"The Trinity in German Thought is a superb analysis of the theological development of trinitarian theology in German Protestantism from the Reformation through the.

See also Christopher Bassford, " Teaching the Clausewitzian Trinity ," tips and tools for teaching the capstone concept of Clausewitzian theory. On one particular point, however, his use of Clausewitz touched an ambiguity that is becoming troublesome to many students of the Prussian philosopher of war. Since interpretations of Clausewitz are a source of such extensive controversy, it seems important to differentiate between what Clausewitz actually said and other concepts of a trinity that are derived fromâ€"but not the same asâ€"the "remarkable trinity" defined in On War. A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War A Critical Analysis of the Gulf War: It is nonetheless an alteration of the concept as it is expressed in On War. Perhaps it would be more accurate to refer to the concept in this form as the "Summersian Trinity. Unfortunately, such adaptations tend to have a counterproductive side effect: When times change, people remember the adaptations and forget the original, fundamental truth to which Clausewitz himself had pointed. The result is that Clausewitz is periodically declared obsolete. The "people, army, government" interpretation of the trinity has caught on among both proponents of Clausewitz and his critics. It has, for example, been enshrined in U. On the less positive side, the "people, army, government" construct has been used by authors like Martin van Creveld and John Keegan to consign Clausewitz to irrelevance. The state, in this view, is rapidly becoming irrelevant to warmaking, and distinctions between the "people" and the "army" are meaningless when wars are in fact fought not between states but between armed and irrevocably hostile populations. The Consequences for Theory War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a remarkable trinityâ€"composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone. The first of these three aspects mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government. The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people; the scope which the play of courage and talent will enjoy in the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army; but the political aims are the business of government alone. These three tendencies are like three different codes of law, deep-rooted in their subject and yet variable in their relationship to one another. A theory that ignores any one of them or seeks to fix an arbitrary relationship between them would conflict with reality to such an extent that for this reason alone it would be totally useless. Our task therefore is to develop a theory that maintains a balance between these three tendencies, like an object suspended between three magnets. In arguing that war is more than a chameleon an animal that merely changes color to match its surroundings, but otherwise remains identical , Clausewitz is saying that war is a phenomenon that, depending on conditions, can actually take on radically different forms. The basic sources of changes in those conditions lie in the elements of his "trinity. The army which refers, of course, to military forces in general and its commander are paired mainly with the non-rational forces of friction, chance, and probability. Fighting organizations deal with those factors under the creative guidance of the commander and creativity depends on something more than mere rationality, including, hopefully, the divine spark of talent or genius. The government is paired mainly with the rational force of calculationâ€"policy is, ideally, driven by reason. This corresponds to the famous argument that "war is an instrument of policy. Thus, when Clausewitz speaks of war as a "total phenomenon," he is not talking about war in the abstract "absolute war" , nor about war "in theory. The concluding simile in our excerpt from On War is a nearly exact analogy: Clausewitz is saying that theory must be, as war is, "like an object suspended among three magnets. As it enters a phase of its arc in which it is more strongly affected by one force than the others, it gains a momentum which carries it on into zones where the other forces can begin to exert their powers more strongly. The actual path of the suspended object is never determined by one force alone but by the interaction between them, which is forever and

unavoidably shifting. The trinity also provides us with clues as to what Clausewitz meant by his famous phrase, "war is a continuation [fortsetzung] of politics by other means. That one word encompasses the two quite different English words "policy" and "politics. Politics, on the other hand, encompasses the whole trinity: Politics, as any intelligent watcher of the evening news soon realizes, is a chaotic process involving competing personalities whose individual actions may indeed have a rational basis , chance and friction, and popular emotion. Will his embarrassing slip of the tongue get picked up by the evening news? Can a widespread "throw-the-bums out" mentality engulf even the most responsible politician? Thus Clausewitz tells us that the conscious conduct of war strategy, etc. That is, this trinity exists on all sides of any conflict, thus further complicating the picture. An approach to theory which denies or minimizes the role of any of these forces or the interaction between them is, therefore, by definition wrong. The soldier who expects the events of war to unfold in any other wayâ€"particularly in a rational, orderly wayâ€"is doomed to be surprised, disappointed, and frustrated as events keep forever spinning off on unpredictable trajectories. The concept of the "remarkable trinity" is a basis for the practical political-military analysis of particular wars, not a description of the social structuresâ€"which may alter over timeâ€"that support war. Therefore, the positive use of the "people, army, government" construct is valid and useful when it is employed by a Clausewitzian proponent like Harry Summers, but it by no means explores all of the important implications of the trinitarian concept. When, on the other hand, writers such as Martin van Creveld or John Keegan use the "people, army, government" construct in attempts to define and thus to marginalize Clausewitzian theory, the result is neither valid nor useful. There are, in fact, many arguments to be made in defense of the Summersian approach. In any conflict organized enough to be called war, there will be some kind of leadership organization, some group of fighters, some kind of population baseâ€"if not people, army, and government per se, then people, army, and government analogs. Regarding the alleged death of the state, a much stronger argument can be made that the Western-style "nation state" is in fact in the ascendancy world-wide: A great many of the conflicts we are seeing are in fact the struggles of ethnic nations to establish their own states on the ruins of the more traditional imperial states. Writers like van Creveld and Keegan frequently confuse the terms "state" and "nation-state," two non-contiguous concepts. This is clearly the case in the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia. The establishment of an independent Eritrea and a proto-Palestine offers rather different examples. As for the drug-war variant, note that Colombia effectively destroyed the Medellin Cartel when it ceased to be merely a criminal organization and sought to vie with the state for primacy. And let us remember that any warfare in which the United States engages is going to be "state warfare" on at least one side. Take for example the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. John Keegan claims that this is an entirely "apolitical" war, driven exclusively by irrational ethnic hatreds and fought by peoples, not armies. But this is clearly nonsense. The Bosnian War is being fought by very conventional armies pursuing rational if extremely brutal political policies. These policies are aimed at the creation of new, independent, ethnic-based political entitiesâ€"in other words, "nation-states," which Yugoslavia was not. The break-up of Yugoslavia was driven by the needs of politicians like Slobodan Milosevic to find a new basis of legitimacy for their continuance in power. With Marxism dead, there was not much to turn to except ethnic identification, a violent emotion always latent in the Balkan peoples. Milosevic very sensiblyâ€"rationallyâ€"grabbed that powerful handle. This was a very successful approach for Milosevic in Serbia itself. He sustained it as long as he could do so profitably. Emotions got out of hand, however, and the pendulum moved into the irrational zone. Cut off from Serbian governmental support, the Bosnian Serb army became in essence an independent force; the pendulum was now in the zone of military chance, probability, and talent. The pendulum will no doubt drift further before this article gets into print. The Bosnian War has come to involve a huge number of players. Some of them are states, many are non- or sub-state actors, others are supranational organizations. Trying to describe each player as a unit made up of "people, army, and government" would be a very dubious enterprise. Herein lies the great value of the "trinitarian" approach to war. Exclusively rational models cannot account for the willingness of peoples to plunge their societies into the nightmarish chaos of war. Technological models and most discussions of "future war," RMA, etc. The courses of these wars have in fact been driven, not by technology which remains essentially a tool , but by the complex interplay among opposing sets of popular emotions,

