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PART I. SPIRITUAL PRESENCE

I. The Fields of the Spiritual Presence

Illustrations from the Old Testament and the New Testament

We can find many illustrations of the fields of the Spiritual Presence in the Old Testament and the New Testament. And the two directions are classified according to two typical elements which are finitude and infinitude, the earth and the heaven, and, human being and God. Two typical elements are as follows and they are called type I and type II respectively in this paper.

Type I: From earth to heaven, from human being to God.
Type II: From heaven to earth, from God to human being.

Type I and type II presuppose philosophical dualism and theological estrangement. And many religious symbols are represented by type I and type II. Religious symbols as we understand them are insufficient expressions between finite elements and infinite elements. The direction of type I and that of type II are vertical in the opposite directions of each other. And religious symbols have four dimensions: Spiritual, natural, social, time-spatial. The biblical document reports that type I and type II don't exist in the integrated type but in the disintegrated type.

A. Spiritual Presence in the Old Testament

The divine character has personal relations to the human being in the Old Testament. The idea of God in the Old Testament is concentrated on the relationship between God "Yahweh" and the human being as creature. God is, of course, transcendent "Being", but at the same time, to be transcendent requires particular participation in the situations of the human being by the absolute divine being. The history, of man and the God is the natural history of particular participation between the Absolute and the Relative. In the Old Testament, the Godhead is the personification of the Absolute. These processes cause the participation, namely, the absolute being is transformed into the ultimate being radically. If the absolute being would participate in the man, the absolute being could not help transforming into ultimate being which is the ground of the eternal being. The Godhead appears in the form of visible being and invisible being in the Old Testament. The Godhead cannot be perceived as the Godhead. God is the image of man and at the same time man is the image
of God: Imago Dei, which leads us to perceive God only by man’s ideas of the absolute being. In spite of the unconditional being of God, the idea of God is conditional and imposes restrictions on unconditional being. In the beginning, the existence of God is perceived by the Creation by God’s power. The relationship between man and God is not contradiction but contradistinction. The ideas of God are concentrated on the creature by God and the self-expansion of God through the historic circumstance of mankind. God manifests himself at the top of the mountain and in the fire and in the Holy of the Holies in which man cannot exist because of man’s essential finitude. And God refuses the man’s existing in the same place where God used to exist. After the manifestation of personification of God, the field of the manifestation was expanded by the will of God: The first is cosmic existence like second Isaiah 40:22, and the second is apocalyptic existence like the description in Ezekiel. The process of the history of theological thought, from concrete existence to abstract existence by diminishing the personification of the Godhead in the Old Testament, returns again to the re-personification by the incarnation of Jesus Christ.

B. Spiritual Presence in the New Testament

The dimension of the Spiritual Presence in the Old Testament is horizontal, but the dimension of the Spiritual Presence in the New Testament is vertical.

What is the common factor in the basis of the Spiritual Presence between the New Testament and the Old Testament? The Old Testament has the history of estrangement between man and the monotheistic God, between other creatures and man. Although man and woman as creature are, of course, creatures created by the ultimate being, they cannot exist in the state of the creatures because of the voluntary intension which causes self-affirmation and self-negation. The Old Testament has the manifest Creation, but the New Testament has the latent Creation which was substituted for the reconciliation at the sacrifice of the secular life of Jesus Christ. God as the ultimate ground is the ground of all beings. Jesus Christ is the New Being for all beings. And the Holy Spirit is the harmonious Being in all beings. These radical Beings are very much opposed to antagonistic anti-polarized beings with finitude. If one use mythical expression, the antagonist of God is the demon, the antagonist of Jesus Christ is the estrangement as sin, and the antagonist of the Holy Spirit is the divergent chaos. These six beings are not static but active ones from the beginning of this universe to the end of that. God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are the biblical expression, but the demon, the estrangement, and the chaos are the theological
expression. The Spiritual Presence is not confined within the biblical content and the theological context, furthermore, the Spiritual Presence is beyond the confines of all beings. Although the revelation or the appearance of the ultimate being and the New Being is external, Paul understands that the revelation is not external but internal, which directly characterizes Paul as mystic. Pauline understanding of internal revelation of the Spiritual Presence determined later Christian thought which forms a theological presupposition. Ironically, internal revelation causes man misery by dividing him against himself as was Paul’s case.

II. The Symbols of the Spiritual Presence

There are many varieties of expressions concerning the concerns for the symbol of the Spiritual Presence in our human community. Unfortunately, the expressions of the Spiritual Presence and the essence of the Spiritual Presence do not correspond, but they have correlations with each other. For instance, the expressions like God, Spirit, Satan, and other imaginative religious elements are reflections of the tension between the essence and the existence of the self. If man tries to solve his disruptive predicament with insufficient symbols, he can become a religious man; however, he loses his self or, his self and demons combine without his intention. Eventually, God to be the ground of all realizations can not realize man but man can realize God as one possibility.

A. Topos and Logos

Topos means the spatiotemporal dimension and Logos means the Spiritual dimension. The Spiritual Presence consist of Topos and Logos. Topos and Logos divide the sanctity from secularity and profanity respectively. The development of any religious history is a transition from Topos to Logos.

Topos has visible, natural, and reasonable form, on the contrary, Logos has invisible, supernatural, and revealing form. The initial role of religions is to join two elements of contradictory essence by the Symbol of the Spiritual Presence. The center of Topos is confined to space and time according to the contents of religions, and the center of Logos is confined to man. Paul considered man as a sanctuary house of the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor 6:19, except for the body of man Paul’s mysticism was not the mysticism of Topos but the mysticism of Logos. Paul’s mysticism of Logos explains why he did not give importance to the Holy Land as the center of Christianity. Though the Protestant principle denied the
Topos as the holy place distinguished from secular places where God doesn't dwell, Solomon in the Old Testament previously felt the problem to build a house for the God of the Israelites.\(^1\)

The infinite being does not dwell in a finite space called a temple, or a church, or a shrine.

According to an insight of Mircea Eliade, a house and a temple are "imago mundi", and a temple is an image of an infinite being and a heavenly world reflected in the earthly world. In our christian doctrine, the holy topos like the Holy Land or the Holy temple does not have positive significance compared with the Holy Logos. It was Paul that converted the Topos to the Logos actually, so that he lost the confidence of the people of the Holy Land consequently. Jesus preceded Paul in performing a theoretical turnabout from Topos to Logos in John 4:21. The combination of Topos with Logos is of importance and the Christian creed identified this combination as Jesus Christ who was the Incarnation being. As to the Incarnation, this transcends the stage of the combination of Topos with Logos, and integrates any elements of the beings eventually. The early ecumenical councils — Council of Nicaea-Council of Constantinople; Council of Ephesus; Council of Chalcedon — struggled to integrate two elements of the beings which were visible and invisible.

B. Time and Space

The ultimate being does not dominate time and space, but harmonize its force with time and space. Of course, a theological tripartite view of cosmic space in terms of earth, heaven, and underworld, is out of harmony with physical space. But without regard to the scientific consideration of space and time, the theological idea of time and space does not make sense.

