

STUDII TEOLOGICE

REVISTA FACULTĂȚILOR DE TEOLOGIE DIN PATRIARHIA ROMÂNĂ

Revistă fondată în anul 1929 de către
Prof. dr. Teodor M. Popescu

SERIA A III-A, ANUL X, NR. 3, IULIE-SEPTEMBRIE, 2014
BUCUREȘTI

COLEGIUL DE REDACȚIE:

Președinte: Preafericitul Părinte DANIEL, Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române

Membri de onoare: Acad. Pr. prof. dr. Mircea PĂCURARIU (SIBIU); Acad. prof. dr. Emilian POPESCU (BUCUREȘTI); IPS dr. Hilarion ALFEYEV (MOSCOVA); Pr. prof. dr. John BEHR (CRESTWOOD NY); Pr. prof. dr. John MCGUCKIN (NEW YORK); Pr. prof. dr. Eugen J. PENTIUC (BROOKLINE MA); Prof. dr. Tudor TEOTEOI (BUCUREȘTI).

Membri: Pr. prof. dr. Ștefan BUCHIU, decanul Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă „Justinian Patriarhul” din București; Pr. prof. dr. Ion VICOVAN, decanul Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă „Dumitru Stăniloae” din Iași; Pr. prof. dr. Aurel PAVEL, decanul Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă „Andrei Șaguna” din Sibiu; Pr. prof. dr. Vasile STANCIU, decanul Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă din Cluj-Napoca; Pr. prof. dr. Ioan TULCAN, decanul Facultății de Teologie Ortodoxă „Ilarion Felea” din Arad.

Redactori corespondenți: Lect. dr. Vasile Adrian CARABĂ, București; Pr. prof. dr. Ion VICOVAN, Iași; Prof. dr. Paul BRUSANOWSKI, Sibiu; Pr. asist. drd. Cristian-Sebastian SONEA, Cluj-Napoca; Lect. dr. Caius CUȚARU, Arad; Pr. lect. dr. Ionuț HOLUBEANU, Constanța; Pr. lect. dr. Radu TASCOVICI, Pitești; Pr. conf. dr. Ștefan FLOREA, Târgoviște; Pr. lect. dr. Jan NICOLAE, Alba Iulia; Pr. lect. dr. Viorel POPA, Oradea; Pr. prof. dr. Ionel ENE, Galați; Pr. lect. dr. Teofil STAN, Baia-Mare; Dr. Mihai GRIGORE, Mainz; Marius PORTARU, Roma; Dr. Marian SIMION, Boston.

Redactor șef: Pr. prof. dr. Nicolae D. NECULA

Redactori: Prof. dr. Adrian MARINESCU (coordonator), Lect. dr. Ionuț-Alexandru Tudorie (secretar de redacție), Lect. dr. Alexandru MIHĂILĂ (tehnoredactare), Asist. dr. Sebastian NAZĂRU

Corectură: Lect. dr. Constantin GEORGESCU (filolog)

Traducere în lb. engleză: Asist. drd. Maria BÂNCILĂ (filolog)

Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune Ortodoxă, Tipografia Cărților Bisericești

Director: Pr. Mihai HAU, consilier patriarhal

Coperta și viziunea grafică a revistei: Doina DUMITRESCU

Redacția: Str. Sfânta Ecaterina, Nr. 2-4, cod 040155, București, sect. 4, România
Tel. (+40) 722 620 172; (+40) 21 335 61 17; Fax: (+40) 21 335 07 75;

Adresă poștală: Editurile Patriarhiei Române, Secretariat (Redacția „Studii Teologice”), str. Intrarea Miron Cristea nr. 6, sect. 4, București, România – 040162

e-mail: studiiteologice@yahoo.com; web: www.studiiteologice.ro

Materialele trimise Redacției nu se înapoiază.

Redacția își rezervă dreptul de a opera modificări atât asupra formei, cât și a conținutului materialelor trimise spre publicare și roagă să fie respectate recomandările postate electronic la adresa web: www.studiiteologice.ro – rubrica „Condiții de publicare”.

Revista respectă normele ISO 9001:2000 & 19011:2002 privind managementul calității și aplică sistemul de recenzare peer-review.

CUPRINS

Prolog	5
Studii	
Zdravko PENO <i>GMO (Genetically Modified Organism) and the Christian Ethos in the Light of Saint Maximus the Confessor's Cosmology</i>	13
Viorel COMAN <i>Ecclesia de trinitate: The ecclesiological Synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in modern orthodox and roman catholic Theology</i>	31
Adrian MARINESCU <i>Pr. Valerian Şesan (1878-1940) și Edictul de la Mediolanum</i>	71
Ovidiu SFERLEA <i>Interpretarea și receptarea teoriei epectazei în gândirea Părintelui Dumitru Stăniloae</i>	137
Răzvan PERȘA <i>Autenticitatea textului scripturistic In 7,1 în comentariul hrisostomic la Evangelhia după Ioan</i>	153
Misiune și Pastorație	
Pr. Alexandru-Corneliu ARION <i>„Interpretatio christiana” a unei mari provocări spirituale a lumii de azi: reîncarnarea</i>	179
Din Sfinții Părinți	
Sf. GRIGORIE CEL MARE <i>Omiliile a XVIII-a, a XXII-a și a XIV-a la Evangelhia după Ioan (trad. din lb. latină de Isabela STOIAN, introd. și note de Isabela STOIAN și Mihai GRIGORAȘ)</i> .	211
Dialog teologic	
George NIȘCOVEANU <i>John Wyclif: viața și opera. 630 de ani de la moartea reformatorului englez</i>	241

Recenzii

Viorel IONIȚĂ, *Towards the Holy and Great Synod of the Orthodox Church. The Decisions of the Pan-Orthodox Meetings since 1923 until 2009*, Published with the Blessing of His Beatitude Daniel, Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church; Translated from Romanian by prof. dr. Remus Rus, Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, Basel, 2014, 211pp. (Pr. Daniel BENGA) 273

Daniel ALIC, *Eparhia Caransebeșului în perioada păstoririi episcopului Miron Cristea (1910-1919). Biserică și societate*, Presa Universitară Clujeană / Ed. Episcopiei Caransebeșului, Cluj-Napoca/Caransebeș, 2013, 449pp. (Mircea-Gheorghe ABRUDAN) 275

Paul JOHNSON, *Viața lui Isus. Povestită de un credincios*, trad. Liliana Donose Samuelsson, Ed. Humanitas, București, 2011, 214pp. (Nicolae DRĂGUȘIN) 280

Viorel COMAN

***ECCLESIA DE TRINITATE: THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL
SYNTHESIS BETWEEN CHRISTOLOGY AND
PNEUMATOLOGY IN MODERN ORTHODOX AND ROMAN
CATHOLIC THEOLOGY***

Keywords: *Trinitarian ecclesiology, pneumatology, Christology, Orthodox theology, Roman Catholic theology.*

Abstract

The ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology has been one of the dominant themes in 20th-century Christian theology and an important topic of reflection in the ecumenical debates. However, theologians who have embarked on the demanding project of synthesizing Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology have achieved such equilibrium with different degrees of success. Given the importance of the subject, this article discusses the synthesis between the two main dimensions of the Church in the works of several Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians: Vladimir Lossky, John Zizioulas, Dumitru Stăniloae, on the Orthodox side, Yves Congar, and Walter Kasper, on the Roman Catholic side. The goal of the article is to examine whether or not there exists a theological emphasis towards Christology or pneumatology in each theologian's writings. In addition to that, it argues that, apart from Stăniloae and to a certain extent Kasper, the models proposed to synthesize Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology have failed to correlate the roles of the Son and the Spirit within the sphere of the inner Trinity with their functions in the economy of salvation as well as in the life of the Church. In so doing, the article emphasizes in its conclusions that the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology needs to be anchored into the doctrine of the inner Trinity. Otherwise, the Trinity and the Church do not intersect with each other (*ecclesia de Trinitate*) but remain two separate or parallel realities (*Trinitas et ecclesia*).

Apart from Vladimir Lossky's *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'église d'Orient* (1944)¹, very few Orthodox works published during the 20th century have had such an enormous influence upon the trajectory of contemporary theology as John Zizioulas' *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (1985)². Several months after the publication of Zizioulas' volume,

¹ Vladimir LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'église d'Orient*, Aubier Montaigne, Paris, 1944 (English translation: *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, transl. by the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, James Clarke & Co. Ltd, London, 1957).

² John ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, 1985.

Charles Lock wrote: “*Being As Communion* is one of the most important contribution of Orthodox thought in many years”³. It addresses, as John Meyendorff observed, “the most contemporary, the most urgent, the most existential issues facing the Orthodox Church today”⁴, including the burning question of the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology. In a nutshell, the synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology refers to the modern theologians’ struggle to harmonize Ignatius’ statement, *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia*⁵, with Irenaeus’ assertion, *Ubi Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia*⁶, to the extent that none of the two aspects of the Church takes precedence over the other.

As a way of marking the thirty anniversary of the publication of *Being as Communion*, this article intends to offer a detailed and critical survey of some of the most relevant contributions provided by 20th-century theologians, including John Zizioulas, to the question on how to adequately integrate Christology and pneumatology into an organic ecclesiological synthesis. On the one hand, the article examines whether or not there exists a theological emphasis towards Christology or pneumatology in each theologian’s writings. On the other hand, it detects several other issues perpetrated by the majority of the ecclesiological essays that have taken over the task of developing such a synthesis. First and foremost, the selection of the authors was based on *the criterion of theological relevance and notoriety*. However, even though there are several other important theologians, such as *Georges Florovsky*, *Nikos Nissiotis*, and *Boris Bobrinskoy*, whose models of an ecclesiological synthesis deserve fair amount of attention, giving the limited space of an article, I opted not to include more than one author from within the same Orthodox and Roman Catholic tradition, ethnical group, or cultural *milieu*. As a matter of fact, the selection was equally guided by *the criterion of ethnical, cultural, and theological diversity*: Slavic Orthodoxy (Vladimir Lossky), Greek Orthodoxy (John Zizioulas), Romanian Orthodoxy (Dumitru Stăniloae), French Catholicism (Yves Congar), and German Catholicism (Walter Kasper).

In terms of structure, the article is divided in two main parts: the first part focuses upon the topic of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit in the works of three notorious Orthodox theologians: *Vladimir Lossky* (1903-1958), a Russian theologian from Paris, *John Zizioulas* (b. 1931), the Greek

³ Charles LOCK, “Book Review: John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*”, in: *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* XXX (1986) 1, p. 91.

⁴ John MEYENDORFF, “Foreword”, in: J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion...*, p. 12.

⁵ IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH, “Ad Smyrnaeos 8”, in: *PG* 5, 714 B (English transl.: “Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans”, in: Alexander ROBERTS, James DONALDSON [eds.], *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1996, p. 90).

⁶ IRENAEUS OF LYON, “Adversus haereses 3”, in: *PG* 7, 966 C (English transl.: “Against Heresies III, 24, 1”, in: Alexander ROBERTS, James DONALDSON [eds.], *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, p. 458).

metropolitan of Pergamon, and *Dumitru Stăniloae* (1903-1993), the most important Romanian theologian of the past century; the second part centers around two of the most significant Western approaches to the question of the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology. Therefore, this section explores the way in which two leading Roman Catholic theologians, i.e., the French Dominican *Yves Congar* (1904-1995) and the German Cardinal *Walter Kasper* (b. 1933), addressed the question of the symbiosis between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit in the life of the Church.

The Relationship between Christology and Pneumatology in Ecclesiology: Orthodox Approaches

The synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in the life of the Church is one of the recurrent themes in modern Orthodox theology⁷. With very few exceptions, the constant efforts of some Orthodox theologians to develop an ecclesiology which maintains a real balance between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit were largely meant to correct what they called as “the overly institutionalized ecclesiology” of the Roman Catholic Church. Leading Orthodox theologians such as Vladimir Lossky and Dumitru Stăniloae, saw the cause of this – real or supposed – Roman Catholic ecclesiological “deformation” as related to the Western doctrine of the *filioque*, which subordinates the Spirit to the Son, charism to institution, personal freedom to Church authority, the prophetic to the juridical, mysticism to scholasticism, common priesthood to hierarchical priesthood, and episcopal collegiality to the primacy of Rome.⁸ However, the majority of the models proposed by Orthodox theologians to connect properly the Christological element of the Church with the pneumatological one have achieved this equilibrium with varying degrees of success, despite their claim that Eastern Trinitarian theology has the potential of securing such balance. A slight priority given to pneumatology is still present in the works of *Vladimir Lossky*, *Nikos Nissiotis*, and *Boris Bobrinsky* whereas the theology of *John Zizioulas* and *Georges Florovsky* leans towards Christology. A more successful equilibrium between the two components of the Church was offered by *Dumitru Stăniloae*. For the reasons exposed in the introduction, this section of the article limits itself to the analysis of the ecclesiological synthesis as developed by three outstanding Orthodox theologians: *Lossky* (priority given to the Holy Spirit), *Zizioulas* (priority given to Christ), and *Stăniloae* (a more balanced approach between Christology and pneumatology).

⁷ For the Greek patristic approach to the topic at stake, see: Michael STAVROU, “La dimension pneumatique de la christologie des pères grecs”, in: *Contacts* LIII (2001), pp. 196-205.

⁸ André de HALLEUX, “Orthodoxie et Catholicism: du personnalisme en pneumatologie”, in: *Revue théologique de Louvain* VI (1975) 1, pp. 12-13.

Christ Unifies Whereas the Spirit Diversifies: Vladimir Lossky

A leading supporter of Georges Florovsky's programme of a "Neo-Patristic Synthesis"⁹, Vladimir Lossky is unanimously recognized as a towering figure of 20th-century Orthodox theology. His dense, systematic, and vastly influential *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'église d'Orient*, is still considered as one of "the most important Orthodox books in modern times"¹⁰. As Rowan Williams pointed out, *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'église d'Orient* grew out of Lossky's participation in the meetings that theologians and philosophers from different Christian traditions attended in 1941-1942 at the house of Marcel Moré in Paris¹¹. Capturing the basic tenets of Orthodox doctrine and spirituality for a Western audience, Lossky's masterpiece aimed at detecting the root of all theological tensions that still divide the East and the West. He assumed therefore that the *filioque* is the key to practically all ecclesiological differences between the two Christian traditions. According to Lossky, the Latin doctrine of the Trinity compromises the full equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, and subordinates the Spirit to the Son; therefore, at the level of ecclesiology, Christology / institution overshadows pneumatology / charisms. In Lossky's opinion, only the Trinitarian theology of the Orthodox Church, which rejects the *filioque* and assigns a prominent role to the Holy Spirit, can provide the resources for a real ecclesiological balance between Christology and pneumatology. However, reacting against what he considered to be the Roman Catholic "pneumatological deficit", Lossky overemphasized the independence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church to the extent of disconnecting pneumatology from Christology.

