

Predrag Petrović

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Orthodox Theology

e-mail: djpredragpetrovic@gmail.com

THE THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF TERMS *SHADOW*, *EIKON* AND *TRUTH* IN THE THOUGHT OF DIVINE DIONYSIUS AREOPAGITE AND VENERABLE MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Abstract: Particular eschatological-historic dimensions of existence make up the symbolic basis for the relationship between God and the world, a relationship hidden as the "backdrop of" biblical expressions *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*, or *shadow* and *truth*, which we also find mentioned appropriately in other texts of the Holy Fathers of the Church. The ontological meanings of the terms *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*, each in a suitable manner, actually connect the divine, benevolent kindness with liturgically-virtuous way of being. The Old Testament prophecies speak of the share of future events in the past or of historic times of yesteryear, and they also speak of definite, yet unrealized future events. And the Lord Jesus Christ announces an identical mode of prophesising reality which he has heard from the Father (in the past) and hence His words: "Two men will be working together in the field; one will be taken, the other left" (Matt. 24, 41) or by drawing on Daniel's prophecy, which had not yet occurred at the time of the Lord's earthly liturgy, as in the example of the Lord's words: "And when you see... the abomination of desolation, spoken by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place (then...)" (Matt. 24, 15).

Key words: Shadow, Eikon, Truth, Symbol, Eschatology, History, Liturgy, Virtue, Grace, Being, Good Being, Eternal Good Being, Archetype of Being.

Introduction

Particular eschatological-historic dimensions of existence make up the symbolic basis for the relationship between God and the world, a relationship hidden as the "backdrop of" biblical expressions *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*, or *shadow* and *truth*, which we also find mentioned appropriately in other texts of the Holy Fathers of the Church. The ontological meanings of the terms *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*, each in a suitable manner, actually connect the divine, benevolent kindness with liturgically-virtuous way of being. The Old Testament prophecies speak of the share of future events in the past or of historic times of yesteryear, and they also speak of definite, yet unrealized future events. And the Lord Jesus Christ announces an identical mode of prophesising reality which he has heard from the Father (in the past) and hence His words: "Two men will be working together in the field; one will be taken, the other left" (Matt. 24, 41) or by drawing on Daniel's prophecy, which had not yet occurred at the time of the Lord's earthly liturgy, as in the example of the Lord's words: "And when you see... the abomination of desolation, spoken by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place (then...)" (Matt. 24, 15).

Apostolic liturgical testimonies of theology of the *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* were for the first time used by Apostle Paul who said: "for the law having a *shadow* of good things to come, and not the very *eikon* of the things, can never perfect the comers thereunto with the same sacrifices which they offered year by year ... That is why, when he came into the world he says: You did not want sacrifice and offering: but you prepared your body for me. Holocausts (and sacrifices) for sins did not please you; Then I said: Here I have come ... to do thy will, O God ... in which (will) we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all (ἐφάπαξ) ... But this man, having offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand side of God ... from then on expecting until his enemies are made his footstool" (Heb. 10, 1-13).

The most general problem that now arises concerns the issue of the relationship of Pauline expressions (of the *shadow* and *eikon*) and is as follows: did the Lord repeal the *shadow* in the *eikon*, or, why did the apostles, and later on other holy fathers, call upon the experience of the *shadow* of the Old Testament righteous ones if it had passed once and for all? If the *eikon* however, does not repeal the *shadow*, and if so, how does liturgical symbolism of Dionysius the Areopagite in the form of the content of his teachings about the *shadows*, the *divine symbols* and *truth*, fit Maximus' theology?

Firstly, Dionysius, in terms of terminology, sees the *eikon* as a hallmark of the Old Testament theology that is waiting for "the future Jesus theurgies"¹ and describes the truth in *eikons*, while the New Testament theology shows the *truth* as being present². However, it seems that Dionysius uses the term *eikon* in a *preparatory* manner and in the Catechetical leading towards "theogenesis"³ or baptism, so that the *eikon* by Dionysius has a preparatory Catechumenal character, whereby his idea of the *eikon* coincided with (Maximus') Old Testament idea of the ministerial *shadow*, which we find, for example in the liturgical words: "Today rejoice, oh you faithful, in the psalms and singing hymns to the Lord, and respecting his ministerial shadow..."⁴.

When he interprets Dionysius' paradigm of the Sun, which, being a "dark *eikon* of... the Archetype"⁵, points to divine acts, due to the fact that each creature by the power of their own logos is receptive to the sunlight, Maximus calls the sun a *paradigm* "Like a dark and almost invisible *eikon* fully non befitting the archetype ... (and) if the *eikons* had the truth, they would not be paradigms, but archetypes"⁶. Maximus, however, talks about *eikons* in terms of natural things, that is, in paradigmatic terms (in this case the Sun as a celestial body), and if we joined this meaning to its most general theological stance on the relationship between the Old Testament *shadows*, the New Testament *eikon* and the future state of *truth*, then expressions *eikon* and *truth* would prove to be problematic and paradoxical like the reality hidden behind the words of the Lord: "Whoever sees me, sees him who sent me" (Jn. 12, 45) or the testimony spoken by the Apostle Paul when saying that Christ was the "*eikon* of the invisible God." (2

1 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 432B. Louth's opinion of Hellenic origin and meaning of this term (*theurgies*) based on his literary hermeneutical perspective. See, LOUTH, 2006, 158. He also denies St. Dionysius Areopagite as the author of *Corpus Dionysiacum*. See LOUTH, „The Reception of Dionysius up to Maximus the Confessor“, *Modern Theology*, 24:4, October, 2008. 573-577. See also, Andrew Louth, „The Reception of Dionysius in the Bizantine World: Maximus to Palama“, *Modern Theology*, 24:4, October, 2008. 585-587. See also throughout the work of AVERINTSEV, 1977.

2 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 432B.

3 Also, 432C.

4 Stihira on Gospodi Vozvah, Menaion, 25 November, Clement of Rome.

5 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων, PG 3, 693B.

6 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων, PG 4, 240B.

Cor. 4,4). It is clear that Paulian theological stance seen in this way, followed also by Maximus the Confessor, would place the terms *eikon* and *truth* opposing each other. Yet, the seriousness of the context in which Dionysius and Maximus use these words entails a whole range of theological premises with it.

Firstly, Maximus says the following about the relationship of the *eikon* and *truth*: "Each local justice compared with a future one serves its purpose as a mirror, an image of archetypal things, not things as such ... and from there, all knowledge of sublime (realities) compared with the future ones, is the enigma, the manifestation of the truth, and not the same existing truth which is to be the manifested in the future"⁷. Maximus further states: "Since the divine (realities) contain the virtue and knowledge, the mirror is by virtue the indicator of prototypes, and the enigma exists for knowledge as the manifestation of archetypes"⁸.

Clement of Alexandria, however, sees *enigma* as the nature of a specific event. He interprets the events that happened at the time of Moses over the Jews „seducers“ who tasted the "end of threats in an *enigmatic* way"⁹. *Shadow* and *eikon*, according to Maximus, carry the emblems of death. Although the aforementioned Maximus' Scholia (which talks about the *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*) is unclear at the appropriate place, Maximus in no way disparages nor is he indifferent to what a state of the *shadow* and *eikons* for him is, but clearly recognizes the changes within a single divine history of salvation, the deeper meaning of which is revealed by the Lord Jesus Christ: "Moses *because of the hardness of your heart suffered you...*" (Matt. 19, 8), distinguishing the liturgical way of being that He establishes, from the way of being which was *established* by God through Moses.

However, at the same time we see that the *eikon* has a stake in the *shadow*, and the *shadow* has it in the *eikon*, which clearly manifests the Lord's establishment of Melchisedec's pattern of serving God! The liturgical nature of the Old Testament symbolism is changed in such a way that symbols of the Old Testament receive their archetypal form in the *eikon*, but they do not receive the *state in the form* Maximus speaks of. Now the one that has been announced through the Old Testament liturgical-symbolic sacrificing is the archetype of every Old Testament sacrificial victims in blood, which false witnesses condemned by Archdeacon Stephen show as blasphemous, speaking of Stephen: "This man does not cease to blaspheme by speaking against this holy place and (against) laws; we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall abolish this place, and change the customs which Moses delivered to us" (Acts. 6:13-14). But the Lord Jesus Christ himself shows himself as the Archetype of each Old Testament Sacrifice with these words: "Do not think that I came to destroy the Law and the prophets. I come not to abolish, but to fulfil" (Matt. 5, 17). The New Testament establishment of liturgically-symbolic sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ gives meaning, fulfils, and also makes the Old Testament sacrificing in blood superfluous. On the other hand, by establishing Melchisedec's symbolic worship, the Lord is also the Archetype of bloodless sacrifice which also existed at the time of Abraham, which shows that nothing was introduced into the liturgical life of the New Israel that had not already been recognized in the Old Testament times, but in such a way, that he himself agrees to his own sacrifice in blood. Hence, the aforementioned Lord's words: "Moses *because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you...*" (Matt. 19, 8) means that "*many times and in many ways from ancient times did God speak to our fathers by prophets...*" (Heb. 1,1) in the *shadow*, while in "the last days of these, he was speaking to us by a Son" (Heb. 1, 2), "who is *eikon* of the invisible God." (2 Cor. 4,4). At that, the Church as the Body of Christ, here and now is the "hypostasis of (things) hoped and evidence of things unseen" (Heb. 11, 1).

7 Ibid, Κεφάλαια θεολογικά καὶ οἰκονομικά, PG 90, 1237B.

8 Ibid., 1237BC.

9 ΚΑΗΜΗΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ, Προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἑλλήνας, PG 8, 197A.

In this way, *shadow* and *eikon* are not opposing to the reality, because Melchisedec as a person from the Old Testament *shadow*, effects divine yield with which now Christ as the *Eikon* of the invisible God establishes his Mystery. This is actually the origin of the changes within a single history of salvation in Christ, who, filling out the *shadow*, unites in Himself the *shadow* and *eikon* with Truth. In the same sense, adoption unites the *shadow* and *eikon* with *truth*, because *Truth* is also the *Truth of the shadow* and the *Truth of the eikon*. Liturgical symbolism of the Church educates the Old Testament *shadow* in different ways. But Lord Jesus Christ says to John the Baptist: "We need to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 3,15), which through the personality of the Lord Jesus Christ projects the established (effective) procession of the *shadows* towards the *eikon* and *Truth*. We are at liberty to say that from this perspective Maximus says that we are complete, and as such, we approach the complete God as "*archetypal eikons*"¹⁰. The *shadow* is thus the recognized divinely effective or liturgical mistagogy, so that the Church in its own way of worship follows the Pauline seeing the personality of the Lord Jesus Christ as the same "*yesterday, today and tomorrow*" (Heb. 13, 8), which associates consideration of time with concrete *events of Christ* and not with the substance existing for itself and perceived in every movement, or in "something of a movement," or in any of the elements of events noticed by senses¹¹. The period in which the present moment is separated from past and future events, i.e. the moment that exists for itself and by itself, is foreign to the Orthodox Christian thought.

About the *Shadow* and *Eikon* of the Ministerial Harmonization with the Archetype of Being

This very important issue of the relationship between the *shadow*, the *eikon* and the *truth* is shown in an example of nonobserving a particular liturgical life, but also, in the lack of seriousness of approaching liturgical reality of the Church as something less important. In other words, relativizing the importance of essentially established liturgical-symbolic ways of Church's existence, the mystery of salvation is unconsciously relocated to a parallel world unknown to Church. That is precisely why we insist on Maximus' teaching according to which God established eikonomically the entire secret of salvation in the *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*. Maximus says: "Law had the shadow, as was said by the divine apostle, of the good things, and not the very eikon of things"¹², analysing the words of Gregory the Theologian (from Gregory's *The Word on Ice*), Which read: "... When we combine godlike and divine, our mind (therefore), and logos, with the like (τῷ οἰκεῖῳ προσμίζωμεν), and when the *eikon* ascends towards the archetype it longs for..."¹³. Quoting the words of Gregory, Maximus says that Gregory pedagogically distances himself from those who have the idea that anyone has ever reached such a measure of a being, or archetype. Still, we have to consider Maximus' words with all major dimensions of Dionysius' ministerial theology, according to which "God himself prelates, not another force (ὁ Θεὸς ἱεραρχεῖ μόνος, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλη δύναμις)"¹⁴.

Dionysius' and Maximus' views of the relationships of reality contained in the background of terms *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* a call for extremely serious theological attention, because this particular issue, which is always a current problem, can be best expressed with the question: What kind of seriousness of the actual existence does the Church testify to if it has

10 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91, 1088A.

11 See more on this subject in ПЕТРОВИЧ, 2014, 126-173.

12 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91, 1253CD.

13 Ibid. 1085C.

14 Ibid. Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας, PG 4, 69D.

nothing to do with the truth itself? In other words: on what basis is Church as an *eikon* of the Age to Come in the salvific mission if it still holds no *truth* itself? And yet, what significance does a shadow have in the way the *eikon* exists?

We talked previously about gradual revelations founded by God, always being shaded by the Lord's liturgically-symbolic words: "Moses *because of the hardness of your hearts allowed you* to let go of your wives, but from the beginning it was not so" (Matt. 19,8), for "God who *knows the heart* of yours" (Acts. 15,8), and He "*purifies hearts*" (Acts. 15,9), and *opens heart to respond* to Paul's message (sr. Acts. 16, 14). *The New Testament theology of the heart* contained in the relations between God and human hearts speaks of the hearts that God purifies, sees and hears, as well as of the gradual people's receptivity to the divine oikonomic will, (in Mk. 6, 52; 7, 6; 8, 17; 16, 14; Lk. 1, 51; 5, 22; 10, 27; 12, 34; 16, 15; 24, 25; Jn. 14, 27; Acts. 5, 3-4; 13, 22; 28, 27; Rm. 2, 5; 5, 5; 8, 27; 10, 1), but also in many other places in the texts of the Old Testament. Gradual change of the history of salvation clearly seen and the words: "What did Moses command you" (Mk. 10, 3), as well as the words: "For if you believed Moses, you would believe me, because he wrote of Me" (Jn. 5, 46). In a similar manner the Lord repeatedly calls upon Moses' words citing: "You heard that it was said to those of old ... but I tell you that..." (Matt. 5, 18-44).

The relationship of the caused liturgical proceedings and their providential causes, which, according to Dionysius, takes place in a liturgical event of ministerial community, explains the intellectual "stripping"¹⁵ of the "invisible *eikon* and mysterious (realities), or symbolic proceeding"¹⁶. Dionysius' verb *to strip* (ἀπογυμνώσαντας¹⁷) refers to an expression ἀγάλματα, and that expression, again, presents eikonic effects as manifestations of life-giving blessings that liturgically-symbolic ways of being carry, established by the Lord. For example, starting the stripping the first of *eikons* used at time to start the service, Dionysius refers to "exceptional divine beauty"¹⁸ of the first of *eikons* (τῶν ἀγαλμάτων) where we see that God-inspired hierarchs walkthrough "with fragrance coming from God's altar to the last (sites) of the sanctity"¹⁹ so that "having it done (τελειωτικῶς)"²⁰, it returned to the place where it started from. What his movement says, Dionysius links to the movement of "principal bliss"²¹, which although *it passes* in a way that brings together all the faithful unto them "ministerial community"²², it still is not out of its, "essentially unmovable state and establishment (ἰδρύσεως), and it shines on all the exceptional ones as they have deserved it, being (always) about itself, and from its, on the whole, not movable identity"²³.

Maximus states, as already mentioned, that in the ministerial arrangements "...God himself is the one that prelates, not another power"²⁴, which we see in Dionysius' description of the established dimensions as eschatological and historical realities, for which Dionysius says: "Even though divine proceeding of the assembly has humanely spread from its simple and unified principle towards a ministerial divergence of symbols and progresses to the wholly superior iconography, it appropriately assembles itself again into its own monad and unifies

15 Ibid., Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 428D.

16 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 4, 140A.

17 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 428D.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., 429A.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας, PG 4, 69D.

those who are hierarchically led"²⁵. In its third mistagogic dimension of *stripping* the eikon, Dionysius says: "In the same divine way, the hierarch, passes its unique science on to followers (εἰς τοὺς ὑποβεβηκότας κατὰγει), using a multitude of ministerial enigmas, but again as free (ἀπό λυτοῦ) and not kept back by the lagging ones, he goes back to his beginning relentlessly, forming for himself an intellectual entrance into the One, he clearly sees the logoses of proceeded (secrets), at the end of the antropophilic progress towards other (beings), making a heavenly return to the first (realities)"²⁶.

Roerem, almost automatically ascribes Dionysius' consideration of divine progress and returning to the One, to the neo-platonic ideological background, which is why he says that "only after the Neo-Platonists Proclus" was such a structure adopted within Christian thought"²⁷. Roerem uses Dionysius' writings as a significant argument against papal authority, since, according to Roerem, among others, these writings also played an important role in this sense"²⁸, although he simultaneously condemns the "completely Neo-Platonist context adopted by Dionysius" in relation to progress, return and ultimate motive of the One, which is, staying within oneself"²⁹. In this sense, Roerem connects some of the basic dimensions of hierarchic existence expressed in Dionysius's writings with the language of Gregory of Nyssa and Origen, and through him with the adopted language of the "stoic or Middle Platonism"³⁰. However, if this important dimension of the Dionysius' theology is found in the Old Testament (taking into account the examples of liturgical-symbolic level of the Jacob's ladder, or the divinely announced tabernacle to Moses or Ezekiel's Theology) as a more clearly shown liturgically-symbolic dimension of existence, prior to the occurrence of any version of Platonism, then is there a possibility for the Platonic philosophical directions "by themselves" to come to a lot lesser meaning of divine progress and returns of beings from the Biblical ones? Finally, all Dionysius' meanings of the divine progress, of living and return have their basis in the Personality of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose effect announces *the arrival within the body, abode among us* (Jn. 1,14), and *going to our Father* (Jn.7, 33) which is the fulfilment of Old Testament anticipations visible effects, such as those in the words: "*Lord came down to see ...*" (Gen. 11, 5), and: "*The Lord is in his holy temple*" (Av. 2, 20), as well as: "*Rise up, you eternal door, so that the King of glory may come in*" (Ps. 24, 7)!

Furthermore, Maximus interprets movement and return of the Dionysius' hierarch as a direct link to the state and the movement of God, as Dionysius insists that hierarch's moving is a visitation of the superior beauty within "the ministerial community"³¹. In this sense, Maximus states: "Notice an immobile state in its essence, and that the Bishop is a kind of God"³², referring to three dimensions of the incense activities of the hierarchs. Hierarch begins to incense from the altar, walks along the entire temple and returns to the (initial) place"³³. Maximus does not interpret Dionysius' words about the proceeding of the ministerial assembly in the context of *stripping the eikon*, but interprets the third dimension in context of expansion of the *One*, i.e. expansion of bishop's activities, who, returning to his liturgical place is not held

25 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 456D.

26 Ibid., 429AB.

27 ROEREM, 1993, 51 and 169. we find the same assertion. It is interesting to note that many of the Italian Neo-Platonists of the fifteenth century were influenced by the Dionysius' teaching which was for them the bridge between *Christian and pagan philosophies*. See, WILBERDING, 1991, 23.

28 Ibid., pp. 32-36.

29 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

30 Ibid, p. 59.

31 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 429A.

32 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 4, 140A.

33 Ibid.

back by the ones lagging behind³⁴. Dionysius in this case is not talking about the determinations of respective liturgical dimensions of one and many, but not because the topic that is shown to him is exhausting. On the contrary, multidimensional meaning of this eschatological-historical horizon of existence pervades all similar liturgically-symbolic gestures of clergy, bishops, priests, deacons, and all other church officers, both in the proceedings of ministerial assembly, but also in other liturgical-symbolic actions. The multidimensional meanings of Dionysius' words do not end there - the entire church ethos rests on divine visitations and return to God, but the entire creation speaks of the respective movement which would be expressed in the most simple manner using liturgically-symbolic words of the Apostle Paul as *the creation waiting with eager for the revealing of the sons of God* (Rm. 8, 19).

Next Dionysius' mistagogy of perceiving the clergy activity (ἡ τελετή) of the ministerial assembly with regards to the psalms of what the clergy speaks of. From the Dionysius' time to this day, the same structure of liturgically-symbolic hymns, which are included in every liturgy has been kept, which is clearly seen from his testimonies about the "Psalmic hierography most important to almost all the important secrets, (and that) it should not have been separated from the most important secret"³⁵. By mentioning the mistagogy of the writings of the Biblical body of his time, Dionysius speaks of the "clergy and holy written book (ἱερὰ καὶ ἀγιόγραφος δέλτος)"³⁶ which tells the story of "existence born of God and of the structure of beings"³⁷, the legal hierarchy and way of life, about the legacy and the distribution to the divine nation, "cleric judges (κριτῶν ἱερῶν)"³⁸, wise kings, God-inspired priests, about the wisdom of ancient men who faced great torment, the practical wise advice, of "divine erotic songs and God-inspired eikons"³⁹, about prophetic foretelling future events of "andrik's (ἀνδρικές) Jesus' theurgies"⁴⁰, about "living and teaching clergy who are dedicated to God and who live accordingly"⁴¹, about the hidden and mystical visions of the divine beloved disciple, the narrated theology of Jesus above this world, to those who are receptive to deification, and all that (God) "roots together clerical and godlike ascendance of worship proceedings"⁴².

Starting from psalm clerical words, via the remaining biblical writings, Dionysius clearly shows *inseparability* of the writings from the Scripture from the entire liturgically-symbolic tradition of the Church. In addition to the liturgical-symbolic rooting of the sacred nature of Scripture liturgical proceedings, Dionysius also states: "Hierography of divine poems aims to sing about all theology and theurgies and praise hierologies and clerical divine men, to form Congregational chanting and tell divine (secrets) towards acceptance and surrender of every superior clerical proceedings"⁴³. Dionysius' term *cantillation* is inseparable from the hierarchical structure of the Church, although it uses the same term and does so in the context of the symbolism of nature as such. And again, it does not set a clear boundary between the natural and God-serving symbolism, which testifies to the ancient biblical theoretical projection according to which the natural symbolism is ontologically linked to the hierarchical

34 Ibid, 140AB.

35 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 429C.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid., 429CD.

42 Ibid., 429D.

43 Ibid., 429D-432A.

structure of the Church. The unity of the natural and God-serving symbolism is observed and in Maximus' attitude, according to which the entire created world was divided to intellect and senses, so that the intellectual world is manifested through the sensual world as the Church not made by man that possesses the intellectual world as its altar, and the sensual world as the temple space⁴⁴. Sensual world is set in the intellectual world with logoses, and intellectual is set in with the sensual types⁴⁵. The church is also the symbol only of the sensual world, with heaven as divine altar and the earth as the beauty (blagoljepije) of temple⁴⁶. Maxim reduces the Church eikonology to the man's natural, that is individual symbolism of the soul, so that the intellectual world and its progresses are identified with the altar part of the Church, and everything that belongs to the intellectual divisions is seen as a space of the temple; Both of these works united make up a secret proceedings at the divine altar⁴⁷.

For Dionysius, priests' chanting is a kind of bond with the divine realities, which we find even today in liturgical texts that identify liturgical chanting with the divine, as in words: "We sing the songs celestial"⁴⁸. And liturgical chanting is called *divine*, not in allegorical, but in ministerial terms; fathers like Dionysius and Maximus show that it is precisely in the service realities that we recognize that God is among us, as much as all the priests effects of ecclesiastical offices announce divine virtuous effects in the way claimed by Dionysius and Maximus. Dionysius' insistence on chanting the divine hymns speaks of concurring single-soulness concerning the "divine (secrets) and to themselves and to each (to) others as a one and confessional choir of clerical (men)"⁴⁹. Dionysius adds that the divine songs spread with, attached, "composed (τὰ συντεταγμένα)"⁵⁰ unclear (things), which are clarified through proceeded symbols (διὰ τῶν ἐπιτελουμένων συμβόλων)"⁵¹. To the attached, composed (things) he also adds shaded (συσκιασμένα) (things)"⁵² that are spread through "the most ministerial biblical readings"⁵³ through "many and clearer eikons and announcements". Here he has in mind the reading of the Scripture that follow reading of Psalms⁵⁴. We can conclude that this also confirms the inseparable nature of written texts (Holy Scriptures) and concrete liturgical-symbolic actions. In addition, when it comes to church chanting we find the distinctive teaching of the Apostle Paul on the Old Testament *shadow* and the New Testament *eikon of truth* only in the context of shading or reality explained in eikonic New Testament writings (chanted in a liturgically-symbolic manner). Therefore, to the Dionysius' expression "shaded (things- τὰ συσκιασμένα)"⁵⁵ we should add the meaning of the words: "Through the many and clearer *eikons* ... of clerical letters (διὰ πλειόνων καὶ σαφεστέρων εἰκόνων...τῶν ἀγιογράφων)"⁵⁶. Dionysius concludes that in the writings of Scripture, "the one who looks in a

44 See ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, *Μυσταγωγία*, PG 91, 669AB. Some authors think about this work of St. Maximus as a supplement to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of St. Dionysius. See BERTHOLD, 1985, 183-225.

45 See also, 669C.

46 See also, 672A.

47 See also, 681CD.

48 Menaion, August 26, svyetenil.

49 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, *Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*, PG 3, 432A.

50 Ibid.

51 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, *Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*, PG 4, 141A.

52 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, *Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*, PG 3, 432A.

53 Ibid., 432B.

54 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, *Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*, PG 4, 141A.

55 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, *Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας*, PG 3, 432A.

56 Ibid., 432AB.

ministerial way will see one kind and one inspiration as driven by a superior Spirit⁵⁷, but also states that legal clergy, and everything ministerial, is the "*eikon of the types* hewn (to Moses) on Mount Sinai"⁵⁸. This is why the older tradition announced the New Testament and the "future acts by Jesus"⁵⁹ in a way that the Old Testament had "written down *truth in eikons*, and the (New Testament) showed the present"⁶⁰, so now the Old Testament theology of foretelling is convincingly established with the acts of Truth. According to what Dionysius teaches, Jesus is the "...most superior mind and is supra-essential, the principal of the whole hierarchy, the consecration and acts..."⁶¹, so that he identifies in a relevant place the Old Testament *shading the truth with eikons* with the theology, and New Testament realities are seen as theurgical presence of truth, so that "acts are (actually) the establishment of theology"⁶². This is to say that Dionysius differs the shading by eikons on the one hand and the presence of Truth on the other, which represents the difference between Dionysius' and Maximus' definitions of terms *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth*. However, Dionysius (as we have shown) does not link the term *truth* to the present divine unavailability, although he recognises the future event of the Resurrection of the Dead.

Let us also mention Clement of Alexandria, who in turn determines the Law as "an eikon, and a shadow of truth"⁶³, while Gregory the Theologian, in his Logos on Epiphany (or Nativity) states that "...*shadows* pass, (and) *truth* steps in"⁶⁴. In the same sense one should consider identification of Lord Jesus Christ with Abraham, so that the transition from the Old Testament liturgy towards the New Testament is expressed as: "Carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom" (Lk. 16: 22-23). According to Gregory the Theologian, God appears "only shaded by mind (νῶ μόνῳ σκιαγραφούμενος) and is darkened and superficial (partially, limited)"⁶⁵.

It seems apparently that unlike Dionysius, John the Evangelist differently presents the degrees of revelation of which is actually a word; according to him "the law was given by Moses, and *grace and truth* was through Jesus Christ" (Jn. 1, 17), which may indicate that the grace of liturgically- symbolic way of being of the Old Testament Church refers to what the Apostle Paul called the "shadow" and John's phrase "grace to grace" (Jn. 1, 16) means fullness of the better liturgically-symbolic mode of existence, which we receive from "His fullness" (Jn. 1, 16) and which speaks of the presence of truth, because with this other grace, as we have seen, *Truth* Christ came through (Jn. 1, 17). It is obvious that because of this John does not speak about the Ascension of the Lord, given that the Lord did not leave his disciples "comfortless" (Jn. 14, 18). To the Apostle Paul, in this way, the *shadow* represents what *shaded eikons* represent to Dionysius, and what the *Law* is to John; but what *eikon* is to Paul, to Dionysius it is *the presence of Truth*, and what *grace and truth* are to John the Theologian. In order to have a clearer picture regarding the importance of the apostolic traditions of reality that

57 Ibid., 432B.

58 Ibid., 501C.

59 Ibid., 432B.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid., 372a.

62 Ibid., 432B.

63 Clement adds the following words: "indeed the law is the shadow of truth". See ΚΛΗΜΗΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΥΣ, Στρώματός, PG 9, 280C.

64 ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΣ, Λόγος ΔΗ', PG 36, 313A.

65 ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΣ, Λόγος ΔΗ', ΠΓ 36 317B. Liturgy hymn presents this problem differently: „Се пророческаја исполњајутеја прореченија, сија бо зарјаи примачними покривиј в будушчих јавленије, јако Бог утјешитељ, ниње излијасја апостолом богатно...“. Сједален, петак, Недеља Педесетнице.

lies behind the aforementioned term, we must take into account Dionysius' insistence on the reality of the New Testament of our union with Christ, and especially the liturgically-symbolic existence of the Church, which means "that *our mostgodlike life has already started in Christ*"⁶⁶. According to Maximus again, God can also be found in the service of law and it does so in such a way that it is on the basis of "visible symbols"⁶⁷ service of law, according to the intellect, not the senses, that one considers divine (θεοτελής) Logos hidden in each of the symbols. The Dionysius' approach reconciles the notions *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* in the liturgically-symbolic context because according to him *our mostgodlike life in Christ has already started*.

When analysing Maximus' eschatological-historic theology about the *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* one should not avoid the suitable Dionysius' exposition, which we also notice in Maximus' taking over of terms from Dionysius' theology. Namely, it concerns the terms *being*, *good being* and *eternal being*. It is easy to guess that in the context of the issue of the *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* the notion of *being* can naturally be identified with the notion of the *shadow*; the notion of the *good being* with the term *eikon*, and the term *eternal being* with the term *truth*. Since Dionysius' historical terms occurred before Maximus', we are faced with two questions: the first one dealing with whether Maximus identified Dionysius' perception of the term *symbol* from the teachings of Dionysius the Areopagite on the *being*, *good being* and *eternal being* with Paul's teachings on the *eikon* as the reality of the New Testament and the second question is related to the issue of whether Maximus, like Dionysius, transfers the eschatological historical overview of *beings*, *good being* and *eternal being*, to the analysed changes within the divine economy of salvation as a divine way of being of people in the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Life of the future time?! Here, we also point to the fact that to the term *being*, Dionysius attributes a natural way of being; to the notion of *good being* he attributes a church or liturgical-symbolic way of being, while *eternal being* as God's gift to the saints belongs to God, or the Time to come. Dionysius links the first and third terms to the creation and precreation of the creation, that is to changes in divine economy of salvation, since he identifies the first change with the leading of beings in existence, and the third with the gift of eternal existence that could be considered synonymous to the term of *becoming again* ("ἡ παλιγγενεσία, recreated). *Good being*, however, that by Dionysius only carries the attribute of *good* (beings) is the existence of the mistagogical body of the Church. Maximus on his part, identifies the sixth day of creation with the "logos of *being*"⁶⁸ of the created substance, the seventh day with "*good being*", while he sees the eighth day, as "ineffable mystery of the eternal *good being*"⁶⁹. He thus inserts the attribute "good" into the Dionysius' term "*eternal being*" to indicate that the *good being* and *eternal good being* are connected with the pre-eternal idea that the salvation occurs so that the Lord will make his Secret the Secret of the Church that cannot be destroyed by the doors of hell. If we're right, then Maximus has the same attitude as Dionysius who says that *our best life in Christ has already started*. Dionysius, as we have seen, keeps the attribute "good (εὖ)" on other grounds only for the state of the Church to

66 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 553BC. As for this point of view, we think it is wrong to use the term "meditation" for St. Dionysius' perspective. See LOUTH, "St. John Damascene as Monastic Theologian", *Downside Review*, 125, 2007. 197-220.

67 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Κεφάλαια θεολογικὰ καὶ οἰκονομικά, PG 90, 1221C.

68 ὅτι τὸν τοῦ εἶναι τῶν ὄντων λόγον. At this point, therefore, the term "being" is not plural but about the genitive singular.

69 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Κεφάλαια περὶ θεολογίας καὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, PG 90, 1104C.

the event of the resurrection; he wants to show the Future Time from another perspective (in relation to Maximus) that is in the power of God with the creation of the world in the context of the Old Testament hierarchy, so that the Church is a place of such a union, which was *the starting point of our best life in Christ, according to Dionysius!* We are free to say that this theological point of view completely matches Maximus' teaching about the *eikon* and *resemblance* as categories of being *communicatively-finished* by the act of creation, so that by Maximus the *eikon*-the essence, and resemblance-hypostasis. The *eikon* would in that case correspond to Dionysius' perception of the divine creation of the world, or a full human in essence, that is, a human without natural flaws (i.e., not a sick person) and likeness would include liturgical-symbolic way hypostatic existence in the principal community, the Church. This Dionysius' term denoting *being* and *good being* would be the same to the Maximus' idea of the *eikon* and the idea of *likeness* (as the essence and hypostases). In this case, the term *likeness* could correspond both the Dionysius' concept of good being (εὖ εἶναι), and Maximus' introduction of the attributes *good* (εὖ) in the previous Dionysius' term *eternal being* (ἀεὶ εἶναι) as a connection between our time and the Time to come in the, now Maximus' term "eternal good being (ἀεὶ εὖ εἶναι)"⁷⁰. Thus one could, from the identical perspective, get a full perspective of the entire liturgical-symbolic background of the *shadow*, *eikon* (*symbol*), *providence* and *truth* in the writings of the Apostles John, the Apostle Paul, Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor.

Conclusion

One finds indicative the thematic similarity between the way Maximus sees *shadow* and *eikon* in the context of his teaching about recognizing the logos of nature, and the way the specific nature exists. In this sense the logos is in a way *weft of nature* and its mobility, and the way in which nature is, testifies about the eikonomy of salvation, which is reflected in the secret of humanization of the God Logos, which reveals the way of its existence, apart from the logos way of nature and the. From there, in terms of the nature of individual beings we distinguish a logos of specific nature, as well as a way of being of that nature, which again points us to the Dionysius' notion of being and good being, so that the first concept would fit the logos of nature, and the other, a way of being in nature. Maximus speaks of the logos as of "oros essentialised energy of every nature"⁷¹.

With all this, Dionysius' theology insists on *theurgical* nature of words of Scripture that means their mistagogical reflexion, so that each in its power "through the sacred curtains of the words and the hierarchical traditions of philathropy"⁷² mimics the mental and supra-essential reality covered with sensual and essential realities and shapes and types of reality clothed formless and impossible to form, and "supernatural and formless simplicity multiplied and made of a multitude of divided symbols"⁷³. The eschatological nature of this divine revelation expressed in Dionysius' work has a sense of ultimate realization of our symbolic life in Church, which now contains latency of the ineffable behind many curtains, and *then* the latency of shapeless and supra essential will be clearly open to those who are *the sons of the resurrection*⁷⁴. Calming the mind of natural energy and its offering to God means *complete*

70 Ibid., Πρὸς Θαλάσσιον, PG 90, 380A.

71 Ibid., Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91, 1057B.

72 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων, PG 3, 592B.

73 Ibid.

74 Ibid., 592C.

union (συναχθέντες) with God, because they have been granted and firmly established themselves in God according to their mind through the Spirit, and as much as it is possible for people, they have taken the entire eikon of the heaven, "because they say that God and man are paradigms of one another, and God makes himself human after his appreciation for humanity inasmuch the man can deify himself through love to God, and God accepts man for his intellect (κατὰ νοῦν) to get to know him inasmuch a man manifests the invisible God for his nature through virtue"⁷⁵.

Maximus sees the Old Testament theology of the Mosaic Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament as *God given legacy of secrets* to the people of God⁷⁶ which certainly should be considered in the relationship of God as Moses' Archetype, because Christ in His secret bequeathed the Kingdom to the Church, like in the words of service: "...until you ascended us to the heavens and gave us your kingdom come." In this way the Christian understanding of the *secret* implies hierarchical liturgically-symbolic structure through which it unfolds, as in the *eikon* what will come, but at the same time the mentioned Maximus' words *God himself prelates and not some other force*, express the divine presence in the ministerial-hierarchical or theurgical mode of existence. The Christian secret does not mean that the world of ideas which stands "behind this world" is hidden from others, nor is the secret an attempt of someone's, in this case Dionysius' "literary symmetry"⁷⁷. On the contrary, the secret presupposes participation in structure of existence defined by God. Through the *eikon* God thus reveals exactly what will happen with this world. In this sense Dionysius' God is "beyond all beings since he is the cause (of the existence) of all (beings)"⁷⁸.

We conclude at this point saying that, firstly, "God created man for immortality and made him to be an image of eternity" (Prem. Sol. 2, 23). Furthermore, Maximus' approach to the relationship between *shadow*, *eikon* and *truth* is best determined by its reference to the words of the Apostle Paul, when he states: "In the shadow, the eikon and the truth the whole mystery of our salvation is wisely set (ὡκονομῇ ΘΗ). Law had a shadow, as the divine Apostle says, of good things to come, not the very eikon of things..."⁷⁹. It is clear that Maximus, like Dionysius does not divide the *one and indivisible* mystery of our salvation, but talks about it as of a single *eikonomia* of salvation. We will repeat here Maximus' words which say that people should be similar to the goods to come and become "living eikons of Christ" and to identify with Him in grace... and if possible (become) become Lord himself, if to some the word is not (too) heavy "⁸⁰. Therefore, according to Maximus the New Testament and its ministry is the forerunner of "... the hidden secrets of treasures untold of the time to come"⁸¹, and the words of the Lord say: "I have much to tell you, but ye can not bear now" (Jn. 16, 12), but "that when he comes, the Spirit of truth will guide you into all the truth" (Jn. 16, 13). This way, the Church is named "the pillar and fortification of truth (ἐδραίωμα)", according to the unique economy of salvation (by Paul), in spite of Paul's distinction made between the *shadow* and *eikons* of the goods to come. "(1 Tim. 3, 15). In this sense Dionysius' words are clear: "(But) let us go up from caused (things) towards (their) causes, just then, in our community, and led in light by Jesus (Ἰησοῦ φωταγωγοῦντος) we notice well perception of intellectual (beings) that clearly

75 ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91, 1113BC.

76 Ibid, Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91, 1117C.

77 ROREM, 1984, 41.

78 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Ἐπιστολή Ε', PG 3, 1076A.

79 Same, 1253C.

80 Same, 1253D.

81 Same, 1253C.

emanate as blessed beauty archetypes"⁸², Which again in the new liturgical sense, sheds light on the liturgical words of the Lord: "and I am no longer in the world, and they are in the world" (Jn. 17, 11).

Literature

ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΟΣ, Λόγος ΛΗ', PG 36.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3.

Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων, PG 3.

ΚΛΗΜΗΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΩΣ, Προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἑλληνας, PG 8.

Στρωματέως, PG 9.

ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΟΜΟΛΟΓΗΤΗΣ, Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91.

Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων, PG 4.

Κεφάλαια θεολογικὰ καὶ οἰκονομικά, PG 90.

Περὶ διαφόρων ἀποριῶν, PG 91.

Σχόλια εἰς τὸ Περὶ τῆς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας, PG 4.

Μυσταγωγία, PG 91.

Πρὸς Θαλάσσιον, PG 90.

Κεφάλαια περὶ θεολογίας καὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, PG 90.

ΑΒΕΡΙΝЦЕВ, СЕРГЕЈ, СЕРГЕЈЕВИЧ, (1982), *Поетика рановизантијске књижевности*, Београд, Српска књижевна задруга.

BERTHOLD, GEORGE, "Maximus the Confessor", *Selected Writings*, London: SPCK, 1985.

LOUTH, ANDREW, (2006), *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition*, Oxford University Press.

(2008), „The Reception of Dionysius up to Maximus the Confessor“, *Modern Theology*, 24:4, NY (USA), Jim Fodor, St. Bonaventure University.

(2008), „The Reception of Dionysius in the Bizantine World: Maximus to Palama“, *Modern Theology*, 24:4, NY (USA), Jim Fodor, St. Bonaventure University.

(2007), "St. John Damascene as Monastic Theologian", *Downside Review*, Somerset, England: Abbey of St. Gregory at Downside.

ПЕТРОВИЋ, ПРЕДРАГ, (2014), *Богословље божанских имена (Есхатолошко-историјски приступ божанском откривењу, богоименовању и богопознању)*, Пожаревац, Одбор за просвету и културу Епархије пожаревачко-браничевске.

ROREM, PAUL, (1993), *Pseudo-Dionysius (A Comentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence)*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

(1984), *Biblical and Liturgical Symbols within the Pseudo-Dionysian Synthesis*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984.

WILBERDING, ERICK, (1991), "A Defense of Dionysius the Areopagite by Rubens", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 52, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

82 ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΟΠΑΓΙΤΗΣ, Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱεραρχίας, PG 3, 428C.

Предраг Петровић

**БОГОСЛОВСКА ПОЗАДИНА ТЕРМИНА *СЕНКА*, *ИКОНА* И *ИСТИНА* У
МИСЛИ БОЖАНСТВЕНОГ ДИОНИСИЈА АРЕОПАГИТА И ПРЕПОДОБНОГ
МАКСИМА ИСПОВЕДНИКА**

Конкретне есхатолошко-историјске димензије постојања чине симболични основ односа Бога и света, односа скривеног као „залеђина“ библијских израза *сенка*, *икона* и *истина*, или пак, *сенка* и *истина*, а што на одговарајуће начине налазимо и у текстовима других светих отаца Цркве. Онтолошка значења израза *сенка*, *икона* и *истина*, свако на одговарајући начин, заправо повезују божанске благодатне доброте са богослужбено-врлинским начином постојања. Старозаветна пророштва говоре о уделу будућих догађаја у прошлим или пак тадашњим историјским временима, као и о засигурним, а још неоствареним будућим догађајима. И Господ Исус Христос пројављује идентичан начин пророковања стварности *које је чуо од Оца*, и које ће нам се у пуноћи открити у Будућем Веку.