Globethics Repository



Transcendent and immanent in the Orthodox theology

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Istodor, Gheorghe
Publisher	Dialogo / Research Center on the Dialogue between Science & Theology (Romania)
Rights	© 2014 RCDST. All rights reserved.
Download date	2026-11-02 21:25:12
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/3978203

DIALOGO 2.2; 45-54 (2015)
CONFERENCES & JOURNAL
doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.4
Constanta, ROMANIA - 2016, March 3
the Dialogue between Philosophy and Theology

Transcendent and Immanent in the Orthodox Theology

Fr. Prof. Gheorghe ISTODOR, PhD
Faculty of Theology . "Ovidius" University
Contanta - Romania
pr_george_istodor@yahoo.com

Abstract: Transcendent and immanent are not valued in Orthodox Theology as simple concepts and they give sense to existence and salvation only in a personalist register. Their existence, both in the plan of eternity, as well as temporary, it is professed by the Church, and in the manner of which they relate and co-exist is the determining factor for understanding and preaching the truth of the hypostatic union in Jesus Christ, real God and real Man. The absolutization of the transcendence and immanence by philosophy or ideology is not accepted by Theology for the harmful consequences with regard to God, man and creation; also, the absolutization of these two lead to the elimination of Christ's deity, reduced to a historical condition, marked either by the genius, or by the powerlessness and instinctuality. From missionary perspective, distortion of the relationship between transcendence and immanence leads to the intensification of the process of secularization, but also to anti-Christian phenomena such as desacralization, indifference and unchristianizing.

Keywords: ***transcendent, immanent, Christology, Christological heresy, hypostatic union, secularization, profane, Christianization, indifference, deism, empiricism, scientific ideology***

I. Preliminaries

Man, the coronation of God's creation is called to an eternal dialogue with his Creator, encompassing both transcendent and immanent because God is equally transcendent and immanent. Thus, man, an immanent creature, carrying the "face" of God, and therefore with existential opening to transcendence, has the opportunity not just to dialog, but also to unite with the Tri-Personal Absolute, which is both transcendent and immanent. Human life becomes therefore a harmonious symbiosis of transcendent and immanent, the two become essential components of human, the presence of the transcendent discovers him and value him as "Anthropos", and the presence of the immanent proves him as a real, living, dynamic, having a historical value person. Both realities outlines the man as having a gift and a call, a free gift that is in accordance with the divine call addressed

eISSN: 2393-1744, cdISSN: 2392-9928
printISSN: 2457-9297, ISSN-L 2392-9928
ISBN 978-80-554-1208-5

to him. We clearly see that man has a purpose – and he is not a hazardous product - has a call that is fulfilled in highlighting the divine gift (cf. the parable of the thalers) and makes the man able to carry out a work with a soteriological value (in relation to God) and with philanthropic value (in relation to his fellow humans). Then, when the ratio between the transcendent and immanent is disrupted, anomalies that affect the man in his very being appear.

II. The ratio between Transcendent and Immanent in the theological plan

In theological perspective, both transcendent and immanent are valued as the incarnation of Jesus Christ, but the problems emerge when trying to define the relations between eternal Person of the Logos and the human nature assumed by Him in the act of incarnation. Thus, we have Christological heresies, and also the Gnostic ones that have greatly troubled the early Church.

A. The Christological heresies - an expression of misunderstanding the reports between transcendent and immanent in Jesus Christ

The Orthodox Christology, as defined in the fourth Council of Chalcedon (451 AD) through four major thesis, are in total opposition with the four major heresies of the time. The four heresies which we will refer briefly are: Aryanism, Apollinarism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism.

