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Today, our culture is engaged in a new “Copernican revolution”, characterized by communication and “being on line”, “in the network” – a phenomenon provoked by a great technological development which is by now almost available to all. This has brought about a change on an anthropological level which is particularly felt in the new way of living, of perceiving reality, and of being in relationship with others.

However, it is not technology that creates this communicational dynamics, as communication belongs to the deepest human reality. Therefore, our reflection must start off from an understanding of the personal being’s ontology as a “communicative being”, because God made us in His own image and likeness, and as such, we are human creatures that are capable of having dialogue with one another (Cf. Gen. 1:26), capable of establishing relationships and thus capable of communicating with God and with others. Since humans are created in the image and likeness of God, they are therefore capable of having dialogue with God and constitutively open to interpersonal communion. This communication (Cf. Gen. 1:28) has been interrupted by sin (Cf. Gen. 3:23) and has been redeemed by a “communicative” act (Cf. John 1:1-14). Consequently, the entire act of evangelization presents itself to us with such an authority (both theological and communicative) that is typical of the Good News’ announcement in history directed to humanity in its entirety, and to all men and women (John 1:14).

Actually, technology has done nothing other than to promote, facilitate, and empower this human capacity as “connectivity is part of human nature, which is of the dialogue kind.” It is currently reaching unexpected possibilities and it is still evolving. For this reason, the characteristics of the so-called information society help us understand the new coordinates of human cultures in which evangelization is proclaimed. In this case, time-space occupies a particular place because, considering these two fundamental categories in human life as a voyager, it presents a challenge to the world of science (that continually tries to go beyond it and take control). However, it is also essential for faith and theology, because Revelation has kept the time-space reality in mind and has unfolded itself following these laws. Therefore, considering the new attitudes and interpretations relating to the realities of space and time, theology must comprehend and propose new “ways of incarnation” of the Good News, which is always the Person of Jesus (Cf. Heb. 13:8).

Communication is an essential element of humanity as well as of the fundamental structure of contemporary culture. Hence, even if the argument is not at all new, as communication belongs to the human essence, development reached by modern technologies in recent times has made it the object of particular interest and projects it in new ways in the fields of human and theological sciences.

According to the culture, the Church has always been greatly committed in the use of various means of communication for its pastoral use as well as the transmission of the kerygma, as there is a great patrimony in the magisterial teaching. On the other hand, we do not have an equally rich and organic approach in the study and presentation of the theological fundamentals for communication, which gives support to all the Church’s pastoral action.... [What we have] risks limiting the subject of communication to an instrumental/media matter, and also the communication pastoral to teach about its use and
moral analysis of utilizing diverse means. All of this deprives communication from its true dimension and its position in the life of the Church, which is its very own place according to its inherent theological reality.

Given the above, we may conclude that it is necessary to present, in a systematic and organic manner and from different points of view, the theological fundamentals that are at the basis of all communication, the conditions of possibilities, its intrinsic and constitutive elements, establishing both the diverse relations possible between theology and communication, as well as the theological study of communication as a “theological subject.”

**Diverse approaches between theology and communication**

The pairing, *Theology and communication*, has led to numerous reflections, both in analyzing the points that permit an approach between these two realities, as well as in establishing a relationship as the basis of setting up a theological work. In the first place, the main interest was focused on the research on that relationship and those ways in which conditions favored a true *theology of communication*; in the second place, the interest was focused on the complexity and richness of both subjects, in order to be able to classify and integrate them into a higher synthesis.

Various authors, with different views and perspectives, carried out an analysis on the distinct relationship that could be established between communication and theology. We verified these relationships according to the ecclesiological models (Dulles, 1987: 1507-1523); the way to establish theology in relationship to communication (Felton, 36/1, 1989: 17-23); the approach of theology to communication (Soukup, 1991); the evolution of the rapport established between the Church and mass communication (Joos, 1998: 1561-1567); and finally, the ways of studying the theological object (Carnicella, 1, 1992: 176-180).

Although these approaches present a great quantity of possible relationships, they do not exclude one another. The very fact that we can look at each of these relationships from various theological and communicational perspectives permits us to better comprehend the elements that are necessary to make up a theology of communication and its articulation. In other words, these diverse views, considering the innate nature of theology and communication, made various points of view possible due to the richness/complexity, which not only does not allows just one point of view, rather, permits and necessitates various approaches.

