

# Scientific Proof that Jesus Christ is God

The scientific proof of a specific subject matter consists in a rational inference made on the basis of a specific empirical content. The scientific proof of God is exactly the same, except that the content which is to be proved is not a specific content, but an absolute one, namely God. The evidence which constitutes the content of the proof, therefore, cannot be a specific evidence drawn from a specific domain of natural science. It must be the absolute evidence: the whole content of science. The entirety of the findings of the logical, natural, and mental sciences therefore constitutes the supporting evidence and content in the proof of God's identity.

The proof of the divinity of Jesus begins with the belief in science in general as its initial presupposition. From there, it is shown that all of science has some essential character, namely formal triunity. (This is the first premise.) And then it is shown that this form belongs essentially to Christianity as a religion only. (This is the second premise.) And on that basis a connection is established between science and religion, a bridge which carries the mind necessarily from knowledge to faith.

In extremely abbreviated form, the proof is:

1. Science is triune
2. Triunity is Christian
3. Therefore, science is Christian

The bridge which carries us from science to Jesus is triunity, which is the form of the Christian God in general. This form is proved by the whole of science to be manifest everywhere in the created world. It is on the basis of the mark that is present in creation, that the identity of the creator is deduced.

An obvious objection to the inference may be addressed here. It might be thought that the syllogism is fallacious because its form may produce absurd results with different content. For example, this apple is red, red is the color of fire, therefore this apple is fire. But the fallacy here consists in that the subjects and predicates are contingently joined: some apples are green, and some fires are blue. But with the proof of Jesus, the connection is essential and thus necessary. It is not that science has triunity as one property among others, but that science is essentially triune, i.e. triunity reveals the essence of what science is, so that if triunity is taken away,

science becomes incoherent. Likewise, Christianity is just as essentially connected to triunity. Triunity is the mark of the Christian God, so wherever triunity is found, there is a reference to Jesus. Therefore, the whole of science shows the creation to be stamped with a mark which proves Jesus's ownership and authorship.

This essay has three chapters, one for each sentence of the syllogism. The first chapter will run through the whole of the logical, natural, and mental sciences, demonstrating that they are triune at every level. The second chapter will show that the triunity doctrine is both unique to Christianity and essential to it. This means that no other religion but Christianity believes that God is triune, and also that the triunity doctrine is not external to Christianity, but is endogenous to the religion and constitutes the foundation of Christian theology.

# Chapter I: Science is Triune

Science in general has the form of triunity, and it has it essentially. This means on the one hand that the sciences as a whole fit together only as three-in-one, or divide into three overall interconnected regions, but also that the specific subfields of the sciences are also intrinsically triune. It is not sufficient therefore to show triunity in this or that area of science. But all of science must be shown to be triune from the highest level down to the minutest phenomenon. The demonstration that science is triune will take its beginning where science begins, at its most elementary, and proceed to what is more complex and involved. The true starting point for science is ontology, which is the study of being. But for the purposes of this demonstrative essay, arithmetic will serve as a sure and certain point of departure, seeing as that science is well known, and all natural science depends on it.

The sciences as a whole are divided into logical science, natural science, and mental science. Mathematics falls in the region of logical sciences, which are *a priori*, i.e. pre-empirical sciences. The natural sciences are *a posteriori*, i.e. empirical. And mind science is simultaneously *a priori* and *a posteriori*.

## Section 1: Logical Science is Triune

Logical science may be divided into mathematics, propositional logic, and syllogistic logic. The reason for this is that mathematics is really just quantitative logic, or logic in general which is reduced to quantitative operation. Quantity is devoid of semantic content and meaning, and that is why is more elementary than other forms of logic, because it has less concrete content it is more abstract.

### Subsection A: Mathematics is Triune

To show that mathematics is triune, it will suffice for this essay to show that arithmetic is triune, since arithmetic operations are the elements of mathematics.

The species of arithmetic operations are six: addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, exponentiation, and root. But these operations come in pairs: addition and subtraction go together, likewise with multiplication and division, etc. So in fact there are three pairs of arithmetic operations. One side of the pair is positive (addition, etc.) and the other side is negative (subtraction, etc.). The triadic aspect of arithmetic consists in these three pairs. The monadic aspect is to be shown, that the three pairs develop from and into a unity. They form a series, in which addition-subtraction are the simplest, multiplication-division are more complex, and exponent-root are considered the most complex, and also bring the series to completion. Arithmetic as a whole thus forms a triadic progression which is complete and whole, i.e. unified.

Addition and subtraction are *monadic* or *one-dimensional* operations. In order to accomplish the calculation  $5 + 10$ , you take 5 as the initial state of the number, and then you count up 10 times, augmenting by 1 each time. The numbers can be taken separately, and then accumulated successively, one after the other. The relationship of the two numbers that are combined in these operations, is really no relationship: they are stacked on top of each other. This operation can be taken as mechanical or static. This is because in addition and subtraction, the unit to augment is always taken as 1, and only the amount of the augmentation varies.

Multiplication and division operations, however, are *dyadic* or *two-dimensional*. This is because the two numbers are taken as *intrinsically* related to each other. In order to complete the operation  $5 \cdot 10$  it is necessary to think 'five tens' or 'ten fives'. The

result is obtained by the *interrelation* of the numbers, which must therefore be thought simultaneously rather than successively. One must think 'ten fives' or 'five tens'. In order to visualize a multiplication operation, one can imagine a graph with rows and columns, 5 rows by 10 columns or vice versa. This operation can be taken as chemical or dynamic. In multiplication and division, one number is taken as unit and the other as amount, and the result is the compound of these.