Aries, the propagator of the heresy with the same name, lived in the fourth century and denied the divinity of Christ; he was condemned at the first Council of Nicaea (325 AD), conviction reaffirmed at the second Council of Constantinople (381 AD). Thus, Christ's transcendence as God was denied, His immanence being valued as the first perfect creature of God-The Father. One of the fiercest opponents of Arius was Apollinaris of Laodicea (+390), which was also categorized as heretic towards the end of his life. He explicitly states the divinity of Christ, affirming the full transcendence of Christ - God, but without accepting the fullness of His human nature. He argued that in Christ, the eternal Word has replaced the human soul or spirit, although he was claiming the Incarnation of the Word, but in a way that the incarnate was not completely human. His teaching were condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381 AD.

If the fullness of deity and humanity of Christ were clearly defined at the end of fourth century AD, the way they come together and coexist, raises serious problems, in this regard two other heretics, Nestorius and Eutyches of Constantinople (c. 386-450; c. 380-456), have failed. The former was a theologian from Antioch in 428 A.D. Patriarch of Constantinople. He preached against the doctrine "Theotokos," Mother of God, which is attributed to the Blessed Virgin Mary. He supported the Antiochian tradition about Word-Man, being concerned about the emphasis of transcendence, of immutability, and impassibility of eternal Logos, in order to keep the deity safe. He stressed the contrast between God the Word and Jesus the human being; only the latter was born of Mary, suffered and died for us. This new formulation for the early theology was intended to protect the transcendence and impassivity of the divine Word, even if the price paid was the abandoning of the doctrine of incarnation. Through the teaching "theotokos" he states that Jesus – the One who was born from Mary - is the incarnated Word, not just a human being in which the Word lived; He was The one who suffered, died and rose again.

He did these things not as God in His divine nature, but as human. Therefore, Christ is not a conjunction or union between Jesus and the Word, but rather the divine Word who assumes a body animated with a living soul, the Word and his humanity are united to give rise to a single reality, a single hypostasis. This is why St. Cyril of Alexandria spoke of a "hypostatic union" of the Word with His body. St. Cyril believes that God - the Word is impassible, unable to experience pain. However, through the Incarnation, the Word suffered in the flesh as a human being,

doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.4

paradoxically expressed by St. Cyril: "He suffered impassive."

Thus, the incarnation does not mean mutation, any reduction nor addition and does not involve a break in the divine life of the Word. A fourth heresy, of Eutychius, refers to the confusion of the natures in Christ, at the disappearance of the human being which is overwhelmed and annihilated by the divine nature of the Word, this being possible because of insufficient understanding of the orthodox doctrine on the "hypostatic union" [1].

We see, therefore, how the Christological heresies theologically distort the ratio of transcendence and immanence in Christ and the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Logos in the fullness of time (Galatians 4.4) of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary reconcile, harmonize and gives value to both transcendence and immanence for orthodox theology.

B. The Gnostic heresies – a distortion of the reports between transcendence and immanence

The "Christian" Gnosis represented the first big test indeed for the early Church, because its roots and its claims have risked compromising and distorting the whole process of teaching and the ecclesiastical life. Its claims to relate to a mysterious knowledge, esoteric, risks to transform Christianity into a "religion" of mysteries and to make those most affected by "vainglory" to be considered elite, chosen and even concrete manifestations of God's. Gnosis' roots were totally pagan at the origin, therefore we are dealing with an attempt of paganism to Christianity. Therefore we have an anti - Jewish Gnosis from the positions of "Christian" and an anti -Christian Gnosis represented by "New Prophecy" montanist, being an antithesis to the New Testament. The origins of anti - jewish gnosis is found in the Samaro -Syrian gnosis, represented by Simon Magul (opponent of the Apostle Paul) and Menander, with his disciples Saturnin and Basilide.

This gnosis paved the way for the appearance of the Marcionite gnosis who emphasized the antithesis of the Old and New Testament, between the Gospel and the Mosaic Law. The anti -Christian Gnosis was represented by Pentecostalism Samaritan exemplified by Simon from Gitton or Magus who in the same time is preparing the Pentecostalism montanism or the "New Prophecy" [2]. The Marcionite gnosis and Montanism drew a Monarchian reaction, the main problem being the Son of God and the relation with God the Father.