In short, there are essential realities that both concepts of *communication* and *theology* share: first of all, *theology*, as *quaerens intellectum* of the faith, has the study of God as object, that is *communicated*, and all consequences can be derived from this principle; secondly, the original reality of communication is theological because, in the first instance, it is an action that can “be applied” to God, as we could observe in the affirmations of some of the authors studied.

Certain approaches are commonly understood as theology of communication, but they cannot be part of such discipline because they do not have the study of communication as a true and proper “theological objective”. These are:

- **Communicational theology** aims at seeing how theology can become more “communicable,” in a way that can be assimilated by people today; but this does not imply that communication is understood as the main object of study, but only as a means for theology. Substantially, it consists in proposing a “communicatively coherent” theology.
- **Genitive theology** aims at studying communication, but does not treat it as a true and proper “theological object,” but rather as a human activity of communicating, illuminated
by faith and studied by theology, as can be done in any other aspect of human life (such as sports, work, etc.).

- **Interdisciplinary relationship** – between theological science and science of communications – aims not only at utilizing instruments that one science can give to another, but also studies the “common space” of both sciences. In this case, although giving this approach great importance, it cannot constitute the reason to be theology of communication, although presuming so. The fact of being inter-disciplinary admits the existence of sciences placed in relationship. In this case, general theology cannot be placed in relationship with science of communication, but must be the theological discipline that occupies the topic in question, namely, the theology of communication.

These three theological approaches that are valid and necessary must be developed and must occupy a part of the theological thought on communication. However, the true and proper theology of communication, on one hand must be situated above these perspectives, because it must include them, but on the other hand, these approaches constitute the fundamentals and the framework, in order to offer support to their work and a point of reference in which to be placed.

It is necessary to clarify these approaches, because the possibility of correctly locating the theology of communication within the “theological reality” is strictly connected to individuating in order to correctly place the various perspectives regarding the argument.

**Theology of communication and its epistemological statute**

With the intent of fortifying the position of the theme communication in the Church through research of its fundamentals and theological bases, it is necessary to enter into the merit of possibility to make communication an “object of theological study,” and therefore, to find which are the elements for its epistemological statute.

After analyzing various approaches between theology and communication, and after having analyzed the perspectives that are commonly applied to the theology of communication, which are not sufficient to be appropriately defined as theological discipline, we examined certain authors who have presented, in their reflections, pillars at an epistemological level in order to verify the conditions of possibility for a theology of communication, thus permitting us to understand what should be its duty, its arguments and its methodology.

We could not find many authors or writings with such precise drive and interest, however, Mazza, Martinez Diez, Aguire-Sierra, and Martins offer sufficiently clear studies that permit answers to the queries that we have posed ourselves. From their works we came to the following conclusions:

The point of departure for the theology of communication is not a simple enculturation of faith, seen only as exchanging themes and terminologies, and not even a pastoral of the media, where open questions can be made. According to Giuseppe Mazza (Mazza, 2006: 147-158), pastoral theology begins from the concept of self communication of God, the kenosis of the Word, the incarnational dynamic of the Revelation that addresses post modern humanity and that is capable of “finding in humanity the grammar of the divine Revelation” (ibid: 156-157).

It is his way through the development of pastoral theology that interests us, because it is the fundamentals on which he bases his speculation. These fundamentals constitute the object of our study, inasmuch as they propose to us communication as a theological object which, according to him, must be framed within the epistemic theological-fundamental structure, because it is divine communication.
It is worth noting that there does exist a great difference between “restyling” proposed by the communicational theology and the proposal of Mazza, because even if they share their attention on contemporary life, the first deals with “rethinking theology” because it is “communicatively coherent,” whereas the second follows the line of “dogma homogeneous development” (Newman, 1967: 183), indicating the depth of the anthropological change, that goes beyond the simple technical-linguistic problem.

From the study of Martinez-Diez (Martinez Díez, 1994) we can deduce:

a. The justification of necessitating a theology of communication implies that communication occupies a basic role for the person: humana are “personalized” when they communicate.

b. Communication is an essentially human phenomenon, but also possesses an essentially theological dimension. There is an intrinsic link of theological reasoning with the propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem reality.

c. Since Christian faith is essentially “incarnate”, history is a “theological place” in which God reveals Himself.

d. The Revelation is carried out through a series of mediations and among these, communication has a prevalent value.

e. Communication recurs in faith and in theology for the sake of comprehension and for the theological dimension: the religious or theological content of the communicative experience.

f. There are two complementary methods in order to realize the theology of communication. The first is descending or deductive: the reality of human communication shines forth starting from the theological fundamentals of divine communication (Trinity, Revelation, Incarnation) from which it is necessary to clarify the theology of communication that they contain. The second is ascending or inductive: search for a higher intelligence of divine communication that starts from the theological dimension of human communication.

g. Three key concepts to realize the theology of communication: It is necessary to start from a good theory of communication; it is necessary to overcome the tendency of mixing up theology of communication with a theological reflection on social communication means; the specific perspective and the hermeneutic key of theology of communication are offered by faith and by Revelation.

