

Advaita Vedanta And Western Idealism: A Comparative Philosophical Analysis

Abhijith Rajendran

*Research Scholar, Department of Sanskrit Vedanta
Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit, Kalady, India*

Abstract—This paper presents a comparative philosophical study of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism, focusing on their respective conceptions of reality, consciousness, and the self. Advaita Vedanta, rooted in the Upanishadic tradition and systematized by Adi Shankaracharya, posits a non-dual metaphysics in which Brahman alone is the ultimate reality, and the empirical world is considered *mithyā* (illusory or dependent reality). Western Idealism, particularly in the works of George Berkeley, Immanuel Kant, and G.W.F. Hegel, similarly challenges material realism, asserting that reality is fundamentally mental or shaped by consciousness. This study explores both convergences and divergences between these traditions. While Berkeley's subjective idealism echoes the primacy of perception, Kant's transcendental idealism introduces epistemological limits absent in Advaita. Hegel's absolute idealism comes closest to Advaita in envisioning an ultimate, unified reality, though it retains a dynamic, dialectical process rather than a static absolute. The paper argues that despite differences in method, language, and cultural context, both traditions converge in their rejection of naive realism and their affirmation of consciousness as foundational. However, Advaita Vedanta uniquely integrates metaphysics with soteriology, aiming at liberation (*moksha*), whereas Western Idealism remains primarily epistemological and speculative. This comparative study contributes to cross-cultural philosophy by highlighting the global relevance of non-dual thought and its implications for contemporary philosophical discourse.

Index Terms—Advaita Vedanta, Western Idealism, Non-dualism, Consciousness, Brahman, Berkeley, Kant, Hegel, Epistemology

I. INTRODUCTION

The philosophical inquiry into the nature of reality has been a central concern across both Eastern and Western intellectual traditions. Among the most profound contributions to this inquiry are

Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism, each offering distinctive yet comparable perspectives on the relationship between consciousness and the external world. Advaita Vedanta, rooted in the ancient Upanishadic texts and systematically articulated by Adi Shankaracharya, presents a non-dualistic framework in which Brahman, the ultimate reality, is the sole existent, and all multiplicity is regarded as an apparent manifestation arising from ignorance (*avidyā*).¹ In contrast, Western Idealism, particularly as developed by philosophers such as George Berkeley, Immanuel Kant, and G.W.F. Hegel, challenges the independent existence of material reality and emphasizes the constitutive role of the mind or consciousness in shaping experience.²

This section aims to introduce the foundational concerns that motivate a comparative study between these two traditions. While separated by geography, language, and historical context, both Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism converge in their critique of naïve realism the belief that the world exists independently of perception or cognition.³ However, they diverge significantly in their metaphysical commitments, epistemological methods, and ultimate philosophical goals. Advaita Vedanta integrates metaphysical inquiry with a soteriological aim, seeking liberation (*moksha*) through the realization of the identity between the individual self (*Ātman*) and Brahman.⁴ Western Idealism, on the other hand, often remains within the domain of epistemology and metaphysics, focusing on the conditions of knowledge and the structure of experience without necessarily prescribing a path to existential liberation.⁵

Furthermore, the methodological approaches of these traditions differ markedly. Advaita Vedanta relies on scriptural authority (*śruti*), rational analysis (*yukti*), and direct experiential realization (*anubhava*) as valid means of knowledge. Western Idealism, particularly in Kantian philosophy, emphasizes critical reasoning and the limits of human cognition, while Hegelian philosophy employs dialectical reasoning to articulate the development of absolute knowledge.⁶ By situating these traditions within a comparative framework, this study seeks to illuminate both their shared insights and their distinctive contributions to the philosophy of consciousness and reality. Such a comparison not only enhances our understanding of each tradition individually but also fosters a broader, cross-cultural philosophical dialogue that remains relevant in contemporary discussions on metaphysics and epistemology.

II. METAPHYSICAL FOUNDATIONS

The metaphysical foundations of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reveal their deepest philosophical commitments regarding the nature of reality, existence, and ultimate truth. Both

¹Śaṅkarācārya, *Brahma Sutra Bhāṣya*, 1.1.4.

²George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, p3; Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A30B/45; G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Preface

³S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 2,

⁴*Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*, 1.4.10.

⁵Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A51/B75.

