CHAPTER III

THE BASIC ASPECTS OF ADVAITA VEDĀNTA

In this Chapter, we discuss the various basic aspects of the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta. The Chapter is divided into three main sections. In the first section, we present the important tenets of the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta. In the Second section, we trace the nature of man according to Advaita Vedānta. This endeavour is effected in such a manner that it brings out perspectives which are compatible with the concept of economic man. In the third section, we approach an economic problem in the light of the Advaita Vedāntic concept of man. This attempt is made in the background of the conventional approach to economics (as expounded in Chapter II. Section A. of the thesis).

Let us now proceed to discuss the basic tenets of the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta. This would provide us with a good background to understand the deduced perspectives of Advaita Vedānta.

A. The Important Tenents of Advaita Vedānta

The 'Vedas', which means 'to know' as well as 'knowledge', are the oldest literary monument of the Indian Philosophical tradition. The Vedas, consists of four portions, namely, the Mantras, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āryanyakas, and the Upaniṣads. The Mantras consists of hymns addressed to various Gods and Goddesses. The Brāhmaṇas deals with the rules and regulations for the performance of rites and sacrifices. The Āryanyakas consists of the mystic interpretation of the Vedic sacrifices.

The Upaniṣads are popularly known as 'Vedānta'. This is so because, firstly, they
are literally the concluding portion or the end of the Vedas, and secondly, they are the essence, the cream, the fountain-head, of the Vedic philosophy. The Upaniṣads or the Vedānta consists of doctrines about the highest Reality. There are three main interpretations of the Vedānta. They are, the Advaita Vedānta (Non-dualism), the Viśiṣṭadvaita Vedānta (Qualified non-dualism), and Dvaita Vedānta (Dualism).

Advaita Vedānta is one of the most complete and holistic system of Vedānta. Advaita teaches that Reality is beyond all dualities and it refers to the highest realization of the non-dual oneness of all being. In the Young India (December 1924), Mahatma Gandhi declared: "I believe in advaita; I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter, of all that lives."

Śrī Śaṅkarācārya is considered as the greatest preceptor of the Advaita Vedāntic tradition. He was the first to systematize and strengthen the philosophy of Advaita. Modern day Hinduism reflects in ample measure the ideas of the great Ācārya firmly grounded in the Upaniṣadic texts. Swami Vivekananda proclaims, "The greatest teacher of the Vedanta philosophy was Shankaracharya" as "He worked out, rationalised, and placed before men the wonderful coherent system of Advaita." Describing Śaṅkara's teachings of Advaita, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan states, "His philosophy stands out complete, needing neither a before nor an after. It expounds its own presuppositions, is ruled by its own end and holds all its elements, in a stable, reasoned equipose."

Let us now proceed to discuss the basic tenets of Advaita Vedānta, as expounded by Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara, in his Brahma-sūtra-āntavālīmālā, quotes the following famous verse and presents the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta:

\[
\text{brahma satyam jagan mithyā} \\
\text{Śīvo brahmaiva nāpṛah} \]

"Brahman is the Reality. The World is illusory."
The embodied soul is indeed Brahman and not essentially different from it."

Let us now elucidate the above three fundamental statements as it would enable us to have a comprehensive understanding of the basic aspects of Advaita Vedānta.

1. Brahman is the Reality

According to Advaita Vedānta, reality is explained as that whose nature remains uncontradicted and ever unique at all times. The test of reality is endurance. In his commentary of the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara states reality as" that is real whose nature by which it is cognised, remains constant, and that is unreal, whose nature by which it is determined, varies". The Chāndogya Upaniṣad points out that reality is that which exists "in its own glory ". In other words, anything that has a dependent existence is not real. Thus, reality is that which never gets sublated, contradicted or changed.

According to Advaita Vedānta, since the Upaniṣads speak of Brahman as "the real of the real" (Satyaśya satyaṁ) and " the real at all times" (traikāla satyaṁ), Brahman alone is the reality. Advaita Vedānta maintains that Brahman, the eternal objective self, is synonymous with ātman, the inner subjective self of man. Therefore, Brahman - ātman alone is the reality.

Śaṅkara states that Brahman is the reality and is the only reality because It is never sublated by any higher experience. While commenting on the Bhagavad -gītā, Śaṅkara points out that Brahman, as pure existence never ceases to be nor does the non-existent ever come into being. Brahman as reality or true existence is expressed by the phrase "traikālikābādhyā" (ie) what remains uncontradicted at all times-past, present adn future. Thus, Brahman alone is real.
On the complete identity of Brahman and ātman, Advaita Vedānta quotes the Māṇḍūkyā Upaniṣad, which states that "This ātman is Brahman." This epoch-making statement is considered as one of the four Mahāvākyas (great spiritual dictums) in the Advaita Vedāntic tradition. The Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad states that "the Supreme Self is the self of all" and "That Self is indeed Brahman." The Upaniṣads also speaks of ātman as the only reality. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad points out that "the Self alone is real or true" (tadsatyam satmā).

Thus, according to Advaita Vedānta, on the basis of the criterion that reality refers to unsublatability and consistency, Brahman-ātman alone is the reality.

a. Nature of Brahman

According to Advaita Vedānta, Brahman is devoid of all qualities (nirguna), devoid of all activity (niskriya) and devoid of all changes (nirvikāra).

The katha Upaniṣad describe Brahman as "soundless, undiminishing, eternal, without beginning or end"; the Mundaka Upaniṣad as "formless, birthless and the Ultimate"; the Taittirīya Upaniṣad as "the pure subject and therefore is beyond the reach of words and thought" and the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad as "neither gross nor minute, neither air nor ether, unattached." According to Śaṅkara, Brahman -in-Itself is to be regarded as free from all anthropomorphic attributes. Since Brahman is nirguna, It can be described only in a negative way through the process of elimination (neti neti). Commenting on the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara states the essential meaning of the Upaniṣads is to remove all finite conceptions about Brahman. Therefore, we must give up all such conceptions and know Brahman to be undifferentiated like the sky. Hence, "there is no other and more appropriate description of Brahman than 'Not this, not this' to indicate It."
other words, only by stating "not this, not this" and thereby, eliminating all specifications and Nature difference limiting Reality, can one hope to indicate Brahman. Brahman is not the object of perception, but the Supreme Subject of intuitive realization. As the *Mundaka Upanisad* states "One who knows Brahman becomes Brahman". To know Brahman is to be It. Thus, epistemology mergers into metaphysics, in Advaita Vedānta.

