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 (Akhicchianyatva).

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 (Sarve’śvara), according to the
text: ‘Relieve me or not of distress, I have no other resort.’

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 Vāli and Rāvaṇa.
(b) Sons cannot be so, from examples of Rudra and Kaṁsa.
(c) Mother cannot be so, from the example of Kaikāyī.
(d) Father cannot be, from the example of Hiranya.
(e) Husbands cannot be, from the examples of the Dharma puta-brothers and Nala.
(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 youth; 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 bodes with demands as to where they might have hidden their property, in the manner of
the verse:

“It thou art becoming forgetful, lot us know where thou hast hidden thy wealth” 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 “Kajai-śy usbudam kajai/lil-oshiadhy kajai kav maśilén” (St. Nammāzhvār’s Tirumōṭi, V. 8. 8.).
2 This is the story between the fighting brothers, Vāli and Sugriva (Rāma).a
3 This again is the story of comity between the brothers Rāvaṇa and Vībhīśaṇa (Rāma).b
4 This is the story of Rudra, the son, wrenching the head of his father Brahmā.
5 This is the story with reference to Kaṁsa usurping the throne of his father, Ugrasena.
6 This is with reference to Rāma’s betaking to the woods through his stepmother Kaikāyī (Rāma).
7 This is the reference to Prahlāda persecuted by his father Hiraṇya-Kaśipu (Pṛthu-Purāṇ).c
8 This is referring to the Five Sons of Pāṇḍu unable to help their wife Draupadi in her hour of disgrace
(Mahā-Bhārata).
9 This is again the story of Nala neglecting his wife Damayantī—in the wilds (Mahā-Bhārata).
10 For example, mothers not sucking their infants, and otherwise entrusting their holy charges to the care of
outsiders who cannot love the children.
11 “Sōrvinī porul-vaittad-undagil sōltu soll ‘ oru ńtum irunda,” (Periy-Āshvār Tirumoshti 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 Hiraṇya and Rāvaṇa, and compelled to do for them all sorts of menial services.

(g) But what about (the demi-gods such as) Indra, Brahma 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 Mahā-bali¹⁶. Such then is Indra, weeping and crawling in the dust!

Brahma (the four-faced demiurge—the Lord of the Brahmapīla) is no better (than Indra); for he is assailed by such evil genii as Madhu and Kaitabha, and is deprived of his Veda 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 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 me!’. Bāpā-sūra 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 Bāpā’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.’ Agastya, a sinner, cut the throat of Brahmā, 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, mangled by kith and kin, chased by illness, breeds enmity and war—and men for its sake poison themselves and die.

Hence, the All-God (Nārāyaṇa) 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, breast the falling arrows, saves from death and gives life to the dead. All this He does by virtue of His being Nārāyaṇa (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 Restorlessness, 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 Sāstras, leading to the Highest Goal he has in view; and by virtue of such resignation alone, and by virtue of his solo leaning on the Lord, considering

---

¹² The Bha (lower), Dhvar (middle) and Svar (upper) worlds.
¹³ This is with reference to the curse of Durvāsas (Vishnu-Purāṇa).
¹⁴ Refers to Vṛtra killed by Indra (Srimad-Bhāgavata).
¹⁵ See Srimad-Bhāgavata.
¹⁶ See Srimad-Bhāgavata.
¹⁷ Read Srinivāsa’s legend in the Śaiva books.
¹⁸ See Vishnu-Purāṇa and Mālāya, p. 193, v. 87 to 100 [Ānandārama Series].
¹⁹ See Vishnu-Purāṇa, Mahā-Bhārata and Srimad-Bhāgavata for the story of Kṛṣṇa and other Avataras.
his nature (or soul-nature) made perfect, i.e., realised. These several ways are *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*. 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 (*upāya*) 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”—comes as the most willing Servitor of his refugee, escorts him along the ‘Path of Light or Glory’ known as *archir-āli,* and in the Spiritual Regions known as *parama-pada,* unites him with the blessed bands of *nityas* and *muktas,* 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.E.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 *Vedas, Smritis, Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas,* and with the Holy twelve-syllable Mantra of the Bhāgavat-Śastra or the *Pāñchā-rātra.* As illustrations of this position, one may read:

