
REVELATION AND VERBAL SYMBOLS IN THE ORTHODOX ICONOGRAPHY - DOGMATIC ASPECTS

Vasile Cristescu*

*University 'Al. I. Cuza', Faculty of Orthodox Theology, 9 Closca, 700065 Iasi,
Romania*

(Received 5 May 2009, revised 11 July 2009)

Abstract

The incarnation of the Son of God made possible the representation of God's image on the icons and revelation of a new Name: the God-Man Name. The icon communicates with the Prototype by its name and the Name of God-Man is found in the icon of the Resurrection of Christ, which is a personal revelation of the God light and of the full triumph over the death.

Keywords: person, icon, name, resurrection, revelation, transparency, light

1. Introduction

The discovery of God in words and icons includes the transmission of the word into God's Name. The doubt that such a thing is possible fades away when we stop thinking that words are a product of humanity, not having anything natural or material. On the contrary, it must be shown that the human word is a natural element, which is capable of being illuminated and transfigured, just like any other natural element, characterized by all the powers and energies of the man.

A word is a symbol, not a symbol in a nihilistic sense of a sign imagined by humans, as was meant by adepts of iconoclasm, but rather in a sense of a communion between two beings. The only words out there are symbolic words and this reality stands true even for the forces of nature, which can become receivers of other forces. In this sense, sacraments are symbolic.

The embodiment, or the Name of God spoken through human words, is done in an act of will and love, of God's availability.

F. Ebner, when talking about the phrase "to believe in God's Name", which is found in the first chapter of the Gospel of John (1.12) as τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (to those who believe in His name), shows that the deepest meaning of this phrase has to do with the Sanskrit base 'hu', which means to summon supernatural beings, and which is the root of the word 'God'. To believe in God's Name means to believe in God as a summoned being, as a

* E-mail: veniamin2001@yahoo.de

Person who is spoken to, as an 'You' corresponding to the 'I' in people, in His personal existence [1].

According to the Holy Scripture there are two revelations of the Name: the Old Testament name Yahweh, told to Moses and the New Testament name Jesus, told to Virgin Mary and through her, to the whole humanity: two icons of the divine Name not created by man (Exodus 3.13-14, 6.3), (Luke 1.31).

In a revelation God communicates His Name and is kept as a sacrament and as a force, and the revelation is known only by the bishop and the Name spoken at the cleansing celebration, when entering the Holiest of Holies and besprinkling with the sacrificial blood. The Name of God can be understood as a simple synonym of God, since it means a particular instance of the divine presence, of its power or in its Name.

In Exodus (33. 18-19) we find that at Moses' request of seeing the praise of God, He promises that He will show him His praise along with the speaking of the name Yahweh (Exodus 34). Here the manifestation of praise and the speaking of the Name are juxtaposed, like two aspects of a unique revelation. Still this was not a revelation of the Godliness sacrament itself. For humans it was part of God's plan of delivering humankind. Man would name God and would realize he needed a law. This law was "the shadow of future goods" (Hebrews 10.1) but the shadow was opaque.

2. The Name of Christ: the God-Man Name

As shown in the Apocalypse, the New Testament encompasses the revelation of a new Name. The fundamental dogmatic definitions show that the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ signifies something different than the Old Testament names: they had been intended for people, but did not belong to them. The name of God-the Human is the name of God in a new sense: it is, at the same time, the name of the Human. That is why D. Bonhoeffer's claim concerning God's name and its pronunciation is incorrect: "Only when we know the un-pronouncing (Unaussprechlichkeit) of God's Name can we pronounce the name of Jesus Christ" [2]. Bonhoeffer's claim disregards the divine-human personality of Christ and along with it, the delivering events it brings, the Embodiment, the death and the Resurrection. Through them, Christ allows us to say 'Ava Father', i.e. to pronounce the Father's name as sons by grace, reaching this point with the help of Christ. This pronouncing was impossible in the Old Testament and through the Name of Christ we are now able to discover God's love for humanity and the communication between man and God, fulfilled in its highest degree.