The Brahman of Advaita Vedānta can be easily be mistaken for the śūnya or void of the Buddhists. But, what Śaṅkara cautions us is against identifying anything finite with Brahman. Śaṅkara quotes the *Chāndogya Upanisad* which states that "in the beginning there was Existence (Sat) alone, one (eka), only (eva) without a Second (advitiyam)." and explains that Brahman-realization is very much positive and dynamic in nature. According to Advaita Vedānta, the three words ekam, eva and advitiyam deny the three kinds of differences (ie) Sajātiya - Vijātiya-Svagata, bhedarahitam with respect to Brahman.

(1) The Two-fold nature

According to Advaita Vedānta, the *Upaniṣads* define Brahman in two ways, They are (a) with reference to its intrinsic or essential nature (Svarūpa-laksana), and (b) with reference to its accidental attributes (Tatstha-laksana). In the words of T.M.P. Mahadevan,"That is the essential nature of a thing which is present in that thing so long as it lasts and distinguishes it from the rest " and "That is the qualification per accidens of a thing which remains in that thing only for a time and distinguishes it from the rest."  

Advaita Vedānta states that when the Taśṭīyī *Upaniṣad* defines Brahman as Existence(Sat), consciousness (Cit) and Bliss (Ānanda), the definition is in terms of the essential nature (Svarūpa-laksana) of Brahman. It refers to nirguna Brahman which is the Ultimate Reality (Pāramārthika-satā). The three - Sat, Cit and Ānanda are not the qualities of Brahman, but its essential nature. Moreover, the definition also indicates that Brahman
is other than non-existence, non-intelligence and non-bliss.

According to Advaita Vedānta, when the Upaniṣads defines Brahman as the creator, sustainer, destroyer and possessor of all noble virtues (Kalyāṇa-guṇas), the definition is in terms of the accidental attributes (tatastha-lakṣaṇa) of Brahman. It refers to God (Īśvara) having attributes (saguna) and is considered as the Empirical reality (Vyāvahārika - Sattā). It indicates that causality is an external or accidental feature of Brahman.

b. The Concept of Māya

As Brahman is non-dual and absolutely featureless, the concept of māya is invoked in Advaita Vedānta to explain the multiplicity of entities and features encountered by us in the empirical world of our experience.

According to Advaita Vedānta, it is due to māya that Brahman, the absolute reality (Pāramārthika-sattā) appears limited as the relative or empirical reality (Vyāvahārika-sattā). In his BrahmaSūtra - Bhāṣya, Śaṅkara states that Brahman appears as the omniscient God because of the limiting adjuncts (upādhis) created by māya. He also states "Brahman is known in two aspects - one as possessed of the limiting adjunct constituted by the diversities of the universe which is a modification of name and form, and the other devoid of all conditioning factors." while commenting of the Bhagavad-gītā, Śaṅkara points out that māya ensures the power of "becoming" to the unborn and immutable Self. In his commentary on the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara argues that Brahman as related to the whole universe refers to the 'conditioned' Brahman and not the supreme Brahman.

In Advaita Vedānta, māya is referred to by term illusory (mithyā), indescribable (anirvacaniyā) and as neither real nor non-real (sadasatvilakṣaṇā). Śrī Gaudapāda, in his Māndūkya kārikā, uses the term 'māya' to refer to an illusive power, which in reality, does not exist.
Śaṅkara describes māyā as the power of God consisting of "name and form" which are falsely superimposed on Him, which are, as it were, His very self, and which cannot be defined as either real or non-real. Name and form constitutes the power and essence of God (Īśvara) with a major difference that, while the former is material (jāda), God is spirit. In this sense, māyā is often referred to as prakṛti. In his commentary on the Bhagava-gītā, Śaṅkara often refers to māyā as the power of God.

Śaṅkara further amplifies the concept of māyā by distinguishing two powers by which māyā operates. In the Vivekacūḍāmani, Śaṅkara states that māyā by its dynamic operation, initiated by its component of rajas, projects the cosmic manifold. This projection power is referred to as the vikṣepaśakti of māyā. By its static function, due to its component of tamas, māyā conceals the nature of reality, which helps its dynamic operations. This concealment power is known as the āvaranaśakti of māyā.

Thus, we are able to understand that according to Advaita Vedānta, Brahman alone is real and Brahman is attributeless one, only and non-dual. It is due to māyā that the nirguṇa Brahman, the pāramārthika-sattā. Śrī Vidyāranya, in his pañcadasī, clearly elucidates the three constituents of the empirical existence, namely, the personal God (Īśvara), the physical world (Jagat) and the individual souls (Jīvas).

To conclude, when Advaita Vedānta states that Brahman is the reality, it means that nirguṇa Brahman alone is the Absolute reality and saguṇa Brahman (ie) Īśvara is the empirical reality, in relation to the world and the individual souls.

Let us now proceed to discuss the second fundamental statement, which pertains to the world.

2. The world is Illusory

According to Advaita Vedānta, the world is neither absolutely real (Sat) nor absolutely
non-real (asat). Hence, the world is illusory (Mithyā). We have to clearly understand the meaning of the term ‘Mithyā’ as used in Advaita Vedānta.

Sat or reality is given by the criterion of unsublatability and therefore, as we have already seen that Brahman alone is the ultimate reality, the world is not absolutely real. Asat or non-existence can never be the object of perception and experience. Since the world is given to our experience, it is not absolutely non-real. According to Śaṅkara, the world, which is an empirical reality, is being sublated by Brahman-realization. Hence, the world is considered as illusory (Mithyā).38

According to Advaita Vedānta, Brahman is both the efficient cause (nimitta-kāraṇa) and the material cause (upādhāna - kāraṇa) of the world. Śaṅkara quotes the Taittirīya Upaniṣad which states; "That from which all these beings take birth, that by which they live after being born, that towards which they move and into which they merge. That is Brahman." and explains that Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the Universe.40 Brahman, without undergoing any change, through its mysterious power (māyā-śakti), evolves the universe. It is true that there is difference of character between Brahman and the world, but the intelligent Brahman is capable of evolving a non-intelligent world through the power of māyā.41

In the introduction to Chapter II of the Aitareya Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara points out that one does not gain anything by knowing the various theories of creation, but only by the realization of oneness, that is, Absolute nature of ātman, which is the Self of all, one attains immortality.42 Vedānta accepts two main theories of creation, namely, the Brahma-parināma-vāda, the hypothesis that Brahman transforms into the world, and the Brahma -Vivarta-vāda. the hypothesis that Brahman appears as the world. The former indicates a real change, while the latter, an apparent change.