Exponentiation and root are, on the one hand, *triadic* or *three-dimensional* operations inasmuch as they simply continuing the foregoing progression into a third order. If 5 is taken to the power of 10, that is equivalent to multiplying 5 by itself 10 times, just as  $5 \cdot 10$  is equivalent to adding 5 to itself 10 times. On the other hand, the exponent is also a return back to the *monad*, because the exponent is a circular relation of the number to itself. This is why exponential equations produce curved lines on graphs, because exponentiation is the *explicit* self-relation of number, or the calculation in which circularity is the default. This is why exponents are associated with curved graphs. In exponentiation, the value of unit and amount are equalized. Or the exponent is the self-relation of amount.

In summary, the triune progression of the operations of arithmetic can be explained summarily as follows. Arithmetic is the counting of numbers. Number is composed of unit (what gets counted) and amount (the count of it). In addition, the unit is locked at 1, and the addends or minuends are the amounts to count. In multiplication and division calculations, one number is taken as unit, the other as amount, and the result is a new number composed of these elements. And in exponentiation, the result is obtained by taking one number as both unit and amount, or it is the amount which is its own unit.

Or again, in addition and subtraction, the unit is stable and the amount is variable. In multiplication and division, both unit and amount are variable, but are two separate numbers. And in exponentiation and root, unit and amount are one number which is variable. This whole progression forms a triune development, which begins with unity, proceeds through duality, and comes to completion in a triplicity which is also a unity. The exponent and the root are therefore the triunity of arithmetic and the completion of arithmetic. The third which is a circular return back to the first.

## Subsection B: Propositional Logic is Triune

The rest of the forms of logic, and even of the whole of science, are very similar to the triune progression we've just discerned in arithmetic. So we may go through them more briefly, since the connections and analogies that we wish to draw out will become easier to see as we move towards more concrete sciences.

Propositional logic is the science of the interconnection of propositions, which are combinations of subject and predicate. The operations of propositional logic are as follows: conjunction and disjunction, conditional and its inverse, and biconditional and its inverse. Like mathematics, these are three pairs of operations. Each operation is more complex than the ones that come before it, and they build on their predecessors in the same way as the forms of arithmetic. Conjunction and disjunction are the simplest; conditionals can be defined in terms of disjunctions; and biconditionals can be defined in terms of conditionals.

In conjunction and disjunction, the two propositions (P and Q) are compounded externally. Each one is taken as self-subsistent, and they are conjoined mechanically. Like addition and subtraction, the operation has the character of stacking boxes. This box is P, that box is Q, and their conjunction is  $P \wedge Q$ . These operations are *mechanical* since no intrinsic connection of the content is asserted, only that P and Q occur as conjoined in thinking, which is a third which is not made explicit.

Conditionals and inverse conditionals are likewise *dyadic* operations, since what is asserted in  $P \rightarrow Q$  is an *intrinsic* connection between P and Q, so that their relationship is one which belongs to the content itself, rather than coming to the content from outside. Or the content, P and Q, now enter into the thinking, i.e. the operation. And just like in multiplication and division, where one number was taken as unit and the other as amount (i.e. one as what is counted and the other as the count, or one as static and the other as dynamic), likewise P and Q are, in the conditional, taken as static and dynamic, or at rest and in motion. The generic example of the conditional is: 'if it is raining, the grass will get wet'. Here, raining is the causal, active side, and the wet grass is the effect is the passive side, the effect.

The biconditional is the *triadic* operation, and also the completion of the operations of propositional logic. Just as exponentiation was the same as multiplication, but a multiplication operation which is *explicitly* turned back on itself, forming a circular

return; likewise the biconditional is a conditional which is turned back on itself. We form the biconditional by conjoining the conditional and its inverse:  $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P)$ . What is asserted is thus a *reciprocal connection* between P and Q, so that they are equivalent. In fact, they are one relation which goes in a circle: P causes Q and Q causes P, so they are a circular causality, i.e. self-causality. Just as exponentiation was the self-relation of number, so the biconditional is the self-relation of proposition, or the self-relation of *positing* in general, i.e. self-creativity. The biconditional is the third species of operation which is also a circular return back to the beginning, and so it is the triunity of the whole.

### **Remark on Computer Science**

A word regarding computer science. The structure of computer programming languages is triune, and derives from the structure of thinking in general, which is the topic of the science of logic. The categories of logic in their immediacy, also called by Kant the ‘mathematical’ categories, are quality, quantity, and measure. In computer science, these correspond to strings, numbers, and arrays. This is the computer language as a *monad*. After the immediate or mathematical categories come the ‘dynamical’ ones, which are substance and inherence, cause and effect, and reciprocity. These correspond to objects, *if/then* statements, and switch statements. This is the computer language as a *dyad*. And there is, in the *third* place, the function, which is the computer language as such, or its power of self-reference. It can be seen that these follow the same schema as the operations of arithmetic and the connectors of propositional logic. (For a deeper discussion of this topic, see the ‘Remark on Metaphysics’ below.)

### **Subsection C: Syllogistic Logic is Triune**

Syllogistic logic is the science of inferences. This has basically the same form and content as propositional logic, except that the unit of operation here are *concepts* rather than propositions. The connection of two concepts is a judgment, and the connection of two judgments is a syllogistic inference. For example: Socrates is a man, all men are mortal, therefore Socrates is mortal.

A syllogism consists of three concepts: e.g., Socrates, man, and mortality. Or A, B, and C for short. A connection is asserted between A and B, and between B and C. On this basis, a new connection is inferred to exist from A to C. The concept which is not present in the conclusion is called the *middle term*, and the two concepts which are present are called the *extremes*.