The Montanist had as opponent primarily the monarchians, opponents of the divinity of the Logos, who were also anti-pnevmatic, meaning opponents of the Spirit because it was identified with Montanus or Priscilla. The patripasian monarchianism represented by Asian Praxeos just like Monarchianism hristopashit of Noetic of Smyrna, following gnosis footsteps dochet radicalized by the Marcionite it was rejecting the reality of the Incarnation of the Logos itself.

Lastly, we have the Alexandrian Gnosis, synthesis, represented by Valentin, a disciple of Basilide, contemporary with Gnostic Cerdon and Marcion. If Basilide and Marcion were radically separating the celestial world "pleroma" of the flesh "kenoma" which was considered empty of any substance and bad in itself, Valentin is concerned about finding a connection point of a synthesis between them, reaching to carry out the explanatory principles of the world in three steps: 1) God the Father allocated first principle of all; 2) second being allocated to pleroma of the 30 aeons, Christ and the Holy Spirit being aeons to pleroma;

3) The third floor is allocated to the formless matter generated accidentally by the last eon [3]. Sophia harmonize transcendent and immanent in the pseudo-theology, the gnosis either defending strenuously God's transcendence rejecting the divinity of the Son and the Spirit, but also the reality of the incarnation, either fails in an immanent sordid, identifying God, the Logos or the Spirit in the controversial person of the Gnostic, but in most cases we

are witnessing a harmful pseudo-religious syncretism of transcendence and immanence of the "Christian" gnosis.

C. Catholicism and the trying to reconcile the transcendence and immanence in Christ

The Roman Catholic Church has affirmed the full transcendence and immanence of Christ the Logos, the Christological dogma formulating in the ecumenical councils - 325, 381, 431, and 451 - with the contribution of the Christian East and West. But with time, the philosophical composition became increasingly larger and more influential, so that was reached proclaiming the "spirit of truth" of Albert the Great, Magister of Father of Scholastics, St. Thomas Aquinas. He argued that there is a truth up into the sky and other on Earth, a fact of theologians and another one of the philosophers. The theory of "spirit" had dramatic consequences in proclaiming the Pope as the vicar of Christ on Earth, viz. a replacement, which it has resulted in the dogma of Papal infallibility at the first Vatican Council (1869-1870), Pope being declared infallible when speaking "ex cathedra" = officially speaking. Saint Justin Popovici speaks about the connection between this event and the appearance to the theory of "death of God", a causal explanation of why only 12 years away from the Vatican I appears Nietzsche's theory.

The idea is clear: God is "dead" as long as it has a substituted on Earth in the person of the Pope as the vicar of Christ, receiving divine attributes as well as the infallibility [4], this came to a conclusion in the occidental space between the transcendence of God and his absence of creation, confusion generated by rejection of the palamite teaching, about the uncreated energies, that could explain both transcendence and immanence of God, in an appropriate way with the foundation revealed. The absence of God from creation was completed in the Occidental conscience of Pope the Infallible. We see therefore that in Catholicism, the report between transcendent and immanent with regard to God is disrupted by the appearance of new dogmas such as the papal infallibility.

D. Protestantism - the absolutization of transcendence with regard to God

In the protestant doctrine God becomes a concept, even if in the theology of the Protestantism representatives He is defined as a person. Thus, Karl Barth speaks of God as an independent person, his vision to God being directed against the so-called natural theology about God. Barth challenges its connection with God through revelation and identifies it with German pantheism practiced in the footsteps of Spinoza and Hegel theologians-philosophers like Schleiermacher, Ritschl or Rothe, who, each in their own way, were identifying the Deity with the universe, society or with each individual at their own religious experience.

