dynasty (वंशानुचरितम्).”

Among these characteristics, the AdhR can be placed under the category of Vamiśānucaritam. There were two outstanding powerful as well as major dynasties in ancient India: (1) the Solar dynasty (सूर्यवंश) also known as Raghuvarṇa) and (ii) the Lunar dynasty (Candravarna or Somavarna).

The AdhR deals with the life story of Śrī Rāma who is the descendent of the Solar dynasty and hence it can be placed under Vamiśānucaritam.

The AdhR has following characteristics of a Purāṇa.

(1) The colophon of the glorification (भाषाल्पनम्) reads, हि स्री-भ्राह्मणराजेश्वरमात्रयशमहात्मयं सम्पूर्णम्।

(2) The AdhR is considered to be a portion of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam. At the end of each canto the metre of the stanza is changed like Vālmīkirāmāyanam. Sage Veda Vyāsa follows the style of Vālmīki-rāmāyanam in presenting the different metres to suggest the end of the canto. It is obvious that the later rhetoricians have framed this rule of a Mahākāvya.

(3) The principles of the Saṅkhya system have a nice blending (सामस्रय) with the tenets of the Vedānta, esp. the Kevalādvaita. Moreover the Purāṇic philosophy has a footing on the पुरुष and प्रकृति of the Saṅkhyas finding the identity in the Highest Reality of the

59 Vide. Appendix 02.
60 एकत्रितवर्गः पद्यरूपसम्बन्धयुतकृतः। (साहित्यदर्पण. ७/३२०)
Vedānta, though both the systems have not taken the form of distinct schools of philosophy.

(4) The AdhR imbibing the Purānic genre presents the various hymns of eulogy like other Purāṇas.

(5) The AdhR contains the verses of reward (फलशृवत:) of reading, listening to, etc. of text like any text of Purānic genre.

(6) The AdhR presents a sort of description at the time of birth, marriage, victory of gods, slaying of demons, etc. expressing joy, happiness, anger, sorrow, etc. through the natural phenomena like Ether, Air, Fire, Water, Earth, Directions including the

---

61 पं. बलदेव उपाध्याय, पुराणविवेचन : सांख्य का प्रभाव पुराणोंके उपर विशेषरूप से है। परन्तु पौराणिक सूत्राविवेच अपना वैशिष्ट्य है, स्वतंत्र है, सांख्यमत से प्रभावित होने पर भी उसमें अपना व्यक्तिवाद है। अनांत को सांख्य-वेदांत केंद्रीय प्रकार का श्रीमल्य अथवा त्रिवेदी का आधुनिक विश्व में लक्षित नहीं होता है। जैसा वह अविनाश ताल के स्पष्टता प्रतीत होता है। यहाँ तो सांख्य तथा वेदांत का मनोध्य सामर्थ्य है जो अर्थात् प्रकृति युक्त है, अतिरिक्त तथा पूर्व देश का प्रतिपादन सांख्य के ही दौरान वेदांत के साथ मिलकर पौराणिक व्यक्तित्व की मूलभल्यता तैयार करता है। प्रकृति तथा पूर्व दो भिन्न तत्त्व नहीं है, प्रायः वे दोनों के द्वारा प्रेमित अपने कार्य केसम्बाद में समर्थ होते हैं। पु. २७४-२७५।

62 Vide appendix 03.

63 e.g. (3T) गुणवत्ता चात्मात्मिकसंज्ञित शुभम्।

   रामायणं सर्वपुराणसमं निरूपितपापा रामायणम् यथिनुष्ठाति तेऽऽ०१२/२/३१।

   (ब) तदाद कथविषयम् गृणु ताप्तत्रापमहम्।

   वन्धुवत्ता मुख्ये जननृत्तात्माभ्याजाति।

   प्रामाणिक पर्यावृत्ति दीर्घामुः: गुणसन्ततिम् ०१०२/२/१५।

64 आकांक्षेपि च देवानां शुद्धुं दुनुमित्वम्: ०१६/६/४६।

   तव च देवानां शुद्धुं दुनुमित्वम्: ०१६/६/४६।

   तव देवानां शुद्धुं दुनुमित्वम्: ०१६/६/४६।

   तव देवानां शुद्धुं दुनुमित्वम्: ०१६/६/४६।

65 ज्ञानलोकोऽज्ञानोऽज्ञानो: ०१५/६/४६।

66 रामेष्यमित्वस्य राजेष्यमित्वस्य: ०१५/६/४६।

67 दिक्षात् विशेषशृवत् स्वर्ग विषयतत्तमः ०१५/६/२६।
reactions\textsuperscript{68} of celestial and semi-divine beings.\textsuperscript{69} Again this is the style of \textit{Pur\text{\text{"a}}nic} text.

As the AdhR is a \textit{Pur\text{\text{"a}}nic} text from the pen of great sage VedaVy\text{"a}s\text{\text{"a}}, its antiquity is obvious and consequently the \textit{pur\text{\text{"a}}nic} characteristics are also witnessed along with the arche-type usages (अर्थत्रयोग). Some of the arche-type forms can be cited alphabetically as under.

\textbf{Verbs}

(1) अगाहत् (5/2/52A)\textsuperscript{70} instead of अगाहत.

(2) बभूजिने (6/3/75B)\textsuperscript{71} instead of बभूजिने.

(3) ऊचः (7/8/60C)\textsuperscript{72} instead of उवाच.

