

SOME REFLECTIONS AND NOTES ON SOUTH INDIAN MYSTICISM

I—EROS IN MYSTIC APPROACH—ĒŪŪĪ

It is well-known to students of Philosophy that Plato held true love to exist between souls and the ordinary ways of love are more clearly of the lower nature that is between the sexes and might properly be described as lust. But the fact remains that we are seized with the sexes and the elements of sex has to be sublimated in the process of love.

The glory of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava theology of the Ālvārs consists in the beautiful understanding of the ways of transformation of the Eros through dedicated devotion (*anbu* or *prīti*). Sublimatory process however, required the understanding of the double poise of the Infinite Being, as an inseparable Di-unity of Nārāyaṇa and Śrī, knowledge and Mercy. Accordingly the soul comes to a peculiar relationship in its realization of the Ultimate Self. The path is the path of Mercy or Dayā invoked as the Teacher and the Mediator to the Infinite, a sort of interpretor of the Infinite to the finite and the finite to the Infinite through mother-love. This has become a cardinal principle of the ascent to divine relationship of the intensest kind. The attainment is nothing less than the attainment of the eros (*Śṛṅgāra*) relationship that is unique to the highest consciousness of absorption in the beloved. Its pale counterpart is the bridal experience, its imperfect image so to speak, in the terrestrial world but nonetheless the only adequate one.

The path of Love was chosen by the hardy souls St. Nammālvār (Śaṭhakōpa) Tirumaṅgai, and Āṇḍāl. But in the case of the former two it was the transformation of the attitude of the ordinary male to the female ere the relationship could be established. It should prove much more easy for the female (sex) to realize the Highest through her own route of being (in physical incarnation). But not until the soul itself becomes feminine could this ecstasy be achieved. Whether this is so or not, it is clear that for the female of this incarnation, the path of Āṇḍāl shews how the transformation could be effected and the rich raptures of the Supramental are open to her.

It is not my purpose in this paper to expound the esoterics of the two works of Āṇḍāl but to shew the psychological process through which a double ascent has been made by her though each one of them seems to promise the attainment of the

¹ Submitted to the All-India Oriental Conference: Annamalaiagar, December, 1955 and read at the Religion and Philosophy Section.

Absolute. Why then the two compositions—one which utilizes the Mother (for Kātyāya-nivrata in Mārgaśīrṣa) to attain Śrī Kṛṣṇa for husband, and another a Kāmadēva-vrata to get the reciprocal love of Lord Kṛṣṇa in all ways. The Tiruppāvai and Tirumōḷi of Āṇḍāl (*Nācciyār*) form two episodes of the same process of growing into the divine nature preparing for the triple absorption of mind, breath and life and body. The final attainment of the Saint has been described as an absorption in the Idol of the Lord which was the fulfillment of the Eros.

It is clear from the Tiruppāvai, that sex of the female must find its culmination in the sex-love of the Divine, but indeed the effect of the entire *vrata* is to lead to the state when the Divine consorting with the Celestial Mother is now weaned away to look at the souls ardent in theirs of the Divine Lord. We are significantly reminded by the Freudian interpretation of the Father-love (which smacks of incestuousness-phobia) but surely the paradoxicality of the psychic development is that it is holy when it is in respect of the metaphysical Ultimate Being who is all to all—the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* recognized this subtly when it said that all men were of the father-essence and all women of the mother-essence and always it is the father and mother that are spouses. Whatever may be the explanation based on the principle that the son is indeed the father born of the mother, it is clear that Āṇḍāl boldly ventured on this experiment of psychic-potentiality and revealed what the tantras had in a gross way sought and failed—the potentiality of the God-love transforming the direction of the ascent, through the Mother's grace. The Divine once perceived by the soul does not give up its love but love urges it on to a final fulfillment.

