Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 49:4, Fall 2014

DUMITRU STĂNILOAE ON THE *FILIOQUE*: THE TRINITARIAN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SON AND THE SPIRIT AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS BETWEEN CHRISTOLOGY AND PNEUMATOLOGY

Viorel Coman

PRECIS

Since twentieth-century theologians have found in the doctrine of the Trinity the structuring principle of Christian theology, this essay surveys Dumitru Stăniloae's trinitarian theology and its implications for ecclesiology in the context of the *filioque* debates. Moreover, it argues that Stăniloae's emphasis on the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit as the basis of their relationship in the Church served as a successful way toward the articulation of an Orthodox ecclesiology that maintains a real balance between Christology and pneumatology.

Undoubtedly, Dumitru Stăniloae (1903–93) is the most important Romanian Orthodox theologian[1] of the past century. His academic and spiritual works have largely influenced and nourished the younger generation of Christian scholars and theologians, who have constantly interrogated his creative and inspiring theology.[2] As the title indicates, the task of this essay is to assess Stăniloae's understanding of the intratrinitarian relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit and its significance for the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology. It is my conviction that, without being totally innovative, Stăniloae's trinitarian theology creatively tried to solve one of the sharpest critiques addressed by Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians to the Orthodox rejection of the *filioque*, that is, that the repudiation of the *filioque* makes the intratrinitarian relationship between the Son and the Spirit unclear; consequently, at the level of Orthodox ecclesiology, Christology has little connection with pneumatology. I will briefly expose the theological and ecumenical context that Stăniloae faced in shaping his trinitarian thinking. I

[1]In 1993, French Orthodox theologian Olivier Clément trustworthily named Dumitru Stăniloae "the greatest contemporary Orthodox theologian" (Olivier Clément, "Le Père Dumitru Staniloae et le génie de l'orthodoxie roumaine," in Ioan I. Icã, Jr., ed., *Persoanã şi comuniune* [Sibiu: Arhiepiscopia ortodoxã, 1993], p. 82).

[2]There are several doctoral dissertations on Stăniloae's theology of Trinity and ecclesiology, including Ronald Roberson, "Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiology: The Contribution of Dumitru Staniloae and Younger Colleagues," unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1988); Daniel Munteanu, *Der trostende Geist der Liebe: Zu einer ökumenischen Lehre vom Heiligen Geist über die trinitarischen Theologien J. Moltmanns und D. Staniloae* (Neukrichen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003); Sorin-Constantin Şelaru, "L'Église, image du mystère de la Trinité: Les accents ecclésiologiques de la théologie de Dumitru Staniloaë," unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Strasbourg, 2008); Radu Bordeianu, *Dumitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, Ecclesiological Investigations 13, Continuum Imprint (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2011); and Danut Manastireanu, *A Perichoretic Model of the Church: The Trinitarian Ecclesiology of Dumitru Staniloae* (Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012).

will then extensively present his thoughts on the issue of the *filioque*, paying particular attention to the intratrinitarian and temporal relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit. Finally, I will draw some conclusions.

I. Theological Context—A Fruitful Re-Encounter between East and West

A. Ecclesiological and Trinitarian Revival

The past century has increasingly known an unprecedented interest in ecclesiology. The first theologian who referred inspiredly to the twentieth century as "the century of the Church" was German Protestant bishop and theologian Otto Dibelius.[3] Nearly thirty years later, French Jesuit Henri de Lubac echoed Dibelius's statement by firmly and rightly saying:

> For some time there has, in fact, been a great deal of talk about the Church—much more than in the past, and about a much more comprehensive sense of the word. This much is common experience, and indeed some people find themselves tempted to say that there is altogether too much talk—and ill-considered talk at that—about it. . . . In a word, it seems as if, as far as the development of doctrine is concerned, the twentieth century is destined to be "the century of the Church".[4]

Several decades later, Orthodox theologian Bishop Kallistos Ware conclusively confirmed Dibelius's prophetic statement, emphasizing the fact that ecclesiology has also been the dominant Orthodox theological theme.[5]

---

[3]Otto Dibelius, *Das Jahrhundert der Kirche: Geschichte, Betrachtung, Umschau und Ziele*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Furche, 1927).

[4]Henri de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church*, tr. Michael Mason (New York and London: Sheed and Ward, 1956 [orig.: *Méditation sur l'Eglise* (Paris: Montaigne, 1953)], pp. 3 and 11. A brief survey of Roman Catholic ecclesiology of the last century is offered in Avery Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies* 50 (September, 1989): 419–442. Dulles's survey is in two major parts: the 25 years to the end of Vatican II (1940–65), and the 25 years since the council (1965–89). Among the Roman Catholic ecclesiologists of the first period, the American Jesuit mentioned especially the names and the works of Charles Cardinal Journet, *L'église du Verbe incarné*, 3 vols. (Bruges: Desclée De Brower, 1941, 1951, 1969); and several by Yves Congar: *Chrétiens désunis: Principes d'un 'oecuménisme' catholique* (Paris: Cerf, 1937); *Esquisses du mystère de l'église* (Paris: Cerf, 1941); *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1950); *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris: Cerf, 1953); and *Le mystère du temple* (Paris: Cerf, 1958). Post-Vatican II ecclesiology has continued to be developed by the principal theologians of this period. Further, Dulles mentioned some other important ecclesiological voices: Karl Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), and *The Shape of the Church to Come* (New York: Seabury/Crossroad, 1974); Hans Küng, *Die Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1967); Heribert Mühlen, *Una mystica persona*, 3rd ed. (Munich: Schöningh, 1968); Louis Bouyer, *L'Église de Dieu* (Paris: Cerf, 1970); and Jean-Marie R. Tillard, *Église des églises* (Paris: Cerf, 1987). At the end of his article, Dulles broadly spelled out some ecclesiological aspects related with secular and political theology, including Latin American liberation theology. The final lines give a compact summary of the 1985 Final Report of the Synod of Bishops.

[5]"What has been the principal issue confronting Orthodox theology during the century that has just drawn to close? . . . For myself, I see the dominant theme in Orthodox theology during the past century as *ecclesiology*" (Metropolitan Kallistos Ware, *Orthodox Theology in the Twenty-First Century* [Geneva: WCC Publications, 2012], p. 17; emphasis in original). "What will be the dominant theological *leitmotif*

Orthodox theology owes this revived interest in ecclesiology partly to Western theology. In the first quarter of the twentieth century, important theologians had to leave their native Russia and move west. Consequently, this providential encounter with the Western world led them to give an account of their self-understanding as Orthodox. Moreover, the ecumenical movement should be clearly mentioned among the key factors that contributed to this rapid ecclesiological renaissance.[6] Confronted with Roman Catholic and Protestant ecclesiologies, Orthodox theologians had to ask themselves what made Orthodox ecclesiology different and what they had in common with Western Christianity.[7] Another great achievement of the twentieth-century ecumenical encounter between East and West has been the realization of the trinitarian dimension of the Church. Both Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians have strongly highlighted that the Church hardly needs to reflect in its "very being the way God exists, i.e., the way of personal communion."[8] In its own being the Church is a mystery rooted in the life of the Trinity, and the Church's communion should reflect the trinitarian communion. Accordingly, diversity and unity in the Church take their inspiration from the trinitarian life. As John

---

in the new century on which we are now embarking? I make no claim to be a prophet, but here is my own answer. In the twenty-first century, undoubtedly ecclesiology will continue to absorb our attention. It is my conviction, however, that there will be a shift in the central focus of theological inquiry from ecclesiology to anthropology" (Ware, *Orthodox Theology*, p. 25). Ware considered the Orthodox revival of ecclesiology to be the result of two main factors: the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, when the symphony "between Church and state had been abruptly terminated," and "the widespread emigration of Orthodox Christians to the West" (Ware, *Orthodox Theology*, p. 18).

[6]Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, in his comprehensive and critical survey of the doctrine of the Church, pointed out that "the main catalyst for the rapidly growing ecclesiological interest has been the ecumenical movement" (Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical, and Global Perspectives* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002], p. 7).

[7]It is important to mention here: (1) Georges Florovsky's ecclesiological articles: "The Catholicity of the Church," in E[ric] L[ionel] Mascall, ed., *The Church of God* (London: S.P.C.K., 1934), pp. 53–74; and "The Limits of the Church," *Church Quarterly Review* 117 (October, 1933): 117–131; (2) Nicholas Afanasiev's *L'Eglise du Saint Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1975), and his articles: "La Doctrine de la Primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie," *Istina*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1957), pp. 401–420; "L'Église qui préside dans l'amour," in Nicholas Afanasiev et al., eds., *La Primauté de Pierre dans l'Eglise orthodoxe* (Neuchâtel/Paris: Delchaux et Niestlé, 1960), pp. 57–110; and "Una Sancta: En mémoire de Jean XXIII, le pape de l'Amour," *Irénikon*, vol. 36, no. 4 (1963), pp. 436–475; (3) Vladimir Lossky's masterpiece, *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient* (Paris: Editions Montaigne, 1944); and (4) Alexander Schmemann's inspiring work, *L'Eucharistie sacrement du Royaume*, tr. Constantin Andronikof (Paris: OEIL, 1985). I should not leave the impression that during the past century Orthodox ecclesiology has been exclusively the fruit of Russian theologians. John Zizioulas's prolific thoughts on ecclesiology continue to be an important source of inspiration for both Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians. His major work, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), can hardly be surpassed. One should not forget the significant ecclesiological contributions of Ioannis Karmiris and Justin Popovitch, or the excellent neo-patristic ecclesiological synthesis of Dumitru Stăniloae, that we discuss in part in the present essay. Furthermore, Panagiotis N. Trempelas's contribution should not be neglected: *Dogmatiki tis Orthodoxou Katholikis Ekklisias* (Athens: 1959), pp. 226–307.

