

**TRINITY AND DIALECTICS:
THEOLOGICAL LINEAGE TO HEGEL'S
PHILOSOPHY**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

GAICHUIMEILU PALMEI



**CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI- 110067**

2012

*To
My Mom
And
My Dad*



**CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067**

23th July 2012

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled “**TRINITY AND DIALECTICS: THEOLOGICAL LINEAGE TO HEGEL’S PHILOSOPHY**”, submitted by Ms.Gaichuimeilu Palmei in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is an original work and has not been submitted in part or in full for any other degree or diploma of this University or any other university.

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Professor R P Singh
(Chairperson)
Centre for Philosophy

Professor R P Singh
(Supervisor)
Centre for Philosophy

DECLARATION

I, Gaichuimeilu Palmei, declare that the dissertation entitled “**TRINITY AND DIALECTICS: THEOLOGICAL LINEAGE TO HEGEL’S PHILOSOPHY**”, submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my own work and has not been submitted in part or in full for any other degree of this University or any other university.

Gaichuimeilu Palmei

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The all sufficient grace and the bountiful supply of God strengthen me in writing my dissertation. I am overwhelmingly thankful to Him for His endless blessings.

My earnest gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. R.P. Singh, who has helped me with his unbending intellectual guidance, cooperation and persistent support that has molded my work. Without his patience and commitment I won't have accomplished my dissertation.

I am thankful to Thangboi, for willingly lending a helping hand with encouragement and moral support. Heartfelt thanks goes to Saya Okram, Thanggoulen, Oliver Gonsalves, Lammin and Akho, who spared their valuable time in prove reading despite of their busy schedules. Sincere thanks to Ruth for her endearing support and advice. I am also grateful to my class mates particularly Varun Sharma for helping me in collecting study material.

Thanks to all the faculty members of Centre for Philosophy for shaping my academic knowledge. I am also thankful to the JNU Library for its sufficiency in laying out sources for my research paper.

I won't have stand where I am now without the constant love and prayers from my family members, especially Pamela, Palmei and his wife Jane and Benjamin. Thanks to all the brothers and sisters from church in New Delhi and Gurgaon for holding me in prayers.

Gaichuimeilu Palmei

PREFACE

This dissertation will analyse Trinity and Dialectics and bring out a theological lineage to Hegel's philosophy. Trinity is the most operative term in Judeo-Christian theological tradition in as much as Dialectics is the theory-loaded and elevated concept in philosophical discourse from Heraclitus (500BCE) to G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831). Trinity is embedded and unfolded in myths and commandments whereas Dialectics has logic and dialogue. However the insight into dialectics in terms of subjective, objective and absolute spirit lies in the triune i.e. the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition is a doctrine of the three divinities namely, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit that is incorporated and mutually co-inheres in one another. They are the Three-in-one God whereby God is manifested in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the consummation of the Triune God.

Likewise, Hegel's dialectics of Spirit (*Geist*) is the unity of the subjective, the objective and the absolute on the same line of argument as that of the concept of Trinity. Dialectics has two operative terms, contradiction and sublation and it is substantiated by three principles namely, unity and struggle of the opposites, quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes and vice versa, and negation of negation. Hegel resolves contradiction between subjective and objective spirit and synthesizes them as one whole without eliminating the distinctive features. Sublation overcomes contradictions and elevates them to a higher level where unity in differences is seen.

The Holy Spirit and Hegel's Spirit have a common feature in the sense that both serve as mediation between dialectically opposite aspects of the absolute. Hegel's absolute spirit mediated objective spirit and subjective spirit in the same way that the Holy Spirit incorporates the Father and the Son as one entity. Trinity therefore presents the theological lineage to Hegel's Dialectics.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Introduction	1-9
2. Chapter One: Concept of Trinity in Judeo-Christian Tradition	10-32
2.1 Trinity in the <i>Old Testament</i>	13-14
2.2 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as one	15-16
2.3 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit being the three aspects of God	16-17
2.4 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being God	17-18
2.5 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being eternal	18
2.6 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit coexist concurrently	19
2.7 Coinherence and inseparability of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit	20-21
2.8 The Son being the embodiment of the triune God	22-23
2.9 The Holy Spirit being the ultimate consummation of the triune God	23-25
2.10 Concept of Redemption	26-32
3. Chapter Two: Dialectics of Hegel	33-61
3.1 From <i>Mythos</i> to <i>Logos</i>	33-36
3.2 From <i>Logos</i> to Dialogue	36-43
3.3 Dialectics	43-61
4. Chapter Three: Trinity and Dialectics	62-92
4.1 The Holy Spirit: the ultimate consummation of the triune God	62-65
4.2 The purpose of the triune God being the Holy Spirit	66-67
4.3 The functions of the Holy Spirit	68-72
4.3.1 Sanctifying Spirit	68
4.3.2 Transforming Spirit	69

4.3.3 Anointing Spirit	69- 70
4.3.4 Transmitting Spirit	70
4.3.5 The Spirit of the body	70-72
4.4 Hegel's <i>Geist</i>	72-84
4.5 Hegel as a Christian philosopher	84-92
5. Conclusion	93-97
6. Bibliography	98-103

INTRODUCTION

G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831), one of the most influential figures in German Idealism and his epistemological position where he incorporates dialectics into logic, is undoubtedly the most developed philosophical system. Interestingly, he vindicates dialectical system in which moment of growth in human history is always in an ascending order in a circular manner, always moving towards from less perfect to perfection. No doubt, Hegelian system is an inclusive whole in which everything exists with its inevitable contradiction and that, it is dialectical reason that resolves contradictions and transforms them to an elevated level. Therefore, this study attempts to present a discussion on Trinity and Dialectics, and highlight a theological lineage to Hegel's philosophy.

With Hegel comes the end of dualism that Kant laid down in his *Critique of Pure Reason*.¹ It is pivotal to see from where Hegel conceives the idea of dialectic. It is evident that Hegel is influenced by Christian theology and that he got the idea of dialectic from Judeo-Christian concept of Trinity. Hegel therefore called Christianity the absolute religion because it has for its content the absolute truth.² Trinity consists of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. They are the three aspects of one God; in substance three, in essence they are one. They are the three-in-one God, Triune God. The Holy Spirit is the application of the Triune God in reality. The concept of Holy Spirit can be compared to Hegel's *Geist* or spirit which serves as mediation between two opposite poles or say two contradictory terms and brings unity in differences. My attempt in the dissertation is to see the connection between Judeo-Christian concept of Trinity and Hegel's Dialectic. I propose to bring into light the distinctions and the similarities that exist between Trinity and Dialectic. In order to organize my discussion I have divided the present study into three chapters. A brief outlay of the chapters is given below.

Chapter 1 will be a discourse on the concept of Trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition to elucidate the paradoxical relation among the Father, the Son and the Spirit. Concept of Trinity is perceived by an outsider as a myth but a believer will view it from

¹ Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 396-415.

²Stace, *The Philosophy of Hegel, A Systematic Exposition*, p. 509.

the point of faith. So it is important to see how a Christian would perceive the Trinity. According to Judeo Christianity, Trinity is not just a doctrine of the Father, the Son and the Spirit but is for the dispensation of God into man. *Bible* being given in the form of commandment, narrative method will be applied in the discussion with the assist of hermeneutic to enumerate the paradoxical connection among the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

In the *Bible* it is given that God created man in His image and likeness which means man was created to express God.³ The *Bible* is God speaking in the form of commandment and man has the responsibility to obey it. Failure to follow the commandment of God leads to sin. The first man Adam thus committed sin by disobeying God's commandment. Initially, God commanded Adam and Eve to eat the tree of life which signifies God Himself so that they can express God to fulfilled God's heart desire.⁴ But man partook of the wrong tree, that is tree of knowledge of good and evil and that issue in sin. After having committed the sin, man can no longer fulfill God's desire.

Man's sin did not deter God from fulfilling His purpose in creating man. In order to bring man back to Him, God has to become the processed Triune God. Since man is sinful, he is incapable of receiving the Holy and Righteous God into his being. So God has to come down at a human level to woo man back to Himself. God, the Father, in His divinity as the source sent forth His Son. One has to keep in mind that the coming of the Son is with the Father. God the Father in the image of His Son possessed humanity and lived a human life and passed through death and redemption in order to redeem man back to God.⁵ Through redemption, man and God are reconciled and thus they can become one. After passing through death, the Son with the Father became the life giving Spirit in resurrection.⁶ As the Spirit, God can enter into man and dwell in man. The Spirit is in the Father and with the Son. The Spirit is the reality of the Triune God.

³*The Holy Bible, Old Testament, Genesis 1:26.*

⁴*Ibid. Genesis 2:16-7.*

⁵*Ibid. New Testament, I Peter 1:24.*

⁶*Ibid. I Corinthians 15:45.*

The Father is the source, the Son is the course and the Spirit is the application. In Judeo-Christian tradition, the concept of Trinity is for God to dispense Himself into man, to make man the same as He is in life and in nature but not in the God head. What makes Trinity real to the believer is the Spirit. One has to keep in mind that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are one. They are not three different Gods, but the three-in-one God. God is three in its aspect but in its essence they are one. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are not three separate Gods, they are one. They mutually coinhere one another; therefore they can never be divided. In their oneness, one has to keep in mind that their unique character is still retained which means their distinctive nature is not eliminated in their being one. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are three in their functions but they are strictly one God. The Spirit makes God real to the believer, real in the sense of experience. After God becomes the Spirit, He can enter into man and be one with men. So, the Spirit is the ultimate consummation of the Triune God by which God becomes enterable, experience-able, enjoyable and contactable.

Chapter 2 will consist the examination of Hegel's dialectics. As a matter of fact, dialectic is an elevated doctrine and is theory-loaded. The form of dialectic can be traced as early as in Greek philosophy, particularly in Socrates dialogue. I will explicate Hegel's dialectic by highlighting the form of development that took place in epistemology starting from myths and then go on to *logos*. And from *logos* to dialogues and eventually proceed to Hegel's dialectics. It is important to start with myths because they were one of the earliest forms of knowledge and have borne considerable influence on the thought and actions of people. To explain the significant role of myths I will take up the concept of trinity especially in Judeo-Christian tradition with reference to Creation, Man in the Image of God, Sin, Redemption, etc. For a Christian, the *Bible* is God's commandment and therefore he believes in it and has the inner urge to obey it. But an outsider will consider what is written in the *Bible* as mythical. Myths are like the creation of the Universe by God. Another myth is like God creating Adam and Eve and commanding them to eat the tree of life but forbidding them to eat the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The tree of life signifies God Himself as life whereas the tree of knowledge of good

and evil signifies Satan as death and sin. The concept of sin is also a kind of myth to the outsider. Sin enters into the world through Adam the first man. The concept of sin is followed by the concept of redemption that paves the way for God and man to reconcile. Another significant myth is the concept of Trinity where the Father, the Son and the Spirit are portrayed as one in spite of their being three persons. Receiving God in its three aspects is to gain the kingdom of God which is also called paradise by an outsider. These are the myths that prevail in the life of a Christian.

The early Greek philosophers are believed to be foremost in questioning the cogency of myths and Heraclitus was one of them. Heraclitus came up with the notion of *Logos* which basically means *word, reason, logic*. He used two terms that is '*logos*' and '*nomos*', the former refer to the inward law and the later refer to the outward law.⁷ *Logos* generally is the law of mind that generates idea that does not necessarily conform to the law outside. On the other hand, *nomos* is the law underlying in the process that takes place in the world specifically change. Heraclitus shakes the idea of permanence by asserting that everything is in flux and that everything is temporary. Heraclitus usage of *logos* can be interpreted as intelligence by which reason set light on the reality of change that takes place in the world process. In Heraclitus, there is a movement from actuality to the world of words that means there is a link between rational discourse and the world's rational structure. Thus, there is a transition taking place in the field of knowledge and indeed it is a growing phenomenon.

Dialogue is derived from '*dia*' which means two and '*logos*' which stands for word. Dialogue is a method which is conducted with the sole purpose of attaining the truth. It consists of two parties, dealing with the same topic and speaking the same language. It is done in a conversational style where there are contradictions and as the dialogue proceeds further in due course it arrives at consensus which is considered to be the most precise truth. The use of dialogue as a method is best seen in Socrates. In Socrates' dialogue, agreement and disagreement are seen as a tool for acquiring the truth. This method leaves no room for dogmatic slumber because absolute contradictions have

⁷Bogomolov, *History of Ancient Philosophy Greece and Rome*, p.54.

no room for consensus. Socrates' dialogue is carried out as an intellectual debate aiming at the most accurate truth.⁸

There is a transition of knowledge from *logos* to *dia-logos* in Socrates' dialogues. But knowledge does not stop growing and so it moves forward to dialectic. Dialectic is supposed to be a higher state of arriving at the truth. Accordingly, dialectic means any formal system of reasoning that arrives at the truth by the exchange of logical argument. Hegel develops his notion of dialectic from Kant's dialectic. Kant has given the distinction of reason, understanding and sensibility. Reason has the three ideals namely, God, immortality and freedom. By understanding, he means the categories which are required to give meanings to sensibility. But when categories of understanding are applied to absolute or unconditioned we come across antinomies. These are the contradictions which human mind cannot help but think. It is in the realm of reason that Kant develops his four antinomies – finite and infinite, simple and complex, freedom and causality, conditioned and unconditioned. According to Hegel, Kant is caught up in the web of dualism where reason is incapable of resolving contradictions though it can explicitly illustrate. It is at this juncture where Hegel appears to solve the dualism which Kant is unable to deal with.

Hegel uses dialectic reason to resolve contradictions. According to him, everything that exists has an inherent nature of contradiction.⁹ So contradiction can never be eradicated, it has to be elevated to higher grounds of thinking. For Hegel, understanding makes known contradictions by distinguishing the particular from the universal and from the one to many. It identifies things in their distinctive nature and does not mix it with the other. Reason on the other hand, tries to resolve contradictions given by understanding. Hegel's dialectic has two operative terms—contradiction and sublation. Dialectic reason sublates contradictions and transforms them into higher state. In sublation, the distinctive identity is not eliminated but is maintained and it shows the interdependence of each contradiction. It can be best illustrated by using Hegel's concept

⁸Plato, *Plato the Republic*, p.130-39.

⁹Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p.11

of being, nothing and becoming. For Hegel, being has the capacity to become anything concrete so it can be taken as empty concept. Nothing on the other hand is void and empty and incapable of becoming anything. Becoming negates and unites Being and Nothing and thus there is unity in differences. In dialectic reason, there is combination of contradictions as one but their distinctness is retained.

Hegel also propounded three principles of dialectic¹⁰ firstly; unity and struggle of the opposites can be explained by the notion of becoming. Becoming negates what Being and Nothing is and sublate them into one. But this sublation does not exterminate their respective nature. In this principle one see there is unity in Being and Nothing in the sense of their being empty and Becoming unites them. At the same time there is also struggle where being has the capacity to become something and nothing is utter voidness incapable of becoming. Therefore Becoming negates their differences and maintains their identity. Second principle is transition from quantity to quality. Hegel states that change takes place because of quantitative change. Increase in quantity leads to qualitative change. And the third principle is negation of negation. This principle is the development of lower stage into higher stage because the unity of the opposite is accomplished by not excluding each other but by passing on to each other. The negation of being and nothing by becoming is not complete negation because being and nothing on one hand is similar to becoming in terms of their emptiness. Becoming is also empty since it has not become something though it has the potentialities like being to become anything. It is negation of negation in the sense that it negates something, but by this negation, that something is not excluded and passes on to an elevated level where there is inclusive whole.

Chapter 3 will compare and contrast Trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition and Hegel's dialectic. Trinity has developed in terms of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. They are the three aspects of one God. There is a relation and differences among these three doctrines and the *Bible* as a written commandment justifies the three-in-one God. Hegel has appreciated the relation and difference among the Father, the Son and the Spirit but he has developed a philosophical perspective known as dialectic. Dialectic has

¹⁰Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 62.

evolved out of the terms like contradiction and sublation including the three law of dialectic. My attempt in this chapter is to enunciate Trinity and dialectic by taking up Holy Spirit as the central doctrine in Trinity and by locating Hegel's *Geist* or spirit as central to his dialectic. This chapter will also discuss Hegel as a Christian philosopher with a view to throw light on the impact of Christianity in his philosophical thinking and bring out a theological lineage to his philosophy.

Judeo-Christian tradition believes that the Holy Spirit is the ultimate consummation of the processed Triune God. The concept of Trinity is developed for the purpose of bringing God into man and man into God. Trinity consists of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit and it is to show God's love for man that man's sin did not deter God to become the processed God to be able to reach man. The Father, the Son and the Spirit become one in God's dispensational grace. Why does God become the Holy Spirit? God the Father in His divinity, being the almighty and holy cannot enter into man since man will be consumed by His Holiness. God, the Son too cannot dispense himself into man since in His humanity, He is a man of flesh and blood. As a human being, He cannot get inside man. But as the Spirit, He can impart Himself into man and thus can become one with man. God became the Spirit in order to make man the same as He is. Trinity is made real because of the Spirit. In other words, Trinity is the actuality of God reaching man. Without the Spirit, the concept of Trinity will be a mere doctrine with no application in reality. In the *Bible*, there are innumerable evidences of the Spirit being the application of God to the believer. I intend to examine the Holy Spirit's functions in order to depict its similarities with Hegel's spirit.

Hegel's *Geist* or spirit on the other hand is a doctrine about the relationship between thought and objective reality.¹¹ Hegel's spirit serves as mediation between subjective thought which he refers to as idea and objective reality which he identifies with nature. Idea and nature are opposites dialectically and spirit is the uniting bond between them. Hegel's notion of spirit is solely for epistemological quest. Hegel established three kinds of spirit – subjective spirit, objective spirit and absolute spirit.

¹¹Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, pp. 103-208.

Subjective spirit can be identified with idea and he also called it as anthropology. It is logic which generates idea irrespective of its existence in reality. Objective Spirit can be considered as nature and it is also called phenomenology. It deals with the nature of thing as they appear to the subject and the subject use his mind to extract something out of it. Finally, absolute spirit is reality of reason and he called it psychology. It is where the two opposite spirits are united to be one without terminating their distinction. Absolute spirit is the meeting ground of agreement in disagreement, or say, identity in differences. These three kinds of spirits can be compared to the Holy Spirit where the Spirit serves as a medium for the Father and the Son to be one. Subjective spirit of Hegel can be compared to the concept of God, the Father as the origins of all things, existing in His divinity. Objective Spirit can be equated with God, the Son as the course or way to reach mankind in His humanity. And the absolute spirit is similar to the Holy Spirit that flows as the means to unite the Father and the Son as one and impart Himself into man. Like Hegel's spirit, the Holy Spirit is the mediation between the Father and the Son. Thus, the three become the Triune God, that is the three-in-one God but their distinctive function is not eliminated by their oneness.

Hegel as a Christian philosopher indeed re-creates the triadic movement in Christianity into his philosophical system. He philosophizes the concept of Trinity and formulates his dialectical reason. Reason is seen as spirit by Hegel and its function is similar to Christian Holy Spirit. Hegel's spirit and the Holy Spirit both operate as the mediation between dialectic opposites. By comparing Hegel's spirit and Holy Spirit one can explicitly observe that Hegel is influenced by Christian theology. It is believed that he got his notion of spirit from the Christian Holy Spirit. Not only that, Trinity as the movement of three persons in one God head is also seen in Hegel. His philosophical system can be all outlines in triadic movement. He also took the concept of redemption in Christianity in his dialectical system where two contradictions are mediated as one with two aspects of identity. In the concept of redemption too, God and man are contradictory in life and in nature but through redemption God and man are reconciled and can become one. In becoming one, God is still God and man is still man, they are not conglomerated into something new. Hegel's dialectic reason like Christian redemption

brings unity in differences. Thus, it is possible to read Hegel as a Christian philosopher not only that, one can identify theological lineage in his philosophy.

CHAPTER ONE
CONCEPT OF TRINITY IN
JUDEO - CHRISTIAN TRADITION

This chapter will throw light to the concept of trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition. Trinity is viewed by an outsider as myth which has symbolic expressions. Judeo-Christians viewed trinity from the point of belief. It is believed that God becomes triune so that He can reach man and be one with man. The concept of trinity as perceived by an outsider is metaphorical, which indicates that God is one yet three in its aspects for the purpose of bridging the gap between man and God. I intend to give an elaborate explanation of the paradoxical relation of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. I will also bring out the underlying meaning of the paradoxical connection between the Father, the Son and the Spirit. One thing which is to be noted is that in the *Bible* the word of God is given in the form of commandments which the believers are obliged to follow. The first, so to say, commandment given by God to man is not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But man disobeyed it and thus sin enters into the world. In order to redeem man back to God, God has to become the processed triune God that is the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

This chapter will explicate the concept of trinity in relation to the *Bible* under the following heads – 1)Trinity in the *Old Testament*, 2)the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as one, 3)the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit the three aspects of one God, 4)the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being God, 5)the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being eternal, 6)the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit coexist concurrently, 7)coherence and inseparability of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, 8) the Son being the embodiment of the triune God, 9)the Holy Spirit being the ultimate consummation of the triune God, and 10) concept of Redemption.

Narrative method will be employed to describe the concept of trinity since everything given in the *Bible* is in the form of commandments. And these commandments were given in relation to the situation and condition of mankind during those respective times. In order to explain the mythical connection of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, hermeneutics as a method will be employed. To prove the co-existence of the Father, the son and the Spirit I will quote from the *Bible* and explain the meaning of each verses. My intention is to give an elaborate explanation of the relationship of the Father,

the Son and the Spirit with the help of hermeneutics to show that they are not three separate divinities but one God.