In the verse 7/8/61, the speech seems to be of sage Vasiṣṭha, because the word ‘I have known’ (ज्ञातो विज्ञानचक्रणा) (7/8/61CD) is in singular though the principal verb is ‘they said’ (ऊचः) (7/8/60C).

The text AdhR follows the Vedic customary rule that all the rules of formation (रूपायन) and declensions (विभक्तिरूप) enjoy options in the Vedic literature (सवेव विषयः छन्दसि विकल्पयते). Here below is an

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{68} वर्षुः पुण्यवर्षीणि स्वृवत्ताश्च मूडः: \textsuperscript{II}6/9/48कड़ II and also in 1/3/15B, 1/6/27AB, 6/8/30CD, 6/11/77AB, etc.,
\item \textsuperscript{69} ततो दुरुभयो नेनुदिविव देवगणेषः: ।
\item ननुत्दास्या हुशा ज्ञानिनविभक्तनः: \textsuperscript{II}3/2/35II and also in 1/5/9CD, 1/6/82, 6/9/48AB, etc.,
\item \textsuperscript{70} अगाहप्रमाणोऽक्तः क्रृत्वा वदनमालिकाम्: \textsuperscript{II}3/2/52अब II
\item \textsuperscript{71} शुच्या रामस्य वचन मंत्रिणः: समुरोहिता: ।
\item ऊचः: प्राण लघु: सवेव राममालिकायित्करिवभूत: \textsuperscript{II}7/8/60।।
\item पूवभवित हि निबिद्धं तत् भूभावहितः: ।
\item लक्षणामेव विद्यगांवः ज्ञाती विज्ञानचक्रणा \textsuperscript{II}7/8/6।।
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
example of employing plural instead of singular (though the agent is also in plural) i.e. the ministers headed by the family priest (i.e. Vasiṣṭha) said (मन्त्रनिम्न: सूपोर्षित: रुचि:) in 7/8/60 where पुरोहित उचाच is understood, because in 7/8/61 the text reads, ‘I have known through my divine vision’ (झातो विज्ञानश्चरु:): Vasiṣṭha has known Śrī Rāma’s separation form Lākṣmaṇa through divine vision.

(2) गिरा गद्वालदेशल (१/५/४२) \(^{73}\) = गिरा गद्वालदेशल instead of ऐड्डा.

Participles

(1) गच्चिन्तिमू (२/५/५) \(^{74}\) for गच्चिन्तिमू.

(2) परिचोदिता: (६/१४/७१) \(^{75}\) for परिचोदिता: \(^{76}\)

(3) रक्तमुद्रमती (५/१/४६) \(^{77}\) for रक्तमुद्रमती.

Vowel Sandhi

योश्चत्विकरामसंहितामू (६/१६/३८) \(^{78}\) for योश्चत्विकरामसंहितामू.

\(^{73}\) उत्तराय च पुनद्वृत्त्वा रम राजीवलोचनम्।
पुलकाकीतार्नीशि गिरा गद्वालदेशल।।१५/५/४२॥

\(^{74}\) यत्र राम: समायायण राज्यश्री कोहिच्छिन्तित।
परशुरामु जानकार सवें पादचरण गच्चिन्तिमू।।२५/५/४॥

\(^{75}\) Normally the classical literature avoids such a usage of चुँड (चोदयति) 10 U by replacing जुँड (जोदयति) cf. Vallabhācārya’s Ānubhāṣya 1.1.1 नोदनालक্ষणोढ़र्थो धर्म स्येत instead of चोदनालक्षणोढ़र्थो धर्म:।

\(^{76}\) भरतस्य वचो श्रृङ्ख्ला श्रृङ्खलपरिचोदिता।
अल्पाखुंडः नगरी मुक्तार्तलयोज्ज्वलेऽ०।०।५४/७९॥

\(^{77}\) हस्तमालापि तं वामविलाजपत्याहनतु।
तदेव परित्य भूमी रक्तमुद्रमती।भूमम्।।२५/१/४६॥

\(^{78}\) श्रुण्योऽयोश्चत्विकरामसंहितामू
प्राप्तिति राजा रक्तमुद्रसम्मानमू।
श्रुण्योऽयोश्चत्विकरामसंहितामू
व्यपेतु: खो विज्ञायी भवेच्छोः।०।५५१॥
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Similar usage of the vowel sandhi is comparable with the *Kathopanisad*\(^79\) गृहोज्यमा (गृह: आत्मा).

**Word**

(1) अखिल: प्रशांसित (२/२A)\(^80\) for अखिले प्रशांसित (Pronouns are declined like सर्व: सर्वो सर्वेः).

(2) जनिन्त्री (६/७/६७)\(^81\) for जनिन्त्री.

(3) सहुण्यम (६/१४/६७A)\(^82\) (Acc Sing. of शहुण् - शहुहा) for शहुण्म.

**Structure**

The Puranic style is explicit from the usage of following particles like अथ, तत: and so on.

(1) अथ means ‘now’, ‘hence’, ‘moreover’, ‘if’, etc.

The indeclinable अथ indicates the beginning of the new canto e.g. in 1/3/1AB Śrī Rāma Saga begins by introducing Daśaratha – the king of Ayodhya.\(^83\)

The same style is also found in 1/7/1, 2/2/1, 3/1/1, 7/8/1 and so on to introduce a new topic as well as the beginning of the canto.

