Afropolitan Journals

This open-access article is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 license

ISSN: 3026-8915 www.afropolitanjournals.com

The Trinity from an Akan Moderate Communitarian Perspective: An Afro Theological Framework

Harry Allotey

Central University Ghana, Ghana.

Corresponding author: hallotey@liberty.edu

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.62154/ajrts.2026.23.01018*

Abstract

This article examines how Kwame Gyekye's moderate communitarianism can illuminate Trinitarian teaching within an Akan setting in Ghana. It argues that the distinction between intrinsic personal worth and communal moral formation offers limited pedagogical resources for discussing personal distinction and communion. The study uses conceptual analysis and a critically controlled comparison of Gyekye, Kwasi Wiredu, selected Akan accounts of personhood, and Trinitarian theology. Biblical interpretation and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan confession govern the comparison. Community nurtures persons whose dignity it does not create; communal development does not establish divine consubstantiality, eternal relations, or inseparable operation. The article therefore distinguishes created interdependence from the eternal relational inseparability of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and rejects the claim that personal association produces divine essence. Its contribution is a bounded use of Akan moderate communitarianism that identifies both the illuminating function and the doctrinal failure points of communal analogies. Recommendations for formation and accountable leadership follow from biblical teaching about the church rather than a direct transfer of divine relations into ecclesial structures.

Keywords: Trinity, Social Trinitarianism, Moderate Communitarianism, Akan Personhood, Kwame Gyekye, Ghana.

Introduction

The doctrine of the Trinity concerns the identity of the God whom Christian's worship as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Explaining that confession within a particular cultural setting requires attention to both its biblical content and the concepts through which it is communicated. African theological reflection has already explored the relationship between inherited understandings of God and Christian confession. The task is therefore not to introduce relational thought into a theological field where it has been absent. It is to determine which uses of relational language clarify Christian doctrine and which substitute a human account of community for the life of God. This article addresses that question through Kwame Gyekye's moderate communitarianism and its Akan philosophical background. Akan thought is one intellectual tradition within Ghana; it cannot stand for every Ghanaian person or for Africa as a whole. Likewise, a Ghanaian philosopher's position is not necessarily an expression of Akan traditional metaphysics. These distinctions matter

because geographical proximity does not establish philosophical agreement. Accordingly, the argument concentrates on Gyekye and Wiredu, while briefly treating Nkrumah as a contrasting Ghanaian thinker.

The thesis is that Gyekye's distinction between intrinsic personal worth and communal formation provides a useful but restricted grammar for teaching personal distinction and communion. It does not explain how three divine persons are one God. The constructive proposal is therefore a disciplined contextual interpretation rather than a new metaphysical derivation of the Trinity. Its principal theological correction is to distinguish human dependence upon communal nurture from the eternal relational inseparability of the divine persons. Its principal anthropological correction is to distinguish a person's moral achievement from the worth that requires protection even when that achievement is absent.

The Problem and Research Questions

African Trinitarian scholarship provides several approaches to the relationship between divine communion and human community. Sakupapa (2019) identifies approaches emerging from ancestral Christologies, communal relationality, and traditional ontology. Bitrus (2018) develops a constructive critique of distorted communal life, including domination and nepotism. These contributions establish that neither African relationality nor the social implications of Trinitarian doctrine constitute an unoccupied field. The specific problem pursued here is narrower: when Gyekye's defence of personal worth and Wiredu's account of moral formation enter Trinitarian discussion, the precise point at which an illuminating comparison becomes an unwarranted claim about divine constitution needs to be identified.

The study therefore asks three questions. First, how do Gyekye's moderate communitarianism and Wiredu's account of moral formation distinguish personal status from communal achievement? Second, which features of those accounts can illuminate the distinction and communion of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit under biblical and Nicene constraints? Third, which features must be excluded, and how does that exclusion shape responsible recommendations for the church? The article's contribution lies in making these controls explicit and applying them to particular analogical inferences. It does not claim that no previous African theologian has recognised the limitations of analogy.