1. *Īśāvāsya-panishad*—the term *vāsyā*.
2. The *Taittiriya-panishad*—Vīṣṇu-gāyatri, *vis.,* “Nārāyaṇāya vidmahē, Vāsudēvīya, dhīmaḥ, tan nō Vīṣṇuḥ prachodayat.”
3. (The) Many minor *Upaṇiṣads* where the term occurs, and the *Pāñchā-rātras.*
4. (The) Explanation of the term given in the *Vīṣṇu-Purāṇa* : (a) confirming its universal sense in V. 17, 15: ‘Vāsudēvas ca sātvatāḥ’ (here *sātvata* meaning *Pāñchā-rātra*), and confirming the *Pāñchā-rātra* also indirectly; and (b) entering into an explanation of its meaning in VI. 5, 79:—

   “Sarvāpi tatra bhūtāni
   vasanī paramā-'tmāni
   bhūtāvah cha sa sarvā-'tmā
   Vāsudēvas tatas smṛitaḥ ” |[2]

and

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

   “Vāsudēvas sārvam iti
   Sa mahātmā su-durlabhah.” (vii—19).

---

[1] Also read:—“Vishnuṃ kṛtāṃ VASUDEVAM viṣṇau viṇo viṣvratvam āpyayāt tata caerit.”
[3] These are two verses called the *Pāñcha-charams,* one beginning with: “sthito manasi su-vasthet bektvā” and “tatas tava meyamāno am tam.”
   Ohānandagīyām jagat sārvam, bhūtāvā sāya tvā ‘mahābhūhī’
   Sarva-bhūtā-viśvāsāt cha Vāsudēvas tatas smṛitaḥ”
These are the documents from which it may be inferred that Bhágavatism or Vásudéivism was not founded by Krishṇa Vásudéva, as Dr. G. A. Grierson says on page 3 of his ‘Náráyaṇiya and the Bhágavatas’ (Indian Antiquary, 1908)\(^8\); but it may be safely said that Krishṇa Vásudéva was most decidedly a propagator or promulgator\(^4\) of that religion.

In this same paper (loc.cit.) Dr. Grierson further says:—“Krishṇa Vásudéva . . . . . . must be identified with the Krishṇa Dévakíputra, mentioned as a disciple of Ghóra Ángiras in Chhándögya-paniṣad III. 17, 6.” Why should the two be identified? Is it because the disciple of Ghóra Ángiras happens to bear the matronymic Dévakí-patra, i.e., the son of Dévakí, which Śrī Krishṇa 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 Ghóra Ángiras is never mentioned as the Tutor of Krishṇa Dévakí-putra (=Krishṇa Vásudéva, by the bye) in any of the several treatises dealing with Śrī Krishṇa, for instance, Viśnu-Púrāṇa, Śrī-Bhágavata, Mahábhárata or Harivímāna. Whereas, in all these treatises, Śándipani is the real Tutor of Krishṇa Vásudéva, who is also of course Krishṇa Dévakí-putra. But the other Krishṇa Dévakí-putra\(^5\), who is the pupil of Ghóra Ángiras is quite a different personage altogether, is further made clear from Śrī Madhva’s (=Pátra-Prajña) Bhágṣya on the Chhándögya passage under discussion. This is what he writes there:—

“Sákhṣút sa Bhágaván Viṣṇuḥ ||

tan-námakñ munir hy abhút ||

Krishṇas tu Vásudéva 'khyañ ||

Paramá-tmaïya kevalam ||

tan-námá Dévakí-ptras ||

tv anyó 'py abhavat añjasä ||

Kapiló Vásudéva 'khyañ ||

Sákhṣud Náráyaṇañ prabhññ ||

tan-námá Kapiló 'nyas tu ||

Sishya nümññ saññah 'bhavat ||

Sa shoñjasā-satam 'jīv ||

Mahidásó paras tv riñhib ||

Ghóra-sishyas tathu Krishṇañ ||

Kapilás cha ku-sāstra-kriñ ||

traya ētu vama prápya ||

Brahmaññañ paramēṣṭhinañ ||

Krīta-kriñyañ pra-mumudññ ||

tan-námānæ cha tē 'bhavan' || (Kālakśya-.)

That the two Vásudévas are different is also evident from the verse:—“Vásudéva sutanya pi'ñhúpanom Vásudeva vatt” [Pañcharātra, Pádna, III. 29, 28].

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

---


\(^4\) “Vásudev āpattayatré dhriṣṭakñ-čharyañmn niyachhati’ti Vásudévaḥ” (Sahasra-náma-bhágys, Name 714).