Since twentieth-century theologians have found in the doctrine of the Trinity the structuring principle of Christian theology, this essay surveys Dumitru Stâniloae’s trinitarian theology and its implications for ecclesiology in the context of the *filioque* debates. Moreover, it argues that Stâniloae’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 Stâniloae (1903–93) is the most important Romanian Orthodox theologian 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. As the title indicates, the task of this essay is to assess Stâniloae’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, Stâniloae’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 Stâniloae faced in shaping his trinitarian thinking.

1 In 1993, French Orthodox theologian Olivier Clément trustworthily named Dumitru Stâniloae “the greatest contemporary Orthodox theologian” (Olivier Clément, “Le Père Dumitru Staniloae et le génie de l’orthodoxie roumaine,” in Ioan I. Ică, Jr., ed., *Persoană și comuniune* [Sibiu: Arhiepiscopia ortodoxă, 1993], p. 82).

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 insipiredly 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

---


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. 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. 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." 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).

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).


Behr has rightly pointed out, the relationship between Trinity and Church has been explored largely through what is commonly referred to as “communion ecclesiology.” 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. 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

---

9John 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’ecclesiologie du cardinal Congar à partir des Églises de professeurs* (Paris: Cerf, 2012). In the Orthodox Church, John Zizioulas is commonly regarded as the supporter of the ecclesiology of communion (see Gattan Baillargeon, *Perspectives orthodoxes sur l’Église—Communion: l’oeuvre de Jean Zizioulas* [Montréal: Paulines; Paris: Médiaspaul, 1989]).

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 Stâniloae’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*

\[
\text{is not a heresy or even a dogmatic error. . . . There is no dogma of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son, and therefore particular opinions on this subject are not heresies but merely dogmatic hypotheses . . .}
\]

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 \text{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

---


\(^{12}\)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 *filioque*...
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," 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 Cléments, systematized and amplified them. 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.

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 "monopatriism" (the procession of the Spirit, like the generation of the Son, can only be from the Father alone) implies the following ecclesiological disadvantages:


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 I (Still River, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1982 [orig.: *La Trinité Chrétienne dans l'Histoire* (Paris: Éditions 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

---


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 Him 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. Retig (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, Questions 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.

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.” 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 *interpersonal* 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.

---


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.*”

Although the bilateral and multilateral dialogues have taken conciliatory positions toward Eastern Orthodoxy, the *filioque* controversy is not yet resolved.

C. Stănîloae 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.” Afterwards, Stănîloae’s ecumenical contact with Western Christianity toned down his previous critique. Unlike Dănuț Mănăstireanu, who was partly right

---


In claiming, "In terms of the conflict between the Orthodox and Catholics over *filioque* Stânioae is definitely one of the Orthodox hard-liners . . . together with Lossky and Nissiotis,"29 Radu Bordeianu's assessment of Stânioae's theology highlighted the fact that "after [Stânioae] 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, Stânioae 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 Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches organized two consultations to study the controversy over the *filioque*. Stânioae 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, Stânioae 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 Stânioae 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, Stânioae not only summa-

---

29Mănăstireanu, A Perichoretic Model, p. 209.
30Bordeianu, Dumitru Stânioae, p. 59.
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.\(^5\)

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*,\(^6\) which was first published in 1993.

II. Stănăiloae’s Theology of Trinity

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

Up to a certain point, Elias O’Brien is right in suggesting that Stănăiloae’s defense of Orthodox trinitarian theology against the *filioque* relied heavily on Photius’s reasoning and objections.\(^7\) However, being aware of the criticism raised by Western theologians against Photius’s trinitarian theology,\(^8\) Stănăiloae 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 Stănăiloae’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.


\(^{37}\)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” (Stănăiloae, “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." The Synod of 1285, with its *Tomus* written by Gregory, "the only synodal reaction of the Byzantine Church to the *Filioque*," 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 expressing 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."