[8]John D. Zizioulas, "The Church as Communion," in John D. Zizioulas, *The One and the Many: Studies on God, Man, the Church, and the World Today*, ed. Gregory Edwards (Alhambra, CA: Sebastian Press, 2010), p. 52. The same idea was expressed by Zizioulas when he wrote, "The Church has its basis in the trinitarian life of God" (John D. Zizioulas, *Lectures in Christian Dogmatics*, ed. Douglas Knight [London: T&T Clark, 2008], p. 139). See also Boris Bobrinskoy, "Communion trinitaire et communion ecclésiale," *Contacts*, vol. 54, no.198 (2002), pp. 169–189; and his *Le mystère de l'église: Cours de théologie dogmatique* (Paris: Cerf, 2003), pp. 31–37.

Behr has rightly pointed out, the relationship between Trinity and Church has been explored largely through what is commonly referred to as "communion ecclesiology."[9] However, we should not be tempted to think that this mutual approach between East and West has always excluded polemics, tensions, or sharp criticism.

Given the fruitful revival of trinitarian ecclesiology, the issue of the *filioque* has again been called into question, especially by some Orthodox theologians. It has been necessary for these Eastern theologians to find out if the procession of the Holy Spirit, as Roman Catholic theology describes it, has practical consequences for the Church's life, structures, and organization—or if the *filioque* is only an abstract debate without practical implications for ecclesiology. Conversely, Roman Catholic theologians have striven to demonstrate that a doctrine of the Trinity without the *filioque* could lead to ecclesiological errors as well, and they have wondered how the connection between the economy of the Son and the economy of the Spirit can be explained otherwise.

B. The *Filioque* and Its Ecclesiological Implications

It is not my task to retrace here the entire theological debate on the *filioque* that has governed the discussions between Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians in the past century. Rivers of ink have flowed from academic towers in an attempt to present the issue comprehensively.[10] In what follows I shall limit myself to a brief consideration of the criticism raised by both Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians regarding the ecclesiological implications of the *filioque* in the life of

---

[9]John Behr, "The Trinitarian Being of the Church," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, vol. 48, no.1 (2004), p. 67. In the Roman Catholic Church, Yves Congar is characterized as one of the most important promoters of an ecclesiology understood in terms of communion. Joseph Famerée emphasized that Congar is, in fact, "the theologian of the ecclesial communion" (Joseph Famerée, "Yves Congar nous interroge encore," *Revue théologique de Louvain*, vol. 28, no. 3 [1997], p. 377). The same idea was expressed by Avery Dulles in his *Models of the Church* (New York: Image, 1978), p. 53. For a comprehensive study on Congar's communion ecclesiology, see Alain Nisus, *L'Église comme communion et comme institution: une lecture de l'ecclésiologie du cardinal Congar à partir des Eglises de professants* (Paris: Cerf, 2012). In the Orthodox Church, John Zizioulas is commonly regarded as the supporter of the ecclesiology of communion (see Gaëtan Baillargeon, *Perspectives orthodoxes sur l'Église—Communion: l'oeuvre de Jean Zizioulas* [Montréal: Paulines; Paris: Médiaspaul, 1989]).

[10]See A. Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, U.K., and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); Tia Kolbaba, *Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century* (Kalamazoo, MI.: Medieval Institute, 2008); Dennis Ngien, *Apologetic for Filioque in Medieval Theology* (Milton Keynes, U.K., and Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2005; repr.:—Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013); Peter Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002); Bernd Oberdofer, *Filioque, Geschichte und Teologie eines ökumenischen Problems* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupert, 2001); Aristeides Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1983; Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996); Richard Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1975); Robert M. Haddad, "The Stations of the Filioque," *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, vol. 46, nos. 2–3 (2002), pp. 209–268; Emmanuel Clapsis, "The *Filioque* Question," *Patristic and Byzantine Review*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1982), pp. 127–136; Brian E. Daley, "Revisiting the *Filioque*: Part 1—Roots and Branches of an Old Debate," *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (Winter, 2001): 31–62; Brian Daley, "Revisiting the *Filioque*: Part 2—Contemporary Catholic Approaches," *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (Spring, 2001): 195–212; Ralph Del Colle, "Reflections on the *Filioque*," *J.E.S.* 34 (Spring, 1997): 202–217; and Avery Dulles, "The *Filioque*: What Is at Stake?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 59 (January–April, 1995): 31–47.

the Church. In doing so, a brief survey of the twentieth-century controversy on the *filioque* aims at providing a clear picture of the discussions that have influenced Stăniloae's trinitarian theology.

Modern Orthodox theologians have held two different opinions on the implications of the *filioque* in ecclesiology:

(1) The *filioque* debate is a "sterile and empty debate"[11] without practical consequences for the life of the Church. The main supporter of this idea was Sergius Bulgakov (1871–1944), an ecumenically minded theologian, who confidently claimed that the *filioque*

> is not a heresy or even a dogmatic error. . . . *There is no dogma of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son*, and therefore particular opinions on this subject are not heresies but merely dogmatic hypotheses . . .
>
> The best evidence for this is the fact that, *in practice*, the two sides, West and East, do not differ in their veneration of the Holy Spirit, despite their divergences regarding the procession.[12]

Moreover, Bulgakov stressed that

> it would have been natural to expect that the existence of such a grave heresy, of such a fundamental dogmatic divergence, would permeate the entire life of the two churches and their entire doctrine. Over the course of many years, I have sought traces of this influence, and I have attempted to comprehend the *life*-significance of this divergence and to find out *where* and *in what* it is manifested *in practice*. And I must admit that I have not been able to find this practical life-significance; and, more than that, I deny that there is any such significance."[13]

He concluded that the *filioque* did not represent an *impedimentum dirimens* for the union of the Churches.[14]

(2) The *filioque* is the cause and root of all Roman Catholic ecclesiological errors. This second position has been heavily shaped by Vladimir Lossky (1903–58). According to this Russian theologian from Paris, the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is essentialist. Moreover, stressing the unity to the detriment of persons and, consequently, asserting that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from a single source or principle, the West reduced the role of the Spirit to a mere function of the divine unity. Nevertheless, Western *filioquism* implies a subordination of the Holy Spirit to the Son,[15] which has practical consequences in the

---

[11]Sergius Bulgakov, *The Comforter*, tr. Boris Jakim (Grand Rapids, MI, and Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2004 [orig., 1936]), p. 148.

[12]Ibid.; emphasis in original. Subsequently, Bulgakov's ideas have been shared by Orthodox theologian Theodore Stylianopoulos, who wrote: "On the practical level it seems impossible to show how such subtle theological interpretations actually impact on the life of a Christian because the Holy Spirit can act or cease to act in a person whether or not he or she is informed about such subtleties" (Theodore G. Stylianopoulos, "The *Filioque*: Dogma, Theologoumenon, or Error?" *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 31 [Fall–Winter, 1986]: 285).

[13]Bulgakov, *The Comforter*, p. 131; emphasis in original.

[14]See ibid., p. 147.

[15]See Lossky, *Essai sur la théologie mystique*, pp. 242–243. The main ideas of Lossky on *the fil-*

Church's life: the subordination of charisma to the institution, of the laity to the clergy, of the person to the institution, of freedom to power. As André de Halleux emphasized in his article "Orthodoxie et Catholicisme: du personnalisme en pneumatologie,"[16] Lossky has never explicitly vocalized in his books the ecclesiological consequences mentioned above. The ideas can be found in an embryonic manner in the Russian theologian's thoughts, but, based on Lossky's course notes, his disciple, Olivier Clément, systematized and amplified them.[17] Surprisingly enough, Lossky was not the first theologian who argued that the doctrine of the Church and the *filioque* connect reciprocally. Seven centuries earlier, Western theologian Thomas Aquinas defended the primacy of the bishop of Rome on the basis of the *filioque*:

> The error of those who deny the primacy of the Vicar of Christ over the universal Church bears a resemblance to the denial of the procession of the Holy Spirit with regard to the Son. In fact it is Christ himself, the Son of God, who consecrates his Church and seals it by the Holy Spirit as by a character and a seal. . . . And similarly the Vicar of Christ, by his primacy and his solicitude as a faithful servant, keeps the universal Church subject to Christ.[18]

Over the centuries, Western theologians have also tried to demonstrate that a doctrine of the Trinity without the *filioque* could lead to some ecclesiological errors: the gulf between the economy of the Son and the economy of the Spirit. In the twentieth century, the criticism of Orthodox theology of the Trinity has been reopened in some Roman Catholic and Protestant theological circles. According to some Western theologians, Eastern "monopatrism" (the procession of the Spirit, like the generation of the Son, can only be from the Father alone) implies the following ecclesiological disadvantages:

1. Making the Father the sole cause of the Spirit and the Son, Orthodox theolo-

---

ioque have been published in his "La procession du Saint Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe," in Vladimir Lossky, *À l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu* (Paris: Éditions Aubier-Montaigne, 1967; Paris: Cerf, 2006 [E.T.: *In the Image and Likeness of God*, ed. John H. Erickson, Thomas E. Bird, and John Meyendorff (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974; new ed., 2001)]), pp. 67–93.