military skills, and political calculations. Political-military analysis, which should precede any attempt to make strategy, has to be based on the real, if messy or, more properly, nonlinear , factors that Clausewitz describes. The standard which Clausewitz set for satisfactory theory is, however, difficult to argue with: A theory that accurately depicts the complexities of war is thus necessarily complex which is not to say that every complex theory is necessarily correct. It is also important to note that Clausewitz saw his theory as a basis for study, not as doctrine. Despite the oft-noted fact that On War is an unfinished work, the ideas Clausewitz expressed in it are remarkably well integrated. If we pick up and follow any one major thread of his argument, we will eventually find it firmly connected to each of the other key ideas. It would be a mistake, therefore, to approach the trinity concept as a discrete, bite-sized nugget of wisdom that can somehow be extracted from the larger work. The trinity establishes a dialectical relationship between the dominant tendencies of war that are revealed by analysis in the rest of the book; it combines the elements that make war such a complex phenomenon. The component dealing with violence and emotion irrational forces relates directly to his discussion of moral forces in war and the proposition that war is distinguished from other forms of human interaction by its resort to organized violence. It represents his thinking at its most mature and sophisticated level. Clausewitz subtitled the section where he introduces the concept as "The Consequences for Theory," and it is the last section of Chapter One, Book One, the only part of the book Clausewitz considered finished and probably the last part he wrote before he died. It is fundamentally missing the point of this great body of military theory. It would be a tragic mistake to accept the consequences of that error. Jablonsky also uses the trinity, very effectively but in much the same manner, as the basis for the whole page introduction to his book, Churchill and Hitler: Translations of the original German phrase, wunderliche Dreifaltigkeit, differ significantly: Carl von Clausewitz, On War, eds. Michael Howard and Peter Paret Princeton: Princeton University Press, Presidio Press, , pp. Dell, , p. Clausewitz, On War, p. Frank Cass, , pp. There was, however, some reason to hope that a Yugoslav nationality could be created in the future, much as a French nationality was created in the later Middle Ages. The concept of an operational or strategic "center of gravity" is in essence a probabilistic tool to reduce the inevitable complexities and swirling uncertainties of war to a manageable level. Maintaining our focus on a small number of key factors preferably just one does not reduce the "fog of war," it simply makes it less distracting.

2: TEACHING THE CLAUSEWITZIAN TRINITY

The Trinity in German Thought by David Vincent Meconi October I n writing both of his Catechisms of , Martin Luther attempted to highlight the trinitarian structure of Christianity by reducing the Roman twelve-article catechesis to a more explicit three-article one.

Summary Rahner divides his work into three sections and begins by discussing the deficiency in the understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity in his day. In his first section Rahner also refutes the idea that any of the members of the Godhead could have incarnated, emphasizing only the ability of the Son to take on human form The second section of his work concerns almost entirely Roman Catholic doctrinal statements in regards to the Trinity and its compositional members. Especially in regards to the former word, Rahner makes it clear that the shades of meaning that it has collected over time are conducive to establishing tritheism when applied to Trinitarian dogma, unless it is carefully defined. Rahner finishes his work by preemptively explaining untreated topics, in preparation for future works. It is certainly true that the actions of the members of the Trinity in redemption history are indicative of who the person performing the action is ontologically. In making his claim about the essential link between the economic and immanent Trinity, Rahner has served the global Christian Church by making aspects of the Trinity essential in the life of the believer. Rather than the Trinity being just one more doctrine, treated at the end of Theology Proper, Rahner is able to elevate it to the height that it should have in Christian thought by demonstrating its essential connection to soteriology, Christology, and pneumatology. In a way, he has made concrete the abstract by helping the believer see the essential identity of the whole Trinity in salvation history. He goes beyond what Scripture itself has to say about the Trinity in formulating his theory, owing more to theologians than to the inspired writers of the New Testament. Additionally, it is possible to arrive at an orthodox understanding of the Trinity without necessarily holding to his axiom, as generations of thoughtful believers have done successfully before Rahner wrote. Even his four categories of divine self-disclosure are necessarily taken with a measure of hesitation as he presents them as logical statements bereft of Scriptural or even historical support. Rahner is attempting to make sense of the Trinity, its being and revelation. While it would be wrong to blithely dismiss discussions of the Trinity because the Trinity is mysterious and cannot be fully known, Rahner overstates when he goes so far as to claim the word axiom, a self evident truth, for his thesis. His statement needs a more thorough explication and interaction with Scripture before it should be accepted as a fact. Even then, the mysterious nature of the Trinity is such that dogmatic statements should be approached with the greatest of care. However, at the practical level of church life, and in the daily walk and prayers of believers, it is true that very often Christians relate to God as if He is one, and yet not three. Rahner writes one hundred pages of dense, complex prose on a mystery that is two millennia old without offering a single verse of Scriptural support for any of his positions. The book is deservedly being read almost a half century after its initial release. Rahner has added a truly new piece of fuel to the fire of theological discussion that burns around the great mystery that is the Triune God, three and yet one, one and yet three.