A symbol is not abstract, but concrete in order to reveal the ground of beings. In the Christian concept, the tripartite cosmic space is concrete, but in the context of the interpretation, biblical cosmic space is abstract. Paul Tillich suggests that biblical cosmic space should be reformulated in the content of a spatially monistic universe where all beings exist.\(^3\)

The Christian creed puts stress on the time dimension from past to future, and the condensed time was neither more nor less than Kairos which was the crucial symbol. World-wide Christianity has many Churches which are segregated from other denominations, and the many churches accord with the creed in so far as the time is identical with "Kairos". Nevertheless, from a spatial point of view, different interpretations exist: biblical mystical; Catholic hierarchical; Protestant tripartite, and so on. By what can the unfortunate fission between time and space be restored? Tillich's answer is the eternal presence of God.\(^3\)
Tillich approves the relationship between God and space as well as time positively. As long as man lives, he cannot help being restricted within narrow limits of time and space. Though God is not body, and in the same manner, he is not directly space and time, yet God is concerned with them. It is highly regrettable that past Christianity was disintegrating space into two elements: namely, a holy place and a secular place. But the Spiritual Presence can combine a holy place with a secular place by its power of the ground of the divine life. The Spiritual community is a place of the integration with holiness, and secularity, and the secular community has the same circumstances under the Spiritual Presence.

C. God and Omnipresence

From the theological point of view by Tillich, "God is neither endlessly extended in space nor limited to a definite space; nor is he spaceless."

The key word between God and space is "extension". Only God creates extension in which everything spatial is rooted to transcend it and participate in it.

The space is, of course, the three-dimensional space in so far as we experience it in our daily life. But the extension which God creates is beyond the four-dimensional space-time. God's omnipresence is not the static condition, but active condition. Hence, God creates space and time, and at the same time, He breaks them conversely, to perform his process. As long as God creates and harmonizes his intention with existing extention, God participates in his time and space as the creative participant.

Man divides time and space into two elements: Holiness and secularity. But God conquers its dualism seen in any religious fundamentals. As previously mentioned by Tillich, God is neither in endless space, nor limited to a definite space; nor is he spaceless.

Contrawise, God's intention and extention created by him, are fulfilled in his time and space. That is the meaning of God's Omnipresence. The extreme emphasis upon Omnipresence inclined toward pantheist formulation, which even breaks ontological basis. Man can not live in the full conviction of Omnipresence with him, but he lives on the power of God's intention. Only God's intention realizes man and other creatures and creates his extention for the existence of man himself and creatures themselves. God creates his participation in man under limited conditions of time and space.

One of the roles of religions is to liberate man from limited conditions which lead him to bondage of existential being. If religions would confine themselves to limited conditions, they might lose a creative power, because religions surrender their unconditional structures.
of infinitude to the conditional structures of finitude.

D. God as Symbol

The names, the kind, and the roles of God differ in each religion. For instance, God, or Buddha in Buddhism is a religious name that was based on the insight of the relation between creatures including man centripetally and the centrifugal power of being. All creatures are the realization of crucial incarnation based on the intention of God. No beings can be created and sustained by means of symbols as certain limited beings. The creation and the sustentation require positive participation of the power of the ground of being.

Man formulates God indefinitely, and God forms man definitely. This is the concise expression of the relation between indefinite God and definite man. Man formulates God as the Symbol within his cognizance of experience in his life, in the same way, God forms man as the symbol of His image including the instability under conditions of the secular existence. In fact, even the ground of being cannot be independent of the instability of the finite structures of the existence. The active aspects of the structures of the beings are called "becoming" in the term of philosophy. In theology, "becoming" is called "Transformation", which is the process from the superficialness of the being as an object to the symbol by the Spiritual Presence as a subject.

The point is whether the transformation is based on the Spiritual Presence or not. If the transformation has nothing to do with the Spiritual Presence on the basis of the ground of being, the relation between symbols and Symbols is transformed in quality.\(^{(11)}\) The relation of the interdependency between symbols and Symbols is just like the relation between the material cause and the formal cause in Aristotelianism. In the concrete relations in the New Testament: God is the Symbol of the Christ; the Christ is the Symbol of man; man is the Symbol of woman, conversely; woman is the symbol of man; man is the symbol of the Christ; the Christ is the symbol of God. The theology of Paul the Saint has these relations in First Corinthians 11: 2-3.

E. Religion and Symbol

The aim and the role of religion are the reunion and the new encounter between man and eternal reality which is the ground of being and doing.

Religion without distinction of natural religion or revealed religion combines philosophy with ethics. Of course, philosophy and ethics cannot have the symbols as well as the
Symbols as the ultimate reality, except spatiotemporally confined symbols. Religion, Philosophy, and Ethics are the different considerations of forms in existence: Absolute existence; and, Relative existence. Divine participation in man unites with man's participation in the Divine. The process of this unity transforms secular man into spiritual man. Absolute existence and relative existence are the radical structures of being and doing of the spiritual man. Absolute existence dominates the ground of being: in a sense, a philosophical and religious phase, and relative existence dominates the ground of doing: the mutual behavior by participation of God and man. Relative existence has an ethical phase as well as a religious one.

1. Absolute Existence-Being

So long as man experiences his universe, he finds one unity in variety of forms of being. Within the universe, we may call “this” universe, the ground of the grounds. This is not a presupposition, but the confirmable facts. By these consistent facts, man presumed the ground of being, which expressed these consistent facts as the various symbols: as an object of religious concern; as an object of philosophical concern; as an object of ultimate concern. Man cannot understand the purpose and the potentialities of ultimate being, but by the power of the ground of beings, man can exist even in antagonism against the power of Nonbeing. Everything under actualization and potentiality is mixed with not only the power of being but also with the power of nonbeing.\(^{12}\)

So long as life has the existence of finitude, being produces courage to be, and nonbeing produces anxiety not to be. Because of mixing the presence of being and the presence of nonbeing, man has courage and anxiety, infinitude and finitude at the same time. Therefore, this essential condition disunites his actual being. As this result, the estrangement between being and nonbeing develops and this estrangement brings man to a crisis from his inside and from his outside. If he wants to exist, he must conquer the estrangements from both the inside and the outside. These estrangements are interdependent with each other. Absolute existence does not mean absolute being positively, because absolute existence consists of the categories of being and nonbeing. As previously mentioned, God has the essence of being. God must give courage to be lest man should have estrangement, but God does not give the power by which man exists without the process of man's self-destruction. God is the process of creation and destruction without ceasing. Between creation and destruction, the ground of absolute existence has instable anxiety, and the ground of relative existence results in
uncertain decision. Absolute existence for man is relative existence for God, and paradoxically absolute existence for God is relative existence for man. Man is an image of God, but at the same time, God is an image of man. Particular attention must be given to the fact that absolute existence is not ultimate existence. Ontological ground does not depend upon the presupposition of absolute existence, but does depend upon the participation in ultimate existence. The significance of the concept concerning God teaches man that the ground of being and doing is not the absolute existence, but the ultimate existence.

2. Relative Existence-Doing

The difference between absolute and relative existence is not the difference between essential and existential existence which has been interpreted traditionally by Plato, Aristotle, Schelling II, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Dewey, Sartre.(13)

Relative existence is the cosmological and ecological existence, which is not confined by the speculative concept like superlative God. Man has much possibility of relative existence with outer beings. At the biological level, the behavior of man has self-purpose and self-contentment for himself, and at the Spiritual level, the purpose of man is self-alteration and the alteration of beings which participate in him. The stage of relative existence is at the Spiritual level. Is there the ground of doing, or the ultimate principle of doing? Doing has the two functions of creativity and destruction. The ambiguities of creativity and destruction are participated in by God, because God creates the creation from potential being, and at the same time, he creates the destruction from created being respectively. Creativity and destructivity have alteration in quality. Creativity and destructivity do not have the two elements of Dualism which requires a transcendent unity of the ground of being and the integration of doing. As to the possibility of the ground of doing, or the principle of doing, the ambiguities remain in so far as the results of doing are judged as good or evil. God does not give man the substance of good and evil, but gives man the results of good and evil of doing. God is the subject of being, and Christ is the subject of doing, and the Spiritual Presence is the integration of internal subject and external object. From a temporal point of view, absolute existence of all beings is not a static but kinetic one.

