

T
430

"ESTRANGEMENT AND RECONCILIATION
IN THE CONTEXT OF PAUL TILLICH'S THOUGHT"

By
Gail Wood

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the
requirements of the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Philosophy Department of the
American University of Beirut

Beirut, Lebanon

1962

ESTRANGEMENT AND RECONCILIATION - WOOD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	v
CHART	
CHAPTER	
I. ESTRANGEMENT	1
II. RECONCILIATION	17
III. THE ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURE	19
IV. GOD	40
V. ESTRANGEMENT AND RECONCILIATION	67
CONCLUSION	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79

INTRODUCTION

I. Rationale of this topic

While studying philosophy and theology I have sought for a philosophical and theological context within which most realistically to understand myself and my world. At this point in my life, I find the concepts "Estrangement and Reconciliation" those by which I can do this most meaningfully. Estrangement seems to me to characterize the existential situation of man's universe, and Reconciliation is, I believe, man's essential need perennially and certainly today. Thus I have undertaken an analysis of these concepts better to understand myself, and, in the process, man's history, cultural, moral, and religious expressions, and in general his "world." In terms of these concepts, therefore, I hope to indicate that basis on which we might understand our world, with its inherent tensions - past, present, and future, and the authentic reconciliation open to us.

II. Introduction to the Tillichian background of my thinking

The insights and basic analysis for my present understanding of myself and my world were gained from Paul Tillich,

whose lectures I attended two years and many of whose books I have studied. Tillich is deeply steeped in philosophy and theology, as well as in the whole sweep of Western culture. Yet he is specifically concerned to use all available historical insights in his philosophical analysis, making it existentially relevant and attuned to the present world in which we live and to new discoveries in many different areas. Likewise, he is concerned to interpret the power and meaning of our Christian heritage in existentially meaningful terms. The power of Christianity to speak to man's needs today is seriously questioned by many. Christianity is, however, that religious expression which Western man in particular has manifested as the substance of much of his cultural and moral foundations. Thus Tillich is specifically concerned to recapture and interpret the Christian message in its real power and meaning, and in terms which can speak to man today. Tillich therefore speaks both as philosopher and theologian, with particular emphasis on the existential relevance of his analysis.

Since my own interests have been much the same, I find Tillich's interest in both philosophy and theology extremely congenial, and particularly because of his "method of correlation" and "systematic approach." Here therefore

I will briefly explain (1) Tillich's distinction between philosophy and theology, and (2) his "method of correlation" and "systematic approach."

A. Tillich's distinction between philosophy and theology.

While recognizing that there is no generally accepted definition of philosophy, Tillich tries to suggest a definition which is broad enough to cover most of the major philosophies which have appeared in what usually is called the history of philosophy. The suggestion he makes "is to call philosophy that cognitive approach to reality in which reality as such is the object. Reality as such ...is the structure which makes reality a whole and therefore a potential object of knowledge. Inquiring into the nature of reality as such means inquiring into those structures, categories, and concepts which are presupposed in the cognitive encounter with every realm of reality. From this point of view philosophy is by definition critical. It separates the multifarious materials of experience from those structures which make experience possible. The question regarding the character of the general structures that make experience possible is always the same. It is

the philosophical question."¹

"The object of theology is what concerns us ultimately. Only those propositions are theological which deal with their object in so far as it can become a matter of ultimate concern for us. . . Our ultimate concern is that which determines our being or not-being. Only those statements are theological which deal with their object in so far as it can become a matter of being or non-being for us."²

"Philosophy necessarily asks the question of reality as a whole, the question of the structure of being. Theology necessarily asks the same question, . . .for that which determines our being or not-being, - the ultimate and unconditional power of being, . . .expresses itself in and through the structure of being. . . . Theology, when dealing with our ultimate concern, presupposes in every sentence the structure of being, its categories, laws, and concepts."³

Thus as a philosopher, Tillich analyzes the structure of being in itself; as a theologian, he indicates the

-
1. Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology (Chicago : University of Chicago Press), Vol. I, pp. 18-19.
 2. Ibid., pp. 12, 14.
 3. Ibid., pp. 20-21.

meaning of this structure of being for us. As a theologian he is convinced that the revelation "Jesus as the Christ" gives the answer to the philosophical and existential questions implied in existence. Revelation can not be derived from the philosophical analysis of the structure of being, but it is revealed through the structure of being and is received by individuals in their existential situation.

B. Tillich's "method of correlation" and "systematic approach."

The method of correlation presupposes that revelation, and its theological interpretation, answers real philosophical and existential questions and needs and for this reason revelation is accepted by men. Thus there is a direct correlation between the philosophical and existential questions and needs and the theological answer to these, based on the revelation "Jesus as the Christ."

Since his ontology is **systematic**, his theology is also systematic. Thus each part of his system presupposes a philosophical analysis and the theological answers to the questions implied in this analysis. Tillich has five parts in his Systematic Theology, each presupposing question and answer: (1) Reason and Revelation, (2) Being and God,

(3) Existence and Christ, (4) Life and the Spirit, and (5) History and the Kingdom of God.

III. My use of these aspects of Tillich's thought.

As a result of my study of Tillich, I feel that Estrangement is the existential situation of man's universe and Reconciliation is the essential need of man in his universe. In this thesis I have tried to indicate the basis for these convictions. Since I am very much aware that my thinking is quite evidently structured and influenced by that of Tillich, I must admit that my treatment is definitely "in the context of Paul Tillich's thought." I have developed my analysis, however, in terms of my own understanding, and thus in my own terminology.

I do not claim originality for my thinking, but only an honest attempt to state that which seems the philosophical and theological context within which I can most realistically understand myself and my world at this time. This accounts for the minimum of footnotes included. When the Tillichian background of my thinking is easily available in his published works in English, I have referred to it. As my Bibliography indicates, however, much of this background

was also gained from lectures of Tillich's which I attended, the material for which has not yet been published. I am thus prepared to defend both my own philosophical and theological thinking here presented, as well as whatever is relevant to my argument in Tillich's thought.

In this thesis, therefore, I have adopted my own approach, but always presupposing Tillich's "method of correlation" and "systematic approach." Although I see "Estrangement and Reconciliation" as the focus of my own larger philosophical and theological thinking at this time, I have developed only those aspects of the Tillichian "Systematic Theology" that were necessary for the development of my argument. Since I have been reminded repeatedly by my advisor that this is an M.A. thesis, and not a Ph.D. thesis, I have not developed exhaustively any aspect of my, or Tillich's, presentation. I sincerely hope, however, that the treatment of my argument gives a sufficient analysis not only to substantiate my claims, but also to indicate my own awareness of further implications.

The subject of the thesis is developed as follows:

Chapter I. Estrangement: a brief analysis of the philosophical and existential foundations.

Chapter II. Reconciliation: a very brief statement of the theologically implied answer to the philosophical analysis of Estrangement.

Chapter III. The Ontological Structure: a development of the philosophical analysis of the structure of being.

Chapter IV. God: a development of the theological answer to the questions implied by the philosophical analysis of the ontological structure.

Chapter V. Estrangement and Reconciliation: a conclusion in terms of the theological answers implied in the philosophical analysis of these two concepts.

Conclusion: concluding remarks on the basis of the analysis developed above.

The accompanying chart gives a further outline of the thesis development and method of correlation followed.

Chapter I. Estrangement

A. What is Estrangement?

1. Separation from the ground of meaning and power of being (the ontological structure)
2. Failure to actualize one's potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way.
3. Lack of authentic "centeredness"

B. How does Estrangement show itself in man?

1. Through anxiety.
2. Three basic types of anxiety.

C. Why does Estrangement exist in man?

1. Because of the basic existential tensions of individualization and participation, destiny and freedom, form and dynamics.
2. Because of man's inability to accept authentically the tenuousness of the basic categories of time, space, causality, and substance.

D. What does Estrangement lead to in man?

1. Concupiscence, hubris, unbelief.
2. Sin and evil.

Chapter II. Reconciliation

A. What is Reconciliation in man?

1. Reunion with the ground of meaning and power of being (the ontological structure) under the conditions of estrangement through love - which takes anxiety into itself.
2. Actualization of one's potentialities, by accepting with courage the basic existential tensions and the tenuousness of the basic categories in the most authentic and fulfilling way.
3. Authentic "centeredness," acquired by overcoming concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil in terms of courageous self-affirmation.

B. How does Reconciliation show itself in man?

Through "Revelation" of the ground of meaning and power of being, which is, philosophically speaking, the ontological structure.

Chapter III. The Ontological Structure

A. What is the Ontological Structure?

1. Introduction: Analogously, we describe the ontological structure in terms of man's self-world structure.
2. Three related aspects of the ontological structure:
 - a. The basic elements which constitute the ontological structure.
 - b. Characteristics of the ontological structure which are the conditions of existence.
 - c. Basic categories of being and knowing.

B. How does the Ontological Structure show itself?

In terms of four interrelated aspects:

1. The "dimensions of life"
2. The "spiritual dimension"
3. The "ambiguity of life" in all its dimensions.
4. Mankind in "history"

Chapter IV. God

A. What is God?

1. Introduction: Symbolically, we know God as man's "ultimate concern."
2. Three related symbols of God:
 - a. Power
 - b. Justice
 - c. Love

B. How does God show himself?

In terms of four interrelated aspects:

1. "Revelation" of God through the "dimensions" of life."
2. The "Divine Spirit" as God's revelation through the "spiritual dimension."
3. "Jesus as the Christ" as God's revelation to mankind in "history," which is communicated by the "Church."
4. The "Kingdom of God" as the reconciliation of "history" to God.

Chapter V. Estrangement and Reconciliation

- A. Anxiety is answered by "grace."
- B. The basic existential tensions of life are reconciled through "faith."
- C. Concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil are redeemed by "salvation."

