

God is Pure Absolute Personhood Therefore All Processions Are Purely Absolutely Personal

Non-Trinitarians forget too much. Their complaints reveal that they are wholly unaware of the following facts:

God is not a being
God is not a person
God does not exist

All of the Non-Trinitarian's definitions are therefore wrongheaded. Thereby all their syllogisms follow suit. They cannot speak of one who isn't a being, who isn't a person, or who doesn't exist. They have no idea *how*. The very suggestion seems to them nonsensical for in their thinking God is "a" "being". They cannot fathom how or why the following is the necessarily the case:

To *have* personhood is not to *be* Personhood itself. To *have* existence is not to *be* Existence itself. To *have* being is not to *be* Being itself. I don't *have* i/me. I *am* i/me.

Meanwhile Scripture forces our hand and the Trinitarian learns the semantics of Eternal Speech:

God is Being Itself
God is Personhood Itself
God is Existence Itself

All the Trinitarian's definitions are therefore properly informed. Thereby all their syllogisms follow suit. They speak of One Who is Pure Being, Pure Personhood, Pure Existence, Pure Act.

Therein:

God is Being Itself therefore all Procession necessarily entails Absolute Being.
God is Personhood Itself therefore all Procession necessarily entails Absolute Personhood.
God is Existence Itself therefore all Procession necessarily entails Absolute Existence.

Therein:

Pure Being = Pure Personhood = Pure Existence = Pure Act

Therein:

All Procession Is Necessarily Personal All...The...Way...Down

Therein:

Procession is Being
Being is Personhood
Personhood is Existence

To emphasize the proper conceptual roadmap of the metaphysically irreducible terminus:

Pure Procession is Pure Being
Pure Being is Pure Personhood
Pure Personhood is Pure Existence

To speak of Being is to speak of Personhood is to speak of Existence is to speak of Pure-Act is to speak of Absolute Consciousness is to speak of GOD vis-à-vis the Trinitarian Life vis-à-vis Being Itself as Timeless Reciprocity and Ceaseless Self-Giving.

To speak of *Imago Dei* just is to speak of *THAT* which just is to speak of the *Blueprint of all things Adamic*.

That's all Prologue — so to speak — as in the following sense:

“Prologue: Next in order we consider the divine relations. [There Thomas Aquinas] says "next in order" because according to faith these relations are the relations of origin or procession, inasmuch as the Son proceeds from the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore the processions are the foundation of really distinct relations which, as we shall see in the following question, formally constitute the persons. Hence we are now speaking implicitly of the persons although they are not yet explicitly mentioned.” (~from *The Trinity and God the Creator* by Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange)

God Is Absolute Consciousness:

More inroads to the same explanatory terminus of Pure Being = Pure Personhood = Pure Existence = Pure Act such that **All Procession is Necessarily Personal All – The – Way – Down** are found in the following quotes:

[A] “...the concept of being is one of power: the power of actuality, the capacity to affect or to be affected. To be is to act. This definition already implies that, in its fullness, being must also be consciousness, because the highest power to act — and hence the most unconditioned and unconstrained reality of being — is rational mind. *Absolute* being, therefore, must be *absolute* mind. Or, in simpler terms, the greater the degree of something's actuality, the greater the degree of its consciousness, and so infinite actuality is necessarily infinite consciousness. That, at least, is one way of trying to describe another essential logical intuition that recurs in various forms throughout the great theistic metaphysical systems. It is the conviction that in God lies at once the deepest truth of mind and the most universal truth of existence, and that for this reason the world can truly be known by us. Whatever else one might call this vision of things, it is most certainly, in a very real sense, a kind of “total rationalism.” (D.B. Hart)

[B] “To speak of God, however, as infinite consciousness, which is identical to infinite being, is to say that in Him the ecstasy of mind is also the perfect satiety of achieved knowledge, of perfect wisdom. God is both the knower and the known, infinite intelligence and infinite intelligibility. This is to say that, in Him, rational appetite is perfectly fulfilled, and consciousness perfectly possesses the end it desires.” (David Bentley Hart)

[C] “...if reason’s primordial orientation is indeed toward total intelligibility and perfect truth, then it is essentially a kind of ecstasy of the mind toward an end beyond the limits of nature. It is an impossibly extravagant appetite, a longing that can be sated only by a fullness that can never be reached in the world, but that ceaselessly opens up the world to consciousness. To speak of God, however, as infinite consciousness, which is identical to infinite being, is to say that in Him the ecstasy of mind is also the perfect satiety of achieved knowledge, of perfect wisdom. God is both the knower and the known, infinite intelligence and infinite intelligibility. This is to say that, in Him, rational appetite is perfectly fulfilled, and consciousness perfectly possesses the end it desires. And this, of course, is perfect bliss.” (D.B. Hart)

What is Eternal is not silence, but Discourse:

[D] “...in the prologue of John’s Gospel... we learn... at the beginning of the whole tale that the biblical God has eternally a word to say, a word that as God’s eternal Word must conversely be God... The Word that eternally is with God and so is God, is discourse... in the triune God, the God of John’s prologue, there is no such thing as the silence of eternity. What is eternal is not silence, but discourse... This does not mean that God in himself is silent and then happens to speak, but rather that precisely the breaking of silence is eternally constitutive of God’s triune life...”

