

Sādhana-pañcakam
Pujya Swamiji's transcribed talk

This is the seventeenth part of the serial article, continuation from June 2022 newsletter.

LOGIC ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH

While you are analysing, however, do not enter into *dustarka*, wrong logic. Do not try to establish that *ātmā* is *jīva* just by *tarka*, reasoning. Instead, you should follow *śrutimatastarka*. *Śrutimatastarka* means *śrutimata-anukūla-tarka*, a reasoning that helps you understand what the *śruti* says. Do not be trapped by *dustarka*, which is pure reason and so on. Pure reason does not help here because the self is not an object of inference. The self is always self-evident, self-revealing and therefore it is not the subject matter of *pratyakṣa*, perception or *anumāna*, inference. You must see the fallacies in wrong arguments. Seeing the fallacy is what is called *mananam*, for which you must follow proper reasoning. Otherwise you will get lost somewhere in the jungle of reason.

That is the purpose of this *nyāya*, logic, and other related disciplines. Those days they did not have any other type of education for creating a capacity to reason properly. So they used to say that without the study of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta is '*anyāya-Vedānta*.' *Anyāya* means without logic, in other words, confusion. But today it is not like that. When you go through school and study mathematics, physics and so on, you develop an intellectual discipline. Once you have an intellectual discipline, it becomes very clear to you when anyone says something that is wrong. That intellectual discipline is gained by proper thinking. In fact, it is better not to study Nyāya because it has a philosophy of its own, which is a problem. Physics does not have its own philosophy nor does chemistry, yet they give you intellectual acumen. People get lost in Nyāya because of its philosophy, they do not know what is right. They have some vision from the *śruti*, but it all gets lost in the jungle of these words and this reasoning.

Then afterwards, you do not know where you started, and you think that Vaiśeṣika says like this, Sāṅkhya says like this, Advaita says like this, and so on.

There is no *mumukṣā*, desire for *mokṣa*. Vedānta should be studied only by a *mumukṣu*, one who desires *mokṣa*. I used to wonder why the qualifications of a student include this *mumukṣutvam*.⁹⁰ Now I know why. It means that one should not study Vedānta academically. Only one who sees a problem will see the solution when it comes. If he does not see the problem, then there is no way he is going to see the solution. *Mumukṣutvam* must be there. Therefore, this reasoning should be used for seeing the fallacies in the contentions against what Vedānta unfolds. That is *śravaṇam* and *mananam*.

OVERCOMING SAṂSKĀRAS

It is very clear now and the person has no doubts whatsoever. This must be *jñāna-niṣṭhā*. Still the *niṣṭhā* has a problem. It does not come because there is a thinking habit, a *saṁskāra*. The habit is *dehe ātmabuddhiḥ*, of taking the body to be I, the self. Everybody needs to have this, of course. It is necessary for transacting business in the world, and that is not a problem. The problem, however, is the notion, 'I am as good as the body', *ātmani deha-buddhiḥ*. This means that if anything happens to the body, you become obsessed with it. Taking care of the body is fine, but if you have the notion that you are as good as the body, then all the fear, hurt etc., do not go away. This is the result of a *saṁskāra*. A lot of change has taken place cognitively, but there is still an emotional problem with its own background. You have to deal with that. If it is really a very serious problem, you have to resolve it through prayer and other means. But here we are talking about an average person who has some *saṁskāras*. *Ātmani deha-buddhiḥ* is something common, something that has been there for a long time. Therefore one has to do *nididhyāsanam*, contemplation, in order to eliminate the *viparītabuddhi*, this notion that I, the *ātmā*, am as good as the body-mind-sense complex. You take a word, such as *aham*, I, and see that *aham* is Brahman. See the meaning of the word. Contemplation on the implied meaning, *lakṣya* of all these words is called *śabdaanuviddha*⁹¹ or *dr̥śya-*

⁹⁰ Desire for freedom, मोक्षो मे भूयादखे इति इच्छा

⁹¹ Contemplation in keeping with a word.

*anuviddha savikalpa-samādhi.*⁹² That is *nididhyāsanam*.

