

Grand Agnosia: A Peril of Meeting a Maytreya-Moshiah-Mahdy

By Arthur Shevenyonov

Abstract

The Grand Agnosia could be the Antichrists ultimate loophole, cutting-edge technologies serving as leverage or force multiplier along similar yet inferior lines. Divine names may be abused to an extent denying any merit to Divinity or stigmatizing those pure of heart as false prophets. Hypocritical reconciliation may be aimed at dismissing the wrong threats, with no genuine peace preceding metaphysical warfare.

Prior Caution

People these days have indulged in every sort of surrogates and satisficing, thereby paradoxically revealing a mounting thirst and hunger after truth. The bulk of science has long embarked on similar simulacra with all the semi-rigorous metaphors of phenomenology, instrumentalism, and *positivism* (ironically thriving on passive and weak *negation*) catering for just that—pragmatic proxies for what ontology could offer yet was denied any chance to. It turns all the more surrealistic bearing in mind that one starts with a minor betrayal as aimed at a big windfall, and cannot help keeping at it, rarely stopping short of providing apology for any lies or atrocities—as a “necessary evil,” or sacrifice to the omnivorous idol of *mammon*—that which promises power, wealth, popularity, romance, and huge networks of friendships as a matter of exercising one’s vain ego or wielding personal power. At this rate, greed comes to stand for rationality—inasmuch as needed by the market, whose umpire say in telling the right from the wrong (more so in democratic vote as bargaining over political assets) cannot be questioned without loss of standing. If you are “serious” about your futures, then do not short-trade these for “elusive and vague truths” which are always so, shall we say, ill-conducive.

If people have progressively praised this transgressing as virtue, why can’t the wicked one? And should the lay public grow tired of flashmobbing as one way of breaking free and actualizing as individuality (aren’t we jaded at these paradoxes?), the wicked one—the oft-alleged spirit of romantically worshiped “creative destruction”—should be able to come up with a story or two just to give you an idea of how one comes to feel he or she really is special, or possibly *the* Special One. How about transcending each and every religion for starters?

Book of Maytreya

It is the rare Abrahamic follower that fails to recall occasionally Jesus' promise to send in a Comforter (Advocate), the Spirit of Truth, to reveal the rest. Many tend to strand the extremes of seeing it as either too abstract or too personified (with neither one being *a priori* wrong despite denying the other option outside a Trinitarian representation). Incidentally, this sequentialism in revealing the truth may have its precursors, as most traditional schools of Buddhism expect an ultimate Illuminator—the Maytreya who is to usher in a revival. Is s/he superior or inferior to Siddhartha (an Attainer)? In fact, this might be one other instance of *Grand Agnosia*, or an “event horizon” beyond which there is little to no lapse of untimely or unapproved glimpses.

What will Maytreya likely profess anyway? That there is a more general version of Buddhism? One making sense of the otherwise far too involved and unduly dualistic notions which are neither straightforward to test experientially nor sufficient to sanctify apathy as a state superior to loving? Indeed, this has long been urged, as *shunyata* and *nirvana* could be most closely (if trivially) intertwined exactly in the domain distinguishing between the vanity of false ties and the ultimate nature of loving as the complete mode of existence stemming from inter-relationships rather than aloofness. Whether or not $M^{ay} * Tra^{(ya)}$ stands for Love Liberating (Transcending) or Personality Trinitarian (in the weaker and mundane case embarking on anthropological taxonomies, e.g. ego-id-superego or consciousness-subconscious-unconscious, or spirit-soul-body) remains to be seen. As does a conjecture of the entire body of Oriental paradigms largely stemming from the nature or structure of the underlying languages.¹

Or did we say Ordinalcy as *the* General Case? In particular, supplying the less apparent treatment of the “transcendental sound” (relational?) over and above the latent-yet-shallow one (“beginning-interior-ending”?) could speak volumes, too.

