

Self-Surrender of the Afflicted One (*ārta prapatti*) as the Concept of Human Existence in the *Prapannapārijāta* of Vātsya Varadaguru

Halina Marlewicz

“Affliction and craving, delusion and anguish will continue, until one takes refuge with You, the Destroyer of all sins”.¹ This verse from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (ViP) describes the human condition with a choice of vocabulary imbued with strong emotional connotations persuasive to everyone, even if miseries are related to a particular religious tradition which interprets the human condition and provides remedies according to principles which are alien and distant to the reader of the verse. Words like “pain”, “craving”, “delusion”, “anguish” as used in the verse are all concepts with certain determined religious connotations. They can, however, also be read and interpreted as speaking about universal experiences such as insurmountable powerlessness in the face of life-torments; the inability to achieve peace of mind due to ever-unfulfilled desires; angst; the sense of deficiency of life or even of its absurdity; and the mutable value of our choices and our deeds resulting from inadequacy and partiality of our judgment.²

Vātsya Varadaguru (1165–1200 to 1277³), a post-Rāmānuja thinker of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta tradition, refers to the triad of life-torments (*tāpatritaya*) in his work *Prapannapārijāta* (PraP) 4,1, along with two other motives which should impel man to seek a spiritual teacher who would guide him into the self-surrender to God (*prapatti*). The refuge-seeker

¹ *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 1.9.73: *tāvad ārtis tathā vāñcā tāvan mohaḥ tathāsukham | yāvan na yāti śaraṇaṃ tvām aśeṣāghanāśanam | |*

Precise dating of the Purāṇas is rather an impossibility. In the early Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta literature, the name of ViP together with the name of its commentary written by Viṣṇucitta is mentioned in the *Ātmasiddhi* of Yāmuna (966/7–1038).

² On the other hand, there are also listed many factors considered harmful to the one who wants to become liberated, which are focused on the inability to fulfil the requirements of the ritual aspects of religious life, cf. *infra* p. 16 (PraP 2,12cd–14ab).

³ Cf. Stark 1990: 23ff., and Oberhammer 2004: 65, footnote 184.

should also be grieved by the [incessant] cycle of rebirths, and be indifferent (*virakta*) to the benefits (*phala*) of life in this and in the other world.⁴ In another passage from the PraP (1, 22–23), being a quotation from the *Viṣvaksena Saṃhitā*, one gets the impression of a personal understanding of miseries of human beings: detrimental effects of time (*kāladoṣa*), unsteadiness of the mind (*manaścāñcalya*), attachment of the senses to their objects (*viṣayendriyaśaṃyoga*), indulgence in forbidden acts (*niṣidhakaraṇa*), etc. What is not and cannot indeed be universally acknowledged is the remedy given for life-afflictions. Therefore, one can meet with different mystagogies in different religious and philosophical traditions aiming at such transformation of one's vision of the world and the metamorphosis of one's self, which will change the perspective on the human condition within the world (as described for example in the verse from the ViP quoted at the beginning).

The focus of the present text will be Varadaguru's concept of self-surrender of the afflicted one (*ārta prapatti*), in which the sense of misery derived from being entangled in the bonds of *saṃsāra* is strongly underlined. Such a perspective on life should lead the devotee to a firm resolution to attain ultimate and final release from the torments of the *saṃsāric* cycle of rebirths. Factors listed in PraP 4, 1 which are to be decisive motives for the *ārta prapatti*, show that in its propaedeutic there is a need to understand one's own life-circumstances. The devotee should be grieved at the hopelessness of his condition (cf. *samsārodviṅghanamasā* (Prap 4,1) and *ātmano durdaśāpattiṃ vimrśya* (Prap 1, 26)), which should also make him indifferent to enjoyments of the present and future life (cf. PraP 3, 1 – *virakteneha cāmutra phale*). He should resolve to unconditionally entrust his fate to God in all awareness of the meaning of this act as well as to offer himself to Him; i.e., he should no longer understand himself to be

⁴ Cf. PraP 4,1: *saṃsārodviṅghanamasā tāpatritayabhīruṇā | virakteneha cāmutra phale ganyo gurur mahān ||*

The triad is a widely known, traditional Sāṃkhya classification, in the SāK 1,1, it is called the triad of miseries (*duḥkhatraya*). In the ViP 6, 5, 1–10 the triad is called *tāpatraya*. The very Sanskrit names of the three life-torments in the ViP and in the SāK 1,1, are the same (though the ViP defines them slightly differently than the SāK): *ādhyātmika* – torments of the self, divided further into mental (psychological) or physical (ViP 6, 5, 2–5); *ādhidaiṅvika* – torments pertaining to the 'divine' such as cold, heat, wind, rain, water etc. (ViP 6,5,8); and *ādhibhautika* – sufferings caused by living beings, either men or beasts (ViP 6,5,7). Also, Venkatanātha while commenting on ŚarG refers to the ViP classification (Cf. ŚarGBh 170, 15–19).

the master (*svāmin*) of his life, but to place his trust in God and know that He will release him by His grace (*madekopāyasāñvittih māñi prapanno vimucyate*). This is why Vātsya Varadaguru says that “the door to self-surrender is the graciousness of the One who is sought for refuge”⁵, just before introducing a quotation from the *Lakṣmī Tantra* (LaT): “[...] the man who is to be protected [by God], renounces being the master (*svāmin*, lit. “Lord”) over the fruit [of actions], which [act] finalizes in granting [oneself] to Keśava [=Viṣṇu and] thus is ‘offering oneself [to Him]’”.⁶ In the verse which follows, Varadaguru interprets the sense of the above LaT quote: “it is clear that depending on the Master (*svāmin*) means giving up one’s own effort with regard to what is to be undertaken (*upāya*) and with regard to the result [of actions].”⁷ Such an attitude is then taken to be the exact sense of an act of offering oneself (*ātmanikṣepa*) to God. In the eighth chapter of the PraP this offering, entrusting, or sacrificing oneself to God is given the name of the middle path⁸ and further explained as the act of taking refuge in God in the full trust that He will protect the devotee. For the purpose of such self-sacrifice one needs to relinquish the mental attachment to the results of religious deeds which are to be performed (*upāya*), and avoid all deeds which are faults (*apāya*).⁹ PraP 1, 26 gives motives for *prapatti* which were expounded by the Lord (Bhagavat) to Viṣvaksena, a teacher from the *Viṣvaksenasamhitā* (ViS)¹⁰:

⁵ PraP 2, 21: *prapattes tu prapattavyaprasādadvārātā*.

⁶ LaT 17, 74 quoted in the PraP 2, 21.

⁷ Cf. PraP 2, 22.

⁸ PraP 8, 4cd–5 gives more information about what this act should consist in: “He who altogether renounces what is to be undertaken (*upāya*) and what is to be avoided (*apāya*) follows the middle course, having determined: «He will protect [me]», he who offered [to God] everything that is his own, will realize Him, the God of gods, the Highest Person as his protector.”

(PraP 8,4cd–5: *upāyāpāyasamnyāsī (tyāgī) madhyamāñi vṛttim āsṛitaḥ | rakṣayiṣyatīti niścītya nikṣiptasvasvagocaraḥ | budhyeta devadevaṃ tañ goptārañ puruṣottamañ ||*).