The natural theology appointed by Barth is the theology of God immersed in the immanence of our world, is the theology of human self-affirmation which is conceived as identical with God and having dominion over God. For Barth, the personal character of God is the ultimate guarantee against the "natural theology" by personal meaning a Trinitarian God. The alternative to "immanence" of God in nature for Barth is "divine transcendence" in the sense of keeping it "majestic" above the world and impenetrable of human reason. The church should in this regard to promote it as quite separate from the world, eliminating the risk of being confused with the world. The consequence of this vision is the location of God in a "transcendent" isolation so sharp, that it becomes useless to the world, the Church and man, although Barth rejects this reality by saying that God isolated in His absolute transcendence becomes only an idol. On the other hand, God created the world through Christ as distinct from Him who is in a relationship, understanding the "relational" character of God.

Therefore, according to Barth, God is not "identical" to the world-as pantheistic affirms the natural theology - but not separated from the world- as mysticism suggests - but

doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.4

in relation with the world even though this relation becomes necessary, limiting God. For Barth, this relationship with God and the world becomes both the condition of the existence of the world and to God; we are talking about a necessary relationship which is more obvious in Christology. Barth understands the mystery of Christ as the fundamental relationship between the transcendent God and the man Jesus as a symbol of man in general, of human finitude.

The existence and knowledge of God depend on his correlative union with the world (cosmology) and with the "man" Jesus (Christology); in addition to these correlations with finitude - the man Jesus is aloof to God and belongs to finitude -God practically does not exist, the man Jesus becomes just the indestructible relationship model of God with man in general. In conclusion, for Barth, God is absolute, transcendent, man cannot know anything of what he is Himself, but only that he is in a relationship with man and the world. This slippage with regard to God, transcendence and immanence from the reformed Protestantism, led to a real craze within the so-called liberal Protestant theologians, which by the theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the promoter of Christianity without religion, decrees a theology of the death of God, without any link to the teaching revealed of the Orthodox Church, where transcendence and immanence are completely eliminated with God himself [5].

The reform opened "Pandora's box", scattering Christianity in countless churches and denominations as it can be seen both in neo-Protestant movements, either with esoteric sects-occult Foundation, those of human potential or those of Oriental origin. The neo-religious phenomenon speaks of transcendent absolutization - speaking of God - or the immanent. An example of absolutization within the transcendent is exemplified in the advent of groups in which "Time of Church" meaning the interval between the first and second coming of Christ takes place without Chris after his resurrection exalted by God the father. We are talking about a absolutization of transcendence in Christ and a cancellation of Its immanence, the lack of a real Savior is real generating waterfall calculations with respect to the date in which the Savior will return at Parousia [6]. On the other hand, we have a absolutization of the immanence of the Savior within groupings "human potential", but especially within the Oriental sects, that being pantheist or humanities, combines transcendent and immanent identifying them into a single reality claimed by the founder of each sect, as the reincarnation of Christ, be it the continuator of his "illumination" and man's release from Samsara. According to Oriental new sects, "Maya", we have the illusion of co-existence of transcendent and immanent about God [7]. At the same time we have a absolutization of the transcendent in the esoteric- occult sects because it updates the old heretical gnosis from the primary period of the Church as a modern neo - Gnosis which distorts the teaching about God and Christ [8].

E. The Orthodox perspective

Orthodoxy has always valued both God's transcendence and immanence, this fact being reflected in the triadology dogmatic formulations and Christological formulations. Formulating the teaching with foundation revealed on the Trinity showed the importance of both transcendence and immanence of God. The theological plan is as important as the iconomic properties of God as are valued equally with predicates. There is neither overrated nor immanence nor transcendence, the personal nature of God - the Holy Trinity gives value both to transcendence and its creation which can and must be transfigured. The Orthodox Christological dogma also valorizes in Christ both transcendence and immanence, Jesus being both eternal Logos and the one who assumes the history of salvation through the Incarnation. Through the combination of the four Caledonian adverbs - undivided, indivisible, unmixed, unchanged - it shows how the transcendence (deity) joins Hypostatic with immanence (humanity) in Jesus Christ the Lord,