According to Judeo-Christian tradition, the Triune God – the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is the creator of man. It is believed that the creation of man is tied up with the divine trinity. Based on the *Bible*, *Genesis 1:26* says, “And God said, let us make man in our image according to our likeness.”¹ It was not merely God who created man but it is the Triune God – the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. In this given verse we see plural pronouns *us* and *our* which indicate that the divine trinity is involved in man’s creation. When we examine this verse it seems that before God came to create man, the Triune God – the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit were having a sort of “*Godhead conference* among the Trinity , to make decision concerning how man is to be created in His image and after His likeness.”² From the above lines we can observe that the creation of man was for the purpose of the Triune God. In Judeo-Christian tradition, Man being made in the image and the likeness of God was for the purpose of fulfilling God heart’s desire that is, He wants man to be His expression and to have dominion over all the created things. *Zechariah 12:1* says that God stretched forth the heavens, laid the foundation of the earth, and formed the spirit of man within him. According to this verse we see that “the heavens are for the earth, the earth is for man and man has a spirit for God so that God can produce many sons for his corporate expression.”³

It is crucial to determine the need of the concept of Trinity in Judeo-Christian traditions. It is assumed that the reason for God to be Triune, which is three-in-one, which is God, wants to dispense Himself into man so that man can be His corporate expression, to be the body of Christ that is the Church. *2 Corinthians 13:14* says, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all”. In this verse three things are given that are grace, love, and fellowship. This sets forth the reason why God is triune: it is thus that He can dispense Himself into man, work

¹*The Holy Bible, Old Testament, Genesis 1:26.*

²Lee, *Basic Lessons on Life*. Living Stream Ministry, p. 8.

³Lee, *The Issue of the Dispensing of the Processed Trinity and the Transmitting of the Transcending Christ*, p.10.

Himself into man for man to enjoy and be their all.⁴ The interpretation of this verse is that, the love of God can be referred to the love of the Father which is the source; the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ refers to the grace of the Son that is the reaching out of the love of the Father. And the fellowship of the Holy Spirit is the Spirit entering into the believer of the grace of the Son along with the love of the Father. The Father is the source, the Son is the manifestation and the Spirit is the transmission that is transmitting the love of the Father and the grace of the Son. From this we notice that, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are not three different things but three stages of one thing for man to possess and enjoy.

According to Judeo-Christian tradition, the concept of trinity is for man to be able to possess God into their being and fulfill the intention of God that is to express Him. Judeo-Christians believe that God is holy and righteous therefore man can not approach God. God who had a purpose in creating man did not give up man in spite of his iniquities. God the Father sent forth His Son who is called Jesus incarnated as a man (*Mathew 1:21*) to live on this earth and who was crucified for the sinners. After His death He was resurrected and became the life giving Spirit (*1 Corinthians 15:45*). Now as the Spirit, God can enter into man and be in their life to be their expression. Thus, God had to pass through a process in order for man to partake of Him. Without God being Triune, man cannot participate in the life God: God will be outside of man and man can have no access to God. The triune God- the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are not three different Gods but one God in its three aspects. They are not separate but distinct from each other. When the Father sent forth the Son, He was with the Son and the Spirit, and when the Son came He came with the Father and the Spirit, and the flowing of the Spirit is also with the Father and the Son. In substance three in essence all are one.

⁴Lee, *Truth Lesson Level One, Volume 1*, p. 22.

2.1 Trinity in the *Old Testament*

Before God became the processed Triune God, many instances in the *Old Testament* testify concerning trinity in the form of myths. The role of myth in the *Old Testament* is given in a narrative approach since everything is conveyed by God to His children through His commandment. I intend to highlight few verses in the *Old Testament* that talks about trinity in order to give an idea that the concept of trinity already existed even before the birth of Christ who is the reality of this concept. In the *Old Testament*, trinity is given in symbolic manner. It was in the form of types and figures, for instance in *Genesis 1:26* as I have mentioned this verse before, *the One God* refers to *us* which means God is plural; but the Hebrew word used for *image* of God is singular. Therefore this means that God is Triune - three-in-one. In His relation with man He is triune. After the fall of man in *Genesis 3:22*, God again refers to Himself in a plural pronoun – “The Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.”⁵ In *Genesis 11*, man had become so rebellious towards God that they built Babel tower to reach heaven. “Then God said, “Let us go down...” (*Gen. 3:22*). Here again plural *us* is used by God to refer to Himself.”⁶ From these given verses we can clearly see that God use plural as a reference to Himself in His relation with man. Thus, this proves that God is triune even before Christ came in order to deal with the fallen and rebellious man. I want to draw your attention here that God never used plural to refer to Himself to other created things but He used plural only when He was dealing with man. This also indicates that the concept of trinity is used for the sole reason of God’s dispensation even in the *Old Testament*.

Another instance of the triune God being revealed in the *Old Testament* is in the book of *Exodus 3:6*, the Lord said to Moses, “I am the God of thy Father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” As I mentioned earlier, the concept of trinity is applied to man. Here in this verse, “the God of Abraham signifies the Father, who called out Abraham from the fallen race which also means the Father calling out

⁵Nee, *The Triune God, A Lesson Book-Level Two*, p. 36.

⁶*Ibid.*, p.p. 36-37.

sinner to carry out His purpose and inherit His blessings (*1 Corinthians 1:9, Ephesians 1:3-5*). The God of Isaac indicates the Son, who was promised and offered back to God which means the Son who was sent by God and was offered back to God through death and resurrection. Lastly in Jacob's experience we see the Spirit because he was always under the dealing of God. He wanted to turn things the way he wanted but God arranged an environment for him which forced him to trust in God. Jacob's experience represents the transforming work of the Spirit."⁷

The Golden *Lampstand* in *Exodus 25* also symbolized the triune God. *Lampstand* consists of three important things namely, gold, stand and the lamp. The *Lampstand* was made of gold. Gold signifies God's divine nature that is unchanging referring to the Father who is the source and the essence. This golden *Lampstand* was beaten in the form and shape of the stand. This means that the gold was embodied into a shape; the shape is God the Son, in whom all the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily (*Colossians 2:9*). Lastly, the *Lampstand's* shining which is for expression signifies the Triune God being express through the Spirit. In short, its substance is the Father, its form and shape is the Son and its expression is the Spirit.⁸

Evidence, which is worth to point out, is in *Exodus 17* which again depicts the trinity as the cleft of rock. "The children of Israel were thirsty in the wilderness and the Lord told Moses to strike the rock with his rod and out came the water to quench the thirst. *1 Corinthians 10:4* says, "the rock is Christ" and Moses with the rod represents the authority of God's law. Moses striking the rock with his rod symbolized that when Christ died on the cross He was judged by God's law. The water that flowed out of the smitten rock is the Spirit which issued out of the judgment on Christ when He died on the cross (*John 14:34*)."⁹ These are the few portions among many which reveal trinity in the *Old Testament*. Now, I intend to proceed further to extract evidences from the *Bible* to elucidate the concept of trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition.

⁷Ibid., p.37.

⁸Ibid., p.38.

⁹Ibid., p.39.

2.2 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as one

My contention at this point is to present the connection of the Father, the Son and the Spirit in Judeo-Christianity which is considered by an outsider as a myth. Though they are three, they can never be separate from each other. There is distinction between them but they indwell one another which means they are not three Gods but One that is the three-in-one God. There may be an emphasis on one but the presence of only one does not nihilate the existence of the other two. The coming of one of the three does not come in isolation but it is always accompanied by the other two as well which means that they are always together. They are never separate in being or in action but they mutually cohere and indwell in one another. The Father can not be replaced by the Son and the Son cannot be replaced by the Spirit. The existence of one implies that all the three exist together irrespective of the limitation of time and space in a sense that they exist together as one from eternity past to the eternity future. Their being One yet three is not bounded by time or space: they coexist together.

To illustrate the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit being One, It would be appropriate to quote few relevant verses from the *Bible*. To begin with, *1 Corinthians 8:4* says, “There is no God but One” and *Isaiah 45:5* says, “I am the Lord, and there is no God besides me”. From the given verses we can lucidly point out that there is one God which means the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one. To prove this further, there are many more verses like *Isaiah 45:6, 21, 22 ; 46:9, 44:6,8* which emphasis on the same words that is ‘no God but one’. But these verses which depict one God do not negate the existence of the three aspects of God – Father, Son and Spirit. Even when God refer to Himself as one He is not denying the fact that He has three substances. The emphasis may be on one but the three always exist as one. In the given verses, “God repeatedly says “there is no God besides me”. He does not say there is no God besides us, but, there is no God besides me. Me is singular, only one. These repeated declarations of God give enough evidence that God is uniquely one.”¹⁰ To shore up God being one, here I quote another verse from the *Bible* that is *Psalms 86:10*, “Thou art God alone”. The

¹⁰ Lee, *Truth Lesson Level One, Volume I*, p.p. 14-15.

emphasis here is not *Ye are God alone* but it says *Thou art God alone*. This clearly indicates that God is one and it is a definite revelation in the scripture; it is also a fundamental and consummate principle.¹¹ I assume that I have quoted necessary verses from the *Bible* to demonstrate that the triune God – Father, Son and Spirit is one.

2.3 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit being the three aspects of God

It would be appropriate to take into account of God having the three aspects - Father, Son and Spirit in Judeo-Christian tradition. As pointed out earlier, one can not ignore God as one, but at the same time, one need to bear in mind that they are three-in-one God. Though God is one, one can not deny the three aspects of God because God being three aspects has very much to do with man. If God does not have three facets, mankind would have no involvement with God as their life. And God will be outside man, unapproachable but He is three-in-one God so man can effortlessly approach God. In accordance to what I have put forward I wish to quote few verses from the *Bible*. *Isaiah 6:8* says, “Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?” Here again, God uses the plural word *us* to refer to Himself and yet He also used *I* which is singular. Now the *I* is *us* and the *us* is *I* which unmistakably indicates that God has three aspects.¹² Moreover in *Genesis 1:26* we also see *us* and *our* to refer to Himself. It is quite intriguing that why would God use plural words like *us* and *our* to point it to Himself. I presuppose that He used it in order to specify that He is the three-in-one God. The evidences from the *Bible* explain that God is triune in spite of His being one. According to Judeo-Christianity, God having the three aspects is for His dispensation.

The matter of the Father, the Son and the Spirit can also be seen in *Matthew 28:19* which says, “Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Spirit”. This verse speaks of the three-Father, Son and Spirit. “But when the Lord speaks here of the name of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, the name which is used is in the singular form number in the original text. This connotes that though the Father, the

¹¹Ibid., p.p.14-15.

¹²Ibid., p. 15.

Son and the Spirit are three, yet the name is one.”¹³ The significance of this verse is to suggest that although God is only one, yet there is the matter of the three- the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

2.4 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being God

According to Judeo Christianity, all the three are God. It is not to be misconstrued that when the Son came, the Father ceased to exist as God and when the Son became the Spirit, the Son ceased to exist as God and is represented by the Spirit. Undoubtedly in the *Bible* it is given that the Father is God. To prop up this point I quote a verse from the scripture which says, “According to the foreknowledge of God the Father” (*1 Peter 1:2*). And an additional verse in line to this verse is *Ephesians 1:17*, “that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory...” These verses have denoted that the Father is God who is the source of life.

To ensue further I will also point out that the Son is God. In align to the Son being God I want to bring in a few verses. *Hebrews 1:8* says, “But as the Son, Your throne, O God...” In this portion of the Scripture the Son is called God. *John 1:1* also says, “In the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God”. The *Word* which is stressed again and again is the Son (Christ). When we scrutinize this verse cautiously we see that the Word (Son) was with God and the Word (Son) was God which means the Son is the Word who was God. Along with these verses *Romans 9:5* says, “Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever”. Here we detect that the Christ that is the Son is God who is over all and blessed forever. I suppose I have quoted sufficient verses from the scriptures to attest the Son being God.

In order to maintain the Spirit being God, I want to pick up appropriate verses from the *Bible*. *Acts 5:3-4* specifies that the Spirit is God. In this portion of the *Bible* Peter told Ananias that he had lied to the Spirit in verse 3 and in the subsequent verse he said that he lied to God. When we inspect this verse we see that the Spirit is God. By

¹³Ibid., p. 16.

putting forward all the above given verses one should not be misguided that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are three diverse Gods. As I have stated before, all three are one God which is also given in the scripture very categorically.

2.5 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit all being eternal

I also want to assert the Father, the Son and the Spirit being eternal since there is no notion in the *Bible* that when the Father exists, the Son and the Spirit do not exist. All three live together from eternity past to the eternity future which means all three are eternal. To begin with I would like to quote a verse from the *Bible* which states that the Father being eternal. The expression “the everlasting Father” is seen in *Isaiah 9:6* which verifies the Father being eternal since the expression *everlasting* is analogous to eternal. The notion of Father in the *Bible* itself bears out the eternity of the Father because the Father is the Source, the Creator and the Originator. Thus the Father has to be eternal.

One thing which one has to keep in mind is that, in the scripture the Son comes from and with the Father. Thus, this concept has substantiated the idea of the Son being eternal. *Hebrew 1:12* says, “You are the same, and Your years shall not fail”. Here *You* and *Yours* is in reference to the Son. And the words *same* and *years shall not fail* indicate boundless time that is eternal. *Hebrew 7:3* also says that the Son has no beginning days or end of life which clearly portrays that the Son is eternal.

In *Hebrew 9:14* it is given as, “the eternal Spirit”. This verse corroborates the Spirit being eternal. The impression of the Spirit being eternal can be extract from the fact that the three (Father, Son and Spirit) always exist together so the existence of one exiting from eternity brings in the idea that the other too exist which means they are eternal. Therefore all the three – Father, Son and Spirit are eternal.

2.6 The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit coexist concurrently

The Father, the Son and the Spirit being one has involuntarily demonstrated that they co exist concurrently. Their oneness is the very substantiation that they coexist at the same time. To prove this point, I wish to base it on the *Bible* in *Matthew 3: 16-17* it is given that, the Father, Son and Spirit exist concomitantly. This portion of the *Bible* portrayed the divine trinity in which the Son (Jesus) after being baptized went up from the water; at the same time the dove which signifies the Spirit descended upon Him. And alongside the dove (the Spirit), the Father from heaven declares concerning the Son. It is very apparent from this picture that the three coexist simultaneously.

Another occurrence in the *Bible* which illustrates the coexistence of the three is in *John 14: 16-17*, “And I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may be with you forever; even the Spirit of reality”. When we consider these verses vigilantly we perceive that the Son will pray to the Father and the Father will give another Comforter which is the Spirit Himself. From this one can scrutinize the fact that the Father, Son and Spirit coexist alongside.

Let’s glance at a further indication that consults the instantaneous coexistence of the three. In *Ephesians 3: 14-17* Paul says that he will pray to the Father that He would grant the believer to be strengthened with His power through the Spirit into the inner man of the believer that Christ may make His home in the hearts of the believer. One can see the Father, the Son and the Spirit coexisting mutually at the same time. “The scripture did not say that the Father exists for a period of time then the Son came; and that after another point of time, the Son no longer exists but He has been replaced by the Spirit. Not one verse in the *Bible* says this.”¹⁴

¹⁴Ibid., p. 18.

2.7 Coinherence and inseparability of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit

“The relationship among the Father, the Son and the Spirit of the trinity is not only that they simultaneously coexist, but, even more, that they indwell in one another mutually. Co inherence, as applied to the trinity, means that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are in one another and thus exist together.”¹⁵ The *Bible* frequently says that, the Son coming is with the Father and with the Spirit too. Correspondingly, the Spirit coming is also with the Father and the Son. The Father’s coming with the Son and the Spirit is not in an objective way but rather in a subjective manner which means they are present jointly in one another instantaneously. To verify the above statement I would like to quote a few verses from the *Bible*. *John 6:46* says, “Except Him who is from God, He has seen the Father”. “The word *from* in the original language carries the sense of *from with*.”¹⁶ From the given verse, it is said that the one who sees the Father is the one who is from God and this one from God is with the Father because the word *from* is equivalent to *from with*. Consequently, the Son not only comes from the Father, but He comes from the Father and with the Father.

It is written in *John 5:43* that, “I have come in the name of My Father”. The Son’s coming in the name of the Father is the same with the Father’s coming. The name connotes a person. Subsequently, when you called someone with a name, the person you called will come because the name and the person are not detached but are one entity. This confirms that when the Son comes, the Father comes.

John 14:10 says, “I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me”. This indicates that the Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son. And the Father did not come with the son in an objective way; rather, He comes in the Son. Hence, the Son can testify saying, “He who has seen Me has seen the Father” (*John 14:9*). As a result, to see the Son is to see the Father and when the Son speaks, it is indubitably the Father who is working in the Son. The two co inhere in one another. Then the *Bible* goes on to say that the Son became

¹⁵Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁶Ibid.

the Spirit after death and resurrection in *1 Corinthians 15: 45*. The Son in whom, is the Father has become the Spirit. The Son comes as the spirit; and when the Son comes the Father comes as well. On the one hand, they are three but on the other hand they are one in view of the fact that they cannot be separated.

According to *John 14: 26*, “when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name”. The Comforter as given clearly is the Holy Spirit who will be sent by the Father in the Son’s name. This suggests that when the Spirit comes the Son comes too. *John 15:26* says, “But the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of reality who proceeds from the Father”. According to the Greek sense, the second *from* in the given verse carries the same meaning as *from with*. This means that when the Spirit who is the Comforter comes, the Son also comes with the Father. In the previous verse we see the Son’s saying that the Father will send the Spirit in His name which shows that He comes with the Spirit. At this juncture, it is apparent that the Father, the Son and the Spirit being co inhering and being inseparable.

Furthermore, *John 8:29* says, “He who sent Me is with Me; He has not left Me alone”. *Luke 41* says, “Jesus full of the Holy Spirit”. These verses provide evidence that when the Son was living on earth He was not alone, both the Father and the Spirit are with Him, they are indivisible. Though the Father and the Spirit did not appear in a physical way while the Son was present in a human form but that does mean not that they are not with Him. The Father and the Spirit never left Him alone, they are always with Him.

“The Triune God has never been separated, when one moves, the other two also move with Him. When the Son comes, He comes in the name of the Father; when He comes, the Father comes. When the Spirit is sent, He is sent in the name of the Son; His being sent is the Son’s being sent. Hence, the Son’s coming is the Father’s coming, and the Spirit’s being sent is the Son’s being sent. The three- the Father, Son and Spirit are one. They cannot be separated for eternity.”¹⁷

¹⁷Ibid., p. 20.

2.8 The Son being the embodiment of the triune God

Judeo-Christianity apprehended that the second of the trinity “(the Son) is the embodiment of the triune God.”¹⁸ To scrutinize the Son being God since He is the embodiment of the triune God I want to refer to the *Bible*. *John 1:1* says “the Word was God” and *John 20:28* says, “Thomas answered and said to Him, My Lord and My God”. *Philippians 2:6* says, “Who subsisting in the form of God”. I want to draw your attention here; all these verses clearly specify that the Son is God. The Son was with God the Father from the beginning and He was never estranged from God even after He was incarnated in the human form. He, on no account, leaves God the Father and God by no means leaves Him alone even while He lived on the earth. Thus, the Son being always with God and in God proves that the Son is God.

The next thing which needs to be expounded here is the matter of the Son being the Father. *Isaiah 9:6* says, “unto us a Son is given and His name shall be called... everlasting Father”. In *John 14: 9-10* the Lord Jesus says “He who has seen Me has seen the Father...I am in the Father and the Father is in Me”. The scripture has cogently revealed that the Father and the Son are one which spontaneously indicates that the Son is the Father. And since the Father and the Son were never separated, the Son is the Father.

Here I want to bring in the concept of “the Son’s incarnation being of the Holy Spirit”¹⁹. *Mathew 1:18* says, “Mary...was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit” and verse 20 says, “For that which is begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit”. And *Luke 1:35* says, “the Holy Spirit will come upon you...therefore also the holy thing which is born will be called, Son of God”. In the incarnation of the Son, He was born of the Holy Spirit which means the Holy Spirit was the source. The Holy Spirit became the Son in a human form. Thus, the Son’s incarnation is of the Holy Spirit.

¹⁸Nee, *The Triune God, A Lesson Book-Level Two*, p. 19.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 20.

Another point which I want to propose is the Son being the Spirit. The Son is not alienated from the Spirit. In fact, according to the *Bible*, the Son and the Spirit are one. The Son was not only born of the Spirit but He also lives and walks according to the Spirit while He was on earth (*Luke 4:14; Mathew 12:28*). But it is not to be misapprehended that the Spirit represents the Son. The Spirit cannot represent the Son because the Son has to partake in the human life and nature. Practically speaking, the Spirit is like air and cannot possess flesh and blood in the human form. Apart from the Son being one with the Spirit and being the Spirit, the Son through death and resurrection became the life-giving Spirit. "...and the last Adam became the life giving Spirit" (*1 Corinthians 15:45*). The Last Adam here is the Son who became the Spirit. *2 Corinthians 3:17* says, "The Lord is the Spirit". In this verse also one observes that the Lord is the Son who is now the Spirit entering into man. The Son is not only the Father but He is also the Spirit.

Most importantly, "the Son is the entire Triune God; all the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Him. He is not merely the second of the trinity or only one-third of the trinity. Neither is He a separate God or someone other than God."²⁰ *Colossians 1:19* says, "For in Him all the fullness was pleased to dwell", and *2:9* says, "for in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily". The Son contained all the riches of what God is and He did not express anything of Himself but of what God is in His divine nature. The presence of the Son is accompanied by God the Father and the Son. So, the Son is the complete Triune God because the three are always one.

2.9 The Holy Spirit being the ultimate consummation of the triune God

Here I want to emphasize on "the Spirit being the ultimate consummation of the Triune God."²¹ First of all I want to assert God being Spirit according to *John 4:24* which says, "God is Spirit". The Spirit is the reality of the divine trinity. Because without God

²⁰Ibid., p. 21.

²¹Ibid., p. 23.

being Spirit it would be impossible for God to be practically applicable to the believer. “God’s essence is the Spirit, so God is Spirit.”²² As stated earlier it is not to be misconstrued that one third of God is Spirit. The entire triune God is Spirit. God the Father sent forth His Son through the Holy Spirit and the Son after being born of the Holy Spirit participates in the human life and nature. The Son who comes with the Father and the Spirit, through death and resurrection became the life giving Spirit to be the reality to the believer. Thus, the divine trinity in Judeo-Christianity is the Spirit.

One thing which is needed to be taken into account is that “the Spirit being sent by the Father and the Son and coming *from-with* the Father.”²³ To maintain the given lines I would like to point out few verses from the gospel of John in the *Bible*. The Lord says in *John 14: 26* “But the comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name”. Also in *John 15:26*, the Lord Said, “But when the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, He testifies concerning Me”. In the former verse the Son says that the Father will send the Spirit in the His name and the later verse says the Son will send the Spirit. Now who sent the Spirit? Is it the Father or the Son? It would be appropriate to say that it is both the Father and the Son who send the Spirit which means they are one. “The Father’s sending is the Son’s sending and the Son’s sending is the Father’s sending because they are one. The Holy Spirit is sent not only by the Father but also *from-with* the Father. The Greek word for *from-with* means *by the side of* and often means *from-with*.”²⁴ The Spirit does not come alone when it was sent by the Father. Though it was the Father who sends the Spirit, the Father comes with the Spirit. The Father who comes along with the Spirit’s coming also indicates that the Son too was with the Father which means the whole of the triune God comes in the Spirit’s coming. The triune God-the Father, the Son and the Spirit are one therefore the Spirit coming is the coming of the complete triune God.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid., p. 24.

