

**Romania**

Ministry of Education and Research

'Babeş-Bolyai' University

Faculty of Orthodox Theology

18 Avram Iancu Sq., Cluj-Napoca

400117, Cluj-Napoca

Tel/Fax: 0264 431005

E-mail: [ot@ot.ubbcluj.ro](mailto:ot@ot.ubbcluj.ro)



**BABEŞ-BOLYAI**

**UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY OF ORTHODOX**

**THEOLOGY**

**WORD AND IMAGE IN THE MISSION OF THE  
CHURCH**

**Summary**

**Th.D. Thesis**

**Th.D. Supervisor:**

Fr. Prof. Valer Bel, Th.D.

**Doctoral candidate:**

Paul Siladi

## **Table of contents**

Introduction.....	7
<b>I. State of the research.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>I. 1 The question of the word in Romanian theology.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>I. 2. The question of the word and the icon in Romanian theology. An overview.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>I. 2. 1. Articles and studies in Romanian theological reviews .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>I. 2. 2. Icon theology in western Orthodox reviews .....</b>	<b>28</b>

<b>I.</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>and</b>	
		image.....		32
<b>II.</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>and</b>	<b>Image-A</b>	<b>semantic</b>
				<b>and</b>
				<b>philosophical</b>
				<b>analysis.....</b>
				<b>34</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>and/or</b>
				<b>logos.</b>
			<b>A</b>	<b>semantic</b>
			approach.....	35
<b>II.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>logos</b>
				<b>to</b>
			word.....	37
<b>II.</b>	<b>2.</b>		<b>Image.</b>	<b>A</b>
				<b>semantic</b>
			approach.....	38
<b>II.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>Greek</b>	<b>philosophical</b>
				<b>terms</b>
			<b>for</b>	<b>image: eikon</b>
				<b>and eidolon</b>
			.....	39
<b>II.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>The</b>	<b>eikon/eidolon</b>
				<b>distinction</b>
			<b>in</b>	<b>Romanian</b>
			<b>theology.....</b>	
			.....	42
<b>II.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>3.</b>	<b>The</b>	<b>adoption</b>
				<b>of</b>
			<b>the</b>	<b>concept</b>
			<b>of</b>	<b>eikon</b>
			<b>in</b>	<b>the</b>
			<b>Romanian</b>	<b>language.....</b>
			.....	43
<b>II.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>4.</b>	<b>Latin</b>	<b>terms</b>
				<b>for</b>
			<b>image: imago,</b>	<b>forma</b>
				<b>and</b>
			<b>figura.....</b>	43
<b>II.</b>	<b>3.</b>			<b>Mission</b>
			.....	45
<b>III.</b>	<b>Logos</b>	<b>and</b>	<b>Eikon,</b>	<b>a</b>
				<b>Christological</b>
			<b>approach.....</b>	46
<b>III.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>God's</b>	<b>embodied</b>	<b>Logos</b>
				<b>–</b>
				<b>Jesus</b>
			<b>Christ.....</b>	47
<b>III.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>look</b>
				<b>at</b>
			<b>the</b>	<b>philosophy</b>
			<b>of</b>	<b>the</b>
			<b>λογος.....</b>	47
<b>III.</b>	<b>1.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>The</b>	<b>theological</b>
				<b>subject</b>
			<b>of</b>	<b>the</b>
			<b>divine</b>	<b>Logos.....</b>
			.....	49
<b>III.</b>	<b>2.</b>	<b>The</b>	<b>Christological</b>	<b>signification</b>
				<b>of</b>
			<b>the</b>	<b>concept</b>
			<b>of</b>	



III. 5. The missionary dimensions of Christ's embodiment. Christ being sent as the paradigm of Christian mission.....	76
<b>IV. Man and creation with respect to the word-image binomial.....</b>	<b>80</b>
IV. 1. The man, Image of the Logos-Eikon.....	80
IV. 1. 1. Man's being created in the image of God and after His likeness.....	81
IV. 1. 2. Freedom: a component of God's image in the human being.....	85
IV. 2. Man's double opening towards communion: the face and the word.....	87
IV. 3. The world, plasticised reason.....	92
<b>V. Logos and eikon during the iconoclastic period.....</b>	<b>96</b>
V. 1. Causes of the iconoclastic dispute and its doctrinary context.....	97
V. 2. The doctrinary context.....	102
V. 3. Short history of the iconoclastic period.....	107
V. 3. 1. The first iconoclastic period.....	107
V. 3. 2. The second iconoclastic period.....	111
V. 4. The image criticism of Byzantine iconoclasts.....	113

