



2016

The Universe, the 'body' of God. About the
vibration of matter to God's command or
The theory of divine leverages into matter

Ciocan Tudor Cosmin

Ovidius University of Constanta, Romania

cosmin.ciocan@univ-ovidius.ro

Follow this and additional works at: <http://dialogo-conf.com/archive>

Copyright © 2014, RCDST (Research Center on the Dialogue between Science & Theology),
Romania. All rights reserved



Recommended Citation

Ciocan, Tudor Cosmin, "The Universe, the 'body' of God. About the vibration of matter to God's command or The theory of divine leverages into matter," *Proceedings DIALOGO (DIALOGO-CONF 2016 SRAC)*, DOI: 10.18638/dialogo.2016.3.1.21, ISBN: 978-80-554-1285-6, ISSN: 2393-1744, vol. 3, issue 1, pp. 226-254, 2016

Available at: <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.18638/dialogo.2016.3.1.21>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)



The Universe, the 'body' of God. About the vibration of matter to God's command or The theory of divine leverages into matter

Fr. Lect. Cosmin Tudor CIOCAN, PhD

Faculty of Orthodox Theology,
Ovidius University of Constanta
Romania

cosmin.ciocan@univ-ovidius.ro

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article history:

Received 10 August 2016
Received in revised form 14 September
Accepted 24 October 2016
Available online 30 November 2016
doi: [10.18638/dialogo.2016.3.1.21](https://doi.org/10.18638/dialogo.2016.3.1.21)

Keywords:

creation ex nihilo; unifying 'spirit';
Deus odiosus; rationes seminales;
God's Particle; preexisting matter;
omnipresence;

The link between seen and unseen, matter and spirit, flesh and soul was always presumed, but never clarified enough, leaving room for debates and mostly controversies between the scientific domains and theologies of a different type; *how could God, who is immaterial, have created the material world?* Therefore, the logic of obtaining a result on this concern (would be) is first to see how religions have always seen the ratio between divinity and matter/universe. In this part, the idea of a world personality is implied by many, so that nature itself was transformed into a person; others have seen within the universe/the world a Spirit ruling all, connecting all and bending all to God's commands. In a way or another, every culture has gifted the universe/nature with the capability of ruling all, seeing everything and controlling, even determining facts by connecting all together with a *Great Spirit*. What is this *Great Spirit* of all and where it resides? With the analogy of human body in relation to his Spirit we will try to figure out a place or vehicle for the Spirit to dwell the body, and the *Great Spirit* the matter. The Christianity names this linkage between God and matter as 'the (un)created grace of God', which indwells matter and helps the Creator move and transform things. Is there any scientific argument to sustain such assertion? Can we argue somehow that God's voice makes matter vibrate from within the way it can recombine primer elements into giant stars to the human body? If so, what should be the ratio between theology and science on this issue and with these assertions? How could God command to matter to bring things and beings out of it and what were the material leverages that was supposed to be operated to accomplish His will? However, if we can assume that God resides in the universe – as a whole, His body, or as in its very fabric – can we also figure out how is this even possible, without transforming our explanation into a pantheistic and immanent exclusive one? Through these 'divine leverages within matter' theory, there is no need for questioning evolutionism, creationism, pantheism, deism and many other cosmological hypotheses any longer.

© 2014 RCDST. All rights reserved.

I. INTRODUCTION

“For My hand made all these things, Thus all these things came into being,” declares the LORD (Isaiah 66:2)

Some have viewed the motion of the world coming from within, others from an external cause. Anaxagoras said that the soul is the motric force of the world, while Democritus asserted that “the intellect moves the Universe”; the latter has considered that the soul and the intellect are all the same[1]. Everybody – in religion or philosophy – link in a way or another the internal movement of matter with a certain, external cause, while science strives to find this cause within the universe or its matter. This article asserts, there are internal leverages to be pulled in the fabric of the universe in order to obey the Creator’s command. His voice when says ‘Let there be...[light, a vault, lights in the vault of heaven]’ is not a magical illusion that makes things and beings appear out of thin air, without the use of any preexisting materials. There is, of course, a great theological teaching saying just the opposite that things were made *ex nihilo*, from nothing at all, but let see first what this *ex nihilo* theory has in fact to say.


II. CLARIFICATIONS ABOUT THE EX NIHILLO CREATION

A. The Creation out of nothing or out of a fundamental fabric?

‘God creating the spiritual and material worlds from nothing (*ex nihilo*)’ has been a distinctive Christian claim almost from the beginning even if this does not stand as a literary teaching in the Bible. In the debate with evolution (mostly of science, but also possible from other religious theologies) many creationist theologians bring into discussion this idea, which – we have to say –

it was contrived only to praise the Creator’s mighty power capable to do whatever He wants without having necessarily a purpose, a proper tool or aid to do what he pleases. Moreover, “at times, an effort has been made to derive from the Hebrew verb **בָּרָא** (*bara’* = to shape, fashion, or create) this truth that creation occurred without the use of previously existent materials.”[2] The mosaic tell about creation found in Genesys 1 – 2 was obviously directed against the polytheistic world that had surrounded their monotheistic island, so it was for sure a tool to purpatrate their misunderstanding of what a Creator has to be. “According to these words[3], the universe is neither eternal, nor formed out of pre – existing things, nor sprung from necessity, but due to the immediate creative act of God. It was created *ex nihilo*, that is, out of nothing.”[4] As some theologians have apointed, it is not always used the Hebrew word *bara* and the Greek word *ktizein*; for they are at times used interchangeably with the words *asuh* and *poiein*. Thus, God is said both to have “created” and “made” the world (Gen. 1: 1; Neh. 9: 6; Col. 1: 16f). But the creation *ex nihilo* is always God’s work, never man’s, for God can create “the wind” (Amos 4: 13), “a clean heart” (Ps. 51: 10), and “new heavens and a new earth” (Isa. 65:17), while man only do things given by his Creator. And all these distinctions had a single purpose only: to emphasys God’s sovereignty[5], about the all – powerful God who created the heavens and the earth from nothing, but in reality it brings no clue on how He did it, because it was never the issue of these ‘creation stories’.

Ex nihilo “is the Latin for ‘from nothing’ and is commonly used in discussions of creation myths to categorize a type of creation in which a lone deity creates from nothing, using only his own mind and will”[6]. However, the ‘*ex nihilo*’ phrase was accepted long ago as a shorthand way of saying: ‘from no prior materials’[7]. This doctrine was




formulated later by the church fathers[8] to defend theism against an ultimate dualism or a monistic pantheism.[9] However, the main reason for ever considering this option of interpreting the creation was to prove the alterity and inferiority of creation, either material or spiritual, related to their Creator since they are not made out of His nature (St. Augustin). “Because the origin from out of nothing determines the otherness, the “non – consubstantiality” of the world and God.”[10] Under Plotinus influences, St. Augustin used the doctrine of creation ex nihilo as the warrant for considering everything good being God’s products and for that “there is nothing that could serve as material for it”[11] since God is the highest source of every good and perfection. This concept, highly used by creationists, still raises lots of questions, e.g. is the world made inside or outside God, or has divinity need to be a personal being or not? Is there a distance between God and His creation, and moreover is this a distance of natures or positions? God is thought remote or distant, or does He stay omnipresent inside His creation even if He has nothing in common with it? All these issues are due to the misunderstanding of what the creation ex nihilo should be regarded in the first place and to what part of the creation is it referring at. That is why, before going further with explaining the premises of LVD theory, I should give a preliminary clarification on this story of creation and place it into the system of LVD thinking.

B. Different perspectives – different significance of ‘the beginning.’

For me the whole content of the Bible is the same story retold three times in a row, each one from another perspective and thus using proper descriptive tools. The whole story is about ‘God creating all’: a) Genesis 1:1; b) Gen 1:2 – 31; c) Genesis 2 – Revelation 21. Each part a), b), c) tells the same story, but

a) does it from God’s angle, where He does all according to His eternal plan in an instant – compared to His eternity. It is the extra time ‘moment’ when He has no one aside while doing all, heavens and earth, all the universes for His beings. It is instantaneous, as so many other actions are described from the perspective of God, even if, for us, those actions would take a lot more than a lifetime. In the same situation, we find the parish of the offsprings of Core (Num 16:21), the social and psychological destruction of a man (Job 32:22; Prov 6:15). The birth of Israel people and its rising as a nation was done by Jahwe in an instant (Isa 66:8); the rise and fall of a kingdom have the same ‘period’ (Jer 18:7). The cleansing of Israel’s enemies done from the historical point of view during centuries or millennium is still regarded as being done “at an instant suddenly” (Isa 29:5). The persistence of sin will not last more than a moment, even if it still last from the beginning of time until the Judgement day (Isa 30:13). Every body that has ever died and had rotted will be changed into a new, eternal one in an instant, “with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet of God” (1 Thessalonians 4:13 – 17), even if the resurrection of dead will take a ‘thousand years to be completed’ (Revelation 20:5 – 6). But, from God’s revealed perspective, the whole humanity that has ever lived shall pass this entire transformation “in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed” (1 Cor 15:52). Everything is done within the same period – ‘in an instant’ –, but this declaration is never done from c) perspective, man’s, but from God’s only (a). That is why I’ve said that, from this point of view, of God’s eternity, the creation of the universe is also done ‘in an instant,’ compressing everything into a concise sentence.

The second vision, b), explains the same story with more information for man from




an angelic perspective, as those that were witnesses to God's creation of the material universe; while c) retells the story in the man's historical perspective with even more details, from his creation to his judgment, from the state of 'image' towards that of 'resemblance/ likeness' – an ongoing creation in its unfolding. This assumption of mine lies on the biblical fact that, while in the beginning of the creation act, Genesis 1:1 encompasses everything God has ever created, heavens and earth, from the beginning, without nothing behind, nothing pre-existent, and God is not the protagonist of this story (as in A or B), but a subject of adulation for His sovereignty, the rest of the first chapter of Genesis brings Him forward as the protagonist of His activity. Thus, in the witnesses version (b) we see Him unveiling His eternal plan; we hear Him speaking [as with another individual] what is next to be done, or even listen Him talking with the creation itself telling what is that He wants from it / what it has to give Him from within.

In other words, "according to the Hebrew syntax of Genesis 1:1 – 3, Genesis 1:1 ("when God began to create...") was NOT the first creative act of God. Rather, Genesis 1:3 was His first creative act — and it was the initial act of re-creating or re-ordering the material described in Genesis 1:1 – 2." [12] The 'days' spoke of in the b) and c) perspectives, yom (day), have nothing to do one with the other, not semantically and mostly not historically, temporal. The subjective, religious ritualic involvement made by the Jewish and Babylonian [13] tradition, when associated with a number or the words "evening" or "morning" [14], make the appearance of the seven days from b) perspective looks like that of the days from the historical perspective, only that they are not referring to the same period of time.

That is why, for me, the only possibility of relating world's creation with an ex nihilo

action is "In the beginning [when] God [has] created the heavens and the earth" (Gen 1:1). Because either we see the creation as a whole (pleroma, St. Gregory of Nyssa), the important fact is here that only the first moment can be related to ex nihilo, only just its beginning [as if it would refer to the first thing], while the rest is just after something. Therefore, we can say either that the 'world' – from A to Z, from creation to judgment – came out of nothing, or that – historically speaking – the first thing ever created from the category of 'earth' was created from nothing, as from nothing pre-existent. It is but logical to assume that once the matter has been created, everything else was made out of it. The word of God, His command 'to made', 'to give', 'to appear', or 'to produce', is all-powerful only if spoken over something, i.e. "the earth formless, and void [unformed and desolate]" (Gen 1:2).