[16]André de Halleux, "Orthodoxie et Catholicisme: du personnalisme en pneumatologie," *Revue théologique de Louvain*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1975), pp. 12–13.

[17]See the article of Olivier Clément, "Vladimir Lossky, un théologian de la personne et du Saint Esprit," *Messager de l'exarchat du Patriarch russe en Europe occidentale*, vol. 8, nos. 30–31 (1959), pp. 137–206; republished in Olivier Clément, *Orient-Occident—Deux passeurs: Vladimir Lossky et Paul Evdokimov*, Perspective orthodoxe 6 (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1985), pp. 17–103.

[18]Thomas Aquinas, *De erroribus Graecorum*, chap. 32, cited in Bertrand de Margerie, *The Christian Trinity in History*, tr. Edmund J. Fortman, Studies in Historical Theology 1 (Still River, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1982 [orig.: *La Trinité Chrétienne dans l'Histoire* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1975)]), p. 177. Drawing on Aquinas's reasoning, Catholic theologian de Margerie responded to Lossky's critique: "The Christ who governs his Church visibly through his Vicar, governs it invisibly through the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth which he sends to her. The strict parallel between ecclesiology and pneumatology so manifest in the *Filioque*, brings out the pneumatic and spiritual character of the divine institution of the papacy without exaggerating an external authority (as the Orthodox say) because it becomes interiorized by the Spirit of the Son, who promotes only the glory of the Father through submission to the Vicar of the Son" (de Margerie, *Christian Trinity*, p. 177).

gy has a subordinationist tendency.[19] Consequently, the Eastern overemphasis on the Father as the sole origin of the Son and the Spirit has practical consequences in the life of the Church, where the authority of the bishop over the priesthood of all believers mirrored the special intratrinitarian place of the Father. Both Erik Peterson and Jürgen Moltmann detected a close connection between the Trinity seen as a hierarchical entity and political monarchy.[20] "It is only when the doctrine of the Trinity vanquishes the monotheistic notion of the great universal monarch in heaven, and his divine patriarchs in the world, that earthly rulers, dictators and tyrants cease to find any justifying religious archetypes any more," wrote Moltmann.[21]

2. According to the Latin fathers of the Church and different Western theologians, in the economy of revelation the Spirit is revealed as the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ points toward the eternal relationships between the Spirit and the other two Persons of the Trinity. Consequently, since in the economy of salvation the Spirit is sent by both the Father and the Son, the Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son.[22] As a matter of fact, the monopatrist position promoted by Orthodox theology "invites an unfortunate split between what God is in Himself (the 'immanent Trinity') and how He acts in the history of salvation (the 'economic Trinity')."[23]

---

[19]George S. Hendry, "From the Father and the Son: The *Filioque* after the Nine Hundred Years," *Theology Today* 11 (January, 1955): 450.

[20]See Erik Peterson, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Teologie im Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig: Hegner, 1935); and Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God*, tr. Margaret Kohl (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row; London: SCM Press, 1981 [orig.: *Trinität und Reich Gottes: Zur Gotteslehre* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1980)]).

[21]Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, p. 197.

[22]For Augustine, the economy is a means of explaining the eternal intratrinitarian relations in such a way that the Spirit is depicted as the One who proceeds from the Father and the Son. On the basis of the fact that the Spirit is "sent by the Father and the Son" (Jn. 14:26, 15:26) and is called "the Spirit of Christ" (Rom. 8:9) or "the One who receives from the Son" (Jn. 16:13), the Latin father claimed that the Spirit should also proceed eternally from both the Father and the Son: "Why, therefore, should we not believe that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son since he is also the Spirit of the Son? For if he did not proceed from him, [Jesus] after the Resurrection, showing himself anew to his disciples, would not have breathed upon them, saying, 'Receive the Holy Spirit.' For what else did that insufflation signify except that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from him?" (Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus* 99.7, in PL vol. 35, 1889 [E.T.: St. Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John, 55–111*, vol. 4, The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 90, tr. John W. Rettig (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 1994), p. 226]). Following Augustine, Thomas Aquinas also argued that those biblical passages that speak of the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom. 8:9; Gal 4:6; Acts 16:7) or depict the Spirit as "receiving from the Son" (Jn. 16:14) reveal the Spirit as proceeding eternally from the Father and the Son; see Thomas Aquinas, *Questiones disputatae de potential dei* III, q. 10, art. 4 (E.T.: *On the Power of God*, tr. Dominican Fathers [Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1932], p. 202).

[23]Dulles, "The Filioque," p. 39. Karl Barth also called into question the monopatrist position advanced by Orthodox theology, emphasizing that God reveals Godself in the economy of salvation as God is in Godself: "God in His revelation cannot be bracketed by an 'only,' as though somewhere behind His revelation there stood another reality of God . . . In connexion with the specific doctrine of the Holy Spirit this means that He is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son not just in His work *ad extra* and upon us, but that to all eternity—no limit or reservation is possible here . . . The Eastern doctrine does not contest the fact that this is so in revelation. But it does not read off from revelation its statements about the being of God 'antecedently in Himself'" (Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. 1, part 1: *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance [Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark, 1975], pp. 479–480). For a comprehensive introduction to Barth's doctrine of the procession of the Spirit, see: David Guretzki,

3. In rejecting the *filioque*, Orthodox theology, from a Western point of view, on the one hand, does not pay enough attention to the intratrinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit and, on the other hand, in the history of salvation, it disconnects Christology and pneumatology. Therefore,

> the monopatrist position runs the risk of portraying the Son and the Spirit as two autonomous and competing agencies, so that what is given to the Son is subtracted from the Spirit and vice-versa. This portrayal imperils the unity of the economy of salvation, according to which all grace and sanctification are from the three divine persons operating in unison—from the Father as sending, from the Son as sent by the Father, and from the Holy Spirit as sent by both the Father and the Son. . . . In some Eastern theologies one gets the impression that an independent sphere of action is being allotted to the Spirit. This tenet would compromise the unity of the godhead and the universal efficacy of Christ's redemptive mediation.[24]

Speaking of the alleged Eastern split between the economy of the Son and the economy of the Spirit, Robert Lethman added: "This, the West claims, has led to a gulf in the East between theology and piety. Speculative theology, grounded on the Logos, has been separated from worship and mediated by the Holy Spirit."[25] Summarizing the most important ecclesiological and ethical consequences of Eastern theology of the Trinity, Matthias Haudel pointed out:

> The view which was postulated in reaction to the *filioque*, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father "alone" (cf. Photius), forced a one-sided concentration on the third article, thus on pneumatology (the Spirit). This is also true of the assumption that God is known only through the power, or the energies, communicated by the Holy Spirit. The one-sided emphasis on the Spirit, with its deficient link to Christology, leads not only to the danger of an eschatological *theologiae gloriae* anchored in the third article (glorification or *theosis* of humankind, *symphonia* of God and the world: The Byzantine empire ideology), but also to the danger of making an absolute of one's own spiritual experience and thus of one's own church tradition. The emphasis on the inner *inter*personal divine communion (social-trinitarian analogies) and on the independence of the Holy Spirit corresponds to the synodal principle and the concept of fully catholic (autocephalic) nature of local churches. The danger of an apparent tritheism, due to seeing the persons of the Trinity as too independent of one another, gives rise to the ecclesiological danger of too tenuous a connection among local churches.[26]

Karl Barth on the Filioque (London: Ashgate, 2009); and Matthew Baker, "The Eternal 'Spirit of the Son': Barth, Florovsky, and Torrance on the *Filioque*," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 12 (October, 2010): 382–403.

[24]Dulles, "The Filioque," p. 40.

[25]Robert Lethman, "The Trinity between East and West," *Journal of Reformed Theology*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2009), p. 48. Although he disagreed with this criticism, Lethman quoted Herman Bavinck, who claimed that the Eastern repudiation of *the filioque* leads to a piety dominated by mysticism (Herman Bavinck, *The Doctrine of God* [Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, repr.1977], pp. 313–317).

[26]Matthias Haudel, "The Relation between Trinity and Ecclesiology as an Ecumenical Challenge and Its Consequences for the Understanding of Mission," *International Review of Mission* 90 (October, 2001): 404.

I believe that both critiques regarding the practical implications of the *filioque* for the life organization and structure are simply based on misunderstandings, prejudices, and oversimplifications. Moreover, two different ecclesiologies could not be only the result of two different theologies of the Trinity; there are some historical and social circumstances that clearly shaped these ecclesiologies. Yet, one should not dismiss these two different understandings on the procession of the Holy Spirit as irrelevant or meaningless, but, as I have already pointed out, oversimplifications and exaggerations do not pave the way to sincere dialogue and unity. However, over the second half of the twentieth century, Orthodox, Protestant, and Roman Catholic theologians hardly worked toward resolving the conflict that has divided and still divides Christianity. Setting the issue within a comprehensive theological and historical framework as a necessary endeavor in order to understand properly the way in which two conflicting trinitarian doctrines took shape, "the twentieth century dialogues, both bilateral (e.g., between the Catholic and Orthodox) and multilateral (e.g., those meetings sponsored by the World Council of Churches), were remarkable in the level of consensus reached on the theology of the *filioque*."[27] Although the bilateral and multilateral dialogues have taken conciliatory positions toward Eastern Orthodoxy, the *filioque* controversy is not yet resolved.