Chapter I

ESTRANGEMENT

A. What is it?

Estrangement can be defined under three basic aspects as:

1. Separation from the ground of meaning and power of being (the ontological structure), which is the condition called finitude.

2. Failure to actualize one's potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way, which may be termed unsuccessful finitude.

3. Lack of authentic "centeredness."

These three basic and interrelated aspects of estrangement can be explained, respectively, in terms of three related questions: How does it show itself in man?, Why does it exist in man?, and What does it lead to in man?

B. How does Estrangement show itself in man?

Estrangement as separation from the ground of meaning and power of being (the ontological structure), i.e. as finitude, shows itself in man in basic human "anxiety".

Anxiety is the characteristic manifestation of estrangement and finitude in man. To understand anxiety we must first distinguish it from fear; we must then distinguish the three basic types of anxiety, which are a) the threat of fate and death, b) the threat of emptiness and meaninglessness, and c) the threat of guilt and condemnation.¹ All three of these basic types of anxiety are, in turn, expressed in the feeling of despair.

1. Anxiety and fear

When we experience fear, we fear something which we can recognize, focus upon, react to, and specify. Thus we fear being alone in the dark in a strange place; we fear failing an examination; we fear losing our youth; we fear "making a fool of ourselves." The things one fears are those which make one specifically, as an individual, feel insecure.

Anxiety, on the other hand, underlies all specific fears and is ever present in all men. It is the awareness, conscious and/or subconscious, of our basic insecurity. So defined, anxiety, in contradistinction to fear, reflects the basic insecurity inherent in the human situation.

1. Paul Tillich, The Courage to Be (New Haven: Yale University Press), 1952, pp. 40-57.

To understand anxiety more fully, let us distinguish its three basic types.

2. The three basic types of anxiety.

a. The threat of fate and death. We feel basically insecure because we recognize that the potentialities open to us are limited by our own individual capacities and by the potentialities of other existents with which we are inter-related. In other words, we feel insecure because of a "fate" which is uncertain and unknown, and which may bring us disease, suffering, and accidents, as well as "lucky breaks" and tenuous fulfillment. We are thus conscious of a great contingency threatening all our existence. We find ourselves in a structure of relationships which we had no share in creating and into which we must fit, to which we must adjust ourselves, in order not to lose our own structure. We cannot predict our own future, i.e. our "fate", or that of any other existent, nor can we ultimately know the meaning and purpose for which they or we exist.

Underlying all this contingency, in turn, is the basic fact that we are approaching our own death at every moment. Underlying all our specific fears and all the manifestations

of our more basic anxiety is the profound and inescapable insecurity arising from the fact and the fear of death.

b. The threat of emptiness and meaninglessness. The anxiety of emptiness is based on the loss of an ultimate concern in terms of which one can give meaning to the special contents of one's life. We feel insecure when a personal belief is undermined through inner processes or external events. We may be prevented from creative expression in a particular cultural sphere; we may be disappointed in the development of that to which we had been passionately committed; we may be drawn from one object of devotion to another, finding each lacking in ultimate meaning or significance for us, or the possibility of leading to such meaning. We may then find our creative response to life replaced by indifference or aversion to the objects and situations surrounding us. This threat of emptiness and loss of meaning expresses itself in terms of doubt which has both a creative and a destructive function in man's life. It is creative insofar as it enables man to free himself from unquestioned answers which have little existential significance or meaning for him. But when doubt undermines the very base of meaning on which one had stood to approach

one's world, without replacing it with another, it is destructive and produces despair.

Yet it is not always personal doubt that undermines one's system of values and leaves one empty of meaning. One's values may have lost the power they once had to express one's own human situation or one's most crucial existential truths. The situation which produced these values of ours have so changed that they no longer fulfill the requirements of the present. This may in fact happen very gradually and imperceptibly, but our realization of the resultant emptiness and loss of meaning may break in upon us with a shock, undermining our last shreds of meaning and leaving nothing in their place.

c. The threat of guilt and condemnation. The anxiety of guilt is the result of falling short of our own demands on ourselves. While recognizing the contingencies of existence, and the inescapable compulsions of our fate, we still hold ourselves responsible for specific instances of misjudgement, error, and the infliction of pain or sorrow. We also tend to feel that we have failed to satisfy our own demands in the context of a larger condemnation directed at us from a source beyond ourselves. We thus condemn our-

selves (guilt) and feel ourselves condemned (i.e. judged).

These three types of anxiety are mutually interdependent. One of them may be predominant, but they are all manifest in the state of anxiety. They all give rise, in their unity, to the situation of despair. Despair means "without hope." The disintegrative forces are felt to be predominant. Yet the integrative forces are maintained to the extent that we can feel this disintegrative predominance. The pain of despair arises when a being is aware of itself as unable significantly to integrate and affirm itself, and therefore wants to get rid of this awareness. It wants to get rid of itself and it cannot do so. It thus despairs of escaping despair.

C. Why does Estrangement exist in man?

Estrangement, already defined as the condition of finitude and as expressing itself in anxiety, occurs when man fails to actualize his potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way. In this sense, Estrangement can therefore be further defined as unsuccessful finitude. The answer to why estrangement exists in man as unsuccessful finitude can be explained in two complementary contexts:

1. Because of the basic existential tensions of individualization and participation; destiny and freedom; and form and dynamics.¹

2. Because of man's inability to accept authentically the tenuousness of the basic categories of time, space, causality, and substance.²

1. The basic existential tensions.

a. Individualization and participation. Each man represents in an individual way the universal characteristics of mankind. Each of us participates in his environment and his world. Man is thus a self-world structure. He must maintain his structure as man in terms of his own individual potentialities, but their actualization depends on his interaction with other existents. Participation is therefore essential for the individual.

The tendency to individualization apart from participation or the lack of balance of individualization and participation account for the failure to actualize one's

1. Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology Vol. I, pp. 168-171, 174-186.

2. Ibid., pp. 192-198.

potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way. The more individualized a being is, the more he is able to participate. But the more a human being "individualizes" himself in terms of differentiating and isolating himself from others, the less is he able to communicate with them and participate in his world. On the other hand, the more he becomes dependent on his world and on the groups in which he participates, the less individualized he becomes.

b. Destiny and freedom. Each man can experience his world only in terms of his individual structural capacities. These constitute his "destiny." Within these actual structural capacities, however, he has many potentialities. His "freedom" is manifest in choosing which potentialities to actualize through deliberation. Our destiny, therefore, is the totality of our individual selves as existing, formed by nature, history, and ourselves. Our destiny is the basis of our freedom; thus every part and every function which makes us man contributes in our freedom. Freedom experienced as deliberation refers to the act of weighing alternatives and motives. This weighing is done by the total man and the reaction to it is called decision. In decisions we exclude some potentialities, while opening others to ourselves. Our freedom is further expressed by

the responsibility we feel and accept for our decisions. Thus our destiny is the basis of our freedom, and our freedom contributes to the shaping of our destiny.

We fail to actualize our potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way, when our freedom is not directed by our destiny. We may not recognize the limitations of our individual structural capacities, and may thus try to actualize that for which we do not have the potentiality. On the other hand, we may not be fully aware of all of our potentialities, and may thus fail to actualize those that we do have. When, furthermore, freedom is reduced to arbitrariness, destiny is reduced to mechanical necessity. If man's freedom is not directed by destiny, or if it is a series of contingent acts of arbitrariness, it becomes dependent on unguided forces which set upon each other without a deciding center. Thus authentic freedom is lost, our destiny loses its effectiveness, and we are in danger of self-destruction.

c. Form and dynamics. "Being something" means having a form. An individual structures with a destiny of our own, we embody a form. Within this individualized destiny we have freedom to actualize various potentialities.

This freedom is based on a dynamic relationship within ourself and to our world, through which new content is continuously expressed within the form. Here, therefore, we are primarily interested in distinguishing form and dynamics. The tendency of every human form to go beyond or transcend its present form and create new forms is dependent on its dynamics. At the same time, however, we tend to maintain our own form as the basis for our self-transcendence. Thus the polarity of form and dynamics also generates basic existential tensions.

When one is just dynamically propelled, so to speak, through life without aim, direction, or self-control, the content of one's life becomes chaotic. Chaos is formlessness and reflects or induces destruction of form, i.e. self-destruction. Similarly, when a form is imposed on a dynamic surge with which it is incompatible, it becomes external law which tends to stifle the dynamic surge. Hence any tendency to separate form and dynamics leads to the failure to actualize one's potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way.

It is evident that anxiety is a product of these three basic existential tensions which are always liable to

imbalance which, in turn, causes our basic human insecurity.

2. The basic categories of time, space, causality, and substance.

Man exists in time, but man can never grasp the present, for he is always coming out of the past and going into the future. This also tends to create a basic feeling of insecurity, of anxiety. It is not only the brute fact of our existence in time that creates anxiety and despair; they are occasioned also by our inability to accept the temporality of all our existence. We keep wanting to transform the temporariness of all our actions into a lasting "present". It is this resistance against time which is behind our failure to actualize our potentialities in the most authentic and fulfilling way.

Anxiety is also experienced in the context of the category of space. Although every existent exists in space and is involved, directly or indirectly, in movement in space - a movement which takes time, one never persists in the same context of space. Thus one can never ultimately call one's present space one's own since the space changes, the existent changes, and the relationship of the two changes. Yet in the face of this spatial contingency, man attempts to make a particular place his own in an absolute sense.

He cannot succeed in this, however, nor can he succeed if he attempts to make as many spaces as possible his own. In thus trying to resist spatial contingency, which is part of his finitude, man is led to the despair of basic uprootedness.

