

A

The logical truth and true logic of the Divine Trinity:

If we take away anything that is ethical (like many aspects of worship) and we see notionally-agnostically the Trinity, then we are faced with pure logical and true schemas (notional figures):

So:

- 1) The essence of God is Love. Also, the Father is unborn as to His hypostasis, so we take His essence as coinciding with His hypostasis (person)
- 2) The second person, that is Jesus Christ, is the Word of God, and God Himself; Word is the Logos that is the spring of Logic
- 3) The third person is the Spirit of Truth (the same God/Entity), thus anything true is due to it.

Now, if we make all the possible combinations among Love, Logos (Word) and Truth, we realize we have existential perfection; notions that are completely autonomous (self-existent) and universally applied:

Love (is the) Word (of) Truth (i.e. the logical truth)

Love (is the) Truth (of) Word (i.e. the true logic)

--

Word (is the) Love (of) Truth (i.e. loving the truth)

Word (is the) Truth (of) Love (i.e. the true love)

--

Truth (is the) Word (of) Love (i.e. the logical love)

Truth (is the) Love (of) Word (i.e. loving the logic)

These seem obviously correct to me. What do you think about this logic or truth, which is the one guaranteeing love?

B

The Incarnation of God by Virgin All-Holy Mary:

There is no human parthenogenesis if we take for granted

- a) The strong anthropic principle (SAP)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropic_principle
- b) The fact that schizophrenia is a myth, i.e. inexistent
ftp://ftp.soc.uoc.gr/Psycho/Nestoros/Psychotherapeutic%20Diadikasies/Chapter_9.DOC

According to (b) no other person can emerge from one person. According to (a) human individual existence is absolute. Therefore the combination from a to b as addressing a to b that is $a \rightarrow b$ leads to the absolutely personal –therefore also social– individuality. As to this, the emerging to existence of a human person/individual includes according to (a) the absolute otherness (a.o.) and according to (b) the absolute uniqueness (a.u.). So as to the birth of a human the a.o. calls for communion, i.e. relationship of persons, and the a.u. calls for the uniqueness of this communion. So this relationship be unique means that one person is uniquely related to one person and vice versa. The unique relationship is therefore the relationship of one man with one woman. There must be a man with a woman for there is a.o. and so individuality between the two must be of other nature.

The a.o. and a.u. apply for all humans regardless of time, space and circumstance and apparently $a.o. \neq a.u.$ because, after all, these two are distinct and two; not one.

Nevertheless, a.o. and a.u. are only two and so their relationship is unique in the same way these introduce the unique relationship for the coming to existence of a human. According to second paragraph above, the human existence includes a.o. and a.u. But also, and obviously, the a.o. and a.u. constitute the human existence. As a conclusion, there has to be some merge between the human existence and the a.o. – a.u.: they somehow have to be existentially related. But, it is mandatory that this relationship has to bear the traits of human, individual, absolute, otherness and uniqueness; all these traits exist is the referred relationship. All these traits of the attempted merge lead to that there has to be one unique human individual who is absolute and as such it bears otherness. Otherness obviously cannot be included together within the as above “one unique human individual who is absolute” for we initially presupposed (b) above. So, only one human individual who is absolute gives the existential way to otherness. Otherness couldn't but be existential, according to our logic, so this means that one human individual is born of only one human individual. And according to what we wrote above, the human giving this birth has to be only one among all the other humans.

So, there is only one and single parthenogenesis throughout the time of humanity (past – present – future). This born human individual is the result of the as above referred existential merge and in fact, as by this logic, he is this very merge! The individual giving the parthenogenetic birth cannot itself be exactly as the individual born by it for the merge is

only one single case of human birth. So the parthenogenesis is the very merge, as referred, so the parent gives the birth that is this merge, and the child is the one who receives this merge that is he comes to existence. According to the previous paragraph, the a.o. and a.u. constitute the human existence. So the parent is comprised by these. But also the parent conducts the merge -parthenogenesis- therefore as we write in the previous paragraph she is "one unique human individual who is absolute". The very merge, i.e. the parthenogenesis, includes "one unique human individual who is absolute" together with "existential otherness". Apparently the child is other than the mother yet it is the very parthenogenesis so both the "one unique human individual who is absolute" and "existential otherness" are included together in the child. So this child is one absolute human individual and at the same time it is not one individual for it includes otherness. Yet as both an individual and an otherness, he is absolute for this we included in the parthenogenesis as our logic. So he is absolutely individual and other (i.e. he is not me or you) and he is the absolute otherness, i.e. he is everything and everyone else, at the same time. And all these are under the prism of existential logic. So this it is about one human who is everyone and everything born by only one human. The parthenogenesis of this parent as we wrote means that the parent has everything the child has apart from the being he and everyone else at the same time. But the parent is the absolute i.e. existential source of the child. She is the only one to be only one step below her son, because there cannot possibly be another human parthenogenesis (see above). That is if according to the definition of the child, the child is God, she is just below the God, i.e. perfect that is God in Grace.

That the parent and the child do not share the same gender is apparent as by the second above paragraph: just as the relationship of only one man and one woman is absolutely essential for one human to come to existence, so is in the parallel way the relationship of the one single parent giving birth to one single child; it is unique and existentially absolute.

All the above logic matches to one parent and one child: Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ. She is defined as the only perfect human being and he is defined as the God, who is present in anything, having received the human existence.

From Greece,

Saturday, November 21, 2015,

Manolis Xagorarakis

www.truescienceforall.com