There are of course some fathers of Christianity who push the creation ex nihilo further, beyond the first moment and say that every thing and body was called by God from nothing to come into being. This confusion is still logical to be made since they were fighting against dualism – G – d and matter co – eternal – existences – and moreover with the idea that G – d is merely ordering his creation, as in the image of a potter working his clay into an ordered structure (e.g. Isaiah 29:16; Jer 18:1–6). "Early Church Fathers such as Theophilus, Justin Martyr, and Origen believed that matter was pre-existent with God. Borrowed from the platonic thought, these Church's fathers believed that God has "ordered" this chaotic matter and gave it its shape and form, thus resulting in the creation of the world." [15] It is evident that they have needed to make a connection between the absolute power of God and his wisdom of shaping and structuring all. For them and others, God was regarded only as the divine architect, so that is why most theologians from the fourth century and beyond rejected this view for it



was bringing a shadow over God's creation power and sovereignty. For them, God has simply created every and each thing without the use of some material support, since this idea would make God linked and dependent on something outside himself, and that was unacceptable [at that time]. In time that was the only explanation seen as 'orthodox' and outside it, every other theory was just heretical.


The problem with this stubborn conclusion is that they could not accept a dialogue and the fact that even those earlier fathers speaking about 'bringing all things from non – being into being'[16] were not actually considering the technical action of creation as *ex nihilo*, but just the ontological coming – into – existence of things. In this regard St. John Chrysostom addresses same ontological *ex nihilo* divine action as referring to all mankind: [God has] 'called us from nonbeing into being'[17], and we can clearly understand from this that, for him, the process of coming into being from nonbeing is not the same thing as the creation *ex nihilo*. The latter refers only to 'the foundation of the world' (i.e. the matter, the fabric of the universe), while the former is his metaphysical conception of things and living beings coming into existence along with the time. The closest to an explicit reference to the cosmic creation's *ex nihilo* comes in 2 Maccabees, a late work (second century bc), where we receive the same ontological coming to existence performed: 'Observe heaven and earth, consider all that is in them, and acknowledge that Yahweh made them out of what did not exist' (7:28).

The temporal relation of creation is more to be understood if we relate Gen 1:1 with John 1:1, first telling about the initiation of the process of calling things into existence, in the beginning, while the latter, "from eternity," speaks about the existence before the beginning, when nothing else but God had existed. This positioning of God before

the beginning of time/existence is proved by Christ when saying "they may behold My glory that You gave Me because You loved Me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24, 5). As St. Gregory of Nyssa says, "The very subsistence of creation owed its beginning to change,"[18] "the very transition from non – entity to existence is a change, non – existence being changed by the Divine power into being."[19] We start counting the time once the existence of a thing/creature starts; and this idea has to do with the relation between eternal paradigms of things and their ontological beginning – as we will see in the last chapter. The mystical essence of time is to be a witness of accomplishing things that are to happen. That because, before time, things were only existent in the divine paradigm, ontological and material non – existent, not happening. In this regard, we can also contradict the *ex nihilo* action as it is widely understood, over all and each thing, since the temporal things actually came from the atemporal ones (as in Platonism) – but this idea will also be made clearer when approaching the significance of *logoi*.

C. *The creation is not yet finished!*

The problem of interpreting the biblical story of creation is that it mostly limits the creation's time to the past tense, "God created all things... the universe was created by the word of God" (Ephes 3:9; Hebrews 11:3; Revel 4:11; Matt 18:31, etc.). Few are speaking in the present tense, "all things are from God" (1 Corinthians 11:12), and almost none about a future time of creation (Matt 19:28). In this case, it is normal that the creation be regarded as closed, and thus the action of God, as related to the world, also closed. It is a theological habit to speak about this *ad extra* work of God at past tense and to leave other activities, like salvation or providence, for the present tense. That is why everybody has the tendency to




consider the creation related only to ‘in the beginning’ time. But, the fact is that the creation has never stopped, as we are still in the sixth day of creation of the b) story, since ‘man’ as *pleroma* is not yet finished, Adam, Moses, Jesus, me, and everyone else being the protagonists of this ‘man made in Gen 1:28’. From the c) perspective we are somewhere in between of the human history, but from the b)’s, we are still one day behind everything created stops being created, we are still before the dawn of the seventh day of creation, waiting for the Creator to stop creating things and enjoy the fullness of the creation. The creation of the first historical man, Adam, his companion – Eva, their temptation, the flood, the second world war, or any future not – yet – happen events are all together compressed into the ‘sixth day’ of the b) perspective. Thus, if we are still in the ‘middle’ [during] of creation, how can we still consider that everything is created *ex nihilo* since we can see lots of [new] things appearing from others, the old ones? “While recognizing God’s *creatio ex nihilo*, special providence constitutes *creatio continua*, a “continuing creation” that is always bringing new things into being rather than simply preserving the past.”[20] And then, the ongoing creation is possible under certain circumstances, some of which are acceptable from the LVD theory, e.g. the unity of consciousness of all humankind, or of the consciousness of the universe.

I know that the general opinion is that the time of the biblical story of creation is very closed linked to that ‘in the beginning’ starting point and that the rest of Genesis continues that beginning from where it has left, the rest and admiration of the Creator (Gen 1:31). However, the premise of my theory leans on a different perspective, showed before, that the point of Gen 2:1 – 7 is not actually giving us a continuation of those ‘seven days’, but a detailed re – tell of the sixth day. I am aware that there are not many traditional writers that would

give credit to this assertion, but there is still room for debating it. However, explaining what ‘the seventh day of creation’ might mean, we will find St. Apostle Paul making a suggestive analogy. While most theologians imply that ‘God has been resting since the establishment of the world’, that God is no longer creating, but either enjoying His creation while resting, or making a post – resting supervision over it, being still active by sustaining this closed creation (Colossians 1:17). No wonder that there are many theologians implying God’s self-distancing from this finished creation (*deism*). The objections of this ongoing creation are weak and thus not taken into account at all. Some may object that God indeed is still creating in the miracles He performs[21], but the miracles, seen as local exceptions to the general rule, cannot be the only acts God makes as exceptional intervention while being resting (the seventh day) or post – resting. This is entirely wrong, since “My Father works until now, and I also work”; hence the work of creation is ongoing, not yet finished. That is why we should take a look at Paul’s suggestion. He says: “for somewhere He has spoken about the seventh day in this way: And on the seventh day God rested from all His works. Again, in that passage [He says], They will never enter My rest.” (Hebrews 4:4 – 5) “Hebrews never says that the seventh day of Creation Week is continuing to the present (in fact they say the opposite), it merely says that God’s rest is continuing.”[22]

If we continue the line of literal interpreting the story of Genesis 1 from Jewish perspective – and they had a religious reason to do that, in order to support the covenant seal, the Sabbath – along with many Christian writers, we have to assume also that God has rested for a 24 – hour day and then continued to rest up until the present day, or take His work on other ‘place’. But this implication is more absurd than any other one, theological or scientific.




Therefore, the seventh day can only be understood as beginning with the final step of fulfilling this world – the resurrection and the Judgement day – which are the last step of the sixth day and the starting point of the seventh. Either we conceive God's rest in front of all other historical 'days' – the eighth, ninth day and so on – as following His work from the sixth day, after which He should take it over (with the creation of Eva at least), or we place it at the same time with ours – we are still misconceiving the whole point of revealing 'the entire creation story' to the mankind[23]. Therefore, the promise 'entering God's rest' made to the elected people will be fulfilled in the time of Christ's Kingdom, the seventh day.

In conclusion, the theory here would be that God has started creating this world from nothing, not using a pre-existing matter, but He had created first the matter, as the core fabric of all, before creating everything. God is not only a potter modeling a preexistent matter, but "rather one who makes both the clay and the pot"[24]. And accepting this theory does not make God's sovereignty smaller, or His implication into the world's appearance worthless. On the contrary, we can have a mutual and logical dialogue with the scientific hypothesis now on the mutual ground. Now we have to figure out how to cut the Gordian knot of the relation between the omnipresence and the interconnection body – spirit. The conception of 'ex nihilo' creation, as we saw, was entirely directed against the dualism of any kind of a second principle, material or evil, co-eternal to the mighty God, and not as a scientific explanation of cosmology as underlined here. "Relying primarily on those Scriptures, they [the theologians of the early Church] formulated a doctrine of the Creator as all – powerful and, in consequence, rejected the view that over against Him there had been from the beginning an ungenerated principle, matter, that was not fully under His sway or lesser beings that were

responsible for the multiple imperfections of the world."[25]

If God has created everything from nothing else but a fabric made prior of all [in the beginning], the period of creation confined to only 'seven days' is still acceptable, or this statement has to be changed? In other words, should we imply that God has created 'the world' in an instant or ages? Moreover, do we even need to search for proponents of concordism over the day – ages view[26]? What is the answer of this rather new explanation to what 'ex nihilo divine action' means to these questions? I think we can solve entirely the situation of considering the biblical version of creation both as an allegorical myth, as well as a non-scientific theory of world's appearance, and more than that we can elude this 'necessity' through this subsequent hypothesis. The conciliation between Theology and Science would be more valuable then, as the proponents of concordism might say, "Bible describes 'a successive creation of plants and animals, ending with man,' and that geology 'proves this history to be true'", because "the focus of these chapters is clearly theological, not historical, and certainly not cosmological"[27]. This is possible in LVD moreover since we are guided to regard 'Genesys 1' not as a historical description of the creation act, and furthermore as a scientific one, but merely a short story encompassing everything the Creator ever did, done and future do, in order to give man a wide, whole perspective and place him in this story somewhere, 'in the sixth day, towards evening'. The making of the world from a matter created in the beginning is conceivable in the line of mankind, 'all made from the same leaven/ dough', and regarded then after, from (c) perspective, in its unfolding. In the same way we can relate the creation/appearance of all things and beings from a single dough, made prior of all, in the beginning, ex nihilo, and used



thereafter the divine leverage to organize it in so many and perfect ways.


III. THE GREAT SPIRIT OF ALL

It is notorious the belief that divinity is deeply implicated into nature. In a way or another, every culture had this belief; either pantheist, panentheist, polytheist or animist, the universe/nature was always given by those creeds with the capability of ruling all, seeing and controlling everything, or even determining facts by connecting altogether. That capability within the nature of the universe was implied in all religions one way or another. One is talking about Wakan Tanka (among the Sioux)[28], another about Gitche Manitou (in Algonquian), or the Nat (in Burma), Temaukel (South America, Selknam tribe)[29], or the Holy Ghost walking above the waters (Gen 1:2). But all these names and conceptions refer to same reality: that behind the matter of nature there is a 'spirit' ruling all and giving forms and life to everything. To be known that these notions mark almost always a different reality that the one that indwells in each creature, often used metaphysically to refer to the consciousness or personality, as the individual spirit or soul (psykhē, ψυχή), nafs (Arabic نَفْس), neshama (Hebrew נֶשְׁמָה nəšâmâh), or animus. The former notions are closely to the Logos[30] philosophical concept, and the spirituality of all these religious manifestations are inclined towards it and not on the individual spirits, even if there are also many cases in which the worship cases is either combined with or derived from them (e.g. the cult of ancestors once they have died and rejoice with the Great Spirit). This unifying 'spirit' is an evident mark of materialistic monism but the specifications that follow look always a little diverse and strange. It is constantly needed to come with additional note, as if this Logos or Great Spirit is not the Creator itself, although not independent of the

Creator (as in Isaiah 55:11 or Psalm 147:15). It is important to draw some points on the understanding over these two type of concepts to see where are they aiming to.

