




Logos and Purusha: A Comparative Study of Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Hinduism(s) through the Transcendental Argument for God

Michael Searles
Greek Orthodox Church of Saints Nicholas, Andrew and Gerasimos
Durban North, South Africa
Email: mjsearles007@gmail.com

 <https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.105.5034>

Abstract

In a series of papers I seek to draw a comparison between Hinduism and Eastern Orthodox Christianity. Inspired by the Anthropic Principle, I have selected to ground the linked comparative principle of the Purusha, (the immobile cosmic principle of pure consciousness, unattached and unrelated to anything, which is nonactive, unchanging, eternal) central to many of the differing traditions of Hinduism, and liken this to the Logos of Christianity. In order to navigate through the differing paradigms I use the Transcendental Argument for God as the filter by which we can analyse these models. In analysing the necessary presuppositions and to see which tradition best coheres with the web of embodied beliefs, I also aim to unite Philosophical terminology and principles with that of Theology. In order to circumvent the problem of circularity, I want to avoid Saṃsāra (a Sanskrit word that connotes 'wandering' and also 'world', wherein the term connotes 'cyclic change') through the correct Pramana (Knowledge-Epistemology). This is taken to be found in the Purusha and also grasped within the Logos (a concept word symbolic of the nature and purpose of Jesus Christ). We appreciate in this paper that both Hinduism(s) and Christianity accept Divine Revelation and the Universal Mind as the basis for Knowledge.

Keywords: Pramana, Purusha, Logos, Christianity, Hinduism.

Introduction

In a series of papers theological conundrums that this journey leads us on will be that of 'The One and the Many', 'Transcendence and Immanence' and 'The Embodiment and Forms'. Of course, which paradigm can answer these questions and problems the best will leave us with the most coherent worldview. Later papers will focus on the issues of the Triad, Monad and Dyad, and the One and the Many. One will emphasise the bodies, forms and avatar-incarnations of such triadic cosmic geometric structures. The final work will seek to poke holes at and ask questions about the implications from each worldview. Finally, I will then look at the iconography and total cosmic picture of said worldviews which aims to bring the series of papers to a conclusion.

Philosophy and Epistemological Blueprint:

Far Eastern philosophy and religions have many works showing us comparisons with Western philosophy and Latin Western Christianity. However, I wish to draw a series of papers showing a comparison of paradigms between Eastern Orthodox Christianity and Far Eastern Hinduism.



I use a modern theory of explanation for the Universe, which carries well into this conversation, that of the Anthropic Principle. The Anthropic principle is a concept that sees consciousness and the human experience as the central basis to understanding the universe. After all, the reference point we have in experiencing the cosmos is indeed the human conscious observer.

The Anthropic Principle states that we can only observe those properties of the Universe that are compatible with our existence as observers. This seems to place the human experience at the center of cosmological consideration, emphasizing that the universe must be such as to admit the existence of humans because otherwise, no one would be here to observe it. (Barrow, & Tipler, 1986).

Ancient Indian thought, as well as most ancient traditions, recognised that the universe itself, is imaged as a giant Person. This is an ingenious imagery to show that, not only is consciousness central to universal experience, but that humanity is the central story teller. Perhaps we rather get to tell the story of this Divine Person. The rich poetic picture is to show that a 'giant Man' is the key blueprint and reference point of the whole cosmos. Not only is it one individual person's story, but the giant cosmic man shows us that we all have this experience, shared, collectively. The concept is that a Universal Consciousness is the starting point to knowledge of the universe itself. We can experience our story, referenced as a giant Person, mapping the whole universe in a Universal pattern of order and meaning. In Hinduism, this is called the Purusha.

Pryin means to fill. Purusha means "one who exists and pervades the entire universe." Or "one who lives in a town in which the supreme being dwells." The analogy extended further describes the human body as a "pur" or "city with the soul Atma residing within it." (Vedalankar, Vedavachaspati & Vidyalankar, 1981).

Hindu Purusha and Christian Logos

Both EO and Hinduism(s) agree with the structure and concept of the Universal Man. The Logos or Christ and the Purusha. The actual iconographic imagery depicting the Cosmos and the Universal Man, will be elaborated as we journey through the papers..

In Christianity, this is the Logos or Christ, incarnated in the Person of Jesus Christ, seen as uniting Heaven and Earth as the Cosmic Sacrifice. Likewise the Hindu Purusha formed the cosmos as a Sacrifice that the gods offered, from whose body all material life emerged. The physical and non-physical universe itself is the body and form of this Purusha.

HYMN XC. Puruṣa states:

2 This Puruṣa is all that yet hath been and all that is to be; The Lord of Immortality ... 6 When Gods prepared the sacrifice with Puruṣa as their offering, 15 ... When the Gods, offering sacrifice, bound, as their victim, Puruṣa. 16 Gods, sacrificing, sacrificed the victim, these were the earliest holy ordinances (Griffith, 2009).

In further papers, the differing aspects or options as to who and what the gods are will be explored. Especially when considering the "One and the Many" and the "Divine Form" of the Purusha.