Syllogistic logic is triune in multiple ways. First of all, concepts by themselves are the *monadic* phase of inferences. The inference as a *monad* is contained in the concept. The *dyadic* phase of the inference is the judgment, which is the concept that is exhibiting its content, e.g. in a predicate: 'the rose is red' or 'Socrates is a man'. And the syllogism as such is the *triadic* phase of the whole: the interconnection of judgments.

But each of these phases is itself triune. Concepts are universal (man in general), particular (mortality), and singular (Socrates). And this forms the basis for the syllogism. The universal is the *monad*, the particular is the partitioning or sundering of the universal and so is the *dyad*, and the individual is the part that has attained the status of universality and so is the unity of the monad and dyad: the *triad*.

Judgments likewise come in three kinds: qualitative judgments (the rose is red), reflective judgments (the rose is a valentines day gift), and conceptual judgments (the rose is beautiful). The qualitative judgment is *monadic* in that it asserts something about the subject in itself; the reflective judgment is *dyadic* in that it asserts the relation of one subject to another; and the conceptual judgment is *triadic* because it asserts the relation of the subject to itself, i.e. is the subject return back to itself via the predicate.

And syllogisms themselves (apart from being overtly triune) also come in three species: the qualitative syllogism, in which the middle term brings the extremes together incidentally (the rose is red, red is the color of fire, therefore the rose is fire-colored); the inductive syllogism, in which the middle term connects the extremes intrinsically but not necessarily (gold, copper, bronze conduct electricity; gold, copper, bronze are metals; therefore metals conduct electricity); and the conceptual syllogism, in which the middle term necessarily connects the extremes (triangles are scalene, isosceles, or equilateral; this triangle is scalene; therefore it is not isosceles or equilateral).

### **Remark on Metaphysics**

The content of metaphysics consists of those concepts which can be predicated of everything whatsoever. E.g. everything is a being, everything has a quality and a quantity, everything has an essence, is a composite of form and matter, etc. These are the propositions of metaphysics. Now it may not seem obvious that *thought* can be predicated of everything, since it seems that only human beings can think. Logic,



the science of thinking as such, would then seem to belong only to the human sciences, i.e. the mind sciences. But in fact, if logic really is the science of thinking *as such*, then it is the science of the thinking of God and the angels. The Logos of God through which He created the world and man, and the Logos of man through which he knows God and the world, are one Logos. So in addition to the agreeable statements, that everything is a being, everything has a form, a cause, etc., we must also add the statement that everything is a thought and a logos, since thinking is the true nature of being and sustains being. What being is, then, is the most elementary thought-form in the region of logic. That is why it shows up everywhere as the copula, the 'is'. Ontology and logic are therefore one, and ontology is just the starting point which develops into thinking as such. Being is inactive thinking, and thinking is infinitely active being. But let us try to get a more determinate grasp of these matters by using an analogy via something more familiar: grammar.

We can understand why logic includes the content of metaphysics within it, by the following analogy. Grammar is logic expressed at the level of *human language*. The forms of grammar and the forms of logic are analogous. Now the subject matter of grammar is the *word*, and in the grammar is assumed three successive shapes: adjectives, verbs, and nouns. These correspond, in metaphysics, to what we have termed being, activity, and thought – or being, doing, and thinking. The *adjective* is the word in the form of simple, immediate *being*, i.e. it is abiding as itself in its unmediated inaction; the *verb* is the word in the form of reflective doing or activity, whereby it departs from the simplicity of its static being and enters into motion and relation with others; the *noun* is the third, the unity of the verb and adjective, in which the unmoved being of the adjective is restored, but *mediated* through the action of the verb. This is made clearer by examining the standard adjective order in English. It is as follows: Size → Age → Shape → Color → Origin → Material → Purpose. E.g. “The large old round blue Italian marble dining table.” We can see that this classification corresponds to the content of classical metaphysics. The earlier forms of adjectives are those that specify immediate *being* of the subject: size and age are *quantity*, shape and color are *quality*. The latter adjectives are those pertaining to the *doings* of the subject, i.e. its causes: origin is *efficient cause*, material is *material cause*, and purpose is *final cause*. The *formal cause* is the essence, which coincides with the subject itself, and which gathers together all the predicates into one. Now the *word* as such, the logos or concept, is this whole complex of being and doing, i.e. of stability and activity. It is not an activity which brings something *else* into being, nor the activity which brings itself into being *as another*, but the absolute unity of being and activity: the reality which is intrinsically active. The science of

the word is logic itself, and so the word is thinking, reason. Thought is the unity whose being is doing, and whose doing is being. This is the true substance and independence of things. All else is derivative, dependent, unfree. Freedom, independence, is not merely selfhood, nor movement, but self-movement, self-realization, self-awareness. God is self-thinking being and self-existent thought. Thought is the true being of things, and reality in general is the product of God's thinking. Or being is the unmoved in general, and doing is movement and motion, and thinking is restful motion: the unmoved mover, the alpha and omega, the first and final cause of created beings. God moves the world teleologically, with his mind. By thinking, he brings into being, because his thinking is being and his being is thinking. We have observed these matters shining darkly through the glass of ordinary English grammar. The eternal being of God is manifest in the structure of human language. Because God is the One who is truly real, and the structure of thought and the structure of reality are the same.

It may be worthwhile to point to an important verse in scripture. In Exodus 3:14, God says 'I am that I am.' This is a composition of the Hebrew words 'ehyeh' and 'asher'. 'Ehyeh' means being. And 'asher' is the abstract connective. So God defines Himself as the unity of being and doing, or immediacy and mediation. Also, the name 'Yahweh' is said to be a composite of 'I am', 'I was', and 'I will be'. Now 'being' indicates presence, as in 'I am writing'. But 'doing' indicates timelessly past being, i.e. essence or ground – 'I do write'. And thinking is that causality, which is self-causality, i.e. teleology: the end which is to come. Being, doing, thinking – these are the elements of God in his eternal being.

