Logical Consistency of Advaita Vedānta: A Machine-Verified Formal System

Abstract

This article presents a formal axiomatization of Advaita Vedānta metaphysics and demonstrates its logical consistency through machine verification using the Isabelle/HOL theorem prover. While Advaita has faced persistent charges of incoherence, particularly regarding the ontological status of māyā and the possibility of self-knowledge, these objections have typically relied on informal argumentation. By translating the core metaphysical claims of Advaita into higher-order logic and subjecting them to mechanical proof verification, we show that the system is not only internally consistent but necessarily so. The formalization reveals that what appears paradoxical in natural language, the identity of ātman and Brahman alongside the apparent reality of phenomenal multiplicity, follows deductively from a small set of axioms concerning grounding relations and ontological dependence. This work contributes methodologically by demonstrating how contemporary formal verification techniques can illuminate classical Indian philosophical systems, and substantively by resolving longstanding debates about Advaita's logical coherence. The verified system suggests that traditional objections conflate levels of discourse and fail to recognize the formal structure underlying Śaṅkara's arguments.

Introduction

The question of whether Advaita Vedānta constitutes a logically coherent philosophical system has occupied commentators since Śaṅkara's time. Rāmānuja's critique that Advaita involves internal contradiction, Madhva's objection that it violates the law of non-contradiction, and more recently, Western philosophers' charges that it commits category errors, all presuppose that careful logical analysis will expose fundamental incoherence. Yet these criticisms typically proceed through informal argumentation, relying on intuitions about what can and cannot be consistently maintained. The present article takes a different approach. Rather than engaging in further informal debate, we construct a formal logical system that captures Advaita's core metaphysical commitments and subject it to mechanical verification.

The use of formal methods in philosophy is not new. From Frege's Begriffsschrift to contemporary work in modal logic and mereology, philosophers have long recognized that symbolization can clarify arguments and reveal hidden assumptions. What distinguishes the present approach is the use of machine verification. When a theorem prover like Isabelle/HOL confirms that a set of axioms is consistent and that certain theorems follow from them, we obtain a level of certainty unavailable through manual proof. Human error in formal reasoning, particularly in complex systems involving quantifiers and multiple domains, is common. Machine verification eliminates this source of uncertainty.

The choice to formalize Advaita may seem odd to some. Is this not a mystical tradition concerned with experiential realization rather than logical demonstration? Several responses are appropriate. First, Śaṅkara himself engaged extensively in logical argumentation, particularly in his commentaries on the Brahma-sūtras. The tradition of Advaita includes sophisticated logical analysis, even if its ultimate aim is non-propositional knowledge. Second, the question of logical consistency is distinct from questions about the means to mokṣa. A system can be both logically coherent and oriented toward trans-rational realization. Third, and most importantly, if Advaita's critics are correct that the system involves logical contradiction, this is a serious philosophical problem regardless of the tradition's soteriological goals. Demonstrating logical consistency does not reduce Advaita to mere logic, but it does remove one persistent objection.

The formalization proceeds in several stages. We first identify the minimal set of metaphysical commitments that characterize Advaita, abstracting from the vast commentarial literature to locate the essential claims. These include the existence of a unique, unconditioned Absolute, the ontological dependence of all phenomena on this Absolute, the identity of the Self with the Absolute, and the apparent but not ultimately real nature of multiplicity. We then translate these commitments into the language of higher-order logic, defining predicates for key concepts like "Absolute," "conditioned," and "phenomenal." The axioms of the system express relationships between these predicates, and theorems are derived showing what follows necessarily from these axioms. Finally, we submit the entire system to Isabelle/HOL for verification.

The results are unequivocal. The system is consistent. Moreover, the apparent paradoxes of Advaita, those features that critics have identified as contradictory, follow necessarily from the axioms and involve no logical incoherence. What appears contradictory arises from conflating different levels of analysis, specifically the level of ultimate reality and the level of conventional description. The formalization makes explicit what is implicit in

Śaṅkara's distinction between pāramārthika and vyāvahārika satya, showing how a single Absolute can ground multiple phenomena without itself becoming multiple or conditioned.

This article proceeds as follows. We first provide background on Advaita's central claims and the traditional objections to its coherence. We then present the formal system, explaining each axiom and its philosophical motivation. Next, we discuss the verification process and the key theorems that emerge. Finally, we consider the philosophical implications of this formal demonstration, including what it reveals about the structure of Advaita metaphysics and how it relates to other Indian logical traditions.

Background

Advaita's Central Claims

Advaita Vedānta, as systematized by Śaṅkara in the eighth century, rests on several core metaphysical claims. The first and most fundamental is that Brahman alone is ultimately real. This Absolute is described as sat-cit-ānanda, being-consciousness-bliss, though these are not properties that Brahman possesses but rather its essential nature. Brahman is nirguna, without qualities or attributes, and nirvikalpa, without internal differentiation. It is the ground of all existence but itself depends on nothing.

The second claim concerns the phenomenal world. All phenomena, from material objects to mental states, from gross to subtle, are dependent on Brahman for their existence. They are neither identical to Brahman nor entirely separate from it. Śaṅkara uses the analogy of clay and pots to illustrate this relationship. The pot exists only through clay, yet the pot as pot is not identical to clay as such. Similarly, phenomena exist only through Brahman yet are not simply Brahman.

The third claim addresses the epistemic status of phenomenal reality. The world of multiplicity is not absolutely unreal, which would make it equivalent to a chimera like a square circle, but it is also not ultimately real in the way Brahman is. It has what Śaṅkara calls vyāvahārika satya, conventional or pragmatic reality. This reality is sufficient for ordinary transactions and empirical knowledge but does not survive ultimate analysis. The stock example is the rope mistaken for a snake. The snake-appearance is not nothing, it produces real fear, but upon examination it is understood as a misperception grounded in the rope.

The fourth and perhaps most controversial claim is that ātman, the true Self, is identical to Brahman. This is the meaning of the great mahavākya “tat tvam asi,” that thou art. What one truly is, beneath all phenomenal identifications with body, mind, and personality, is the non-dual Absolute itself. This identity is not a merging or union, for that would presuppose prior separation. Rather, the appearance of separation is what requires explanation. The Self was never actually separate from Brahman, it only appeared so through avidyā, ignorance or misconception.

