

BOGDAN POPOVENIUC

TRANSECUMENICAL *FILIOQUE*

Bogdan Popoveniuc

University “Ștefan cel Mare” of Suceava, Department of Human, Social and Political Sciences, Suceava, Romania.

Email: bpopoveniuc@usv.ro

Abstract: The present article proposes a hermeneutical interdisciplinary strategy aiming to transpose a part of the great conceptual achievements in conceiving the tri-unitary schema of the Holy Trinity to the understanding of the triadic nature of human person. At the same time, it claims that the scientific knowledge about the structure, behavior and complexity of human mind might be incorporated in the hermeneutical effort of theological understanding. The consequence of this understanding is mutually beneficial. On the one hand, it proves that the theological insights promise a perspective able to provide the desired comprehensive framework necessary for an all-inclusive theory on personality, able to reunite all the three ontological aspects of human being: biological substance, social structure and cultural nature. On the other hand, it offers a new base for the reconceptualization of some of the millennial theological debates. Last, but not the least, it shows that such interdisciplinary ecumenism could provide a base for spiritual personal development, given that the largely referred opposition between theological and scientific knowledge can be dissolved in a comprehensive theanthropic model.

Key words: Holy Trinity, human person, (trans)ecumenism, Filioque, interdisciplinary hermeneutics.

Combine two words, Myth and History. What do you get? Mystery.
Ashwin Sanghi

1. Introduction

I think that the impressive conceptual analyses made over almost two thousand years by those who had lived in God, hence not only by Christians, represent an inestimable cognitive treasure for the modern scientific approach in understanding the tri-unitary nature (bio-socio-cognitive) of human person. At the same time, the empirical and scientific evidence brought by contemporary research in neurobiology, sociology, physiology, could also enrich the theological comprehension over this divine mystery. Such overlaps of the two perspectives over the world are more and more frequent than seems at first glance. Unfortunately, their explanatory convergence and potential mutual empowerment is often overlooked because of the prejudices. For example, only a malevolent reading could label the following observation of the Nobel Prize-winning Belgian cytologist and biochemist Christian de Duve as a heresy. “The writers of Genesis had detected the inherent selfishness in human nature that I propose is in our genes, and invented the myth of original sin to account for it” (Duve quoted in Witchalls 2011). On the contrary, a few revisions could turn this perspective into an argument sustaining the notion of „original sin”: The writers of Genesis *under the guidance of God* had detected the inherent selfishness in human nature that I propose is present in our genes, and *expressed* this in the form of the myth of the original sin to account for it.

This paper proposes a transdisciplinary perspective. It is not an intention to interpret scripture, but to suggest an image that could enlighten the non-theological understanding man. It is not an exegetic work, but only a (non-theological) general hermeneutical strategy for merging or, at least, designing a possibility for mutual support of theology and science. It only aims to reveal the fact that theological and scientific perspectives could complement each other in a very constructive way. My scope is to show how the theological wisdom, accumulated over centuries of attempts to understand one of the core mysteries of Christian faith, i.e. the relations between the Divine Persons within the Holy Trinity, can prove to be a crucial landmark for the scientific understanding of human person. I consider that the enormous efforts made throughout centuries to understand this mystery deserves a better treatment from the contemporary scientific research on the human being.

I am also very aware that, unfortunately, such approaches will encounter a strong resistance from both sides. For example, former Oxford University professor and evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins

considers that “the Bible should be taught, but emphatically not as reality. It is fiction, myth, poetry, anything but reality. As such it needs to be taught because it underlies so much of our literature and our culture” (Dawkins quoted in Beckford 2010). On the other side, Hierotheos Vlachos of Nafpaktos contend that “the inclusion of anthropology, ecclesiology and sociology within the study of the Trinity” is a “serious mistake” and a “heresy”, because “there is a confused difference between created and uncreated”, a confusion perpetuated even by some orthodox theologians. “St. John of Damaskos says in apt and precisely worded thought and phrase, that is impossible to find in creation any image which exactly portrays the way of being of the Holy Trinity. There is no resemblance between them” (Hierotheos 2002, 158, 213). The proposed hermeneutical strategy is not about applying the structural relationships *between* Holy Persons to sociological patterns of interpersonal relationship, but refers to the very relationships of the threefold aspect existing within human person. However, I consider that both sides share the same fault. The idea that religious truth is the opposite of truth (Science) or above the mundane knowledge (Theology) represents the same simple fact of disallowing it.