Liberation through Purusha

In general Hindu thought, Knowledge of this Person, either to merge with or to know of in intellectual space, or through yogic practices, is the goal and means of liberation. The Purusha



takes on many names and forms and will also make appearances in many incarnations or avatars. Knowledge of the Purusha is the means of liberation from the endless cycle of rebirth, termed moksha, from samsara. How can we attain this knowledge or make knowledge claims? If it is necessary for liberation, then this question is of utmost importance.

Knowledge and Epistemology: Forms of Knowledge to Attain Liberation

In this paper we will make the claim that trying to justify knowledge from the position of autonomous man, separate from God, but starting in referencing ourselves as the foundational basis for knowledge is to end in circular reasoning and a nihilistic end. However, the other facet of knowledge is justification and the grounding of how we can make truth claims about knowing, of how we can experience the external world and how we can have a foundation to experience the Personal feedback of life as a Person.

Grounding the ability to know, have sense experience and the ability to think from oneself or mankind separate from this Cosmic Person, is a journey into a pointless spiral, a wandering around a circle, man tripping over himself. The only way out is to transcend via a Universal Mind, imaged as the Divine Person. A Person who serves as the universal Blueprint, who also is immanent in Form within the created particulars and material order. One which balances the One and the Many through Transcendence and Immanence.

God is proven, not as the conclusion of rational or empirical theistic arguments, but as the very ground of argument itself." – Russell Manion, *The Contingency of Knowledge and Revelatory Theism*. (Manion, 1999).

Philosophical Tie-ins to Christianity and Hinduism

The endless circular spiral around itself is reminiscent of Samsara. Always moving about in a futile circle, trying to achieve liberation. To appeal to and reach up towards the Supreme Mind is the central point. This is to be achieved through knowledge and a union of the forms and avatars that the Purusha takes.

Both circles, whether in logic or in the life of the soul, demand a transcendent ability to leap out of the repetition of either circular reasoning or the rebirth of the soul. There are two traps, the mind in the body and the other, the soul in the body, both preventing the person from finding enlightenment or truth.

Comparing Christianity to Hindu Thought

Making a direct comparison from Hinduism to Christianity would be very difficult, as Hindu religion isn't a monolith as there isn't a central creed, dogma, council or text which defines it via a set interpretation or Tradition. For the most part, it can be quite syncretistic, absorbing differing viewpoints and often accepting seemingly contradictory interpretive traditions as alternative paths to the Truth. Hence, we will specify which particular Tradition we are comparing as we read. Further, the similarities and diverging points will be expanded on in further papers (Fisher, 2017).

Monad vs Dyad and History of Philosophy

Throughout the history of philosophy, most traditions tend to lean either towards a monistic or a dualistic starting point. This will approach the question of the One and the Many and offer interpretations based off of these starting points. The ability of Transcendence and yet Immanence also needs to be accounted for in that can this Divine Person be transcendent and yet how can it be immanent. What forms and incarnations can this principle hold, if any?



Thus also the principle of avatars, incarnations and the corporal bodies of this Purusha are to be in question.

Pramana and Knowledge

In Hindu thought, “pramana,” “knowledge,” is the word for epistemology. Whilst Hinduism is not one school of thought, I suggest it could be referred to as “Hinduisms”, alluding to its many differing viewpoints (Fisher, 2017). The foundational common link between all though, is the principle of Sanata Dharma and the knowledge that one can have about their Dharma. All other fields of philosophy and schools of venerating different gods, are enveloped around this principle of Dharma and the access to said knowledge. Dharma is the meaning for “way” or “duty,” this is one’s purpose in life (Olivelle, 1993). In Pramana, knowledge and forms of yoga associated with knowledge are necessary to merge with the Universal Person or attain liberation from the futile circle. There are a six forms of Pramana, each Orthodox Hindu school focusing on a particular combination of the six criteria accepted as stated by various authors (Matilal, 1986; Menon, n.d.).

1. Perception (pratyakṣa)
2. Inference (anumāna)
3. Verbal testimony (śabda)
4. Comparison (upamana)
5. Postulation (arthapatti)
6. Non-apprehension (anupalabdhi)

Orthodox Hindu Schools

As noted, there are many differing interpretations via differing Traditions. Each Orthodox Hindu Tradition is a diverging interpretation of the accepted Scriptures as Inspired, these are the Vedas. We will explore a few following these philosophical schools. There are six orthodox Hindu schools, each basing their foundation off of the Vedas as authoritative (Radhakrishnan, 1929).

1. Samkhya (Dualism)
2. Vedanta (Monism)
3. Vaisheshika (Atomism)
4. Mimamsa (Rationalism - Realism)
5. Nyaya (Logic)
6. Yoga (Discipline)

Then within the Vedanta we find further traditions.