A. Attributes of the Spirit within the universe. *Deus otiosus vs. The great Spirit*

In all the religious view about the Spirit that indwells nature the most present attribute is omniscience – besides the creationist characteristic that mostly is also understood as Ghost's, due to the overlapping the Creator with his omnipotent Spirit. As the Creator itself sees all, knows all, so does his helper in controlling the nature, as every highest Being. In most cases the characteristic is due to this more elevated position, making him located up in the sky (heaven), thus above, as in an empirical thinking who is higher sees more and clearer. Therefore, positioning G – d above all it is logical to have this 'good sight' over everything. The position grants him this characteristic, but sometimes it costs him the real contact with the matter, the creation itself. Temaukel, the creator of heaven and earth in the animistic myth of Amerindians, have never come down to earth, nor is the other Supreme Being that has sent him to do it – Kenosh – "they stood far, beyond the stars: there he lives and stays forever"[31]. Manitou, the Great Spirit, also made everything, the earth, the sun, the moon, and the stars, and stays between the veil of stars. Even the God of Bible, Jahowa of Jews, inheriting the space positioning from the Mesopotamian religion, and also in the attempt to contradict and overcome all idolatrous understanding of a god from Egypt and lands near Canaan (Exodus 15:11), is positioned "[I live] in a high and holy place" (Isaiah 57:15) for He is nothing like things from universe, in the heavens above, the earth below, or the waters under the earth... Yahweh can be assimilated to nothing in the universe. He is "wholly other," to use the



phrase of Rudolf Otto.[32] For that reason, most 'creators' are not the object of religious worship; they do not possess a cult, don't receive prayers or offers, because they are 'too far', retreated from their creation, and thus they have been transformed by man into deus otiosus[33].

Eargning for a closer god, involved into surveilling and controlling the nature, mostly for favoring man, people have attached to the Creator's Son or successor; e.g. the peers Kenosh – Temaukel, Anu – Marduk, Amon Ra – Pharaoh, Osiris – Horus – Seth, Atum – Shu[34] (Egypt), Brahma/Sonja – Vishvakarman[35] (Hinduism), Vivasvat – Mânu (India), ^hang – ti – The Emperor (China)[36], Uranus – Cronos – Zeus (Greece), Jehova – Jesus. This was the first act to be more attracted to a god or Supreme Spirit that can inhabit the creation, to be closer to man and his needs, to help him be saved and go through the life experiences. In this regard man has considered that God, even if he is above, otiosus and far distanced, he still should be in control of things since he sees all and knows all.


But, in order to give him these two powers, omniseeing and omnicontrol, theologians invested creation with spirit(s) with whom you can talk, discuss and pray to everywhere since there are no created boundaries to forbid God being anywhere at the same time, for everyone and to every need – omnipresence. "Religion is," says James Frazer "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and human life"[37].

B. Where, in the body, lies its spirit?

1) Envisioned in breath

As I was already mentioned before[38] the Spirit of God was always positioned within creation, as a God that indwells his

creation. In order to find him everywhere and at all times it is important to know how religions conceive the relation between a spirit and a body, where they positioned the spirit of a body, either of individual, or of the universe. The later comes out definitely from the former one. The relation between a spirit and its possessed body was always seen very tight in all religions since the removal of it from the body leads to the death of the latter. It was supposed to lay in heart, in breath, or mostly in blood. The first supposition is not supported by this theory because it only had one explanation: life ends with heart cease beating. Instead, the analogies made with the breath are aiming towards the observation that the air is taken into the body, and then it was supposed to fill the lungs and whole body. But the strongest analogy was with blood since it fills the entire body and no part of it is without blood. Both these two analogies are present into most religious phenomenon. In the Bible we see that the man made out of clay [adhamah] receives his spirit from the breath of Yahweh who breathes into his mouth and became man [adham] (Gen 2:7), as Tirawa did in the myths of Pawnea Amerindians, Viracocha for the Incas[39], or the three Spirits Asa (Honir, Odhinn, and Loki) that granted breath – spirit to Askr and Embla[40]. In the same way, the Spirit that grants power of life also has the power of ending it; e.g. Marduk kills Tiamat with his breath blown into her mouth. The power of healing the body was invariably linked with the illness of the spirit, therefore in those traditions recounting about the analogy spirit – breath the shamans (witch doctors) used smoke blown into mouth, anus, and all over the body, as a 'blessed breath' that should replace the ill/bad/evil spirit within. 'The body without breath' or 'the last breathe' were always the figures of speech for a dead individual, spiritless, and this is accompanied with one of the primary, universal ritualic acts used in



religious worship is incense, the use of vegetal incense to create a thick smoke that ascended to heaven, as the spirit does after death. Therefore, as the individual soul does for its body, so does the Great Spirit for the universe itself, e.g. “the Spirit of God was hovering over the surface of the waters” (Gen 1:2). There are so many tells about evil spirits that possess the bodies of man or animals that show procedures to exorcise them with smoke, breathe or yawning. All these religious beliefs are a profound proof that it is notoriously believed that spirits, individuals or universal, are tied with their body until they are forced to leave them leading to the body’s death.


2) *Alternatively, in the circulatory system*

Considering many empirical observations on body parts which have dried due to the lack of blood, and due to other comments relating the body health and life with blood, a stronger doctrine was build on that: that more than breath blood is the essential element through which the spirit inhabits the body, since there is no live existence that doesn’t have blood and moreover, it drains out when an individual dies. This has encouraged many religious manifestations to take blood as the spirit conveyance into any type of body, vegetal, animal or human, a vehicle that helps the spirit travel all over the body and also to be present in it at all times.

The religious stories give us important clues about the relation thought between blood and soul/spirit. For example, in the Babylonian Genesis, man’s soul was made out of Kingu’s blood by Marduk and thus it is considered to be divine. There are also stories in which, from the blood of someone spilled on the ground, a new form of life grew, e.g. a plant [as in the Ancient Egyptian religion, the myth of Geb who bleed onto earth from nose], a powerful amulet [from the blood of Isis], or for making someone younger by taking the spirit of another being

by bathing in its blood, etc. In the Bible, from the beginning, it was believed that the blood bears not only the life of an individual, but also its spiritual entity; e.g. “the voice of thy brother’s blood crieth unto Me from the ground” (Gen 4:10), or “you shall not eat flesh with the life of it... For the life of every creature is the blood of it” (Gen 9:4; Leviticus 17:14). Another important characteristic of blood is that it carries the features of a person or the traits of the tribe: mostly the ‘spirit’ of someone as in ‘the bloodline’, “you are my own flesh and blood” (Gen 29:14). Many cultures strengthened this belief on blood – spirit bond and gave an important role of it in various domains of life, especially those related to dominance, or social relating. People wanting closer ties became ‘blood brothers’ by mixing their blood (a ceremony known as a blood oath, “Blood Covenant”), and that was deemed to have become a ‘spirit.’ In other culture people with mutual interests and aims share their blood from a cup and drink it[41], or drink the blood of the first hunting kill.


On the other hand, it is notorious that Jehovah’s Witnesses refuse to accept blood transfusions[42]. People, considering the modernity and the ‘evolution’ of human society, incriminate them for this refusal, but it is based on Bible commands, the earliest of which says: “Only flesh with its soul—its blood—you must not eat.” First – century Christians were told simply: “Keep abstaining . . . from blood”, and the command had no exception, “You shall eat no blood whatever, whether of fowl or of animal, in any of your dwellings”— Genesis 9:4; Acts 15:29; Leviticus 7:26. They simply cannot update this view, since it is a theological dogma that in blood lies the soul of an individual. Same notoriety has the story of vampires, mystical evil creatures that can transform/possess anyone into their own kind only by dropping some of their blood into the inflicted wound of someone.



The blood was always seen sealed within the religious landscape as the supreme seal of man – God’s covenant. Therefore one of them must have ended that covenant in blood, either man [with endless sacrifices 1 Kings 3:4], or divinity [some how, e.g. Marduk, Kingu, Jesus]. The analogy of the relations blood – spirit – life (on man and other living creatures) with that of God’s Spirit – Universe was easily made, for it was the divine commandment prohibiting the bloodshed, “Whoever sheds man’s blood, his blood will be shed by man, for God made man in His image” (Gen 9:6). There are lots of religious rituals involving the use of blood for the same reason, the analogy between blood and life/spirit. Blood rituals often involve a symbolic death and rebirth, as literal bodily birth involves bleeding.[43] That is why most sacrifices were bloody, as offerings soul for a soul, life for a life – a man was to be forgiven by divinity for a certain sin if he would offer another life for his, his own blood or of an animal. The Aztecs believed the gods sacrificed their own blood to create the universe, so in turn, the Aztecs offered blood to the Gods as a sort of exchange and gift for their creations (Pendragon 2)[44]. The analysis of these rituals – e.g. circumcision, sacrifices, voodoo – gives the same impression as the ‘blood covenant’ we have talked about earlier: persons exchanging blood become ‘brothers’, with same rights and privileges. That happens to the people that have sinned and after that offer bloody sacrifices in order “to make atonement for souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life” (Lv 17: 11). Same happens with Christians that share blood with Christ through His offering, “Therefore, brothers and sisters, since we have confidence to enter the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus” who “died for all, so that they who live might no longer live for themselves, but for Him” (Hebrews 10:19; 2 Corinth 5:15). “To intimate the ratification of God’s

covenant with his people, as at Horeb, the blood of sacrifice by the priesthood was sometimes sprinkled; and, consequently, the priesthood, under the law, kept up the remembrance of the covenant, and pointed forward to its final confirmation.”[45] Always Absolution was assured by the spills of blood, and with more certainty if it is yours offered, because the forgiveness of sins is not “linked in mechanical fashion to the presentation of blood”[46] (Genesis 22:1 – 19), but in the life that is offered along with blood, ‘Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins’ (Heb. 9:22).

The bottom line is that blood, the most common element in a body, one that fills it and run throughout every part of it, was always considered to be the vehicle of the spirit in every culture and for all religions. As the universe was also seen as a body, either a body of divinity, or only an organism, it was also seen with same characteristics as a micro – body, i.e. inhabited by a Spirit. From these analogies, we have analyzed it is also important to see what is ‘the blood’ of the universe in which conveys the Spirit of divinity. In every ritual involving blood, a thing is the most important to know: nobody else’s blood will be as effective as the blood of the person who is performing the magic![47] The most important belief that in blood rests somehow the spirit of the body lies in the ritualic key element, the consumption of the blood. On the one hand, there are divinities that drink man’s blood with the effect of consuming their souls. On the contrary, there are people in so many religions and occult that are asking for blood – spirits so that, by its consumption, they end up rejuvenating their spirit and also their body. It is well known the vampire rejuvenation as well as the ‘black rituals’ with blood consumption for the purpose of rejuvenation and/or possessing another body and replacing its soul. But the climax of all is probably the Christian ritual of Eucharist, and more than



that its foundation in Christ's words "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves" (John 6:53). The result of drinking his blood – of course symbolic/liturgic, not the real bodily blood – is, for the Christian theology, the union between the spirit of the believer with the Spirit of Christ, and by this, the indwelling of God – the tri-union God, Father-Son-Spirit – in the believer's whole body. "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood dwells in me, and I in him... For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed... and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make a dwelling with him" (John 6:56,55; 14:23).