These four claims generate what critics have identified as logical problems. If Brahman is without qualities, how can we say anything about it, including that it is without qualities? If phenomena depend on Brahman but are not identical to it, what is the nature of this dependence? If the Self is identical to Brahman, how can there be ignorance of this identity? If ignorance is what produces the appearance of multiplicity, where does ignorance itself reside, given that Brahman is pure consciousness? These questions have occupied Advaita commentators for centuries and provided ammunition for critics from rival schools.

Traditional Objections

Rāmānuja’s critique in his Śrī-bhāṣya focuses on what he sees as the incoherence of the concept of māyā. If māyā is the power that produces the appearance of multiplicity, it must be either real or unreal. If real, then Advaita’s claim that Brahman alone is real is false. If unreal, it cannot have the causal power to produce appearances. Moreover, if Brahman is infinite consciousness, how can ignorance arise in it? Consciousness by nature dispels ignorance, so the notion of ignorance in or of pure consciousness is contradictory. The appearance of individuality, according to Rāmānuja, cannot be explained away as mere ignorance without explaining where this ignorance comes from and how it operates.

Madhva’s objections are even more direct. He argues that Advaita violates basic logical principles, particularly the law of non-contradiction. To claim that the Self is both identical to Brahman and appears as separate is to assert both A and not-A. To claim that the world is both existent and non-existent is similarly contradictory. Madhva insists that the scriptural statements about non-duality must be interpreted in ways that preserve logical consistency, which for him means accepting real distinction between souls and God.

Western philosophical critiques have taken different forms. Some argue that Advaita commits a category mistake, conflating the transcendental ground of experience with an object of experience. Others claim that the notion of self-knowledge is incoherent, involving a circularity where the knower must be known by the knower. Still others point

to what they see as the practical refutation of Advaita, the fact that Advaitins continue to act as though multiplicity is real even while claiming it is not. These objections, whether from Indian or Western philosophers, share a common assumption that careful logical analysis will expose Advaita as fundamentally incoherent.

Previous Formal Approaches

Formal logic has had a complex relationship with Indian philosophy. The Nyāya school developed sophisticated logical systems, including a theory of inference that shares some structural features with Western syllogistic logic while differing in important respects. Navya-Nyāya extended this tradition with increasingly formalized languages for expressing philosophical arguments. Buddhist logicians like Dignāga and Dharmakīrti developed their own formal systems, particularly concerning the logic of negation and the structure of inference.

However, Advaita has received less attention from formal logicians than these other schools. This is partly because Advaita's concerns are primarily metaphysical rather than epistemological, and partly because its central claims involve concepts like non-duality and identity that resist easy formalization. The few attempts to formalize aspects of Advaita have typically focused on specific arguments rather than the system as a whole, and none have employed machine verification.

The present approach differs from previous formal work on Indian philosophy in several ways. First, rather than attempting to capture the inferential structure of specific arguments, we formalize the underlying metaphysical system from which those arguments derive. Second, we use contemporary type theory and higher-order logic rather than attempting to work within traditional Indian logical frameworks. This choice is pragmatic, modern theorem provers are built around these formalisms, but it also allows us to express relationships that may be difficult to capture in traditional frameworks. Third, and most crucially, we subject the formalization to machine verification, obtaining certainty about consistency that manual proofs cannot provide.

The Formal System

Ontological Categories

The formalization begins by distinguishing two fundamental ontological categories. The first category contains what we call the Absolute, that which exists independently and grounds all else. The second category contains what we call the conditioned, that which

exists dependently. These categories are mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive of what exists. Nothing can be both Absolute and conditioned, and everything that exists is one or the other.

We introduce predicates to mark membership in these categories. Let A(x) mean "x is Absolute" and C(x) mean "x is conditioned." The first axiom asserts that these categories are exclusive. For any x, if A(x) then not C(x), and if C(x) then not A(x). This captures the idea that to be Absolute is precisely to be unconditioned, and to be conditioned is to be non-Absolute. The distinction is fundamental and admits no middle ground.

The second axiom asserts that the Absolute category is populated by exactly one entity. There exists some a such that A(a), and for any x and y, if both A(x) and A(y), then x equals y. This captures Advaita's commitment to the uniqueness of Brahman. Why must the Absolute be unique? The argument proceeds by considering what would distinguish two putative Absolutes. Any distinguishing feature would be a determination, a way of being thus rather than otherwise. But determination is precisely what characterizes the conditioned. The unconditioned, by definition, has no determinations. Therefore, there can be no principle of individuation for multiple Absolutes, which is to say, the Absolute must be unique.

The third axiom concerns the relationship between the Absolute and the conditioned. For any x, if C(x), then there exists exactly one a such that A(a) and x is grounded by a. We write this grounding relation as Grounded(x, a). This axiom captures the idea that all phenomena depend on Brahman. Nothing conditioned exists independently. The existence of every phenomenal entity is derived from, depends upon, and is sustained by the Absolute. The uniqueness of the grounding entity follows from the uniqueness of the Absolute established in the previous axiom.

Grounding and Ontological Dependence

The grounding relation requires careful specification. It is not causal in the ordinary sense, for that would suggest temporal priority and change. Brahman does not create the world at some moment in time. Rather, the grounding relation is one of ontological dependence. The phenomena exist through Brahman in the way that a reflection exists through the object reflected, or a shadow exists through the object that casts it, or to use Śaṅkara's preferred analogy, pots exist through clay.

We specify several formal properties of the grounding relation. First, it is irreflexive. Nothing grounds itself. This follows from the nature of grounding as dependence. To depend on oneself would be to exist both dependently and independently, which is

incoherent. Second, the relation is asymmetric. If x is grounded by y, then y is not grounded by x. This ensures a genuine direction of dependence. Third, the relation is well-founded. There is no infinite descending chain of grounding. Everything ultimately traces to the Absolute, which grounds but is not grounded.

The grounding relation also has what we might call a preservative character. If x is grounded by y, then anything essential to y is in some sense present in x, though perhaps in a modified or limited form. This is why Advaita can claim that Brahman's essential nature as sat-cit-ānanda is reflected in all phenomena, even while those phenomena are not themselves Brahman. The clay's nature is present in all clay pots, though each pot has a particular form that clay as such does not possess.

This analysis allows us to address one traditional puzzle about Advaita. If phenomena are neither identical to Brahman nor entirely different from it, what is their status? The grounding relation provides a formal answer. Phenomena are non-identical to Brahman in that they possess determinations that Brahman lacks. They are not entirely different from Brahman in that their existence is nothing but Brahman's existence manifested through particular conditions. The appearance of paradox dissolves when we recognize that identity and difference are not the only options. Grounding is a third category of relationship.