(~from *Joining The Eternal Conversation: John’s Prologue and the Language of Worship* – by Robert W. Jenson ~ <https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/joining-the-eternal-conversation-johns-prologue-language-of-worship-robert-w-jenson.pdf>)

[E] “This is true in two related and consequent senses: on the one hand, love is not originally a reaction but is the ontological possibility of every ontic action, the one transcendent act, the primordial generosity that is convertible with being itself, the blissful and desiring *apatheia* that requires no pathos to evoke it, no evil to make it good; and this is so because, on the other hand, God’s infinitely accomplished life of love is that trinitarian movement of his being that is infinitely determinate – as determinacy toward the other – and so an indestructible *actus purus* endlessly more dynamic than any mere motion of change could ever be. In him there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning because he is wholly free, wholly God as Father, Son, and Spirit, wholly alive, and wholly love. Even the cross of Christ does not determine the nature of divine love, but rather manifests it, because there is a more original outpouring of God that – without needing to submit itself to the order of sacrifice that builds crosses – always already surpasses every abyss of godforsakenness and pain that sin can impose between the world and God: an outpouring that is in its proper nature indefectible happiness.” (D.B. Hart)

[F] “[The] very action of *kenosis* is not a new act for God, because God’s eternal being is, in some sense, kenosis – the self-outpouring of the Father in the Son, in the joy of the Spirit. Thus Christ’s incarnation, far from dissembling his eternal nature, exhibits not only his

particular *proprium*as the Son and the splendor of the Father's likeness, but thereby also the nature of the whole trinitarian *taxis*. On the cross we see this joyous self-donation *sub contrario*, certainly, but not *in alieno*. For God to pour himself out, then, as the man Jesus, is not a venture outside the trinitarian life of indestructible love, but in fact quite the reverse: it is the act by which creation is seized up into the sheer invincible pertinacity of that love, which reaches down to gather us into its triune motion." (D. B. Hart)

[G] "What's the difference between mere individuation and personal identity distinction...?" "...if you individuate a person you've made them personally distinct, having provided a basis for distinguishing *this who* from *other whos*. I don't know why you'd need more. That seems distinct from the question of whether a subsisting relation can be a person..." "...I'm trying to tease out what "personal" means here. If it means "of a person" then it's hard to know how an individuation of a person (having intellect and will) is impersonal. I agree each person knows who he is. I don't see on the face of it how that is not so on the subsisting relations view. It's only that each knows this by the same act of knowing. That one act of knowing of the divine essence is had in three really distinct relations..." (David Mahfood)

[H] "...the identity of *Communicate* transcends efficient and final causality for that which *Is Caused* does not exist before in *Act* whereas that which *Is Communicated* exists before in *Act*..." (Garrigou-Lagrange, *italics* added)

[I] "Intentionality is the key to the issue: either an ego intends the other or an ego is constituted in the act of becoming the other as other. For St. Thomas, self-consciousness is a dimension of a spiritual act: it follows that "self" is simply nothing outside of an act of consciousness and to be conscious is to be conscious of an other. Consciousness, in Thomistic terms, is always relational and the term of the relation is the other."
(~from Frederick D. Wilhelmsen "Being and Knowing: Reflections of a Thomist")

[J] "Trinity As Paradigmatic Love" by James Chastek at Just Thomism
<https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/trinity-as-paradigmatic-love-by-james-chastek-at-just-thomism-.pdf>

The following is perhaps of interest:

Trinity, Simplicity and the Status of Gods Personal Relations
~by James Dolezal <https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/j-dolezal-trinity-simplicity-and-the-status-of-gods-personal-relations-by-james-dolezal-pdf.pdf>

The following is a rather abbreviated discussion placed here primarily to allude to the overall "landscape" of some of the concepts involved in a few layers.