According to Śaṅkara, Brahman and māyā together are the cause of the world.43 Brahman, without undergoing any change, is the substratum (adhiṣṭhāna) on which māyā
changes and functions as a creative principles of the world. While Brahman is the transfigurative material cause (Vivarta-upādhwāna-kāraṇa), māyā is transformative material cause (parināma-upādhwāna-kāraṇa) of the world. The Advatins give the example of a rope mistaken for a snake. Just as the rope becomes or happens to be the substratum for the illusory appearance of the snake, even so Brahman is responsible for the appearance of the world.

In his commentary on the Māndūkya kārikā, Śaṅkara states that Brahman is the sustaining ground of all various modifications (vikāras). But ordinary men (ie) those in the realm of māyā, see only the universe of multiple objects. They fail to see the universe as Brahman manifesting itself in the form of the universe, they see the snake instead of the rope. While commeting on the Taittiriya Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara points out that Brahman is present and operative behind the changes and transformations evolving from it. Brahman is the ever-present ground or controller of all the nāma-rūpas or vikāras.

Since Brahman and māyā together are the cause of the world, it is only logical that they be seen to be represented in the various entities of the world. Śaṅkara, in his Dṛg-Dṛśya-Viveka, states that every entity of the world has five characteristics, namely, existence (asti), cognizability (bhatti), attractiveness (priyam), form (rūpa) and name (nāma). Of these, the first three corresponds to existence (sat), consciousness (cit) and bliss (ānanda) respectively. Sat-cit-ānanda characterize the svarūpalaksana of Brahman. The next two, namely, form and name (rūpa-nāma) are the chief characteristic features of māyā. We distinguish one object from another only by their names and forms. Name and forms are characteristics of the individual and hence, relative. After the negation of names and forms, there exists the common substratum whose nature is Existence- Consciousness-Bliss, the svarūpa-laksana of Brahman.

To conclude, when Advaita Vedānta states that the world is illusory, it is to be understood in the sense when the world's substratum (ie) Brahman is realized, what vanishes is not the world per se, but the wrong notion of "Absolute reality" that is
superimposed on the world. It is the "name and form" of the world that is found to be illusory. According to Advaita Vedānta, the world has its practical reality and the problem of man is not the world, but in his attitude and understanding of it.

Let us now proceed to discuss the third fundamental statement, which pertains to the embodied souls. (Jīvas).

3. The Embodied Soul is indeed Brahman and not essentially different from It.

According to Advaita Vedānta, Brahman as conditioned by māyā is cognised as the embodied soul (Jīva) at the empirical level. The difference between Brahman and Jīva is only apparent and not essentially real. Therefore, Advaita Vedānta states that the embodied soul is indeed Brahman and not essentially different from It.

Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, states that the individual soul is indeed Brahman (pure consciousness) as characterized by the limiting adjuncts. That which underwent individuation, anupraṇaviṣṭa (i.e.), having entered into the limiting adjuncts or inorganic element of world - manifestation, and became jīva (ie) the parānadhāraṇkarṣa, is ofcourse none other than the Sat which in Itself is pure consciousness, Caitanayasvarūpaṃ.

Śaṅkara declares that each existent in the manifested universe has its rank of reality in the graded hierarchy determined by the quality of its limiting adjuncts. Let us now proceed to discuss the limiting adjuncts that constitutes the individual soul.

a. The Limiting Adjuncts of the Individual Soul.

While commenting on the Brahma-sūtra, Śaṅkara states that the limiting adjuncts
which characterize the individual soul are the psycho-physical organism apparently 
associated to Brahman, the pure consciousness.\textsuperscript{50} The psycho-physical complexes, 
consists of the gross physical body and the subtle body (sūkṣma śāriṅa) including the mind.\textsuperscript{61} 
The Upādhis, psychologically, consists of tendencies (vāsanās) which constitute the mind 
of the jīva.

According to Advaita Vedānta, the jīva, due to the ignorance of its true essential nature, 
considers itself to be the gross and subtle body. The jīva considers the world to be ultimately 
real and fully involves itself in the various activities of the world and experience the 
consequences. When the Upaniszads\textsuperscript{52} declare that the individual soul is the agent (Kartrā) 
of activities and an experiencer (bhoktrā) of the world, it refers to the functions of the jīva, 
which out of ignorance identifies itself with the psycho-physical organism.

b. Brahman and jīva

Advaita Vedānta explains the relationship between Brahman and jīva with the help of 
two analogical theories, namely, the limitation theory (avaccheda-vāda) and the reflection 
theory (pratibimba-vāda).

Through various analogies, Śaṅkara illustrates his doctrine on the Brahman - jīva 
relation. Through the analogy of Mahākāśa (the universal ether or space) and ghatākāśa 
(pot - ether or pot-space), Śaṅkara argues that Brahman, the eternally unchanging, undivided 
and pure consciousness (cidātmakam, akhanda -caitanyam) manifests itself as many, in 
the form of human souls. Brahman exhibits itself as divided, so to say, into many human 
souls through the media of limiting adjuncts (upādhis). This apparent division of Brahman 
into many human souls (i.e. creation of many souls by God) is often compared by Śaṅkara 
to the delimiting of the infinite space (Mahākāśa) into various finite spaces (ghatākāśa), i.e., 
spaces in jars, jugs, rooms, etc. \textsuperscript{53}
The main idea that is to be understood from this limitation theory is that the human soul in its deepest level is Brahman and that it cannot exist separate from it.\(^{54}\)

In his commentary on the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Śaṅkara compares the soul of man to the images of the sun reflected in different waters.\(^{55}\) He also compares the soul to the images of a person reflected in various mirrors. Śaṅkara calls the souls the 'reflection' or 'effulgence' (*ābhāsa*, appearance, phenomenon) of the *paramātman*. The soul is, like the reflected image of the sun in water, a reflection (*ābhāsa*) of the *paramātman*, neither absolutely identical nor totally different.\(^{56}\)