⁶G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Introduction.

traditions challenge the assumption that the material world is independently real, yet they articulate their positions through distinct conceptual frameworks and methodologies.

Advaita Vedanta

Advaita Vedanta, systematized by Adi Shankaracharya, is grounded in the Upanishadic revelation that Brahman is the sole, non-dual reality (*ekam eva advitiam*).⁷ Brahman is described as *sat-chit-ananda* pure existence, consciousness, and bliss and is beyond all attributes (*nirguna*), forms, and distinctions. It is not merely the highest being but the very ground of all being. The empirical world (*jagat*), according to Advaita, is not absolutely real but is categorized as *mithyā*, meaning it has a dependent or provisional reality.⁸ This concept avoids both strict realism and nihilism: the world is neither completely real (*sat*) nor completely unreal (*asat*), but appears real due to ignorance (*avidyā*). A classic analogy used is that of mistaking a rope for a snake in dim light the snake appears real but is ultimately sublated upon correct knowledge.⁹ Central to Advaita metaphysics is the identity of *Ātman* (the individual self) and Brahman. The Upanishadic *mahāvākya* ‘*tat tvam asi*’ expresses this non-dual identity.¹⁰ The apparent distinction between individual selves and the ultimate reality arises due to ignorance, which superimposes (*adhyāsa*) limitations upon the self. Liberation (*moksha*) is achieved through the removal of this ignorance by means of knowledge (*jñāna*), revealing the ever-present unity of existence.

Western Idealism

Western Idealism encompasses a range of philosophical positions that emphasize the primacy of mind or consciousness in constituting reality. Although diverse, these theories share a rejection of material substance as the ultimate foundation of existence. George Berkeley’s subjective idealism asserts that reality consists solely of ideas and perceiving minds. According to Berkeley, objects do not exist independently of perception; rather, their existence is contingent upon being perceived (*esse est percipi*).¹¹ However, Berkeley avoids solipsism by positing God as the ultimate perceiver who ensures the continuity and coherence of the world. Immanuel Kant’s transcendental idealism introduces a critical distinction between phenomena (the world as experienced) and noumena (things-in-themselves).¹² Kant argues that human knowledge is limited to phenomena, which are structured by the a priori categories of the mind, such as space, time, and causality. While Kant does not deny the existence of an external reality, he maintains that its true nature remains unknowable.

G.W.F. Hegel’s absolute idealism represents a more comprehensive metaphysical system in which reality is understood as the self-unfolding of the Absolute Spirit (*Geist*).¹³ For Hegel, reality is not

⁷Chandogya Upanishad, 6.2.1.

⁸ Śāṅkarācārya, *Brahma Sutra Bhāṣya*, II.1.14.

⁹ Eliot Deutsch, *Advaita Vedanta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*, p31.

¹⁰Chandogya Upanishad, 6.8.7.

¹¹ George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, p33.

¹² Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A30/B45.

¹³ G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Preface.

static but dynamic, evolving through a dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The Absolute is not separate from the world but manifests itself through historical and rational development, culminating in self-consciousness.

While Advaita Vedanta posits a timeless, unchanging absolute reality, Western Idealism particularly in Hegel conceives of the absolute as dynamic and historically unfolding. Advaita's metaphysics is grounded in revelation and direct realization, whereas Western Idealism relies more heavily on rational and critical inquiry. Despite these differences, both traditions converge in their assertion that ultimate reality is fundamentally non-material and intimately connected with consciousness.

Epistemological Frameworks of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism

The epistemological foundations of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reveal both convergences and divergences in their approaches to knowledge, perception, and the limits of human cognition. While both traditions emphasize the centrality of consciousness, they differ significantly in their sources of knowledge and ultimate epistemic goals.

Epistemology in Advaita Vedanta

Advaita Vedanta recognizes multiple valid means of knowledge (pramāṇas), among which the most significant are śruti (scriptural testimony), anumāna (inference), and pratyakṣa (perception). However, for realizing the ultimate truth of non-duality, śruti particularly the Upanishads is considered the highest authority, as it reveals truths that transcend empirical experience.¹⁴ The epistemological process in Advaita involves three stages: śravaṇa (listening to scriptural teachings), manana (rational reflection), and nididhyāsana (deep meditation).¹⁵ Through this process, the seeker overcomes avidyā (ignorance), which is the root cause of misperceiving the self as separate from Brahman. Knowledge (jñāna) in Advaita is not merely intellectual but transformative, culminating in direct realization (aparokṣānubhūti) of the identity of Ātman and Brahman. Importantly, Advaita distinguishes between two levels of reality vyāvahārika (empirical reality) and pāramārthika (ultimate reality). While empirical knowledge operates within the realm of everyday experience, true knowledge pertains to the realization of the non-dual Brahman beyond all distinctions.¹⁶