\(^79\) एष: सर्वभूतार्थ गृहोज्यमा न प्रकाशते ||कठा १/३२/१२||

\(^80\) भगवन् राममिलनः प्रशांसित मूद्दुभुः || पौराणिक निगमास शूक्रा मन्त्रिणिश्व विशेषतः ||

\(^81\) भक्तिर्देवीव्रजस्तय भक्तिमौलप्रदातिनः ||

\(^82\) आज्ञपन्वच्छन्नहु युद्ध युक्तं मुदानित: ||

\(^83\) अथ राजा दशरथः श्रीमानसत्यपरायणः ||
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The new topic is mostly introduced with the word अथ, e.g. in 2/1/7 the divine sage Nārada comes to remind Śrī Rāma about accomplishing the task of gods. The same style is also found in 7/6/34 to introduce the narration of the Horse sacrifice (in Ayodhayā) under the running topic of Kuśa and Lava passing their life in singing Śrī Rāma’s glory in sage Vālmīki’s hermitage.

It is also employed to change the topic e.g. in 2/2/8, 3/2/41, 7/3/29 and so on.

It is employed to show the succession of the event e.g. in 6/6/15, 7/1/2, 7/6/34 and so on.

It is employed in the sense of ‘moreover’ e.g. in 6/11/78.

It is employed in the sense of ‘hence’ e.g. in 3/2/12.

(2) The indeclinable ‘तत:’ (then, after that, thereafter) is employed to indicate the changing of topic or idea or sometimes to add something in continuity.

It is employed in 1/1/44A to show the continuity of the topic but the change of the speaker.

It is employed to show the result of the action done prior e.g. 1/2/8 and so on.

It is employed in the sense of ‘thereafter’ in 1/3/11A, 1/4/26A, 1/6/18A and so on.

It is employed in the sense of ‘at that time’ in 1/4/33A, 1/5/37C, 1/6/13C and so on.

84 अथ रामोऽश्वेतेदार्द्धिः वहुद्विक्षणाः।
बधानु च वर्णनमयेः सीतां विधाय विपुलस्वतः॥७/६/३४॥
85 अथ प्रभाते मुनिना समेतो राम: ससीत: सह लक्ष्मणेन।
अगस्त्यसम्भाषणलोकमानसः शान्तिगत्यांशज्ञाय सदौ॥
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It is employed in the sense of ‘therefore’, in 2/2/3A etc.

Dr. Gaṅgārāma Garg mentions that the Adhṛ is a manual of devotion and tāntrīka in character, he wants to adhere the authorship to Lord Śiva answering the question of mother goddess Pārvatī, as is the fact with almost all the tāntrīka texta like Rudrayāmala etc. It must be borne in mind that some of the texts of Yogic practices like Śivasamāhī hitā, Gheraṇḍasamāhī hitā, etc. also have the similar form of the dialogue between Lord Śiva and Pārvatī.

It is possible that the description of the the ritualistic worship (क्रियायोगः:) explained by Śrī Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa in 4/4, the scholar is tempted to prove the Adhṛ as a manual of tāntrīka in character on the basis of the said description where various placements (न्यासम्) like (1) external (2) internal (3) names of Lord Viṣṇu (4) elements (तत्त्वन्यासम्) (5) pañjaranyāsa (6) the formula (मन्त्रम्) are prescribed under 4/4/21-23.

Metre

The Adhṛ containing Śrī Rāma Saga in 07 Kāṇḍas divided into 64 Cantos and 4224 verses employs various metres.86

The change of metre is employed in the hymn e.g. Ahalyā’s hymn (1/5/43-60), Brahmā’s hymn (6/13/10-23), Indra’s hymn (6/13/24-32) and so on.

The change of metre is employed to introduce a new episode also as e.g. (i) 1/2/6. Here the beginning of Śrī Rāma Saga is indicated by change of metre.

(ii) In the Adhṛ (7/8/9) on the arrival of Time (कालः), there begins a new episode and that is indicated by the change of metre.

Textual Analysis

86 For details, vide. Appendix 02.
(1) **Bālakāṇḍa** comprises of 391 verses in 07 cantos. Lord Śiva narrates Śrī Rāma Saga as the reply of Parvati’s question. On the request of Lord Brahmā, Lord Viṣṇu along with His divine glories incarnates Himself to lessen the burden of the earth as the sons of king Daśaratha. The four brothers grow up and their childhood sports are described.

Sage Viśvāmitra asks Daśaratha to send Śrī Rāma for the protection of the sacrifice. Śrī Rāma and Lakśmaṇa go with him. Śrī Rāma kills Tātakā, defeats Mārṣaṇa as well as Subāhu and releases Ahalyā from the curse.

After the breaking of Śiva’s bow Śrī Rāma was offered Sītā’s hand. On the path of their return to Ayodhyā, there is a confrontation with Bhārgava Rāma.

(2) **Ayodhīkāṇḍa** comprises of 728 verses in 09 cantos.

Divine sage Nārada reminds Śrī Rāma the task of His incarnation. King Daśaratha decides to coronate Śrī Rāma as heir-prince in which Kaikeyī creates hindrance by asking the two boons given to her formerly by the king.

Kaikeyī demands exiling Śrī Rāma for 14 years and Bharata’s enthronement on the throne. Śrī Rāma departs to the forest and the king dies in His separation. Bharata rejecting the kingdom, goes to the forest to bring Śrī Rāma back. He returns with Śrī Rāma’s wooden-shoes.

(3) **Aranyakāṇḍa** comprises of 472 verses in 10 cantos.