The *Nācciyār* or Āṇḍāl now dreams and yearns sleeplessly for the culmination, the spiritual marriage with the Lord Himself who has become a lover. The dreams are wonderful portrayals of the sole absorption in the marvellous exploits of the Lord in all His incarnations. Love itself is the master of this drama, a selfless love which is rich and grand, fragrant with the perfume of renunciation and resignation. Kāma is the inner spirit and breath of all beings, by desire does every thing love and move and has its being. The Vedic Hymn to Kāma is almost identical with the status given to the supreme Puruṣa. Indeed the supreme is the Love of love (Manmatha-manmatha—Kāmasya Kāmaḥ). Śrī Āṇḍāl seeks this father of all Kāma through Kāma himself. The Bhāgavata hierarchy reveals that Pradyumna is the son of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Pradyumna is Kāma himself. The saint seeks the Father through the son. The indwelling principle in every one is the Kāma or love which is identical with our very *antaryāmī*. The mystical understanding of this love within us seeking the Eternal transcendent Love which is Universal and supra-cosmic makes it possible for the Divine Love to incarnate and possess us fully and in all our parts.

Thus St. Āṇḍāl practiced the two fundamental vratas of Mother and Son typifying the essential nature of one-self as part of the Mother integral to the Mother, and the essential nature of oneself as love (son) of the Eternal Love and integral to him

In mystic experience these two are co-ordinated and integrally experienced are very unique. St. Āṇḍāl therefore, stands as the most marvellous exponent of the bridal path of Mystic Attainment.

II—AYONIJA

The concept of ayonija or not born or unborn or born of no womb has been one of the most common among mystical subjects. The true meaning is certainly beyond the usual conception of not being born of a womb. *Aja* and *ayonija* have to be distinguished. ‘*Ajo’ pi san*’, being unborn, I am yet born says Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is usually interpreted as meaning that God is not born forced by the results, good or bad, of his previous karma. His birth is free birth out of His free will, of course, guided by His compassion and love to his devotees and adherence to dharma or supreme Law which He himself has promulgated. Birth from womb therefore, would refer to the conception of being born through karma. *Ayonija* would therefore, mean not materializing oneself as is said to be in certain theosophical literature but rather that their conception is through free will and grace of God for doing His work in this world. The dwelling in the womb (*garbhavāsa*) or even the concept of ‘immaculate conception’ need not be thought of except by those who will hold the literal truth in a physical sense of the conception.

The first three Āḷvārs are said to hve been born of flowers growing in tanks. The fourth was also said to have been rather mysteriously born, though Bhṛḡu is said to have been his parent. Āṇḍāl is claimed to have been born under the basil (*tulasī*) plant. So Sīta is said to have been earlier born of the plough. We also know that the Pāṇḍavās were said to have been born of the gods, Dharma, Vāyu, Indra and Aswinis, and Karṇa of Sūrya. The truth behind this concept has to be gleaned through the birth of Śrī Kṛṣṇa himself who said that he of his own wish and the prayer of Vasudeva and Devaki in their previous lives was born of them three times as Pṛṣṇigarbha, Vāmana and lastly as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The birth of Śrī Rāma is also a case in point showing how divine birth happens—*janma karma ca me divyam*—and it is the real meaning of *ayonija*—not born of the womb of karma but the womb of dharma, yoga, tapasya, satya of women whose life was divine and divinised for the birth of God. Great Mahātmās are always born of parents whose life bore the stamp of dedication through lives. Āṇḍāl therefore, is not a myth nor her birth should be said to be miraculous. Viṣṇu-Citta could have no other glory than to be the father of a divine child. He was the soul of purity and dedication and love. The reference to the kind of flower as in the case of Gods is to show what divine quality they exhibited in their lives. A more natural explanation when it is available should be adopted.

Āṇḍāl was a divine child, a self-gift of Śrī or the Higher Mother who has the three forms of Śrī, Bhū and Nīlā, and a trinity of Mother form which helped to rouse maidenhood to levels of divinity.