3: Trinity - Wikipedia

"The Trinity in German Thought describes the three ideas that govern modern German Trinitarian thought: the ideas of reflective selfhood, of revelation, and of history. "Reflective selfhood" designates the attempt at finding an analogy between the Trinity and the structure of the human self.

Old Testament Trinity icon by Andrey Rublev , c. The Second Council of Nicea in confirmed that the depiction of Christ was allowed; the situation regarding the Father was less clear. The usual Eastern Orthodox representation of the Trinity was through the "Old Testament Trinity" of the three angels visiting Abrahamâ€"said in the text to be "the Lord" [Genesis Such depictions spread to the West and became the standard type there, though with an adult Christ, as described above. This type later spread back to the Eastern Orthodox world where post-Byzantine representations similar to those in the West are not uncommon outside Russia. The canon is quoted in full here because it explains the Russian Orthodox theology on the subject: It is most absurd and improper to depict in icons the Lord Sabaoth that is to say, God the Father with a grey beard and the Only-Begotten Son in His bosom with a dove between them, because no-one has seen the Father according to His Divinity, and the Father has no flesh, nor was the Son born in the flesh from the Father before the ages. And though David the prophet says, "From the womb before the morning star have I begotten Thee" [Psalm Has not the artificier of wood made an image, or the goldsmiths, having melted gold, gilt it over, and made it a similitude? It is, then, uttermost insanity and impiety to give a form to the Godhead" Orthodox Faith, 4: In like manner St. Gregory the Dialogist prohibits this. For this reason we should only form an understanding in the mind of Sabaoth, which is the Godhead, and of that birth before the ages of the Only-Begotten-Son from the Father, but we should never, in any wise depict these in icons, for this, indeed, is impossible. For this reason, it is fitting on this occasion only to depict the Holy Spirit in the likeness of a dove. But in any other place those who have intelligence will not depict the Holy Spirit in the likeness of a dove. For on Mount Tabor , He appeared as a cloud and, at another time, in other ways. Furthermore, Sabaoth is the name not only of the Father, but of the Holy Trinity. And although Daniel the prophet says that he beheld the Ancient of Days sitting on a throne, this should not be understood to refer to the Father, but to the Son, Who at His second coming will judge every nation at the dreadful Judgment. The Coptic Orthodox Church never depicts God the Father in art although he may be identified by an area of brightness within art such as the heavenly glow at the top of some icons of the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Eritrean Orthodox Tewahedo Church follows the same practice. Scenes[edit] Only a few of the standard scenes in Christian art normally included a representation of the Trinity. The accounts in the Gospels of the Baptism of Christ were considered to show all three persons as present with a separate role. Sometimes the other two persons are shown at the top of a crucifixion. The Coronation of the Virgin , a popular subject in the West, often included the whole Trinity. But many subjects, such as Christ in Majesty or the Last Judgement , which might be thought to require depiction of the deity in the most amplified form, only show Christ. There is a rare subject where the persons of the Trinity make the decision to incarnate Christ, or God sending out the Son. Even more rarely, the Angel of the Annunciation is shown being given the mission. Saint Martin church, Courgenard , France. Especially in the 15th century, and in the less public form of illuminated manuscripts , there was experimentation with many solutions to the issues of depicting the three persons of the Trinity. The depiction of the Trinity as three identical persons is rare, because each Person of the Trinity is considered to have distinct attributes. Nonetheless, the earliest known depiction of God the Father as a human figure, on the 4th century Dogmatic Sarcophagus , shows the Trinity as three similar bearded men creating Eve from Adam , probably with the intention of affirming the consubstantiality recently made dogma in the Nicene Creed. There are many similar sarcophagi, and occasional images at intervals until a revival of the iconography in the 15th century. Such "Cerberus" depictions of the Trinity as three faces on one head were mainly made among Catholics during the 15th to 17th centuries, but were condemned after the Catholic Council of Trent , and again by Pope Urban VIII in , [12] and many existing images were destroyed. The Trinity may also be represented abstractly by symbols , such as the triangle or three triangles joined together , trefoil or the

triquetra â€"or a combination of these. Sometimes a halo is incorporated into these symbols. The use of such symbols are often found not only in painting but also in needlework on tapestries , vestments and antependia , in metalwork and in architectural details. Different depictions[edit] Four 15th century depictions of the Coronation of the Virgin show the main ways of depicting the persons of the Trinity. The conventional depiction, with older Father, dove, and Christ showing the wounds of his Passion Enguerrand Quarton with Christ and God the Father as identical figures, and a dove, as specified by the cleric who commissioned the work Page from an English Book of Hours c.

4: The Trinity In German Thought | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