Every existence has the power in itself. The power of the absolute existence determines the quantum and quality of the relative exisence in so far as the ultimate being takes part in the formation of the absolute existence. In the case of having no relationship between relative existence and individual essence, the structure of self-identity begins its destruction.
Without the power of courage to create and retain being on the ground of being, man cannot have any courage to be. If man identified his real existence as absolute existence, he would be a demon to himself completely. To prevent man from changing into a demon, the ground of being gives him the courage to be, because only the ground of being has courage to be itself.

III. The Significance of the Symbols

Strictly speaking, symbols have no relation to substance which symbols represent. Symbols are, of course, imaginary not real existence. But if it were not for the symbols, man could not comprehend the meaning and function of the ground of being. Nevertheless, the symbols are distortion and absurdity are contrast with that which the symbols mean. Symbols are not realistic existence, but have the power as active symbols to those who believe in symbols.

A. The Relation between the Symbols and the Spiritual Presence

The symbols derive from the unconsciouslyness in man's eagerness to realize and expand himself. On the contrary, the Spiritual Presence derives from the transparency of consciousness that the structures of being emerge as a result of the participation and the acceptance of the ground of being. The symbols are indirectly the expression in the sphere of reason. The Spiritual Presence as the power to be and do acts on the sphere of emotion directly. The symbols indicate the structures and the laws of nature without distinctions between many objects of reason. In the scope of the natural science, the role of symbols is typically harmonious as to the relation between cause and effect; between the consistent formation and the data; between explanation and facts; between noumenon and phenomenon; formula and principle.

To symbolize the nature within the scope of reason means the process of study based on common foundations: mathematics; language; and other common methods. Spiritual Presence reveals itself partially through the field of reason. Man understands the cosmological order by means of the intellectual action and the experimental response according to his capacity of comprehension. Without this process as the positive participant, he cannot even find and know himself. So, the relation between subject as himself and object of himself has the structures of profound polarity which is based upon coincidence of time and space. The symbols are the products of empirical occurrence and have the results of
deduction and induction. The Spiritual Presence destroys the foundations of individual existence in order to create the New Being and the new structures in the depth of existence of man. Therefore, the destruction causes the anxiety and the disintegration inside the spirit of man. This critical demonic power is sufficient to make man uncertain in all respects. The fullness of fears and anxieties drives man to absolute despair which grasps his death and life, which do not liberate man from bondage of the predicaments of existence. Man's longing to die as soon as possible, his earnest desire cannot solve the predicaments and the ambiguities concerning his finite life. In the same way, the symbol represents infinity cannot solve his predicament and the ambiguities in spite of his reality of the object of his reliance even if the object is temporary.

Symbols are divided into two structures: fixation and fluidity, the former is transformed for the sake of man and his liberation from the predicaments and his inhuman destiny, and the latter makes man transform into a peripheral being.

B. Visible Symbol and Invisible Symbol

Basically, God can have the symbolic elements intrinsically but cannot have symbolic figure visually. The limitation of visualization concerning God brought the unlimited imagination of the elements and the structures and the purpose of God which formed the whole creation. In the religion of Shinto and the denominations of that, the Gods are symbolized as round mirrors.

Each religion has symbols which characterize the dogmas and the doctrine respectively. And every religion had to lay great emphasis upon the symbols; nevertheless those symbols are distortion and arbitrariness from the essence and the purpose of each religion. The religious symbols take the form of visible and invisible objects within man's cognizance of the five senses.

Religious symbols are expressed in words and concrete forms: the creeds; the hymns; the Bible; the church; the icons; the incense; and so on. Essentially, religious symbols must be based not upon the supplements of a symbol but upon the reality for which the symbols stand. In actual history eternal reality has not been confined to the finite being within the religious occurrence and structure. Divine structures are different from the religious structures concerning the crucial distinction between infinite expansion of truth and finite narrow symbol. Unfortunately, the disunion between the truth in the realm of reason and God in the realm of religion has occurred with the consequence that God's elements
escaped from religion. The object of faith and reliability is not the concept of God but the reality and the courage to be and to be based on the power of God.

As mentioned by Tillich, sign and symbol are different.\(^{(14)}\) Sign is a cipher which must be deciphered and a local agreement in order for men or other creatures to communicate with each other. Symbol is reality, which has the will to realize itself beyond man's cognizance and reason, in the process of struggling against the demonic presence simultaneously.

IV. Freedom and Destiny Based on Spiritual Presence

A. The Dipole Composed of Freedom and Destiny.

Freedom is not opposite to destiny in the depth of paradigm of man's life. No one can deny the fact that every man has his destiny through life. His destiny becomes his destination all his life through; this destiny does not put restrictions on his life but gives the significance to his existentence positively.

This destiny is the basis of freedom; and freedom participates in shaping the destiny, destiny and freedom are an indispensable correlation between the program in determinism and the reformation of selfhood. The loss of selfhood simultaneously leads man into the loss of his destiny. The more man has freedom, the more he has destiny.\(^{(15)}\) This reason is based on a fact that every freedom and destiny has participation in the ultimate power. No one can deny and reject God's participation in man's freedom and destiny. But, once man loses his selfhood, he surrenders his structure consisted of freedom and destiny, and he can be liberated from bondage as God's participation in his existence and structure. God's participation in the essence of each human being can be called destiny. In contrast to destiny, freedom results from the man's invasion upon the sovereignty of God from the viewpoint of man; and at the same time, freedom means that God disregards His participation in the essence of human being. Only God integrates destiny with freedom, which has no inconsistency between destiny and freedom in so far as God, who is freedom, participates in an ontological polarity which freedom and destiny constitute.\(^{(16)}\)

B. The Transformed Polarity of Freedom and Destiny under Finitude

Man cannot control entirely his freedom and destiny because the polarity of these two is distorted by the power of finitude which is incidental to the structure of alteration between being and nonbeing.\(^{(17)}\) Intrinsically, the acceptance of destiny leads man to the process of his destination in consequence. And the realization of freedom selfhood, individuality,
self-identity leads man to the starting point of being. It is nothing, not nonbeing. Both The necessities implied in destiny <determinism> and the contingencies implied in freedom <indeterminism> make man subject to the structure of finitude and make mutual participation in the infinity of God and the finity of man destructive and disruptive.

To preserve freedom by arbitrarily defying destiny and to save destiny by surrendering freedom lead man to the finite structure which is disconnected from the divine participation in man.<[18]

Symbol that cannot help having finite representation cannot stand for the structure of freedom and destiny. The history of Christianity is also the history of contending with different interpretation about symbol of an ultimate object. Conversely, man cannot appreciate the direction to ultimate reality unless symbol as finitude — language, art, rules and regulations and myth — is substituted for the ground of being as infinitude. Two existential elements of freedom and destiny ontological polarity, everything that participates in being must participate in this polarity belongs to the individual men who are categorized in the finitude and the conditioned structures. Therefore, freedom and destiny are based upon the will of ultimate power; are under the influence of divine compatibility, in spite of these facts, are finitude in relation to the participation in men.

C. Freedom and Destiny of Nature

Freedom and Destiny of nature is a strange expression, because nature has structures of interdependency internally, and therefore, nature is finite and has not arbitrariness but necessity. Nature cannot understand its freedom and destiny beforehand.