The main idea that is to be understood from this reflection theory is that, just like the various reflections of the sun are not essentially different from the sun itself, but appear as different only because of the reflecting media, the soul's consciousness is non-different from God's consciousness. But we speak as if there is a difference because of the difference in the adjuncts presented to consciousness.\(^{57}\)

C. Bondage

We have already seen that the embodied soul (*jīva*) is essentially Brahman-*Ātman*. But, due to the limiting adjuncts created by *māyā*. ignorance, the *jīva* identifies itself with the body, senses, mind, etc., and performs the functions of an experiencer, thinker and the doer, in the universe.\(^{58}\) Commenting of the *Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, Śaṅkara states that the world is the tree of *saṃsāra* which sprouting from the seeds of acts, *karma*, grows in the field of *avidyā* (ie) it is an apperance resting on ignorance of the *jīva*’s metaphyscial nature as Brahman.\(^{59}\) It may be pointed out that the term ‘*avidyā*’ is used with reference to *jīva* just like the term 'māyā' is used with reference to Brahman. Śaṅkara generally considers *māyā-avidyā* as synonyms.

Bondage refers to the state of non-realization that the *jīva* is essentially pure
consciousness (Brahman). As a consequence, the jīva superimposes (adhyāsa) on itself the attributes of matter and thinks itself to be a limited being and consequently suffers. In other words, bondage refers to the state of existence where the non-self (ie., matter and other outer attributes) are superimposed on the Self (pure consciousness) and the jīva considers this superimposition as ultimately real. In his introduction to his Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya, Śaṅkara states that the entire activity of a bonded soul is supposed to originate from the fundamental error of superimposition (adhyāsa).  

d. Liberation (Moksa)

In his commentary on the Brahma-sūtra, Śaṅkara defines liberation as that incorporeal state which is absolutely real, immutable, eternal, all penetrating like ākāśa, exempt from all changes, every-satisfied, impartite, self-luminous, effected by neither good nor evil, not past, present or future. 61 Śaṅkara holds that mokṣa is identity with the Infinite Non-dual Absolute. As the Mundaka Upaniṣad states that mokṣa is a state where the original non-dual absolute is realized. 62

While commenting on the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Śaṅkarā states that the state of ignorance (māyā-avidyā) which enshronds the ātman is the sphere of plurality. 63 Due to saṁyagdarsana (right knowledge), the perception of plurality vanishes. Śri Gaudapāda says that "All this duality that is nothing but māyā, is but non-duality in reality." 64 He also states that, "When the individual, sleeping under the influence of beginningless māyā is awakened, then he realizes the birthless, sleepless, dreamless, non-dual (Turiya)." 65

Thus, we are able to understand that liberation, in Advaita Vedānta, refers to the understanding of the essential nature of the soul (jīva) by overcoming ignorance (māyā-avidyā).
e. The importance of knowledge (jnāna)

According to Advaita Vedānta, since ignorance (mâyā-avidyā) is the cause for bondage, it logically follows that knowledge (jnāna) is the means or liberation. This is one of the cardinal tenents of Advaita Vedānta.

Śaṅkara emphatically affirms that jnāna is the direct and immediate means to mokṣa. This is so because mokṣa is not to be produced, is not to be attained, is not to the result of the purification of ātman, nor of any modification of it. The realization of one’s Self as one with infinite Brahman or to realize ātman is Brahman, is jnāna. This identity is pre-existent and is only to be recognized. Mukti is the very nature of ātman, one’s real Self. Only the ignorance about it in the empirical state is to be removed through constant dwelling of Reality or Truth (jnāna - nisṭhā).

Śaṅkara further states that liberation come when its seed-potential is burnt by knowledge (jnāna). The seed-potential is the nature of ingorance (mâyā-avidyā) and is denoted by the word 'unmanifest' (Avyakta). It is a kind of deep slumber in which the transmigrating souls sleep without any consciousness of their real essential nature.

In his introduction to Chapter III of the Bhagavad-gītā, Śaṅkara declares "Therefore, the indubitable doctrine of the Gītā and the Upaniṣads is that emancipation ensues from the self-sufficient knowledge alone." He also states that the conclusion of the gītā is that salvation is attained by jnāna alone, not by jnāna conjoined with karma. This adequately brings out the supreme importance given to jnāna, in Advaita Vedānta.

It is not to be understood that karma and bhakti are not adequately recognised in Advaita Vedānta. According to Śaṅkara, karma and bhakti performed with a view of renouncing the fruits of action and dedicating the same to God, leads to jnāna or end in jnāna. Such a performance will in the end gain jnāna and mokṣa.
f. The path to Liberation

According to Advaita Vedānta, liberation implies the realization that the jīva is essentially none other than Brahman. The capacity to understand this truth is given to human beings alone. But, very few humans appreciate the supreme value and have the readiness to strive for it. Hence, in his Vivekacūḍāmani, Śaṅkara states that "Only through God's grace we obtain those three rarest advantages—human birth, the longing for liberation and discipleship to an illumined teacher."  

Advaita Vedānta insists on four-fold qualifications or requirement (Sādhana catuṣṭaya) need for the discipline of Brahman inquiry (Brahma-vicāra). One who is qualified is known as the adhikārin. Commenting on the very first aphorism of the Brahma -sūtra, Śaṅkara shows how Brahman-inquiry depends upon the sādhana -catusṭaya and not on the knowledge of rituals. The sādhana -catusṭaya are: (1) Nityānityavastuvivekaḥ, the ability to discriminate between permanent and ephemeral. (2) Ṭhāmutrārthaphalabhogavrāgah, the absence of desire to secure pleasure or avoid pain in this world or in heaven. (3) Samādhisādhanasampat, the possession of six virtues, namely, a) Śama (restraining of the mind) b) Dama (control of the senses) c) Uparati (spirit of renunciation) d) Titikṣa (fortitude in enduring the pairs of opposites like pain and pleasure) e) Samādhiśaṁ (concentrating the mind) and f) Śraddhā (faith in regard to the teachings of the Vedanta and in the teacher). (4) Mumuksutvam, the burning desire for liberation.

