## God’s Transcendence and Immanence

God’s transcendence means that He is distinct from His creation. Unlike the pantheistic worldview, God is not identical with the universe, but He exists independent of it. On the other hand, God’s immanence is His nearness to the created order. He intervenes in the affairs of the world, and people can have a personal relationship with Him.

The ideas of “transcendence” and “immanence,” though, are not exactly opposite conceptions. The question of God’s transcendence concerns His essential being – that He is not a constituent part of His creation. The question of “immanence,” however, deals with His “distance” from us. He does not isolate Himself from creation, but is very near to us.

Classic Scripture passages that express both God’s transcendence and His immanence are Ephesians 4:6: “One God and Father of all who is over all and through all and in all,” and Isaiah 57:15: “For thus says the high and exalted One who lives forever, whose name is Holy, ‘I dwell {on} a high and holy place, and {also} with the contrite and lowly of spirit.’”[[1]](#footnote-1)

### А. God’s Transcendence

**1. Definition and Biblical Testimony**

As stated above, the doctrine of God’s transcendence states that He differs from His creation. We can further define it as “the attribute of being above and independent of the universe.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

We list here several specific Bible passages that confirm God’s transcendent nature.[[3]](#footnote-3) In all these references, God is shown as distinct from the material world. This is especially highlighted in the book of the prophet Isaiah:

- Thus says Yahweh, "Heaven is My throne and the earth is My footstool. Where then is a house you could build for Me? And where is a place that I may rest? (Isa 66:1).

- In the year of King Uzziah's death I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, lofty and exalted, with the train of His robe filling the temple (Isa 6:1).

- It is He who sits above the circle of the earth (Isa 40:22).

In addition, Isaiah chapter 40, verses 19-22, stresses that God differs from idols. Since idols are a part of creation, a transcendent God must differ from them.

Other biblical books testify of God’s transcendence as well:

- But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain You (1 Kin 8:27).

- Yahweh is high above all nations; His glory is above the heavens. Who is like Yahweh our God, who is enthroned on high (Ps 113:4-5).

- To You I lift up my eyes, O You who are enthroned in the heavens! (Ps 123:1).

- And He was saying to them, "You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world” (Jn 8:23).

Cairns makes several comments on transcendence.[[4]](#footnote-4) God’s personal name Yahweh, for example, indicates His distinct personhood. In addition, several of His attributes, such as love, holiness, and authority, require the quality of transcendence. Moreover, only a transcendent God can create.

Erickson investigates the question of God’s transcendence from the perspective of His “distance” from the world.[[5]](#footnote-5) He feels that we should not take descriptions of the Lord being “over” or “above” the earth literally. Since the earth is round, such descriptions are archaic. Additionally, since God is an infinite, eternal spirit, He has no specific “location” in the time-space dimension.

Erickson concurs with Søren Kierkegaard and Karl Barth that the difference between God and humans is not quantitative, but qualitative.[[6]](#footnote-6) God exists in a different dimension. Yet, He is not distant from us, but very near. His “closeness” to us is to be understood as nearness in another mode of existence. In Erickson’s words, “While God is ontologically distinct from the universe and the human race, he is influentially present,” i.e., He exerts His influence on the world.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Other writers attempt to describe God’s transcendence in non-spatial categories as well. Tozer speaks of the “distance” between God and creation not as physical separation, but as spiritual condition. In other words, separation from God is the result of sin. However, it seems that Tozer is confusing the categories of God’s holiness and His transcendence.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Helm claims that God’s transcendence implies dependence of the creature on God. The universe is “distinct” from the Lord not only in essence, but also in the sense of being dependent on the One, on whom it depends for its existence.[[9]](#footnote-9) Yet again, we see a confusion of categories. God’s transcendence concerns distinction in essence, while dependence on God involves His role as Sustainer (see chapter 12).