Limitations

The study is limited to selected, predominantly English-language philosophical and theological literature. Its Akan focus does not represent all Ghanaian societies or settle contested translations of okra and sunsum. Its reconstruction of Gyekye and Wiredu is selective and directed toward a theological question; neither philosopher is presented as having intended the Trinitarian applications developed here. The analysis does not establish how ordinary church members understand these concepts or whether a particular illustration is effective. It also does not resolve the wider metaphysical debate between

classical and social Trinitarian accounts. Its conclusion is restricted to the warranted use and demonstrable limits of the proposed comparison.

Conceptual Framework and Relevant Scholarship

Moderate Communitarianism and its Interlocutors

Moderate communitarianism affirms that human beings are constituted and sustained within social relationships while possessing capacities, interests, and moral worth that cannot be reduced to communal approval. Gyekye (1997) resists both an unrestricted priority of community and an account of autonomy detached from social obligation. A community can educate, sustain, or mistreat a person; it does not thereby become the ultimate author of that person's worth. This is a normative philosophical claim rather than a report that every Akan social practice honours individual rights.

Menkiti's (1984) account provides an important interlocutor. His emphasis on the achievement of personhood through communal participation is commonly described as radical communitarianism. That description should not obscure the ethical question he raises: how does a human being become a mature participant in communal life? Gyekye objects to making this achievement the basis of personal standing. The disagreement concerns the relationship among being human, possessing moral status, and attaining moral excellence, rather than a simple choice between valuing individuals and valuing communities.

Wiredu's (1997) work situates cultural particularity within philosophical inquiry rather than treating inherited concepts as immune from criticism. Wiredu (2009) gives particular attention to the social processes through which human capacities become effective agency. In this article, "programmatic" describes that emphasis on formation; it does not designate a universally recognised third school alongside radical and moderate communitarianism. Sands (2024) stresses the strength of Wiredu's account of achieved personhood and its moral and political implications. This reading cautions against presenting Wiredu as merely repeating Gyekye. The two thinkers offer overlapping but distinguishable accounts of the relation between humanity, socialisation, and evaluative recognition.

Recent discussion also prevents the debate from being reduced to a fixed opposition between two canonical philosophers. Molefe (2020) distinguishes humanity, moral status, and the development of virtuous character when constructing an account of a meaningful life. His analysis supports the need to keep these questions separate, without settling every disagreement between Gyekye and Wiredu. Famakinwa (2010), meanwhile, questions whether Gyekye's balance is as moderate as claimed. Jecker (2022) further argues that both strong and moderate communitarian accounts can provide resources for respecting moral dissenters. Her analysis qualifies any suggestion that strong communitarianism simply entails the denial of dignity. The issue must be tested through the account of moral standing and the treatment of actual disagreement. A theological appropriation must therefore identify the specific proposition it adopts, rather than assuming that the label "moderate" resolves conflicts between rights and communal duties.

Social Trinitarian Approaches and their Differences

Social Trinitarianism designates a family of approaches that foreground the real distinction and communion of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is not a single theory of divine unity. Zizioulas (1985) gives personhood and communion a central place within a retrieval of patristic and ecclesial theology, with particular attention to the father. Moltmann (1993) emphasises the communion of the three and develops its implications for freedom. Volf (1998) examines the relationship between Trinitarian confession and ecclesial participation. Their shared relational vocabulary does not make their accounts of theological method, the Father's monarchy, or church order interchangeable.

Gunton (1997) explores the significance of Trinitarian theology for personhood and created relations. Hasker (2013), working more explicitly within analytic metaphysics, defends three personal lives sharing one concrete divine nature. Hasker's account raises questions about consciousness, will, and unity that cannot be answered by citing human solidarity. The present study receives the social approaches' attention to communion while declining to adopt all their metaphysical commitments. In particular, it does not infer three independently deliberating divine wills from the language of three persons. The one divine action must not be reduced to successful cooperation among otherwise separate agents.

