The Many Faces of God (3)
Mystery and Play: God in mysticism and post-modernity

I have been trying to imagine God. First through the drama and dialogues of the Bible - where God is presented above all as a very personal presence, communicating a personal moral will; and as a personal agent who invites our response and who, in one way or another, makes things happen. Then through the more reflective imaginings of the classical theological traditions and Greek philosophy - where our images of God are of absolutes, a God transcending all time and change. And I ended last week with more than a hint that these do not sit easily together: they are like great tectonic plates which grate against each other. They set up a conundrum. How can an active, communicating personal reality who interacts with things in this world and makes them happen, also be an absolute unchanging reality beyond time?

But what I also hinted was that this can be a creative tension. Although historically one set of images has often predominated, either the transcendent or the personal, neither has ever completely let go its grip on the Christian imagination: and as they play on each other, our imagination is given even more to work with. Perhaps it's precisely in these contradictions and conceptual untidiness, that we may find more compelling images for God - and where we will find a sense of authenticity in the underlying revelation which has generated them: after all, a purely invented religion would not be so untidy, one might think...So what I now want to do in this final lecture is look more closely at these teasing incoherences and contradictions which occur whenever we try to think about the nature of God.

To do this I will consider two distinct phases in imagining God where this contradictory sort of imagining is especially to be found: the first is pre-modern mysticism; the second is its more recent post-modern counterpart. In between them I will take a brief detour to look at a form of mysticism which lies, in a sense, mid-way between them - William Blake's visionary perceptions of God of the late 18th century.

So - first the mystics, in their pre-modern form. Just what were they trying to communicate? We need first to understand something of the nature of their experience of God out of which their images came. It was, characteristically, an experience of intense yearning: God's longing for us and our yearning towards God. It was an experience of intense desire. Its nearest approximation is eros, from which of course we get the word erotic; an experience of extraordinary attraction which draws two persons together. In other words, God was for the mystics the sort of reality which elicited intense magnetic desire: a desire to contemplate the one desired, and in some way be deeply united with the one desired - i.e. united with God.

In that experience they found they encountered mystery. But they also felt a greater sense of knowing as they were drawn in further to the mystery. So the yearning and love at the heart of the experience was itself experienced as a pathway to real knowledge of God. St. Augustine was one of the first to
express this in any systematic sort of way. God is the kind of reality who can only be known through love.

It's an experience which follows at least some of the contours of Plato's philosophy, whom I mentioned last week as being such a great influence. Plato taught that is part of the very structure of reality that our souls must yearn to ascend their eternal source and be united to it, because that is their true home. The same contours of experience can be found in scripture itself. It's there in the psalms: 'as a deer longs for the running brooks so my soul thirsts for the living God'. Or think of the Song of Songs, where human erotic love is very explicitly used as a picture: 'My beloved thrust his hand into the opening and my inmost being yearned for him'. In the New Testament Paul longs to be united with Christ, longs to share his life and even his suffering. John's Gospel speaks of abiding in Christ, using images of deep union with him: we are like branches 'joined' to a vine. Unsurprisingly, then, it was often by deep meditation on scripture that the early mystics found both a catalyst for experiencing God in this way and new hidden meanings for God. Early church Fathers such as Clement (150 –c 215), Origen (c185-c254), and then St Augustine himself (354-430), all approached God this way, as did the earlier Jewish philosopher Philo.

But what sort of images of God actually emerged from these experiences? Well – not instantly illuminating, it has to be said! They tended to be elusive, paradoxical, puzzling. This is most famously presented in the 5th or early 6th century writings of a figure who himself, perhaps suitably, remains shrouded in mystery. The name of the author usually given is Pseudo-Dionysius.¹

Here's a taste of what he wrote: in these experiences, we are led up (I quote) 'beyond the unknowing and light, up to the farthest, highest, peak of mystic scripture, where the mysteries of God's Word lie….simple, absolute, and unchangeable…. in the brilliant darkness of a hidden silence….'. A number of things to notice. First, remember, personal desire is drawing him, so God is in some sense personal. But what is perceived is clearly not simply another person: it is something beyond ordinary personhood, something 'simple, absolute, and unchangeable'. Second, some of it is only negative: God is 'beyond light'. Third, the positive images are themselves oxymorons, apparent contradictions: the example here is what he calls a 'brilliant darkness'. Here's another taste: if you are prepared 'to leave behind everything perceived and understood….all that is and is not', if 'with your understanding laid aside you strive …towards union with Him', you will meet one 'beyond all being and knowledge.' Again, there's contradiction here: on the one hand we are approaching a 'Him' (a personal reality, something knowable in personal terms), yet what 'He' is is also unknown and inexpressible, 'beyond all being and knowledge'.