**2. Extreme Positions on Transcendence**

Some thinkers emphasize God’s transcendence to the point of compromising His immanence. For example, Deism proposes that God created the world and then abandoned it and no longer has any dealings with it. People need no special revelation from God. It is thought below His dignity to communicate directly with His creatures.[[10]](#footnote-10) The Deist Edward Herbert of Cerbury (1583-1648) claimed that general revelation provides all that we need to know about God, namely: (1) there is a God, (2) people must worship Him, (3) good works please Him, (4) people must repent of sin, and (5) God will reward or punish our behavior, either in this life through the action of natural laws, or in the afterlife.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Deism gathers support from scientific discoveries. In the Middle Ages, people believed that angels directed the course of nature. With the dawn of the Enlightenment, though, convictions changed – natural processes are ruled by natural laws. So then, Deism considers divine intervention in the natural world unnecessary. Consequently, God’s interventions in human affairs are no longer anticipated.

Another worldview that stresses God’s transcendence at the expense of His immanence is apophatic theology.[[12]](#footnote-12) We describe and evaluate this school of thought in detail in chapter one of this volume. According to this teaching, God is unfathomable and is beyond all verbal description or mental conception. God’s essence cannot be expressed in human words. Therefore, advocates of apophatism insist that one must not speak of what God *is*, but of what He *is not*. They describe God not by affirmation, but by negation.

Pelikan notes that for Gregory Palamas, even description by negation is not adequate.[[13]](#footnote-13) In the same spirit, Pseudo-Dionysius writes,

But when making the predications and abstractions of things after It, we neither predicate, nor abstract from It ; since the all-perfect and uniform Cause of all is both above every definition and the pre-eminence of Him, Who is absolutely freed from all and beyond the whole, is also above every abstraction.[[14]](#footnote-14)

However, defenders of apophatic theology do not totally reject God’s immanence, but insist that He must be approached not in a rational fashion, but a mystical one. He maintains His ontological “distance” from humans, yet at the same time makes Himself available for fellowship through His so-called “uncreated energies.” Although God’s essence is totally transcendent and unapproachable, He connects with people through His self-manifestation in the form of His “uncreated energies.”

Bloesch adds that some mystics emphasize God’s transcendence to the point of encroaching on His triune nature. This means that God manifests Himself as a “Trinity” only in His “immanent form.” Pseudo-Dionysius represents this view in the East, and Meister Eckhart in the West.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Bloesch properly assesses that such thinking derives from Neoplatonism. He comments on the mystical approach to knowing God:

The Christian mystic sought to maintain the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, but by envisaging God in Neoplatonic terms as a motionless, undifferentiated unity they were not able to preserve the biblical conception of a God who actively works in history and identifies with our pain and sorrow. To find the pure god, they said, we need to rise above words and images, time and materiality, to the realm of pure spirit.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Another adherent of “hyper-transcendence” in the West was Rudolph Otto (1869-1937).[[17]](#footnote-17) Although he did not reject God’s immanence, he nonetheless laid great stress on God’s uniqueness. He felt that the knowledge of God is better attained not through reason, but with a direct, inner experience with the “numinous” – Otto’s designation for Deity. In his view, “A God who is understood is no God.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

The concept of the “numinous” corresponds to the idea of “holiness” and is defined as “that which is wholly *other* from the mundane, separate, set apart, unapproachable.”[[19]](#footnote-19) For Otto, experience with the numinous is foundational for the religious life. The numinous is also called the *mysterium* *tremendum*, or “the tremendous or mighty, but mysterious and indescribable power – which we can experience but cannot articulate or analyze.”[[20]](#footnote-20)An experience with the numinous, on the one hand, terrifies the worshipper, but on the other hand, strangely attracts and fascinates him/her, producing a paradoxical reaction.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Karl Barth offers another extreme perspective on God’s transcendence. He felt that God was so “other” that a person cannot know Him or relate to Him unless God first of all takes the initiative to reveal Himself to that individual.[[22]](#footnote-22) In Barth’s opinion, “Through God alone may God be known.”[[23]](#footnote-23) Mueller expounds Barth’s thought, “Only God can reveal himself. He alone determines when, where, and how he will manifest himself; moreover, he defines the conditions under which he may be known by man.”[[24]](#footnote-24) Consequently, God is “Revealer, Revelation, and Revealedness.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

In Barth’s thought, people have no idea at all how God might reveal Himself until that moment of revelation occurs. As fallen creatures, our reason is not in proper condition to know God truly. Nonetheless, through incarnation of the Son and the work of the Holy Spirit, God has transcended that barrier to make Himself known.