Last Updated on Sunday, 27 October Re-published here with the permission of Quadrant and the C. The lecture format as Sigmund Freud discovered with his Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis conveys a level of immediacy and understanding unmatched by other formats. Jung subsequently revised and expanded his Eranos lectures, frequently sacrificing immediacy for completeness. Unfortunately for the reader of Jung, the original lectures were either not translated into English or the early translations are not readily available. The four lectures in The Integration of the Personality translated by W. Stanley Dell are a case in point. They subsequently were published in Psychology and Alchemy, CW 12, where it is impossible to recognize the original lectures. The expanded version in Psychology and Religion: West and East, CW 11, runs ninety-three pages as opposed to the thirty-four of the original lecture. The additions Jung made, primarily in the Foreword and the section on the Trinity, obscure his argument and threaten to lose the reader in a welter of scholarly amplifications. The second section of the lecture in The Collected Works, "The Problem of the Fourth," is essentially identical to the original lecture. Although the following translation is a new one, R. West and East has been consulted. In deciding to use R. Baynes Psychological Types , and Cary F. Hopefully, my translation at least approximates the high standard they set. Hartman Biographical Statement Gary V. Hartman is an analyst, writer, and translator. He maintains a private practice in Kansas City, St. Louis, and Fayetteville, Arkansas. My critics would likely raise fewer objections at the similar treatment of Buddhist symbols, whose sanctity is just as unquestionable. What, however, is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. What is more, I seriously question whether it is not much more dangerous for Christian symbols to be withheld from thoughtful understanding and to be removed to a sphere of inaccessible incomprehension. They are all too easily withdrawn from understanding to such an extent that their irrationality becomes meaninglessness. Belief is a charisma not granted to everyone. For this reason, human beings have the capacity of thought that should address the loftiest of things. Paul and, subsequently, a long series of venerable church fathers, did not look upon the act of thinking about symbolism with as much anxious defensiveness as certain modern individuals. This anxiety and this concern about Christian symbols is not a good sign. If the symbols represent a higher reality, which my critics certainly do not doubt, then a science that addresses the symbolic understanding and proceeds unwisely can only make a fool of itself. Moreover, I have never had the tendency to depotentiate the validity of symbols but occupy myself with them, because I am convinced of their psychological validity. The man who merely believes and does not think, always forgets that he is the one constantly exposed to his very own enemy: Doubt always lurks where belief rules. For the thinking individual, on the other hand, doubt is always welcome, for it serves him as the most important step toward improved knowledge. People who are able to believe should be somewhat tolerant of their fellow human beings who are only capable of thinking. Belief has anticipated the summit that thinking strives to attain through laborious ascent. The believing individual should not project doubt, his habitual enemy, onto those who think and thereby burden the latter with destructive intentions. If those of old had not thought, we would have no doctrine of the Trinity at all. That the doctrine is believed in, on the one hand, and serves, on the other hand, as an object of reflection proves its vitality. The believer, therefore, should be glad that others also attempt to climb the mountain upon which he sits. The Trinity When I set about to discuss the Trinity, that central Christian symbol, from the psychological perspective, I do so with the awareness that I am entering an area seemingly far removed from psychology. In my opinion though, religions, with all that they are and express, are so closely connected to the human soul that psychology least of all may disregard them. A notion like the Trinity belongs so much to the realm of theology that today, of the secular disciplines, history at most deals with it. People have even largely stopped thinking about dogma and specifically about a concept like the Trinity, which is so difficult to picture. I expressly say, "Trinity," and not "triad. The grouping in triads is something like an archetype of the history of religion on which the threefold Christian Trinity may well be modeled. Yet the Trinity is not an example of

a triad, but of a tri-unity, a three-oneness, indivisibilis trinitas, that is fundamentally different from the triad corresponding to a "tri-theism. The one is lacking in a triad without which the Trinity would be unthinkable. Professor Speiser provided the derivation of the three from the one as it occurs in the Timaeus 31b to 32b. The "one" lays claim to an exceptional position, which Professor Speiser has explained. We find this same, exceptional position again in the natural philosophy of the Middle Ages. For the latter, the "one" was not a number at all, only the "two" was. With "two" an "other" enters in addition to the "one," a phenomenon that makes an impression to such an extent that the word "other" in many languages means "second. With two, namely, one emerges from oneness, which means nothing less than that the separation has reduced and transformed oneness into a "number. The "one" attempts to retain its single and solitary qualities, while the "other" strives to remain an other compared with the one. The "one" does not want to release the "other," because it would thus lose its own quality, and the "other" rejects the "one" in order even to survive. To such an extent, a tension of opposites results between the "one" and the "other. The tension resolves itself in the third inasmuch as the lost "one" again emerges: The absolute One is innumerable, indeterminate, and unrecognizable; only when it appears in "one" does it become recognizable, for the "other" required for this recognition is missing in the condition of the One. Three is, therefore, an unfolding of the one to recognizability, that is to reality in space and time. A "one-next-to-another" is only possible in space and a "one-after-another" only in time. Three is the "one" become reality, which without the resolution of the opposition between the "one" and the "other" would remain devoid of any quality in every determination. The relationship of "threeness" to oneness can be expressed as an equilateral triangle: This intellectual idea of the equilateral triangle is a cognitive pre-requisite for the idea of the Christian Trinity, as Professor Speiser has noted. The Platonic idea makes it possible for us to think at least somewhat logically yes, even mathematically, about the mysterious essence of the Trinity. The true contours of the dogma, however, have very little to do with the logical formula. The Platonic formula only supplies an intellectual structure for contents that originate from completely different sources. The Trinity may be largely grasped through the Platonic formula; as to contents, though, we have to depend on psychological factors, on irrational data that cannot be logically predetermined. In other words, we have to differentiate between the logical idea of the Trinity and its psychological reality. The psychological factors are the following: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If we start with "Father," "Son" results logically from it; but neither from "Father" nor from "Son" does "Holy Ghost" result logically. We must, again, be dealing with special circumstances that are due to psychological requirements. According to the ancient teachings, the "Holy Ghost" is "vera persona, quae a filio et patre missa est. This somewhat unusual notion is in keeping with a separation already existing in the Middle Ages of corpus and spiramen breathing , whereby the latter meant something more than just "breath. While "breathing" is an activity of the body, when conceived of as autonomous it is a substance apart from the body. The idea being expressed is that although the body lives, "life" is imagined as an additional, autonomous quality, namely as a soul independent of the body. Applied to the formula of the Trinity, one would therefore have to say, "Father, Son," and "Life," where the latter emanates from both or is lived by both. The Holy Ghost as "Life" is a concept that simply cannot be derived from the identity of Father and Son. It is much more a psychological notion, that is, a factor based on an irrational, primordial idea. In addition to the logic of the Platonic idea, an aspect that cannot be derived from the Platonic idea forces its way into the concept of the Trinity. It does not follow from the idea of the equilateral triangle that one angle is Father, the second the Son, and the third the Holy Ghost. Pater Filius Spiritus Sanctus We are not dealing with mere letters designating the angles of a triangle but with personalities: This is a concept that results from a primitive assumption: From this assumption originates the idea, for example, of the immortal soul that can separate from the body and does not depend on the body for its existence. In this regard, the primitives have richly developed conceptions of souls. There are souls, for example, that are immortal; others are only loosely connected to the body and, therefore, wander away, get lost in the night, lose their way in a dream, and can be taken prisoner. If you analyze Indian philosophy you will notice that the Indian mind does the same thing. We always believe it to be abstract. It is not at all abstract but rather concretely graphic. The Indian mind places being and other qualities next to things as essences. These concretizations are usually not related to one another logically but are simply in proximity

to one another. At this level there are certainly triads and the like, but simply no Trinities, a concept that corresponds to a more advanced, intellectual stage. A trinity is not a matter of a tri-theistic coexistence, but of a unity effected through reflection from internal and reciprocal relationships. By definition, the Father is the creator, the maker, the auctor rerum, the author of things who, at a cultural level where there is not yet reflection, can simply be the One. The Other results from the One through separation. This separation need not take place as long as no one takes any kind of critical position toward the auctor rerum, that is, as long as a culture does not reflect on this unity and begin to criticize the work through which the creator makes himself known. Far from critical judgment and moral conflict, the human feeling for oneness also leaves the patris auctoritas untouched. I observed this condition of the original oneness of the father world in a Negroid tribe on Mount Elgon.