⁹ Cf. PraP 8, 40cd–41: “The wise who is dear to the Husband of Śrī (=Viṣṇu) [...] should avoid mental hold (*graha*) over what is to be undertaken (*upāya*). But should he perform, in conformity with the given place and time, the particular [act] prescribed (*viśeṣavilīta*), which is appropriate to his social rank (*varṇa*) and stage of life (*āśrama*)” (*upāyatvagrahañ [...] varjayen manasā sudhīḥ | svavarṇāśramayuktañ tu deśakalānurūpataḥ | viśeṣavilītañ yac ca tat kuryāc chrīpateḥ priyañ || 41 ||*).

¹⁰ Cf. Oberhammer 2007: 49f.

Having reflected on the miserable condition (*āpatti*) [that has] befallen oneself (*ātmanah*) and on My [auspicious] qualities, whoever surrendered to Me [having] the knowledge of Me as the sole means, is released [from the *saṃsāra*].¹¹

This statement quite straightforwardly suggests that the *ārta prapatti* is the means towards the ultimate emancipation of the devotee.

In the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta philosophical tradition to which Vātsya Varadaguru belonged, self-surrender (*prapatti*) to God came to be the acknowledged means to spiritual emancipation.¹² Varadaguru classifies *prapatti* under two headings, i.e. the *prapatti* of the “afflicted” (*ārta*) and of the “contented” (*dr̥pta*). The motive of the misery of life seems to be sustained in the considerations about *prapatti* of the afflicted one (*ārta*). The source of the *prapatti* division into the *ārta* and *dr̥pta* is the epic *Rāmāyaṇa*, quoted in the PraP 2, 24cd–25ab: “If even an enemy, be it an afflicted or a contented one, searches refuge with somebody else, he is to be protected by the man with disciplined spirit, [to the extent of] giving up his life [for him].”¹³ In the lines that follow the quote, Varadaguru changes the context and the connotation of the *ārta* and *dr̥pta*. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* the persons in need are shown to be either the enemy whose afflictions deprived him of his self-confidence (*ārta*) or the enemy who still retained his pride (*dr̥pta*). Varadaguru imbues the words *ārta* and *dr̥pta* with religious connotations by saying that “the contented (*dr̥pta*) is the one who grieves [only] when he attains another body, the afflicted (*ārta*) is the one who grieves also when he has just entered the body.”¹⁴ From the epic, socio-cultural setting of the long-established law of giving refuge to everyone who needs it, he shifts to the religious plane and classifies *prapatti* under

¹¹ Cf. PraP 1, 29: *ātmano durdaśāpattiṃ vimṛśya ca guṇān mama |
madekopāyasāṃvittih māṃ prapanno vimucyate | |*, cf. also PraP 2, 6.

¹² PraP 3, 13 (quoting the LaT 17, 100cd–102ab): “This is the refuge of the non-knowers [of gnostic knowledge], this is the refuge of the sages: this is the bank (*pāram*) for those desiring to reach the other shore (i.e. to be delivered from *saṃsāra*), and this is for them who strive for immortality/future happiness.”
(*idaṃ śaraṇam ajñānāṃ idam eva vijānatām |
idaṃ titīṣatām pāram idam ānanyam icchatām | |*).

¹³ Rām VI, 12, 15: *ārto vā yadi vā dr̥ptaḥ pareṣāṃ śaraṇāgataḥ |
ariḥ prāñān parityajya rakṣitavyaḥ kṛtātmanā | |*

¹⁴ It is the person who lives at present and does not wish to transmigrate, i.e. who wants to attain emancipation in this life.

two headings: the *ārta* and the *dr̥pta prapatti*, indicating that it is the means to attain the Lord (*bhagavatprapti*).¹⁵

What may be of some interest is that Rāmānuja (died around 1137), the foremost representative of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, also hints at the triad of torments in his later work *Śaraṇāgatigadyam*¹⁶ (ŚarG)¹⁷. The three factors of human misery in the world appear there in a different context, which changes their connotations as well. The dread of the *samsāric* existence is not present as a motive for turning to God for shelter. Here, the devotee realises his guilt before God, before His whole creation and before the community of co-believers “even with an endless [amount] of offences against me, even with an endless [amount] of offences against what belongs to me, even with an endless [amount] of unimaginable offences [...]”) and then asks God for shelter. In this particular citation, Rāmānuja seems to indicate the beneficial effects of entrusting God, who by His grace will deliver the devotee. The detrimental situation of being thrown into the inevitably afflictive worldly reality does not seem to be of importance. There is also no mention of the need to turn to a spiritual preceptor for receiving the *dvaya*-mantra. The devotee understands and realises as well that his status is that of a “servant” to God¹⁸ (*kainkarya*), which

¹⁵ Cf. PraP 2, 26–27: *yasya dehāntarakṛte śoko dr̥ptas sa ucyate |
yaś ca prārabdhadehe’pi śocaty ārtas sa ucyate || 26 ||
ārtadr̥ptavibhāgena prapattir iyam ucyate |
sādhanam bhagavatprāptau sa eveti sthitiḥ dṛḍhaḥ || 27 ||*

¹⁶ In the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta Rāmānuja is the acknowledged author of the ŚarG, but his authorship has been questioned by scholars (cf. Carman 1981 [1974]: 62ff., Lester 1976: xff.).

¹⁷ Cf. ŚarG 17–19: “[...] even with an endless [amount] of offences against me, even with an endless [amount] of offences against what belongs to me, even with an endless [amount] of unimaginable offences, even with the soul’s (Ātman’s) nature proper confused by the beginningless, adverse [to it] I-principle (*ahaṃkāra*), that is its cause and effect [...]. [Even if] you are such [as described], you, free from the mere smell (i.e. slightest trace) of torments of the self, or [torments] caused by other living beings or brought about by nature, stay happy here in Śrīraṅgam until you leave the body, always merely reciting the *dvaya*-mantra and pondering on its sense. (*duḥkha anantamadapacārayukto’pi, anantamadiyāpacārayukto’pi, anantāsahyāpacārayukto’pi etatkāryakāraṇabhūtānādivi-paritāhārikāravimūḍhātmasvabhāvo’pi* [...] || 17 || *evaṃbhūto’si* || 18 || *ādhyātmi-kādhībhautikādhidaivikaduḥkhaḡandharahitas tvam dvayam arthānusandhānena saha sadaivaṃ vaktā yāvac charīrapātam atraiva śrīraṅge sukham āsva* || 19 ||).

¹⁸ Rāmānuja’s notion of being in one’s own entirety the ‘servant’ of God is inter-

should become the incentive to search shelter with the Compassionate One, pronouncing the *dvaya*-mantra in whichever manner he can¹⁹.

The context in which the issue of the triad of life-torments appears in the works of the two authors shows that the 'spiritual atmosphere' in which the devotee should turn to God for shelter was conceived somehow differently by the two authors. The devotee who undertakes *śaraṇāgati*²⁰ as it is expounded by Rāmānuja seems to take refuge in God, trusting in Him with the complete freedom of his spirit, even if the awareness of offences committed towards God and co-beings should arouse in him the sense of guilt. Dread and the sense of a miserable condition into which the devotee is thrown in his life should not be for him the primary reasons for placing his confidence in the Omnipotent.²¹

preted by G. Oberhammer as the particular state of man's existence in his relatedness to God which consists in remaining at immediate disposition of the master as his possession, allowing him to use freely his property, which turns into the sense of personal immediateness, becoming for man a joyfully experienced reality (cf. Oberhammer 2010a: 29–31).