Besides this liturgic and rather nonviolent act, there are of course the gnostic tells about the Holy Grail in which can be found the 'fountain of youth' and the 'everlasting life' for one who drinks from the cup of the Last Super, for "this chalice holds great power because within it can be found the blood of the Redeemer of the World." [48] And then there are also the scientific practices of using blood as the vehicle of rejuvenation, either by transfusion [49], plasma therapy [50], or stem cell [51], most of them 'treated with healthy skepticism' by many scholars due to the mystical implications these stories involve. Through one of the 700 proteins and other substances blood carries throughout our bodies, Wyss – Coray suspects that among them are factors that orchestrate the aging process [52]. Either way, taken as religious beliefs, occult rituals, liturgic practices, or scientific treatments, Blood is considered to be the repository of life and the vehicle of spirit within the body.

C. Force equals control

Let's bring now our assertion into a physical problem. If you have a bulk of bricks, and you want to move them what would you do? Of course, you will need a significant force, as a piler, to do it. But

what if you require to do it with brick by brick and have a construction worked out at the same distance would be in the same time? Well, the math solution always works the same: depending on how detailed is the project and how quick do you want it to be done, you have two options: either a) you multiply the time of movements with the number of bricks => the speed conserves but the time expands exponentially. Or b), you multiply the moving speed by the number of bricks => the speed increase exponential, but the time is conserved. In order to get this result, you take the same massive force that you need to do it in bulk and split it into tiny pieces distributed on every brick at the same time. And so you will have a whole construction built with the same energy at the same time you need only for moving it, but the difference is that you have split the force infinitely, behind every piece of construction, $f_1+f_2+\dots+f_n = \Delta F$. Also, if you can break that massive power into tiny pieces and put them all together into work you will have all done in an instant according to the Formula: Time = Distance ÷ Speed. Now the time will not expand for building a macro universe (dimension) if the speed of construction is fast, and it is almost an instant if the power of getting all done is Quantically split, in particles of each atom within the universe.


If we want a comparison to make it more acceptable for our mind comfort, then we can compare it with the relation Magneto has (the character in the "X – Men" serial) with things with or without metal inside: he can impose his will to everything that has metal inside and makes it do whatever he wants to, even with conscious beings (as Wolverine) that has to obey his 'voice'. That is because he is not talking with the conscious of the person or of any macro structure, but with the web of the Quantic pieces of matter that follows other rules and listens to other call than of the structure. If we can picture that we can then understand



how God speaks with the creation as it would be a conscious being commanding it to do whatever HE pleases. This understanding brings us closer both to Buddhism as well as to science. The former talks about a universal spirit that goes through everything and connects everything like pieces of a giant puzzle, “Everything in the universe is connected by energy, and that energy is consciousness”[53]. That inhabitation of grace within whole creation not only connects with the creative force of the universe, the unified field, or ‘the matrix of all matter’ as physicist Max Planck called it, but he was in fact that creative force beyond the shell of matter. How is that possible? To answer that we have to take the controversy of the nature of divine grace between Catholicism and Orthodoxy all over again, and it is not the place here, but each variant of explanation – created grace or uncreated – give us a clue on the implication of ‘God’ in the quantum reality of creation. This is how God, leaving everything to have its own rules and regulation as its ‘natural’ laws, still is in charge of everything, “you are ruling over them all. You control power and in your hand is power and strength” (1 Chronicles 29:12); this is God’s sovereignty. Thus, there is nothing, no creation in the universe, nor an atom of it that has not the particle of God’s influence inside. So, His presence is inevitable and ensured in everything; that is how I conceive His omnipresence working inside this universe or another. Also, this theory explains how His omnipower works, how he omnisees as immanent while being transcendent at the same time, etc. Through these particles that constitute the skeleton of the world, the invisible yet the most of it, the bulk of everything, the Creator resides within the universe as whole and in everything in particular, but not as a personal presence, instead as a force, an energy that connects, builds, reconfigures and makes everything as their possessor pleases.

If someone would say that this is an incontestable proof of panentheism (divinity being all), then he doesn’t know the traditional Christian understanding of icons or holy relics, through which God’s grace works, and for that matter Orthodox believers worship them as if God’s indwells them. “However, you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you” (Rom 8:9) because “God indwells in all and is all in all... to strengthen you mightily through his Spirit in your inner nature” (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:28; Ephesians 3:16).

So, now it comes to the question raised by Buddhism, can we control everything as well, as part of God? No, of course not, because as ‘part’ we are in relation to all other parts, but not in control of them, as we are not in control of our part also, but only as we are allowed to. The answer some experienced saints might tell about would be that we can get to control everything only by ‘controlling’ God and telling Him what is that we would like Him to command to the Quantic leverages to do for us (John 14:13; 16:23). That leave us with an uncontrolled desire of getting even closer to God, stronger related with Him and his will than we have ever been before since this is the only way of making creation obey our voice too as if it was God’s. By attaining the state of ‘God’s households’ we receive such ‘powers’ as Christ – God has, not as being ours, but by working with God for the good of all, “I will give you control over great things: take your part in the joy of your lord” (Matt 25:21, as in John 9:31). Named sometimes God’s Spirit (Proverbs 1:23), His hand (Ps 139:5; Job 1:11; 12:9), his right hand (Ps 20:8), his eyes (2 Chron 16:9; Zech 4:10), his power (Rom 1:16), light (Gen 1:3; John 5:35), or dominion (Ps 145:13), his Kingdom (Ps 102:19; Mat 13:44), a fact is certain: it rules over all, it touches all, and nothing can escape it; this indwelling in everything and anything has to be the power of God



influencing, leading and keeping all into being and order, his sovereignty.


D. Love concurs all

How is this idea even possible and acceptable for theologians? The first argument lies in the role man was given at creation, to be the ‘spirit’ of them all, to rule them all as a spiritual guidance towards its Creator. By empowering man with the ability to control everything was intended for the principal purpose only. We know what is the source of disrapture between man and his ability to control everything; according to most theologies, his sin was at fault, followed by the disobedience of nature. “For the creation was subjected to futility not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it” (Rom 8:20) because “Cursed is the ground [אדמת האדמה ‘adamah = land, earth, ground] because of you” (Genesis 3:17 – 19) since “We know that all creation has been groaning in agony together until now.” (Rom 8:22). But this control will be possible again when the ‘Kingdom of God’ will be reestablished; then “the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them” (Isaiah 11:6 et.all.). Along with this eschatological view of order and harmony restoration comes the key of understanding how all will come under command. First of all Isaiah speaks about a silent command, not one that resides in the mighty of the ruler, but in the linkage he has with everything; his mighty power will be broken into tiny pieces that moves all, so he doesn’t have to be strong or all – powerful since “a little child [עַבְדֵי נַאֲרָא, young child, babe] will lead them” or “The nursing child [בְּנֵי יָנָאק, sucking child] will play by the hole of the cobra” (Isa 11:6,8). It is evident that the intention is to bring forward the idea that the power of control over all should not be conceived as bulk, as

a mega – power, but it lies in the connection with the capacity to control everything already installed into the matter. This idea does not change the soteriology of any religious thinking because, in order to do it, to gain the physical control over matter, it is required to know what is the proper mean of controlling it, or if this even exists, or, moreover, if it is attainable by man through any worldly resource.

Do we have any tool of controlling either directly the matter or indirectly through God? I cannot find another answer to that but in ‘love.’ We know what New Testament says about Love (I Cor 13) that it conquers all, it encompasses all, it never dies or ends [as the power over everything], and it covers all sins [as the inability to control] (1 Peter 4:8). Apostles of Christ have received this command to love all and infinitely with the result of receiving the power over everything (Marc 16:16 – 18; Luk 10:19). Related to our previous understanding of who runs throughout the organism of the universe and keep them all connected, the Great Spirit, there are many other biblical sentences linking love with this universal Spirit, for “the fruit of the Spirit is love” (Gal 5:22), “[you] are united in spirit, having the same love” (Phil 2:2). The power of ruling all and controlling everything is giving to all Christ’s followers if ‘they remain in His love’, ‘stay united with God – Father in the same love of the Son’, “because the love of God has been poured out within our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us” (Rom 5:5).

From the accomplished mission of Christ to “redeem all man that believe in Him” (John 3:16) and the relation with the Judgement Day we also see that due to His double infinite love – proved to Father and showed to all mankind – He is empowered with “All authority in heaven and on earth” (Matthew 28:18). Until ‘the end’ everything and everybody seem free to do whatever




they please, according to God's eternal paradigms or against it, but at Judgement Day no one will be able to stand against God's will, no matter how strong his or her desire or inclination will be. It also seems that whatever shape things in the universe have they will all shapeshift according to a new plan and command regardless everybody's expectations and will. Thus, the power to do all these changes is always related to the Bible with supreme, divine Love. The repayment to this? "Full authority in heaven and on the earth has been given to Me... by My Father" (Mat 28:18; 11:27; 1 Peter 3:22). But this empowerment is not only a reward but also the prove that Christ – God has everything under His control, and this is only due to His eternal and infinite love, one that made Him create all than redeem all and sustain all in close connection to His life – sustaining power. If until Christ's sacrifice seemed that everything went away from His control, that was only spoken from a soteriological point of view. In reality, God [Father] never had loose power over the creation, no matter how deep into sin was taken. But then again, for the sake of soteriology which is the main issue of God's revelation, the cosmological reality of God's control was not relevant. Anyways, it is proven in the Scripture so many times, because, due to His sacrifice made to regain man from his damnation [not from God's control, but from embracing God's plan willingly], God – Father has returned the control and government of everything under His Son, "The Father loves the Son and has given all things into His hand" (John 3:35, cf. Luke 1:32 – 33; Hebrews 1:2; Isaiah 9:6 – 7). How can we be sure that this is 100% right? Well, we can start from what is the aim of soteriology: man's redemption; so, the crucifixion is definitely done exclusively for humanity, "I am the door: if any man goes in through me he will have salvation" (John 10:9). Moreover, since the fruits of crucifixion (Rom 5:9; 8:23; Hebrews 9:12)

can be obtained only by believing (Rom 1:16), hope (Rom 8:24), and good deeds (James 2:20) as acts of love to Christ, our Redemption (John 15:9), now we know that soteriology speaks only about man – God relationship. But all other references of (re –)gaining control or getting it from God [Father] is always in relation to all things, as the cosmological branch (Luke 10:22; John 13:3; Matt 11:27).