V.	4.	1.	The	iconoclastic	
Christology.....					118
V.	5.		The	iconodules'	theological
positions.....					120
V.	5.	1.St.	Germanos,	Patriarch	of
Constantinople.....					120
V.	5.	1.	1.	Biography.	
.....					121
V.	5.	1.	2.	Works	
.....					126
V.	5.	1.	3.	The teaching on the icons of St. Germanos of Constantinople	
.....					127
V.	5.	1.	4.	Speech on the Holy Cross and the Holy Icons, by St. Germanos.....	131
V.	5.	2.	George,	monk	from
Cyprus.....					137
V.	5.	3.	St.	John	of
Damascus.....					140
V.	5.	3.	1.	Biography	
.....					141
V.	5.	3.	2.	St. John of Damascus, defender of the icons.....	142
V.	5.	3.	3.	The word-image relation by St. John of Damascus	
.....					149
V.	5.	4.	Word and image in the Horos of the 7 <sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council of Nicaea,787... 158		
V.	5.	4.	1.	From Hereia (754) to Nicaea (787)	
.....					158
V.	5.	4.	2.	Word and image at the Council of Nicaea in	

787.....	160
V. 5. 4. 3. The Hosos of Nicaea II	.....162
V. 5. 5. St. Nicephoros of Constantinople.....	169
V. 5. 5. 1. Biography	..... 169
V. 5. 5. 2. Image apology at St. Nicephoros of Constantinople	.....172
V. 5. 6. St. Theodore of Studion.....	177
V. 5. 6. 1. Biography	.....177
V. 5. 6. 2. St. Theodore's teaching on the icons.....	179
V. 5. 6. 3. Word and image at St. Theodore of Studion..	.....183
<b>VI. Word and image in western theology.....</b>	<b>187</b>
VI. 1. Iconoclasm in the west.....	187
VI. 2. The word-image relation in Catholic theology - Jean Philippe Ramseyer.....	.....192
VI. 2. 1. Image theology in its relation to the word.....	193
VI. 2. 2. Word and image prior to Christ's advent.....	195
VI. 2. 3. Christian good deeds as an expression of God's	

image.....	196
VI. 2. 4. The word and the Christian good deeds.....	197
VI. 2. 5. Faith and sight.....	197
VI. 3. Criticising the image and emphasising the word - Jacques Ellul.....	199
VI. 3. 1. Introduction.....	199
VI. 3. 2. Sight and hearing.....	201
VI. 3. 3. Truth and reality.....	202
VI. 3. 4. Word and truth.....	203
VI. 3. 5. The word and the person.....	203
VI. 3. 6. Word and critical judgement.....	205
VI. 3. 7. Word's ambiguity.....	206
VI. 3. 8. Word and writing.....	207
VI. 3. 9. Image and reality.....	208
VI. 3. 10. Image's objectiveness.....	208
VI. 3. 11. Word and image in Christendom.....	209



VI. 3. 12. Recent history: exacerbating the image and humiliating the word.....	211
VI. 3. 13. The religious conflict between word and image.....	214
VI. 3. 14. Once more about sight, critical observations.....	216
VI. 3. 15. The iconoclastic commandment.....	216
VI. 3. 16. Observations.....	218
VI. 4. Partial conclusions.....	219
<b>VII. Word and image in modern times.....</b>	<b>220</b>
VII. 1. Modernity and postmodernism.....	220
VII. 2. The issue of self-reference as the defining element of modernity and postmodernism.....	225
VII. 3. Word and language.....	226
VII. 4. The image in modern times.....	228
VII. 4. 1. The image's break with its original or its self-reference.....	228
VII. 4. 2. Homo videns.....	233
VII. 4. 3. Televised image as a means of disenchanting the world.....	237