That is enough of logic. I have written this remark as a consolation, because in place of being and doing I have treated of mathematics and propositional logic. This is due to the difficulty of the subject matter of ontology, which makes it inappropriate for this merely demonstrative essay. But the selection of mathematics and propositional logic is not arbitrary – it makes sense, because mathematics is an immediate, intuitive contemplating, and propositional logic is likewise a mediated thinking via *symbols*, which are representations, i.e. mediations.

## Section 2: Natural Science is Triune

Whereas logical science was primarily *a priori* or pre-empirical, natural science is primarily *a posteriori*, or empirical. In the first place, the whole of natural science is in triune shape, just as logical science was. The three regions here are physics, chemistry, and biology. The pattern established in the logical sciences may be seen to be clearly continued. In the physical (i.e. material, mechanical) sciences, matter is brought together into *external* conjunction and combination. Like addition and subtraction, and conjunction and disjunction, physics studies the external motions and changes of matter in space and time. If these changes of matter are thought as *intrinsic* to the matters themselves, so that the matters are brought into *dynamic* interrelation, then the science which studies such changes *chemistry*. And if the movement of the matter is one that abides in the matter itself, so that the matter is self-moving or self-propelling, and its change and development is a self-change and self-development, then this matter falls under the *biological* sciences.

### Subsection A: Physics is Triune

I would like to apologize for the inadequate treatment of this section, since my understanding of the physics is limited. There are no doubt myriad deficiencies in my comprehension. And yet I know that I am roughly correct, and this inexact but generally accurate account of physics will be sufficient for the sake of this essay. Physical science should exhibit the three phases described above: extrinsic relation, intrinsic relation, and self-relation; or universal, particular, singular.

First of all, physics starts in the abstract with the study of *spacetime*, which is the universe as such, or the universal in immediate externality. Spacetime divides into a space and time. Space is the positive and restful aspect, and time is the negativity, the motion. The spacetime continuum is a unity of rest and motion. The branches of physics which study spacetime in general are general and special relativity, cosmology, and astrophysics.

Second, if spacetime is the universal, then the particular is the *particle*. Physics studies particles at three scales. The branch called 'particle physics' studies particles as such, the smallest particles: quarks, leptons, and bosons. Quarks are triune, being composed of three quarks. If two up quarks are united to a down quark, the result is a proton; if two down quarks are united to an up quark, the result is a neutron; and

electrons are leptons. Atoms are also triune, being composed of neutrons, protons, and electrons. Particles make up the *matter* of the universe. At the highest level, matter can be studied as classical mechanics, the principles of the motion of large scale bodies. Also belonging here is quantum physics, and the study of wave-particle duality. The wave is the universal, the particle is the particular, and their unity is the composite, e.g. a photon.

If spacetime is the universe as *universal*, and the matter within spacetime is its *particularization*, then the third, the singular, is the unity of matter and motion. This is *radiation* in general. The science of radiation would also include the study of gravitational waves, the curvature of spacetime, and massless radiation such as light. Light forms the transition from physics to chemistry.

### Subsection B: Chemistry is Triune

Chemistry forms the middle science and bridge between physics and biology. Physics is the external relationality of nature, it is nature in its externality or outwardly inverted. Chemistry stands in between large and small, outer and inner, or the middle science between outer space and Earth, and forms the transition from the science of the universe in general, to the life sciences. Chemistry is the study of *reaction*, or of the inner affinity of physical substances which are not matter in general, but organized matter, organic matter. But this matter is not yet self-organizing, which is the principle of life science. The branches of chemistry can be divided by the scale at which they operate, and getting gradually more complex and concrete.

Chemistry as such, as universal chemistry, is the chemistry of inorganic matter. So this is inorganic chemistry and molecular chemistry: the science of the reactions of matter in general, and the kinds of compounds that form in outer space and in the universe in general.

The second kind of chemistry is the reactions that occur when different kinds of matter come into contact with different kinds of radiation. These branches of chemistry are photochemistry and radiation chemistry. Here, the passive, material element are the inorganic compounds, and the active, formal element is light or radiation, which is shining or radiating on the matter.

The third kind of chemistry forms the transition to biology, and consists of the branches of chemistry that study the unity of light and matter, or motion and rest

brought into unity at the chemical level. This is biochemistry, organic chemistry, and prebiotic chemistry. Relevant here is the science of abiogenesis, or the genesis of life from non-living things. This involves the process by which the life which is implicit in the universe as a whole comes to be entangled with matter to the extent that matter is enlivened and enlightened. In the solar system, the sun is the universal, the planets around it are the particular, and the planet with life, Earth, is the singular: the universal united to the particular, or radiation united to matter.

### Subsection C: Biology is Triune

Biology is divided into three branches: microbiology, botany, and zoology.

Microbiology is the science of microorganisms. This is the plant and animal in its implicit being. The whole of microbiology is divided into bacteria, archaea, and eukaryotes. The endosymbiotic theory of the genesis of eukaryotes follows the pattern we have established. Bacteria are the first and simplest (immediate); second come archaea, which split off and develop more complex genetic machinery, and through this they enter into relationship to the bacteria around them (mediation); and thirdly, the eukaryotes come when the archaea engulf the bacteria, the latter becoming organelles. So this is the triune structure of the microorganism: the bacterium is the eukaryote in its immediacy, then it deepens itself into the mediation of the archaea, and then this reciprocal relation brings the two together, the archaea becoming the complex being which *has* the bacteria in it. In other words, the eukaryote evolves when the relation of archaea to bacteria becomes self-relation. This lays the scheme for the whole of biology: 1. bacteria are to microorganisms, 2. as archaea are to plants, 3. as eukaryotes are to animals.