The pronunciation of God's name through Christ does not mean a degradation of God, as Bonhoeffer suggests: "It is best not to pronounce God's name than to lower Him to a human word... This can take place only when we pray daily, as Jesus Christ taught us: 'Holy be Thy name'" [3]. If we were to remain to this day at the idea of not pronouncing God's name we would lack the familiarity with the Father which was brought to us by Christ. Were that the

case, we should also deny the fruition of Christ listening as a human being to the Father, of His sacrifice and of our conciliation with the Father, through Christ.

Along with all of this, we should also deny the absolute power He had and displayed through miracles, as God and as a human being. In reality, Christ showed and enacted the absolute power of forgiving sins, just like God and as God, for He-Himself is God, as shown by part of the western exegesis [4]. That is why his apostles worship him [5]. Christ is 'included' in the Church's doxologies, "along with the Father and the Holy Ghost" [6] ever since the apostolic time. "Since then He is given the name Lord, a correspondent of Yahweh from the Old Testament (2 Corinthians 10.13, Galatians 2.5, 2 Peter 3.18, etc.)" [6].

U. Luz reaches the same conclusion when saying that the apostles' obedience of Christ "includes worshipping" [7]. Luz thus responds to the unilateral interpretation given by G. Eichholz, who speaks only of the apostles' obedience of Christ, denying the fact that He was entitled to worshipping [8]. By affirming this, Eichholz was trying to challenge the position of Eustatio of Sevast, which was phrased: "Through this (Christ), You (Father) are entitled to praise to the Holy Ghost" [9]. It must be noted though that the worshipping of Christ as God implies His equality with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Faced with the Name of Christ, of God-the Human, the mind of man is confronted with the sacrament of God's Name in a new sense, in which It is at the same time the name of Man. That is why the mind now has to deal with a new, fundamental and simply inductible fact, which has to be admitted as such: the transcendent name of Yahweh, the Old Testament revelation, has in reality become old when the Son showed God (John 1.18) and when He gave "those who received it, who believe in His Name, the power to become sons of God" (John 1.12). This is the Name above all names in the face of which everyone bows, the name of everything celestial and everything earthly and underneath the earth (Philippians 1.2, 9-10). This however does not imply - as Bertold Klappert seems to believe - the deletion of God's self image which derives from His Name as It is in the naming of the Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost [10]. On the contrary, it means the absolute revelation of the person and the name of the Father through the Son, a revelation which is brought to humanity through the Holy Ghost.

The name of Christ, God-the Human, means something completely different than the temporary naming of existence. His Name accompanies Him on Earth, in His life and death. It is written on the cross (John 19.19, Luke 23.38, Mark 15.26, Matthew 28.37). This Name accompanies the one who bears it throughout His whole life on Earth, but also beyond it, into eternity (Apocalypse 1.11). God's Name is the reality which reveals the divine nature, it is Godlike, but saying that does not deplete Its reality, for it is God Himself. The Saviour is the heavenly Man, flawless, absolute, in which the entire plenitude of Godliness lies (Colossians 2.9).

Having both the Godly and the human nature energy, the Name of Christ, God-the Human, stands for the transcendence of the Old Testament Name and the entrance of the immanent into transcendence, outside of humanity and the world, into the divine domain which is neither man nor the world. In the Old Testament only the high priests could speak the Name as a sacrament in the Holiest of Hollies, protected by all the sacred means of a liturgical moment.

In the light of the New Testament revelation fulfilled by Christ, God-the Human, all of us, deep down inside our hearts, are called upon as “monarchic priesthood”, “chosen seed” (Peter 1.2, 9), to invoke the Name through which Jesus the world's Saviour is present. The Name of Christ is, thus, “overflowing chrisim, through which the whole world was filled with the good scent of Godliness” [11].

3. The Resurrection of Christ – the personal revelation of God light and the full triumph over death

In order to understand the sacrament of Christ from the icon of the Resurrection, held in the Church of the Drăgănescu congregation [12], one first needs not only silence, but also the conversion (*conversio*) of the mind through the calling of Christ's Name, as the author of the icon himself underlines: “The person of Christ is not only our contemporary, in time, but also our soul, our life, our mind. As the Scripture says, ‘Then you will have the mind and feeling that were in Christ’. That is why we say that only the life itself of Jesus explains His Gospel the best. It is clear that in order for us to understand it, we need the same reference: the light on the mountain!” [13]

Saint Gregory Palamas prayed for the light for years in his youth, constantly invoking the name of Jesus: ‘Light my darkness, Lord, light my darkness!’

This is the prayer that is requested from the person who enters a church filled with light from the saints represented in the icons. The destination of man and nature, the transparency gained through the work of the Holy Ghost's grace, is represented here both in a symbolical and in a real way. Through this we can discover the fundamental definition of the symbol: ‘An existence greater than itself’. The symbol is an existence with an energy which flows along with another energy, ‘in connection with its existence full of virtue’ which it bears inside.

Since the relation we're interested in bears a more complete existence, the symbol, although it has a name, can rightfully have the name of that existence with a greater, more complete value. All these names are subsumated to the name of Jesus, as shown by Apostle Paul: “For this, God too praised Him and gave Him a name, one which is above all other names” (Philippians 2.9). The meaning of this Scripture quote concerns the pre-eminence, the size, the exquisite quality, the honesty and the praise (*excellencia, amplitudo, eminentia, fama, celebritas, gloria*).

These are the ways in which the icon representing the central event for humanity, the Resurrection of the Lord, is revealed. The icon can be named light-revelatory, depicting in the foreground the divine-human Person of the resurrected Saviour, the personal Revelation of the Godly light. It is the complete revelation of the victory of light over the opaqueness brought over the body by sin, the lack of any opaqueness in the resurrected body, the total transparency of the body through the receiving of Godlike features, made possible by the union of the divine Person of Christ with the human nature.

The icon depicts the moment of the Resurrection of the Lord previously to the one usually depicted in iconography, which is based on the information given in Scriptures by Matthew 28.1-6, Mark 16.1-8, Luke 24.1-9 or John 20.1-8, in which our Saviour Jesus Christ, resurrected, is depicted over his grave, the tomb stone set aside (knocked down) by an angel (Matthew 28.2).

The dogmatic aspect contained by the icon of Christ's Resurrection in the Drăgănescu Church is that of our Saviour Christ's raising from the grave, announced by the angel himself to the women who show up at the grave: "He is not here, for He has risen, as he said" (Matthew 28.6, Luke 24.6).

This is why the Resurrection is centred on this event and depicts the Person of our Saviour Jesus Christ with the body resurrected in the raising from the grave, with the tombstone untouched, thus showing that His Resurrection took place before the tombstone was removed (Mark 16.6).

The passing, with the body resurrected, through the tombstone is like the passing of the Saviour, after the Resurrection, through the closed doors, where his apostles were gathered, frightened by Hebrews (John 20.19).

The miracle of the tombstone knock over was done for the women through an angel described by the interrogative pronoun 'who' (Mark 16.3).

The resurrected body of Christ shows, in the icon, the complete transparency received by the human nature through its embrace in the divine instance. This transparency is depicted through the white-grey colour dominated by the glow of the divine energy, created by something else than human nature.

The whole iconographical representation is framed by a cross which has the lower part in the grave, to strengthen the belief in the authenticity of the body Resurrection of our Saviour Jesus Christ. In addition, it evokes the passions of the Lord, revealed through the marks of nails in the hands and legs and that of the spear in the rib (Luke 24.40).

The expression of pain, completely overcome in the Resurrection, is revealed in the human face of God. In the look that foreshadows the assumed suffering we also see, at the same time, the light of absolute victory through Resurrection: it is the joy of receiving the complete, Godly work in His human nature. "That is why the face turns into a figure. The figure is now the resemblance with God through face." [14]

We paint Christ's icon not only to remind ourselves of the human face of God, who was once on Earth, but also to make visible, through art, "His face which exists even now and which will forever be in communion with us, reassuring us that our faces will resurrect for eternal life in communion with Him" [6, vol. 3, p. 337].

The fact that the Son of God could make his face human, "give it the interior dimension of infinity, manifest the Godly transcendence through it and make said transcendence eternal, shows us that the human face, generally speaking, has within itself the capacity to become a visible figure of God, that God has a figure, a way of manifestation, from which the human face was created" [6, vol. 3, p. 338].

The human face is a unique occurrence in the cosmic process and an opening to transcendence. Although it transcends the cosmic process, it remains enclosed in this process by death. The human face of Christ however is filled by this divine transcendence. Because it is not enclosed by death, it remains forever turned to us. Through the face's transcendence, which can have a relative nature since it can be enclosed by death, the absolute transcendence of God becomes transparent, and that makes it overcome death and remain forever open.

From the communion with Christ's face, our face will also gain the power to resurrect for eternity. This is the theological message of the icon of Resurrection from the Drăgănescu Church. In its presence, the author calls not only for someone who is isolated and can contemplate within themselves the reality of Resurrection, but also for the whole history of humanity from which Christ asks for the verdict on His existence: "Christ asks history for the verdict on His existence" [13, p. 7].

Such a verdict concerns the eternal destination of our personal face towards resurrection, its opening towards the personal existence of the Holy Trinity, towards its contemplation. Just as the representation of a simple person's face "suggests the encircling material face which the painter is depicting, the rich spiritual life, because it depicts the person, so does the Saviour's icon suggest not only His human life, but also His Godliness, completely unrestricted" [6, vol. 3, p. 340].

The icon thus leads not to the absence of the figure, but above and beyond the figure. This aspect is seen by some as an iconographic apophysis [6, vol. 3, p. 340].

The icon of the Resurrection foreshadows the structure which present human existences will receive. The matter of things and bodies itself is light. This material light is penetrated by the non-material, non-created light, thus overbearing individualistic separations. Still, matter transfigured in a state of resurrection remains matter. The icon of the Resurrection unveils for us clearly that all the light that will overcome the world will radiate from the body of Christ. The day in which Christ will appear as the Sun will be 'the day of God' par excellence. He Himself will be that day, for he is its light (Apocalypse 21.24).

The light of Christ's face, light of the divine-human Person, will overwhelm all of the lights from outside: "From the human face of Christ, who is the medium through which never-ending understanding and kindness of the Godlike Person radiates, [a light] will spread over everything and everyone who opened their heart to see and feel the light which overwhelms everything, or it will reveal to them the complete meaning of existence" [6, vol. 3, p. 393].

In the above mentioned icon of the Resurrection one can see the figures bathed in light of two angels. We must, however, grasp a correct understanding of the apparition of the two, in the sense found in the Scripture at Ephesians 4.10, and not in the sense that all the Godlike beauty comes to us, as claimed by S. Bulgakov. As God resurrected, Christ shows Himself so overwhelming in His light that the angels are hardly distinguishable when the man receives the revelation of God's presence. The icon of the Resurrection found at Drăgănescu depicts the overwhelming light which causes the transparency of the body, light which is coming from Christ as a Godlike Sun: it is transcendent to colour, colourless, as something that is above colour, having within itself all the colours, all of the plenitude and richness of shapes.

Such plenitude concerns the reality of the resurrected body, in which matter is overcome by the Holy Ghost. Saint Gregory of Nyssa deems resurrection to be a reinstallation in the state in which man would have been had it not sinned: "We must first wonder what the purpose of the resurrection dogma is and why we were told about it in the Holy Scripture. If we wanted to encompass it in a definition, we would say that the resurrection is our reinstallation in the ancient state of our nature" [15].

4. The relationship between icon and name

Resurrection and the transfiguration need to show a generative change expressed in the revelation of the true name. Death is on the one hand the separation and singularization of the name related to its bearer and on the other it is the death of the old name, which is only a force of the past now (Genesis, 32.26-29).

Our Saviour Jesus Christ resurrected from the dead but having the same Name. Specifically, He passed through the gates of death and life, through the gates of hell, having the same occurrence with the One who was "in the tomb with the body, in hell with the soul, as God, in heaven with the thief, on the chair with the Father and the Holy Ghost" (the resurrection hymn). As the name shares the fate of the person who bears it beyond his worldly life, thus the holiest of all the Names remains inseparable from its Bearer, in which there is no change.

It shows in the above mentioned Resurrection icon, through the seeing (eikon) of the way the Resurrection takes place. Through its shape, the icon acknowledges directly and intuitively the reality of that way. It speaks in lines and colours that uncover the light and uncovers itself: "It is God's Name written in colours, for what is the image of God? The spiritual light from a holy figure,

God's Name ingrained on a holy person. As the witness, an apostle or a saint, though the one who speaks, does not bring forth facts about himself, but about God, thus the witnesses of the iconographical witnesses do not express their iconographical art, they do not bring forth facts about themselves, but about the saints, the witnesses of God, and through this, about the Lord Himself.” [14, p. 161]

The fact that in iconoclastic arguments the issue of names has had a capital importance is highly significant. Arguments bared the mark of an incipient debate on the meaning of God's Name. The icon cannot be complete without a name, without an inscription. This aspect was established by the VIIth Ecumenical Synod: “The icon resembles the prototype not through substance, but only through name (*kata to ōvoua*) and the disposition of the represented members” [16].

From this definition it follows that the icon is the seal of divine energy, but it also differs from it: “The visible icon does not communicate with the prototype except for its name, but not by its nature (*kata to ōvoua ... ou kata ousian*). The true mind recognizes in an icon nothing more than the communion with the one being represented through their name and not their nature.” [16, col. 258]

We find the same ideas in the teachings of Saint Theodore the Studite of praising the holy icons: “According to nature, Christ is one thing and the icon of Christ is another thing, although there is also a certain unity pertaining to the un-sharing of the name. When we look at the nature of the icon we cannot name what we see, neither Christ, nor the icon of Christ, for the nature of the icon is made of wood, of colours, of gold, of silver or any other nature. But when we see what was obtained through them, the resemblance with the initial figure, we call it Christ and the icon of Christ, but Christ only by the name resemblance and the icon of Christ by the relation that is established, for representation assumes the initial image, as name resemblance assumes the name which it bears.” [17]

In the first ‘Rejection of the iconoclasts’, in answering their question “Must we worship the inscription or the image that has the name on it? One of them? Not both? And if so, which one?”, Saint Theodore answers: “This is like asking whether we should worship the Gospel or the name written on it? The Cross or the letter on it? But the same thing applies to each of us and each of our names: of Paul and of Peter and maybe each of the individuals in the same species. And how is this not a mindless thing, or rather a laughable thing? For what is nameless of that which is bestowed upon our eyes? Thus how can you separate the thing which is named by its name, so that we worship one but not the other? This deals with the categories of relations, for the name is the name of that which is named by it and through its nature it is a sort of natural image of the thing which we talk about and that is why the unity of worshipping cannot be disjointed.” [17, col. 340]

Patriarch Nichifor uses similar reasoning: “The icon of Christ is named by its name according to the sense of its naming, while at the same time it is worthy of being worshipped and praised” [18]. In defending the holy icons, the patriarch also shows that “The Lord has not only a common name, but also the proper name of Jesus; He can thus be described according to humanity” [18, col. 397].

The icon of the Resurrection at the Church from Drăgănescu unfolds to the eye like a contemplated reality which spreads the light: “It is a light of colours opened to a world similar to the figure of our Saviour who has come to bring us light from above” [19]. No matter how it is expressed, the only thing you can say about it is that it lifts you. It is perceived like being found in a space of its own and in a different time: that of eternity. It is the product of a brush, but it overwhelms us in such a way that faced with its overcoming beauty we cannot believe our eyes. The icon shows the possibility of an absolute revelation, restored through the divine-human Person of the resurrected Saviour, through the light that transfigures everything, that reaches all the way to the eternal darkness of hell.

The icon confers to the one who contemplates it, in time and in a certain state of spirit, the power to feel its holy essence. When we will live ourselves the reality of the revelation, through those who entered it, we will no longer perceive it from the outside. Then it will be like recognition from within ourselves: the icon reminds us of the heavenly prototype. It is an icon because the Church admitted the correspondence between the represented figure and the Prototype to be represented [14, p. 179], by giving it a name. The endowment of this name, the confirmation of the identity of the figure represented on the icon, belongs solely to the Church.

The icon of the Lord’s Resurrection is the face of the upcoming century. It allows us to overcome time and see the face of the future century. The image is entirely material and the opinion that there might be some random parts actually translates in the complete denial of its symbolic nature. That which seems random comes from the “bodily wisdom” (II Corinthians 1.12) which the sinful mind wants to include in the spiritual symbolism.

On the contrary, the spiritual image of the icon of Resurrection is entirely filled with the revelation of the light from the Resurrected. That is why it is painted on a background of light. According to the iconographic tradition this light becomes golden. Another dogmatic truth is at stake here, highlighted by the theological thinking of Father Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae: the pneumatic nature of the resurrected body of the Lord and through connection with Him, the same character of our bodies. The resurrected bodies will somewhat stop being impenetrable and unable to penetrate [6, vol. 3, p. 406]. Due to the coming of Christ on the day of the resurrection, they have to show themselves in all of their beauty (John 3.2), received through the constant presence of the Holy Ghost within themselves. It is the working of the force of the Ghost’s grace that makes the bodies overcome the exteriority or the separation and become completely transparent.

This truth is restored in the icon of the Resurrection, where it appears to be nothing more than the light, the pure light, colourless, which represents the space of true reality. It comes from the resurrected body of the Lord through which “we live, we move and we are” (Chronicles 17.28).

Because the white colour is used, representing light, the specific nature of Christian ontology is revealed, one that is clearly separated from the platonic ontology, contrary to what P. Florensky believes [14, p. 216].

The white light has no longer an abstract nature, but a transparent one, a completely revelatory one. Through it obscurity is ended, but at the same time, the apophatic and impenetrable nature of the divine origin is asserted.

5. The iconographic representation of eastern and renaissance art

While in a pictorial acceptance light is just a pretext for things to reveal themselves, for the iconographer there is no other reality than the reality of light and what it leads to. In this sense, P. Florensky speaks about a perspective that is the reverse version of that of Renaissance, one which asserts the reality of the primordial light. Through this new perspective the individuality of a thing is obtained in a new manner: “In order to obtain the individuality of a thing we must not deny anything, not that there would be anything to deny, since before it was created by light it did not even exist; the thing obtains its materiality not through negation, but in a positive manner, through the emergence of light... The Godly ‘let there be light’ addressed to the world represents the creative verb, put into action, because we perceive God’s voice as light”. [14, p. 223]

P. Florensky sees the difference between the Christian teachings and art on the one hand and the Renaissance art on the other hand, in a particular dimension: you either believe in the ontological underline and the autonomy of the world, in its capacity to self-create and self-destruct, either you believe in God and recognize the world to be His creation [14, p. 223].

Renaissance paintings depict the first conception, while the Christian iconography is based on the second one. The first is defined by its eclectic, conflicting nature: “Renaissance culture is analytically fractioned, made up of divergent elements, each craving for an autonomous existence... in the western paintings the object exists in itself, just like the light, and the relation between them is random, the object simply receiving the light, and that is why the enlightened parts, especially the lights spots, can find themselves anywhere. They are random, thus the light creates a new object, the object between objects, the source of light.” [14, p. 224]

The positivistic purpose of this painting is to dissolve the hierarchy of existence. “The light which brightens, like the spirit in a state of contemplation, identified as external objects, are placed within the same plane of the conventional... If light would be regarded as escaping any ontology, than the shape which is into the light, thus only enlightened, not produced by light, and would turn into something we did not understand anyway.” [14, p. 225]

P. Florensky makes a clear distinction between the brushwork of Rembrandt, lacking 'unity of perspective', in which space is enclosed and there is no source of light, in which objects are swirls of a illuminating, phosphorescent substance, and the eastern iconography. We can distinguish the latter in the icon of the Resurrection at Drăgănescu.

