

THE PRAPANNA-PARITRANA, OR THE REFUGE OF THE REFUGEE, OF
PILLAI LOKACHARYA.

Translated from the Tamil original.

BY ALKONDAVILLI GOVINDACHARYA SVAMIN, C.E., M.R.A.S.

THE aspirant for release (moksha), who solely leans upon the All-Lord, must possess the two-fold qualifications of:—

1. Resortlessness (Ananya-gatitva).
2. Waylessness (Ākiñchanyatva).

1. **Resortlessness** means that attitude of the refugee (or aspirant) which makes him to rely as his Protector on no other than the Universal Lord Himself (Sarvêśvara), according to the text: 'Relieve me or not of distress, I have no other resort¹.'

It may be argued however, why may not brothers, sons, mother, father, Brahmā, Rudra and others be protectors? This argument is met by the answer that (in the Sacred History) it is discovered that:—

- (a) Brothers cannot be protectors, taking the examples of Vāli² and Rāvaṇa³.
- (b) Sons cannot be so, from examples of Rudra⁴ and Kāmsa⁵.
- (c) Mother cannot be so, from the example of Kaikēyī⁶.
- (d) Father cannot be, from the example of Hiranya⁷.
- (e) Husbands cannot be, from the examples of the Dharma-putra-brothers⁸ and Nalā⁹.
- (f) Sun, Moon, etc., cannot be.
- (g) Indra, Brahmā and Rudra, cannot be.
- (h) Wealth or Riches, cannot be.

Some of the foregoing incidents are expanded for the instruction of the novices. Thus:—

(c) and (d) Mothers and Fathers often neglect their children, thinking they are inimical to their youth¹⁰; cast them into pits, unobserved, in times of famine; sometimes sell them; part from them in times of distress, and oft oppose and kill them for the sake of wealth and acres.

(b) The sons retaliate upon the parents, and when the latter are on their death-bed, besiege their beds with demands as to where they might have hidden their property, in the manner of the verse:—

"If thou art becoming forgetful, let us know where thou hast hidden thy wealth"¹¹ and thus at the hour of death prevent the dying from remembering God, the Lord—, and thereby reaching the Shore (of their pilgrimage). Thus do they harass and finish their parents.

¹ "Kaḷaiṇḍy tumbam kaḷṇṇiyāḷ-ozhivāy kaḷai kaṇ matitēn" (St. Nammāzhvār's *Tiruvāy-mozhi*. V. 8. 8.).

² This is the story between the fighting brothers, Vāli and Sugriva (*Rāmāyana*).

³ This again is the story of enmity between the brothers Rāvaṇa and Vibhishana (*Rāmāyana*).

⁴ This is the story of Rudra, the son, wrenching the head of his father Brahmā.

⁵ This is the story with reference to Kāmsa usurping the throne of his father, Ugrasēna.

⁶ This is with reference to Rāma's betaking to the woods through his stepmother Kaikēyī (*Rāmāyana*).

⁷ This is the reference to Prahlāda persecuted by his father Hiranya-Kaśipu (*Viṣṇu-Purāṇa*).

⁸ This is referring to the Five Sons of Pāṇḍu unable to help their wife Draupadī in her hour of disgrace (*Mahā-Bhārata*).

⁹ This is again the story of Nalā neglecting his wife Damayantī—in the wilds (*Mahā-Bhārata*).

¹⁰ For example, mothers not suckling their infants, and otherwise entrusting their holy charges to the care of outsiders who cannot love the children.

¹¹ "Sērvindl poruḷ-vaittaḍ-undagil sollu soll" enṇu kuttum irundu." (*Periy-Āzhvār Tirumozhi* IV. 5. 8.).

(f) But they may say: "Well and good so far, but may not celestial denizens like the Sun and Moon who are to us like our eyes, be our protectors?" This objection is met by the answer that these beings go round their determined orbits at determined velocities by the fiat of a Supreme Lord above them, and thus have their risings and settings in fixed order. And more, they are sometimes known to be vanquished by such mighty Asuras as Hiranya and Râvaṇa, and compelled to do for them all sorts of menial services.