However, an unbiased reading of the fundamental assertions of Christian and anthropological perspectives shows that the feasibility of this hermeneutic proposal is supported by both biblical assertions and scientific perspectives. On the one hand, the Bible says: “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness” (Genesis 1:26). This means there *must* be a sort of resemblance between the creator and the creation, even if this resemblance remains inscrutable in the absence of revelation. On the other hand, ethnographers, like Bronisław Malinowski, suggest the existence of a frontier between what people can and cannot explain logically and out of this arises their need to create myths when this limit is reached. But although they are speculative creations, they incorporate and express traces of existential truths who make them possible. And once the myths are created it becomes less relevant “how men think in myths, but how myths operate in men’s minds without their being aware of the fact” (Lévi-Strauss 1969, 12). Because they are creations of the unconscious mind, these myths definitely represent possible gates, no matter how narrow they are, to the profound structures which produces them.

Any attempt to resume the huge conceptual analysis, the various positions and interpretations made during almost two millennia of fierce theological debates and unimaginable efforts to comprehend the mystery of the Holy Trinity, made by thousands of people which dedicated their entire life-span to understanding and living in Christian *Weltanschauung*, would not only be childish, but also a wrong endeavor. As a consequence, in order to illustrate my epistemological strategy, I will only present the general lines of this model as it is accepted by most of the Christian catechisms and make use of it in supporting my thesis.

2. The general lines of the Holy Trinity model

Although one cannot speak of “the” Holy Trinity model, because there are several models that describe the Trinity in Western theology alone, not to speak of the differences between Eastern and Western Churches, all of them share several general lines. For propaedeutic aim of this article these primary lines of the Trinitarian pattern will be considered, along with the major conceptual schism of *filioque*, but further discussions could be extended to encompass the complex and subtle differences from the extensive treatises of systematic theology (e.g. Emery 2011; Rahner 1970; Ganoczy 2001).

According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC), the Divine Persons are really distinct from one another (and not simply names designating modalities of the divine being): “He is not the Father who is the Son, nor is the Son he who is the Father, nor is the Holy Spirit he who is the Father or the Son.” (Council of Toledo XI (675): DS 530:25, in *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC), § 254). They are also distinct in their relationships: “The divine persons are relative to one another.” (CCC, § 255). Nevertheless, they are one and “dwelling” in all others within Divine Unity which is Triune, i.e. the “consubstantial Trinity” (Council of Constantinople II (553): DS 421, in CCC, § 253). And although they are equal in their Godhead, their relations are not like: “It is the Father who generates, the Son who is begotten, and the Holy Spirit who proceeds” (Lateran Council IV (1215): DS 804, in CCC, § 254).

A similar situation is expressed by the Orthodox Church Catechism. “God is one in substance but Trine in persons, The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, a Trinity consubstantial and undivided” (St. Philaret 1845, 50). And again, “God Father is neither begotten, nor proceeds from any other Person: the Son of God is from all eternity begotten of the Father: the Holy Ghost from all eternity proceeds from the Father,” but “all of absolutely equal Divine majesty. The Father is true God; the Son equally true God; and the Holy Ghost true God; but yet so, that in three Persons there is only one Tri-personal God” (St. Philaret 1845, 51).

The exceptional features of triune Christian godheadness was expressed in many forms in theological discourses during the ages. “The Father is unborn, the Son is born, Holy Spirit is proceeded” (St John Damascene, *On Holy Trinity*, 1, Migne, P. G., XCV, col. 9). The position of the three in the Trinity, which is one, is different although they share the same nature. “The oneness of the Persons of the Holy Trinity is due both to the Father, Who begets the Son and sends out the Holy Spirit, and to their common essence” (Hierotheos 2002, 219). “Inseparable in what they are, the divine persons are also inseparable in what they do. But within the single divine operation each shows forth what is proper to him in the Trinity”, so that all things are “from the Father”, “through the Son” and “in the Holy Spirit” (CCC, § 267).

The crucial difference between the two major Christian Churches on the Holy Trinity concept consists in the role assigned to the Son. For the Catholic Creed “the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father as the first principle and, by the eternal gift of this to the Son, from the communion of both the Father and the Son” (St. Augustine, *De Trin.* 15, 26, 47: PL 42, 1095, in CCC § 264). While, as we have seen for Orthodox Creed, the Holy Ghost proceeds from all eternity *only* from the Father. But, the Orthodox theology rejects very clearly, at the same time, as “erroneous interpretations” claims as: “the Father alone is God and that the Son and the Holy Spirit are creatures”, “the God in himself is One who merely appears in different forms to the world”, “the God is one, and that the Son and the Spirit are merely names for relations which God has with Himself” or “the Father is one God, the Son is another God, and the Holy Spirit still another God” (Hopko 2016).