VII.	5.	The	solution	of	the	icon.....	240
VIII.		Mission	through	word,	image	and	Sacrament.....
							241
VIII.	1.	The	general	meaning	of	the	Sacraments
							.....241
VIII.	2.	Mission	through	word,	image	and	Sacrament
							.....242
VIII.	3.	Word	and	image	in	the	liturgical
							tradition
							of
							the
							Christian
							east.....
							255
VIII.	4.	Witness	through	life's	holiness.....		261
VIII.	5.	The	connection	between	word	and	image
							in
							preaching
							the
							word
							and
							the
							will
							of
							God
							in
							the
							Sayings
							of
							the
							Egyptian
							Desert
							Fathers
							.....
							263
IX.							<b>Inclusive</b>
							<b>simultaneity.....</b>
							268
IX.	1.	Analogy	and	complementarity.....			268
IX.	1.	1.	Nikolai	Ozolin			.....268
IX.	1.	2.	Dumitru	Vanca			.....270
IX.	1.	3.	The	faults	of	defining	the
							word-image
							relation
							as
							analogy
							and
							complementarity.....
							.....
							272
IX.	2.	The	relation	of	mutual	interiority.....	273
IX.	3.	The	relation	of	inclusive	simultaneity	

.....274

**Conclusions**  
.....275

**Bibliography**.....  
..... 279

*Keywords: Word, Logos, image, eikon, icon, iconoclasm, mission*

The present thesis entitles ‘Word and image in the mission of the Church’, written under the coordination of Fr. Prof. Valer Bel, Th.D. is attempting to prove that it is impossible to fully deliver the Christian message as long as word and image are separated. Mission is understood as the sum of the Church’s actions, by the means of which it transmits, sustains, and creates the environment for experiencing faith. In this paper the word and the icon, or in a broader sense, the image, are seen as means through which God’s work and our faith in Him are communicated.

From the point of view of the structure, the thesis has nine chapters preceded by an *Introduction* and followed by *Conclusions* and *Bibliography*.

In the *Introduction* we succinctly contextualize the topic that will later be analysed. It shows that the inseparable connection between word and image is based on Christ Himself, Who possesses the double quality of being both the Father’s Word and His Image. Even if the word and the image have been the objects of numerous analyses, their connection has only seldom been addressed from a theological point of view, and there are only a few works dedicated exclusively to it, mostly in the western protestant space (Jean Phillippe Ramseyer, Jacques Ellul, Jérôme Cottin). A notable work in the Romanian theology is the Th.D. thesis of fr. Dumitru Vanca, focusing chiefly on didactical and catechetical aspects. All these contributions at the theology of the word and the image will be analysed in detail when the time comes. Since the theological relation of the two concepts hasn’t yet been determined, such investigations are of utmost necessity (it should be reminded here that in 1968, the famous Romanian theologian Dumitru Stăniloae, assessed in his study ‘Revelation Through Acts, Words, and Images’ that the relation between the two in the field of the Revelation is one of the greatest theological challenges of the future).

*Chapter I* entitled *State of the research* lists the works dedicated to the issue of the word and the image in Romania from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on, precisely because Romanian theologians have shown interest in this matter. The main

sources were the central theological reviews, especially *Studii Teologice*, *Ortodoxia*, *Glasul Bisericii*, *Mitropolia Olteniei*, *Mitropolia Sucevei*, and among the newer *Studia Babeş-Bolyai Theologia Orthodoxa* and *Tabor*. In special cases, studies published in other reviews are also presented or mentioned. The articles were divided into three categories, depending on subject matter: studies dedicated to the word, the icon/image, and to the relation between them. In addition to these, there is a section presenting the articles of icon theology appeared in representative western journals (*Contacts*, *Le Messenger Orthodoxe*, *Irénikon*, *The Greek Theological Review*, *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, *Orthodoxes Forum – Zeitschrift des Instituts für Orthodoxe Theologie der Universität München*, *Ostkirchliche Studien*).

At the end of this overview of Romanian theological publications dealing with our topics it can be noticed that although the matter has been largely debated, it hasn't been exhausted. Luckily for those preoccupied with this issue, the Romanian theologians were generally aware of the icon theology written in the west (particularly in France and Germany), a fact verified by translations. Despite their scarcity prior to 1989, due to the oppressive context, they abound in the last 15 years, so that the major works and syntheses of icon theology are also accessible in Romanian.

On the other hand it must be said that in the multitude of local papers dedicated to the icon, there is not enough originality, neither in approach, nor in structure. The remarkable iconology articles written by fr. Stăniloae have stood the test of time and have irrevocably marked the Romanian theological thought (restricting it to Christology as fr. Ioan I. Ică jr criticizes). Equally worthy of being remembered are the article written by Ioan Rămureanu on the veneration of icons in the first three centuries of the Christian era, and the well documented contributions of fr. Nicolae Chifăr in the field of Byzantine iconoclasm and the icon theology elaborated on that occasion. There are only a few theoretical approaches concerning the meaning of the image and that of the word, from a theological perspective, and there are likewise few comparative attempts. Once more, the foremost contribution belongs to fr. Dumitru Stăniloae. Numerous other theologians have only schematically presented the patristic teachings on the icons, but left out placing this theology in the broader doctrinary and historical context it was created; furthermore, this message has

only seldom enjoyed vivid and authentic actualisations for modern readers.