1. Advaita (Idealist Monism)
2. Vishishtadvaita (Qualified Non-dualism)
3. Dvaita (Dualism)
4. Bheda-Abheda (Same, but Difference)



The main school of focus will be that of Vedanta (within which will be mostly Advaita and Vishishadvaita) and a little on Samkhya. These being the monistic and dualistic schools. The other schools, such as Mimamsa and Vaisheshika, are prone towards realist and materialist schools, reducing all metaphysics to atoms. This will already be indirectly touched on in the next section of Epistemology and would tend towards a very different topic for the paper if we were to go into them. The Main schools of Vedanta and Samkya lean towards being either theistic and noting consciousness underlying creation and as said, are monistic or dualistic, which help our conversation. This makes the comparison to Orthodox Christianity easier and more direct.

Points of Agreement

Up to this point both Hinduism(s) and Eastern Orthodoxy may agree, a participation with a higher Consciousness at the very least and a foundation grounded in the Divine Person of the Cosmos as the basis for knowledge and epistemology. Both Hinduism and Eastern Orthodoxy share a common ground in that a Divine Mind or Consciousness at least, is the inspiration for the ability to have access to knowledge and sense experience and that there are inspired Scriptures which are there to guide us towards our Dharma (Nicolaidis, 2023/4). Within these philosophical schools are the Theological schools who worship specific god/gods, often based on region and tribal identity. "Without a revelation from God, we cannot know that all the objects of the world are rationally related and that our attributes are appropriate to know it." (Manion, 1999).

Cross-Analysis of Eastern Orthodox Christianity to Hinduism

Both Hinduism(s) and Eastern Orthodoxy refer to their accepted Scriptures as inspired and sacred. However there is a major conundrum, how do we analyse the different paradigms? After all, making the statement that the Bible/Vedas are true because they say they are True, is a circular argument. This would be to refer to the thing in question as a foundational claim and would be begging the question. Thus, a kind of Philosophical Samsara of sorts and not a basis to justify knowledge claims (Dimmitt & Buitenen, 2012). The question isn't just how we can be liberated from Samsara with the correct knowledge, but also to escape the problem of circularity and ground our knowledge correctly. How do we establish which knowledge is correct or justify our usage of knowledge? How do we have access and what is the starting point? As stated, this is a critical question if we assume that knowledge of the Purusha or God-Man is necessary for liberation.

Circularity, Samsara and Atman: Hindu Correlation

The very idea that the world or the self has an Intrinsic nature – one which the physicist or the poet may have glimpsed – is a remnant of the idea that the world is a divine creation, the work of someone who had something in mind, who Himself spoke some language in which He described His own project. Only if we have some such picture in mind, **some picture of the universe as either itself a person or as created by a person** (emphasis mine) can we make sense of the idea that the world has an "intrinsic nature." (Rorty, 1989).

What is the Solution?

The Transcendental Argument for God

Whilst the Transcendental Argument is often used to prove the existence of God, it can also be used to weed out the differences between differing religions and worldviews (Ndlovu & Nicolaidis, 2023). When it comes to the category of religions and comparing them, it is often



assumed that these are purely subjective and relative, faith and hope claimed, with no potential for objective argumentation at all. By comparing the web of traditions, expressed as paradigms, we can see which best cohere the necessary presuppositional starting points common to them all.

It is important to note that this philosophical argument in this paper cannot nearly cover enough of the main points, but does request that some conclusions are given in order for the argument to work. Conclusions which we cannot elaborate on due to Essay Length demands.

Transcendental Argument Basics

These points will be expanded on as you read, so don't worry if they seem foreign for now.

We need a foundational starting point to justify all truth claims made within our worldview. There can be no foundational launching pad however, to ground our truth claims, without being viciously circular.

Circularity becomes inevitable at the paradigmatic level.

Since Rationalists will make innate self-evident a priori beliefs their foundations for epistemic justification for other beliefs, the justification for foundationalist principles or epistemic givens will ultimately be circular, since it will assume such epistemic basic beliefs justify one's argument that they are foundational and epistemically basic.(Sorem, 2024).

We have a web of beliefs that need to cohere together and refer to one another, rather than there being one single foundation per se. These webs form a corporal body of sorts, a whole embodiment.

There are no such things as self-explanatory facts or a "given" state to the external world.

All data is interpreted through a filter, that being one's paradigm.

Not everything is proven in the same way. The way we prove 7 coconuts are in the cupboard is different to proving something immaterial, that the number 7 exists Universally outside of the cupboard in all minds at the same time. (The number 7 is not contained within the coconuts, but is immaterial and Universal). Empirical examination will be different to metaphysical questions.

Something will be proven by being shown to be necessary for the "brute fact" in question to be able to exist at all. Hence it "Transcends" the knowledge claim and comes "prior" to it. *"...One that proves a conclusion by showing that unless it were true, experience itself would be impossible."* (Blackburn, 2008).

If there are no brute facts and all is open to interpretation, can we know a paradigm as being objectively true, over and above another?