Of course, man that belongs to the natural world cannot also understand his freedom and destiny as polarity from the standpoint of object in contrast with subject as ultimate reality itself.

The intrinsic freedom of man is finite in the same manner, man has finite destiny.<[19]

God brought nature to completion within itself, so, nature does not need reconciliation like human beings. As a result, the biblical documents are not concerned with the reconciliation of nature. Nowadays, unfortunately, the human activities in the sphere of material civilization are not linked with nature with much felicity. Several parts of nature are under the control of human being concerning its freedom and destiny extremely. Although our nature is the best friend and the best mother, we attack nature as if it were an enemy against us.
But, the existence of human beings has limitations as compared with the totalities of nature which nurtures all creatures. Therefore, Freedom and destiny of nature do not depend upon human beings, but freedom and destiny of human beings depend upon nature from past to future. Of course, the entirety of nature is finitude, nevertheless, its finitude is a complete structure which is called fulfilment in biblical terms. The human race cannot participate in the freedom and destiny of nature which belongs to the will and power of God. Theology transferred the quest for truth of essence of nature to the natural sciences. The process of a half forgotten theological truth causes the emptiness of theology to a great extent, in so far as theology does not participate in the modern understanding of the foundation in the laws and the contexts of nature.\textsuperscript{(20)}
PART II. STRUCTURES

I. The Structure of Anxiety

A. Anxiety as an Ontological Element

Finitude is an ontological quantity, not quality. Anxiety is an intrinsic element annexed to finitude. Only human beings can be aware of finitude. Consequently, human being are in danger of self-destruction from “inside” and “outside”, because finitude has death in time and space as a necessity.

Finitude involves nothingness “outside”, not “inside”. But the nothingness outside drives man to anxiety which appears in his mind as intensive power of “the inside”\(^{(23)}\).

The structure of anxiety has an ontological element as the ultimate cause. Fear is different from anxiety, because anxiety is an ontological quality and fear is a quality of psychotherapy that is the result of anxiety\(^{(22)}\). Both anxiety and fear have four main categories-time, space, causality, substance\(^{(23)}\). These categories are ontological elements. In so far as man belongs to four categories, man cannot escape from them or ignore their presence of them. On the contrary, anxiety is the foundation that constitutes the life, namely, essence and existence of man. Man strives to expand his finitude in order to bring finitude near to infinity. This process conduces to the progress of superior culture and technical civilization. To have anxiety and to have courage are ambiguous. To have anxiety means that man accepts his selfhood in the present, but, to have courage means having the annihilation of himself in order to transform from existence to essence which is latent. Anxiety is not effect but cause in the law of causality, on the other hand, effect involves man’s anxiety in it. Anxiety has energy of a higher level, for which instability releases energy of anxiety without distinction between consciousness and unconsciousness in the form of a stream or impulse.

In spite of the finitude of anxiety based on the power of ontological structures ironically, ontological element that is anxiety has structures of finitude. We can define the ontological elements which we experience usually, as ultimate substance. But, this definition cannot give any solution to the participation in ultimate reality which reveals its structures only through finite categories within the realm of the cognized objects.

B. Essential Finitude and Ontological Anxiety

Finitude comes into contact with infinitude. The point of contact between finitude and
infinitude is not that between being and nonbeing, because finitude and infinitude are the reality of our empirical substance beyond ontological elements. Nonbeing is the intensive power of negation against being and acts on ultimate being as the participation of annihilation. Being and nonbeing correlate mutually, and are not completely separated from each other. Therefore, Nonbeing participates in being and vice versa. Usually, a creative being is threatened by the power of nonbeing, because not only nonbeing participates in the realm of being, but also being includes nonbeing in the realm of being itself. The concrete power of nonbeing is anxiety, Conversely, the concrete power of being is courage. Ultimately, Being that is based upon essential finitude includes both ontological anxiety and ontological courage. Anxiety and courage are inseparable ontological elements as polarity for being. Eventually, as the result of interaction between being and nonbeing, The twofold process causes creation out of nothing and destruction out of being. The Christian doctrine placed great emphasis upon the creation out of nothing in a directly opposite position to the destruction out of being which is an ontological element of polarity. God has twofold power of creation and destruction which belong to essential finitude in so far as creation and destruction participate in the realm of being we experience. The ground of being involves creation and destruction in itself intrinsically. Traditional theology maintains the doctrine of God's creativity and man's creatureliness, but it does not maintain God's destructivity and man's creativity as doctrine, because the divine life is essentially creative in the past in the present moment and in the future.

C. Conflict between Being and Nonbeing

The Christian doctrine of "creatio ex nihilo" caused a sharp conflict between being and nonbeing and dualism which depends upon being and nonbeing. The tragic separation of being and nonbeing came to two necessary conclusions: On the one hand, it needed the absolute Revelation that is predicated upon the basic principles of separation between being and nonbeing; On the other hand, it needed the relative participation which correlates creatures and Spiritual Presence. Man can participate in the categories of being and God can participate in the categories of nonbeing as well as being. Therefore, man can secondarily and existentially create that which he wants to create out of preexistence. He can create a new self which can conquer his old self. Conversely, God can primarily and essentially create being and nonbeing and can expand them with his ultimate power.

God is God of being and God of nonbeing simultaneously. Man has two possibilities
concerning his creation: the first, the realization of himself; the second, the transformation of himself. The dissimilation between realization and transformation cause existential inner and outer separation of himself. This process leads his creativity to ambiguities, because man's creativity is not self consistent. Only God has the power of creativity which controls all three modes of time from past to future. The structures of being are sustained according to the forces of the universe which natural science can explain to a great extent. But the purpose of being and creativity by God can not be explained.

D. Conflict between finitude and infinitude

Being in itself is existence of finitude, and simultaneously, it has potentiality of infinitude. The imbalance of two poles leads man to anxiety, i.e., unusualness of being. Every religious symbol oscillates between existence of finitude and existence of infinitude. We can observe and analyze the structures of existence of finitude as an object by means of immanent reason. On the contrary, infinitude can only reveal through and beyond the boundaries of interface between finitude and infinitude. From microcosm to macrocosm, every being is finitude. But there were, are, and will be various forms of being in spite of the restrictions within narrow limits. In time and space, being cannot help escaping from these boundary and initial conditions. No religious symbol can liberate beings from bondage of conditions of existence. In so far as the concern of religion concentrates upon only the problem of human beings, the participation of religion in the rest of finite beings is neglected. The religious ideologist has a learning toward man's salvation from his predicament. But the acceptance of its predicament means that the structures of his finitude are transformed into less finitude. Even though all the universe looks like infinitude, the finitude of the universe in time and space is of negligible quantity compared with infinitude.

