

## Foundations as Inherently Trinitarian Holistics

By Arthur Shevenyonov

### Abstract

God being Love (and love being about “betweenness” or “amongness” rather than a substance outside the subject-object dichotomy), the latter is maintained as the underlying essence and the ultimate, complete and superior mode of existence. The Ordinal calculus is deployed to substantiate the Trinitarian account, with textual evidence oversufficing to lend support to the version in question.

*I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world [...] (John 17:6)*

*He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love (1 John 4:8)*

*And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us; God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him (1 John 4:16)*

### **Background on Lativity**

It has been maintained thus far (Shevenyonov, 2016d) that relationships (indeed a basic and universal one to crop up at many a level toward more involved aggregates or “structure-values”) are what underlies and upholds being. However complex, matter is a level of relationship, and so is energy—as their equivalent is lative (relational) in nature. Where there is little to no “mass” or “energy”, one can speak of the lower-bound threshold of relationship and existence (cardinality as illusion, chaos, vacuum, destruction, orthogonality, *hyle* or entropy).

The whole of existence can be reduced to the commonly shared “structure accounting”:

$$(1.1) (A, a)^\rho \sim (a, A)^{\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

$$(1.2) [(A, a), X] = [X, (a, A)]$$

The (1.1) and (1.2) representations are fully equivalent and will be used interchangeably, with *X* standing for the “third object” or “floating basis” (Shevenyonov, 2016d) mediating or informing the relationship.

It is this basic rho-symmetry, duality ( $\Psi$  “ons/ens”) or *conservation and equivalence principle* (incidentally hinting at a generalized Poisson bracket commutator, should there be one in the literature) that can further be narrowed down to a *particular* “value” of rho, thus defining a specific mode of existence or creation—a “species” or modality of matter:

$$(1.3) \quad (A, a)^{\bar{\rho}} \sim (a, A)^{\frac{\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\rho}-1}}, \exists \rho \equiv \bar{\rho}$$

With respect to creatures or matter, this reduction or narrowing-down can be either “genuine” (substantive, ontological) or phenomenological (perceptive). This opens ample room for straddling materialism and idealism—subjective as well as objective. It is ironic, though, how the former tends to follow the very “cardinalcy” (naïve determinism or antecedent based causality) that will now be shown to boast questionable merit at best, little short of positing a “devilish enterprise.” Among other things, fallacious parallels will need to be debunked with legacies that my research has never embarked on (e.g. Kabbalah, occult accounts, etc.)

### ***Unexpected Applications: No Causality but Divine***

From what has been maintained above, one may opt to abide by one of the strongly “cardinal” versions of Unity and creation whereby The One and Only inspired life into the otherwise barren matter. What is being proposed instead is a more detailed perspective, whereby the *whole* of the creation has somehow been patterned after (or in the image of) the Divinity—or a Trinitarian mode of the Unity.

To name a few illustrations, the atom could be seen as a *relationship* of the particles rather than an aggregate of them—and the same holds for macro-level or long-run regularities that may not otherwise fully shine through snapshots or individual behavior. That said, this is not to revalidate the role of time or space, which fictitious categories (sic!) can only regain existential merit indirectly or in “*interaction*” with each other (spacetime). Otherwise, competing fields such as the general relativity versus quantum mechanics will sustain their artificial schism due to the drastically disparate simplifying assumption on the nature of space and time.

At this stage, the reader may want some recollections of the basic lative or relational rationale. *Inter alia*, whereas  $R(Y, X)$  points to a relationship as an extension of treating the objects in strongly *hierarchic* or *causal* terms as a function versus an argument, this generalization may collapse to functionality (or cardinalcy) as either object converges to the other or the lative parameter (rho implied) takes on a degenerate value, e.g. 0 or 2:

$$(2.1) \quad R(Y, X) \equiv (Y, X)^{\rho} \xrightarrow{\rho \rightarrow \bar{\rho} \equiv 0} (Y, X)^0 \sim Y(X)$$

$$(2.2) \quad R(Y, X) \equiv (Y, X)^{\rho} \xrightarrow{Y \rightarrow X} (X, X)^{\rho} \sim P(X)$$

$$(2.3) \quad R(Y, X) \equiv (Y, X)^{\rho} \xrightarrow{Y \rightarrow X, \rho \rightarrow 0} (X, X)^0 \sim p(X) \sim \{1\}$$

Whereas in the former case, the relationship converges to a *specific function* (with the rho being defined or narrowed down), in the former it posits a *property at large* (with the rho as a henceforth-property, no-longer-relational domain still unbounded).