AVOID WRONG LOGIC

Dustarkāt suviramyatām; may you completely avoid all wrong logic. *Tarka* means *anumāna*, logic or reasoning. *Dustarka* is logic that has a semblance of reasoning. It is only *tarka-ābhāsa*, an appearance of logic. For example, a person adds cola to an alcoholic drink and consumes it. That combination gives him a kick. Then he adds the same cola to rum or whatever, and again gets tipsy. Next he adds cola to whiskey and again gets intoxicated. Therefore, what is common in all of them? Cola. So his conclusion is that cola gives him the kick. This is *dustarka*.

In another example regarding *mokṣa*, some use the expression, 'There are many paths to the temple.' So you can go right, you can go left, you can go by helicopter, you can go by car etc. There are many ways to reach the temple. It looks very simple and very convincing also. People also want different things, so you can choose your own path. They compare paths also. 'I follow this path, you follow that path,' and so on.

This is all silly, it is *dustarka*, *tarka-ābhāsa*. Because there is an example, reasoning is involved. Yet that reasoning is fallacious because I can give a counter example. One person says that *mokṣa* is achievable by many paths because it is a place to be reached, like the temple on the hill. This is clean logic. People talk like this. Whether they know the logic or not, they talk like this. But I say that *mokṣa* cannot be reached by many paths, like entry into the main shrine. There is only one door to enter into the shrine. Or, it is like knowing the colour of an object. How many ways do you have to know the colour of an object? Only one, so now that *tarka* is gone. If you are giving an example that uses fallacious logic, I can give you another example and an entirely different logic.

THE NATURE OF MOKṢA

Therefore the first question we have to ask is, what is the *svarūpa* of *mokṣa*?

⁹² Contemplation in keeping with an object.

Afterwards, we can think of the path. As the *svarūpa* of *mokṣa* is not understood, people create all kinds of silly logic. What is *mokṣa*? What do you mean by *mokṣa*? If that is very clear, you do not have many paths at all. If confusion is bondage, then resolution of the confusion is *mokṣa*. And how are you going to get that except by knowledge? If you say, 'I can get knowledge differently', that is also not possible, because no knowledge takes place without a means of knowledge. Therefore you require an appropriate means of knowledge. Any *tarka* will fall apart if it does not conform to what the *śruti* says. If what *śruti* says is true, then any *tarka* that leads you to conclude differently is not going to help.

One person says that the cause of the world is inert because the effect is insentient.⁹³ And he gives the example of a pot being insentient, as its cause, clay is inert. This is the logic of Sāṅkhya. So to counter this person, we also use the pot as an example. We say that a product requires an efficient cause precisely because it is an effect.⁹⁴ This therefore implies a *karṭṛ*, *cetana-karṭṛtvam*, conscious agent of action. Pot is a product, implying a conscious agent. Now this person's logic is finished.

The *tarka* we present is in keeping with what the *śruti* says: *so' kāmayata bahusyām-prajāyeyeti*.⁹⁵ It says *satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma*, not *satyaṁ jaḍam anantam*.⁹⁶ The *yukti*, logic, is there, and at the same time *śruti* is also there. This is called *śruti-sammatayukti* or *śruti-anukūla-yukti*, reasoning that is helpful in understanding what *śruti* says.

ASSIMILATING THE WORDS OF ŚRUTI

Therefore, *śrutimatastarko'nusandhīyatām*; *śrutimatas-tarka* is called *śruti-anukūla-tarka*. You should that kind of *tarka* alone. May you pursue a *tarka* that is helpful. Anything other than what the *śruti* says is not going to help you anyway. What

⁹³ जगत्कारणंजडंप्रधानंकार्यस्य-अचेतनत्वात् घटवत् (Sāṅkhya school)

⁹⁴ यदखेकार्यं तदखेसकर्तृककार्यत्वात् घटवत्

⁹⁵ 'He desired, 'May I become many' (Taittirīyopaniṣad 2.6)

⁹⁶ Brahman is existence, consciousness, limitless, NOT existence, inert, limitless.

kind of *mokṣa* will you get from another *tarka*? That means you let all your reasoning help you assimilate what the *śruti* says. What is unfolded by the *śruti* here is to be understood by you without any doubt and therefore you must use reasoning. Reasoning is meant for assimilation, however, and not to prove anything. *Śruti* proves it, *śruti* unfolds it, but *tarka* is useful in eliminating all doubts. In this way, the *tarka* helps you assimilate the vision. This is what is called *śrutimatastarka*. This is *mananam*.