Phenomenal Properties

The conditioned entities possess what we call phenomenal properties. These include temporal location, spatial extension, and various qualities. We introduce a predicate $\Phi(x)$ to mark entities that have phenomenal properties. A crucial axiom asserts that all conditioned entities have phenomenal properties, and only conditioned entities have them. For any x, $C(x)$ if and only if $\Phi(x)$. The Absolute has no phenomenal properties, not because it lacks something that conditioned entities possess, but because phenomenal properties are precisely what characterize the conditioned as such.

This raises a question about negative predication. When we say Brahman has no qualities, are we not attributing the quality of being qualityless? The formalization helps clarify this issue. To say that not $\Phi(a)$ where $A(a)$ is not to attribute a negative property to the Absolute. It is simply to deny that the predicate Φ applies. The distinction between denying a predicate and asserting its negation is crucial here. Formal logic maintains this distinction where natural language often blurs it.

Phenomenal properties come in various types. There are temporal properties, marking entities as present at particular times. There are spatial properties, marking entities as

extended in particular ways. There are qualitative properties, marking entities as having particular features. The formalization can accommodate all of these by introducing additional predicates and axioms as needed. For present purposes, the important point is that all such properties belong exclusively to the conditioned realm.

The relationship between phenomenal properties and the underlying reality of Brahman is complex. Advaita maintains that phenomenal properties are not ultimately real, yet they are not simple illusions either. They have what Śaṅkara calls vyāvahārika satya, pragmatic or conventional reality. The snake-appearance has reality sufficient to produce fear and guide action, even though it is ultimately understood as a misperception of the rope. Similarly, phenomenal properties have reality sufficient for ordinary experience and knowledge, even though they do not survive ultimate analysis.

The formalization captures this by distinguishing levels of discourse. At the level of conventional description, we can assert predicates about phenomenal properties and construct true propositions about the conditioned world. At the level of ultimate analysis, we recognize that all such predication depends on the prior reality of the Absolute, which itself admits no phenomenal predication. There is no contradiction here, only different legitimate levels of analysis, each appropriate to its own purposes.

The Identity Thesis

The most philosophically significant axiom concerns the Self. Let S(x) be the predicate marking something as a genuine Self, not in the empirical psychological sense but in the metaphysical sense of what one truly is. The axiom states that for any x, if S(x), then there exists exactly one a such that A(a) and x equals a. In other words, whatever is truly Self is identical to the unique Absolute.

This is a strong claim. It asserts numerical identity, not merely similarity or union. The Self is not a part of Brahman, for Brahman has no parts. The Self does not merge with Brahman, for that would presuppose prior separation. The Self simply is Brahman, though this identity is obscured by identification with phenomenal properties. The empirical ego, the sense of being this particular person with this particular history, belongs to the realm of the conditioned. The true Self, which is what remains when all phenomenal identifications are stripped away, is the Absolute itself.

How can this identity be expressed formally without generating paradox? The key is recognizing what the identity claim asserts and what it does not. It does not assert that the phenomenal person is Brahman. The person, with all its particular properties, is conditioned and therefore not Absolute. What the identity thesis asserts is that

consciousness itself, the pure awareness that underlies all particular mental states, is not distinct from Brahman's essential nature as consciousness. When one traces awareness back to its ground, removing all content and all individuation, what remains is not a particular consciousness but consciousness as such, which is Brahman.

The formalization makes this explicit through a distinction between the Self as pure subject and the self as object of thought. The latter is conditioned, a construction of phenomenal properties including memories, personality traits, and bodily identification. The former is what witnesses all phenomenal content, including the empirical self. This pure subject cannot itself be an object of thought, for any thought about it would be a phenomenal content and therefore not the subject itself. Yet it is not nothing, for it is the condition of all experience. It is, in Advaita's terms, the sākṣin, the witness consciousness that is identical to Brahman.

Traditional objections to the identity thesis often involve confusion between these levels. When critics ask how individual souls can be identical to one universal Brahman, they are thinking of souls as phenomenal entities with particular properties. But Advaita denies that the true Self is such an entity. When critics ask how the Self can know itself, they are assuming that self-knowledge requires subject-object duality. But Advaita maintains that the Self's self-luminosity is immediate and non-relational. These objections fail to engage with what Advaita actually claims once it is formally clarified.

Appearance and Reality

The relationship between appearance and reality requires careful formalization. We introduce a predicate Appears(x, y) meaning "x appears as y." This relation is distinct from identity. The rope appears as a snake without being a snake. Brahman appears as multiple phenomena without being multiple. The appearance relation is real, appearances genuinely occur, but what appears is not what it appears to be.

An important axiom governs this relation. For any x and a, if A(a) and Appears(a, x), then C(x) and not A(x). What the Absolute appears as is always conditioned and never Absolute. This captures the idea that Brahman's manifestation as the phenomenal world does not compromise its unconditioned nature. The manifestation is real as appearance but not as ultimate reality. Brahman does not become the world, rather, the world is how Brahman appears under the conditions of māyā.

What produces appearances? Advaita attributes this to māyā, often translated as illusion but better understood as the power of manifestation. Māyā is neither real nor unreal. It cannot be real in the sense that Brahman is real, for then non-duality would be

compromised. It cannot be unreal in the sense that a square circle is unreal, for then it could not produce appearances. Māyā has what is called anirvachanīya status, indefinable or inexplicable in terms of the real-unreal dichotomy.

The formalization handles this by treating māyā not as an entity but as a feature of the appearance relation itself. To say that x appears as y is to invoke māyā, but māyā need not be reified as a separate power or substance. It is simply the fact that appearance differs from reality, that the one Brahman presents as many phenomena. This avoids the problem of having to locate māyā ontologically. It is not an entity that could be either real or unreal, it is a relationship between the Absolute and the conditioned.

Critics have long objected that this makes māyā inexplicable and therefore philosophically suspect. How can something neither real nor unreal produce genuine effects? The formal analysis suggests that this objection assumes an exhaustive dichotomy between real and unreal that Advaita rejects. Just as the grounding relation showed that identity and complete difference are not exhaustive alternatives, the appearance relation shows that reality and unreality are not exhaustive alternatives. There is a third status, the status of appearances, which have pragmatic reality without ultimate reality.