5: The Trinity in art - Wikipedia

At the very end of his treatment of the peregrinations of the doctrine of the Trinity in German Protestant thought, Powell sketches possible directions which future Trinitarian journeys might take.

Zizioulas5 Being as Communion. Having taken note of this recent rise of interest in the doctrine, certain questions linger: Why has it lately sprung back to center stage? Why did theologians previously consign it to the irrelevant periphery? Such an explanation does not aid us in the task of understanding; understanding requires that we attend to the history of this thought. Zizioulas, Being as Communion: Jiirgen Moltmann, The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God, trs. Margaret Kohl San Francisco: The thesis I propose is that modern Trinitarian thought is driven by three engines: The importance and form that the doctrine of the Trinity assumes in any given period depend on the ways in which the theologian or philosoher understands these concepts and on the relative weight assigned to them. Since we are examining the ways in which these concepts â€" Word, self and history - have changed in the last three centuries and how these changes have affected thinking about the Trinity, this book is necessarily concerned with history and in particular with one slice from history, German Protestant theology and philosophy. Why German theology and philosophy? Like no other part of the Christian tradition, German Protestant theology and philosophy of religion have consistently been on the forefront of modern thought, functioning as a virtual idea-factory for the contemporary world. In order to grasp the movement and inner logic of German Trinitarian thought, it is necessary to understand the ways in which the concepts of Word, self and history have developed and interacted in this Germanic tradition. The concept of revelation has been, even among Protestants, the subject of more disputation and development than might be expected. Macmillan, , 1. Introduction 3 the very first generation of Protestants who unwittingly sowed the seeds of later contentions with their ambivalent declarations on the subject. The dynamics of this concept are caused first by conflicting philosophical theories of subjectivity and second by the fact that the doctrine of the Trinity speaks of three Trinitarian persons. It has been a perplexing task to harmonize a belief in three persons with a belief that God is a single and personal subject. History is the third concept to be introduced because, historically, it was the third to become important for this tradition. Since it is a daunting task to trace out the history of thought on so complex an issue, it may be helpful to sketch out in a preliminary fashion the general contours of the history of German Trinitarian thought, showing how these three concepts function as the engines that move the tradition along. From the beginning of this tradition in the Reformation until the early eighteenth century, only the first two of these concepts were operative; as noted above, "history" did not become an issue until the middle part of the eighteenth century. Early on, then, the main issues were two: The first issue whether revelation contains the doctrine might seem to admit of easy resolution, a matter of discerning whether the Bible does or does not contain the doctrine of the Trinity, or at least statements that imply the doctrine. However, as is so often true in theology, the matter is scarcely so simple. Involved here is the question of how one is to interpret the Bible and related questions about the role of the church and other authorities in coming to an adequate interpretation. We should also note that this was a peculiarly Protestant problem; no 4 Introduction Christian had ever questioned whether the doctrine of the Trinity could be drawn from the Bible until Luther and Melanchthon proposed a view of the Bible and of theological authority largely at odds with the medieval view. Luther and Melanchthon both dearly wanted to affirm the doctrine of the Trinity, yet neither could simply do so on the basis of its appearance in the ancient creeds their understanding of authority compelled them to justify everything by means of a direct appeal to the Bible. But, as all could plainly see, the doctrine in its technical formulation is absent from the Bible; the most that could be accomplished would be to show that it is implied by Scripture. To this task Luther and Melanchthon set themselves assiduously and not without success. However, complicating their work were their own public declarations to the effect that revelation is all about the way in which God relates to us, particularly in such vital matters as forgiveness of sin. Although initially innocuous sounding, such sentiments could be and were later taken to imply that revelation describes God only in a certain way, namely insofar as God appears to us in the events of salvation. When this attitude is