Similar observations can be made concerning the categories of causality and substance. When a man tries to make himself the conditioning cause for all that takes place around him, he is forced to recognize that he is but one in an infinite structural interdependency. He is constantly confronting other centered selves who resist his manipulation of them and to which he must adjust his own activities in order to survive as a centered self. In a similar way, man's tendency to make himself into an absolute substance is doomed to failure and results in anxiety and despair. Even his own substance is expressed through accidents which change and even disappear. Thus his substance, as well as that of other existents, is not a static thing, nor is it eternal.

Throughout our discussion of the basic existential polar tensions and the tenuousness of the basic categories, as experienced by man, we have seen that these elements are potentially destructive, causing basic human insecurity and

anxiety. They threaten man's self "centeredness". Man is a self with a world. He must maintain the structural wholeness of the self in relation to the world as it exists or lose both self and world. Failure to maintain this self-world structure authentically is unsuccessful finitude under the conditions of estrangement.

D. What does Estrangement lead to in man?

Estrangement in man leads to a lack or loss of authentic "centeredness." Lack of authentic centeredness can be understood in terms of two sets of related phenomena:¹
1) Concupiscence, hubris, and unbelief, and 2) sin² and evil.³

1. Concupiscence, hubris, and unbelief.

1. As an integrated structure, man is a self; he is a "centered self". Yet his centeredness is dependent on his interrelationship with his world, the larger whole from which he is separated. In his desire for union with the whole, he wants to draw the whole of reality into himself. This unlimited desire is "concupiscence." It refers to all aspects of man's self world relationship: physical hunger

1. Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 47-55

2. Ibid., pp. 55-58.

3. Ibid., pp. 59-62.

as well as power, knowledge as well as sex, material wealth as well as spiritual values. Concupiscence thus prevents authentic centeredness and manifests estrangement.

An aspect of concupiscence is further explained by the term "hubris." Man not only is the center of his world; he can also transcend himself and look at his world and himself in it. His "hubris" consists in his not acknowledging his finitude. When he forgets his limitations and equates his necessarily partial truth with ultimate truth and gives ultimate and infinite significance to his finite cultural creations, his self-elevation becomes hubris. The disintegration and decay of every great culture in the course of history is the answer to man's cultural hubris.

An additional aspect of concupiscence is "unbelief." "Unbelief" occurs when man attributes ultimate significance to his own self-realization and to his ability to assess the criteria by which the universe is to be understood and evaluated. When he assumes that the analysis made possible by his own cognitive faculties and abilities is the controlling criterion to which the cosmos must conform, he denies the possibility of infinite potentialities beyond his own cognitive analysis. Since his finitude prevents the ultimate success of his effort to grasp his world, here

again man's authentic centeredness is subverted in estrangement.

He will be frustrated by those manifestations of the cosmos which cannot be sufficiently explained within his own cognitive analysis. We attribute this to "unbelief" because man here has lost the belief that his own cognitive participation in the structure of reality is ultimately limited.

2. Sin and Evil.

Estrangement as finitude and as anxiety has been seen to characterize our human predicament. No matter how thorough or scientific our explanations of the forces which bring about this predicament may be - be they physical, biological, psychological, sociological, or cultural, - we can not escape the sense of personal responsibility which we have for our acts. Man not only exists in a state of estrangement; he feels responsible for this estrangement. The religious term "sin" refers to the personal act of turning away from the total structural ground of meaning and power of being in which one exists and which is the source of man's authentic centered self. Guilt is man's sense of sin. Man feels guilt only when he denies what he essentially is, i.e. his best

nature. It is this turning away and denying of one's essential nature which is sin and which leads to lack of authentic centeredness.

The concept of "evil" is relevant to our discussion because loss of one's center, or self-loss, is the distinctive mark of evil. Destruction has no independent existence of its own. It is in essence disintegrative. It has power only within the structures of integration. Destruction of one's centeredness is therefore dependent on the structure of this centeredness in and upon which it acts destructively. Destruction aims at disintegration and chaos. Were disintegration and chaos to be completely attained, structure would disappear and destruction with it. In this sense we can describe "evil" as that self-destruction which is implicit in the nature of universal and personal estrangement. Evil is the destruction of the centered self by disintegrative forces which can not be harmonized and controlled.

In this very brief introduction to an analysis of estrangement, we have shown how the three basic aspects of Estrangement can be understood respectively in terms of three related questions and the explanations which answer them. Let us now ask what Reconciliation is available to men under the conditions of existential Estrangement.

Chapter II

RECONCILIATION

We will here indicate very briefly what Reconciliation is, point by point, in relation to Estrangement. This is admittedly only a preliminary and terse statement to indicate our initial awareness of the bridge between Estrangement and Reconciliation. A fuller analysis of all of these ideas will be found in the rest of the thesis.

A. What is Reconciliation in man?

1. Reunion with the ground of meaning and power of being (the ontological structure) under the conditions of estrangement through love which takes anxiety into itself.

2. Actualization of one's potentialities, by accepting with courage the basic existential tensions and the tenuousness of the basic categories in the most authentic and fulfilling way.

3. Authentic centeredness, acquired by overcoming concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil in terms of courageous self-affirmation.

B. How does Reconciliation show itself to man?

The possibility of reconciliation is made known to

man through "Revelation" of the ground of meaning and power of being, which is, philosophically speaking, the ontological structure. At this point we must pause to consider in some detail the nature of the "ontological structure."

Chapter III

THE ONTOLOGICAL STRUCTURE

A. What is it?

1. Introduction:

Basically, man is a centered self with a world. He is dependent on a source of existence greater than himself, which sustains both himself and his world. In this sense, man exists within a total structure of being, which we will term the ontological structure. Our knowledge of the ontological structure must necessarily be in terms of our own structural elements and our own basic categories of being and knowing. Thus when we speak ontologically, we move by analogy from man's self-world structure to reality itself. Let us try to understand the ontological structure under three related aspects:

a. The basic elements which constitute the ontological structure.¹

b. The characteristics of the ontological structure which are the conditions of existence.²

1. Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 186-189, 174-186.

2. Ibid., pp. 189-192.

c. The basic categories, within the ontological structure of being and knowing.¹

2. Three related aspects of the ontological structure

a. The basic elements which constitute the ontological structure. We have seen that man participates in three basic polarities. These are now seen to be the elements which constitute the ontological structure itself, as well as every existent within it. These three ontological elements are individualization and participation, destiny and freedom; form and dynamics. By analogy from the implications of these, we can now describe the ontological structure itself in terms of the related polarities of 1) Being-itself and Non-Being, 2) Being in Essence and Being for Existence, 3) continuing cosmic structure and cosmic creative openness, and 4) the ground of meaning and the power of being.

1) The ontological structure is the total structure of reality, within which all existents exist. "To exist" means to "have being". That which enables an existent to exist is "Being-itself". All existents are continuously interacting with their world and are thus changing. The power of "Non-

1. Ibid., pp. 192-198.

Being" is that which enables an existent to change. Being-itself thus refers to the actuality of being at any given moment; Non-Being refers to the potentiality of being. Being-itself and Non-Being are the basic polarities in terms of which we can describe the ontological structure, and they are inseparable, though distinguishable.

2) The ontological structure manifests itself in existence. Therefore Being-itself may be further described as "Being-in Essence", and Non-Being as "Being for Existence." Being in Essence is that being which is essential for any existent to be what it is. Every existent expresses its essential being through its own existential structure and context. Thus Being in Essence expresses itself through the inter-related structures of Being for Existence.

3) As the total structure of reality, the ontological structure is dependent only on itself, since there is nothing beyond it. It is the full source of its own actuality and is totally itself at any given time. Yet it is continuously expressing itself in existence; it is continuously fulfilling its own potentialities. In this light, we can further describe the ontological structure in terms of Being-itself as its form, Non-Being as its dynamics; Being-itself as the

basis for its destiny, Non-Being as the source of its freedom; Being-itself as the "continuing cosmic structure" within which "cosmic creative openness", or Non-Being is expressed.

4) Everything is dependent on the ontological structure for its existence and takes its meaning and value from its place within it. In this sense, therefore, we speak of Being-itself as the "ground of meaning" and Non-Being, as that which enables Being-itself to express itself in existence, as the "power of being."

b. Characteristics of the ontological structure which are the conditions of existence: finitude and infinity, essence and existence. The ontological structure can not be said to be infinite, or unlimited, for we have seen that it has freedom only in terms of its own destiny, and it has potentialities only in terms of its own actual structure. However, the ontological structure is not finite, or limited by existents other than itself. It embodies its own limits and is the source of all potentialities in existence. Thus the finite and finitude are concepts used to point to the ultimate dependency of all existents and existence on something other than themselves. The infinite and infinity are concepts useful to indicate the vast potentialities of existence

transcending incomprehensively those actualized at any given time. Thus the infinite and infinity are directing, not constitutive, concepts. ✓

This distinction carries with it certain value judgments. It seems to imply that Non-Being is somehow less than Being-itself, and that existential being is somehow less than essential being. Actual being or Being-itself alone is unexpressed being and is thus less than what it potentially is. Without Being-itself, however, there would be no being to express itself and thus no potentiality to fulfill. In this sense then, Non-Being, as potential being, can be said to be both more than and less than Being-itself, and this holds for existential being and essential being.

c. The basic categories, within the ontological structure, of being and knowing: time, space, substance and causality.¹ The basic ontological elements are derived from and understood in terms of these four basic categories. Being-itself, in dynamic interaction with Non-Being, expresses itself in existence. All existence is continuously changing and this change takes place in "time". All existents occupy

1. We are very much aware of the inadequacy of this treatment of these categories here. These are only briefly included to indicate our awareness of their relevance to a fuller presentation of our argument.