Barth is ready to admit that God does reveal Himself through the Bible, preaching and the sacraments. However, that revelation comes only when the Spirit “quickens” or “makes alive” those words or that experience in the hearts of the recipients. As far as general revelation goes, Barth ardently insists that people cannot accurately perceive God in nature or by unenlightened human reason alone. In Barth’s thought, “What is important is not what man thinks about God, but what God thinks about man.”[[26]](#footnote-26)

Therefore, Barth held to a “limited immanence.” Knowledge of God is available only when God is pleased to bestow it. Outside of these special, personal encounters, people cannot know the transcendent God.

Next, we can examine the views of a contemporary of Karl Barth – Rudolf Bultmann.[[27]](#footnote-27) His understanding of God’s transcendence approximates Barth’s. Yet, they differ in that Bultmann felt that people’s inability to properly perceive God was not so much because of human depravity, but from God’s transcended excellence. He “stands over and against the material order.” Bultmann “stresses the great distance between God and humanity.” He adds, “God is so great that we cannot know him or speak of him sensibly at all.”[[28]](#footnote-28)

 Therefore, the knowledge of God again is attained not through written revelation, but only by means of a personal encounter with Him. Bultmann asserts that this is how the biblical writers knew the Lord. They expressed their existential experience with Him in the form of myths about the Lord Jesus, which do not necessarily correspond to historical events. Consequently, when we study Scripture we must “demythologize” the story to find its true inspirational value.

Although we will offer refutation of all these theories in our conclusion, it is worth raising an immediate objection to Bultmann’s views. It is clear that Bultmann seeks to emphasize God’s transcendence over creation. Yet, at the same time, He rejects the supernatural features of Scripture, assigning them to myth. He feels the miracle stories of the Bible are imports from ancient, magical worldviews. What better way, though, to accent the Lord’s transcendence than to acknowledge that He works in supernatural ways? Bultmann limits God’s actions to the natural plane, which actually undermines His transcendence.

### B. God’s Immanence

**1. Definition and Biblical Testimony**

In the wake of the Enlightenment and as a reaction to the emergence of Deism, theologians and philosophers swung into the opposite extreme and embraced liberalism, which focused on God’s immanence. McConnell observes, “It was inevitable that, after the old deism had swung to one extreme, the new immanence would swing to the other.”[[29]](#footnote-29) He also comments that promoters of God’s transcendence lived by a heavenly hope, while defenders of immanence focused on earthly life. The former “acted as if they could not find God here,” while the latter “act as if we could find him nowhere else.”[[30]](#footnote-30)

Millard Erickson provides the following definition of immanence: “By this we mean God’s presence and activity within nature, human nature, and history.”[[31]](#footnote-31) Bloesch shares the insight that God’s immanence is not a necessary feature of His nature, but rather is an act of His will. Just as He was under no compulsion to create the world, but did so according to His good pleasure, He draws near to creation to fellowship with it not because He has to, but because He wants to.[[32]](#footnote-32)

Many Scripture passages relate that the Lord is near to His creatures and is actively participating in the affairs of this world.[[33]](#footnote-33)

- Yahweh is near to all who call upon Him (Ps 145:18).

- You are near, O Yahweh (Ps 119:151).

- In whose hand is the life of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind? (Job 12:10).

- “Can a man hide himself in hiding places so I do not see him?” declares Yahweh. “Do I not fill the heavens and the earth?” declares Yahweh (Jer 23:24).

- (He) upholds all things by the word of His power (Heb 1:3)

- …that they would seek God, if perhaps they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and exist, as even some of your own poets have said, “For we also are His children” (Acts 17:27-28).

Other passages speak of people’s dependence on God for their very existence (Job 34:14-15; Ps 104:29-30). The Bible also relates that God is among His people (Isa 63:11; Hag 2:5) and that He personally cares for His creation (Matt 5:45; 6:25-30; 10:29-30).

McConnell clarifies that immanence can be understood in various senses.[[34]](#footnote-34) One can be “close” to another in different ways: emotionally, physically, or socially. In addition, people can experience intimacy with the Lord at various times and in various ways. One often experiences His nearness especially during prayer, worship, or the study of His Word. Moreover, God is especially “close” to those who keep His commandments (Jn 14:21-23). In addition, McConnell comments that the Lord’s presence seems especially near when He manifests His power in blessing or chastisement. Finally, he makes the interesting observation that when Jesus healed the woman with a hemorrhage (Mk 5:25ff), many people were physically near Him, brushing by Him, but only her touch of faith released His power on her behalf.