It is as early as at this point that one may be led to invoke the Trinitarian account along similar lines! Namely, the distinct-yet-intertwined Hypostases are part of a relationship, which is what accounts for both Unity and genuine Existence. In other words, *God Is—and Is Love*. Insofar as The Son (*Logos* <Greek>, BRa <Aramaic>) has the exact same existential nature (*ousia*?) as The Father, this suggests the (1.2) representation (as befitting creature) has to transcend to the  $a \rightarrow A$  case (pertaining to the Creator):

$$(3.1) [(A, A), X] = [X, (A, A)]$$

$$(3.2) (A, A)^\rho \sim (A, A)^{\frac{\rho}{\rho-1}}$$

In either the (3.1) or (3.2) account,  $X$  as symbolically referring to the Holy Spirit (R<sup>W</sup>Ha [d] Q<sup>W</sup>DSa <Aram.>), clearly has an inherently relational nature:  $X = (A, A)$ , while simultaneously acting as a subject (object) in its own right. Put differently, it is the Third Hypostasis that most directly conveys the loving nature, which pertains to the other two Hypostases and is exercised by them, with the Name referring to both the *ultimate essence* and the *manifestation* of Divinity.

One other way of fully appreciating the all-par and distinct-yet-related nature of the Hypostases would be to represent the floating basis (FB) in (3.1) in terms of the ultimate floating basis (UFB):

$$(3.3) [(X, X), X] = [X, (X, X)]$$

Now, as per (3.2), one has to appreciate that the lative parameter rho has not been defined—amidst the basis converging to the corner case. What this effectively suggests is that, while denying the creature version (with rho taking specific values or otherwise the two objects entering an asymmetric and possibly antagonistic relationship), the Creator representation points to the like of (2.2) with the Divinity being indeed an Absolute Being. Reducing the role of the Third Hypostasis to strong relational symmetry as per (2.1) (i.e. the other two being indistinguishable in any way whatsoever) could either paradoxically posit too much hierarchy or otherwise weakly support the “substance” or “fractal” nature of Divine self-induction. For that matter, embarking on (2.3) as the more restrictive version could refer to a more special, reduced nature of the Absolute—too literal Unity (i.e. singularity) amidst too narrow an existential domain (Oneness, basic existence as *ousia*) and too little leeway for the creature (predetermination).

Based on the above, it can be imputed that God is by far the *One and Only Cause*, with no other causality (nor any strong-form predetermination) being plausible.

### ***Cross-Creed Evidence: Overlaps Pointing to the Ultimate?***

It would appear that, whereas (2.2) lends itself well with the traditional Christian creeds, (2.3) refers to the other Abrahamic versions and (2.1) to either neo-Platonics or Oriental legacies. In this light, the Kabbalah appears to be standing out while striking a peculiar balance of (2.1) and (2.3). More specifically, note that despite the symmetry of the Hypostases, the two-way relationship (love) need not be either strongly symmetric or bounded to any specific value.

On the one hand, this only holds for the Divine (all-uppercase A's) domain—the kind of rho-invariance (and unobservability) that creature at large can never boast. On the other hand, it is still to be maintained generally that,

$$\rho \neq \frac{\rho}{\rho - 1}$$

Otherwise, the above strong cardinalcy would at best refer to (2.1), a near-pagan instance. The corollary could be as follows. While the “Third Hypostasis being love” may be characteristic of a Catholic catechism (while shared by the other two Christian creeds), it is the weakly symmetric lativity (rho neither 0 nor 2, somewhat at odds with “*Filioque*”) as well as the “Third Hypostasis being a Subject” that refers to the Eastern Christian Orthodox vision, which thereby appears to be the closer match overall.