III—ARS INTUITIVA OR INTUITIVE LOVE²

Āṇḍāl, it is said, was a genius; and her first, and in one sense the work that made her immortal mystic of the path of śrīṅgāra, Tiruppāvai reveals the subtle intuitions of her consciousness, both transcendental and poetic. As such one eminent critic almost suggested that such perfection cannot be referred to her but to her poetico-mystic father Viṣṇu-Citta. It is well-known that her work has been interpreted and expounded with a wealth of learning and scholarship and delicacy that makes it a work of true Vedic and Vedāntic wisdom, Gitāic versatility and Bhāgavata-beauty. Hearing such discourses one almost could agree with the eminent critic. But intellectual thought though it can admire and adumbrate cannot reach up to transcendence of itself. Intuitive Vision and approach is of a different order of experience which, whilst it can exalt and suggest and uplift man's consciousness including his sensations and perceptions, and reasonings and imaginations, cannot be truly understood. Her love was not of the sensate amatory order, nor is it an intellectual love of God as found among philosophers but only of the intuitive order of being, which found in Him being and consciousness and bliss, apart from whom she felt as non-existent, unconsciousness and inconscient and miserable. Her intuition was not contemplative resignation but dynamic seeking for mergence in the Body of God. Intuitive Love then is integral in a sense; it is love with a totality of self-surrender to the Universal Being who is the life of the universe, and with whom one is eternally united, in-separable and basic to all existence, of the sensate, waking, dreaming and deep sleep. Understood in this sense, and also in the sense that one does not become a jñāni in one life alone (*bahūnām janmanām antē jñānavān mām prapadyatē*), that one is born intuitively loving the Divine One Person, is not inconceivable. In this sense are mystics made and born, and poets too and others. In this case it is a divine afflatus descending into the creation, freely to demonstrate the glory of love and the truths of Real Being.

Bhaktyātvanyayā śaktuma jñātum draṣṭum ca tattvena praveṣṭum ca..... said the Lord. The only way to know, to have Vision, and to enter into God is through devotion. Bhakti only is capable of making God reveal Himself to the soul. Devotion is of course, to be shewn through observances, such as those prescribed by the śāstras; in the case of those who are not qualified in any sense from following the direction of the śāstra, the śāstras themselves have prescribed the methods, to be adopted by women, girls, outcastes and so on. Thus it cannot be said that the śāstra has not prescribed to each his particular method of devotion fitting his station and condition. Even devotion to be pleasing must be *vidhi-pūrvakam* and not *avidhi-pūrvakam* (according to rule and not otherwise). The *Svadharmā* or one's own

². Substance of the Inagural Lecture on Āṇḍāl, Tiruppāvai festival, T.T. Devashtanam Tirupati, on Dec. 17, 1958.

dharma in this regard also must be remembered as better than the dharma of others. Āṇḍāl following her *svadharmā* as woman or girl awaiting to be married to proper person, elects to seek God as husband, and indeed asks her comrades to do the same. Thus, individual effort or Tapasya or Vrata is necessary for shewing devotion. God's grace is always ready (*siddhopāya*) but one should revere it, receive it, with devotion, and earnest necessity for living should prompt one to get up in the morning at Brāhmī-muhūrta and having bathed go to the temple of God to receive the prasāda or Grace of acceptance, Vision and knowledge and entry into the temple. One of the very important differences between the necessity for individual effort and spontaneous grace is solved by Āṇḍāl who shews that if one is physically fit one should express one's devotion in all one's parts (*trikaraṇa*). The Vrata concept itself is ancient and has the sanction of the Vedic Yajñā and Bhāgavata-vrata and kalpa. The soul should seek God, aspire after the highest state of union with Him. Undoubtedly, this love for God may grow or arise from the Divine selection (*vṛṇute in Yameva eṣa vṛṇute tena labhyaḥ* of the *Gītā* and the *Kāthopanīṣad*). This is *kāma-yajñā* dis-interested love of God for the sake of God who is not a viṣaya of the senses. Real nirviṣaya-bhakti or karma does not seek a material object that satisfies the senses (viṣaya). The love of God is self-giving utter and complete for the sake of realizing God. Bridal union usually develops as a consequence of integral aspiration, seeking a melting of oneself in the Divine Personality. This truth is brought out by Śrī Kṛṣṇa's special statement: *tattvena praveṣtum*, entering by one's essence into God. Some enter through their sense or perception, some through knowledge or jñāna, but rarely does one enter into God through or by his essence or spirit, substantially. The other two are by means of *dharma-bhūta-jñāna* or consciousness as attribute but the last is by means of one's substance.