Epistemology in Western Idealism

Western Idealism, particularly in the works of Berkeley, Kant, and Hegel, offers diverse epistemological frameworks centered on the role of the mind in constituting reality. George Berkeley's epistemology is grounded in empiricism, asserting that all knowledge arises from sensory perception. However, he denies the existence of material substance, arguing that objects

¹⁴ S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 2, p. 512.

¹⁵ Śaṅkarācārya, *Brahma Sutra Bhāṣya*, I.1.3.

¹⁶ Śaṅkara, *Aparokṣānubhūti*, verse 11.

exist only as ideas perceived by minds.¹⁷ Thus, knowledge is limited to perceptions and the relations between them, with God serving as the ultimate perceiver ensuring continuity. Immanuel Kant introduces a critical turn by distinguishing between *a priori* and *a posteriori* knowledge. According to Kant, the mind actively structures experience through innate categories such as causality and space-time.¹⁸ While phenomena (things as they appear) are knowable, noumena (things-in-themselves) remain beyond human cognition. This establishes a fundamental epistemic limit absent in Advaita Vedanta. G.W.F. Hegel, in contrast, seeks to overcome Kant's dualism by proposing a dialectical method in which knowledge evolves through contradictions and their resolutions. For Hegel, the Absolute is not static but unfolds through historical and logical processes, and knowledge is achieved through the progressive realization of this Absolute Spirit.

III. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Both Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reject naïve realism and emphasize the role of consciousness in shaping knowledge. However, Advaita posits that ultimate reality can be directly realized through disciplined inquiry and spiritual practice, whereas Western Idealism especially in Kant maintains that ultimate reality is fundamentally unknowable. Furthermore, Advaita integrates epistemology with soteriology, viewing knowledge as a means to liberation. In contrast, Western Idealism largely confines itself to theoretical understanding, with Hegel being a partial exception in linking knowledge to historical self-realization.

Concept of Reality

The concept of reality occupies a central position in both Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism, though each tradition articulates it through distinct metaphysical frameworks and philosophical vocabularies. In Advaita Vedanta, reality is understood in terms of a hierarchical ontology consisting of three levels *paramārthika satya* (absolute reality), *vyāvahārikasatya* (empirical reality), and *prātibhāsika satya* (illusory reality).¹⁹ At the highest level, *paramārthika satya*, Brahman alone is really unchanging, infinite, and non-dual. The empirical world, though experienced, is considered *mithyā*, meaning it has dependent existence and is neither absolutely real nor absolutely unreal.²⁰ This nuanced understanding allows Advaita to account for the apparent multiplicity of the world without compromising its commitment to non-dualism. The analogy of illusion (*māyā*) plays a crucial role in explaining this conception. Just as a rope may be mistaken for a snake in dim light, the world is perceived as real due to ignorance (*avidyā*), but upon true knowledge (*jñāna*), its dependent nature is revealed.²¹ Thus, reality in Advaita is ultimately non-dual consciousness, and the multiplicity of the world is a superimposition (*adhyāsa*) upon Brahman.

¹⁷ Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 1, p 423.

¹⁸ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, A51/B75.

¹⁹ Śaṅkarācārya, *Brahma Sutra Bhāṣya*, II.1.14.

²⁰ Eliot Deutsch, *Advaita Vedanta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*, p31.

²¹ Vivekachudamani, verse 20.

In Western Idealism, the concept of reality varies significantly among philosophers. George Berkeley's subjective idealism denies the existence of material substance altogether, asserting that reality consists solely of ideas perceived by minds. For Berkeley, objects exist only insofar as they are perceived, and their continuity is guaranteed by the eternal perception of God. Immanuel Kant, however, introduces a critical distinction between phenomena and noumena. While phenomena constitute the world as experienced and structured by the categories of human understanding, noumena represent things-in-themselves, which remain inaccessible to human cognition.²² Kant thus preserves empirical reality while limiting metaphysical claims about ultimate reality.

