Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională
ISSN: 2066-7329 | e-ISSN: 2067-9270
Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 14, Issue 3, pages: 444-456 | https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/14.3/618
Submitted: August 13th, 2021 | *Accepted for publication:* May 17th, 2022

The Synergistic-Generative Knowledge of God in the I-Thou Encounter

Paul NEGRUȚ[1],
Ioan G. POP[2]

[1] Prof. dr., PhD Theology and PhD Political and Administration, University Emanuel Oradea, Romania,
paul.negrut@emanuel.ro
[2] Prof. dr., PhD Physics and PhD Engineering Sciences, University Emanuel Oradea, Romania,
ioan.pop@emanuel.ro

Abstract: This paper applies the transdisciplinary methodology to knowing God by introducing the synergistic-generative knowledge, real, reality, perception and hidden third, in the interpersonal dialogue I-Thou. The first part of the paper explores the revealing dialog between Deus and Imago Dei who travel together an epistemic path in which the dialectic of transcendence and immanence, the knowable and the unknowable, progressively and dynamically change their boundaries communicating generatively-synergistically through the transdisciplinary window of knowledge. From this perspective, the idea of levels of reality is essentially structuring in transdisciplinarity because it presupposes a different logic and conceptual framework depending on the specific way of being of each level. The transdisciplinary approach uses the concept of "epistemic window" to explain how knowledge and communication become possible when we operate with ontologically different reality levels.
The last part of the paper illustrates from some Biblical records the way in which this epistemic approach connects the transdisciplinary triade, real, reality, and perception to the semiotic triade sign, signifier and significant through the hidden third, thus opening the window for a seminal dialog between science and religion. Such an approach enhances knowledge and integrative education specific to a knowledge based-society. In conclusion, the semiophysical seven pillars model of knowledge, real, reality, perception, sign, signifier, signifcant and the hidden third, opens the window for a dynamic dialog between science and religion.

Keywords: *I-Thou dialogue; Deus-Imago Dei; episteme-doxa; episteme-gnosis; transdisciplinary levels; synergistic-generative knowledge; semiophysical model.*

How to cite: Negruț, P., & Pop, I.G. (2022). The Synergistic-Generative Knowledge of God in the I-Thou Encounter. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională, 14*(3), 444-456.
https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/14.3/618

©2022 Published by LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

1. A transdisciplinary approach TO KNOWING GOD

Philosophical reflection has tried to separate from its beginnings the real existence from the apparent one, what really exists from what seems only to exist, knowledge as *episteme* from knowledge as *doxa*, the primary unity and uniqueness of the universe, and how man, as a created and limited being, can come in contact with what lies beyond his perception and the level of physical existence, that of phenomena. A similar approach is represented by the research conducted in the scientific domain of quantum fields, which spring from a common idea, namely the unification of all physical interactions in a search for unity, invariants, universal laws, a process that raises a perfectly legitimate question with regard to the unity of the whole universe (Nicolescu, 2014; Pop et al, 2021).

This approach to knowledge requires the clarification of some fundamental concepts with which we can advance in the process of the knowing of the world. These include the real, reality and perception, for which a general way of defining from the point of view of transdisciplinary thinking is offered, before analyzing them in their scriptural context. In Greek philosophy, from Parmenides to Aristotle, it is obvious that "to on" – Being, denotes both the absolute and indeterminate First Principle or the One, as well as the possibility of knowing what is given in thought (Lucaci, 2005, p. 23). In other words, it can be said that "without the being in which it is expressed, you will never find the thought." In this sense, using the metaphor of light, Dumitru Stăniloae notes: "The whole universe is a light. But a light dependent on a supreme light, so a light created in relation to an existence, which is the uncreated and creative light" (Stăniloae, 1993, p.3). This creative light is in fact that One, the referent of the concept of Principle and, ontically, it is the First Principle of all existence (Aristotel, 2005, p.9).