²⁴Ibid.

Another thing to be noted here is that the Spirit's coming is in the name of the Son. "In *John 14:26* the Holy Spirit comes in the Son's name to be the reality of His name."²⁵ In the given verse I would like to emphasize to the meaning of *in My name* which is used by the Son. "The name is the Son Himself, and the Spirit is the person, the being of the Son. When the name of the Lord is addressed, the Spirit comes (*1 Corinthians 12:3*)."²⁶ The Son's coming is in the name of the Father according to *John 5:43* because the Son and the Father are one and cannot be separated (*John 10:30*). Whenever the Spirit comes, it comes in the name of the Son because the Spirit and the Son is one Spirit (*2 Corinthians 3:17*). The above given lines have shown that the Spirit is the means for the triune God – Father, Son and Spirit in reaching man. In short, the Spirit's coming is the three coming in reality.

Lastly, I want to corroborate that "the Spirit is the ultimate consummation of the triune God."²⁷ To elaborate this further let me point out some verses from the scriptures. *John 1:1* "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" and *John 1:14* and "And the Word became flesh and tabernacle among us". *Isaiah* prophesied that "a son is given...and His name shall be called ...everlasting Father" (*Isaiah 9:6*). The Word which was God and the Word which became flesh in the two former verses is the Son. And this Son in the later verse is also called the everlasting Father. The Son after passing through death and resurrection became the Spirit (*1 Corinthians 15:45*). What we notice here is that, the Son who was with the Father became a man with the Father in His incarnation through the Spirit. And the Son after His death and resurrection became the Spirit. Hence, the Spirit is the ultimate consummation of the Triune God. Now the process triune God who has become the Spirit is accessible to all man kind. "All that the Father is, planned, and willed, along with all that the Son has accomplished, obtained, achieved and attained are now made real and available to the believer."²⁸

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., p. 25.

²⁸Ibid.

2.10 Concept of Redemption

According to Judeo-Christianity God's intention is to work Himself as life into His creatures. However, He cannot be life to the plants or the animal because they are not created in His kind. Logically speaking, He can be life only to the highest created life, the life that is after His kind and this life is possessed by man (*Gen. 1:26-27*). This Man is like a vessel that can contain God's life. God's creation of man was in such a way that it can fulfill His intention. And His intention was that He wanted man to have Him as his life for His expression. Here in this paragraph we see the hierarchy among the creatures in which man is placed at the highest level.

In *Genesis 2*, the tree of life and the tree of knowledge were set up according to two principles by which man is either to live or die. The principle of the tree of life is to depend on God and the result of partaking from this tree is to receive God's life. Whereas the principle of the tree of knowledge is to be independent of God and by eating from it issues in death. In the eyes of God, the greatest sin is independence which results in death. Death here means not physical but spiritual deadness. When Adam and Eve took of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, they chose the principle of independence. And their choice cut them off from the tree of life (*Genesis 3:22-23*). Through eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, they were corrupted and they were no longer pure because Satan as another source entered into them (*Genesis 3*). As a result, man's life became sinful and corrupted. Because of this corrupting element, God was barred by His glory, holiness, and righteousness from contacting fallen man. Before discussing the redemption of God it would be proper to explicate the real significance of man's fall in order to know why redemption is needed in Christian belief.

First of all, man's fall causes him to transgress against God's commandment. In the *Bible* there are many places where we can find about man's transgression. *Romans 5:14* address *Adam's transgression*. Adam transgressed against God's commandment by forsaking the tree of life, which denotes God as life. Instead of taking the tree of life,

Adam pursues the tree of knowledge, which signifies Satan as the source of death (*Genesis 2: 8-9, 17; 3:1-7*) and thereby transgresses God's commandment.

Secondly, man falls under God's condemnation. Adam's one offense caused man to fall under God's condemnation. *Romans 5:16* speaks of Adam's "one offense unto condemnation". Not only did man transgress against God's commandment but also fell under God's condemnation.

Thirdly, man became alienated from God by partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. *Genesis 3:8* says that man hid himself from God's presence right after his fall. This means that man was estranged from God and *Ephesians 8:18* tell us that man in his fallen state is "alienated from the life of God". Man lost the right to take pleasure in God as his everything and therefore become alienated from the God.

Fourthly, man's sin ruined him from fulfilling God's purpose which is to express God in His image and represent God with His dominion (*Genesis 1:26*). Due to man's fall, satanic nature has entered into him and thus this nature hinders him from fulfilling God's purpose.

Through his fall, man received Satan's evil thoughts, feeling and will into the inward parts of his soul and his spirit became deadened and his body corrupted. In *Genesis 3:1, 4* and *5*, we see that Satan's thoughts were injected into man's mind, his feeling was injected into man's emotion, and his will injected into man's will. This means that man's soul was taken over by Satan. Not only was his soul affected but by eating the tree of knowledge, man took the tree of knowledge into the members of his body. From that time on, Man's body was being transmuted into flesh and it was corrupted with full of lust. That is why in *Romans 7:8* Paul says, that in my flesh nothing good dwells. Satan became the very sin within man through man's eating of the tree of knowledge. *Romans 7:8, 11, 17, 20* indicate sin as a person, the embodiment of Satan. In short, sin is the personification of Satan. Through man's fall, man became one with Satan. As a result, man became deadened in his spirit (*Eph. 2: 1, 5*). Deadened means that the function of the

spirit is damage. The real significance of man's fall is that Satan was taken into man which means sin entered into man, and man became a victim of death (*Romans 5: 12,14a; 1 Corinthians 15: 22*). *Romans 5: 12b* points out that death passed on to all man through sin entering into the world. Death is the ultimate result of man's fall. *Romans 5: 14a* says that from Adam to Moses, death reigned as a king. *1 Corinthians 15: 22* says that in Adam all die which means that from Adam's fall man is destined to die. Thus, all of mankind became a victim of death through man's fall. Now it will be appealing to know the significance of redemption after understanding the seriousness of man's fall.

Christ as the redeemer has to come to redeem man back to God because of his fall and fulfill His original purpose for creating man, which is making man like Him in life and in nature for His expression. So now, Man being sinful is condemned under law, he commits sin and cannot redeem himself. "The universe is not without an owner. It is ruled by God, who controls the universe with His rules. God's rules are God's laws. God's law is righteous therefore He cannot regard a sinful man as sinner. Man has sin and is condemned under the law. Therefore, sinful man needs redemption. A price must be paid to fulfill the demand of the law and to redeem man from the condemnation of the law."²⁹

Hebrew 9:12 reveals that according to God's righteous requirement, Redemption resolves man's sins. Because in God's righteousness, sinful man must die, so in order to redeem man, there must be another death. Only another death can satisfy the requirement of God's righteousness and only such a death can redeem men from their sins.

"In the *Old Testament*, the redemption of Christ was not yet accomplished. Therefore it was typified by the propitiation accompanied through the animal sacrifices. Under this propitiation, God was legally free to contact man, and man was repositioned to enjoy the right to take God as life (*Psalms 36: 8-9*)."³⁰ Redemption was typified by the offering of goats and bulls in the Old Testament. Animals were killed and blood was shed

²⁹Lee, *Gospel Outlines*, p. 69.

³⁰Lee, *The Triune God to Be Life to the Tripartite Man*, p.13.

for sin offering to God in order to accomplished atonement for man's sins. "But the death and shedding of the blood of goats and bulls was only a shadow, not the reality; while it made atonements for sin, it could not redeem men from their sins."³¹

The first step of God's accomplishment of redemption in veracity was the incarnation of Jesus (the Son of God). In the *Old Testament*, God did not enter into man but in the *New Testament*, God entered into man in His incarnation to become a man. He was conceived as a human into the womb of a Virgin Mary for nine months (*Mathew 1: 20, 23, 25*). He became not only a man but also a flesh (*John 1: 14*) and He was sent by God in the likeness of the flesh of sin (*Romans 8: 3*). Christ was in the likeness of the flesh of sin though there was no sin in His flesh. "According to *2 Corinthians 5: 21*, Paul says that Christ did not know sin, yet this one who did not know sin was made sin on behalf of man which was also portrayed in the Old Testament as the brass serpent in *Numbers 21*."³² When the children of Israel sinned against God, they were bitten by a serpent and were dying. Moses looked to God for them and God told him to make a brass serpent and lift it up on a pole. Whoever looked upon the brass serpent would live (v.v. 6-9). This portrait clearly indicates that the brass serpent bears only the appearance, the likeness, of a serpent, but not its poisonous nature. This corresponds to Paul's word, "in the likeness of the flesh of sin", which means the brass serpent signifies Christ who did not have sinful nature but was made sin on behalf of mankind and was hung on the cross to die for sinners. Not only the brass serpent, He was also the lamb of God who was obedient unto death. Lamb in the *Bible* signifies meek, lowly, humble and obedient. The Lord Jesus like the lamb was always under God's ruling while He was living on this earth and by obeying the Father's command; He suffered on behalf of all fallen men. "When Christ died on the cross, He was not only a lamb in the eyes of God but also a serpent. Both of these aspects of Christ are in *John 1: 29* that refers to the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world and in *John 3: 14* that refers to the Son of Man, Christ, lifted up like the brass serpent in the wilderness."³³

³¹Lee, *Gospel Outlines*, p. 317.

³²Lee, *The Basic Revelation of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 21.

³³*Ibid.*, p.22.

By His incarnation for the accomplishment of redemption, He took the form of man to be one with man, having blood and flesh. *Hebrew 2: 15* tells us, “Since therefore the children have partaken of blood and flesh, He also Himself in like manner shared in the same”. In the *Bible* it is said that, there is no forgiveness of sin without the shedding of blood (*Hebrew 9: 22*). The blood of Christ is able to redeem man from under the law that the law could no longer confine man under condemnation. Since the blood of Christ redeems man from the condemnation of law, it breaks down the barrier between God and man. Thus, man who was alienated from God because of sin was brought back to God.

Redemption was accomplished on the cross. “The Lord Jesus bore man’s sin on the cross and suffered punishment for sins (*I Peter 2:24, I Corinthians 15: 3, Hebrew 9:28*). Also according to *Isaiah 53: 6*, when Christ was on the cross, God took all our sins and put them upon the Lamb of God.”³⁴ Sin was condemned and judged on the cross since Christ bore the sins and was judged by God once and for all. In His crucifixion, all the believers are also crucified with Him (*Galatians 2: 20*). *Romans 6: 6* say, “our old man has been crucified with Him”. The old man here is the sinful man who has become old because of sin and the old creation is all the creation before Christ (the Son) redemption. When He was crucified the old man and the old creation had been crucified with Him.

Not only old man and old creation were crucified on Christ’s crucifixion, “He also abolished the law of commandments in ordinance through His death (*Eph. 2: 15*). In the Old Testament, among many ordinances, the main thing was the circumcision of Jews which divided them from the gentiles. The Lord came to abolish this on the cross (*Colossians 2: 10, 14*).”³⁵ Through Christ’s redemption, the difference between the Jews and the gentiles were terminated and in the eyes of God they are one member. Other ordinances were concerning the Jewish regulation on diet. In *Acts 10: 9* and *6*, Peter was told by the Lord to eat unclean and common animals which signifies that Christ already abolished this dietary regulation so there is no more unclean and common food; all are sanctified in Christ. Christ’ complete redemption has taken away sins, crucifies the old

³⁴Ibid., p. 45.

³⁵Ibid.

man and terminated the old creation, and also abolished the differences between races. Now in Him there are no sins. All the believers have become the member of the body of Christ which is the Church (*2 Corinthians 12: 12*).

Through His death He also destroys the devil (*Hebrew 2: 14*). Not only that, He also cast out Satan, the ruler of the world and He judged the world (*John 12: 31*). The Son of God through His redemption abolished death and destroyed Satan who has the might of death (*2 Timothy 1: 10b; Hebrew 2:14*). Now, Satan is defeated and his power can no longer reign over man. Through His redemption, by the shedding of His blood on the cross, the enemies of God were reconciled to God. *Romans 5: 10* say, “For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His son”. The death of Christ redeemed man back to God and laid a foundation upon which God could justify the sinners. *Romans 5: 1-9* depicts of the condition of man being reconciled to God, now the believers are standing on His grace, walking in peace and enjoying His life in tribulation.

Through His redemption, crucifixion and death, He was resurrected on the third day and became the life giving spirit (*2 Corinthians 15: 45*). Now God can enter into man and man can be brought back to God in order to fulfill God’s original intention that is to express God. Man can now receive God into his spirit and be transformed by the sanctifying works of the Spirit. Thus, Christ as a redeemer made God available to man through the Spirit. So that, man can fulfill God’s purpose that is to be like Him in life and in nature but not in the God-head to be His expression. So far I think I have elucidated the real significance of redemption which paves the way back to God. Redemption on one hand can be taken as mediation that bridges the gap between man and God. There was the need of mediation since man and God had incommensurable difference due to man’s sin. But through redemption man can return back to God and be one with Him according to what He has planned and willed in creating him before sin enters into him.

To summarize, first of all we have seen the biblical narrative of God's plan in creating man and man's fall by partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Due to man's fall, God has to become the process triune so that He can bring man back to Himself for His expression. God came down at a human level as the Son and passed through the process of human living, death and resurrection. Through the Son's redemption, man's sins are forgiven and he is reconciled back to God. Redemption tears down the enmity that exists between God and man. Thus, redemption opens the way for reconciliation. And through His resurrection He became the life-giving Spirit and now as the Spirit, God can enter and man can become one with God. God by becoming the Father, the Son and the Spirit paves the way for man to partake of His divine and human nature. The Father, the Son and the Spirit co-exist simultaneously and indwell in one another. They are not three separate Gods but one God. The father, the Son and the Spirit can be distinguished only in the mind but not in reality. They are the three-in-one God. The significance of the concept of trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition is for God to be able to reach man and become one with man in life and nature but not in the Godhead.

CHAPTER TWO
DIALECTICS OF HEGEL

The present chapter will examine critically the dialectics of Hegel. As a matter of fact, dialectics is theory loaded and elevated doctrine. Its simple formulation can be found in the dialogues of Socrates. We will therefore develop Hegel's dialectics from Socrates' dialogues. Dialectics has two operative terms namely, contradiction and sublation. Likewise in Socrates' dialogues we find agreement and disagreement as the most operative term. However, dialogues itself has evolved from *Logos* of Heraclitus. In the dialogues, Socrates has shifted philosophy from physics to ethics and Heraclitus has shifted philosophy from *mythos* to *logos*. So in the following sections, I will first develop the transition of philosophical enquiry from *mythos* to *logos* and from *logos* to *dialogos*. In order to meticulously explicate how Hegel's dialectic developed, it will be appropriate to divide this chapter into three parts namely, 1) From *mythos* to *logos*, 2) From *logos* to *dialogos* and 3) Dialectics.

3.1 From *Mythos* to *Logos*

Myths play a very significant role in the belief system of man before development of knowledge as epistemology. Myths pervaded for about 2000 years and have an immense impact in the life of human beings. Since man has a relentless desires and was never gratified with what he possess. And it was myths that satisfied him psychologically. Myths have an intrinsic meaning in which man can relate himself. The faith that a Judeo-Christian has in God and in the Holy Bible is viewed by an unbeliever as myths. These myths which a Christian believes are fundamentally derive from the Commandment of God that are conceive by a believer as God's word. I will give a brief summary of those myths that operate in the life of a Christian faith. For an outsider myths are like God creating the heavens and the earth out of His word. "God created man in His own image and likeness with the intention of making them His very expression,"¹ a Christian believe in it as the truth while other consider it to be myth. Another myth is that "God placing Adam and Eve in front of the two trees (i.e. tree of knowledge of good and evil and tree of life) in the Garden of Eden. God forbid man from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil which has its source from Satan and will ultimately lead to

¹*The Holy Bible, Old Testament, Genesis 1:26.*

death.”² But by partaking of the tree of life man shall live because of God being their source and live a dependent life on God. Since man partook of the wrong tree the sin enter into man and into the world and man lost the right to enjoy the Garden of Eden. So the concept of sin came by eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Now man is a sinner and cannot partake of the divine life and nature of God and thus fail to fulfill God’s purpose. But God did not give up His plan in creating man; He became the process Triune God. He became a man called Jesus which is also the Messiah who is considered as a messenger from God. Jesus as the Messiah lived a human life and passed through death to redeem man back to Himself. Through the process of redemption, man sins are forgiven and he is reconciled back to God.³ Thus, the shedding of blood on the cross is done through redemption by Christ and there is reconciliation between God and man. “God the Son became the life giving Spirit after passing through death and resurrection.”⁴ The Spirit is the consummation of the triune God. God became a man by sending His Son and the Son became the Spirit through death and resurrection in order to impart Himself into man. “God, the Father is not separated from the Son and the Son is also inseparable from the Spirit.”⁵ The Father, the Son and the Spirit are one. Now the concept of Trinity came in the belief system of Judeo-Christian. Christian’s believe in “the trinity that is the three-in-one God, they are three in persons but in essence all are one.”⁶ This concept of trinity is perceived by a non Christian as myth. A Christian believe that there will be the end of this world and at that time “God will come back to take His children which includes the living and the death in order take them to the new heaven and new earth that is the new Jerusalem.”⁷ The concept of Messiah coming back at the end of the world is also perceived by unbeliever as myth. Myth in Judeo-Christian traditions are derived from the commandment of God and therefore it is morally integrated in the believe system where unfulfilling of the commandments leads to punishment on the final judgment day. Myths have ethical norm which one is obliged to follow and failure to follow come along with punishment.

²Ibid., *Gen.3.*

³*The Holy Bible, New Testament, 1 Peter2:24, 1 Corinthians15:3, Hebrew9:28.*

⁴Ibid., *1 Corinthians 15:45.*

⁵Ibid., *Mathew 28:19.*

⁶Lee, *Truth Lesson Level One, Volume 1*, pp. 18-19.

⁷*The Holy Bible, Old Testament, Revelation 21:1-10.*

In short, the myths that are prevailing in Christian faith are about creation, Adam and Eve being the first sinners by partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil instead of choosing tree of life which signifies life, Christ coming as the Messiah to save sinners by dying on the cross on behalf of man's sin, redemption being the mediation to reconcile God and man, and God becoming the Triune God that is the Father, the Son and the Spirit to infuse Himself into man. All these myths essentially come from the commandment of God which is given in the written word that is the Holy Bible. Myths do not quench the thirst of man inquisitive nature and thus man started to question the existence of myth. If I am not wrong, as knowledge grows, the Greeks are believed to be the foremost in questioning the validity of myths. The discovery that "the unexamined life is not livable by man" was the beginning of the intellectual adventure of the West, and it was the Greeks who made that discovery.⁸ This line of Socrates was like the day break of the dawn that paved a way for a new kind of life. This was the earliest sign of the development of knowledge from myths to *Logos*.

"Now the word *logos* currently used in the time of Heraclitus was polysemantic, ie, covered a broad range of notion which was closely linked in the Greek's mind. *Logos* can mean word, speech, story, narration, argument, teaching, count, calculation, relationship, proportion, etc."⁹ "The philosophical meaning of *logos* as used by Heraclitus can best be expressed by the word *law* understood as an inner essential connection of things and phenomenon."¹⁰ Heraclitus used two terms that is *logos* and *nomos* which more or less hint the same thing except that one is inward law and the later is outward law. The concept of *logos* in Heraclitus is generally used for the law of mind which inevitably lead one to think subjectively in one own way and thus come up with ideas that is not necessarily in conformity with the law outside. And *nomos* for Heraclitus is the law underlying the world process and this law is change and change is the reality. Everything is in the flux of change; nothing is permanent in this world. Heraclitus wants to state that,

⁸Allen, *Guide Book to the Western Thought*, p.13.

⁹Bogomolov, *History of Ancient Philosophy Greece and Rome*, p.54.

¹⁰Ibid.

although this law exists forever, men cannot understand the law before hearing it and when they hear it for the first time. Man is still ignorant of the existing law in nature though all things come into being in accordance with this law. The point he want to assert here is that man keep on thinking that he posses the absolute truth while in fact he is under the veil of his own assumption. “According to Heraclitus, *logos* speak to man revealing itself in words and deeds and it is also perceived by senses and comprehended by the mind. However man is incapable of seeing this *logos* in their daily mundane life and feel strange when things change.”¹¹ Man tends to be comfortable with the notion of permanent despite the fact that everything undergoes change. Heraclitus usage of *logos* on the other hand is intelligence by which man has to reason and see the reality of change which is the law underlying the world process. *Logos* provide the link between rational discourse and the world’s rational structure. Heraclitus started with a move from the actual reality to the world of words. The law of order in nature is change and change is the reality of all things. This reality has to be realized by us through reason so that one can really see things as they are. Now in this stage myths have no significant role like before since men are led to see the reality by *logos*. Heraclitus philosophically uses *logos* to question the reliability of myths and thus one notice the transition that take place in the field of knowledge. Knowledge now becomes a growing phenomenon, it moves from less perfect to more perfect. With the view of keeping one’s attention to the development of knowledge, I would like to proceed further to the next stage, the transition from *logos* to dialogue.

3.2 From *Logos* to *Dialogos*

Dialogue derived from *dia* which means *two* and *logos* stand for word. Socrates used the method of dialogue, which consists of two different parties of different opinion, for extracting knowledge by engaging in an intellectual debate. The conversational method of Socrates is to remove falsity and bring out the truth and this process is what is known as *dialectic*. “Dialectic method has two meanings – first as the ability to ask and answer questions; that is in the Socrates sense in which it is widely represented in his

¹¹ Ibid.

dialogue. And second, as the ability to divide concept according to their kind and embrace each one under a single idea.”¹² This method is the most effective means for acquiring knowledge which prevail during the ancient time especially among the Greeks.