***Book of Mashiach*²**

It is conceivable that similar instruction can be forthcoming in the other Abrahamic domain, with m*SyH likely to detect a similar linguistic premise (hardly confined to neo- or post-positivism), with the entire structure of Semitic languages revealing multiple overlaps

¹ Consider these illustrations. *Boddhi* may stand for an alert mind, and *sa^(m)* for completeness, which invites constructs like *sa[m]boddhi*, “ultimate consciousness.” Likewise, where one considers *guna* <an illusory property or cord>, the *nir-* modus of negation (alternative to the generic *a-*) will yield *nirguna* <apathy, liberatedness, empty>. However, just to fill in the gaps, there is little that stands in the way of coining things like *aboddhi*, *aguna*, which process could be about as much part of *shunyata* (*sunā*nyid*=void begetting) as it could have been spawned by *maya* (possibly as *dharma*-phenomenologies). It might be equally awkward to either accept this rationale or deny its hand in some of the theorizing that informed modern thought along the traditional lines.

² When referring to Jesus (Yeshua, Eesho) specifically, the Aramaic cognate of *Msheekhaa* (The Christ, Anointed) is implicitly assumed. When compared to Moses (Moshe), both could allude to salvation as well as baptism, referring to submerging into (as followed by drawing out of) water—in line with one of the ZL connotations.

and crossovers. This can superficially start with poetry in the narrow sense and proceed to the low-key construing of the patriarchs' names. A more advanced approach would merge the two³. Still more complete quest would reveal how ubiquitous stems (notably ZL) have shown to be replete throughout the Scriptures while informing the very Design rather than just being supplied as a matter of toying with notions. The genuine Mashiakh may reveal the ultimate Nomen, as the essence of complete existence as well as power. This has little to do with politics—much less with single-shot developments in retrospect (like the Roman rule) or desirable lasting alternatives in the future (the rule of the chosen people). Apart from remembering the underpinning of Yehudaya (Unity), he will elaborate on Love-Unity as the Law in a nutshell.

Book of Mehdi

No *m*h-d-y* would be in a position to bypass the aforementioned grand themes. On the one hand, his or her very title, apart from its conventional interpretations (*m*h-d-y*=the guided or directing one) may connote the ultimate knowledge (HD⁷/HZa as penetrative faculty of mind and a complement of yDa/yHw or DD/ZZ) as well as Unity (yHD/wHD) yet to be construed. Much like Maytreya, this one may choose a revival of the faith as a matter of pointing to the ZL origin⁴ or *ursinn*. For that matter, the linguistic domain may have to be addressed as well, if only in line with dismissing the shallow, or debunking the undue, dualisms⁵.

Depending on whether the local audience is of *qblh* or *b-h-y* (as opposed to Sufi) background, the Mehdi may choose to reconcile some of the prior theories, e.g. provide an account of how karmic *sa(m)sara* could necessitate reincarnation. For one thing, it might not be straightforward to see the rationale behind a human turning into, say, a cat or a stone as a result of one's sinning; how can this lower-mode being repent or suffer as long as its mind organically fits with the degraded mode? By the same token, if one is born into a rich or righteous family without inheriting a superior mind or spirit, the gain as supposedly accruing to good past deeds would again suggest a questionable map. Not least, as long as the

³ [...] father <AB> [...] Abraham, [...] do <'BD> as Abraham. Not <La> bread <LHM> [...], but <eLa> every/full <ML> word (ML) of-God (^ALH^{YM}).

⁴ Inter alia, *iss-l-h* (possibly an [h]iph'al verbal) may refer to "reform" as reverting to the ultimate-primordial. Alternatively, ZL^H could be a graphic as well as semantic cognate of ZDQ (also an inverse of QDS)—again in line with DD/ZZ < proximity, being privy >, which in turn makes it a cognate of QR(B) < convergence, renewal, reiteration > in a pairwise fashion. The issue of letter-cognates will be addressed shortly.