But unlike the dialectical interplay between *episteme* and *doxa*, specific to philosophical and scientific knowledge, theological thinking operates with the synergistic *episteme-gnosis* model, specific to the epistemic approach when the "Object" of knowledge is simultaneously transcendent and immanent. The *episteme-gnosis* synergy simultaneously covers the two dimensions of the "Object" of knowledge (Jecu, 2006, p. 11). The fundamental concepts with which this epistemic approach operates are: *Deus* as the Object of knowledge, *Imago Dei* as the subject of knowledge and *episteme-gnosis* as ways of knowledge (Negruț, 1996, p. 31). This epistemic approach starts from three basic assumptions. The first presupposition identifies the "Object" of knowledge, the "absolute reality", or "source of all that exists", as the Triune God (*De Deo Trino*), as Gregory of Nazianzus states: "The Father is the One

who is true, and the Son is the Truth, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth" (Nazianzus, n.d.). The second presupposition refers to the nature of the "Object" of knowledge and states that the Triune God is simultaneously *transcendent* in His being and *immanent* in His manifestations, and is therefore simultaneously unknowable and knowable. The way in which the dialectic of the simultaneity of *transcendence* and *immanence* is defined circumscribes not only the limits of theological epistemology, but also its content (Lossky, 1978, pp. 51-54). The third presupposition states that the purpose and meaning of the knowing subject understood as *Imago Dei* is realized in his response to the *oikonomic* manifestations of *Deus*, which is the Object of knowledge (Zizioulas, 1989, p. 45). The definition of the way in which the epistemic dialogue between *Deus* as the Object of Knowledge and *Imago Dei* is perceived as a knowing subject indicates the predominant orientation of the epistemic approach towards transcendence or immanence, and respectively towards the suprarational or rational content of knowledge (Negruţ, 1996, p. 32). *Episteme* describes knowledge using methods of research and rational interpretation specific to the epistemology of immanent realities, while *gnosis* refers to the knowledge resulting from the revealing encounter initiated by the personal Absolute – i.e. *Deus – Imago Dei*, in the interpersonal dialogue "I-Thou" (Lossky, 1978, p. 27). In this revealing dialogue, *Deus* and *Imago Dei* together travel an epistemic path in which the dialectic of transcendence and immanence, the knowable and the unknowable, progressively and dynamically change their boundaries communicating generatively-synergistically through the transdisciplinary window of knowledge (Negruţ, 1996, p. 34). From this perspective, the idea of levels of reality is essentially structuring in transdisciplinarity because it presupposes a different logic and conceptual framework depending on the specific way of being of each level. Thus, if in the natural, physical world, we generally speak of three levels of transdisciplinary reality, epistemological, logical and ontological, when we enter the semantic space of spirituality we speak of *divine* and *human*, i.e. of two levels of reality ontologically differentiated, but *oikonomically* related (Dumitrescu, 2020; LaCugna, 1991, p.1). In terms of the relationship between the two ontological levels of reality, theological epistemology can be seen as an attempt to know and explain how the two come into contact, interacting specifically. Depending on the emphasis on the dimension of God's self-revelation or on the *analogia entis* specific to Thomas Aquinas's epistemic approach (2006), we distinguish two kinds of theologies – each with its own particularities and specificities –

high or revelational theology and low or natural theology[1]. The theological reflection anchored in revelation starts from the divine to the human level (top-down perspective), while the *analogia entis* starts from the human level to the divine level (bottom-up perspective). The differences and similarities between these two approaches are found in Christology, especially when the person of Jesus Christ is seen in terms of the relationship between the divine Christ (*Mashiah*) and the historical Jesus (*Yeshua*) (Witherington III, 1995, p.17). Achieving a generative-synergistic synthesis in the person of *Yeshua ha Mashiah* provides the hermeneutical key to understanding and explaining how the two levels of reality can interact (Pop & Vereş, 2010). In other words, the raising of the creature from the level of human existence (bottom-up movement) to the salvific meeting point with the divine Being can take place only through the mediation of Jesus Christ, in which the historical man (Jesus) and the divine Being (Christ) unite hypostatically in one Person, Jesus Christ, who is simultaneously *Deus* and *Imago Dei*, or *filius hominis* and *Filius Dei*[2]. In and through Jesus Christ (*Yeshua ha Mashiah*), who is simultaneously Jesus and Christ, not just Jesus, or only Christ, eternity and time, the transcendent and the immanent (*top-down movement*) meet (Costache, 2019, p. 205). In this transdisciplinary approach we will use the concept of "epistemic window" to explain how knowledge and communication become possible when we operate with ontologically different reality levels. Thus, when there is a point of convergence between the two levels that makes communication possible, the epistemic window is open, and when there is no point of convergence the epistemic approach is in front of a closed window[3].