¹⁹ Cf. ŚarG 17 (p. 169), 4–7:

[...] *etanmūlādhyātmikāḍhibhautikasukhaduḥkhataddhetutaditaropekṣaṇīyaviṣayānubhavañjānāsaṅkocaruṇāpamaccaraṇāravindayugalaikāntikātyāntikaparabhaktiparajñāna-paramabhaktiviḥṅnapratoḥato'pi* [...] *yena kenāpi prakāreṇa dvayavaktā tvam* [...].

²⁰ Of the two notions, which with time began to be used interchangeably, though at the beginning they did not carry precisely the same sense in their religious application, the term *śaraṇāgati* seems to be older (cf. Matsubara 1994: 32). In the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta tradition, approximately two hundred years before Varadaguru, Rāmānuja used the term *prapatti* only twice in his earliest work, the VedS (VedS 116, 9). He neither discusses *śaraṇāgati in extenso*, nor does he make a distinction between *śaraṇāgati* and *prapatti* in the works to be subsumed under the heading of the orthodox Vedāntic tradition, i.e. in the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* (VedS), the *Śrībhāṣya* (Śrībh) and the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* (BhGBh). In the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* (BhGBh), the formula *śaraṇam prapadye*, always meaning the refuge-taking in God, occurs quite often, but this is obviously conditioned by the very text of the commented work. It is only in the ŚarG that *śaraṇāgati* becomes the *terminus technicus*, so to say, for the path of refuge-taking. In contradistinction to Rāmānuja, Vātsya Varadaguru prefers to use *prapatti*, for which other terms such as *nikṣepa* (offering of oneself), *nyāsa* (sacrifice of oneself), *saṅgīnyāsa* (complete renunciation), and *tyāga* (renunciation) are proposed to be synonyms.

(Cf. PraP 2, 7(=LaT 17, 75): '*nikṣepāparaparyāyo nyāsaḥ pañcāṅgasamyutaḥ | saṅgīnyāsas tyāga ity uктаḥ śaraṇāgatir ity api*').

²¹ More on the history of the concepts of *śaraṇāgati*, *prapatti* and *bhakti*, as well as

In Vātsya Varadaguru's *prapatti*, however, the afflicted one is motivated by experiencing the dread of life-torments connected to the *saṃsāric* existence; he should also be indifferent to the present and the future lives. All this should prompt him to turn to the spiritual preceptor in order to be initiated in the *prapatti*. The introduction of the devotee into the self-surrender by means of initiation gives to the act a more ritualistic frame than the *śaraṇāgati* of Rāmānuja seems to have.

*The ārtaprapatti in the Prapannapārijāta*²²

“This composition, known as the *prapannapārijāta*, told on earth, is where all that is wished for is generated in its entirety for living beings”²³. The work “fulfils wishes” of the devotees in its overall aim of establishing the self-surrender to God (*prapatti*) as a path to salvation (*mokṣa*) meant for all members of the Vaiṣṇava community²⁴, and not only for a limited group which can have access to the salvific paths as prescribed by the orthodox sources. It also grants the Vaiṣṇava the complete knowledge about the “middle path”, which consists of relying on God for emancipation.

their interrelation, cf. e.g. Buitenen 1962: 24ff., Matsubara 1994:32, Oberhammer 2004:142–161, Oberhammer 2010: 261–294, Marlewicz 2012: 111–115.

²² The subject is also discussed extensively in Marlewicz 2012: 148–172.

²³ PraP 10, 49: *prapannapārijātākhyāḥ prabandhaḥ kathito bhūvi | aśeṣāpekṣitaṃ yatra parito jāyate satām | |*

²⁴ The basic tenet in the PraP is that every member of the Vaiṣṇava community can practice *prapatti*. In the PraP 1, 15cd–16 as well as in the PraP 3, 2ab, Varadaguru quotes the *Sanatkumārasaṃhitā*, which says that “*prapatti* always grants the fruit of all wishes to everyone” (*sā hi sarvatra sarveṣāṃ sarvokāmaphaladā*). However, there is also made a reservation that “it shall abandon men because of [their] lack of trust (*aviśvāsāt*)” (cf. PraP 1, 17cd: [...] *pumṣām aviśvāsāt prapattiḥ pracyutā bhavet*). In the third chapter of the PraP, which deals with the eligibility (*adhikāra*) for *prapatti*, Varadaguru says that “the right to practice *prapatti* belongs to the man wishing to attain something, unable to have it by other means, from all classes (*varṇa*), possessing virtues (*sāttvika*)” (PraP 3, 1: *ananyopāyaśaktasya prāpyecchor adhikāritā prapattau sarvavarṇasya sāttvikatvādiyogataḥ (sāttvikatvāyoginaḥ)*), and in the fourth chapter Varadaguru says that a good pupil to learn the *prapatti* is “a Vaiṣṇava of good nature, religious righteousness (*dharmaśīla*), who believes in God (*āstika*), is pure, profound, clever and courageous” (cf. PraP 4, 7cd–8ab:

āstiko dharmasīlas ca śīlavān vaiṣṇavaḥ śuciḥ | gambhīras caturō dhūraḥ śiṣya iti abhidhīyate).

In the preface (*avataraṇikā*) to the PraP, Varadaguru introduces the reader into the ten topics of the book²⁵ in the following sequence: scriptural evidence (*pramāṇa*) for *prapatti*, its nature (*svarūpa*), the devotee's eligibility (*adhikāra*) to the practice, the devotee's conduct towards the spiritual teacher, as well as the qualities of a good teacher and a good pupil. In the fifth chapter of the PraP the Vaiṣṇava manner of worshipping God is described in minute details²⁶ and the *bhakti* components are listed²⁷. The sixth chapter is mainly dedicated to the description of the nature of the Goddess Lakṣmī in relation to her husband Viṣṇu. In the eighth and ninth chapters, Varadaguru refers to what the Vaiṣṇava should do

²⁵ PraP (*avataraṇikā*) 1–2: “auspiciousness of self-surrender, its nature proper, eligibility, the conduct of the refuge-takers towards spiritual teacher, towards God, towards sages and humans, injunctions established [in the Vedas], what is to be avoided and the results of it. These are ten topics declared from the concise exposition of topics of the Vedānta and so on”

(PraP 1–2: *prapatter mānasaubhāgyaṃ svarūpam adhikāryaṃ api |
prapannānāṃ gurau vṛttiḥ śrīṣe sūriṣu satsu ca |
vihiteṣu vyavasthānaṃ varjanīyaṃ phalaṃ tathā |
ete daśārthāḥ kathiyante trayyantādyarthasaṃgrahāt || 2 ||*).

²⁶ In the PraP 5, 3 Varadaguru refers to a “king of ascetics” (*yatīndra*), which one might suppose is Rāmānuja: *yatīndroditanīyoktakrameṇaiva yajed dharim* – he should worship Viṣṇu in the succession described in the Nitya[grantha], which was proclaimed authoritatively (*udīta*) by the king of ascetics.