As we have already seen, it is extremely difficult to conceive this religious concept of the Holy Trinity purely analytically, perhaps impossible. As a possible analytical solution for logical consistency of the idea of a triune God, Peter van Inwagen, proposes the concept of relative identity: God the Father is the same God as the Son and the Holy Spirit, but is not the same person as the Son and the Spirit. [For a comprehensive combined analysis of modern theological works and analytic approaches on the doctrine of the Trinity see William Hasker (2013)]. The concept of Triune God violates the logical principle of identity by stating that something can be different and yet unique, that there are three distinct entities that form one. It states the truth of 7 aggregate inconsistent claims: 1. There is exactly one God (John 1:1, Romans 3:30 etc.); 2. The Father is God (1 Corinthians 8:6 etc.); 3. The Son is God (Isaiah 9:6, Isaiah 54:5 etc.); 4. The Holy Spirit is God (1 Corinthians 6:19, John 1:1 etc.); 5. The Father is not the Son (Luke 3:21-22 etc.); 6. The Son is not the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:21-22 etc.); 7. The Father is not the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:21-22 etc.). But no matter how strange it sounds such situation, it is not unknown to science at all. Here we also have, at the core of the most empirical science of modern Physics, such paradoxically notions which are either logically impossible or, at least, conceptual paradoxically, like quantum entanglement, or extremely difficult to comprehend as the nature of time or the difficult problem of consciousness. Consider, for example, the underlying logical structure of our common concept of space. The space (just as *divine nature*) has three dimensions (with similar relational proprieties like *hypostases*). All three dimensions *are* space, they could not be qualitatively distinguished, but they are still distinct. Not to mention they are conceived to be from all eternity and infinite, too! In fact, my point is that the theological complex analysis on the Holy Trinity problem is promising to provide, at least as far as the problem of consciousness is concerned, new insights that can lay the foundations for finding a scientific solution: how phenomenal consciousness, mental states/events with phenomenal

qualities or qualia can arise from physical or neural processes in the brain (Chalmers 1995).

Not only the semantic identity structure of Holy Trinity is difficult to understand, but also the meanings of the key terms involved, i.e. person (and *hypostasis*) and “same substance, essence or nature” (*homousios*). About the last topic, the conceptions of the two Churches differ as in the case of the procession of the Holy Spirit, i.e. the question of *Filioque*. For the Western Church, in a Platonically influenced tradition, essence is conceived more concrete, something existing on its own (in an eternal way) and the existence of something is predicated upon its essence. Hence, the essence of God exists distinctly and manifests itself within the three relations with Himself. For the Eastern Church, the person prevails ontologically over nature, and the essence is rather a description of the qualities shared by the three subjects of the Holy Trinity united in will and activity. Apparently destructive, such doctrinal disputes actually enrich and propel human understanding and the gains of the secular theological debates worth to be valued by scientific knowledge.

3. The Model of Holy Trinity and Human Tri-unity

I chose to discuss about this subject, because it seems that the image of this incomprehensible mystery is equally relevant for the situation of the three dimensions of the human personality (Popoveniuc 2006a). In this context, the biological “nature” of man is *what* he/she is, the social dimension of his/her “person” is *who* he/she is, and the cognitive “spirit” means *how* he/she is, all three forming his Triune Personality. The dogma of the Holy Trinity could be conceived as the fundamental intuition of the truth of the essence and structure of the human personality, shaped in the image of God. In order to illustrate this claim, further on I will make a parallel reading of the Theological teaching on the issues of the Holy Trinity model and on some of the modern formulations on Human Person Tri-unity.

My endeavor is not totally new, even if it is different. There was already an well-known attempt to provide psychological interpretation for the theological terms in Psychoanalysis. It seems a natural similarity, once the psychoanalysts’ aim is to reveal the deep unconscious mechanisms which direct the conscious behavior, while theology scrutinizes the deep Trinity mystery of nature of God Almighty, the creator of all things visible and invisible. According to Carl Gustav Jung, the theological constructs can be interpreted as referring to structures within the psyche: the archaic self is represented by the (inner) God. The dreams and prophecies from the Old Testament were incentives for evolution toward consciousness. The self attains ego-consciousness through the incarnation of God in Jesus of Nazareth, from the New

Testament, and emerges to its transcendent(al) function with the manifestation of the Holy Spirit (Jung 1973c). Hence, Jung regards God as the personification of unconscious content because He reveals Himself to us through the unconscious activity of the psyche. Father is seen as a representation of the Self (the source of energy within the psyche), Son as the emergent structure of the consciousness that replaces the self-alienated ego and the Holy Spirit as the mediating structure between the two (Jung 1973a, 163).

There are many useful insights in Jungian psychological use of religious concepts which deserve to be developed further. For instance, the indissoluble relationship between human consciousness and the archetype of God from the collective unconscious develops in a dialectical way. Unfortunately, unlike the present hermeneutical strategy, he employs theological constructs in his work in a peculiar way. He mostly makes use of the prestige of the biblical content rather as an authoritarian support for his theory and has no misgiving to distort the image when the line of his own argumentation requires it. For example, in order to be in accordance with his theory of psyche movement toward completion in four stages (made up of pairs of opposites), he nonchalantly converts the Trinitarian structure in a Quaternity by including the feminine or evil side of the God (Jung 1973b). He also he keeps the religious revelations as expressions of collective unconscious. The most striking example of his unconcerned psychologisation of theological concepts is the strange hermeneutical inversion of the symbolic gesture of God. According to Jung, God sent his only Son to be sacrificed in repentance for the God's sins, as the mistreatment of Job, and not for the sins of humanity. This interpretation was meant to support the idea that even God's undergoes psychological development.