Śrī Rāma kills Virādha in their way to Daṇḍaka forest. They visit the hermitage of sage Sarabhaṅga, Sutikṣṇa and sage Agastya. They stay at Paṇcavati where they meet Jāṭāyu. Lakṣmaṇa makes demoness Śūrpanakhā deformed and Śrī Rāma destroys the demons like Khara.
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As a result Rāvaṇa her brother abducts Sītā with the help of Mārića. Jaṭāyu, while rescuing Sītā gets injured and hence dies after reporting Śrī Rāma about Sītā’s abduction. Kabandha attains liberation, after being killed by Śrī Rāma. The two brothers meet Śabarī who guides them to Sugrīva for getting Sītā back.

(4) Kiskindhākāṇḍa comprises of 560 verses in 09 cantos.
Śrī Rāma allies with Sugrīva. Śrī Rāma kills Sugrīva’s brother Vālī who had kidnapped his wife. Lakṣmaṇa threatens Sugrīva to start processing Sītā’s search. Monkeys are on the search of Sītā. They meet Sampāti, the brother of Jaṭāyu. Hanumān becomes ready to cross the ocean on the prompting of Jāmbavān.

(5) Sundarakāṇḍa comprises of 227 verses in 05 cantos.

Hanumān while crossing the sea, meets with the demoness Surasā, Mt. Maināka and demoness Sanē hikā. He reaches in Laṅkā and is con-fronted with Laṅkini. He delivers Śrī Rāma’s message to Sītā and gets arest-jewel from Sītā for Śrī Rāma. He is captivated in Brahma-nooze. He burns Laṅkā and returns to Śrī Rāma.

(6) Yuddhakāṇḍa comprises army march to Laṅkā, Vibhīṣaṇa’s surrender to Śrī Rāma. The army invades Laṅkā. The war takes place.

Hanumān goes to bring the divine medicinal herb for Lakṣmaṇa’s swoon. Śrī Rāma kills Kumbhakarna and Lakṣmaṇa kills Indrajit.

The monkeys obstructs the sacrifice performed by Rāvaṇa. Śrī Rāma kills Rāvaṇa, Sītā’s fire-ordeal takes place and they depart for Ayodhyā. Śrī Rāma is enthroned on the throne of Ayodhyā.

(7) Uttarakāṇḍa comprises of 611 verses in 09 cantos. Sage Agastya and others approach Śrī Rāma and narrate the past life of Rāvaṇa, etc. and the reign of demons. The sage narrates the past life of Vālī and Sugrīva. Śrī Rāma’s reign is described. Śrī Rāma aban­dons Sītā. He instructs Lakṣmaṇa. Śatrughna slays demon Lavaṇa.
Śrī Rāma performs *Aśvamedha* sacrifice in which sage Vālmīki comes with Lava and Kuśa. Both sing the Śrī Rāma Saga. Sītā enters into the earth.

Śrī Rāma instructs the mother. Time (काल) arrives and on the bereaking of the condition, Śrī Rāma abandons Laksmana. Laksmana ascends to heaven.

Śrī Rāma ascends to His abode.

The Adh.R II.9.11-17AB need to be reconstructed as follows:

ततोज्ञनृत्नः सर्वं मातृशर्त तथापरे॥ २/९/१५अब ॥ should be after सीता च लक्षमणश्रीव विलेपपुर्तो भृशाम् ॥ १६क्षं ॥, because there lies the problem of context
शुल्या तत्कर्णशौलाय गुरोदचनमम्भसा ।
हा हतोस्मीति पतितो रुद्धू रामः स लक्षमणः ॥ १४॥
हा तात मां परिश्ववक्य क्वगतोडसि धृष्णाकर ।
अनाथोदसिम महाबाहो मां को वा लाल्येदितः ॥ १५॥
सीता च लक्षमणश्रीव विलेपपुर्तो भृशाम ।
ततोज्ञनृत्नः सर्वं मातृशर्त तथापरे ॥ १६॥

These words of the preceptor went into Śrī Rāma’s ears like the piercing pain of an ear-cancer. He fell on the ground and laments “O father, O father, Woe unto me.” and along with Laksmana He began to weep. He cried aloud, “O merciful father, where have you gone abandoning me?” He bemoaned saying, “O noble one, I am now orphaned. Who will hereafter fondle me? Following Him, Sītā and Laksmana cried out even more loudly. Following Him, all his mothers and others began to cry.

स्वनविधितां रांचं तदा बोधितोविगतनिन्द्र आस्थित: ॥ ३/६/२४अब ॥ should be taken as 3/6/23EF, because तद्वचानामी विमुच्य चायपें रांचं प्रतिगृहं प्रयाहि भो: ॥ ३/६/२४क्षं ॥ and
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रक्ष राक्षसकुलं चिरागातं तत्स्मृती सकलमेव नशयति।
तब हिंतं चतुरं मम भाषितं परिगुणण परात्मनि राधवे।
॥३/६/२५॥ should be taken as 3/6/25 due to (1) the metre is द्वितिलम्बित, (2) the context tallies.

The AdhR (7/6/27-29) is a remarkable case of text mixing or clearly saying, the case of interpolation. The three verses run like this:

“The sage gave them the names to Sita’s two sons, Kuśa to the elder boy and Lava to the younger. Both of them acquired learning gradually. The sage initiated both of them, too when they were prepared for the Vedic studies. He narrated to both the boys the entire Ramayana that was narrated formerly by Lord Siva, destroyer of the cities to Pārvatī and which was taught for the sake of amplifying the Vedas (बेदोपबुहिणायायं)॥८७॥

The above text shows clearly that a latter scribe or a traditional devotee follower has inserted the verse (29) in the main body of the AdhR. It is a fast the V.R. is the first composition of the Classical Sanskrit literature, because it is well known as the Ādi Kāvyā of Vālmīki teaches the Rāmāyana which is obviously his own historical poem which has been composed during the life time of Śrī Rāma hence the words Formerly narrated by lord Śiva do not fit in the context. So 7/6/29 is a clear case of interpolation.

The verse 7/9/70॥८॥ reads “Śrī Rāma becomes pleased on hearing His (रघुनायकस्य) account which was composed by lord Śiva (महेष्वरेण)॥

॥८७॥ मुनिस्तयोनीम चक्के कुशो ज्येरोजुनो रथः।
क्रमेऽन्वित्व विद्यासम्पन्नी सीताएवर्ते भमूलाम्।॥७/६/२७॥
उपनीती च मुनिना बेदाध्यमतवरी।
कृत्स्व रामायणं प्राह काश्य बालकयोपमै:॥७/६/२८॥
श्राभुरेण पुरा प्रोकतं पवित्रच्यं पुराणम्।
जेरोजुनो तात्वाराहयत प्रभुः॥७/६/२९॥
॥८॥ आक्षानमेतद्वुनायकस्य कृतं पुरा राधवचौदितेन।
who was inspired by Śrī Rāma for the future (enhancement of devotion) of His dear most person (i.e. Pārvatī).\(^{89}\)

The author of the Purāṇa is revealed here in 7/9/68 which says, “Lord Mahādeva narrated the Rāma Saga of the Uttarkāṇḍa upto here.” The word ‘upto here’ means upto the V. 7/9/67.\(^{90}\) Till here the story of the Uttarkāṇḍa is narrated by lore mahādeva.

(A) The AdhR & Upaniṣads

It is interesting to note that many principles of the Upaniṣadic ideology are imbibed in the AdhR. The most important one is that of the Garbhopaniṣad. It will be clear from the following table of comparision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa (4/8/22-28)</th>
<th>Garbhopaniṣad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22कड़ दिनेन्द्रक कलं भूस्वाखा रूपत्वापूर्यात्</td>
<td>एकारासेषितं कऽलितं भवति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23अब पक्षारेण बुद्धुदकारतामिवात्</td>
<td>सप्तसर्वोषिसं बुद्धं भवति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24अब पक्षामुक्तं स पेषी संधिरेण परिपुष्टता</td>
<td>अर्धभांभाध्यन्तरं पिन्दों भवति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24कड़ तस्या एवंहीरोपति: पश्चाटविस्मितात्रिषु</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25अब श्रीचन्द्र श्रवण्ष द्वान्तराष्ट्रमाध्यपहदयुसम्भवात्</td>
<td>मासाध्यन्तरेण कठिनो भवति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25कड़ पश्चात्काज्ञनि चैकैकंजानये मातातः क्रमातू</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26अब पाणिपादी तथा पार्श्वंकार्जूनः तथैव च</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26कड़ मातायन्तःक्रमायः क्रमेन न चान्यथा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27अब त्रिभूमिरत्र प्रजायते अंकानां सम्ययः क्रमातू</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27कड़ सर्वत्रृस्ता: प्रजायते क्रमामिसचाचतुष्ये</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28अब नासा कण्णे च नेत्रे च जाज्ञे पक्षामाति:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28कड़ दत्त भृकुटिन्या गृहं पादमे जाज्ञे तथा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 श्रीरामच्चिद्रिकोलकस्य भवितुद्वा नीर्मित्व प्रसिद्धा III/9/10कड़ ॥
90 एतावेदोत्तममाहाशभुः श्रीरामच्चिद्रियः कथावशेषम् ॥
व: पादमायात्र पदेशं पापाधिप्तच्ये जनसहाय: जानातु III/9/68॥
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The AdhR\textsuperscript{91} incorporating the Upanisadic method of ‘Not that, Not that’ (नेति नेति) of the Chandogyopanisad) explains Śrī Rāma as the Supreme Reality. The same idea is incorporated in रत्नद्वाबृत्या of the Śivamahimnastotram of Puspadantācārya.\textsuperscript{92}

The ocean before the construction of the bridge, prays to Śrī Rāma calling Him the Vairāja when He adopts the qualities of His illusory power and says that the gods, the creators and Rudra are produced out of the Sattva, Rajas and Tamas portions of the Vairāja, This ideology can be well compared with the passage of the Taittiriyopanisad (2/6) तत्सृष्ण ललिताद्वाल्पितनाः and the Brahmasutra (2/1/33) लोकवतु लोकाक्षवत्यम्.\textsuperscript{93}

Sri Rama can not be perceived by gods, demons or serpents except the one whom he grants favour.\textsuperscript{94} The idea is similar to the Kathopanisad, “This Self can not be known through much hearing. It can be known through the self alone that the aspirant prays to; this self of that seeks reveals its true nature.\textsuperscript{95}

(B) AdhR & Śrīmadbhagavadgītā

The AdhR (1/1/34 & 4/7/17AB) states, “When Sita (i.e. the Primordial Matter) gets associated with Supreme Intelligence, creates the world, yet the ignorant superimpose the doership upon Śrī Rāma.” The same idea is found in the Gītā (7/5) “This, O mighty