African Contributions and Critical Objections

The African discussion supplies both resources and warnings. Sakupapa's (2019) survey situates communal approaches within a wider theological history and recognises the danger of treating human community as transparent access to God. Bitrus (2018) makes clear that communal traditions themselves require criticism. Banda (2020) brings Trinitarian reflection into an assessment of reliance upon anointed objects in African neo-Pentecostal practice. These studies address different questions. Banda is relevant to theological evaluation of religious mediation, not evidence for the meaning of Akan personhood. Kombo (2007) also examines the relationship between African intellectual culture and Trinitarian confession. His project reinforces the need to distinguish inherited concepts of God from the Christian identification of God through the Son and Spirit. The present article builds on this differentiated conversation by testing a particular philosophical resource rather than treating African relationality as a self-validating theological foundation.

Kilby's (2000) criticism poses a methodological challenge: an interpreter may project a preferred social ideal into the Trinity and then return that ideal to society with divine authority. Holmes (2012) challenges claims that modern Trinitarian renewal simply recovers a relational doctrine obscured by earlier theology. Together these objections require more than a general warning about analogy. They require the argument to specify where its doctrinal premises originate and to show that its ethical recommendations have grounds beyond the social model it wishes to commend. A cultural resemblance may assist understanding without proving either a doctrine of God or a form of church government.

Methodology

This is a qualitative, literature-based study using conceptual analysis and constructive theological comparison. It is neither an ethnographic investigation of Akan communities nor a systematic review claiming exhaustive coverage. Gyekye is selected because his explicit treatment of personal worth and communal obligation directly addresses the research problem. Wiredu is selected as a major Akan interlocutor whose account of social formation tests the limits of that treatment. Nkrumah functions only as a contrast that prevents "Ghanaian philosophy" from being mistaken for one metaphysical position. Recent studies of personhood and selected Trinitarian critics are included where they challenge the proposed inference or clarify an interpretive dispute.

The theological premises are the biblical identification of Father, Son, and Spirit, read within the Nicene-Constantinopolitan confession, and the Creator-creature distinction. The method proceeds in four stages: establish the relevant doctrinal claims; reconstruct the human concept in its own setting; identify a restricted resemblance; and test the proposed comparison against its disanalogies. This sequence makes the theological norm explicit. It does not pretend that philosophical interpretation is free of theological commitments. Ayres (2004) supplies historical orientation to pro-Nicene theology, rather than a licence to equate every modern social account with fourth-century teaching.

Five criteria govern the comparison. It must preserve real personal distinction, the numerical unity and indivisibility of divine being, the full deity of each person, the eternity of the personal relations, and inseparable divine action. A comparison fails when it makes God an aggregate, introduces temporal acquisition of deity, treats a divine person as a component, or requires cooperation to produce unity. Where sources conflict, their disagreement is retained rather than harmonised by appeal to a supposedly common African worldview. A human claim that fails the theological criteria may remain valuable anthropology, but it cannot be transferred into the account of God.

Biblical and Doctrinal Controls

Divine Unity and Personal Distinction

Biblical references in this article use the *New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition Bible* (2021). Deuteronomy 6:4 locates Israel's confession of God within covenantal allegiance and exclusive worship. The passage does not present a developed Christian doctrine of three persons, and it should not be made to do so by lexical argument alone. It establishes a constraint: Christian interpretation of Father, Son, and Spirit must not replace the one God with a plurality of deities. Reading the New Testament canonically requires asking how its claims about Christ and the Spirit belong within that monotheistic confession.

John 1:1–3 provides a particularly important starting point. The Word is distinguished in relation to God and is simultaneously identified as divine. The subsequent attribution of creation through the Word excludes placing the Word among the things that came into being. The distinction is therefore not merely between temporary roles adopted within salvation history. Read with John 1:14, the passage identifies the incarnate Son within a

divine relation that precedes created existence. The text does not explain the metaphysics of consubstantiality in later terminology, but it establishes why an analogy involving one person performing three successive functions is inadequate.