To move on from the transition of *logos* to dialogue I would like to bring in Socrates to illustrate his contribution to knowledge in this stage. Socrates’ prime concern was to attain the true knowledge which is distinct from mere opinion. Socrates maintained that sense perception could not give genuine knowledge. True knowledge, according to Socrates, is innate in us and by reasoning one can recollect what one already has. He held that sense perception is incapable of leading one to true knowledge of virtue. In other sense, he used dialectic method to reason on man’s morality that draws the attention of the Athenian when he proposed the use of reason to decide on moral question. Thus, Socrates seems to claim that the standard by which we judge the empirical things in the world to have certain features obviously is not derived from the observation through our senses but by the recollection. For instance, we have the idea of absolute justice, equality etc and thus try to measure or judge things according to the absolute standard of justice. The objective of Socrates is to arrive at the explicit knowledge of the absolute idea of virtue which is universal and true at all time. It is seen in Plato’s writings that Socrates had used the method of dialogue to extract the most accurate form of knowledge. Through the method of dialogue, Socrates forms the art of discarding invalid ideas and combining useful ideas to bring out the truth which is universal and true at all time. From Socrates we see that knowledge is more develop from less perfect to more perfect.

Plato indeed is one of the significant figures in the field of knowledge and his contribution to knowledge has an immense impact to many philosophers. He also practiced the method of dialogue in his writings in order to arrive at the truth. He forms conversational style in his writings where he address himself as Socrates and there is also the other young participant called Glaucon to whom he keep on asking questions for

¹²Ibid., p. 181.

the purpose of arriving at the truth. There are many issues that Plato has brought up in his writings especially regarding moral issues. I will take up one particular moral question that Plato discusses in the *Republic* in order to illustrate the importance of dialogue for arriving at the truth. The question he raises is on the idea of justice which is one of the four cardinal virtues - wisdom, courage, self-discipline and justice. Justice, according to Plato in the *Republic* is “justice is the principle which has in fact been followed throughout, the principle of one man one job, of ‘minding one’s own business’, in the sense of doing the job for which one is naturally fitted and not interfering with other people .”¹³ One thing which I would like to point out here is that in dialogue there is agreement, disagreement and consensus. Agreement between the two parties is that they agree to each other on the ground of their topic where one can develop dialogue otherwise there cannot be dialogue at all if both parties are speaking about different topic. Disagreement undoubtedly takes place with the view of arriving at the truth by arguing for the most accurate truth and consensus will be when one arrives at the truth. In this chapter, my attempt is to illustrate how the method of dialogue approaches the notion of justice through the agreement, disagreement and consensus by using the dialogue between Socrates and Glaucon in the *Republic* (427d-432d).¹⁴

Let me begin with the point of agreement where Socrates and Glaucon agree to discuss on the theme of justice.

Socrates: Well, we seem to have got your city founded for you, Adeimantus, Now you must look at it and get your brother and Polemarchus and the rest of them to see if they can help you throw enough light on it for us to see where justice and in justice are to be found, how they differ from each other, and which of them anyone who is to be happy needs, irrespective of whether god s or men think he has it or not.

Glaucon : Nonsense, Socrates, You promised to deal with the problem yourself, because you said it would be wicked for you no to give justice to all the support of which you were capable.

Socrates: That’s true, I remember. I must do as I said, but you must all help.

¹³Plato, *Plato the Republic*, p.130.

¹⁴bid., pp.130-139.

Glaucon :Yes, we will,

Socrates :I think we shall probably find what we want as follows. If we have founded it properly, our state is presumably perfect.

Glaucon :It must be.

Socrates :Then it will obviously have the qualities of wisdom, courage, self-discipline, and justice.

Glaucon : Obviously.

Socrates : Then if we can identify some of these qualities in it, the ones that are left will be the ones that we are still looking for.

Glaucon : Yes.

Here I intend to throw light to the point of disagreement which is done with the attempt to acquire the most accurate truth.

Socrates :The state we have described seems to me to be genuinely wise. For its judgment is good, isn't it?

Glaucon :Yes.

Socrates :And the quality of good judgment is clearly a form of knowledge, as it is because of knowledge and not because of ignorance that we judge well.

Glaucon :Clearly.

Socrates :But there are many different kinds of knowledge in our city.

Glaucon :Of course there are.

Socrates :And do we say it has wisdom and judgment because of the knowledge of its carpenters?

Glaucon :Certainly not- that merely makes it good at carpentry.

Socrates : So it's not called wise because of its knowledge of woodwork and the excellence of its designs?

Glaucon : No.

Socrates : The same is presumably true of bronze and other materials.

Glaucon :The same is true.

Socrates : And I expect you would agree that knowledge of farming merely makes it good at agriculture.

To draw a conclusion here I wish to show the point of consensus where both the parties finally come to an agreement by considering the amount of truth that they have obtained.

Socrates : At any rate, wisdom, discipline, courage, and the ability to mind one's own business are all rivals in this respect. And we can regard justice as making a contribution to the excellence of our city that rivals that of the rest.

Glaucon : Yes, certainly.

Socrates : Look at it again this way. I assume that you will make it the duty of our rulers to administer justice?

Glaucon : Of course.

Socrates : And won't they try to follow the principle that men should not take other's people's belonging or be deprived of their own?

Glaucon : Yes, they're bound to.

Socrates : Their reason presumably being that it is *just*.

Glaucon : Yes.

Socrates : So we reach again by another route the conclusion that justice is keeping what is properly one's own and doing one's own job.

Glaucon : That is true.

Socrates : There's another point on which I should like your agreement. Suppose a builder and a shoemaker tried to exchange jobs, or to take on the tools and the prestige of each other's trade, or suppose alternatively the same man tried to do the same jobs, would this and other exchange of the kind do great harm to the state?

Glaucon : Not much.

Socrates : But if someone who belongs by nature to the class of artisans and businessmen is puffed up by wealth or popular support or physical strength or any similar quality, and tries to enter our military class; or if one of our military Auxiliaries tries to get into class of administering Guardians for which he is unfit, and they exchange tools and prestige; or if a single individual tries to do all these jobs at the same time-well I think you'll agree that this sort of mutual interchange and interference spells destruction to our state.

Glaucon : Certainly.

Socrates : Interference by the three classes with each other's jobs and interchange of jobs between them, therefore, does the greatest harm to our state, and we are justified in calling it the worst of evils.

Glaucon : Absolutely justified.

Socrates : But will you not agree that the worst of evils for one's own community is injustice.

Glaucon : Of course.

Socrates : So that is what injustice is. And conversely, when each of our three classes (businessmen, Auxiliaries, and Guardians) does its own job and minds its own business, that, by contrast, is justice and makes our state just.

I entirely agree with what you say, I said.

Don't let's be too emphatic about it yet, I replied. If we find that the same pattern applies to the individual and is agreed to yield justice in him, we can finally accept it- there will be nothing to prevent us; if not, we shall to think again. For the moment let us finish our investigation.

From the given dialogue one can undoubtedly perceive that the arriving of this conclusion is done after much discussion between Socrates and Glaucon. They first begin by bringing in the cardinal virtues namely; wisdom, courage and discipline which according to them can help them identify the definition of justice by identifying each virtue that will eventually open up the notion of justice. As I read the *Republic* I can clearly see the dialogues of Socrates and his pupil where they have agreements and disagreements. They get involved in conversation where there are undoubtedly contradictions and as their dialogue goes on in due course they arrive at consensus. One thing which is worth noting in their dialogue is that they always come at a consensus despite of their differences in opinion. And the consensus is believed to be the most accurate form of truth which is arrives after thorough investigation. Thus, one observes the transition from *Logos* to dialogue in Socrates period.

One noticed that in dialogue, there are at least two parties who get involved and they maintained a common ground where there can be dialogue. And the objective of this method is to pull in the most accurate form of truth. ‘The basics requirement for a dialogue to be carried out by both the participants is – 1) Speak and 2) Listen, 3) Aim at truth, 4) understand each other’s language, 5) understand each other’s way of thinking, 6) do not live in two worlds whose content totally differ.’¹⁵ We observe the given requirement in Socrates dialogue too. “The two characteristics features that are found in Socrates dialogue are consensus and contradiction. Within the method of dialogue, it can be taken as two operative terms that can assist in the improvement of ideas.”¹⁶ These two operative terms in Socrates dialogue are used with the sole interest of arriving at the truth. The method used in dialogue avoid ones from being a dogmatist because absolute contradiction leaves no ground for consensus which is suppose to possess higher form of truth.

So far, one can observe the transition of knowledge from myths to *logos* and from *logos* to *dialogos*. Each transition of knowledge is always in the form of growing from less to more accurate truth. In part-I, myths was considered as a form of knowledge that plays a significant role in the life of human beings. With the inquisitive nature of man, knowledge grew and it was the Greeks who first question the reliability of myths. It was Heraclitus who more or less torn down the concept of myths by bringing in his notion of *logos* which is the inner law of thought that reason out that the reality of things is change. This *logos* operate in the mind and thus reason became the tool for acquiring the truth. Heraclitus notion of *logos* indeed pave the way for knowledge to grow but it is still obscure and it not systematic. The transition from *logos* to *dialogos* is more systematic in a way that it has method of arriving at the truth. This method is called dialogue which involves two opposing parties who have a point of agreement, disagreement and finally by debating they arrive at the most accurate. In dialogue, there is conversation with the intention of achieving the truth. Here in the method of dialogue, reason is used to raise question about the validity of truth through conversational style and gradually comes to a

¹⁵Perperzak, *System and History in Philosophy*, p. 84.

¹⁶Singh, “From Dialogue to Dialectics: Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx,” p. 262.

conclusion where the truth is seen in most accurate form. Now, knowledge is acquired in a more systematic way in dialogue than in *logos* and myths. And thus epistemology has finally evolved in the field of philosophy.

3.3 Dialectics

As idea of dialogue as philosophical method has evolved, it would be appropriate to proceed to the higher stage of arriving at the truth by discussing the concept of dialectics. According to word web dictionary dialectics means any formal system of reasoning that arrives at the truth by the exchange of logical arguments. The method of dialectic played a significant role in Hegel's philosophy but before getting in to Hegel's concept of dialectic let us first examine Kant's notion of dialectic. "For Kant, dialectic is the critical movement of thought or the self-criticism of reasons itself. This kind of critical movement of thought can also be trace in Socrates dialogue whose criticism is for the sole purpose of attaining the truth. What one has seen in dialogue is that the relation of both the speakers is like the subject and the object in proposition whereas in dialectic reason is the subject and object of the critique. Dialectic is inherent in the nature of reason itself."¹⁷ In the preface of *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant mentioned,

Human reason has this peculiar fate that in one species of its knowledge it is burdened by question which, as prescribed by the very nature of reason itself, it is not able to ignore, but which, as transcending all its powers, it is also not able to answer.¹⁸

According to Kant, reason has come up with issues which are contradictory and reason itself is unable to adjudicate these issues. These issues that have derived from reason are term by Kant as antinomy which will be expound later. To go along with movement of knowledge, let me discuss the role of reason in dialectic. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant says,

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 262-263.

¹⁸Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p.7.

All our knowledge starts with the senses, proceeds from thence to understanding, and ends with reason, beyond which there is no higher faculty to be found in us for elaborating the matter of intuition and bringing it under the highest unity of thought.¹⁹

From the given quotation we notice that reason differ from understanding. Understanding, to put it in a simplistic manner, derives from sensibility which has its impression from the senses. Through the senses one has an experience of the external world and these experiences are given names in our understanding e.g. cold, hot etc. Reason, on the other hand, does not derive from experience, it is pure concept. What Kant want to emphasis here is that reason investigate issues which cannot be ignore yet reason itself cannot gives an absolute answer to it. For Kant, dialectic operates where reason comes up with definite arguments which are contradictory in nature and these arguments are in the realm beyond the grasp of science.

As I have mentioned before, Kant has propounded four antinomies in the *Critique of Pure Reason* which are divulge through his dialectic. These antinomies are the areas that can be term as traditional metaphysics where science cannot operate. Each antinomy has valid statements which are contradictory to each other. These four antinomies are – 1) finite and infinite, 2) simple and complex, 3) freedom and causality, 4) condition and unconditioned. Let us see the definition of each antinomy as given by Kant in *Critique of Pure Reason* in order to examine his concept of dialectic. First of all, finite and infinite is defined as - “finite: The world has a beginning in time, and is also limited as regards space. Infinite: The world has no beginning, and no limits in space; it is infinite as regards both to time and space.”²⁰ Secondly, simple and complex is define as- “ simple: Every composite substance in the world is made up of simple parts, and nothing anywhere exists save the simple or what is composed of the simple. Complex: No composite thing in the world is made up of simple parts, and there nowhere exists in the world anything simple.”²¹ Thirdly, freedom and causality is define as- “freedom: Causality in accordance with laws of nature is not the only causality from which the

¹⁹Ibid., p. 300.

²⁰Ibid., p. 396.

²¹Ibid., p. 402.

appearances of the world can one and all be derived. To explain these appearances it is necessary to assume that there is also another causality, that of freedom. Causality: There is no freedom; everything in the world takes place solely in accordance with laws of nature.”²² Fourthly, condition and unconditioned is defines as- “condition: There belongs to the world, either as its part or as its cause, a being that is absolutely necessary. Unconditioned: An absolutely necessary being nowhere exists in the world, nor does it exist outside the world as its cause.”²³ Each antinomy derived from reason that has a sound argument in which one cannot draw a conclusion where each of the argument meets. In Kant dialectic, reason discloses the identity of each contradiction in a crystal manner. For him, it is futile to attempt to resolve these antinomies since it does not come from human experience and one can never get an absolute solution for all these contradiction.

From the given antinomies in Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* one can observe that contradiction is apparent in Kant’s dialectic. Kant’s dialectic did reveal identity in differences but there is no unity in differences. Like Socrates dialogue with Glaucon, Kant’s dialectic also has disagreement or contradiction but unlike dialogues there is no agreement or consensus in Kant’s dialectic. “In the formulation of dialectic, Kant fails to integrate the characteristic feature of Socrates dialogue, which is moment of consensus. It is precisely due to this failure that Kant could not resolve the antinomies.”²⁴

According to Frederick Beiser’s assumption, the function of dialectic is to maintain unity between two contradictory concepts yet retain their differences as two aspects of one concept. How the method of dialectic does arise in the field of philosophy? In a general sense, the method of dialectic came to surface when one faces an ineluctable contradiction in the operation of understanding.²⁵ Now it would be befitting to discuss how Kant implemented the method of dialectic in his philosophy. One cannot deny the fact that Kant’s antinomies play a significant role in developing Hegel’ notion of dialectic

²²Ibid., p. 409.

²³Ibid., p. 415.

²⁴Singh, “From Dialogue to Dialectics: Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx,” p. 265.

²⁵Beiser, *Hegel*, p. 164.

.Let me first discuss Kant's differentiation of understanding and reason which plays a significant role in implementing the method of dialectic. The faculty of understanding, as stated by Kant, separates ideas that derive from sensibility and form contradictory ideas that are independent of each other. Understanding tends to examine/analyze things and classify them into parts which are self sufficient in itself that it led to contradictory ideas.²⁶ Understanding obtains ideas that have its impression from sense experience. So for Kant, understanding operates within the reach of human experience only and thus knowledge is restricted only to science and cannot go beyond it. The understanding cannot employ its concepts to grasp the unconditioned because it can never be given in sensibility. According to Kant,

Objects are given to us by means of sensibility, and it alone yields us intuitions; they are thought through understanding and from understanding arise concepts. But all thought must, directly or indirectly, by way of certain characters, relate ultimately to intuitions and therefore, with us, to sensibility, because in no other way can an object be given to us.²⁷

In the above quotation, Kant meant to assert that it is only reason which can make a judgment on what is absolutely unconditioned. For him, reason on the other hand is implemented when the mind raise the metaphysical questions like concept of permanent soul, the existence of God, the origin of the universe etc. These are the ideas that does not have an impression from sense experiences and that is where Kant's transcendental dialectic came into being.

For Kant, dialectic operates where reason tries to deal with metaphysical issues which are the four antinomies. Each antinomy has a sound and valid argument with no final conclusion. These four antinomies contradict each other in such a way that both of the arguments are true yet no connection between them. Kant said that one can conceive such antinomies but reason can never solve the contradictory nature of the antinomies. So for him, one should stop groping the infinite which does not come from sense experience.

²⁶Ibid., p. 164.

²⁷Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 7.

Reason can show the contradictory nature of metaphysical issues which are valid in their own way in the faculty of human mind but it does not resolve those contradictory issues. According to Hegel, this is where the flaw of Kant's antinomies lies. Reason seeks to identify the infinite for the existence of finite and the unconditioned for the existence of condition and it goes on and on. It fails to resolve the contradiction. Kant himself said that "Human reason has this peculiar fate that in one species of its knowledge it is burdened by questions which, as prescribed by the very nature of reason itself, it is not able to ignore, but which, as transcending all its power, it is also not able to answer."²⁸ Here one can infer that Kant draw distinction between understanding and reason. And as I have mention earlier, Kant's dialectic of reason operates in the realm of transcendental illusion.

In opposition to Kant's dialectic of reason, Federick Besier said, "the chief result for the dialectic is that reason is not only a form of mechanical explanation, which shows how one finite thing depends upon another, but also a form of holistic explanation which shows how all finite things are parts of a wider whole."²⁹ For Hegel, dialectic of reason gives a common meeting each contradicted antinomies to meet. Understanding in Hegel's view shows contradictions in things but reason in dialectic serves as a consensus for two opposite concepts or ideas to become one entity. In short, reason identifies the differences but bring unity in these differences. "According to Hegel's notion of dialectic, there are two operative terms that are, contradiction and sublation. Sublation, in Hegel's dialectic means to resolve into a higher unity or to bring into the wholeness that which is fragmentary."³⁰ As mentioned before, Kant's dialectic of reason can only shows contradictions which are valid in their respective way and there is no mutual agreement in the disagreement in antinomies. But in Hegel's dialectic we see agreement in the disagreement. In other words, there is unity in differences. Hegel says,

²⁸Ibid., p.7.

²⁹Beiser, *Hegel*, p. 164.

³⁰Singh, "From Dialogue to Dialectics: Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx," p. 265.

The true solution can only be this, that two determinations, being contradictory, and yet necessary to the same concept, cannot be valid each of itself, in its one sidedness, but have their truth only in their transcendence, in the unity of their concept.³¹

So Hegel uses the term *sublation* for the reconciliation of two contradictory concepts. As Federich Beiser said, in Hegel's dialectic differences or contradictions are not eliminated in order to form one non contradictory concept but rather brings identity in differences. And this identity forms a wholistic view in which no differences or contradiction are winnowed out but sublated to form higher part of the whole. In Hegel's view, contradictions or differences are not to be considered as irrelevant mistakes. It is the part that constituted the whole that is higher than a mere concept which has no contradictory nature. Everything that exists has contradicted nature and in this contradictory nature there is sublation in which there is reconciliation between the two opposite concept. So for Hegel, the growth or development of things are not linear but circular which means whenever sublation takes place between two contradictions, this very sublation which form unity in differences again become a part which has contradiction. And again this contradiction is sublated and form higher truth which in turn become contradiction again and this goes on and on but in a progressive manner. The higher it becomes the more absolute it is. So Hegel's concept of dialectic is wholistic in nature in which nothing is extirpated, everything serves as part to constitute the whole.

Before getting into details of Hegel's dialectic, let us see what the bases for building his concept of dialectic are. Hegel writes,

These Kantian antinomies still remain as an important part of the critical philosophy, they principally, affected the fall of the previous metaphysics and may be looked on as a chief transition to modern philosophy; for they in particular assisted to produce a conviction of the invalidity of the categories of finitude by examining their content; and this is a more correct method than that former method of a subjective idealism according to which their

³¹Hegel, *Science of Logic*, pp.205-6.

only fault is supposed to be that they are subjective and not that which they are in themselves.³²

Kant in *Critique of Pure Reason* has given four antinomies which operate within the transcendental dialectic. Though Hegel did appreciate Kant's antinomies but he said that one can discover more than four antinomies. And the area where reason operates in Kant can only show contradictions and that Kant fail to resolve it. Kant leaves these contradictions unresolved. And by doing so, he draws a limit to the extent of categories of understanding. Reason is never in immediate relation to objects given in sensibility. It is understanding that holds sway in Kant's Epistemology. Reason is required as the indispensable corrective to the deficiencies of understanding.³³ Another point to be noted here is that, for Kant reason serve to be in hand only within the realm of transcendental where human mind can formulate such concept which one cannot take no notice of it whereas in experience one cannot extract meaning from it.

As I stated before, Kant's transcendental dialectic has something to do with the metaphysical realm which according to him is unnecessary in dealing with it. It can be opine that Kant bring in such notion of transcendental dialectic because human reason cannot help but think of the metaphysical concept though he did not give an answer to all possible question that one can raise. For him such kinds of concepts are not possible in experience. Hegel remarks,

What Kant tried to give is an appearance of completeness to his for cosmological antinomies by his method of classification which he borrow from his scheme of categories. A deeper insight into the antinomies or rather into the dialectic nature of reason shows, however, that every concept is a unity of opposite moments, which could therefore be asserted in the shape of an antinomy. Thus, becoming, determinate being, and so on, and other concepts, could each furnish its particular antinomy, and as many antinomies could be set up as concepts were yielded.³⁴

³²Ibid., p. 204.

³³Singh, "From Dialogue to Dialectic : Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx," pp. 264-5.

³⁴Hegel, *Science of Logic*, p.206.

As for Hegel, there can be more than four antinomies that the reason can produce. Unlike Kant he did not give a rigid difference between understanding and reason. According to Hegel, understanding can indeed show the identity of a thing and separate them from what is common whereas reason tries to unite the differences into one whole unit maintaining their distinct aspects yet reconciling them into one. From the above discussion, one can observe that Kant was caught up in the web of dualism in formulating his antinomies. Hegel saw this dualism and says “The proper solution to the antinomies is not to divide but to unite the noumenal and the phenomenal unconditioned and conditioned, by showing how both form necessary parts of a single indivisible whole; it was necessary to show, in other words, the noumenal is within the phenomenal, the unconditioned within the conditional.”³⁵ Every concept, as far as Hegel is concerned, has its characteristic; viz. a moment of self-identity and another moment of self-differentiation; and the form the basis of the Hegelian dialectic. As discussed above, Hegel’s criticism of Kant’s concept of reason consists in the fact that while recognizing its dialectical characteristic, reason fails to overcome the antinomies between the finite and infinite, simple and complex, freedom and necessity, conditioned and unconditioned.³⁶ Basically, Hegel’s dialectic is to unite the differences and subsuming them into one. By doing this he did not eliminate their distinguish nature but retain it and bringing them into higher level of absolute. For him, contradiction is the very nature of things and one cannot annihilate it, instead one should try to bring them to higher stage by uniting them into one whole which is more close to absolute.