The following examples will illustrate, in a corroborative manner, different ways to employ this theological concept of Holy Trinity in order to enrich scientific and philosophical understanding on human person. The proposed hermeneutical strategy is not limited to the use of the theological symbol of Trinity *within* the psychological processes or structure of the mind, as it is in the psychoanalytic theories, nor does it explain the relationships *between* persons, as in sociology. This concept is better exploited when it is used to put together, in the same matrix, the *different kinds* of processes acting within the human personality with their dissimilar determinations: psycho-physiologic, socio-cultural and affective-cognitive (Popoveniuc 2006a).

The first example, consists in the general ascertainments make by both theologians and personality researchers which content the impossibility of fully and definitive understanding of God and Personality. The main agreed-upon statements made by the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation, on October 25, 2003, after an extensive review of the Scripture, history and theology, claims that "all

involved in such dialogue expressly recognize the limitations of our ability to make definitive assertions about the inner life of God.”

On the other hand, C.G. Jung states in the definition of self that “in so far as psychic totality, consisting of both conscious and unconscious contents, is a postulate, it is a *transcendental* concept, for it presupposes the existence of unconscious factors on empirical grounds and thus characterizes an entity that can be described only in part, but, for the other part, remains at present unknowable and illimitable” (Jung 2014, par. 789, 460).

St. Gregory the Theologian says that “the three hypostases are a single Godhead” and “one nature in three properties, understanding, perfect, existing by themselves, distinct in number, but not distinct in the Godhead.” (*Against Arians and Concerning Himself*, Migne, PG, XXXVI, col. 236 A) The three hypostases “differ without sharing, so to speak, and unite distinct. One in three is the Godhead and three make one” (*The Holy Lights (Epiphany)*, 11, Migne, P.G., XXXVI, Col. 345 C.D.).

According to the proposed hermeneutic, these could be read that the three ontological proprieties of human being – biology, socialness and cognitive –, exists by themselves distinct in number, but not distinct in humanness. The human being is not a biological creature which develops social organization and rational thinking, but sociality and consciousness are only names for complex organic development of human being, differ without sharing, so to speak, and unite distinct, because all three form a triune being.

St. Basil of Caesarea in the *Letter 38 (To his Brother Gregory)* comments that “when we are exalted to this conception, again, led by God-inspired guidance, we are taught that by that power all things are brought from non-being into being, but yet not by that power to the exclusion of origination. On the other hand there is a certain power subsisting without generation and without origination, which is the cause of the cause of all things. For the Son, by whom are all things, and with whom the Holy Ghost is inseparably conceived of, is of the Father. For it is not possible for anyone to conceive of the Son if he be not previously enlightened by the Spirit. Since, then, the Holy Ghost, from Whom all the supply of good things for creation has its source, is attached to the Son, and with Him is inseparably apprehended, and has Its being attached to the Father, as cause, from Whom also It proceeds; It has this note of Its peculiar hypostatic nature, that It is known after the Son and together with the Son, and that It has Its subsistence of the Father” (Migne, P. G., XXXII, col. 329).

This assertion could be read in the proposed hermeneutical note as follows: All things are brought from non-being into being by the evolution of life on Earth, which has its origin(ation) in a certain primordial power (energy) which has brought through Big Bang the Universe into being. The contemporary cosmology asserts correspondingly that the energy which

caused the Big Bang was subsisting without generation and without origination. For civilization, by which all (man-made) things are, and with which reason is inseparably conceived of, is of the organic matter. It is impossible for anyone to conceive of civilization if he was not previously enlightened by reason. Since, then, the reason from which all the supply of good things for earthly creation has its source, is attached to civilization, and with it is inseparably apprehended and has its being attached to the general phenomenon of life evolution in Universe, as cause, from whom also it proceeds; human rationality has this note of its peculiar hypostatic nature that is made known after and together with Human Civilization and has its Biological subsistence as a Cause.

The assertion that “From the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit” (Eph 2: 18-22) expresses the plain fact that the life evolved biologically through society in consciousness.

The Father is unborn for all eternity, the Son is (eternally) begotten from the Father, and the Spirit (eternally) proceeds from the Father. It can be interpreted as the human biology, society and consciousness are also “eternally” begotten in the sense that no biologist could find a starting point of human anatomy, “there is no zero point in the historicity of human development, just as there is none in the sociality, the social interdependence among men” (Elias 2000, 135) neither an absolute moment when consciousness becomes noticeable. “Consciousness is a fundamental, an elementary, property of living matter. It can’t be derived from anything else; it is a simple substance” (Koch 2012, 119).