E. God's particle

Is this possible other than a simple theological theory? Scientists would rather say Yes because due to Higgs boson we can construct now this theological hypothesis on new ground and with a little bit more mental projection of it. Discovered in LHC (Large Hadron Collider) particle accelerator, near Geneva, Swiss, four years ago (July 2012), this boson – 'God's particle' – it was not a revelation for bringing unequivocally science and religion together in a mutual understanding beyond any doubt, but it was a hope nonetheless. This epiphany – as some of the team scientists call it[54] – brought so many answers, from Thales who wondered if the universe is not leaning on a simple, basic substance – principle, coined by Democritus who 'saw' in a – toms this basic fabric of all, to "Albert Einstein, Enrico Fermi, Richard Feynman, Murray Gell – Mann, Sheldon Glashow, T. D. Lee, Steven Weinberg, C. N. Yang, and many other heroes of particle physics"[55]. It was not a hope of finding God inside matter, as the name would imply, and even so, many of religious persons considered it as a denigration to what God really means – for them. It was also a questionable theory for many scientists and thus, in the end, it was considered not to serve anyone. Nevertheless, looking for other sources of energy while the universe is expanding and it does it quicker no slower as it was considered until very recently, scientists quickly moved back around 'God's



particle,' a.k.a. the Higgs boson, and expect to understand the skeleton of the universe, because "The Higgs boson, which scientists have been hunting for at least five decades, is a theoretical sub – atomic particle that many believe to be the reason everything has mass. The particle is considered to be a critical building block to everything we know, since without it – without mass – there would be no structure, and no weight, to anything." [56] Beyond the doubts that followed Higgs [57] the idea it assumes is still in place for the theory of everything: that the universe leans on a structure, invisible for us, but forming the majority of its fabric. We do not know if this boson is the ultimate structure a-tom, but we are aware for sure that giving aside the carcass of matter, we have a structure that supports and keeps everything together, and this is also our theological assertion hereinbefore.


$$\vec{F} = m \frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = \frac{d(m\vec{v})}{dt} = \frac{d\vec{p}}{dt}$$

IV. THE DIVINE LEVERAGES WORKING FROM WITHIN THE MATTER

Beyond those metastories about creation and how the influencing divine energies dwell inside matter making it grow into different forms of beings (stars, vegetals, man), the cosmogonic tells and the scientific research are also talking about the possible development of the matter due to its internal structure: recombination. It is already notorious that every chemical element – more or less reactive – can be transformed into another one in the periodic table of elements Mendeleev, either by losing an electron (Redox), by disintegration/ beta decay (β – decay), by binding energy of two or more atomic nuclei came close enough to react (nuclear fusion), or by the combination of two or more elements (as alloy or cluster). We know that

the isomers are chemical compounds with the same composition but with different shapes, or that quarks combine to form particles such as protons and neutrons. It is also known that, while transforming into various elements or isotops, a huge amount of energy is necessary and/or released, as in radioactivity. In case of beta decay (β – decay) for many nuclides the decay times can be thousands of years, and there is no average period of decaying, "Radioactive decay is a stochastic (i.e. random) process at the level of single atoms, in that, according to quantum theory, it is impossible to predict when a particular atom will decay" so "The half – lives of radioactive atoms have no known lower or upper limit, spanning a time range of over 55 orders of magnitude, from nearly instantaneous to far longer than the age of the universe." [58] But what is important for us to know in this exposition is the fact that the time of fusion or decay is possible on different levels, either natural or 'artificial.' Even the natural period can differ in circumstantial conditions (e.g. how big or old is a star, how ordered is the movement of the gas' particles, the speed of a particle, etc.).

The artificial or controlled fusion can obtain same results but within a period of thousandfold time time shortened. The energy needed to do it is enormous, but none the less that is required on the stars; the only difference is the period, shortened. So, as we can conclude here, with special requirements and a huge amount of energy, it is possible to obtain almost everything that naturally takes a lot more, ages or billion years. But if we can do this artificially with proper technology and we know that it is possible for many other elements, can't we accept that it would also be possible to do it quicker by someone else that has the right capacity to use a higher amount of energy, or distributed in a better way? I suppose that, at least for the sake of scientific assumption, we can admit this possibility after all.



Another premise of the material leverages used by divinity to 'move' things by recombining the fundamental fabric of all is that the energy is not stored into large objects or corps, but into the smallest parts of matter. "Size is related to energy. Nuclear energy is to chemical energy as atomic dimensions (10–10 m) are to nuclear dimensions (10–15 m). Nuclear reactions have energies on the order of 100,000 times the energy of chemical reactions." [59] In the report of Sir Arthur Eddington (1920) about F. W. Aston's discovery of hydrogen fusion into helium proved that this simple fusion releases 0,7% of the mass equivalent of the energy of the sun, allowing the sun to shine for about a 100 billion years [60].


The material leverages used by divinity from within the fabric of all things grants Him the power to control it as a 'clay in the potter's hands' and also the full capability to create, combine, and recombine that fabric in infinite ways. Episodes like banning demons (Matt 8:16), walking on waters, Christ or Peter (Matt 14:25–28), rising deeds from death (Luk 7:14), healing the eyes of the blind people (John 9: 1–41) and paralytic (Matt 9: 1–8), or pouring water from a dry stone in desert (Num 20:11), bringing quail from nowhere (Exo 16:13) – all have in common the same explanation: all their substances, material or spiritual, obey God's command or Christ's word. These episodes of clear influence over everything made the witnesses wondering about the power of penetration into matter and spirits of Christ's word: 'What is this word, that with authority and power he doth commands the unclean spirits, and they come forth?' (Luk 4:36). The connection between Christ – God and the elements of things was so obvious for everyone, believer or not, that made them afraid that His power is beyond the will of beings, and thus He could make them do things that are not willing to, for his command have some properties or a proper tool beneath the seeing surface of objects

and beings to move them as He pleases. 'Who, then, is this, that even the winds he doth command, and the water, and they obey him?' (Luk 8:25). It is thus obvious that everything ever created vibrates at the word – command of God, creating and recombining everything after His will. All things follow not only an intelligent design and their natural attraction to the completion of it [61], but they are doing all transformations demanded by the Creator, by bending under His will (Luke 3:5; Isaiah 45:2, 23–25; Philippians 2:10) on the way, as an ongoing creation. This way, we can also leave a certain legerity to 'the world' and the conscious beings to act at their own will, without being predestined to act that way, while God acts in the world 'on the way' as recalibrating and rebalancing all after the eschatological plan He has and the detailed historical book He pre – knew.

As for the omnipresence of God into the world the LVD prove that divinity is not present at all within the universe since it has a different nature, but God is still present all over, in this universe or another, since He has spread his energy/grace/divine material leverages into the fabric of all things, material or spiritual. Due to that determination, God remains transcendent to all things and universes by nature while being profoundly immanent into all through LVDs. "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven, and the highest heaven cannot contain You, how much less this house which I have built!" (1 Kings 8:27). Here, there is no conflict of nature/substance between a God omnipresent and the universes of different beings, material or spiritual.

A. Logos or logoi?

The Greek term Logos had a beautiful, yet deep route of use, both in philosophy and theology, mostly Christian. The antic philosophical term of Logos was close to




personalization and transformation into a real person, one that creates everything and has the power over all as the Heraclitic principle of order. From this to the Stoic term of *logoi*, it was always implied into the world's destiny as the logical and causal starting point. Naming the Son of God with the Neoplatonic content of *Logos*, Christianity made the statement through St. Apostle John that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (1:1), and by that they have enhanced the person of Christ with same powers and capabilities as the God of OT, Yahwe. But the sentence "Everything came into being through this Word" (John 1:3) was a real doubt between theologians if they should consider *Logos* or *logoi* to answer to: what is that God's word used for creation? If it would be for *Logos*, then God's Son would be rather a tool into the Father's hand than a consubstantial and equal being with Him. Thus, it leave us to the other use, the primary meaning, with the whole philosophical implication that comes through this. And this brings us back to our central question in this paper: how could God command to matter to bring things and beings out of it and what were the material leverages that was supposed to be operated to accomplish His will?

Stoics (301 BC – 150 AD) have seen the world/universe as a giant body and all its parts connected by something in a way that it behaves like an organism, obeying thus to his Creator's demands. The fire within, that stimulates and also links everything, for them was the "divine reason (*logos*) – a visible influence from Heraclitus of Ephesus' ideas." [62] A poor yet strong concept, these "seminal *logos*" (gr. *λογοι σπερματικοι*, *logoi spermatikoi*) where in fact the only philosophical concept to answer our initial question, in spite of the lack of substance this concept has. Even if it doesn't bring a clue what are the material leverages pulled out by 'the word of God' within the fabric

of the universe in creation, this concept clarifies at least that the nature is full of God's conscience that has also a material substrate [63], that divinity and matter are not overlaid, yet they share something that connects them, and that the creation has at least one internal resort to 'listen' [resonate] its Creator's voice which is, at the same time, its capability to 'obey' [to fulfil] His demands. Of course, there were some Church fathers rejecting this material substrate of God's involvement into the world's creation, but this opponency was only due to the contemporary visualisation of a material creator. "Those who were too ignorant to rise to a knowledge of a God, could not allow that an intelligent cause presided at the birth of the Universe; a primary error that involved them in sad consequences. Some had recourse to material principles and attributed the origin of the Universe to the elements of the world. Others imagined that atoms, and indivisible bodies, molecules, and ducts, form, by their union, the nature of the visible world. Atoms reuniting or separating, produce births and deaths and the most durable bodies only owe their consistency to the strength of their mutual adhesion: a true spider's web woven by these writers who give to heaven, to earth, and to sea so weak an origin and so little consistency" [64]. So, a thought over a theory as such has been given, but never considered as an option since one of the main Saints rejected the very premise of it; now it is time to reconsider it from a different, open – minded perspective.

In this alternative, between the term *logos* and *logoi*, we will find them described both as premises [65] of the things that are about to be done, and also as paradigms of the same things, but existing in the eternal mind of the Creator. Both are referring to the real things [not only to their matter] but in different relations with them: the former lays in the actual thing as its natural law, according to whom it comes to the



programmed being – as the oak coming from a specific seed –, while the latter is the eternal divine models, a hypothetical and essence – creating plan residing in the divine mind. Both premises, both latent, but the existence of them is consequent, one belonging to this temporal plan of existence, while the other stands preexistent in the original plan. There is no evidence that they are not equally fulfilling, that the seed – premise is not becoming the thing thought as in its eternal paradigm. Yet, the religious belief is that the divine plan/paradigm is fulfilling exactly, in spite of the problems arising from this, e.g. the paradox of free will, the existence of evil.


It seems that St. Maximian placed these two options of Logos/logoi together, in a logical ratio. He has placed the Logos as a metaphysical center of the logoi, and also made Him [the Logos, Son of God] present in each of them.[66] His possible inspirator, Dionysius the Areopagite, gave an even more accurate interaction between the processions and logoi with God. He speaks, as a matter of fact, of an unconfused union. [67] This idea is in accordance with the teachings of the Bible who says that Christ/ the Logos “upholds all things by the word [ροημα, Rhema = word, action of saying] of His power” (Hebrews 1:3) and that He is the power which sustains all things all together [Upholding all things] (Col. 1:17). This is the genuine relation between the Logos and Logoi, One being the Subject of action, while the other one the action itself. By this view we can now assume that the Word is in all things, involved and inherent in all things created, through the seminal principle, that are vehicle of expression of the Logos, “the very Word being God himself (John 1:1), Who while different from things that are made, and from all Creation, is the One own Word of the good Father, Who by His own providence ordered and illumines this Universe.”[68]

V. HOW THIS THEORY WORKS

Relating LVD with evolution, we can say that the ‘curse’ over the snake to be condemned to crawl on the face of the earth without legs is the first sign of ‘evolution,’ a transformation consent in the kingdom of animals.