Hegel writes in the sub heading 81 of the *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* that,

Everything that surrounds us may be viewed as an instance of Dialectic. We are aware that everything finite, instead of being stable and ultimate, is rather changeable and transient, and this is exactly what we mean by that Dialectic of the finite by which the

³⁵Beiser, *Hegel*, p. 166.

³⁶Singh, *Dialectic of Reason : A comparative study of Kant and Hegel*, p. 78.

finite, as that which is itself is other than itself, is forced beyond its own immediate or natural being to turn suddenly into its opposite.³⁷

In the dialectic process, Hegel use two operative terms – contradiction and sublation. Hegel believes that two contradictory viewpoints can be reconcile and culminate for the higher truth. In fact, these are not two separate terms but they are mutually interdependent to each other and under certain circumstances they pass into each other. Hegel says that there can not be pure contradiction; each contradiction at some point unites to form higher level of knowledge so contradiction has to be there every moment. Sublation here means that the capacity to overcome the contradiction and elevate the stage of knowledge. In short it is the progression in knowledge that takes place when two contradict concept unites. What Hegel means by understanding is that, it has the tendency to reflect the distinction of identity from differences. The understanding, however, restrict itself to the finite, and its thinking is always finite thinking. Hegel often calls it *finite reason*.³⁸ By reason, Hegel means that, when the unity of opposites takes, reason operate not as combining or connecting agent; but it functions as the one who transforms the opposites so that they cease to exist as separate entities and become more real form of being at a higher level. In the process of unifying the opposites, reason negates the finite and its negation, and sublates them together in mutual dependence, so that they revealed as moments of a more inclusive whole.³⁹

Unlike Kant notion of reason, Hegel's uses reason as the unifying agent to complete a whole which were scattered as contradictions in understanding. Kant stresses too much on contradictions in the dialectic of reason whereas Hegel's dialectic of reason resolve this contradiction by sublating them into higher form of absolute. Micheal George points out, "it was Hegel's purpose in his philosophical system to demonstrate both the method by which and the extent to which, Reason, understood dialectically could be just such a corrective."⁴⁰ Hegel acknowledges the logical implication of contradiction in

³⁷Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, p. 150.

³⁸Singh, "Kant and Hegel on Categories and Consciousness," pp. 11-12.

³⁹Ibid., p.12.

⁴⁰George, *Marx's Hegelianism : An Exposition from Hegel and Modern Philosophy*, pp. 118-87.

everything that is given to us. He did not just overlook the contradiction and end there but he sublimate contradiction by elevating them into higher stage where each identity is retained yet seen as one whole. One can say that this is the significance of Hegel's dialectic of reason which is similar to Socrates' dialogue where there is consensus in the two opposite parties. "Despite such similarities, there are certain fundamental differences between Socrates' dialogue and Hegel's dialectic. The amount of consensus in Socrates's dialogue is not and cannot be, the same as sublation (aufheben) in Hegel's dialectic. Sublation, in Hegel's dialectic means to resolve into a higher unity or to bring into the wholeness that which is fragmentary."⁴¹ Hegel pointed out in *Phenomenology of Spirit* that,

The true is the whole. But the whole is nothing other than the essence consummating itself through its development of the Absolute, it must be said that it is essentially, result, that only in the end, is it what it truly is, and that precisely in this consists its nature.⁴²

What can be drawn out from the given quotation is that everything in existence is given in its completeness which means things are given not as fragmentary. They are given with its contradictory nature that has to be united into a whole and this whole is the true because this whole contains contradictions that did not annihilate each other but constitute as one whole. The whole is the conglomeration of contradictions which at some point complement each other and transform into higher level of absolute. So every concept of contradiction has been transformed into higher absolute where there is unity in differences. And this complete series which constitute the whole become again a starting point for developing more absolute truth and this moves on until one obtains the ultimate absolute. For Hegel, the development of absolute is in a circular form where nothing is eradicated but everything is included in this whole. Every stage is the stage of development from the earlier stage and this series continues till it reaches the absolute.

It would be appropriate to see what Hegel has to say regarding the notion of contradiction which will further bring light to his conceptualization of dialectic. In *Science of Logic*, Hegel said that,

⁴¹Singh, "From Dialogue to Dialectic: Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx," p. 265.

⁴²Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, p.11.

...everything is inherently contradictory and in the sense that this law in contrast to other expresses rather the truth and the essential nature of things...Contradiction is the root of all movement and vitality; it is only in so far as something has a contradiction within it that it moves, has an urge and activity.⁴³

The above lines evidently indicate that, contradiction in Hegel's concept is not something that is unnatural and has to discard since it has the tendency to misled one from knowing the truth. Contradiction is bound to exist in ones mind otherwise everything will exist as one where the notion of identity will be irrelevant. To talk about identity in a realm of non contradiction will be absurd and there will be no progressive movement or activity. The movement of things or activity of things happened only when there is contradictory nature. As Hegel said, the essential nature of things is contradiction; it exists everywhere and without it everything will be moribund. According to Hegel, the law of nature is change and change takes place only when there is contradiction. Every change that takes place always moves towards the direction of higher state. There is a movement from lower to higher state in which contradiction plays a significance role for being the cause of this movement. When one think logically, there cannot be any motion where everything is stagnant, something has to be there to cause motion and one can say that changes happen only in the presence contradiction. In Hegel's view, contradiction is the root of all activity and the cause of development. For him, the nature of things is contradiction and nothing subsists without contradiction since it can be considered as the prime mover of all things.

To substantiate Hegel's notion of contradiction I wish to proceed by quoting his lines

...internal self-movement proper, instinctive urge in general...is nothing else but the fact that something is, in one and the same respect, self-contained and deficient, the negative or itself. Abstract self-identity is not as yet negativity, goes outside itself and undergoes alteration. Something is therefore alive only in so far as it contains

⁴³Hegel, *Science of Logic*, p. 439.

contradiction within it and moreover in this power to hold and endure the contradiction within it.⁴⁴

For Hegel contradiction is the very intrinsic nature of each term but in Socrates dialogue one can see that in the process of dialogue contradiction is obviated when thoughts develop. According to Hegel, in every term there is contradiction whether in thought or reality, one cannot conceive things without its contradiction. Eradicating contradiction does not assist the mind to be more close to truth instead it lead to misapprehension of things. Here, Hegel seems to hold that any form of activity always takes place when there is contradiction and this activity is always in the process of elevation. Contradiction as term by Hegel is an instinctive urge which is integral in things or in concepts and it pioneer motion that tend to progress from lower to higher mode. Not only that, thing is in the process of becoming more absolute by undergoing alteration which are cause by contradiction. When things contradict, identity is being questioned and Hegel use reason to conciliate differences and thus melioration takes place. Therefore, Hegel says that contradiction make something alive to persist in order to move towards elevated state. For him, everything is in the process of becoming more and more absolute. In corroboration to the concepts of contradiction in Hegel's philosophy I intend to highlight the following lines:

Nothing exist, as just brutally given and simply possessing one or two fully positive characteristics. Nothing exists that is first and primary and on which other things depend without mutual relation....what appears at first simple and immediate is actually complex and mediated.⁴⁵

According to the given line, one can assume that things are given with its distinctive opposite nature. And that a thing is not to be taken in its singleness without its contradiction which means one should not view things as one simple thing that is free from contradiction. Things does not possess only one distinctive nature but it always come along with its opposite nature. "Close to the end of the logic, Hegel reasons out that

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 439-40.

⁴⁵Kolb, *The Critique of Pure Morality-Hegel, Heidegger, and after*, p. 46.

there is nothing, whether in actuality or in thought, that is as simple and abstract as is commonly imagined.”⁴⁶

From the above discussion one can see that, Hegel did not regard contradiction as something which is to be extinguish but rather it is something that one has to hold on in order to perceive thing in line of movement. From this line of thought, one can notice that Hegel's dialectic differs from Socrates dialogues that advocate the elimination of contradiction with the development of thought. In short, in spite of some similarities in terms of consensus, the differences between Hegel's dialectic and Socrates dialogue is that Hegel merged logic and dialectic and therefore use contradiction and sublation as two operative terms to bring identity in differences. Hegel philosophy also prevails over the conventional belief that the annihilation of contradiction take place with the gradual development of thought which Kant also seems to suggest. In Kant, one observes that he does not integrated logic in his notion of dialectic which Hegel essentially refutes. “He applies in the science of logic to the gradual explication and development of not only of the *separation* but also of the connectedness between one category and another.”⁴⁷

“Indeed the point of the dialectic will be to remove contradictions by showing how contradictory predicates that seem true of the same thing are really only true of different parts or aspects of the same thing.”⁴⁸ To illustrate how Hegel's dialectic work by using his two operative terms namely contradiction and sublation, I would like to bring in the notion of thesis, antithesis and synthesis though he himself did not use these terms. These terms correspond to his idea of Being, Nothing and Becoming. Regarding the concept Pure Being Hegel says,

Being, Pure Being- without any further determination. In its determinate immediacy it is similar to itself alone, and also it has no differentiation either within itself or relatively to anything external: nor it would remain fixed in its purity, were there any determination or

⁴⁶Singh, “From Dialogue to Dialectic : Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx,” p. 267.

⁴⁷Ibid., p.268.

⁴⁸Beiser, *Hegel*, p. 162.

content which could be distinguished within it, or whereby it could be posited as distinct from an other. It is pure determinateness and vacuity.⁴⁹

Being as the thesis is a concept which has the capacity to become something and yet when examine cautiously it is void and does not have something solid as its content. It has no form, no shape, no color, no size etc. It cannot be given any definite form as Hegel put forth, it is total vacuity. Pure Being is something which can take any form of existent. Being in itself is self sufficient to become something but it is still in an abstract form without any particular name, quality, quantity, measure etc. Therefore, Hegel says it is pure determinateness and vacuity. Pure Nothing according to Hegel is,

Nothing, Pure Nothing: it is simple equality itself, complete emptiness; without determination or content: undifferentiatedness in itself ...Nothing, therefore, is the same determination (or rather lack of determination), and thus altogether the same thing as pure Being.⁵⁰

Nothing on the other hand can be taken as antithesis which by itself is empty and is incapable of becoming something. On the other hand, Nothing is similar to Being since both implies void or empty. Nothing can also be identify with negation. Nothing by itself negates what it is in itself and thus implies emptiness since it has no content at all. Hegel defines Becoming as

Pure Being and Pure Nothing are then, the same: the truth is not either Being or Nothing but that Being – not passes- but has passes over into Nothing, and Nothing into Being. But equally the truth is not their lack of distinction, but that they are not the same, that they are absolutely distinct, and yet unseparated and inseparable, each disappearing immediately into its opposite. Their truth is therefore this movement, this immediate disappearance of the one into the other, in a word, Becoming: a movement wherein both are distinct, but in virtue of a distinction which has equally immediately dissolved itself.⁵¹

⁴⁹Hegel, *Science of Logic*, p. 94.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 95.

The idea of synthesis can be identified with Becoming which merge Being and Nothing. Becoming sublate the two contradictory idea that is Being and Nothing by eliminating yet retaining their distinctive nature. In the concept of Becoming one can see that Being which has the tendency to become something has been integrated with Nothing by sublation and thus it turn into Becoming. Becoming can now be the form of something more concrete. Since Becoming is in a very abstract form it can be considered as a starting point for the process of dialectic system where Becoming is taken as the thesis which will in turn has antithesis and then eventually synthesis operating. The whole process goes on and on in a circular manner until it reaches the absolute. In Hegel dialectic process one see three distinct idea but they mutually co exist in one another, in short they are three yet one. George Michael interpret Hegel dialectic process as,

First, it has the moment of 'transcendence' in which it goes beyond a 'limit' or 'boundary'. Secondly, it is 'negation' of the first negation; this 'limit', in which it is the moment of 'preservation; in which what has been 'gone beyond' or transcended is brought again into a new relation.⁵²

From the above discussion, one can see the identity of the three moments (Being, Nothing and Becoming) and yet their differences is still maintain. One can see their unity in their difference or to put in other words, there is identity in their differences. One can not exist without the other, they coincide in one another. In the dialectic process of Hegel, sublation serve as an elevating agent which negates yet preserve the different nature of Being (thesis) and Nothing (antithesis). They are inter related in spite of their differences and not only that they also are dependent on one another because the absent of one cannot complete the series of dialectical process. They mutually work together to culminate into a more develop form. Since, the result of synthesis in turn becomes thesis again and this thesis is again bound to have anti thesis and eventually synthesis takes place. And again this synthesis becomes thesis and this whole process goes on and on until it reaches the consummating point which Hegel calls the absolute.

⁵²George, *Marx's Hegelianism: An Exposition from Hegel and Modern Philosophy*, p. 123.

To proceed further with the view of expounding Hegel's concept of dialectic with the assistance of his two operative terms I want to draw out some lines for W.T. Stace,

The fact that it is an identity of differences means that the differences are merged. The fact that it is an identity of differences means that they are preserved. We have not mere identity, ie simple abolition of differences. Nor have we a mere opposition ie simple preservation of differences. What we have is an identity of opposites. Simple abolition would mean that we have identity, but no opposites. Simple preservation would mean that we have opposites, but no identity. Becoming is the unity of Being and Nothing. And their difference is absorbed. Yet being and nothing are still there, present in becoming, and may get out of it by analysis. They have ceased to exist as separate entities, as opposite abstractions. In this sense, they are abolished. But they now exist in combination, as factors of concrete unity. They exist in absorption and not lost. And when the synthesis becomes the thesis of a new triad, it will in its turn be merged but yet preserved along with its opposite, in a further synthesis.⁵³

From the above lines one can perspicuously see that, in the dialectic process nothing is eliminated. Each process in every stage absorbs what was given before and continued to proceed in an ascending manner in the following process. This process is a never ending journey which moves with the vision of achieving a final destination. It can be assumed that for Hegel, everything is in the process of becoming which is yet to be achieved. Hegel asserted that human history is the history of development which means it is an on going process of consummating. But one thing to be noted here is that, it is always ascending towards a higher ground. For Hegel, everything that is in thought or in reality is in the system of dialectic, in short he sees dialectic everywhere.

Another thing which is essential to add in my present paper in order to endorse dialectical method in Hegel philosophy is his three principles of dialectic. These principles were presumed by Frederick Engels as – i) Law of the interpenetration of opposites, ii) Law of the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa, iii) Law

⁵³Stace, *The Philosophy of Hegel*, pp. 106-7.

of the negation of the negation.⁵⁴ According to Hegel, knowledge is a growing phenomenon and always in the process of becoming the absolute truth. Hegel explicates three basic principles of dialectics. i) Unity and struggle of opposites. This principle can be explicated out of his formulation of the categories of Being, Nothing and Becoming. Hegel defines Being as follows,

Being, pure Being- without any further determination. In its indeterminate immediacy it is similar to itself alone, and also not dissimilar from any other; it has no differentiation either within itself or relatively to anything external: nor would it remain fixed in its purity, were there any determination or content which could be distinguished within it, or whereby it could be posited as distinct from an other. It is pure indeterminateness and vacuity.⁵⁵

When we try to abstract Being from all its qualities which we attributed, we are left with nothing just an empty vacuum. For instance, when I want to define chair I define it by abstracting all its properties of being a chair like its solidness, its hardness, its stability etc, finally I am left with nothing but the concept of chair. But nothing can come out of nothing. So Hegel found that Pure Being, though absolutely indeterminate, it contains in itself its own opposite. The mediation is hidden within itself and that the opposite can be deduced from it and made to function. Pure Being in a sense is the same as Pure Nothing. Being, therefore, is the same as nothing. Pure Being is contained in the Pure Nothing. And this indicates that Nothing comes out of Being and this Nothing is in the process of Becoming. The opposition between Being and Nothing has an aspect of unity that is becoming. In this principle we see the unity and the struggles of the opposite. Hegel calls this the category of Becoming.

⁵⁴Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 62.

⁵⁵Hegel, *Science of Logic*, p.204.

ii) Transition from quantity to quality and vice-versa. Whenever any changes takes place, it takes place quantitatively at first and then quantitative changes lead to qualitative change. And qualitative changes again lead to quantitative changes. This principle is the on going process which has no end. For instance, use of internet, earlier only emails and chatting can take place one to one through at different places but now people can see each other web-cam and held conference with many people at the same time. Same principle applies in our thinking in which we find new concepts in our mind and it changes later in a develop manner. “The combination of quality and quantity is found in what Hegel call as measure. Measure is defined by Hegel as the dependence of quality upon quantity, or as quantity upon which quality depends. Quality, for Hegel, is the internal self-determination which is identical with the being which it determines. Quality, when fully developed as repulsion and attraction, passes into quantity and *vice-versa*. It is the unity of quantity and quality.”⁵⁶

iii) Negation of negation. This is the principle of development in which the earlier lower stage is not denied but elevated into a higher stage. The unity of the opposite is possible because they did not exclude each other but pass on to each other. Becoming is actually present in Being and Being is potentially present in Becoming. Lower stage is not rejected but assimilated into a higher stage. For example, agriculture has developed into industry and industry to technology and so on. The earlier stage is not excluded but integrated together to form a higher stage. This kind of development takes place in our thinking process as well. The contradiction and opposites at some point complement each other to form a higher level of thinking. He suggests that every thing that surrounds us may be viewed as an instance of dialectic. Hegel demonstrates that the laws of dialectic are not only operating in our thought but are also the fundamental features of the change and development taking place in the material reality. So the dialectic has this dual function to perform: viz. to show that dialectic is operating in thought, and, that, simultaneously it is operating in the objective reality. As an absolute

⁵⁶Singh, *Dialectic of Reason: A Comparative study of Kant and Hegel*, p. 90.

idealist, Hegel regards dialectic of thought as primary and dialectic of nature as secondary, being an externalization of the dialectic of thought.⁵⁷

In this chapter I have discussed the transition of knowledge from myth to *logos* and from *logos* to dialogue and then move on to dialectic. I have explained the dialectic process of Hegel by bringing in Kant's notion of antinomies which serves as ground for Hegel to develop his Dialectical process. He used two operative terms namely, sublation and contradiction which are essential in his dialectical process. In Hegel's view, contradiction is inherent in the nature of things in thought and actuality and the idea that contradiction is eliminated with the growth of knowledge is inapplicable in his philosophy. Sublation according to Hegel is that, it unites contradiction and elevates them to higher form of truth. Each moment has a moment of identity which is being preserve and moment of differences which is annihilated. And the function of reason is to sublates contradictory nature by bringing unity in differences. I have also explicated the three principles of dialectics which are seen in our empirical world as well as in our theoretical world.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 178-179.

CHAPTER THREE

TRINITY AND DIALECTICS:

A COMPARISON AND CONTRAST

This chapter will compare and contrast the concept of trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition and Hegel's dialectic. As a matter of fact trinity has developed in terms of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. There is relation and difference among these three doctrines and the method to vindicate these doctrines is commandment. Hegel has appreciated the relation and difference among those three doctrines but he has developed a philosophical perspective known as dialectic. It has evolved out of the terms like contradiction and sublation including three principles of dialectic. In my attempt to articulate trinity and dialectic I will take up Holy Spirit as the central doctrine in the trinity in as much as Hegel's *geist* or spirit is central to his dialectic. In order to make my position clear and precise I wish to divide this chapter into two parts. In Part I, I will compare Holy Spirit of the trinity with Hegel's spirit in his dialectic. And in Part II, I will discuss Hegel as a Christian philosopher.

PART I: HOLY SPIRIT IN THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITION

4.1 The Holy Spirit: the ultimate consummation of the triune God

According to Judeo-Christian tradition, the Holy Spirit is the ultimate consummation of the Triune God. *John 4:24* says "God is Spirit..."¹ This verse asserts God being the Spirit which means God's essence is the Spirit. God is Spirit and without the Spirit, the concept of Trinity is inapplicable to the believers. The Spirit is the reality of the divine Trinity. It is not to be misconstrued that one third of God is Spirit, the entire Triune God is Spirit. God the Father sent forth His Son through the Holy Spirit and the Son was born of a human virgin after being conceived in the Holy Spirit. The Son, who was one with the Father and the Spirit, passed through death and resurrection and became the life giving Spirit which has become the reality to the believer. Thus, the concept of divine Trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition is the Spirit.

To elaborate the concept of the Holy Spirit I intend to deploy all the relevant biblical references. As I have pointed out before, the consummation of the processed

¹*The Holy Bible, New Testament, John4:24.*

Triune God reaching the believers is through the Spirit. It is in the Spirit that one can see the divine incorporation of the coinhering Triune God coinhering with the believers.² *John 14: 16-20* says, “And I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may be with you forever, Even the Spirit of reality, whom the world cannot receive, because it does not behold Him or know Him; but you know Him, because He abides with you and shall be in you. I will not leave you as orphans; I am coming to you. Yet a little while and the world behold Me no longer, but you behold Me; because I live, you also shall live. In that day you will know that I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you.”³ The four *ins* in these verses clearly depicts that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit does not come into the believer as three separate Gods but come as the Triune God. The coming of the Triune God is through the Spirit. The bible lucidly mentioned that “the Holy Spirit is the reality of the divine Trinity.”⁴ *John 14: 26* says , “But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things and remind you of all the things which I have said to you”. This verse states that the Spirit as the son with the Father is in the believer. This verse also shows that the coming of the Spirit is the coming of the Father and the Son. The Spirit is the presence of the Triune God within the believers.⁵ Undoubtedly, one can clearly see in the bible that, the Father, the Son and the Spirit are the three aspects of one God and the Spirit is the means for God to reach man and man to contact God.

Without God being the Spirit, the believers have no way to receive and contain God. *John 16: 7-11* says “But when He, the Spirit of reality, comes, He will guide you into all the reality; for He will not speak from Himself, but what He hears He will speak; and He will declare to you the things that are coming. He will glorify Me, for He will receive of Mine and will declare it to you. All that the Father has is Mine; for this reason I have said that He receives of Mine and will declare it to you”. This indicates the Spirit being the organic transmission of the divine Trinity.⁶ The divine and human element of

²Lee, *The Spirit*, p. 5.

³*The Holy Bible, New Testament, John 14:16-20.*

⁴*Ibid., John 14:17-20, 1 Corinthians 15:45, 2 Corinthians 3:17.*

⁵*Ibid., Mathew 1:23, 18: 20, 28: 20, 2 Timothy 4:22.*

⁶Lee, *The Spirit*, p. 5.