adopted, the doctrine of the Trinity becomes an ornament that, although admired and reverently adored, is generally regarded as useless and extravagant, belonging as it seems to the realm of mystery. Although Luther and Melanchthon each found this attitude abhorrent, their understanding of revelation had unwittingly established the conditions for it. From this time onward, there would always be representatives of this skeptical attitude within the Protestant tradition, claiming, perhaps with good reason, to find warrant for their views in the thought of the early reformers. Much of the energy devoted Introduction 5 to Trinitarian thought from the period of the Reformation until the early eighteenth century was accordingly occupied with trying to show that the doctrine of the Trinity is well grounded in the Bible. These voices constitute the liberal wing of Protestant thought, with its emphasis on what we may call the existential dimension of the Christian faith and its disdaining of such recondite doctrines as the Trinity. At the same time, other theologians in the eighteenth century, notably Ludwig von Zinzendorf; in the twentieth century, Barth, Moltmann and Pannenberg are examples have insisted just as adamantly that the idea of the Trinity can be read off the surface of revelation; however, their insistence is made possible by their having altered the meaning of "revelation. So, although we may represent the debate about revelation as an internecine Protestant struggle between those who hold that revelation does imply and those who believe that it does not imply the doctrine of the Trinity, we must also observe that the conception of revelation itself is a moving target in the history of Trinitarian thought. All hands agree on its centrality to theology; however, accord on the meaning of revelation has not been forthcoming. The second issue whether we can find an analogy to the Trinity in the nature of the human self was of far less concern to the early reformers because of their general antipathy toward speculative 6 Introduction approaches to the doctrine. Convinced that the Bible alone could provide a basis for the doctrine, they rather contemptuously eschewed the long medieval heritage of searching for analogies to the Trinity in the attempt at understanding the doctrine. Paradoxically, it was Melanchthon, who early in his life was most vehemently opposed to speculative and analogical approaches, who later in life proved most amenable to the speculative method among early reformers. Nonetheless, the medieval tradition of regarding the human mind as an analogy of the Trinity found few supporters in the Protestant theological tradition. There was, however, a tradition of philosophical thought represented by G. Leibniz and Gotthold Lessing that continued to find inspiration in this medieval and speculative approach. It found direct inspiration in the thought of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, both of whom saw in the human mind an image of the Trinity. Although these analogies may not seem intuitively obvious at first, they make sense if we focus on the mental processes involved. Although the notion of eternal generation has engendered considerable debate, at least the metaphor of begetting is established. The Augustinian-Thomistic approach finds an analogy between the begetting of the Son and the production of a concept in the mind when the subject reflects upon itself. That is, when in self-consciousness the subject thinks about itself, an idea or concept of the self is formed. Although we today refer to the result of this process as an idea or concept, in the medieval period it was called the "inner word. Thus they discovered an analogy between the conception of the inner word and the begetting of the Son. However, the Augustinian-Thomistic tradi- Introduction 7 tion noted that the mind is possessed of two faculties, intellect and will, and that, whereas the process of intellect issues forth in the conception of the word, the process of will culminates in love. They further noted that, just as in the doctrine of the Trinity the Spirit in a sense connects Father and Son together, so love in general unites lover and beloved. Protestants were distinctively cool to this method of expounding the doctrine of the Trinity. Although Augustinians and Thomists did not claim that they could deduce this doctrine purely from the analogy between the Trinity and the structure of the self, they were enamored of this approach as a means of understanding the doctrine. Protestants, however, almost uniformly ignored this analogical method, preferring instead not only to infer but even to explain doctrines strictly by means of Biblical exposition. Nonetheless, there were a few in the Protestant camp who claimed the Augustinian heritage. Notable among these is the philosopher Leibniz, who among his other pursuits gave time to defending and expounding the doctrine of the Trinity by means of both Biblical and speculative arguments. Yet the Augustinian-Thomistic tradition did not remain within the confines sketched above; it developed over time in response to changing conceptions of the self. Although the Augustinian understanding of the self had enormous longevity, by the early s a different conception of the self

had taken the field that, although having roots in the Augustinian tradition, effected substantial modifications to that tradition. The new conception was provided by idealist philosophers such as G. Hegel, for whom the leading concept for understanding the self was "spirit. As a result, whereas Augustine had to labor mightily in order to accommodate the Holy Spirit into the analogy of the self-knowing and -loving mind, such accommodation was a comparatively easy matter for the idealists; their conception of the self readily lent itself to Trinitarian exposition. No sooner had idealism come to fruition than its life as a movement came to an end, to be replaced, in the liberal theology of 8 Introduction the late s, by an understanding of the self built on the concept of "personality. As a result, when God is thought of as a person, it becomes difficult to make room for the Trinitarian persons without falling into a tritheism in which each Trinitarian person is a God. So, liberal theology, with a view of the self vastly different from that of idealism, had no significant interest in the idea of the Trinity. Twentieth-century Trinitarian thought has witnessed, first, a resurgence of the Augustinian tradition in the theology of Karl Barth and, second, a renewal of the Hegelian view of the self in the thought of Jurgen Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Barth rescued the doctrine of the Trinity from the oblivion facing it at the hands of liberal theology; he did so by reverting to the Augustinian account of subjectivity, with its emphasis on the unity of the self and its subordination of intellect and will to that unity. Moltmann and Pannenberg, on the contrary, have truculently attacked Barth for his excessive zeal for monotheism and have reached back to Hegel for a view of the self that places greater emphasis on the inherent relationality of persons. In this interpretation, persons come to be what they are only in their mutual relations; persons are not independently existing entities, but instead are radically dependent on each other. But does not the full subjectivity of each person raise the specter of tritheism? Only if subjectivity is thought to apply to individually subsisting entities; however in the Hegelian interpretation, persons do not exist apart from their relations with others â€" no "person" has subsistent reality Introduction 9 in itself. In summary, the changing conceptions of the Trinity in modern German thought have reflected the history of thinking about the self. In each era, the Trinity has been interpreted in light of some philosophical conception of the self. The third issue is "history. Like the concept of subjectivity, it too went through several distinctive phases. Atfirst,history was significant as a mode of critical thinking. We see this illustrated in the thought of Hermann Samuel Reimarus who came to the Bible with presuppositions dramatically different from those of Protestant scholastic theology. According to Reimarus, scholastic theology was guilty of a grossly anachronistic interpretation of the Bible - of interpreting the Bible in the light of later Christian doctrinal formulations. So, he argued, it is not surprising that Christians found doctrines such as the Trinity in the Bible, for they postulated complete historical continuity between the Bible and doctrines fashioned in the third, fourth andfifthcenturies and read the Bible accordingly. Reimarus, on the contrary, postulated a vast gulf between the Bible and early Christianity, holding that the earliest Christians, indeed the apostles themselves, had either thoroughly misunderstood or even knowingly distorted the message of Jesus. Consequently, when the Gospels are interpreted against the background of first-century Judaism, instead of being interpreted anachronistically from the perspective of the later church, a great many traditional doctrines are found to be without Biblical support. So, at first history meant the use of historical criticism to question the validity of traditional modes of interpreting the Bible and its effects were utterly negative for the doctrine of the Trinity. This historical development is due to the fact that God relates to the world through uniting with finite reality, first with human nature in the person of Jesus Christ, then with human nature more collectively in the community of the redeemed. This dynamic and historical relation to the world is according to Schleiermacher the real meaning of the doctrine of the Trinity: For Schleiermacher, the doctrine of the Trinity is a way of representing the historicity and progressive nature of this relation; in history God becomes a Trinity. The historicity he spoke of pertained only to the relation between God and the world, not to God; it was left to the idealist philosophers such as Hegel to extend the concept of historicity to the divine being itself. For Hegel the divine being is itself historical. This means not only that God enters into history, but also that God is essentially a process. Spirit has a history, according to Hegel, because it develops according to a rational pattern, whether that pattern occurs in logic, in the world of nature, or in the history of art, religion and philosophy. Introduction 11 Word, self and history: Like the persons of the Trinity, these concepts relate to one another in various ways; unlike