When, as a result of the preliminary discipline, the student is ripe enough for the higher knowledge, he betakes himself to a guru. The Katha Upanisad states that the right kind of guru is one who is not only learned in the sacred lore, but has first hand and direct experience of Brahman. The guru must also be willing to impart the knowledge to those who humbly entrust themselves to him.

The Advaita higher - training consists of three stages. The first stage is Sravaṇa. This is the close study of the Upanisads with a view to grasping their ultimate import. The
second stage is Manana. This consists in continued reflection or arguing within oneself with a view to secure intellectual conviction and remove all doubts. The final stage is Nididhyāsana. It consists in uninterrupted meditation on the Advaita truth and has to be persisted in till the worldly tenedencies (Vāsanās) are completely removed. The person spontaneously realizes the immediate experience of the non-dual Brahman. It is the consummation of Advaita Vedānta. What was mediately known has become a realized fact. With the onset of this saving experience, one is said to be jīvan-mukta - liberated-while-living.

**g. Jīvan-muktha (Liberated - while - living)**

A jīva which has realised its true non-dual nature is known as a jīvan - mukta. The Brahadrānyaka Upanisad states that when desires, which consistsutes man's mortality, is totally annihilated, the knower become immortal. While living in the body, he attains the status of Brahman. The Katha Upanisad states that one become free even before the falling of the body, if one succeeds in realising the non-dual Brahman.

To a jīvan - mukta, the whole universe and its beings are all manifestation of Brahman. He is not affected by the universe, though his body functions like an actor in a drama. He lives in the world but is not of it and exists always for the welfare of the world (lokasamgraha), which is the spontaneous expression of pure love. Śaṅkara, in his Brahma -sūtra - bhāṣya, describes the state of jīvan-mukta and points out that a jīvan - mukta live in the world until his prārabdha karma is exhausted. The Vivekacūḍāmani clearly brings out the hallmark of a jīvan-mukta.

To conclude, when Advaita Vedānta states that the embodied soul is indeed Brahman and not essentially different from it, it means that Brahman-realization can be "here and now" and not necessarily "here-after". Moreover, acceptance of the state of jīvan-mukta reveals that the problem is not with the body, but in our attitude and understanding of it.
Let us now proceed to discuss the nature of man according to Advaita Vedānta, in such a manner that the exposition brings out perspectives which are helpful for us to address the issues pertaining to the concept of economic man.

B. The Nature of Man according to Advaita Vedānta

According to Advaita Vedānta, man (jīva) is essentially Spiritual or Divine (ie) Brahman. Śaṅkara states that the identity of the essential nature of man with Brahman is clearly indicated by the Mahāvākyā, "Aham Brahmasmi" of the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. 81 Another Mahāvākyā "Tattvamasmī", which occurs in the Sixth Chapter of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad 82 also conveys the complete non-difference of the essential nature of man, which is, pure consciousness, and the essential nature of God (Īśvara), which too is pure consciousness. 83 Swami Vivekananda has summarized his message in his own words: "To Preach unto mankind their divinity and how to make it manifest in every movement of life." 84 We have also just discussed that man (jīva) is indeed Brahman and not essentially different from it. Thus, man's essential and eternal nature is spiritual or divine.

The fuller realization of this divine nature is the highest culmination as it is the ultimate reality (pāramārthika-sattā). The Taittirīya Upaniṣad states that the knower of Brahman reaches the highest. 85 Śrī Vidyāranya, in his Pañcadaśī, states that the supreme bliss of Brahman is the highest. The joy is perfect, complete, infinite and absolute. It can never be compared to any earthly joy. 86 Thus, realizing one's divinity is the highest realization for man.

1. The Two-Fold Self in Man

According to Advaita Vedānta, every man is a composite of a higher Self (Ātman),
which is eternal, and a lower self (Anātman), which is relative by nature. The eternal higher Self (Ātman) in man is identified with Brahman and Brahman-Ātman is considered as the highest and ultimate reality. The relative lower self (anātman) in man is identified with the psycho-physical organisms, created by māyā-avidyā, which apparently divide the indivisible Brahman.

The Mundaka Upaniṣad speaks of two-fold self, a higher Self (Ātman) which is omniscient and immortal, and a lower self (Anātman) which is conditioned by the mind. The Upaniṣad further states, "When that Self, which is both the high and the low, is realized, the knot of the heart gets untied, all doubts becomes solved, and all one's actions become dissipated." 87 The relation between the higher Self and the lower self has been beautifully described through an allegory in the Katha Upaniṣad : "Know the (individual) Self as the master of the chariot, and the body as the chariot. Know the intellect as the charioteer, and the mind as verily the bridle. They call the organ the horses; the organs having been imagined as horses, (know) the objects as the roads. The discriminating people call that Self the enjoyer when It is associated with body, organs and mind." 88

The Śvetāsvartara Upaniṣad points out the two-fold self when it states, "The individual self, ignorant of his divine identity, has a feeling that he is enjoyer. In consequence, he is in bondage. But the same individual self becomes free when he realizes that he is in bondage. But the same individual self becomes free when he realizes that he is Brahman". 89 The two-fold self in man in further emphasized in the same Upaniṣad when it gives the famous example of two birds, sitting on the same tree, while one partakes the fruits, the other, merely watches as a spectator. 90

Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, state "That the self identifies itself with action, its factors and its results, is due to the limitations of name and form, and is superimposed by ignorance. It is this that causes people to come under relative existence, consisting in their identification with action and the rest. This has to be removed by a knowledge of the real nature of the unconditioned Self (Ātman)." 91 Elsewhere,
Sankara points out that "When the teacher enlightens it (anatman) that it is not the body etc., but the transcendent supreme Brahman (ātman), then it gives up the pursuit of the three kinds of desire (ie., the desire for son, wealth and heaven) and is convinced that it is Brahman". 92

In his Aparokshanubhuti, Śaṅkara states that the lower self (ie., atman attached to psycho-physical organisms) arises due to ignorance (māyā-avidyā) and again through self-realization, it disappears in the Supreme Ātman (ie., higher Self). 93 He further states that "all the actions of man perishses when he realizes that (Ātman) which is both the higher and the lower." 94 Swami Vivekananda terms the higher Self as the "Real" man and the lower self as the "Apparent" man. 96

