

# A Comparative Metaphysical Analysis: The Plausibility of Brahman and the Abrahamic God from the Standpoint of Stoic Logos

## Introduction: Establishing the Philosophical Framework

This report undertakes a rigorous comparative analysis to evaluate the philosophical plausibility of two distinct concepts of a universal divinity—the non-dual Brahman of Advaita Vedanta and the dualistic Abrahamic God—when viewed through the lens of Stoic Logos. The objective is not to declare one concept as "correct" in an absolute sense, but to determine which of these two external metaphysical systems demonstrates a greater degree of conceptual harmony and logical coherence with the core principles of Stoicism. The analysis is grounded in a precise and detailed definition of the Stoic framework, which will serve as the standard for judgment.

The Stoic concept of Logos is far more than a simple notion of logic or reason. It is the "intelligent order behind the universe," a rational principle that governs nature, the cosmos, and human behavior when aligned with virtue.<sup>1</sup> For the Stoics, the universe is not chaotic but ordered by this divine rationality, which is an immanent and material force.<sup>2</sup> This principle, which provides the foundation for Stoic cosmology and ethics, is the critical yardstick by which the other two concepts will be measured.

In contrast to the Stoic Logos, the concept of Brahman in Advaita Vedanta presents a monistic worldview. It asserts that Brahman is the sole, unchanging reality, and that the universe and all individual selves (Atman) are ultimately one and the same substance as Brahman.<sup>4</sup> This philosophy espouses a non-dual reality where no fundamental separation exists.

Conversely, the Abrahamic concept of God is rooted in a fundamental duality. God is a transcendent creator, distinct from the universe He created through the doctrine of *Creatio ex nihilo*.<sup>6</sup> While God is also considered immanent and involved in creation, this immanence is a quality of a being that is ultimately separate from and external to the world.

To provide a foundational reference for the subsequent detailed analysis, the core tenets of each philosophical system are outlined in the following table.

---

**Table 1: Key Tenets of Stoicism, Advaita Vedanta, and Abrahamic Theology**

Category	Stoic Logos (Standard)	Advaita Vedanta (Brahman)	Abrahamic Theology (God)
<b>Ontology</b>	Monistic, Materialistic	Non-dual, Idealistic	Dualistic, Creator/Created
<b>Divinity</b>	Immanent, Impersonal Logos	Immanent, Impersonal Brahman	Transcendent and Immanent, Personal God
<b>Cosmology</b>	Deterministic, Cyclic	Illusory ( <i>Jagat Mithya</i> )	Linear, <i>Creatio ex nihilo</i>
<b>Free Will</b>	Limited, Co-fating	Ignorance-based ( <i>Avidya</i> )	Free Choice, Moral Responsibility
<b>Epistemology</b>	Reasoned Assent	Knowledge ( <i>Jnana</i> )	Divine Revelation
<b>Ethics</b>	Virtue, Living in accord with Nature	Detachment, Liberation	Divine Law, Redemption

---

# Part I: The Stoic Logos: Defining the Standard for Plausibility

The Stoic philosophical system is built upon a unified account of the world, integrating logic, a monistic physics, and a naturalistic ethics.<sup>3</sup> At the core of this system is the Logos, which serves as the ultimate rational principle and standard for all reality. A precise understanding of the Logos is paramount to the comparative analysis that follows.

## 1.1 The Immanent, Material, and Rational Cosmos

The Logos is conceptualized as the divine rationality that is not external to the cosmos but "embedded in nature itself".<sup>2</sup> It is the intelligent structure that underlies all natural processes and operates according to rational laws.<sup>2</sup> The Stoics conceived of the universe as a "material reasoning substance," or an intelligent aether/primordial fire that pervades and animates all matter.<sup>3</sup> This material, immanent divinity is the cause of the cosmos and gives "form and energy to matter that is docile".<sup>8</sup> This monistic and pantheistic conception means that the universe *is* the divine.<sup>3</sup>

This understanding of the Logos is a critical philosophical point. The Stoic "god" is not a personal deity to be worshipped in the modern religious sense, but rather a philosophical concept of cosmic rationality.<sup>2</sup> It is not a being with an arbitrary or capricious will that dictates events. Rather, it is the inherent, logical structure of the universe itself.<sup>9</sup> The Stoic "piety" is not based on superstition or myth but on an existential commitment to a providentially ordered cosmos.<sup>8</sup> This distinction establishes a fundamental conflict with concepts of a personal, external deity and provides a nuanced basis for comparison with non-personal concepts of divinity.