²⁷ PraP 5, 35–37a: “This is the eightfold *bhakti*: parental love (*vātsalya*) for My devotees and rejoicing in the worship; one's homage paid [to Me], avoiding deceit (*dambha*) with regard to Me, devotion to listening to stories about Me, which should produce change of voice, tears and trembling, constant remembering Me as well as that one does not subsist on Me”

(PraP 5, 35–36ab: *madbhaktajanavātsalyaṃ pūjāyāṃ cānumodanaṃ |
svayamabhyarcanaṃ caiva madarthe dambhavarjanam || 35 ||
matkathāśraoṇe bhaktiḥ svaranetrāṅgaovikriyā mamānusmaraṇaṃ nityaṃ yac ca māṃ
nopajīvati || 36 || bhaktir aṣṭavidhā hy eṣā [...]*).

The contemporary editor of the PraP suggests that the above passage is taken from the *Garuḍa Purāṇa* 219. The quote, however, can be traced down to the GarP 1, 227 (the chapter devoted to the loving devotion to Bhagavan *bhagavadbhaktivaraṇam*), where the eightfold aspect of Viṣṇu-bhakti is given in a slightly different form. What Varadaguru refers to as the “eightfold *bhakti*” – in its fixed determinations and the prescribed manner of executing it – is a daily routine of the devotee, which differs, in its overall sense, from the *bhakti-yoga* as it was described by Rāmānuja in the Śrībh (cf. Marlewicz 2010).

(*upāya*) and what he should avoid (*apāya*). The tenth chapter speaks about the results of *prapatti*. Even a brief summary of the book allows one to see a shift in both how – in about two hundred years after Rāmānuja – the practice of self-surrender was understood, as well as what its actual content was. In the new religious and spiritual milieu in which Varadaguru lived, the practice was notably redefined. An immediately striking feature is an extensive reference to the agent-centred code of conduct of a Vaiṣṇava, with its rules meticulously codified in chapters five, eight and nine, which altogether make almost half of the composition.

Authoritative sources which Varadaguru uses in order to give a detailed description of the main subject of the PraP include both Vedāntic and non-Vedāntic texts. The verse from the ViP, which describes the miserable human condition and indicates the self-surrender to God as the way to emancipation, is one of many quotations²⁸ to be found in the introductory chapter of the PraP, in which the author seeks to establish, for the Vaiṣṇava religious tradition to which he belongs, the historicity, doctrinal authenticity and validity of the path of self-surrender (*prapatti*).

According to the author of the PraP, the first scriptural reference to self-surrender is *nyāsa* (the reminiscence of the Vedic sacrifice) as it is presented in the TĀ²⁹. In the PraP, “this ascetic practice is reinterpreted to be a ‘sacrifice of oneself’ in terms of the *śaraṅāgati* spirituality.”³⁰ In the

²⁸ There are many more quotations in the first chapter which indicate ancient and reliable roots of the practice of self-surrender (*prapatti*) as a valid and acceptable means to attain salvation, though the array does not constitute the historicity of the notion in terms of its theological interpretation, but it rather speaks for what Varadaguru himself thought about the origins of the notion (cf. Oberhammer 2004: 69). The sources that Vātsya Varadaguru mentions are: *nyāsa vidyā* of *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (TĀ 10, 63, 19ff. (=MNārU 24–25 or NārāyaṇaU 49–52)), *Kaṭhāvallī* (a passage from *Śvetaśvataropaniṣad* 6, 18), the *Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās* (*Lakṣmītantra*, *Sanat Kumāra*-, *Viṣvaksena*-, and *Ahīrbudhmya Saṃhitās*); the Smṛti literature; *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, *Rāmāyana*, *Mahābhārata*, *Bhagavadgītā* (*caramaśloka*, BhG 18, 66), *Manu*, *Viṣṇudharma*. The very fact that Varadaguru wants to establish the validity of the practice by profusely citing also from the Pāñcarātric *saṃhitās* show that at least for him these sources were already authoritative.

²⁹ *Nyāsa*, taken by Varadaguru as a synonym of *prapatti*, can be traced down to the Vedic orthodoxy, i.e. to the TĀ 10, 63, 19ff. (=MNārU 24–25). Cf. Oberhammer 2007: 46–48.

³⁰ Cf. Oberhammer 2007: 48: “He should sacrifice the living *atman* (*jīvātman*) as an oblation (*haviḥ kṛtvā*) in the mighty fire of the *Brahman*, whose body the [living *ātman*] is, with the [syllable] *om*, which has the form of the *dvaya*[-mantra]. (4) In

words of Varadaguru, “there (i.e. in the TĀ) it is prescribed as the sacrifice within the body for the one who knows this. They say that *prapatti* called *nyāsa* (sacrifice of oneself) is the highest of ascetic practices.”³¹

In the second chapter of the composition, Varadaguru describes *prapatti* the following way:³²

The state of mind (*buddhi*) which has the nature of resolve (*adhyavasāya*) resulting in supplication (*yācñā*) [of the man] who, not having obtained something, wishes to obtain it, is urged by the structure (*rūpa*) of self-surrender.³³

The element inductive to undertake *prapatti* is the sense of not being able to obtain the desired thing by one’s own resources. In the face of incapability to achieve one’s spiritual aim, one turns to God to supplicate Him for granting the wish. After the short characteristics of *prapatti* as a mental attitude, Varadaguru continues to describe it in a more detailed manner, quoting profusely from the Pāñcarātric³⁴ sources:

“Refuge-taking (*śaraṇāgati*) is self-surrender (*prapatti*) being the supplication (*yācñā*) – with a strong trust as its cause – which is the only means for that [wish], in the case that one’s own wish is not to be obtained otherwise³⁵. (2) But self-surrender (*prapatti*) is characterised with the word refuge-taking (*śaraṇāgati*): “One should take to self-surrender (*prapatti*), characterised by *śaraṇāgati* with loving devotion (*bhaktiyā*)” so it was said by the Lord to Viṣvaksena, [listening] with respect (3–4ab). What is called “the self-surrender of the afflicted (*ārta prapatti*)” consists of five parts (4cd): “I

this manner, the practice of *prapatti* [using this *mantra*], whose nature is the *praṇava*, is handed down.”

(PraP 1, 4–5: *jīvātmanam haviḥ kṛtvā taccharire mahīyasi |
brahmāgnau juhuyād om ity anena dvaya rūpiṇā ||
iti prapatter āmnātaḥ prayogaḥ pranavātmanaḥ |*).

The very same passage is to be found in the MNārU 24–25.

³¹ PraP 1, 12: *tasyaivaṃ viduṣo yajñāḥ śarīre tatra kalpitaḥ |*

prapattiṃ tapasām eṣāṃ nyāśākyām alhur uttamām || and Oberhammer 2007: 48.

³² Cf. German translation of the same in Oberhammer 2004: 74–77.