Upon looking at a world view of any kind, we see necessary preconditions that it raises. If we can meet those necessary conditions, whilst being coherent within that paradigm, we could claim a better foundational claim that said worldview is closer to being "true" and "accurate." Both the atheistic position and theistic position share the same paradigmatic issues. The materialist position is not dealing with brute facts whilst the theist solely mythology. The question of theology is answering differing level order categories, in fact these are the same categories that the atheist will have to account for.



What can cohere and satisfy the necessary preconditions is the foundation to that worldview. We need a centre to all of the web of beliefs to cohere them and act as the foundational starting point (Killingley, 2007; Bowes, 1977). Due to the limitations of insufficient data and our ability to cohere, know and escape circularity. We need an all-knowing God to cohere all paradigms together and to give us Divine Revelation as that which bridges the gap and is the first spark for us to ever know anything at all. *“Without a revelation from God, we cannot know that all the objects of the world are rationally related and that our attributes are appropriate to know it.”* (Manion, 1999).

Sorem (2024) states:

“Natural revelation is known and understood fully in the light of supernatural revelation, or we might say that natural revelation is given and maintained by God continuously through his own divine act which is above nature. That is why Saint Maximos the Confessor does not posit an essential distinction between natural and the supernatural revelation or biblical one. According to him, this latter is only the embodying of the former in historical persons and actions.”

How can we establish which paradigm claiming divine revelation is True? This will follow the criteria below.

What makes the access to knowledge possible at all? We will elaborate on these points more later, but keep these in mind as you read on.

- Evidence to the Contrary and the Impossibility to the Contrary
- Does the argument reduce to absurdity?
- Does it Satisfy its Own Presuppositions?
- Does it have a Foundation?
- Is it Coherent?

For the most part, Hinduism(s) various Traditions will agree with Orthodoxy up to the point of needing a Universal Mind of some kind and the need to centre everything through a God or Consciousness at least. The points of divergence and overlap may occur from there. Copi and Cohen (2008) argue that:

- **Premise 1:** X is a sufficient condition for Y.
- **Premise 2:** X.
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, Y.

- **Premise 1:** X is a necessary condition for Y.
- **Premise 2:** (not X).
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, (not Y).

I will give three analogies as to the structure of a transcendental argument. This will be a very brief summary to explain the gist of the approach between worldviews or paradigms. This cannot exhaust the argument at all and doesn't intend to, rather it's a glossing over.



Analogy 1

Whilst this example works only under strictly defined scenarios, it can still work if we grant Premise 1.

In order for us to have cake (Y), we have to presuppose the existence of eggs and flour (X). Thus, eggs and flour are the necessary conditions for the existence of the said cake. These act as axioms in this analogy. Thus, they are proven indirectly, for if these are the transcendent categories. The eggs and flour exist prior to the sense experience of eating cake and verifying the flavours of cake.

- X (Eggs and Flour) is a necessary condition for Y (Cake).
- **Premise 2:** (not X) (no Eggs and Flour).
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, (not Y) (no Cake).

Or

- X (God) is a necessary condition for Y (knowledge).
- **Premise 2:** (not X) (no God).
- **Conclusion:** Therefore, (not Y) (no knowledge).

Examples of the Immaterial Presuppositions Assumed Prior to Sense Experience of Knowledge:

1. Identity of self over time
2. Problem of Universals vs Particulars
3. Universal Truth
4. Laws of Logic
5. Law of non-contradiction
6. One and many
7. Law of non-excluded middle
8. Numbers
9. Etc.

An argument which appeals to the fact that we possess knowledge or that we can learn from experience, and which concludes from this fact that knowledge or learning from experience must be possible, and further, that every theory which entails the impossibility of knowledge, or of learning from experience, must be false, maybe called a 'transcendental argument'. (Popper, 1934)

When it comes to the comparison between Hinduism(s) and Eastern Orthodoxy, we will only focus on the One and the Many for the most part to keep the paper short. The other theological points will be:

1. Transcendence and Immanence
2. Views of Incarnations or Avatars



Analogy 2

These eggs and flour, the axioms, are like the frame of a picture. Inside our universe of sense experience and empirical basis (tasting and eating the cake, akin to the scientific method) we have these framed categories. It can be thought that we exist inside the picture, however, we pre-assume the categories that frame the picture itself, just like we pre-assume the eggs and flour. The 3rd analogy will be given little later to tie in the concept of Transcendence and Immanence.

Analogy 3

Example in Mathematics & Kurt Gödel

Kurt Gödel showed that there are axioms (truths or laws within Mathematics) (eggs and flour as the frame) which are indirectly proven by being necessarily true in order for the numbers in the set "below" the axiom (the world of cake within the framed picture) to be able to actually exist and be calculated (to eat the cake). However, we cannot prove the axioms (Y) in the same way we would prove the empirical numbers (X) being added and divided within the "set." However, the axiom (Y) is true because it is necessarily true in order for the set numbers (X) to be real. In other words, by having numbers in the set and by following the axiom principles, the axioms themselves are true.

Gödel's (1931) first incompleteness theorem proves that any consistent formal system in which a "moderate amount of number theory" can be proven will be incomplete, that is, there will be at least one true mathematical claim that cannot be proven within the system (Megill, n.d.).