Śrī Vidyārānya, in his Pañcadasī, states that true knowledge is understood through the discrimination that it is the jīva (lower self), a 'reflection' of the Self (higher Self), which is affected by the pain and pleasure of this transmigratory life, but not the real Self. 96 Śaṅkara, in his Dhṛtya-Viveka, terms the higher Self as the "real Self" (pāramārthika-jīva) and the lower self as the "empirical self" (Vyāvahārika-jīva). 97

According to Advaita Vedānta, the intuitive vision of this inner Ātman (higher Self), which is essentially the paramātman, is the ultimate aim and supreme goal of human existence. But man's innate ignorance (naisargikā-avidyā) is very powerful that it makes man, in his day-to-day life, ignore his higher Self (Ātman), the indwelling spirit in him. Hence, the Katha Upaniṣad states that many do not even hear about the divinity of the Self. Of those who hear, many do not understand it. 98 The Bhagavad-gītā points out that māyā, the divine delusive power, is extremely difficult to overcome. 99

The apparent intimate association of the Ātman (higher self) with the upādhis (psycho-physical organisms), created by māyā-avidyā, evolves a sense of 'I' and 'Mine' in the jīva (lower self). In his commentary on the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara states that the jīva's identification with desire alone is sufficient as this would lead the jīva's
identification with everything else in the world. The jiśa perceives the world and its multiplicities as eternal and ultimately real.

a. The Two-Fold nature of the Lower self

Since the lower or empirical self consider the world to be real, it actively participates in world-affairs, both as an agent and as expericer of the world. Empirical man's perception and understanding is different from that of a Spiritually illumined person (i.e.) the person who has realized the nature of ātman, the higher Self.

Commenting on the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara points out that vision is of two kinds, namely, ordinary and real. A man of realization has a spiritual insight (parāmārtha-drṣṭi), the real vision, while the worldly man have only an empirical insight (laukīka-drṣṭi or Vyāvahāra-drṣṭi), the ordinary vision. In his introduction to Part II, Chapter I of the Aitareya Upaniṣad, Śaṅkara states that "there are two kinds of vision—the transitory vision of the eye (as perceived by the worldly man) and the eternal vision of the Self (as perceived by the Spiritual man)."

Since the empirical self is ignorant of its divine nature, it reveals a two-fold nature (other than Spiritual) in its interaction with the entities and features of the world. The empirical self evolves an 'ideal' in the external world and attempts to achieve the same in its life-time.

Indian tradition recognizes the Four-fold aims or ideals or values of life, known as the Puruṣārthas. The theory of the four-fold aspirations of man (caturvidha-Puruṣārthas) are developed taking into account the divergent needs or 'ends' to be achieved by man.

Let us now briefly discuss the puruṣārthas as it would bring out the two-fold nature of man.
(1) The Purusārthas

The world 'Purusārtha' literally means the 'values sought by man'. Traditionally, purusārthas are considered to be four, namely, dharma (righteousness or ethics), artha (material well-being or wealth), kāma (desire or pleasure) and mokṣa (liberation or self-realization).

The supreme or highest human value (paramapurusārtha) accepted in Indian philosophy is Mokṣa. Mokṣa is considered as the end (siddhi) to be realized. Achieving a siddhi is possible only through adopting the appropriate means (sādhanas). In this connection, the purusārthas of dharma, artha and kāma may be referred to as the Sādhanas. Thus, mokṣa is considered as the end-value (ultimate Value) while the other three are guidered as the means - value (instrumental values).

(2) The importance of Dharma

Etymologically, the word 'Dharma' means "to uphold, sustain and nourish". It signifies that it is the basis of all order, whether social and moral. Eventhough, generally dharma is considered as an equivalent to ethics, it stands for the code of conduct concerned with both religious and social duties of man. The Brahadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad identifies dharma with satya (truth). Thus, speaking the truth and the practice of righteousness are two aspects of the one and the same value.

At the very outset of his introduction to the Bhāgavad-gītā, Śaṅkara defines dharma as "that which is the cause of worldly exaltation (abhyudaya) and ultimate or supreme bliss (niḥśreyah), and which are followed by the people of the four classes of society (Varnas) and the four stages of life (āśramas)." According to Śaṅkara, this dharma is of two types, namely, pravṛtti dharma, the dharma of action, and nivṛtti dharma, the dharma of renunciation.
According to Indian tradition, *dharma* acts a guiding and regulating principle of man's life. The different aspects of the human personality and aspirations are regulated and co-ordinated by the principle of *dharma*.

The *Mahābhārata* states that "Artha and kāma are to be realized only through *Dharma*. *Dharma*, the eternal, is not to be abandoned for any reason whatsoever." 106 Elsewhere, it points out: "Artha got by improper means, Kāma enjoyed in wrong ways, are not artha and kāma for and ethical man. It is *dharma* which makes artha and kāma worth possessing. Even life is not worthwhile if one gives up *dharma*." 107 The traditional law-giver Manu, proclaims, "Let every individual abandon Artha and Kāma Which are devoid of *Dharma* and also that *Dharma* which is not conducive to human happiness and censured by all." 108 Thus, we are able to understand the importance given to *dharma* (ethics) in a man's life, by the Indian tradition, Advaita Vedānta manitains that *dharma* is to regulate artha and kāma towards the objective of *Mokṣa*.

b. The Ethical -nature and the Animal -nature of Man.

Indian tradition points out that it is the adherence to *dharma* that specially characterize man as man or else he is one with the beast. In other words, man reveals his 'ethical' nature only when he follows *dharma*. If devoid of *dharma*, man only reveals his 'animal' nature. These are the two-fold natur of man, the empirical self.

The *Hitopadeśa* states that "Eating, sleeping, sex and fear are common to both men and animals. What then, is the difference between the two? It is adherence to *dharma* that distinguishes human beings from animals. Without *dharma* to guide him, man would be no better than an animal." 109 Bhartrhari, in his *Nīti-Śataka*, proclaims that those who do not posses *dharma* may take the shape of men while they live among us, but they travel through life nevertheless like beasts that encumber the ground." 110
The two basic animal tendencies, namely, impulsiveness and acquisitiveness, are clearly visible in man. Śāṅkara, in his commentary on the Yoga-Sūtra, points out that the taint of self-preservation is found in a just-born worm as well as a knower (vidvāt), the one with right vision (saṃyagdaśana). In this commentary on the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Śāṅkara states that what distinguishes man from other animals is his competence and eligibility for jñāna and dharma. The human or ethical tendencies in man includes the power of discrimination, free-will, intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual pursuits.