God the Father and God the Son are being transmitted to the believers through the Spirit. God, without being the Spirit is unprocurable for man since man is a sinner and has no capacity to obtain the holy and righteous God into their being. I will explicate later how man can receive God. For now, I would like to linger on the concept of the Spirit being totality of the Triune God.

It is given in *John1:14* that, “And the Word became flesh and tabernacle among us...” when one observes this verse meticulously one cannot deny the fact that the Word becoming flesh is the Son with the Father in the Spirit. This shows the stage of incarnation of Christ. The Son’s incarnation was carried out by the Spirit in the Father which means the Father sent the Son by the Spirit to become human being. The Son becoming human does not mean the absence of the Father and the Spirit. The Spirit as the embodiment of God, bring God into man and to make God contactable, tangible, receivable, experience able and enjoyable.⁷ All that the Father and the Son is in its divine life and nature is embodied in the Spirit. Thus, the receiving of the Spirit is the Receiving of the Father and the Son. “The Spirit is the mingling of divinity with humanity. And the Spirit can be considered as the prototype for the mass reproduction of many God-men.”⁸ God-men are the believers who possess the same life and nature of God through the Spirit. The point to be noted here is that, when a person believes in the Son i.e. Lord Jesus, he receives God’s life into him since God has become the Spirit by passing through human living, death and resurrection. The Spirit as the Son with the Father carried out God’s organic salvation to bring many people into God.⁹ In the form of the Holy Spirit God impart Himself into man. Without God being the Spirit, God and man can never be connected.

It is also pivotal to consider how the Spirit becomes the ultimate consummation of the Triune God. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and they are not three separate entities. God the Father is the creator, the almighty, the divine, the holy and the righteous God who is the source of all things that exist in the universe. God the Son being

⁷Ibid., p.7.

⁸Ibid.

⁹*The Holy Bible, New Testament, 1 Corinthians 15:45.*

in the Father is sent by the Father to become human possessing divine nature through the Spirit. And God the Spirit in the Son with the Father is the dispensing of God into man. When one meticulously observes the relationship of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, one can intelligibly conclude that they are distinct in their functions but they are the same in nature. They are three yet one, in short, Triune God. They are related to one another so it is apparent that coming of one of the three is always accompanied with the other two. One cannot deny that they are distinct but one has to keep in mind that they are not three different Gods. The Father cannot be completely severed from the Son and the Spirit and the disuniting of the Son from the Father and the Spirit is out of the question. And the Spirit too can never be isolated from the Father and the Son. They are closely knitted together and are embedded to one in relation to the other and therefore they are one.

With regard to the present topic of discussion, it is important to emphasize on the Holy Spirit. As pointed earlier, the Spirit is obviously from the Father with the Son. Let's see how the Triune God becomes the Spirit. The Father came to reach out man in the Son by becoming a man called Jesus (*Mathew 1:21*). Man being sinful cannot receive God and so the Son came to redeemed man back to God. Redemption is carried out in the Son on the cross by the shedding of blood to wash away the sins of men and of the world (*Hebrew 9:12*). The Son died and was resurrected to become the life giving Spirit (*1 Corinthians 15:45*). The Spirit has the elements of the divinity and humanity of Christ and also the elements of the all inclusive death along with the excellent resurrection (*Exodus 30:23-25*). Now the Father and the Son became the Spirit for the purpose of imparting life to men and to make them the same as He is (*Genesis 1:26*). So, the Spirit is the practical application of the Triune God in Judeo-Christian tradition. The Father is the source, the Son is the manifestation and the Spirit is the transmission of all that the Father and the Son is. The Spirit unites the Father and the Son as one and dispensation takes place. The Spirit infuses and transfuses the being of the Triune God into the believer. As the Spirit, God can enter into man and dwell within man. Thus, one can notice the unity of the Father, the Son and the Spirit in their differences. In substance three that is the Father, the Son, and the Spirit and in essence all are one that is Triune God. The reality of the application of God is in the Spirit.

4.2 The purpose of the triune God being the Holy Spirit

Is the concept of the Holy Spirit necessary in Judeo-Christian traditions? Why does God have to become the Spirit? What significant role does the Spirit have to play in the concept of Trinity in Christian faith? As I have mentioned earlier, the absence of the concept of Holy Spirit in Judeo-Christian tradition will fail to fulfill God's purpose in creating man. The purpose of God creating man is that He wants to fill man with Himself thus making man the same as He is in life and in nature but not in the God head.¹⁰ God's desire is that He wants to dispense Himself into man and this dispensing can be accomplished only when God become the processed Triune God. Man and God has unbridgeable gap which can never be mend unless God become the Spirit by being the Triune God since man is sinful. The Holy and almighty God can enter into man only by becoming the Spirit through the process of incarnation, human living, crucifixion, redemption, death, resurrection and ascension. God has to pass through all these processes in order to be able to impart Himself into man. The Spirit is means for God to contact man and for man to receive God.

The reality of the Triune God is the Holy Spirit which paves the way for God and man to live as one entity. The whole concept of Trinity is bound to collapse in the absence of the Spirit. Not only that, the faith of a Christian will be just a doctrine in the mind without any practical experience of God. The reality of Judeo-Christian traditions lies in the Holy Spirit. It is only through the Spirit that God and man can be become one. Salvation of sinners is possible only when God become the processed Triune God whose essence is the Spirit. The reconciliation of God and man is established because of the God being the Spirit. As the Spirit, He is available to all mankind and He can be received irrespective of space, time, race, culture, and nation. Man can contact God the Spirit since man is also created with a spirit which is one of the three parts of man. Man being tripartite, consist of three parts- spirit, soul and body.¹¹ "The human spirit is an organ to contact God and it consists of intuition, conscience and fellowship. It is a spiritual realm

¹⁰Ibid., *Genesis 1:26*

¹¹Ibid., *1 Thessalonians 5:23, Proverbs 20:27, Job 32:8, Genesis 2:7.*

where God speaks to man by being the Spirit. The soul consists of mind, will and emotion, that is, the mind is to think or know, will is to choose or decide and the emotion is to feel. All of these are in the psychological realm. The body being in the physical realm is to contact the things of the world.”¹²

According to *John 4:24* it is mentioned that, “God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truthfulness.” From this verse one can see how significant the role of Spirit is. In order for Christians to be in fellowship with God, they need to be in the spirit since the Triune God is Spirit Himself. The processed Triune God lives and operates within man by the Spirit. God the Father is the source, God the Son is the course and God the Spirit is the means. To illustrate this I would like to cite a metaphor of the divine Trinity. The Father being the source of life can be compared to a fountain of water (*John 5:26*). The Father in the Son that is the Son as the course is similar to the spring of water emerging for the manifestation and expression of life (*John 1:4, 1John 1:2*). The Son as the Spirit of life spring up to be a river, avail as a means to all (*Psalms 36:8-9, 46: 4, John 7: 38*).¹³ This metaphor shows how the three-in-one God functions as one entity. It also depicts the unity of the divine Trinity in the dispensation of life. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinct from each other but they are not discreet. The believers can enter into the divine and mystical realm through the consummated Spirit. Not only that, God being everything to the believer become subjectively available to be the solutions to all problems (*1 Corinthians 1:2,9, 15:45*). It is the Spirit that carries out God’s heart desire and accomplished God’s organic salvation by making every believer members of the body of Christ that is the Church.¹⁴ From the given discussion one can see the significant role of the Holy Spirit in Judeo-Christian traditions.

¹²Less, *The Economy of God*, pp.4-10.

¹³Lee, *The Spirit*, p. 8.

¹⁴Ibid.

4.3 The functions of the Holy Spirit

It would be appropriate to discuss the functions of the Holy Spirit with a view of showing the crucial role that the Holy Spirit plays in Judeo-Christianity. To begin with, it is the Spirit that seeks out sinners to turn to God by convicting them to repent to God.¹⁵ *John 1:12-13* says “But as many as received Him, to them He gave the authority to become children of God, to those who believe into His name, who were begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” From these verses one can acknowledge that it is the will of God that one can receive God. This will is carried out through the Spirit who convicts sinners to repent and turn to God. The main purpose is to make sinners children of God for the producing of the Body of Christ, the church. The church is constituted of many believers who are gained by the Spirit of God. According to Judeo-Christian traditions, the Spirit functions as the main element in making the believer the many members of the church, the body of Christ. This Spirit is the all inclusive Spirit. To certify the significance of the Holy Spirit it is important to see functions of Spirit with biblical references.

4.3.1 Sanctifying Spirit:

As the member of the body of Christ, the many believers were made holy with God’s divine nature through the sanctifying Spirit as the word. To prove this point I would like to quote few verses here, *Ephesians 5: 26-27* says, “That He might sanctify her, cleansing her by the washing of the water in the word, that He might present the church to Himself glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such things, but that she would be holy and without blemish.” To be the members of the body of Christ one has to be holy to match God’s holy nature.

¹⁵Ibid., *Luke 15*.

4.3.2 Transforming Spirit:

Not only holiness is required, there is also the need of transformation in order to conform into the image of Christ. And this transformation work is carried out by the Spirit. *2 Corinthians 3:18* says, “But we all with unveil face, beholding and reflecting like a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory , even as from the Lord Spirit.” From this verse one can perceive that the transforming Spirit transforms the believers for the building up of the body of Christ. This transformation work take place from day to day into the believer’s spirit by allowing the transforming Spirit to spread from the spirit to the soul and then eventually to the body. The transforming Spirit continually and gradually transforms the believer so that they can become like God in life and in nature but not in the God head. The believers can be transformed to the extent of being like God is possible because of the Spirit along with the believer’s corporation to the working of the transforming Spirit. The purpose of being transform is for the effective building up of the body of Christ.

4.3.3 Anointing Spirit:

The Spirit being the essence of the Triune God, it anoints the believers to listen and obey the word of God without needing the outward instructions and teachings. *1 John 2:27* says, “And as for you, the anointing which you have received from Him abides in you, and you have no need that anyone teach you; but as his anointing teaches you concerning all things and is true and is not a lie, and even as it has taught you, abide in Him.” This teaching of the anointing Spirit teaches the believer about all things from small and mundane things to big or enormous things. It not only teaches but it also enlightens the believers in dealing with things in life. Not only it anoints but also seal and pledge the believers to show that they belong to God. *1 Corinthians 1:22*, “He who has sealed us and given the Spirit in our hearts as a pledge.” This verse clearly indicates that the Spirit seals the believer with the Spirit of God to show that the believers belongs to God just as one sealed things with a name on it to prove that, that things belong to someone. The pledging Spirit is like assurance to the believer that they can never be

snatch away from God since they are the inheritance of God. “The anointing being, the moving and working of the indwelling Spirit to transfuse, infuse and add the divine and mystical elements of His all inclusive person into the inner being of the believer so that they may grow so that they may grow in the divine life for the producing of the church.”¹⁶

4.3.4 Transmitting Spirit:

In *2 Corinthians 13:14*, it is put forth that, “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all.” This verse asserts that the transmitting Spirit transmits the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ to the believers for experiencing God’s grace in their daily life through thin and thick so that they can overcome the situation by God’s grace. Grace implies the Son’s being the bountiful riches in the believer’s experience. Along with grace comes the love of the Father that did not give up on sinners but continues to pursue with love after them until they repent and turn to Him. This love of God is unconditional love for all mankind that transcends space and time. The Holy Spirit communicates with the believers in their spirit by fellowship concerning the things pertaining to God. The love of God, the grace of Christ and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit is being transmitted to the believers which means all that the Father is and all that the Son is, are being transmitted by the Spirit to the believers as the church.

4.3.5 The Spirit of the body

Through the redemptive work of Christ on the cross, the barrier between God and men is broken down and in resurrection He became the life-giving Spirit to impart Himself to all those who believe in Him (*Romans 8:3, 11,34*) and thus making them the members of the body of Christ. The reality of the body of Christ is the Spirit. *Ephesians 4:4* says, “One Body and one Spirit, even as also you were called in one hope of your calling.” The body of Christ which comprises many believers is made one because of the

¹⁶Ibid., p.10.

Spirit. Without the dispensing of the Spirit, there can be no church in reality. The church is the manifestation and expression of Christ in reality which is practically done by the Spirit. to keep the oneness among the believer, the Spirit operates as the binding bond that unite all kinds of believer coming from different background, cultures, languages, races and nations. The possibility of oneness among different believers is the Spirit that brings unity in differences. “The members of the one Body have access through Christ in the one Spirit unto the Father (*Ephesians 2:18*). The Father strengthens the members of the Body through the Spirit for Christ to make His home in their heart (*Ephesians 3:14-19*).”¹⁷ From the given lines, one can assume that the Father supply the members of the body through the Spirit so that Christ can make His home in the believer’s heart in order to dwell in the believer. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are functioning as one in producing the church as the body of Christ.

The Spirit, apart from the given functions, also led man to do the will of God by giving him the right and willing spirit (*Psalms 51:10-13, 143:10*). Men, in their fallen nature are rebellious to God and do not have the heart to receive and do the will of God. So, it is the Spirit that causes men to be responsive and receptive towards God. Along with that, it also gives man wisdom and understanding, knowledge and power (*Isaiah 11:2, Micah 3:8*).¹⁸ It is generally held that men can never know God because of their limitedness in comparison to God. But such notion is prove wrong in Judeo-Christianity because the Spirit reveals God’s being to men through the word. It is by the Spirit that the things of God are made known to men and it also teach the things of God to men (*1 Corinthians 2:11-13*). By making known the things of God to men, God reveal His heart’s desire to men that is to build up the body of Christ where all the believers functions as one Body. And it is the Spirit that baptize the believers as one Body (*1 Corinthians 12:11*) to constitute them as the testimony of the church. Another thing that is worth mentioning is that, “the Lord being the Spirit is freedom to the believer, liberating them from all the veils, bondage, blindness, darkness and even death (2

¹⁷Ibid., p.27.

¹⁸Ibid., p.21.

Corinthians 3:16-17).”¹⁹ The believers, being united as one Body by the Spirit, are gradually being freed from being the slave of sin and death in order to serve the living God in spirit. The rich elements of God in Christ are aggregated for the believers partaking of and practical participation in the transmission of the Spirit (*2 Corinthians 13:14*).²⁰ Thus, the Holy Spirit in Judeo-Christian traditions is the prime factor in implementing the concept of divine Trinity to the believers.

4.4 Hegel’s *Geist*

Hegel’s spirit has evolved from two fundamental sources, namely, from Judeo-Christian tradition on the one hand and the philosophical tradition of the German Idealism on the other. From Judeo-Christian tradition Hegel’s regards that philosophy is itself religion and it is profoundly a study of God. And the justification of God takes place only with the concept of subjective spirit. This position has evolved out of the notion of Holy Spirit in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Just as in Judeo-Christian tradition there are three features, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. For Hegel there are objective spirit, subjective spirit and the absolute spirit. There is distinction and relation between Father, Son and the Holy Spirit as already discuss in the part I of the chapter. Similarly, Hegel also proposes objective, subjective and absolute spirit in terms of philosophical concepts of contradiction and sublation. Just as Holy Spirit is the relationship between Father and Son similarly Hegel’s *Geist* or absolute spirit is the relationship between subjective spirit and objective spirit.

“Hegel’s spirit is a doctrine about the relationship between thought and objective reality.”²¹ For Hegel, thought is represented as idea and objective reality can be represented as nature. Idea, according to Hegel, is “the categories and the notion which are also known as the truth in the most absolute and objective form. And nature is the sphere of external existence of which the truth is about. In short, the term *idea* Hegel

¹⁹Ibid., p.30.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Singh, *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspectives*, p. 288.

designates to the absolute truth and nature refers to the truth as we find it in the world which has outward existence.”²² Now for Hegel, spirit is the mediation between idea and nature like in Christianity, Holy Spirit bridged the gap between the Father and the Son. For Hegel, idea and nature are dialectical opposites, there is a difference between them but the spirit unites them. The spirit maintains the relationship between idea and nature by uniting them in spite of their differences. By uniting the differences between idea and nature does not become the same but their differences is retain yet they can be put together as one entity with their distinctive nature. Hegel’s believes that between idea and nature, there is something that is identical but this notion of being identical is not with the sphere of thought and also not with the objects of thought. Hegel asserts that it is the spirit that imparts intelligible form of both this sphere. Basically, what Hegel means to say is that, it is the spirit that creates the relationship between idea and nature irrespective of their differences. In fact, the spirit forms the concept of identity in differences. Hegel gets this notion of spirit from Christianity. In Christianity, it is also the Holy Spirit that unites the Father and the Son as one, by uniting; their distinctive nature is not eliminated but maintained. It is the function of spirit in Judeo-Christian tradition, which brings the Father and the Son as one, in spite of their respective nature, so is Hegel’s concept of spirit, which brings unity in differences.

The only differences between Hegel’s spirit and the Holy spirit is that Hegel’s notion of spirit is purely for epistemological quest, where as in Christianity, the Holy Spirit is wholly for the believer’s experiences of the triune God, in reality. By Epistemological quest, it does not mean that it is purely in thought, that it has no connection with the external world. In fact, Hegel applies this dialectical method of spirit in everything he sees. For him, the two operative terms contradiction and sublation is always present everywhere, whether in thought or in reality. For Hegel, spirit serves as sublation where contradiction between idea and nature are overcome by transforming them into higher unity in which their distinctive aspect is retain, yet being put together as one. There is always a movement of thought in an ascending order which means whenever there is contradiction, there is sublation too. And this sublation always move

²²Ibid.

towards more absolute since the concept of absolute is the highest point which is yet to be attain. So, everything is in the process of becoming absolute.

In order to substantiate this point we have to take into account Hegel's epistemological position in order to show his application of religious concept to his philosophy. Basically, epistemology deals with consciousness of object that gives knowledge. For Hegel, "spirit is the active synthesis of our consciousness of the world, and what we are conscious of."²³ As it is pointed out earlier, spirit is the mediation between idea and nature. This idea can be referred to our consciousness of the world and nature can be referred to what we are conscious of. The object of consciousness which gives us knowledge does not show the distinction between what exist for us and what exist in itself. Hegel believes that things exist because we are conscious of it. And his prime concern not to show distinction between what is available for us and what is not available in our consciousness. He believes that things are given to us in its entirety. Therefore, he rejected Kantian distinction between phenomena and thing in itself. For Kant, things in itself can never be known since things are known as they appear to us, and that we can only know the phenomena (appearance) and not know noumena (things in itself). Against Kant's theory of dualism, Hegel contend that consciousness is conscious of what is given to us and what is given to us is given to us in its entirety. There is no such thing as phenomena and noumena. "Hegel's main concern is how in consciousness we are related to our object and when object is our own consciousness, it is clear that there is no danger that our consciousness should have an existence in itself which is in principle hidden from us and separates from the consciousness as it exists for us."²⁴ From the above lines, it is apparent that Hegel pays attention to consciousness which relates object to our own consciousness. Unlike Kant, he is bothered whether our consciousness captures things as they are not. His concern lies in consciousness that makes objects exist because we are conscious of it. And what is given as the object of consciousness is what that matters. There is nothing that is knowable and unknowable object. The point that

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., p.289.

matters is what ignites consciousness that produce knowledge from less perfect to more perfect.

“Hegel does appreciate Kant’s discovery of the transcendental consciousness as the ultimate source of conceptual synthesis. He also approved that consciousness cannot be an object of sensibility and hence categories cannot be applied to it.”²⁵ For Kant, there are twelve categories which are applicable only to understanding. Understanding derives from consciousness and deals with the things that are given to us in its appearance or phenomena. One is conscious because of sense object contact. It is understanding that organizes and gives names to what is given in consciousness. Consciousness derives from sense experiences. For Kant, reason operates realm of transcendental consciousness where categories are not applicable. Reason shows contradictions of various concepts like finite and infinite, limited and unlimited, simple and complex etc. these are the concept which human being cannot helped but think. But reason could not resolve this contradictory concept and therefore, Kant referred it to transcendental illusion which is in the metaphysical realm and can never be resolved. Whereas for Hegel, understanding shows contradictions that exist in things and for him, there are unlimited categories, not only twelve categories, since knowledge is a growing phenomenon. Understanding for Hegel show contradiction in the mind and it is reason that resolves this contradiction. For Hegel, there is no transcendental illusion, reason resolve every contradictory notion.

To further affirm the role of reason, it is important to see how Hegel elucidates spirit and relate it to reason. According to Hegel, there are two aspects of spirit. One is the spirit that enumerates the distinction of subject and object. And the other aspect is the spirit that overcomes the distinction between the subject and object. Just like in Christianity, the Holy Spirit has two aspects, one aspect is the before the resurrection of Christ and this was with the Father and the Son. The divinity and humanity of God was not yet manifested as one. And the other aspect of the spirit is the spirit after the resurrection of Christ. This spirit posses both the divinity and humanity as one and can be dispense into the believer. Thus the Holy Spirit overcomes the difference between

²⁵Ibid.

divinity and humanity and thus imparts it as one to the believer. Similarly, in Hegel's concept of spirit, there is a distinction between subject and object and there is overcoming of the distinction which means there is unity in the spirit. According to Hegel, "the first aspect of spirit is the moment of estrangement and the second is its transcendent or its enlargement. Spirit is thus the locus of God estrangement and enlargement."²⁶ So in Christianity too, the spirit is the locus point of estrangement and enlargement. Estrangement of spirit is the aspect where spirit distinguishes divinity and humanity, divinity referred to the Father and humanity to the Son. The aspect of enlargement of spirit is where divinity and humanity are united after Christ's resurrection. Hegel conceive this idea of spirit being two aspects from Kant's doctrine of consciousness which asserts that consciousness is always two sided that is understanding and reasoning. And it is reasoning in which two contradictory poles exists together. Hegel approves Kant's reasoning that proposes two contradictory terms and that consciousness is possible only when the subject is conscious of the object. In other words, Charles Taylor says, "Kant rational awareness requires separation. Consciousness is only possible when the subject is not set over against an object."²⁷

Hegel, in the *Encyclopedia of the philosophical sciences-A* outline, divided his philosophical system into three parts:-

- 1) Logic: the science of idea in and for itself.
- 2) The philosophy of nature; the science of idea in its otherness.
- 3) The philosophy of spirit; the science of the idea comes back to itself out of the otherness.²⁸(Section 18)

He identifies logic with anthropology, philosophy of nature with phenomenology and philosophy of spirit with psychology. The philosophy of spirit is followed by logic and philosophy of nature. Philosophy of spirit as given in the outline above is, "to show that and how spirit' frees itself from nature, from its otherness. All three moments of this *movement*-anthropology, phenomenology and psychology are concern with this *notion of*

²⁶Singh, *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspectives*, p. 289.