⁵ As one case, consider the problem of inner antagonism as embedded in *h-n-p* < paganism vs. eschewing idolatry > and *h-r-m* < sacred vs. forbidden >. Although the former predominantly refers to *deflection* at large (mostly negative or neutral at best), it could be perceived in line with the contingent notion of "liberalism"—namely, opposition to the incumbent or dominant legacy (be it idolatry back in Abraham's times of *jahiliyya* or extremist forms of fanaticism as well as primitive theories these days). Evidently, though, this has to be articulated, as nothing can become conclusive on the strength of the highly contingent forms alone. It is one case when names mean little, and could become idols or phenomenologies in their own right, to be picked and abused by the unscrupulous. It is unfortunate, as will be shown later in text, that this can befall names Divine and (more so) angelic.

continually made choice (with possibly indefinitely many degrees of freedom) causes one to incarnate in a finite setup (with the combinatorics featuring just so many countries, statuses, and the like), this borders on inconclusiveness akin to the Continuum Hypothesis⁶.

A Structure of the Inconclusive

It has been argued before that the Christ has elaborated on it all—indeed revealed that Love straddles or spans the Nominal and Legal agendas. The proposed paradigms could at best be seen as but ways of approaching the complete yet simple vision. In this sense, The Christ could [at least] be deferred to as the *genuine and ultimate personification of all of the three* mentioned above.

Regrettably, it is the wicked one who can claim largely the same. Indeed, the *Antichrist may abuse this tentative formula* in claiming that, (a) the above being true, (b) he or she is all of the above, (c) and hence is the Christ. The tragedy of this scenario can hardly be overrated, as many weaker forms of the rationale can be tried out, should any other fail. Whereas debunking the false claims and transitivity would be a challenge in its own right.

The Antichrist may opt to talk peace and love amid wars being waged one the verge of despair and apathy. Needless to say, he or she will unlikely *act* upon this placative handwaving. One other extreme should be avoided, though: Just like the wicked one may indulge in this path, hardly anyone who does amounts to the wicked one. That would be one twin tragedy that the evil one could in fact secure as a surefire win for him or herself—far from the only trick to tap into. Otherwise, the sad irony would be about warfare and anger being maintained as immunity against false pacification or reconciliation.

One reasonably awkward (and possibly prone to spawning such like pitfalls) attempt at “structuring” the Grand Agnosia one way or another would be to formalize it. Suppose the complete (triple) title suggests the following identity, or denotation:

$$\{M \cap M \cap M\} \equiv \{\}$$

It will further be maintained that the Christ may at least comprise it all, with sufficiency denoted as implication or inclusion:

$$X \rightarrow G\{\}$$

The *G* here stands for “genuine” involving generality as one facet. As one possibility, this could amount to a linear-like operator,

$$G\{\} = \{G\} \leftrightarrow G\{M \cap M \cap M\} = \{G(M) \cap G(M) \cap G(M)\}$$

Denying generality OR truth may amount to a special case (narrowing) OR falsity:

⁶ I first raised this issue in 2005 when challenged by a Buddhist discussion group. They were apparently disillusioned with my difficulty (or was it the beer?) conveying the algebraic grievances; whilst I wondered if the enlightening leads to a liberty of overlooking these concerns altogether.

$$\overline{Gen \cap T} = S \cup F$$

Negating completeness could further supply some interim or weak combinations:

$$\overline{Com} = (S \cap T) \cup (Gen \cap F) \dots$$

One might even try to represent the genuine with respect to these other categories,

$$G = Gen \cap T \cap Com$$

However, the third term appears to have been captured in the former two.

The wicked triad (whether devil or the false prophet or the antichrist) might choose to posit a different implication—or one fallaciously inverted:

$$\{ \} \rightarrow X$$

Note that it lacks the G-qualifier, which might even pretend to be tantamount to utter generality. One big threat is that the above might well hold in the event of an identity or equivalence or definition being maintained as,

$$[X \equiv \{ \}] \text{OR} [X \leftrightarrow \{ \}]$$

A safer way of preserving the asymmetries could be to denote⁷,

$$X \rightarrow G\{ \} \text{OR} X \ni G\{ \} \text{OR} X > G\{ \}$$

In other words, the Christ is superior to and far more complete than the triple title in question. In any event, this only applies alongside the *G* qualifier rather than to the weak form of the title, which latter may refer to either *s{ }* or *F{ }*⁸. The wicked triad might, however, seek to smuggle the weaker identity, which in fact comes in line with one of the meanings of “*anti*” (substitute, instead, underrating, placed prior to or as superior of, which scope is somewhat more general than “*ante*”).