C. Stăniloae and the Ecclesiological Consequences of the *Filioque*

In his early career, even, following in the footsteps of Lossky, blamed the *filioque* for all the weaknesses of Roman Catholic ecclesiology. In this regard, he quoted Roger Mehl, who said: "It seems to us that the refusal of the Orthodox Church [to recognize papal primacy] springs from an original conception of the relations between ecclesiology and pneumatology; that the exemplary seriousness with which Orthodox has always considered the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the action of the Spirit in the Church, has preserved it from the pitfalls of an abstract legalism."[28] Afterwards, Stăniloae's ecumenical contact with Western Christianity toned down his previous critique. Unlike Dănuţ Mănăstireanu, who was partly right

[27]See "The *Filioque*: A Church-Dividing Issue? An Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation, St. Paul's College, Washington, DC, October 25, 2003," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 1 (2004), pp. 93–123; "The Greek and Latin Tradition regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit," *L'Osservatore Romano*, September 13, 1995, pp. 3 and 6; Lukas Vischer, ed., *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the* Filioque *Controversy*, Faith and Order Paper 103 (London: SPCK; Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981); Kallistos Ware and Colin Davey, eds., *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Statement Agreed by Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, 1976* (London: SPCK, 1977); John D. Zizioulas, "One Single Source: An Orthodox Response to the Clarification on the *Filioque*," in Zizioulas, *The One and the Many*, pp. 41–45; Daniel Ciobotea, "The Spirit of Truth and Communion: The *Filioque* Problem Today," in Daniel Ciobotea, *Confessing the Truth in Love: Orthodox Perceptions on Life, Mission, and Unity*, 2nd ed. (Bucharest: Basilica, 2008), pp. 89–102; Jean-Miguel Garrigues, "A la suite de la clarification romaine: le Filioque affranchi du 'filioquisme,'" *Irénikon*, vol. 69, no. 2 (1996):, pp. 189–212; Theodore Stylianopoulos, "An Ecumenical Solution to the *Filioque*," *J.E.S.* 28 (Spring, 1991): 260–280; Mark E. Chapman, "A Lutheran Proposal for the Neuralgic Question of the *Filioque*: The L.W.F. at Curitiba, Brazil, 1990," *J.E.S.* 28 (Spring, 1991): 239–259; and Lance P. Nadeau, "Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the *Filioque* Controversy," *J.E.S.* 20 (Winter, 1983): 140–141.

[28]Dumitru Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations and the Life of the Church," in Dumitru Staniloae, *Theology and the Church*, tr. Robert Barringer (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), p. 13.

in claiming, "In terms of the conflict between the Orthodox and Catholics over *filioque* Stăniloae is definitely one of the Orthodox hard-liners . . . together with Lossky and Nissiotis,"[29] Radu Bordeianu's assessment of Stăniloae's theology highlighted the fact that "after [Stăniloae] had become exposed to what recent Catholic theologians actually affirmed [on the procession of the Holy Spirit], he adopted a more reconciliatory position."[30]

In 1964, Stăniloae approached the dividing issue of the *filioque* for the first time in an article called "Trinitarian Relations and the Life of the Church," in which he explicitly and polemically vocalized his concerns regarding the ecclesiological implications of the *filioque*. Nine years later, his second article on this topic ("Recent Catholic Studies about the *Filioque*")[31] extensively analyzed some Roman Catholic reflections on this issue, as they were presented in 1969 at an ecumenical colloquium at the St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. In October, 1978, and May, 1979, the Paith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches organized two consultations to study the controversy over the *filioque*. Stăniloae was one of the Eastern Orthodox theologians summoned to examine the issue at stake, and he made a decisive contribution to the final report. His paper, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His Relation to the Son, as the Basis of Our Deification and Adoption," was a reaction to the position taken at that meeting by Moltmann and Jean-Miguel Garrigues.[32]

After this event, Stăniloae became much more ecumenically minded, trying to find a solution to the issue of the *filioque* that could be widely accepted by both Orthodox and Roman Catholics. In addition to the first volume of his masterpiece, *The Experience of God*,[33] another important contribution of Stăniloae regarding the *filioque* was his lecture, "Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie byzantine et dans la réflexion orthodoxe contemporaine,"[34] delivered in 1982 on the occasion of the 1,600th anniversary of the Second Ecumenical Council (381 C.E.) and of the 1,550th anniversary of the Third Ecumenical Council (431 C.E.) when a theological congress on pneumatology was organized in Rome. In this article, Stăniloae not only summa-

---

[29]Mănăstireanu, *A Perichoretic Model*, p. 209.

[30]Bordeianu, *Dumitru Staniloae*, p. 59.

[31]Dumitru Stăniloae, "Studii catolica recente despre Filioque," *Studii Teologice* 25 (July–August, 1973): 471–505; also published in the Dominican journal *Istina* (vol. 17, nos. 3–4 [1972]).

[32]Dumitru Staniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His Relation to the Son, as the Basis of our Deification and Adoption," in Vischer, *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ*, pp. 174–186 (orig.: "Furcederea Duhului Sfînt de la Tatăl şi relaţia Lui cu Fiul, ca temei al îndumnezeirii şi înfierii noastre," *Ortodoxia* 31 [July–December, 1979]: 583–592). In 1982, Stăniloae published a very similar article in a French version: "La doctrine de la procession du Saint-Ésprit du Père et de la relation de celui-ci avec le Fils en tant que base de l'adoption filiale et de la deification de l'homme," in *Le IIe concile oecuménique: Signification et actualité pour le monde chrétien d'aujourd'hui* (Chambésy-Genève: Editions du centre orthodoxe du patriarcat oecuménique, 1982), pp. 201–211.

[33]Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. 1, 3rd ed. (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 2003), pp. 291–334 (E.T.: Dumitru Staniloae *The Experience of God: Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 1, *Revelation and Knowledge of the Triune God*, tr. and ed. Ioan Ionita and Robert Barringer [Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Fress, 1994], pp. 245–280).

[34]Dumitru Stăniloae, "Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie byzantine et dans la réflexion orthodoxe contemporaine," in *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Atti del congresso teologico internazionale di pneumatologia, Roma, 22–26 marzo 1982*, vol. 1 (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983), pp. 661–679.

rized the trinitarian reflections of St. Gregory II of Cyprus and St. Gregory Palamas, but he also explored to what extent the *filioque* has implications in ecclesiology. He concluded that in the spiritual life of the Roman Catholic Church, despite the doctrine of the *filioque* that emphasizes that the Father and the Son are one principle of the Spirit, Western Christians experience Christ as distinct from the Father.[35]

Stăniloae's last contribution on the issue of the Spirit's procession is represented by his book, *The Holy Trinity: In the Beginning There Was Love,*[36] which was first published in 1993.

II. Stăniloae's Theology of Trinity

A. Stăniloae and the Byzantine Theology of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries

Up to a certain point, Elias O'Brien is right in suggesting that Stăniloae's defense of Orthodox trinitarian theology against the *filioque* relied heavily on Photius's reasoning and objections.[37] However, being aware of the criticism raised by Western theologians against Photius's trinitarian theology,[38] Stăniloae strove to ground his thoughts creatively in the works of the Byzantine theologians of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries and to develop a theology of the Trinity in which not only is the monarchy of the Father strongly defended but also the relation between the Son and the Spirit—which the *filioque* explores—is expressed in terms other than those of causality and origin. Three outstanding Byzantine theologians decisively influenced Stăniloae's trinitarian theology: Gregory II of Cyprus, Gregory Palamas, and Joseph Bryennios.

1. Gregory II of Cyprus

Gregory II of Cyprus was patriarch of Constantinople from 1283 to 1289.

---

[35]Ibid., p. 669.

[36]Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Holy Trinity: In the Beginning There Was Love*, tr. Roland Clark (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2012 [orig.: *Sfânta Treime sau la început a fost iubirea* (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1993)]).

[37]Elias O'Brien, "The Orthodox Pneumatic Ecclesiology of Father Dumitru Staniloae," unpublished M.Phil. dissertation (Dublin: Trinity College, 1984), p. 20. The *Mystagogy* of the Patriarch Photius of Constantinople (c. 810–c. 895) was the first Eastern theological work that severely reacted against the double procession of the Spirit. Over the centuries, Photius's criticism and arguments have represented the basis on which Eastern theologians have firmly grounded their reflections on *the filioque* (*The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, tr. Joseph P. Farrell [Boston, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2005]).

[38]"After the ninth century, however, the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit became one of the polemical themes separating East and West, and the West reproached the East with the fact that they recognized no relationship between the Son and the Spirit, for they did not admit the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father while the West recognized a relation of the origin of the one from the other (*oppositionis relatio*). In response Byzantine theologians attempted to show that on the one hand a relationship of origin between Son and Holy Spirit was not necessary, and that on the other hand there *did* exist a certain relationship which distinguished Son and Holy Spirit as persons" (Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 15; emphasis in original).