The transcendental categories which are assumed in the presuppositions are akin to these axioms, which aren't proven in the same way the "set numbers" or world of data and empiricism "below" it is. However, the axiom is proven indirectly, by "having" to be true, otherwise one cannot do any equations at all or have access to the "laws of logic" let's say, and be able to reason at all. There can be no evidence to the contrary of the existence of the laws of logic in this case.

The Need for a Foundation

We must strive to get to a foundation, a starting point in which to base all our other truth claims. There is a problem though, this appears to be impossible. The more historically accepted foundation has been that of strong foundationalism, where there is a self-evident and simple, basic starting point to all succeeding truth claims. There is a major problem though, before we can get to a basic claim that has no prior foundational self-evident truths, we need to establish the criteria for the justification of truth.

The bottom line is this; we must determine our criterion of justification, prior to determining our criterion of justification, so that we can use it to determine our criterion of justification. If we recognize this as a problem that is in principle unsolvable, we will save ourselves considerable time and headache by not chasing solutions that appear to work, only because they have first obfuscated the problem. - Nicholas Everitt (Manion, 1999).



The Impossibility of that Foundation

Knowledge claims from man are impossible to act as a foundation and in reality, man has no basis for a justified truth claim within himself as a contained system. No matter the position we take, whether it be, coherentism, strong or weak foundationalism, empiricism or rationalism. We will see that any theory of knowledge that originates solely from man must be characterized as arbitrary, ambiguous, and incoherent. But, if man has no coherent theory of knowledge, then his beliefs are without warrant, and if his beliefs are without warrant, then he can make no claim to be in possession of knowledge. All truth claims are contingent upon language structures, which are then dependent on human expression and interpretation. One cannot escape the problem of a human relational point that is dependent on man's mind, expression and his limitations. As Richard Rorty aptly argues, "Since truth is a property of sentences, since sentences are dependent for their existence upon vocabularies, and since vocabularies are made by human beings, so are truths." If at the bottom, vocabularies really are made by human beings, then Rorty is right"

Aristotle had already pointed out long ago that our options regarding first truths, that is foundations, are limited. Asked to justify why we ultimately believe something, we will either give an answer or we will not. If we do not give an answer, our belief is arbitrary and fideistic. If we give an answer, then our answer will make reference to some other belief or beliefs. Then we will be asked to justify those beliefs and so on. If in the course of justifying our beliefs we refer back to some belief we have already been asked to justify, then we will be involved in circular reasoning. If, however, we never refer back to a belief we have already been asked to justify, then we will be involved in an infinite regress. – Fr. Dcn Dr Ananias Sorem (Sorem, 2024).

Coherentism

Another valuable model that works with a Transcendental Argument is Epistemic Holism. Being internally coherent, we don't have a single foundation as such, but rather like those pearls on a string, can show a consistent pattern of coherency and a bridging of other epistemological approaches. The arguments will be like pearls on a necklace, overlaying a coherency and a correspondence to the world which links to observation and also a pragmatic benefit. We will have a basis as to why and how we can have a correspondence to the external world and the appeal to the foundational justified source of knowledge, truth, experience and reality itself. The web-of-beliefs form a corporal body of sorts, reminiscent to the Purusha concept noted earlier. The more points of in-coherence will create more breaks in the link of the chain and thus we can see more of a questionable worldview. As much as coherentism is helpful, it also has limitations.

But, as Michael Depaul in his article "Coherentism" points out, coherentism really doesn't escape the foundational problem at all. It is simply another "version of foundationalism that holds all beliefs to be foundational." He says regarding the coherentist's solution to the problem of circularity, But coherentism seems to be a nonstarter, for if no belief in the chain is justified to begin with, there is nothing to pass along. Altering the metaphor, we might say that coherentism seems about as likely to succeed as a bucket brigade that does not end at a well, but simply moves around in a circle." (Manion, 1999).

Further examples of a type of Transcendental Argumentation.

Suppose someone does not believe words have meaning. Ask that person to write a meaningful sentence, that their words used, also have no meaning. Suppose someone does



not believe in universal truth categories. Ask that person if their truth statement is also not universally true and therefore is false?

Meta-Narratives and Second-Order Logic

This is the reason for Reason, the Logic of Logic. This is another Order of Question altogether. “1st Order Logic” has to do with “knowing” something, whereas “2nd Order Logic” has to do with “how” we can “know” anything at all. So before we can get to “1,” the “knowing” of something, we are forever stuck in the “2” sphere, due to having to answer the “how” we can know something. Being stuck in the 2nd order question, we still acknowledge and refer to the 1st, we grant that we do indeed have knowledge. However, the 1st order level of knowing, still is stuck in having to answer the 2nd order question of knowledge. Which is, “how” we can know what we know. This is a circular problem, always referring to another category, never justifying how we can “know” anything.