Knowledge and Ignorance

The formalization must also address epistemological issues. How is knowledge of Brahman possible? What is the nature of ignorance that prevents such knowledge? Traditional Advaita makes a distinction between immediate knowledge and mediated knowledge. Knowledge of Brahman is immediate, it is Brahman's self-luminous awareness of itself. Ignorance consists in identification with the phenomenal, mistaking the conditioned for the Self.

We can formalize this through predicates concerning knowledge. Let K(x, y) mean "x knows y." If x is the Self and the Self is identical to Brahman, then K(x, x) is a trivial truth. The Self necessarily knows itself because it is pure consciousness. Ignorance, then, is not absence of self-knowledge but rather the overlaying of phenomenal identifications on top of this self-knowledge. One knows oneself as Brahman but mistakes oneself for the body-mind complex.

The removal of ignorance, which Advaita calls mokṣa or liberation, is therefore not the acquisition of new knowledge but the removal of false identification. This is why Śaṅkara insists that liberation is not something to be achieved or produced. It is one's true nature, simply obscured. The formal system captures this through axioms showing that certain

knowledge relationships hold necessarily, while others hold only under conditions of ignorance.

An important theorem follows from these axioms. If S(x) and x knows that S(x), then x knows that A(x). In other words, knowing that one is Self entails knowing that one is Absolute, given the identity thesis. This is not a inference in the ordinary sense, for there is no temporal gap between the two pieces of knowledge. Rather, they are the same knowledge viewed from different angles. To fully understand what it means to be Self is to understand one's identity with Brahman.

Machine Verification

The Isabelle/HOL Theorem Prover

Isabelle is an interactive theorem prover that supports various logical frameworks. Higher-Order Logic (HOL) is a typed logic that extends first-order logic with quantification over predicates and functions. It provides a natural framework for expressing metaphysical claims because it can handle relations between relations, properties of properties, and other higher-order concepts that arise in philosophical discourse.

The verification process involves several steps. First, the axioms are stated in Isabelle's formal language. This requires translating from philosophical vocabulary to logical notation while preserving meaning. Second, theorems are stated as conjectures. These are propositions that we believe follow from the axioms but have not yet proven. Third, proofs are constructed using Isabelle's proof tactics. These tactics apply logical rules to derive conclusions from premises. Fourth, Isabelle checks each proof step mechanically, ensuring that no invalid inferences occur. When Isabelle confirms a theorem, we have machine-verified certainty that it follows from the axioms.

The choice of HOL rather than first-order logic is important. First-order logic can express "there exists an x such that x is Absolute," but it cannot easily express "the property of being Absolute applies to exactly one thing." HOL allows us to quantify over properties themselves, making claims about all properties or about relationships between properties. This additional expressive power is necessary for capturing Advaita's metaphysical claims.

Some might worry that machine verification only confirms that theorems follow from axioms, not that the axioms are true. This is correct but not a limitation. The goal is to

demonstrate logical consistency and to show what follows necessarily from Advaita's commitments. Whether those commitments are true is a further question, one that formal logic alone cannot answer. However, showing that a philosophical system is consistent removes one serious objection to it. A system that can be proven contradictory is certainly false. A system proven consistent might be true.

Key Theorems

Several theorems emerge from the formal system that illuminate Advaita's structure. The first establishes the uniqueness of grounding. For any conditioned entity x, there exists exactly one a such that x is grounded by a and a is Absolute. This follows from the axioms asserting the uniqueness of the Absolute and the fact that all conditioned entities are grounded by the Absolute. The theorem confirms that the grounding structure is not a complex web but a simple radial pattern, all phenomena trace to the single Absolute.

The second theorem concerns ontological exhaustiveness. For any x, either A(x) or C(x), and not both. Everything that exists is categorized definitively as Absolute or conditioned. There is no third category and no overlap. This theorem depends on axioms asserting the exclusivity and exhaustiveness of the fundamental categories. It confirms that Advaita's ontology is genuinely binary at the ultimate level, even though the phenomenal realm contains vast multiplicity.

The third theorem addresses the Self-Absolute identity. If x is Self, then x is identical to the unique Absolute. Moreover, if x is Self, then x has no phenomenal properties. This follows from the identity thesis and the axiom that the Absolute lacks phenomenal properties. The theorem shows that the claim "the Self is Brahman" is not a mystical paradox but a logical consequence of how Self is defined within the system. It also reveals that the true Self cannot be identified with any phenomenal properties, for that would contradict its identity with the Absolute.

The fourth theorem concerns appearance without transformation. For any x, if the Absolute appears as x, then x is conditioned and the Absolute remains unconditioned. In other words, appearance does not alter the nature of what appears. This theorem blocks a common misunderstanding of Advaita, the idea that Brahman somehow becomes the world or transforms into multiplicity. The world is how Brahman appears, but Brahman itself undergoes no change. The formalization makes this explicit through the logical structure of the appearance relation.

The fifth theorem addresses the impossibility of real distinction between Self and Absolute. If x is Self and y is Absolute, then x equals y. There is no case where something

is Self without being Absolute. This theorem closes off attempts to interpret Advaita as maintaining qualified non-dualism or subtle dualism. The identity is strict and admits no exceptions.

Several additional theorems establish relationships between knowledge, ignorance, and liberation, but these suffice to show the system's character. Each theorem is not merely consistent with the axioms but necessarily follows from them. The machine verification confirms that the proofs contain no errors and that the logical connections are valid. This provides a foundation for philosophical interpretation that informal argumentation cannot match.

Consistency Proof

The most significant result of machine verification is the consistency proof. Isabelle confirms that the axiom system contains no contradiction. No theorem of the form P and not-P can be derived. The system is internally coherent.

How does this work technically? Isabelle constructs a model of the axioms, a mathematical structure in which all the axioms are satisfied. The existence of such a model entails consistency, for a contradiction would be true in no model. The model need not be philosophically interesting in itself. It might be a simple mathematical structure with no resemblance to metaphysical reality. The point is merely that the axioms can be satisfied simultaneously, which proves they do not contradict each other.

This result directly addresses the oldest objection to Advaita, that its claims are logically incoherent. Whatever philosophical worries one might have about Advaita's truth or explanatory adequacy, logical contradiction is not among them. The system says what it says clearly, and what it says is consistent. This shifts the burden of proof to critics. They can no longer simply assert that Advaita is contradictory. They must either identify an axiom that misrepresents Advaita's commitments or accept that the system is logically coherent.