Matthew 28:18–20 places baptism within the commission of the risen Jesus and names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit together. The singular baptismal name and the threefold designation belong together in the church's initiation into discipleship. The verse does not independently supply a complete account of essence and hypostasis. Nevertheless, treating the three simply as unrelated divine patrons fails to account for their unified place in baptismal allegiance. The doctrinal reading emerges from this text in relation to the wider scriptural witness, rather than from counting grammatical features as though they constituted a complete proof.

Mutual Indwelling and the Spirit

In John 14:8–11, Jesus' response to Philip connects seeing the Father with the Son's revelation of him. The Father's presence and works in the son are inseparable from the son's presence in the father. Yet the speaker and the one he reveals remain distinguishable. John 14:16–17 develops that distinction further: Jesus asks the Father, and the Father gives another Advocate. The Spirit is therefore not merely a later name for the same acting person. John 16:13–15 describes the Spirit's communication in relation to the Son and the Father, presenting a coherent divine disclosure rather than competing revelations.

These passages permit the theological language of mutual indwelling, but they do not identify divine indwelling with social proximity. Nor do they imply that the Father, Son, or Spirit possesses only a portion of divine life. Acts 5:3–4 strengthens the attribution of deity to the Spirit by connecting lying to the Holy Spirit with lying to God. This episode is not a full treatise on divine personhood; its contribution belongs within the cumulative witness of texts that distinguish the Spirit and associate the Spirit with divine action and authority.

Participation without Identity

John 17:20–23 is especially important for communal analogies because Jesus relates the unity of believers to the unity of Father and Son. The comparison establishes a real theological connection; Christian unity is not unrelated to who God is. Yet the disciples do not become numerically one divine essence. Their unity is received through Christ, maintained in love and testimony, and directed toward the world's recognition of his mission. The passage therefore warrants participation and correspondence, while requiring a distinction between ecclesial unity and divine unity.

Ephesians 2:18 likewise places believers' access to the Father through Christ in one Spirit. The surrounding argument concerns the reconciliation of formerly divided peoples. Here an ecclesial consequence follows through God's saving action: those brought near in Christ must recognise their shared access and belonging. This provides a stronger route to practical implications than a direct inference from an imagined divine society.

Essence and Relations

The Nicene-Constantinopolitan confession identifies the son as begotten rather than made and as sharing the father's essence. It identifies the Spirit as Lord and giver of life, worshipped with the Father and the Son (World Council of Churches, 2025). These commitments do not resolve every disagreement among later Trinitarian theologians, but they constrain the use of social language. Classical theology should also not be caricatured as positing an impersonal essence that exists first and subsequently produces personal relations. Aquinas (1920/2017, I, q. 39, arts. 1–2) holds together the identity of essence and person in God with real distinction among the persons. The divine essence is not a fourth entity standing behind Father, Son, and Spirit.

Accordingly, the present argument rejects a causal thesis that communion constitutes divine essence. Neither essence nor persons should be conceived as temporally assembling into the triune God. The unity of God is eternal, and the relations of Father, Son, and Spirit are eternal. This formulation does not claim that Thomistic and social Trinitarian metaphysics converge on every question. It identifies the doctrinal requirements that the contextual proposal accepts while leaving their further metaphysical interpretation open to argument.

Akan Accounts of Personhood in their Ghanaian Setting

Spiritual Embodiment and Kinship

Gyekye's (1995) reconstruction of Akan thought describes the person through bodily and spiritual language, including honam, okra, and sunsum. Honam concerns bodily existence; okra is associated with life and destiny in relation to God; sunsum concerns spiritual identity and personality. These terms should not be treated as simple equivalents of English philosophical categories. Mogya concerns blood and matrilineal belonging, while abusua names the lineage or clan. Their significance includes social identity and obligation, not merely an inventory of substances inside the human being.

The interpretation of these terms is contested. Majeed's (2017) examination of Gyekye's account of sunsum challenges aspects of his treatment of earlier Akan writers. It is therefore misleading to state, without qualification, that sunsum has a single agreed origin or that all Akan philosophers accept the same spiritual anthropology. The present comparison does not require resolving that dispute. Its narrower claim is that bodily existence, personal identity, and familial relations are considered together within the Akan sources under discussion.