So with that clarification given:

As Trinitarians we affirm Divine Simplicity. To our Non-Simplicitarian and/or Non-Trinitarian friends:

False: Simplicity = Zero Distinctions
True: Non-Simplicitarianism Collapses
True: Procession = Being As Distinction

The philosophy of mind is helpful in locating where and why Non-Simplicitarianism collapses and perhaps a few inroads as to how or why:

The reason Physicalism fails to retain the Unity of Mind/Consciousness is because it must equivocate where (1) (metaphysical) Logical Identity and (2) (metaphysical) Singularity are concerned vis-à-vis (3) all (metaphysical) First Person termini. An [A] must be equated to a [Non-A] both in Being and in Identity and thereby all First Person termini collapse into Non-Being. No Non-Trinitarian map of Processions as Being escapes the reductio — and Nonsimplicitarians are not able to address that nor the 4D Static Block's similarities to their fundamentally Verbless God. There are only two options:

Simplicitarian & Non-Simplicitarian

And to clarify:

Trinitarian = Simplicitarian

Key Collapse::

Only the forfeiture of and dissolution of *Absolute Consciousness* allows one to claim incoherence in Simplicity and ultimately in Procession||Trinity. That move into that forfeiture and that dissolution is costly and eventually forces the Hard Problem of Consciousness i.e. locating Singularity i.e. "I" in First-Person is not solvent in *Logical Identity* — **not *even *in *principle*. A brief excerpt from another essay regarding the relevant Chain-Of-Logical-Identity there:

BEGIN ARROW-EXCERPT:

Non-Theists or physicalists or etc. may say:

“But the Hard Problem of Consciousness is not hard at all. Approximation is good enough.”

That's fine to say but one must mean what one says and follow-through — and so the following:

Basic Reply:

Ok. To clarify:

Your claim is that the physicalist has solved Equivocation in logical identity along the way FROM —> the Irreducible Singularity that is First Person/I/i/I-Am —> TO —> Gravity or whatever terminus physicalism opts for etc.?

Yes? For example:

If we start with, say, gravity and begin drawing arrows one need never equivocate logical identity on either side of any arrow:

$$A \longleftrightarrow B \longleftrightarrow C \longleftrightarrow D \longleftrightarrow \dots Z$$

Such that, because *there never is a single step* in which we equivocate in *logical *identity we can therefore remove all the *middle* arrows and get to the point:

$$A \longleftrightarrow Z$$

$$A = Z$$

Where:

A = **Gravity** ((whatever fundamental nature/wellspring one posits))

Z = **I/i** ((fundamental nature that is the Singularity || First Person))

Yes? Or do you mean something different?

Perhaps [A] = [Not-A] ?

End Basic Reply.

(...but continuing with “Arrow-Excerpt”...)

Regarding the aforementioned Chain of Logical Identity vis-à-vis $A \longleftrightarrow B \longleftrightarrow C \longleftrightarrow D \longleftrightarrow \dots Z$ the following is not an argument and is given only to mention the Christian Metaphysic and allude to its inherent means by which to thoroughly fund all requisite bookkeeping:

No Chain of Continuity vis-à-vis **Identity** will ever tolerate [A] = [Non-A]

No Chain of Continuity vis-à-vis **Being** will ever tolerate [A] = [Non-A]

No Chain of Continuity vis-à-vis **Existence** will ever tolerate [A] = [Non-A]

—&—

Chain of Continuity vis-à-vis Identity||Being||Existence||**[I-AM]**||Absolute-Consciousness

Principle of Proportionate Causality

Principle of Divine Concurrence

Principle of Divine Conservation

—&—

The Great I-AM = Absolute Consciousness = Pure Act = Being Itself = Existence Itself =
Metaphysical Wellspring of All Ontological Personality

END ARROW-EXCERPT.

Keeping that in mind we find that Non-Trinitarian Monotheism fails because:

IF there were no Processions of/via Pure-Act vis-à-vis Absolute Consciousness aka the Divine Mind **THEN** there could only be Non-Trinitarian Monotheism — **HOWEVER** — in the Unity of Being/Consciousness we discuss the *Living God* and the moment we arrive at **I-AM** we arrive at *Absolute Consciousness* and, then, the moment we arrive *there* we arrive at the *Self-Aware* — and, then, *that* necessarily arrives as *Communique||Processions* — and, then, *that* necessarily arrives as *Distinction not of Composition but of Relation* and, then, *that* just is the entailment of *Logos||Communique*. It is uncanny but expected that the unicity of [Pure-Act] + [God-Can-Do-Otherwise] forces more vectors into view, for example:

All Non-Theisms and the Non-Trinitarian Monotheist fail to break free of the following problems:

Accounting for the combination of (1) Pure Act and (2) God-Can-Do-Otherwise.