Botany is the science of plants, so it occupies a middle field between microbiology, which studies the simple and immediate organism, and zoology, which studies the self-mediated organism. Accordingly, plants are the *dyadic* organism.

Micrororganisms are essentially wrapped up in themselves and self-contained. In this they are *monads*. The plant is quintessentially dyadic in that it develops from a seed. Binary fission is the main reproductive method of microorganisms, because they are immediate organisms. They therefore correspond to addition and subtraction, and conjunction and disjunction. Plants however reproduce through seeds, i.e. through mediation of inner and outer, potential and actual. Plants thus correspond to multiplication and division, and conditionals. Because in these arithmetic and logical operations, the one term is mediated *through* the other. This

is explicit in the conditional, where the left side of the expression is the cause, and the right side is the effect. And indeed, the seed relates to the vegetative plant as cause to effect. It is an if-then relationship: *if* the seed is planted, *then* then plant will grow. The reproductive method is *dyadic* and *mediate*. That is how plants as such fit into the whole of biology. Now let us look at the triune evolution of plants. Plants evolved through three stages: 1. bryophytes evolved first, 2. then pteridophytes, 3. and finally spermatophytes are the complete plant. Bryophytes are *monadic* because they are the *immediate* plant: the whole plant is just the leaf. Pteridophytes, which evolved second, are *dyadic* because they differentiate between stem, root, etc. (Both bryophytes and pteridophytes reproduce via spores, just as both bacteria and archaea reproduce by fission.) The *triadic* plant is the plant as such: the spermatophyte, where the seed first appears. This is the plant as such, and the bryophyte and the pteridophytes were just the phases of its genesis. The plant as such is exemplified in the fruit-bearing plant. The whole triune structure is most visible here: the plant is first 1. the seed, which is the immediate and universal plant, the *monad*; 2. the plant itself, which is the differentiation of the one seed into many branches and leaves, and 3. the fruit, which is the *circular reversion* of the plant back to the seed, as well the *third* phase of the whole plant.

Zoology is the science of animals. The triune structure of the animal is revealed in the evolution of animals, which is a development from water to land on the one hand, and from egg-laying to live birth on the other. The three phases are: 1. fish, 2. reptiles, and 3. mammals. The first two phases reproduce with eggs, i.e. outside the body, which indicates their structural affinity with plants, and with the dyadic organism in general. The mammal is the animal as such, the real animal, because it is here that the reproduction is brought back into the animal itself, indicating a triumph over externality and external dependence. The animal body itself is triune: the skeleton is the universal body or the body as implicit *monad*, the organ system is the *dyad* or the body in its particularity, and the nervous system is the *third*, the universal part: the part which governs the whole. The human being is the absolute animal, the animal as such, of which all others are phases of its genesis. A word may be added here about the family structure. The father is the universal and the *monad*, the head of the family; the mother is the *dyad* or mediatrix through whom the offspring is generated, and the offspring is the *third* element which is the unity of the male and female. The development of the fetus in the womb can be understood as the fetus striving to return back to the father from within the matrix. That is the completion of our discussion of the natural sciences, because with the human being a transition is made from nature to mind. Because at just this point does the Logos,

the logical element which is buried and implicit in nature, resurface and become self-related *as a natural organism*. This is the *mind*.

## Section 3: Mind Science is Triune

Mind science is the unity of logical and natural science, and the mind is the unity of logic and nature generally. Logical science is the *monad* or universal element in science as a whole, it is *intrinsic* science, *a priori* science or science-in-itself. Natural science is the *dyad*, the object of science which is estranged from thinking in general, or is 'outer knowledge': *extrinsic* science, *a posteriori* science. The mind and its mental sciences are the reversion of nature back to the Logos, back to logic. Accordingly, the human being is defined as the *logical nature*, i.e. the rational animal. The word 'nature' in the previous sentence is taken in the sense of a *particular* nature, i.e. a created being, a creature. So in the same way that the fruit is that part of the tree which contains the universal in it, the seed, in the same way is the human being that created thing which contains the creative Word or Logos in it. This creative Word is reason, the power of thinking and speaking, which dominate the subject matter of the mind sciences.

### Subsection A: Psychology is Triune

Psychological science is triune because the psyche is triune. The psyche has three levels at which it operates, which correspond to the three parts of the animal body that we identified in the subsection on zoology. We said that the animal organism consists of a universal body, its particularization in the system of organs, and then the universal organ which is the nervous system. These three parts of the body correspond to the three parts of the soul: sensation, emotion, and reason. The sensuous soul is the soul outside itself, or in direct connection to the natural world; the emotional soul is the soul relating itself to the outer world and other souls in an irrational way; and the rational soul is the soul turned back upon itself, relating to itself, i.e. thinking.

The rational part of the soul is more usually called the *mind*. By 'rational' we mean that it can think and speak. But this capacity for thinking and speaking takes three different forms. Immediate reason is *intuition*, or the capacity to experience and introject rational content. This is the basis of human experience in general. The second form of reason, the dyad, is *representation* which involves the recollection, memorization, and reproduction of rationally organized content. This may consist in images as well as words, since the two are bound together in representation. This



is the level of art and symbolism. And the third form of reason is *thinking* in general, or rational contemplation which corresponds to philosophy and science.

Thinking is language as such, and thinking takes place in language. Language likewise has three modes in which it operates: immediate or *literal* language is when we use language to describe factual phenomena in the world, such as pointing at things and describing events and so on. This is also the *literal* use of language.