(g) But what about (the demi-gods such as) Indra, Brahmâ and Rudra? an objector may ask. The answer is:—It is too true that Indra is the Ruler of the Three Regions¹², and yet it is too well-known how he is in constant fear of losing this high estate. He is often curse-stricken¹³, pays the penalty, by suffering for Brahmicide¹⁴, is bound as a captive by Indrajit¹⁵ and allows his sway to get into the hands of such beings as Mahâ-bali¹⁶. Such then is Indra, weeping and crawling in the dust!

Brahmâ (the four-faced demiurge—the Lord of the Brahmâṇḍa) is no better (than Indra); for he is assailed by such evil genii as Madhu and Kaitabha, and is deprived of his Vêdas which to him are his 'eyes and treasure.' And his head he allows to be ripped by Rudra (his own son).

Nor again is Rudra any the better. For he is to begin with, the Destroyer *par excellence* (how can he then protect?). Water is wished for by the thirsty, but Rudra of the fire-colour offers himself to such thirsty (worshippers of his) as fire! He exacts horrid offerings from his devotees by saying: "Kill for me, roast for me¹⁷." Bânâ'sura was his votary—so much so that Rudra pledged himself to guard him so that even 'the flower he wore on his head should not fade.' But when Kṛṣṇa was hacking Bânâ's (one thousand) arms as if they were so many cactus-stems, the boasted guardian Rudra shut his eyes and slipped away from his ward, uttering: "If life is spared, I can live by selling salt." Again he, a sinner, cut the throat of Brahmâ, the Guide of the worlds, his own father; and wandered about after such acts of treason in his own house, with the skull of his victim (father) fast clinging to his hand, from door to door, in search of a Saviour¹⁸.

(h) Can wealth save a man then? No. For it is subject to be stolen by thieves, bartered away for lust, seized by kings, mulcted by kith and kin, chased by illness, breeds enmity and war—and men for its sake poison themselves and die.

Hence, the All-God (Nârâyana) alone is the True Resort or Protector inasmuch as He stands by us when parents and all have deserted. He is the true Nurse of the soul from the beginning. He incarnates for us and thus stands like a mother in visible presence, speaking to us like her in sweet endearing accents. He takes upon Himself the duties of a Carrier, when brothers and husbands stand aloof. He guides the chariot (of his votary) in the thick of raging battle, breasts the falling arrows, saves from death and gives life to the dead. All this He does by virtue of His being Nârâyana (or He who is *in* and *over* all), the Life of life, Soul of soul, abiding in the core of all things¹⁹. Only He can be the Resort and none else. This is the attitude of the refugee known as **Resortlessness**, for he is destitute of all Resorts save Him—the High Lord.

2. Now what is **Waylessness**? It is the attitude of the refugee (or aspirant) which makes him resign all the several ways, indicated in the Sâstras, leading to the Highest Goal he has in view; and by virtue of such resignation alone, and by virtue of his sole leaning on the Lord, considering

¹² The *Bhû* (lower), *Bhuvar* (middle) and *Svar* (upper) worlds.

¹³ This is with reference to the curse of Durvâsas (*Vishnu-Purâṇa*).

¹⁴ Refers to Vṛtra killed by Indra (*Sṛîmad-Bhâgavata*).

¹⁵ See *Sṛî-Bhâgavata*.

¹⁶ Read Sirutondar's legend in the Śaiva books.

¹⁷ See *Vishnu-Purâṇa* and *Mâṭsya*, p. 183, v. 87 to 100 [*Anandâsrama Series*].

¹⁸ See *Vishnu-Purâṇa*, *Mahâ-Bhârata* and *Sṛî-Bhâgavata* for the story of Kṛṣṇa and other Avatâras.