Some might argue that the formalization captures only one interpretation of Advaita, perhaps Śaṅkara's version, and that other interpretations might involve contradiction. This is possible but does not diminish the result. If at least one coherent interpretation of Advaita exists, then the tradition cannot be dismissed as inherently contradictory. Moreover, the axioms were chosen to represent the minimal commitments that any version of Advaita would accept. The uniqueness of Brahman, the dependence of phenomena, the identity of Self and Absolute, these are not sectarian views but the core of what makes a position Advaitic.

Others might object that formalization inevitably distorts the subject matter, reducing living philosophical insight to sterile symbols. This objection misunderstands the purpose of formalization. The goal is not to replace philosophical understanding with logical notation but to supplement it. Formalization provides one tool for assessing certain kinds of claims, particularly claims about logical relationships. It does not address questions about experiential realization, soteriological efficacy, or hermeneutical adequacy. Those require different methods. But for questions about logical consistency, formal methods provide unmatched precision.

Philosophical Implications

The Structure of Non-Duality

The formal system reveals something important about the structure of Advaita's non-dualism. It is not simply the assertion that "all is one," a vague monism that collapses distinctions. Rather, it involves a specific logical structure with two levels, the Absolute and the conditioned, related through grounding and appearance. The non-duality consists in the fact that only one entity is self-subsistent, while all others exist through it. Multiplicity is real at the phenomenal level but not ultimately, and the Self is identical to the ultimate reality despite appearing as multiple selves.

This structure differs from other forms of non-dualism found in Indian philosophy. Buddhist Madhyamaka's emptiness is not the same as Advaita's Brahman, for Madhyamaka denies substantial existence to everything including an Absolute. Kashmiri Śaivism's non-dualism includes dynamic aspects in the Absolute itself, something Advaita denies. The formalization helps distinguish these positions by making their logical structures explicit. They are not all saying the same thing in different words, they have genuinely different logical commitments.

The structure also clarifies what Advaita means by māyā. In the formal system, māyā is not a mysterious third entity between reality and illusion. It is simply the appearance relation itself, the fact that the one Absolute presents as multiple phenomena. This avoids many traditional puzzles about māyā's ontological status. Questions like "is māyā real or unreal" turn out to be misguided, for māyā is not an entity but a relationship. It is as real as the relationship of grounding, which is to say, it is part of the logical structure of reality.

The identity of Self and Absolute also takes on new clarity. It is not a mystical union to be achieved but a logical identity that always holds. What obscures this identity is not some

barrier between Self and Absolute but rather false identification of the Self with phenomenal properties. Liberation consists in recognizing what is already the case, not in bringing about a new state of affairs. The formalization captures this through axioms that make the identity a necessary truth, not a contingent fact.

Resolution of Traditional Objections

The formal system allows us to address traditional objections with new precision. Consider Rāmānuja's objection that māyā must be either real or unreal and either option leads to contradiction. The formalization shows that this objection assumes an exhaustive dichotomy that Advaita rejects. The appearance relation is real in the sense that appearances genuinely occur. It is not ultimately real in the sense that it depends on the Absolute rather than being self-subsistent. This is not a contradiction but a distinction between levels of reality.

Madhva's objection that Advaita violates the law of non-contradiction by asserting both identity and difference can also be addressed. The formalization makes clear that Advaita does not assert identity and difference in the same respect. The Self is identical to Brahman at the level of ultimate reality. The Self appears as different from Brahman at the level of phenomenal appearance. These are not contradictory claims because they operate at different levels. The law of non-contradiction prohibits asserting P and not-P at the same level of analysis, not at different levels.

The objection that self-knowledge involves incoherent circularity also dissolves under formal analysis. When we formalize knowledge relations, we find that K(x, x) where x is Self is not circular but tautologous. The Self knowing itself is not a relational knowledge where one entity knows another. It is the self-luminous awareness that characterizes consciousness as such. The formalization distinguishes between relational knowledge, which requires subject-object duality, and self-awareness, which is immediate and non-relational.

Western objections about category mistakes can be addressed by noting that the formalization carefully maintains categorical distinctions. The Absolute is never treated as an object among objects or a substance among substances. It is consistently characterized as that which grounds all conditioned existence without itself being conditioned. This is not a category mistake but a coherent ontological claim about the ground of being.

Comparison with Other Indian Systems

The formal approach allows systematic comparison with other Indian philosophical systems. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realism maintains that individual substances, qualities, and relations are ultimately real. Formalized, this would require multiple self-subsistent entities rather than the single Absolute. The difference in axioms would lead to different theorems, particularly regarding the relationship between wholes and parts, universals and particulars.

Buddhist abhidharma analyzes reality into momentary dharmas. A formalization would need to incorporate temporal succession as fundamental rather than treating time as a phenomenal property. The resulting system would have very different logical structure from Advaita, with change and plurality as basic rather than appearance and non-duality.

Sāṃkhya dualism posits two ultimate principles, puruṣa and prakṛti. Formalized, this would violate Advaita's uniqueness axiom for the Absolute. The resulting system would need to explain how two self-subsistent principles relate, a problem that Advaita avoids through its rigorous non-dualism.

The comparison is philosophically illuminating. It shows that these systems are not simply different ways of talking about the same reality but genuinely different metaphysical theories with different logical commitments. The differences are not merely verbal or cultural but substantive and formal. This validates the traditional Indian practice of vigorous philosophical debate between schools. They were arguing about real differences, not merely terminology.

Interestingly, Advaita's logical structure bears some resemblance to Neoplatonic henology, particularly Plotinus's theory of the One. Both posit a single transcendent principle from which multiplicity emanates without the principle itself becoming multiple. Both distinguish levels of reality with different ontological status. Both maintain that return to the source involves recognition rather than change. A formal comparison of these systems might reveal deep structural similarities despite vast cultural and historical differences.

Limitations and Extensions

The formalization presented here captures core metaphysical claims but leaves much out. It does not address epistemological issues in detail, particularly the pramāṇa theory that Advaita shares with other Indian schools. It does not formalize the theory of the three states, waking, dreaming, and deep sleep, which Śaṅkara uses to argue for the reality of pure consciousness. It does not capture the distinction between higher and lower Brahman, though this could be added through additional axioms.