\textsuperscript{91} अतितिर्सनयं बृहदेष्ठिष्ठः॥ १०/२/४ अभ॥
\textsuperscript{92} अतीत: पन्थां तव च महिमा वाज्ञमनस्वलट्ट्यावृत्यं च चक्रितमभिद्वे शृद्धविलपि ।
स केष स्तोत्र्वः: कालिविलसयुः केष विवेय: पदेत्वाचीनाः पति न मनः: केष न वच: ॥ महिमः । ॥
\textsuperscript{93} निगुणात्मकं निरक्षारो यदा मायागुणांशतु।
लोकाशीर्षकोषि त्वं तद्वैराजनामावन॥
गुणाग्नि विभाज्यं सत्वंश्ववम्बोवमर॥
रजोगुणात्मके यथिर् सत्यमेवार्थितं सत्मनोभिप्रविशिष्टत्मकं।६/३/२४-३५॥
\textsuperscript{94} इहुं न शक्त्यस्तैः कैषिकाश्विद्वानावप्पर: ।
वेदसत्वं कुलो स चैव इहुं श्रुद्धविलपि ॥६/३/२५॥
\textsuperscript{95} नायामां मृतवर्ण न नेत्रया न बहुना श्रुतिन।
यमेव वृहते स तत् लघुस्तव्यं आत्माविवृण्यात स्त्राय तु॥ कठो १/२/२३॥
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armed, is my lower nature. Know that, as different from it, is my higher nature forming the source of all Jīvas and the support of the whole universe.”

The AdhR (1/7/32) declares that the power of projection which depends upon the Supreme Self is within His perception, produces the world like foam in water and smoke in fire. This idea is similar to the Gītā (9/10) “Under my direction and control, Nature brings out this mighty universe of living and non-living beings. Thus does the wheel of this world revolve.”

The AdhR (2/1/1) states that Māyā endowed with 03 Qualities, gets the contact with the Supreme Reality, creates Brahmā and others. This is similar to that of the Gītā (7/13) “Delivered by the mental states accruing from the three guṇās of Prakṛti, this world knows not me, the imperishable, transcending these guṇās.”

According to the AdhR (4/8/16) the doership and the enjoyship are also superimposed on the Self. This thought is similar to the Gītā (3/27) “Every where the disposition (powers) of Nature perform all works. But deluded by egoism, man thinks, ‘I am the doer’.”

Nārada on the slaying of Kumbhakarna (6/8/36) ascends on the earth and addresses Śrī Rāma as one who resides in the heart of all the beings. The same idea is also found in Upaniṣad as well as in Gītā (18/61) “O Arjuna! The Lord dwells in the heart of all beings

96 आपेयैतस्तत्त्वां प्रकृति नियंत्रिते प्राप्यम्।
जीवभूतं महाबाहो यथेऽद्धर्यं जगत्। ||गीता ५ ७/५॥

97 महात्म्यश्योऽग्निन्द्र अविनाशी।
हेतुनाचनेन बौद्ध जनमित्वम्। ||गीता ६ १/५॥

98 त्रिभुजः प्रवृत्तिः संधिवृत्तस्तिः।
मोहितः नामिनाय भावायः। परमव्यमः। ||गीता ८ ६/३॥

99 प्रकृतं ज्ञातं सुधारा:।
ञ्जातिन भवेत। अहंकाम्यस्याम्।
कर्तारि मन्यन्ति। ||गीता २ १/२॥
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revolving them all by His mysterious power *Māyā*, as if they were objects mounted on a machine."\(^{100}\)

The *AdhR* (7/4/52-53)\(^{101}\) mentions that Śrī Rāma is not perceived through the means like sacrifice, etc., but only through the profound devotion with knowledge. The thought is similar to *Gītā*, “On whom His grace has been bestowed, none in this world could see Him by Vedic study, by sacrifice, by good works, by rituals, or by severe austerities.”\(^{102}\) It is also found in 11/53.

(C) *AdhR & Other Rāmāyaṇamas*

The *AdhR* (1/5/27) is completely the innovation of the author or in other words it is an allegorical presentation of the curse given by *Gautama* that Ahalyā turns into the stone.\(^{103}\) According to VR Ahlayā would get disappeared for people and mere by ŚrīRāma’s sight she would get her original form back after getting released from the curse.

The *AdhR* (3/7/1-3) reads, “Śrī Rāma knows Rāvana’s plan and speaks Sītā that she should stay invisible in the fire for a year leaving her shadow (चाय) She would regain her original form (पूर्ववत) after Rāvana’s destruction.” Such a mention is found in VR, while other texts like *Saupadyarāmāyaṇam*, *Rāmacaritamānas*, etc. do mention Chāyā Sītā.

\(^{100}\) cf.(1) ईश्वर: सर्वभूतानां हृदेऽंतरूं तिष्ठति ||
*भामथ्यस्वैभूतानि यत्रार्थां बाधीः मायया ||* सीता ० ७४/६१\||

(2) एवं देवो विश्वकर्मः महात्मा सदा जनानां हृदये संपिनिष्ठः ||
*सदा हृदिःयं मनसा य एतमेवं विदुरमुतास्ते भवति ||* सीता ० ४/२०क्षः\||

\(^{101}\) न च बज्जातपीथानो न दानाध्यक्षनानिभि: ||
*शाक्यः भगवानः हृद८ुपार्दित्सत्सयी ||
*तदेकस्तिस्तेजः प्राणार्जिनिचतृंदैवत्वः: ||
*शाक्यः भगवानः विविधदिग्नितमल्लिनि: || ७४/५२-५३\||

\(^{102}\) वेद्यासृष्टिकर्मनेन दामनेचं च भ्राज्यं भिन्नं तपोमिभ्यः: ||
*एवंस्युः: शाक्य अहं चूर्णे क्रृत्तिक्षेत्रे कृपांचिरे || ९१/४८\||