The creation has to be consent to every moment of world’s history because things and beings are created all the time. A creation ex nihilo has to be assimilated with the first moment of creation, the making of world’s fabric, while every moment consecutive is only ontological ex nihilo, since things that previously did not exist come to being from not – being. Therefore, the ongoing creation of LVD has many advantages, both for science and for several theological systems. A continuum relation between divinity and the universe has always been presumed or directly implied by diverse theological systems. More or less involved in the existence and the function of the world, divinity was either presumed to be too immanent – until its confusion with the world/nature, pantheism –, or too transcendent – to the cruel indifference of deus otiosus. A medium involvement of ‘God’ was significantly assert by Christianity, which, through the complex theo – logy of a God trifold existent – Nature, Persons and Grace – can be conceived both as omnipresent into the created world, as well as totally different from it – one through His grace, the other by His nature. A good help to this theory can provide LVD too.

Imagining the inflatable house we were playing in from childhood, I know that we were amazed how a flat, indistinct and unfunctional skin can become an entire building, with rooms, toboggans, stairs and other things with the help of ‘nothing,’ from thin air (literally). For those who are movie lovers we can also relate this continued creation with some movie scenes – for the sake of our imagination and for giving



extra understanding. For example, in the *Avatar* (2002) when the body of avatars used to transfer a human conscious from their original, human body, has received this conscious, it rise firm and acted as being full of life; when the plug of the transferring machine was turned off, the avatar body became flat, soft and limpness.


In the same way LVD shows the fabric of the universe: it is only the 'skin' of an organism that needs a Spirit to inflate and animate it. A force that controls every particle of an avatar body can raise it to its life fullness, and it is also its living unity. As the soul is for the man's body, man for the nature, the same involvement and role has the Great Spirit for the universe's organism. All the elements within these bodies, of course, can be regarded separately, working each in its own tempo and duty, but they "exist only together, in a concrete and indivisible correlation / Into the "body" the matter is "formed" by the soul, and the soul realizes itself only in its body." [69] This comparison does not suppress the individuality, but it has its genuine and full role only as part of the whole, imprinted both with an individual purpose, as well as with a holistic aim.

A. Can LVD explain the source of evil?

The LVD does not need any specification to explain why an organ or another acts the way it does, as other philosophical theories explain, e.g. *εντελέχεια* "the first actuality of a natural body" [70], or the universal 'Anima mundi' [71], or the predestination. Can LVD answer to the issue of illness and diseases and general evil? While religion declares them un-natural and unfitting to the world's essential aim – to live and enjoy the life-giving by the Creator –, science has declared otherwise – the natural process of ending a course of actions, philosophy share both explanations. The LVD says that all is a matter of subjective statement: boiling is a natural process of or bad if we place the goal

in a wrong way. "A fever is simply a natural process of rapid combustion—the "burning up" of this material—unduly retained within the organism." [72] Since there is a single will acting in all things and actions inside the world and through each particle of the universe, we cannot conceive that it would act in a bad way as against things or beings within. In this regard, we have to agree "that all disease is itself a curing process or method of elimination, and, as such, cannot possibly be cured!" [73] Thus, as Buddhism says, "every so – called disease can be shown to be a friendly, curative effort on the part of the bodily organism" [74] and not a destructive force came from outside the world to corrupt what is inside. That because life "does not result from an organism when it has been built up, but the vital principle builds up the organism of its own body" [75] and this vital principle cannot act against the organism that has built.

In this context a highly important issue in understanding how LVD considers the world's moving is the old question if God is or not the author of evil/bad? Because, since we say that He is the one that moves all and nothing of existence, material of spiritual, does not move by itself, not exclusively by virtue of an internal, ruling and determinant law, this means that either things move through the will of One who moves them (*sola gratia*), or that they are predestined to move the way they do. However, neither one of these alternatives grant us a response to the problem of Evil existence since, in both options, the Creator is responsible for 'wanting'. LVD says that, by anchoring within the seen and unseen creation, the divine agency animates things and moves them according to the plan thought before and destined for our worlds. Until here things seems more determinist than in any other theory, but we should take into account of a single aspect that changes everything in our favor. Moving thing and beings from within the very fabric that makes them up, God has




access for sure to all, at the same time and with the same unlimited force of change. Only one thing is beyond LVD's capacity of movement. Beyond the fabric from which things and beings – spiritual and material – are made of, God founded an aspect transcendent to any fabric, something that does not belong to matter, nor the spirit. It escapes from their grasp or of any other existence that requires a fabric to consist of, and still, it governs both without being confused with them, something that leads and move things and both worlds altogether, like Him, from within, being both immanent as well as transcendent, by their alterity. This something else and the fabricless thing are the consciousness, and this is the true 'image' of God, one used for making men, angels, or any other self-conscious being God would have made in this or other universes. Without substance, ethereal and intangible, the consciousness is that which, once anchored in one of the two materials, changes them according to its own plan and pattern. It can follow the divine pattern and 'stay in the God's love', or it can chase a selfish plan, outside the divine conception and disagreeing with this, becoming thus the opposite of the Supreme Good – absolute Evil. Therefore, evil does not consist of things and does not reside in their fabric, but in their selfish use, one inconsistent with the plan – revealed or inferred – divine. In this case, the consciousness – the divine image – is determined by the 'free' will, being outside the divine leverages that are only in the material of things and beings, and not in their will or conscious.

While the divine action can pass 'over' the intentionality of consciousness and free will, and create a movement of the fabric – spiritual or material – even unwanted by the consciousness: [e.g. "What do you want of us, you Son of God? Have you come here before the appointed time to torture us?", Mat 8:29] because it has the full capacity

to move things through the anchor within the fabric. Still it cannot constrain the consciousness by any means to want to act according to the divine plan, nevertheless implemented exactly, mostly against the conscious will of beings. We know that religion asserts that the free will is the only spiritual instance God does not restrain and censor, and the best explanation for it cannot do that is because of its kindness. However, here it is not about a respect brought by the divinity to the free will [human, angelic, or other] because it is not the case for this. We have understood that things and beings move after the will of God entirely, respecting the plan completely, regardless of what the conscious beings might want. The Tower of Babel, the flood, the life of Job, of Jonah's or [the humanity of] Jesus Christ's opposition, or of Saul of Tarsus are only a few notorious examples of the fact that the divine leverages act the fabric from which all are made from, even if their conscious will may be headed in an opposite way.

In all these cases – in which the conscious that masters the fabric could not also control it – those beings get to 'fulfill' the plan without necessarily wanting this, and their reluctance proves clearly that they are not 'in charge' of their own being. Christ is the only one who, being aware of the fact that there is no other way but to submit his conscious will to the divine plan that would be fulfilled anyway unequivocally, acquiesces to become partaker entirely, body, soul, and spirit (free conscious) to that plan and its fruits. In this reasoning lies the 'punishment of Hell' as well. Because the beings who have systematically resisted the cooperation with the divine plan and submitted their body, spiritual or material, to some actions against this scheme imposed on world through its internal leverages, will wake all of a sudden trapped in a body that no longer listens to their will and that is "carry where you do not wish to go" (John



21:18). “In that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (Matt 22:13; 8:12; cf. Psalm 112:10). For how have succeeded some to attain the level of sanctity? Is there a single way that leads to this state? Of course not, because each one has left in his own way and lived a life different from other saints. The denominator common to all was ‘the surrender of will’ to God’s or ‘the cutting off the will’. Only when a person become aware that the plan of God fulfills anyways and that no matter what it would be he must surrender to that because that is the true and the only-lasting reality, only by doing so they were made partakers of the divine promise, “They shall not enter My rest” (Hebrews 4:3). Moreover, what other rest Christ promises to His followers but the inner one, the peace “of God that surpasses all understanding” (Philippians 4:7). What another climax of existence foresees many other religious or philosophical system of thought, integralist, such as Buddhism, then the ‘inner peace,’ self-reconciliation?


From the perspective of the oriental religious systems, it is obvious that things appear even clearer than in others because the climax of spiritual transformation is the total reconciliation with the inevitable, the acceptance of the implacable and the embrace of the conditions/circumstances imposed by the universal plan/design. “Really, is it hurting you to keep on kicking against the cattle prods?” (Acts 26:14). The conscious and deliberate systematic reluctance brings the status of ‘evil’, and this belongs neither to divinity, nor to the plan imposed to things for the proper operation of the creature, but resides only in the [bad] leadership of the body or soul against this plan. This leadership is made through the conscious operating of the body[76] found in possession of the volitional conscious in the wrong direction. When things degenerate, and the being is diverted from the original plan closed to the limit, the material divine leverages remake the balance by forcing

things to step back on the right track. This is perceived by the diverted as being a source of ‘evil/bad,’ as against their will, even if this circumstantial bad is nothing else but the projection of their will against the natural course of the world. For example, one who intends to kill several persons and is forced to stop by drastic measures, maybe even painful, he will perceive these ‘normal’ measures as being a bad, a privation of liberty, and a mutilation of his physical integrity as well. In reality, things should stay that way, and he should only accept them for at least consciously to escape the ‘pain’ of the reluctance against the normality.

Why does divinity not intervene all the time to correct wrong behavior and put it back on the right track? Maybe it does, because the plan is immutable, and its completion through LVD relentless. That is why no one can escape it physically, but conscious, volitional[77] alone. However, the ‘dreaming’, typical to lost consciousnesses in their own plan, ends always painfully, because of the accentuated degradation of the will – that stage of scoundrel, deuced, demonic possession, defined by a visible and quickening state of “anti-” (against).

B. Other applications:

There are numerous events and stories within the Bible that come to my mind in a new appearance once I had this theory figure it out, and I look upon them with a new recognition of their possibility of accomplishment. Many episodes of material use that were somehow taboo and shrouded in mystery became now possible to be understood without losing their religious value at all. For example, the moment of receiving by Moses of ‘The Two Stone Tablets’ “written with the finger [עבצא, ‘etsba’ = means especially the index – finger][78] of God” (Exod 31:18) was so taboo and unspeakable of since there was no actual possibility of considering an actual



'finger of God', as a part of the God's body. But correlating the LVD with many other mentioning of 'etsba' it is so obvious that this is not about a bodily finger, but about the bending of matter under God's mighty touch, one that makes the whole Egypt bend upon God's touch of His finger on the fourth plague (Exod 8:19), while another mention of same God's finger (Luke 11:20) prove it is also powerful over the other type of material, the spiritual one, since it has 'the authority to cast out demons' (Matt. 10:1), since its presence is the proof that "the kingdom of God has come upon you". None of these three episodes would be possible unless this so-called material 'finger' would not be somehow linked to the fabric of the things it touches and bends under God's will. It also denotes power, direction, or immediate agency. "Thy heavens, the works of thy fingers [of thy power]," says the Psalmist (Ps. viii. 3). So, by the explanation given by LVD we can consider now that the 'two tables of testimony, tables of stone' are actually written, carved in stone by this finger, and the letters were really there, done not by Moses hand and then sanctified by a spiritual act of consecration, but by the bending of matter through the action of LVD. Therefore, this 'finger of God' is not a figure of speech, not an analogy, but a real tool [as in John 20:27] that touches both kinds of materials, spiritual and matter.