without being favored at the expense of any other detriment, the incarnation being real not apparent and committed by Logos at the fullness of time (Galatians 4,4), after was committed to eternity in the "bosom" of the Holy Trinity. Again, to dispel the confusion that come within the scope of "non-Christian" religious, we make it clear that in the incarnation act, Jesus is not an "avatar" of the Divine Logos, but the Logos Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier human that descends to deify man. Therefore Orthodoxy is delimited by the extremes that absolutizes both immanence and transcendence of God. Orthodoxy reproaches scholars the unilateral emphasize of transcendence immutable to God, as a consequence granting a first logical divine being of Trinity persons, the divine being is and will remain incommunicable because of their rejection to the doctrine of uncreated divine energies, doctrine that allows Orthodox theology to affirm, concurrent with divine transcendence, an immanent presence in the world of God through his works. Likewise, Orthodoxy rejects any substitute against Christ and rejects, therefore, claims of people's infallibility.

Equally, Orthodoxy is delimited by the protestant vision which absolutizes transcendence of a God whose existence is conditional on relations with the world and man. Orthodoxy exceeds in the same time the ancient dualism spirit-matter, which made it impossible to accept the incarnation of the spirit and the transfiguration of matter by it. Thus, Christological orthodoxy rejects the Christological distinctions made in the West, between a Christ of glory and a "Jesus of history" but also the existence of a Christology of "up" and "down". Lastly, Orthodoxy rejects the total immanence as it happens in the sectarian size of oriental inspiration and states that transcendence and immanence have equal value to God, man, world, by this avoiding both the banishment of God in a state of isolation "transcendent" and valuing the matter considered bad and impossible to be transfigured and to avoid ideology dangers naturalist-materialist that proclaims the existence of the only manifestation in the material dimension of creation, leading to pragmatism, desecration and de-Christianization. By teaching the uncreated Palamite energies, Orthodoxy not only reconciles transcendent with immanent but gives value to both aspects of existence.

III. The Ratio between transcendent and immanent in philosophical plan

Philosophy operates in her speech with the binomial transcendent- immanent, these realities having another meaning to theology. If ancient philosophy identify and value the transcendent at the root cause of things, being either One or Multiple, she remained largely dependent on immanent because most of the identified causes to explain the world were eminently materials.

Modern philosophy relate differently to the transcendent and immanent, the relationship between them, therefore there is a tendency to absolutization of either transcendent or immanent or to deny both in the nihilistic perspective of "philosophy".

A. Deism - transcendent triumph in philosophy

Appeared during the 17th century, flourishing in the next, he goes off in the XIXth century. It is a negative, destructive criticism of supernatural revelation, with its origins in the pagans' writers like Celsus or Porphyrius. As a philosophical movement, Deism has borrowed the theist concept of God and interpreted in terms of a mechanistic model according to the new scientific insights of Bacon.

The Deism theological antecedents are Pelagianism, Socinianism and Arianism. Deism emphasizes the perfect character of man, denies the Trinity in favor of the unity of God, and Christ's divinity was reduced or negated altogether. The Deists believe that God is the Creator of all, a premium cause beyond the natural world, between Him and the world

doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.4

existing an ontological separation [9]. The anti-supernaturalism of the deism would be based on the nature of God which is unchanged on the uniformity of the laws of nature and on their inviolability. The Deist concept regarding God is unitarian, excludes the possibility of Revelation and incarnation. God's indifference towards the world leads to limitation - as boundness and his power. But mostly it deprives God of love toward man and his own caring toward the entire creation. By emphasizing God's unilateral transcendence, deism has contributed greatly to the emergence and the amplification of the phenomenon of secularisation, which leads to human desacralisation, to the process of autonomy in relation to God, that generates the dissolution of man's religious universe and builds a sinful universe, where violence, murder or pornography lead to a perversion of the soul and body. To these are added the indifference, negativism and, human conviction to a "prison" purely immanent. Yet it ranks man outside of God and Orthodox Christian theology [10].