Symbolic or *metaphorical* use of language is when we use language to describe things other than what these words directly or immediately mean, and in this way we build up a network of metaphors and metonymies of meaning. And thirdly, there is a use of language wherein the metaphorical turns back on itself and is related to itself, where the topic of discussion is the intrinsic meaning of words in and of themselves, and this is the kind of discourse which is involved in philosophy and science.

### Subsection B: Sociology is Triune

Sociology is the science of man in his relationality and involvement with other humans. It was already remarked in the subsection on zoology that the family has a triune structure. This may be reiterated in light of the triune division of the soul. The father is head of the family and rational person, the leader; the mother is the emotional part, the medium; and the children are the lowest part, the sensuous and appetitive aspect of the family. In this way the family is exposition of the soul, or the soul outside itself.

The interrelation of families forms the basis for the political sphere, which is the family outside itself, or the 'outer' family, the extended family. The state as a whole is like a larger family, and the relations that obtain are the same as those in the family and the individual soul. The state accordingly has a triune structure. Even in states without an explicit class system, there are three classes in the state. The sensuous and appetitive part of the soul corresponds to the laboring class, which is immediate and directly fulfilling day-to-day tasks. The emotional part of the soul corresponds in modern states to the merchant class or warrior class, these individuals are involved highly with competition and success. And the third and highest class in the state are the administrators.

The third part of the science of sociology is legal science, which is social science turned back on itself and become self-related. The law is freedom in general. But in sociology, the law has an external character, which is imposed on people from

beyond. This belongs necessarily to the social sphere and must be maintained there. When the law is internalized, so that the law comes from within, that is the reconciliation of man and the law. And the sphere in which it takes place is the religious sphere, which is theology.

### Subsection C: Theology is Triune

The object of theology is God, and has governance of the world. It is not to be thought that God is absent from the world, or uninvolved with human affairs. On the contrary, everything that happens is the will of God. This assertion is met with the disbelief, that the manifest injustice in the world contradicts the thesis of his governance. But the reason for this is that history is still in process, that we are in the middle of things so to speak, and the invisible king has not yet become the present, visible one. The whole world thus has the character of a *test of faith*. If the whole world were overtly just, God would not be able to test our loyalty. The return of the king is the presence of God, who alone is the just judge, who knows the content of everyone's heart and promises to wipe away every tear. This is not an abolition of the law, but the fulfillment of the law. The world is essentially just, but not overtly just, because the king is not yet present. When the king returns, the essential nature of the world, that it is just, i.e. that it is governed by God, will be revealed and made manifest.

The cause of evil, of calamity and political turmoil, is usually attributed to the activity of fallen angels. This is certainly correct, but it should be added that the fallen angels are servants of God. And it is really the deepest theological truth, that God is the devil, i.e. everything Satan does is really a trial from God, and the demons have only an illusory power. God uses his disobedient children to chastise and test the loyalty of the obedient ones. The punishment for disobedience, is that one joins the ranks of those who God uses to chastise the righteous. This is why 'bad things happen to good people'. Because God disciplines and rebukes the one he loves, while he uses the ungodly as his instrument of discipline. The wicked are allowed to prosper at the expense of the righteous so that God and his church may be glorified, and the vanity of the things of this world is exposed. This is the solution to the problem of theodicy or evil. The devil is the angel who is in charge of this chastisement. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." (Job 13:15)

The story of the Bible has an overall triune structure. The Garden of Eden is humanity in its immediacy, our simple immediate living and being. The desire for

knowledge causes us to fall from this immediate subsistent paradise into the disunity of space and into, into the dialectical cycle of life and death, and of good and evil. Life is held apart from death, good is held apart from evil. Jesus is the one who unites life and death, i.e. defeats death with death, lives by dying; and unites good and evil, i.e. loves his enemies, loves unconditionally. By taking the sin and wickedness onto himself, he bears the pain of the opposition. Jesus is the good itself, who sustains and bears evil; and He is life itself, who survives death, i.e. withstands dying. This *sublation* of the opposite, whereby the negative is taken back into the positive, is the whole process of science we've witnessed up to this point. Through the negation of negation, i.e. defeating of death with death, Jesus overcomes the principle of pride and lust which keeps us trapped in this world, which is constituted by a cycle of violent exercise of power and sexual reproduction. The Kingdom of Heaven accordingly maintains law without force and in it reproduction occurs without lust, i.e. asexually.

Finally, God Himself is triune: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father is monad, the One; the Son is the mediator of the Trinity and the image of the Father, as well as the creative Word *through* whom all things were made; and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, which proceeds from the Father *through the Son*, and abides on the Son and in the heart of man. The Father is thus *abiding*, the Son is *proceeding*, and the Holy Spirit is the unity of abiding and proceeding, or He is *reverting*, since that is the unity of remaining and going out, rest and motion, being and doing, etc. These may appear as unjustified assertions, but the next chapter of this essay will substantiate the claims made in this paragraph.

## Chapter II: Triunity is Christian

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated that science as a whole is triune, essentially and thus at every level. In a single sentence the whole previous chapter is the statement: science is triune. As was noted in the introduction, this does not mean that triunity is one predicate or quality among many that science possesses. Rather, the meaning is that science is essentially and intrinsically triune, i.e. triunity is *the form of science*, and the *whole of science* fits together into a triunity.

Now in this chapter we will demonstrate the next premise of the proof of Jesus's divinity, which is the following: Triunity is Christian. By this is meant, not that Christianity and triunity are incidentally related, but essentially related. And further, that Christianity *alone* is the triune religion. Only if Christianity is uniquely triune can our proof of Jesus's divinity succeed. If there were some other religion which held that God is triune, then Christianity could not be proved in this way. But in fact, historically and actually, Christianity has the triune theology. Christianity is *the* religion where God is manifested as the triune God. So in the first place, it is a matter of demonstrating this, which will be done by traversing the history of religion.