Nevertheless, finitude participates in the basic nature in infinitude as the other element of polarity. This fact leads man to his creativity in spite of his creatureliness. But the creativity from finite existence implies incompatibilities and incompleteness. man's creativity lacks originating creation, sustaining creation, and directing creation because only God is creative, creation being the destiny of God alone.\(^{(28)}\)

II. The Structure of Courage

A. The Principle of Directing Theology based on Courage

The conception and structures of Courage which dominate creatures are in antagonism
to anxiety. No ontological foundation can exist without the ground of courage. Courage can be called the power of making being, divine power, the foundation of creation. The directing theology implies the participation in both the horizontal dimension as time and space on which finitude depends, and the vertical dimension as realization of eternal power by which the ground of being reveals. Above all, the striking character of the directing theology participates in the necessary nexus toward the future, especially, the destination as fulfillment of synthesis of contingency and necessity which contradict each other. The past is accumulations of the determined solid facts, and the future is vast pressures of the as yet unrealized potentialities. According to the Big Bang theory, time and space of the universe expand themselves toward infinity from the point of origin of finity. If the universe does not have the ultimate death in itself, the contents of the future as such are infinities that in proportion to the expansion of time and space increasingly actualize the potentialities. The directing theology that implies time and space in itself presupposes the participation of courage to be and do, because the divine power is based upon courage to create and harmonize. The purpose of creation is self-purpose from the point of view of the creature and the creator respectively.²³³

The process of the directing theology is a solution of the conflict and the estrangement between human beings and the world that they live in.

What is each creature's purpose? And at the same time, what is the creator's purpose? Theology and theologians should answer these questions without unfamiliar technical terms of religion. The directing theology participates in directions to human beings and the world in time and space to come in the future.

B. Self-destruction and Courage

All creatures involve ontological self-destruction. This ontological self-destruction acts on two elements of beings from the inside and the outside of individuals. The action of the inside of self-destruction causes the desire of annihilation of life continuously, on the other hand, the action of the outside of self-destruction causes the desire of negation toward others, for example, the former indicates suicide, disease, melancholy, indifference, and the latter indicates murder, war, destruction of environment and so on. Ultimately, self-destruction finds its way to the destruction of all beings at last.

Courage as a latent element of the individual changes the structures of self-destruction into the potentialities of self-creation. Self-destruction and self-creation constitute polarity.
Therefore, self-destruction and self-creation exist at the same time. Eventually, courage, coexists with anxiety in each individuum. Paradoxically, courage accepts anxiety which is the ground of self-destruction, because courage participates in closeness as well as openness of individual from the point of view of correlation of creation with destruction. The ambiguities of courage cause man much anxiety in spite of the participation of courage which is the ground of self-creation. Courage does not mean the rejection of anxiety as antagonism toward courage. Man can not usually exist by the alternative of courage or anxiety because of the principle of polarity as real existence.

C. Courage to Accept Nonbeing

All beings participate in nonbeing through the process of being. And no being can avoid the coming of the power of nonbeing even in the repletion of being. Courage by which one can exist and courage by which one accepts one’s death are not coincident with their directions, but with their necessities. Though man does not experience nonbeing within himself, he ponder partial experience of nonbeing, and, at the same time, the power of nonbeing causes him much anxiety. Ultimate nonbeing is death of being and death after being. However, unrelated to his own will, man must accept his ultimate nonbeing.

Of course, we cannot bear to accept our death, and our lives depend upon the uncertainty of tension between being and nonbeing. Nonbeing accepts being with its power just like a black hole in the universe. Any religion emphasizes the elimination of threats of the power of nonbeing and regeneration conquering the power of nonbeing. From religion courage to accept nonbeing is given through a symbolical medium as the centre of its doctrine. The problem that we must contemplate in all its aspects is whether the symbolical medium has a power valid to work the salvation of both manifest and latent creatures or not. Only man needs courage to accept nonbeing as well as being. The quest of being causes the quest of nonbeing at the same time. The point of contact of being with nonbeing has caused the religious concern in the form of decisive doctrine. If the religious symbols are not based upon the ground of being or connected with the core of being, the structures of religion are in vain.

D. Courage to Accept Being

In so far as the reason of man explains the structures of nature as being, nature as well as the universe is independent upon the being and existence. The correlation and the
interrelationships between the being of nature and the being of man are not relations of mutuality of subordination. On account of the distortion of fate and destiny, it is impossible for man to accept his own being. He can not realize his own selfhood, at the utmost, he can only explain and utilize other beings with all the power of reason in order to substitute for the realization of his selfhood. For man, being as his environment is a serious threat to him, and at the same time, his being as an invader of his environment is a serious threat to them. Being as such does not have only one being, but has structures of very different kinds. Therefore, since early times, being was made man's main object of study. Hence, the definition and the presupposition of ultimate being contain symbolic meaning partially, but do not have meaning based upon the facts. One of the roles of religion is to give courage to man in order to accept being as reality without false cognizance. Only ultimate courage can grasp the gist of the ground of being because ultimate courage is based upon the power of being. Occasionally, man cannot but accept the unacceptable reality that he is under the powers of being opposed to his interests; for instance, disease, predicaments, death. Above all, it is a challenge for man to accept himself, whether his actuality is coincident with his reality or not. Without realizing it, he is destroyed gradually by the separation between his actuality and his reality.

E. Kinetic Courage and Potential Courage

The definitions of kinetic courage and potential courage are as follows.

The kinetic courage: The courage to do and transform one's external self.

The potential courage: The courage to be and actualize one's internal self.

Courage is only ontological concept, but man cannot live and exist without courage which is based upon the ground of being. And courage is the power of reality which is a posteriori. What is the ground of courage? By what is courage given the power of reality? The religious symbols and the idols are pseude-reality of visibility. Both the doctrine and the ideology are also pseude-reality of spirit. Basically, the essential courage has to consist of, in, and with, kinetic courage and potential courage defined above. Courage that gives the power to man intrinsically has the static element and the dynamic element. These elements are inseparable from the ground of being. If the existence of man is not based upon the participation in genuine courage, he cannot help having a haphazard way of being and doing everything. It is absolutely necessary that the kinetic courage and the potential courage coexist together in order to attain one's self, realize one's identity and actualize one's
potentiality. And, at the same time, it is necessary that the principle of courage is in exact accordance with the principle of the ground of religion. Religion has the system of kinetic experience and potential experience, and courage has the system of kinetic activity (creation) and potential activity (sustenance); moreover, courage as such has the structure of directing creativity. If the actualization of courage is not based upon the essence of courage, kinetic courage runs into the danger of demonic courage which causes great destruction of life with full self-justification by faith and other ideologies, and the potential courage runs into the danger of vain courage which does not negate transformation. The distortions of courage cause the demonic power and the conservation based upon self-justification which denies the progress of humankind.

F. Courage and Religion

Each religion participates in the ground of courage without distinction of doctrine. Indoctrination transforms man's mind and existence through the demonic power without awareness. In spite of the structure of destruction which religion has, religion gives man virtues and courage as creative power. The essence of religion is not identical with the essence of being in itself, because being exists without conception but man's conception builds and formulates religion as a bearer of supreme actualities. Basically, courage is not identical with the conquest of existential predicaments dominate man, but with the acceptance and the understanding of the essence of being.

The understanding of the essence of being does not mean the verification of ultimate "Being" beyond all beings, but the correlation between the ground of being beyond being and means of beings which participate in other beings. The structures of beings have openness which is the foundation of causality in time and space in creation, acceptance of the outer structures of beings, and transformation by the inner purpose in the process of self-actualization. In addition, "being" and "becoming" each need the participation of divine courage and other courage under the power of ultimate participation.

Individual being is created, transformed, and destroyed by the power of the participation in itself without the powers of religions. Conversely, individual one transforms adequately the meaning of religions to put man on firm bases. The essence that religion aims at differs entirely from the contents that religion implies. Man's conduct is amply justified on the ground of religion which he embraces. In a general way, man's courage has a connection with his mentality. But courage needs the vertical dimension in order to participate in the
horizontal dimension.