¹⁹ See *Râmâyana*.

his nature (or soul-nature) made perfect, *i.e.*, realised. These several ways are *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti* ²⁰. In this attitude of perfect resignation he recognizes that it is not he who is the fashioner of his destiny, but He the Lord alone. This is named **Waylessness**, for the refugee is bereft of all other Ways save The Way—the High Lord.

Thus **Resortlessness** and **Waylessness** mean in other words that the Lord Nārāyaṇa alone is the True and Only Goal (*upēya*) and Way (*upāya*). The refugee in such a frame of mind feels that he is disburdened, or rather relieved of all burden. When the time comes for ending the body (with which the soul is mating), and the Goal is near, the Lord Himself deigns to come, as said in the verse: “I lead him ²¹”—comes as the most willing Servitor of his refugee, escorts him along the ‘Path of Light or Glory’ known as *arohir-āli*, ²² and in the Spiritual Regions known as *parama-pāla*, unites him with the blessed bands of *nityas* and *muktas*, ²³ thus ordained in Divine Service for ever and ever.

Note.—**Resortlessness** is the *positive* attitude of the soul, and **Waylessness** is the *negative*. The soul empties itself as it were of itself (*negative*) and fills in the same with God (*positive*). These two joined together produce the required effect, *viz.*, eternal salvation, which is no other, according to the Bhāgavata Religion, than Eternal Disinterested Divine Service.

A NOTE ON THE NAME “VASUDEVA.”

BY ALKONDAVILLI GOVINDACHARYA SVAMIN, C.E., M.R.A.S.

THIS word has two meanings: (i) He who is resident everywhere, and (ii) the Son of Vasudēva. The first meaning is connected with the word wherever it happens in the *Vēdas*, *Smṛtis*, *Itihāsas* ¹ and *Purāṇas*, and with the Holy twelve-syllable Mantra of the *Bhagavat-Śāstra* or the *Pāñcha-rātra*. As illustrations of this position, one may read:—

(1) *Īśā-vāsyā-panishad*—the term *vāsyā* ¹.

(2) The *Taittirīyā-panishad*—Vishṇu-gāyatri, *viz.*, “Nārāyaṇa vidmahē, *Vāsudēvāya*, dhīmahi, tan nō Vishṇuḥ prachōdayāt.”

(3) The many minor *Upanishads* where the term occurs, and the *Pāñcha-rātras*.

(4) The explanation of the term given in the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*: (a) confirming its universal sense in V. 17, 15: ‘*Vāsudēvaś cha sātva-tāiḥ*’ (here *sātva* meaning *Pāñcha-rātra*), and confirming the *Pāñcha-rātra* also indirectly; and (b) entering into an explanation of its meaning in VI. 5, 79:—

“Sarvāṇi tatra bhūtāni
vasanti paramā-tmani |
bhūtēṣhu cha sa sarvā-tmā
Vāsudēvas tatas smṛitaḥ” ||²

and

(5) The *Bhagavad-gītā* itself, where the real son of Vasudēva (second meaning of the word) *viz.*, Śrī Kṛishṇa, declares its universal sense in the verse:—

“*Vāsudēvas* sarvam iti
Sa mahātmā su-durlabhaḥ.” (vii—19).

²⁰ See J. R. A. S. for July, 1910, *Artha-Pañchaka*.

²¹ These are two verses called the *Varūha-charama*, one beginning with: “*sthite manasi su-svasthē śartrē*” and “*tatas tam mriyamāṇam tam*.”

²² See *Chhāndōgya* and other *Upanishads* and *Bh. Gītā*, viii, 24 ff.

²³ See J. R. A. S., July, 1910, *Artha-pañchaka*.

¹ Also read:—“*Vishṇum krātum VASUDEVAM vijñānam vipro vipratvam āpnuyāt tatra darśi*.”