Moreover, it will also be necessary to show that this element which is unique to Christianity really belongs to it, and has not been surreptitiously introduced or imposed on Christianity by Platonism, as some have dishonestly claimed in order to challenge the traditional doctrine.

## Section 1: Christianity is Uniquely Triune

The task in this first section is to examine the history of religion and see which religions, if any, contain a Triunity doctrine, i.e. they hold that God is triune, that He is three-in-one in precisely the way we have discovered in the examination of the sciences: that there is first of all a *monad*, which develops to the point of a *dyad*, and then through the mediation of this dyad there emerges a *triad*, which is also in a way a return back to the beginning to the *one*, and thus the brings the whole to completion. The specific technical term for this special kind of triad is that it is a *perichoretic triunity*. Perichoretic means that the members of the triad interpenetrate each other, maintaining their independence while remaining *one being* and *one person*. Moreover the triunity is in a sense equal and in a sense not. It is equal in the sense that all three members are one member and thus share a single being, and this may be called a kind of equality. And yet they are also not equal, because they arrive in succession, and the succeeding members manifest what is concealed and implicit in the first member. That is the perichoretic triunity as we have seen it in the whole circle of science.

Now we must go through the history of religion to see whether the perichoretic triunity appears in any of them. A rough list of the history of world religions is as follows: Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam. We will now examine these seven religion one at a time.

1. Buddhism does not have a God. Or rather, their God is the nothing. This can be considered the emptiest and most abstract conception of God. It is not a Triunity.
2. Taoism has a fuller conception of divinity than Buddhism, but it is not a God, instead it has a highest principle: the Tao, which is a unity of active and passive natures (yin and yang). This is similar to Jesus, who is likewise a unity of two natures. But it is not a triunity.
3. Next, Hinduism is a pantheon of a gods, and so does not have a single triune deity. However, it does have the Trimurti of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. However, the Trimurti it is not a triunity. This is because the third person of the Trimurti is a destroyer, who is not the complement to the other two deities. The Hindu Trimurti is based on the temporal aspects of past, present, and future, or beginning, middle, and end. Consequently it is a succession of three deities rather than an

interconnection of three-in-one. So Hinduism has a triadic, and this triad is a series, but the three of them do not form a single God, who is a perichoretic triunity.

4. The Zoroastrian deity is wisdom, Ahura Mazda. This is similar to Christianity where Jesus is called the wisdom of God. But it is not a triunity. There is a Holy Spirit in Zoroastrianism, called Spenta Mainyu, but it is not regarded as God, but only as a creative effluence.

5. Judaism is the seed of Christianity in the Hebrew people. There is likewise a monotheistic God and a Holy Spirit, but still they are not regarded as one divine Triunity.

6. Christianity does regard God as triune, and this is intrinsic and essential to the religion, as will be shown in the next section of this chapter.

7. Islam is a religion which came after Christianity, but is really a regression to Judaism, since God is regarded as simply one, and the doctrine of Triunity is regarded as polytheism, which is a misunderstanding that the Muslims insist on.

## Section 2: Christianity is Essentially Triune

In the previous section we showed that Christianity is the only triune religion. So if Trinity is proved, Christianity is proved, and not some other religion. Now the task is to show that the Trinity doctrine belongs to Christianity *essentially*. This is because it may be objected that, while Christianity is uniquely triune among the religions, this is a doctrine which has been foisted on Christianity from outside, from Platonism or elsewhere, and so it cannot be a scientific proof the Jesus is the true God. Many people have in fact claimed this. But they are wrong, because in fact the doctrine of the perichoretic self-developing Trinity can be discerned within the scriptures.

Let us begin this demonstration by examining the Greek text of John 1:1. Which is as follows: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. This verse is usually translated into English as: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. This is not strictly speaking wrong, except that two things come out in the Greek version which are slightly obscured in English. *First*, the Greek word ‘pros’ in the second clause has a meaning of ‘towards’, which suggests a kind of forward directionality or outward procession. *Second*, the word order in Greek is the reverse of the translation, because Greek allows for placing the predicate first. Logos is still in the subject position in the Greek (the subject is designated by the article: ὁ).

By putting the two foregoing observations together, we can discern that the whole of John 1:1 has the general shape of the triune progression, which is as follows: there is first of all a *monad*, this monad proceeds outward towards an other, opposite the first, bringing itself into relation to it and thus forming a *dyad*; but then this second, to which the initial monad is related, turns out to be identical to the first, so the journey outward is just as much a return journey; the whole thus assumed the shape of a circle which *makes itself into a circle* by passing through three phases: the monad, the dyad, and then a return to the monad which preserves the first two within itself, and thus constitutes a distinct monad which makes the whole an interrelation triunity.

That is the basic form of perichoretic triunity, which is discernible in John 1:1 – in the beginning was the Logos (A by itself); and the Logos was in relation to the Theos (A proceeds to B); and Theos was the Logos (B returns back to A, resulting in

C). These three phases may be roughly designated as *abiding*, *proceeding*, and *reverting*. But they could also be designated as *monadic*, *dyadic*, and *triadic*; or just as well as *universal*, *particular*, and *singular*; or as *immediate*, *mediate*, and *self-mediating*; or as *being*, *doing*, and *thinking*. All of these descriptions are more or less accurate. Monadic-dyadic-triadic seems to be the most widely applicable, whereas abiding-proceeding-reverting is the most descriptive.