This transdisciplinary epistemic model will be applied to the relationship between the two ontologically different levels of reality – divine and human. The specific concepts we operate with are, on the one hand,

[1] Colin Gunton points out that one must bear in mind the fact that natural theology must be firmly rooted in the theology of nature to avoid the gap between secular and religious epistemologies, that is between the autonomous self-sufficient reason, on the one side, and the reason grounded in revelation, on the other side (Gunton, 1995, p. 21).

[2] The Council of Chalcedon stated that the divine and the human are not two parallel levels of reality, but in the event of the Incarnation co-exist inseparable and unmistakable in the person of Jesus Christ.

[3] The act of prayer in Christianity is the supreme example of the encounter and interaction between the two levels, the "above" perspective and the "bottom" contemplation, which make the divine unite with the human, the transcendent with the immanent, the divine providence with human freedom. In this way we can reach a fuller understanding of the communitarian-participatory aspect of Christianity (Vereș & Pop, 2009).

reality, the real, perception and the hidden third, and on the other, *Deus revelatus, Deus absconditus, Imago Dei* and *Deus-Imago Dei.*

Reality, or what we know it to be, represents from the perspective of *episteme* "that which resists to our objective experiences, representations, descriptions, images or formalizations", on which we intervene through observation, measurement and evaluation in the process of knowledge (Nicolescu, 2008, p.19). From the perspective of *gnosis*, reality represents what we observe and experience in the I-Thou encounter at the level of the immanent manifestations of what we intuit to exist in the transcendent. In other words, in the initial phase of the epistemic dialogue, reality is what we observe and experience from the manifestations of *Deus revelatus* in nature (cf. Romans 1:20). Compared to reality, which is accessible to *episteme*-type knowledge, the **real** remains hidden. The Real means "what is", without other determinations, independent of us. From the perspective of *gnosis*, the real is *Deus absconditus*. Due to the fact that reality is filtered through channels related to the subjectivity of each participant in the act of knowing and measuring reality, the instruments used for measurement, we need to introduce a third term in this equation, namely **perception**, *that which we think it is*, defined as a projection of reality at the level of consciousness, through the process of meaning and signification (Nicolescu, 2014; Dumitrescu, 2020). From a theological perspective, perception is the image that each person builds of *Deus revelatus* in creation. Each level of reality corresponds to a certain level of perception, in a biunivocal relationship with it[4]. Two levels of reality are different when the transition from one to the other involves a break of laws and fundamental concepts (Nicolescu, 2008; Odom & Natarajan, 2016). In order for the two levels of reality to be able to communicate with each other, an area of absolute transparency is needed, non-resistant to our experiences, descriptions or formalizations, which restores the isomorphism between the top and the bottom level in the pattern of the transdisciplinary window of knowledge (Nicolescu, 2014; Pohl et al., 202; Pop et al., 2018).

There are on the one hand the levels of reality, which belong to the object of knowledge, of information, and on the other hand, the levels of perception, which belong to the subject of knowledge, in the sphere of consciousness. In terms of knowledge, each "flow of information" corresponds to a "flow of consciousness", which is in a relationship of interpenetration, due to a unique area of non-resistance that plays the role of

[4] The level of reality means "a set of systems always under the action of a number of general laws" (Nicolescu, 2014).

the hidden third (***Deus / Imago Dei***) and allows the dialogue to the transdisciplinary subject with the transdisciplinary object, thus facilitating the interaction between subject and object (Lupasco, 1987; Nicolescu, 2014).