²⁷Taylor, *Hegel and Modern Society*, p.26.

²⁸Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, pp. 103-208.

freeing itself."²⁹ For Hegel, only the moment of movement that takes place in psychology shows the reality of reason. According to Hegel, the moment of psychology can be identified to the absolute spirit where reason unites contradictory poles and there is identity in differences which takes place in reason. The phenomenological moment which he termed as *Objective spirit*, shows that, "reason is to be the goal of consciousness."³⁰ This means that there consciousness at the fundamental level that it can show the object of consciousness and that reason has not yet evolved out of it. Here in this moment, there is consciousness because object is given to our senses but its consciousness is unorganized and it is given in its unfurnished form. The anthropological moment on the other hand is also called the subjective spirit. And in this moment, "reason is to be the goal of nature."³¹

Since reason is operating in the absolute spirit, reason is the goal of nature. In nature things are given as they are and nature creates consciousness to the mind. It shows things in the mind in its primal form. Psychological moment as it mentioned earlier, referred to the absolute spirit. The goal of psychological investigation of spirit is to show that reason is the element of subjective spirit, that reason is the active power of spirit. In the philosophy of spirit which Hegel called it as absolute spirit, reason is the main factor of uniting subjective and objective spirit. It is in this psychological moment that contradictory term like anthropology and phenomenology has common meeting ground, i.e. they are sublated by reason. Here, the differences between them are not eradicated but overcome into higher unity, i.e. the absolute spirit. Absolute spirit where knowledge is perfect since, it is not given in its one sidedness. It is given in its contradictory nature and this contradictory nature is not annihilated but overcome in an elevated ground.

According to Hegel, there are three sources of knowledge and it important to see these sources of knowledge to enumerate Hegel's psychological spirit which is the absolute spirit. The three sources of knowledge are -sense certainty, understanding and reason. These three sources of knowledge is given in relation to his notion of absolute

²⁹Ibid., p.91.

³⁰Singh, *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspective*, p. 290.

³¹Ibid.

spirit. “The procedure which Hegel adopted is best seen in the opening argument of phenomenology of spirit. Hegel begins the notion of spirit from our ordinary senses of consciousness of object and then takes us to the true perspective of spirit.”³² He uses phenomenology because it deals with the *phenomena* which is the way things appear to us in our consciousness. Appearance in phenomenology, unlike Kant’s phenomena, is not in contrast with things as they are, i.e. in reality. For Hegel, things appear to us in its true sense, i.e. in its absoluteness and it is essentiality self appearance which means there is not dualism like in Kant. For Hegel, things appear to us in its pure and true senses and what appear to us is what is in its wholeness. Hegel’s “phenomenology is not science of lesser things, which can be left behind but one way of ascending to absolute knowledge of making the absolute apparent.”³³ For Hegel, the absolute knowledge begins with our ordinary consciousness which he called *sense certainty*. In this moment of sense certainty, things are given in our consciousness and the mind has not developed the consciousness of sense object. “From this ordinary experience of things, Hegel proceeds to the stage of understanding and moves forward to the stage of reason.”³⁴

Though Hegel criticizes Kant’s antinomies where reason cannot resolve the contradictions that exist in antinomy, he agrees Kant’s distinction of understanding and reason. “In Kant *reason*, is never in immediate relation to object. It is understanding that holds sways in his epistemology.”³⁵ Understanding, according to Hegel, differentiate things and gives identity to its existing object. Not only identity, it also separates things from the common and shows contradiction of things. In a precise manner, “by understanding, Hegel means, the capacity of reflective interpretation, the capacity which relently separates identity from differences, particular from universal, one from many, form from content, and so on, allows neither to contaminate the other.”³⁶ Understanding operates within the realm of finite and also deals with finite objects. Therefore, understanding is also called finite reason. Understanding restrict object from being overlapped, and when it restrict, it negates the other over against another which means it

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Ibid., p. 291.

isolates things from being general. Understanding gives identity to things in their own characteristic features and differentiates things as they are. It shows identity and differences that exist in things. When understanding identifies object, it negates the identity of other and thus points out the differences. In short “what it determines is what it excludes and what it excludes defines what it is.”³⁷ Understanding basically defines things as it separates and shows its unique identity. Now what is defined and identify over against other is being negated. Thus, understanding shows the contradiction of opposites.

Here, Hegel brings in the notion of reason. For him, it is reason that unites contradiction. According to Hegel, everything that is given is given with its contradiction, and it is reason that serves as a uniting factor. By uniting contradiction, the distinctive nature of its opposite is not eliminated but it overcomes the contradiction and elevates them into higher level of absolute by putting them together. Reason comes in to unite what understanding separates as contradiction. “Reason in the process of unifying the opposites, it negates the finite and its negation, and bind them together in mutual dependence so that they are revealed as moments of more inclusive whole.”³⁸ In fact, reason brings identity in differences and show the whole which is constituted by contradictory parts. This whole truth which Hegel pointed out as the work of reason can be related to the absolute spirit that unifies subjective and objective spirit. Reason like absolute spirit is mediation between dialectical opposite.

“With this in interpretation of sense-certainty, understanding, and reason, Hegel gives strikingly new interpretation of logic. Novelty consists in Hegel’s attempt to incorporate dialectic into logic. It requires two lines of argument: the first showing that a given category is indispensable; the second showing that it leads us to a characterization of reality, which is somehow contradictory. Hegel, in fact, fuses these together.”³⁹ Hegel dialectics is actuates by contradictory nature. For Hegel, everything that exists has opposites character for each existing things and it is dialectic that operates to amalgamate

³⁷Ibid., p. 291.

³⁸Ibid., p. 292.

³⁹Ibid.

them by transforming them from less perfect to more perfect. In the *Science of Logic* one can see Hegel's position on contradiction, when he says,

“...everything is inherently contradictory and in the sense that this law in contrast to other expresses rather the truth and the essential nature of things...Contradiction is the root of all movement and vitality; it is only in so far as something has a contradiction within it that it moves, has an urge and activity.”⁴⁰

Contradiction, according to Hegel, is the inherent nature of things and this very essential nature of things cause movement. And this movement makes things in the process of developing from less perfect to more perfect. That is why he even says that “Something is therefore alive only in so far as it contradiction within it and more-over is this power to hold and endure the contradiction within it.”⁴¹ As long as contradiction exists, things are always moving in a progressive manner. In fact, Contradiction is the very vitality of things and therefore Hegel uses contradiction and sublation as the two operative terms in his dialectics.

Along with contradiction, there is also sublation that resolves contradiction and elevates it in to higher level of truth. Sublation overcomes contradictions and unites it by transforming it in to complete whole where their discrete nature is not excluded but synthesis into one. For Hegel, in thought or in reality, nothing is as simple as it seems to be, near the end of *Logic* he says,

Nothing exist, as just brutally given and simply possessing one or two fully positive characteristics. Nothing exists that is first and primary and on which other things depend without mutual relation....what appears at first simple and immediate is actually complex and mediated.⁴²

Hegel use these terms mediation and mediated in opposition to immediacy and immediate to explain his dialectics.

⁴⁰Hegel, *Science of Logic*, p. 439.

⁴¹Ibid. p. 440.

⁴²Kolb, *The Critique of Pure Morality-Hegel, Heidegger, and after*, p. 46.

“To *mediate* is to be in the middle, to connect two extremes. Everything, Hegel states, is mediated that nothing exists as *immediate* first. In Hegel’s dialectics, the thesis is always regarded as *im-mediate* or as characterized by *immediacy*. The second term, the anti-thesis, is *mediate* or *mediation*. The third term, the synthesis, is the merging of *mediation* and emerging as a new *immediacy*. And this process goes on.”⁴³ Synthesis can be considered as sublation where preservation of the identity is maintained while at the same time abolishing also takes place.

The concept of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis can be best expressed as, “First, it has the moment of *transcendence* in which it goes beyond a *limit* or *boundary*. Secondly, it is *negation* of the first negation; this *limit*, in which it is the moment of *preservation* in which what has been *gone beyond* or transcended is brought again into a new relation.”⁴⁴ According to Hegel, every given entity is bound to come with opposition but this opposition is not exclusive, there is unity and struggle between the opposites. To further illustrate this concept of dialectics lets take up his notion Being, Nothing and Becoming. In Hegel’s dialectic we see that pure Being which signify complete indeterminacy is in opposition to pure nothing. And the mediacy between these two extremes is Becoming in which we see the unity of Being and Nothing. This unity in turn become the foundation for another being which comes with its opposites that is nothing and becoming sublates this two opposites and become more absolute than the previous one. This movement goes on and on but always in a progressive manner from less absolute to more absolute and the development is in circular form. Dialectic method excludes nothing but integrated everything involve to ascend from lower stage to higher stage. In other words, Synthesis unify thesis and anti-thesis and this synthesis again become thesis which naturally has anti-thesis followed by synthesis and this cycle goes on and on until it reach the absolute So Hegel’s dialectics indeed depicts the ever emerging development until the zenith point is reach.

⁴³Singh, *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspectives*, p. 292.

⁴⁴George, “Marx’s Hegelianism : An Exposition from Hegel and Modern Philosophy,” p. 123.

For Hegel, change and development does not only take place in thought, it also takes place in the world outside. Hegel writes in the sub heading 81 of the *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* that,

Everything that surrounds us may be viewed as an instance of Dialectic. We are aware that everything finite, instead of being stable and ultimate, is rather changeable and transient, and this is exactly what we mean by that Dialectic of the finite by which the finite, as that which is itself is other than itself, is forced beyond its own immediate or natural being to turn suddenly into its opposite.⁴⁵

From the above lines one can assert that Hegel's see dialectics in everything that he encounters in the world. Dialectics cause transition of things which transforms it in an ascending order and this process of becoming is interminable until it reaches its destination of being absolute. Hegel's concept of dialectics can be in tune with his notion of spirit. Spirit too operates in a dialectical manner where spirit can be place with the concept synthesis. "The laws of dialectics – unity and struggles of the opposites, transition from quantity to quality and negation of negation are the *externalization* of the spirit."⁴⁶ First, unity and struggle of the opposites can be explained by the notion of Becoming. Becoming negates what Being and Nothing is and sublate them into one. But this sublation does not exterminate their respective nature. In this law one sees that there is unity in Being and Nothing in the sense of their being empty and Becoming unites them. At the same time there is also struggle where Being has the potential to become something while Nothing is utter voidness impotent of becoming anything. Therefore Becoming negates their differences and maintains their identity. Second law is transition from quantity to quality. Hegel states that changes takes place because of quantitative change. Increase in quantity leads to qualitative change. And the third law is negation of negation. This law is the development of lower stage into higher stage because the unity of the opposite does not exclude each other but pass on to each other. The negation of Being and Nothing by Becoming is not complete negation because Being and Nothing on one hand is similar to Becoming in term of their emptiness. Becoming is also empty since

⁴⁵Hegel, *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, p. 150.

⁴⁶Singh, *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspectives*, p. 292.

it has not become something though it has the potentialities to become anything. It is negation of negation in the sense that it negates something but by this negation that something is not excluded and pass on to an elevated level where is there is inclusive whole. It is spirit that gives rise to the law of dialectics. And the operation of the spirit is similar to the law of dialectics where the absolute spirit sublates the objective and subjective spirit.

According to my observation, sense certainty can be place with subjective spirit where idea exists in and for itself and does not expressed itself. Subjective spirit like sense certainty does have consciousness but it has not developed itself in a lucid manner and therefore it shows reason to be the goal of nature. This sense certainty along with subjective spirit can be compared with Christian concept of the Father where the Father is still in its abstract form which has no manifestation yet. The concept of understanding can be identified with the objective spirit where one sees idea in its otherness. In objective spirit, the idea expressed and relates itself in other and its shows reason to be the goal of consciousness. Similarly, the Son who is in the Father expresses the Father's love by becoming a human. Finally reason can be refer to the absolute spirit in which the idea comes back to itself out of that otherness. The main faculty of the absolute spirit is reason that sublates and unites the subjective and objective spirit as one while their differences is still preserve. The concept of the Holy Spirit can be compared with reason and the absolute spirit. The Holy Spirit too unites the Father and the Son but the aspects of being the Father and the Son is still retain. It is in the Holy Spirit that God imparts Himself in His three aspects- Father, Son and the Holy Spirit into the believers.

Like the concept of Trinity, Hegel's dialectics too operates in its triadic moments. The three aspects of spirits in Hegel's dialectics can not be separated because they are undividedly one. They can be considered as the three aspects of the absolute truth. Like the Holy Spirit, absolute Spirit also combines subjective and objective spirit as one how ever different they may be. Hegel's absolute spirit can also be called as the three-in-one spirit just like the three-in-one God. Like the Holy Spirit being the reality of the Triune God, the absolute spirit too is the actuality of the subjective and objective spirit which

operates in the external world. Hegel's absolute spirit does not only operates in the mind, it is practically seen in the world process since he asserts that everything is inherently contradictory and also states that everything that surrounds us may be viewed as an instance of Dialectic. Similarly, the Holy Spirit's reality is not only in the human inner life but also in the practical living of the believers in their day to day life. The Holy Spirit is the reality of the Triune God. The practicality of God applicable to the believer is in the Holy Spirit. Thus, there is striking similarities between the Holy Spirit and Hegel's *Geist* or spirit.

PART II: THEOLOGICAL LINEAGE TO HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY

4.5 Hegel as a Christian philosopher

Hegel's philosophy is profoundly under the influence of Christian theology particularly in developing his dialectics. He has propounded his philosophical system in a triadic structure which he has taken from Christian concept of Trinity. Hegel's dialectical reason has its insight from the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as well as the concept of redemption. In order to bring out the theological lineage to Hegel's philosophy it would be appropriate to first see his idea of religion. Hegel, near the end of *Encyclopedia*, says, "The content of philosophy and religion is the same."⁴⁷ Their content basically is to strive to attain the highest goal i.e. God for religion and Absolute for philosophy. Stanley Rosen interpreted that what Hegel means here is that "religion is to be assimilated upward into philosophy. Only when this is accomplished does modern history fully enlightened human spirit."⁴⁸ For Hegel, human history is always in the process of becoming the Absolute and it is the spirit that endeavors to achieve this goal. As I have mentioned before, Hegel's dialectics operates in the making of history because it is contradiction itself that causes vitality and sublation of the spirit overcomes this contradiction. So it is the spirit striving to become more perfect. Looking at the perspective of religion, it also encourages the devotee to use their human spirit to endeavor to conform to the image of

⁴⁷ Stanley, *G.W.F Hegel. An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom*, p. 228.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

God which according to the religious belief is to achieve the highest truth. Thus, Hegel rationalizes religion and used the intrinsic significance of religious notion of perfection by philosophizing it.

Stanley Rosen has given an interpretation of Hegel's idea behind the story of the Garden of Eden. Hegel, while interpreting the Garden of Eden, he rationalizes the act of Adam and Eve partaking of the wrong tree i.e. the tree of knowledge of good and evil. He postulates that the act of Adam and Eve is the primal beginning of human history which presupposes that human beings are capable of differentiating the good from evil. Stanley says that a man who has faith does not see the rational insight in the act of Adam and Eve. He says, "Hegel's intention precisely is to replace faith by rational knowledge. In Hegel's language, the fall of Adam is the beginning of the process by which absolute spirit renders abstract essence concrete, by *working* or *showing* the essential modalities of logic within human history. Man's loss of innocence is the representational or pre-scientific, and hence human rather than genuinely divine, description of the necessary condition for the emersion of spirit in its work. The *fall* of spirit into the world thus represents the externalization process of the absolute as a creation or separation which itself depends upon the pre-existence of spirit and world."⁴⁹

The above lines clearly suggest how Hegel philosophizes the Christian context of the fall of man. He seems to suggest that, the fall of Adam and Eve is the beginning of human intellectual development in which man has the capacity to identify contractions i.e. good and evil. And he also says that, it is the starting point for a human spirit to strive to attain the absolute since man realized that he is imperfect by committing sin. From the time of Adam's fall, man has relentlessly kept trying to conform into the image of God. Hegel's rational knowledge supervenes upon the faith of Christian and he contends that man's fall is the fundamental bases for human spirit to struggle to achieve the absolute spirit. He held that man's fall is an alienation of self from the true self and thus man endlessly drudge to attain the truth. Man, in his struggle to proceed each time to higher stage means that the history of man history of spirit who is always developing from less

⁴⁹Ibid., p.224.

perfect to more perfect. The development of the spirit depend and mould it self from the pre existing past and moves higher and higher until it reach the absolute. This concept of becoming more and more perfect of the spirit in Hegel has it insight from Christian notion of transforming and conforming into the image of God. Christian held that, man need transformation due to his sinful nature. Even human history, as interpreted by Hegel, need to undergo the process of becoming more perfect in which each aspect of life is relevant. Thus, one sees theological insight in Hegel's philosophy.

Hegel further gives a theological explanation concerning the separation between God and man. He says, "Their unity is spirit in its triune excitation, and not the judgment and the spiritless is or a finite logical determination of dialectic totality. In order words, God and man are united in the life of absolute spirit, which also is the conceptual activity of (Hegelian) logic, and not a sequence of static or traditional logical propositions. God and man are identity- in- difference or the spiritual truth of the one differentiating itself into the continuum of that whole."⁵⁰ Hegel suggests that, the Spirit unite God and man in spite of their drastic differences. One can also see the idea of Christian's Spirit being the uniting bond in Hegel's dialectic. He also used the term spirit in his dialectics where contradictions are inevitable and it is the absolute spirit that sublates and overcomes the difference. One can see unity-in-differences in Hegel's dialectics too in which the absolute spirit act as a uniting agent that serves as mediation between objective and subjective spirit just like the Holy Spirit that serves as mediation between God and man. When dialectics takes place none of the contradictions are made the same in stead their differences being a part constitutes the whole. In fact their differences is the thing that make the whole all inclusive. Similarly, the differences of God and man are maintained but they can be one without diminishing their differences. From given discussion one can assert that Hegel's undoubtedly rationalizes theology.

Not only being theologically influenced, Hegel also affirms that, "Christianity is the absolute religion because it has for its content the absolute truth. Its content is,

⁵⁰Ibid., 225.

according to Hegel, identical with the Hegelian philosophy.”⁵¹ Hegel’s held that philosophy also has the absolute as its content. According to Hegel, Christianity also has this identical content like philosophy which is the absolute truth. Hegel called Christianity as *revealed religion*⁵² in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*. “It is the religion in which God completely and finally reveals himself as what He is, as concrete spirit, the full nature of which is now made manifest.”⁵³ In Christianity, the absolute truth is God and He revealed Himself to man through the Spirit. God is reveal through the Spirit in the doctrine of creation, fall, incarnation, redemption, resurrection, ascension, church and Trinity. For him, all these doctrine are the essence of Christianity and he firmly considered it as the truth. With the assertion of Christianity as the absolute religion, Hegel conceives the notion of spirit from the Holy Spirit. Just as he sees the Holy Spirit as the revelation of God, he also used his notion of spirit as the manifestation of the absolute truth. Hegel, in trying to reveal the absolute truth, he states that human spirit has to pass through a lot of processes in which his dialectics operates. Like Christian God who has to passed through incarnation, redemption, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension in order to be able to dispense Himself. Here, one sees the same line of thought in Hegel’s philosophy as well as in Christianity concerning the revelation of the absolute truth.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit can be expounded in Hegel’s logical ideas of Universal, Particular and Individual. “The fundamental determination of Christianity is that God is concrete spirit. Concrete spirit is that which, in accordance with the moment of the notion is, 1) the universal which suffers redemption into 2) the particular, which returns to identity with universal in the three individual.”⁵⁴ The notion of the universal can be identified with God, the Father. The first moment is, God before the creation of the world is the same with the notion of Universal. Universal has no concrete existent, it lies in it abstract form but it has the potential to become something. When God the Father took the form of man by becoming the Son, one can see the second moment. In this

⁵¹Stace, *The Philosophy of Hegel, A Systematic Exposition*, p.509.

⁵²Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, pp. 457-63.

⁵³Stace, *The Philosophy of Hegel, A Systematic Exposition*, p.509.

⁵⁴Ibid., p.511.

second moment, the Father being the Universal took a Particular form in the Son out of itself. The Son, being the Particular return to the Father that is the Universal by passing through incarnation, redemption, and resurrection, He becomes the Spirit that is the Individual. Here one sees the returning of the Particular to the Universal in Individual. The Universal is not only the universal, it also contain the Particular as well as the Individual. The three notions are one, they can never be separated in a strict sense. They in dwell in one another just like the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit mutually co-exist. They are three notions yet one, like the three-in-one God. The Universal is the Particular and the Individual and the Particular like wise is the Universal and the Individual. Similarly, the individual is the Universal and the Particular. They are three notions yet one so is the doctrine of Trinity in Judeo- Christian Traditions. Just like the Individual that contain three moments, the Holy Spirit also contain the Father as well as the Son. They are not different from each other yet they are three aspects of one God. Each part contains the whole that is they are present in each part, which means the Father is in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. Like wise, the Universal is also in the Particular and Individual. They are not three notions but one. The logical connection of the Universal, Particular and the Individual is apparently seen in the doctrine of Trinity. In both case one can see unity of differences. This also again proves that Hegel can be considered as a Christian philosopher since his philosophy has theological lineage to it.

The doctrine of redemption can be applied to Hegel's dialectic where contradictions like Universal and Particular are sublated in the Individual. There is moment of sublation when dialectical opposites are put together. The concept of Individual is the sublation between Universal and Particular. Like wise the concept of redemption, reconcile God and men who were once enemies. God is the Holy and righteous one whereas man is sinful and can never matches God's righteousness and holiness. Similarly, Universal is different from Particular, the former has the potential to become something while the later is complete impotent, incapable of becoming anything. So it is the Individual that amalgamated the Universal and Particular. Thus they become one in the Individual. It is in redemption that God and man can become as one. But their oneness does not produce the third element, God is still remains as God and man still

remains as man. Likewise, the Universal and the Particular are sublated as one in the Individual but their identity is still maintained. When they are put together they display one complete whole which is elevated to a higher stage of development. The whole development is the development of spirit where the subjective and objective are reconciled in the Absolute spirit just like redemption reconciled man and God in the Holy Spirit. So Hegel's dialectics clearly has its insight from theology.