If it is true that knowledge exists (1st-order), then our beliefs/statements “that knowledge exists” is also true. The 1st-order must be affirmed if we are to affirm the 2nd-order. However, any affirmation or statement about the 1st-order is a 2nd-order statement. Therefore, one can never affirm the 1st-order statement because one is always making 2nd-order statements. Therefore, autonomous man cannot establish if knowledge exists. (Ananias, Fr. D. 2024, July 8).

Geometry of the Transcendental Argument

Going back to Gödel’s Theorem, there is a geometric example. A kind of “strange loop” which relates to music, numbers and language structures. Hofstadter, who coined the term, has trouble in elucidating. His chief method of instruction is through the use of examples. In an effort to give a more direct definition in his 2007 book *I Am A Strange Loop*, he states:

What I mean by “strange loop” is — here goes a first stab, anyway — not a physical circuit but an abstract loop in which, in the series of stages that constitute the cycling-around, there is a shift from one level of abstraction (or structure) to another, which feels like an upwards movement in a hierarchy, and yet somehow the successive “upward” shifts turn out to give rise to a closed cycle. That is, despite one’s sense of departing ever further from one’s origin, one winds up, to one’s shock, exactly where one had started out. In short, a strange loop is a paradoxical level-crossing feedback loop. (Sahiner, 2017).

The strange loop is a kind of self-referential loop, showing a closed system. Where the numbers within the system are incomplete. Although not technically accurate, this is helpful in conception and visualization. There is a need for the contained system to loop “up” out of the spiral of circular reasoning. As it spirals, it has a strange way of looping back to the starting point again, like the figure “8” or the infinity sign. It’s also a helpful mathematical and musical analogy as the “appeal” to the unprovable axiom “above” as a means of justification for the equations and theorems “below”. This geometric loop also gives us a basis for understanding consciousness, self-awareness as it is self-referential, and is influential in the world of AI. Therefore, we will approach the many worldviews from this approach, asking the presuppositions questions and seeing how each worldview can justify its own demands and claims. This strange loop analogy will be a geometrical model that we will revisit again when referencing the concept of transcendence and immanence, which all ties into the concept of Forms, Embodiment and Incarnation. As the figure “8” shows a closed system of transcending “upwards” to appeal to the axiom, to embody the set numbers “below” into a corporal embodied unity as a self-referential loop, known as the Strange Loop.



Justification for the Presuppositions

The frame, axiom, eggs and flour, all need to still be cohered into something higher still. Our web of beliefs needs to be grounded and connected to a single starting point. Historically we have taken these as the starting point to attempt the grounding of these axioms and form the foundation.

Sense experience of material external world “out there” as brute facts.

In Hinduism the equivalent school would be that of Vaisheshika, proposing that all is made up of atoms only. Linked similarly to Realism, suggesting an external world as the basis to foundational claims. The other Western school this has counterpart to is that of empiricism and naive scepticism. Interestingly, scepticism is sceptical that even the external world and causation exists, however the emphasis on sense-data perceptions of the physical atomistic entities would be its own similarity

Rational mind and the Ability to Think (“I think therefore I am”)

Nyaya is the school concerned with logic and rationalism, also depending on perception and inference between observed phenomena.

Or by just accepting just one of the framed categories, such as the egg over the flour, as the correct foundation. However the eggs will need to refer to the flour and then the flour back to the eggs. For example, accepting our usage of Logic as the base, without referring to the other categories or depending on them, such as Universals or Language. However, as shown briefly, that usage of logic will have to refer to something else (another of the Transcendental categories i.e. eggs and flour) to justify its usage.

In order to explain the laws of logic, one needs to use language, which will appeal to grammar etc. and so the circle grows. Can these framing categories be grounded in our minds, or are they in matter? Well, they are not material themselves and if they are purely mental categories, how do they universally connect to all individual minds? The Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Mimamsa schools all depend on perception and inference amongst other criteria) as the means to correct knowledge. Each focusing more on different foundational points, they all need to appeal to the necessary preposition claims first, before they can perceive or infer anything.

The Problems of Assuming Matter or Sense Experience Grounds Knowledge Claims

The Myth of the Given and the Insufficiency of Data

There's not enough data and each data point is neutral; these are interpreted through our paradigm which acts as the filter. Thus, there are no brute facts about the external world and to even be able to rely on our interpretations will not be enough. Either way, we first have these categories as mental claims and the other issue is that the external world is in itself also first perceived first through the mind.

We have already seen from Berkeley and Hume that man cannot justify belief in the external world. Immanuel Kant said it was one of the greatest scandals of science and philosophy that there was no proof of the existence of the external world. Because we can make no distinction between our internal world of thought and the external world, we cannot know that what we call the external world is not just a form of our internal world. Therefore, we cannot know that the external world even exists. (Manion, 1999).



All will lead to a problem of infinite regress and circularity.