*Chapter II* entitled *Word and Image-A semantic and philosophical analysis* is where the theological investigation of the two concepts actually debuts, beginning with their etymology then extended towards their philosophical meanings. The first phase presents the meanings of the word ‘*cuvânt*’ (word) in Romanian, and then compares them to the ample meanings the Greek word *logos* has.

In Romanian, the word’s first definition is *a fundamental unit of vocabulary, comprised of a sound, or a complex of sounds, to which one or more meanings correspond*; but its meaning isn’t limited at this designation: it goes deeper, towards a greater degree of interiority: *thoughts, ideas expressed in speech*. Going further in exploring the meanings of this notion, it can be observed the word gradually gains a stronger spiritual connotation; its third meaning is *engagement, promise, vow*, and finally, a fourth reads *private point of view, judgement, position; consideration, opinion, assessment*.

On the other hand, the Greek *logos* has a broad range of meanings, gravitating around *reason, principle, fundament*.

The Romanian ‘*cuvânt*’ comes from the Latin *conventus* meaning assembly or community; however, the verb *convenio* which formed the noun *conventus*, also means to come together, to converge, to agree upon. At least from an etymological point of view, the connection between signifier and signified is utterly conventional, as it excludes the ontological participation the Greek word supposes. The centre of gravity shifts from reason and understanding to convention. If *logos* was a fundamental philosophical term, *cuvânt* occupies a lower step.

In the Greek speaking world (even if not exclusively), the *logos* has been a constant source of meditation. A whole fascinating philosophy has been created around it touching on the reasons of things, God’s thoughts hiding within the created world, and so on. It can be supposed that these speculations have been if not generated, at least supported by the wide semantic sphere of the word. In the Romanian theology the terminology made it impossible to continue this type of cogitation without adapting the meanings first. Fr. Stăniloae introduced his solution in

this context. Due to its communitarian potencies the word could be easily integrated into a personalistic theology, in perfect accord with the patristic theology of the *logos*. The theology of fr. Dumitru Stăniloae insists mainly on the communal dimension of the word: its obvious function is uniting people (the etymological sense is made clear here). Nonetheless, he doesn't stop at exploring this dimension; instead he organically assumes the tradition of *logos* theology, adding to the meanings the word has in Romanian the sense of reason the Greek *logos* has. Thus the theology of the word surpasses its etymology, and by integrating the *logos* in brings the Latin and the Greek cultures together. The complex sense created by fr. Dumitru Stăniloae is the one we've used throughout the thesis when writing about the word.

With regard to the concept of *image*, the theological language uses two different key concepts, inherited from the Greek: *eikon* and *eidolon*. Although both of these terms may, on a certain level, be translated with *image*, the relation the types of images have with reality is different. *Eikon* is an image reflecting a reality, whereas *eidolon* is the image of an illusion, of a figment of imagination.

The most well-known analysis of the two concepts in Romanian theology is fr. Dumitru Stăniloae's study 'The idol as image of deified nature and the icon as window on divine transcendence'. Synthesising fr. Stăniloae's ideas from the introduction to his study, it can be stated that even though *eikon* and *eidolon* partially share a common semantic field centred on the image, the distinction between them at a strictly conceptual level isn't all that unambiguous in the biblical sphere. However, with the aid of determinants this distinction can be made; but devoid of other determinants the two terms are differentiated by what they mean: 'Most of the times, the Old Testaments employs the term idol (*eidolon*) for a condemnable image, at times without any other determination, other times specifying it refers to invented gods. For the image in the accepted sense, it uses only image (*eikon*) without adding anything.' In the present thesis image/icon are the terms used as equivalents of the Greek term *eikon*.

The last section of *Chapter II* is dedicated to a brief presentation of the Latin terms for image: *imago*, *forma*, and *figura*.