## 1.2 Determinism, Co-Fating, and Human Assent

The Stoics were deterministic, believing that all events are part of an eternal, interconnected sequence governed by the Logos.<sup>2</sup> This perspective is often misunderstood as fatalism, which suggests that human action is pointless. The so-called "Lazy Argument" posed this very criticism: if everything is fated, why bother to do anything?<sup>10</sup>

The Stoic response, articulated by Chrysippus, is one of the most profound aspects of their philosophy. They introduced the concept of "co-fating" or "confatal".<sup>10</sup> This doctrine posits that while external events are causally inevitable, human actions and character are also

necessary components of the fated outcome.<sup>10</sup> The Stoics differentiated between proximate causes (external events) and principal causes (the nature of the person involved).<sup>10</sup> For example, the appearance of a doughnut is a proximate cause, but a person's virtuous character, cultivated through habit and reasoned choice, is the principal cause of their refusal to eat it.<sup>10</sup> This perspective transforms a passive-seeming world into one that demands active participation.

The Stoic path is one of "willing obedience" to a providentially ordered cosmos.<sup>8</sup> The human capacity for reason, which is a portion of the divine Logos, allows for reasoned assent (

*synkatathesis*) to external impressions.<sup>2</sup> Our "free will" is not the freedom to change the course of external events, but the freedom to align our internal judgments and responses with the rational nature of the universe.<sup>11</sup> This active participation through reasoned assent is a necessary and integral part of the deterministic chain. The Stoic model thus presents a logically elegant resolution to the free will versus determinism problem, which will be a key point of comparison with the other philosophical systems.

### **1.3 Logos as the Foundation of Virtue and Ethics**

For the Stoics, ethics is not a separate discipline but "essentially applied Logos".<sup>2</sup> To live "in accordance with Nature" is to live in accordance with Logos, the organizing principle of all things.<sup>2</sup> The capacity for reason within humans is a direct share in this cosmic Logos, making us active participants in the rational unfolding of life.<sup>2</sup>

This view establishes a direct link between the physical structure of the universe and moral law. Virtue is the direct result of choosing reason over impulse, which is a form of aligning oneself with the universe.<sup>2</sup> The Stoic worldview posits a universe where moral truths are not dictated by an external authority but are inherent in the very fabric of reality itself. By using our rational faculty, we can understand and live in harmony with these truths.<sup>3</sup> The moral good is the only thing of ultimate value.<sup>8</sup> This philosophical grounding of ethics in a material, immanent cosmology is a key distinction from systems that derive moral law from a transcendent, personal God.

## Part II: Analysis of Brahman: A Monistic Metaphysics

The philosophical system of Advaita Vedanta offers a compelling, monistic view of reality that shares significant points of conceptual congruence with Stoic Logos. This section will explore the tenets of Brahman and analyze their plausibility from a Stoic perspective.

### 2.1 The Non-Dual Reality of Brahman

Advaita Vedanta is a non-dualistic school of Hinduism that asserts a single, indivisible reality. Its metaphysics can be summarized in three core postulates: *Brahman Satyam* (Brahman is the only truth), *Jagat Mithya* (the world is an illusion due to *Maya*), and *Jivo Brahmaiva Naparah* (the individual self, *Atman*, is identical to Brahman).<sup>4</sup>