**2. Extreme Positions on Immanence**

As we witnessed in the case of God’s transcendence, His immanence is also at times taken to an extreme. The classic example is pantheism, which totally rejects the idea of a transcendent Supreme Being. Pantheism teaches that God is one with the universe. The universe is simply a manifestation of His being. God, in essence, is not distinct from the universe.

Another example is the theological movement oddly called “the death of God.”[[35]](#footnote-35) According to this view, God was once transcendent, but consciously chose to enter into His creation, become “absorbed” in it, and ceased to exist apart from it. In other words, God committed “transcendental suicide” and now only exists immanently in creation. He did not cease to exists, of course, but just forfeited His transcendent nature. Borden Brown describes this idea in the following way: “Then we come to a natural which roots in the supernatural, and a supernatural whose methods are natural.”[[36]](#footnote-36)

Some advocates of this view theorize that God abandoned His transcendence when He became incarnate in Jesus Christ. From that time on, He now only exists in His immanent form as part of the world. Expressions of religious devotion to a transcendent God, like worship, prayer, ceremony, and the like, are thought meaningless. A more appropriate form of “worship” is to take part in the improvement of the world and human society.

This system requires a total reworking of Christian faith.[[37]](#footnote-37) The kingdom of God is understood as “merely the realization of man’s latent possibilities,” unbelief is the “inability to believe in our own opportunities,” and sin is refusal “to follow our own hopes.” Salvation is “not from God, but through pulling our boots on.”

A well-known but poorly understood figure in the history of Christianity is Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whom Hitler executed near the end of World War II.[[38]](#footnote-38) Bonhoeffer’s passion was to apply Christian faith to practical, everyday life. He strove to tear down the division between religious and secular aspects of life. He was disturbed that the Church gave such little attention to world affairs. He feared that society saw the Church as irrelevant.

Working off the model of Christ’s incarnation, Bonhoeffer taught that the Church should exist for the world, to serve it. The Church is a point of contact between Christ and human society. Robertson describes Bonhoeffer’s views, “The church is only a section of humanity, in which Christ has taken form… the church is humanity in Christ, incarnate, sentenced and awakened to new life.”[[39]](#footnote-39) Furthermore, “The supernatural must be found in the natural and the holy must be found in the secular.”[[40]](#footnote-40) Finally, “Christianity is not interested specially in religion, but in the whole of human life. Christ calls men, not to be religious, but to be men.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Cairns feels that Bonhoeffer lost the conception of God’s transcendence. Bonhoeffer himself states,

This concern of Jesus for others (is) the experience of transcendence… Our relation to God (is) not a religious relationship to a supreme Being, absolute in power and goodness, which is a spurious conception of transcendence but a new life for others, through participation in the Being of God.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Another erroneous view that rejects God’s transcendence is the philosophy of Georg Hegel, who taught that nothing exists except God.[[43]](#footnote-43) God is an absolute spirit, and the world is a manifestation of His being. More precisely, all objects in the universe are figments of His imagination.

According to Hegel, God is aware of Himself only in virtue of the fact that through human beings, who are, in essence, manifestations of God’s imagination, He is able to think about Himself. Pessin describes it this way, “Our knowledge of God just is His way of knowing Himself and thus being Himself. God could not fully manifest Himself unless human beings had the proper awareness of God.”[[44]](#footnote-44) So then, even the idea of God’s transcendence is a figment of His imagination created through human imagination.