2. The generative-synergistic representation of the knowledge of Divinity

One of the best-known texts of Scripture that presents the point of convergence of the divine and human levels is Exodus 3:14, where (*Deus*) God initiates an epistemic dialogue with (*Imago Dei*) Moses through the mediation of a fire. In this encounter one could notice an obvious synergistic-generative pattern with learnable knowledge opportunities and constraints, as well, within a specific scientific-cultural-religious context (Hu et al, 2018; Pop et al, 2018; Pohl et al, 2021). Moses observes that the burning fire has different properties from the ordinary fire and initiate in an epistemic approach to this different ***Reality***. Surprising is the fact that not only Moses is heading towards what is visible in this *Reality*, but also the Reality addresses to him by pronouncing his name: Moses! Moses! If in the initial phase the epistemic dialogue takes the form **I-It**, from this moment, the epistemic approach takes the form of a propositional dialogue of the **I-Thou** type in which ***Reality*** presents itself as *Deus revelatus* known to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the ancestors of Moses. At the legitimate attempt of *Imago Dei* (Moses) to know more about this *Deus revelatus*, the *episteme* faces a barrier that it cannot cross unilaterally. Thus, at Moses' request to know His name, he receives an answer that in Hebrew takes the form of the tetragram YHWH (*Yahweh*), a name that the Jews do not pronounce for fear of saying God's name in vain, replacing it with other names that describe certain "faceted representations" of the Divinity (*Adonai, Elohim, El Shaddai* etc.) (Cole, 1973, pp. 69). In writing, the tetragram YHWH is a name, a representation behind which the **Real** is glimpsed – *Deus absconditus*, the One who in Greek is described as *Ego eimi o on* – "*I am the one who is*", a variant that expresses more suggestively the invitation to the knowledge of the One who is simultaneously *Deus revelatus* and *Deus absconditus*, than the translation "I am the one who am" (Lucaci, 2005).

The epistemic dialogue *Deus – Imago Dei* reaches a higher qualitative level during the meeting in Exodus 33:12-23, where Moses requests an extension of the knowledge of God through the possibility of contemplating His glory. In other words, *Imago Dei* tries to broaden the scope of the epistemic dialogue with *Deus revelatus*, in the sense of knowing even deeper aspects of *Deus absconditus*. The I-Thou dialogue presented in the text

demonstrates the existence of an epistemic progress from the direction of *Deus revelatus* towards *Deus absconditus*, with the mention that *Imago Dei* cannot unilaterally exceed the imposed limit. In this simultaneity of the presence of *Deus revelatus* / *Deus absconditus*, *Imago Dei* is really in the presence of God, even if the revelation is partial and manifested through certain facets of the Divine being. The description of the encounter between *Deus* and *Imago Dei* in Exodus 33 emphasizes that his *epistemic* sphere expands as the I-Thou dialogue opens the window to new manifestations of the Real, such as "all My beauty ... and the Name of the Lord before you".[5] However, in Exodus 33:23, *Deus revelatus* states that the "face" of God, that is, what He **really** is – *Deus absconditus* – can only be partially seen, a glimpse from behind[6].

The I-Thou dialogue in which *epistemes* and *gnosis* end up in front of a barrier that separates, seemingly irreconcilable, the two levels of reality – divine and human, *Deus* and *Imago Dei* – directs the approach of knowing God towards the search for the hidden third that opens the epistemic window, to create an area of non-resistance accessibility between the two levels of reality – divine and human. In this sense, the statement: "No one has ever seen God; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath made him known" John 1:18 (Holy Bible, 1997) provides an epistemic clue to the possibility of establishing the relationship between the hidden third and Jesus Christ. To make the connection between these two levels of reality, the hidden Third must be simultaneously *Deus* and *Imago Dei*.