That this is a reading that is to be really accepted is testified to by the very story of Āṇḍāl who was absorbed into the Iconic personality of God in the temple. She found herself entering into the Infinite Godhead even as earlier Pān Āṭvār entered into the Iconic personality of Śrī Raṅganātha. The Infinite Godhead took them into the body of Himself (tanu). It is said in the story of Mārkaṇḍeya (*Bhāgavata* XII) that the Child on the banyan leaf opened its mouth so that he could enter into Him and see the worlds within. This opening of the body of God to the devotee for the entry of the devoted soul and his coming out of it is there declared to be the Viṣṇu-māya. Here then the Door of the Infinite is open and one thence is born of the Immortal Being. A divine birth is the beginning of a Divine Life in God for God and by God. One moves in Brahman freely, living and moving and being in Him really in one's own fullness.

IV-PRAPATTI AND BHAKTI OR THE SO-CALLED

Mārjāla-Kiśora-Nyāya and Markaṭa-Nyāya³

³ Submitted to the All-India Oriental Conference: Delhi, 1957, December

In Śrī Vaiṣṇavism alone the distinction between prapatti and bhakti is characteristically exploited. There has been some kind of loose thinking about the former being the mārjāla-kiśora-nyāya and the latter as markāṭa kiśora-nyāya. Indeed the two are accepted by both the schools of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism and emphasized almost equally as the means to the highest realisation. The whole question then bristles with reference to the problem of realisation and liberation. The former shews utter helplessness and fear of impediments, obstructions including the wily but powerful māya and all beings and element and so on. The latter is not so much fear-conscious as love-conscious. This differentium is usually forgotten. If liberation means the freedom from fear of saṁsāra, then the prapatti is quite adequate and fear to the One Supreme Being who can save him from saṁsāra and all fear—*abhayaṁ sarvabhūtebhyo*. But realisation means not merely liberation from saṁsāra but also attainment of Brāhmaṇ or Godhead, experience and service and one's own self-realisation as God-dependent Being, then prapatti leads up to the same through engendering bhakti for the saviour-God which leads to the highest experience of Him. It is true that in this case prapatti is both capable of being the means to God as also directly to liberation from saṁsāra. Thus, it is an independent method for attaining liberation through God's grace even like Karma, Jñāna and Bhakti which entail certain fundamental performance of works, mentation and worships in prescribed manner in a selfless manner and for God realisation together with liberation. Prapatti can indeed also lead to God-realisation directly even without passing over to the bhakti-state of prīti or love because in a sense prapatti or declaration of utter dependence on God alone through surrender is an assertion of the metaphysical or real truth of the nature of the soul—which is utter dependence on God alone, and on none other—*parama śeṣataika svarūpa*, or *parama-ēkānta-bhāva*.

There is hardly any possibility of considering that prapatti and bhakti are to be equated with the theory of self-effort and God's-grace as if they are separable in the Śrī Vaiṣṇava theology. The one puruṣa-kāra or doer or bringer about of the result is the Supreme Being himself or Mother who is the Supreme Being or so intimately in union with Him. The guru partakes of the nature of the Mother and leads the surrenderer to the highest realisation.