So - these experiences on the one hand offer positive images but then also seem to deny them at the same time. God is like brilliant light, but He is also like darkness. God is personal being, but also beyond all being. This is a
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pattern of much mystical theology: whatever is affirmed of God is also denied. The effect is never to allow us to settle in any one picture. We are always being moved on to something other and greater, beyond anything we can grasp.

Is this insistence on restlessly using different and even contradictory images perverse, just irrational? No. First it’s just what seems to arise inevitably if we are to be true to the fullness and mystery of the experience. But also, it’s a positive way of insisting that if we settled only in any one image, or compatible set of images, then we would have reduced the meaning of God to only one kind thing in our experience, and therefore by definition we could not be speaking of God who is beyond all these things. In that sense it is a rational response to mystery. It is displaying the deeper rationality of transcendence, and of infinity: contradictory descriptions are the only way to make sense of an infinite reality.

Pseudo Dionysius certainly believed this what he was doing. Let me spell out his logic a little more exactly. Because God is the infinite source of all things of this world, and has revealed Himself in them, we should at least try to offer images derived from the known things of this world to describe God (so we do use images like light, love, person, mind, and so on). At the same time, because God is the transcendent source of all, and cannot ever be just like any one, so they must also be denied, lest they limit and reduce God. Yet, equally, you cannot just deny them either, for that too would also limit God. This leads to more affirmations - and so to a counterpoint of constant affirmation and denial. I quote again: ‘since [God] surpasses all being…we should negate all these affirmations’. Yet ‘the negations are not simply the opposites of the affirmations for [as] the cause of all things [God] is [also] beyond every denial’.

What then do you do in the face of this mystery? On the one hand you give up and fall silent (the ‘apophatic way’). As Wittgenstein famously said 1500 years later, ‘whereof one cannot speak one must be silent’. This what the mystics do in their denials, when they say what God is not. On the other hand, silence and negation on its own fails to do justice the fullness of the experience of God. So you also use many of these images together, even if they contradict each together - as the mystics also did. All this ensures we never limit God just to our own finite image.

But it also purports to do more. This plethora and profusion of many different images, playing on each other, also claims to convey new meaning beyond the sum of its parts. To say God is both light and darkness (a ‘brilliant darkness’), both personal and unchanging, both three and one, is to convey something about God which can be expressed in no other way (rather like a c.v. of someone’s life: if we take it just sequentially, first one aspect of someone, then another, we get a limited picture; take it as a whole, take the tension between different aspects, some of which may seem odd in the same person, and perhaps we get nearer to who the person really is). So that was what the mystics were driven to do – and underlying it was always this deeper rationality that the structure of infinite reality of God cannot be confined to
binary opposites (God as either changing or unchanging, either light or darkness, either three or one). The structure of infinite reality must include all these apparent opposites playing on each other.

Abstract? Perhaps. But remember, this was not a view arrived at by the mystics simply through abstract thought - this deeper rationality has been grasped above all through the experience of intense love and yearning. Nor, incidentally, does it lead only to abstract thought: as we shall with William Blake, it can also play out in how we approach concrete social situations in this life. More of that in a moment.

So that is a brief outline of some of the features of this early mystical theology. What, if anything, you may ask, has it added?

In one sense nothing: you could say it’s only making explicit what is implicit in biblical theology and in later more reflective theology as I outlined them in the first two lectures. After all, Scripture itself uses a via negative i.e. saying what God is not, reticence about definite pictures of God (we can only see his ‘backside’), and it uses a riot of contradictory images (God is Father and Son, King and servant, light and love, unchanging and responsive). Reflective theology is the same. It has doctrines of God who is both beyond time and change and intimately involved with it: it has its incarnational doctrines of a God who is both ‘without body, parts or passions’ and embodied in the world with us. But - there is a difference. What is distinctive, I suggest, is the way mystical theology doesn’t try to reconcile these paradoxes but positively celebrates them. What is distinctive is the way it uses them to take us further into this divine mystery; actively to subvert our shallow ‘either-or’ distinctions, which so limit God, and perhaps ourselves too.