The hidden third appears as a hermeneutic window in the texts of the gospels when *Yeshua ha Mashiah* asks the disciples what is the perception of people from the far circle about His identity: "Who do people say that I the Son of Man am?" Matthew 16:13 (Holy Bible, 1997). The disciples' response reveals a major difference between the levels of reality and those of perception in the circle of those who look at *Yeshua ha Mashiah* from far away: "Some say you are John the Baptist; others Elijah; others Jeremiah or one of the prophets" Matthew 16:14 (Holy Bible, 1997). In other words,

[5] This word, beauty, can also be rendered by "goodness," but in the context of Moses' experience the word cannot have a proper moral connotation, but a visible one, of the attractiveness of goodness. One possible interpretation would be that the term does not refer to something visible, an appearance of goodness, but to a demonstration of God's character, to a continuous experience of God's nature manifested in goodness to His people by covenant (Durham, 1987, p. 45).

[6] The "face" of God refers to the identity of God, insofar as the "return of the face" is equivalent in the biblical context to the abandonment, abandonment of man by God (Vereş & Pop, 2009, p. 102).

from a distance *Yeshua ha Mashiah* is perceived only as *filius hominis*, or *imago hominis*. In the apostolic group, however, the perception of the identity of *Yeshua ha Mashiah* is significantly different: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" Matthew 16:16 (Holy Bible, 1997). The level of reality that Peter perceives captures beyond the human the divine dimension – *Filius Dei* (Barclay, 1980, pp. 14-19, 20-37). The difference and relationship between the two levels of reality – divine and human – between the Son of Man and the Son of God is found in the way the distant circle perceives **Reality** only in terms of immanent *filius hominis / Imago Dei*, while the apostolic group perceives the same **Reality** in terms of *Filius Dei / Imago Dei* with reference to transcendence. Once the difference and the relationship between the two levels of the same reality are identified, the epistemic approach goes from **Reality** to **Real**, from what we know to be to what it is, given what we think it is, **Perception** (Nicolescu, 2014; Pohl et al., 2021).

From the transdisciplinary perspective, the divine dimension of *Yeshua ha Mashiah* fulfills the role of the hidden third that opens the epistemic window for the knowledge of *Deus absconditus*. The text in Matthew 16 captures the fact that this type of knowledge is not possible through a bottom-up epistemic approach, but it requires an I-Thou top-down encounter – *per revelationem divinam*: "Blessed are you, Simon, son of Jonah; for it was not the flesh and the blood that revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven" Matthew 16:17 (Holy Bible, 1997). Moreover, the epistemic role of the hidden third is emphasized by *Yeshua ha Mashiah* himself when he tells his disciples: "If you had known Me, you would have known My Father. And henceforth ye shall know him, and have seen him. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" John 14:7,9 (Holy Bible, 1997). The new transdisciplinary approach on knowledge, considering the hidden third, reveals clearer that *Yeshua ha Mashiah*'s statements about the relationship between Him and *Deus Pater* open the epistemic window to *Deus absconditus*. Thus, in the healing of a paralyzed man, Yeshua ha Mashia's statement, "Son, your sins are forgiven," provoked a protest from religious leaders. "How does this man talk like that? He blasphemes! Who can forgive sins but God alone?" Mark 2:7 (Holy Bible, 1997). The relationship between *Yeshua ha Mashiah* and God is so close that it is clear that he actually identifies himself: whoever knows Him knows God – John 8:19; 14:7 (Holy Bible, 1997), whoever sees Him sees God – John 12:45; 14:9 (Holy Bible, 1997), whoever believes in Him believes in God – John 12:44; 14:1 (Holy Bible, 1997), whoever receives Him receives God – Mark 9:37 (Holy Bible, 1997), whoever hates Him hates God – John 15:23 (Holy Bible, 1997), and whoever honors Him honors God – John 5:23 (Holy Bible, 1997).