Erickson makes the following comment on Hegel:

Hegel understood the fundamental character of reality as being mental or ideational in nature. Reality is one great thinking mind, the absolute. In a very real sense, everything that happens within this world is merely a thought in the mind of God.[[45]](#footnote-45)

Also worth mention is the teaching of the so-called “father of liberal theology,” Friedrich Schleiermacher, who laid great stress on God’s nearness to us. He emphasized God’s immanence to the point that Carl Henry considers him a pantheist.[[46]](#footnote-46)

Schleiermacher did acknowledge God’s transcendence, but his stress of His immanence eclipsed it.[[47]](#footnote-47) According to Schleiermacher, a miracle “is simply the religious name for an event. Every event, even the most natural and usual, becomes a miracle as soon as the religious view of it can be the dominant. To me all is miracle…. The more religious you are, the more miracle you will see everywhere.”[[48]](#footnote-48)

Concerning God’s revelation, Schleiermacher felt that what was written is not as important as why it was written, that is, what inspired the biblical writers to compose their books. Truth is found in the religious experience of the writers.

Schleiermacher claimed that the confirming sign that a person really knows God is the presence of a deep sense of dependence on Him. Another identifying mark is a feeling of compassion in fellowship with others. Schleiermacher expounds his thought:

The usual conception of God as one single being outside the world and behind the world is not the beginning and the end of religion… but immediate consciousness of the Deity as He is found in ourselves and in the world.[[49]](#footnote-49)

So then, the basis for one’s knowledge of God is not a written record of divine revelation or church tradition, but personal experience with the Divine. Sykes comments,

For a liberal theology which acknowledges that is it possible to disbelieve what both the Bible and Church teach, the question of why one should believe in God becomes inescapable in its own terms. Something has to be pointed to as evidence; and Schleiermacher begins a whole tradition of theology by pointing to human religious experience.[[50]](#footnote-50)

For Schleiermacher, our goal is seeking God should not be to grasp His nature, but to be grasped by Him. Truth is discovered not by studying theology, but when a person is personally moved by God. However, Schleiermacher taught that one’s personal experience with the Lord is not unique – all people have access to the same experience. This common encounter with God serves as the basis for unity among people.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Paul Tillich is the author of yet another aberrant view of God immanence.[[52]](#footnote-52) His theological method, the “principle of correlation,” proposes that theological investigation should begin with topics that interest people. By Tillich’s observation, the greatest concern people have is anxiety about death and the corresponding loss of significance. Therefore, Christian faith should respond to this and other needs pressing on the human soul.

Tillich suggests that the answer to the problem of death and insignificance is “being.” A person must learn to “be.” For Tillich, God is “being” itself, that is, the “ground of all being.” Since God is the “ground of all being,” He has the power to counteract “non-being,” which is the root problem of humanity. Therefore, the key to authentic living is to battle “non-being” and attain to authentic living, or “being.”

Tillich understands God in an impersonal sense. He would not use terms like “person,” “living” or “existing” to describe Him.[[53]](#footnote-53) God even surpasses the attribute of “being” – He is deeper still. In Tillich’s opinion, “To say that God exists is to make him one entity among others, an object, of however exalted a kind, within his own universe.”[[54]](#footnote-54)

Whenever someone experiences a deep connection with another person or object – animate or inanimate – he or she is drawing near to God, the “ground of all being.” This individual is discovering the underlining unity between all things, finding a connection with the “ground of all being,” that is, God.

Although Tillich’s system is rightly classed with those that over-emphasize God’s immanence, we can detect an aspect of transcendence in it as well. Since God is the “ground of all being,” He is beyond being. In a way, He exists beyond existence – in His uniqueness. He is a “God above God, the abyss of the Godhead.”[[55]](#footnote-55)

### C. Conclusions

A true understanding of God’s nature includes both aspects – His transcendence and His immanence. As noted above, adequate biblical evidence exists to support this conviction. We may summarize the biblical teaching by stating that the transcendent God is present and active in His creation. Tozer contrasts these two features in the following way: “God is above all things presiding, beneath all things sustaining, outside of all things embracing, inside of all things filling.”[[56]](#footnote-56) Erickson cautions,

The Bible teaches that God is both immanent and transcendent. God is present and active within his creation, but superior to and independent of anything that he has created. These biblical ideas must be kept in balance. The tendency to emphasize one or the other will lead to a faulty conception of God.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Unfortunately, both these concepts have been abused. One form of “hyper-transcendence” is Deism. The personal testimony, however, of millions of individuals contradicts Deism’s claims that God is not active in human affairs. Countless individuals have experienced specific answers to prayer. It also seems fantastic to assume that God would create such a glorious world for His creatures to inhabit, then abandon them and refuse to fellowship with them or take part in their lives. In addition, if God is a personal God, then one would expect that He would desire and seek personal interaction with people and not isolate Himself from them. Moreover, how can a loving God forsake His creation when so many insurmountable challenges prevent it from enjoying the life He certainly intended it to enjoy. A more thorough treatment of Deism is found in volume 1 of this series.