B. Empiricism - the triumph of immanence in philosophy

After the absolutization of the transcendent in philosophy through deism, it was reached to the opposite extreme through empiricism as a counterweight to rationalism of XVII century. Empirical knowledge is focused on gaining knowledge in the process of practical activities of man. Francis Bacon believes that people should discover the phenomenal causes by inductive method, using analysis, comparison, observation and experiment. It is a philosophical doctrine of testing the experiment and found that human knowledge derived exclusively from the senses and experience. Empiricism rejects the in-born ideas of man and challenges any knowledge without reference to experience.

He is considered the promoter of modern scientific method which absolutizes observation at the expense of intuition or faith. Names associated with empiricism include Thomas Hobbes [11], Francis Bacon, John Locke [12], George Berkeley and David Hume. Among these, Hobbes and Locke connected with deism, and in the same time, Locke is considered in the same time a basic representative of sensualism. In this regard, he believes that outside of our senses there is no true knowledge. His fundamental idea is that there is nothing, if it wouldn't have been existed first in our senses. Therefore he absolutizes the senses in the extent that he affirms that outside the senses, there is no knowledge and reason can only systematize knowledge. As for the connection with deism, Thomas Hobbes is the promoter of the deism materialism. Even though he declared himself as Christian, he was epicurist in his epistemology and materialist in his metaphysics.

He argued the impossibility of conceiving God and affirmed that God's name is invoked only to induce indirectly. Locke's connection with deism refers to the affirmation of deist conception of God as opposed to the traditional Trinitarian doctrine. But he denied the deity of Christ, like most deists. Here is a clear example of disruption of the relationship between transcendent and immanent in philosophical plan, through empiricism are accessible only the total immanent with consequences to the theological level.

C. Nietzsche or the denial of divine transcendence and immanence

Through the empiricist "philosophies" it was prepared the way of philosophical negativity concerning God. Before Nietzsche, the romantics envisioned death of God, according to Călinescu Matei. He finds the disposal of the name of God among the "theologians". Paul Tillich prefers to talk about "the Foundation of our existence" including the study materials in some theological schools of discipline "theothanalogy", i.e. theology of 'the death of God'. Before Nietzsche, L. Feurbach argued that the nature of God is nothing else but the expression of natural feeling. Further, he defines religion as actually being human self-consciousness of man, which, in an uninspiring way, calls it "God".

Nietzsche as father of postmodernism exposes his theory of God's death in the form of a parable in which a madman makes finding of death (murder) of God in his dialogue with the crowd, ironically and laughing affirms the death of God.

Through this parable, Nietzsche expresses the characteristic of nihilism which was typical of those times, the killing of God would represent chaos in the human soul and transition to a new era, the postmodern one as a spiritual fatality. The road opened by the nietzschean nihilism is continued by the negativity of new generations that accuse the old lack of spirituality and authenticity and too much of conventional thinking. This way is continued by Emil Cioran, which would have raised through his skeptical-nihilism ideas against sterility and superficiality at romanians and wants a culture of despair, experiencing the frantic, rampaging, which is carried out through barbarism. It would have been a "spiritual attitude" of negation that builds the "new man" free, harmonious, creative, inherent from the balance of spiritual force, along with the destruction of the "old man", i.e. the one of Christian tradition. We see the link between Nietzsche's Superman and the "new man" of the Christian deconstruction on negativistic foundation. Therefore we have an elimination sample of transcendent and immanence regarding God, looking from philosophical positions, if we consider atheism, nihilism, negativism or skepticism as philosophers [13].

IV. Transcendent and immanent in the sphere of ideological sciences

With the Renaissance, radical changes were made within Western society on religion, God, church or man. The Christian God has been denied or sentenced to a marginalization "transcendent," religion and the Church began to be assimilated to the private sphere, human's subjectivity, not being recognized as worthy institutions to conduct public activities. The Church's place and of the theologian in the modern and postmodern society has been taken by the scholar, as the exponent of science that began to recant the tutelage of religiousness and Church's, becoming increasingly more autonomous. The banishment of God in an illusory transcendence through deism means the succumb for the Western - as Nietzsche proclaimed and in the same time, made possible the triggering phenomenon of secularization. So it came to the implementation of "the old scientific paradigm" that will transform the science into ideology and will bring science into a cruel bondage of four ideologies: materialism, naturalism, atheism and scientism.