Let us take the example above and assume that the *jagat-kāraṇam*, the cause of the world, is inert. If so, then it is other than yourself. You know the world, the product is inert. Now if you go one step further, you conclude that the cause is also inert. Even if you could logically arrive at that, which is not possible, what do you get out of it? You remain the same individual. If the cause of the world is inert, then my mind-body-sense complex, everything, is born of the inert. That is why there is this kind of thinking also. *Jagat-kāraṇaṁ jaḍam* does not help you at all.

But suppose you say that the cause of the world is *brahma-caitanya*, Brahman which is consciousness. And that Brahman is *ekam*, one, and *advitīyam*, without a second. Then, you are released. Nothing else will stand up to argument or scrutiny anyway. In the *śruti*, we have a very clean arrangement. First, *ātmā* is to be seen, in other words, understood. That is the first *vākya*; *ātmā* is to be understood by you. For that you require a *pramāṇa*, which is why the verse says *śrutiśirovākyaṁ samākarṇyatām*.⁹⁷ Then, after using the *pramāṇa*, you have to exactly understand the *tātparya*, vision of the *śruti*. This means that analysis is involved in the *śravaṇam* itself. *Śravaṇam* includes not only what you get out of the *śruti*, but also analysis of the *śruti-vākyas*. Therefore *vākyārthaśca vicāryatām, śrutiśiraḥ pakṣaḥ samāśrīyatām*. That is the *tātparya-niścaya*, a clear understanding of the intended meaning.

With the help of the *ṣaḍliṅgas*, the indicators involved in ascertaining the *tātparya*,

⁹⁷ Refer to Verse 2

you understand the meaning of the *śruti*. If that itself is enough for you, there is no problem. But generally, it is not enough. In that case, you have to assimilate this knowledge. For that, you should do *mananam*. Thus, in the Brahma-sūtras, the first chapter is called *samanvayaadhyāya* because it presents the *samanvaya*, the connection. All the Vedānta *vākyas* talk about *jagatkāraṇam brahma*, and that Brahman is yourself. This is the *tātparya* of the *śruti*.

With the various *sūtras*, this whole chapter of the Brahma-sūtra discusses how this is established. It discusses how all these topics are *param-brahma*, topic by topic. Each topic has a subject matter, a sentence that raises a doubt. Varieties of sentences are there. Some of the sentences are called *spaṣṭabrahma-liṅga-vākyas*, meaning they are very *spaṣṭa*, clear. *Liṅga*⁹⁸ means they are indications that help you to appreciate that *param-brahma* is the only subject matter of the sentence. Then there are sentences which are *aspaṣṭa-brahma-liṅga-vākyas*, meaning they have *liṅgas* which are not very clear. But no other meaning is possible and therefore Brahman is the only meaning for all of them. In this way, all the *śruti-vākyas* and even *smṛti-vākyas* are analysed in the first chapter. This is why it is called *samanvaya-adhyāya*.

Then the second chapter is called *avirodha-adhyāya*⁹⁹ because what is said by the *śruti* is not contradicted by perception or inference. Here, we again see the people who are outside the Vedas, as well as those who accept the Vedas as *pramāṇa*. Yet they arrive at something different because they give more importance to reasoning. These Vaiśeṣikas, Sāṅkhyas, Bauddhas, Jains, Bhedābheda-vādins, all of them are discussed. It is proved that they are wrong and what the *śruti* says alone is right. This is what they call *avirodha-adhyāya*. First *śravaṇam*, next *mananam*. Thereafter comes *upāsana-phalam*, the results of meditative practises and *nididhyāsanam*, contemplation and so on. So *nididhyāsanam* is also included here. The sentence *dustarkāt suviramyatām śrutimatastarko' nusandhīyatām*¹⁰⁰ means that *mananam* is over.

To be continued...

⁹⁸ लिङ्गखेयते अनेन इति लिङ्गम्

⁹⁹ *avirodha* = non-contradiction.

¹⁰⁰ Refer to Verse 3