

Poiesis of Wisdom: Enhancing Relational Span

By Arthur Shevenyonov¹

Abstract

Poiesis is the ultimate nature of Wisdom showing its innate entanglement with Love to a far greater extent than is the case of matter and energy. This meta-relationship is most simple and well-defined as per their most complete levels, as lative Gradiency.

But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me (John 15:26)

Wisdom-Love

It was shown previously (Shevenyonov, 2016e) how both the reference indices, “The Comforter” and “The Spirit of *truth*” can be rendered as a single Name, MnC_{Ma} (with Aramaic versions being more inclusive and accurate largely because of the article endings). However, this structure-value can also read as, “The Spirit of *wisdom*.” Indeed, love and wisdom are arguably inseparable when complete.

One way of demonstrating this would be to invoke the Ordual (lative, relational) paradigm again as by far the more minimalist ontologically (not to be confused with the phenomenological or instrumentalist pragmatics *a la* Dewy, even though the Arabic *h-q* cognate may neutrally refer to ‘reality’ amid *h-k-m* not standing too far from the Greek *techne*). Love is a path or modality of relating things—but the same holds for Wisdom! In actuality, it could be about relating or reconciling truths, thereby attaining *the* Truth as a higher-order relationship.

To outline a complete set of related emanations of Wisdom, consider the following:

(W1) Wisdom aims to reach for the ultimate truth as a higher-level reality

(W2) At this rate, wisdom acts as love—reconciling and resolving any apparent clash

(W3) Wisdom cannot contradict truth, yet seeks levels that are too complete to be fitted into any lower-level or special-case version

¹ For better or worse, none of my research has been inspired by any particular source or author other than the Holy Writ. Wherefore to God alone shall eschew all the praise and glory. However, apart from credit as well as debts of gratitude (which latter should be extended to my parents, Ludmila Fedorovna and Victor Georgievich), I would like to dedicate this paper to Syria’s, Donbass’, and other suffering people of goodwill. Nothing good or innocent shall perish; none of the evil ugliness of the world shall be salvaged.

(W4) Special cases or smaller “truths” will tend to be at loggerheads with one another, if only because they are just that—reductions, instances of narrowing, or phenomenological illusions, or images (ZLM) at the very best

(W5) Each and every such reduction confronts a clash with a more general theory as well as with fellow special theories, and cannot be reconciled but for Wisdom’s action

(W6) Wisdom acts to take them back to a [more] general or complete case—as if to “pull the relational string” away from its linear shape at rest (perfect substitution or rho at a unity value as antagonistic potential) and beyond orthogonality (“lukewarmth” or rho around zero) toward greater complementarity (rho far below zero)

(W7) By the same token, Wisdom fits an aggregate of objects into a complete yet simple relationship (“structure-value” for rho), or embarks on Gradiency (Shevenyonov, 2016a) by reducing the (A, G) *ontological distance* (or global “XX-transcendence”) in terms of (B, F) azimuthality as a matter of securing the best local “X-transitions” (A, B) through (F, G)

(W8) This action can also be seen as *Poiesis*—locating a possibly complete multitude of related objects (connotations) which “rhyme” (or prove to be part of an implied relationship).

Poiesis, or Transcending Poetry—and History

The latter can now be applied to the innumerable instances of poetry in the Holy Writ which do not come down to poetic rhyming or artistic reduplication, as in say, “arrow and the daughter of the arch” or even “image and likeness.” Whereas the former has been intended as prior means characteristic of Semitic poetry in the narrow sense, the latter could more meaningfully be decomposed in complementary or dual terms: the peripheral versus the innermost, the immanent versus transcendent, the actualization versus potential, a phenomenological versus ontological congruence, etc. All of these readily apply to humankind. Thus, man was created in the image of God—in that the resemblance was not one-for-one, and “likeness” had yet to be attained beyond the primordial innocence for lack of exposure to temptations and test.

This is just one step toward rethinking the conventional poetry in the aforementioned terms. Other, more pertinent demonstrations, refer to the $Mn\bar{C}Ma$ case (M^*NHMa =The Comforter, $MN^*h\bar{C}Ma$ = The Spirit of Truth~The Medim of Wisdom). One infamous illustration could be centered around $QBLh$ versus $HBLh$, which are related at least with an eye toward the “tying, binding, hinged-upon, payable.” The QB stem in the former conveys “suppression, narrowing, imperative indication, or a confined venue,” with the entire notion referring to terms (of an agreement), inevitable trade-off, or authoritative direction (yet in terms of structure or flipside rather than straight-line or sequential) as well as path-dependence (legacy, tradition). The latter, aside from connoting “rope” (binding and meaningless limbo), may also signal mimicry or mockery of love amidst sheer lack thereof (cf. Iblis in Arabic).

In fact, this could showcase the threat of taking the apparent or plausible at face value. The commandment of not working or worshiping idols or images could be reduced to a single verb ‘BD referring to either ministry or productive action.

A far more insightful and “godly” case could be made for the ZL stem which is omnipresent throughout the Biblical plot, as if to have embedded the entire history metaphysically, or designed it such that its every stage spawns the next most naturally:

(G1) Creation in the image of God

(G2) In the bosom of the Father

(G3) Eve created out of Adam’s rib

(G4) Moses drawn out of water (rescue)

(G5) Prayer

(G6) Crucifix

(G7) Chain as a sequence of events or as path

(G8) Distant cognates: completion or peace (SLM), way out (YZY), host (ZB), commandment (m*ZB), etc.

One related approach would be to treat consonant letter cognates with an eye toward their repeat relationships. For instance, HyB and HnB could be related not only because yodh and nun are stable cognates, but also because the two words are in fact broad sets of notions referring to related (generally negative) connotations, i.e. “sin” (debt) and “deflection” (adultery), respectively. While at it, note that qoph and heth are also related graphically, so it is no wonder that so are QBL and HBL as mentioned above.

“Ultimate Underpinning”: Afterthoughts

The opening phrase on creation (John 1:1) can alternatively be interpreted as follows: “Underlying is the Completeness, that be to [the] God and be [the] God.” (Yukhanan 1:1, Peshitta). “Underlying” refers to b*RS, “Completeness” to MLTa (with the same standing for “The Word”), “be” to the verbal form aYT*Hwn*Hwa, whose first two parts connote an unbound complete (“ever, aught, indeed whatsoever”), yet which taken together may hint at a triality of existence (complete being). Interestingly, in this Peshitta text, “and the Word be God” applies a definite article to Divinity, which should waive the bulk of speculations around the “*ho* versus *ton*” debate around the Greek version.

References

Shevenyonov, A. (2016a). Gradiency: A two-tier introduction. viXra: 1610.0346

Shevenyonov, A. (2016e). Foundations as inherently Trinitarian holistics. viXra: 1611.0008