All things considered, it is still far from crystal-clear, as whatever holds for *G{ }* may not carry over to *{ }*. This may or may not be about their orthogonality, or could mark an Agnosia, albeit of a secondary relevance, with *{ }* possibly referring to a subclass of a created nature far too inferior to (and hence less than comparable with) the Christ’s completeness—or convey more of image than likeness.

⁷ In my original exposition, I do not make use of *X* or “>”, but rather of the Greek CHI symbol and the more convex form of the latter comparison sign, taking after the like of “preferred” (as in social choice or economics) and connoting “strongly superior.” That said, *X* might allow an interesting allusion to the *ousia* as well as “floating basis” as previously denoted by a similar indicator.

⁸ In passing note that the *G*-modus could qualify the Hegelian or Oriental style entangling of the *special* versus the *negated*—or indeed the “absolute as nothingness”: $(Gen \rightarrow F) \leftrightarrow (T \rightarrow S)$. This issue will be treated at length along the lines of the ordinal or rho-calculus as well as a *series of calculi* (a total of some 12 occurred to me over an 88 days’ time this past summer) that have been underpinned by similar logic, albeit inspired by very distant and disparate applications. Their convergent nature was made evident much to my own surprise. For the time being, suffice it to surmise that the relationship between *S* and *T* is about as simple as it is implicit, e.g. of the form $G = \bar{S} \cap T = Gen \cap T = Gen \cap T \cap Com$

However, the antichrist's manipulation may resume here again. Suppose $\{\bar{\}} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ or even, $\overline{G\{X\}} \rightarrow \bar{X}$. The first case implies, $\overline{\{M \cap M \cap M\}} = \{\bar{M} \cup \bar{M} \cup \bar{M}\}$, which rather weak qualifier alleges that, absent at least one of the three natures, the Christ is contradicted or fails to reveal himself—ironically despite Him being orthogonal to these [inferior] partial natures. In other words, suffice it for the Christ to be effectively transcendental with respect to all or any of these special-religious representations for the wicked triad to posit Him as an impostor (e.g. a *dajjal* or an antichrist).

To treat the other case, a chain-rule or like decomposition might apply:

$$\bar{G} \sim G * \{\} \leftrightarrow \overline{G\{\}} \sim \bar{G}\{\} \cup G\{\bar{\}}$$

Or simpler yet,

$$G\{\bar{\}} \sim G \cap \{\} \leftrightarrow \overline{G\{\}} \sim \bar{G} \cup \{\bar{\}}$$

Either version points to a threat, as $\bar{G}\{\bar{\}} \sim \{\bar{\}}$, which again reverts to the aforementioned paradox (with implications being either trivial or inconclusive amid truth values formally holding):

$$\overline{G\{\bar{\}}} = \{\bar{\}} \cup \{\bar{\}} \text{ OR } \bar{G} \cup \{\bar{\}}$$

One could proceed differently:

$$G \sim G * 1 \sim G * [\{\bar{\}} \cup \{\bar{\}}] \text{ OR } G \sim G \cap T \sim G \cap [\{\bar{\}} \cup \{\bar{\}}]$$

$$\bar{G} \sim \bar{G} * [\bar{\}] \cup G * [\bar{\}] \sim S \cup (F \cup T) \sim S \text{ OR } \bar{G} \sim \bar{G} \cup [\bar{\}] \sim \bar{G} \cup \emptyset \sim S \cup F \cup F \sim S$$

This holds irrespective of what “genuine negation” implies (here it is discerned as either inconclusivity or falsity).