Man can command sufficient courage on the basis of the participation in ultimate reality, not by his own will. Courage is in close contact with both religion and philosophy. In so far as religions emphasize that God or other beings like God are superior to indispensable courage, the concept of god and religious actuality are limited in scope from the view of spiritual reality. The principle of courage is acceptance of participation of being-itself which accepts creatures in which the power of being reveals.

III. The Structure of God
A. God as Providence

There is a striking contrast between man as the finite and god as the infinite. God is not absolute existence to all creatures which God actualizes. To be more exact, God coexists with his creatures in order to harmonize god’s views with those of existing creatures. Actualizing Providence is a divine process in which God participates. Providence is not divine history which happened in this world in time and space by the power of God as a ultimate tyrant, but the divine-creatures-history by the power of participation of God as relatedness beyond subject and object. Providence as participation of God exercises dominion over not only beings but also non-beings. This relatedness enables a wide gap between the beings and nonbeings to fill up, therefore, the representative being like life is consistent with the representative nonbeing like death. According to traditional Christianity, God is the absolute existence, and he does not admit man's participation in the process of God’s self realization. Only the chosen people like Israel and Christians can participate in the process of divine-man-relatedness, therefore, providence lost its universal relatedness to all creatures in spite of the certainty of participation of the ground of being. Man cannot understand the meaning of providence as events in time and space, because the contents of providence belong to the divine sphere. Nevertheless, man under the power of God as creator participates in God’s providential activity as grace in spite of fragmentary participation.

In every occasion, in time and space, in encounters with other creatures, God reveals the process of his self-realization in terms of man’s finite activity fragmentarily. Although providence is an abstract concept of religion, the ultimate contents of providence are transcendent of all experience and imaginations of every religion. Of course, providence is not compatible with any contingency. Externally, providence to which each individual belongs
is not manifest to reason, therefore, philosophy cannot grasp the meaning of providence. God's providence by which all the creatures exist, is destiny in the individual dimension. Because of the certainty about the providence of God who determined individual destiny, all the processes of life and death participate in each destiny by compulsion under the power of divine relatedness. Man in the history can create his individual providence as given self-actualization according to God's will, But one cannot participate in another creature's providence, further, cannot participate in a cosmologic system, because man's existence and cosmology are independent of each other. Cosmology participates in the existence of human beings continuously since the Big Bang of the universe, nevertheless, human beings cannot essentially participate in the sphere of cosmology by which they are confined.

B. God as Reality

There is difference between the reality of God and the reality of the concept of God. The concept of God indicates the right way to go in order to reconcile human beings with their God in terms of theology. The traditional theology insists on the most decisive sin of humankind, and therefore every human being exists in the state of estrangement from God who constitutes the existence of man. The existence of man is not the state of the ground of his being, but the state of something estranged from the ground of his being and God. And at the same time, the state and reality of God as ultimate being to man and other creatures is distorted and estranged from the ground of ultimate being, which we may call a double tragedy.

The essence of God in Christianity must be identical with the essence of the ground of being universally, but the particular truth within Christianity or other religions shows a tendency to impose exclusive possession of all truth upon human beings who are willing or unwilling to accept them. Although the existence of any god is not verified physically, the conceptions of god have reality in terms of experience by which the ground of the being of religious god was formed. Only the certainty about the reality of god forms the existence of man and other creatures, which means that the reality of god is both internal reality and external reality.

Neither reality is merely the object of study in theology, but is also the object of some other study. God reveals himself as formulas in science; as ideology in politics; as beauty in art, and so on. But, traditional theology hardly mentions that the manifestation and the revelation of god have many various forms. The theological sterility is entirely derived
from the ignorance of and the disregard for the various forms of revelation of God in time and space through the finitude.

God as reality reveals itself as the integration of subjects and objects through the finitude of creatureliness and empirical events. The reality of God gives man breaking through finitude in the direction of infinitude. But, at the same time, God transforms infinitude which is identified with divine being into finitude which is delimited in time and space, like the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.

From the point of the instability of creature, any creature as well as human beings needs the reality of God in order to sustain its life and existence against the demonic power which breaks the structures of its being from the inside and the outside. Individual reality in the form of finitude is not separated from the reality of God, but participates in the reality of God. Nevertheless, the ultimate realities and the structures of truth do not show their whole contents clearly in spite of the elaborate endeavor of man from the beginning of history. Religious abstract ideas are, of course, not identified with universal truth. But ultimate truth reveals itself partially in the form of religious contents. Nowadays, the problem of God and the quest for God's participation with creatures are illuminated and done by scientists in different ways and fields. Especially cosmology closely combines natural science with the philosophical aspect of religion. The problem of God from the point of view of science is ontology on which religion is based. Furthermore, the cosmological God liberates human beings from the bondage of the religious God who demands the exclusion of other Gods and heresy.

C. Process and Eternity

Finitude faces two elements of the structures and categories of god: process and eternity. Process means that finitude is transformed into other finitude, and infinitude is transformed into finitude, and vice versa. The point of contact of the transition is birth and death through which the process of life is based upon finitude. Thereupon the process of life and the finitude which delimits the process, combine against the will of self-liberation from the bondage of existential agony. And at the same time, the universe that is within the confines of finitude has limited process also as well as creatures. The process of transitory finitude transforms itself, that is, from existence to nonexistence gradually but continuously in every time, space, and segmented individual. God is not the god of stability which is absoluteness, but the god of process which is ultimateness. Everything that is included in the
universe is subjected to individual process which actualizes the potentiality of each being. The participation in the certainty of process belongs to spheres of eternity which is the ground of every being. Even though religions give a clear definition of eternity in terms of technical terms, the reality of eternity does not actualize potentiality without the participation of ultimateness of process.

Each process embraces the moment and intention of fulfillment into eternity. Beings participate in eternity through each process of which beings are within the confines. Time and space as well as creatures within them do not have eternity. But eternity is not a false and a cloudy conception. Eternity is the ground of being, and at the same time, eternity is the ground of non-being. The spheres of eternity involve both existence and non-existence, namely, the reality of God as the power of ground participates in both being and non-being; life and death, the cosmos and the chaos, creation and destruction. Furthermore, being and non-being participate in each other through the power of God as ultimate ground. Our cognitive reason can only comprehend the spheres of being by which we are surrounded in the world. The process of individual life is not segmentation of the eternity of the universe compared with the limited lives of creatures which belong to the interior of the universe. The power and the reality of God dominate both the process toward life which means that eternity participates in the becoming of actual being from the point of view of philosophy, and the process toward death which means that eternity participates in the becoming of potential non-being from the point of view of religion. The main reason concerning philosophical actual being and religious potential non-being is that the core of the concern is philosophy is rooted life and being, on the other hand, the core of the concern in religion is rooted in death and non-being.

The core of the ultimate concern must be rooted in the two sides of being and non-being which constitute the actualities and potentialities of God. In the spiritual stage, actual being participates in potential non-being, and vice versa. These paradoxical statements are directly attributable to the structures of religious ontology which the concerns toward being and non-being constitute, compared with philosophical ontology which the concern toward only being constitutes.

D. God as polarity

No creatures can exclude the structures of polarity on the basis of their essence. The creation and the destruction happen simultaneously and combine together. According to the
doctrine in Christianity, the destruction of being as such means that God consummates all creatures which belong to Him. All creatures which existed in times past, exist in the present moment, and will exist in future, belong to both the process of the creation and the process of the destruction because the power of God as the ground of the existence of beings has polarity. God is God that dominates being, and at the same time, God is God that dominates non-beings. This means that God has polarity and inconsistency. Consequently, a creature includes polarity as being and nonbeing in the form of essence, and as anxiety and courage in the form of existence.\(^{(33)}\)

The process under the power of God has two elements: being from nonbeing (creatio ex nihilo, creation), and nonbeing from being (eschaton, consummation).