Thus, any form of foundation that begins with an autonomous man as the launching pad to his worldview, will end in nihilism and an arbitrary worldview. One which is not justified, therefore whatever his claims may be about the world, will not be grounded or have any kind of epistemic justification or privilege. Even if we wish to base the foundational starting point in our mind or in nature, it's still not enough to claim it as the launching pad as we will need to establish the criteria for that foundation, which will need a criteria for that starting point and on and on. The problem of circularity is unavoidable at the paradigmatic level. So after granting for the Presuppositions or frames that we all exist in and utilize in order to be able to have knowledge and noting that there can be no strong or weak foundation to base our worldview on. How can we establish which paradigm is which? Some might say that we cannot really ground anything, but we just use what we use and know is beneficial. Thus, a pragmatic approach ultimately is all that matters. Such a view takes us towards nihilism and is meaningless.

Other Transcendental Type Critiques against these sort of Statements

1. There are no Universal Categories
2. There is no Universal Absolute Truth
3. There is no Meaning

Law of Excluded Middle and Impossibility to the Contrary

So how can we eventually make a statement about which whole paradigm is the correct one or at least closer to being wholly correct? Because of the impossibility to the contrary. That is to say, for example, truth has to exist, for if there is no truth, then there can be no truth statement about truth not existing. Therefore, the evidence to the contrary of the statement, "there is no truth," is that there is indeed a universal truth." If this statement is correct that truth doesn't exist, it makes the possibility of knowledge impossible to begin with. We could not even know that truth doesn't exist. Then perhaps one should stop reading this paper.

- Either truth or not truth.
- No, no truth, (i.e. there is truth).
- therefore truth.
- Either A (eggs and flour) or not-A; (no eggs and flour)
- not-not-A; (not, no eggs and flour ie. we have eggs and flour)
- therefore A. (therefore eggs and flour exist)

We can say this about a worldview if it has been established to account for and cohere its own pre-conditions and is most coherent within itself and does not reduce to absurdity.

Reductio Argument

If we reduce the argument to its logical conclusion, does it reduce to absurdity and self-contradiction? Example to claim that there is no Universal Truth is a Universal Truth claim, claiming that there is no Universal Truth.

Does it Satisfy its Own Presuppositions?

If one claims to have access to the Universal Laws of Logic, but denies in their worldview that Universals and Universal Truth exists and all is only relativistic and made of particulars, they



have not satisfied their presupposition that Universals, Truth or Logic exist. Therefore, they cannot use Logic or Universals in their worldview.

Foundation

Can the starting point not refer to anything else, is it sufficient as the launching pad to then make other truth claims?

If when asked how they can use said Universals without appealing to anything else as a starting foundation and they appeal to the external world with these examples:

1. Brute Facts in the external world
2. Or “Logic” just is and we use it

As stated, they are being arbitrary, begging the question and being circular. What is even more viciously circular is that before they can even get to answer the 2nd order logic questions, the logic of logic and the reason for their reason, they will need to account for the criteria of justification, of which will need to account for their criteria ad infinitum.

Strength of the Tradition:

Other criteria's for the validity of a Tradition also Include:

1. Historical proofs
2. Eye Witness Accounts
3. Scientific Evidence of Claims
4. Continuity of Tradition
5. Coherency and Stability of Transmission of the Tradition

Proof of God

God Coheres the Transcendental Categories as the Launching Pad

The point which will need to be granted which is most controversial at this point would be to claim that God is the necessary condition, for the necessary conditions, to our access to knowledge at all. God is the centre that connects all the differing webs of beliefs together and coheres everything in the cosmos.

The Conclusion

Now this part is a major leap in conclusion and as stated, does not aim to satisfy the full argument. However, due to both Vedanta and Christian sources claiming Divine Metaphysical realities, it is easier to invoke the following conclusion. That is, these categories are dependent and appeal to the need of a Universal Mind from within which the Universal Logic transcends even them. There is a Consciousness that needs no other starting point and that cannot reference anything outside of itself. Thus is the foundation and pre-condition for the potential of knowledge itself.

Premise 1: The existence of God (X) is a necessary condition for Y (the intelligibility of the universe, objective morality, etc.).

Premise 2: Y exists or is true (we have intelligibility, moral values, logic, etc.).



Conclusion: Therefore, X (God exists) must be true because Y depends on X.

This Mind, though, cannot need to appeal to something higher than itself, otherwise the circle will continue to grow again. Thus the demand for a universal “Mind” is to unify all our individual minds and yet transcend them. In this way, we can get out of the finitude of our mental categories and actually have a basis to experience and see the world. It will need no beginning, but will need to be source of logic, truth, order etc. Thus is the necessary condition for the justified use of logic, knowledge, the identity of self and ultimately in our case, the one and the many. Language structures will be dependent on this Universal Logic, which enables us humans to have a foundation to have vocabulary for truth claims. It will need to have fore-knowledge, be in all places at all times, have all knowledge, have no origin and be the originator of all things, There is a further suggestion that this Mind is the Source of all Consciousness and indeed Conscious (Clooney, 2001; Hume, 1921). It would need to be the ground of all notions of Metaphysical Being and would need to also transcend all Being, yet without being Nothing and having no Existence. It also is the ground and embodiment of the corporal web of beliefs, connecting them as the cohered Body.