Brahman is described as pure awareness or consciousness, not merely possessing consciousness but being consciousness itself.<sup>4</sup> It is the ultimate reality that is beyond all duality and is the root source of everything that exists.<sup>4</sup> The universe does not simply come from Brahman; it *is* Brahman.<sup>4</sup> This stands in stark opposition to dualistic worldviews that posit a fundamental separation between a Creator and creation. The reality of Brahman is a monistic ideal, where the distinction between subject and object, self and other, is ultimately seen as illusory.<sup>15</sup>

### 2.2 Conceptual Congruence with Stoic Immanence

A significant point of conceptual harmony exists between the immanent nature of Stoic Logos and the non-dual nature of Brahman. Both philosophical systems reject a creator who is separate from creation. The Stoic view of the Logos as the "divine rationality embedded in nature"<sup>2</sup> and the Advaita Vedantic assertion that the universe "is Brahman"<sup>4</sup> are profoundly aligned. Both posit a single, all-pervading, and indivisible reality. In both systems, the divine principle is not a being to be worshipped at a distance but is the very substance of reality that is to be understood and realized. This shared monistic foundation provides a powerful point of congruence that is absent in dualistic frameworks.

This alignment of ontology is a crucial finding. The Stoic Logos, a "material reasoning substance" that animates the entire universe, and the Advaita Brahman, the singular, indivisible reality from which all existence emerges, both operate from a fundamental premise of immanence. They both see the divine not as something that acts *upon* the world but as something that *is* the world. This conceptual overlap provides a strong argument for the philosophical plausibility of Brahman from a Stoic perspective, as it does not require a complete re-framing of the fundamental nature of reality.

## 2.3 Ethical and Epistemological Parallels

The philosophical and ethical outcomes of Stoicism and Advaita Vedanta also demonstrate notable similarities. Both traditions emphasize an internal path to enlightenment or virtue, stressing a detachment from externals and the cultivation of an unperturbed state of mind.<sup>17</sup> The Stoic pursuit of virtue through reason and the Advaita path to liberation through knowledge (*jnana*) share the goal of overcoming "incorrect judgment" or ignorance (*Avidya*) that leads to suffering.<sup>3</sup> The Stoic image of the "inner citadel" finds a parallel in the Upanishadic "city of Brahman," both of which serve as a sanctuary against the vicissitudes of the external world.<sup>17</sup>

However, a fundamental metaphysical difference exists between the two worldviews. Stoicism is materialistic, viewing the Logos as a tangible, material substance.<sup>3</sup> The world, and all its phenomena, is real, and the goal is to live in harmony with it and to "love everything that is happening" (*Amor Fati*).<sup>18</sup> Advaita Vedanta, in contrast, is idealistic. The material world (*Jagat*) is considered an illusion (*Mithya*) caused by ignorance, and the ultimate goal is liberation from this illusion through knowledge of the true, non-dual reality.<sup>13</sup> This means that while both philosophies promote a similar ethical outcome (a tranquil mind), the underlying logic for that state is different. The Stoic embraces a real, deterministic world, while the Advaitin seeks to realize the unreality of that world. This is not a direct contradiction, but a divergence that demonstrates a less than perfect alignment between the systems.

## Part III: Analysis of the Abrahamic God: A Dualistic Metaphysics

The Abrahamic concept of God is predicated on a series of foundational tenets that stand in direct and often irreconcilable conflict with the Stoic Logos. This section will demonstrate the deep-seated conceptual friction between these two worldviews.

### 3.1 The Great Divide: Transcendence and Duality

The most significant point of conflict lies in the fundamental ontology of the two systems. The Abrahamic God is a transcendent creator who stands outside of space and time.<sup>20</sup> The doctrine of *Creatio ex nihilo* (creation from nothing) establishes a clear and permanent duality between God and His creation.<sup>6</sup> While God is also considered immanent—permeating the world with His power—this immanence is cast as a quality of a transcendent being, not as a state of being one with the cosmos.<sup>21</sup> This is a profound philosophical schism. The Stoic Logos is a monistic and pantheistic entity, where the divine *is* the universe.<sup>3</sup> It cannot logically accommodate a being that stands outside of the causal, material reality that it is.<sup>9</sup>

The Abrahamic worldview requires a fundamental separation between Creator and creation, with God as the "other" and "outside of human comprehension".<sup>21</sup> The Stoic, by contrast, seeks to find the divine within the very structure of the cosmos and within human reason itself.<sup>2</sup> This ontological conflict is absolute and represents the most significant barrier to conceptual compatibility.

### **3.2 The Paradox of Divine Will and Human Free Will**

Abrahamic traditions grapple with the complex problem of theological fatalism: if God is omniscient and knows every choice a person will make, how can humans have free will?<sup>23</sup> The resolution of this tension is a central and perennial debate within Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, often relying on paradox, divine mystery, or a form of compatibilism where divine foreknowledge does not negate human responsibility.<sup>24</sup>

From a Stoic perspective, the Abrahamic model's reliance on a paradox or an external, non-logical premise makes it philosophically less plausible. The Stoic concept of "co-fating" offers a logically elegant resolution where human action is seamlessly integrated into a deterministic, causal chain.<sup>10</sup> A Stoic would find the Abrahamic God's ability to "change destiny" based on human choices to be a form of irrational intervention.<sup>26</sup> In a purely rational universe governed by Logos, every effect has a cause, and there is no room for a transcendent being to arbitrarily alter the course of events. The Stoic model provides a coherent and self-contained logical system, whereas the Abrahamic model requires an appeal to a mystery that stands outside of a logical framework.

### **3.3 Personal Deity vs. Impersonal Force**

The Abrahamic God is a personal, volitional, and often anthropomorphic being.<sup>6</sup> He has a "will" and "purpose," listens to prayers, and reacts to human actions.<sup>6</sup> The relationship with this God is personal, devotional, and often based on worship and submission to a revealed will.<sup>31</sup> This is in stark contrast to the Stoic Logos, which is an impersonal, rational force that is not an object of worship or a being one has a "personal relationship" with.<sup>2</sup>

This difference also creates a fundamental conflict over the source of moral law. The Abrahamic moral framework is based on divine approval and a revealed will conveyed through scripture.<sup>32</sup> The Stoic, on the other hand, believes that ethics is based on the "goodness inherent in the immanent law of Nature".<sup>9</sup> The Stoic would find the Abrahamic God's "capricious actions and an arbitrary or punitive Will" to be an irrational basis for moral law.<sup>9</sup> A rational universe dictates its own ethics; it does not require an external, personal legislator to hand down commandments.

## Part IV: Synthesis and Final Judgment of Plausibility

This report's final section synthesizes the analysis to provide a reasoned and comprehensive judgment on which concept—Brahman or the Abrahamic God—is more philosophically plausible from the standpoint of Stoic Logos. The judgment rests on the degree of internal consistency and shared logical underpinnings between the systems.

### 4.1 Systematic Comparison of Ontological and Epistemological Foundations

A systematic comparison of the three worldviews reveals a clear pattern of alignment and conflict.

- **Ontology:** The Stoic monism (materialistic) and Advaita non-duality (idealistic) share a foundational rejection of the dualism that defines the Abrahamic worldview.<sup>3</sup> The Abrahamic separation between a transcendent Creator and creation is an immediate and absolute contradiction to the Stoic Logos.
- **Divinity:** Both Stoic Logos and Advaita Brahman are impersonal, unifying principles that are one with reality. This stands in stark contrast to the personal, volitional, and anthropomorphic Abrahamic God, whose nature is inconsistent with the Stoic ideal of perfect, impersonal rationality.<sup>2</sup>
- **Epistemology:** The Stoic path relies on human reason and natural law.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Advaita Vedanta's path to liberation is a cognitive one, achieved through knowledge (*jnana*) and self-inquiry.<sup>13</sup> The Abrahamic model, however, relies on external, revealed truths and divine revelation as the primary source of knowledge.<sup>6</sup> This difference highlights a shared focus on an internal, cognitive path between Stoicism and Advaita, which is absent in the Abrahamic model.