Now, when turning to the overlapping Abrahamic origins, a few points could be suggested to lend further support to the Trinitarian (as ordinal, lative, relational) nature of the Divine.

**(E1)** AHYH ASR AHYH (Exodus 3:14) = “I Am That (what, therefore, by means of, so that, *ergo, ut*) I Am.” Here, AHYH (first singular person of *praesens* or *futurum*) in both cases could statically be referring to the commonly shared basic existential essence (Yh as *ousia* or X) of the Two Hypostases, and ASR/S ([a]TR <Aram.>) to a relational modality as the Third Hypostasis

**(E2)** Tetragrammaton (rendering the third-person singular for present or future) = “He Is” and/or “He Will Be”. Alternatively, a *haphel* verb structure could be implied suggesting, “He That Caused [all to come unto existence].” Needless to say, no one can refer to oneself in the third person—unless in indirect speech, as when requesting that one be named or recommended as that. In any event, one of the traditional readings (“Was, Is, Will Be”) could again statically be hinting at a Trinitarian possibility

**(E3)** *Ekhadaya* (Yukhanan 1:14, Peshitta) = “The One” (or “The Only Begotten”). This Syriac term has been rendered as YhYdYa, which appears strikingly similar to (E1), with YD (“privy to,” “with the power of”) being related to aTR as follows: “Yh Knoweth Yh,” “Life Via Life,” or even “Divine Times Divine”—referring to the likes of Cartesian dimension product as the Divine “space.” Alternatively, notable is the plural [‘gentilic’] ending form for Unity—as if to convey Completeness (rather than respect and grandeur, which is at odds with rabbinical legacy as per plurality endings), or indeed Trinity as Complete Unity

**(E4)** It is unlikely that The Son revealed the exact same Name to the audience that they knew before. With reference to love, HBH sounds very close to (E2), while more than capturing the essence of existence as well as its ultimate mode. Rendered in the third person, it may also convey “He [That] Giveth.” (It remains to be figured out whether Moses, as an Egyptian national, knew Hebrew or Egyptian Aramaic; yet in any event, it was Jesus who revealed the complete, ultimate form.)

**(E5)** TLTh Q<sup>WM</sup> (Mark 5:41)=“Arise, O girl.” However, the predominantly Greek Gospels must have retained the Aramaic originals in the more mysterious utterances for a purpose. Strictly speaking, one cannot assert that the NT makes no mention of Trinitarian representation, if only because TLTh as *talitha* might be awkward to distinguish from *tlothā* (‘Trinity’)—as long as another vocalization is applied. With Q<sup>WM</sup> broadly standing for “sustained presence,” “restoration/resurrection,” “revelation/answer” (akin to PTa as in “*ephtatha!*”—open or disclose or reveal), the alternative or parallel connotation could be, “[May] Trinity reveal (or be sustained).”

**(E6)** A somewhat similar yet distinct set of connotations may pertain to YhW (and its Arabic cognate of *w-h-y*), standing roughly for “that which is revealed, conveyed, manifested, [con]descended or emitted downward, remitted or represented indirectly as well as by delegation” (as with the issue of whether it was an angel acting on the behest of the Divinity that passed on the law, strove with Jacob, etc.) This may or may not be correlated with Bh (splendor, irradiation, emission) graphically (as the *yodh*, *waw*, and *beth* letters really are). In any event, this broad triconsonantal stem could refer to the *basic* (non-relational) essence as well as the most *peripheral* manifestations of the Divine.

**(E7)** The previous again refers back to the Nominal agenda, pointing to the related dichotomies (indeed dualities) of the intricate essence as opposed to external or phenomenological properties (substance versus form) and the one of basic and commonly shared nature versus external revelations (and incarnations) acting on its behalf—either time possibly referring to *X* as the floating basis. Now, since  $X=(X, X)$ , the line between basic versus relational essence is further blurred (as between the interior-versus-hull of the  $\Psi$ ).

**(E8)** Abraham= “Exalted father.” However, as one cognate structure, this could lend itself with a duplication/reinforcement: HB(h) RHM= “Render Sympathy” or “Loving [most] Complete” or “[may] Spirit(s) Give/Recompense.”