³³ PraP 2,1: *buddhir adhyavasāyātmā yācñāparyavasāyini |*

prāpyecchor anupāsya prapatte rūpam iṣyate |

³⁴ A Vaiṣṇava tantric tradition with very rich textual heritage; many texts were written most probably between 5th and 10th centuries. On the name Pāñcarātra cf. Buitenen 1966 and Raghavan 1965.

³⁵ The editor of the text ascribes the verse to Bharata Muni.

am the abode of sins, a nothing, who has no other way out, ‘You be my only means [of salvation],’³⁶ this thought of supplication expressed as ‘refuge-taking’ (*śaraṇāgati*) should be applied to this God³⁷ (5). “Having reflected on the miserable condition (*durdaśāpatti*) of oneself, and the [auspicious] qualities of Hari, the one who surrendered to Him, [having] the knowledge of Him as the sole means [to liberation] is released [from the bonds of *saṃsāra*]”³⁸ (6)³⁹.

The choice of quotations gives a coherent characterization of one of two kinds of the *prapatti* of the afflicted one, which consists of five limbs. This five-limbed *prapatti* is preceded by words of earnest prayer, a supplication founded on faith and complete trust in God. Indeed, requesting God for help requires putting all one's faith in Him; without this precondition, the prayer of supplication would be meaningless. In the immediately following statement, supposedly taken from *Viṣvaksena Saṃhitā* (ViS), it is said that “One should take to self-surrender (*prapatti*), [...] with loving devotion (*bhaktiyā*)”. The use of the adverbial form *bhaktiyā* here seems to suggest that the ritual act is to be performed *with religious ardency* rather than to indicate that *bhakti* (taken as the means of emancipation) is to be made subservient to the *ārta prapatti*. In the next step of characterizing

³⁶ AhirS 37, 30. Verse 22 of Yāmuna’s StoR is similar in its overall emotional atmosphere: “I am not well-established in religious virtuousness (*dharma*), neither am I the knower of the self nor the loving devotee of Your lotus-feet. I am nothing (*akiñcana*), have no other resort. O, my Protector! I take shelter at your feet” (*na dharmaniṣṭho’smi na cātavedī na bhaktimāṃs tvaccaraṇaravinde | akiñcano’ nanyagatiḥ śaraṇya tvatpādamūlaṃ śaraṇaṃ prapadye | |*).

³⁷ AhirS 37, 30c–31.

³⁸ Cf. PraP 1, 29. The verse here is a slight modification of one of the ViS verses referred to in the PraP 1, 23–32.

³⁹ PraP 2, 2–6: “*ananyasādhye svābhiṣṭe mahāviśvāsapūrvakam | tadekopāyatāyācñā prapattiḥ śaraṇāgatiḥ | | 2 | | śaraṇāgatisābdena prapattis tu viśeṣatā | “prapattiṃ saṃśrayed bhaktiyā śaraṇāgatilakṣaṇām” | | 3 | | ity hy uktaṃ bhagavatā viṣvaksenāya sādaram | ārtaprapattit ity uktā saiṣā pañcāṅgasamnyutā | | 4 | | “ahamasmy aparādhānam ālayo’kiñcāno’gatiḥ | tvam evopāyabhūto me bhaveti prārthanā matiḥ | śaraṇāgatir ity uktā sā deve’smin prayujyatām | | 5 | | ātmano durdaśāpattiṃ vimṛśya ca harer guṇān tadekopāyasaṃvittitḥ taṃ prapanno vimucyate” | | 6 | |*

ārta prapatti, Varadaguru chooses an excerpt from the *Ahīrbudhnyā Saṃhitā* (AhrS)⁴⁰ to describe the five-limbed *prapatti* of the afflicted one⁴¹. The passage, in its undertone, is surprisingly similar⁴² to the 22nd *stotra* (religious hymn) from the *Stotraratna* of Yāmuna (966/7–1038)⁴³. In spite of announcing the five-limbed *ārta prapatti*, in the citation there are only four constituents: the first is the realization that one is sinful (*aham asmy aparādhānām ālayaḥ*). This generates the sense of one’s worthlessness (literally the sense of being a “nothing”, *akiñcanaḥ*). The third component is the realization of having no other way out (*agatiḥ*), which in turn becomes the incentive to supplicate God by saying “You be my means” (*tvam evopāyabhūto me bhaveti prārthanā matiḥ*), i.e. turning to the particular God in order to request him to give refuge (*śaraṇāgatir ity uktā sā deve’smin prayujyatām*). In the summarizing, conclusive quotation-verse, the same as PraP 1, 26, the five-limbed *prapatti* of the afflicted one is said to result in the emancipation of the devotee. He becomes released from the bonds of *saṃsāra* provided that he understands his hopeless situation and recognizes that God is his only means towards emancipation. Since this kind of self-surrender is shown to be refuge-taking (*śaraṇāgati*) undertaken by the devotee with loving devotion, it seems that here Varadaguru explains *ārta prapatti* as *śaraṇāgati* proper.

In the subsequent verses there appears a description of a six-limbed *prapatti* (already shortly characterised in verses 30–31ab of the first chapter of the composition, which constitute a part of a longer quotation from the ViS)⁴⁴. This *prapatti* is identified with *nyāsa* (sacrifice of oneself) in the

⁴⁰ Since 1916, when Otto Schrader published the text and the study of the *Ahīrbudhnyā Saṃhitā*, there was an on-going discussion as to the place of origin and approximate period in which the *Ahīrbudhnyā Saṃhitā* was composed. Varadaguru, whose dates are 1165–1200 to 1277, quotes the AhrS as an authority, so the work must have existed long enough before Varadaguru to achieve this position. Matsubara 1994: 27 places it around 600 A.D. Rastelli indicates that the first text which quotes AhrS is the PraP, as well as that “the AhrS shows the influence of several other traditions, as for example Kashmir Śaivism and Viśiṣṭādvaitavedānta” (cf. Rastelli 2005:116).

⁴¹ Cf. AhrS: 37, 29–31.

⁴² Cf. Rastelli 2005:126. According to Rastelli, this is an indication that AhrS relied on Viśiṣṭādvaitic teachings regarding the *prapatti* theory.

⁴³ Research of R. Mesquita resulted in establishing the most feasible dates of Yāmuna as 966/7 to 1038 (cf. Mesquita 1973: 179–183).

⁴⁴ As a matter of fact, the ViS as quoted by Varadaguru, the AhrS 37, 28–29ab, and

AhirS⁴⁵, and in the *Viṣvaksena Saṃhitā* (ViS) passage there are introduced the following circumstances leading towards the practice⁴⁶:

Because one does not have the right (*adhikāra*) to perform *karma yoga*⁴⁷, [...] as well as one has no right (*adhikṛti*) to *jñāna yoga*⁴⁸, and also, since these [two] are not there, there is generated neither affection (*prīti*) to Me nor loving devotion (*bhakti*), therefore one should take refuge at My feet as the only aim and end (*aikāntyāt*).⁴⁹

It is noticeable here that factors conducive to taking refuge “at the feet of the Lord” consist in the inability to follow the paths of *karma-*, *jñāna-* and *bhakti-yoga*. The incapacity to realise these is evaluated on the formal plane as not having the right (*adhikṛti*) to perform *karma-* and *jñāna-yoga*. Though the reason given here is jurisdictional, the overall sense of the quote agrees with what Yāmuna says in stotra 22 to such an extent that even the sequence of reasons is the same. When Yāmuna says: “I am not well-established in religious virtuousness (*dharma*)”, he most probably speaks of

the LaT 17, 60 give an identical definition of the six-limbed *prapatti*. In the AhirS the definition is said to be that of the knowers of the Veda. Cf. Oberhammer 2007: 47.