Thus, man’s adherence to dharma refers to the fact that aspirations of artha and kāma are to be fulfilled only in the background of dharma. Such a man reveals his ethical nature and is alone qualified to be called a man. On the other hand, if artha and kāma are pursued deviod of dharma, then the individual reveals only his animal nature.

Eventhough we are aware of the fact that one and the same individual, may at times, reveal his ethical nature, and at other time, may reveal his animal nature, to facilitate discussion we would consider a man who follows dharma, as an ethical man, and a man who ignores dharma, as a animal man.

2. Dharma Fulfils the interest of an Individual and the Society

An ethical man, who pursues artha and kāma by adherence to dharma, perform actions taking into account the interest of the society along with his own interest. His actions would reveal the intention of benefiting both the individual and the society.

When dharma regulates artha and kāma, it performs two important tasks. Firstly, dharma ensures that the genuine aspirations of artha and kāma are entertained and realized by man. Secondly, dharma also ensures that indiscriminate accumulation of material wealth (artha) and unhealthy impulsive desires (kāma) are checked and sublimated to higher values in life. By encouraging good and genuine tendencies, and by discouraging evil and unhealthy tendencies, dharma develops human personality in an individual. The animal
man is transformed into an ethical man. Simultaneously, by curbing the greed for wealth and passion for desire, dharma develops a healthy relationship between an individual and the society, between the different sections of the society, thereby leading to greater social welfare.

Thus, we are able to observe that the adherence to dharma ensures the individual well-being as well as social welfare. There is no conflict between the interest of the individual and that of the society. An ethical man's action is always intently to benefit himself (self-interest) as well as the society (others' interest). On the other hand, when artha and kāma are pursued as end-in-itself, devoid of dharma, it makes man view life only from the narrow angle of self-acquisitiveness and self-indulgence. Self-interest becomes the paramount motive for an animal man. Such a man would neglect the interest of others in the society and would be unconcerned about his own obligations to the society.

A spiritual aspirant would pursue artha and kāma regulated by dharma towards the objective of Mokṣa. He is not satisfied with mere artha and kāma pursued in the background of dharma. He employs dharma as an instrument to achieve the sate of mokṣa, the highest purusārtha. This reflects the aspiration of an ethical man to realize his essential innate nature, namely divine or spiritual. A man who has realized his higher Self is a spiritual man.

Contrary to the existence of the animal man, is the existence of the Spiritual man, the knower of the higher Self, the Jīvanmuktha. Blind love for the narrow self, which characterizes the animal man, is replaced by enlightened and, therefore, equal love for all. The basis for this Universal love can be seen in the famous Mahāvākya “Tattvam asi” (That thou art). 113 Swami Vivekananda proclaims that tattvamasi, signifying the oneness of all being, "is the basis of all our ethics and morality". 114 The feeling of universal identity that the spiritual man experiences is described in the Bhagavad-gītā "With equality of vision everywhere, he whose inner sense has been attuned to yoga beholds the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self". 115
The spiritual man, who has transcended the very notion of duality, is utterly free from egoism and serve for the welfare of the world (Lokasamgraha). His service to the society, without any motive, is simply the spontaneous expression of his very nature, just like a flower which sheds its fragrance. Śaṅkara, in his Vivekacūḍāmaṇi, gives the simile of the moon who voluntarily save the earth from the flaming rays of the sun. 116

In conclusion, we may say that according to Advaita Vedānta, man is essentially spiritual, the higher Self. But, due to ignorance (māyā-avidyā), man identifies himself with the lower self, and subsequently reveals a two-type nature, namely, the ethical man and the animal man.

The spiritual man is characterised by the selfless service for the welfare of humanity. The ethical man is characterized by self-regarding as well as others-regarding motives. The animal man is characterized by selfish or self-regarding motives only. Let us conclude by quoting Bhartrhari on the three types of men. In the Niti Śataka, he proclaims: "Good men (Spiritual men) devote their attention to benefiting others without thinking of themselves. Ordinary men (ie., ethical men) benefit others, but they do not at the same time forget their own interests. Those men are demons (ie., animal men) who destroy the good of another for their own profit." 117 In this Sringa Śataka, Bhartrhari states, "One man (ie., Spiritual man) walks in the path of absolute renunciation, while another (ie., ethical man) follows the way of moral obligations, and a third (ie., animal man) denotes himself to desires. (Kāma)." 118

C. An 'Economic Problem' Revisited in the light of the Advaita Vedāntic concept of Man.

An attempt is made in this Section to approach an economic problem in the light of the Advaita Vedāntic concept of man. Let us recall the conventional approach to economics
as expounded in Chapter II. Section A. of the thesis. An economic problem is the central core of economics and the twin-aspect of an economic problem and (a) Human wants are unlimited, and (b) Resources are limited and are capable of alternative uses. Economists approach an economic problem by focussing their attention on the resources and its allocation in the economy, while holding the cardinal assumption that human wants are ever unlimited.

In the light of the Advaita Vedāntic concept of man, economic problem may be approached by scrutinizing the sweeping assumption regarding human nature, namely, the "unlimitedness" of human wants.

Human wants (in economics), may be equated to the desire (kāma) of man to possess material wealth (artha). It refers to the aspirations of artha, the possessions. ¹¹⁹ Heinrich Zimmer defines artha as the "whole range of tangible objects that can be possessed, enjoyed or lost, and which we require in daily life for the upkeep of a household, raising of a family and discharge of religious duties, i.e., for the virtuous fulfilment of life's obligations." ¹²⁰

Indian tradition does not encourage men to give up material wealth in toto. In the Brhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, We find the great Brahma - Jñāni, Yajñavalkya, desiring both material wealth and trans-material value, in the court of emperor Janaka. ¹²¹ The Mahābhārata stresses the great importance of wealth in human life by saying: "All kinds of meritorious acts flow from the possession of great wealth, as from wealth springs all religious acts, all pleasures and heaven itself." ¹²²

But, at the same time, Indian tradition also warns against excessive and indiscriminate possessions of wealth. Śaṅkara, in his Bhajagovindam, advises men to be ever aware (bhāvaya nityam) of material wealth as it could be a source of great danger (anṛthāṁ). Wealth is generally accompanied by the worries and anxieties involved in it acquisition, preservation and protection. Constant use leads to attachment, dependence and addiction on them. Moreover, our acquisition deprives someone else of them.
1. Human 'need' and human 'greed'

Indian tradition makes a distinction of human wants into human need and human greed. Any pursuit of human want backed by dharma reveals human need, whereas any pursuit of human want devoid of dharma reveals human greed.