A Twofold Divine Economy. Lossky noticed that St. Paul's depiction of the Church as «the Body of Christ» (*Eph* 1, 22- 23; *I Cor* 12, 12-13) whose

⁹ For a comprehensive introduction into the history and theology of the Neo-Patristic movement in Orthodox theology, see: Paul GAVRILYUK, *Georges Florovsky and the Russian Religious Renaissance: Changing Paradigms in Historical and Systematic Theology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013; Andrew LOUTH, "French Ressourcement Theology and Orthodoxy: A Living Mutual Relationship?", in: Gabriel FLYNN, Paul D. MURRAY (eds.), *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth Century Roman-Catholic Theology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012, pp. 495-507; A. LOUTH, "The Patristic Revival and Its Protagonists", in: Mary B. CUNNINGHAM, Elizabeth TKEOKRITOFF (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008, pp. 188-203; Paul LADOUCEUR, "Treasures New and Old: Landmarks of Orthodox Neopatristic Theology", in: *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* LVI (2012) 2, pp. 191-227; Pantelis KALAITZIDIS, "From the «Return to the Fathers» to the Need for a Modern Orthodox Theology", in: *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* LIV (2010) 1, pp. 5-36.

¹⁰ P. LADOUCEUR, "Treasures New and Old...", pp. 201-202. See also: Christos YANNARAS, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*, trans. by Peter Chamberas and Norman Russell, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 2006, p. 292.

¹¹ Rowan WILLIAMS, *The Theology of Vladimir Nikolaievitch Lossky: An Exposition and Critique*, doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Oxford, 1975, p. 21.

“fullness” is guaranteed by the Holy Spirit (*Eph* 1, 23) points to the fact that the Church is “founded on a twofold divine economy: the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit”¹². Even though the Spirit and the Son are intimately linked in the economy of salvation, they “remain nevertheless in this same work two Persons independent the one of the other as to their hypostatic being”¹³.

The Russian theologian argued that only a Trinitarian theology which rejects the *filioque* in line with East can provide the foundation for a pneumatology that retains its independence in relation to Christology within the life of the Church. Otherwise, pneumatology becomes solely an appendix of Christology¹⁴. As a matter of fact, striving to put the pneumatological component of the ecclesiological construct on an equal footing with the Christological one, Lossky detected two communications of the Spirit to the Church: “One was effected by the breath of Christ when He appeared to His apostles on the evening of the day of His resurrection (*John* XX, 19-23); the other by the personal coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost (*Acts* II, 1-5)”¹⁵.

The “first” communication of the Spirit to the Church, i.e., the Johannine Pentecost, has a functional character in relation to Christ. Under the outward form of breath, the Spirit is given by Christ to the Church as a whole, or as a body, and, moreover, it appears as a “bond of unity” and a “sacerdotal power”¹⁶. Considered rather an impersonal communication of the Spirit, the Johannine Pentecost guarantees the objective sanctity of the Church as a corporate entity. The “second” outpouring of the Spirit, i.e., the Lukan Pentecost,

¹² V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 153 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 156). At the beginning of the chapter 9 of the same book, Lossky points out again: “Since the Church is the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Church has a double foundation – it is rooted both in Christology and in pneumatology” (V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 171; English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 174).

¹³ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 156 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 159).

¹⁴ “The personal coming of the Holy Spirit – «sovereignly free», to use an expression from a hymn for Pentecost – could not be conceived as a plenitude, as an infinite treasure suddenly disclosed within each person, did not the Eastern Church acknowledge the independence (as to His eternal origin) of the Hypostasis of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Son” (V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 166; English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 169).

¹⁵ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 164 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 167). While patristic Tradition and contemporary orthodox theologians have always distinguished the event reported in *Jn* 20, 19-23 from the event described in *Acts* 2, modern Roman Catholic and Protestant biblical exegesis claim that both scriptural passages describe the same event. See: Raymond E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John [XIII-XXI]*, Doubleday, New York, 1970, p. 1038; Joost VAN ROSSUM, “The «Johannine Pentecost»: *John* 20:22 in Modern Exegesis and in Orthodox Theology”, in: *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* XXXV (1991) 2-3, pp. 149-167.

¹⁶ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 164 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 167).

is no longer the communication to the Church as a whole, but has a personal character and, moreover, is an independent work of the Spirit in relation to Christ so that “[The] Pentecost is not a «continuation» of the Incarnation. It is its sequel. Its result... One can say that in a certain sense the work of Christ was a preparation for that of the Holy Spirit... Pentecost is thus the object, the final goal, of the divine economy upon earth”¹⁷.

While at the Johannine Pentecost the Holy Spirit remains “unknown to persons and imparts to them no personal holiness”¹⁸, at the Lukan Pentecost the Spirit “communicates Himself to persons, marking each member of the Church with a seal of personal and unique relationship to the Trinity, becoming present in each person”¹⁹. However, Lossky’s major but often criticized contribution to the relationship between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology concerns the distinct roles that Christ and the Holy Spirit perform in building up the Church. His crucial axiom is captured in the following lines:

“The work of Christ concerns human nature which He recapitulates in His hypostasis. The work of the Holy Spirit... concerns persons, being applied to each one singly... Christ becomes the sole image appropriate to the common nature of humanity. The Holy Spirit grants to each person created in the image of God the possibility of fulfilling the likeness in the common nature. The one lends His hypostasis to the nature, the other gives His divinity to the persons. Thus, *the work of Christ unifies, the work of the Holy Spirit diversifies*. Yet, the one is impossible without the other”²⁰.

Lossky argued that through the Incarnation the divine Logos took on human nature and deified it; therefore, Christ is the principle or the head of the renewed humanity he assumed. Through baptism, each person becomes a member of Christ’s body and has access to the unity of the “new man” in whom all divisions are overcome. As members of the body of Christ – Lossky

¹⁷ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 156 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 159). Michel Stavrou is of the opinion that Lossky’s depiction of Pentecost not as the continuation of the incarnation was a response to different Roman Catholic theologians who understood Pentecost as an instrument of incarnation (M. STAVROU, “Quelques réflexions sur l’ecclésiologie de Vladimir Lossky”, in: *Contacts LXII* [2010], pp. 64-65).

¹⁸ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 164 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 167).

¹⁹ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p. 165 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 168).

²⁰ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, pp. 162-163 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, pp. 166-167). M. Stavrou highlights the fact that: “L’ecclésiologie ainsi développée par V. Lossky est la vision d’un rapport «dialectique» entre les fonctions du Christ et de l’Esprit Saint. Face à la polarité nature-personnes, il voit dans l’Économie du salut une sorte de répartition des rôles entre les deux «Main du Père» (saint Irénée): la restauration de la nature humaine est assurée par l’action du Christ, et celle des personnes humaines est fait par l’action de l’Esprit” (M. STAVROU, “Quelques réflexions...”, p.62).

added – human persons are not annihilated in the unique Christ, but each of them preserve their own identity. In this regard, the Holy Spirit becomes the principle of diversity in the Church, the One who “imparts to human hypostases the fullness of deity after a manner which is unique, «personal», and appropriate to every man as person created in the image of God”²¹. *While Christology is the foundation of the unity of nature, pneumatology is the affirmation of multiplicity and diversity in the Church*. Moreover, Lossky went on to say that while the Christological aspect of the Church – grounded upon the incarnation of the Word – concerns its objective, unchangeable, perfectly stable, and immovable dimension, the pneumatological aspect – rooted in the Pentecost event – refers to its dynamic, continuous, and progressive dimension.

A Critical Assessment. Lossky’s essay on the Church prompted critical reactions among Orthodox theologians. In 1955, Georges Florovsky became the first Orthodox theologian who vocalized publically his criticism against Lossky’s ecclesiological synthesis. Florovsky’s basic argument against Lossky’s depiction of the Church as “one in Christ, multiple by the Spirit” ran as follows: if Christ’s redemptive work concerns human nature, and if the Spirit imparts the fullness of deity to human persons, then *only* in the Holy Spirit, and *not* in Christ, is the human personality fully and ontologically (re-)established. Lossky’s synthesis, argued Florovsky, does not leave enough room for the *personal relationship* of individuals *with Christ*²². Almost ten years later, a similar criticism, yet a similar a more extensive criticism was raised by Stăniloae in one of the articles he published in 1967²³.

In 1981, in a contribution given to a symposium jointly organized by the University of Louvain and the *Instituto per le scienze religiose* (Bologna) on the perspectives of ecclesiology after the Second Vatican Council, John Zizioulas, at that time professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Glasgow, also called into question the Losskian ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology. Although the Greek theologian considered that Lossky’s theology offers valuable “material for a synthesis between Christology

²¹ V. LOSSKY, *Essai sur la théologie mystique...*, p.163 (English transl.: *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 166).

²² “Is not the relationship with Christ, established and wrought «by sacraments», precisely personal – a *personal encounter* – and is it not effected by the Spirit? And, on the other hand, are not all personal encounters of Christians with Christ possible only in the «fellowship of the Holy Ghost», and by the «grace of the Our Lord Jesus Christ?» (Georges FLOROVSKY, “Christ and His Church: Suggestions and Comments”, in: Lambert BEAUDIN [ed.], *1054-1954: L’Église et les églises: neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l’orient et l’occident*, vol. II, Chevetogne, 1955, p. 169).

²³ Dumitru STĂNILOAE, “Duhul Sfânt și sobornicitatea bisericii”, in: *Orthodoxia* XIX (1967) 1, pp. 32-48 (English transl.: “The Holy Spirit and the Sobornicity of the Church”, in: D. STĂNILOAE, *Theology and the Church*, trans. by Robert Barringer, St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, Crestwood, 1980, pp. 45-71).

and Pneumatology in ecclesiology”, he conceded that his attempt remains problematic. Zizioulas noted that a distinct “economy of the Holy Spirit” alongside the economy of the Son “renders the synthesis so difficult that it must be abandoned”²⁴. More recently, Jaroslav Z. Skira stated that Lossky’s comments concerning the Pentecost leans in the direction of a definitive “temporal priority” of the Spirit over Christ. According to Skira, “this is because he emphasized the Spirit’s descent as the final goal of the divine economy”²⁵.

Even though towards the end of his life (1957-1958)²⁶ Vladimir Lossky attempted to bring correctives to his ecclesiological synthesis, the way he continued to depict the functions of Christ and the Spirit in the life of the Church remained indeed problematic. His valuable attempt to highlight that pneumatology is an essential component of the ecclesiology cannot be denied. However, without any intention of vulgarizing his ideas, Lossky’s overemphasis on the hypostatic independence of the Spirit in relation with Christ lead to a split between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit: Christology refers to the unifying / objective / institutional aspect of the Church whereas pneumatology refers to the diversifying / subjective / charismatic aspect. Lossky’s axiom, i.e., the Spirit diversifies what Christ unifies, encourages the idea that the Christological aspect of the Church goes against the pneumatological one, just as the unifying / institutional principle moves against the diversifying / charismatic one. As a matter of fact, Lossky perpetrated the tension between the institutional structures of the Church and its charismatic or spiritual manifestations. At the same time, he failed to show how Christology and pneumatology relate to each other in ecclesiology. In addition to that, Lossky’s ecclesiology remained almost silent about the role of the Father in ecclesiology.

I am of the opinion that there is one central reason that explains Lossky’s problematic ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology: his commitment to “radical apophaticism” did not allow him to inquire any further into the mystery of the inner Trinity and address the question of the indissoluble union that exists between the Son and the Spirit within the inner Trinity. The lack of a solid Trinitarian theology that explores properly the eternal non-causal relationship between the Son and the Spirit reverberated in ecclesiology, where Christology and pneumatology remained disconnected from each other.

²⁴ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit, and the Church”, in: J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion...*, pp. 124-125.

²⁵ Jaroslav SKIRA, “The Synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in Modern Orthodox Theology”, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* LXVIII (2002) 2, p. 463.

²⁶ V. LOSSKY, “L’œuvre du Saint Esprit”, in: V. LOSSKY, *Théologie dogmatique*, Cerf, Paris, 2012, pp. 159-169.

Christ Institutes Whereas the Spirit Con-stitutes: John Zizioulas

In the English-speaking world there is no other living Orthodox theologian as famous and influential as John Zizioulas. His world-wide reputation is based on:

- his work in the ecumenical movement as well as in the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church;
- his activity as a professor of Systematic theology in Athens, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Thessaloniki, and London;
- his creative theological ideas, which have been exposed in a series of articles and books, including his masterpiece titled *Being as Communion*.

Unlike *Yves Congar*, *Karl Rahner*, *Karl Barth*, *George Florovsky*, or *Dumitru Stăniloae*, whose publications covered a whole range of theological issues, Zizioulas’s area of interest does not expand beyond ecclesiology, Trinitarian theology, and anthropology.

Following the approach of his mentor George Florovsky, in the introduction to his doctoral dissertation, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (1965, in Greek)²⁷, Zizioulas opted initially for a Christological approach to ecclesiology. According to him, when pneumatology gets precedence over Christology in the life of the Church there is always “the risk of ecclesiology being made into «charismatic sociology», and the unity of the Church becoming nothing more than a *societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus*”²⁸. However, the publication of the article “Ordination – A Sacrament? An Orthodox Reply”²⁹ marked a turning point in Zizioulas’ theology: the Greek theologian begins to integrate pneumatology organically into the texture of his ecclesiology and Christology. Yet it was not until the beginning of the 1980s that Zizioulas elaborated his understanding of a proper ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology³⁰. His effort to incorporate pneumatol-

²⁷ J. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries*, trans. by Elizabeth Theokritoff, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 2001.

²⁸ J. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church...*, p. 16.

²⁹ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Ordination – A Sacrament? An Orthodox Reply”, in: *Concilium* VIII (1972) 4, pp. 33-40.

³⁰ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Cristologia, pneumatologia e istituzioni ecclesiastiche: un punto di vista ortodosso”, in *Cristianesimo nella storia* II (1981) 1, pp. 111-127. The original English version of this article has been published in Zizioulas’ book *Being as Communion* under the title “Christ, the Spirit, and the Church”, pp. 123-142; See also: J. ZIZIOULAS, “Implications ecclésiologiques de deux types de pneumatologie”, in: Boris BOBRINSKOY, Claude BRIDEL, Bruno BÜRKI (eds.), *Communio Sanctorum: mélanges offerts à Jean-Jaques von Allmen*, Labor et Fides, Genève, 1982, pp. 141-154. The article has been republished in Zizioulas’ book *L’Église et ses institutions*, textes réunis par l’archimandrite Grigorios Papatomas et Hyacinthe Desti-

ogy into his ecclesiology explains Zizioulas' initial hesitation to publish a French or English translation of his doctoral dissertation. When the dissertation was finally translated into French in 1994, Zizioulas noted in the preface of the book: "L'étude que voici présente un caractère christologique accentué qui pourrait faire négliger le rôle du Saint Esprit dans l'unité de l'Eglise. Tout effort de l'auteur au cours de ses travaux ultérieurs a été de réaliser une synthèse correcte entre Christologie et Pneumatologie"³¹.