Another example that came to my mind when trying to connect LVD with the Biblical teachings is the 'Christ's transfiguration' [μεταμορφώω, metamorphoo = to transfigure, transform, change], when His bodily 'face shone like the sun, and His garments became as white as light' (Matt 17:2). It is only a prefiguration act of His eternal appearance, taken after His resurrection (Matt 28:3) and it touches not only His body - as many theologians imply - but His clothes as well, white as snow. The LVD help us see that the resurrection, the transfiguration and any other change made


in flesh is actually possible since the "flesh trembles for fear of You" (Psalm 119:120).

"We can conclude that consciousness is a quantum mechanical entity that can have an independent existence."[85]

CONCLUSION

To sum up: I have to underline here that this ancient and patristic idea of seminal notions (rationes seminales) that gradually 'e - volves,' 'un - folds,' or 'en - velops' in time[79] are nothing but another possible reference for the theory of God's body and not the theory of it. Therefore, the world union [henosis] has various fundamentals starting from as many possible meanings as we have considered here, all asserting that there is a union between the spirit and the flesh, an attraction force that keeps altogether transforming the whole universe into a giant body, reasoning and obeying its Spirit. "For in the mystery of Christ the synthetical union not only preserves those natures which are united in an unconfused manner, but also allows for no separation between them." [80] This theory saves us from pantheism, as well as from deism, in the same time being more than a mere theistic evolution that is "the process of evolution as the primary term, and makes the Creator secondary as merely a qualifying adjective." [81] It proves that God is present into nature through a material link used as a hook to anchor the spirit into the body of the universe. It also proves that, while being immanent into the universe, God is not confused with it since He is not the nature itself or overlapping it as a block, but He is represented into each and every piece of the matter by proxy.

We have seen that a theory of compromise for connecting science and theology was evolutionary creation. It was almost a success if would not have been so criticized by both scientists and theologians equally. The lobby for creationist ideas such




as “intelligent design” was considerable and aimed to serve as a “wedge” for reopening science classroom discussions of God [82]. It mostly fights against the unscientific character of evolutionary theory based on some undiscovered links between species, while the proponents of evolutionism blame the other part for same things. Accepting almost everything science already proved, Theistic evolution has added ‘God’ variable above all, but this version of a god “is not the omnipotent Lord of all things, whose Word has to be taken seriously by all men, but He is integrated into the evolutionary philosophy” [83]. The important fact of the divine leverages theory (LVD) is that neither evolution, nor another compromising theological idea have to forget to concur science and theology over cosmogony. Evolution of things, deistic or atheistic, is no longer needed if we accept that there are no discontinuities in the relationship between the creation and its Creator, since He makes everything step by step according to a thoroughly made plan. While through evolution everything has a genetic code that tries to achieve its fulfillment, and, with the intervention of accidental circumstances, became other recombination codes, through LVD nothing is autonomous in any degree, but stays dependent to God’s permanent intervention and caring. This way if, by scientific perspective, the nature looks like it follows its genetic program and sometimes any rerouting also appears as ‘accident’, by LVD perspective the universe has no program that involves accidents, a random reprogramming of genes, or a fickle Spirit that runs all at his whimsy will. In LVD the universe has neither gaps, errors, nor intentional ‘evil’ actions, since everything is conducting, step by step, by the Great Spirit through the divine leverages anchored in all fundamental fabric. There is no ‘natural’, nor ‘supranatural’ since the nature of the universe does not follow any natural pattern and thus it doesn’t neither receive

supra – natural actions. There is nothing ‘wrong’ going on per se since everything is smoothly adjusting ongoing with the time passing, not randomly, since the Spirit that runs through all matter interconnecting all – as the quantum theory asserts – has both a precise plan and also an eschatological aim, so that He has to rebalance things after the interventions of the conscious beings. This way the ‘intelligent design’ resides not only in the mind of God while it leaves for the world to accomplish it as it can; that is why God is not only a and w, but everything in between as well.

On the other hand, LVD underlines that God did not place seminal reasons into things in order to accomplish a purpose mentioned and designated from the beginning. This idea would probably look like God has no need to be present around any longer since everything seems to run by themselves towards the eternal paradigms they have imprinted into their nature (essence). Now, the theory of divine leverages tells that God has more active influence to things than that, because He has not left seeds to grow into grown up plants if they find proper conditions. In that theory, things can go wrong all the time, since, by accident, only a little part of seeds comes to get into their final pre – assigned stage (Luke 8:5 – 15). Here, God never leaves the reins of the universe aside, being plugged into the very fabric of all things and beings at all times, and making everything moving [as *perpetuum movens*], living, transforming and interconnecting as a net. Of course, it is not exhaustive in explaining how the world runs, but it certainly helps a lot. For example, it says nothing about the role of free will, but it definitely explains why are miracles (extra – natural actions) happening when necessary.

However, is this theory applicable to the material universe only, or it is possible to apply it even to other, spiritual universes




as well? Alternatively, how all beings and universes have a certain bodyness, involving a created fabric as fundament? Because even if God is spiritual 'like angels' are, their spirituality remains still created. Thus, obvious it cannot be but different from God's. Now, the difference between these two spiritualities is that angels' is corporeal, while we cannot assign but incorporeity to God. "It is clear that every created spirit needs corporeal substance." [84] "For by Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities – all things have been created through Him and for Him" (Colossians 1:16 – 19). The theory saying that everything that has been ever created vibrates at the word, command, and will of God, makes us also understand how all things that have not obeyed Him due to their free will until the Judgement Day, will follow then all transformations demanded by the Creator, bending under His will (Luke 3:5; Isaiah 45:2, 23 – 25; Philippians 2:10). Moreover, the LVD theory helps us understand that every created thing and universe, material or spiritual, is bound to the fabric made in the beginning out of nothing and that is why there is no necessity of considering another eternal existence before creation or the world, no void, or matter, or something else. Before the LVD God was all that there was, while the whole creation is therefore bond not primarily to the beginning of time, but with the bringing into existence of raw materials – so, we solve the problem of when, leaving us only to the intentional why.

As an ultimate light brought by this theory I should say that, if we would took into account, instead of his theory, the 'seminal reasons' assumed to reside in the nature of things helping them to fulfil God's paradigms accordingly, then it would be incomprehensible why the Judgement Day would not be only for mankind and fallen angels, but for all things and their

restoration to fit their new use, Matt 17:11, 18:16.


It does not answer to some problems such as why is the lifespan determined the way it is, the role of telomere shortening in cell senescence, or ... Instead it proves that miracles are a basic kind of acts in the universe, almost as regular as the 'natural laws', since they are happening regularly (I cannot say anything about the frequency of them since there is no relation between the miracles and the natural law except that the former completes the latter when it is not efficient or it needs corrections). The LVD explanation about miracles is that they are not at all supra – natural, since there is no such thing as natural/supranatural, since all actions, both natural – physical laws – and supernatural – miracles – are conducted within the nature of things [not outside of them] by the same power and will, God's. It is thus impossible for a single conscious being to do two different things, one according to its presumed nature and another as opposed to it. Both with same aim, use, and target, both using same substance to accomplish their task, sharing same conscious will, and made by the same powerful being over the same things – cannot be declared one as being natural, while the other supra – natural. What would be then the element that can characterize the 'supra'? We know that for the philosophers those actions declared as 'supra' (Latin *suprā* "above") was due to the belief in the alterity of the Supreme Being that intervenes from time to time inside the self – sustaining world to correct its irregularities or flaws. With this explanation we can understand now why LVD has no need for this distinction, nature – supernature, since every action is made inside the nature/fabric of the world and always by the same powerful Word/will; no self – sustaining or alter nature involved, only the Spirit connected/ hardwired to the network of matter's particles doing all kind of acts within.




The worlds are created by God directly, personally and moreover, ‘by hand’. The expression ‘by hand’ is implied in many passages in the Bible to underline the personal implication of the Creator into the making of the worlds. This direct involvement has opened the possibility of working with a material as in comparison with the potter and the clay. “I look up at the heavens, made by your fingers, at the moon and stars you set in place” (Ps 1), “The heavens declare the glory of God, the vault of heaven proclaims his handiwork” (Psalm 19:1). And others: ‘The voice of Yahweh over the waters’ (Psalm 29:3); ‘The heavens are yours, and the earth is yours’ (Psalm 89:11); ‘You stretch out the heavens like a tent’ (Psalm 104:3).

REFERENCES


- [1] Aristotel, *De anima. Parva naturalia*, 404a 25.
- [2] Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, vl.1 1990, 368.
- [3] “In the beginning God created the heavens and earth” (Gen.1: 1).
- [4] Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures In Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989, 112.
- [5] Gerhard May, *Creatio ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of ‘Creation out of Nothing’ in Early Christian Thought*, trans. A. S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, p. viii.
- [6] David Adams Leeming, *Creation Myths of the World: An Encyclopedia*, Volumul 1, second Edition, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC Clío, 2010, 411.
- [7] David B. Burrell, Carlo Cogliati, Janet M. Soskice, and William R. Stoeger (edit.), *Creation and the God of Abraham*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 11.
- [8] Gerhard May suggests that it is to Basilides in the mid-second century that we owe the first quite explicit formulation of the doctrine of creation ex nihilo that has come down to us. Later on St. Theophilus of Antioch who in his *Ad Autolyicum* was the first, so far as we know, to have proclaimed creation ex nihilo in the full sense within the Christian tradition, arguing for it in some detail. May, *Creatio ex Nihilo*, pp. 83–84, 160–161.
- [9] I. Barbour, *Religion in an age of science*, The Gifford Lectures 1989-1991, vol. 1; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990, 14.
- [10] Georges Florovsky, *Creation And Redemption*, Vol 3 in “the Collected Works”, Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976, 46.
- [11] Burrell, *Creation and the God of Abraham*, 21.
- [12] Michael S. Heiser, “God as Creator of All Things — Including the Material Already Present at Genesis 1:1”, in *The Naked Bible*, August 21, 2010. Accessed 27.07.2016, http://michaelsheiser.com/TheNakedBible/2010/08/god-as-creator-of-all-things-including-the-material-already-present-at-genesis-11/#utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=god-as-creator-of-all-things-including-the-material-already-present-at-genesis-11.
- [13] The Babylonian *Atrahasis* epic.
- [14] James Stambaugh, *The Days of Creation: A Semantic Approach*, *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, 5(1):70–78, 1991.
- [15] “Creation out of nothing”, in *Theopedia*, accessed 15.7.2016, <http://www.theopedia.com/creation-ex-nihilo>.
- [16] The obstinent doctrinal prayer in the Eastern Christian liturgy, ‘Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom’, e.g. the silent prayer after ‘Our Father’.
- [17] Ibidem.
- [18] St. Gregory of Nyssa, “Or. cath. m.”, c. 6, *PG* xlv, c. 28; cf. St. John Damascene, *De fide orth.* I, 3, *PG* xciv, 796: “for things whose being originated with a change [απὸ τροπῆς] are definitely subject to change, whether it be by corruption or by voluntary alteration.”
- [19] Gregory of Nyssa “De opif. hom.”, c. XVI, *PG* xliv, 184; rf. “Or. cath. m.”, c. 21, *PG* xlv, c. 57: [“The very transition from nonentity to existence is a change, non-existence being changed by the Divine power in being”]