This anthropology does not provide a set of components to be mapped onto the three divine persons. Honam, okra, and sunsum are not three persons within one human being, and mogya is not an analog of the divine essence. Attempting such a correspondence would confuse distinctions within an account of a created person with distinctions among the uncreated persons. The value of these categories is introductory and anthropological; they expose the inadequacy of describing human identity as an isolated interior consciousness. They cannot explain the Trinity by dividing a human being into three elements.

Gyekye and the Distinction between Worth and Achievement

Gyekye's (1997) moderate communitarianism supplies the central normative distinction. A person can receive nurture, language, education, and moral correction from a community without receiving basic worth from that community's verdict. The distinction is consequential when communal recognition is withheld. An unpopular dissenter, an infant, or someone unable to satisfy customary expectations does not become disposable because approval is absent. The community has obligations toward such persons before they demonstrate socially admired achievement.

This claim should not be made to depend exclusively on the interpretation of okra. Gyekye's moral defence of persons includes capacities for judgement and choice as well as his account of the Akan conceptual scheme. Treating dignity as simply a spiritual ingredient risks turning an ethical argument into an unexamined metaphysical assertion. Moderate communitarianism is useful here because it permits reciprocal obligations while retaining a critical question about communal demands: does this practice honour persons, or does it make their standing conditional upon conformity?

Famakinwa's (2010) objection presses the issue further. If communal love or social obligation receives overriding priority, the promised protection of individual rights may become unstable. The present argument therefore adopts a specified commitment from Gyekye, which is that communal recognition does not create basic worth. It does not assume that every application of his philosophy has already settled how conflicting claims should be adjudicated. In theological use, the rights of a vulnerable member cannot be made contingent upon whether protecting that member preserves institutional convenience.

Wiredu and Moral Formation

Wiredu's (2009) treatment of socialisation concerns the development of language, agency, and responsibility. Human capacities become effective through relations of nurture and participation. This is an important account of how moral life develops, but its evaluative vocabulary requires care. To describe someone as failing to be a good person is not necessarily to deny that the person is human or may be treated as an object. The distinction between basic standing and mature moral agency helps clarify the disagreement without eliminating it.

Sands (2024) emphasises how demanding Wiredu's achieved account of personhood remains. That interpretation prevents a convenient assimilation of Wiredu to Gyekye's intrinsic account. Molefe's (2020) distinction among humanity, moral status, and excellence offers a further analytical aid. The constructive finding is not that the philosophers secretly agree. It is that their debate identifies different questions which theological comparison must not confuse: what a person is, what respect is owed, and how a person learns to live well.

Nkrumah as a Contrasting Ghanaian Position

Nkrumah's (1964) consciencism advances a materialist philosophy shaped by decolonisation and social reconstruction. His treatment of mind as arising within materially organised reality cannot simply be fused with an account of okra as an immortal spiritual principle. His appeal to communal responsibility belongs within a political and philosophical project with its own premises. The fact that Nkrumah, Gyekye, and Wiredu are Ghanaian does not make their ontologies interchangeable. Nkrumah remains relevant as evidence of intellectual plurality, rather than as a metaphysical foundation for the present Trinitarian proposal.

Findings and Constructive Discussion

Personal Distinction without Absorption

The first finding concerns the limited pedagogical value of non-reducibility. Gyekye's person is not simply a function assigned by the community. This helps a teacher challenge the assumption that relationship necessarily erases distinction. In a Trinitarian lesson, it can introduce the question of why Father, Son, and Spirit are not merely interchangeable titles. The positive doctrinal answer, however, comes from the biblical relations already examined, especially the Son's relation to the Father and the sending of the Spirit. The analogy therefore does not itself refute modalism. Human individuals are already distinct created beings; using their distinction to prove divine personal distinction would assume the feature under investigation. The warranted inference is smaller: belonging and distinction need not be contradictory concepts. Scripture and doctrine establish that the divine distinctions are eternal and real. This restriction preserves the cultural illustration while withdrawing an exaggerated apologetic claim.