"space" and are distinguishable in terms of the space which they occupy. Striving for space is thus an ontological necessity. Being-itself expresses itself in time and space and thus is the underlying "substance" of all existence. Since there is no substance without accidents, Being-itself is the substance whose accidents are manifest in existence. "Causality" as the fourth category of ontological necessity refers to the interaction and interdependency of all existents. Whereas substance refers more to the continuing cosmic structure, causality refers primarily to the cosmic creative openness. Both express the union of Being-itself and Non-Being, but refer respectively to the different poles within the ontological structure.

With this brief description of what the ontological structure is, we can now ask more specifically, How does it show itself?

B. How does it show itself?"

This can be answered in terms of four interrelated aspects:

1. The "dimensions of life."
2. The "spiritual dimension."
3. The "ambiguity of life" in all its dimensions.
4. Mankind in "history."

1. The "dimensions of life"¹

The ontological structure expresses itself in existence and is as truly expressing itself at any one time as another through the "dimensions of life". "Life" is a mixture of Being-itself and Non-Being, of essential and existential elements. "Dimension" is a metaphor taken from the spatial realm. Dimensions of space are structural potentialities of space and dimensions of life are structural potentialities of life. All dimensions of life are potentially present in every manifestation of life and differences are dependent on the different potentialities for manifesting the totality of the ontological structure.

To more fully understand this we may distinguish the three basic functions of life as

- a) self-integration,
- b) self-production, and
- c) self-manifestation,²

a. Self-integration

1. Every existent is a centered self, participating in a

1. These were discussed by Tillich in his lectures on "Life and the Spirit".
2. In all three, the self-world character of all that exists is acknowledged, as well as the three basic existential tensions and polarities.

world in which it is related to other centered selves on which it depends for its own existence. In this way it participates indirectly in the whole of reality. Life is real through centered selves. This centeredness is the basis for the natural self affirmation of everything that is and is basically positive. This differs in the many different dimensions of life. The "self-integration" of life can approach the point of complete self-identity and complete alteration. Only in the unity of self-identity and self-alteration can self-integration maintain itself.

b. Self-production.

"Self-production" refers to the fact that life transcends itself creatively; its dynamics transcend its given form. Life in all of its dimensions is continuously creative. This has different forms in different dimensions of life, but we can speak of evolution, growth, propagation, and work us ways in which life produces itself.

c. Self-manifestation.

In regard to life's function of "self-manifestation" we mean that in transcending itself productively life manifests its possibilities and its standards. Every form of life points to that which is and is not expressed in

the particular form because it transcends every expression; it points to the ground of meaning and power of being. It is the expressive function of life which gives the metaphysical dimension to knowledge, as well as the arts, and makes it possible to encounter the ultimate meaning of life as well as the production of life.

We must now acknowledge distinctions within the inorganic and organic dimensions. We must take the inorganic dimension of life as importantly as its quantitative predominance demands. We can say of the inorganic that here we have the highest exclusion of self-integration and the highest degree of self-identification. The unconditional attempt of a body to resist any other body taking its place is the highest extent of self-identity. In the inorganic dimension we have the highest degree of a being to resist non-being.

Life as a mixture of Being-itself and Non-Being includes self-identity and therefore includes the inorganic. It comes to an end if one of these two poles is removed, and death pushes the organic back to the inorganic. The distinctions we make between lower and higher organisms, e.g., plants, animals, and man, is in terms of the independence of a living center from its environment and the

number of elements which are united. Man is more free of his environment than the lower organisms and unites the world into himself.

2. The "spiritual dimension".¹

The differences in the dimensions of life are dependent on the different potentialities for manifesting the fullness of the ontological structure. The ontological structure breaks through into existence in its fullness and meaning most authentically in the spiritual dimension. The spiritual is a dimension of life and not a part of man. Thus it is present potentially in the inorganic as well as the organic. But it is a dimension of life and not the universe of potentialities. Only if this dimension is actualized do we have the spiritual, for the spiritual is not a realm beside life.

Let us here try to clarify the confusion often surrounding our use of "mind", "body", and "spirit". By "mind" we mean the functioning brain of the living human being. As such it is that organ through which man in the totality of his being, including all of his bodily functions, is related to his world. It is in terms of our mind that

1. This was discussed by Tillich in his lectures on "Life and the Spirit".

we are able to collect and connect our experience, and thus to "understand" our world and speak of the ontological structure in which this understanding process takes place. Understanding includes both the structure of the mind and the process in which the mind receives and controls information from its world. It is thus a structured-process. Here we want to equate understanding and reason. Reason is thus the structured-process in which the mind grasps and shapes information from its world. We thus speak of reason as the structured-process of the mind and of reality. We can define ontological reason as the structured-process of the mind which enables it to grasp and shape reality. Thus subjective reason is the structured-process of the mind, and objective reason is the structured-process of reality.

Through his mind, therefore, man is able to reason and thus participate in the world of meaning in terms of universals. He is able to grasp and interpret these universals in terms of language and symbols. These universals are the expression of ontological reason which is theoretical and practical, detached and passionate, subjective and objective. Because of the greater participation in the world of meaning which his mind affords him and the greater potentiality for thus grasping and shaping a fuller manifestation of the

ontological structure than that open to other existents, life is able to manifest itself more fully in man. In this sense, we can say that man's mind has this potentiality, while "spirit" is the dynamic actualization of these relations and manifestations. Man acts and all his activities are spiritual, because all of them are done in the power of life in the world of meaning. Reason is only one of the many activities of man, although it is in terms of these activities that the mind and thus reason function. Mind and body are not separable; man's body is as spiritual as his mind. The expression of his body is an expression of his spirit.

The "spiritual" is thus both the break-through and the fulfillment of the organic. "Breakthrough" implies that something is suppressed or covered, which then breaks through the covering surface. The new dimension which is potentially present breaks through the old one - therefore something must break through and something must be broken. When it breaks through it reaches what it was supposed to reach for its fulfillment. Only in the spiritual dimension, therefore, do the organic elements receive their fulfillment, their aim.

We can now define "nature" as that dimension of life in which the spiritual potentialities of life are actualized

in an incomplete way. Nature shows less fulfillment and more perfection than man. Thus nature is unfulfilled spirit. As spirit it is open for man; as unfulfilled spirit it is strange to man. Since man through his body is a part of nature, human spiritual life is on the one hand determined by its natural basis and is on the other hand, the permanent breakthrough of its natural basis.

3. The "ambiguity of life" in all its dimensions.

Something is "ambiguous" if a quality which essentially belongs to it is inseparably united with a contrasting quality. If a process which has destructive qualities necessarily includes creative qualities it is ambiguous and visa-versa. Here we will refer to the ambiguity of all life-in terms of the three basic functions of life dealt with above. This ambiguity is manifest in all the dimensions of life - inorganic, biological, psychological, sociological, cultural, spiritual, etc. Our explanation here, however, will be brief and focus primarily on the ambiguities of human life as a whole.¹

a. In terms of self-integration, the ambiguity of life is ultimately rooted in the tension between the potential and the

1. Here the basic existential tensions are acknowledged and further support given to our discussion above on "anxiety".

actual (freedom and destiny). Although every individual desires to actualize all of his potentialities, every action includes rejected potentialities. We must surrender possible vocations, human relations, experiences, and creative expressions for the ones we have chosen. This must be done to actualize any at all. One ceases to actualize himself at all as a centered being if he tries to actualize all potentialities.

b. In speaking of self-production, we recognize that death is present in every life process from its beginning to its end. In the moment of our conception in our mother's womb, we not only begin to live, but also to die. Also there is always the desire to go beyond what one is, to experience potentialities which are not given and still not to destroy oneself in this self-transcendence. The nature of life is both productive and destructive.

c. In the self-expressive function, we recognize the ambiguity of the greatness and tragedy of life. Every life process, even the smallest, has elements of greatness in itself insofar as it expresses the inexhaustible ground of meaning and power of being. Every life process at the same time implies tragedy insofar as it betrays its infinite distance from the ground of meaning and power of being. There

is tragedy because there is greatness which does not accept its finitude. It belongs then to the ambiguity of life that its greatness inescapably experiences tragedy.

4. Man in "history".¹

The spiritual dimension expresses itself through man's humanness, which manifest itself in terms of the context in which it exists within the ontological structure, and thus in history. Here we will briefly discuss a) the nature of history and b) the "bearers" of history.

a. The nature of history. There is a distinction between events and history. "History" starts in the moment when a group becomes conscious of itself as a history bearing group, and becomes conscious of the importance of events and thus creates a tradition. Historical events are events in which man is a determining factor. Man is a determining factor when he acts through his human freedom, when he acts decisively - through deliberation, decision, and responsibility. Man has this possibility because he has language, which means having universals. What man does in history is the actualization of meanings and values. Thus man acts in history

1. This was discussed by Tillich in his lectures on "The Interpretation of History".

purposefully, and history is determined by human purposes. Purpose means something which one puts before oneself and ahead of time now and which is the object of a series of actions by which that shall be reached. Therefore we say that nature has in itself historical elements, but is not history. Likewise, history has in itself natural elements e.g. climate, soil, water, etc., which partially determine history. Nature as a whole and its structure determines the possibility of history.

b. The "bearers" of history. The "bearers" of history are those historical groups which are able to act historically. Thus it is not an individual who is the bearer of history. Whenever an individual becomes historically relevant, we will always find that he becomes important historically in connection with the life of an historical group. Historical groups unite two elements: 1) power, and 2) value or meaning.

1) History is the continuous encounter of groups in history who have the power to act historically. Power in the ultimate analysis means power of being, or the continuing power to resist non-being. Both men and social groups have the power of resisting non-being only insofar as they are centered - have the common will to resist non-being and can unite to overcome other tendencies. The power of overcoming

non-being is linked with the power of providing a space for oneself. Every living being and social group tries to find a space for itself. (There is the resistance of others who either want this space or had it.) He who has no space has no power.