This isn’t special pleading for thinking about God. We do this in other ways too when confronted by something beyond us which is a mystery: we appeal to apparent contradictions to describe and express the mystery we see. This is true of the mystery of other people. The poets know this well. You don’t have to go further than Shakespeare’s most famous sonnet. How can he describe his beloved? ‘Shall I compare thee to a summer’s day?’ No! ‘Thou art more lovely…’ There’s the negation. But then also, yes! ‘thy eternal summer shall not fade’. So summer gives some reference to what he wants to describe, but never enough - and so denial and other new images follow as well. And the outcome is not just confusion - we really do feel we have sensed something new about personal reality in this process.

Even the natural sciences sometimes proceed by a similar way. In their case it is the mystery of the cosmos which elicits it. Thus on the one hand they find they can describe some particles only in their absence, in the sense that they cannot describe them directly in themselves, but only in relation to their effects on something they are not. That is what the Cern laboratory near Geneva is pursing: realities at the sub-atomic level which defy ordinary observation. On the other hand they also model some realities by offering many positive images, even by a contradiction of images. The most celebrated is light itself which seems indescribable in any one image but
better modelled by being imaged as both a wave and a particle. So here too is a denial of the adequacy of any one image, and a recourse to a multiplicity of apparently contradictory images - in order to do full justice to the mystery of what we are encountering.

This mystical approach does not commend itself to all. For some, the contradiction of images is just irrationality and the denials, just saying what God is not, are just empty silence. The suspicion for some is, then, that this is all nonsense: there is nothing real there at all. That is how one recent theologian Don Cupitt read the later Medieval mystic Meister Eckhart: Cupitt claims Eckhart wasn’t experiencing the deeper rationality of a real mystery - he was actually experiencing nothing real at all.

But I’m sure that’s a wilful misreading of Eckhart and other mystics like him. Don Cupitt is simply reading Eckhart in his own image (Cupitt himself certainly had given up believing in anything real beyond). Whatever we ourselves experience and believe, or don’t, the mystics themselves certainly believed they were in touch with something real. Their silences or their contradictions were not driven by their sense of the absence of God, but by the opposite: it was the unique fullness of God in their experience that led them either to be silent or to use such profusion of images. So much so that even when they did experience times of absence (‘dark nights of the soul’), even those had to be interpreted in the light of the underlying presence. And it is that irreducible uniqueness of their experience, I suspect, which helps explain why this tradition has survived - why it survived the binary either-or rationality of enlightenment, positivism, and early modern science, with its demands that everything must be empirically testable. It is why now, in post-modernity, as we shall see, this mystical approach is still receiving attention: people experience mysteries in life which will not reduce to binary formulae or empirically testable data - and they always will.

However – before post-modernity, the detour. I want to step back from the ‘mainstream’ theological traditions for a moment and consider briefly a more maverick figure who stands historically between pre- and post-modern, mystical era: the late 18th century engraver and poet William Blake. Someone who was experiencing the new world of growing enlightenment rationalism, but not persuaded by it. Also, someone who showed in a particularly vivid way how a mystical approach and a deeper non-binary rationality affects not only our imagining of God but also our views of concrete social issues too.

So - what did Blake see? He certainly had strange experiences! Bizarre visions, we would instinctively say. When he was 4 years old he says he saw God put his head to the window which set him screaming. Once he saw the prophet Ezekiel under a tree in the fields. Later, when he was 8 or 10 one day as he was walking on Peckham Rye he saw ‘a tree filled with angels, bright angelic wings bespangling every bough like stars’
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Were these really in any sense visions of God? It is in his poetry, where he expresses these experiences most fully, that we are most likely to find out. At first sight, the visions seem just as bizarre there too, especially if we look at his long prose poems. There he gave expression to his visions by creating a whole Tolkien-like world of mythological figures to represent the mysterious forces and energies he was experiencing. He creates, for example, the figure of Urizen to describe the power of reason, and Los to describe the power of creative energy. Along with others, these characters of reason and creative energy then struggle in dramatic warfare within humanity, and within the processes of creation, sometimes one assuming dominance, sometimes another, but never resolving it. They are dramatic titanic figures cast in a torrent of vivid but opaque imagery, apparently representing energies of God or within God (or possibly just human energies - it's by no means always clear).