⁴⁵ Cf. AhirS 37, 27–28cd: *yad yena kāmakāmena nāsādyam sādhanāntaraiḥ |
mumukṣuṇā yat sāmikyena yogena na ca bhaktitaḥ || 37–25 ||
prāpyate paramaṇi dhāma yato nāvartate punaḥ |
tena tenāpyate tattannyaśenaiva mahāmune || 37–26 ||
paramātmā ca tenaiva sādhyate puruṣottamaḥ |
ṣoḍhā hi vedaviduṣo vadanty enaṇi mahāmune || 37–27 ||
ānukūlyasya saṅkalpaḥ prātikūlyasya varjanam |
rakṣiṣyatīti viśvāso goptṛtvavaraṇaṇi tathā || 37–28 ||
ātmanikṣepakārpaṇye ṣaḍvidhā śaraṇāgatīḥ |*

⁴⁶ Cf. Oberhammer 2007: 49–50, who indicated that “the fragments transmitted by Varadaguru cannot derive from the extant ViS, because in this text Viṣvaksena is the teaching person”, though he supposes that it is nevertheless the ViS, but in a form which we do not know at present.

⁴⁷ Literally “the discipline of action”, I take the variety of *yoga* of the BhG to mean union with God through action here.

⁴⁸ Literally “the discipline of gnostic knowledge”, here: union with God through gnostic knowledge.

⁴⁹ PraP 1, 26cd–29ab: [...] *tasmān na karmayoge’smin adhikāro hi vidyate |
[...] jñānayoge’py abhiratīḥ (adhikṛtīḥ) kasyacid vidyate na ca |
tad abhāvān mayi prītir na ca bhaktis ca jāyate || 28 ||
tasmān matpādayugalam aikāntyāc charaṇaṇi vrajet || 29ab ||*

a more general idea of *dharma*. Nonetheless, *karma-yoga*, of which the above passage from the ViS speaks, can certainly be subsumed under *dharma*. In the expression: “neither am I the knower of the self” it is suggested that the devotee is unable to attain the gnostic knowledge (*jñāna*) of the *jñāna yogin*. The remaining “nor [am I] the loving devotee at Your lotus-feet” can be reasonably interpreted as indicating the fact that one is also unable to follow the path of *bhakti-yoga*. Having realised all this, one takes refuge with God (cf. “I am nothing (*akiñcana*), have no other resort. O my Protector! I take shelter at your feet!”). It can be reasonably assumed that the *śaraṇāgati* of the ViS resounds with the ideas of Yāmuna, who is traditionally regarded as one of the founders of the Viśiṣṭādvaita. After having indicated the absence of any formal right to the practice of *karma-* and *jñāna-yoga*, the ViS lists the six limbs of *prapatti* identified with sacrifice of oneself (*nyāsa*): “Producing benevolence, avoiding adverseness, the belief ‘He will protect [me]’, as well as the choice of the protector, offering of oneself⁵⁰ and humbleness, this is the six-fold refuge-taking.”⁵¹

In the second chapter of the PraP, however, Varadaguru uses mainly the LaT to define the six-limbed *prapatti*. In the LaT 17, 75, it is said to be the same as the sacrifice of oneself (*nyāsa*), offering (*nikṣepa*), complete renunciation (*saṅṅnyāsa*), relinquishment (*tyāga*) and refuge-taking (*śaraṇāgati*)⁵².

“Because of unsuccessful accomplishing of all parts of the [ritual] acts and also because of inability to complete [them], as well as because one does not succeed (*asiddheḥ*) in the right to perform (*adhikāra*), since there are faults [regarding the required] place, time and quality, acts to be performed (*upāya*) are, indeed, not effective and also there arise manifold faults (*apāya*). (12–13ab) Thus what consists in giving up pride is called humbleness (*kārpānyam*), miserable condition (*dānyam*). The miserable condition (*dānyam*)

⁵⁰ In the PraP 2, 21 and the LaT 17, 74, offering of oneself (*ātmanikṣepa*) is explained as giving up one’s lordship over the fruits of one’s own deeds and transferring it to Keśava (Viṣṇu). It is clear that depending on the Master is desisting from self-exertion with regard to what is to be undertaken (*upāya*) and the fruit [of actions]; such is offering (*nikṣepa*) which consists of these parts. (22).

⁵¹ PraP 1, 30cd–31ab (also AhirS 37, 27–28):

ānukūlyasya saṅkalpaḥ prātikūlyasya varjanam |
rakṣiṣyatīti viśvāso goptṛtvavaraṇaṃ tathā |
ātmanikṣepakārpānye śaḍvidhā śaraṇāgatiḥ | |

⁵² Cf. PraP 2, 8: *nikṣepāparaparyāyo nyāsaḥ pañcāṅgasāṅgyutaḥ |*
saṅṅnyāsas tyāga ity uktāḥ śaraṇāgatir ity api | |

which [involves] desisting from [self-] contentment [having described the situation as above] is called humbleness (*kārpaṇya*)⁵³.” (12cd–14ab) Because other means are difficult to be accomplished [as it was shown above], their discontinuance is, indeed, proposed and it is suggested that the “nobody” (*akiñcana*) is entitled (*adhikārin*) to refuge-taking. (14cd–15ab) “Because of potency (*śakti*) and easy approachability (*sūpasadatva*), and on account of compassion/grace (*krpā*) eternally [extended], because of the foremost relation of the Ruler and the subordinate (*īśēśitavyasambandhāt*), and also because it (*prapatti*) is not the first/prominent element, the strong conviction: ‘He will protect us, who are in conformity [with Him]!’ would be the confidence (*viśvāsa*) destroying/wiping out all demerit: o Śakra!”⁵⁵ (15cd–17ab) Having acknowledged the impossibility of one’s own protection in accordance with the appropriateness of the One who is to be surrendered to, the desired thought regarding the means [of salvation] due to trust (*viśvasāt*): “he will protect [me]” is created: (17cd–18ab) “Even being the Compassionate One, even as the Lord of the souls being obviously the One who has power (*śakta*), not having been requested, he will not protect [anyone]” so the thought to ask Him [arises]. “Be the One who will protect [me]!” In this way the act of choosing of the protector is transmitted in the tradition”.⁵⁶ (18cd–19) Hence it is desired that self-surrender means as much as/results in prayer. Whereas for the self-surrender in the like manner the graciousness of the One who is sought for refuge is the way. (20) “By this for the one who is to be protected there is giving up [his] lordship (*svāmin*) with regard to the fruit [of actions] which finalizes in conferring [it] to Keśava, therefore it is called offering of oneself.”⁵⁷ (21) It is clear that depending on the Master is giving up one’s own effort with regard to what is to be undertaken (*upāya*) and the fruit [of actions], so offering [of oneself] consists of these parts. (22) In this manner, these parts are collected in the self-surrender of the afflicted.⁵⁸

⁵³ LaT 17, 68cd–70ab.