All creatures are based on beings, and at the same time, are based on nonbeings with compatibility. The essence of creation and destruction belongs to the power of ultimate being. But divine power through the process of ultimate revelation dominates the creation and the destruction in the history of each being, hence, the creation and the destruction participate in the providence which is the ultimate participation of God. God is finitude from the view of revelation, because He reveals Himself in the form of finitude only, for instance; the creation, the coming of Logos Jesus Christ in our history. Man's anxiety is fundamentally rooted not in the estrangement within the inwardness of man, but in the polarity which belongs to God. The one pole leads man to consecration toward God, and the other pole leads man to estrangement against God. In the case of Jesus Christ, the one pole leads him to glory and the other pole leads him to the cross as estrangement from the glory of God. We are confronted with each polarity; life and death, health and disease, freedom and destiny, individualization and participation, divine power and demonic power, essence and existence, material being and spiritual presence, anxiety and courage, actuality and potentiality, and so on.

Although God is polarity, man accepts acceptance and accepts participation. Man can participate in God only through man's finitude as individual destiny given by God. Man's destiny is God's destination, including his existence and non-existence.

Only God has the ultimate power which conquers non-being, and at the same time, which conquers being from the point of view of ontology. Courage means that man accepts the participation of God, hence courage is rooted both in the elements of ontology and in the elements of religion.
E. God as Telos

According to Paul Tillich, man is the telos of creation. Creation is the telos of God explicitly. Creation and eschatology combine from the view of point of the process of God as the bearer of ultimate telos. In spite of the finitude of being, man has conquered his finitude which belongs to him essentially. Man's telos is to liberate himself from bondage which exists in the outside of him and which exists in the inside of him, and furthermore, which is himself.

The telos of God is apprehended by the process of beings in the universe. According to the biblical statement in Genesis the telos of the creation of man by God is to subordinate the earth, to rule other living creatures, and to till the garden of Eden. (Genesis 1: 26, 28, 2: 15). The telos of the creation of man is not the inwardness which is toward the image of God, but the outwardness which means that man is the king to other creatures without distinction of living or non-living under the power of God. The meaning of the telos of God lies in the creation, not in the eschatology, hence, modern physical scientists concentrate their attention upon the beginning of the universe. The meaning of telos as ultimate fulfillment lies in the purpose of the creation. We might call the birth of the universe the first revelation with the forms of finitude (the categories). Infinity reveals itself toward creatures with the forms of finitude, because all creatures are confined within the limited categories which creatures can observe.

Divine power and demonic power constitute the polarity of God, consequently, God reveals himself as both the divine participant and the demonic participant in the process of life of finitude of creatures. The telos of God is included in the process of the depth from nonbeing to being, and at the same time from being to nonbeing. Only human beings can participate in the telos of God partially. The manifest bearer of the telos of God is Jesus Christ and the latent bearer of the telos of God is the Holy Spirit in Christianity. In the religious sense, these definitions are correct. But man quests for the universal telos of God separated from the limited religious telos. Man cannot endure acquiescence in the unilateral telos of God, and cannot endure to be himself as a means of the telos of God. The process of the actualization of the telos of god has finite structures, but the process of the potentialization of the telos of god has infinite structures.

Disagreement between the telos of God and the finite actualization of man caused miseries in history. Religious liturgies must be agreed with the telos of God. And in the liturgies, man can confirm the telos of God, in spite of the confinement in time and space.
The categories of liturgies are, of course, finitude, but through the finitude, the infinitude beyond finitude reveals itself toward creatures. Ultimately, the telos of God is infinity, to be more exact, the telos of God is infinite in quality and in quantity.

IV. The Structures in Categories

A. The Theology and Categories

The concern of traditional theologians is absolute being or ultimate participation. In both cases, a common basic factor is that there is God within each system of theology. Ontological theology based upon the finitude of being which subjects creatures to its structures in categories, has been neglected by the theologies who embraced spiritual theology.

Nevertheless, the reason of man is confined within the structures of finitude, therefore, the theological quest for the ground of structures based upon divine power is also confined by the structures of finitude, namely, categories; time, space, causality, and substance.

Categories are revelation in the form of finitude. This fact leads us to investigate a necessity of ontological theology.\(^{(35)}\)

The incarnation of ultimate spiritual reality in finite reality in this world with categories is a necessity in order to reunite finitude and infinitude into divine presence. Traditional theology has regarded the spheres of finitude as objects of scientific interest. It is partially correct concerning the objectivity on the finitude in which a observer is separated from a source.

Theological studies, of course, include scientific interest, and are not compatible with that. Categories are conditioned by finite powers which give the law to categories. Ultimately, theology cannot disregard the categories of structures of finitude, and theology should combine the structures of finitude and the ground of infinitude on the basis of Spiritual reality. Religious symbols indicate the emancipation from the bondage of finitude.

This phenomenon means that man essentially aspires after the freedom which infinitude has through all eternity. Religious symbols as well as God which is the ground of religious symbols, dominate the categories in finitude, and at the same time, liberate finitude from finite categories which we can observe and cannot observe respectively. The fact that only God liberates man from the finite categories which God as such creates, leads us to investigate what God re-creates transcendentally. The secular categories within man's cognizance based upon reason and the transcendent categories within the spheres of divine power are synthesized at a point of contact between being and nonbeing. The certainty of all cate-
gories depend upon the plena of the divine power. Conversely, one might say that theology is restricted to secular categories, in so far as man depends upon the secular categories, without his own volition. In Christian history, the research on the categories mentioned, could not gain centeredness on the subjects of study in Christianity. This miserable process caused the essential and ontological relation between God and man to break, as categorical estrangements on the principle of deism. Eventually, in so far as theology has the centeredness in the relation between the ground of being and the existence of being, theology cannot, of course, avoid the categories of theological thought. In point of fact, without categorical foundations, the Incarnation and the Resurrection cannot make sense at all.

B. God as Categories

God can be free to originate, sustain, and direct categories and his Creativity. And at the same time, God frees himself and his creatures from the bondage of finite categories, because he is freedom. Why did God create categories like time, space, causality and substance? The power of reason cannot answer this basic question. The power of reason can only answer how finite categories are.

Real categories are not active processes, real categories were determined under the initial condition which God gave at the ultimate moment in past years. Categories are finite, but not indefinite. God is categories from the point of view of substantiality. The aspect of a material element on God can not be denied on the basis of beings.

Theologians should fulfill their obligations on this aspect of God as categories. God created categories, and at the same time, sustained the categories. However, categories have horizontal reality. Vertical reality is God above categories. Categories are the ontological expression of God itself. Epiphanies of God are not limited in the forms of verbal expression like Protestantism which stresses the invisible power of God. Natural science became aware of the importance of categories and made much importance of being and becoming under the structures of categories. Even though God transcends categories which God created, the life of all creatures is limited within categories. This means that the vanishment at the ultimate moment of an individual, like his inescapable death, takes away the activity of life coercively. No creatures can resist this negative process.

Therefore, each life depends upon the structures of the finite categories, but the finite categories do not depend upon each individual life. By comparison with finite categories, the life of each creature is more finite. Only through the categories which we experience, can
we be aware of the reality of God. God expands his reality; God re-creates his creations: Time and space expand themselves, causality continues from past to future, substances correlate with each other.