But although the imagery is obscure, one feature of it all is clear - especially in his shorter poems known as 'Songs of Innocence and Experience'. In one way or another Blake is describing ultimate reality as a co-existence of 'contraries' (e.g. contraries like innocence and experience). For Blake, the texture of life, and the texture of ultimate reality, is always this 'dialectic', this constant dialogue, between opposites. Not in the Hegelian sense that these opposites move through their battle towards a resolution or synthesis and so cease to be contrary. Instead, for Blake, the contraries go deeper: they seem to co-exist eternally, without losing their difference - contraries of reason and creative energy, body and soul, all need each other as contraries to be properly themselves and so to form the shape of ultimate reality. That, for Blake, is what he sees to be the truth about ultimate reality: a clear echo of how earlier mystics used contradictory images.

Now let's see how he also makes this concrete. For Blake, it is precisely when we do not see this necessity of contraries that we find ourselves in error in our social and political life, as well as in our religion. It is when one thing has total dominance over its opposite that things go badly wrong. In his own time, this is precisely what he saw happening when scientific reason and technology dominated. When reason (with its affinity for uniform and universal truths) came to have primacy over creative energy (with its affinity for unique, individual, particular, things) it destroyed every area of life. In the social realm the result could be seen in the effects of the industrial revolution - in the way a rational appeal to efficient production had crushed and ignored individual people, and left them in appalling social conditions. His poems about the plight of young chimney sweeps in industrialised London are moving expressions of this. In the aesthetic realm the result could be seen in classicism - in the way its appeal to reason had produced uniform anonymous rational geometric forms (especially in architecture) which ironed out all the creative individuality and particularity you see in Gothic, where each pillar has its own embellishment and decoration (it is well documented that Blake spent hours studying the Gothic art and sculpture here in Westminster Abbey, which he loved - unlike those new classic styles further down the river!). Then in the religious sphere, which taxed him most, the result of elevating reason was that it fed a false view of God. It had produced a remote and objectified deist
sort of God who created general laws through institutionalised religion which were made to apply to everyone equally, to keep everything in order and in its place, ignoring their individuality and creativity. This, he thought, was not the real God at all, but just a projection of the dominance of a human desire for rational control of everything, unconstrained by its opposite, the creative spirit. This view of God which had produced a church only concerned to punish those who resisted these generalised laws. In one poem he caricatures and lampoons this false rational image of God as an ‘old Nabaddly aloft’: who says ‘I love hanging & drawing & quartering/evry bit as well as war & slaughtering…’. It was a complete contrast to the true image of God in Jesus, where we see divine life revealed in a person who was not a slave to general laws but a creative merciful interpreter of them; one who assessed what was right according to the value of particular people in particular situations.

This withering social and religious critique may not be surprising in itself. Like Dickens later, it was because Blake could see in front of him the bad consequences of too much abstract universalizing instrumental reason. He saw it destroying England’s green and pleasant land with dark satanic mills. He saw how a false view of God was being used to justify these social evils around him. But what perhaps is surprising was that he could also see, even then, the deeper underlying rationality as well. This meant you could not simply dismiss reason altogether - there is always necessary co-existence of contraries, in which no one side must prevail. So although Blake’s particular context led him to press one side of the warring contraries, he knew it was not as simple as just sacking reason for creativity, sacking Jehovah in favour of Jesus. He could see the opposite dangers waiting in the wing. Yes, too much uniform reason might oppress, but a world devoid of reason, organization, and ordered laws, could become anarchic, and that too would be a form of tyranny. So his mythology didn’t just fling critical rhetoric at one thing or another, but also dramatized how any excess must be re-balanced by its opposite. The Book of Urizen, his mythological re-writing of creation, fall, and the great Christian themes of creation and redemption, shows this vividly. Urizen (the power of reason and ordering) first tries to bring order out of the chaos by making law. That goes wrong because, as we’ve seen, even good laws oppress when they generalize. So Los, the liberating force of creative energy, the life of artists and individuals, arises to put this right, to limit and curtail Urizen’s power. But as the myth goes this too gets taken to an extreme. Orc, the son of Los, like an unruly adolescent, then shows what unfettered creative desire is like, how that too becomes destructive if allowed to reign supreme. So it is that the myth as a whole expresses the deeper truth that a complete reality always requires warring contraries: reason and creativity, soul and body, what we call good and evil, need each other.