G.W.F. Hegel advances a more comprehensive vision through Absolute Idealism, wherein reality is conceived as the self-unfolding of the Absolute Spirit (Geist). Unlike the static conception of Brahman in Advaita, Hegel's Absolute is dynamic and evolves through a dialectical process involving thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.²³ Reality, in this view, is not merely given but is progressively realized through historical and rational development.

Despite these differences, both Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism converge in rejecting naïve realism and affirming that reality is fundamentally grounded in consciousness or mind. However, Advaita's assertion of an unchanging, non-dual absolute contrasts with the more epistemologically constrained or dynamically evolving conceptions found in Western Idealism.

IV. SELF AND CONSCIOUSNESS

The concept of self and consciousness occupies a central position in both Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism, though each tradition articulates it in distinct philosophical terms. In Advaita Vedanta, the self (Ātman) is understood as pure consciousness, which is identical with Brahman, the ultimate reality.²⁴ This identity is expressed in the mahāvākya 'Tat Tvam Asi' indicating that the individual self is not separate from the universal consciousness.²⁵ Consciousness in this framework is self-luminous (svayam-prakāśa), unchanging, and not dependent on any external object for its existence. The apparent individuality of the self arises due to ignorance (avidyā), which superimposes limitations upon the infinite nature of consciousness.²⁶

In contrast, Western Idealism presents a more varied understanding of self and consciousness. For Berkeley, the self is a perceiving subject that exists as a spirit distinct from its ideas, though dependent on God as the ultimate perceiver.²⁷ Kant introduces the notion of the transcendental unity of apperception, which refers to the self as the organizing principle that unifies all experiences, though it cannot be known as an object in itself.²⁸ Hegel further develops this idea by

²² Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, A30/B45.

²³ G.W.F. Hegel, Phenomenology of Spirit, Preface.

²⁴ Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, 3.4.1.

²⁵ Chandogya Upanishad, 6.8.7.

²⁶ Śaṅkarācārya, Vivekachudamani, verse 20.

²⁷ George Berkeley, Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, Dialogue I.

²⁸ Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, B132.

conceiving the self as part of the Absolute Spirit, which realizes itself through historical and dialectical processes.²⁹

While both traditions emphasize the primacy of consciousness, Advaita Vedanta asserts its absolute and unchanging nature, whereas Western Idealism often treats consciousness as structured, relational, or evolving. This distinction highlights a fundamental divergence: Advaita seeks to dissolve the subject-object duality entirely, while Western Idealism tends to reinterpret rather than eliminate it.

V. LIBERATION VS KNOWLEDGE

A fundamental distinction between Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism lies in their ultimate philosophical aims namely, liberation (moksha) versus intellectual knowledge. In Advaita Vedanta, philosophy is not merely a speculative or theoretical enterprise but a transformative discipline aimed at the cessation of suffering and the realization of one's true nature. Liberation (moksha) is achieved through the direct experiential knowledge (aparokṣa jñāna) that the individual self (Ātman) is identical with Brahman, the absolute reality.³⁰ This realization dissolves ignorance (avidyā), which is considered the root cause of bondage and the cycle of birth and death (saṃsāra).³¹

The process of attaining liberation in Advaita involves a structured path that includes ethical preparation (sādhana-catuṣṭaya), scriptural study (śravaṇa), reflection (manana), and deep meditation (nididhyāsana).³² Knowledge in this context is not merely conceptual but existential and transformative, leading to a radical shift in one's perception of reality. Thus, knowledge and liberation are inseparable in Advaita Vedanta; true knowledge is itself liberation.

In contrast, Western Idealism, particularly in the works of Kant and Hegel, is primarily concerned with epistemological and metaphysical inquiry rather than existential liberation. Kant's project in the Critique of Pure Reason seeks to delineate the limits and conditions of human knowledge, emphasizing that while we can know phenomena, the noumenal realm remains inaccessible.³³ This epistemological humility does not aim at liberation from suffering but at clarifying the scope of human cognition. Hegel, while moving beyond Kant's limitations, envisions knowledge as the self-realization of the Absolute Spirit through a dialectical process.³⁴ Although this process involves a form of intellectual and historical development, it does not culminate in liberation in the Advaitic sense. Instead, it represents the unfolding of rationality and self-consciousness within history.