Communion without Aggregation

The second finding is a significant disanalogy. Moderate communitarianism can describe people whose lives are inseparable in practical, moral, and historical respects, but those people remain numerically distinct beings. A household or clan is composed of members. Their cooperation does not make them one indivisible essence. Consequently, the analogy cannot establish divine unity and cannot by itself guard against tritheism. If pressed into a metaphysical model, it may encourage precisely the picture of several beings that Christian monotheism excludes.

Hasker's (2013) defence of one concrete divine nature illustrates why the problem requires a theological and metaphysical argument beyond social solidarity. This article does not adopt his complete account. It notes that asserting communion leaves the numerical unity question unanswered unless one explains the sense in which the three are one God. The contextual framework therefore receives consubstantiality as a doctrinal commitment and makes its absence from the human analogy explicit.

Eternal Relational Inseparability

The third finding concerns the limits of the language of interdependence. Created persons need nurture, resources, recognition, and assistance. Their dependence can involve lack, vulnerability, and change. None of these conditions should be transferred to divine life. Calling the divine persons "not self-sufficient" would suggest that each lack something supplied by the others, as though their association completes an otherwise deficient deity. The language also risks confusing the self-sufficiency of the one God with the personal relations through which Father, Son, and Spirit are distinguished.

"Eternal relational inseparability" is therefore the more appropriate description for the present purpose. The Father is never without the Son and Spirit; the Son is eternally Son in relation to the Father; the Spirit's identity is not a temporary communal assignment. These are relations of the one divine life, not exchanges that overcome deficiency. The Father's unbegottenness and the relations of origin must also not be erased by a symmetrical account of mutual causation. The persons are not three self-sufficient gods, but neither are they three incomplete beings whose dependence produces deity.

This distinction also clarifies the treatment of essence and communion. Divine essence is not a material or conceptual substrate that precedes the persons, and it is not an outcome produced when they associate. The article therefore does not use "co-primordiality" to propose a new causal explanation of divine being. It affirms eternal distinction within undivided deity without claiming that an Akan account of social emergence demonstrates this confession. Aquinas's treatment of essence and person prevents an easy opposition between classical unity and supposedly exclusively social relationality (Aquinas, 1920/2017, I, q. 39, arts. 1–2).

Formation belongs to Creatures

The fourth finding locates Wiredu's most useful theological contribution within anthropology and ecclesiology. Human beings develop judgement, learn language, and receive correction. The divine persons do not become morally mature or acquire personhood through participation. Treating communal formation as a description of divine being would therefore introduce temporal development into the Trinity. This is the point at which the analogy fails; it is not evidence that Wiredu's own human philosophy teaches Trinitarian subordinationism.

Formation becomes relevant again when considering the church. Christians are creatures whose character is shaped through teaching, worship, service, and correction. Ephesians 4:11–16 places growth within the body's life under Christ, while 1 Corinthians 12:4–7 connects differentiated gifts with the same Spirit and the common good. These passages support communal formation without equating the church's growth with God's eternal being. The distinction between anthropology and theology thus clarifies where Wiredu assists the argument and where he should not be employed.

Responding to Projection and Historical Simplification

Kilby's (2000) objection cannot be answered merely by prefacing a social model with a declaration of biblical authority. The argument must actually refrain from using the desired social conclusion as evidence for its account of God. In this instance, divine unity and distinction are established before the Akan comparison; the comparison then encounters explicit exclusions. Recommendations for church life receive an additional scriptural warrant. This does not remove every interpretive judgement, but it prevents a preferred communal arrangement from functioning as its own theological proof.