From the study of Aguirre and Sierra (Aguirre & Sierra, 73, 1997) we can deduce:

a. The theology of communication is developed on the terrain of Christology, which is constantly inspired toward eschatology and seeks its practical justification in ecclesiology.

b. The reason why such a discipline exists is because the ultimate principle of human communication is founded on the Trinity.

c. A theological reflection on communication can be fully relevant in the measure it expresses a reflection on human communication carried out in the light of divine revelation: this is the foundation that qualifies theology to speak of communication. Two consequences emerge from this affirmation: Theology becomes incomprehensible if it is not understood as God's self communication; and human communication becomes senseless unless it reaches its fullness of expression and significance in the Trinitarian mystery of communication and communion of God.

d. Communication is the locus theologicus of the manifestation and revelation of the saving will of God for humanity, so the theological reflection on communication is a reflection on the mystery of the communion-communication between God and humanity.
e. It is important not to confuse the theology of communication with a theology of the media or with the relationship between the disciplines of communication and the related theories on communication.

f. The Church cannot shirk from a reflection on the phenomena of communication, because its being, as well as its action, are inscribed in the communicational processes of God with the human race.

g. The theology of communication must be articulated in the great mysteries of the faith: Trinity, Revelation, Christology, Pneumatology, Ecclesiology.

From the studies of Martins (Martins, 1997, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2006) we take the following points:

a. The actual interest for the subject is stimulated by the development of technological media of communication, but cannot be the cause for minimizing the subject to the media. The communication surpasses the media reality, because it existed before and because the media do not exhaust human communication. Human communication cannot be reduced to the transmission of information as it embraces the whole of human life.

b. The redeemed human communication must be the place of search and rediscovery of the truth, giving a meaning to existence, of self and of the divine presence. Truth is presented as a gift of God that reveals God and as a pursuit for those that have this desire in their hearts. The Revelation is the communication of God, and it is the place where it is possible to find the truth.

c. Communication is a reality that marks the whole of human existence in an indelible manner therefore it does not constitute only a sector of human life and it cannot be limited to a simple genitive theology or to a “part” of a theological discipline. Communication is a reality that is present in all the dimensions of Christian existence, both as a human reality as well as a Revelation fact, thus object of scientific reflection on behalf of theology.

d. Revelation, insofar as communication, is not understood as “message transmission” but as “interpersonal dialogue” – the ordinary path of people’s relations – and has as objective the communion between those participating: God and the individual. So, the specific contribution of the theology of communication must begin with asking: in what measure does the Christian Revelation offer a light for a better comprehension of the human communication? This beginning with a theological reflection on the communication between God and humans is actually Revelation itself.

e. Jesus Christ, apex of Revelation, is the fullness of God’s self communication to humanity. Therefore, in Him one finds the answers to the questions on the meaning of communication and how this should unfold in order of truth, in an interpersonal encounter, in relating with others and with God. In Him love is the vehicle of communication that leads to communion.

f. The “communicational reality” of Jesus is not to be identified with His communication techniques, as understood by today’s communication science. On the Cross there is the paradox of “communications” failure and “communications” victory of Jesus. Thus, he re-establishes, once and for all, the communication between God and humanity, with the death of all the self references of communication.

g. Theology is born by a communicative act, has communication as the objective, and its central object of study is communication: communication is found at the centre of any theology whatsoever.

h. Communication is constantly affirmed by God, where communion and communication find perfect correspondence. Hence, both communion and communication, before
constituting a destination of human development, are a reality in God, thus placing themselves at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the human story.

i. The Church is a place of communication, insofar as it is a place of welcoming hospitality and experiencing God’s self communication.

j. The ultimate root of human communication dignity is precisely in the fact that God addresses His Word to humanity. This implies a theological consideration in a session of fundamental theology, intended as the discipline that studies the Revelation and its reception/response on people’s behalf.