² Cp. *Sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya* (name 334) and *M. Bh. Moksha*. 166:—

Ohhādayāmi jagat sarvam, bhūtā sūrya ivā mśūbbhiḥ |
Sarva-bhūtā-dhivāsāś cha Vāsudēvas tatas smṛitaḥ ||

These are the documents from which it may be inferred that Bhāgavatism or Vāsudēvism was not founded by Kṛishṇa Vāsudēva, as Dr. G. A. Grierson says on page 3 of his 'Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas' (*Indian Antiquary*, 1908)³; but it may be safely said that Kṛishṇa Vāsudēva was most decidedly a propagator or promulgator⁴ of that religion.

In this same paper (*loc. cit.*) Dr. Grierson further says :—“Kṛishṇa Vāsudēva must be identified with the Kṛishṇa Dēvaki-putra, mentioned as a disciple of Ghōra Āṅgiras in *Chhândogyô-paniṣad* III. 17, 6.” Why should the two be identified? Is it because the disciple of Ghōra Āṅgiras happens to bear the matronymic Dēvaki-putra, *i. e.*, the son of Dēvakti, which Śrī Kṛishṇa also bore? But no identification should so hastily be established or conceived, simply from similarity of names. For such similarities are a legion in Indian literature, and much historical confusion is, therefore, likely to occur. Further, there is no vindication for this identification in view of the fact that Ghōra Āṅgiras is never mentioned as the Tutor of Kṛishṇa Dēvaki-putra (=Kṛishṇa Vāsudēva, by the bye) in any of the several treatises dealing with Śrī Kṛishṇa, for instance, *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*, *Śrī-Bhāgavata*, *Mahābhārata* or *Harivaṃśa*. Whereas, in all these treatises, Sāṇḍipani is the real Tutor of Kṛishṇa Vāsudēva, who is also of course Kṛishṇa Dēvaki-putra. But the other Kṛishṇa Dēvaki-putra⁵, who is the pupil of Ghōra Āṅgiras is quite a different personage altogether, is further made clear from Śrī Madhva's (=Pūrṇa-Prajña) *Bhāṣya* on the Chhândogyā passage under discussion. This is what he writes there :—

“Sākshāt sa Bhagavān Vishṇuḥ ।
tan-nāmaikō munir hy abbhūt ॥
Kṛishṇas tu Vāsudēvā 'khyah ।
Paramā-tmaiva kevalam ॥
tan-nāmā Dēvaki-putras ।
tv anyō 'py abhavad aṅjasā ॥
Kapilō Vāsudēvā 'khyah ।
Sākshād Nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuh ॥
tan-nāmā Kapilō 'nyas tu ।
Sishya nāmnā sahā 'bhavat ॥
Sa shoḍaśa-satam jīvī ।
Mahidāsō paras tv rishih ॥
Ghōra-śishyas tathā Kṛishṇah ।
Kapilās cha ku-sāstra-kṛit ॥
traya ētē varam prāpya ।
Brahmaṇaḥ paramēshthinaḥ ॥
Kṛita-kṛityāḥ pra-mumuduh ।
tan-nāmānās cha tē 'bhavan” ॥ (*Kālakṛyō.*)

That the two Vāsudēvas are different is also evident from the verse :—“Vāsudēva sutasya pi'sthāpanom Vāsudeva vat” [*Pāñcharātra*, *Pādma*, III. 29, 28].

Hence, in the light of these remarks one needs be over-cautious before establishing identities between personages from mere similarity of names, particularly in Hindu literature.

³ *Ante*. Vol. xxxvii, p. 253.

⁴ “Vasudev āpatyatvē dvīṣaṅkṣā-dhyātman niyachhati-ti Vāsudēvaḥ” (*Sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya*, Name 714).

⁵ *Dēvakti* also means *Brahma-vidyā*. Read : “Devakyām Brahma-vidyāyām” [*Bṛihad-Brahma-Saṁhitā*, II, 4, 176].