Holmes's (2012) historical challenge likewise requires relinquishing a sweeping opposition between an individualistic Western tradition and a relational African alternative. Neither tradition is homogeneous. The constructive position does not claim that classical theology lacked relations or that Akan communities already embody ideal communion. It offers a culturally situated teaching resource within an ongoing, contested theological discussion. That limited claim is more defensible than asserting a convergence of African communitarian metaphysics, Thomism, and all social Trinitarian accounts.

Ecclesial Implications and Recommendations

Teaching and Christian Formation

Churches and theological institutions should introduce the Trinity through the biblical relations of Father, Son, and Spirit before using communal illustrations. When an Akan example is employed, the teacher should state both the resemblance and its limit in the same explanation. For example, belonging to a family can illustrate that relationship need not erase identity; it cannot illustrate one numerical divine essence, since family members remain separate beings. A lesson should test understanding by asking learners where the illustration fails, rather than asking them merely to repeat that God resembles a community.

The distinction between intrinsic worth and moral achievement also calls for careful discipline. Members may need correction without losing the respect owed to them. Ephesians 4:15–16 links growth to truth spoken in love, and 1 Corinthians 12:22–26 calls us to care for members who appear weaker. Pastoral formation can therefore require responsibility while resisting humiliation or exclusion based upon social usefulness. This application concerns the treatment of created persons in the redeemed community; it does not make their moral progress an image of development within God.

Leadership and Accountability

Accountable leadership follows most directly from Christ's instruction concerning service and the apostles' teaching about the church. Mark 10:42–45 contrasts domination with the service exemplified by Jesus. First Peter 5:1–3 forbids domineering shepherding. These texts provide grounds for consultation, transparent decisions, and meaningful correction of leaders. Trinitarian confession locates such practices within life received from God, but it

does not supply an organisational chart or prove that one polity uniquely reproduces divine relations.

Church leaders should therefore establish clear avenues for members to raise concerns and for decisions affecting communal welfare to be reviewed. The particular mechanism may differ across episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational structures. The theological criterion is whether authority serves the body under Christ and protects those with less institutional power. Ephesians 2:18–22 further challenges ethnic restriction of belonging because access to the Father is shared through Christ in the Spirit. This warrants practical attention to inclusion without claiming that the article has conducted an empirical study of Ghanaian church leadership.

Recommendations for further Research

Further study should examine how Akan-speaking congregations actually understand communal illustrations of the Trinity. Interviews or classroom studies could test whether a carefully qualified analogy improves comprehension or instead encourages the idea of three cooperating gods. Such research would require an explicit sampling strategy and ethical procedures, which are outside the present conceptual investigation. Comparative work with other Ghanaian traditions should reconstruct each tradition independently rather than extend the Akan account by geographical association.

Additional research should investigate how the distinction between moral status and achievement applies to persons whose age, disability, or social position limits conventional participation. A separate study of authority and gender could examine whether communal practices protect dignity in experience, rather than infer their effects from philosophical ideals. These are recommendations for subsequent investigation, not findings established by this article. They would also provide a concrete test of whether the proposed teaching resource improves pastoral practice.

Conclusion

Gyekye's moderate communitarianism offers a useful distinction between the worth persons possess and the communal processes through which their lives develop. Wiredu's treatment of social formation sharpens the account of human moral agency, while the disagreement between them prevents a simplified appeal to one Akan position. Nkrumah's contrasting premises further show why Ghanaian philosophy cannot be treated as a single ontology. The constructive result is a bounded analogy. Akan accounts can help learners see that relationship need not erase identity, but they cannot establish the unity of divine essence, eternal personal distinction, or inseparable operation. Human interdependence must therefore be distinguished from eternal relational inseparability. Divine being is neither a prior impersonal substrate nor the product of personal cooperation. The article takes the biblical and Nicene confession as its norm; communal philosophy helps interpret it rather than prove its truth.

Christian formation and accountable leadership follow through the church's participation in God's saving work and biblical teaching about service and shared belonging. These

practices provide a setting to test the pedagogical value and pastoral effects of Akan communal illustrations.