the Trinitarian persons, the meaning of the concepts evolves over time, with the result that the complexity of modern Trinitarian thought is thereby exponentially increased. This book is an attempt at cutting through this complexity by demonstrating the contours of this history. It elaborates the themes adumbrated in this introduction, showing how in each period of modern German thought the changing fortunes of the doctrine of the Trinity can be explained by observing how these concepts developed and related to each other. This fact is all the more surprising when we recall that both Luther and Melanchthon repeatedly abjured the role of doctrinal innovators and protested without end their allegiance to the ancient creeds in which the doctrine of the Trinity is enshrined. Germanic Trinitarian theologians who, like Luther and Melanchthon, subscribe to the creeds are legion; from theologians of the second Protestant generation such as Martin Chemnitz to contemporaries such as Jurgen Moltmann, the doctrine of the Trinity has in every generation been defended, expounded and developed.

the trinity in german thought Download the trinity in german thought or read online here in PDF or EPUB. Please click button to get the trinity in german thought book now.. All books are in clear copy here, and all files are secure so don't worry about.

First, it is the synthesis of his dialectical exploration of the nature of war. Second, every identifiable concept in On War can be related to one or more of its elements. A popularized treatment of the subject is HERE or see local backup copy. The identity of those elements is readily evident to anyone who actually reads the first paragraph of his description: Prior to the American debacle in Vietnam, no one writing in English had paid any serious attention to the trinity. The term first achieved prominence in somewhat skewed form in U. Army Colonel Harry G. This useful secondary trinity consists of the people, the army, and the government. Their failure to read the actual wording of the theory they so vociferously attack, and to grasp its deep relevance to the phenomena they describe, is harder to credit. This exercise is designed primarily for the purpose of clarifying the issues involved in teaching the trinity to instructors. That said, there is no good reason not to pass it on to students as well. One need not explicitly point out these changes to students, but merely note that this version is from a different translator. The reasons for the changes are: The point is that emotion and reason [i. So, here is my translation: The first of these three aspects concerns more the people; the second, more the commander and his army; the third, more the government. The passions that are to blaze up in war must already be inherent in the people; the scope that the play of courage and talent will enjoy in the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army; but the political aims are the business of government alone. These three tendencies are like three different codes of law, deep-rooted in their subject and yet variable in their relationship to one another. A theory that ignores any one of them or seeks to fix an arbitrary relationship among them would conflict with reality to such an extent that for this reason alone it would be totally useless. The task, therefore, is to keep our theory [of war] floating among these three tendencies, as among three points of attraction. In any case, the conception of war defined here will be the first ray of light into the fundamental structure of theory, which first sorts out the major components and allows us to distinguish them from one another. The working working translation is based on comparisons among the first edition of Vom Kriege, the translation by J. Matthijs Jolles translation New York: Obviously, I bear sole responsibility for the result. There are no numbers in the original. The file is less than 1Mb. Your browser does not support the video tag. Clausewitzian "Trinity" demonstration device The " Trinity " is a key concept in Clausewitzian theory, which Clausewitz illustrated by referring to this scientific device. Given a complete and accurate quantification of those forces, we could predict in perfect detail the course the pendulum will follow. At any given point, we can predict with some confidence the immediate consequences of the present trajectory. As anyone familiar with the workings of government or bureaucracies in general knows, it also means that massive inputs can have little or no measurable output. We can never know the factors to the infinite precision necessary to get long-range predictability. Even if we could control for every other factor, we could never release the pendulum with precisely the same initial force or direction to get repeatability. Each running of the experiment results in a different course of events. You can, however, get pretty good repeatability by running the video clip a second time. But the metaphor is still a good one. War, like most real-world events, belongs to a class of nonlinear phenomena that defy our attempts at precise prediction. Beyerchen, historian of science at Ohio State University, describes this experiment in his important article, " Clausewitz, Nonlinearity and the Unpredictability of War. The demonstration usually starts with a magnet pendulum hanging over one magnet; when the pendulum is pulled aside and let go, it comes to rest quickly. Positioned over two equally powerful magnets, the pendulum swings toward first one, then the other, and still settles into a rest position as it is captured by one of the points of attraction. But when a pendulum is released over three equidistant and equally powerful magnets, it moves irresolutely to and fro as it darts among the competing points of attraction, sometimes kicking out high to acquire added momentum that allows it to keep gyrating in a startlingly long and intricate pattern. The probability is vanishingly small that an

attempt to repeat the process would produce exactly the same pattern. Even such a simple system is complex enough for the details of the trajectory of any actual "run" to be, effectively, irreproducible. His final metaphor of Chapter 1, Book One captures this understanding perfectly. And what is needed is infinitely fine precision, for an immeasurably small change in the initial conditions can produce a significantly different pattern. Nor is it possible to isolate the system from all possible influences around it, and that environment will have changed since the measurements were taken. Anticipation of the overall kind of pattern is possible, but quantitative predictability of the actual trajectory is lost. I find that running this actual demonstration fascinates students and gets the point across. It disarms the linearist thinkers and actually draws in those with scientific or mathematical backgrounds—often the students most resistant to Clausewitz. It also causes some people to roll their eyes at high speed—especially entrenched and concrete-minded members of war college faculties. Remember that, when we apply this metaphor to the real world, we are not standing outside the system watching the pendulum move among the attractors. Rather, we are riding on the tip of the pendulum, experiencing the simultaneous pull of the various forces ourselves while hurtling towards one or the other seemingly at random. If the magnets are left in attraction mode, however, the pendulum will eventually lock onto one of them. Consider the implications of a rational peace, a peace of mere military exhaustion, and a peace of continuing but inactive hostility, which is what the various possibilities might symbolize. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a paradoxical trinity--composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone. The first of these three aspects mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government. The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people; the scope which the play of courage and talent will enjoy in the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army; but the political aims are the business of government alone. A theory that ignores any one of them or seeks to fix an arbitrary relationship between them would conflict with reality to such an extent that for this reason alone it would be totally useless. Our task therefore is to develop a theory that maintains a balance between these three tendencies, like an object suspended between three magnets. German first edition Die erste dieser drei Seiten ist mehr dem Volke, die zweite mehr dem Feldherrn und seinem Heer, die dritte mehr der Regierung zugewendet. Carl von Clausewitz, On War, trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret Princeton: Army War College c.