2. The conception of the identity of the upāya and upeya, the means and the end of self-realisation which in Śrī Vaiṣṇava theology and Vēdānta includes the attainment of freedom from saṁsāra and all-fear (*sarva-bhaya*) entails the Śrī Vaiṣṇava conception of oneness of the Mother and Brāhmaṇ or Nārāyaṇa and Śrī. There is of course, the peculiar difficulty of the puranic view not so much of the Pāñcrātra view which makes Śrī, a soul albeit eternally free, *nityamukta*, and in a special sense capable of being the Guru or *puruṣakāra*, even as the Īśvara of the Yoga school. The two schools of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism designated northern (*Vaḍagala*) and southern (*tengala*), seem to differ from one another on this issue. The Yogic situation demands that the Mother-Guru must be deemed to be identical with the Supreme Being or Parama-

puruṣa or Brāhmaṇ in order to satisfy this canon of identity of upāya and upeya. The conception of Ācārya— dēvobhāva becomes in a sense the guiding principle of ācārya-niṣṭha. The Yoga becomes the activity of uniting the soul (jīva or the surrenderer) with the Supreme Status of the Paramapuruṣa or Brāhmaṇ by the Supreme Puruṣa himself in the form of the Mother or in the Mother-aspect or Guru-aspect. Thus, the method of prapatti for the sake of self realisation or self-protection clearly envisages this acceptance of the Guru as Mother also in the spiritual sense of granting divine birth or knowledge-birth or bliss-birth to the soul. The supreme meaning of the Gītācārya is essentially this identity of means and ends in Brahman as Mother. All souls however eminent are less than the Highest and cannot be the final means to the Final End. This is obviously the reason for the concept of di-unity of the twin-personalities of the Final Being. Whilst this is the ultimate concept, the actual process of release and realisation proceeds with the co-operative activity of the twin-personalities of the Mother-Guru and the Ultimate Being known as the Goal of All Beings—Nārāyaṇa—*narāṇām ayanaṁ*.

3. The third concept of importance for prapatti thus naturally follows that prapatti is the preparation for bhakti, the surrender leads to the enjoyment to the person who saves and redeems and frees and finally becomes the Object of all one's being and the substance of all life. Bhakti includes both the attainment of the Divine Lord through love or enjoyment as well as the realization of one's self as dependent on the Ultimate Being and not merely as a self-conscious intelligence. It would certainly appear to be too much of a claim to state that prapatti for self-protection from saṁsāra or even for realisation of oneself could engender love for the Divine as such and for the sake of the Divine. The utter offering of oneself and all for the Divine that one loves and seeks to love exclusively and solely is different from a surrender that is made out of fear of the world and its cycle of saṁsāra and associations and death. Therefore it follows that only in a limited way does prapatti lead to God-realisation as saviour and not to God as the Ultimate Being of supremest worth.

4. There is another point of importance which has to be considered, namely that self-realisation does not lead to God-realisation and those who seek to save their souls through attainment of self-realisation really never attain the highest. This doctrine of isolationism or *paraccheri* is impossible because of the intimate relation between oneself and the Divine Lord which is one of the prakāra and prakāri and the knowledge of oneself entails the knowledge that one is the prakāra of God. It is perhaps a severe way of stating that one should seek to know God rather than oneself: the knowledge of God entails the knowledge of oneself, but not vice versa. The knowledge of the whole leads to the knowledge of the parts but not the knowledge of part the knowledge of the whole. This is impossible in the organistic view. There can be no isolationism and just as the attainment of freedom from saṁsāra inevitably will engender love for the saviour or redeemer or the Guru so also the knowledge of oneself inevitably will lead to the knowledge of the Divine Lord and

lead to Love of God solely. The great teacher held this organic relationship and it is only the atomistic and mechanical thinking that has led to the schism.

5. There is another interesting point as to the speed of the ways. Prapatti is speediest way of release whereas bhakti is a slow and arduous path. In the Yoga Upaniṣads there is a version about this. There are said to be two parts to the highest Reality, the Śuka-patha or the patha followed by Ṛṣi Śuka or otherwise stated as bird-path or flight to the Divine and the Vāmadeva path or the path followed by Vāmadeva, the path of ant or slow-ascent or gradual path.⁴