\(^{103}\) Nṛsīṁhapurāṇam mentions this episode in the same way.
The AdhR (3/7/36-37AB) follows VR and hence there is no reference to the line marked by Lakṣmaṇa (लक्ष्मणरिक्ष) which seems to be a later addition. Even there is no reference in Mānasā. According to Ānandarāmāyaṇa Sārakāṇḍa 8/98-100:

तथापि श्रणु महारथे यन्मयानोन्यते हितम्।
मयैता धनुषं रेखा वृक्तं त्वपतितोधुना ॥९८॥
तवर्कणाय दुःखानां दुर्विरलां महत्तमाम्।
मा तवमुद्तुत्तस्वैम्या प्राणीः कण्ठगतरिपि ॥९९॥
इत्युक्तवा धनुषं कोठा कृत्वा रेखा समन्तः।
वाह्यदेशे पवनं च तीर्थं सौमिष्ट्रि: परियोपमाम् ॥१००॥

The AdhR (3/10/38) reads that Śabarī suggests Śrī Rāma to make friendship with Sugrīva who would help Him in the search of Sītā, VR (3/72/7-15) reads that Kabandha requests Śrī Rāma to visit sage Matanga’s hermitage (where Śabarī is waiting) and then to Sugrīva to get the information about Sītā as well as His help, because Sugrīva suffers with the same problem (of losing his wife and kingdom).

It seems that the verse (3/10/44) must have been incorporated from some other text of Śrī Rāma Saga, because the metre is different and the change of metre also marks the end of the canto.

The AdhR (4/7/51) and the Mānasā (4/6/7) are unanimous in stating that the combat between Vālī and demon Māyāvī lasted for 01 month, while the VR (4/1/15) states the duration of 01 year.

Both the AdhR (4/1/74AB) and the Rāmacaritamānasā read that Śrī Rāma’s arrow pierces the 07 palm trees (ताल्लुक्ष्यः), while VR reads Sāla trees.

104 भक्तिमुक्तिविश्वासिनी भक्ति: श्रीरामचन्द्रस्य हे
लोकाः कामदातथतीपितनिग्रहं संस्कृतमयुक्तसः।
नानान्यविशेषत्वतित्वालित्वा सुदूरे पूर्णः
रामं व्यासाचर्च मनुष्यश्वरं भान्तं बनहं बुद्धाः।
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The AdhR (7/6/27CD-29) mentions directly the teaching of Rāmāyaṇa by sage Vālmīki which not only proves the prior composition of the VR (naturally too the AdhR) but also indicates the historicity of the VR composed during the life time of Śrī Rāma.

The AdhR (7/4/24-26) narrating the episode of Śambuka’s killing presents Śrī Rāma’s superhuman acts (अमःनुष्णाणि कार्याणि), hence Sītā’s abandoning is taken place afterwards i.e. in 7/4/55-59, while the VR (7/45) puts it after Sītā’s abandoning.

Various hymns of the AdhR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymns</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Reward of reciting, listening to, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Śrī Rāma hrdaya</td>
<td>Extremely precious, secret, dear to the Śrī Rāma’s heart, purifier and destroyer of the sin.</td>
<td>It removes the sin incurred through Brahmānicide and brings liberation even for them who are sinful, greedy and lustful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/1/44-56)</td>
<td>It is the valuable compendium of Vedānta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Brahmākṛtā-stutih</td>
<td>Lord Brahmā eulogizes Śrī Rāma as the Creator etc., Importance of devotion.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2/14/24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Kausalyākṛtā-stutih</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma’s glory as the Supreme Self is described.</td>
<td>The reciter attains Śrī Rāma’s form and His</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105 तालाम्बस विनिमिष्ठ गिरि भूमि च सायकः ||4/१/७७कठ ||
106 तुलिभि अतिथि तालु देखाए ||
107 बिनु प्रयास रघुनाथ ध्वाहें ||मानसः४/७/१२||
108 तालाम्बस मुनि भावेय चालान भित्वा महाजवः ||
109 निष्पत्ति च पुस्तुष्ण तमम प्रविबेरा ह ||4/२/२/२||
108 एततेवभिविषित देवि श्रीरामहद्यं मया ||
110 अतिगुण्ठतं हृदं पवित्रं पापोपवजनम् ||२/१/५/३||
| Chapter 02 |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| (1/3/20-34) | remembrance at the time of death.\(^{109}\) |
| (4) **Ahalyākṛtāstutih** (1/5/43-64) | Śrī Rāma’s glory is described. | It makes one free from all sins such as violating preceptor’s bad, liquor-drinking, killing of mother etc. It offers a son to a barren woman.\(^{110}\) |
| (5) **Paraśurāma-kṛtāstutih** (1/7/21-45) | Śrī Rāma’s glory. | It brings devotion with knowledge. |
| (6) **Naradakṛtāstutih** (2/1/9-31) | Śrī Rāma and Sītā are described as universal parents, the female form is Sītā and the male form is Śrī Rāma. | It leads to the attainment of the Absolution. |
| (7) **Virādhakṛtāstutih** (3/1/38-46) | The devotee hankers after the Rāma’s lotus-feet. | It brings Śrī Rāma’s blessings.\(^{111}\) |

\(^{109}\) सांवादमायोयेवस्तु पापं भ्रष्टं गृहिणायादपि ।
सहायति मम सारङ्गं मरणे मत्स्वर्गं लभेतु ।।३/३॥