In that icon, we can discover the difference, which P. Florenski sees, in a profound sense, between the western and eastern cultures: "In Rembrandt one can see a highly harmful manifestation of the Renaissance inclination for the self-partitioning of the world. Iconography depicts things as being created by light and not enlightened by a source of light. For Rembrandt, on the contrary, light is not in the least the objective cause of things, and things are not created by light either, but are bright in themselves, from the very beginning, they are the primordial light of darkness, the 'Abgrund' Bohme was talking about, i.e. pantheism, the second pole of the Renaissance atheism." [14, p. 225]

In eastern iconography everything that is brought forth, "the content of every existence, of any experience, is the light" [14, p. 230], or, as the Apostle says: "Everything that manifests itself openly is revealed through light" (πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν) (Ephesians 5.13).

The process that takes place in the icon of the Resurrection from Drăgănescu envisages the reality of this world fully visible on the face of the resurrected Saviour, while at the same time relating to the advice of the Apostle of being 'the sons of light', of leading your life for it, being chosen by Christ for this purpose from the very beginning, even before the world was created (Ephesians 1.4).

References

- [1] F. Ebner, *Das Wort und die geistigen Realitäten*, Springer Verlag, Regensburg, 1921, 42.
- [2] D. Bonhoeffer, *Widerstand und Ergebung*, E. Bethge (ed.), WEN, München, 1970, 175.
- [3] D. Bonhoeffer, *Die erste Tafel der zehn Worte (1944)*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, E. Bethge (ed.), Bd. IV, WEN Verlag, München, 1961, 608.
- [4] O. Hofius, *Vergebungsanspruch und Vollmachtsfrage*, in *Wenn nicht jetzt, wann dann?*, FS H. J. Kraus zum 60. Geburtstag, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchener Vluyn, 1983, 115.
- [5] F. Hahn, *Mathew 16-20*, Von A. Falkenroth (ed.), Bd. 3/2, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1975, 22.
- [6] D. Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică ortodoxă*, vol. 2, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, București, 1978, 105.
- [7] U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt. 26-28)*, EKK 1/4, Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2002, 438.
- [8] G. Eichholz, *Meditation zu Mt 28, 16-20*, in *Herr tue meine Lippen auf*, G. Eichholz (ed.), Bd. III, Gütersloh, Wuppertal, 1964, 262.
- [9] A.M. Ritter, *Handbuch der Dogmen-und Theologiegeschichte*, von C. Andresen (ed.), Bd. 1, 2. Aufl., Gütersloh, Göttingen, 1999, 198.

- [10] M. Welker and M. Wolf (eds.), *Der lebendige Gott als Trinität*, Gütersloh, München, 2006, 240.
- [11] Sfântul Grigorie Palama, *Omilii*, vol. 1, Romanian translation by C. Daniel, Anastasia, București, 2000, 280.
- [12] V. Cristescu, *Eur. J. Sci. Theol.*, **5(1)** (2009) 41.
- [13] A. Boca, *Cărarea împărăției*, Editura Sfintei Episcopii Ortodoxe Române a Aradului, Arad, 1995, 13.
- [14] P. Florenski, *Iconostasul*, Romanian translation by B. Buzilă, Anastasia, București, 1994, 148.
- [15] Gregorius Nyssenus, *De anima et resurrectione*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, J.P. Migne (ed.), vol. 46, Bibliotheca cleri universae, Paris, 1863, col. 145.
- [16] J.D. Mansi (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, tomus III, Expensis Antonii, Florentiae, 1759, col. 241.
- [17] Sfântul Teodor Studitul, *Antirrheticus I*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 99, J.P. Migne (ed.), Bibliotheca cleri universae, Paris, 1891, col. 341.
- [18] Patriarhul Nichifor de Constantinopol, *Antirrheticus adversus Const. Copron.*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 99, J.P. Migne (ed.), Bibliotheca cleri universae, Paris, 1891, col. 361.
- [19] N. Crainic, *Scrisoare*, in *Cărarea împărăției*, Editura Sfintei Episcopii Ortodoxe Române a Aradului, Arad, 1995, 333.