According to Aristeides Papadakis, "In the internal life of the Byzantine Church, perhaps no patriarchate in the second half of the thirteenth century is of greater historical and theological significance than that of Gregory II of Cyprus."[39] The Synod of 1285, with its *Tomus* written by Gregory, "the only synodal reaction of the Byzantine Church to the *Filioque*,"[40] represents one of the most consistent and solid reactions to the Western doctrine of the procession. Far from preserving the conservatism of the Photian tradition, Gregory II of Cyprus creatively enriched it by articulating a theology of the procession, arguing that the old theological formula "through the Son" should not be restricted only to the temporal relation between the Son and the Spirit but has to be understood—the patriarch said—as expressesing the eternal manifestation or illumination of the Spirit by the Son, too:

> The particular idea of Gregory of Cyprus is that the Holy Spirit is manifested through the Son not only temporally but also eternally: the "manifestation" or "shining forth" of the Spirit through the Son represents the eternal relation between them. According to Gregory, the expression "through the Son" used by some of the Fathers "indicates the irradiation and manifestation of the Spirit through the Son, for, in a manner known to all, the Paraclete shines forth and is manifested eternally through the Son, like light from the sun through a ray. The phrase 'through the Son' points also to the fact that the Spirit is led forth and given and sent down upon us through the Son, but not that the Spirit subsists . . . through and from the Son or that he receives his existence through and from him."[41]

Interpreting St. Gregory II of Cyprus's thoughts on trinitarian relations, Stăniloae made a clear distinction between "[t]he movement of the Spirit towards existence . . . which is from the Father and the movement towards manifestation or illumination which is from the Son."[42] However, the distinction between the unique procession of the Spirit (the movement of existence) and the Spirit's eternal manifestation should not be seen as two separated movements, because the latter act depends upon the former. Moreover, Stăniloae mentioned the fact that the shining forth of the Spirit from the Son "is not the expression of the identity of essence between Son and Spirit but the expression of a personal relation."[43] As a matter of fact, the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son is not an essential attribute but should be seen as a personal attribute and relation. In shining forth from the Son, the Spirit aquires another personal attribute (besides procession from the Father), as

---

[39]Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, p. 2.

[40]Ibid., p. 3. For an introduction to Gregory's theology, see Jean-Claude Larchet, *La vie et l'oeuvre théologique de Georges/Grégoire II de Cypre (1241–1290), patriarche de Constantinopol* (Paris: Cerf, 2012); Christostomos Savvatos, "Il patriarca Gregorio II il Cipriota ed il problema del Filioque," *Kleronomia*, vol. 19, nos. 1–2 (1987), pp. 205–218; Ioan I. Ică, Jr., "Sinodul constantinopolitan din 1285 şi pnevmatologia patriarhului Grigorie II Cipriotul," *Mitropolia Ardealului*, vol. 32, no. 2 (1987): 47–78; Pérez Martinez, *El patriarca Gregorio de Chipre (ca. 1240–1290) y la transmisión de los textos clásicos en Bizancio* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigationes Cientificas, 1996); and Andrew J. Sopko, "Gregory of Cyprus: A Study of Church and Culture in Late Thirteenth Century Byzantium," unpublished thesis (London: King's College, 1979).

[41]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 17.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid., p. 20.

the Son receives a new personal attribute (besides generation from the Father). Following Gregory's thoughts, Stăniloae stated, "Just as it belongs to the Holy Spirit not only to proceed from the Father but also to be made manifest through the Son, so it belongs to the Son not only to be begotten of the Father but also to manifest the Spirit who shines forth through him."[44]

Stăniloae went on to say that, unlike begetting, which means a mere going forth of the Son from the Father, the movement of procession implies, rather, a departure from one person to reach another one; therefore, the procession of the Spirit from the Father has as its goal the eternal resting of the Spirit in the Son. The significance of the Spirit's resting in the Son is twofold: (1) The Father alone must be the cause of the Spirit's procession; to make the Son another cause of the Spirit's procession implies the assertion that the Spirit goes forth from the Son instead of being the Spirit's eternal place of rest. Actually, this would imply a continuous multiplication of God, because nothing could prevent the Spirit from becoming the cause of another divine Person. (2) The procession of the Spirit from the Father should have as its goal the eternal abiding in the Son; otherwise, the procession of the Spirit would imply "a separate existence as Person alongside that of the Son," and there would therefore be no reason why another Person, as a separate existence, might not go forth from the Father.[45]

At this point, in order to have a clear picture of Stăniloae's thinking on the intratrinitarian relations and their consequences in the life of the Church, three important aspects should be mentioned: (1) Without admitting the procession of the Spirit from the Son, Orthodox theology outlines other relations than those of origin: The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and "rests" upon the Son or "shines forth" from the Son. (2) There is a close connection between the begetting of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Spirit from the Father together with the shining forth of the Spirit from the Son. (3) The sending of the Spirit into the world by the Son reflects the eternal shining forth of the Spirit from the Son. Nevertheless, the fact that Christ is made known to us only in the Holy Spirit reveals the Spirit's eternal resting upon the Son.[46]

2. Gregory Palamas

Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), Archbishop of Thessalonica, was a prominent Orthodox theologian of the fourteenth century whose theological distinction between divine essence and uncreated energies systematized the basic premise that, although God's essence is unknowable, it is still possible to have a real knowledge and experience of God thorough God's divine grace. Written in 1336, Gregory's main work on the *filioque*, *Logos Apodeiktikoi*,[47] argues that the Eastern Fathers of

---

[44]Ibid., p. 21.

[45]Ibid., p. 23.

[46]See ibid., pp. 21–22.

[47]Gregory Palamas, *Traités apodictiques sur la procession du Saint-Esprit*, tr. and notes Emmanuel Ponsoye (Paris: Ancre, 1995), p. 136. Throughout the past century, Gregory of Palamas's theology has been progressively explored by scholars. In 1938, Stăniloae was the first Orthodox theologian to offer a monograph on Gregory Palamas: Dumitru Stăniloae, *Viața și învățătura Sfântului Grigorie Palama* (Sibiu, 1938), but, written in Romanian, it remained largely unnoticed. Among other important theological

the Church used the formulation "through the Son" not to express the Spirit's hypostatic existence but in order to speak of the Spirit's energetic procession. As Edward Siecienski noted, "Palamas's trinitarian theology even found a place for Augustine's 'love' analogy, which had described the Spirit as the bond of love between Father and Son."[48]

Drawing on St. Gregory Palamas's insights, Stăniloae highlighted the fact that the Father, proceeding the Spirit in order to "rest" in the Son, shows the Father's paternal love for the Son, and, moreover, through the Spirit, the Son returns to the Father, manifesting the filial love of the Son for his Father:

> Through the Holy Spirit the Son returns to the Father in order to love him through the Spirit, just as the Father causes the Spirit to proceed in order to love the Son through him, or because of his love for the Son. . . . The Spirit does not move beyond the Son within Trinity, nor does he proceed in isolation from the generation of the Son thus remaining alongside the Son, as it were, without any personal relationship to him. . . . Within the Trinity the Spirit is the one who brings the Father and the Son into unity (a unity of love, not of being), not the one who unravels this unity still more.[49]

Based on the fact that the Son does not possess the Spirit in the same way that the Father does, that is, as the Spirit's cause, the love of the Son through the Spirit does not change his personal character as Son:

> The irradiation of the Spirit from the Son is nothing other than the response

---

works on Palamas, see John Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Seuil, 1959); idem, *St. Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe* (Paris: Seuil, 1976); Georgios Mantzaridis, *The Deification of Man: St. Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984); Jacques Lison, *L'Esprit répandu: La pneumatologie de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Cerf, 1994); and Amphiloque Radović, *Le Mystère de la Saint Trinité selon saint Grégoire Palamas*, tr. Yvan Koenig (Paris: Cerf, 2012).

[48]Siecienski, *The Filioque*, p. 146. In fact, the influence of Augustinian trinitarian theology on Palamas's thinking is a very sensitive topic. Based on the fact that, in the thirteenth century, Augustine's famous *De Trinitate* was translated into Greek by Maximus Planoudes (1255–1305), scholars have been interested to see to what extent Augustine's description of the Holy Spirit as the common love between the Father and the Son inspired Palamas's trinitarian theology. Among the scholars who clearly suggest that Palamas was making use of Augustin's *De Trinitate* is John Meyendorff, who called Palamas "one of the most Augustinian authors of the Christian East" (Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*, p. 175, my translation); although this opinion was severely criticized in John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (Winter, 1960–61): 186–205. Since 1996, Reinhard Flogaus has been one of the prominent scholars who definitively validated the thesis about Augustine's influence on Palamas; see Reinhard Flogaus, "Der heimliche Blick nach Western: Zur Rezeption von Augustins De trinitate durch Gregorios Palamas," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, vol. 46 (1996), pp. 275–297; idem, "Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East and West in the Hesychast Controversy of 14th Century Byzantium," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 1 (1998), pp. 1–32; and idem, "Inspiration-Exploitation-Distinction: The Use of St. Augustine in the Hesychast Controversy," in George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolau, eds., *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008), pp. 63–80. There are still some theological voices that reject the Augustinian influence on Palamas, including R. E. Sinkewicz (Robert E. Sinkewicz, ed. and tr., *St. Gregory Palamas: The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters—A Critical Edition, Translation, and Study*, Studies and Texts 83 [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988]).

[49]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 30.

> of the Son's love to the loving initiative of the Father who causes the Spirit to proceed. The love of the Father coming to rest in the Son shines forth upon the Father from the Son as the Son's love. . . . When it falls upon the Son, however, it is shown to the Father; . . . and joins with the loving subjectivity which the Son has for the Father.[50]

Proceeding from the Father and resting upon the Son, the Spirit has "the role of keeping the other two [divine Persons] . . . from immersing themselves in each other,"[51] and, at the same time, the Spirit of communion is the "loving tie formed between the Father and the Son."[52] Consequently, Stăniloae suggested that the Spirit's role of unification and diversification in the Church cannot help but reflect its intratrinitarian function.