Prapatti may be claimed to be the method of flight to the Unknown or the supreme Saviour. The ease with which the goal is achieved and the simplicity of the method show that it is open to all who are qualified by helplessness; whosoever seeks my refuge him (or her or it) shall I save without doubt. Him even if he be a sinner shall I make righteous'. There are of course variations of the urge for release due to intensity or purpose. Some seek immediate release: some could wait for it. But the flight to the Supreme Being happens because of the knowledge that the Supreme Being is the life and being of the soul. The path of gradual ascent by Vāmadeva is indeed also dependent on the grace of God which makes the seeker realize the eternal presence of God in all and his own oneness with that Supreme Puruṣa which makes him exclaim that he is Manu etc..... The prapatti of the āṛta has the characteristics of the Śuka-patha which entails immediate release and immediate realisation of the Supreme Brahman, whereas the prapatti of Vāmadeva has the characteristic of bhakti and kairkarya rejoicing in the Nature of the Divine immanence in all and love of God in all things. So much so the contrast drawn between bhakti and prapatti is merely a distinction without difference. Ultimately, the aim of the seeker is integral realisation of God and love of God and freedom from the world of death and saṁsāra and rebirth. The concept of loving service (kairkarya) of God as the Ultimate aim of being resolves this duality for it is that which is implicit in the notion of absolute dependence of the soul on God and in all states and in all circumstances of the Divine Nature.

6. The Divine or God is clearly defined as five-fold unity, as the Ultimate Transcendent Being beyond all knowings and realisations too, as well as the Creator etc., and the Incarnate Historical personalities, the inner Ruler immortal in all beings or creatures, and the Object of Worship in the temples who is the luminous power that can lead us to the apprehension of the other statuses of the Divine. Indeed to know one is to be guided to the knowledge of all in a truer sense than the usual version that to taste a drop of the ocean is to know the taste of the entire ocean. It is in this sense alone did the Tamil saint speak of the knowing of one is to know all; the integral unity of the five-fold nature entails this deduction. Prapatti is said to be direct and requires to be made by each soul in its moment of distress and dire need. To

⁴. Varaha Up. IV.

which Godhead has it to make this offering or surrender? The Śrī Vaiṣṇava thinkers following the ĀḶvārs made this counsel: prapatti should be made to the Arcā or Icon in the temple or to the Godhead directly known as Vibhava or Incarnation as in the case of Vibhīṣaṇa, Kākāśura, Arjuna etc. The conception of prapatti however, has undergone certain changes in the history of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism. Indeed the prapatti is performed as rite or ritual in the set terms of Śrī Rāmāṇuja's *Gadya-traya* specially the *Śaraṇāgati-gadya* either at the time of performing the samāśrayaṇa or *pañca-saṃskāra* or as a special rite when the soul is needing the surrender—*bharanyāsa*, getting conscious of its futility and inability to attain realisation by its own efforts. There can be hardly any doubt about the need to become individually conscious of the need to attain self-realisation or and freedom from saṃsāra and death and rebirth. The technique of *bharanyāsa* if it is given over to the Guru or the ancient Teacher or performed in such a way that the individual whose *bhara* has been offered is unconscious of this act itself as in the case of a consecrated or dedicated cow or calf or gift of animal for the service of the Divine, would be precisely the extension of the mārjāra-kiśora-nyāya (the Kitten's way). But such a technique however, acceptable to be self-abasing creature does not entail the fullest attainment of the self-realisation or God-realisation. What is true of the unconscious creature or helpless soul cannot be said to be open to the soul already aware of its spiritual nature and able to choose the right way and means and goal. Bhakti, on the other hand, demands the conscious acceptance of God and love and seeks only the freedom from saṃsāra and ignorance and enjoyment of God alone through love, for love, and as love. Thus Prapatti is self-surrender either conscious or unconscious but bhakti is always a self-conscious act, therefore the distinction between self-surrender and self-offering. They are however, capable of being integral steps in a single process of divine attainment resulting in a double realisation as stated in the Upaniṣads: *vināśena mṛtyum tīrtvā sambhūtyā amṛtam aśnute*⁵ *ātmanā vīndate vīryam, vidyayā-vīndate amṛtam*⁶.