7: RECLAIMING THE CLAUSEWITZIAN TRINITY

Buy The Trinity in German Thought at www.enganchecubano.com

Spirit The " Shield of the Trinity " or Scutum Fidei diagram of traditional medieval Western Christian symbolism In Trinitarian doctrine, God exists as three persons or hypostases, but is one being, having a single divine nature. As stated in the Athanasian Creed , the Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, and the Holy Spirit is uncreated, and all three are eternal without beginning. Each person is understood as having the identical essence or nature, not merely similar natures. A possible interpretation of Genesis 1: Perichoresis A depiction of the Council of Nicaea in AD , at which the Deity of Christ was declared orthodox and Arianism condemned Perichoresis from Greek , "going around", "envelopment" is a term used by some scholars to describe the relationship among the members of the Trinity. The Latin equivalent for this term is circumincessio. This concept refers for its basis to John 14â€"17 , where Jesus is instructing the disciples concerning the meaning of his departure. His going to the Father, he says, is for their sake; so that he might come to them when the "other comforter" is given to them. Then, he says, his disciples will dwell in him, as he dwells in the Father, and the Father dwells in him, and the Father will dwell in them. This is so, according to the theory of perichoresis, because the persons of the Trinity "reciprocally contain one another, so that one permanently envelopes and is permanently enveloped by, the other whom he yet envelopes". Hilary of Poitiers , Concerning the Trinity 3: Perichoresis provides an intuitive figure of what this might mean. Therefore, Orthodox theologians also see the marriage relationship between a man and a woman to be an example of this sacred union. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. Filioque Trinitarianism affirms that the Son is "begotten" or "generated" of the Father and that the Spirit "proceeds" from the Father, but the Father is "neither begotten nor proceeds". The argument over whether the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son, was one of the catalysts of the Great Schism , in this case concerning the Western addition of the Filioque clause to the Nicene Creed. The Eastern Orthodox Churches object to the Filioque clause on ecclesiological and theological grounds, holding that "from the Father" means "from the Father alone". This language is often considered difficult because, if used regarding humans or other created things, it would imply time and change; when used here, no beginning, change in being, or process within time is intended and is excluded. The Son is generated "born" or "begotten" , and the Spirit proceeds, eternally. Augustine of Hippo explains, "Thy years are one day, and Thy day is not daily, but today; because Thy today yields not to tomorrow, for neither does it follow yesterday. Its controversial use is addressed in several confessions: Economic and immanent Trinity[edit] The neutrality of this section is disputed. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please do not remove this message until conditions to do so are met. According to the Catechism of the Catholic Church, The Fathers of the Church distinguish between theology theologia and economy oikonomia. Through the oikonomia the theologia is revealed to us; but conversely, the theologia illuminates the whole oikonomia. So it is, analogously, among human persons. A person discloses himself in his actions, and the better we know a person, the better we understand his actions. The three persons of the Trinity always work inseparably, for their work is always the work of the one God. They have but one will as they have but one being. Otherwise they would not be one God. According to Phillip Cary , if there were relations of command and obedience between the Father and the Son, there would be no Trinity at all but rather three gods. His object is to make it plain that His own will is connected in indissoluble union with the Father. Let us rather, in a sense befitting the Godhead, perceive a transmission of will, like the reflexion of an object in a mirror, passing without note of time from Father to Son. Athanasius of Alexandria explained that the Son is eternally one in being with the Father, temporally and voluntarily subordinate in his incarnate ministry.

8: War, Clausewitz and the Trinity by Thomas Waldman

the trinity in german thought The Trinity in German Thought describes the three ideas that govern modern German

THE TRINITY IN GERMAN THOUGHT pdf

Trinitarian thought: the ideas of reflective selfhood, of revelation, and of history. "Reflective selfhood" designates the attempt at finding an analogy between the Trinity and the structure of the human self.

9: The Trinity in German Thought by David Vincent Meconi | Articles | First Things

The Trinity in German Thought Samuel M. Powell vii + Cambridge University Press Â£/$ 0 5.

THE TRINITY IN GERMAN THOUGHT pdf

Steve and Celestia Tracys viewpoint Websphere Application Server V5 for Iseries Sea Serpent of Grenadier Pond Continued fractions with applications Pmdg md 11 tutorial deutsch Enders game book 2 The complete works of Lewis Carrol Grammar and communication Drupal 8 theme tutorial God redeems our mistakes Anatomy a regional atlas of human body clemente Swiss Family Robinson (Squirrels) Mini Shopaholic (Shopaholic, #6) Nginx designing and deploying microservices Experimental approaches to multifactorial interactions in tumor development Manpower policy and programmes in Canada. On medullary carcinoma of the thyroid. Effectiveness of population policy and family planning in Mardan District Ready-to-use science activities for the elementary classroom 17. Retirement (1926-1929 210 Pluck! Providing Courageous Take-Charge Retail Service Derren brown pure effect Conserving our fish and wildlife heritage, annual report, fiscal year 1976 Treatment and Prognosis Sp physical education book for class 11 Interpretive traditions surrounding Genesis 25.23 and Malachi 1.2-3 6. The distribution of North American forest trees. George Vasey. The sub-Apostolic period : the Shepherd of Hermas The Chinese Fortune Cookie Christmas Story Ornament Kit Flex 4.5 tutorial for beginners List of codes and ciphers Juan Fernandez enters Africa Chapter 9 Date Time Functions 2/2: Time Intelligence Functions Around South America with a sample case Hutchinson world weather guide V. 21 Achatinellidae by Alpheus Hyatt and Henry A. Pilsbry. Leptachatina by C. Montague Cooke. 1911 The Eighth Ghost Book Babbette deutsch ebook finlnd Halliday resnick walker physics for iit jee Arabism and identity