3. Joseph Bryennios

Joseph Bryennios (1350–1436), a Byzantine theologian from Constantinople, has been unjustly ignored by scholars. Initially court chaplain of the Emperor Manuel Paleologus, Bryennios was then appointed imperial ambassador to the West. When Emperor John Paleologus favored union with the Latin Church, Bryennios retired from public life and apparently spent the last years of his life in Crete.

Stăniloae's unceasing effort to find a way to describe the intratrinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit found support in one of Breyennios's lectures on the procession of the Holy Spirit, given in 1422 at the imperial palace in Constantinople. In Breyennios's opinion, the intratrinitarian relationships among the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are very complex; each Person of the Trinity, he said, has two names. While the names of the Father (Father and Cause of Procession) indicate that the Father is the cause of the two other divine Persons, the names of the Son (Son and Word) and the names of the Spirit (Spirit and the One who proceeds) express not only the fact that they are caused but also that they share the fact of being caused together by the same Person. Stăniloae explained that the relationship between the Son and the Spirit,

---

[50]Ibid., p. 31.

[51]Staniloae, *Experience of God*, vol. 1, p. 269. Stăniloae commented about the role of the Spirit at the intratrinitarian level: "The third fulfills the role of 'object' or horizon, assuring the sense of objectivity for the two by the fact that he keeps the two from becoming confused within an indistinct unity because of the exclusiveness of their love, an exclusiveness which can flow from the conviction of each that nothing worthy of love exists outside the other. When a third of the same worth exists, neither of the two who love each other loses sight of the merit of loving that belongs to the third, and both are thereby kept from becoming confused, the one in the other" (Stăniloae, *Experience of God*, vol. 1, pp. 268–269.

[52]Stăniloae, *The Holy Trinity*, p. 63. "The Spirit is sent by the Father to rest in the Son as a demonstration of the Father's love for the Son. For the Father Himself is pleased to rest in the Son through the Spirit who proceeds from Him. But the Son does not remain passive and uncaring in the face of the Father's loving attention. He is pleased that the Father sends His Spirit to Him, and by accepting the Spirit He shows the Father His joy. . . . The Spirit does not proceed from the Father as an end in Himself, but the Spirit constitutes a loving tie formed between the Father and the Son. . . . The Father and the Son unite as Father and Son even more through the Spirit. They are three Persons, but the third does not stand to the side of the other two; He unites Them. He is in each, uniting Them and reinforcing Them in Their distinct qualities even when They speak with us" (Stăniloae, *The Holy Trinity*, pp. 62, 63, and 65).

> [a]lthough [it] is not a causal one it is not on the other hand a purely essential relation, but, according to Bryennios, derives from the fact that the two Persons are differently caused by the Father and so indicates at one and the same time their common and different character as beings who have their causation from the same source and hence also their distinct personal character."[53]

Stăniloae used human relations as an analogy that was meant to explain the intratrinitarian relationships. According to him, one can see that there are human relations that are based on the fact that a person has biologically received his or her existence from another person; however, there are human relations between two persons who have a common biological origin or among all persons due to the fact that they share a common origin and, consequently, a common human nature. Although the second type of human relations, Stăniloae pointed out, does not rest on the fact that one person is the origin of the other, it "actualizes some new characteristic . . . in those who are in relation."[54] In one way or another, each human being is, so to speak, enriched by an encounter with another human being. Metaphorically speaking, each human person to some extent is "born" from every other human being whom one encounters: "Every person 'passes through' the other or others in order to manifest as fully as possible what belongs to him in his very being by virtue of his coming into existence."[55] Aware of the infinite difference that exists between human persons and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, Stăniloae emphasized the fact that the human relations he described could reflect only partially and obscurely the intratrinitarian relationships, in which a divine Person, given its perfection and infinity, does not contribute to the enrichment of the two other Persons.

It is therefore evident that, for Stăniloae, in returning to the Father from the Son, the Spirit bears the personal character of the Son. In short, the Son imprints his personality onto the Spirit, who thus becomes also the Spirit of the Son. As a matter of fact, unlike many Eastern theologians who sharply criticized the *filioque*, Stăniloae was willing to see its positive aspect; that is, the procession of the Spirit cannot be thought of without the generation of the Son. Although Serbian theologian

---

[53]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 34. Stăniloae quoted Bryennios, who said: "That is to say, the Son, because he is the one who . . . possesses the name of Son *vis-à-vis* the Father, for he is the Son of one Father only, not of two; but the name of Word which belongs to the Son alone within the Holy Trinity has reference not only to the Father as the one who is Mind, but also to the Spirit in another way. . . . For the Word belongs to the Father as one who exists from within him, but the Word belongs to the Spirit not as one existing from within the Spirit but as one who has his existence from without, and in fact from the same source whence the Spirit has his own existence, and as one who is consubstantial with the Spirit. The same is true of the one who proceeds. He truly is He Who Proceeds and is so called only in reference to the one who caused him to proceed, that is to say, to the one who is and who is called Father with reference to that other Person who shares with him the character of being caused, namely, the Son. But the Spirit is not and is not given the name of Spirit with reference to the Father alone, but he is Spirit and is called Spirit correctly and truly with reference also to the Son. However, the Spirit belongs to the Father and is named Spirit as one who exists from within him, while in reference to the Son He is Spirit not as one who has his existence from within the Son, but as one who through the Son, that is, together with him, comes forth from the Father and shares one being and one glory with the Son" (Joseph Bryennios, *Twenty-Two Lectures on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* [Buzau, 1832; orig.: *Cuvinte douăzeci şi două de pentru purcederea Duhului Sfânt*], p. 345; cited in Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," pp. 34–35).

[54]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p 35.

[55]Ibid., p. 36.

Athanasie Yevtic called into question Stăniloae's statement, by pointing out that "it would be possible to reach an agreement on dropping out the *Filioque* while still recognizing that it has something valuable to offer,"[56] Stăniloae wanted to suggest that the procession of the Spirit and the generation of the Son are two simultaneous and inseparable acts. He went on to say that "the procession of the Spirit necessarily involves the existence of the Son in whom the Spirit rests when He proceeds from the Father."[57] Without making the Son the second cause of the Spirit's procession, Stăniloae stressed that the shining forth of the Spirit from the Son "marks a progress in the existence which the Spirit receives from the Father, one might say a fulfillment, the achievement of the end for which he came into existence."[58]

The Orthodox Church speaks of an eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit, but not in terms of causality or origin. The Father alone is the "uncaused cause" within the Trinity, yet, as Congar rightly pointed out when commenting on Eastern pneumatology, the "Trinitarian life . . . does not simply consist of processions or relationships of origin. The Fathers and the Orthodox tell us again and again that the Spirit is received in the Son or that he takes from the Son and, in so doing, they are providing a foundation for relationships of reciprocity, the relationships, in other words, of the *perichōrēsis*."[59] The key concept of *perichōrēsis*, historically speaking, as Verna Harrison highlighted,[60] has been a christological term used to describe the interpenetration between Christ's natures; later, the concept of *perichōrēsis* was applied to the Trinity in order to speak of the mutual indwelling of the divine hypostases. Although some theologians, among them Kallistos Ware,[61] relating the notion of *perichōrēsis* to the Greek term "*horos*," consider that the term should be understood as a "circular movement" or as a "circular dance," Stăniloae

---

[56]"il serait possible d'arriver à un accord sur l'abandon du *filioque*, tout en reconnaissant qu'il y a en lui 'quelque chose'" (Athanasie Yevtic, "Danger des hérésies triadologiques dans la théologie contemporaine," in *Le IIe concile œcuménique: Signification et actualité pour le monde chrétien d'aujourd'hui*, p. 492, my translation).

[57]"La procession de l'Esprit présuppose le Fils vers lequel l'Esprit se dirige en partant du Père" (Stăniloae, "La doctrine de la procession du Saint-Ésprit du Père," p. 203, my translation).

[58]Staniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father," p. 184.

[59]Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3: *The River of the Water of Life (Rev 22:1) Flows in the East and in the West*, tr. David Smith (New York: Seabury Press; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983 [orig.: *Je crois en l'Espirit Saint, III: Le Fleuve de Viecoule en Orient et en Occident* [Paris: Cerf, 1980]), p. 75.

[60]Verna [E. F.] Harrison, "Perichoresis in the Greek Fathers," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 1 (1991), p. 61. For a comprehensive introduction to the theology of *perichoresis*, see George Leonard Prestige, "*Perihoreo* and *Perichoresis* in the Fathers," *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (April, 1928): 242–252; Brian Hebblethwaite, "*Perichoresis*: Reflections on the Doctrine of the Trinity," *Theology* 80 (July, 1977): 255–261; Peter Stemmer, "Perichorese," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, vol. 27 (1983), pp. 9–55; Joseph K. Hogan, "Two Concepts from Eastern Spirituality: *Perichoresis* and *Epiclesis*," *Diakonia*, vol. 20, no. 2 (1986), pp. 86–89; Daniel F. Stramara, Jr., "Gregory of Nyssa's Terminology for Trinitarian *Perichoresis*," *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (August, 1998): 257–263; Ciril Sorc, "Die perichoretischen Beziehungen im Leben der Trinität und in der Gemeinschaft der Menschen," *Evangelische Theologie*, vol. 58, no. 2 (1998), pp. 100–119; Randall E. Otto, "The Use and Abuse of *Perichoresis* in Recent Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 54 (August, 2001): 366–384; Emmanuel Durand, *La périchorèse des personnes divines* (Paris: Cerf, 2005); and Dănuț Mănăstireanu, "*Perichoresis* and the Early Christian Doctrine of God," "*Archaevs*" *Studies in the History of Religion*, vols. 11–12 (2007–08), pp. 61–93.