2) Every historical group is conscious of itself also in terms of representing something which is uniquely valued. Groups are always groups of individuals. Nations or state-like organizations of a centered character have a vocational consciousness which is one of the greatest historical forces in their history. But the expression of what is the unconscious trend of a group is mediated by individuals. Individuals are historically important only if they express what is moving in the subconscious tendency of the group. If they are not historically important, in this sense, they may nevertheless anticipate things to come. Thus the prophet must be in "Kairoi" (the right time) to express what is meaningful to the group. If he prophesies without being accepted as the unconscious trend of the group, he will be forgotten, and does not become historically significant.

Summary and transition.

Men have, at various times in the ontological struc-

ture, actually different total truth expressed within the processes in which they participate. The ontological structure is always creatively fulfilling its potentialities and thus expressing newness, although "the new" has been potentially present in the past. "Truth" is the essence of things as well as the act in which this essence is grasped. Truth is expressed through interrelated existents and their potentialities cumulative from the past. Thus men living in 1000 B.C., 300 A.D., and 1962 A.D. actually exist in different cumulative contents of truth. Buddha, Socrates, Lucretius, St. Paul, Hegel, and Gandhi existed in different total structured contents of truth which were, however, all equally true.

History thus always creates something new. In history the new is not a mere transformation of something given, but the new is a transformation of meaning. If we are interested in a thought or experience, it will take on different meaning one week and then one year later. An element in the past has been changed—that of meaning. So mankind moves and is open infinitely into the future and history is opened to the past with respect to meaning. We thus see the past as running ahead to the future, toward the creation of the new.

We can speak about epochs and periods from the sub-

jective side. But periodization is possible only when there is rhythm, which can give understanding. "Historia" is both the event and the report about the event. There are different structures in different times and according to these structures we speak of historical periods. We do not know what we are without knowing what history is. We are fulfilled by going back into history. Thus the periodization of history is both subjective and objective. History gives us the possibility of finding the rhythms by which to understand it. The choice in order of importance presupposes a structural vision. A period is characterized by a dynamic structure carried by the few, but affecting the whole and the many. Our mind can understand history only through rhythms--these are determined by the dynamically structured few who have power in the long run to transform the whole.

An historical interpretation is thus one in which one believes that history contributes something definite to the answer to the question as to the meaning of life. In history something happens which is not just determined by history, not even human nature. It is not a circular process, but the creation of something which did not exist before in any sense of that word. An historical interpre-

tation of history has the following main concepts, as outlined by Tillich:

1. History has a definite beginning, which can be fixed symbolically and legendarily.

2. History has a definite end. End is a decisive word, with the double meaning of finish and aim. Thus it refers not just to the finishing of an historical end, but end is also here meant in the sense of aim.

3. Every historical interpretation of history has a center, which is the meaning-giving point in the historical experience of a special group.

4. There is a struggle going on in history between different forces; between positive and negative forces, between the Kingdom of God and kingdoms on earth or of demons. There is a struggle, a fight between two decisive powers which struggle about the actualization of the meaning of history or at the end of history. If we have these four points, we can understand in different ways the answers given in different interpretations of history.

With this background on the ontological structure as it is expressed in the "dimensions of life", the "spiritual dimension", and through mankind in "history", we can now return to our discussion of "Reconciliation". After a brief definition in Chapter II of what Reconciliation is available

to man, we then asked "How does this reconciliation show itself to man?", to which we answered, "Through 'Revelation' of the ground of meaning and power of being, which is the ontological structure."

Estrangement has been explained in philosophical terms as separation from the ontological structure and as the existential situation of man's universe. Reconciliation will now be explained in theological terms as reunion with God and as the essential need of man in his universe. The term "God" is the theological counterpart of the philosophical term "ontological structure". We have here tried to present the philosophical analysis in terms of which a theological answer may be understood. In following this "method of correlation" we will now develop our understanding of God in correlation, point by point, with our understanding of the ontological structure. This will lead us to a consideration of revelation as the manifestation of God.

Chapter IV

GOD

A. What is God?

1. Introduction:

We have said that man is a centered self with a world. What concerns him ultimately is the ultimate ground and power of meaning and being of himself and his world. His centeredness is maintained most authentically when this "ultimate concern" is expressed through all his actions and concerns. In religious or theological terms, man's ultimate concern is "God."

When we speak of God, we speak symbolically. A symbol is distinguished from a sign. A "sign" is something which points arbitrarily, not necessarily, to that to which it refers. Thus it can be changed voluntarily for expediency. A "symbol" in contrast participates in the reality for which it stands; there is a direct correlation between the symbol and that for which it stands. Thus the symbol cannot be replaced arbitrarily.

We will now try to understand God in terms of three

related symbols: a) power, b) justice, and c) love.

2. Three related symbols of God

a. Power. God is Being-itself in relation to Non-Being and as such is the source of the power of being of all that exists. God expresses his power "creatively. Symbolically we can define God's power in terms of his 1) originating, 2) sustaining, and 3) directing creativity.¹

1) Originating creativity. God is the cause of all that exists; there is nothing other than God to explain his activity and his structure. The doctrine or concept of creation does not describe an event. It indicates a situation, that of the relation of the creation to the creating power of the creator, the relation of "the world and all that dwells therein" to God. To speak of God's originating creativity is to refer to the fact that he is the ultimate origin and source of all that has ever existed, exists now, and will exist in the future.

2) Sustaining Creativity. God is the continuing cosmic structure within which cosmic creative openness is manifest.

1. Ibid., pp. 253-254, 261-264.

God's sustaining creativity refers primarily to the continuing structural element-the form -in this polarity, while his directing creativity (as we shall see) refers to the openness - the dynamics expressed through the form. Without the former we would have chaos and in our finitude we would not be able to identify ourselves with anything or anything with any other thing. To account for the continuing structural elements through which being and knowing take place, we speak of God's sustaining creativity.

3) Directing creativity. This refers to the dynamics of God. The meaning of this concept is often expressed as "the purpose of creation". Yet creation has no purpose beyond itself and the actualization of its own potentialities. The actualization of potentialities is the basic function of all life. Thus we can refer to the "telos" of creativity, the drive toward self-fulfillment manifest in all existents. God's directing creativity indicates his creative openness, and thus that of existence, to the future.

b. Justice. An existent has the power of being only insofar as it maintains its own structural centeredness. This is dependent on the balancing of the basic existential tensions of individualization and participation, destiny and freedom,

1. Ibid., pp. 266-270.

form and dynamics. All existence participates in these basic tensions or ontological elements, as does God himself. God's justice is manifest in that all existence is dependent on the same basic elements, which continuously operate on every existent impartially. When any existent can no longer maintain its centeredness by the balancing of these basic elements within its own structure, it ceases to exist.

We can further explain God's justice in relation to 1) God's creative power, and 2) the paradoxical nature of God's justice.

1) Justice in relation to God's creating power. God's creative power is that which drives every existent toward its self-fulfillment. Yet this creativity always creates through the structures of existence. Thus God's creativity is present in every context of finite conditions and in the totality of all finitude, past, present, and future, directing all existence toward actualization of its own potentialities in terms of its centeredness. God's creativity and justice is thus not interference. It is creation, but a creativity participated in by all existents.

Justice implies judgment, just as freedom implies responsibility. He who resists either his freedom or his

destiny contributes to the ultimate judgment upon him, as well as to his existential loss of both self and world.

2) The paradoxical nature of God's justice. God's creative power has its own structures of manifestation. We are limited to understanding God and these structures by analogy from our own structural orientation. Scepticism and cynicism concerning the meaning of life and history is often the result of our demand that God be God according to our conception of what is "Godlike", and the ensuing loss of confidence when God fails to follow our analyses and patterns.

That which is most likely to cause one to lose confidence in the directing creativity and justice of God is the awareness of pain and suffering in our world. There is indeed much pain and suffering in our world, and many creatures seem to be excluded from participating in even the most limited and anticipatory fulfillment. We see examples of this in earthquake, fire, flood, and famine, as well as in war, tyranny, brutal torture of living creatures, loss of loved ones, incapacitating disease, individual loss of creative powers, the disintegration of once-great cultures; we see it in individual and group loss of prestige and effectiveness within a community because of a foolish risk, a well-

intentioned miscalculation, or errors of unavoidable misinterpretation or misjudgment; we see it in the real despair when the more deserving are passed over and the less deserving are promoted or acclaimed because of prejudices, more "pull" or greater "know-how"; we see it wherever there seems to be no meaning at all in the occurrence of early death, feeble-mindedness or insanity, and social conditions capable of producing little more than evil and violations against humanity.

The list of pains and sufferings is long and its scope is wide and the temptation to question the meaningfulness of life and justice of God is very great. Yet in a world originated, sustained, and directed creatively by God, with every existent in dynamic interaction with every other, and each having its own destiny and freedom, all we can say is that life is, to us, necessarily ambiguous. For there to be life there must be a mixture of Being-itself and Non-Being, a mixture which embodies creative and destructive elements. Within every existent, however, is the demand authentically to fulfill its potentialities, as is evident in our human experience of guilt and responsibility. Thus all existents, and man in particular, must be understood in terms

of relative self-affirmation and disintegration, authentic and inauthentic grasp of and participation in their world, and of fulfillment and lack of fulfillment of their destiny. Yet one can only ultimately apply these evaluations to oneself and not to others.

All theological statements are existential. Thus we say that God's justice operates through the structures of existence, while recognizing that all ultimate evaluation and judgment comes from God, within whom we get our ultimate meaning and being. The future reinterprets the past. But in our own life we must as best we can, affirm or reject that which is open to us in terms of our destiny and freedom. It is thus that we acknowledge or refute, with paradoxical confidence, our belief in the ultimate justice of God.

c. Love.¹ All existents need basically to maintain their centeredness. To do this most authentically, and thus attain reconciliation, they must be united with God through love, which takes anxiety into itself. Through love one is enabled to actualize one's potentialities by accepting with courage the basic existential tensions and the tenuousness of the basic categories of being and knowing in the most authentic and fulfilling way. This leads to authentic

1. Ibid., pp. 279-284.

centeredness, acquired by overcoming concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil in terms of courageous self-affirmation.