“But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you” (1 John 14:26). We could find a similar interpretation in evolutionary biology if we conceive the Holy Spirit as the expression of the hive mind of human collectivity that holds most of the human knowledge and teaches us all things. “Our intelligence resides not in individual brains but in the collective mind” (Sloman and Fernbach 2017, 5). Humans as social species evolved within the special settings of collaboration. As consequences, many of human abilities have been outsourced, wherever possible and much of our intelligence lies in the people and things around us. Human knowledge is immersed in a world beyond individual understanding. “Because we confuse the knowledge in our heads with the knowledge we have access to, we are largely unaware of how little we understand” (Sloman and Fernbach 2017, 129).

But the Holy Spirit resides not only in all men and breaths, but in the entire creation of God. “For thine incorruptible Spirit is in all things.” (Wisdom of Solomon 12:1 from *Apocrypha*, but related with *Genesis* 1:2, *Psalms* 139:7-8 [“⁷ Where can I go from your Spirit?/ Where can I flee from your presence?/ ⁸ If I go up to the heavens, you are there;/ if I make my bed in the depths, you are there.” (Psalm 139:7-8)] etc.). The conscious also exists in all physical systems. There are several physical theories of

information like Tononi's Integrated Information Theory (IIT) (Tononi 2012), Chalmers's Dual-Aspect Theory of Information (Chalmers 1995), or "It from bit" conception of Participatory Universe Theory (Wheeler 1989), that supports the idea that information and sentience could be found in the entire physical world. "You and I find ourselves in a cosmos in which any and all systems of interacting parts possess some measure of sentience. The larger and more highly networked the system, the greater the degree of consciousness" (Koch 2012, 120).

In the theological tradition, the etymology of the term *person* is interpreted relationally. *Prosopon* (πρόζ- ωπου, pl: *prosopa*) resulted from the merger of the preposition *pros* ("towards") and the noun *ôpos* (a genitive for "eye", "face", or "countenance") means "I-have-my-face-turned-toward-someone/something" or "I-am-opposite-someone/ something." It means that a person indicates a relationship determination. The essential difference between an individual and a person is the relation: the person is always in relation (with another person or something superior) (Yannaras 2007). This vision also has a correspondent outside the theological paradigm. "There is a presumptively ontological, pre-psychological version of the concept of persons as essentially formed by their relations to others. It perceives the person as constituted, formed by «the look of the other.» According to this theory, consciousness is initially unreflective, without a sense of self; it acquires an image of itself – an image that comes to form the person's somatic sense of itself – by seeing itself mirrored in the eyes of others. We form one another's identities by the act of mutual mirroring, mutual regard. A person's life is constructed from and constituted by, such interactive formative relations" (Rorty 1988, 38).

Yannaras' concept of the relational ontology of human persons finds an equally non-theological counterpart in the work of the Indian philosopher Joseph Kaipayil (2003, 2009), where the human person stands in triple relationality with the world around it. The three aspects of our consciousness from the latter correlate with the three hypostasis of the Holy Trinity: the ontic *I-exist* correlates with the Godhead Father, the ethic *I-act* is the moral action and ideal of the Son, and the epistemic *I-know* links with the Holy Spirit. The structure of the human tri-unitary is to be found in the Holy Trinity pattern by gaining its Existence from Father, Love from the Son and Understanding for the Holy Spirit.

Augustine explains that if God is considered to be "love" for eternity ["Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love." (1 John 4:8)], it means that there are always divine Persons in God who love each other. One God, three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, each of whom "dwells" in the other two, by virtue of a perpetual movement of love. God is not only a unity but a union. They share the divine nature with God the Father, being of one "essence" with him. In the neurobiology of emotions, love is also the expression of the deepest basal link which makes possible

human consciousness. It resides at all three levels: in the biology of human attraction (biological brain), in the social continuous interconnection vital for surviving in the conditions of the decline of surviving skills (social brain), and cognitive synchronizing with the universe by abstract knowledge (understanding brain). In the same vein, our capacity to be loved is what makes us to be persons. “Love is to recognize that the other person is a person, is precious, is important and has value,” says Catholic theologian and humanitarian Jean Vanier.

Love is in all three hypostases of the Trinity and in the triune nature of human person. Firstly, “the hypostasis of biological existence is «constituted» by a man’s conception and birth. Every man who comes into the world bears his «hypostasis», which is not entirely unrelated to love: he is the product of a communion between two people” (Zizioulas 1985, 50). Secondly, the Son is the expression of God’s love.[“As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you. Now remain in my love.” (John 15:9)] Love is also a social result of persons’ communion, and people need to love and beloved for being fully persons. Furthermore, “the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, forbearance, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control” (Galatians 5:22-23). And what are these traits other than a list of characteristics of self-actualized persons? (Maslow 1954) And thirdly, love is conscious emphatic understanding of the other. The psychological perspective also leaves room for religious upper stages of personal development under the hypostasis of the self-transcendence (Maslow 1971). Another revealing parallel can be found in brain neurobiology and social studies that also reveal three stages or hypostasis of love: lust, attraction and attachment, each of them triggered by specific neurotransmitters and hormones. The chemical brain cocktail of lust is mainly composed by testosterone/estrogen; attraction is a mixture of norepinephrine, dopamine, and serotonin; while attachment is an infusion of oxytocin and vasopressin (Fisher 2016). The mature love is an phenomenon all-encompassing and transcending these three forms.