k. If in the Old Testament one could consider “divine talk” as a metaphor of human reality (if a person speaks, then God cannot actually speak); in the New Testament the situation is the other way around, because in Christ God speaks, and He does so in fullness, transforming human speech into a metaphor of “divine talk” teaching humanity to “talk”. So, in order to know the meaning of human communication, one must look to God in Jesus Christ.

l. Theology of communication consists of the organization of theological reflection around the central concept of the Christian Revelation: communication. If one were to start from fundamental theology, theology of communication shows how a transversal reflection informs all theology. Fundamental theology constitutes the discipline in which communication must “find its first cradle,” and in this seat the central theological value of human communication is respected.

Pertinent themes
In this present work, it is not our intention to offer a systematic exposition of the various arguments in which one can articulate the theology of communication, and even more so, to give a complete one. However, we must mention the fundamental arguments if we wish to change the logic of comprehension of communication “starting from the human reality”, almost self-referential, which we can apply to God in an analogical manner. These theological reflections allow us to understand the human communication “starting from its foundation: God, communion/communication.” At the very base of the arguments one finds Revelation; at their centre the Incarnation of the Word; and at the top, the culmination, is the Trinity.

At the base of the arguments: Revelation. Revelation, understood as the communicative act of God, is situated at the same base of communication as object of the theological study. This affirmation, even if presented synthetically, has run through several stages, beginning with creation/nature, reaching up to Jesus Christ, in the fullness of time, fullness of the Revelation.

In the midst of these “alpha” and “omega” manifestations, various realities are gathered, thus composing the whole of revelations of God: “many times and in various ways God has spoken” (Heb. 1:1) where the words times and ways include a great variety of events and words, spaces, and times.

But it is looking at all this together that we can verify that Revelation is manifested, fundamentally, as a communicative act of God: Revelation is the communication of God to humanity. In the seeking of what is revealed and of how God revealed himself, we contemplate up to what point God is involved in this Revelation, because “He did not save His own Son, but He gave Him for us all” (Rom 8:32), “in fact the Son of God became human to make us God” (Saint Athanasius).

What is revealed? The content of Revelation is God Himself, because the Word is called the self-communication of God. For this reason, the fundamental characteristic of Revelation
consists of a grace, of a gift. It starts with God's initiative that is free and loving: God loves us. The intrinsic logic of this self communication is this Divine Love that does not only forgive human sin, but gives Himself to the point of bringing humanity into intimate communion with Him.

How is it revealed? God does so in the human manner by making use of human categories: time, space, and the word. Then, the Lord, throughout the entire process of Revelation, has embraced the kenosis of time and space, of history and flesh. History will be the ubi of Revelation, the privileged place in which God will unfold the Mystery of Love and His love for humanity. For this reason it will be a revelation that is progressive, cumulative, and growing towards fullness, in diverse moments, with various events, in a creative variety of ways designed by the greatness of His love and faithfulness, but even in the limitedness of our response and the historic unfaithfulness of His people, turning history into a story of salvation.

If Revelation be a communicative act of God, a personal encounter, dynamic and engaging with people, this unfolding on the part of God requires that people respond: with the response of faith (that is another gift), of abandonment, of trust that He would be our God, our King, our Father. Therefore, Revelation does not have a noetic aim but soteriological one (Cf. John 6:47), in which God is personally involved. In fact, the contents revealed, in the fullness of Revelation, is not a "message" nor "signs" nor "words" said by others, it is a Person (John 10: 35); God, invisible and unpronounceable, took a name and a face in Jesus.

From all the above, it is evident that the theology of communication, in order to understand the very essence of what "communicate" signifies, must start from this very point of Revelation, that is, the communicative event organized by God Himself. This is the communicative event par excellence, from which the conditions and the constitutive parts of every human communication, that claims to be a true communication, should be drawn.

At the centre of the arguments: Incarnation. In dealing with the subject of Revelation as communication, we arrive at the Incarnation, because in Christ Revelation, the story of salvation, the mediations, the Covenant, the Name and the Face of God find completion and fullness. He is the cornerstone of the story of Revelation and salvation. He is the epiphany of the hidden mystery of God, the Lord of time and space that manifests His being (John 21:7) in His presence in the crib (Cf. Luke 2:6) and in His absence in the empty tomb (Cf. Mark 16:6), the Lord of History (Rev 22:13).