The views of apophatism, Otto, Barth, and Bultmann have common features. They exaggerate the idea of God’s transcendence to the degree that they deny to believers the use of reason in obtaining knowledge of God. They “conceal” God’s nature in a mystery and thereby undermine the authority of His written revelation in Holy Scripture. They replace the intelligent study of God’s Word with a mystical or existential approach to knowing the Lord.

However, mysticism presents multiple difficulties. Most notable is that it results in subjectivism since it is impossible to verify its claims by any objective standards. Every mystic will have his/her own “indisputable” theory about God. If believers do not test the spirits by the Word of God, how can they be sure that they are really contacting God’s Spirit? Furthermore, both Old and New Testaments urge God’s people to seek Him through the Word (see Josh 1:8; Ps 1:1-3; Ps 118; Prov 4:20-22; Matt 4:4; Col 3:16; Acts 20:32; 1 Pet 2:2). God does not “conceal” His nature in a mystery; He “reveals” it in His Word. Apophatism is more fully discussed and refuted in chapter 1 of this volume.

To further refute “hyper-immanence,” we can note several weaknesses in this approach. First, it clearly contradicts the biblical testimony that declares that God acts and speaks independent of His creation. Second, this theory rejects the supernatural and undermines the practice of prayer. Third, God is basically presented as an impersonal force, with whom it is impossible to fellowship.[[58]](#footnote-58) Fellowship with a transcendent God who is able to interact with us is certainly superior to contact with an immanent, impersonal force.[[59]](#footnote-59)

Furthermore, if God was “absorbed” into the universe and is now one with it, how can we explain the presence of evil in a world in which God is enmeshed and supposedly directs?[[60]](#footnote-60) If God directs all the events in the world, then He is responsible for all the evil we encounter in life.

Some have posited that an over-emphasis on God’s immanence enabled Hitler to come to power in Germany. People took him to be God’s special instrument.[[61]](#footnote-61) Acknowledging God’s transcendence, though, affords us an external, objective basis for judging what is happening in the world.[[62]](#footnote-62)

McConnell claims that “hyper-immanence” robs Christian faith of its uniqueness. If God works exclusively through natural means and processes, what place is there for the redemptive work of Christ?[[63]](#footnote-63)

In the following chapter, we will discuss God’s providence and miracles. This will be, in fact, a continuation of our discussion of immanence and transcendence. The former finds expression in God’s work of providence, while the latter is demonstrated in His supernatural acts of power.