In the field of theology the issue of the image has completely different

connotations, which began to be defined during the christological disputes of the 4<sup>th</sup> century when the meanings of this term had to be broadened by the Church Fathers, in order to be able to carry the supra-rational truths regarding the intra-trinitarian relationships between the Father and the Son. The term *face*, which is connected to *image*, is also approached theologically.

*Chapter III* is dedicated to Christology. In Christian theology the connection between *Logos* and *Eikon* is based on their unity in the unique person of the Son of God, Who the Scriptures define as the Word and Image of God. The chapter has two parts: the first one presents the philosophy and the theology of the divine Logos, and the second focuses on the Christological significance of the term *eikon*.

The fact that the Son of God made flesh was the Father's Logos or Word has never been challenged, being part of what might be called the common doctrinary corpus of all Christian theologies. For this reason the space reserved for the divine Logos in the structure of the thesis is smaller than the one dedicated to the Son as Father's Image.

The matter of the divine Logos has been permanently addressed by the philosophical meditation, beginning with the pre-Socratics, through Philo of Alexandria, to St. John the Evangelist who dedicated the Prologue of his Gospel to Him. In the first three centuries of our era the attempt has been made to reconcile the notion of *logos* taken from Greek philosophy with the Christian assertion that Jesus Christ is the Word of God and the Truth, by the Greek Apologists (who had a foregoer in Philo who had tried to harmonize Greek cosmology and the Old Testament). St. Justin, Martyr and Philosopher, St. Irenaeus of Lyon or Tertullian are from among those who contributed to expressing the primary teaching of the Church on the identity between the Saviour Jesus Christ and the Christian Logos. But the truly crucial century for the dogmatic definition of the Logos is the 4<sup>th</sup>. Nicean Christology is essentially based on the unity of the Logos: everything is generated by and relates to Him. He is the unique Son, identical to Himself. Before and after the embodiment Christ is the name of the Logos.

On the other hand, the matter of the Son as the Father's Image is much more complicated and more controversial than the former. Just as there is no place in the



Gospels where the Son defines Himself as the Word of God, although the Johannine Prologue is very convincing, Christ never speaks of Himself as the Image of God. The only statements we have are found in Pauline corpus.

The way we comprehend God's visibility, considering the biblical sources, bears the mark of our confessional appurtenance. This is the case of the French Calvinist theologian, Jérôme Cottin, who tried to outline a Protestant theology of the image, but who still holds fast to the traditional positions of the Reformation, reaffirming the incompatibility between the theology of the image and that of the word. For the Reformed theologians such as J. Cottin the biblical statement that the Son is 'the image of the invisible God' (Col. 1,15) is nothing more than a reformulation of the Johannine assertion that the Son is the Word of God.

By contrast, the Orthodox east has developed in time an image theology based on Christology. The issue of the Son's visibility was central to the Church Fathers, as one that had ultimate implications and was an endless source of theological speculations. For the Romanian theology the one who absorbed and went into these aspects of Christology even deeper was fr. Dumitru Stăniloae. His vision is largely concentrated on the point where Christology and anthropology connect, elaborating on the implications of the embodied Christ's being God's Word and Image has for the word and image used in human communication.

From the perspective of Orthodox theology, separating word and image is senseless. Since the Son of God became human, God's revelation through actions, words and images reaches its climax in Jesus Christ, who is the Word and the Image of the Father. Consequently, the word and the image become means of passing on the Revelation and of communicating the faith.

In *Chapter IV* we analyse the connection the two concepts have on an anthropological and cosmological level. On the former level, it is significant that the man is created in the image of the Logos-Image, a syntagma reuniting the two fundamental qualities of the Son of God, namely being God's Word and Image. These qualities are also found in the man created in the image of the One Who is both Logos and Image.

Moreover, the word-image binomial is not confined to the anthropological sphere; it can be seen in the entire creation. The world hides behind the image, through which it is accessible to us, reasons of the things placed there by God; when the man perceives them he knows their source, God the Word. An eloquent expression for this is fr. Stăniloae's phrase naming the world 'plasticised reason', a meaning that became material, and due to its corporeality, accessible to sight.

God communicates Himself to us through the worlds and the people, as if through words, or better yet, through echoes of His words. Things cannot be separated from words, because they require words in order to be expressed, and words need things and they involve them so that they would not remain empty, abstract notions. In this harmonious union alone can the meanings appear in their real plenitude. Word and image, word and existence, rational perception and supra-rational intuition are best combined in the person. A person speaks and offers itself often by the very fact that it is. It is a concentration of all the possible words and actions it can communicate ad infinitum and even more than that, providing it hasn't drained its existence by the absence of love.