Thus, while both traditions value knowledge, their purposes diverge significantly. Advaita Vedanta integrates knowledge with spiritual emancipation, whereas Western Idealism largely

²⁹ G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p177.

³⁰ Śaṅkarācārya, *Vivekachudamani*, verse 20.

³¹ *Mundaka Upanishad*, 2.2.8.

³² Śaṅkarācārya, *Upadesa Sahasri*, 1.1.

³³ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B306.

³⁴ G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p808.

confines itself to theoretical understanding and philosophical system-building. This distinction highlights the practical and soteriological orientation of Indian philosophy in contrast to the predominantly analytical orientation of Western thought.

VI. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

A detailed comparison between Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reveals both striking parallels and fundamental divergences in their philosophical outlooks. These similarities and differences can be understood more clearly when examined across metaphysical, epistemological, and practical dimensions.

Similarities

One of the most significant points of convergence between Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism is their shared rejection of naïve materialism. Both traditions challenge the assumption that the external, physical world exists independently of consciousness. Advaita Vedanta asserts that the empirical world is *mithyā* dependent on Brahman for its existence while Berkeley's idealism similarly denies the independent existence of matter, arguing that objects exist only as perceptions in the mind.

Another important similarity lies in the emphasis on consciousness as the foundational principle of reality. In Advaita Vedanta, Brahman is pure consciousness (*cit*), which underlies all existence.³⁵ Likewise, Western Idealists such as Kant and Hegel emphasize the central role of the mind or spirit in shaping or constituting reality. Kant argues that the structures of human cognition determine how we experience the world,³⁶ while Hegel sees reality as the unfolding of Absolute Spirit. Both traditions also critique empirical realism the belief that sensory experience provides direct access to an objective, independent reality. Advaita Vedanta considers sensory perception to be limited and often misleading due to ignorance (*avidyā*), while Kant argues that our knowledge is confined to phenomena, not things-in-themselves (*noumena*).

Differences

Despite these similarities, there are profound differences between the two traditions. One of the most fundamental distinctions is that Advaita Vedanta is strictly non-dual (*advaita*), asserting that there is only one ultimate reality without any second. In contrast, most forms of Western Idealism retain some form of subject-object distinction. Even in Hegel's Absolute Idealism, the unity of reality is achieved through a dialectical process rather than being an already established, unchanging truth.³⁷

Another key difference lies in their ultimate aims. Advaita Vedanta is deeply soteriological it seeks liberation (*moksha*) from the cycle of birth and death through the realization of the identity of

³⁵Taittiriya Upanishad, 2.1.1.

³⁶Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, A51/B75.

³⁷Śaṅkarācārya, Vivekachudamani, verse 11.

Ātman and Brahman. [Western Idealism, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with epistemological and metaphysical inquiry. Its goal is to understand the nature and limits of knowledge rather than to provide a path to existential liberation. Furthermore, Advaita Vedanta integrates philosophical inquiry with spiritual practice, including meditation, ethical discipline, and renunciation. Knowledge (jñāna) in Advaita is transformative and experiential. In contrast, Western Idealism largely remains within the realm of theoretical philosophy, emphasizing rational analysis and dialectical reasoning rather than direct experiential realization.

Finally, there is a difference in how change and reality are conceived. Advaita Vedanta views the ultimate reality (Brahman) as changeless and eternal, with all apparent change belonging to the realm of illusion. Hegelian Idealism, however, sees change and contradiction as essential to the development of reality itself, making the Absolute dynamic rather than static.[14]

VII. CRITICAL EVALUATION

A critical evaluation of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reveals both the strengths and limitations inherent in each philosophical system, particularly in their approaches to metaphysics, epistemology, and the nature of consciousness. While both traditions converge in their rejection of naïve materialism and their emphasis on the primacy of consciousness, they diverge significantly in their methods, scope, and ultimate aims.

Advaita Vedanta offers a comprehensive metaphysical framework grounded in non-dualism, asserting that Brahman alone is ultimately real and that the empirical world is a dependent appearance (mithyā).³⁸ This position provides a radical solution to the problem of multiplicity by dissolving all distinctions into a single, unified reality. However, critics argue that Advaita's reliance on scriptural authority (śruti) as a primary means of knowledge may limit its accessibility to those outside its traditional framework. Furthermore, the concept of māyā, which explains the appearance of the world, has been criticized for its ambiguity being neither fully real nor unreal, it raises questions about its ontological status.