[61]Kallistos Ware, *L'ile au-delà du monde* (Paris: Cerf et Sel de la terre, 2005), p. 42.

added that the word

> has been interpreted as meaning a reciprocal interiority for it cannot be understood only as the motion of each Person "around" the others . . . Thus with respect to the Holy Trinity, *perichoresis* must mean *a fortiori* a passage of the Spirit through the Son and of the Son through the Spirit. The Father is also included in *perichoresis* inasmuch as the Spirit passes through the Son as one who is proceeding from the Father and returning to him. Similarly, the Son passes through the Spirit as one begotten by the Father and returning to him. It should also be observed that each divine Person manifests the divine fullness in a form which shows the effects of this passage through the others and of his interior relation with the others.[62]

It becomes even clearer now that Eastern theology, on account of these perichoretic relationships between the divine Persons, insistently emphasizes the fact that "no divine Person is ever, either in the Church as a whole or in the individual believer, without the other divine Persons."[63]

Given the fact that Stăniloae conceived the trinitarian relations as the basis for the relation of the Trinity with the world and the Church[64]—that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have the same relationships in the Church as within the Trinity—the ecclesiological implications of his trinitarian theology are briefly explained in the lines that follow.

B. Ecclesiological and Soteriological Implications

1. The Church as a Chapter of the Doctrine of the Trinity:

Throughout the last century, theologians have tried to articulate the doctrine of the Church in close relationship with the doctrine of the Trinity. Unfortunately, their "self-proclaimed trinitarian ecclesiologies are de facto monistic or binitarian," that is, the Church has been described only in relation with Christ and the Holy Spirit.[65] In this context, what makes Stăniloae's ecclesiology attractive and unique is the full incorporation of the Church into the doctrine of the Trinity. In doing so, Stăniloae managed successfully to overcome the Florovskian interrogation: Is the Church a chapter of Christology or a chapter of pneumatology?[66] On the basis of the fact that Stăniloae conceived the eternal relationships of the divine Persons as the basis of their relationships with the Church, his ecclesiology is a chapter of the theology of the Father as much as it is a chapter of Christology and pneumatology.[67] While the intratrinitarian relationships are extended to the Church, the Church

---

[62]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," pp. 38–39.

[63]Ibid., p. 39.

[64]Staniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father," p. 178.

[65]Radu Bordeianu stated, "The terms monistic and binitarian are probably too strong, since, in reality, it is a matter of priority (at worst) or emphasis (at best)" (Bordeianu, *Dumitru Staniloae*, p. 67, n. 1).

[66]Georges Florovsky, "Christ and His Church: Suggestions and Comments," in Lambert Beauduin, ed., *1054–1954: L'Église et les église: Neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'orient et l'occident* (Chevetogne: Editions de Chevetogne, 1955), p. 165.

[67]In his doctoral dissertation, Bordeianu argues extensively that, in Stăniloae's theology, the Church is a chapter of the doctrine of the Trinity (Bordeianu, *Dumitru Staniloae*, pp. 41–141).

itself is raised up into the Trinity:

> When the Son becomes incarnate and unites men with himself, the love of the Father which is upon him and his own response to the Father's love are assimilated by all who are united with the Son. All are beloved of the Father in the Son and all respond to the Father in the Son with the Son's own love. This is the climactie moment of the condition of salvation: the union of all with Christ in the Spirit, and through the Spirit, in the consciousness of the Father's love for them and of their own love for the Father. Hence salvation is recapitulation in Christ. All are loved in the Son by the Father and all respond in the Son with the Son's love, for inasmuch as all are found in the Son, the Spirit of the Father hovers over all and shines forth from all upon the Father.[68]

Through Christ, all those gathered as members of his Body are placed in a filial relationship with the Father who, "by having a Son from eternity, . . . has from eternity the capacity to make us his children, too, though not through birth from his nature . . ., but through the Son's descent to us."[69] If in Christ human beings become adoptive sons of the Heavenly Father, the Spirit, by resting upon Christ and, consequently, upon all those unite with him, "kindles [their] own loving filial subjectivity"[70] and gives them strength to respond actively to the paternal love of the Father. Since the Church introduces the human being into a personal relationship with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the Trinity represents both its principle of life and its eternal model.

2. An Ecclesiological Balance between Christology and Pneumatology:

According to Stăniloae, the same inseparability, simultaneity, interiority, reciprocity, and mutual interpenetration that characterize the eternal relationships between the Son and the Spirit are reflected in the economy of salvation, where the works of Christ cannot be separated from the works of the Holy Spirit.[71] Since the immanent relationships between the Son and the Spirit determine their temporal relations, it is worth mentioning that Stăniloae's reflections on the constitutive act of the Church effected a balance between the role of Christ and the role of the Holy Spirit, that is, between Incarnation and Pentecost. Therefore, the Spirit—who eternally rests upon the Son—descends upon the humanity assumed in the hypostasis of the Son and deifies it so that in Christ's risen, deified, and fully spiritual body is the foundation of the Church. Moreover, at Pentecost, the Spirit—who eternally shines forth from the Son—shines forth from Christ's body into the human being,

---

[68]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," pp. 31–32.

[69]Dumitru Stăniloae, *Spiritualitate şi comuniue în liturghia ortodoxă* [*Spirituality and Communion in the Orthodox Liturgy*] (Craiova: Editura Mitropoliei Olteniei, 1986), p. 154, my translation.

[70]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 31.

[71]Bordeianu affirmed: "In my estimation, the main reason for Staniloae's success in avoiding the dangers of prioritizing the presence of Christ and the Spirit in the Church was that his ecclesiology was deeply rooted in a very solid Triadology. His discussion of the Spirit of the Son in the immanent Trinity determined his understanding of the Spirit of Christ in the economy of salvation" (Bordeianu, *Dumitru Staniloae*, p. 125).

producing the Church:

> The descent of the Holy Spirit is what gives the Church a real existence; it initiates the indwelling of Christ's deified body in human beings and thereby initiates the Church as well.
>
> The descent of the Holy Spirit is thus the act of transition from Christ's saving work in His personal humanity to the extension of this work within other human beings. Through the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, Christ lays the foundation of the Church in His body, and through these events, the Church's being exists in its potential form.[72]

The Spirit who rests upon Christ's humanity rests as well on those gathered in the Body of Christ, which is the Church. The Spirit's indwelling in the members of the Church not only makes possible their faith in Christ, but it also reveals to them Christ's divinity, fashioning them more and more in the image of the Son and placing them in the paternal love of the Father. However, on the basis of their eternal relations of manifestation, in the economy of salvation, the Spirit not only leads human beings to Christ, but the Spirit is also known through Christ.[73] Given the inseparability, interiority, and reciprocity between Christ and the Spirit, Stăniloae affirmed that

> it has always been the Orthodox judgment that union with Christ can be lived only in the Holy Spirit, and that the experience of being in the Holy Spirit is nothing other than union with Christ. The more vividly one knows Christ and the more one comes to live in him, the more one knows and lives in the Holy Spirit. The more spiritual a life one leads the more lovingly is one bound to Christ.[74]

---

[72]Dumitru Staniloae, *The Experience of God: Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 4, *The Church: Communion in the Holy Spirit*, tr. and ed. Ioan Ionita (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2012), p. 2 [orig.: Dumitru Stăniloae, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1978), p. 202]. Commenting upon Stăniloae's ecclesiological balance between the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit, Peter Bouteneff remarked: "Fr. Dumitru begins his reflection on the Church with a chapter on the descent of the Holy Spirit. It is equally significant that he begins this same chapter by identifying the Church as the fulfilment of the saving work of the Incarnation, associating it with Christ's body with Christ remaining as its head—traditional imagery to which he constantly returns. He effects a balance between Christ and the Spirit in the Church, identifying the Spirit with the transition from Christ's saving work in the fleshly body to his saving work in the spiritual body that is the Church. The Spirit makes Christ's human body into the spiritual body, transparent to its divinity, dwelling in our hearts. . . . In this way, Fr. Dumitru . . . can come up with his traditional but unique formulation of 'the Church pneumatized by the Spirit of the risen Christ'" (Peter C. Bouteneff, Foreword, in Staniloae, *Experience of God*, vol. 4, pp. viii–ix).

[73]"[T]here is a special reciprocity between the Son and the Spirit which is reflected in their contact with the world. The Son by himself transmits the Spirit to those who believe in him. But only through the Spirit is the Son known by those who believe. The Spirit shines out from the Son above all after Resurrection and since the day of Pentecost. But it is exactly on account of this that the face of the Son gains its radiance, and its divine reality (visible or invisible) is intensely felt through the Spirit, or in the measure that the Spirit is communicated by the Son. Thus one can say that the Son makes the Spirit accessible to us, but that the Spirit in his turn makes the Son accessible in his divine interiority, where by the Spirit, we know the Son and rise to the Father in a pure life and in prayer" (Stăniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father," p. 186).