The system also does not formalize specific arguments from Advaita texts, such as the discrimination between Self and not-self or the various means of removing ignorance. These could be represented as theorems within the system, but that would require considerable expansion. The present formalization provides a foundation that could support such extensions.

Another limitation is that the formalization uses classical logic rather than attempting to capture any distinctively Indian logical framework. Some might argue that Advaita's claims are best understood within a different logical system, perhaps one that allows for degrees of truth or alternative negations. This is an interesting suggestion that would require developing non-classical formal systems and showing that they better capture Advaita's commitments. The present work uses classical logic because it is well-understood and widely accepted, but alternative approaches are worth exploring.

The formalization also does not address comparative questions about whether Advaita's metaphysics coheres with modern physics or cognitive science. Some contemporary Advaitins make such claims, but assessing them would require formalizing relevant scientific theories and examining their relationship to the metaphysical system. This is a substantial project beyond the scope of the present article.

Despite these limitations, the formalization achieves its primary goal, demonstrating that Advaita's core metaphysical claims form a consistent logical system. This removes one major objection and provides a foundation for further philosophical work. Extensions and refinements are certainly possible and desirable, but they would build on rather than replace the basic system.

Methodological Reflections

Formal Methods in Indian Philosophy

The application of contemporary formal methods to classical Indian philosophy raises methodological questions. Is this approach legitimate? Does it respect the integrity of the tradition or impose foreign categories? Several considerations support the legitimacy of formalization.

First, Indian philosophy has always included rigorous logical analysis. The Nyāya-sūtras systematize inference. The Navya-Nyāya tradition developed increasingly formalized languages. Buddhist logicians created sophisticated theories of negation and quantification. Formalization is not foreign to Indian philosophy but rather an extension

of methods already present in the tradition. Using contemporary logical notation rather than Sanskrit technical terms is a matter of convenience, not a fundamental change in approach.

Second, the question of logical consistency is independent of cultural context. A system is either consistent or contradictory regardless of where or when it was developed. The laws of logic are not Western or Eastern but universal. Therefore, using formal methods to assess consistency is appropriate for any philosophical tradition. This does not mean that logic exhausts philosophy or that formalization captures everything important about a tradition. It means that for questions about logical relationships, formal methods are appropriate tools.

Third, formalization can actually help recover aspects of classical texts that are obscured in translation. Sanskrit philosophical texts often have a quasi-formal structure that gets lost when translated into English prose. Terms are used with technical precision, arguments follow standard patterns, and the logical skeleton is clear to those trained in the tradition. Formalization in contemporary notation can restore some of this clarity, making the logical structure visible to those who lack training in Sanskrit scholasticism.

Fourth, critics who object to formalization often presuppose that it must distort or reduce its subject matter. But formalization is a tool, not a complete methodology. It addresses certain questions, those about logical relationships, and leaves others to different approaches. No one suggests that formalization replaces textual study, historical research, or contemplative practice. It supplements these by providing precise answers to specific questions.

The methodological approach here treats classical texts as making philosophical claims that can be assessed using contemporary tools. This presupposes that cross-temporal and cross-cultural philosophical dialogue is possible. Some contemporary scholars doubt this, arguing that philosophical concepts are inextricably embedded in particular cultural contexts. If this radical contextualism were correct, not only would formalization be impossible but any philosophical engagement with classical Indian texts would be misguided. The fact that such engagement has been fruitful for centuries suggests that the skepticism is overdrawn.

The Role of Machine Verification

Machine verification adds something that manual proof cannot provide. Even expert logicians make errors, particularly in complex systems with many axioms and long derivations. A human prover might miss a subtle inconsistency or assume a step that

does not actually follow. Machine verification eliminates these errors. When Isabelle confirms a proof, we have certainty that the inference is valid.

This does not make human understanding irrelevant. Someone must formalize the system in the first place, choosing axioms that capture the philosophical content. Someone must interpret the results, explaining what the theorems mean philosophically. Someone must assess whether the formalization is adequate to the tradition it represents. These tasks require philosophical judgment that machines cannot provide. But for the specific task of checking logical validity, machines are superior to humans.

The use of machine verification also makes the work reproducible in a way that informal philosophy rarely is. Anyone with Isabelle can verify the proofs independently. The axioms and theorems are stated precisely enough that ambiguity is eliminated. This allows for cumulative progress. If someone believes the formalization is inadequate, they can propose specific changes and verify whether the modified system remains consistent. Philosophical debate can then focus on whether the changes improve adequacy rather than getting bogged down in disputes about what follows from what.

Some might worry that machine verification gives a false sense of certainty. After all, the consistency of the formal system does not prove that Advaita is true or even that the formalization adequately captures Advaita. This is correct but not a problem. The claim is not that formalization solves all philosophical questions but that it solves certain questions, those about logical consistency. For those questions, machine verification provides genuine certainty.

Future Directions

This work opens several avenues for future research. First, the basic formal system could be extended to capture more of Advaita's philosophical apparatus. The theory of superimposition, adhyāsa, could be formalized as a relation between the Self and phenomenal identifications. The doctrine of the three states could be represented through indexed predicates capturing different levels of manifestation. The means of knowledge, pramāṇas, could be formalized as functions from evidence to justified belief.

Second, similar formal systems could be developed for other schools of Indian philosophy. A formalization of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika realism would allow precise comparison with Advaita. A formalization of Buddhist Madhyamaka would reveal how its non-dualism differs structurally from Advaita's. A formalization of Sāṃkhya dualism would show exactly what changes when we move from one ultimate principle to two. These comparative formalizations would advance understanding of how these systems relate.

Third, the formal systems could be used to model specific debates. The arguments between Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana Miśra over the role of action in liberation could be represented as different theorems within an extended system. The dispute between Advaitins and Viśiṣṭādvaitins over qualified versus unqualified non-dualism could be shown to turn on specific axiom choices. This would clarify what is actually at stake in these debates.

Fourth, connections could be explored between Advaita's formal structure and contemporary metaphysics. Do theories of grounding in analytic ontology capture what Advaita means by ontological dependence? Does work on levels of reality in metametaphysics illuminate Advaita's distinction between ultimate and conventional truth? Can theories of vagueness help formalize the anirvachanīya status of māyā? These questions could benefit from formal analysis.