And what did that mean specifically for what God is like? As I’ve said, in context, in the social and religious oppressions he saw in his 18th century London, Blake’s preference is clearly for Jesus rather than Jehovah: for seeing divinity in particular human beings, seeing God within the depths of creative human experience, feeling, imagination, and love ‘Where Mercy, Love, and Pity dwell/There [is] God…dwelling too’, as he says in a poem from Songs of Innocence. So much so that we might, in fact, wonder whether Blake
is actually reducing the meaning of God to just to this, just to the human spirit - as if he (unlike Eckhart) really was a fore-runner of what we now call non-realism, the view that 'God' means only the human spirit with no transcendent reality at all, and there is literally 'Nobadaddy aloft'.

But that, I think, would be the same sort of misunderstanding that Cupitt made of the mystics. It would also be to mistake Blake’s his critique of one context to be a manifesto for all. If we also listen, for example, to Jerusalem we find something rather different. ‘I rest not from my great task! To open the Eternal Worlds, to open the Immortal Eyes/ Of man inwards into the Worlds of Thought: into Eternity/ Ever expanding into the Bosom of God’. This surely speaks of transcendence: it is an approach to God through human experience, but which cannot be contained there: it goes beyond it into unknown worlds. The sheer abundance of his visions reinforces this: like the earlier mystics, he expresses his sense of the reality of God with a plethora of images. What is God like in this abundance? It is as one might expect: Blake’s God is supremely this co-existence of contraries. God is not a reality who is in either spirit or body, either reason or creative energy, either what we see as good or evil. Nor is God just an undifferentiated unity beyond all these. Rather, God is the reality who is constituted of them all together.4

Much here, then, that resonates with the earlier pre-modern mystics. What is notable is that he came to it in midst of so-called enlightenment, at a time when the rise of science and modernity was making so much progress. Before romanticism and before our later disenchantments with rationalism, even then, Blake was realizing that a purely binary and positivist view of reason simply was not able to do full justice to reality.

But what about now? How do we imagine God where we are now, which is no longer like Blake in the dawn of modernity but in its evening? – in what is often called post-modernity?

One way of characterising post-modern picturing of God, or indeed anything else, is simply as play. We are in an era, it is said, where we've lost certainty in all previous secure foundations of knowledge. Scriptural literalism, the medieval world view, and even now the modern scientific and rational worldview, have been tried and found wanting. So all we can do is play an imaginative game. We can try anything: anything might be true, or nothing. Or more radically - and here perhaps is the truly new element of post-modernity - any truth that might be found will be in the gaps, the impossibilities, the contradictions, the mysteries these other world-views have left behind. We come closest to the truth about reality, especially ultimate reality, at the point where previous explanation fails, where the gaps are. To see those gaps, you will need to use all the previous stories and images, but you cannot settle in any of them: you will also need to look past them and behind them.

4 Note that Blake arrived at this, again like the earlier mystics, by being steeped in scripture. He used scripture strangely, took huge licence in his re-writing of scriptural narrative in his mythologies, yet scripture remained the launchpad.
An illustration. Consider a picture which the philosopher Kiekegaard used to explain what he called irony - which is a precursor of post-modern mentality. Take a look. The picture is an anonymous print of Napoleon. Where, you may ask? In fact his figure only emerges when you look at the space left by the gap between two trees. Did you see this immediately? Almost certainly not. The point is, you have to look at the picture in many ways, and undo the way you look at it many times, before it emerges. The further point is this: even when this picture of Napoleon does eventually emerge in these gaps, you still do not actually see Napoleon directly but only as a kind of gesture towards him. You do see him, but in what he’s not. And that is a picture of how God emerges, in post-modernity. If we want to describe God in 21st century we mustn’t look just at any one set of previous outlines and images, such as the philosophical categories of ‘transcendent spirit’, or ‘perfect rational mind’, or ‘moral demand’, or ‘unchanging ground of being’; nor just at a more concrete biblical images like ‘personal presence’, or ‘the image of Christ’: we must also look for what emerges when you see all these, and also realize that none is quite adequate, and begin to see the reality hidden by them as well as revealed by them. Even then you will not then see the fullness of God definitely and concretely, any more than you actually see Napoleon in the gap between everything. But you will have arrived at something, with some sort of real shape to it: just like that shape of Napoleon’s absence. This is the best way of sensing something really transcendent: that is, a real revelation precisely because it is something that is not just ‘in’ any of these other human attempts to understand, but has emerged from beyond and ‘behind’ them.