According to Indian tradition, material wealth is to be pursued only in the background of dharma. Artha is purely a means of fulfilling man’s duties in society. The Mahābhārata points out that acquisition of wealth should not be for gratifying one’s own sensual desires, but for achieving the nobler purpose of sharing with others in the society. The Bhāgavata states that no one should acquire more wealth than that is actually necessary for meeting his own requirements and if any one desires more, he is a thief deserving punishment. Even Kautāliya, who upholds the importance of artha, maintains that “Dharma is the basis of artha”.

Thus, man is enjoined to acquire wealth only in the background of dharma to satisfy his needs. Śaṅkara, in his commentary on the Taittirīya Upanisad, states that wealth in the hands of an undisciplined man is a sure source of evil. Elsewhere, in his commentary of the same Upanisad, Śaṅkara proclaims that food (i.e., wealth) is to be acquired so that is can be given to all who come for shelter and food. Thus, human wants pursued by adherence to dharma (i.e., considering the interest of the society along with self-interest) reveals human need and such wants are encouraged by the Indian tradition. On the other hand, if human wants are pursued devoid of dharma (i.e., considering self-interest only), it reveals human greed and such wants are discouraged in the society.

2. The Sources of Dharma

The division of human wants into human need and human greed is effected by dharma.
Now, a pertinent question that arises is: How to know one's dharma? or what are the sources of dharma?

According to Indian tradition, the foremost source of our knowledge of dharma is the Vedas, which are 'revelations' (śruti). The next important source is the Smritis. Which are 'remembered or recollected'. The importance of the Smritis as a source of dharma stems from the fact that they are ultimately based on the Vedas. The third source are the customs and traditions (Ācāra). Ācāra depends upon smritis and smritis on śruti as the sources of dharma. Another important source is the Conscience of the individual (ātma-tuṣṭi). If ācāra signifies social approval, ātma-tuṣṭi represents self-approval. According to Manu, self-approval refers to the satisfaction of the inner self or antarātman. The other sources of dharma that are recognised by tradition are the epics (Itihāsas) and the Purāṇas.

It is a common fact that human needs are generally limited when compared to human greed, which are unlimited. Human needs consist of the necessaries of existence and necessaries which makes man an 'efficient' as well as an 'equitable' participant in the welfare of the society. Human greed includes not only the necessaries of existence, but also comforts and luxuries, unmindful of other's interest in the society. King Yayati's experience in the Bhāgavata clearly brings out the unlimitedness of human greed and desire. He states that desires are innumerable, and no one can, even in millions of lives, satisfy all his desires, for they go on multiplying and are never quenched by enjoyment. The unlimitedness of human greed is explained by Manu: "Desire is never extinguished by the enjoyment of the desired object; it grows only stronger like fire fed with clarified butter."

From the Advaita Vedāntic concept of man, we understand that an ethical man is one who follows dharma, while an animal man ignores it. Therefore, pursuing human wants in the background of dharma, refers to the characteristic function of an ethical man. Thus, human wants pursued by an ethical man are human needs. On the other hand, pursuing human wants devoid of dharma, refers to the characteristic function of an animal man. Thus, human wants pursued by an animal man are human greed. In other words, the ethical
nature of man is revealed when human need is entertained and the animal nature of man in revealed when human greed is entertained, by an individual.

Since human needs are limited, it follows that human wants of an ethical man are limited. On the other hand, since human greed are unlimited, it follows that human wants of an animal man are unlimited. In other words, the wants and desires of an ethical man are limited, while that of an animal man are unlimited. Moreover, it may be pointed out that human wants of an ethical man in pursued not only for 'self-satisfaction' but also for the welfare of the society. But, the human wants of an animal man is pursued with the sole objective of self-gratification and selfishness.

In conclusion, we may say that responding to the cardinal assumption of an economic problem that human want are ever unlimited, Advaita Vedānta would state that wants of all men in the society are not unlimited. Even though there are ethical men in the society, for whom wants are unlimited, there are also ethical men in the society, for whom wants are limited. Therefore, Advaita Vedānta would question the statement of conventional economics that wants of all men are unlimited in the society.

The synthesis of the above perspective of Advaita Vedānta with conventional economics, is effected in Chapter V, the concluding Chapter of the thesis. The implications of such a synthesis is also clearly attempted therein.

Let us now proceed to deduce the perspectives of Advaita Vedānta in such a manner that the deduced perspectives are compatible with the concept of economic man (as expounded in Chapter II. Section B. of the thesis).
CHAPTER- IV

AN APPROACH TO ADVAILTA VEDĀNTA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONCEPT OF ECONOMIC MAN

In this Chapter, an attempt is made to approach the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta in the context of the concept of economic man. Our discussion on the concept of economic man, (as effected in Chapter II. Section.B. of the thesis) enabled us to understand that conventional economics perceive man as rational. In the light of the above position of conventional economics with reference to the context of economic man, there arises two possible directions of approach to the philosophy of Advaita Vedānta. One line of inquiry would be to approach the concept of 'man' in Advaita Vedānta, in the context of economic man. The other line of inquiry would be to approach the concept of 'rationality' in Advaita Vedānta, in the context of economic rationality.

The primary objective of the thesis is to deduce and incorporate the perspectives of Advaita Vedānta into the concept of economic man and discern the implications of such a synthesis. Inline with our primary objective, we would start by analysing the concept of rationality in Advaita Vedānta, in the context of economic rationality. This endeavour would enable us to deduce perspectives of Advaita Vedānta which may be compatible to the various dimensions of the concept of economic man. Further, a synthesis of the deduced perspectives with the concept of economic man may be effected and its implications can also perceived through this line of inquiry.

Accordingly, this Chapter is divided into two main Sections: In the first section, we approach the Advaita Vedāntic concept of rationality in the context of economic rationality.