Due to the fact that Zizioulas considered that the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology elaborated by Eastern theologians before him – especially Lossky – was by no means satisfactory, in his article from 1981 he tackled the issue by attempting to clarify the question of the proper synthesis between the two vital components of the Church. In Zizioulas' view, the problem

"is not whether one accepts the importance of Pneumatology and Christology and vice versa; the problem arises in connection to the question of *priority* (should Christology be made dependent on Pneumatology or should the order be the other way round?), and *content* (what *particular* content of Christian doctrine is at stake when speaking of Christology and pneumatology?)"³².

Christology and Pneumatology in Ecclesiology: Priority and Content.

According to the metropolitan of Pergamon, the question of priority of either Christology or pneumatology in ecclesiology is not of a minor importance. The entire theology and liturgical practice of the Church, right from the early centuries of Christianity down to contemporary period, rests upon it. In order to

velle, Cerf, Paris, 2011, pp. 29-47. For details regarding Zizioulas' ecclesiological synthesis, see: Aristotle PAPANIKOLAOU, *Being with God: Trinity, Apophaticism, and Divine Communion*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, 2006, pp. 32-38; Veli-Matti KÄRKKÄINEN, "John Zizioulas: Communion Pneumatology", in: *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*, Baker Academy, Grand Rapids, 2002, pp. 106-111; Michael STAVROU, "La place de l'Esprit saint dans l'ecclésiologie du métropolitain Jean Zizioulas", in: Ysabel DE ANDIA, Peter Leander HOFRICHTER (eds.), *Der heilige Geist im Leben der Kirche: Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens*, Tyrolia, Innsbruck, 2005, pp. 353-372; Jean RIGAL, *L'ecclésiologie de communion: son évolution historique et ses fondements*, Cogito 202, Cerf, Paris, 1997, pp. 175-195; Gaëtan BAILLARGEON, *Perspectives orthodoxes sur l'église-communion: L'oeuvre de Jean Zizioulas*, coll. Brèches théologiques 6, Médiaspaul, Paris, 1989, pp. 99-122; Stavros YANGAZOGLU, "La christologie pneumatique de Jean Zizioulas, métropolitain de Pergamon", in: *Contacts LXVI* (2014), pp. 523-543; Rémi CHENO, "Eschatologie et communion: les conséquences d'une constitution pneumatologique de l'ecclésiologie selon J. Zizioulas", in: *Istina LI* (2006) 4, pp. 375-412.

³¹ J. ZIZIOULAS, "Preface", in: J. ZIZIOULAS, *L'eucharistie, l'évêque et l'église durant les premiers siècles*, trad. par J.-P. Palierne, Desclée De Brouwer, Paris, 1994, p. 7.

³² J. ZIZIOULAS, "Christ, the Spirit and the Church", p. 127.

unfold his thoughts, the Greek theologian made thus reference to the New Testament's two schemes or patterns of divine revelation:

- *the classical schema*: the Holy Spirit is imparted or given to us by Christ. To quote Zizioulas, “l'Esprit est donné *par* le Christ; et apparaît comme agent du Christ. Son travail est d'accomplir la mission du Christ et de le glorifier”. As a matter of fact, “Il est l'Esprit du Christ, et par conséquence dépend du Christ. La christologie, dans ce cas, devient la source de la pneumatologie. Nous pouvons appeler ce type de pneumatologie, une pneumatologie *conditionnée par la christologie*”³³. Within the framework of this schema that defines pneumatology as a function of Christology, the Church is conceived in terms of mission whereas history is considered as a linear process. Roman Catholic ecclesiology, generally speaking, is framed by this Christological pneumatology.
- *the messianic schema*: the Spirit is both a forerunner to Jesus and the one who “constitutes his very identity as Christ, either at his baptism (Mark) or at his very biological conception (Matthew and Luke)”³⁴. In other words, “l'événement du Christ *est constitué dans et par l'Esprit...* dans ce cas-là, *la pneumatologie est la source de la christologie*. Cette voie, nous pouvons l'appeler *une christologie conditionnée par la pneumatologie*”³⁵. In the framework of a Christology which is conditioned by pneumatology, the Church reveals itself rather as an eschatological reality, a community reassembled in one place, than as a missionary organism. Orthodox ecclesiology is, generally speaking, shaped by this pneumatological Christology.

Zizioulas was of the opinion that, as long as the two schemas of divine revelation are not separated, the question of priority between Christ and the Spirit does not necessarily constitute a problem. He even went as far as to comment that the East will always pay more attention to the Messianic schema whereas the West will always maintain a preference for the classical schema. If both schemas are incorporated into an organic and unbreakable synthesis, the “question of priority can remain a «theologoumenon»”³⁶.

As for the question of content, the Greek metropolitan held to the fundamental assumption that God's activity *ad extra* is one and invisible. Namely, the unity of the divine operations *ad extra* is indivisible but not undifferentiated. Each Person of the Trinity contributes to the economy in a different way, and the unique contribution of each divine Person is directly relevant for ecclesiology. In articulating the particularity of the Son, Zizioulas rejected the Losskian idea of a separate “economy of the Spirit”. For him, to speak of an “economy of the Spirit”, as Lossky did, confuses the distinctive roles of the

³³ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Implications ecclésiologiques...”, pp. 29-30.

³⁴ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 127.

³⁵ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Implications ecclésiologiques...”, p. 31.

³⁶ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 129.

Persons of the Trinity, especially that of the Son and the Spirit. Even though both the Father and the Spirit are involved in history, only the Son “becomes history” through Incarnation. As Zizioulas noted, “the economy, in so far as it assumed history and has history, is *only one* and that is the *Christ event*”³⁷. A question that arises inevitably is: What is the particular role of the Spirit? Since the Spirit is not related to history in the same way as the Son, the contribution of the Spirit is depicted as the opposite, i.e., to liberate from history. In a lecture delivered on November 4, 2015, having being awarded an honorary doctorate at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, Zizioulas wrote: “Whereas Christology links the present with history, the role of the Holy Spirit is to bring «the last days», the future, into the present”³⁸. Eschatology turns to be one of the main particularities of the Spirit:

“What is the contribution of the Spirit? Well, precisely the opposite: it is to liberate the Son and the economy from the bondage of history. If the Son dies on the cross, thus succumbing to the bondage of historical existence, it is the Spirit that raises him from dead. The Spirit is the *beyond* history, and when he acts in history he does so in order to bring into history the last days, the *eschaton*. Hence the first fundamental particularity of Pneumatology is its eschatological character. The Spirit makes of Christ an eschatological being, the «last Adam»”³⁹.

Apart from the eschatological character of pneumatology, another central function of the Spirit is to fashion Christ into a “corporate personality”. As Zizioulas pointed out, “because of the involvement of the Holy Spirit in the economy, Christ is not just an individual, not «one» but «many»”⁴⁰. The Holy Spirit, since the time of Paul has been associated with the notion of “communion”, as well as taking on the role of making Christ as a relational being. It is important to stress here that, in Zizioulas’ understanding, “it is only because of

³⁷ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 130. Aristotle Papanikolaou notes that “Zizioulas’ use of «economy» is not always consistent. On the one hand, he insists on rejecting an «economy of the Spirit», suggested by Lossky, arguing that only the Son «becomes history», thus, implicitly arguing that «economy» is linked to the person of the Son. On the other hand, he often speaks of «God’s economy» or will insist on a distinction between the «economic Trinity» and the «immanent Trinity»” (A. PAPANIKOLAOU, *Being with God...*, p. 37).

³⁸ J. ZIZIOULAS, “The Task of Orthodox Theology in Today’s Europe”, in: *International Journal of Orthodox Theology* VI (2015) 3, p. 12.

³⁹ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 130. Commenting upon Zizioulas’ understanding of the Spirit’s particularity, Paul McPartlan emphasizes that when the Greek theologian speaks of the eschatological function of the Spirit he does not mean “that when the Holy Spirit is given we are in the final phase of history, but that the Holy Spirit confronts history with its very end... How then does the history not come to a halt? Because the confrontation occurs dialectically; the eschaton is different from the history and cannot abide in history, it visits again and again” (P. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1993, p. 167).

⁴⁰ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 130.

this function of Pneumatology that it is possible to speak of Christ as having a «body», i.e., to speak of ecclesiology, of the Church as the Body of Christ⁴¹.

For Zizioulas, a real synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology is achieved only when pneumatology and some of its fundamental aspects, i.e., eschatology and communion, are constitutive for the very being of Christ and the Church. That being so, the Holy Spirit must not be perceived as a mere “animator” of the ecclesial structures and institutions but the very condition of their existence. In order to express the idea that pneumatology is an ontological category role in ecclesiology, the Greek theologian spoke of the Church as “instituted by Christ” and “con-stituted by the Holy Spirit”⁴².

Implications for Ecclesiology. Any effort to explain in details the way in which Zizioulas nuances the ecclesiological implications of such a synthesis between Christology and pneumatology goes far beyond the bounds of this essay. Suffice to say that, according to his reasoning, when pneumatology is made a decisive category in ecclesiology two major implications are to be detected:

- First, if the Holy Spirit has a constitutive role in ecclesiology, the Church “ceases to be regarded as a historically given reality – an institution – that is a provocation to freedom. She will be regarded at the same time as something constantly con-stituted”⁴³. The epicletic character of ecclesiology, i.e., the continuous invocation of the Holy Spirit to validate each and every ecclesial act, shows that “there is nothing given in the Church – be it ministry or sacrament or other forms of structure – which is not to be asked for as if it had not been given at all”⁴⁴. Even the Eucharist itself is pneumatologically or epicletically conditioned. The invocation of the Holy Spirit, which descends upon and gives life to the Body of Christ, “removes the sacramental reality of the Church from any notion of causality: thanks to the epiclesis, the Church realizes in herself the Christ event without her causing it to happen and without her being caused by it”⁴⁵.
- Second, when pneumatology is not a secondary ecclesiological category but a component of a primary importance, the pyramidal understanding of

⁴¹ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 131.

⁴² J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 140

⁴³ J. ZIZIOULAS, “The Doctrine of God the Trinity Today: Suggestions for an Ecumenical Study”, in: George EDWARDS (ed.), *The One and the Many: Studies on God, Man, the Church, and the World Today*, Sebastian Press, Alhambra, 2010, p. 15. The study has been published for the first time in: Alisdair I.C. HERON (ed.), *The Forgotten Trinity: A Selection of Papers Presented to the BCC Study Commission on Trinitarian Doctrine Today*, British Council of Churches, London, 1991, pp. 19-32.

⁴⁴ J. ZIZIOULAS, “The Doctrine of God...”, pp. 14-15.

⁴⁵ J. ZIZIOULAS, “The Pneumatological Dimension of the Church”, in: G. EDWARDS (ed.), *The One and the Many*, p. 81. The study has been initially published in: *Communio / International Catholic Review* 1 (1974), pp. 142-158.

the Church vanishes. A pneumatology that is an ontological category in ecclesiology means that on both the universal level and the local level “the «one» and the «many» co-exist as two aspects of the same being”⁴⁶. On the universal level, the co-existence between the “one” and the “many” implies that “local Churches constitutes one Church through a ministry or institution which composes *simultaneously* a *primus* and a synod of which he is a *primus*”. On the local level, the same co-existence conveys that the ministry of a bishop is always conditioned by the existence of the community as well as by the rest of the ministries⁴⁷. The bishop cannot be conceived without his community and the community cannot function without its head, which does not stand “outside or above the Church but is part of the community”⁴⁸.

Evaluation. The attempt to integrate Christology and pneumatology into a harmonic ecclesiological synthesis along with the development of a communion-based ecclesiology crown Zizioulas’ theology. And yet several issues are perpetrated by Zizioulas’ way of relating the Christological dimension of the Church and the pneumatological one.

Zizioulas’ ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology primarily intended to revise the Losskian theological imbalances of the topic at stake. However, the solution advanced by the metropolitan of Pergamon in relating the two components of the Church is, to a certain extent, similar to the Russian theologian’s proposal. Due to the fact that the polarization operated by modern existentialist philosophy between nature / necessity and person / freedom permeated the theologies of both Lossky and Zizioulas, the ecclesiological syntheses they proposed bear traces of this influence. Lossky associated Christology with nature (what is given) and pneumatology with person (freedom) whereas Zizioulas linked Christ with history (what enslaves us) and the Spirit with eschatology (what liberates us). As a matter of fact, despite his plea for a simultaneity between Christology and pneumatology, Zizioulas’ ecclesiological synthesis is framed by the same relationship of opposition / tension between Christ and the Spirit as Lossky’s theology. As Sorin Șelaru observed, “la structure binaire de l’approche de Zizioulas édiflée sur des relations d’opposition, laisse entendre une continuité avec la pensée de Lossky”⁴⁹. Moreover, as in the case of Lossky, Zizioulas’ ecclesiological synthe-

⁴⁶ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 139.

⁴⁷ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Christ, the Spirit and the Church”, p. 139.

⁴⁸ J. ZIZIOULAS, “Ecclesiological Presuppositions of the Holy Eucharist”, in: G. EDWARDS (ed.), *The One and the Many*, p. 71. The article was initially published in: *Nicolaus X* (1982) 2, pp. 333-349.

⁴⁹ Sorin ȘELARU, *L’Eglise, image du mystère de la Trinité: les accents ecclésiologiques de la théologie de Dumitru Staniloă, thèse de doctorat soutenue à l’Université de Strasbourg, 2008*, p. 129; Radu Bordeianu has also noticed these similarities between Lossky and Zizioulas (Radu BORDEIANU, *Dumitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, coll. Ecclesiological Investigation 13, T&T Clark, New York, 2011, p. 123). See also: Anthony C. THIESELTON, *The*

sis was primarily constructed within the framework of Christology and pneumatology, without making the Person of God the Father part of it.

Apart from the opposition posited between Christology and pneumatology, Zizioulas' ecclesiological synthesis leaves open the question as to how to relate the "economic" functions of both Christ and the Spirit with their "immanent" status. This criticism echoes John Behr's remark concerning Zizioulas' ecclesiological synthesis: "Christology and pneumatology may have been synthesized, but Trinitarian theology is considered as a realm apart... We have the Trinity and the Church"⁵⁰. As interesting as it might seem, Zizioulas' model of a synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in the life of the Church does not connect ecclesiology with the doctrine of the Trinity. The entire ecclesiological vision of Zizioulas remains silent about the way in which the roles of Christ and the Spirit in the life of the Church, on the one hand, and the Trinity's own inner life, on the other hand, intersect with each other. Even though the Orthodox theology does not subscribe to Karl Rahner's *Grundaxiom*, i.e., "the «economic» Trinity is the «immanent» Trinity, and the «immanent» Trinity is the «economic» Trinity"⁵¹, a certain continuity between God *ad intra* and God *ad extra* still needs to be emphasized.