- (Srawley's translation). Since the origin of man comes about "through change," he necessarily has a changeable nature.
- [20] Stephen H. Webb, *American Providence: A Nation with a Mission*, New York: Continuum, 2004, 7.
- [21] Is the Seventh Day an Eternal Day? | Answers in Genesis, <https://answersingenesis.org/days-of-creation/is-the-seventh-day-an-eternal-day/> (accessed July 31, 2016).
- [22] "Is the Seventh Day an Eternal Day?" in *Answers in Genesis*, June 1, 1999. Accessed 30.07.2016, <https://answersingenesis.org/days-of-creation/is-the-seventh-day-an-eternal-day/>.
- [23] See more in Andrew S. Kulikovsky, "God's Rest in Hebrews 4:1-11", in *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, 13.2 (1999): 61-62. Retrieve at <http://hermeneutics.kulikovskyonline.net/hermeneutics/heb4.pdf>.
- [24] Colin Ewart Gunton, *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2001, 17.
- [25] Ernan McMullin, "Creation ex nihilo: early history", op. cit., 20.
- [26] For example, Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954. Christopher M. Rios, *After the Monkey Trial: Evangelical Scientists and a New Creationism*, USA: Fordham university Press, 2014.
- [27] Ernan McMullin, "Creation ex nihilo: early history", in David B. Burrell (edit.), *Creation and the God of Abraham*, 12.
- [28] Jeffrey Ostler, *The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee*. Cambridge University Press, Jul 5, 2004. ISBN 0521605903, pg 26.
- [29] Victor Kernbach, *Miturile Esențiale* [engl. *Essential Myths*], translate in Romanian, Bucharest: Editura științifică și enciclopedică, 1978, 110.
- [30] Heraclitus, regarded by St. Justin (Apol. I, 46) as a Christian before Christ, coined this metaphysical concept as the universal principle which animates and rules the world. But the development of the concept was due to Stoics. God, according to them, "did not make the world as an artisan does his work, but it is by wholly penetrating all matter that He is the demiurge of the universe" (Galen, "De qual. incorp." in "Fr. Stoic.", ed. von Arnim, II, 6); He penetrates the world "as honey does the honeycomb" (Tertullian, "Adv. Hermogenem", 44), this God so intimately mingled with the world is fire or ignited air; inasmuch as He is the principle controlling the universe, He is called Logos; and inasmuch as He is the germ from which all else develops, He is called the seminal Logos (logos spermatikos). "The Logos", in *The New Advent Encyclopedia*, accessed 17.07.2016, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09328a.htm>.
- [31] Kernbach, *Miturile Esențiale*, 110.
- [32] Ben C. Ollenburger (edit.), *Old Testament Theology: Flowering and Future*, vl. 1. USA: Eisenbrauns, 2004, 148.
- [33] Mircea Eliade, *Traite d'Histoire des Religions*, 53.
- [34] Ștefan Mașu, Marele Arhitect Al Universului. *Tratat de cosmologie și antropologie* (eng. The Great Architect of the universe. *Treatise of cosmology and anthropology*), Bucharest: RAO, 2012, 34, 42.
- [35] *Ibidem*, 50.
- [36] *Ibidem*, 61.
- [37] James G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*, New York: Macmillan, 1958, 58-9. Definitions of Religion - Portland State University, <http://web.pdx.edu/~tothm/religion/Definitions.htm> (accessed July 31, 2016).
- [38] Fr. Lect. Cosmin Tudor CIOCAN, "God's immanency in Abraham's response to revelation: from providence to omnipresence", in *Dialogo*, 2:2 (2015), 176 et.all., doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.15.
- [39] Masu, *Marele Arhitect Al Universului*, 104, 112.
- [40] Kernbach, *Miturile Esențiale*, 88.
- [41] Caspar Meyer, *Greco-Scythian Art and the Birth of Eurasia: From Classical Antiquity to Russian Modernity*, OUP (2013), 246 (fig. 98b)
- [42] "Why won't Jehovah's Witnesses accept blood transfusions, even when their lives are



- in jeopardy?”, in *Catholic Answers*, accessed 19.07.2016, <http://www.catholic.com/quickquestions/why-won39t-jehovah39s-witnesses-accept-blood-transfusions-even-when-their-lives-are-i>.
- [43] Blood Rituals - The Evil Wiki - Wikia, http://evil.wikia.com/wiki/Blood_Rituals (accessed July 31, 2016).
- [44] “Blood ritual”, in *Wikipedia*, accessed 13.07.2016, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blood_ritual.
- [45] “Covenanting Enforced by the Grant of Covenant Signs and Seals”, in *Bible Hub Library*, accessed 22.07.2016, http://biblehub.com/library/cunningham/the_ordinance_of_covenanting/chapter_xi_covenanting_enforced_by.htm.
- [46] Elmer A. Martens, *God's design. A focus on Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981, 54.
- [47] Kris Aaron, “Blood Sacrifices - Blood Spells - Blood Charms”, in *An exploration of Dark Paganism*, accessed 20.07.2016, <http://www.waningmoon.com/darkpagan/lib/lib0003.shtml>.
- [48] Samael Aun Weor, *The Great Rebellion: The State of Our World and How to Change It Through Practical Spirituality*, Glorian Publishing, 2010, ch. 29.
- [49] One of the first physicians to propose blood transfusions to rejuvenate older people was Andreas Libavius, a German doctor and alchemist. In 1615 he proposed connecting the arteries of an old man to those of a young man. “Can we reverse the ageing process by putting young blood into older people?”, in *TheGuardian*, august 2015, accessed 23.07.2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2015/aug/04/can-we-reverse-ageing-process-young-blood-older-people>.
- [50] *The Platelet Rich Plasma*, also known as *the vampire facelift*, is so called because your own blood is taken and after separation of different constituents, the plasma with the platelets is reinjected into the skin. The PRP treatment has been used to treat elite athlete's injuries for some time, but has only recently been recognised as an anti-ageing treatment, and is now in high demand at cosmetic clinics around the world. Dr Jaishree Sharad, “Would you inject your own blood into your face to fight ageing?”, in *The HealthSite*, January 2014, accessed 23.07.2016, <http://www.thehealthsite.com/beauty/vampire-facelift-or-platelet-rich-plasma-therapy-anti-ageing/>.
- [51] See, for example, Hartmut Geiger, Heinrich Jasper, Maria Carolina Florian (editors), *Stem Cell Aging: Mechanisms, Consequences, Rejuvenation*, Vienna: Springer, 2015.
- [52] Ibidem.
- [53] Brandon West, “You Are God: The True Teachings of Jesus”, in *Walking Times*, November 14, 2014, accessed 13.07.2016, <http://www.wakingtimes.com/2014/11/14/god-true-teachings-jesus/>.
- [54] Leon M. Lederman și Dick Teresi, *The God Particle: If the Universe Is the Answer, What Is the Question?*, New York: Mariner Books, 2015, 7.
- [55] Ibidem, 8.
- [56] Sharon Gaudin, “Scientists raise doubts over discovery of elusive God particle”, in *ComputerWorld*, Nov 10, 2014 5:44 PM PT, accessed 14.07.2016, <http://www.computerworld.com/article/2845897/scientists-raise-doubts-over-discovery-of-elusive-god-particle.html>.
- [57] Christoph Paus, an MIT physics professor who organized the search for the Higgs in 2012, said it's clear that the collider found a new particle. “The new particle”, said Paus, “appears to match the Higgs from all sides, but our vision at the moment is not perfect, or even close to perfect. There's no reason why it shouldn't be the Higgs, but there's no reason why it couldn't be something else either.”
- [58] “Radioactive decay”, in *Wikipedia*, accessed 17.07.2016, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radioactive_decay.
- [59] “Fusion”, in *The Physics Hypertextbook*, accessed 29.07.2016, <http://physics.info/fusion/>.
- [60] Ibidem.
- [61] Fr. Lect. Cosmin Tudor CIOCAN, “God, the Creator of the multiverse. The theory of concomitance” în volumul *The 1st International Virtual Conference on Advanced Scientific Results (SCIECONF-2013)*, conferință pe 10-14 iunie 2013 Slovakia,



- Zilina: EDIS - Publishing Institution of the University of Zilina, pp. 295-300, ISBN: 978-80-554-0726-5. Online: SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2374468>;
- [62] Fr. Lect. Cosmin Tudor CIOCAN, "The philosophic paradigm as basis for early Christian doctrine of God's immanence", in *Dialogo* 2:2 (2015), 141, doi: 10.18638/dialogo.2015.2.2.12.
- [63] Ibidem.
- [64] St. Basil the Great, *The Hexaemeron*, Aeterna Press, 2016, 5.
- [65] Jeanne Fahnstock, "The Appeals: Ethos, Pathos, and Logos". Retrieved 20 October 2014. http://members.tripod.com/butler_s/f2002-1002/appeals.html.
- [66] Torstein Tollefsen, *The Christocentric Cosmology of St Maximus the Confessor*, 68.
- [67] Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite: Volumes I & 2, Section II*, Aeterna Press: "the self-existent Peace, both the general and the particular; and that It mingles all things with each other within their unconfused union, as be seems which, united indivisibly, and at the same time they severally continuously unmingled stand, as regards their own proper kind, not muddled through their mingling with the opposite, nor blunting any of their unifying distinctness and purity."
- [68] Saint Athanasius (Patriarch of Alexandria), *Against the Heathen*, tom. 41. Trad. by pr. prof. D. Stăniloae, in the collection „Părinți și scriitori bisericești”, București: Editura IBMBOR, 1987, vol. 15, p. 78.
- [69] Florovsky, *Creation And Redemption*, 115.
- [70] Aristotel, *De anima. Parva naturalia*, 412a 27.
- [71] See Tommaso Campanella, for whom nature is a complex of living realities, each animated and tending to its end, but then all unified and harmoniously directed toward a common goal by the same universal 'Anima mundi'.
- [72] Hereward Carrington, *Vitality, Fasting and Nutrition. A physiological study of the curative power of fasting, together with a new theory of the relation of food to human vitality*, New York: Redman Company, 1908, 12.
- [73] Ibidem.
- [74] Ibidem.
- [75] Charles George Herbermann, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 1, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 131.
- [76] There is a material body and also a spiritual body; both are subject of this theory.
- [77] By the reluctance of will, but the trout swimming against the water current does not equals the change of the flow direction. Moreover, many times not even this will against the planed normality is nothing else but merely a fruit of imagination.
- [78] 'FINGER', in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, accessed 06.08.2016, <http://jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/6120-finger>.
- [79] Mariusz Tabaczek, "An Aristotelian Account of Evolution and the Contemporary Philosophy of Biology", in *Dialogo*, 1:1 (2014), Zilina (Slovakia): EDIS, 61.
- [80] John Anthony McGuckin (editor), *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 2 Volume Set, 668.
- [81] Denis O. Lamoureux, "Evolutionary Creation: A Christian Approach to Evolution" (PDF), in *The BioLogos*, University of Alberta. Retrieved 25 April 2012.
- [82] John Rennie, "15 Answers to Creationist Nonsense", in *Scientific American*, July 1, 2002. Accessed 29.07.2016, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/15-answers-to-creationist/>.
- [83] Werner Gitt, "10 dangers of theistic evolution", in *Creation Ministries International*, accessed 29.07.2016, <http://creation.com/10-dangers-of-theistic-evolution>.
- [84] St. Bernard of Clairvaux, "Homilies on the Gospel 'Missus est'" (1120), vi.
- [85] Bryan Borich, "THE AWAKENING – Quantum Mechanics of the Human Brain and Consciousness", in *END GAME TIMES*, accessed 09.08.2016, <https://endgametime.wordpress.com/the-awakening-quantum-mechanics-of-the-human-brain-and-consciousness/>.