**(E9)** RHM or R<sup>WH</sup>Y<sup>M</sup> may connote love as well as Spirit—in the masculine plural, despite it formally recognized as a female noun.

**(E10)** My long-standing point regarding Jesus’ [most] Divine nature is that, the latter has been *increasingly implied* throughout the Holy Writ as the NT drew near. One may venture comparing and distinguishing between the “mighty God, everlasting Father” (Isaiah 9:6) referring to Messiah versus AL SDY (“God all-mighty”?) (Genesis 17:1, 35:11, Exodus 6:2-3)

**(E11)** The “Wonderful Counselor” (Isaiah 9:6) might also refer to Paraclete (John 14:16, 26). Notable is the Eastern Orthodox prayer referring to Psalm 51 and that NT passage of promise, and addressing the Third Hypostasis as follows: “O Heavenly King, the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth [...]” Interestingly, the two latter names could be pointing to the exact same word or “structure-value” in Aramaic and Hebrew: Menachem/Menachma, to be rendered as M\*NHMa (comforting, consoling) or MN\*(H)C̄Ma (the Spirit of the Truth)—with the A postfixes referring to the definite article. The first one, MLC̄(a)\*SM(y), resonates too.

**(E12)** The Self-Identity in (E1) construed as, “[I] Will Be As/Whatever Will Be” might point to the *unbounded* status of the rho in (3.2). In other words, no *tzimtzum* is applicable—much less given that the Kabbalist “self-compression” (perhaps building on the neo-Platonic overflow as in fact bordering on excess—akin to *hybris* or *hablah/HbLa* (“no love, wicked/foolish, fluke/illusion”))—which would be at odds with completeness as a wise level or moderate measure).

### ***Perceived Parallels***

The core paradigm could be perceived strikingly and utterly similar to the following traditional as well as classic results—fallaciously so unless rethought along the relational lines.

**(T1)** The  $\Psi$  “ons/ens” or  $[(A, a), X]$  clearly does not lend itself with cardinalcy or absolute and causal or functional properties—a Kantian “thing unto itself” (*Ding an sich*), *Ansein*, Sartrean *l’en-soi* (being in self), etc. On second thought, it might not be at odds with *Dasein*, the latter definitely neither exhausting nor capturing the notion in question.

**(T2)** It may be consistent with *le pour-soi* (“being for/unto self”), yet clearly not in the hedonistic sense of the term, and only when applied to the Divine Existence. The latter refers to treating (3.2) as a matter of Persona, or indeed self-consciousness as the lative nature of full-fledged personality. That said, “I perceive self” clearly is not the same as “The self perceives me”—unless an intricate taxonomy involving alter ego or the Id and superego are tapped.

**(T3)** The Platonic *eidōs* and Aristotelian *morphe* have been treated at length in prior expositions—either time referring to higher-order relationships or a “phenomenological encounter” as a mode of narrowing the creature’s rho down to specific “structure-values.” The neo-Platonic, gnostic, Manichaeic, and Kabbalistic narratives are nowhere near what had been attempted from the outset: a non-oppositional duality (with evil being a deviation or extreme narrowing rather than any immanent facet of [divine] nature), no emphasis on numbers or absolute values per se, completeness (*Plaena* referring to a portmanteau of *plena* and *plana*, complete and simple) embarking on no excess.

**(T4)** Absolute and Identity bordering on nothingness (the unknowable, the trivial, the homogeneous, etc.), as in Buddhist depictions, is not an option. For one thing, the reversed or  $A \rightarrow a$  extreme secures a fictitious cardinalcy (pseudo-properties) which essentially amounts

to either illusion or minimal existence. One might retort that this is what exactly refers to a Buddhist perspective, and possibly to some of the Hindu worldviews. In fact, the situation is quite the opposite: This points to the correct perception that may have been denied these said legacies, as perceived these days. To begin with, *nirvana* (*nibbana*) may point to a negation of being, yet it comes close to actually negating *individual* being as a grand fallacy—thus reinforcing genuine relationships and love to counter selfishness. The same might be emphasized as *nirguna* in Hinduism, referring to either “no properties,” or “no ropes,” or “no inferior dependence.” (Consider a striking overlap with the Semitic HBL <ties>, QBL <obligation, reconciliation> and GBR <might, absolute value>). However, it is by acknowledging genuine and superior relationships (love foremost) that this notion can fully be recovered along the Ordinal lines. Finally, the *shunyata* (“a begetting emptiness,” *ab nihilo*) notion could best be elicited along the Orduality lines, with a relationship appearing about as “soft” (*Tao?*) as it proves all-spawning, such that its objects are ill-defined outside it.