1. Grudem W. Systematic Theology. – Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994. – P. 267. Erickson M. J. Christian Theology. – Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983. – V. 1. – P. 312-313, 316. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. From the Oxford Dictionary, cited in Cairns D. God Up There? A Study in Divine Transcendence. – Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1967. – P. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Packer J. I. Concise Theology: A Guide to Historic Christian Beliefs. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1993. – P. 28-30; Henry, C. F. H.God, Revelation, and Authority. – Waco, TX: Word Books, c1976-c1983. – V. 6. – P. 45; Erickson M. J. God the Father Almighty. – Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998. – P. 267-268; Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 312-313. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Cairns, p. 26-36. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Erickson, God the Father Almighty, p. 268-274; Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 313. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Unlike Kierkegaard and Barth, though, Erickson does not feel that this difference is “infinite,” or else fellowship between God and people would not be possible. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Erickson, God the Father Almighty, p. 271. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Tozer A. W. The Attributes of God. – Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1997. – V. 1. – P. 121-123. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Helm P. The Providence of God. – Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1993. – P. 81. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Warfield B. B. The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield, Volume 1: Revelation and Inspiration. – Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008. – P. 38. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Helm P. The Divine Revelation. – Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1982. – P. 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Лосский В. Н. Богословие и Боговидение // Общ. ред. Владимир Писляков. – М.: Издательство Свято-Владимирского Братства, 2000. – P. 45; Иларион, А. Таинство Веры. – М.: Издательство Братства Святителя Тихона, 1996. – P. 32. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Pelikan J. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 2 The Spirit of Eastern Christendom. – Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1974. – P. 265. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Pseudo-Dionysius. On Mystic Theology // The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite / Trans. John Parker. – London: James Parker and Co., 1897. – chp. 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Bloesch D. G. God the Almighty. – Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1995. – p. 81, 175-178. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Bloesch, p. 176. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See Pessin A. The God Question. – Oxford: One World, 2009. – P. 210-211. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Ibid., p. 211. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Harrisville R. A., Sundberg, W. The Bible in Modern Culture. – Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995. – P. 208. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See Mueller D. L. Karl Barth // Patterson B. E. Makers of the Modern Theological Mind. – Waco, TX: Word, 1972. – P. 62-91; Webster J. Karl Barth. – 2nd ed. – London: Continuum, 2004. – P. 76-86; Henry, v. 6, p. 36-41. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Mueller, p. 62. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Ibid., p. 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Torrance T. F. Karl Barth // Hunt G. L. Ten Makers of Modern Protestant Thought. – New York, NY: Association Press, 1958. – P. 60-62. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. See Hill J. The History of Christian Thought. – Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 2003. – P. 278-281; McClendon J. W. Pacemakers of Christian Thought. – Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1962. – P. 47-52; Michalson C. Rudolph Bultmann // Hunt G. L. Ten Makers of Modern Protestant Thought. – New York, NY: Association Press, 1958. – P. 104-112; Jacobsen H. Rudolf Bultmann // Douglas J., Comfort P. W. Who's Who in Christian History. – Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1992. – P. 116-117. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Hill, p. 279-280. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. McConnell F. J. The Diviner Immanence. – New York, NY: The Methodist Book Concern, 1906. – P. 60. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Ibid., p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 302. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Bloesch, p. 24, 44-46, 99. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Grudem, p. 267; Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 302-303. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. See McConnell. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Henry, v. 6, p. 38; Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 309-310; Cairns, p. 13, 69-70, 89-103. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Brown B. P. The Immanence of God. – Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1905. – P. 17; quotation from Erickson, God the Father Almighty, p. 265. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Noted in Cairns, p. 69-70. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. See Hill, p. 288; Cairns, p. 79-93; Robertson E. H. Dietrich Bonhoeffer // Nineham D. E. Robertson E. H. Makers of Contemporary Theology. – Richmond VA: John Knox, 1966. – P. 14-51. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Robertson, p. 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Ibid., p. 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Ibid., p. 50. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Bonhoeffer D. Letters and Papers from Prison / Ed. E. Bethge // New York: MacMillian, 1953. – P. 381. Parentheses added. Also see Cairns, p. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. See Henry, v. 6, p. 36-38; Pessin, p. 180. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Pessin, p. 180. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Erickson, God the Father Almighty, p. 264. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Henry, v. 4, p. 154. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Sykes S. Friedrich Schleiermacher // Nineham D. E. Robertson E. H. Makers of Contemporary Theology. – Richmond VA: John Knox, 1965. – P. 25-47. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Schleiermacher F. On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers. – London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893. – P. 88. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Ibid., p. 101. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Sykes, p. 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Ibid., p. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. See Bloesch, p. 178; Thomas J. H. Paul Tillich // Nineham D. E. Robertson E. H. Makers of Contemporary Theology. – Richmond VA: John Knox, 1965. – P. 11-15; Erickson, Christian Theology, v. 1, p. 306-309; McClendon, p. 41-44. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Nonetheless, Tillich believes that God became personal in Jesus Christ. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Cairns, p. 60. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Bloesch, p. 178. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Tozer, v. 1, p. 22. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Erickson M. J. Christian Тheology. – 2nd ed. – Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1998. – P. 327. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Cairns, p. 20, 65-66. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. McConnell, p. 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Ibid., p. 23-24. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Some German Christians signed a document which stated, “We are full of thanks to God that He, as Lord of history, has given us Adolf Hitler, our leader and savior from our difficult lot“ (see Berkouwer G. C. The Providence of God. – Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952. – P. 176-177; Erickson, God the Father Almighty, p. 267). [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. McConnell, p. 22-23. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Ibid., p. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)