Glenn Gray says that "In his insistence that God is completely knowable through mind as it develops in history, Hegel reveals his preference for theology as the highest manifestation of religion. In philosophical theology or a theological philosophy, we discover the identity of the three consubstantial activities of *geist*."⁵⁵ Hegel indeed, develops the movement of *Geist* or spirit from the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Judeo-Christian traditions. He regarded Christian theology as the highest manifestation of religion in which God has become Triune by becoming the Holy Spirit in order to make man the same as He is. The spiritual concept of becoming like God in Christianity is rationalized in Hegel's philosophy as human spirit endeavoring to become the absolute truth. Like Hegel's concept of becoming more perfect as time goes by, Christian also believes in the process of becoming God in life and in nature. It is the functions of the Holy Spirit that transformed man into the image and likeness of God. Hegel also has this similar idea of spirit which acts as the vital force in attaining the highest truth. Hegel's spirit also operates in transforming subjective and objective spirit to higher stage of the absolute spirit.

Glenn Gray in his interpretation of Hegel's concept of religion says that, "the words of the Bible are a statement of truth which is not systematic; they are Christianity as it appears in the beginning; it is spirit which grasps the content, which unfolds its meaning."⁵⁶ This line of interpretation suggest that Hegel approves the Bible to be the truth and its content is to be capture by the spirit that will eventually disclose its meaning in relation to thought as well as in actuality. He emphasizes the work of the Spirit that

⁵⁵Hegel, *On Art, Philosophy and Religion*, p.20.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p.153.

makes the words of the Bible real to the believers. The Spirit, in fact, is the application of the word of God in reality. Not only that, the Spirit makes God real to man. Hegel, who gets his motivation from theology, also applies the doctrine of Spirit in his dialectics. For him, the human spirit has the capacity to capture the absolute and while in the process of attaining the truth, the spirit gives meaning to each moments of movement.

Stanley Rosen says, “Hegel insist upon religious self consciousness as the root of spirit. “The foundation of all actuality,”⁵⁷ he submits Christianity (the ostensibly true religion) to an interpretation so rationalistic as to evoke the often overpowering conviction that we are once more in the presence of the pride of the philosophers.”⁵⁸ For Hegel, the beginning of philosophical thinking arises from religious self consciousness because the spirit activates as real entity in the philosophical mind. He emphasizes on religious consciousness since he believes that philosophy and religion are closely connected and he brings religious concept into his philosophy and rationalize them. He admits that Christianity being the true religion is the foundation of all actuality which means that his philosophical system has its fundamental bases mainly from Christian doctrine of Trinity and redemption. He sees dialectics everywhere whether in thought or in actuality since things are given with its respective contradictions and it is dialectical reason that resolves contradiction and sublates them into one whole while at the same time maintaining their uniqueness. He got this idea of dialectic from the Christian doctrine of Trinity where the Father and the Son though different in their nature are united as one in the Holy Spirit. And he also conceives the idea of sublation from the doctrine of redemption where God and man in spite of being dialectical opposites are reconciled as one. Thus, his application of Christian theology vindicates his saying that Christianity is the foundation of all actuality.

Martin, in *Hegel and Theology*,⁵⁹ says, “Hegel even goes as far as to say that *philosophy is theology*, and one’s occupation with philosophy- or rather in philosophy-is

⁵⁷Ibid., p.140.

⁵⁸Stanley, *G.W.F Hegel. An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom*, p.10.

⁵⁹Martin, *Hegel and Theology*, p.8.

of itself the service to God.”⁶⁰ Hegel identifies philosophy with theology and even goes to the extent of saying that doing philosophy itself is a service to God. Hegel’s claim implies that his philosophy is entwined with theology. “Hegel’s association of theology with philosophy has to do with the claim that the significance of the religious representation need to be rethought in fully conceptual, philosophical terms if the intelligibility and truth of that significance is to be properly express.”⁶¹ Hegel basically conceptualizes theology and implements it in his philosophy particularly the concept of Trinity and redemption. Thus, there is triadic movement in his philosophical thought which he also implement it in reality.

Martin further says that, “Hegel always identifies religion in its consummate form with Christianity, and always emphasis the essential importance of revelation for this religion. Hegel always devotes attention to the central Christian mysteries like God, the trinity creation, incarnation, redemption and reconciliation, the indwelling of the spirit in the gathered community.”⁶² He philosophize those mysteries and used the idea behind this mysteries as the bases for his philosophy.

Hegel’s writing on religion is “The whole of spirit, the spirit of religion as such, is a movement away from immediacy towards knowledge of what spirit is in and for itself, toward a shape that is perfectly identical with its essences. Hegel believes that this movement attain its consummation in a particular historical religion, Christianity, which consequently is the absolute or “revelatory religion”.”⁶³ “The revelatory Christian religion, where spirit attains true shape in a self consciousness that is both divine and human: but the representational form in which this is express must still pass into absolute knowing. This is Hegel’s first sustained afford to establish the internal arrangement of religion.”⁶⁴ From the above quotation, one can not deny the fact that that Hegel’s philosophy has a theological lineage and that he can be read as Christian philosopher.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 4.

⁶¹Martin, *Hegel and Theology*, p.81

⁶²Ibid., p.59.

⁶³Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, pp.457-63.

⁶⁴Hodgson, *Hegel and Christian Theology*, p.36.

To sum up, I have discussed the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Judeo-Christian tradition with the view of comparing and contrasting with Hegel's *Geist*. Hegel's absolute spirit is the mediation between subjective and objective spirit likewise the Holy Spirit is the also mediation between the Father and the Son. In both cases, the Spirit sublates and unites and brings unity in differences. Their movements are also in a triadic structure, always ascending towards the highest truth. The only difference between the Holy Spirit and Hegel's spirit is that the former is purely for spiritual experience of the believer and the later is for ontological and epistemological quest. I have also discussed different interpretations of Hegel's philosophy in order to point out the theological lineage to his philosophy which naturally makes him a Christian philosopher. He considers Christianity as the absolute religion whose content is the truth in its pure form. He conceptualizes Christian belief and integrates it in his philosophy. In other words, he rationalizes Christian doctrine of creation, fall, incarnation, redemption, resurrection and of course the doctrine of Trinity. Hegel's dialectical system portrays the triadic movement which he has taken it from Christianity. Thus, one sees theological lineage to Hegel's philosophy.

CONCLUSION

The concept of Trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition and Hegel's Dialectics have made great stir in theological and philosophical developments. It is the concept of Trinity with the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit i.e. the Triune, which is one of the earliest formulations of human thinking. It came to us a commandment and even today it is revered as a commandment in theology. Through the Dialectical insight into the Trinity we come across the philosophical discourses on it. The Trinity as commandment was questioned and raised to the level of philosophical discourse by Heraclitus, who proposed a shift from Trinity as a myth to *Logos*, reason or logic. There are three problems that I took up in each chapter of my dissertation and I believe that each of these three problems are philosophically contested and contended at many levels.

In the first chapter I have taken up Trinity which is supposed to be the first problem contested in Judeo Christian traditions. It involves the logical aspects of the three-in-one God that is triune and it has found its philosophical formulation in Hegel's dialectics. There is a problem regarding trinity in Judeo Christian tradition concerning the status of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit and the process of redemption. This position is based on the myth of "...God created man in His own image and likeness" (*Genesis* 1:26). When one looks at it from Hegel's dialectic, one finds that Hegel has logical reasoning to prove the unity of the opposites. The insight to that logical reasoning has certainly come from the myth of the Trinity.

To demonstrate my standpoint in asserting the concept of Trinity as a logical relation among the Father, the Son and the Spirit, I have given full explanation of how God becomes the three-in-one God that is Triune God. To begin with, I have discussed the biblical narrative on God's plan in creating man and man's fall by partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Due to man's fall, God has to become the processed Triune God so that He can bring man back to Himself for His expression. God came down at a human level as the Son and passed through the process of human living, death and resurrection. Through His resurrection He became the life-giving Spirit and now as the Spirit, God can enter into man and man can become one with God. God by becoming the Father, the Son and the Spirit, He pave the way for man to partake in His divine life

and human nature. The Father, the Son and the Spirit coexist simultaneously and dwell-in one another. Their oneness is the very substantiation that they co exist at the same time. They are not three separate Gods but one God. The father, the Son and the Spirit can be distinguished only in the mind but not in reality. They are the three-in-one God. The real significance of the concept of trinity in Judeo-Christian tradition is for God to be able to reach man and become one with man in life and nature but not in the Godhead.

The Spirit in Christianity becomes the oneness of the Father and the Son. Not only that, it unite them together as one but their respective aspect is not excluded. It is the Spirit that brings identity in their differences. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are the three manifestations of one God but that does not mean that they are three separate Gods. The relation and difference among the three of the Godhead is possible because of the Holy Spirit. Hegel makes use of the idea of the Holy Spirit in his dialectic reason and also used the term spirit for the reality of reason in his philosophical system.

I have also discussed about the concept of redemption, to anticipate a later discussion, with the help of biblical evidence to prove later in the third chapter that Hegel has drawn his concept of spirit from it. It is Redemption that reconciles man and God in spite of their differences. It is a kind of mediation where two contradictory terms are made one. The oneness of these two opposites does not extirpate their unique features. So redemption can be called identity of the opposites. It is held that Hegel's notion of spirit was derived from the concept of redemption in Judeo Christianity.

The second problem lies in formulating Hegel's dialectic from the dialogue of Socrates in chapter 2. No doubt, dialectics is a theory-loaded concept with two operative terms of contradiction and sublation and the three principles of dialectic. In a very pre theoretical formulation it can be found even in the dialogue. In order to solve the problem in formulating the development of Hegel's dialectic I have given the supposed-to-be origins of dialectic starting from myths which is the earliest form of knowledge. Myths gave meaning to life and therefore people believe in it. Then I proceed to the notions of *logos* which is more develop than the earlier stage in the field of knowledge. Through

Heraclitus' concept of *logos* which asserts that everything is in the flux of change and change is the law that operates in the mind, one see the first sign of systematic knowledge. I moved further to show how systematize knowledge has become by bringing in Socrates' dialogue. Socrates' dialogue is a method where conversation is conducted with the aim of gaining the pure form of truth. To extract out the truth in having dialogue Socrates used two term, consensus and disagreement. These two operative terms can still be traced Hegel's dialectic except that he used contradiction and sublation.

I have discussed the transition of knowledge from myth to logos and from logos to dialogue and then move on to dialectic. I have explained the dialectic process of Hegel by bringing in Kant's notion of antinomies which serves as ground for Hegel to develop his Dialectical process. He used two operative terms namely, sublation and contradiction which are essential in his dialectical process. In Hegel's view, contradiction is inherent in the nature of things in thought and actuality, and the idea that contradiction is eliminated with the growth of knowledge is inapplicable in his philosophy. Sublation, according to Hegel is that, it unites contradiction and elevates them to higher form of truth. Each moment has a moment of identity which is being preserve and moment of differences which is annihilated. And the function of reason is to sublimate contradictory nature by bringing unity in differences. I have also explicated the three principles of dialectics which are seen in our empirical world as well as in our theoretical world.

In Chapter 3 I have discussed the relationship and the status between the Holy Spirit in Judeo Christian tradition and Hegel's *absoluter geist* or absolute spirit. The Holy Spirit has been created out of the notion of three-in-one God coming into man as their life and everything. With references to the biblical evidences, it is seen that the Spirit is the reality of the Trinity which means, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit has become one in Spirit. The Spirit tore down the partition of the divinity of the Father and the humanity of the Son. Before God became the Spirit, God cannot infuse and transfuse Himself into man. But after God become the Spirit, He can not only infuse, He can also live in man. The point to be emphasized here is that, the Spirit creates oneness and

transmits God into man. While transmitting, the Spirit unites the Father and the Son without eradicating their unique identity which means they are transform as the Spirit. The Father, the Son and the Spirit can never be separated; they always co-exist and co-inhere in on another. Apart from that, they mutually dwell in one another. However, it is to be held that the Spirit is the meeting ground or mediation where God, the Father and God the Son are one.

The concept of the Holy Spirit has a great impact on Hegel's formulation of his spirit. Hegel believes that spirit is the mediation between two opposites term, that is idea and nature. Spirit, according to Hegel is the reality of reason and it operates as the sublating factor of contradiction. Idea, which is in opposition of nature, is called subjective spirit and nature is called objective spirit. He identifies his subjective spirit to anthropology which is logical in nature while he named objective spirit as phenomenology. And the absolute spirit he refers it to psychology. Hegel's three kind of spirit can be compared to the Christian concept of Trinity. The concept of the Father can be likened to the subjective spirit, the Son can be compared with the objective spirit, and finally the Holy Spirit can be equated with Hegel's absolute. The Father being divine has no connection with the external world is similar to the subjective spirit. The Son, possessing human nature, has to deal with the things in the world. Therefore, it is liken to objective spirit. The Holy Spirit being the ultimate consummation of the Triune God is similar to the absolute spirit. It is in the Holy Spirit that the Father and the Son are one. Likewise it is in the absolute spirit that subjective spirit and objective spirit are mediated as one. From this comparison one can see the similarities between the status of Holy Spirit and Hegel's spirit. Holy Spirit and Hegel's spirit both are the mediation of dialectic opposites. They sublimate contradictions by bringing unity in differences. Their mediation does not terminate distinct nature but retained them elevated them to higher state where the opposite can co exist as one.

The difference between the Holy Spirit and Hegel's *geist*, according to my reflection, is that Holy Spirit is a purely religious doctrine that have to deal with spiritual life whereas Hegel's *geist* is epistemological and ontological and it is aiming to arrive at

the absolute truth which is still in the process of becoming. Another thing is that, the Holy Spirit is for God's dispensation whereas Hegel's spirit is for acquiring the most absolute truth. Though Hegel was influenced by the Holy Spirit in Christianity, his absolute spirit has profound philosophical basis; hence Hegel remains a Christian philosopher, he applies the concept of Trinity and redemption in his dialectic method. He is largely influence by Christian theology particularly the concept of the Holy Spirit which is why he integrated contradictions by sublating them. By sublating he means contradiction are overcome by uniting them. Their unity does not diminish their identity. Thus, one sees identity of the opposites which is also seen in Holy Spirit where the Trinity is made one by the Spirit, and yet their distinctive aspects are not eliminated in their oneness. Further Hegel as a Christian philosopher develops the idea of redemption in his dialectic reason. Redemption brings reconciliation between God and man just like dialectic reason that reconcile contradictions as one entity which has two aspects. God and man are also opposites in nature but it is redemption that unites them as one where their identity still remains, that is, God is still God and man is still man. Their incorporation does not bring another special species and they still remain the same but united as one. Similarly, Hegel's reason resolve contradiction but it does not extinguish their characteristic features. By noticing the similarities between the concept of redemption in Judeo Christian tradition and Hegel's dialectic reason, one can undoubtedly assume Hegel as a Christian philosopher. He also uses triadic movement in his philosophical system, which I believe he has taken it from Trinity. Besides this, he also says that Christian religion is the absolute religion. In fact, he philosophizes Christian theology and integrates it in his philosophical system within Christianity. Thus, there is in deed theological lineage in Hegel's philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, E.L. *Guide Book to the Western Thought*. The English universities press Ltd., 1957: 13.

Beiser, Frederick. *Hegel*. New York and London: Routledge, 2005: 162, 164,166.

Bogomolov, A.S. *History of Ancient Philosophy Greece and Rome*. Moscow: Progress Publisher, 1985: 54, 181.

Brown, Alison Leigh. *On Hegel*. New Delhi: Wadsworth Cengage Learning India Private Limited, 2001: 1-19, 38-57.

Dean, Mayor and Micheal Quante. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: A Critical Guide*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2008: 1-43.

Engels, Frederick. *Dialectics of Nature*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976: 62.

Ferrarin, Alfredo. *Hegel and Aristotle*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2004: 31-34, 105-115, 234-348.

Frost, S.E. *Basic teachings of the great philosophers: A survey of their Basic Ideas*. Revised Edition. New York: Anchor books Doubleday, 2003: 257-258.

George, Micheal. *Marx's Hegelianism: An Exposition from Hegel and Modern Philosophy*. Edited by David Lamb. London: Croom Helm, 1987: 118-87.

Hardimon, Micheal O. *Hegel's Social Philosophy: The Project of Reconciliation*. Cambridge University Press, 1994: 85.

Harris, Errol E. *An Interpretation of the Logic of Hegel*. New York: University Press of America, 1983: 65.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Lecture on the philosophy of World History. Introduction : Reason in History*. Edited by, Johannes Hoffmeister. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975: x, xxvi, 40, 51, 105, 110, 115, 131.

Hegel, G.W.F. *On Art, Philosophy and Religion*. Introductory Lectures to the Realm of Absolute Spirit. Edited by. J. Glenn Gray. New York: Harper Touchbooks, 1970: 1-22, 128- 207.

Hegel, G.W.F. *On Christianity, Early Theological writings*. Translated by T.M. Knox. New York: Harper Touchbooks, 1948: 1-67.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977: 11, 439-40, 457-63.

Hegel. *Science of Logic*. trans.by W.H.Johnstone and L.G.Struthers. Vol. I. London: George Allen and Unwin. Humanities Press Inc., 1966: 94-5, 204-6, 439-40.

Hegel. *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. Translated by William Wallace. London, Second Revised Edition, 1892: 150.

Hegel. *The Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. Translated by M.J. Petry. Dordrecht and Boston, D. Reidel. Section 445-60. 1977: 91, 103-208.

Hodgson, Peterson C. *Hegel and Christian Theology*. A Reading on the Lecture of the Philosophy of Religion, Oxford University Press, 2005: 3-51.

Inwood, M.J. *Hegel*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983: 1-2.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003: 7, 300, 396, 402, 409, 415.

Kedouries, Elie. *Hegel and Marx. Introductory Lectures*. Edited by Sylvia Kedourie and Helen Kedourie. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995: 69-75.

Kolb, David. *The Critique of Pure Morality-Hegel, Heidegger, and after*. Chicago: The University Press, 1986: 46.

Krasnoff, Larry. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: An introduction*. Cambridge Universtiy Press, 2008: 18-32, 62-77.

Lauer, Quentin. *Hegel's Concept Of God*. New York: State University Press, 1982: 128-161.

Lee, Witness and Watchman Nee. *The Triune God, A Lesson Book-Level Two*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1990: 9- 23, 31-35.

Lee, Witness. *Life Lessons, Volume Four*. Anahiem. California: Living Stream Ministry, 1987: 24-29.

Lee, Witness. *Basic Lessons on Life*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1993: 5-8, 23-33, 39-45.

Lee, Witness. *Gospel Outlines*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1980: 71-73, 274, 301, 317.

Lee, Witness. *Life-Study of Exodus*. Vol. 2. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1987: 591-622.

Lee, Witness. *The Basic Revelation of the Holy Scriptures*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1984: 19-33.

Lee, Witness. *The Economy of God*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1997: 4-10.

Lee, Witness. *The Issue of the Dispensing of the Processed Trinity and the Transmitting of the Transcending Christ*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1993: 10.

Lee, Witness. *The Spirit*. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 2003: 5, 7, 8, 21, 27, 30.

Lee, Witness. *Truth Lesson Level One, Volume 1*. Anahiem. California: Living Stream Ministry, 1985: 13-25.

Lucas. *The Young Hegel. Studies in the relations between Dialectics and Economics*. London: Merlin Press, 1975: 3-30, 58-89.

Martin, J.De.Nys. *Hegel and Theology*. London: T&T Clark International, 2009: 4, 8, 59, 81.

Perperzak, A.T. *System and History in Philosophy*. New York: State University Press, 1996: 84.

Plato. *Plato the Republic*. Translatd by Desmond Lee. Penguin Classic, 2007: 130-139.

Rockmore, Tom. *Before and After Hegel: A Historical Introduction to Hegel's thought*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Rosen, Stanley. *G.W.F Hegel. An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom*. Yale University Press, 1974: 10, 224-5, 228.

Russell, Bertrand. *History of Western Philosophy*. London: George Allen & Uwin Ltd., 1971: 46-55, 87-89, 108-132, 637-652, 661-675.

Singh, R.P. "From Dialogue to Dialectics: Socrates, Kant, Hegel and Marx." *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* XXVII No.3, July, 2000: 262-3, 265, 267-8.

Singh, R.P. "Kant and Hegel on Categories and Consciousness." *The Journal of Indian Academy of Philosophy*, Vol. XXX, No. 2, 1991: 9,11-12.

Singh, R.P. *Consciousness Indian and Western Perspectives*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2008: 288-92.

Singh, R.P. *Dialectic of Reason : A comparative study of Kant and Hegel*. New Delhi: Intellectual Publishing House, 1995: 28-30, 32-33, 36, 50-51, 78, 82, 90, 178-9.

Singh, R.P. *Kant and Hegel Methodology, Ontology, Epistemology, Dialectic and Ought*. New Delhi: Galaxy Publication, 1990: 24-85.

Spencer, Lloyd & Andrzej Krauze. *Introducing Hegel*. Malta: Gutenberg Press, 1996: 3-171.

Stace, W.T. *The Philosophy of Hegel, A Systematic Exposition*. Canada: Dover Publication Inc., 1955: 106-109, 509, 511.

Taylor, Charles. *Hegel and Modern Society*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1979: 26.

Taylor, Charles. *Hegel*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975: 51-350.

The Holy Bible. Old Testament (Genesis 1:26, 2:7, Psalm 36:8-9, 46,51:10-13, 143:10, Exodus 30:23-25, Isaiah 11:2, Micah 3:8, Proverbs 20:27, Job 32:8,). New Testament (John 4::24, 14:16-20, 1 Corinthians 15:45, 2 Corinthians 3:17, Mathew 1:23, 18: 20, 28: 20, 2 Timothy 4:22,1 Thessalonians 5:2, Luke 15, 1 Peter2:24, 1 Corinthians15:3,45,

Hebrew 9:28, Mathew 28:19, Revelation 21:1-12). Translated by Witness Lee. Recovery Version. Anahiem, California: Living Stream Ministry, 2003.

Thilly, Frank. *A History of Philosophy*. Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1982: 31-42, 73-80.

Warburton, Nigel. *Philosophy the Classics*. London: Routledge 3rd Edition, 2006: 79-81.

Wedberg, Anders. *A History of Philosophy. Vol. I. Antiquity and the Middle Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982: 10 -22.

Williamson, Raymond Keith. *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Religion*. New York: State University Press, 1984.