Last but not least, although Zizioulas insisted that the Church should be portrayed as instituted by Christ and con-stituted by the Holy Spirit in a simultaneous manner, Christology, as Skira emphasized, still detains a certain "temporal priority" over pneumatology in the ecclesiological model of the Greek metropolitan. According to Skira, in Zizioulas' view, "Christ is the only one who has entered into history and has become part of history and continues to be part of history, or part of the «temporal» order, that is, part of time. Christ, not the Spirit, becomes incarnate and is related to the Church in time"⁵². Since in Zizioulas's theology the Spirit does not enter into history or does not assume history in the same way as Christ, it is only with Christ that one enters first into a personal relationship.

Holy Spirit – In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today, Wm. E. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 2013, p. 418; J. SKIRA, "The Synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology...", p. 461.

⁵⁰ John BEHR, "The Trinitarian Being of the Church", in: *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XLVIII (2004) 1, p. 69.

⁵¹ Karl RAHNER, *The Trinity*, trans. by Joseph Donceel, Crossroad, New York, 1970, p. 22. See also: Fred SANDERS, "Entangled with the Trinity: Economic Trinity and Immanent Trinity in Recent Theology", in: *Dialog* XL (2001), pp. 175-182.

⁵² J. SKIRA, "Breathing with Two Lungs: The Church in Yves Congar and John Zizioulas", in: Jaroslav Z. SKIRA, Michael S. ATTRIDGE (eds.), *In God's Hands: Essays on the Church and Ecumenism in Honour of Michael A. Fahey, S.J.*, coll. Bibliotheca Ephemeridium Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXXIX, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 2006, p. 463.

A Trinitarian Ecclesiology: Dumitru Stăniloae

As metropolitan Kallistos Ware remarked, the Romanian theologian Dumitru Stăniloae “occupies a position in present-day Orthodoxy comparable to that of Karl Barth in Protestantism and Karl Rahner in Roman Catholicism”⁵³. However, unlike Lossky and Zizioulas, Stăniloae’s theological influence has not extended too much beyond the borders of Orthodoxy. Although over the past few decades, many of his books and articles have been translated into many different languages, Stăniloae’s theology is very little known amongst Western scholars⁵⁴. Perhaps this anonymity of Stăniloae’s theology explains why Jaroslav Z. Skira’s article on the synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in modern Orthodox theology⁵⁵ has not taken into account

E
O
L
O
G
I
C
E

⁵³ Kallistos WARE, “Forward”, in: D. STĂNILOAE, *The Experience of God: Revelation and Knowledge of the Triune God*, vol. I, trans. by Ioan Ioniță and Robert Barringer, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 1998, p. xxiv.

⁵⁴ As R. Bordeianu says, “Despite the importance of Staniloae’s theology, its study is barely in its infancy. It is impossible here to look at Western perceptions of the East, but a quick glance at five major journals offers a significant insight about what constitutes Orthodox theology in the West. Until recently, Stăniloae was mentioned episodically together with Zizioulas and Lossky, and sometimes Florovsky and Schmemmann appeared as other representatives of Orthodoxy. Around 2005, Stăniloae began to be regarded as an alternative to Zizioulas and Lossky, but mention of him remains drastically minimal. Overall, Staniloae is quoted 3.5 times less than Zizioulas and almost four times less than Lossky. The ratio is even more unfavorable to Staniloae when counting only Catholic and Protestant journals, which rarely mention him” (R. BORDEIANU, *Dumitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, p. 4). Dumitru Stăniloae is one of the few theologians of the Neo-Patristic movement whose theological *corpus* touches upon a wide range of topics: 1. the complementarity between apophatic and cataphatic theology; 2. the dynamic relationship between Scripture, Tradition, and the Church; 3. the Holy Trinity: structure of supreme love; 4. the rationality of creation (i.g. λόγοι) as grounded in the divine Logos; 5. person and communion; 6. the saving work of Christ as the basis of human deification; 7. the Church as *imago Trinitatis*; 8. the inaugurated eschatology as a foretaste of the transfigured cosmos. See: Daniele COGONI, “La teologia di padre Dumitru Staniloae: Personalità – teologia – cristologia- ecclesiologia (prima parte)”, in: *Studi Ecumenici* 1 (2007), p. 49.

⁵⁵ The article of Skira is in fact a summary of his doctoral dissertation: *Christ, the Spirit and the Church in Modern Orthodox Theology: A Comparison of Georges Florovsky, Vladimir Lossky, Nikos Nissiotis and John Zizioulas*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of St Michael’s College, 1998. In his doctoral dissertation Áron Fejerdy has not taken into consideration Stăniloae’s contribution either. See: Aron FEJERDY, *L’Église de l’Esprit du Christ. La relation ordonnée du Christ et de l’Esprit au mystère ecclésial: une lecture de Vatican II*, Academic Press Fribourg, Fribourg, 2013, pp. 147-256. Stăniloae’s ecclesiological synthesis has been made known to the English-speaking world by: Calinic (Kevin M.) BERGER, “Does the Eucharist Make the Church? An Ecclesiological Comparison between Stăniloae and Zizioulas”, in: *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* LI (2007) 1, pp. 23-70; R. BORDEIANU, *Dumitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, pp. 41-144; Viorel COMAN, “Dumitru Stăniloae on the *Filioque*: The Trinitarian Relationship between the Son and the Spirit, and Its Relevance for the Eccle-

his original contribution to this topic at hand. The neglect of Stăniloae's contribution is lamentable, especially since his ecclesiology, as Peter Bouteneff emphasized, managed to redress "the imbalance of the twentieth-century essays on the Church"⁵⁶. The Romanian theologian was more successful in balancing Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology as he chose to integrate his doctrine of the Church into an extremely elaborated and skillfully nuanced Trinitarian scheme.

Stăniloae's Trinitarian Theology. The doctrine of the Trinity, "the supreme mystery of existence" which "explains everything, and nothing can be explained without it"⁵⁷, is the structuring principle of Stăniloae's entire theology. Far from being a remote, speculative, and peripheral issue, the doctrine of the Trinity shapes every chapter of Stăniloae's theological work: gnoseology, anthropology, cosmology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. Relying heavily on the Trinitarian reflections of several Byzantine theologians such as *Gregory II of Cyprus* (d. 1290), *Gregory Palamas* (d. 1359) and *Joseph Bryennios* (d. 1438), Stăniloae's theological *corpus* offers one of the most captivating Orthodox depiction of the inner dynamics of the Triune God. Since the Romanian theologian developed his reflections of the mystery of God in the context of the 20th-century debates on the *filioque*, the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit received significant attention in Stăniloae's Trinitarian theology. In line with Trinitarian tradition of the Byzantine theologians, Stăniloae oper-

siological Synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology", in: *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* XLIX (2014) 4, pp. 553-576.

⁵⁶ Peter C. BOUTENEFF, "Foreword", in: D. STĂNILOAE, *The Experience of God*, vol. 4, trans. by Ioan Ionita, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 2012, p. viii. R. Bordeianu also writes: "Staniloae was able to achieve this much-needed balance between the Son and the Spirit in both immanent and economic Trinity, as well as in its applications in the life of the Church" (R. BORDEIANU, *Dumitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, p. 125). See also: V. COMAN, "Unity and Diversity in the Church: Vladimir Lossky's Reflection on the Roles of Christ and the Spirit in the Church, and Its Critical Reception in Dumitru Staniloae's Theology", in: Dagmar HELLER (ed.), *Catholicity under Pressure: The Ambiguous Relationship between Diversity and Unity, Proceedings of the 18th Academic Consultation of the Societas Oecumenica*, coll. Beihefte zur Ökumenischen Rundschau 105, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Leipzig, 2016, 303-322.

⁵⁷ D. STĂNILOAE, *Sfânta Treime sau la început a fost iubirea*, Ed. Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1993, p. 7 (English transl.: *The Holy Trinity: In the Beginning There Was Love*, transl. by Roland Clark, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 2012, p. i). †Teoctist Arăpașu, the Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church in the period from 1986 to 2007, who wrote the "Foreword" to his book, remarked: "The dogma of the Trinity has always been at the center of Orthodox theology, which is why was an endless subject of reflection for Fr. Stăniloae... The special place that the Trinity occupies in his teaching on the Church makes Fr. Stăniloae the theologian *par excellence* of the Holy Trinity in the contemporary world. In fact, his entire corpus is a mammoth effort to place the unspeakable mystery of the Holy Trinity at the center of all recent Christian life and thought" (†Teoctist ARĂPAȘU, "Foreword", in: D. STĂNILOAE, *The Holy Trinity...*, p. vii).

ated a clear distinction between the Spirit's movement towards existence, which is from the Father, and the Spirit's movement towards manifestation, which is from the Son. According to him,

- the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and rests in the Son. The Son is therefore the eternal resting place of the Son. In proceeding from the Father in order to rest in the Son, the Spirit communicates the Father's love to the Son, which is the goal of procession⁵⁸;
- the Holy Spirit shines out from the Son towards the Father, as the Son's loving answer to the love of His Father, which is the goal of manifestation⁵⁹;
- the procession of the Holy Spirit from and Father and the generation of the Son from the Father happen simultaneously and inseparably⁶⁰;
- the Holy Spirit, that is, the third Person of the Trinity, not only "keeps the other two Persons from immersing themselves in each other"⁶¹, but is also the "loving tie formed between the Father and the Son"⁶².

⁵⁸ D. STĂNILOAE, "Purcederea Duhului Sfânt de la Tatăl și relația lui cu Fiul ca temei al îndumnezeirii și înfierii noastre", in: *Ortodoxia* XXXI (1979) 3-4, pp. 588-589 (English transl.: "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His Relation to the Son, as the Basis of Our Deification and Adoption", in: Lukas VISCHER [ed.], *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy*, coll. Faith and Order Paper No. 103, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1981, p. 181).

⁵⁹ D. STĂNILOAE, "Relațiile treimice și viața bisericii", in: *Ortodoxia* XVI (1964) 4, pp. 516-517 (English transl.: "Trinitarian Relations and The Life of The Church", in: D. STĂNILOAE, *Theology and the Church*, pp. 30-31).

⁶⁰ D. STĂNILOAE, "Relațiile treimice", p. 516 (English transl.: "Trinitarian Relations...", p. 30).

⁶¹ "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. With 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" (D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia dogmatică ortodoxă*, vol. I, Ed. Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, ³2003, p. 323; English transl.: *The Experience of God*, vol. I, pp. 268-269).

⁶² "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 to us" (D. STĂNILOAE, *Sfânta Treime sau la început a fost iubirea*, pp. 70, 71, and 73; English transl.: *The Holy Trinity: In the Beginning There Was Love*, pp. 62, 63, and 65).

In Stăniloae's theology, the Trinitarian life does not simply consist of processions or relations of origin. In speaking of the Spirit who abides in or shines forth from the Son, he provided a foundation for relationships of reciprocity, that is, the relationships of the *perichoresis*. Unlike Kallistos Ware, who considered that the notion of *perichoresis* should be related with the Greek word *horos*, i.e., a "circular movement" or a "circular dance"⁶³, Stăniloae claimed that the term

"cannot be understood only as the motion of each Person «around» the others... Thus with respect to the 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 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"⁶⁴.

On account of these perichoretic relationships which exist between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, Stăniloae emphasized that "no divine Person is ever, either in the Church as a whole or in individual believer, without the other divine Persons"⁶⁵. That being so, any attempt to define Christ's activity in the Church in opposition to the Spirit's activity, as in the case of Lossky, goes against the inseparability, simultaneity, reciprocity, and mutual interiority that characterize the relationship between the Son and the Spirit within the inner Trinity and in the history of salvation. Therefore, Stăniloae conceived the perichoretic relations between the divine Persons as the basis of the relation of the Trinity with the world and the Church.

The Church as a Chapter of Trinitarian Theology. In spite of the fact that both Lossky and Zizioulas tried to articulate the doctrine of the Church in light of the doctrine of the Trinity, their ecclesiologies were rather binitarian⁶⁶ than Trinitarian; that is, the Church is described mostly in relation with Christ and the Spirit. In this context, what makes Stăniloae's ecclesiology attractive and unique is the full incorporation of the Church into the loving communion of the Trinity. The mystery of the Trinity's divine life is extended to the Church

⁶³ K. WARE, *L'île au-delà du monde*, Cerf et Sel de la terre, Paris, 2005, p. 42.

⁶⁴ D. STĂNILOAE, "Relațiile treimice...", pp. 521-522 (English transl.: "Trinitarian Relations...", pp. 38-39).

⁶⁵ D. STĂNILOAE, "Relațiile treimice...", p. 522 (English transl.: "Trinitarian Relations...", p. 39).

⁶⁶ R. BORDEIANU points out that "The terms monistic and binitarian are probably too strong, since, in reality, it is a matter of priority (at worst) or emphasis (at best)" (R. BORDEIANU, *Dumitru Stăniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology*, p. 67).

while the Church is raised up into the loving communion between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and rests upon the Son to communicate to Him the love of His Father. Shining forth from the Son, the Spirit returns back to the Father as the loving response of His Son. In the history of salvation as well as in the life of the Church, the same Spirit descends upon Christ and upon those gathered in His Body the Church to show them the love of the Heavenly Father. Through the Holy Spirit they respond back to the loving initiative of the Almighty Father:

“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”⁶⁷.

For the Romanian theologian, the Trinity and the Church are no longer two parallel realities which do not relate to each other. On the contrary, the Church is being brought into the mystery of the Trinity’s loving relationships. In portraying the Church as the extension of the loving Trinitarian communion, Stăniloae managed to overcome G. Florovsky’s interrogation: *Is the Church a chapter of Christology or a chapter of pneumatology*⁶⁸? Since Stăniloae extends the loving relationships between the divine Persons to the Church, his ecclesiology is a chapter of the theology of the Father as much as it is a chapter of Christology and pneumatology. In so doing, Stăniloae also avoided the danger of prioritizing either Christology or pneumatology in ecclesiology. According to him, the perichoretic relationship between the Son and the Spirit within the Trinity is reflected in the life of the Church, where Christology and pneumatology are inseparable and mutually dependent. The Church, both in its constitutive moment and in its continuing existence, is a Christocentric reality as much as it is a pneumatocentric one.

The Spirit, who eternally rests upon the Son, descends upon the humanity which is assumed in the act of the Incarnation by the hypostasis of the Son, and deifies it through Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension. Christ’s risen, deified, and fully spiritual body, which is offered back to the Father, becomes

⁶⁷ D. STĂNILOAE, “Relațiile treimice...”, p. 517 (English transl.: “Trinitarian Relations...”, pp. 31-32).

⁶⁸ G. FLOROVSKY, “Christ and His Church...”, p. 165.

the permanent foundation of the Church. At Pentecost, the Holy Spirit, who eternally shines forth from the Son, shines forth from Christ into human beings, and extends His deified body in them, producing the Church that is constantly oriented towards the Father:

“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... The descent of the Holy Spirit is what gives the Church a real existence; it initiates the indwelling of Christ’s body in human beings and thereby initiates the Church as well”⁶⁹.