### 4.2 Ethics and the Human Condition

Both Stoicism and Advaita Vedanta advocate for an internal path to a tranquil state of mind, emphasizing detachment from external circumstances.<sup>17</sup> The Abrahamic approach, while also valuing virtue, frames it within a context of divine reward and punishment and a path of "redemption".<sup>6</sup> The Stoic would find this extrinsic motivation to be less virtuous than the intrinsic pursuit of excellence for its own sake. The Stoic and Advaita paths are centered on a form of rational self-governance and an internal cognitive shift, which stands in contrast to the Abrahamic reliance on external grace and divine intervention.<sup>31</sup>

### 4.3 The Final Judgment of Plausibility

Based on the comprehensive comparative analysis, the concept of **non-dual Brahman is significantly more plausible** than the Abrahamic God from the standpoint of Stoic Logos. The judgment is not based on a subjective preference but on the degree of conceptual harmony and logical coherence.

The most critical point of alignment is the shared monistic ontology. Both Stoic Logos and Advaita Brahman reject the fundamental duality of a Creator who is distinct from creation. The Abrahamic dualism is a non-negotiable contradiction to the Stoic worldview.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the shared impersonality of Logos and Brahman stands in stark contrast to the personal, anthropomorphic Abrahamic God, whose capricious and arbitrary nature would be seen as fundamentally irrational by a Stoic.<sup>2</sup> While Stoicism and Advaita have different metaphysical views on the nature of reality (material vs. illusory), their shared rejection of an external, personal Creator and their focus on a unifying, all-pervading divine principle make Brahman a far more compatible and "plausible" conceptual ally than the dualistic, transcendent Abrahamic God.

The following table summarizes the findings of this analysis.

---

**Table 2: Points of Conceptual Congruence and Conflict with Stoic Logos**

Category	Stoic Logos vs. Non-dual Brahman	Stoic Logos vs. Abrahamic God
<b>Ontology</b>	<b>Strong Congruence:</b> Both are monistic/non-dual and immanent.	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Monism vs. Dualism. Creator is separate from creation.
<b>Divinity</b>	<b>Strong Congruence:</b> Both are impersonal, unifying principles.	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Impersonal, rational force vs. a personal, volitional being.
<b>Free Will</b>	<b>Nuanced Conflict:</b> Stoic co-fating vs. an ignorance-based model. Both reject external control.	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Stoic deterministic model vs. a paradox of divine foreknowledge and free will.
<b>Epistemology</b>	<b>Strong Congruence:</b> Both rely on an internal, cognitive path (reason, knowledge).	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Reasoned assent vs. divine revelation.
<b>Ethics</b>	<b>Strong Congruence:</b> Both advocate for a detachment from externals and an internal, tranquil mind.	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Ethics based on natural law vs. ethics based on divine, revealed law.
<b>Relationship with Material World</b>	<b>Nuanced Conflict:</b> Material world is real and embraced vs. material world is an illusion to be transcended.	<b>Fundamental Conflict:</b> Divine is the material world vs. divine is distinct from the material world.