Categories are, of course, finitude. God as categories breaks such traditional doctrine of religion as eternity, infinity, nothingness, Revelation. Man's destiny and significance are finitude, but the depth beyond his destiny and significance participates in the ground of being. Categories are divine law, whether for animate nature or for other nature. The law of categories is theonomy partially. This statement means that the categories which God actualizes and potentializes transcend finite categories as in the universe.

God has and creates manifold dimensions of categories at every moment. The theologians of the old Testament and the New Testament: the priest in Genesis chapter one and John emphasized the categories especially in terms of mythic description. In both cases a difference between divine Logos beyond our reason and scientific categories within our reason has consistency, which enabled God and creatures to participate in each other, even though the consistency has the participation fragmentarily.

Notes


"When Solomon built the Temple, the omnipresence of God made it a problem for him to build a house of God at all".

In: p. 225 Solomon himself spoke about the impossibility of having the infinite within a finite space.

(2) Tillich, Paul. S. T. I p. 277


The same abbreviation as S.T. applies correspondingly to the following.

"Almost every Christian doctrine has been shaped by these symbols and needs reformulation in the light of a spatially monistic universe."

(3) S. T. I p. 278: "Only on this basis can the eternal presence of God be affirmed, for presence combines time and space."

(4) S. T. I. p. 277
(5) S. T. I.  p. 277 : "Certainly one cannot say that God is body."

(6) S. T. I.  pp. 276-277

(7) S. T. I.  p. 277 : "God creates extension in the ground of his life, in which everything spatial is rooted. But God is not subject to it; he transcends it and participates in it."

(8) S. T. I.  p. 277 : "God's omnipresence is his creative participation in the spatial existence of his creatures."

(9) See, S. T. I.  pp. 276-277

(10) S. T. I.  p. 277 : "A theology inclined toward pantheist formulation…"

(11) The term "symbols" (with a small s) is distinguished from "Symbols" (with a capital S), The former is a concrete imagination of the supreme ground of being reflected in the spirit of man; the latter, a creative image by the power of the Spiritual Presence.

(12) S. T. I.  p. 189 : "However, everything which participates in the power of being is "mixed" with nonbeing."

(13) S. T. I.  p. 165 : "they [essential being and existential being] are hypostasized into two realms (Plato), or combined in the polar relation of potentiality and actuality (Aristotle), or contrasted with each other (Schelling II, Kierkegaard, Heidegger), or derived from each other, either existence from essence (Spinoza, Hegel) or essence from existence (Dewey, Sartre)."

(14) S. T. I.  p. 239 : "Special emphasis must be laid on the insight that symbol and sign are different; that, while the sign bears no necessary relation to that to which it points, the symbol participates in the reality of that for which it stands. The sign can be changed arbitrarily according to the demands of expediency, but the symbol grows and dies according to the correlation between that which is symbolized and the persons who receive it as a symbol. Therefore, the religions symbol, the symbol which points to the divine, can be a true symbol only if it participates in the power of the divine to which it points."

(15) S. T. I.  p. 185 : "Only he who has freedom has a destiny. Things have no destiny because they have no freedom. God has no destiny because he is freedom."

(16) S. T. I.  p. 185 : "Since freedom and destiny constitute an ontological polarity, everything that participates in being must participate in this polarity."

(17) S. T. I.  pp. 189-190 : "However, everything which participates in the power of being is "mixed" with nonbeing. It is being in process of coming from and going toward nonbeing.
It is finite. Both the basic ontological structure and the ontological elements imply finitude."

According to P. Tillich, finitude is the ground of both being and nonbeing, and in essence both ends of being are nonbeing, so the correlation of being and nonbeing is a sequence in time and space without distinction between material and nonmaterial. Hence, being reveals itself in consequence of nonbeing, and vice versa.

(15) S. T. I. p. 200: "Man is threatened with the loss of freedom by the necessities implied in his destiny, and he is equally threatened with the loss of his desitiny by the contingencies implied in his freedom. He is continuously in danger of trying to preserve his freedom by arbitrary defying his destiny and of trying to save his destiny by surrendering his freedom."

(16) S. T. I. p. 31: "One can say that nature is finite necessity, God is infinite freedom, man is finite freedom."

(20) S. T. I. p. 261 P. Tillich emphasizes that theology should learn from modern naturalism. And, in so doing, theology can serve as an introduction to a half-forgotten theological truth, which means the understanding of a progressive scientific truth today.

(21) S. T. I. p. 191: "Anxiety is an ontological concept because it expresses finitude from "inside."

(22) S. T. I. p. 191: "Finitude in awareness is anxiety. Like finitude, anxiety is an ontological quality. ... It has become clear that fear as related to a definite object and anxiety as the awareness of finitude are two radically different concept. Anxiety is ontological, fear, psychological."

(23) S. T. I. p. 193: "In dealing with the four main categories — time, space, causality, substance."

(24) S. T. I. p. 202: "Being is essentially related to nonbeing."

(25) S. T. I. p. 253: "Being a creature includes both the heritage of nonbeing (anxiety) and the heritage of being (courage)."

(26) S. T. I. p. 253: "Since the divine life is essentially creative, all three modes of time must be used in symbolizing it. God has created the world, he is creative in the present moment, and he will creatively fulfill his telos. Therefore, we must speak of originating creation, sustaining creation, and directing creation."

(27) S. T. I. p. 256: "God is primarily and essentially creative; man is secondarily and
existentially creative.”
Ibid; “However, if creativity means ‘to bring into being that which had no being,’ then
divine and human creativity differ sharply. Man creates new syntheses out of given
material. This creation really is transformation. ⋅⋅⋅⋅⋅⋅Human creation is ambiguous.”
(20) S. T. I. p. 252: -“God is creative because he is god. ⋅⋅⋅⋅⋅⋅Creation is not only god’s
freedom but also his destiny.”
(20) S. T. I. p. 263: -“Creation has no purpose beyond itself. From the point of view of the
creature, the purpose of creation is the creature itself and the actualization of its
potentialities. From the point of view of the creator the purpose of creation is the
exercise of his creativity, which has no purpose beyond itself because the divine life is
essentially creative.”
(30) S. T. I. p. 273: -“Ultimate courage is based upon participation in the ultimate power of
being.”
(31) Paul Tillich adopts the term “God’s directing creativity” as “providence” in traditional
theology. S. T. I. p. 264: -“The traditional term for directing creativity is ‘provi-
dence.’”
(32) S. T. I. pp. 264-265: -“Although man does not know the reasons for God’s providential
activity, it was emphasized that there are reasons, known by God, and that man is able
to participate in this knowledge at least fragmentarily.”
(33) S. T. I. p. 253: -“Being a creature includes both the heritage of nonbeing (anxiety) and
the heritage of being (courage).”
(34) S. T. I. p. 258: -“we affirm, implicitly that man is the telos of creation.”
(35) Paul Tillich agrees that categories must be analyzed, but the general character of
categories is not significant in the system of theology for him. His philosophic theology
is based upon the principles of philosophy, the grounds of which span the depth of
spiritual realities.
Tillich’s theology is based on the spheres of finite structures, and, on the other hand,
his ultimate ground is not so called philosophic object, but transcendental realities upon
which his theology depends fundamentally. This paradox confuses his theological ideas
for us.
S. T. I. pp. 165-166: -“From the theological point of view four main categories must be
analyzed: time, space, causality, and substance. Categories like quantity and quality
have no direct theological significance and are not especially discussed.”
P. Tillich refers to originating, sustaining and directing Creativity as God as Creating. S. T. I. pp. 253-270.
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