There is always a reciprocity between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit in the life of the Church. The Spirit who rests upon all those gathered in the Church not only makes possible their faith in Christ, but fashions them in the image and likeness of him. At the same time, the Spirit points towards Christ but the Spirit itself is known through Christ. As Stăniloae stated, “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 one is bound to Christ”⁷⁰. Therefore, Stăniloae concluded, in each and every ecclesial event, aspect, component or structure, the Church is both Christological and pneumatological at the same time.

The christological and pneumatological Dimensions of the Church in a post-Vatican II roman catholic Ecclesiology

Even though the critique raised by some of the Orthodox theologians against the doctrine of the *filioque* and its ecclesiological-damaging conse-

⁶⁹ D. STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. II, Ed. Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, ³2003, p. 202 (English transl.: *The Experience of God, Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. IV, p. 2). Commenting upon Stăniloae’s ecclesiological balance between the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit, P. Bouteneff remarks: “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»” (P. BOUTENEFF, “Foreword”, in: D. STĂNILOAE, *The Experience of God*, vol. IV, pp. viii-ix).

⁷⁰ D. STĂNILOAE, “Relațiile treimnice...”, pp. 505-506 (English transl.: “Trinitarian Relations...”, p. 14).

quences were not without exaggerations and oversimplifications, it received a fair amount of attention from the part of Western theologians. Needless to say, most of them defended Western theology against the charge of “ecclesiological Christomonism”. Yet they acknowledged their Church’s need to explore deeper the ecclesiological function of the Holy Spirit, and to work out a proper synthesis between Christology and pneumatology⁷¹.

Stimulated by the presence at the Council of the Orthodox observers and different theologians working in the field of liturgical and sacramental theology, the task of rediscovering the pneumatological and the Trinitarian fundamentals of the Christian life laid at the heart of the *Second Vatican Council* (1962-1965). As such, in contrast to the institutional rigidity and static doctrinal approaches that had largely characterized Roman Catholic theology in the era before the council, *Lumen Gentium*’s renewed attention to pneumatology and Trinitarian theology inspired a shift towards an understanding of the Church as *communion* and sacramental reality⁷². Unfortunately, as Congar highlighted, Vatican II’s efforts to recover the pneumatological dimension of the Church “stopped halfway”⁷³. Some Orthodox theologians objected even

⁷¹ “La théologie latine mérite-t-elle cependant le reproche que lui adressent les Orthodoxes, quand ils disent qu’elle est purement christologique? Nous ne le croyons pas, mais devons reconnaître l’existence d’un problème: notre théologie ne voit pas assez que la Mission du Saint Esprit est propre et originale” – Yves CONGAR, “La pneumatologie dans la théologie catholique”, in: *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* LI (1967) 2, p. 251; Y. CONGAR, “Pneumatologie ou christomonisme dans la tradition latine?”, in: Joseph COPPENS (ed.), *Ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto edocta: Lumen Gentium 53. Mélanges théologiques - Hommage à Mgr Gérard Philips*, coll. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 27, Éditions J. Duculot, Gembloux, 1970, pp. 41-63.

⁷² “The ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea of the Council’s documents” (THE SYNOD OF BISHOPS, “The Church in the Word of God Celebrates the Mysteries of Christ for the Salvation of the World - Final Report of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod of Bishops”, in: *L’Osservatore Romano*, December 16, 1985). A similar affirmation is made by Ladislav Orsy: “Communio was the central theme of the Council... The Council Fathers made a profession of faith in the church of Christ as the communion of believers” (L. ORSY, *Receiving the Council: Theological and Canonical Insights and Debates*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 2009, p. xiii). In a presentation delivered at a symposium on the reception of the Council held in Rome in November 2000, pope Benedict XVI, at that time the Prefect of the congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, wrote: “it should be recognized first of all that the word *communio* does not have a central position in the Council. But if it is properly understood it can serve as a synthesis for the essential elements of conciliar ecclesiology” (BENEDICT XVI, “The Ecclesiology of the Constitution of the Church, Vatican II, «Lumen Gentium»”, in: *L’Osservatore Romano*, September 19, 2001).

⁷³ “Le deuxième concile du Vatican a commencé à nous rendre la dimension pneumatologique de l’Église, inséparablement en elle-même et dans son rapport avec le cosmos. A commencé, disons-nous. Car, ici comme en beaucoup de choses, Vatican II est resté comme à mi-chemin, mais il a ensemencé l’Église de germes vivants, qui ont fructifié depuis. Nous pensons à la place reconnue aux charismes, à une théologie des Eglises locales, à un début de considération des ministères, à ce qui est dit du «sensus fidei», à l’action de l’Esprit dans l’histoire du

more strongly against the ecclesiology of the Council. According to Olivier Clément, Vatican II's ecclesiology seems to tip in favor of a pneumatology that is too much dependent on Christology⁷⁴.

Despite the fact that the Second Vatican Council managed only partially to place its ecclesiology within a pneumatological horizons, it gave a decisive impulse to the pneumatological renaissance in Roman Catholic theology. Yves Congar and Walter Kasper were two of the most prominent theologians who took over the Council's commitment of integrating pneumatology organically into ecclesiology.

Christ and the Spirit, the Church's Two Lungs: Yves Congar

Yves Congar was one of the most influential 20th-century Roman Catholic ecclesialogists. His thoughts have not always been systematically presented but scholars have still detected some of the main characteristics of his doctrine of the Church. Richard P. Mc Brien begins one of his articles on the French Dominican theologian by illustrating that Congar's published work counts more than 1700 items, "and a relatively substantial portion of them have at least something to do with his understanding of the relationship existing between ecclesiology, pneumatology, Christology, and theological anthropology, or any combination thereof"⁷⁵. The impressive results of his work, which aimed

monde... Je ne sais – ce serait une étude à faire – avec quelle vision de Dieu a opéré Vatican I: peut-être avec celle de ce qu'Heribert Mühlen appelle «un monothéisme prétrinitaire»? Vatican II a une vision formellement trinitaire" (Y. CONGAR, "Actualité de la pneumatologie", in: José SARAIVA MARTINS [ed.], *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum: atti del congresso teologico internazionale di pneumatologia, Roma, 22-26 marzo 1982*, Libreria editrice Vaticana, Vatican City, 1983, p. 16).

⁷⁴ "De ecclesia mentionne souvent l'Esprit Saint – à la suite des critiques orthodoxe notamment – dont sa première rédaction avait fait l'objet. Pourtant, on n'y saurait trouver de véritable pneumatologie, de sorte que les intuitions si remarquables des premiers chapitres restent isolées, sans application dans l'organisation (ou le refus d'organisation) de l'Eglise... Dans *De ecclesia*, il est rarement question du Saint Esprit comme tel, mais, le plus souvent, avec une grande insistance, de «l'Esprit du Christ», de «l'Esprit du Fils», répétition qui, rapprochée du rappel constant de l'Eglise comme Corps du Christ, finit par donner de l'Esprit une impression plus fonctionnelle que personnelle... l'ecclésiologie de notre texte reste donc nettement filioquiste" (Olivier CLEMENT, "Quelques remarques d'un orthodoxe sur la constitution *De ecclesia*", in: Friedrich W. KANTZENBACH, Vilmos VAJTA [eds.], *Oecumenica: Jahrbuch für ökumenische Forschung*, Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel, 1966, p. 107, 108, and 109).

⁷⁵ Richard P. MCBRIEN, "I Believe in the Holy Spirit: The Role of Pneumatology in Yves Congar's Theology", in: Gabriel FLYNN (ed.), *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 32, Peeters Prees, Louvain, 2005, 303. Pavel Czyz also claim that Congar's attempt to develop a pneumatological and Trinitarian foundation of the Church is a main ecclesiological theme in his theology (P. CZYZ, *Il rapporto tra la dimensione cristologica e pneumatologica dell'ecclésiologia nel pensiero di Y. Congar*, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Theology, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1986, p. 6). See also: François-Marie HUMANN, *La relation de l'Esprit-Saint au Christ: une relecture d'Yves Congar*, coll.

to overcome the divorce between pneumatology, Christology, and ecclesiology, placed him among the architects of the radical changes which took place in Catholic theology in period after the Second Vatican Council.

Experts in Congar's theology observed that there is a gradual development in his theological reflections on the relationship between pneumatology, Christology, and ecclesiology. The periodization of Congar's reflections on Christ, the Spirit, and the Church, differs from scholar to scholar. F.-M. Humann proposes a periodization in three stages: 1) 1930-1945; 2) 1945-1965; 3) 1965-1985⁷⁶. Joseph Famerée speaks of two main periods: 1) before Vatican II; he divides this period in three stages: 1937-1950; 1952-1953; 1954-1959; 2) after the Council⁷⁷. Following Cornelis Th.M. Van Vliet⁷⁸, both Elisabeth Groppe and Alain Nisus detected four major periods in Congar's pneumatology: 1) 1931-1944; 2) 1944-1959; 3) 1959-1968; 4) 1969-1991⁷⁹. In presenting Congar's reflections I will rely on the four-stage period, which has been adopted by most of the scholars.

1931-1944: The Spirit as the Soul of the Mystical Body of Christ. The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ stands as the predominant paradigm of Congar's initial reflections on ecclesiology. "La vraie définition de l'Eglise, Congar says, c'est 'le Corps mystique de Jésus-Christ'⁸⁰. His struggle to reincorporate the theology of the Mystical Body into the ecclesiology of the pre-Vatican II period needs to be read as a reaction against the post-Reformation theologians' preference for the *societas perfecta* image of the Church, i.e., a juridical and centralized monarchical entity. In this period, Congar's approach did not go far beyond the Christ-centered ecclesiology of his predecessors within Roman Catholic tradition. As A. Nisus remarks, his ecclesiology "est construite surtout à l'aide du matériau christologique"⁸¹. Even though Congar

Cogito Fidei 274, Cerf, Paris, 2010; Elisabeth T. GROPPE, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004; Joseph KALLARANGATT, *The Holy Spirit, Bond of Communion of the Churches: A Comparative Study of the Ecclesiology of Yves Congar and Nikos Nissiotis*, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Theology, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1989; Mario MEINI, *Lo Spirito Santo nell'ecclesiologia di Yves Congar*, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Theology, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, 1988; Alain NISUS, "L'Esprit et l'église dans l'oeuvre d'Yves Congar", in: *Transversalités* XCVIII (2006), pp. 109-155.

⁷⁶ F.-M. HUMANN, *La relation de l'Esprit-Saint au Christ...*, pp. 35-121.

⁷⁷ Joseph FAMERÉE, *L'Ecclesiologie d'Yves Congar avant Vatican II: Histoire et église. Analyse et reprise critique*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, 1992, p. 400.

⁷⁸ Cornelis Th. VAN VLIET, *Communio sacramentalis: das Kirchenverständnis von Yves Congar*, Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, Mainz, 1995.

⁷⁹ E. GROPPE, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 33-35; Alain NISUS, "L'Esprit et l'église dans l'oeuvre d'Yves Congar", pp. 111-114.

⁸⁰ Y. CONGAR, *Chrétiens désunis: principes d'un «œcuménisme» catholique*, coll. Unam Sanctam 1, Cerf, Paris, 1937, p. 266.

⁸¹ A. NISUS, "L'Esprit et l'église dans l'oeuvre d'Yves Congar", p. 111; A. NISUS, *L'Église comme communion et institution: une lecture de l'ecclesiologie du cardinal Congar à partir*

was aware of the fact that “l’Eglise est le Corps du Seigneur ressuscité et glorifié; elle est la Pentecôte continuée, le signe permanent de l’envoi du Saint Esprit”⁸², the Holy Spirit played no significant role in his ecclesiological explorations of these years. The Dominican Father preferred to speak of the Holy Spirit as the indwelling soul of the mystical body of Christ⁸³. The major risk of this pneumatological approach is that Spirit’s activity seems to be domesticated or monopolized by the Church’s structures. Such a theological vision on the status of the Spirit in the life of the Church was the result of the dominance in Roman Catholic theology of what Zizioulas has identified as the “classical schema of divine Revelation”: the Holy Spirit is conditioned by Christ; as a result of that, the Church, as the extension of Christ’s incarnation (*Christus prolongatus*), controls the activity of the Holy Spirit.

1944-1959: The Spirit as the Animator of the Church’s Structures. The notion of the Church as the People of God became a central ecclesiological theme in Congar’s post-war writings. From 1944 to 1959, the French theologian’s promotion of the “People of God” ecclesiological paradigm reflected his interest in laying down the theoretical basis for a rediscovery of the laity’s role in the life of the Church. In the words of a Congarian scholar, “les concepts clefs qui l’aident à aborder ces questions, sont les couples dialectiques «structure et vie», «institution et communion»”⁸⁴. As for the function of pneumatology in ecclesiology in the post-WWII period, Congar began to develop the idea that the Spirit’s *opus proprium* refers to the vivification and dinamization of the Church’s structures which are established by Christ. Holding a sharp distinction between “une écclésiologie de la vie et une écclésiologie de la structure”, Congar claimed that the first type of ecclesiology is identified with “une écclésiologie pneumatologique” whereas the second type with “une écclésiologie christologique”⁸⁵. Therefore, as in the case of Lossky, Congar associated Christology with the institutional and objective component of the Church. Pneumatology, on the contrary, refers to the subjective dimension: the Holy Spirit brings life to the Church’s structures and interiorizes Christ’s salvific work. The similar criticism that has been advanced against Lossky’s ecclesiology can also be directed against Congar’s view on the roles of the Spirit and Christ in ecclesiology in the period prior to the Second Vatican Council. Given the fact that Congar has started to associate pneumatology with the subjective / char-

de la tradition des Églises de professants, Cogito Fidei 282, Cerf, Paris, 2012, p. 103. J. Rigal also writes that in this period “l’écclésiologie du dominicain reste fortement christocentrique” (J. RIGAL, *L’écclésiologie de communion...*, p. 157).

⁸² Y. CONGAR, “Bulletin d’écclésiologie”, in: *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* XXV (1936) 4, p. 766.

⁸³ Y. CONGAR, *Chrétiens désunis...*, p. 64.

⁸⁴ A. NISUS, “L’Esprit et l’église dans l’œuvre d’Yves Congar”, p. 111.

⁸⁵ Y. CONGAR, *Esquisses du mystère de l’église*, coll. Unam Sanctam 8, Cerf, Paris, ²1953, p. 176.

ismatic element of the Church in the years immediately following the publication of Lossky's *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l'église d'Orient* (Paris, 1944), it might be the case that the Russian theologian has exercised a certain influence upon the Dominican Father's ecclesiological approach.