By that we mean in the same sense as we find in the proverbial 4D Block/Static Block within which all Motion/Verb is finally reduced to Circularity, Equivocation, and Blind Axiom aka ontological illusion aka non-being ((...the short version is that the Conscious Observer is both the Why and the How...)). As such all Non-Trinitarian Monotheisms are forced into the following:

All-Is-Non-Distinction

...because

There is no Distinction-Void-Of-Composition

...and therefore we are left with

God-Cannot-Do-Otherwise

That holds because there is no possibility of *Distinction-Void-Of-Composition* — and therefore no possibility of *Communique* — and therefore of *Procession* — of *Eternal-Speech* — of *This||That* — of *Yes||No* — of *Create||Not-Create* — and in fact of All Ontological Possibility *whatsoever* vis-à-vis Absolute Consciousness vis-à-vis Pure Act vis-à-vis Being Itself vis-à-vis Procession Itself.

Here's the thing:

Notice that the *Living* God entails not only Verb but also I-AM and therein Fundamental Distinction void of Composition and Non-Trinitarian Monotheisms *cannot* get there.

Here's the thing about that:

God is Pure Absolute Personhood Therefore All Processions Are Purely Absolutely Personal and Non-Trinitarian Monotheisms *cannot* get there.

All (1) Non-Trinitarian Monotheisms and all (2) Non-Theisms face incoherence BECAUSE they are forced to forfeit the Unity of Consciousness as we map the Great Chain of Being — which means they are forced to retain the following untenable terminus:

Mind||Consciousness as Being is void of all Procession||Communique — and therein void of all Distinctions. Equivocation||Elimination become the cheat. This is merely a brief item to point out a few key loci in which the Trinitarian Map succeeds in pushing through to closure in the self-explanatory explanatory terminus free of circularity & equivocation — while — simultaneously — pointing out those same key loci and where/why the Non-Trinitarian & Non-Theist fall into this/that *Reductio Ad Absurdum*. See philosophy of mind <http://Mind.Bible> and see where and how epistemology is endlessly lost within the Münchhausen Trilemma ~ and so on.

The many epistemological and logical catastrophes that arrive at the forfeiture of Absolute Consciousness || the Great I-AM as one maps the Great Chain of Being become undeniable as one navigates the (Ontic) Philosophy of Mind: <http://Mind.Bible> Meanwhile the Christian Metaphysic carries forward to the following chain-of-logical-identity:

Absolute Consciousness = Being = Logos = Communique = Procession = Distinction

Only the Trinitarian Life coupled to Proportionate Causality fully grounds and funds the Contingent Conscious Observer. Only the Trinitarian Life survives the unavoidable litany of metaphysical reductions to absurdity faced in mapping the Great Chain of Being. All others are forced to retain the following untenable terminus:

Absolute/Pure Consciousness is void of Absolute/Pure Communique/Procession — hence void of Absolute/Pure Relation — hence void of Absolute/Pure Distinction — hence void of Absolute/Pure Act.

The Non-Trinitarian Monotheist must expunge all Communique||Verb (Procession) and while it's not the topic here that ultimately forces that paradigm into the same absurdities of Non-Theism's "4D Block" which is a Static Block housing Pure Stasis void of all Verb||Act as all Verb reduces to Illusion and so too the Conscious Observer suffers the loss of all *First Person Ontics* because all such points of identity collapse into illusion aka non-being thus *failing* the Hard Problem of Consciousness. Physicalist thinking forfeits the Hard Problem of Consciousness — of I-AM — because it cannot retain Logical Identity in and through Procession||Essence in and through Unity||Singularity in and through Closure.

Postscript:

Mind/Consciousness as per www.Mind.Bible which is to say
<https://metachristianity.com/consciousness-emergence-intentionality-searle-reason-atop-the-irrational/>

"Trinity As Paradigmatic Love" by James Chastek at Just Thomism
<https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/trinity-as-paradigmatic-love-by-james-chastek-at-just-thomism-.pdf>

John 1 Opening Verses In Prologue With Greek and Grammar Observations by Thomas Dierson
<https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/john-1-opening-verses-in-prologue-with-greek-and-grammar-observations-by-thomas-dierson.pdf>

John 1 and 1C and Colwell and Greek and Grammar by Colin Green
<https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/john-1-and-1c-and-colwell-and-greek-and-grammar-by-colin-green.pdf>

John 1, Christology, Jehovah's Witnesses, Bruce Metzger, Michael Marlowe, YHWH, and Theological Appraisals at <https://metachristianity.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/john-1-christology-jehovahs-witnesses-bruce-metzger-michael-marlowe-yhwh-and-theological-appraisals-pdf.pdf>

Define Trinity — www.DefineTrinity.com —