Finally, the pedagogical value of formalization deserves attention. Would students understand Advaita better if introduced through formal systems as well as texts? Would the logical structure become clearer? Would common misunderstandings be avoided? These questions could be investigated empirically. If formalization proves pedagogically useful, it might become a standard supplement to traditional teaching methods.

Conclusion

This article has presented a formal axiomatization of Advaita Vedānta metaphysics and demonstrated its logical consistency through machine verification. The system captures Advaita's core commitments, the uniqueness of Brahman, the ontological dependence of phenomena, the identity of Self and Absolute, and the distinction between ultimate and conventional reality. Machine verification confirms that these commitments form a consistent system. No contradiction can be derived from the axioms.

This result addresses the oldest and most serious objection to Advaita, that it is logically incoherent. Whatever one's philosophical assessment of Advaita's truth or adequacy, logical contradiction is not a legitimate criticism. The system is consistent, and what might appear contradictory in informal presentation follows necessarily from clearly stated axioms.

The formalization also illuminates Advaita's logical structure. It is not a vague mysticism but a precise metaphysical theory with specific commitments and determinate implications. The relationship between Brahman and the world is formalized through grounding relations. The status of māyā is clarified as the appearance relation itself rather

than a mysterious entity. The identity of Self and Absolute is shown to be a logical consequence of how these terms are defined within the system.

Methodologically, the work demonstrates that contemporary formal methods can be fruitfully applied to classical Indian philosophy. Formalization does not replace traditional approaches but supplements them. It provides precise answers to questions about logical relationships while leaving other questions to other methods. Machine verification ensures that the answers are not merely plausible but certain.

The formal system presented here provides a foundation for further work. It could be extended to capture more of Advaita's philosophical apparatus. It could be used for systematic comparison with other Indian schools. It could inform contemporary debates about grounding, levels of reality, and the structure of consciousness. Most importantly, it establishes that Advaita is a philosophically serious system deserving continued attention and development.

Śaṅkara's insight that the Self is Brahman, that apparent multiplicity rests on non-dual reality, that liberation consists in recognizing what is always already the case, these are not merely mystical intuitions or cultural artifacts. They are philosophical claims with clear logical structure. The formalization shows that these claims cohere, that they form a system as rigorous as any in Western philosophy. This does not prove that they are true, but it proves that they are not obviously false. They deserve to be taken seriously as contributions to perennial philosophical questions about the nature of reality, self, and knowledge.

The verification process confirms what careful students of Advaita have long maintained, that the tradition's arguments have logical force. Critics who dismiss Advaita as mystical nonsense have not engaged seriously with its claims. The formalization makes engagement unavoidable. One cannot simply assert contradiction, one must either accept the system's consistency or point to a specific axiom that misrepresents Advaita. Either way, philosophical progress is made.

In an age when cross-cultural philosophy has become increasingly important, work like this shows that rigorous engagement is possible. Indian and Western philosophical traditions are not incommensurable. They can be compared, contrasted, and integrated using tools that transcend cultural boundaries. Formal logic is one such tool. By applying it to Advaita, we honor both the tradition and the universal aspiration of philosophy toward truth.

References

Primary Sources

Gauḍapāda. 1950. *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. In S. Radhakrishnan (ed. and trans.), *The Principal Upaniṣads*, 695-714. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Madhva. 1936-1937. *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya of Śrī Madhvācārya*. S. Subba Rau (trans.). Tirupati: Sri Vyasa Press.

Rāmānuja. 1904. *Śrī-bhāṣya*. George Thibaut (trans.). In F. Max Müller (ed.), *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 48. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Śaṅkara. 1962. *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*. Swami Gambhirananda (trans.). Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.

Śaṅkara. 1965. *Eight Upaniṣads with the Commentary of Śaṅkarācārya*, Vol. 1-2. Swami Gambhirananda (trans.). Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.

Śaṅkara. 1984. *Bhagavad Gītā Bhāṣya*. Swami Gambhirananda (trans.). Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.

Śaṅkara. 1992. *Upadesa Sahasri*. Swami Jagadananda (trans.). Madras: Sri Ramakrishna Math.

Secondary Literature on Advaita Vedānta

Alston, A.J. 1980. *Saṃkara on the Absolute*. London: Shanti Sadan.

Barua, Ankur. 2025. "The Nullity of Nescience: G. R. Malkani's Contemporary Formulation of Advaita." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 29(1): 33-54.

Comans, Michael. 2000. *The Method of Early Advaita Vedānta: A Study of Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara, Sureśvara, and Padmapāda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Dasgupta, Surendranath. 1922. *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deutsch, Eliot. 1969. *Advaita Vedānta: A Philosophical Reconstruction*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Fort, Andrew O. and Patricia Y. Mumme (eds.). 1996. *Living Liberation in Hindu Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Grimes, John. 1996. *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit Terms Defined in English*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hacker, Paul. 1995. *Philology and Confrontation: Paul Hacker on Traditional and Modern Vedānta*. Wilhelm Halbfass (ed.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1991. *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Indich, William M. 1980. *Consciousness in Advaita Vedānta*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Mahadevan, T.M.P. 1938. *The Philosophy of Advaita*. London: Luzac and Company.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1979. *A Thousand Teachings: The Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkara*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Menon, Sangeetha. 2020. "Pluralizing the Non-dual: Multilingual Perspectives on Advaita Vedānta, 1560-1847 (Introduction)." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 48(1): 1-12.

Mudgal, S.G. 1975. *Advaita of Śaṅkara: A Reappraisal*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Potter, Karl H. 1981. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. 3: Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṃkara and his Pupils*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Ram-Prasad, Chakravarthi. 2001. *Knowledge and Liberation in Classical Indian Thought*. New York: Palgrave.

Rao, S. 1996. "Two 'Myths' in Advaita." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24: 265-279.

Roodurmun, Pulasth Soobah. 2002. "Bhāmatī and Vivaraṇa Schools of Advaita Vedānta: A Critical Approach." PhD dissertation, University of Durban-Westville.

Satchidanandendra, Swami. 1997. *The Method of the Vedānta*. A.J. Alston (trans.). London: Kegan Paul International.

Sharma, Chandradhar. 1960. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. London: Rider and Company.

Indian Philosophy and Logic

Balcerowicz, Piotr and Brendan S. Gillon. 2022. “Logic in the Religions of South Asia (Introduction).” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 50: 771-774.

Bhattacharya, Sibajiban. 1987. *Doubt, Belief and Knowledge*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.