In spite of the French theologian's efforts to assign to the Spirit an essential place in ecclesiology, his doctrine of the Church continued to remain profoundly shaped by Christology. Pneumatology detained a very secondary role: the Spirit animates what has been already constituted by Christ. As Congar said, the Holy Spirit "est envoyé lors de la Pentecôte à une Église déjà constituée et structurée; il vient en elle comme un principe de vie et de mouvement, mais l'Église existe par l'institution de Jésus"⁸⁶. As a matter of fact, Congar's entire ecclesiological approach in the pre-conciliar lacked a robust pneumatological outlook⁸⁷.

1959-1968: A Transitory Stage. Congar was a man whose theological vision had a decisive influence upon the documents of Vatican II⁸⁸. At the same time, Vatican II had an important impact upon the trajectory of his post-conciliar theology, especially upon Congar's search for a proper ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology. The third period of Congar's explorations of the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church was significantly driven by the Second Vatican Council's pneumatological impulse. As a very general observation, from 1959 to 1968 Congar was preoccupied with the necessity to respond to the exaggerated criticism of the Orthodox theologians against the "Christomonism" of Western ecclesiology than to examine the contribution of the Spirit in the Church⁸⁹. Furthermore, the conciliar period of Congar's theology represented the preparatory stage for Dominican Father's most prolific years. It is in 1969 that Congar

⁸⁶ Y. CONGAR, "L'Esprit-Saint dans l'église", in: *Lumière et vie* X (1953), p. 54; Congar also writes: "Le Saint-Esprit vient essentiellement animer et mouvoir un corps constitué à partir du Christ et qui est son corps; il est pour le triple dépôt de la foi, des sacrements et des pouvoirs apostoliques, ce qu'est le principe vital d'un organisme" (Y. CONGAR, *Esquisses du mystère de l'église*, p. 159).

⁸⁷ "le principe christologique restera prédominant dans les écrits antéconciliaires, mais Congar tâchera progressivement de le compléter par un principe pneumatologique" (J. FAMERÉE and Gilles ROUTHIER, *Yves Congar*, Cerf, Paris, 2008, p. 151).

⁸⁸ Alberto MELLONI, "Yves Congar à Vatican II", in: André VAUCHEZ (ed.), *Cardinal Yves Congar (1904-1995): actes du colloque réunis à Rome les 3-4 juin 1996*, Cerf, Paris, 1999, pp. 117-164. J. Famerée and G. Routhier are of the opinion that "on ne saurait séparer l'œuvre de Congar du concile Vatican II auquel il a contribué avec toutes ses énergies" (J. FAMERÉE and G. ROUTHIER, *Yves Congar*, p. 235).

⁸⁹ Y. CONGAR, "La pneumatologie dans la théologie catholique", pp. 250-258. For a brief introduction into the topic of Congar's relationships with Orthodox theology, see: J. FAMERÉE, "Orthodox Influence of the Roman Catholic Theologian Yves Congar, O.P.: A Sketch", in: *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXXIX (1995) 4, pp. 409-416.

started to develop his much more solid reflections on the relationship between Christology, pneumatology, and ecclesiology.

1969-1991: The Holy Spirit Co-institutes the Church. Congar's ecclesiology in its last phase was profoundly shaped by the Dominican theologian's increased interest in pneumatology. "Convinced as he was that Western Catholics have not done justice in recent centuries to the person and work of the Holy Spirit", writes Aidan Nichols, Congar ended "his theological career by, at least in appearance, turning away from his great love, ecclesiology, to what was, in fact its own deepest basis, the doctrine of the Spirit"⁹⁰. Congar's most significant books in this period, e.g., the trilogy *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint* (1979-1980) and the volume entitled *Le Parole et le Souffle*⁹¹, showed considerable changes in his understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. In contrast with the French theologian's writings before Vatican II, in which he had presented the Spirit as the one who continues or animates the work of Christ, his publications from the 1970s and 1980s started to emphasize that the Spirit is not a mere instrument or appendix of the Word but Christology and pneumatology are of equal importance in the establishment of the Church.

Integrating more fully the pneumatological aspect into his ecclesiology, in the opening lines of his introduction to the volume *Le Parole et le Souffle*, Congar noted that there is one phrase that could summarize his latter essays and books on the Holy Spirit: "pas de christologie sans pneumatologie, pas de pneumatologie sans christologie"⁹². Apart from indicating the inseparable communion that exists between Christ and the Spirit in the economy of salvation and in the life of the Church, the statement speaks of Congar's orientation towards a pneumatological Christology: the Holy Spirit is not simply sent to the world by the risen Christ but constitutes Jesus as

⁹⁰ Aidan NICHOLS, *Yves Congar*, Morehouse-Barlow, Wilton, 1989, p. 61.

⁹¹ Y. CONGAR, *Le Parole et le Souffle*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1984 (English transl.: *The Word and the Spirit*, trans. by David Smith, Harper and Row, San Francisco, 1986). See also the following articles of Congar: "Le troisième article du credo: l'impact de la pneumatologie dans la vie de l'Église", in: J. DORE (ed.), *Dieu, Eglise, Société*, Cerf, Paris, 1985, pp. 287-309; Y. CONGAR, "Les implications christologiques et pneumatologiques de l'ecclésiologie de Vatican II", in: G. ALBERIGO (ed.), *Les Églises après Vatican II: dynamisme et prospective*, Actes du colloque international de Bologne, coll. Théologie historique 61, Beauchesne, Paris, 1980, pp. 118-130; Y. CONGAR, "Renouveau de l'Esprit et institution ecclésiale: mutuelle interrogation", in: *Recherches d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* LV (1975), pp. 143-156; Y. CONGAR, "La Tri-unité de Dieu et l'Église", in: *Vie spirituelle* CXXVIII (1974), pp. 687-703; Y. CONGAR, "Pneumatology Today", in: *The American Ecclesiastical Review* CLXVII (1973), pp. 435-449; Y. CONGAR, "Actualité d'une pneumatologie", in: *Proche-Orient Chrétien* XXIII (1973) 2, pp. 121-132; Y. CONGAR, "Actualité renouvelée du Saint-Esprit", in: *Lumen Vitae* XXVII (1972) 4, pp. 543-560.

⁹² Y. CONGAR, *Le Parole et le Souffle*, p. 13.

Messiah⁹³; therefore pneumatology defines Christology and *vice-versa*. Congar's articulation of a pneumatological Christology in the latest decades of his theological activity intended to balance the Christological pneumatology of his earlier writings, which prioritized an understanding of the Holy Spirit as the gift communicated by Christ.

The Dominican theologian's development of a pneumatological Christology considerably refreshed his reflections on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Therefore, Congar deemed it necessary to correct his previous essays on ecclesiology, which had argued that the Holy Spirit's mission in the Church succeeds that of Jesus Christ, animating the ecclesial structures instituted by Christ. In so doing, he accentuated that the Spirit does not simply animate but also "co-institutes" the Church, which is the Temple of the Holy Spirit. This means that "l'Esprit ne vient pas seulement animer une institution totalement déterminée en ses structures, mais qu'il est proprement «co-instituant»"⁹⁴. In order to indicate the ecclesologically constitutive role of the Spirit, Congar entitled the first chapter of volume II of *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint* as follows: "L'Église est fait par l'Ésprit: Il est en co-instituant"⁹⁵. Nevertheless, he pointed out that a correct pneumatology should not receive absolute autonomy in the economy of salvation. "La santé de la pneumatologie, states Congar, c'est la référence à l'oeuvre du Christ et à la Parole de Dieu"⁹⁶.

The fact that Congar came to stress that pneumatology really co-institutes the Church of Christ led him to reject the idea of a free and autonomous sector attributed to the Holy Spirit, i.e., acts, activities, and interventions of the Spirit that could go beyond or against the institutional dimension of the Church. Given the inseparable communion that exists between Christ and the Spirit in the economy of salvation, the French theologian wrote that there is no tension between Christology and pneumatology in the life of the Church. "Le Seigneur glorifié et l'Esprit font la même oeuvre. L'unité du Christ glorifié et de l'Esprit est fonctionnelle, c'est-à-dire d'opération"⁹⁷, claimed Congar.

⁹³ Y. CONGAR, *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint, vol. III: Le fleuve de vie qui coule n Orient et en Occident*, Cerf, Paris, 1980, pp. 219-228 (English transl.: *I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. III: The River of the Water of Life Flows in the East and in the West*, trans. by David Smith, The Seabury Press, New York, 1983, pp. 165-173).

⁹⁴ Y. CONGAR, *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint, vol. II : Il est Seigneur et Il donne la vie*, Cerf, Paris, 1979, p. 19 (English transl.: *I Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. II: He is Lord and giver of Life*, trans. by David Smith, The Seabury Press, New York, 1983, p. 9). In another text, Congr writes: "le Saint-Esprit, ou le Christ glorieux pneumatisé, est co-instituant actuel de l'Église du Verbe incarné" (Y. CONGAR, *Le Parole et le Souffle*, p. 99).

⁹⁵ Y. CONGAR., *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint*, vol. II, p. 13. David Smith translated the title of this chapter as follows: "The Church Is Made by the Spirit" (Y. CONGAR, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit...*, vol. II, p. 5).

⁹⁶ Y. CONGAR, *Je crois en l'Ésprit-Saint...*, vol. II, p. 24 (English transl.: *I Believe in the Holy Spirit...*, vol. II, p. 12).

⁹⁷ Y. CONGAR, *Le Parole et le Souffle*, p. 53.

Accordingly, each ecclesial reality is determined by Christ and the Spirit at the same time. The sacraments of the Church, the charisms, or any other institutional or spiritual ecclesial components are the work of the Holy Spirit as much as they are the work of Christ. As a matter of fact, even though the idea that the Holy Spirit “co-institutes” the Church was equally present in Congar’s ecclesiology as in Zizioulas’s reflections on the Church, there is an important difference that distinguishes their approaches. Whereas Zizioulas refers to the notion of “co-institution” to emphasize the relations of oppositions between Christ and the Spirit, Congar’s term was not intended to express any tension between the two divine Person in the life of the Church but their relations of reciprocity. In this respect, Congar’s approach was more similar to Stăniloae’s view than to Zizioulas’ position.

Brief Evaluation. Departing from an early ecclesiology that has been connected mainly to Christ, Congar strove to elaborate the balance between Christology and pneumatology in the Church. The appropriation of a pneumatological Christology along with a Christological pneumatology caused Congar to say that the Holy Spirit enters into the texture of the Church to the extent pneumatology constitutes each and every aspect of Christ’s Church.

On the one hand, in stressing the inseparable communion between Christ and the Spirit that rules out any tension or opposition between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology, Congar achieved, in some aspects, much more than the majority of his colleagues. On the other hand, Congar remained captive to an ecclesiology that is connected almost exclusively with the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit, that is, a “binitarian” ecclesiology. Under the influence of Irenaeus of Lyon’s the “two hands of the Father” theology, his doctrine of the Church is primarily shaped by Christology and pneumatology. In Congar’s ecclesiology, the role of Father in the life of the Church did not receive significant attention. As in the case of some of the Orthodox theologians, his ecclesiology showed no major interest in the ecclesiological implications of the theology of the Father. It might not be an exaggeration to say that the theology of the Father became the new “Cinderella” of modern theology. When the two other sisters go to the ball, “Cinderella” is left home.

Apart from that, Congar did not fully incorporate his doctrine of the Church into the Roman Catholic doctrine of the intra-Trinitarian relationships. His emphasis on a pneumatological Christology did not manage to relate the way the Spirit acts in the economy of salvation, i.e., the Spirit is not only the gift poured forth by the risen Christ (*filioque*) but the one who empowers Christ and conditions His activity (*spirituque*), with the way the Spirit exists eternally, i.e., the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (*filioque*). In other words, since Roman Catholic theology tends to read from the “economic Trinity” back into the “immanent Trinity”, a central question arises: what does the fact that the in the economy of salvation the Spirit empowers Christ say about the eternal relationship between the Son and the

T
E
O
L
O
G
I
C
E

Spirit? In some of his writings, Congar seems to suggest however that the Western doctrine of the *filioque* should be complemented by the *spirituque*⁹⁸. However, the challenge posed by pneumatological Christology to the Western understanding of the dynamics of the inner Trinity remains still a subject of discussions at the ecumenical level.

Ecclesiology and pneumatology: Walter Kasper

As James Rudin pointed out, “Cardinal Walter Kasper is a unique combination of a world-class theologian and an emphatic pastor”⁹⁹. His academic career as a professor of theology started at the University of Münster in 1964. Six years later Kasper moved to the University of Tübingen, and remained there until 1989, when he accepted to be consecrated as a bishop. After ten years in the Diocese of Rottenburg-Stuttgart, in 1999 Kasper was asked to move to Rome and serve as the secretary of the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity. He was named cardinal and president of the Pontifical Council and its Commission in 2001. In 2010 Cardinal Kasper resigned from his position in Rome. Among his most renowned publications are: *An Introduction to Christian Faith* (1972)¹⁰⁰, *Jesus the Christ* (1974)¹⁰¹, *The God of Jesus Christ* (1982)¹⁰², and *The Catholic Church: Nature, Reality and Mission* (2011)¹⁰³.

In an article published in 2008, Denis Edwards mentioned that, after Congar, Kasper is “the second radical example of Catholic ecumenical receptivity in the area of pneumatology and it is this that bears fruit in his ecumenical theology and practice”¹⁰⁴. The German Cardinal did not subscribe to the criticism of Orthodox theologians against the so-called “Christomonism” of Roman Catholic tradition but acknowledged that post-Reformation ecclesiology largely neglected the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. Therefore,

⁹⁸ Y. CONGAR, *Le Parole et le Souffle*, p. 151.

⁹⁹ A. James RUDIN, “Tributes to Cardinal Kasper”, in: Kristin M. COLBERG, Robert A. KRIEG (eds.), *Speaking Truth in Love: The Theology of Cardinal Walter Kasper*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 2014, p. xii.

¹⁰⁰ Walter KASPER, *Einführung in den Glauben*, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Mainz, 1972 (English transl.: *An Introduction to Christian Faith*, trans. by V. Green, Pauline Press, New York, 1980).

¹⁰¹ W. KASPER, *Jesus der Christus*, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Mainz, 1974 (English transl.: *Jesus the Christ*, trans. by V. Green, T&T Clark, New York, 2011).

¹⁰² W. KASPER, *Der Gott Jesu Christi*, Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag, Mainz, 1982 (English transl.: *The God of Jesus Christ*, trans. by V. Green, T&T Clark, New York, 2012).

¹⁰³ W. KASPER, *Katolische Kirche: Wesen - Wirklichkeit - Sendung*, Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2011 (English transl.: *The Catholic Church: Nature, Reality, and Mission*, trans. by Thomas Hoebel, T&T Clark, New York, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ Denis EDWARDS, “The Holy Spirit as a Gift: Pneumatology and Catholic Re-reception of Petrine Ministry in the Theology of Walter Kasper”, in: Paul D. MURRAY (ed.), *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, p. 198.