This 'scientific' paradigm will be a completely deterministic, materialistic and atheistic, and in her will reign hazard, the absurd and the non-sense. In the ideologized science, the religiousness has no longer value and God becomes an "unnecessary" hypothesis (La Place) [14], a "delusion" (Richard Dawkins) [15], being replaced by a "daimon" - omniscient spirit, purely theoretical that knew all future and all past. Dramatic changes are taking place at the level of life which is seen as an "improbable accident" and for man who appears only as an evolutionary process in the Darwinian sense, through the struggle for survival, through natural selection and by adapting to the environment.

If religiosity is accepted in a society having as highlights the ideological sciences, is a pantheistic type, God is accepted more, as an impersonal "power" that does not intervene in the secularization of human life. Secularization means refusal of transcendence and proclaiming materialistic-naturalistic immanence as the only reality. This phenomenon has consequences, both in the relationship of man with God, as well as in Christological plan.

Savior Jesus Christ is no longer the God-Man in which the transcendent (deity) and immanent (humanity) are joined in a real way, but is desecrated, devoid of his divinity, in the best case being presented as a man of genius, a moral model, in unfortunate cases being portrayed as a decadent, a slave of the passions

doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.4

and of the bodily infirmities. Here's where it was, from a position of majestic God transcendence, to absolute degrading immanence and unthinkable to theology. This dimension of ideological sciences remains a major challenge for the contemporary man, even if it is within the sciences of matters. In the last century, Carter formulated the principle anthropic which values man and appeal to the existence of a Creator of the universe.

Conclusion

We analyzed the role of transcendence and immanence in human life, both in relation to God and in relationship with others or with the rest of its creation. We have also seen how important is the valuation of transcendence and immanence and also how harmful is the unilateral absolutization of an obvious reality that leads to offset the other. Lack of understanding and responsible management of the two realities, but also the reports between them leads - as we have demonstrated - to a fault, especially in a religiously plan of the contemporary man.

Speaking missionary, the ratio between transcendent and immanent has a particular importance because it involves certain facets with major impact in the Christian life. The absolutization of transcendence has negative consequences at the level of teaching as well as the level of the missionary life of man. At dogmatic level, this absolutization removes the mystery of the Trinity, removes the deity of Christ The Lord and condemns God to an isolationism that actually cancels deity. The plan of missionary life, this absolutization leads to a devaluation of creation material in the Gnostic manner, but also to a lack of missionary dynamism which is replaced by a passive state of contemplation pseudo-religious, man being thus deprived in the status of being a partner in word and deed of the living God.

On the other hand, the absolutization of the immanent has consequences in the same plans. Thus, at dogmatic level it opens the path of a "theology" of death of God, but also of a nihilistic perspective about God, Which, if not denied, it is depersonalized, limited in His omnipotence and incapable of being involved in man's life conducted in coordinating strictly materials. The deity of the Savior is eliminated as well, Jesus Christ being levied only on the size of humanity and Its historicity - in the happiest case as a man of genius and moral model. Missionary speaking, this absolutization has catastrophic effects because it condemns man to be an eminently pragmatic entity coming from hazard and going towards nonentity. It also exacerbates in man just the size of the action, the man becomes a social being, without the possibility of contemplation and of a spiritual life, through this man loses his "Anthropos" ontological characteristic. Furthermore, it is removed, the theological dimension of man, and its call is reduced only to the bodily and mental life of man. We clearly see that any form of absolutization of the two realities lead to a distortion of existence and life of God - the Holy Trinity and of man - the Crown of his creation. Equally, the distortion of the report between transcendent and immanent has major consequences in human's life, both at the level of the relationship with God, as well as the relationship with his peers. In conclusion, the orthodox theology and the Church's mission value transcendent and immanent and offers as a model of relationship between the two realities of Jesus Christ-true God and true Man.