Interpreting St. Gregory II of Cyprus's thoughts on trinitarian relations, Stâniloae 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." 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, Stâniloae 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." 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 acquires another personal attribute (besides procession from the Father), as

---

39Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, p. 2.
41Stâniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 17.
42Ibid.
43Ibid., 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.”

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.

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 through the Holy Spirit reveals the Spirit’s eternal resting upon the Son.

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, Logos Apodeiktikoi, argues that the Eastern Fathers of

---

44 Ibid., p. 21.
46 See ibid., pp. 21–22.
47 Gregory Palamas, Traités apodictiques sur la procession du Saint-Esprit, tr. and notes Emmanuel Ponsonye (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 invățătura 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."

Drawing on St. Gregory Palamas’s insights, Staniloae 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.

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


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.  

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,” and, at the same time, the Spirit of communion is the “loving tie formed between the Father and the Son.” Consequently, Stâniloae 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.

Stâniloae’s unceasing effort to find a way to describe the intratrinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit found support in one of Bryennios’s lectures on the procession of the Holy Spirit, given in 1422 at the imperial palace in Constantinople. In Bryennios’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. Stâniloae explained that the relationship between the Son and the Spirit,

---

50Ibid., p. 31.
51Stâniloae, *Experience of God*, vol. 1, p. 269. Stâniloae 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” (Stâniloae, *Experience of God*, vol. 1, pp. 268–269.
52Stâniloae, *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, unifying Them and reinforcing Them in Their distinct qualities even when They speak with us” (Stâniloae, *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."

Staniloae 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, Staniloae 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.” 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.” Aware of the infinite difference that exists between human persons and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, Staniloae 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 Staniloae, 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, Staniloae 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

53Staniloae, “Trinitarian Relations,” p. 34. Staniloae 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 și două pentru purcăderea Duhului Sfânt], p. 345; cited in Staniloae, “Trinitarian Relations,” pp. 34–35).

54Ibid., p. 35.

55Ibid., p. 36.
Athanasie Yevtic called into question Stâniloae’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,”\(^{56}\) Stâniloae 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, Stâniloae 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 processes 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 *perichôresis.*”\(^{59}\) The key concept of *perichôresis*, 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 *perichôresis* 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 *perichôresis* to the Greek term “*horos,*” consider that the term should be understood as a “circular movement” or as a “circular dance,” Stâniloae

---

\(^{56}\)“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).


added that the word

has been interpreted as meaning a reciprocal interiority for it cannot be un-
derstood 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 di-
vine 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 Stâniloae conceived the trinitarian relations as the basis for
the relation of the Trinity with the world and the Church64—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 ex-
plained 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 Stâniloae's ecclesiology attractive and unique
is the full incorporation of the Church into the doctrine of the Trinity. In doing so,
Stâniloae 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 Stâniloae 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 pneumatol-
ogy.67 While the intratrinitarian relationships are extended to the Church, the Church

63Ibid., p. 39.
65Radu 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).
67In his doctoral dissertation, Bordeianu argues extensively that, in Stâniloae'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 climactic 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 Stâniloae, 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 Stâniloae'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,

68Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," pp. 31–32.
70Staniloae, "Trinitarian Relations," p. 31.
71Bordeianu 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

72Dumitru Staniloae, The Experience of God: Orthodox Dogmatic Theology, vol. 4, The Church: Communion in the Holy Spirit, tr. and ed. Ioan Ionița (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2012), p. 2 [orig.: Dumitru Stăniloae, Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Editura Institutului Bibliic și de Mișcări 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 fulfillment 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"The Church pneumatized by the Spirit of the risen Christ" (Stăniloae, "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." 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."

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," 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, Staniloae detected in the New Testament two patterns of Revelation: (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.

---

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.
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. Stâniloae 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

Stâniloae'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, Stâniloae 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 communiqué 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 communiqué 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” (Stâniloae, “Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie byzantine,” p. 664, my translation).
By way of conclusion, some remarks are worthy of emphasis:

1. Stâniloae’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 Stâniloae, 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. Furthermore, 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, Stâniloae’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.