Kasper's receptivity to the criticism coming from the Orthodox side prompted him to restore the balance between Christology and pneumatology in Roman Catholic ecclesiology. As a matter of fact, the careful reader will notice that "theological consideration of the Holy Spirit runs like a golden thread through all of Cardinal Kasper's work"¹⁰⁵, especially in essays and volumes related to matters concerning ecclesiology. In fact, Kasper is one of the Catholic theologians who sought to enhance or complement the traditional *Logos*-Christology with a Spirit-Christology¹⁰⁶, determining the ecclesiological implications of such a pneumatology. Nevertheless, Kasper's ecclesiology attempted to go beyond the "binitarian" tendency of some of his Orthodox and Roman Catholic colleagues. In so doing, he related the doctrine of the Church with each Person of the Trinity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

The Pneuma-Sarx Christology. Following the Vatican II's renewed attention to the role of the Holy Spirit, the publication of the monograph *Jesus the Christ* almost ten years after the closing of the council made Kasper one of the first Roman Catholic theologians to develop a pneumatologically-defined Christology. In the monograph on Christology he integrated the entire life and activity, death and resurrection, history and mystery of Jesus "within a rich theology of the Holy Spirit, arguing that the mediation between the divine and the human Jesus can only be understood as an event in the Spirit"¹⁰⁷. According to Kasper, his choice for a Spirit Christology does not exclude the *Logos*-Christology but complements it. In comparison with the monograph from 1974, in his later book, *God of the Jesus Christ Kasper*, presents a more traditional *Logos*-Christology.

Unlike scholastic theology, which saw the hypostatic union as a condition of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit, Kasper argued that *Logos*-Christology derives from the Spirit-Christology, and not the other way round. The union with the eternal Logos is not the presupposition of the outpouring of the Spirit upon Jesus' humanity. The union is instead the consequences of the Spirit's descent. According to Kasper, the Holy Spirit is the "creative principle which

¹⁰⁵ Elisabeth A. JOHNSON, "Pneumatology and Beyond: «Wherever»", in: Kristin M. COLBERG, Robert A. KRIEG (eds.), *Speaking Truth in Love...*, p. 98.

¹⁰⁶ See also: David COFFEY, *Grace: The Gift of the Holy Spirit*, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 2011; D. COFFEY, "Did You Receive the Holy Spirit when You Believed?" *Some Basic Questions for Pneumatology*, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 2005; D. COFFEY, "The Holy Spirit as the Mutual Love of the Father and the Son", in: *Theological Studies* LI (1990) 2, pp. 193-229; D. COFFEY, "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit", in: *Theological Studies* XLVII (1986) 2, pp. 227-250; D. COFFEY, "The «Incarnation» of the Holy Spirit in Christ", in: *Theological Studies* XLV (1984): 3, pp. 466-480; D. COFFEY, "The Gift of the Holy Spirit", in: *Irish Theological Quarterly* XXXVIII (1971) 3, pp. 202-223; Ralph DEL COLLE, *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit-Christology in Trinitarian Perspective*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.

¹⁰⁷ D. EDWARDS, "The Holy Spirit as a Gift...", pp. 198-199.

sanctifies the man Jesus in such a way as to enable him, by free obedience and dedication, to be the incarnate response to God's self-communication"¹⁰⁸. Without excluding the idea of the assumption of flesh by the Logos, he presented the Spirit's temporal work upon Christ's humanity as mediating the union of the human and the divine nature in the Person of the eternal Son of God. In other words, the Spirit mediates continuously the Incarnation.

Kasper's plea for the *Pneuma-sarx* Christology tried to overcome one of the central problems of the traditional Christology, that is, the doctrine of the *Logos*-Christology is "exclusively concerned with the inner constitution of the divine and human subject. It separates this question from the total context of Jesus' history and fate, from the relation in which Jesus stands with «his Father», and misses the total eschatological perspective of the biblical theology"¹⁰⁹. Despite the criticism that can be directed against the *Pneuma-sarx* schema, Kasper still considered that a Christology pneumatologically defined can hold together the very being of Christ in relation to the God with Christ's history of obedience to and love for the Father¹¹⁰. Kasper is aware that a Spirit-Christology, i.e., a less static and abstract Christology which makes Jesus' humanity theologically significant, runs the risk of Adoptionism, which sacrifices the uniqueness of the person and ministry of Christ. Yet he avoided this problem which had already confronted the early Church by anchoring Jesus' Spirit-person in the being of God. Furthermore, he claims that the *Pneuma-sarx* Christology and the *Logos*-Christology are only apparently opposed. The two Christological schemas are organically related according to a link that is rooted in the eternal mystery of the Trinity¹¹¹. In this regard, Kasper's approach went beyond Congar's ecclesiology, determining an eternal ground for what has been identified as the *Pneuma-sarx* Christology or pneumatological Christology.

The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Doctrine of the Church. In Kasper, the *Penuma-sarx* Christology and the *Logos-Christology* cannot exclude each

¹⁰⁸ W. KASPER, *Jesus the Christ*, p. 239.

¹⁰⁹ W. KASPER, *Jesus the Christ*, p. 226. Gary D. Badcock writes that according to Kasper the Christological dogma of the Council of Chalcedon is "overly static and metaphysical in character, and too little concerned with Jesus' historical, human relation, not to his divine nature as the Son, but to the Father" (G. D. BADCOCK, *Light of Truth & fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, Eerdmans, Cambridge, 1997, p. 155).

¹¹⁰ Commenting upon this aspect of Kasper's theology, E. Johnson states: "Especially in the light of the resurrection, which divinely vindicates Jesus as the one who now sends the Spirit to others, a theology of the soteriological *mission* of Jesus in the power of the Spirit (*Sendungstheologie*) necessarily cannot be separated from a theology of the *being* of Jesus in relation to God (*Seinstheologie*)" (E. JOHNSON, "Pneumatology and Beyond...", p. 102).

¹¹¹ Carlos Kalonji NKOESHA, *Penser la tradition avec Walter Kasper: pertinence d'une catholicité historiquement et culturellement ouverte*, coll. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 259, Peeters, Leuven, 2013, p. 180.

other because the experience of Jesus and the Holy Spirit in the history of salvation and in the life of the Church presents the Son and the Spirit as they exists always in the Trinity. The basic question is then what Trinitarian schema inspires Kasper in order to connect the experience of Jesus and Spirit in the history with the way in which the two divine Persons exists eternally?

The German Cardinal arrived at the conclusion that a model of the Trinity that portrays the Spirit as the love between the Father and the Son provides the necessary link between the two Christological schemas. According to him, in spite of the differences concerning the issue of the Spirit's eternal procession, both traditions can agree on the fact that the Holy Spirit is the bond of love between the Father and the Son. However, Kasper went beyond Augustine's paradigm, pointing out that the Spirit is not only the mutual love between the two other Persons of the Trinity but also the "surplus and effusion of freedom in the love between the Father and the Son". In the Holy Spirit, "as love that is utterly free, God at the same time has the possibility of producing something outside, that is, a creature, and while maintaining its intrinsic creaturely independence, to draw it into his love". It is the Spirit, gift and giver at the same time, who is the transcendental possibility of a free self-communication of God in history: "The Spirit as mediator between Father and Son is at the same time mediator of God into history"¹¹². A double Trinitarian movement, said Kasper, shows even more clearly the function of the Holy Spirit: on the one hand, "the Father communicates himself in love to the Son, in the Spirit this love is aware of its freedom". Through the Holy Spirit this love between the Father and the Son communicates itself outside the Trinity to the creation; on the other hand, in the Spirit-filled humanity of Jesus, the Son gives himself back in love to the Father. Moreover, "in this all-consuming dedication to the point of death, the Spirit as it were becomes free; he is released from his particular historical figure, and consequently Jesus' death and resurrection mediate the coming of the Spirit"¹¹³. The Spirit universalizes the Christ event and renders us receptive to the Father's love. Yet only in Jesus Christ is God's self-communication fully accepted. He is the only bearer of the Spirit in the absolute sense of the word: "The universal historical activity of the Spirit therefore reached its goal in him in a way that is ultimate. Light falls from Jesus Christ on the rest of history"¹¹⁴.

¹¹² W. KASPER, *Jesus the Christ*, p. 238. "A theology of the Holy Spirit as both giver and gift, and thus a theology of the Holy Spirit as self-gift, is the ultimate ground or, in other language, the transcendental theological condition for the possibility of the reality and effective realization of the salvation that is bestowed on us through Jesus Christ" (W. KASPER, *The God of Jesus Christ*, p. 227).

¹¹³ W. KASPER, *Jesus the Christ*, p. 252.

¹¹⁴ W. KASPER, *Jesus the Christ*, p. 255.

Ecclesiologically speaking, Kasper's reflection on the way in which the two Christological schemas are rooted in the mystery of the Trinity is important for several reasons: first, it insisted in presenting the economy of salvation and the life in the Church as the extension of the Trinitarian love to the human person. Since pneumatology and Christology are synthesized in closed connection with the functions of the Spirit and the Son in the inner Trinity, the Trinity and the Church seem no longer to be parallel realities; second, even though the relationship between Christ and the Spirit dominated his theology, God the Father, as the one who initiates and receives back the loving movement, acquired in Kasper's theology a prominent ecclesiological relevance. Through the Holy Spirit the members of the Body of Christ are drawn into the love of the Father. What happened once and for all in Jesus Christ, i.e., the Father's self-communication in Jesus as well as Jesus's complete response to the Father's love, is extended in the Church and the world through the Spirit.

Ecclesiology as a Function of Pneumatology. Kasper's understanding of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit in the economy of salvation in light of the *Pneuma-sarx* Christology had significant implications for his ecclesiology. The emphasis on Spirit-Christology allowed Kasper to speak of ecclesiology as a function of the Holy Spirit¹¹⁵. His choice to define the Church as an instrument of the Holy Spirit contrasted with Western medieval ecclesiology, which assigned a subordinate role to the Spirit in relation to the Church's institutional structure. Instead of presenting the Church as domesticating the Spirit's activity, Kasper opted for an ecclesiology that is a function of pneumatology. An ecclesiology built on pneumatology fashions the Church not as an institution which possesses the Spirit but as an event in the Spirit, which includes the institution. As the German theologian wrote, in the history of salvation

“the Spirit does not simply follow the work of Christ; the Spirit precedes Christ's work, supporting and enabling it. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ but not His servant...The Spirit is not a slavish administrator of the word and work of Christ; he is sovereign and live-giving Spirit that interprets the person, word of and work of Christ spiritually with relative freedom”¹¹⁶.

For Kasper, it is precisely the freedom of the Spirit which grounds an ecclesiology which sees the Church “as an event in which the truth, freedom and justice which entered the world with Christ remain alive in history and are

¹¹⁵ W. KASPER, *An Introduction to Christian Faith*, p. 138.

¹¹⁶ W. KASPER, “The Renewal of Pneumatology in Contemporary Catholic Life and Theology: Towards a Rapprochement between East and West”, in: Doris DONNELLY, Adelbert DENAUX, Joseph FAMERÉE (eds.), *The Holy Spirit, the Church, and the Christian Unity*, coll. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 181, Peeters, Leuven, 2015, p. 15.

constantly given new life"¹¹⁷. Nevertheless, an ecclesiology as a function of pneumatology does not exclude the institutional dimension of the Church. The institutional components are essential for Kasper. According to him, the Church is called by the Holy Spirit not to be enslaved by the limits and rigidity of the institutional forms. The Church has to be open to witness the Spirit's freedom and newness. The institutions themselves are to be understood not as structures that monopolizes the Spirit but as sacramental signs of the Spirit.

Kasper's Spirit-Christology guided all the elements of his ecclesiology, especially the relationship between charisms and institution. In his opinion, the fact of depicting the Church as sacrament, place, and instrument of the Spirit

"excludes both extremes: the extreme of enthusiasm which excludes the sacramental and ministerial mediation as well as the extreme of a purely hierarchical-institutional view of the Church which identifies the Church with the ecclesiastical establishment and thereby overlooks the mere sign and service nature of the institution"¹¹⁸.

For Kasper, the Church understood this way implies a dynamic complementarity between the different ministries and charisms. He noted that the Holy Spirit as the ecstatic and kenotic love between the Father and the Son, that is, the love that give itself freely and gives the other persons space, provides the model and source of a correct interaction between ministries and charisms: "As spiritual gifts, ministries and charismata should be totally themselves by giving themselves and particularly by spreading love they are to keep their own freedom and that of others"¹¹⁹.

Brief Assessment. Kasper's ecclesiology attempted to go beyond the «binitarian» tendency of his colleagues, and relate the doctrine of the Church with each Person of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. His preoccupation with connecting the synthesis between Christology and pneumatology within the inner relationships between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit offered a unique contribution to the relationship between ecclesiology and the doctrine of the immanent Trinity in Roman Catholic theology. In other words, the synthesis between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit in the life of the Church is illuminated by and rooted in the eternal Trinitarian mystery. However, in spite of the German Cardinal's bold pronouncement of the simultaneity between Christ and the Spirit, the pneumatological element of his ecclesiology tended to get a certain priority. His emphasis laid, therefore, on a Christology that is conditioned by pneumatology. Nevertheless, his Spirit-centered ecclesiology insists that the first rule for discerning the

¹¹⁷ W. KASPER, *An Introduction to Christian Faith*, p. 139.

¹¹⁸ W. KASPER, *The Catholic Church*, p. 141.

¹¹⁹ W. KASPER, *The Catholic Church*, p. 142.

Holy Spirit is Christological in nature. The decisive criterion, then, for the discernment of the Spirit is Jesus Christ¹²⁰.

Conclusions

By way of conclusions, several aspects need to be emphasized:

1) 20th-century Orthodox theologians' efforts to articulate a proper synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology found the equilibrium between the two components of the Church with different degrees of success. Vladimir Lossky affirmed the independence of the Spirit to the extent of disconnecting pneumatology from Christology. Although John Zizioulas intended to revise Lossky's ecclesiological divorce between Christ and the Spirit, his approach resulted in being to a certain extent similar to that of the Russian theologian: Christology goes against pneumatology and *vice versa*. It is Dumitru Stăniloae who has succeeded in elaborating a Trinitarian ecclesiology which avoids the risk of prioritizing either Christology or pneumatology as well as the "binitarian" tendencies of Lossky and Zizioulas. Unfortunately, his ecclesiological contribution is not sufficiently known outside the borders of his country.

2) The drastic charge of "Christomonism" that has been raised against Roman Catholic ecclesiology has always been rejected by Western theologians but the plea for the revitalization of the pneumatological dimension of the Church has been a central theme in Western theology since Vatican II. Following the Council's impulse of a pneumatological renaissance, theologians such as Yves Congar and Walter Kasper have acknowledged the need of the Catholic Church to integrate the work of the Spirit more fully into ecclesiology. In doing so, they have moved from a pneumatology conceived as a mere function of Christology, or even worse ecclesiology, to a symbiosis between the Christological pneumatology and the pneumatological Christology. Unlike Yves Congar, whose ecclesiology paid very little attention to the role of the Father in the life of the Church, Walter Kasper provided his doctrine of the Church with a fully Trinitarian foundation. Yet, some theological emphases towards pneumatology can still be detected in his ecclesiology.