This unsystematic list of illustrations indicates that the possibilities to enlarge the scientific and evidence-based understanding over human personality by developing the theological insights on the Mystery of Holy Trinity are potentially infinite. I consider the possibility to illuminate the understanding, and implicitly, the research on human personality, to be the most important teaching of theological conception on the Holy Trinity.

4. The Trinity Model and the Contemporary Theories of Personality

A person is a dynamic and dialectical ensemble of knowledge, sensations, memories, desires, intentions, emotions, experiences and so on, while its ontological substrate is formed by an continuous dynamic

interaction between its body, its physical and symbolic social relationships and its thoughts and feelings. The human being is a bio-socio-cultural non-generic triunity. Similar to the structure of the Holy Trinity “the human person consists in three different persons. The human person comprises: the *biological person* – which is an organic material construct and has this particular species-like type because it is a form of adaptation through philogenesis, and individual-like form because its ontogenetically development; *social person* – which consists in the fact that the persons are constituted through socio-historical and civilizing processes which coin in every society and every time a social framework which allows people to turn into persons and to be recognize as such; and the *cultural person* – which is that unique ability of the knowledgeable subject to actively constitutes itself as a self by an incessant self-narrative process, within the ideative realms, in every moment. This is the miracle of human reality: the quality of living, not only in the physical and social world, but also in the ideative world, this amazing fact that the ideas regulate our behavior like any other physical or social cause” (Popoveniuc 2006b). All these “parts” exist and are integrated in a specific way particular to the person, they overlap and interconnect in different modes. They are connected in part or integrally, because they all belong to a body and a brain nurtured in a particular social and cultural settings. Identity and, implicitly, the unity of the person is constantly created by the story he/she is continually saying to himself/herself, the experience he/she has when he/she remembers things from the past, the way he/she receives present experiences and how he/she imagines his/her future. The person is the sum of the experiences of his/her life lived according to his/her particular way of accepting them, which in turn was determined by certain previous attributes and subsequent experiences. These prior traits are partly innate, partly determined by ontogenetic formation and, from a certain point, self-created. Personality is not a state but a dynamic process in which the exterior influences the interior, which in turn influences the way the exterior influences it, and so on. The personality sums up all the experiences of life. Just as there is no substance called water in which two hydrogen atoms and are attached by the oxygen one, so we do not have a personality attached to the body, its social relationships, its ideas, emotions and feelings. Nowadays the perspectives of personality theories are too narrow. We have different approaches which concentrate, more or less successfully, on one or two of the human personality’s dimensions. For the evolutionary/biological approach, human personality is determined by the combined effect of the inherited capacities of the body and its past experience. It emphasizes the fundamental character of the human physiology, genetic inheritance, behavioral genetics and adaptive pressures (e.g. Hippocrates, William Sheldon, Gordon Allport). The social cognitive approach regards human personality as being shaped by formative social relations. Human conduct is determined from what the

body has learned in the past, the perceptions it learns in the present, and the way in which all these are thought and organized at a higher mental level. It emphasizes the principles of learning and information processing (e.g. John Dollard and Neal Miller, Albert Bandura, Burrhus Skinner, Arthur W. Staats). Humanistic or phenomenological psychology considers that human conduct can only be understood in terms of inner perceptions of the self and the others and that is oriented towards personal self-realization. It puts emphasis on one's subjective experiences and the potential for human growth, spontaneity, and creativity (e.g. Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow). For the psychoanalytic approach, human personality and conduct is determined by past experiences (from childhood) which color its perception of current events. It emphasizes the role of the unconscious in determining adult personality (e.g. Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, Erik Erikson, Carl Jung). All these approaches lack a general framework for incorporating the other aspects of human personality, too.