## Works cited

1. viastoica.com, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://viastoica.com/what-is-logos/#:~:text=Often%20translated%20as%20%E2%80%9Creason%E2%80%9D%20or,behavior%20when%20aligned%20with%20virtue.>
2. What Is Logos? Understanding the Stoic Meaning and Practice - Via Stoica, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://viastoica.com/what-is-logos/>
3. Stoicism - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stoicism>
4. Brahman - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brahman>
5. Non-duality of Brahman: Significance and symbolism, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.wisdomlib.org/concept/non-duality-of-brahman>
6. Abrahamic religions - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abrahamic\\_religions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abrahamic_religions)
7. Creator deity - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creator\\_deity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creator_deity)
8. Universal Reason – The Guide to Stoic Practice - Traditional Stoicism, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://traditionalstoicism.com/universal-reason-the-guide-to-stoic-practice/>
9. Stoic Theology: Revealing or Redundant? - MDPI, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/10/3/193>
10. Stoics on Fate, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://uh.edu/~cfreelan/courses/fate.html>
11. A Stoic's Perspective On Free Will - Practical Stoicism, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://practicalstoicism.net/p/stoics-perspective-free-will>
12. A Stoic View on Fate: How to Endure What Happens to Us All - Via Stoica, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://viastoica.com/a-stoic-view-on-fate/>
13. The spiritual philosophy of Advaita: Basic concepts and relevance to ..., accessed August 18, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10956581/>
14. Brahman which is consciousness: Significance and symbolism, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.wisdomlib.org/concept/brahman-which-is-consciousness>
15. Nondualism - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nondualism>
16. Philosophy of Sacred Geometry - Number Analytics, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/philosophy-of-sacred-geometry>
17. Stoic Echoes in the Upanishads by Eric O. Scott | Modern Stoicism, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://modernstoicism.com/stoic-echoes-in-the-upanishads-by-eric-o-scott/>
18. Philosophical Stoic Approach in Hinduism - IJRESM, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://www.ijresm.com/Vol.2\\_2019/Vol2\\_Iss3\\_March19/IJRESM\\_V2\\_I3\\_67.pdf](https://www.ijresm.com/Vol.2_2019/Vol2_Iss3_March19/IJRESM_V2_I3_67.pdf)
19. Stoicism and Advaita Vendanta - jabdakhata, accessed August 18, 2025, <http://jabdakhata.blogspot.com/2010/07/stoicism-and-advaita-vendanta.html>

20. God in Abrahamic religions - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/God\\_in\\_Abrahamic\\_religions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/God_in_Abrahamic_religions)
21. Transcendence | Theology Thursday | GCU Blog, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.gcu.edu/blog/theology-ministry/theology-thursday-transcendence>
22. Immanence - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanence>
23. The Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freewill: Critical Analysis of Classical Solutions on the Basis of Zagzebski's Opinion, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://jpht.ut.ac.ir/article\\_77685.html?lang=en](https://jpht.ut.ac.ir/article_77685.html?lang=en)
24. Free will in theology - Wikipedia, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free\\_will\\_in\\_theology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_will_in_theology)
25. Free Will In Judaism - How much choice do we really have? - Chabad.org, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://www.chabad.org/library/article\\_cdo/aid/3909393/jewish/Free-Will.htm](https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/3909393/jewish/Free-Will.htm)
26. Reconciling the Divine Decree and Free Will in Islam - NYU Faculty Digital Archive, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://archive.nyu.edu/bitstream/2451/40069/2/Reconciling%20the%20Divine%20Decree%20and%20Free%20Will%20in%20Islam.pdf>
27. Predestination vs. Free Will in Islam: Understanding Allah's Qadr - Yaqeen Institute, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://yaqeeninstitute.org/read/post/predestination-vs-free-will-in-islam-understanding-allahs-qadr>
28. How does God's plan square with free Will? : r/Catholicism - Reddit, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/189nf1l/how\\_does\\_gods\\_plan\\_square\\_with\\_free\\_will/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/189nf1l/how_does_gods_plan_square_with_free_will/)
29. Free Will and Providence | Encyclopedia.com, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://www.encyclopedia.com/religion/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/free-will-and-providence>
30. Free Will vs Determinism - Orion Philosophy, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://orionphilosophy.com/free-will-vs-determinism/>
31. Stoicism and Christianity: Lessons, Similarities and Differences - Daily Stoic, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://dailystoic.com/stoicism-and-christianity/>
32. Stoicism Is Not Compatible With Your Religion, accessed August 18, 2025, <https://stoicismpod.com/episode/stoicism-is-not-compatible-with-your-religion/>
33. Is Brahman conscious of itself? and if so, what is it conscious of? : r/AdvaitaVedanta - Reddit, accessed August 18, 2025, [https://www.reddit.com/r/AdvaitaVedanta/comments/14hh73i/is\\_brahman\\_conscious\\_of\\_itself\\_and\\_if\\_so\\_what\\_is/](https://www.reddit.com/r/AdvaitaVedanta/comments/14hh73i/is_brahman_conscious_of_itself_and_if_so_what_is/)