\(^{110}\) अहल्या कृतं स्तोत्रं यं पतेः लिङ्गसूत्रं ।
स सुख्यात्रेऽविषे: पापे: परं भ्रमाधिगच्छति ॥
पुनः पतेः पदस्य रामं हृदि निधाय च ।
संविसर्जने लभे वन्ध्या अपि सुपुनः ॥
सर्वायाकमायानवन्नाति रामचन्द्रप्रसादं ।
ब्रह्मणो गुलटयोगधिपि पुरुषः स्त्री सुरापेति वा
मातृभावविहिसकोद्योति सतं भौगोकब्राह्मारुः ।
निनयाः स्तोत्रमिदं जपनु रघुपति भक्तं हृदिस्तं समस्येः
ध्वान-मुक्तमूप्ति किं पुनः स्वाच्छायुक्तं न । ॥ ८/५/६२-६५॥

\(^{111}\) रामेण रक्षोविफळ सुघोरः शापाखुशिन्वितविदानमेकः
विद्याधरस्तः पुनः ऋषि रामं गुणसे तत्र रोहिनिलाभाच ॥ ॥ ८/६॥
| Chapter 02 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| (8) **Sūtikṣṇakṛtā stutīḥ** (3/2/27-37) | ----- | The reciter becomes dear to Śrī Rāma.112 |
| (9) **Agastya-yakṛtā stutīḥ** (3/3/17-50) | Śrī Rāma is the Brahman described in Vedas. His cosmic form is Virāj. | The listener goes away highly satisfied in the direction shown by the sage.113 |
| (10) **Moksāvarāṇm** (3/4/19-55) | The nature of Māyā, knowledge etc. are described. | It shatters the thick darkness of Ignorance and leads to liberation.114 |
| (11) **Jaṭāyukṛtā stutīḥ** (3/8/44/56) | Śrī Rāma is the high-est object of worship. | The reciter remembering Śrī Rāma at the time of death attains to His form. |
| (12) **Kabandhakṛtā stutīḥ** (3/9/30-56) | The universe is superimposed on Śrī Rāma. He is Hiranyagarbha. | The reciter crosses over *Sanā sāra*, the product of Ignorance and attains the state of perpetual intuition of Śrī Rāma.115 |
| (13) **Sugrīvakaṛtā stutīḥ** (4/1/76-93) | The devotee seeks the devotion to Śrī Rāma’s lotus-feet, offers all movements of his mind to His feet and serves Śrī Rāma through all his limbs. | -- |

112 निषेधानान्यतास्तोषेषाष्टोष्योहमन्नम्।
स्त्रीयमेतिष्ठएवध्यो त्वत् कृत्तं मस्य यथा ॥३/२/३७॥

113 स्मुद्भावमोक्षस्माप्पूतं ववः: स्तोत्रं च तत्वार्थसम्बन्धिं विभुः:।
मुनि समाख्याय गुज्जनितो यथी प्रदर्शिः मार्गमर्शेषविद्वादि: ॥३/३/५०॥

114 य इत्यु तपेत्रित्वं श्रद्धाभिक्षितप्रग्नितम्:।
अज्ञापकलुभावं विभूय परिमित्येत: ॥३/४/५४॥

115 तुष्टेऽद्वेष्यन्वयं भक्ति स्मुद्भावं च तेजपः।
याहि म परम स्थानं योगिजम्य सनन्तनम् ॥३/६/५५॥
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(14) Kriyāyoga-vārnam</th>
<th>The ritualistic worship of Śrī Rāma is descried.</th>
<th>The reciter or the listener gets the reward of ritualistic worship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) Vibhiṣānakṛtya stutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma is the Supreme Self.</td>
<td>It brings Śrī Rāma’s favour and attainment of Sārupya type of liberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Nāradakṛtya stutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma is eulogized as the Supreme Person.</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Brahmakṛtya stutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma’s divine glory is described.</td>
<td>It brings freedom from all sins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Indrakṛtya stutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma’s form is eulogized.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Bharadwāja-kṛtāstutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma is the witness of all. The Supreme Consciousness reflected in all living beings.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) ŚrīMahādeva-kṛtāstutiḥ</td>
<td>Śrī Rāma is the luster among all lustrous and consciousness among all living beings.</td>
<td>It brings the highest state as well as Śrī Rāma’s grace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Śrī Rāma Gītā</td>
<td>It is the compendium of the Vedas (शृविलिसारस्वतः).</td>
<td>It removes all sins and brings bliss. The reciter attains Śrī Rāma’s form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

This chapter deals with the authorship, style and the place of the AdhR in the Sanskrit literature.
Chapter 02

The external as well as the internal evidences, its puranic style, structure and subject matter have unanimously proved that great sage VedaVyāsa is the author of the AdhR and none else.

The AdhR being a portion of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam, its date is one and the same of that of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam.

The philosophy presented throughout the entire Rāma saga is none but Kevaladvaitavāda philosophy. Hence any claim for its authorship in favour of Rāmānandi cult is not tenable and ultimately that argument seems futile. Even the authorship cannot be ascribed to Ādi Śaṅkara or any of his followers, as the philosophy found in the AdhR is philosophy in making which is not analyzed systematically. It is the practical philosophy similar to Śrīmad-bhagavadgītā which based upon upanisadic philosophy. The AdhR has its impact on later Sanskrit Rāmāyanas as well as other Rāmāyanas composed in different vernacular languages of India.

In this way it is undoubtedly one of the most popular Rāma Saga ever read with due respect by the readers worldwide.

*** *** ***