*Chapter V*, the most extensive section of the thesis, is dedicated to the analysis of the relationship between *logos* and *eikon*, between word and image during the Iconoclastic period. This time is fundamental for our topic, because that is when the theoretical bases for the icon theology are laid and because those conflicts are 'the genesis of a thought on the image we have inherited'. The foremost representatives of the iconodules, namely St. Germanos of Constantinople, St. John of Damascus, St. Nicephoros of Constantinople and St. Theodore of Studion have paid special attention to the connection between word and image in their treatises.

St. Germanos of Constantinople is the first patriarch to oppose the iconoclasts, thus risking his ecclesiastic position and even his life. His icon theology isn't as elaborate, but he is the first one who theoretically bases the legitimacy of the icon on Christ's embodiment. In addition to the classical testimonies extracted from his letters, the thesis also presents a Homily on the Cross and the Icons by him, a very important text for the understanding of the complex issue of the image. For a long time his homily has remained unknown to the scholars, because it had been lost from

the Greek collections and was preserved only in a Georgian translation that in 1999 was finally translated in French and reintroduced in the cultural circuit.

The entire homily is imbued with an anti-spiritualist intent, determining St. Germanos to refute the iconoclasts' views arguing that the image, the icon isn't worthy of veneration because it is material and made by human hands.

There is a single highly persuasive paragraph in this homily with respect to the relationship between word and image, in which it is shown that whoever doesn't venerate the image/icon of Christ, cannot confess the embodiment of the Lord without being worthy of punishment. We are thus introduced into a circuit train of thought leading us to confessing the faith through the image, the word and then back. The two types of bearing witness are interdependent, as none of them can really exist without the other. The flow uniting the image and the word, the sight and the hearing will later be more thoroughly theorised by the other theologians.

For St. John of Damascus the relationship is approached in various places and ways in his 'Three treatises against the iconoclasts'. Comparing the two terms plays an apologetic part, because the word's role had never been contested, and the iconoclasts' effort was to re-establish the icon's function, because both the word and the image are the fundamental means of human communication. St. John identifies a series of contradictions and similarities he then uses to set the image on the same level as the word. There is the opposition between the Old and the New Testaments, because the former forbade the image/icon and solely favoured the word, whereas the latter re-instated the image due to the Lord's embodiment, which gave the people a complete sensorial experience of God through sight and hearing/ image and word. What the Apostles and the contemporaries of Jesus Christ have seen and heard, can be seen and heard by their descendants by the means of the Scriptures and the icons.

Words and images possess an anamnestic function; they make events of the past present for those who listen or see. Still, they also meet in the kerugmatik field: they both generate questions and perplexities, make mutual references, in a flow proving and confirming their natural equality.

The work of St. John of Damascus brings an invaluable contribution to

clarifying the theological connection between the two notions. The ideas he did not express clearly or precisely enough in his discourses will be taken and mended by the icon's theologians who followed.

The issue of the connection between word and image has been raised again at the 7<sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in 787, during the preliminary discussions and then formulated in the synodal Horos.

During the debates, it has been attempted to show there was an old ecclesiastic tradition favouring images, just as there is one affirming the role of the word and of the Scriptures. Both word and image are means of communication and communion, which once perceived by the senses enlighten the mind that received them. Despite the fact that the sight and the hearing perceive them differently, their object is the same, and the two ways of becoming aware of it are interdependent. They both evoke past events that are relevant for salvation, and only together are they able to create a complete perspective of those events. The written transmission of the Gospels has the same status and is equally as compulsory as painting icons, and they are both passed on to us by the Church Fathers of old.

The equality between word and image, Gospel and icon is re-asserted in the council's Horos, where it is emphasised once more that the icons strengthen the faith 'in the true and not the illusory embodiment of the Son of God'.

St. Theodore the Studion was in his own way a pinnacle of Byzantine icon theology. His teachings preserve synthetic forms of the theological elements the icon rests upon in the argumentation of his predecessors, but, what's more, he refines them. He was important for the present research due to how he determines the equality of the two concepts: it can be deduced from the relation between hearing and seeing, on the anthropological level, where sight comes first, followed by hearing. Furthermore, St. Theodore identifies a practical way of applying their inseparability: the icon is complete only when the name of the one depicted in it is also written.