7. There is however a very important difference between prapatti and bhakti in addition to what we have stated. Prapatti or self-surrender has no niyama or condition in respect of place or time or fitness or fruit or methods of yama or niyama: provided the five conditions of *akiñcanatā*, *anukūlyatā*, *pratikūlyavarjanam*, *gopṭṛtvavaraṇam* (*bhagavaccaraṇ-varaṇam*), *mahāviśvāsa*, *kārpanya*, *ātmanikṣepa* happen. Even here it may be pointed out that five conditions are so interrelated that if one of them is present the others naturally follow by the grace of God. The central aspect is *akiñcanatā*, which must relate itself with *varaṇam* of God's feet for refuge or in some divine manner get related to the Grace of God who chooses to save the help-less, willy nilly. The aim of sādhana on the prapatti path is to arrive at this helpless or nothingness state of being so as to ensure the flow of grace of God to it. The aim of the bhakti sadhana is to love God and feeling the help-lessness of attaning him love

⁵ Īśa

⁶ Kena

more and more for the sake of God alone till oneself is forgotten utterly in such a love.

8. It is the most important part of the Northern school to hold that the two must be integrated to arrive at the Highest state of Realisation of God and freedom, and each individual though he might have been chosen by the Divine out of sheer pity (*karuṇā* or *dayā*) for being saved should again perform the deep dedication of surrender and offering to Him alone. Though surrender is said to be such that it must be done once only and that this 'once' ness can refer to that performed by one's teacher or *ācārya* sometime also, yet it is claimed rightly in *sādhanā* that to remind oneself and perform it for other aims than that which prevailed at the first time, since the conception of release or realisation undergoes changes as one advances in the spiritual life of God and in God. The charge of lack of faith is never so serious as the charge of not doing what ought to be done by each individual soul in its conscious moments of self-realisation as the utter dependent of God who had developed the illusory sense of independence of oneself. This is serious enough from the point of view of *sādhanā*, for faith of the real kind is that which grows as an organic force of dependence of God rather than an external imposition or habit.

9. The conclusion follows from all the above that:

- (1) The integral yoga has two parts: Prapatti and Bhakti.
- (2) Prapatti is the act of seeking refuge of God, but it also includes when refuge cannot be consciously made or one is incapable of doing it, the act of God's grace which protects him, this latter being a spontaneous act (*iāyamāna kaṭākṣam*).
- (3) Prapatti accordingly is unconditional surrender to God or acceptance by God of the incapable soul, and depends on no other condition of knowledge or birth or station or place or occasion or fruit.
- (4) Bhakti is the self-offering of the soul to God for the sake of freedom or for the sake of God-Love or both, and is a development of the real knowledge culminating in supreme devotion and love.
- (5) The source for both these can be found in the Pāncarātra Āgama, the Gīta and the Rāmāyaṇa. It depends on the type of individual whether he seeks the God-love or just freedom from fear of all kinds. But once being freed from one kind of fear by God's grace it is but natural for him to turn to God for securing freedom from all kinds of fear for which he could make his surrender more and more complete. But the main feature of prapatti is more or less selfish searching for security from fears of all kind whereas

bhakti is the unselfish love of God for the sake of God and fused with true intelligence of jñāna; it is self-offering integrally.

- (6) The conflict between the mārjāra-kiśora and markata-kiśora-nyāyas is not found in the earliest works of the sampradāya writers, even till the time of Manavāla Mahāmuni. The reference to it by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan in the introduction to the Gīta is therefore not sanctioned in the earliest schismatic writers of the Śrī Vaiṣṇavism. There is no sanction for it in the works of Śrī Rāmāṇuja or the ĀḶvārs or the ācāryas up-till the 15th century. Popular contrasts somehow have come and have led many writers to contrast the two schools of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism on the basis. Śrī A.Gōvindācārya of Mysore in his *Arthapañcaka* edition of Pillai Lōkācārya⁷ mentions this but it is not found in the works.⁸

⁷ J.R.A.S., July 1910.

⁸ References are given no J.R.A.S. 1908p. 338 and vade-mecum, A.Govindacharya, p.45.