The way in which the divine dimension of *Yeshua ha Mashiah* opens the possibility of knowing *Deus absconditus* is even more clearly defined by the seven statements "I am" in the Gospel of John (Vereş, 2008). The connection between *Yeshua ha Mashiah* presented in the Gospels and YHWH in Exodus 3:14 is present in the statement, "Before Abraham was born, I AM" John 8:58 (Holy Bible, 1997). *Deus absconditus* – YHWH – "I am He who is" in Exodus 3:14 is now revealed as *Deus revelatus* – "I am" – in the Gospels. It can also be seen that *Yeshua ha Mashiah* as a hidden third invites the knowing subject not only to the theoretical knowledge of God, but also to the saving participation by grace and not by nature: "Our life is hidden with Christ in God" (Colossians 3:3) (Mărtincă, 2000, p. 54). Thus: (1) John 6:35 "I am the bread and water of life (top-down), He who comes to Me (bottom-up) will never go hungry; and he that believeth in me shall never thirst" (included third); (2) John 8:12 "I am the Light of the world (top-down); whoever follows Me (bottom-up) will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (included third); (3) John 10:9 "I am the door of the sheep" (top-down). If anyone enters through Me (bottom-up), he will be saved (included third); (4) John 10:14, "I am the good Shepherd. I know my sheep (top-down) and they know Me (bottom-up)". They will listen to My voice and there will be a flock and a Shepherd (included third); (5) John 11:25, "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in Me (bottom-up), even if he dies, will live" (included third); (6) John 14: 6, "I am the way, the truth, and the life (top-down). No one comes to the Father except through Me (bottom-up); If you had known Me, you would have known My Father, and from now on you will know Him and see Him (included third). (7) John 15: 5, "I am the vine (top-down), you are the branches" (bottom-up). Whoever abides in Me and in whom I abide bears much fruit; for apart from Me you can do nothing (included third)". All these statements about Himself of *Yeshua ha Mashiah* represent new dimensions through which *Deus absconditus* becomes knowable in terms of *Deus revelatus* through the mediation of the hidden third, represented by the One who is simultaneously *filius hominis* and *Filius Dei*, or *Deus* and *Imago Dei* (Vereş, 2008; Pop et al., 2021). In Him, **Reality**, the **Real** and **Perception** overlap, *Deus revelatus* being identical with *Deus absconditus*, even if his immanent manifestations do not exhaust the whole mystery of the transcendent Being, as LaCugna argues: *Deus in se* is the same as *Deus pro nobis* (LaCugna, 1991, p. 6). The implications of this transdisciplinary approach go beyond epistemology to soteriology, due to the fact that the I-Thou dialogue is

participatory[7]. *Imago Dei* which is the knowing subject and *Deus* which is the Object of knowledge do not remain in parallel worlds, but through the mediation of the hidden third which is simultaneously *Deus* and *Imago Dei*, becomes the included third who participates salvifically in a metamorphosing relationship with *Deus pro nobis*. In this sense, the seven "I am" statements illustrate the dynamic top-down / bottom-up relationship that allows, through the transdisciplinary search window, the realization of knowledge in synergistic communication through a salvific I-Thou dialogue[8].

From the synergistic-generative way of knowledge we argue that the transdisciplinary triad analyzed - Real, Reality and Perception- must be connected in a complementary construct with the semiotic triade - Sign, Signifier and Signified (Dumitrescu, 2020; Pohl et al., 2021). The transdisciplinary triad - Real, Reality and Perception – and the semiotic triade -Sign, Signifier and Signified - are mediated by the hidden third, as semiophysical model of the seven nodal points of the knowledge of God, for the purpose of revealing both the risen Christ, presented in the Gospels and the Epistles, as well as the living Christ, *Panthokrator*, from the book of Revelation (Soritau & Pop, 2014; Pop et al., 2021).