Western Idealism, particularly in the works of Kant and Hegel, offers a more systematic and critical approach to epistemology. Kant's transcendental idealism provides a rigorous analysis of the conditions of human knowledge, emphasizing the role of the mind in structuring experience. However, his distinction between phenomena and noumena has been criticized for creating an unbridgeable gap between appearance and reality, thereby limiting the possibility of metaphysical knowledge. Hegel attempts to overcome this limitation through his dialectical method, proposing that reality is the self-unfolding of the Absolute Spirit. While this offers a dynamic and historical understanding of reality, it has been critiqued for its complexity and for potentially subsuming individual experience under an abstract totality.

Another key point of divergence lies in the practical implications of these philosophies. Advaita Vedanta integrates metaphysical insight with a clear soteriological goal liberation (moksha)

³⁸ Śaṅkarācārya, Vivekachudamani, verse 20.

through self-realization.³⁹ This gives it a transformative dimension that extends beyond theoretical speculation. In contrast, Western Idealism, despite its profound insights, largely remains within the realm of philosophical inquiry and does not prescribe a direct path to existential liberation. In conclusion, while Western Idealism contributes valuable analytical tools and critical perspectives, Advaita Vedanta offers a more holistic vision that unites metaphysics, epistemology, and spiritual practice. A dialogue between these traditions can enrich contemporary philosophical discourse, particularly in addressing enduring questions about consciousness, reality, and the possibility of ultimate knowledge.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The comparative study of Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism reveals a rich and nuanced dialogue between two major philosophical traditions that, despite their geographical and cultural differences, converge on several fundamental questions about reality, consciousness, and the nature of existence. Both traditions challenge the assumptions of materialism and emphasize that reality cannot be fully understood without acknowledging the central role of consciousness or mind.

Advaita Vedanta presents a radical non-dualistic framework in which Brahman is the only ultimate reality, and the apparent multiplicity of the world is a product of ignorance (*avidyā*). Its philosophical system is not merely speculative but deeply practical, aiming at the realization of one's true nature as identical with Brahman, thereby achieving liberation (*moksha*). This integration of metaphysics, epistemology, and spiritual practice gives Advaita a distinctive character that extends beyond theoretical inquiry into existential transformation. Western Idealism, on the other hand, offers a diverse range of perspectives. Berkeley's subjective idealism emphasizes perception as the basis of existence, Kant introduces critical limits to human knowledge while maintaining the structuring role of the mind, and Hegel develops a comprehensive system in which reality unfolds through a dialectical process culminating in the Absolute Spirit. While these thinkers share a commitment to the primacy of mind or consciousness, their approaches remain largely within the domain of epistemology and metaphysical speculation rather than spiritual liberation.

The key differences between the two traditions lie in their treatment of duality, the nature of the self, and their ultimate aims. Advaita Vedanta asserts an absolute non-duality and seeks experiential realization, whereas Western Idealism often retains some form of subject-object distinction and focuses on intellectual understanding. Nevertheless, the similarities between them open up possibilities for meaningful cross-cultural philosophical engagement. In contemporary philosophical discourse, especially in fields such as consciousness studies, metaphysics, and comparative philosophy, the dialogue between Advaita Vedanta and Western Idealism remains highly relevant. By bringing these traditions into conversation, scholars can gain deeper insights

³⁹Mundaka Upanishad, 2.2.8.

into the nature of reality and explore integrative approaches that bridge Eastern and Western thought.

REFERENCES

- [1] Berkeley, George, A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis, 1982.
- [2] Dasgupta, Surendranath, A History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1922.
- [3] Deutsch, Eliot, Advaita Vedanta: A Philosophical Reconstruction, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, 1969.
- [4] Hegel, G.W.F, Phenomenology of Spirit. Translated by A.V. Miller, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1977.
- [5] Kant, Immanuel, Critique of Pure Reason, Translated by Norman Kemp Smith, Macmillan, London, 1929.
- [6] Radhakrishnan, S, Indian Philosoph, Vol. 2, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1958.
- [7] Shankara, Brahma Sutra Bhashya. Translated by Swami Gambhirananda, Advaita Ashrama, Kolkata, 1965.
- [8] The Principal Upanishads. Translated by S. Radhakrishnan, HarperCollins, New Delhi, 1994.