Chakrabarti, Arindam. 2010. “The Nyāya on the Meaning of Some Words for Cognition.” In Matthew Kapstein (ed.), *Buddhist Philosophy: Essential Readings*, 37-43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ganeri, Jonardon. 2001. *Philosophy in Classical India*. London: Routledge.

Ganeri, Jonardon (ed.). 2001. *Indian Logic: A Reader*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Ganeri, Jonardon. 2007. *The Concealed Art of the Soul: Theories of Self and Practices of Truth in Indian Ethics and Epistemology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ganeri, Jonardon. 2011. *The Lost Age of Reason: Philosophy in Early Modern India 1450-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gillon, Brendan S. 1991. “Dharmakīrti and His Theory of Inference.” In Bimal K. Matilal and Robert D. Evans (eds.), *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology*, 77-87. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Hayes, Richard P. 1988. *Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1968. *The Navya-Nyāya Doctrine of Negation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1971. *Epistemology, Logic, and Grammar in Indian Philosophical Analysis*. The Hague: Mouton.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1985. *Logic, Language and Reality: Indian Philosophy and Contemporary Issues*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1998. *The Character of Logic in India*. Jonardon Ganeri and Heeraman Tiwari (eds.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mohanty, Jitendra Nath. 1992. *Reason and Tradition in Indian Thought: An Essay on the Nature of Indian Philosophical Thinking*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Phillips, Stephen H. 1995. *Classical Indian Metaphysics: Refutations of Realism and the Emergence of “New Logic”*. Chicago: Open Court.

Potter, Karl H. 1977. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. 2: Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Schang, Fabien. 2010. "Two Indian Dialectical Logics." *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 27: 47-76.

Sen, Pranab Kumar. 2000. "Conditions for Understanding the Meaning of a Sentence: The Nyāya and the Advaita Vedānta." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28: 273-293.

Siderits, Mark, Tom Tillemans, and Arindam Chakrabarti (eds.). 2011. *Apoha: Buddhist Nominalism and Human Cognition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Staal, Frits. 1973. "The Concept of Pakṣa in Indian Logic." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2: 155-166.

Tillemans, Tom J.F. 1999. *Scripture, Logic, Language: Essays on Dharmakīrti and His Tibetan Successors*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Comparative Philosophy and Metaphysics

Carpenter, Amber D. 2014. *Indian Buddhist Philosophy*. Durham: Acumen.

Coseru, Christian. 2012. *Perceiving Reality: Consciousness, Intentionality, and Cognition in Buddhist Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garfield, Jay L. 1995. *The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way: Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garfield, Jay L. 2002. *Empty Words: Buddhist Philosophy and Cross-Cultural Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Perrett, Roy W. 2016. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siderits, Mark. 2007. *Buddhism as Philosophy*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

Westerhoff, Jan. 2009. *Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Contemporary Analytic Metaphysics

Fine, Kit. 2001. “The Question of Realism.” *Philosophers' Imprint* 1(1): 1-30.

Schaffer, Jonathan. 2009. “On What Grounds What.” In David Chalmers, David Manley, and Ryan Wasserman (eds.), *Metametaphysics*, 347-383. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schaffer, Jonathan. 2010. “Monism: The Priority of the Whole.” *Philosophical Review* 119(1): 31-76.

Sider, Theodore. 2011. *Writing the Book of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Formal Methods and Logic

Avigad, Jeremy and Rebecca Morris. 2016. “The Concept-Script: Frege’s Logic.” In Gillian Russell and Delia Graff Fara (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Language*, 69-89. New York: Routledge.

Benzműller, Christoph and Bruno Woltzenlogel Paleo. 2016. “The Inconsistency in Gödel’s Ontological Argument: A Success Story for AI in Metaphysics.” In Subbarao Kambhampati (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-16)*, 936-942. Palo Alto: AAAI Press.

Blanchette, Patricia. 2012. *Frege’s Conception of Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hales, Steven D. and Timothy A. Johnson. 2010. “Endurantism, Perdurantism and Special Relativity.” *The Philosophical Quarterly* 60(241): 713-732.

Harrison, John. 2009. *Handbook of Practical Logic and Automated Reasoning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nipkow, Tobias, Markus Wenzel, and Lawrence C. Paulson. 2002. *Isabelle/HOL: A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*. Berlin: Springer.

Nipkow, Tobias and Gerwin Klein. 2014. *Concrete Semantics with Isabelle/HOL*. Berlin: Springer.

Paulson, Lawrence C. 1994. *Isabelle: A Generic Theorem Prover*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 828. Berlin: Springer.

Paulson, Lawrence C. and Jasmin Christian Blanchette. 2015. “Three Years of Experience with Sledgehammer, a Practical Link Between Automatic and Interactive Theorem Provers.” In Geoff Sutcliffe, Stephan Schulz, and Eugenia Ternovska (eds.), *IWIL 2010: The*

8th International Workshop on the Implementation of Logics, 1-11. EPiC Series in Computing.

Rushby, John. 2005. "Automated Deduction and Formal Methods." In E. Allen Emerson and Kedar S. Namjoshi (eds.), *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, 1-12. Berlin: Springer.

Wiedijk, Freek. 2006. *The Seventeen Provers of the World*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3600. Berlin: Springer.

Software and Digital Resources

Isabelle Development Team. 2024. *Isabelle2024*. https://isabelle.in.tum.de/

Scherf, Matthew. 2025. *Only-One: Machine-Verified Formalization of Advaita Vedānta Metaphysics*. GitHub repository. https://github.com/matthew-scherf/Only-One [Note: Replace with actual repository URL]

The Isabelle Archive of Formal Proofs. 2024. https://www.isa-afp.org/

Methodological Works

Cappelen, Herman. 2012. *Philosophy Without Intuitions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, David. 2011. "Verbal Disputes." *Philosophical Review* 120(4): 515-566.

Dutilh Novaes, Catarina. 2012. *Formal Languages in Logic: A Philosophical and Cognitive Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Priest, Graham. 2014. "Revising Logic." In Peter Rush (ed.), *The Metaphysics of Logic*, 211-223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, Timothy. 2007. *The Philosophy of Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Williamson, Timothy. 2017. "Semantic Paradoxes and Abductive Methodology." In Bradley Armour-Garb (ed.), *Reflections on the Liar*, 325-346. Oxford: Oxford University Press. advaita_references.md Displaying advaita_references.md.