The foregoing may be called the form of love in general. It is what is contained in the command: to love your neighbor as yourself. It is not merely said, that we are to love our neighbor. Rather, we should love him *as we love ourselves*, which means that our love for our neighbor is a relation which extends from ourselves towards the other, but in reaching the other, at the very same moment reaches into the very heart of the self, revealing self and other to be one.

As we said, the basic progression which goes monadic-dyadic-triadic may be more concretely described as abiding-proceeding-reverting. And this is not an arbitrary choice on the part of the author, but has its origin in scripture. In order to see this, let us turn to John 1:33. The English version is: 'He upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining [καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον] on him, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.' The word for 'remaining' is μένον which can also be translated as 'abiding'. They mean the same thing: that it stays in place, is at rest. And the word for 'descending' is καταβαῖνον which means literally 'to come down' but it is also a word with a long history pertaining to the classic hero's journey: the hero departs from his point of origin to go into a foreign world, where he fights some battle, and then returns back to the origin. So 'katabasis' is synonymous with 'procession', because it is the departure from the origin. The departure of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden is likewise a 'katabasis', i.e. a descent, a *fall*.

Now we can understand the properties of the persons of the Christian Trinity more determinately: the Father is the one who abides in the beginning. He is the *monad*, the One, who "no one has ever seen" (John 1:18). No one has seen Him because he dwells in heaven and does not come out (1 Timothy 6:15-16). The monad is revealed by the *dyadic other*, the Son, who is the *image* of the Father (Colossians 1:15) and the *representation* of the Father (Hebrews 1:3). The Son is the one who descends to Earth and "makes known" the ineffable monad (John 1:18). He is the procession from the Father. The Holy Spirit for its part also proceeds from the Father (John 15:26), but he also has the role of abiding on the Son (John 1:33) and dwelling in the hearts of believers (Romans 8:9, 1 Corinthians 3:16). Abiding



means the same as dwelling: it remains in place and rests there. And this descending and abiding is made possible by the Son's mediation, i.e. his descending and ascending (procession and reversion): "It is to your advantage that I go away; for if I do not go away, the Helper will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send Him to you" (John 16:7). The journey of the Son to Earth and back to heaven, is the mediation through which the Spirit is able to both descend and abide. The Father abides, the Son descends, and *through* the Son's descending and ascending is able to abide in man and thus reconcile man to God.

Or if the whole Trinity is understood as a syllogism, it would look like this:

1. God is the Son (Father)
2. The Son is man (Son)
3. Therefore, God is man (Holy Spirit)

The Son is the mediator between God and man (1 Timothy 2:5-6, Hebrews 8:6, Hebrews 9:15, Hebrews 12:24). The Holy Spirit, by contrast, is not said to be mediator, but rather he is the result, since he is literally living and being in our hearts (Galatians 4:6, 2 Corinthians 1:22), abiding in our inner being (Ephesians 3:16, John 7:38-39). And that is why, in the above syllogism, it is appropriate to place the Son in the position of the middle term connecting God and man, and to say that the first premise is to the Father, as the second is to the Son, as the third is to the Holy Spirit. This is likewise why Jesus is called both 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man', because he perfectly reconciles these *extremes*.

Now it has been demonstrated that the Triunity doctrine is not something foisted on Christianity from beyond, e.g. from Platonism, but that scripture itself testifies that God is a self-developing perichoretic Triunity who is accurately represented by a syllogism connecting God and man, and who may be seen to have the general form of abiding-proceeding-reverting, or unmediated-mediating-mediated. These latter characterizations are rough but do obtain in general, and serve to helpfully make sturdy our bridge from knowledge to faith.

### Section 3: Christianity is *the* Triune Religion

The purpose of the previous two sections has been to produce the following result: that we know that Christianity is *the* Triune Religion. This means that 'triune' is almost synonymous with 'Christian'. When we say of something, that it has the predicate 'triune', this should connect is essentially with Christianity and thus with Jesus, as if by a kind of signature. Therefore if such and such a phenomenon may be shown to be authentically triune, genuinely triune, therefore we may with right say that it belongs to Jesus Christ.

Now let us turn to the conclusion of this brief essay, which brings Chapter I and Chapter II together into a unity, and thereby establishes the conclusion, which is the proof of God's identity, that the true God is the Christian God, namely Jesus Christ.

## Chapter III: Science is Christian

In the first chapter we established definitely, and in detail, the way in which science is essentially triune. This means that science has triunity as its basic form, which is the form of reason in general: the shape of the *λόγος*, which is the power of thinking and speaking, which only human beings possess and not animals.

In the second chapter, we demonstrated that Christianity is essentially and uniquely triune, and that it is therefore *the* triune religion. ‘Triunity’ and ‘Christianity’ are basically synonymous, so that whatever is triune may be said to be Christian in the sense of belonging to Christianity and to the Christian God, who is Himself triune and who has left his mark on his creation, and this is the reason why creation is triune.

The first two premises therefore go in a circle: the creation exhibits triunity essentially, and the knowledge of the truth of creation and creating beings is a triune knowledge, which is this perichoretic, circular form. And this triune form acts as a mark which refers back to the Creator, who created the creation in this way because He Himself is triune and wanted to make Himself known through the creation. This is stated by Paul in Romans: "For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse." (Romans 1:20)

The first premise of the proof is: Science is Triune. The second premise is: Triunity is Christian. The conclusion is: therefore, Science is Christian. And therefore it is scientifically true that Jesus Christ is God, since He alone is truly the Triune God. This proof is a bridge from knowledge to faith. Whoever travels along it will win his soul. The order of the premises is also reversible, and the conclusion may be said to be that ‘Christianity is Scientific’. In any case, the proof satisfies the high standard set by Paul the Apostle, that we should “demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God” and “take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ.” (2 Corinthians 10:5)

Amen.