Worse yet, the antichrist may choose *not* to lie as if he or she lived up to each or any of those religions' expectations—save for Christianity. This could be attained by positing (as if to arrogantly if hypocritically comprise, not fall short of, the triple title), $\bar{X} > \{\bar{\}}$, with negation of tripartite title securing the coveted alternative. The craziest thing about this is that he need not even shun his antichrist implicature while at it!

One other shocking issue about this possibility is it being a plausible inversion of the true version:

$$X > \{\bar{\}} \cup \{\bar{\}} \cup G\{\bar{\}}$$

This refers back to $X > G\{\bar{\}}$ while reconciling two representations:

$$[\bar{X} < \{\bar{\}}] \cap [X > G\{\bar{\}}]$$

$$[X > [\{\bar{\}} \text{ XOR } G\{\bar{\}}]] \cup [X > [\{\bar{\}} \text{ XOR } G\{\bar{\}}]]$$

Whereas the antichrist is inferior to even the special case title (first representation), the Christ is superior to even the genuine or general one⁹.

Aftermath & Disclaimer

The proposed discussion was not meant as an assault on (much less insult to) any of the traditional (or even new age) narratives. On the contrary, it would appear we are all in the same boat confronting the likely catastrophe drawing near. Many of the findings might actually be striking back on their author¹⁰ (woe unto him!), even though most might have passed the Inquisitorial scrutiny as it were by following the *in modo disputandum* self-selection. No one can stay put or have an “alert mind” without begging the perennial, “Is it I?” question.

On second thought, it remains to be seen whether “blissful childhood” is *the* pure state of ignorance as disturbed by the advent of such expositions, or whether these aggravate the Grand Agnosia rather than mitigating it by keeping the wicked one more forewarned as well as forearmed than his victims. The sad-but-true *zeitgeist*, though, is that evil need not really be either at odds with genuine creativity (*a la* Berdyaev) or conducive to its destructive forms. It ends up better off being just that—orthogonal inferiority or nonentity making apt use of state-of-the-art means (notably the social media marketing setting agendas and frames and praising the ensuing of vain riots as inspired by manipulative rhetorics).

Irrespective of whether the Moshiach is maintained by some to be an abstract mode of reality, the antichrist is there in the *zeitgeist*—and possibly in the scientific paradigm.

⁹ The XOR operator could be a poor choice, yet it is intended to convey orthogonality between the objects as largely disjoint classes. I omit the discussion of how the plausible yet absurd allegations could be dismissed positing an overlap between the genuine versus the inferior titles—as if the former were a special case of the latter (or a general theory maintained to be just the extreme or hull of the preceding special cases, as if to exalt those past inferiors as a generality interior). Again, though, this entire issue can be scrapped as trivial by invoking the “superiority” operator rather than its “inclusion” or implication version—in which case the grand agnosia of whether or how entire classes or parts enter the X domain dissipates its relevance.

¹⁰ The wicked one might easily make use of accounts like mine thus far, thereby implicating me a (*volens nolens*) false prophet—or positing as one. In effect, he need not even be a “genius of geni” (at odds with Solovyov’s exposition in his *Three Talks*, or with some of the readings of Brianchaninov’s letters) reconciling religions in a perverse manner (as if to counter the Christ’s “sword”—or disclosure, judgment, and divide by the Light shed). Worse yet, if one were to invoke the 7-day (soonest possible) enlightening of Maytreya, that measures up to the time it took me to explain how Ordinalcy could prove a generalized version of Buddhism—which hunch I espoused from the late 1999s. Paranoid conjectures aside (amid no visuals or voices ever seen and heard), I might fall prey to my own *prelest*—an Eastern Christian notion referring to one thinking too highly of one’s spiritual faculty, mission, or fruit—if I were to take or cherry-pick on any such coincidence at face value. On second thought, the rest of traditions may easily fall victim to, and overlook, the wicked one, unless they incorporate this useful notion (of *prelest*) beyond the special and unentangled cognates such as *maya* or idolatry extended or hubris as lack of moderation.