Undoubtedly, the period of the iconoclastic disputes has been the critical moment of the genesis of the icon theology in the Orthodoxy, with a crucial importance for the entire Christian thought that followed. The image theology, as

understood by the Byzantine fathers, is profoundly joined with the whole of theology, precisely because it mainly rests in Christology, the cornerstone of the entire theological edifice. For this very reason, the image question in Byzantium (and later in the Orthodoxy, as the heiress of the thought created in the great Empire) is neither one of aesthetics, nor of art. Christoph Schönborn notices in this respect that ‘iconoclasm was a form of art secularization’. It was intended to restrict the art to its decorative or illustrative functions, without any relation to the sacred space. Nonetheless, since theology was part of daily life, the argumentation of both parties was based on Christology. Therefore, as the dialogue shifted, a series of clarifications have been made and the implications of the Son’s embodiment had for the entire creation have been emphasised. ‘The embodiment has not only changed the way we know God, it also changed the way man sees the world, himself, his actions in the world. Even the work of the artists has been engulfed by the power of attraction of this mystery, (...) and the consent between art and cult, icon and faith, is a consent for the divine-human mystery.’ The question of the image is ultimately the question of how to understand Christ’s taking on human flesh, and this is the single area where the relation between word and image may find a coherent explanation from the point of view of Christian theology; namely that both the word and the icon are God’s means of communicating, means of sustaining and experiencing faith and therefore instruments of Christian mission.

*Chapter VI* is dedicated to the relationship between word and image in western theology and is consequently divided into two sections: a presentation of the reception and the consequences of the Byzantine iconoclasm in the west, and a review of two works of reference on the topic, written by Jean-Philippe Ramseyer and Jacques Ellul.

The Byzantine quarrel over the image has been only partially and often badly received in the west. Details aside, what matters is that the image has never been radically refused; quite to the contrary, it has been admitted that it has a revelatory function. An argument to this respect is the fact that the icons were acknowledged as the ‘Bible of the illiterate’, to quote the famous definition of Pope Gregory the Great. Denying its revelatory possibilities is denying the embodiment of the Son of God.

The two western theologians addressing the issue, Jean-Philippe Ramseyer and

Jacques Ellul, have different approaches and perspectives. Ramseyer is much closer to Orthodox than to Catholic theology when he writes about the word of God: from the beginning it is connected to the sphere of visibility, for the simple reason that when God speaks He also acts, or rather God acts by speaking. His word is not a vehicle of intellectual communication, but an action by which God becomes involved in history, calling beings and things into existence. This way, although He is not actually visible, the Word of God becomes visible through His actions.

The sight J. Ellul takes such great pains to criticise, has a entirely different meaning in the theological structure of Ramseyer. According to him, the sight introduces a *plastic* dimension in biblical revelation. It is naturally an immaterial plastic, a sort of spiritual body whose visibility offers itself to the inner sight. Therefore, sight is a Word in immaterial images. At this point we should recall once again fr. Dumitru Stăniloae's view: almost any word of the revelation is a word-image, a plasticised meaning, as the images are God's inevitable way of revealing Himself to the human spirit. We believe in God because He speaks to us through His Word. But who is God? He is the One Who became flesh in the person of Jesus Christ, so that for those who listen to Him, the Word of God does not have an auditory content, because He is a visible image in which we are called upon to contemplate the invisible and unfathomable mystery of the thrice holy God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, the French Reformed theologian, Jacques Ellul assumes an iconoclastic position. Endowed with fantastic intuitions, Ellul's image criticism cannot be fully ignored, even when he writes about the use of icons in the church. Exactly because of this reason, the analysis of the word-image relationship found in his works is very useful for Orthodox theology, with the necessary patristic amendments. The value set by the author on word and personalism is often in perfect accord with Orthodox theology, once their unilateralism is eliminated. Reading Ellul and Stăniloae, who gives an excellent Orthodox framework with patristic bases, parallel to each other helps to comprehend word and image as complementary ways of knowledge and communication.

*Chapter VII* deals with the word-image relationship in modern times. The

starting point is the idea that modernity and postmodernism share a continuity, not only historically, but mostly with respect to ideas. The specific element of modernity on a semiotic level is breaking the bond between signifier and signified. Words and images are self-referential: they no longer refer to something found beyond them. Both words and especially images have this destiny. The solution to free the image from this tyranny is the icon, free from the logic of modern imagery. Instead of the image's self-reference, the icon's kenosis which fades as much as possible in order to allow a bridge to the beyond to form.