To affirm ourselves, we must know ourselves authentically, as we really are. We are what we are and thus come to know ourselves through interaction with our world and communication with other existents. Although total communication with another is never possible, communication is most possible with other human beings, in that their structures, and thus communicative power, are most nearly like our own. Communication, however, is two-way - a giving and a receiving. It is authentic to the extent that the communication given is received in its fullness. It is most significant and fulfilling when our communication with another is able to express as much of the totality of our being as can be communicated. When this happens we are enabled most fully to understand ourselves, and thus affirm ourselves. Since authentic self-affirmation is our basic need, we feel "love" for that which enables us most authentically to do this. To communicate most fully with another means that he also is able to know himself more fully for the totality of our being must be received by him in terms of his own total being. We are able to understand ourself in relation to his communication to us

of his understanding of us through his own understanding of himself. When successful communication is two-way, each experiences "love" for the other.

My need authentically to understand and affirm myself is my ultimate concern. Symbolically, God, as the ground of meaning and power of being, is the ground of myself, other existents, and the communication between us. God expresses himself in existence and thus affirms himself through existence. In this sense, and symbolically, we say that God "loves" existence. God is the ground of my existing at all, and thus of my affirming myself through communication with others in existence. We can therefore say that it is ultimating God whom we love when we know ourselves through loving others. We are never able to know ourselves fully, for we always have further potentialities to actualize in the future, and we can certainly never know God fully. But the love existing between God and existence, between the creator and his creation, is ever manifest and ever developing.

B. How does God show himself?

This question can best be answered in terms of its four interrelated aspects:

1. "Revelation" of God through the "dimensions of life"
2. The "Divine Spirit" as God's revelation through the "spiritual dimension".
3. "Jesus as the Christ" as God's revelation to mankind in history, which is communicated by the "Church".
4. The "Kingdom of God" as the reconciliation of history to God.

1. "Revelation" of God through the "dimensions of life".¹

God expresses himself most fully by "Revelation". To understand revelation we will discuss it in terms of its a) mediums, b) marks, c) dynamics, and d) paradoxical nature.

a. The mediums of revelation. "Revelation" is the manifestation of that which concerns us ultimately; revelation is the manifestation of God. The revelation of God is thus a manifestation of that which transcends existence, though it is manifest through existence.

Since everything that exists is a partial manifestation of God, every existent is a potential medium for revelation. As such, anything - be it nature, human artifacts,

1. Ibid., pp. 106-126, 129-131.

history, particular historical eras, individual men or groups, religious or secular institutions, or the creative and cultural works of man, including language - is a potential medium of revelation. However, only that which is a manifestation "for me", or for us as individuals, - that which concerns "me" or "us" ultimately can be called revelation "for me" or "for us". Thus revelation is always manifest to a particular person, in a specific context. Likewise, every existent has its own individualization and participation in terms of which it is in its own way a vehicle for the manifestation of God. Thus revelation is manifest to us as both abstractly and concretely, as universal and as individual. It is a manifestation to us in a concrete situation of that which transcends all concrete content, and it has significance for us as individuals, but is a manifestation of ultimate, universal meaning.

All existents and dimensions of life vary in their potentiality for manifesting the fullness of meaning and being of God. Yet any aspect of existence can be a medium of revelation. It is a medium insofar as it participates in a revelatory context in such a way that it itself becomes significant as a vehicle for the revelation. Thus that which is revelatory for one person may or may not be revelatory for another. Revelation is revelation only if one experiences

it as such.

b. The Marks of revelation. That which concerns us ultimately transcends all existence, and thus can never be fully expressed or known through existence. We speak therefore of the ultimate "mystery" of God. In a revelatory experience, the ultimate mystery of God is recognized by us. If that which was revealed to us in what we considered to be a revelatory experience becomes quite understandable after further experiences and analysis, then it is no longer mysterious for us and thus ceases to be "revelation" for us. It may continue to be extremely significant and meaningful for us, but it should not be considered revelation. The word revelation in our popular usage has tended to be distorted from its precise and real meaning. We tend to use it in connection with the sudden clarification of that which was previously unclear, unknown, or mysterious. Yet revelation is a manifestation of that which is essentially mysterious and which remains so in its manifestation of itself to us.

"Mystery" is the first mark of revelation. But this needs further clarification, for not everything which is considered mysterious by us is revelation. Revelation is the reception of that which is ultimately mysterious in a

distinctive manner - in a state of "ecstasy". Ecstasy means "standing outside of oneself". The word ecstasy is perhaps most familiar to us in terms of the experiences of the great mystics of every religion and culture. According to their own account, their mystical experience is termed an ecstatic one because in it they are "grasped" and "shaken" in the very totality and depth of their being by that which is outside of themselves, yet in which they participate. Thus they speak of their ecstatic experience of the "ineffable", the "ultimate", the "divine mystery" as a manifestation of that which transcends explanation in terms of human categories, though it is necessarily experienced through the human structure.

An ecstatic experience is therefore a transforming one. It gives "new being" and new meaning to our life for it is the "breakthrough" of that which we recognize to be our ultimate concern into the totality of our being at a particular time, in a particular context through specific mediums. As a "breakthrough" it is fulfilling, new, and thus transforming. God manifests himself continuously through existence and is the ultimate concern underlying all our preliminary or transitory concerns. But when a particular experience reveals to us, - through the

totality of our being, so that we are totally convinced - the ultimate meaning of our existence, this experience enables us to affirm ourselves in a new and meaningful way.

Thus revelation and an ecstatic experience are possible only within a "Kairos" situation,-when the "time is ripe", "in the fullness of time", where a whole constellation of events make possible the breakthrough of God in his fullness of being and meaning for an individual.

c. The dynamics of revelation. Revelation is experienced in terms of our total being, and thus through our mind, body, and spirit. The structures of ourself and our centeredness are in no way disrupted, interfered with, or negated by Revelation, for we exist only through them. Revelation opens the way for "reconciliation"; it does not estrange and disintegrate: The ecstatic experience without which there is no revelation is that state in which we "grasp" that which we are ultimately "grasped by".

d. The Paradoxical nature of revelation. The ecstatic breakthrough of that which is essentially mysterious must be appropriated by us in terms of our individual existential situation. We must keep the revelation effective in our lives in terms of the harmonious balance of the polar factors of

Being-itself and Non-Being already described. This harmonious reconciling effect can be distorted into demonic and destructive consequences for us if we forget the ultimate mystery of that which was manifest in the revelation and try to identify it with specific content. It must be received by us through a particular constellation of events and things, but we must not forget that its ultimately mysterious character transcends the content of this "Kairoi". Thus revelation is paradoxical just as all of life is ambiguous, God's justice and creative activity are paradoxical, and there are destructive elements in all their creative manifestations.

2. The "Divine Spirit" as God's revelation through the "spiritual dimension".

We have defined the spiritual dimension of life as life in the totality of his being for man. The spiritual dimension of life is always present in man and history, although it is not always fulfilled. When the spiritual dimension is fulfilled for an individual man, we say that the power and meaning of the Divine Spirit has broken into a man's life. Thus by the Divine Spirit we mean that which enables man to "reconcile" his essential being in terms of his continuing existential situation. He who is ultimately concerned

in the depths of his existential being about his estrangement and the possibility of reconciliation is grasped by the Divine Spirit. Man experiences "reconciliation" through revelation and the "new being" thus released through the continuing power of the Divine Spirit which enables him to fulfill his basic need to constantly affirm his centeredness. In this sense we speak of the Divine Spirit as the answer to the inherent ambiguities of life.

The Divine Spirit does not, however, thereby remove the ambiguities of life. Both revelation and the Divine Spirit are subject to distortion. They open to man the possibility of entering into a new existential situation of reconciliation under the conditions of estrangement, but this "new being" must be constantly reaffirmed.

3. "Jesus as the Christ" as God's revelation to man in "history", which is communicated by the "Church".

We will first discuss a) "Jesus as the Christ", and second, b) the "Church".¹

a. "Jesus as the Christ". Revelation manifests God to man. The medium best able to serve as a vehicle for this is that through which man communicates most fully, i.e. other

1. This was discussed by Tillich in his lectures on "The Church and the Kingdom of God".

human beings. Since revelation is both universal and concrete, it reveals to man what is universally meaningful for him as man in terms of his specific historical context.

Here the meaning of the Christian belief in the revelation of "the Christ" through Jesus of Nazareth becomes more understandable. As Jesus of Nazareth who lived from 1-33 A.D., he was a concrete individual, participating in the basic existential polarities and categories of being and knowing. As "the Christ" he is believed to manifest man's essential being in his existential situation, to be the perfect medium for revealing the reconciliation available to man under the conditions of existential estrangement, and thus to be the medium for the revelation of God to man.

Among his contemporaries Jesus was believed to be "the Christ" only by those for whom he was the medium for the manifestation of their ultimate concern, and who thus participated in a revelatory experience. "Jesus as the Christ" thus fulfilled for them the definitions we gave above in relation to revelation:

1) Medium: He was a concrete individual in a particular historical context, and spoke the language of a particular people with their own historical and cultural perspective. He likewise manifest to them the ultimate ground of meaning and

power of being, their essential being under the conditions of existential estrangement, and the reconciliation with God available to them.

2) Marks: Those who received him as "the Christ" did so in "ecstatic" and transforming experiences, which gave them "new being" by which to find new meaning for interpreting their past and experiencing their present and future. For them Jesus was in the "Kairos", "the fullness of time."

3) Dynamics: They were made aware in the totality of their being how most meaningfully to affirm themselves as human beings, - how to fulfill, not distort, their total structural potentialities.