Another picture of the way post-modernity approaches God is by comparing it the way we surf the world wide web. In his introduction to The Postmodern God, theologian Graham Ward describes postmodern experience of the world by this analogy. You enter a cyberspace where: ‘You can move from electric libraries in Sao Paolo, chat-lines in Florida, info sites in Sydney, data banks in Vancouver, on-line shopping in Paris, audiovisual tours with 3-d graphics of the Vatican, the White House…the Taj Mahal’. In this experience of reality ‘Time and space…collapse…reality is malleable…permeable…a land of ceaseless journeying’. This, says Ward, is how ordinary reality now appears to us - or if not to us, to the younger generation. So Ward now applies it to ultimate reality as well, to God. What we need to realize, he suggests, is that God too is something that emerges only as we, like the surfer, are ‘willing to lose our hold on one position and enter into many’. In this post-modern world which is suspicious about all settled positions and certainties, God can only be credibly imagined in this sort of ceaseless journeying.

Again, you can see how similar all this is to earlier mystics: in one way or another the reality of God emerges from what is not as well as what is in the visible world around us; and God emerges from many images and perspectives, even contrary perspectives, not just from one. Mystical theology, Blake’s mystical poetry, and the restless theology of post-modernity - these are all attempts to enter and articulate mystery in this sort of way.

But - what has it left us with? Has it resolved the tension of those tectonic plates of contrasting images of God with which we began: the biblical images
of the personally speaking and active moral presence in history, and the transcendent God of philosophy, the unchanging self-sufficient, perfect and absolute reality, beyond all time and change of history? Or has it at least helped us choose between them? Neither! But what these mystical traditions have done is turn the question on its head. We should neither try to resolve the paradox nor choose between its elements, because that is just what bound to fail to convey the fullness of God to us. Only by keeping the contradictions and ironies, only in the endless exploration of different ways of seeing things - rather than the peremptory closing down to one dominant image - can Napoleon, or much better, God really emerge…

Does this come as a threat to traditional, thoughtful, faith? No - it need not. In fact it could come as a great relief. After all, many of core traditional images of God have always required us to live with apparent contraries (just as we have seen: personal and transcendent; changing and unchanging; and, one might add, male and female). So too have many formal doctrines (such as Incarnation and Trinity). These images and doctrines which have been required by revelation and experience, which have pressed themselves on the church as vital ways to imagine God have always, if we’re honest, needed us to live with apparent contradiction. The relief offered by both mystical experience and post-modern philosophy is that we both can live with this and indeed should. Anything less is actually less likely to be true to God.

To be sure, it is also a challenge - both to teachers of the faith and to all who simply want to faithfully reflect on it. It does mean we can never settle. It does mean no one image or formulation of God will ever be decisive in itself. It will still only be provisional, setting up new gaps to be explored. So does that unsettle us? Does that mean it’s all only travelling never arriving? Is it all just play? Does it sound so fluid it just opens up a vacuum of uncertainty which dangerous fundamentalisms are bound to fill?

It needn’t. It is not that anything goes. We can still choose in faith to go to some particular places more than others. After all, particular images are still part of the paradox, still held within the restlessness of the vision even if they cannot be the whole vision. And so we can hold to the faith, as I do, that some particularities have peculiar authority for us within this flux: the particularity of Jesus is a unique image of the invisible God, even though still only image and not full reality; the particular dramatic biblical narratives of a personal presence with which I began I the first lecture do set some shape and boundaries, even though they are often expressed metaphorically; particular doctrines of theology like incarnation and trinity, though inadequate, are still needed to guide us. At the very least they are needed in the same way that the visible shapes in the picture are needed: the invisible figure in their gaps only emerges because of them; they give shape to that figure, even though they are not the figure themselves. So - there are these particular bedrocks. Nonetheless, even with these, there is also always much to play with and play for, when we imagine God. But surely - that is how it must be if it is indeed God we are trying to imagine?
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