*Chapter VIII* presents the mission through word, image, and Sacrament. The entire cult of the Church and, above all, the Sacraments, are examples of the union between word and image, spirit and matter. The word, the image, and the Sacrament are means through which the Church can efficiently fulfil its mission to grow and to incorporate all people in the mystical body of Christ, so that they may all live fully this way.

A special aspect of this union is the witness given by the holiness one's life. Taking Christ as a model in life he who preaches the word of God has to complete the words he utters by his own image, as the fulfilment or the embodiment of those words. The word which doesn't become a reality in the one who articulates it is a mere empty promise. For someone to have *a powerful word*, a persuasive word, capable to convert others, it is necessary that that word be accompanied by the image of the person talking, embodying the message of the Gospels he preaches. This reality is exemplified by the monks in the Egyptian desert, for whom personal example took precedence over empty, moralising talk.

*The last chapter* analyses several possible definitions of the word-image relation. Firstly, there is the definition of N. Ozolin who perceives this relation as 'analogy and complementarity'. When this relation is discussed from a theological perspective, its terms are theology and icon, and everything becomes clearer now: the two concepts, *analogy* and *complementarity*, show their faults, but this does not annul their didactic value. The source of the shortcomings is the tendency for a mechanical understanding brought about by the latter term. Usually, two complementary objects form a unity, which is often something else than what each element is in itself. In this

case, theology and icon form a unity that is paradoxically nothing different from what they each express.

Another syntagma which may define the relation is *mutual interiority*. It has been inspired by fr. Dumitru Stăniloae's ideas in the study 'Revelation Through Acts, Words, and Images'. This phrase is a step further to understanding the complex and crucial relation between word and image within Christian theology. Nevertheless, a more accurate definition of the relation is *inclusive simultaneity*: thus the mechanic understanding suggested by complementarity is overcome, and at the same time, it shows that both the word and the image simultaneously cover the same area, integrating each other in order to express, as much as it is humanly possible, the same divine revelation.

In *Conclusions* it is emphasised that both concepts are simultaneous means of communicating and transmitting revelation, and they are equally means of communicating and transmitting the faith in God and His work. Jesus Christ is the supreme and ultimate synthesis of God's work, because He is the embodied Son and Word of God, as well as 'the image of the invisible God' (Col. 1,15). Among the ways God communicates Himself and his work to us are the word and the image/icon, in a relation of inclusive simultaneity, playing a major part in the mission of the Church, namely in preaching, supporting and experiencing faith.

The word and the image have various concrete forms of being present in the Church. The word is found in the Scriptures, in preaching, in prayers etc. The image is found in icons, the image of Christ and His saints, the image of the confessor, the image of the Christian mother etc., even the image of the authentic Christian community. The word and the image in their simultaneity, in these forms or others, are means of communicating and living the faith, means of Christian witness and mission.

The preached word must be accompanied by image. The man, created in the image of He Who is the Word and the Image of the Father, is in his turn word and image, and in order for his testimony to be authentic, his words must express his inner reality, they must spring forth from an authentic experience of the reality preached. Otherwise the words remain empty and never go beyond being mere sound (even



articulated ones), a superficial shell for a distant truth. In these situations the risk of hypocrisy is immense. Abba Poimen answers when asked what a hypocrite was: ‘A hypocrite is he who teaches his fellow man a thing he has not achieved’ (Poimen 117). Abba Isidore Pelusiotes said: ‘a life without words is more useful than words without life. For life is useful even when it is silent, but the word is annoying even when it is shouted. But when both word and life shall meet, they shall form the icon of all philosophy’.

An important element underlined in the *Conclusions* is the humility inspired by the icon. Its logic is radically opposed to the one of the self-referent image. The icon is the very kenosis of the image. The first humble act on which the icon rests is Christ’s kenosis, Who empties Himself and becomes visible. Filled by this logic, the icon claims nothing for itself, is never hungry for a close-up and ‘precisely because the icon doesn’t give itself for itself, but it gets rid of its own magical illusions, is entitled to claim veneration – a veneration which it does not confiscate, but one it lets pass through it until it reaches the invisible prototype’.

Humility, the chief virtue of Christian spirituality can be learned from the icon, as well as from the word. The latter, just as the former, exists only as long as it averts the danger of self-reference, meaning as long as it refers others to Christ-the Word and doesn’t try to preach itself.