Because the One regulates and orders His creation, nature is uniform and causality exists. Since the same causes bring about the same effects, induction is possible and universal propositions can be formulated. And since universal propositions are a precondition to logical deduction, logical deductions can be made.(Manion, , 1999).

Does this Prove Just Any God?

Does any generic deity suffice to satisfy the necessary conditions above? No!

The argument will plainly not do, however, since in this form the reasoning is based on a simple quantifier-shift fallacy of the kind: (9 QSF) Every girl is in love with one boy. Therefore, there is one boy every girl is in love with. (Geréby, 2021).

Boy here is not a generic boy, it refers to a specific boy. Much in the same way, not all gods possess the same qualities or refer to the same God in mind.

Whilst an extreme and strange analogy, this god cannot account for being a universal and orderly god, from which we have an orderly universe. Plus this god cannot be the first cause as he has a cause, he cannot be all knowing, but is limited. Thus, this god cannot satisfy the necessary conditions demanded within all paradigms of our true God. So if revelation is true to bridge the gap and initiate the potential of knowledge, how can we know which revelation claim is true?

By using the Transcendental Argument and comparing paradigms (Acharuparambil, 1996; Bassuk,1987). The correct one will be most coherent and satisfy the necessary conditions listed. It will not be possible for it to not be true, otherwise the potential for knowledge will be impossible (Ndlovu & Nicolaidis, 2023). Now from this point we can begin the next phase which will compare the various paradigms and Traditions. They agree on most of the granted positions up to now. Where do they converge and depart hereafter?

Transcendence and Immanence

Granting that God is indeed the necessary Condition for the necessary conditions and is therefore real, these further Presuppositions demand other conditions for the paradigm claiming the correct God.



Conclusion

Necessary Presuppositions of God

The Transcendental Mind suggests a capacity to express itself imminently and be known on a human level. This suggests a connection to humanity. It also suggests a personal capacity to be known and to know. Therefore, a personal capacity to personally interact and experience this universality, in the particulars. Then this would suggest that it needs to take an imminent form without exhausting itself of its own transcendent state. This implies that God also needs to be able to make forms of “itself”, whilst maintaining unity, while existing in separate “parts” or “forms.” (i.e. incarnations) This also means that this God needs to give form and body to the webs of beliefs, to embody them as the Source and Ground of all Truth. Ultimately God will need to balance the “*One and the Many.*”

As will be shown in subsequent articles, this demands the need for a Triad in the God-head with multiple forms and incarnations, balancing unity and distinction.

References

- Ananias, Fr. D. (2024). The reason for reason. *Apologetics, Orthodox Christianity, Philosophy*. Available at <https://www.patristicfaith.com/philosophy/the-reason-for-reason/>
- Acharuparambil, D. (1996). Hinduism In Interreligious. *Dialogue*, 4(1), Oxford: ISKCON *Communications Journal*
- Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). *The anthropic cosmological principle*. Oxford University Press.
- Bassuk, D. E. (1987). *Incarnation in Hinduism and Christianity: The Myth of the God-Man*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Bowes, P. (1977). *The Hindu Religious Tradition: A Philosophical Approach*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bradley, A. (2012). Presuppositional apologetics (Unpublished paper). *Apologetics*, 500 B-16, Liberty University, Dr. Knox.
- Clooney, F. X. (2001). *Hindu God, Christian God: How Reason Helps Break Down the Boundaries between Religions*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Dimmitt, C. & van Buitenen, J.A.B. (2012). *Classical Hindu Mythology: A Reader in the Sanskrit Puranas*. Temple University Press.
- Geréby, G. (2021). *Theistic fallacies*. Central European University.
- Hume, R.E. (1921). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads with an Outline of the Philosophy of the Upanishads*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Killingley, D. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Hinduism*. Editors: Denise Cush et al., Routledge.
- Klostermaier, K. K. (1994). *A Survey of Hinduism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.



Manion, R. M. (1999). *The contingency of knowledge and revelatory theism*. The Edwin Mellen Press.

Megill, J. (n.d.). (August 24, 2024). The Lucas-Penrose argument about Gödel's theorem. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Ndlovu, S. & Nicolaidis, A. (2023). Karl Jaspers and the Eastern Orthodox View of Transcendence: A Comparative Analysis, *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 104(3).

Nicolaidis, A. (2023/4) Brief Comparative Study of the Hindu and Orthodox Christian Faiths and their Weltanschauung, *J.E.S. 20-10s: 7202-7214A*.

Popper, K. (2002). *The logic of scientific discovery* (Originally published in 1934 as *Logik der Forschung*). Routledge.

Sahiner, A. (n.d.). (July 10, 2017). *On Asymmetric Systems: The Strange Loops of Ideology*. Medium.

Sorem, R. D. D. A. (2024). *An Orthodox theory of knowledge: The epistemological and apologetic methods of the Church Fathers*. Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Conflict of Interest Statement: *The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*



This article is open-access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY: credit must be given to the creator, the title and the license the work is under. This license enables reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator.