Journal of Studies in Social Sciences
ISSN 2201-4624
Volume 10, Number 2, 2015, 77-111

Is the Dispute Over the Images Ended?

- Some Notes from Lutheran Perspective about the Power and Powerlessness of Images.

Andreas Pawlas

Department of Theology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Abstract: To understand modern thinking about images it is necessary to give an historically informed account account of the function of a belief in the images - even in the current supposedly secular age. And it is to see that even in this secular age, in which reason seems to have abolished every sort of believing and faith, images have regained power over the believing and faith of the people.

It can be observed that images beeing "released" from the sphere of faith in the Reformation times now are used as instruments of a new "faith", whose manipulative target is only the economic (and eventually, probably politically) exploitation of the followers of their faith.

Keywords: Images; prohibition of images; Iconoclasm; Faith; Luther.

I Pictures belong to human life

Modern Times are times of images. Images seem to be most powerful and successful because they have influence on the thinking, feeling and believing of the people - even in a so called "secular" age. It is not only nearly every marketing-company that uses images at its work, but also science has enforced studies of the images.[1] Apparently images are essential for human life. And that is emphasized by the current phenomenon of an "iconic turn"[2], "imagic turn"[3] or "pictorial turn"[4].

On the other hand, images (and statues) can lose their power as e.g. the images (and statues) of Stalin or Saddam Hussein. Or was it not possible to demonstrate that the power of Stalin or Saddam Hussein and their followers are eliminated by destroying their images? Evidently the relation of an image to that what it is representing is complicated and requires an accurate account.

First Thesis of this article is that such account is necessary even in the current supposedly secular age. To understand modern thinking about images it can not be waived to have a look on the history of the images - mainly to see that often similar methods arise in dealing with the images. And further it is to remember that images had to do with that "what was really important in a community"[5] in former times, what was in connection to the ultimate life-determining, what finally was understood as the divine and the religious.

On the other hand Stoellger points out that power apparently needs manifestation, for which images can serve. Here, the self-manifestation of power is theologically traditionally just been the revelation of God "from the Creation, to the burning thornbush along the history of Israel, the Temple cult to incarnation" and resurrection. And indeed God without revelatio would be "just a deus absconditus (supra nos, nihil ad nos). Only for us is his power relevant power - usually (punishing? or) healing fully acting power".[6] Apparently, just visibility is associated with power, just "the power of those who seek attention by virtue of their visibility and find, to show up and to be others in mind. In short, it's about the power of interpretation - in the self-presentation of rulers (from Egypt to Rome to the present day); in 'small' principalities of nobles, by Great citizens who imitate them, by books

writing educated citizens up to graffities; or in appropriate company strategies: from the quifecit of the artists (workshops) unto Apple". And if further visibility and power belong together, then there is found also the place for the struggle for "attention, public influence, quotas and ultimately to the power of interpretation"[7]. Should now a modern "secular" age be above such conflicts, or might it happen that concerning the images only the old questions of religion and power appear dressed up new?

That leads to the Second Thesis of this article that even in the secular age, in which reason seems to have abolished every sort of believing and faith, images have regained power over the hearts and souls of the people. There it is helpful to look back at Luther‘s position to the images, who has no objection against the use of images if they are not connected with (wrong) faith and belief. That had become an element of modern freedom. And this freedom actually is endangered.

But giving an theological account on images and their power from the perspective of the Reformation seems to be a special problem because of the focus of Reformation on the "word" as a crucial foundation of faith[8] and its (alleged) emphasis on the rational and the teaching[9].

In spite of this in the history of the images Reformation Time is attached just a "prominent position"[10]. It is even regarded as an "Axial Age" in dealing with the images[11]. And the history of the image in the Reformation has become "our cultural history"[12]. For the theologians and the laity, magistrates as well as the common man spiritually, emotionally and rationally had dealt intensively with the phenomenon of "image". And there the quite moderate judgment of Martin Luther was: the pictures were "neither good nor bad, they can have them or not have"[13]. That is regarded as the "birth certificate of modernity"[14] because images lose their ritual power function when they are no longer be worshiped. [15]

With a look at the Reformation Time, however, the debate about the power and powerlessness of pictures never can be completed, because the arguments are hardly understandable without the preceding positions such as the prohibition of images in the Old Testament[16] and the Byzantine[17] iconoclasm.[18]

II The prohibition of images in the Old Testament an the disempowerment of the images

First it must be acknowledged that these three important periods certainly are not the first periods in which disputes about images took place. For alone in the ancient Egyptian culture the veneration of images of gods and Pharaohs[19] admittedly belonged to the everyday political life, but as well the damage or destruction of the images of "disgraced" political people up to Pharaoh[20]. The background for it was apparently that in the Old World a (cult) image basically should make the "holy appear visible and thus recall it earthly".[21] And to this stage of religious understanding belonged "a substantial or complete identification of the image with the represented deity, whose real presence is assumed in that image." And the image was not allotted a mediating function, but "an independent sacred power." And that posed the basis of the cultic veneration of the image.[22] If so then the pharaohs, which were worshiped as divine, were seen as "present" in their (cult) images, the destruction of these images appear consistent in case of an unfriendly power change.

Concerning this background, the prohibition of images in the Old Testament given by God to the ancient people of God as part of the Decalogue must be considered to be particularly significant. In explanation of the instruction "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" it is continued „Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them".[23] Luther‘s German translation of "Bild" (image) is based on the Hebrew term לספ what more precisely is to understand as a stone hewn or carved wooden idol statue, which is a "cult image"[24] and which to worship is prohibited. In this respect the prohibition of images does not generally prohibit images - and it has certainly not aimed, as Belting says, not to jeopardise the monopoly of theologians, who do not paint, but "talk and write"[25] - but the prohibition of images simply fights against idolatry.[26] However, it must not be

overlooked that before the "disenchantment of images" in Reformation Times there hardly might have been images which were not devoted to deities and (divine worshiped) rulers.[27]

In any case, the prohibition of images given to the ancient people of God and which in practice obviously was obeyed[28], was seen as unique in cultural history and led to a (wanted) separation of this people among the peoples of the Old World. And in later times was analysed that the "distant and unapproachable, the invisible Jewish God. (reserves) it‘s crucial alterity against the human world only, if it is ensured that there is not any possible correlation in it. Each image would shorten and reduce this principle foreign and inscrutable God."[29]

Simultaneously, the (idols) image is accorded enormous power, namely the actual ability, "to recall an impalpable and distant being" and even a "likeness to the sculptured." From this perspective, then, the golden calf[30] of the Old Testament is indeed a God. For the "image and its contents merge to indistinguishability."[31] And that is why that the ancient people of God is prohibited to have an available image of the unavailable God.

Later it is Kant, who wants to see he doctrine of prohibition of images in a completely different light in face of the emphasis of reason, when he says: "Perhaps there is no more exalted place in the law book of the Jews as the commandment, Thou shalt not make thee any graven image, or any likeness, neither of which are in heaven, nor in earth, nor under the earth, etc.. This commandment alone can explain the enthusiasm, the Jewish people felt in its civilised era for its religion, when it compared itself with other nations, or that pride, which is inspiring Mohammedanism." And he meant with it an enthusiasm that it is not necessary to be supported by "images(s) and childish apparatus", because it apparently was led just as in his age "by the idea of the moral law and the predisposition for morality in us".[32]

It remains to be seen whether therefore the depth dimension of the prohibition of images is really captured. However for Otto Kaiser it is not unimportant to note, that the imageless worship of Yahweh got the character of the status confessionis

after the destruction of the independent statehood of Israel (722/587 BC) because it very well gave expression to the "difference between Yahweh and the other gods in an immediate way". But further it meant to the winners, who could indeed bring the gold and silver temple vessels to Babylon, that they had not the opportunity, to drag away to Babylon in triumph an image of God from Jerusalem, and thus the God of the conquered.[33]

However there is already a certain parallel to the Kantian idea of the moral law and the obedience consequently associated with it, and the consciousness in the Old Testament: Because Kaiser points out, "The imageless worshiped God is not only higher than all the other gods, but he has been the only God since the creation the world. As he has chosen Israel's fathers and their offspring and therefore exempt from Egypt so they owe him obedience."[34] And simultaneously it might be remembered that obedience mostly is associated with the dimension of the listening not looking[35].

Remains to note that in the ancient people of God the prohibition of images represented a massive disempowerment of the images. That did not exclude, however, that in the "word of God" in the Old Testament was used an overwhelming abundance of "figurations of God"[36], such as "arm", "hand", "castle", "tower", "stone", "rock", "mountain", "eye", "circle", "wheel", "fire", "sun", "child". And standing in this tradition, then Jesus also told of God's being in his kingdom of God parables. [37]

III The quarrel about the power of images in Byzantium

In the pagan world of early Christianity the lack of an image of God among Christians was perceived „as something strange and inappropriate" - and in other religious contexts still today[38]. But also from the perspective of the new people of God God's spirituality and exclusiveness did not allow any representation. Idols were something created, but God is the Creator. In this sense, the former spokesmen of Christianity rejected images[39] and it was mainly the apologetic literature in which was developed a polemic against the idols with arguments of the

Old Testament prohibition of images against the arguments of the Greek popular philosophy.[40] It was also the first time the argument is used that the spiritual man, is the true image of God.[41]

But then that in 306 at the Synod of Elvira (Spain), a decision against images in churches came about, or that they should not be revered and worshiped,[42] must suggest the emergence of Christian mural paintings, etc.. This critical position against images first was mainly prevalent in the Latin West of the then world[43] while it comes to a change process in the Greek East since the sixth Century. Here the Christian images changed to icons. And those are to be understood most as handy plates with the image of a saint, that one sees such connected which what it represents, that it can mediate both the help of the Holy as well as to receive the veneration that the Holy is attributed. However, in the core the ancient pagan thinking was continued unbroken in this idea.[44]

It should certainly not be thought on a simple pagan identification of image and the divine. Certainly the Platonic doctrine of ideas is not unimportant, and it's more to think at a "revival" of the art work by divine influence,[45] and that the worship and adoration done to the image passes over to its prototype.[46]

But by the action power of images apparently not only the simple minded[47] saw it possible to have present the saints in all places, whether in houses, monastic cells, ships or prisons. These icons also were worn as an amulet on the body or were fixed over the door to protect the house. And the erecting of churches in honour of famous images and setting up there and in other places burning candles or lamps for the worship of the saints, or the crowning and incense, the kiss and proskynesis, the washing and anointing, gilt and attaching coins, all „these forms of worship“ were based on „pagan models.“[48]

However, in this a basic human experience might shine up: because the icon in most cases "is coded with a face", it is referring back to the "original childhood experience of being looked at". And then the effective power of icons seems to be, "to spell us under its gaze"[49] and thus to ascertain orientation, help or even miracles.[50]

These beliefs, however, were not shared everywhere in the Eastern Church.[51] But the actual arguments of the iconoclasts are barely preserved.[52] Anyway it finally came to the so-called "iconoclasm", which began in 726 with the fact that the Emperor Leo III. was not only preaching against the images, but also let carry away the image of Christ on the Chalke Gate of the palace. In the year 730 he sent a bill to remove all pictures and he let replace the patriarch.[53] Because otherwise it would not be possible to venerate the Triune God[54], but wrong gods.[55]

This attack of the Iconoclasts on the power of images, however, neither found the approval of Rome nor of the Franks[56]. But that influenced the iconoclastic controversy in the East little. Here the accusations raised by the iconoclasts forced the church to clarify its position on the use of images. And this position is submitted e.g. by Theodore Studite, the Seventh Ecumenical Council of 787[57] and especially by St. John of Damascus. And at first it had to be directed against the reproach of idolatry[58] and to make the claim that the creature should not be honoured instead of the Creator.[59]

And so St. John emphasised that to make a portrait of the invisible God is a stupidity and impiety, yet he created man in his own image.[60] Under no circumstances St. John is worshipping the creation, but the Creator - the Creator who has become man (in Christ)[61]. Thus incarnation enables to make an image of Christ (not according to his divinity, but only according to his humanity, but with which the deity is inextricably linked).[62]

And if Christ is called by St. Paul "image of God"[63] so God had first made an identical image of himself,[64] whose veneration and worship is without any question. And with reference to St. Basil it is compared in the Council of 787: if the image of the Emperor is standing for the Emperor and there are no two Emperors, and reign and glory will not be shared, so "our ruler" (Christ) has one power and not more, and so there is one glory for him and not more, divided between him and the image.[65] However, the council differed with regard to the images that them are attributed only veneration (ἀσπασμον / τιμητικήν ιτροσκύνησιν) unlike truthful worship (ἀληθινήν λατρείαν) which alone is attributed to the divine nature.[66]

Overall then the incarnation of God was the main argument of the iconophiles against the iconoclasts.[67]

Because when "the Word was made flesh, and if the creation is the medium of reconciliation, that is when the world is a parable capable for the presence of God (as in the kingdom of God parables of Jesus) - then the visible is appreciated as an area of perception of the invisible God; then metaphors and similes Word of God are capable; and then images are at least possible, if not necessary, as the visibility of the invisible. Religion is multimedia. The word is convertible, convertible into the image - because seeing his glory, and thus the visible to equal medium has become - perhaps even to the healing medium. Not Scripture alone or only the word of God are worthy, but also the image. Christ as the image of God.“[68]

After decades of debate and changing the reign of the iconophiles and iconoclasts in 843 the Dowager Empress Theodora restored the worship of images - to the great satisfaction of the monasticism which was strongly connected with her even by the production of icons[69]. And so finally an image eagerness began in the veneration and worship of icons as well as crucifixes, relics and Gospel books. That became a binding and high affective[70] part of life in the Eastern Church.[71]

So the iconoclastic attack on the power of images by means of a repristination of the prohibition of images was repulsed. In the end that meant a considerable increase in the power of images. And actually only from this state Stoellgers opinion could be accepted that Christianity is "an iconic turn of the monotheistic religious history", "an iconic turn against the Judaism of its time, from the exclusion of the image in the prohibition time via the approval in early Christianity to the worship in the Middle Ages."[72]

On the other hand the power of images to some extent has been mitigated by the fact that it was customary to take the pictures of the saints in a fixed image canon and to install it through an ecclesial act of Consecration[73]. Actually showed itself "a certain loss of representational power"[74] and thus was given an important part of the power of images in hands of the Church, so that Papajohn can say: „It is here that the permeating power of the spiritual existence of the Eastern Church is

revealed".[75] But how the church then should waive on a maximum possible effect of an image, namely as "Christ is what he shows"; and that therefore as sacred images not only refer to something or hint on something else, but that they are what they show and represent?[76]

In any case, this logic is fulfilled in the east in the icons, later in the West in the relics, and after Stoellger finally compacted in the wafer of the Eucharist. He stressed that they were "visual artifacts that are what they show" (or of which said at least partly and desires is that it is so ...).[77] In the West, after a few twists it was pointed always on the (educational) usefulness of the images ("laicorum litteratura") to the iconoclasts.[78]

Thus it is mapped the way to a worship of images within a popular Piety[79] which arose in the Middle Ages, "even when it did not maintain the same importance as in the Eastern Church."[80]

Nevertheless, churchly had been made concessions to popular Piety, which paid little attention to fine theological distinctions. There have even been accepted so called "miraculous images" that were considered miraculous. Pilgrimages to these "grace images" were promoted without the subsequent protest of the Reformation was able to change anything.[81]

Relevant to the Middle Ages remained the image theory that even was underlying in the previous images cult, in which the beauty was identified with the truth and the good (resp. Divine)[82] and there was assumed a total and direct relationship of the saint to his iconophiles by the so-called "sacramental Look".

It was "a fundamental late medieval act of piety", when it was thought that by means of an eye contact to have "a contemplative, in extreme cases, an ecstatic encounter" with the depicted saint.[83] People had the opinion to be able to grasp "God in vision, to eat God in Grasping and to be with him physically as in his embodiment."[84] In this respect, images were venerated as 'remedies'.[85]

And even Luther reported how concrete he himself before Reformation felt this connection which he later judged as absurd and sinister: "We thought that St. Barbara, Anna, St. Christophel, would look at his picture and hear our prayers".[86]

Signifying for the age of the Reformation is then that exactly this image theory is questioned and replaced by a different view.

IV Luther's new disempowerment and evaluation of the images

In intellectual history, the age of the Reformation is brought in conjunction with iconoclasts. But in spite of that Luther's Reformation approach is not responsible for that.[87] - so cataclysmic his change in the rating of the power of images was through his change in the "conditions of perception"[88]. But his aim was a church reform and not a "social revolution" such as the Anabaptists in Munster, where then the images, the memorial plaques and statues were regarded as "domination symbols"[89] and therefore were delivered to disempowerment by destruction.

In this vandalism should be performed a "public image of punishment." And when "the 'decapitated' and death 'tortured' images remain visible on display - deads are represented (similar to the exposure of the dead bodies of the Münster Anabaptists)."[90] And by this destruction of the images is made evident at the same time that "no picture is able „to repair itself". This banal insight is consequential because it obviously scatters doubts "to the vibrancy of the image as a 'bodily self'."[91]

Luther was forced to public comment regarding the images in 1522 facing the Wittenberg turmoil that resulted from the actions of Karlstadt, who celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds at Christmas 1521 in the collegiate church, and to whose program belonged also central the removal of the images as "Ölgötzen" (oiled idols)[92].

In contrast to Luther, the images question was of secondary importance, because, as he explained already in his lectures on Romans from 1515-16, he saw the images as not necessary for salvation, as well as not as prohibited[93]. They are, like other cultic institutions, "umbra et signa rerum et puerilia"[94]. And generally the requirements of the Mosaic law have no longer validity to the Christianity.[95] (But here remains a significant disagreement with the Reformed branch of the Reformation movement,[96] as the prohibition of images appears as 2nd

commandment of the Decalogue in the works of Calvin.[97] However the Tridentine theologians "largely agree with Luther" in the image theory.[98])

Loewenich summarises the events after Luther's return from the Wartburg on 06/03/1522 briefly. Because Luther had taken position in the 3rd and 4 Invocavit Sermon concerning the iconoclastic controversy. And in the 3rd Sermon (Tuesday 11 March [99]) he refers to the images and says, "referring the images it is to say that they are not useful but free to use, we might have them or not. But it would be better to have them not. I don‘t like them.“[100]. But one should not make out of freedom a "must"[101]. Furthermore, in Ex 20.4 it is not prohibited to make, but the worship of images[102]. One must understand Verse 4 looking on Verse 5. Otherwise Moses himself had contravened his commandment with the establishment of the brazen serpent.[103] In addition to the mercy seat, the two cherubim were attached.[104] Therefore, one should only „destroy and throw away“ the images, where one worships the images,[105] but not "with a storm and sacrilege, but the government should order to do these things"[106] One can not prove the image friends, that they worshiped the images when they deny that[107]. One can only preach that the images were nothing and that one is doing no service to God by their erection, then they would vanish by themselves.[108] Rather images friendship would be reinforced by the iconoclastic[109].[110] In his next sermon[111] Luther reiterates that the images are to be dismissed only if they are worshiped, not otherwise, "as I wanted, they were thrown away in the whole world because of its abuse which is not to deny."[112] But the actual abuse Luther sees in the works of piety associated with the images, because many people were thinking that it was possible to acquire merit before God by endowing images[113]. Overall, so Luther could stop the iconoclasm of the year 1522 by his Invocavit Sermons.[114]

Luther expressed his opinion concerning the images on many other occasions, but too with repetition of his arguments and, most comprehensively“[115] in the first Part of his work "Against the Heavenly Prophets, from the Images and Sacrament"[116]. Noteworthy here considered that the images must “first be taken out of the heart,“ then they would do no harm to the eyes [117]. And Luther reiterated his

conviction that with the "woks of piety" would also vanish the service on the images[118]. And he criticised that Karlstadt supporters were suspect because they tolerated images on coins and cups[119] and even used his translation of the Bible with its images.[120]

And just in this use of images in his translation of the Bible, he took on the traditional[121] educational aspect to use images as educational and teaching aids.[122] And in the same sense its incredibly image-rich and powerful language served for a "magnificent transfer of visual imagery in the verbal."[123]

And he reiterated the consideration of the human base he had personally experienced: that if he hears from the works of God and reads about it he makes an image of it in his the heart[124]: „if I would or not, when I hear Christ, then there comes in my heart an image of a man hanging on the cross, similarly as my face is mirrored in the water, if I am looking in the water. It is no sin but good that I have an image of Christ in my heart. Why should it be a sin when I have his image in my eyes?“[125] He admits easily that man in the religious life could not do without view, "because we must grasp ideas and images of that is submitted to us and we can not think and understand anything without image”.[126] Thus, God had shown himself to us in the person of Christ, stooped to our nature, and meets us in the visible; and accordingly the Bible is full of vividness[127]: "This always had been the way of God, our lord, that ears don‘t hear alone, and that eyes are looking too".[128] Insofar Volp is right in his observation that images are no "appendix" for Luther, "but the power of the word, witness and sign the memory of Christ".[129]

So it was consistently for Luther to combat Catholic images with Reformation images. Supported by the painter Lucas Cranach e.g. new altar images now were painted, on which the existing community and its well-known preacher was set into picture in a reportage way. By this the image was made „so discursive and realistic, that its metaphysical authority waned." Referring to Belting thus "the hierarchy between the two media was backed: the disempowerment of the images stood against the power of the theologians". And the image would be treated as a text, "so that it appealed more to a cognitive understanding as to the affective impression".

The images were so to deliver the keywords for the memorization of the content of the religion and thus draw back the viewer to his inner images, "but also to control them in the same way as it did the word in the sermon."[130] But certainly Belting underestimates with this view of a pale "word and theologians-servitude" in Reformation Time the considerable power of Reformation affections[131], which e.g. gave expression in a wealth of new hymns.

But if it only had been the object of the Reformation images, to contribute to the memorisation of the content of the religion and thus the viewer draw back to his inner images, then referring to Volp it would be definitely a contribution to the most important theological task of the category of the images, namely "*to make evident in the Hither the Beyond of God*".[132]

However, it also must be noted concerning the power of images in the Reformation period that in the vicinity of iconoclasm images were used as caricatures too, "to break the power of the enemy." Images were also popular for denunciation. And it is said that Pope cartoons flourished with the same frequency as Luther cartoons since the outbreak of the Reformation.[133] And to the extent that now images were discharged by pamphlets and leaflets which came into everyone's hands, images were "democratised". And thereby they just lost that aura, "of which its cult had lived."[134]

In any case, now, after the "revolution of the theory of signs"[135] initiated by Luther, in which the "relationship between the ritual and the written word" had been changed[136] and thus the use of images was released, images now could be used on one hand didactically helpful for believing in the "word" without being fixed by (religious) power. On the other hand - and if the condition is true that the viewer is held in faith - any other aesthetic or ornamental use was opened.[137]

However, after Stoellger (and probably many contemporary art lovers of images) this forbearance of Luther "is actually the worst thing you can do to images: not to take them for serious, but as decorative, useful and helpful if they are made submissive, thus actually dispensable". But by this Luther had „relaxed“ the situation in front of a picture": Because so it does not go "around the image itself,

but on the right use . And the only wrong thing is to worship them." Otherwise everything was allowed. By this Luther had given to protestant believer a very broad license concerning the images, if he just feels to be kept in faith. But the the price of it is an significant depotentialization." However, the remark of Stoellger should not be concealed that pictures are "often more subtle and significant than thought " and often smarter than their viewers or even" more powerful than its users.[138] Because the „power of the image“ is as well „'power of desire' as 'power of showing' , in short: interpretive power".[139]

V Outlook: manipulation by the power of the images in the modern world?

Now there is a lot to say on the power of desire, of showing and of the interpretation in the light of the many confrontations, which arose then in the age of the Reformation - alone in the churches of Reformation[140], or concerning the Baroque as "art of the Counter Reformation"[141] and then resulted in the Age of Enlightenment in terms of images and their power. However, this may not be the place to address these large-scale issues.

It must remain open whether Boehm's thesis that the meaning of the image density in principle go beyond the possibilities of language acquisition, and that the image as such resists the linguistic substitution[142], can ever turn against Luther's position to the images. Anyway, Luther did not succeeded to stop all iconoclasts in that time - perhaps just because of its differentiated position to the images. It became clear in this time, that the destruction of the images could be some "consequence of an intellectual or political change, not the cause". And yet they could continue the process of revolution. And mocking the Iconoclasts then showed, "that they may accomplish their deeds without lightning rain from the sky and the sky collapses." They want to believe that their world has changed, thereby has only "changed its symbolic representation."[143]

And in this change of the symbolic representation a relatively independent, highly flourishing art of painting then was developed at the end of the age of the Reformation. And the artwork - "becoming dispensable churches, if not sold out of

them" then had found a new home in the museum. After Hofmann therefore "theoretically" the "Musealization of artwork" begins with the Reformation. On the one hand it is "correlate of its abandonment of the ideology", but it brings with it, "that a new ideology has seized for it" - which provided the artwork a new "sphere of action untouched by the magic of the image".[144]

And for some in this process it includes the visual representation of the so-called "beautiful." In the Christian tradition may thus attracting a receptivity, to realize the sensuous revelation of the glory of God in nature[145], to wonder and to praise, of which can result a very unique power of beautiful pictures.[146] However, it must still be held against theologically that the aesthetic truth claim could only be a "derived" relative truth claim. The "beautiful" is, here and now "only the first - flashing and fading again - splendour of truth."[147]

And for others meant the development of an "autonomous" art, that the fascination and power of the image is attributed to the "personal invention of an artist" and disputing over the image is no longer theologically but only aesthetically.[148] Yet the picture seems no more to witness the presence of the Beyond, but seems to be rooted entirely in the Hither.[149]

But thereby it is also seen a different type of relationship of the image or the art to religion that describes not opposites but rather relationships. Because after Erne there exists a religious designation of modern art at its core, which is why he speaks of "family resemblances" in the relationship between church and art.[150] That would at least make it plausible, why so obviously many modern museums as an exhibition of images resemble sacred spaces, which claimed to be it pictorial, contemporary cult places, which show "similarities with church-Christian rituals and liturgies".[151]

Such plausibility, however, would also apply to the analysis of Roeck. Here after Reformation Time now the artist - in an antireligious or religion replacing thinking - is venerated by some as "inspired Creator God", "who produces works, which in turn, are objects of religious veneration."[152] But even without all artists cult in modernity remains the experience that images can make visible and represent the

"unspeakable, inconceivable, Holy“ in a way that may have the aura and even numinous character."[153] Because an image possesses the "strange power to teach about itself"[154] and shows "another view of reality"[155]. However Hofmann summarises: ,,After the art, that belonged to the religion, follows the religion of art, whose articles of faith the respective spectator has to sort out with himself."[156]

Referring to Roeck this quasi-religious worship occurs not, "because God is suspected in the images or because they refer to divine. But they substitute, in a world in which the deity is moved away, the lost."[157]

But that raises the question of what is substituted here. For it remains the "stupendous phenomenon that a piece with paint smeared surface can offer access to incredible sensory and spiritual insights"[158], can not be remedied by a sharp remark. Rather remains the serious question as to whether it can really be that in modern art, the "concrete abstraction of stroke, surface, colour means nothing more than stroke, surface, colour"[159]. Aren‘t there good reasons to question whether such a proposed separation of Modern Art "from their metaphysical background foundation" and "in farewell to their absolute“ can gain „its aesthetic autonomy"?[160]

Must not rather be expected that in that moment where the belief - which is from Luther in the "release of the images" still presumed - is ignored, this empty space then will be used by other "beliefs" willingly and the images and their power ultimately would be harnessed to the carts of other metaphysical theories?

Calvin too clearly had seen the danger of penetration of quasi-religious powers in the human soul when he said, that „the human spirit in all ages have been a workshop of idols".[161] Or from another perspective such discourse theorists as Dewey and Habermas report to word because obviously the images of media jeopardise[162] the public discourse necessary or would manipulate[163] it.

They till remembered all too clearly how especially in the 20th Century leader cults had grown up which’s multimedia influence hardly was to withstand. And then it was Lenin - apart from the delay in "bringing home" Napoleon to Paris - who was the first modern ruler, who "was embalmed not only and buried in a tomb, but whom was placed the permanent, lasting until today ritual veneration by pilgrims

from his country and from all over world."[164] In the so-called" enlightened" modernity no longer heroes of religion, but political leaders were regarded as "messianic figures, true saviours“ and their portraits won „magical power over men, they drew admiration, veneration, worship on themselves." And that not only on demonstrations and memorial services and marches, but partly also in the domestic life. In this way the ikonophile personality cult became to the "characteristic of the modern political religions".

With the death of Hitler and Stalin this modern image religions, that promised salvation on earth and not in the Beyond[165], found no end, but were continued up to the present time by Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Kim il-Sung, Che Guevara, Castro, Ceausescu and many other.[166] And the destruction of the images of these "saints" after the upheavals of 1945 and 1989 and so had quite "parallels to the Reformation iconoclasm."[167] These images had to suffer their disempowerment by destruction as well as the former holy images, as their admirers had lost their sustainable faith.

Now, presently there are some voices who see the current international conflicts and acts of war as prime examples of the power and powerlessness of images. Thus it is talked polemical about "George W. Bush's image-war"[168]. But it is overlooked that since time immemorial military actions have rarely been committed without visual accompaniment. The current extent of media in the war is of course adequate to the current extent of the media in the society. However, in this should be agreed to G. Paul, that in this war, especially the "apparent evidence of media images" has suffered and thus the quantity of images has damaged the power of images.[169]

But by no means the power of pictures is damaged in the quasi-religious devotion to the "stars" from politics, arts, sports, fashion and music, with its fetishes and emblems, its brands, and to the faithful worshiping of their idols.[170] Here variously in modern society, an "implicit religion"[171] is worshiped in a secular garb. And perceive attentive observer can see how strong "the modern imagery in advertising and its promises of salvation, in the film, and especially in the social dominant medium, television, interspersed religious" and some even attached with a "ritual, i.e. cultic character"[172]. And it is not just the "look out the window .. that is

replaced by the TV, where everything happens: music, news, football, court scenes, executions, marital drama, Wedding, Fun, Games, Serious and tragedy", but too "the life as a film, often as a substitute for one's own"[173] is absorbed and then perhaps further still varied and individualized by modern programming and Internet technology.[174] For man's desire "for a cure and a happiness that is located beyond the physical world represents itself in its real things" is obvious.[175]

Therefore, many companies are quite successful in their attempt to force the consumer into purchasing decisions and to get an economic advantage from him by using images[176] in marketing-interest, and partly those images are charged religious or quasi-religious or are manipulative[177]. It is solely to raise criticism from the viewpoint of market economic theory, because in the end "it is not the objective picture of a product critical to the buying process, but its perception".[178]

But more significant must be the question of what such an application of images makes with the soul of the consumer when it is in the context of development of a "customer relationship" no longer a question "to make a sale," but "to create a customer"[179]? Because if you have him then created as your product-loyal "customer" whose efforts and life orientation and life hope is now just aimed after the images you presented him in film and television etc., can that ever be his "true" meaning of life?

Is not exactly the space of that viable faith, Luther in his "releasing the images" still presumed, now occupied by a "belief" whose manipulative target is only the economic (and at some point, probably political) exploitation of their faith's followers?

The more important to emphasise at this point is the remaining "religion critical function of an image-critical, negative theology," whose job it must be to inculcate the "unavailability of God" and thus the inadequacy of all worldly promise of salvation and fulfilment, and thus also has to reflect the dubious power of the images as well as the borders of images prohibition consistently.[180] And of course, any critical theological effort must be accompanied by the testimony of a living faith in the sense of Luther.

Stoellger here emphasises correctly for the „visible church“ that it stands in the horizon of visual cultures and lives where we just live now. But he further points

out rightly that the visible is not everything.[181] And in this respect the theological task remains "to reflect the ambiguity of illusion critical," is non-negotiable and therefore "to distinguish between truth and falsehood."[182] But this has not joy to happen at some investigative journalism, but as a spiritual help for the people of this world, so that - as Luther understood and believed it - at the end of the world and to myself everything will be again so perfect and well-formed, as it was meant by God from the beginning of the creation. That ought we believe and be true that „the Holy Spirit helps us to believe so; and then we become again that image of God, what we have lost in paradise“.[183]

Notes

[1] Look e.g. at the newly founded Institute for Visual Science, University of Rostock, or at the Interdisciplinary Working Group "The World as Image" of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences along with various art departments at academic departments and the art galleries.

[2] G. Boehm, Die Wiederkehr der Bilder, in: Ders. (Hrsg.): Was ist ein Bild? München 21995 (11994), p. 13

[3] Ferdinand Fellmann: Symbolischer Pragmatismus. Hermeneutik nach Dilthey. Hamburg 1991, p. 26

[4] W. J. T. Mitchell, The Pictorial Turn, in: Artforum, März 1992, S. 89-95, See S. 89; see further E. Führ, lkonik und Architektonik, in: Die Realität des Imaginären. Architektur und das digitale Bild. 10. Internationales Bauhaus-Kolloquium, Weimar 2007, p. 49

[5] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Reformatorischer Bildersturm im Kontext der europäischen Geschichte. München 2002, p. 11f.

[6] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), S. 151f.

[7] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), S. 143

[8] See e.g. Röm. 10,17 with the often recited „Fides ex auditu". See e.g. E. Bizer, Fides ex auditu. Eine Untersuchung über die Entdeckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1966 till to D. Gebhard, Glauben kommt vom Hörensagen, Göttingen 2010.

[9] J. Kunstmann, Bild und Religion, International Journal of Practical Theology, 2003, Vol. 7 Issue 1, p. 23. And H.-M. Barth, Dogmatik. Evangelischer Glaube im Kontext der Weltreligionen. Gütersloh 20022, p. 582 and p. 601 remarks that the „word" in Protestantism nearly had been regarded as a „fetish".

[10] P. Blickle, Bilder und ihr gesellschaftlicher Rahmen. Zur Einführung. In: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Reformatorischer Bildersturm im Kontext der europäischen Geschichte. München 2002, S. 4. (Further quotations from the german language in own translation)

[11] Confirming Hans Belting see P. Blickle, Bilder und ihr gesellschaftlicher Rahmen. S. 4.

[12] R. Volp, Die Reformatorischen Kirchen und das Bild, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute.München 1984, p. 34

[13] WA 10 III, 35,7-9 („... die bilder seindt weder sonst noch so, sie seindt weder gut noch bóße, man mag sie han oder nit haben")

[14] W. Hofmann, Die Geburt der Moderne aus dem Geist der Religion, in: Ders. (Hg.), Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst [Katalog zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung in der Hamburger Kunsthalle vom 11. November 1983 - 8. Januar 1984], München (Prestel)1983, 23-71, hier S. 46

[15] Vgl. P. Blickle, Bilder und ihr gesellschaftlicher Rahmen. S. 4.

[16] Even looking on modern art See G. Boehm, Die Bilderfrage, in: Ders. (Hrsg.): Was ist ein Bild? München 21995 (11994), p. 327-329

[17] W. Hofmann, Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute. München 1984, p. 68

[18] These three periods are regarded as the most important historical iconoclasms from Asmuth and apparently acceptet by Krüger. See M. D. Krüger, Rezension Asmuth, Christoph: Bilder über Bilder, Bilder ohne Bilder. Eine neue Theorie der Bildlichkeit. Darmstadt 2011, in: ThLZ 12/2012, Sp. 1383.

[19] see alone the placing of Ramses II. in the row of Gods in Abu Simbel.

[20] see the destroying of the faces of Hatschepsut, Echnathon etc. on their portraits and statues after their death

[21] G. Lanczkowski, Bilder I. Religionsgeschichtlich, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 516.

[22] G. Lanczkowski, Bilder I. Religionsgeschichtlich, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 516. But Thümmel points on transitions between unreflected identification and more reflected interpretation of the connection of image and deity in the (later) pagan antiquity. See H. G. Thümmel, Bilder IV. Alte Kirche, in: TRE Bd 6, p. 525

[23] See Ex 20, 3-5a, see further Dtn 4,15-19 or Dtn 5,8-10

[24] O. Kaiser, Der Gott des Alten Testaments. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Bd. 2, Jahwe der Gott Israels, Schöpfer der Welt und der Menschen , Göttingen 1998, S. 173. The appositional extension Dtn 5,8aßb (or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth ..) refers on anthropomorph und theriomorph relations as models for a cult image." Vgl. C. Uehlinger, Art. Bilderverbot, in RGG I4, Sp. 1575

[25] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 15. And he continues - not to be taken siriously: „The bigger the power of the theologians the smaller the power of the images".

[26] J. Kunstmann, Bild und Religion, International Journal of Practical Theology, 2003, Vol. 7 Issue 1, p. 30f.

[27] It remains to be seen whether E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, Religionsgeschichte oder Kulturgeschichte? Über das Verhältnis von Kunst und Religion im Alten Orient, in: Richard Faber/Volkhard Krech (Hg.), Kunst und Religion. Studien zur Kultursoziologie und Kulturgeschichte, Würzburg (Königshausen & Neumann) 1999, 101-118 is right about that, "that even the ancient oriental high-civilizations possessed an „autonomous" art which was differentiated from their religions. She therefore derives the plea, to get rid of religious historical perspective restrictions in the debates about the relationship between religion and art and to lead it as cultural and historical debates.“ See C. Albrecht, Kunst und Religion. Ein Forschungsüberblick, in: IJPT 2004, vol. 8, pp. 251-287, p. 258

[28] Stoellger likes to stress that there were in fact images in the ancient Israel. (P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 27.). But O. Kaiser relativizes and says: "The founds, in fact, of hoards with terracotta figurines of male and female gender are all outside the official sanctuaries and can be regarded as evidence of the continued Canaanite influenced folk religion." See O. Kaiser, Der Gott des Alten Testaments. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Bd. 2, Jahwe der Gott Israels, Schöpfer der Welt und der Menschen , Göttingen 1998, S. 172. See also P. Welten, Bilder II. Altes Testament, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 520: "In the face of the lot of images from ancient Israel one might speculate that the prohibition of images has become only partially and perhaps only known late and come to effect. This assumption is, however refuted, because in in addition to Ex 20.4-6 and the parallel in Dtn 5,8-10 in all the other old collections of law are to find corresponding formulations (Ex 20.23; 34,14.17; Lev 19.4; Dt 4, 16-19; 27.15). "

[29] G. Boehm, Die Bilderfrage, p. 329

[30] 2. Mose 32

[31] G. Boehm, Die Bilderfrage, p. 330

[32] Immanuel Kants Werke hrsgg. v. H. Cassirer, Bd. 5, Kritik der Urteilskraft. Berlin 1922, p. 346f.

[33] O. Kaiser, Der Gott des Alten Testaments., p. 174

[34] O. Kaiser, Der Gott des Alten Testaments, p. 179 referring on 5. Mose 4,36-40

[35] R. Bultmann, Der Begriff des Wortes Gottes im Neuen Testament, p. 273 stresses this association in the German language: „From listening everything depends; who has ears to hear shall hear! Look what you hear! Hear and get it! Hearing is not only listening but an obediance that is connected with doing.“

[36] "But one should notice that God not only speaks, God also presents himself. He presents himself according to biblical tradition not alone and therefore not exclusive in the word, but according to biblical narration quite visually. The bush to smoke and pillar of fire of the

Flood and the Rainbow to the beauty of creation". See P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 28. Here, however, Stoellger simultaneously points on the phenomenon of "presence in the withdrawal". For as Moses should see God, he gets the "Look on the passing over that does not see nothing, but nevertheless must be content with the traces of passing over."(p. 30)

[37] Volp, Bilder VII. Das Bild als Grundkategorie der Theologie, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 562

[38] See e.g. the hinduistic criticism of Vivekananda: „Idolatry is condemned! Why? Nobody knows. Because some hundreds of years ago some man of Jewish blood happened to condemn it? That is, he happened to condemn everybody else's idols except his own. If God is represented in any beautiful form or any symbolic form, said the Jew, it is awfully bad; it is sin. But if He is represented in the form of a chest, with two angels sitting on each side, and a cloud hanging over it, it is the holy of holies. If God comes in the form of a dove, it is holy. But if He comes in the form of a cow, it is heathen superstition; condemn it!" Vgl. Swami Vivekananda, "Defence of Image Worship," in Religion Today A Reader, ed. Susan Mumm (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate in association with The Open University, 2002), p. 22

[39] See e.g. H. Koch, Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, no. 27 (Göttingen, 1917); See Walter Elliger, Die Stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten, Studien über christliche Denkmäler, no. 20 (Leipzig, 1930); see further R. Griggg, Aniconic Worship and the Apologetic Tradition: A Note on Canon 36 of the Council of Elvira, in: Church History Vol. 45, No. 4 (Dec., 1976), pp. 428-433 p. 428; see further C. Uehlinger, Art. Bilderkult III. Bibel, in RGG I4, Sp. 1570

[40] R. Griggg, Aniconic Worship and the Apologetic Tradition, p. 428

[41] H.G. Thümmel, Bilder IV. Alte Kirche, p. 525

[42] Canon XXXVI: „Ne picturae in ecclesia fiant." und „Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere nec, quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur." Vgl. Concilium Eliberitanum - Documenta Omnia, in: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0306-0306__Concilium_Eliberitanum__Collectio_canonum_falso_Isidori_Mercatore_adscripta__LT.doc.html of 30.10.2012, XXXVI, p. 2, p. 5

[43] However sings e.g. Paulinus of Nola (354-431) even commissioned image decorations in the basilicas to Nola and Fundi, or Gregory I the Great. (540-604) is opposed to the destruction of sacred images, because they are particularly instructive for the illiterate. See H. G. Thümmel, Bilder IV. Alte Kirche, p. 528f.

[44] H. G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, in: TRE Bd 6, p. 532

[45] J. Papajohn, Philosophical and Metaphysical Basis of Icon Veneration in the Eastern

Orthodox Church, in: Greek Orthodox Theological Review, 2 no 1 Easter 1956, p. 84: (The Greeks) „They did not believe that the image was really alive, nor did they actually identify the image with a god; but rather they thought of the god as in some sense animating all the consecrated images there might be of him in different places."

[46] H.G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 536

[47] J. Papajohn, Philosophical and Metaphysical Basis of Icon Veneration in the Eastern Orthodox Church, in: Greek Orthodox Theological Review, 2 no 1 Easter 1956, p 84: „... it has to be conceded that many peasants conceived of the animation of the idols in *its* most realistic sense..."

[48] H.G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 532

[49] Jacques Lacan, Was ist ein Bild/Tableau, in: Boehm, Was ist ein Bild? München 21995 (11994), p. 78

[50] H. G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 533

[51] H. G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 534

[52] G. Florovsky, Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy, in: Church history. 1950, p. 77-96 , p. 80

[53] H.G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 535

[54] And concerning monotheism G. Young, Byzantine Iconoclasm: An Imperial Religious Policy Aimed At Unification? in: PHRONEMA, VOL. XXIII, 2008, S. 35-49, hier S. 45 is resuming: „Nevertheless, both Leo III and Muslim opponents of Christianity utilised accusations of idolatry in order to assert a superior understanding of monotheism."

[55] T. Sideris, The Theological Position of the Iconophiles during the Iconoclastic Controversy, in: St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 17 no 3 1973, p 210-226 hier S. 211: „ Idolaters, therefore, are those who believe and worship not the one God in the Trinity, but false gods." But see too the arguments of G. Florovsky, Origen, Eusebius, and the Iconoclastic Controversy, p. 77: „It has been variously suggested that originally the conflict had nothing to do with doctrine, and theological arguments or charges were invented, as it were, *post factum,* as efficient weapons in the struggle. Some historians went so far as to suggest that the religious problem was simply a kind of a "smoke screen," manufactured and employed by the rival parties as a disguise to conceal the true issue, which was economic." Against this argument e.g. K. Baus, Art. Bilderstreit, in LThK II2, Sp. 461f."

[56] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder V/2. Im Westen, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 540; see further H.-G. Beck, Die griechische Kirche im Zeitalter des Inkonoklasmus, in: H. Jedin(Hrsg.), Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte Bd. III, Freiburg/ Basel/ Wien 1985, p. 35

[57] E. Lamberz (Hrsg.), Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Concilii Actiones IV- V.

Berlin u. a.: De Gruyter 2012

[58] T. Sideris, The Theological Position of the Iconophiles, p. 210

[59] Vgl. H.G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 536

[60] De fide orthodoxa 4.16 vgl. http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0675-0749__Ioannes_Damascenus__De_Fide_Orthodoxa__EN.pdf.html

[61] Vgl. De Imaginibus, Oratio I, PG 94, 1236A-B. Vgl. ebenso De fide orthodoxa 4.16 vgl. http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_0675-0749__Ioannes_Damascenus__De_Fide_Orthodoxa__EN.pdf.html

[62] H.G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 536

[63] εικων του θεού See 2. Kor. 4,4 oder Kol. 1,15

[64] Vgl. T. Sideris, The Theological Position of the Iconophiles, p. 212

[65] With reference to Nicaeanum II, Actio IV, Mansi 13, 69D. Pointed out by St. John of Damaskus (PG 94, 1264A: „Ει η εικων του βασιλεως εστι βασιλευς, και η εικων του Χριστου, Χριστος, και η εικων του αγιου αγιος. Και ουτε το κρατος σχιζεται, ουτε η δοξα διαμεριζεται, αλλ η δοξα της εικονος του εικοιζομενου γινεται." (The Emperor's image is the Emperor, and the image of Christ is Christ, and the image of the saint is the saint. And the power is not divided in two and the glory is not parted in two; but the glory of the image belongs to the painted.)

[66] With reference to Nicaeanum II, Actio IV, Mansi 13, 377D. See T. Sideris, The Theological Position of the Iconophiles, p. 217; see further H. G. Thümmel, Der byzantinische Bilderstreit, in: ThR 61, 1996, p. 355-371, p. 360

[67] T. Sideris, The Theological Position of the Iconophiles, p. 215; see further J. Papajohn, Philosophical and Metaphysical Basis of Icon Veneration, p 85

[68] Vgl. P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 25; Vgl. auch P. Stoellger, JENSEITS DER SCHRIFT DER PROTESTANTISMUS NACH DEM ICONIC TURN, in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 58

[69] "Thus the victory of icon-veneration turned out to be also a victory for monasticism." See A. Schmemann, Byzantium, Iconoclasm and the Monks, in: St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, ns 3 no 3 Fall 1959, p. 29

[70] See e.g. C. Barber, From Transformation to Desire: Art and Worship after Byzantine, in: The Art Bulletin, March 1993 Vol XXV, Number 1, p. 7-16, p. 7, who reports: „There are reports that worshippers talked to, embraced, and wept before these images." And he suggests to define an icone as „a site of desire" (p. 11)

[71] H. G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 536

[72] Vgl. P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 25; Vgl. auch P. Stoellger, JENSEITS DER SCHRIFT DER PROTESTANTISMUS NACH DEM ICONIC TURN, in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 58

[73] J. Papajohn, Philosophical and Metaphysical Basis of Icon Veneration, p 89: „Finally, it should be mentioned that a portrait of Christ, or of the saints, does not become an "icon" in the sense taught by St. Theodore until it has been consecrated by the Church. Only when the Church through this consecration testifies to the correlation of an icon with the image of Christ is it established as a true "eikon." Without this act of consecration, the reproduction remains only a religious picture."

[74] H. G. Thümmel, Bilder V/1. Byzanz, p. 538

[75] J. Papajohn, Philosophical and Metaphysical Basis of Icon Veneration, p. 89

[76] P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 25; see further P. Stoellger, JENSEITS DER SCHRIFT DER PROTESTANTISMUS NACH DEM ICONIC TURN, in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 58

[77] P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 25

[78] Again and again in this sense Gregory I is quoted from his letter to Bishop Serenus of Marseilles, and then the images called "laicorum litteratura": „Nam quod legentibus scripturae, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa ignorantes vident, quod sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt; unde praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est": MGH. Ep II, 270,14-16 (Okt. 600).

[79] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder V/2. Im Westen, p. 543

[80] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder V/2. Im Westen, p. 542

[81] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder V/2. Im Westen, p. 543f.

[82] R. Sprenger, Weltanschauung des Mittelalters im Spiegel der Kunst, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute.München 1984, S. 55

[83] H. Oelke, Luther und das religiöse Bild, in: in: Lutherjahrbuch 57. Jg 1990, p. 265. See further O. J. Bräunlein, 'Bildakte. Religionswissenschaft im Dialog mit einer neuen Bildwissenschaft', in: Brigitte Luchesi & Kocku von Stuckrad (eds.), *Religion im kulturellen Diskurs:* Festschrift für Hans G. Kippenberg zu seinem 65. Geburtstag / Religion in Cultural Discourse: Essays in Honor of Hans G. Kippenberg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter 2004, 195-231. p. 215: "The confrontation with pictures was understood as an elementary-process of communication - as an exchange of

glances. Not only the viewer captures the image with his eyes, but he is looked at the other way around of this. Prayer and the orientation of the gaze-intentio ... were inextricably linked, and the response of that look was taken for granted. The aim is available via the eye contact as a physical connection, which concerned ultimately about the transfer of power". See further K. v. Stuckrad, VISUAL GODS: FROM EXORCISM TO COMPLEXITY IN RENAISSANCE STUDIES, in: *Aries Vol. 6, no. 1*. Leiden 2006, p. 70: „Hence, the practice of looking, displaying, visualizing, and imagination is a sensual action that creates a relationship between the observer and the object of observation."

[84] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), p. 146f.

[85] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), p. 160

[86] „Ac fingebamus S. Barbaram, Annam, Christophorum, singulos ad suas statuas respicere, et exaudire preces nostras." WA 44,176,22-24

[87] Referring A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt, Bilder als Objekte – Bilder in Relationen. Auf dem Weg zu einer wahrnehmungs- und handlungsgeschichtlichen Deutung von Bilderverehrung und Bilderzerstörung. In: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 517 there basically haden't been a „Reformation" iconoclasm, but only a "pre-Reformation" iconoclasm. Iconoclasm was part of the movement to the Reformation, but rarely part of institutionalized Reformation itself."

[88] B. Roeck, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Die historische Perspektive. In: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 33, who states: "... that, though the biological requirements of vision have not changed between medieval and modern times, but the conditions of perception; they were dependent on the structures of the life world that was very different structured medial than life world of modernity"

[89] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 550

[90] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), S. 149

[91] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), S. 155

[92] „Das wir bilder in Kirchen un gots hewßern habe/ ist unrecht/ und wider das erste gebot. Du solst nich frombde gotter haben. Das geschnizte und gemalthe Olgotzen uff den altarien stehnd ist noch schadelicher und Tewfflischer. Drumb ists gut/ notlich/ loblich/ un gottlich/ das wir sie abthun/ un ire recht und urteyl der schrifft gebe." Vgl. Karlstadt, Andreas: Von Abthuung der Bilder und das Keyn Bedtler unther den Christen seyn soll, Wittenberg 1522, S. 2,

[93] WA 56,493,32 - 494,17

[94] WA 56,494,3

[95] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 546; see WA 18, 76,6ff.; see further WA 14,622,29ff.; see further WA 16,439,16-22

[96] About the images question at the Reformed and concerning their general rejection of images see W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 551ff.

[97] J. Calvin, Unterricht in der christlichen Religion = Institutio Christianae religionis/ Johannes Calvin. Nach der letzten Ausg. übers. und bearb. von Otto Weber, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1997 (1955), (Institutio II,8,17), p. 228. In Latin: „Non facies tibi sculptile, neque similitudinem vllam eorum quae in caelo sunt sursum, vel in terra deorsum, vel in aquis quae sub terra sunt. Non adorabis neque coles." See J. Calvin, Institutio Christianae religionis, Genf 1569, (Institutio II,8,17), p. 224

[98] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 556

[99] WA 10 III,21ff.

[100] „umb die bilder ist es auch so gethan, das sie unnoettig, sondern frey sein, wir mügen sie haben oder nicht haben, wie wol es besser were, wir hetten sie gar nicht. Ich bin jn auch nit holt" see WA 10 III,26,6f.; see further WA 28, 716, 23f. „.. es sol einem Christen Menschen frey stehen Bilder haben und nicht haben." see further WA 10 III, 35,7-9 „... die bilder seindt weder sonst noch so, sie seindt weder gut noch bóße, man mag sie han oder nit haben".

[101] WA 10 III,26,12

[102] WA 10 III,27,4.2lf; see further WA 18, 69,5ff.

[103] WA 10 III,27,10f; see further WA 18, 70,1ff.; see further WA 14,621,20-29

[104] WA 10 III,27,34

[105] WA 10 III,28,5; see further WA 28, 716, 31-3; see further WA 28, 678, 31f.. In this respect, how Stoellger noted, the principle of Scripture (the sola scriptura) of Luther aimed against tradition and the rule of the Magisterium on the Scripture and also against the cult of the image in the late Middle Ages. P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, p. 27

[106] not „mit eim sturm und frevel, sondern sollen der Oberkeit solchs zu thun befehlen" WA 10

III,28,24; see further WA 18, 72,3ff.; see further WA 14,621,13-19; see further WA 28, 678,18

[107] WA 10 III,28,10

[108] WA 10 III,28,16ff.; see further WA 16,440,10-14

[109] WA 10 III,29,7ff.

[110] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 548

[111] WA 10/3, 30-36

[112] „wie woll ich wolt, sie weren in der gantzen weldt abgethann von wegen jres myßbrauchs, welchen mann jo nichts laügnen kan". WA 10/3, 31,1-3

[113] WA 10/3, 31,9-11

[114] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 548

[115] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 549

[116] End of Dec. 1524; WA 18,62-125; about images see p. 67-84

[117] WA 18,67,9 ff.; see further WA 14,622,18

[118] „Denn wo die hertzen unterrichtet sind, das man alleyn durch den glauben Gotte gefalle und durch bilde yhm keyn gefallen geschicht, sondern eyn verlorner dienst und kost ist, fallen die leute selbs williglich davon, verachten sie und lassen keyne machen." Vgl. WA 18,67,18-21; see further WA 16,440,23ff.

[119] WA 18,70,37ff.; see further WA 14,622,14-16; see further WA 28, 677, 36f.; see further WA 16,442,30-33

[120] WA 18,82,21ff.

[121] In the sense of Gregor I. images as „laicorum litteratura" MGH. Ep II, 270,14-16.

[122] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 550

[123] J. Helmke/ A. Ströhl, DAS VERTRAUEN IN DIE BILDER ZERSTÖREN, UM MIT BILDERN ARBEITEN ZU KÖNNEN! EIN GESPRÄCH ÜBER DAS DISKURSIVE MEDIUM FILM. in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 75

[124] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, in: TRE Bd 6, S. 550

[125] „... ich wolle, odder wolle nicht, wenn ich Christum hore, so entwirfft sich ynn meym hertzen eyn mans bilde, das am creutze henget, gleich als sich meyn andlitz naturlich entwirfft yns wasser, wenn ich dreyn sehe, Ists nu nicht sunde sondern gut, das ich Christus bilde ym hertzen habe, Warumb sollts sunde seyn, wenn ichs (sein Bild) ynn augen habe?"WA 18,83,9-13

[126] "weil wir ja müssen gedancken und bilde fassen des, das uns jnn worten fürgetragen wird,

und nichts on bilde dencken noch verstehen können". WA 37,63,25-6; see further WA 46, 308,1-310,5

[127] W. v. Loewenich, Bilder VI. Reformatorische und nachreformatorische Zeit, p. 550

[128] „Das ist unseres herr Gots weise alzeit gewest, das ohren nicht allein horeten, sed etiam oculis viderent." WA 49,74,39-75,1

[129] R. Volp, Die Reformatorischen Kirchen und das Bild, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute.München 1984, S. 35

[130] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 16f.

[131] Th. Kaufmann, Die Bilderfrage im frühneuzeitlichen Luthertum, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 450

[132] R. Volp, Bilder VII. Das Bild als Grundkategorie der Theologie, p. 566.

[133] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 20

[134] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 23

[135] B. Stollberg-Rilinger, Zeremoniell, Ritual, Symbol. Neue Forschungen zur symbolischen Kommunikation in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, in: Zeitschrift für historische Forschung 27, 2000, S. 289-405, hier S. 392

[136] E. Muir, Ritual in Early Modern Europe. Cambridge u. a. 1997, S. 150: "The process of gaining access to the sacred shifted from experiencing the divine body through sight, touch, and ingestion to interpreting the scriptural Word, a process that had wide-ranging implications for the status of ritual as weil as for the mentality of lay believers".

[137] Luther: „Alias levi pictura imagines privata in domo non possum damnare." WA 14,622,30f.; see further WA 16,441,28-30. And concerning the previous sacred images and its value, so Luther suggests against 1. Mose 35, 4 not to burry alien sculpures, images, silver, gold etc. but to use it diaconically for the support of the pious godly teachers and ministers of the Gospel."(„... distribuantur in pios doctores et ministros Euangelii) WA 44,178, 18-21

[138] P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 23; vgl. auch P. Stoellger, JENSEITS DER SCHRIFT DER PROTESTANTISMUS NACH DEM ICONIC TURN, in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 57

[139] P. Stoellger, AN DEN GRENZEN DES BILDES - POTENZEN UND IMPOTENZEN DES BILDES: PARADOXE MODI ÄSTHETISCHER ERFAHRUNG, in: Lebenswelt, 1 (2011), S. 152

[140] See the careful tracing by Th. Kaufmann, who holds initially: "Viewed in the horizon of scientific history the position of early modern Lutheranism to images - as to others so called

adiaphora - appears to be clear: it is equally in distance to the Roman Catholic Idiolatrie one hand, reformed iconoclasm on the other hand. Lutheranism retained ... from the traditional "liturgical objects with which the churches of the Reformation are to be equiped", among other "Catholic tradition" altars, candles, pictures and sculptures" and thus proved ... its "keeping power" in relation to medieval art. And or that is not to find neither in qualitative and quantitative terms convincing analogies in other Western confessional churches"See Th. Kaufmann, Die Bilderfrage im frühneuzeitlichen Luthertum, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 407f. Anyway, Kaufmann understands that dealing with the images as a "confessional culture identity feature of Lutheranism par excellence." (p. 410)

[141] Vgl. W. Weisbach, Der Barock als Kunst der Gegenreformation, Berlin 1921. Vgl. auch die Analyse von H. Burda, Vom Wort zum Bild: Iconic Turn, in: forum 1/2013, S. 8: „Und die Höhepunkte der visuellen Kunste um 1500, also Raffael, Leonardo und Michelangelo, sind im Kontext einer päpstlichen Offensive zu sehen, die christliche Lehre durch große Bildwände zu verbreiten. Das war, wenn man so will, eine frühe Version von »Iconic Turn«."

[142] B. Collenberg-Plotnikov, Bild und Kunst. Zur Bestimmung des ästhetischen Mediums. In: http://www.fernuni-hagen.de/philosophie/team/lg3/bernadette.collenberg.shtml v. 25.10.2012, Hagen 2003, S. 9 referring e.g. to: M. Imdahl: „Ikonik".In: G. Boehm (Hrsg.): Was ist ein Bild? München 19952 (19941),S. 300-324, p. 310.

[143] B. Roeck, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 34

[144] W. Hofmann, Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute. München 1984, S. 74

[145] K. Huizing, Art. Bild III. Religionsphilosophisch, in RGG I4, Sp. 1561; see further EG 503

[146] See e.g. *M. Yoshida,* The Power of Imaging - Art as Love and Struggle as Beauty, in: *Asia Journal of Theology.* Oct2008, Vol. 22 Issue 2, p. 288: „The power of art comes from the power of imaging in the midst of struggling. Seeing through the psyche's depth profoundly, beauty brings us God's re-velation and one can encounter God in the process of imaging to experience God's Love. Through imaging, God's Love is incarnated in the power of art. The power of the imaging becomes the power of art."

[147] E. Jüngel, „Auch das Schöne muß sterben" - Schönheit im Lichte der Wahrheit. Theologische Bemerkungen zum ästhetischen Verhältnis, in: Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 81 (1984), 106-126, p. 125. And W. Gräb, Lebensgeschichten - Lebensentwürfe - Sinndeutungen. Eine praktische Theologie gelebter Religion, Gütersloh (Chr. Kaiser/ Gütersloher) 1998, 100-118), p. 111 can differ: ,, The Aesthetic aims on the liking to the shape, the Religious on the concern with the content, which reveals itself. "

[148] H. Belting, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 26

[149] P. Sack, Die Macht der Bilder und die Bilder der Macht.Versuch zur Genealogie des White Cube. Heidelberg 2011 (in: http://www.google.de/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=14&ved=0CDQQFjADOAo&url=http%3A%2F%2Farchiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de%2Fartdok%2Fvolltexte%2F2011%2F1673%2Fpdf%2FSack_Die_Macht_der_Bilder_und_die_Bilder_der_Macht_2011.pdf&ei=9uygUNXeM8_Jswa3r4Aw&usg=AFQjCNG7BIQhFr-sJKk8zlfS7uHngw1UDw&sig2=YuerLJu7akh6NkRY-MG_9g), S. 43

[150] T. Erne, Formaufbau und Formzerstörung. Familienähnlichkeiten im Verhältnis von Kirche und Kunst. In: IJPT, vol. 10 2006, pp. 76–90, p. 78, who states that "many things are similar in the relationship between church and art, similar but not identical." He further said: ""family resemblances" is a metaphor that Ludwig Wittgenstein induces to describe relationships that have nothing in common logically or materially and in spite of that somehow belong together. Art becomes not religious by using Christian symbols. Religion becomes not art that it points out religious sense in characters. Yet both have something in common." He also refers to D. Korsch, Herrschaft der Poesie. Eine kategoriale Deutung von Stefan Georges Kunstreligion, in: V. Drehsen/ W. Gräb/ D. Korsch (Hg.), Protestantismus und Ästhetik. Religionskulturelle Transformationen am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts, Gütersloh (Gütersloher Verlagshaus) 2001, 123-144, who writes about the awareness of the relationship between art and religion, that includes a permanent difference.

[151] Susanne Natrup, Ästhetische Andacht. Das postmoderne Kunstmuseum als Ort individualisierter und impliziter Religion, in: J. Herrmann/A. Mertin/E. Valtink (Hg.), Die Gegenwart der Kunst in der Kunst der Gegenwart. Ästhetische und religiöse Erfahrung heute, München (Fink) 1998, p. 74.

[152] B. Roeck, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 63; und U. Barth, Religion in der Moderne, Tübingen (Mohr Siebeck) 2003, 235-262, p. 261f. analyzed rightly, that art has "in many places adopted the uplifting function of religion."

[153] J. Kunstmann, Bild und Religion, p. 33

[154] M. Merleau-Ponty Der Zweifel Cézannes, in: G. Boehm (Hg.), Was ist ein Bild? p. 52

[155] J. Kunstmann, Bild und Religion, p. 25

[156] W. Hofmann, Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst, in: R. Beck/ R. Volp/ G. Schmirber (Hrsg.), Die Kunst und die Kirchen. Der Streit um die Bilder heute. München 1984, S. 74

[157] B. Roeck, Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Die historische Perspektive. In: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Reformatorischer Bildersturm im Kontext der europäischen Geschichte. München 2002, S. 63

[158] Vgl. G. Boehm, Die Wiederkehr der Bilder, in: Ders. (Hg.), Was ist ein Bild?, München 1995, 30f.

[159] Vgl. T. Erne, Formaufbau und Formzerstörung. Familienähnlichkeiten im Verhältnis von Kirche und Kunst. In: IJPT, vol. 10 2006, pp. 76–90, hier S. 86

[160] Vgl. T. Erne, Formaufbau und Formzerstörung. Familienähnlichkeiten im Verhältnis von Kirche und Kunst. In: IJPT, vol. 10 2006, pp. 76–90, hier S. 86

[161] J. Calvin, Unterricht in der christlichen Religion, p. 45. In Latin: „Vnde colligere licet, hominis ingenium perpetuam, vt ita loquar, esse idolorum fabricam." See J. Calvin, Institutio Christianae religionis, p. 44; psychological strengthened by e.g. J. Yandell, Graven Images: Idol and Icon, in: Psychological Perspectives Volume 52, Issue 4/2009, S. 430: „Calvin's pronouncement that "the human mind ... is a perpetual forger of idols" is valid at least in the recognition that we are not just passive cameras but also active projectors. If the unconscious is the "always happening," as Jung characterized it, then the conscious is the *always projecting*. Whatever is going on inside us, we find in the outer world."

[162] „Vision separates us; conversation unites us". So Dewey nach. C. A. Finnegan/ J. Kang, "Sighting" the Public: Iconoclasm and Public Sphere Theory, in: Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 90, No. 4, November 2004, pp. 377-402 hier: S. 383

[163] The modernity project of Habermas „appears on its face to be iconoclastic. It proceeds with a will to purge images and vision and to open a path to a more rational, dialogic public sphere. ... Habermas believes that images in modern society reproduce the feudal system by producing passive subjects who are vulnerable to propaganda. Habermas attests that the modern public sphere has declined with the rise of images and representation. Contemporary society, in which mass media are a primal means of communication, operates through "manipulation and show" that can only create manipulative publicity." Vgl. C. A. Finnegan/ J. Kang, "Sighting" the Public: Iconoclasm and Public Sphere Theory, in: Quarterly Journal of Speech Vol. 90, No. 4, November 2004, pp. 377-402 hier: S. 386

[164] H. Maier, Die Politischen Religionen und die Bilder, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder. Reformatorischer Bildersturm im Kontext der europäischen Geschichte. München 2002, p. 486

[165] A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt, Bilder als Objekte – Bilder in Relationen. Auf dem Weg zu einer wahrnehmungs- und handlungsgeschichtlichen Deutung von Bilderverehrung und Bilderzerstörung. In: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 526

[166] H. Maier, Die Politischen Religionen und die Bilder, in: P. Blickle/ A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt/ F.-J. Sladeczek (Hrsg.), Macht und Ohnmacht der Bilder, p. 494

[167] A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt, Bilder als Objekte – Bilder in Relationen, p. 512

[168] G. Paul, Der Bilderkrieg. Inszenierungen, Bilder und Perspektiven der „Operation Irakische Freiheit". Göttingen 2005, S. 216

[169] G. Paul, Der Bilderkrieg, p. 225

[170] A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt, Bilder als Objekte – Bilder in Relationen, p. 526f.

[171] U. H. J. Körtner, Theologie des Wortes Gottes. Positionen, Probleme, Perspektiven. Göttingen 2001, S. 250

[172] U. H. J. Körtner, Theologie des Wortes Gottes, p. 250. See further J. Herrmann, FILM UND RELIGION. ERLEUCHTUNG GARANTIERT? In: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 83

[173] H. Burda, Vom Wort zum Bild: Iconic Turn, in: forum 1/2013, S. 9f.

[174] H. Burda, Vom Wort zum Bild: Iconic Turn, in: forum 1/2013, S. 8f.

[175] A. Holenstein/ H.R. Schmidt, Bilder als Objekte – Bilder in Relationen, p. 527

[176] Apparently, the amount of advertising that can dispense visual messages is minimal. See C. Homburg/ H. Krohmer, Marketingmanagement. Strategie - Instrumente . Umsetzung - Unternehmensführung. Wiesbaden 20072, p. 794

[177] J. Yandell, Graven Images: Idol and Icon, in: Psychological Perspectives Volume 52, Issue 4/2009, S. 427 with a hint on Vance Packard's "hidden persuaders" of 1957

[178] E. Göbel, Art. Werbung , in: Handbuch der Wirtschaftsethik hrsgg. im Auftrag der Görres-Gesellschaft von W. Korff u.a. Bd. 4.2 Konkrete wirtschaftsethische Problem!elder, Berlin 2009 (Gütersloh 1999) S. 653-670 p. 662

[179] J.-P. Thommen/ A.-K. Achleitner, Allgemeine Betriebswirtschaftslehre, Wiesbaden 5. Aufl. 2006, p. 130

[180] U. H. J. Körtner, Theologie des Wortes Gottes, p. 250

[181] P. Stoellger, Die Macht der Bilder und die Kraft des Wortes, in: forum 1/2013, S. 30; Vgl. auch P. Stoellger, JENSEITS DER SCHRIFT DER PROTESTANTISMUS NACH DEM ICONIC TURN, in: Kulturbüro des Rates der EKD (Hrsg.), KIRCHEN-KULTUR-KONGRESS, Berlin 2012, S. 61

[182] U. H. J. Körtner, Theologie des Wortes Gottes, p. 249

[183] „der heilige Geist wircket in uns den glauben, do bekommen wir dan widder Gottes bild, so wir im Paradis verlorn hatten.WA 47, 13