References

[1] See in this regard Les Anathematismes de Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie, "Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastiques", 7, 1906; Anthony N.S. Lane, Cele douăsprezece anatematisme ale lui Chiril: un exerciţiu de moderaţie teologică (engl. The twelve anathemas of Cyril: a moderate theological exercise), în "Erezie şi Logos. Contribuţii româno-britanice la o teologie a postmodernităţii", Bucureşti: Editura Anastasia, 1996, pp. 11-13; 16-18, 32-35.

[2] See Pr. Adrian Niculcea, *Systematic History of Trinitarian dogma*, Iaşi: Publishing Vasiliana '98, 2010, pp. 31-64.

[3] See J. Lebreton, *Histoire de dogme de la Saint Trinité. De origins au concile de Nicée*, p. 249-250; D. Barreile, *Gnosticisme art in Dictionnaire de Teologié Catolique*, vol. VI B, col. 1448; idem, Basilide, art cit., vol. II A, col. 473.

[4] See Iustin Popovici, *Omul şi Dumnezeul-Om*, Sibiu: Publising Deisis, 1997.

[5] See Pr. Prof. Dr. Adrian Niculcea, *The concept of God, Protestantism and Orthodoxy and its consequences for sacramental life of the Church, being master practice,* pp. 1-11.

[6] See Pr. Prof. Dr. George Istodor, *Christian sectarian phenomeno*n, Do Minor Publishing, Bucharest, 2009, pp. 106-117; Charles Wheeling, Armageddon now, " Jamison " 1992, p. 324; Ralph Larson, Apostasy is the Issue, vol. I- II, Cerrystone Press, 1993.

[7] See Pr. Prof. Dr. George Istodor, *The non-Christian sectarian phenomenon,* Do Minor Publishing, Bucharest, 2009, pp. 35-145; Jean Vernette, XXI century will be mystical or it will not be at all, translated by Cristina Jinga, Zoe Petre foreword, afterword by Adrian Ene, Corinthian Publishing, Bucharest, 2003; Bryan Wilson, Les religieuses sects, Paris: Publisher Hachette, 1970.

[8] J. Gordon Melton, *The Encyclopedia of American Religions*, vol. II, McGrath Publishing, Wilmington, 1978; Richard Bergeron, *Le Cortège des Fous de Dieu. Un chrétienscrute les nouvelles religion*s, Montréal: Paulines et Apostolat des Editions, 1982, p. 187.

[9] John Orr, *English Deism: Its Roots and Its Fruits*, Publisher, Literary Licensing, Whitefish, MT, 2011,p. 61; Norman Geisler, Christian Apologetics, Wheaton: Romanian Missionary Publishing, 1995.

[10] Archimandrite Assist. Dr. Teofil Tia, *Photography values : christianisation contemporary Europe, the " spirituality and consumerism in the united Europe "*, Working Paper International Symposium organized by the Faculty of Theology of the University " 1 December 1918 " Alba Iulia 26 to 27 April 2004, Publisher reunification, Alba Iulia, 2004, p. 438-439; Pr. Univ. Dr. Valer Bel, in *the context of Community Confessor in the world context secularized and globalized world,* in the Symposium " Modernism, Postmodernism and Religion ". Constanta May 2005; Iasi: Publishing Vasiliana '98, 2005 pp. 33-40.

[11] See Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, cap. 1 şi 3, Create Space Independent Victoria, BC, Canada: Publishing Platform, 2009.

[12] John Locke, *The Reasonableness of Christianity: As Delivered in the Scriptures,* Intr., ed., comm. and annot. by G. W. Ewing, Regnery, Washington, D.C, 1998, 160.

[13] Matei Matei Călinescu,, *modernity, modernism and modernization : Modern variations on themes* in " Postmodernism - philosophical openings ", Cluj -Napoca: Ed. Daria, 1995, p. 67.

[14] See the dialogue between an atheist French astronomer Laplace and Napoleon III.

[15] Richard Dawkins, *God - a delusion*, Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House, 2013.