References

Aquinas, T. (2017). *Summa theologiae* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.; 2nd rev. ed., Part I, Question 39). New Advent. (Original translation published 1920). https://www.newadvent.org/summa/1039.htm

Ayres, L. (2004). *Nicaea and its legacy: An approach to fourth-century Trinitarian theology*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0198755066.001.0001

Banda, C. (2020). Mediating God's relationality? A trinitarian perichoretic critique of the reliance on anointed objects in African neo-Pentecostalism. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 76*(1), Article a5856. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i1.5856

Bitrus, I. S. (2018). *Community and Trinity in Africa*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315283135

Famakinwa, J. O. (2010). How moderate is Kwame Gyekye's moderate communitarianism? *Thought and Practice, 2*(2), 65–77. https://doi.org/10.5840/tap2010224

Gunton, C. E. (1997). *The promise of Trinitarian theology* (2nd ed.). T&T Clark. https://books.google.com/books?id=5CwcAQAAMAAJ

Gyekye, K. (1995). *An essay on African philosophical thought: The Akan conceptual scheme* (Rev. ed.). Temple University Press. https://tupress.temple.edu/books/an-essay-on-african-philosophical-thought

Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195112252.001.0001

Hasker, W. (2013). *Metaphysics and the tri-personal God*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199681518.001.0001

Holmes, S. R. (2012). *The quest for the Trinity: The doctrine of God in Scripture, history and modernity*. IVP Academic. https://ivpress.com/the-quest-for-the-trinity

Jecker, N. S. (2022). African ethics, respect for persons, and moral dissent. *Theoria, 88*(3), 666–678. https://doi.org/10.1111/theo.12390

Kilby, K. (2000). Perichoresis and projection: Problems with social doctrines of the Trinity. *New Blackfriars, 81*(957), 432–445. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2000.tb06456.x

Kombo, J. H. O. (2007). *The doctrine of God in African Christian thought: The Holy Trinity, theological hermeneutics and the African intellectual culture*. Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004158047.i-298

Majeed, H. M. (2017). An analysis of Kwame Gyekye's conception of 'sunsum' in Akan philosophy. *Ghana Journal of Religion and Theology, 7*(1), 137–150. https://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/handle/123456789/30703

Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and community in African traditional thought. In R. A. Wright (Ed.), *African philosophy: An introduction* (3rd ed., pp. 171–181). University Press of America.

Molefe, M. (2020). Personhood and a meaningful life in African philosophy. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 39*(2), 194–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2020.1774980

Moltmann, J. (1993). *The Trinity and the kingdom: The doctrine of God* (M. Kohl, Trans.). Fortress Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=-W3BngEACAAJ

New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition Bible. (2021). National Council of Churches. https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/New-Revised-Standard-Version-Updated-Edition-NRSVue-Bible/

Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and ideology for decolonization and development with particular reference to the African revolution*. Heinemann. https://search.worldcat.org/title/877390827

Sakupapa, T. C. (2019). The Trinity in African Christian theology: An overview of contemporary approaches. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 75*(1), Article a5460. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i1.5460

Sands, J. (2024). Kwasi Wiredu's moral and social philosophy: Community and the birth of personhood. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics, 47*(1), 75–86. https://jcla.in/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/JCLA-47.1_Spring-2024_Justin-Sands.pdf

Volf, M. (1998). *After our likeness: The church as the image of the Trinity*. Eerdmans. https://www.eerdmans.com/9780802844408/after-our-likeness/

Wiredu, K. (1997). *Cultural universals and particulars: An African perspective*. Indiana University Press. https://iupress.org/9780253210807/cultural-universals-and-particulars/

Wiredu, K. (2009). An oral philosophy of personhood: Comments on philosophy and orality. *Research in African Literatures, 40*(1), 8–18. https://doi.org/10.1353/ral.0.0128

World Council of Churches. (2025, August 15). *Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed*. https://www.oikoumene.org/resources/documents/nicene-constantinopolitan-creed

Zizioulas, J. D. (1985). *Being as communion: Studies in personhood and the church*. St Vladimir's Seminary Press. https://svspress.com/being-as-communion/