(T5) By the same token, it occurred to me two decades ago that the transcendental sound of AUM could stand for “the beginning, the interim, and the ultimate”—the complete, as when respectively moving your jaws uttering this. However, it is rendered in the writing as just that—an *anusvara* nasalization applied to a basic matrix for the A letter. In other words, this might connote the “*ons/ens*” as long as it refers to ultimacy as lative or relational in nature. Likewise, perceiving M or M(i)/M(ay) as a love-connoting alternative to *maya* (illusion) and the first-personal pronoun (“Me,” as in the Gita)—perhaps in line with some other Indo-European languages such as Pashto (*meena*), Russian (*mil*), and Polish (*mil*) as well as the nasal underpinning of the M (as in *sa[m]bodhi*)—could dot the i’s and cross the t’s.

(T7) Likewise, stems such as *yoga* (Sanskrit), *iugo/junctio* (Latin), and *youse* (Slavonic “*ons/ens*”) all capture the relational or unifying connotation

(T8) The Bh (“splendor,” “radiance”) stem as in the Baha’i faith may either posit an inverse of hB(H) or otherwise be part of the latter as a *haphel*: h\*Bh= “Source of emission, radiance, glory, light.” Alternatively, a Ba (“advancement”) stem could be treated as somewhat akin with Bh, with h\*Ba as a *haphel* connoting “The Cause of any progression.” In other words, the alternate legacy cannot be seen as either underlying or inclusive vis-à-vis the one under study.

To cut the story short, never have I drawn upon any of the traditions I knew little to nothing of, as the Ordinalcy paradigm had evolved before I got a chance of growing interested in whatever might suggest the foggiest similarity with it. I still would go on with whatever has been tested and proven to have the merit it claimed before the ordinalcy test was designed and revealed tightest possible match.

### ***Disclaimer***

Interestingly, I have recollection of first arriving at the Nominal issue on watching the controversial Warlock movie back as a highschool kid. For some reason, I was absolutely

certain that the name that materialized and lingered for an instant read as, ‘Rohim.’ Although it wasn’t their last version (which is the script writers discretion), and there was no way I could possibly have known what that means, about two decades on I arrived at an extension quile along those same lines.

Although mention has been made of select esoteric accounts, Kabbalah not least, I disavow any knowledge or interest in these per se. For one thing, it appears that, despite there being a lot of apparent parallels, all of these are superficial rather than substantive in nature—largely pertaining to the alternative phenomenological modes of reducing the otherwise unconfined rho as well as interpreting the asymmetry. For instance, Kabbalah may deviate from strong-form unitarian accounts, while still positing *tzimtzum* as a mode of rho-narrowing, which perspective I strongly oppose in light of the prior accounts. What may have been “narrowed” (defined) is the rho in the creation—admittedly modeled after the Divinity—but not in the latter itself.

That said, the present analysis has aimed to delineate some objective underpinning based on which close matches can be identified alongside any cross-religious overlaps, if any. This is neither to insult the less “accommodative” alternatives nor to question their own underpinnings.

Not least, a word of caution would be due: “Plague be o’ the houses” of those unscrupulous enough to seek to establish an esoteric religion, an occult movement, a sect, or a manipulative design based on any of the above account. All of this could facilitate the advent of evil intents, Antichrists trying to pass for peacemakers or grand reconciliators, and their ilk. Take the liberty of staying wherever you are, or consider venturing the paths superior; irrespectively, just be sure to embark on loving as the alpha and omega of living.

## References

Shevenyonov, A. (2016d). Ordinalcy calculus: Entangled avenues nuanced. *viXra: 1610.0379*