Besides Revelation, there is another aspect of the Incarnation that particularly interests the theology of communication: all theological foundations of communication are concentrated and unified in the Person of Jesus the Christ. He is the peak of it because He is the perfect encounter between God and humanity: the hypostatic union is the maximum expression of the communication, and its ultimate goal is the affirmation of the Communicatio idiomatum.

However, the Incarnation-Redemption makes humanity participate in this communication fullness of God with humanity. It is in the divinae consortes naturae that God communicates the divine life to us, and it is here that one understands not only the full value of theological communication, but how essential it is to the personal being that is destined for the fullness in communion. Therefore, it is through the Incarnation and starting from it that the reality of the communication can be known in its essence and in its depth, and only beginning from its deep theological dimensions can one arrive at comprehending its anthropological articulation (Cfr. GS 22).
According to some theologians, communication essentially signifies a phenomenon of people, who in their “pilgrimage situation” journeys towards the eternal home, where God will be all in all (Cf. 1 Cor 15:28) and the communion will be full. If the term communication were to be applied to God, it should be expressed to such a high degree (full, eternal, perfect communication…) that at that point, it would no longer be “communicate” (put in common) but rather the reality of communion (have in common).

It is the fact of handing over intellectual and volitional contents that constitutes the essence of communication. As it is a space-time related fact, it manifests itself as the communication of a series of contents to be transmitted. Among the Divine Persons, there it is no need for the communicatio, as it has been understood, because there is full communication between them and hence it is communio in intellect and love. Rather, among the Divine Persons, there is such immediateness, as each one has the same Truth and Love that renders “communication” unnecessary. Consequently, the Divine Persons do not “communicate,” as they are “communion”. Created persons need this form of communication, in the sense of mediation, in order to transmit formal objects of intellect and will.

Communication is bound to space-time condition and so the first sphere in which it manifests itself is the body. The human person is marked by this bodily dimension that distinguishes it inasmuch as it is a space-time unit. The Divine Persons, who do not have bodies, do not communicate in this way. Human communion is always a scheme that extends in space-time. It is not immediate. Therefore, if we define communion as the sharing of intentional goals of truth and love, then this sharing requires communication.

Therefore, the communicative hinge between God and humanity is revealed, because it is His humanity that allows the communication: on the one hand with the Father it remains Divine Communion but also in the human way; and on the other hand, with humanity, it is not merely human expression but it finds the maximum expression to communicate the Life to those who believe in Him (Cf. John 6: 47). The divinae consortes naturae resounds in the mouth of Jesus: «because you are even where I am» (John 14: 3), and the Abba of Jesus (Mark 14: 36) becomes Abba for the man in the Spirit (Cfr. Gal 4: 6).

The Second Person, who is the Eternal Word of the Father, is at the same time word that communicates, that prays and says Abba. In this sense, a theology of Abba, that is fundamentally a theology of visible missions, of the Incarnation, signifies the inclusion of human communication within the Trinitarian dialogue.

So, the mystery of the Incarnation is of great interest because it is in the hypostatic union that God’s communication with humanity is fully accomplished. It is in the “reality of Jesus” that communication, not only reaches its climax, but even human communication becomes communion; in Him we are in full communion with God.

At the culmination: the Trinity
From Trinity to Trinity through the way of Abba, from communion to communion, through the way of communication. This is the way laid out by God: creation, that is, Trinitarian procession ad extra, starts off from the communicating love of God and to this communicating love comes back; this is its way, from Trinity to Trinity, from its communion to its communion.

However, there is an “inter” that is human history, where the communion is not full, where there is no “sharing in possession” but a “reception in the making” to the point that this love-life can be lost. This is the way to communication, our Homeland (Heaven)’s way of sharing where we hope all is shared, where “God will be all in all” (1 Cor 15:28), always through grace, always through gift, but forever.
Therefore, it is here that theology of communication comes into play, because if communication is the “inter” between two communions, then the point of departure and the point of arrival become essential. The central element needed in order to speak about the Trinity as communion of Persons consists of creating an identity between the individual being in the Trinity and the being in communion. The key to the Trinitarian theology as communio personarum is the relationship that constitutes the individual as an individual and also that which constitutes communion as such. For this, being one is to be in communion. The relationship between unity and Trinity *ad intra* is this: neither unity before Trinity, nor Trinity before unity, but both mutually constitute one another; the Persons are one in personal communion, and the personal communion is what distinguishes them.