⁵⁴ The very same expression is used by Yāmuna in his StoR 22:

*na dharmaniṣṭho’smi na cātmavedī na bhaktimāms tvaccaraṇaravinde |
akiñcano’ nanyagatiḥ śaraṇya toatpādamūlaṃ śaraṇaṃ prapadye | |*

(I am not well-established in pious acts (*dharma*), neither am I the knower of the self nor the loving devotee of Your lotus-feet. I am nothing (*akiñcana*), have no other resort. O, my Protector! I take shelter at your feet.

⁵⁵ LaT 17, 70,cd–72ab.

⁵⁶ LaT 17, 73.

⁵⁷ LaT 17, 74.

⁵⁸ PraP 2, 12–22: *aṅgasāmagryasampatteḥ aśakteś cāpi karmaṇām |
adhikāryasya cāsiddheḥ deśakālaguṇakṣayāt | |12| |*

By now it is noticeable that in the five-limbed self-surrender the emphasis is on creating a particular frame of mind of the devotee – which becomes the condition for the prayer of supplication which the five-limbed surrender is; man recognises his offences against God, his unworthiness, helplessness, and he submits unconditionally to God’s grace in his supplication, recognizing Him as the only One who can save him.

The constituents of the six-limbed self-surrender, identified, in its overall character, with the “sacrifice of oneself” – namely being well-disposed to others, avoiding adverseness, trusting in God as one’s protector, asking God for protection, offering of oneself and the sense of humbleness – are all conditioned by earlier-acquired awareness that the orthodox *karma-*, *jñāna-* or *bhakti-yoga* cannot be successfully accomplished. This, paradoxically, makes one eligible for the self-surrender, i.e. for an unconditional sacrifice of oneself. The self-surrender which is supplication and the one which is identified with the sacrifice of oneself seem to be different facets of the same event, except that in the first case Varadaguru refers to prayer and in the second, to a crucial transformation of the understanding of one’s existence.

The self-surrender of the afflicted (*ārta*) in both these dimensions is a radical step – the devotee renounces the fruits of his actions, which means that he should no longer expect to liberate himself from *saṃsāric*

upāyā naiva sidhyanti hy apāyāḥ bahulās tathā |
iti yā garvāhānis tat dainyaṃ kārpanyam ucyate’ || 13 | |
upāyāntaradauṣkaryāt tannivṛttir hi sūcitā |
akimcanādhikāritvaṃ prapatter api sūcitam || 14 | |
‘śakteḥ sūpadatvāc ca kṛpāyogāc ca śāśvatāt |
īśēsitavyasambandhāt anidaṃ prathamād api || 15 | |
rakṣiṣyaty anukūlān na iti yā sudṛḍhā matiḥ |
sa viśvāso bhavet chakra! sarvaduṣkṛtanāśanaḥ || 16 | |
svarakṣāyogyatām jñātvā prapattavyasya yuktitaḥ |
rakṣayīṣyatiti viśvāsāt abhiṣtopāyakaḥ || 17 | |
vāruṇāvānapi vyaktaṃ śaktaḥ svāmy api dehinām |
aprārthito na gopāyet iti tatprārthanā matiḥ || 18 | |
gopāyitā bhavety evaṃ gopṛtvāvaraṇaṃ smṛtam |
yācñāparyavasāyitvaṃ prapatter ata iṣyate || 19 | |
prapattes tu prapattavyaprasādadvāratā tathā || 20 | |
tena saṃrakṣyamāṇasya phalaṃ svāmyaviyuktatā |
keśavārpaṇaparyantā hy ātmanikṣepa ucyate || 21 | |
upāye ca phale caivaṃ svaprayatna nivartanam |
svāmyāyattam iti vyaktam; nikṣepasyāṅgitā tathā || 22 | |

bonds by means of his own effort. Instead, he puts his trust in the salvific power of God and, in this sense, becomes entirely dependent on God for his salvation. The inability to fulfil requirements of religious-ritualistic life or lack of competence (*adhikāra*) to fulfil them are indicated as reasons to feel miserable. The obvious connotation of this afflictedness seems to be that every devotee wants to perform acts which are beneficial and conducive to his spiritual welfare, so the inability to meet the desired requirements leaves one desolate and may result in a conviction that he has no rescue. Not only is the afflicted unable to realise his *dhārmic* life. What is more is that due to his incapacity in this regard, he fails to accumulate the fruits of meritorious acts and generates bad karma by his demerits. Therefore, the ego-centred conviction and trust in the ability to govern one's life in order to attain one's aim only by one's own effort have to necessarily disappear and be replaced by humbleness (*kārpānya*).⁵⁹ The relation (*sambandha*) between the supplicant and God as his only means of salvation is obviously a relation of a subordinate servant and a Master, which can be directly concluded from the fact that Viṣṇu pervades all his creation, so he is its protector with divine power to save, before whom the devotee learns to live his life.

An absolute act of entrusting oneself to the compassionate redeemer does not seem here to be a passive acceptance of God's will. To completely entrust God means to recognise the *sine qua non* of the self-surrender, which consists in unconditional offering of oneself (*saṃnyāsa*, *nyāsa*) and relinquishment (*tyāga*). This is not tantamount to a submissive compliancy with God's will or with *saṃsāric* existence, with its "affliction and craving, delusion and anguish", and all its mental and physical suffering, in order to propitiate God for one's transgressions against *dharma*. It rather suggests taking a different perspective on one's life. To entrust oneself without reserve to God imbues one's life, paradoxical as it seems to be, with a sense of spiritual freedom which becomes less ego-, but much more theo-centred. This imbues the devotee with a sense of responsibility and accountability before the One who permeates all His creation, the One who is present in it and directs it according to His nature of the benign and benevolent protector.

Such a transformation of one's core, essential being, to the effect that one resigns oneself to God in the totality of his being, will not make the

⁵⁹ Cf. a similar attitude expressed in St. Matthew 23, 12: "And whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted."

“triad of life-torments” disappear. The afflictions will not cease, as the change of attitude does not change the reality of life, but the oppressive, detrimental nature and its immediate influence on man are delegated to the *saṃsāric* sphere, where in fact they belong. The sense of unconditional belonging to God, of completely entrusting oneself to Him, presupposes in itself integrating God in one’s own life. In that sense, the *ārta prapatti* becomes a concept of human existence, in which the life of the devotee, thrown into the *saṃsāric* existence, is directed by the radical imperative to submit to the grace of a benevolent, compassionate and all-pervading God. The *ārta prapatti* thus truly becomes the *sādhya bhakti* as the kind of loving devotion in which God is not considered a means (*sādhana*) to the devotee’s emancipation, but the actual end and aim of it. When the devotee understands this, he understands as well that the way to emancipation is God’s grace.

Two aspects of Varadaguru’s conceptualization of self-surrender seem to have become more prominent in the attempt to reconstruct its basic conceptual frames. Firstly, it seems to be saturated with *bhakti* spirituality, though the loving devotion to God is radicalised to the extent of the absolute sacrifice of oneself and completely entrusting oneself to the grace of God. Secondly, the ritualistic approach of the Pāñcarātra appears much more prominent in Varadaguru’s times, with its meticulously described rules of conduct, particularised account of the eligibility for the practice and a more formalised religious-ritualistic approach. The present analysis of the self-surrender has not explored the actual implications of the devotee’s role in the process, though the passages from the PraP do not show him as a passive witness to God exercising His grace. Fulfilling religious obligations and performing duties connected to the rank and stage of life remain a necessity, though the devotee should renounce, or better, confer their results to God.