3. Discussions, conclusions and perspectives of the research

The epistemic approach put forward in this paper avoids the fallacy of formal parallels between transdisciplinarity and Christian thought, by using a methodology appropriate for different levels of reality where the concepts and their contextual meaning must be relevant for both the theological and transdisciplinary fields. Further, the dynamic interplay

[7] In Christian thought a different logic of self-knowledge is identified, so that the famous saying "know yourself" seems absurd because it reduces knowledge to only one level of reality. The Christian cannot know himself alone, Christian knowledge is an authentic knowledge only through the Other, you can know yourself only when you know Him, the Other, the divine Being, in all its depth, having access to knowledge, through all its dimensions, "The breadth, the length, the depth, and the height," in "all his fullness" (Ephesians 3: 14-21). Only in this way can you know your neighbor, opening yourself to the needs of others from the perspective of the three essential levels of this new reality, love, forgiveness and ministry (Cruceru M., 2010)

[8] Transdisciplinarity and eternity through communion (sustainability of higher spiritual integration) is achieved when the rivers of living water that have their source in a purified heart lead to eternity, a fact achievable only after the walls and barriers of incompetence, unworthiness, inadequacy are penetrated, to fall in the end, thus favoring the knowledge of God in all His fullness ("... to know the love of Christ, which passes knowledge, that you might be filled with all the fullness of God" (Ephesians 3: 19-20) (Vereş & Pop, 2009; Pop et al., 2021).

between *episteme* and *gnosis* reconciled the two seemingly irreconcilable levels of reality – divine and human - through the I-Thou dialogue. The heuristic role of the hidden third in the epistemic dialog between *Deus* and *Imago Dei* paves the way for a better understanding the epistemic role of Jesus Christ in the transdisciplinary knowledge of God. In other words, being at the same time God and man, He provids an area of non-resistance accessibility between the two levels of reality – divine and human. The biblical examples of Moses and the burning in Exodus and the I am saying of Jesus Christ from the Gospel of John illustrates the role of the hidden third as an epistemic window between the divine and human levels of reality. As a very important perspective of this research we consider that the semiophysical model of the seven pillars of the knowledge, the hidden third, the semiotic triade sign, signifier and significant, and the transdisciplinary triade real, reality and perception offers a new approach to overcome the separation between the religion and the science in the context of the knowledge based society.

References

Aquinas, T., St. (2006). *Summa theologiae*. Cambridge University Press.

Aristotel. (2005). *Categorii. Despre interpretare.* [*Categories. On interpretation prior Analytics*.] Humanitas.

Barclay, W. (1980). *Jesus as They Saw Him* (3rd. ed.). SCM Press.

Cole, A. (1973). *Exodus*. IVP.

Costache, D. (2019). A Theology of the World: Dumitru Stăniloae, the Traditional Worldview, and Contemporary Cosmology. In *Orthodox Christianity and Modern Science: Tensions, Ambiguities, Potential*. Brepols Publishers. https://www.academia.edu/35940919/A_Theology_of_the_World_Dumitru_Sta_niloae_the_Traditional_Worldview_and_Contemporary_Cosmology

Cruceru, M. (2010). *Şi voi care sînteţi răi fiţi desăvîrşiţi ca Tatăl, O abordare periegetică a Predicii de pe Munte.* [*And you who are evil, be perfect, as your Father. A periegetic approach on the Sermon on the Mount*]. Risoprint Press, Cluj.

Dumitrescu, M. (2020). The Christian Finality of John Locke's Theory of Empiricism. *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, *12*(3), 416-425. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.3/329

Durham, I. J. (1987). *Word Biblical Commentary,* Vol. 3. Exodus.

Gunton, C. (1995). *A Brief Theology of Revelation*. T&T Clark.

The Holy Bible (1997). *The MacArthur Study Bible. New King James Version*. Word Publishing. Nashville, TN.

Hu, Zh., Yang, Z., Salakhutdinov, R.R., Qin, L., Liang, X., Dong, H., & Xing, E.P. (2018). Deep Generative Models with Learnable Knowledge Constraints. *In Proceedings of the 32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018), Montréal, Canada* (pp. 10522–10533). Curran Associates Inc. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1806.09764

Jecu, R. (2006). *Comunicarea interumană, preliminarii la un studiu ştiinţifico-teologic.* [*Interpersonal communication, preliminary reflection to a scientific theological study*] AdSTR.