[74]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 14.

Since the unity between Christ and the Holy Spirit truly constitutes the Church and sustains continuously its life, "Both in its unity and in its diversity the Church comes into being as much through the Holy Spirit as through Christ."[75] Furthermore, the same unity between Christ and the Spirit provides grounds for saying that the institutional aspect of the Church "is not devoid of spirituality," just as spirituality does not imply a lack of "structure and institutional order."[76]

C. Immanent Trinity and Economic Trinity

Karl Rahner's widely accepted axiom, "*The 'economic' Trinity is the 'immanent' Trinity, and the 'immanent' Trinity is the 'economic' Trinity,*"[77] which postulates a fundamental identity between "God for us" and "God in Godself," does not contradict Orthodox theology, which also claims that the eternal God is the same as the One who revealed and acted throughout history. However, the second part of Rahner's axiom, that "the 'immanent' Trinity is the 'economic' Trinity," becomes problematic from an Orthodox point of view, because the revelation of God in the history of salvation does not reveal God entirely. In this regard, Orthodox theology maintains that: (1) God reveals Godself freely and in a humble way in the history of salvation; (2) God communicates to human beings through God's uncreated energies, while God's essence or nature remains unknowable; and (3) although there is a distinction between the eternal relations of origin (the Father begets the Son and is the sole cause of the Spirit's procession) and the temporal sending (the Father sends the Son and the Spirit, while the Son and the Spirit send one another reciprocally), the "immanent Trinity" is not disconnected from the "economic Trinity," because the eternal relations of manifestation between the Son and the Spirit are the basis of their temporal relations.

Since in the economy of salvation the relations between Christ and the Spirit mirrored their eternal relations of manifestation, that is, the Spirit rests in, and shines forth from the Son, Stăniloae detected in the New Testament two patterns of Revelation:[78] (1) the classic pattern of succession: Father-Son-Spirit; and (2) the messianic schema of Revelation: Father-Spirit-Son. According to the classic pattern of succession that was revealed mainly at Pentecost, the eternal shining forth of the Spirit from the Son becomes the basis of the Spirit's temporal sending by Christ.

---

[75]Dumitru Staniloae, "The Holy Spirit and the Sobornicity of the Chureh," in Staniloae, *Theology and the Church*, p. 66.

[76]Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 40.

[77]Karl Rahner, *The Trinity*, tr. Joseph Donceel (London: Herder and Herder, 1970; New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1997), p. 22; emphasis in original. Although Rahner's axiom tried to reinvigorate Western trinitarian theology, it has received not only positive comments but also criticism; see, e.g., Fred Sanders, "Entangled in the Trinity: Economic and Immanent Trinity in Recent Theology," *Dialog* 40 (Fall, 2001): 175–182.

[78]For an extensive presentation of Stăniloae's understanding of the two patterns of revelation, see Sorin Şelaru, "Eternal Intra-Trinitarian Relations and Their Economic Consequences: An Approach according to Father Dumitru Stăniloae's Theological Perspective," *International Journal of Orthodox Theology*, vol. 2, no. 1 (2011), pp. 91–92. In his book, *Sfânta Treime între Apus şi Răsărit: Despre Filioque şi alte dileme teologice* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Eikon, 2012), Romanian theologian Ioan Moga historically explores the issue of *the filioque*, seen as a result of two different theological understandings of the relation between 'economic' Trinity and 'immanent' Trinity in East and West.

Furthermore, by being sent by Christ at Pentecost, the Spirit's work could appear as purely instrumental in relation to Christ. Nonetheless, at Christ's baptism, when the same Spirit who rests eternally in the Son descended on Christ, the messianic schema that portrayed Christ as empowered by the Spirit complemented the previous pattern of revelation with a more robust pneumatology that conditions Christology. Stăniloae is of the opinion that the classical schema in which the Spirit could appear as an instrument of Christ's work should always be connected with the messianic schema, because the Spirit

> is sent not only by the Son, in a passive way, but in a very active way the Spirit sends himself when He blows wherever He pleases (John 3:7), and He also sends the Son. This means that the Son and the Spirit not only reveal one another, each of Them from His own position, but They also reveal the Father without sending Him as the Father sent Them . . . The Son and the Spirit are mutually transparent and both make the Father transparent.[79]

In keeping the balance between these two perspectives, not only is "christomonism" downplayed, but a Spirit-centered ecclesiology is also avoided.

In an article published in 1998, Gerald Bray called into question the possible limits of a theology that takes Christ's baptism as a point of access to the eternal relationships between the Son and the Spirit. According to him,

> If the baptism of Jesus is to be taken as a model of the eternal relationship of the Son to both the Father and the Holy Spirit it [this approach] raises the specter of adoptionism once again, a specter that is only reinforced if there is then some connection between the Spirit's descent on him and the Spirit indwelling in us. The thrust of Eastern mysticism may be to raise us to the level of God by developing the concept of deification, but the danger is that in fact Jesus will be lowered to the level of a Christian, deprived of his eternal deity and assimilated to other Spirit-filled believers.[80]

Stăniloae's reflections on the relations between Christ and the Spirit in the history of salvation prove Bray's concern groundless. In taking Christ's baptism as a model of the eternal relationships between the Son and the Spirit, Stăniloae did not consider it to be the sole and exclusive model. While Christ's baptism reveals only the fact that the Spirit rests eternally in the Son, Pentecost informs us equally that Christ sends and gives us the same Spirit who eternally shines forth from the Son of God. Of course, Bray's previous lines are not aimed to accuse Orthodox theology of supporting adoptionism, but they are intended to emphasize that a balance between the two patterns of revelation has continuously to be maintained.

---

[79]"il est communique non seulement par le Fils, c.à.d. d'une manière passive, mais se communiqué lui-même d'une manière active, en soufflant lui-même où il veut (Jean 3, 7), et communique lui-même le Fils. Ceci signifie que le Fils et l'Esprit non seulement se montre réciproquement chacun de sa propre position, mais ils montrent aussi le Père, sans l'envoyer comme Il les envoie . . . Le Fils et l'Esprit se font réciproquement transparents et tous deux font transparent le Père" (Stăniloae, "Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie byzantine," p. 664, my translation).

[80]Gerald Bray, "The Double Procession of the Holy Spirit in Evangelical Theology Today: Do We Still Need It?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41 (September, 1998): 422.

III. Conclusions

By way of conclusion, some remarks are worthy of emphasis:

1. Stăniloae's trinitarian theology is undeniably the result of the influence exercised by the Greek Fathers of the Church and three outstanding Byzantine theologians: Gregory II of Cyprus, Gregory Palamas, and Joseph Bryennios. While Photius of Constantinople, engaged in the *filioque* controversy, argued that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and is only temporally manifested through the Son, from the thirteenth century onward different Byzantine theologians deepened the intuitions of the Greek Father about the eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son. Since the West reproached the East with the fact that the rejection of the *filioque* leaves the eternal relation between the Son and the Spirit unclear, their attempt aimed at showing that a relationship of origin between the Son and the Spirit is not necessary as long as there is a certain noncausal relation of manifestation between them.

2. Since the indissoluble unity between Christ and the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church is rooted in the relationship that, according to Stăniloae, exists between them within the sphere of their inner trinitarian relations, the ecclesiology that he developed succeeded in showing that Orthodox theology does not introduce a separation between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit in the life of the Church. Futhermore, conceiving the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit as the basis of their relation in the Church, he avoided the risk of prioritizing Christology over pneumatology in the realm of ecclesiology, unity over diversity, and institution over charisms.

3. Given the topic of this essay, I have focused mainly on the relationships between the Son and the Spirit, both in the life of the Church and in the sphere of the immanent Trinity. However, Stăniloae's doctrine of the Church, as I briefly emphasized when I assessed the ecclesiological implications of his trinitarian theology, is not binitarian. His ecclesiology is a chapter of the doctrine of the Father as much as it is a chapter of Christology or a chapter of pneumatology.

Viorel Coman (Romanian Orthodox) has been a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium) in systematic theology, since 2012. After studies at the Orthodox Theological Seminary "Bishop Kesarie" in Buzau, Romania, he received both a Bachelor and a Master of Theology from the Orthodox Faculty of Theology at the University of Bucharest. In 2012, he received a Master of Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion from KU Leuven. He has participated in the Porticus Scholarship Formation Program for several days each summer, 2012–14, in Warsaw, Vienna, and Rome, respectively, most recently exploring religion and culture in Central and

Eastern Europe through film. He has received Porticus Scholarships in 2011–12 and 2012–16. Beginning in October, 2014, he became a research assistant for the KU Leuven Faculty of Theology, working on a project in the area of Jewish-Christian and ecumenical dialogue through interpretation of John's Gospel. His own research focuses on the topic of the present essay. From 2009 to 2012, he published over fifty articles in *Lumina*, a daily published by the Romanian Patriarchate. He has presented papers and abstracts at conferences and symposia in Budapest (Societas Oecumenica, 2014), Leuven (2013 and 2014), Vienna (2013), Brixen, Italy (2013), and Warsaw (2012). *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* published a review he wrote, in 2014. He is especially interested in trinitarian theology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, ecumenism, and twentieth-century Orthodox theology.

ATLAS erials

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may priut, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the eopyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.