In my view, the ancestral theological wisdom on the image of the Trinity could play a crucial role in the development of such comprehensive theory on human personality, integrating all three dimensions of human tri-unity. The theological model of the Holy Trinity, so abstruse and metaphysically profound and complex, provides an excellent paradigm for the base of a scientific model of human personality. The archetype of Holy Trinity is the expression of the millennial long evolution of human consciousness gradually elevated from its first biological roots, through the social interrelatedness development toward individual autonomy. The difference between the image of the God from the Old Testament and that of the God from the New Testament are obvious and support this idea at the same time as substantiate the proposed hermeneutics. The former is harsh, wrathful and just, the expression of a basic deontological moral. His commandments addresses to the primal human biological urges and basic social surviving needs. In contrast, the God of the New Testament is merciful, open-hearted and forgiving. He is the expression of virtues moral addressing to the social communion and higher human needs. This development of God profile reflects the social and psychological transformations of people who warships it and ask for a further development. It mirrors both the sociogenetic development and ontological moral development of society and people. If we relate this process with Kohlberg's moral development stages, the image of a social progress that mirrors and it is mirrored in the progress of human consciousness become plain and clear. The image of God is the expression of moral consciousness which evolved during centuries of social and technological progress. The thirteenth century "heretical error" of Joachim da Fiore and Berdyaev's (1916, 320) three epochs of divine revelation - the revelation of the law (the Father), the revelation of redemption (the Son) and the revelation of creativity (the Spirit) - are preceding insights of this general process. Likewise, the

proposed hermeneutics casts a new light on the subtle and theological significant issues discussed here. The righteousness of the *Filioque* could be conceived in the terms of the relations between cognition and its social and biological substrate. Even though cognition is congenitally related to the physical brain beyond any dispute, its intrinsic relation with a social nurturing environment is still debatable within scientific research of human personality. May there be (human) cognition without social environment? The social forces act as a generating factor for cognition (or at least of some particular genuine structures) or only as a transformative one? The problem of *Filioque* parallels the problem of the social origin of cognition. At this point, Science and Theology can find a mutual benefit in joining their particular rational insights for finding the answer.

5. Conclusion

On the problem of understanding human person and its core issue, consciousness, theological autism is as much detrimental as scientific chauvinism. In an age when Physics of the inanimate nature, the most objective, experimental, empirical and objective of all sciences, encounters the problem of conscious in the very foundation of its theories and its foundations are philosophical as ever, it is unconceivable that the sciences devoted to the study of human beings to “neglect millennia of learned philosophical debates and focus on what physic neurobiology, and psychology have to say” (Koch 2012, 92). Such an attitude is not only counterproductive, but ironic. “Consciousness comes first; it is the ground of all being. Everything else, including matter, is a possibility of consciousness. And consciousness chooses out of these possibilities all the events we experience” (Goswami 2011, 3). Thus, Dawkin’s suggestion to treat the Bible as any other myth or history is also unfair and detrimental. The Bible, as all foundational myths, “is far truer than a history, for a history only gives a story of the shadows, whereas a myth gives a story of the substances that cast the shadows” (Besant 1902, 151). If a story, a myth, a popular image or a religious concept reveals even a grain of truth (or history) it deserves to be deepened by all means. This is even more so for the religious beliefs which are *not just true, but especially true*. Even if such ideas tell us little or “nothing instructive about the order of the world, the nature of reality or the origin and destiny of mankind,” they teach us a great deal about the societies, *raison d’être* of beliefs, customs and institutions, and most importantly, “they make it possible to discover certain operational modes of human mind, (...) that we can assume them to be fundamental and can seek to find them in other societies and in other areas of mental life, where their presence was not suspected, and whose nature is thereby illuminated” (Lévi-Strauss 1990, 639).

The human personality is complex, triune and in part unconscious and it exists in a dialectical relationship with the enduring images provided by the most comprehensive products of the collective mind, i.e. religious mysteries. Any progress in understanding one of them will definitely enlighten the other as well. "For the myth is the foundation of life; it is the timeless schema, the pious formula into which life flows when it reproduces its traits out of the unconscious" (Mann 1959, 374).

For the sake of human understanding progress, both the theological closure and scientific self-sufficiency should be revealed and cured. I dare think that under the auspices of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity there could start the real (trans)ecumenism between Science and Theology. An ecumenism that the thinkers from all domains of knowledge, concerned with the understanding of the great mystery of World and Life, should be open and follow regardless of the (minor) misunderstandings and limits of their particular fields.

References:

- Beckford, Martin. 2010. "Richard Dawkins interested in setting up «atheist free school»". *The Telegraph*. June 24. Accessed April 10, 2018. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/7849563/Richard-Dawkins-interested-in-setting-up-atheist-free-school.html>
- Besant, Annie. 1902. *Esoteric Christianity or the Lesser Mysteries*. New York: J. Lane.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. 1955. *The Meaning of the Creative Act*. Translated by D. A. Lowrie. London: Gollancz
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Accessed April 10, 2018. <http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc/index.htm>.
- Chalmers, David J. 1995. "Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* Vol 2 Issue 3: 200-19.
- Elias, Norbert. 2000. *The civilizing process sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Emery, Gilles. 2011. *The Trinity: An Introduction to Catholic Doctrine on the Triune God*. Catholic University of America Press.
- Fisher, Helen. 2016. *Anatomy of Love: A Natural History of Mating, Marriage, and Why We Stray*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ganoczy, Alexandre. 2001. *Der dreieinige Schöpfer: Trinitätstheologie und Synergie*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (transl. 2003. *La Trinité créatrice: synergie en théologie*. Paris: Cerf).
- Goswami, Amit. 2011. *The Quantum Doctor: A Quantum Physicist Explains the Healing Power of Integral Medicine*. Hampton Roads Publishing.
- Hasker, William. 2013. *Metaphysics and the Tri-Personal God*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hierotheos, Vlachos, Metropolitan of Nafpaktos. 2002. *The person in the Orthodox Tradition*. Translated by Esther Williams. Birth of the Theotokos Monastery.
- Hopko, Thomas. 2016. *The Orthodox Faith*, Volume I. Doctrine and Scripture. SPCK. Accessed April 10, 2018. <https://oca.org/orthodoxy/the-orthodox-faith/doctrine-scripture/the-holy-trinity/wrong-doctrines-of-the-trinity>.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 1973a. "A Psychological Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity." In *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, 107-200. The Collected Works of C. G. Jung (CWJ), vol. 11. Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 1973b. "Psychology and Religion." In *Psychology and religion: West and East*, 3-105. CWJ: vol. 11, Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 1973c. "The Answer to Job." In *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, 355-470. CWJ: vol. 11. Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 2014. "Definitions." In *Collected Works: Psychological Types*, vol. 6. Princeton University Press.
- Kaipayil, Joseph. 2003. *Human as Relational: A Study in Critical Ontology*. Front Cover. Jeevalaya Institute of Philosophy.
- Kaipayil, Joseph. 2009. *Relationalism: A Theory of Being*. Joseph Kaipayil.
- Koch, Christof. 2012. *Consciousness: Confessions of a Romantic Reductionist*. MIT Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969. *The Raw and the Cooked*. Mythologiques, Volume 1. University of Chicago Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1990. *The Naked Man*. Mythologiques, Volume 4. University of Chicago Press.
- Mann, Thomas. Spring, 1959. "Freud and the Future." *Daedalus* Vol 88 No. 2, Myth and Mythmaking, 374-378. MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts & Sciences.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1954. *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1971. *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Orthodox Eastern Church. 1846. *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East: Being the Longer Russian Catechism: with an Appendix Consisting of Notes and Extracts from Scottish and Anglican Authorities* A. Brown. <https://books.google.ro/books?id=ayoPAAAAIAAJ>.
- Popoveniuc, Bogdan. 2006a. "Despre persoană (On Person)." *Symposion. Revistă de Științe Socio-Umane* (Symposion. Review of Social and Human Sciences). Institute for Economic and Social Researches "Gh. Zane" (ed.), Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, Tom. IV, Nr.2(8).
- Popoveniuc, Bogdan. 2006b. "Globalised person." In *The Philosophy of Culture*, vol II, edited by K. Bouduris, 162-176. Ionia Publications, Athens.
- Rahner, Karl. 1970. *The Trinity*. New York: Herder and Herder.

- Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg. 1988. *Mind in Action: Essays in the Philosophy of Mind*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sloman, Steven, and Fernbach, Philip. 2017. *The Knowledge Illusion: Why We Never Think Alone*. New York: Penguin.
- St. John Damascene. *On Holy Trinity*. 1, Migne, P.G., XCV, col. 9.
- St. Basil of Caesarea. *Letter 38 (To his Brother Gregory)*. Migne, P.G., XXXII, col. 329.
- St. Gregory the Theologian. *The Holy Lights (Epiphany)*. 11, Migne, P.G., XXXVI, Col. 345 C.D.
- St. Gregory the Theologian. *Against Arians and Concerning Himself*. Migne, PG, XXXVI, col. 236A.
- St. Philaret (Drozdov) of Moscow. 1845. *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox, Catholic, Eastern Church. The Doctrine of the Russian Church: Being the Primer Or Spelling Book, the Shorter and Longer Catechisms, and a Treatise on the Duty of Parish Priests*. Oxford: A. Brown.
- The North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation. 2003. *The Filioque: A Church Dividing Issue?: An Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation*, Washington DC: Saint Paul's College. Accessed April 10, 2018. <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/orthodox/filioque-church-dividing-issue-english.cfm>
- Tononi, G. 2012. "Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness: an Updated Account." *Archives Italiennes de Biologie* 150: 290-326.
- Wheeler, John Archibald. 1989. "Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links." In *3rd Int. Symp. Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, 354-368. Tokyo.
- Witchalls, Clint. 2011. "Biology Nobelist: Natural selection will destroy us." *New Scientist*, February 23. Accessed April 10, 2018. <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20928015.400-biology-nobel-natural-selection-will-destroy-us/>.
- Yannaras, Christos. 2007. *Person and Eros*. Translated by Norman Russell. Holy Cross Orthodox Press.
- Zizioulas, John. 1985. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.