4) Paradoxical nature: "Jesus as the Christ" was a concrete medium for that which transcends all concreteness. Yet those who accept him as "the Christ", as the revelation of God to man, often tend to forget the ultimate "mystery" of God, and try to identify God with the specific content of Jesus' life, elevating the specific acts of Jesus to ultimate patterns of behavior. Here we see the power of the demonic in distorting the manifestation of the Divine Spirit.

All revelation is a manifestation of God. God is

totally himself at any given time, for there is nothing beyond God to limit or distort him. As such he is always reconciled with himself; his essential unity is manifest as "reconciliation". Thus all revelation not only mediates but also manifests reconciliation and is thus essentially the same. It differs only in the specific media and content through which it is received.

"Christians" are those who accept the revelation in Jesus as "the Christ". The Christological essence of this revelation has always been potentially available for all men. But the "Kairos" for it only existed with the historical "Jesus as the Christ". Christians believe that the essence of all revelation was manifest completely through this medium. This revelation cannot be separated from the medium of its manifestation. As revelation, "Jesus as the Christ" is "the Christ" for all men. He will, however, only be "the Christ" for all men when all men actually accept him as "the Christ". Thus "Jesus as the Christ" is the criterion by which Christians believe the Divine is to be distinguished from the demonic in history.

b. The "Church". For the Christian it is the church which establishes the criterion by which to distinguish the

divine from the demonic. The "Church" is the community of those who have received Jesus as the Christ. And it is through the Church that the revelation of "Jesus as the Christ" is mediated. The people who first received Jesus as the Christ were the church for their time and place in history, and the New Testament is the record of their belief. Simply reading the New Testament does not necessarily produce a revelatory experience, as is quite obvious from the fact that many who have been acquainted with it nevertheless have had no revelatory experience. This revelation must be experienced by men in historical contexts different from that of the New Testament writers and thus through their own contemporary historical media. Jesus has continued to be the Christ because of the church.

How we must further distinguish 1) the "manifest" and "latent" church, and, 2) the "visible" and "invisible" church.¹

1) The "manifest" and "latent" church.

By "manifest" church we mean that community of people who accept the revelation that Jesus is the Christ and thus are Christians. through this revelatory experience in their lives. By "latent" church we mean those people of all ages,

1. These terms of distinction were suggested by Tillich in his lectures on "The Church and the Kingdom of God."

cultures, and individualities who have been ultimately concerned in the depths of their existential being about their estrangement and the possibility of reconciliation, but who have had no revelatory experiences.

2) The "visible" and "invisible" church.

By "visible" church we mean the community of people in all of history who constitute the "manifest church", as well as those who call themselves Christians. There may be people, however, who call themselves Christians and associate themselves with the visible Christian churches in history who actually have not received and accepted in the totality of their being the revelatory power of Jesus the Christ, with its power of new being and transformation.

By "invisible" church we refer to all those people who have ever had revelatory experiences. We mean by revelation the manifestation of that which concerns man as man ultimately. Thus we say that all revelation is manifesting essentially the same thing, but through different media and appropriated uniquely by each individual. Thus all men who have had revelatory experiences can be said to belong to the "invisible" church.

Here we may pause to recall what was explained in our

section on "history". History is carried not by an individual, but by groups who are able to act historically. Historical groups unite two elements: 1) power and 2) value or meaning. History itself is carried by that which transcends history, - by God.

As the revelation of God to man in history, "Jesus as the Christ" is carried by the historical group called the church. It can be seen as uniting power, and value, and meaning, and it is in terms of its ability to unite these at any given time and place in history that its historical significance can be assessed.

The reconciliation manifest in "Jesus as the Christ" is potentially so powerful and of such totally fulfilling meaning and value for those who have experienced it that they feel it is the answer for all men. This accounts for the "missionary" drive of the Church, as well as the differences of expression and interpretation within the various manifestations of the church. Since revelation is interpreted according to the particular orientation and historical context of individuals, differences are expressed within the many churches. Whatever the differences are, however - be they in doctrine, ritual, places of worship, sacraments, etc., - they are all

united in the essential belief that in Jesus is manifest the Christ. This is the ultimate basis on which the Church stands in its function of providing the criterion for distinguishing the divine from the demonic.

Since the Church is the mediator of God's revelation to man and God judges all existence, the Church has the power of judgment. It is the essence of the Church to judge, both itself and the world in which it exists. Once the Church loses this power to judge by ceasing to know how to judge or by losing its significance and effectiveness as a judge within the context in which it exists, the church ceases to be the Church and becomes just another social group. The Church must decide for itself and for its world what is divine and what is demonic. Since it nevertheless exists in the world, with all its ambiguities, the church may be wrong in its judgments. Thus the church must likewise judge itself, be open to new revelatory expressions, and recognize that universality must ever be expressed through new concreteness. Infallibility is not possible for any man, any group of men, any culture, or any age, and thus not for the Church. But the Church must continuously manifest in ever new contexts the essential revelation of reconciliation and

fulfillment manifest to it through the New Being in Jesus as the Christ.

4. The "Kingdom of God" as the "reconciliation" of "history with God."

The Church therefore must be a manifestation of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is the manifestation in history of that which transcends history. The Church is the manifestation of the New Being in Jesus as the Christ, believing this to be God's manifestation of himself to man, (and through man to all of nature and existence). In this sense the Church is the historical manifestation of the Kingdom of God. Some people feel that the Kingdom of God refers to something, or a state, that will come only at the end of history. The Kingdom of God symbolically expresses that situation in which God's power will be the ruling power. God is united, and thus we say, symbolically, "reconciled" with himself. God, expresses himself in existence, and in history. Thus when all of existence and so all history is reconciled and unites essential with existential being in a totally fulfilling and thus nondestructive way the Kingdom of God will be in all its completeness. Estrangement means separation from God. Thus when "estrangement" is conquered by "reconciliation",

God's power, the unity of the ground of meaning with the power of being, will fully express itself through all. This will be the end of all history, for history is the dramatic stage for the revealing of the divine forces under the conditions of estrangement. But whenever "reconciliation" takes place, the Kingdom of God is present. Thus the Kingdom of God is potentially present in history in revelation. Whether this potential reconciliation ever becomes actual under the conditions of estrangement is what God constantly judges.

Summary and Transition

In summary, let us recall what we discussed in philosophical terms earlier, and then apply it in the light of our further theological analysis here.¹ "An historical interpretation", we said, "is one in which one believes that history contributes something definite in answer to the question of the meaning of life. In history something happens which is not just determined by history, not even by human nature. History is the creation of something which did not exist before in any sense of that word. An historical interpretation of history has the following main concepts:

- a. "History has a definite beginning, which can be

1. The quotes are to indicate our own earlier statements in Chapter III, pp. 380-9.

fixed symbolically and legendarily." We have indicated in what sense God is the origin of all creation. In the context of the larger Christian perspective, which was built on that of the Old Testament, we see that this theological concept of "creation" was given symbolic and legendary expression in the "creation stories" in the Book of Genesis.

b. "History has a definite end. This refers not just to the finishing of an historical process; by end is also meant the sense of aim." Our explanation of the Kingdom of God meets this requirement.

c. "Every historical interpretation of history has a center which is the meaning - giving point in the historical experience of a special group." The revelation of "Jesus as the Christ" as mediated by the "Church" in this center.

d. "There is a struggle going on in history between different forces - between positive and negative forces." We can now refer to the constant struggle in history between the creative and destructive forces, between the power of the Divine Spirit which leads to reconciliation and the demonic spirit which leads to disintegration.

Thus Christians believe that the revelation "Jesus, the Christ" is that by which God manifests himself to man, and

thus enables man to understand himself, history, the dimensions of life, and life.

We have attempted in this chapter to analyze certain important areas towards an understanding of the very inclusive concept of Estrangement in its philosophical perspective, as the existential situation of man's universe, and the no less inclusive concept of reconciliation in its theological perspective, as the essential need of man in his universe. In short, we have endeavored to understand the Christian theological answer to man's existential situation. We must remember, however, that in this "method of correlation," the theologian as theologian stands within the "theological circle" as he begins his analysis. The answers he gives are directed toward the human situation, but he acknowledges that they come from a source which ultimately transcends this situation and thus are not wholly derivable from it. Revelation can not be derived from our existential situation, though it is experienced through it. We will now conclude our analysis of "Estrangement and Reconciliation" by expanding our theological answer to include three further concepts - those of grace, faith, and salvation. These will be seen as correlative to the three major aspects of Estrangement and Reconciliation outlined in Chapter I and II.

Chapter V

ESTRANGEMENT AND RECONCILIATION

"Estrangement and Reconciliation" are correlative concepts. On the basis of our point by point correlation of our philosophical analysis of Estrangement and the ontological structure on the one hand, and our theological analysis of Reconciliation and God on the other, we can now correlate the two once more, in theological terms. It will, we hope, be evident that:

A. Anxiety and despair are answered by "grace".

B. The basic existential tensions of life are reconciled through "faith".

C. Concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin and evil are redeemed by "salvation."

A. Anxiety and despair are answered by "grace"

"Grace" is that state of existence made possible for any individual authentically desiring and striving "to grasp that by which he is grasped," to find the authentic reconciliation open to him under the conditions of existential

estrangement. Reconciliation does not refer to a segment or aspect of our existence; it characterizes a state of our total being. We attain authentic reconciliation only insofar as God manifests himself through us in the fullness of meaning and being. This is not a state which man can attain by his own efforts alone. It is dependent on a revelatory experience, which in turn is dependent on a "Kairos" situation. Since man is only a part of any historical context, which is rooted in nature, no one individual or group can so control themselves or their world as to produce a "Kairos" situation. The "Kairos" is ultimately dependent on God. Also, a "kairos" situation opens up for man only insofar as he is capable of receiving it. There is much available for men to receive which is not received by them because of their own lack of receptivity. But within a man's destiny, he has freedom. Insofar as this freedom manifests his desire to find the authentic reconciliation open to him in terms of his destiny, he is grasped by the Divine Spirit and is in a state of grace. He is then potentially open for a Kairos situation which will enable him to enter into a revelatory experience. Whether this takes place or not is ultimately dependent on God. If man, however, does not use his freedom to try authentically

to fulfill his destiny, he is not actualizing the spiritual dimension of his life. This failure keeps him from a state of grace and manifests the destructive consequences of existential estrangement.