LaCugna, C. M. (1991). *God for Us. The Trinity and the Christian Life*. Harper.

Lossky, V. (1978). *Orthodox Theology*. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.

Lucaci, F. (2005). *Propoziţii biblice, Interpretări logico-filosofice.* [*Biblical propositions, Logical and philosophical interpretations*]. Eikon.

Lupasco, S. (1987). *Le principe d'antagonisme et la logique de l'énergie - Prolégomènes à une science de la contradiction.* Hermann & Cie.

Mărtincă, I. (2000). *Isus din Nazaret, Fiul lui Dumnezeu* (curs). [*Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God*] Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Nazianzus, Gregory of, *Oratio XXIII*, (*De Pace III*), II, *PG*, XXXV, 1164 A. []

Negruţ, P. (1996). *Revelaţie, Scriptură, Comuniune. O interogaţie asupra autorităţii în cunoaşterea teologică.* [*Revelation, Scripture and Communion: An Interogation on the Authority in Theological Epistemology*]. Cartea creştină.

Nicolescu, B. (2014). *From Modernity to Cosmodernity - Science, Culture, and Spirituality*, State University of New York (SUNY) Press. https://dx.doi.org/10.17646/KOME.2016.19

Nicolescu, B. (2008). *Transdisciplinarity – Theory and Practice*. Hampton Press.

Odom, P., Natarajan, S., (2016), Active advice seeking for inverse rein-forcement learning, *In: Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, In-ternational Foundation for Autonomous Agents and MultiagentSystems, 2016, 512–52.*

Pohl, C., Thompson Klein, J., Hoffmann, S., Mitchell, C., & Fam, D. (2021). Conceptualizing transdisciplinary integration as a multidimensional interactive process. *Environmental Science & Policy, 118*, 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.12.005

Pop, G. I., & Vereş, L. O. (2010). *Elemente de semiofizică aplicată [Elements of applied semiophysics]*. Risoprint.

Pop, G. I., Fotea, I., & Fotea S. (2018). Innovation networking, knowledge transdisciplinary spaces, GSMAC 2018. *Studia Universitatis „Vasile Goldis" Arad – Economics Series Journal, 28*(2), 86-106. https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/sues.2018.28.issue-2/sues-2018-0011/sues2018-0011.xml

Pop, G. I., Soritau, I., Burtic, D., & Popa, N.N. (2021). *Autoritate şi mărturie, Lecţii practice de comunicare şi cunoaştere sinergică (Authority and Testimony. Communication and knowledge Applied Lessons)*. Risoprint.

Soritau, I., Pop, G. I.,, (2014) Transdisciplinary Perspective through the Synergistic Communication on Faith in the Seven Letters of Revelation, *Conference: ComSymbol 2014 Montpellier, Beziers, Volume: Communication on Faith, Published in Espace Public et Communication de la Foi, pp 453-468, DOI: 10.13140/2.1.3981.1203.*

Stăniloae, D. (1993). *Iisus Hristos lumina lumii şi îndumnezeitorul omului. [Jesus Christ the light of the world and the deifier of man]*. Anastasia.

Vereş, O. & Pop, I. G. (2009). Transdisciplinarity and Christian Thought. *Transdisciplinarity in Science and Religion Dialogue, 6, pg. 14-22*

Vereş, O. (2008). A Study of the „I am" Phrases in John's Gospel. *Perichoresis, The Theological Journal of Emanuel University of Oradea*, *6*(1), 109-125. https://silo.tips/download/a-study-of-the-i-am-phrases-in-john-s-gospel

Witherington III, B. (1995). *The Jesus Quest. The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth*. Paternoster Press.

Zizioulas, J. (1989). Preserving God's Creation. Three Lectures on Theology and Ecology. II. *King's Theological Review,* XII. *https://resourcesforchristiantheology.org/preserving-gods-creation-1/*