Dasein’s rebirth in faith is “a transformation (*Umstellung*) of human existence by God’s mercy,” says Martin Heidegger.⁶⁰ Heidegger indicates that the transformation takes place both “in and by trusting taken hold of the mercy of God” (*ibid.*), so the synergistic aspect of the transformation is brought to light – man has to trustingly turn to God as his sole resort so that God can grant him His salvific grace. The intuition of Heidegger brings out in full relief the mystic dimension of *prapatti* as “sacrifice of

⁶⁰ Martin Heidegger 2004: 53: „[...] ein Umgestelltwerden der Existenz in und durch die gläubig ergriffene Barmherzigkeit Gottes“.

oneself". If man takes refuge in God unconditionally and with complete trust in the divine grace, this radical step results in the transformation of being. Living one's life with the awareness of God's presence, conscious of Him permeating his creation, opens the believer's perspective on life here and now. This, in turn, allows him to attain the freedom of spirit with its healing effect on understanding the hierarchy of life values.

Abbreviations

| | |
|-----------|---|
| AhirS | <i>Ahīrbudhnya Saṃhitā</i> |
| ĀtmaS | <i>Ātmasiddhi</i> , see: SiT |
| BhGBh | <i>Bhagavadgītābhāṣya</i> |
| BSū | <i>Brahmasūtras</i> |
| CŚ | <i>Catuḥślokī</i> , in: Srivatsankaracharyar (ed.) 1969[?]: <i>Srimad Vedanta Desika's Chatusslokihashyam, Sthothratnabhashyam, and Gadyatrayabhashyam</i> . Madras: Sri Vedanta Desika Seventh Century Trust. |
| GiS | <i>Gītārthasaṃgraha</i> by Yāmuna |
| GarP | <i>Garuḍa Purāna</i> |
| LaT | <i>Lakṣmītantra</i> , see: Gupta, Sanjukta 1972. |
| MNārU | <i>Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad</i> |
| NārāyaṇaU | <i>Nārāyaṇopaniṣad</i> |
| PraP | <i>Prapannapārijāta</i> (see: Sudarsanacharya, T.K.V.N. (ed.) 1954) |
| SāK | <i>Sāṃkhyakārika</i> of Īśvarakṛṣṇa |
| ŚarG | <i>Śaraṇāgatigadyam</i> (in: CŚ) |
| ŚrīBh | <i>Śrībhāṣya</i> by Rāmānuja |
| SiT | <i>Siddhitrayam</i> by Yāmuna |
| StoR | <i>Stotraratna</i> by Yāmuna (see: CŚ) |
| VedS | <i>Vedārthasaṃgraha</i> (see: Buitenen, Johann, A. B. van 1956) |
| ViP | <i>Viṣṇupurāna. maharṣivedavyāsapraṇītaṃ viṣṇumahāpurāṇam śrīdharasvāmīkṛtātmaprakāśākhyaṅkākhyaṅkā bhūṣitam</i> . Ed. Thāneśacandra Utpretī. (Parimal Sanskrit Series 21). Vol. 1 (1 to 3 aṃśas), vol. 2 (4 to 6 aṃśas). Delhi: Parimal Publications 2003 (2nd ed.). |
| ViS | <i>Viṣvaksena Saṃhitā</i> |

References

- Buitenen, Johann A. B. van 1968. *Rāmānuja on the Bhagavadgītā: a condensed rendering of his Gītābhāṣya with copious notes and an introduction*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Buitenen, Johann A. B. van 1988. "The Name 'Pañcarātra', in: *History of Religions* 1, 2 (Winter, 1962): 291–299.
- Buitenen, Johann A. B. van 1956. *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha*. (Deccan College Monograph Series 16.) Poona: Deccan College.
- Carman, John Braisted 1981 [1974]. *The Theology of Rāmānuja. An Essay in Interreligious Understanding*. (Ananthacharya Indological Research Series No. IX.) Bombay: Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute.
- Gupta, Sanjukta 1972. *Lakṣmī Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Text*. Translation and Notes by Sanjukta Gupta. (Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina 15.) Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Heidegger, Martin 2004. *Phänomenologie und Theologie*. Frankfurt: V. Klostermann.
- Lester, Robert C. 1976. *Rāmānuja on the Yoga*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Marlewicz, Halina 2010. "Loving is Remembering. Bhakti meditation in the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja", in: *Cracow Indological Studies* 12: 261–297.
- Marlewicz, Halina 2012. *O praktyce duchowej wiśisztatdwaita wedanty. Studium koncepcji bhakti i prapatti u wybranych myślicieli tradycji*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Matsubara, Mitsunori 1994. *Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās & Early Vaiṣṇava Theology. With a Translation and Critical Notes from Chapters on Theology in the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mesquita, Roque 1973. „Yāmunamuni: Leben, Datierung und Werke“, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde Südasiens* 17 (1973): 177–193.
- Mesquita, Roque 1990. *Yāmunācāryas Philosophie der Erkenntnis. Eine Studie zu seinen Saṃvitsiddhi*. (SbÖAW 563. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 24.) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Oberhammer Gerhard 2010. „Im Angesicht des Anderen. Rāmānujas Śaraṇāgatigadyam. Ein wichtiger Text viṣṇuitischer Religionstradition“, in: *Cracow Indological Studies* 12: 261–297.

- Oberhammer, Gerhard 2004. *Zur spirituellen Praxis des Zufluchtnehmens bei Gott (śaraṇāgatiḥ) vor Veṅkaṭanātha. Materialien zur Geschichte der Rāmānuja-Schule VII* (SbÖAW 710. Veröffentlichungen zu den Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 36.) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard 2007. "The Influence of Orthodox Vaiṣṇavism on Viśiṣṭādvaita and Pāñcarātra", in: G. Oberhammer & Rastelli, M. (eds): *Studies in Hinduism IV. On the Mutual Influences and Relationship of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta and Pāñcarātra*. (SbÖAW 756. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 54.) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 37–54.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard 2010a. "The Forgotten Secret of Human Love. An attempt of an approach", in: *Cracow Indological Studies* 12: 17–50.
- Sudarsanacharya, T.K.V.N. (ed.) 1954. *Prapannaparijatam of Sri Vatsya Varadacharya alias Nadadur Ammal*. (Sri Vaishnava Sampradaya Granthamala 5). Tirupati: Tirumala-Tirupati Devasthanams Press.
- Raghavan, V. 1965. "The Name Pāñcarātra: With the Analysis of the Sanatkumāra-Saṃhitā in Manuscript", in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85: 73–79.
- Schrader, Otto 1916. *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. Madras: Adyar Library.
- Stark, Sylvia (ed.) 1990. *Vātsya Varadagurus Tattoanirṇaya, Teil 1: Kritische Textedition*. (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Südasiens 4,1; Sitzungsberichte, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 570.) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.