Since anxiety and despair are the ways in which man's estrangement are manifest, we can say that the state of grace provides the potentiality for reconciliation which is open to man by allowing him to take anxiety and despair into himself through God's love.

B. The Basic existential tensions of life are reconciled through "faith".

"Faith" is that state in which we are convinced in the totality of our being that our self-affirmation is authentic and that we grasp that by which we are grasped. Faith thus involves the total man, in all of his aspects and parts. As such, it is the state in which the risk involved in all life decisions is answered by the courage to affirm oneself "in spite of" the ambiguity of all life. It is that state in which the basic existential tensions, as well as the tenuousness of the categories of being and knowing are accepted with courage, in full recognition of their effect on us, but with the confidence that ultimately these polarities are

being creatively directed toward fulfillment and reconciliation, rather than destruction.

Yet faith also includes, by its very nature, doubt. Without the ontological pole of Non-Being there would be no life. The negativities and ambiguities of life make existential doubt an inherent part of every act of faith. Doubt recognizes the ambiguity and insecurity of all life, but in faith the risks recognized by doubt are accepted with courage in acts of self-affirmation which we believe, in the totality of our being, to be authentic. It is only by faith that we can experience reconciliation.

C. Concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil are redeemed by "salvation". "Salvation" is the state in which one actually is able to grasp that which is actually available to him to grasp and affirm. There is much that is available for man that is not received because his concupiscence, hubris, unbelief, sin, and evil distort the realities of life for him. When man is able to recognize that to which estrangement leads and in contrast, how a state of grace through faith can fulfill his actual destiny in authentic freedom, he attains salvation.

The "love of God" underlying grace and the "risk and doubt" accompanying faith are operative in the state of salvation. But salvation is the reconciliation open to the man who is able to accept God's love while recognizing that he personally is not on an equal standing with God which full communication in love implies. Thus man recognizes that the God who loves him and whom he loves infinitely transcends man's ability to receive God's love. It is in this light that we say that salvation is that state in which man "accepts that he is unacceptable" and it is only then that he can attain real reconciliation in his total being with that which is the ultimate ground of meaning and power of being - God.

CONCLUSION

As I conclude this thesis, I cannot but realize that it has been a significant experience for me. I was challenged to try to pull together my own thoughts into a context meaningful for me. The thesis, however, is a very limited reflection of the endeavor, thought, and background of learning and understanding which both prompted and grew out of the writing of it.

Tillich, as I have encountered him in person and in print, has given me insights verging on the "revelatory". The very basis of Tillich's philosophical and theological approach, and of my response to this, is his own existential involvement as a person. Yet this same existential involvement has been largely minimized in this thesis, due to the demands for conciseness. I therefore look forward to my "oral" in defense of this thesis as an opportunity to indicate the life throbbing within the skeletal structure here presented.

Despite the limitations in presentation, however, I feel quite strongly that the understanding behind the rough outline given here is vital to a realistic and existentially relevant and meaningful understanding of ourselves and our

world. It enables me, at least, to find not only more coherent meaning in my world, but also a well-based incentive for a serious endeavor to affirm myself in the most authentic way possible. It has made me much more aware that life is not just "a thrilling and exciting adventure, - that is also dangerous", but, as Professor Greene refocused it, "life is indeed challenging and exciting, but very dangerous". Life is inherently ambiguous and in this is its greatness and its tragedy. Every aspect of existence and dimension of life has elements of greatness insofar as it reflects that which is the source of its ultimate meaning and being. Yet it experiences tragedy when it forgets its finitude and, in fulfilling its greatness, assumes that it is the source of its own achievement.

The world we live in is beset with tensions; we are in great danger of becoming a victim of our own creative expressions and a tool of the tools we produce. Yet the "telos" of man is to fulfill the spiritual dimension of life, which is "the breakthrough of life into life". This fulfillment, however, is no easy endeavor, since the ambiguities of life are great and the concupiscence of man is rampant. Those who would tell us, "This above all - to their own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then

be false to any man", speak a penetrating truth. To know ourself is our greatest challenge and our most difficult attainment. The reasons for this I hope to have made clear in my thesis. We are "estranged" not only from our God, our world, and from others, but also from ourselves. We can never be ultimately sure that we are fulfilling our potentialities with integrity. But even when we feel most confident that our self-affirmation is realistic, we find that the circumstances in which we are emmeshed bring suffering and disappointment to ourselves and to others, and that which we had most passionately believed in as an anchor in life is itself subject to the ambiguities of life and is insufficient to be that in which we can have ultimate confidence and find ultimate meaning. Our human predicament is that of "estrangement", as is that of all of our world.

Our challenge is to have the courage to accept this inherent estrangement and take it into ourselves with the courage to affirm ourselves "in spite of" all the ambiguity which it manifests. Since this is the human and existential predicament, it should not be in itself a cause for despair and lack of hope in our lives. Instead this awareness should be a realistic insight by which to live with integrity. To

acknowledge that greatness includes tragedy, that creativity embodies destruction, that success incorporates failure, that life manifests death - this is to acknowledge our world as it is, has been, and will continue to be insofar as we can know it. Yet we must not forget that these are not alternatives, but rather are polar aspects of all that is. Despair and lack of hope arises when we overemphasize either pole to the exclusion of the other.

Reconciliation is authentically possible, but only insofar as we affirm in our life what is realistically available to us to affirm. This should be our ultimate concern. When we seek to find ultimate meaning in preliminary concerns, whatever they may be, we will be open to the pain of anxiety and despair resulting from accepting any aspect of life as ultimately meaningful in itself. These preliminary concerns may be the seeking of material possessions or wealth, the establishment of liberating political systems, the pursuit of science in an endeavor to uncover the mysteries of our life and world, the devotion to the goals of education, the preaching of theological truths through particular religious institutions, the expression of ourselves creatively through works of art, or the endeavor to fulfill ourselves through giving birth and meaning to new life. In spite of the value

of all of these things and many more, all are open to demonic and destructive elements. To be more than preliminary concerns in our life, they must be manifestations of our ultimate concern, of the power of life in the world of meaning, of the breakthrough of that which transcends all life in power, justice, and love. All of our endeavors can be a means of entering into the fullness of life, but only insofar as this fullness is able to breakthrough in power and meaning.

It is through revelation, as defined in the thesis, that this breakthrough is most fully manifest, bringing new meaning and new being into our lives. Revelation, as the manifestation of the ground of meaning and power of being of all that exists, is open to all existence insofar as it is able to receive it. But we must be authentically seeking for real meaning in our lives before we can even hope to find it. The search itself, however, does not preclude the actual finding, for we are not the final source of our life's direction or possibilities. We are emmeshed in a contingency of circumstances which may destroy or fulfill us at every turn. But if we reject that freedom given us by our destiny to affirm that which is available to us, we have rejected that which is the source of real and authentic self-affirmation and will become simply an object moved by external forces

with no deciding center. As such we will have negated our humanity and cannot hope for the breakthrough of real power and meaning into our lives as men, but will be reduced to an object predominantly dependent on the forces of its environment.

Man's deepest needs and greatest hopes are expressed through the spiritual dimension of life. As such they have given rise to religious expression and religion. As Tillich so penetratingly states "Religion is the substance of culture and culture is the form of religion. Morality is the act in which both of them are constituted. If they are separated we have a religion not aware of the fact that without its moral foundation it becomes self-intoxication and which gives absolute validity to special content which is culturably conditioned, not knowing that what it calls eternal doctrines are one's formulated under special historical and cultural conditions, - including the language and concepts used. Religion is the relation of man's spiritual life to the ground of being and meaning. The holiness and greatness of life, its self-expressive power of something greater than itself, becomes manifest in man's religious life. It is the place where the answer to the quest for eternal life is received and in this sense it is unambiguous.

Religion is the reception of this answer in cultural acts and personal form. When it participates in this it experiences the ambiguities of life. Religion is the spiritual act in which revelation is received and united with morality and culture and at the same time transformed into something which is no more revelation. The religious life is the highest glory and the deepest shame of life."¹

On this note I conclude my thesis, but not without expressing my sincere gratitude to Professor Th. M. Greene, under whose supervision it was written. At our first meeting he said to me, "This year I hope to be your friend, mentor, and severest critic." He has been all three and will always remain so I hope. The existential insights gained from writing this thesis under Professor Greene are as meaningful for me as those gained from studying under Paul Tillich.

1. Tillich, "Life and the Spirit," Lectures.

Bibliography

Books

- Tillich, Paul, Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- _____, The Courage to Be, New Haven : Yale University Press, 1952
- _____, Dynamics of Faith, New York : Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- _____, Love, Power, and Justice, New York and London : Oxford University Press, 1954.
- _____, The Protestant Era, translated by J.L. Adams, Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- _____, Systematic Theology, 2 vols. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1951-1957.

Unpublished Material

- Tillich, Paul, "Art, Science, and Religion," Lectures delivered at Harvard College, 1958.
- _____, "The Church and the Kingdom of God." Lectures delivered at Harvard Divinity School, 1958.
- _____, "Interpretation of History." Lectures delivered at Harvard College, 1957-58.
- _____, "Life and the Spirit." Lectures delivered at Harvard Divinity School, 1957-58.