In the Trinitarian understanding, all this is understood in the theology of missions, which precisely includes the created reality. Therefore, it is a theology of missions in which the external processions are truly operating in history. Hence, from the moment they are operating in history and vivify it, even history is transformed in an experience environment of that Divine reality.

It is exactly because *agere sequitur esse* that creation, and specifically humanity – in the image of the Trinity (Cf. *Gen* 1:26) – is essentially *communional*, and no communication can bring people to their fullness if this communication does not tend toward *communion*. For this reason all Revelation, from creation to Jesus, is the announcement that they who believe will live in God and God in them (Cf. *John* 14:19-23). Benevolent love, manifested from the freedom from Egypt up to the Passover of Jesus, is the ultimate condition of the possibility of a communication, of a consumed encounter and dialogue. God’s plan of salvation is a project of intimate communication with humanity, so that humans will eventually reach perfect communion. “Communion is the ultimate target of every communication” (Martinez Díez, 1994: 133).

“We must understand the *ad extra* Trinitarian action as temporal effect of eternal processions: in this way, the Trinitarian doctrine opens to the ultimate content of salvation as the self-fulfillment of an eternal communion of life between humanity and God. In fact, this can be understood in the measure that we are given to participate in the intimacy of the life of God. … Through the Incarnation and the Gift of the Spirit, the created world is admitted to the intra-Trinitarian life, and the human person is admitted to participate in all that is owned by that life: as the known with the be-known, as the lover in the beloved; known in the Word, beloved in Love” (Galvan, 2001: 204-226).

**Final considerations**

To study a theological subject implies the conviction that its deepest meaning can be better reached in the light of Christ. The question is what can be done so that theology may acknowledge communication as its object of its study. It is here that a theology of communication begins, because it is a theological science that takes its object under consideration and starts to study it, in order to see its different parts and how they relate to one another. It examines its diverse points of view, its relationship with other theological subjects, and even with other sciences.

What is the theological content of communication? What does the Christian communication as a determining factor of being Christian mean? First and foremost, all of this means to establish characteristic elements of this notion; secondly, one needs to know the elements that integrate it and fix them on the basis of perception that the Church has today.
The lack of theological production (in this field) with important works constitutes a serious problem in “repositioning” the topic of communication in the thought and action of the Church. Since there are no great works at hand, but only an infinite number of articles and publications in the contexts of other scripts, the theology of communication cannot be considered in its true dimension, nor can it be considered in its proper ratio studiorum. The paradox is on the one hand, communication is transversally present in all theology, and on the other hand, in general, the “theological object of communication” cannot find its proper place in the world of theology and theologians, nor in a place for theology in the world of communication and of communicators.

In the measure in which theology is understood as *fides quaerens intellectum*, it imposes a theological reflection on communication in “strong sense” and demands a departure from the formalities and from the logic of the salvific self-communication with which God has wanted to reveal himself to humanity. In the divine dynamics that have revealed His tri-personal mystery and received humans into these dynamics, it is good to investigate and unveil the sense of *communicating*, starting from what it means in God, in order to understand what it means in us. After which, as the theological journey ends, one can arrive at the approach that undertakes the human communicative capacities to a pastoral theology and a pastoral of media, and people that make use them. Behold the theology of communication, that “has its first cradle” in fundamental theology, journeying transversely through all theology, and furnishing a frame and an arrangement to all the theological and pastoral developments on communication.

To Be Trinitarian (communication-communion) and act in the Revelation (self-communication of God) and the Incarnation of the Word (insofar as it is a definitive Word of God to humanity) read in a communicational key, does not only allow us to justify a theology of communication, but demands it. This becomes even more necessary insofar as the hermeneutics of the world are essentially communicational. This means that communication is essential to human culture and of the world, especially in the times in which we live.

However, we are not dealing with human communication taken in the common manner of understanding, nor in the sense given by the science of communication in explaining communication’s essence, the elements that compose it and its internal dynamics. If in knowing Christ, we know the Father, and in His Mystery we come to know the our own mystery, then it is the Divine speaking, in Christ, that we can find the essential keys to all human speech.

All human communication derives from being in *communicatio-communio* in God, in the participation to the being and to grace. It is in Christ that one finds the answers to the questions on what is communication and on how one should proceed. The Incarnation unveils constitutive elements of communication: an interpersonal encounter, a relationship with others and with God, love as vehicle, truth as condition, and communion as the aim.
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