3) Most of the theologians discussed in this article have constructed their ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology by introducing a polarity or opposition between the activity of Christ and the activity of the Holy Spirit. Vladimir Lossky identified Christology with the principle of unity in the Church whereas pneumatology was connected with the principle of diversity. In his understanding, Christology refers to the objective / institutional dimension of the Church whereas pneumatology refers to the subjective / charismatic component of the Church. In a similar way, John

¹²⁰ W. KASPER, *The Catholic Church*, p. 144.

Zizioulas distinguished between the Son's function of becoming history and the Spirit's role of liberating from history. In a nutshell, Christ refers to history, the Spirit to eschatology. Even the French Dominican theologian Yves Congar has opted in the pre-Vatican II period to explain the relationship between Christology and pneumatology in terms of opposition: structure / institution (Christ) *vs.* life / dynamism (the Spirit). As interesting as it might be, the depiction of Christology and pneumatology in terms of opposition or tension goes against the reciprocity, *perichoresis*, and mutual interpenetration that exist between the two divine Persons at the level of the inner Trinity as well as in the life of the Church. Christology is not anti-pneumatological as pneumatology is not anti-Christological. Each and every dimension of the Church is both Christological and pneumatological at the same time. In this sense, Stăniloae's ecclesiology deserves to be credited as a much more successful attempt to elaborate a balance between Christology and pneumatology. Furthermore, Lossky's identification of Christ and the Spirit with two opposing aspects of the Church, i.e., institution / unity (Christology) – charisms / diversity (pneumatology), might run the risk of perpetrating the conflict that has arisen very often in the history between the two ecclesial realities or components. In addition to that, the implication of this identification is that the institutional aspects of the Church seems to be devoid of "spirituality" or "charisms" whereas the charisms seem to accomplish their role outside the Church as an institution. Such a strict compartmentalization as well as the opposition between Christ and the Spirit create more problems than they solve.

4) In order to avoid any dichotomy between Christ and the Spirit, an adequate ecclesiological synthesis must be grounded in the perichoretic relationships within the inner Trinity. The way Christ and the Spirit act in the economy of salvation as well as in the life of the Church should express the reciprocal interiority that exists between the Son and the Spirit at the level of the inner Trinity. On the one hand, such an approach could prevent theologians from speaking in terms of opposition about the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit in the Church. On the other hand, when the eternal perichoretic relationships between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, are portrayed as the basis of their temporal activities, the doctrine of the Church is incorporated into the Trinitarian mystery and defined in relation to all divine Persons. That being so, the Church becomes not only a chapter of Christology and pneumatology but also a chapter of the doctrine of the Father. Stăniloae and Kasper are two of the theologians who explicate the synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in ecclesiology on the basis of the Trinitarian mystery. Neither Lossky nor Zizioulas or Congar have presented the eternal union, inseparability, and *perichoresis* between the Son and the Spirit as the basis of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit in the Church. Unlike Kasper, who still give a certain priority to pneumatology, 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 ecclesiology that a. maintains a proper balance between Christology and pneumatology; b. outlines the role of the Father in the life of the Church; c. underlines the fact that there is a communication between the Church and the Trinity.

Rezumat: Ecclesia de Trinitate. Sinteza ecleziologică dintre hristologie și pneumatologie în teologia ortodoxă și romano-catolică modernă

Publicată în anul 1985, cartea *Ființa eclezială* a mitropolitului de Pergam, Ioannis Zizioulas, reprezintă un excepțional tratat de ecleziologie ortodoxă. Încă de la apariția sa, lucrarea a marcat decisiv peisajul dezbaterilor teologice despre Biserică și continuă să fie o importantă sursă de inspirație pentru ecleziologii contemporani. Printre temele centrale ale volumului mitropolitului Zizioulas se află și cea referitoare la sinteza dintre hristologie și pneumatologie în ecleziologie. Pentru a marca aniversarea a treizeci de ani de la apariția lucrării *Ființa eclezială*, studiul de față își propune să ofere o analiză critică a câtorva dintre modelele de sinteză ecleziologică între hristologie și pneumatologie elaborate de unii dintre cei mai renumiți teologi ai secolului trecut: Vladimir Lossky (1903-1958), Ioannis Zizioulas (n. 1931), Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993), Yves Congar (1904-1995) și Walter Kasper (n. 1933). Selecția autorilor a ținut cont de două criterii: 1) *criteriul relevanței teologice și a notorietății*; deși teologi importanți precum Georges Florovsky, Nikos Nissiotis și Boris Bobrinsky au oferit ecleziologiei sec. al XX-lea modele de sinteză ce meritau a fi incluse în studiul de față, în alegerea autorilor s-a ținut cont și de 2) *criteriul asigurării unei diversități teologice, etnice, și culturale*. În încercarea de a nu depăși limitele unui articol, a fost ales un singur autor pentru fiecare tradiție ortodoxă și grup catolic: Lossky (tradiția ortodoxă slavă), Zizioulas (tradiția ortodoxă grecească), Stăniloae (tradiția ortodoxă românească), Congar (catolicismul francez) și Kasper (catolicismul german).

Studiul urmărește să identifice în ce măsură teologii amintiți au reușit să articuleze un model ecleziologic ce menține un echilibru real între lucrarea lui Hristos și lucrarea Sfântului Duh în viața Bisericii. Nu în cele din urmă, scopul studiului este de a argumenta că, în majoritatea cazurilor, cu excepția lui Stăniloae și, într-o anumită măsură Kasper, modelele de sinteză ecleziologică nu încadrează însă deplin Biserica în taina treimică. Pe de o parte, nu există o corelare între rolul Fiului și cel al Duhului în sfera intra-trinitară și funcțiile lor în viața Bisericii. Pe de altă parte, relevanța ecleziologică a lui Dumnezeu-Tatăl este trecută într-un plan secund. Cu alte cuvinte, modele de sinteză au în vedere doar hristologia și pneumatologia, fără referințe majore la Persoana Tatălui.

Teologii ortodocși. Problema sintezei ecleziologice dintre hristologie și pneumatologie a apărut în spațiul ortodox în contextul dezbaterilor din sec. al XX-lea despre *filioque* și implicațiile acestuia în viața Bisericii Romano-Catolice. Conform unor teologi precum Nikos Nissiotis, Vladimir Lossky sau Dumitru Stăniloae, „deviațiile” din ecleziologia romano-catolică nu sunt altceva decât ramificația doctrinei despre *filioque*, care subordonează pe Duhul Fiului, harisma instituției, libertatea personală autorității, elementul profetic celui juridic, mistica scolasticismului raționalist, preoția universală ierarhiei, iar colegialitatea episcopală papalității. După opinia lui Lossky, doar o teologie care

respinge adaosul *filioque* poate asigura la nivel de ecleziologie un echilibru între lucrarea lui Hristos și cea a Duhului. Cu toate acestea, modelele ecleziologice ortodoxe de îmbinare armonioasă între hristologie și pnevmatologie nu au reușit întotdeauna să găsească echilibrul necesar între cele două componente esențiale ale Bisericii.

Teologul rus din Franța, *Vladimir Lossky*, ajunge să separe pnevmatologia de hristologie în viața Bisericii. Pentru Lossky, Hristos realizează mântuirea naturii umane și este factorul de unitate în Biserică. În schimb, funcția Duhul Sfânt este aceea de a mântui persoanele umane. Astfel, Duhul devine principul diversificator în Trupul lui Hristos care este Biserica. Modelul ecleziologic dezvoltat de Vladimir Lossky a primit o serie de critici din partea unor teologi precum George Florovsky, Dumitru Stăniloae și Ioannis Zizioulas. Conform lui Florovsky, ecleziologia lui Lossky lasă impresia că omul intră într-o relație personală numai cu Duhul Sfânt. Nu întâmplător Jaroslav Skira vorbește de faptul că sinteza ecleziologică elaborată de Lossky sfârșește prin a acorda o oarecare prioritate pnevmatologiei. Motivul principal care explică separarea pnevmatologiei de hristologie în ecleziologia lui Lossky îl constituie minimalizarea relației perihoretice dintre Fiul și Duhul la nivelul „Treimii imanente”.

În pofida încercării mitropolitului *Ioannis Zizioulas* de a corecta dezechilibrul din teologia lui Lossky, rezultatul sintezei sale eclesiologice nu se distanțează foarte mult de cel al teologului rus. Opoziția dintre hristologie și pnevmatologie operată de teologia losskiană este prezentă și în gândirea mitropolitului de Pergam. Pentru Zizioulas, Hristos este Cel Care asumă istoria, iar Duhul Sfânt este Persoana Care ne oferă acces la eshatologie, eliberându-ne de povara istoriei. Ca și în cazul lui Vladimir Lossky, gândirea mitropolitului grec rămâne totuși captivă conceptelor filozofiei existențialiste. O altă problemă majoră perpetuată atât în lucrările teologului grec cât și în cele ale teologului rus o reprezintă absența, aproape totală, a raportării sintezei eclesiologice la Persoana Tatălui. Cu toate că insistența asupra monarhiei lui Dumnezeu Tatăl este una dintre temele de referință ale teologiei lui Zizioulas, sinteza ecleziologică a acestuia nu are în vedere decât dimensiunea hristologică și dimensiunea pnevmatologică a Bisericii. În plus, la fel de problematic este și faptul că hristologia și pnevmatologia sunt într-o oarecare măsură armonizate în opera lui Zizioulas, însă teologia trinitară este separată de Biserică. Astfel, Treimea și Biserica apar ca două realități paralele sau separate.

Teologul ortodox a cărui ecleziologie a reușit să ofere o perspectivă mai echilibrată între hristologie și pnevmatologie este *Părintele Dumitru Stăniloae*. Considerând relațiile intra-trinitare ca bază a relațiilor Persoanelor dumnezeiești în viața Bisericii, Stăniloae nu numai că integrează ecleziologia sa în Taina Sfintei Treimi, dar evită și conturarea hristologiei și a pnevmatologiei în termeni de opoziție. Având în vedere perihoreza treimică, Stăniloae arată că în Biserică nicio Persoană dumnezeiască nu lucrează separat de Celelalte. Prin urmare, unitatea și diversitatea în Biserică sunt roade ale împreună-lucrării Persoanelor treimice. Nu se poate concepe, spune teologul român, ca dimensiunea instituțională a Bisericii să fie raportată exclusiv la hristologie, iar dimensiunea harismatică să fie legată exclusiv de pnevmatologie. Atât în aspectul ei instituțional cât și în cel harismatic, Biserica poartă o amprentă trinitară. Din păcate, cu toate încercările recente de traducere a operei sale în limbi de circulație internațională, teologia părintelui Stăniloae este prea puțin cunoscută în afara granițelor României și ale spațiului ortodox. Deși există numeroase studii și teze de doctorat dedicate gândirii părintelui Stăniloae, teologia acestuia este încă foarte puțin cunoscută de către teologii romano-catolici și protestanți.

Teologii romano-catolici. Teologii romano-catolicii au respins încă din anii '60 ai secolului trecut acuzația de „hristomonism” ecleziologic. Cu toate acestea, în contact cu critica teologilor ortodocși, Biserica Romano-Catolică a conștientizat necesitatea de a oferi o atenție sporită rolului Duhului Sfânt în ecleziologie și spiritualitate. În acest sens, Conciliul II Vatican a reorientat teologia romano-catolică prin documentele sale, în special prin constituția despre Biserică *Lumen Gentium*, în direcția unei renașterii pnevmatologice. Impulsul acestei renașteri dat de Conciliul II Vatican a fost continuat de numeroși teologi romano-catolici, dintre care cei mai renumiți sunt Yves Congar și Walter Kasper.

În ceea ce privește componenta pnevmatologică, ecleziologia lui *Yves Congar* cunoaște patru etape importante: 1) 1931-1944; 2) 1945-1959; 3) 1959-1968; 4) 1968-1991. Între 1931 și 1944, ecleziologia congariană este elaborată aproape exclusiv cu „material” hristologic, iar lucrarea Duhului Sfânt apare ca fiind subordonată instituțiilor și structurilor bisericești. În etapa următoare, binomul instituție-viață domină ecleziologia teologului dominican. Atribuind pnevmatologiei rolul de a dinamiza sau de a da viață structurilor instituționale ale Bisericii, Congar continuă să acorde Duhului un rol ecleziologic secundar în scrierile sale din perioada 1945-1959. Dacă între anii 1959-1968 Congar este preocupat mai mult de respingerea criticilor adresate de teologii ortodocși cu privire la „hristomonismul” ecleziologic romano-catolic, începând cu 1968, pnevmatologia începe să ocupe un rol central în opera călugărului dominican. Ca și în cazul Părintelui Stăniloae, sinteza ecleziologică dintre hristologie și pnevmatologie elaborată de Congar în această perioadă respinge orice relație de opoziție între lucrarea lui Hristos și cea a Duhului Sfânt. Unitatea nu este lipsită de diversitate și nici instituția de elementul spiritual sau harismatic. Orice lucrare în viața Bisericii, menționează Congar, este rezultatul împreună-lucrării Fiului cu Duhul. Cu toate acestea, spre deosebire de Stăniloae, ecleziologia lui Congar rămâne captivă binomului hristologie-pnevmatologie.

În teologia romano-catolică recentă, Cardinalul *Walter Kasper* este cel care a dezvoltat o ecleziologie cu un pronunțat caracter trinitar. În numeroasele sale lucrări teologice publicate începând cu anul 1972, teologul german a căutat să dezvolte o ecleziologie care să reflecte în însăși natura ei taina treimică. Astfel, Kasper ajunge să înțeleagă Biserica mai ales ca o extindere a comuniunii iubitoare dintre Persoanele Sfintei Treimi. Prin urmare, sinteza ecleziologică dintre hristologie și pnevmatologie elaborată de Kasper este marcată de acest efort de a lega Biserica de Treime. În pofida acestui aspect, teologul german pare că manifestă uneori o preferință pentru componenta pnevmatologică a ecleziologiei. Deși încearcă o îmbinare între hristologia pnevmatologică (predominantă în scrierile sinoptice) și pnevmatologica hristologică (predominantă în Evanghelia după Ioan), Walter Kasper tinde să acorde o oarecare prioritate ecleziologiei văzută ca un capitol sau o funcție a Duhului Sfânt.

În *concluzii* sunt prezentate, în mod sumar, principalele idei ale articolului și se evidențiază limitele sintezelor ecleziologice care au descris în termeni de opoziție rolul lui Hristos și pe cel al Duhului în viața Bisericii. În finalul concluziilor se insistă pe importanța elaborării sintezei ecleziologice dintre hristologie și pnevmatologie pe baza relațiilor treimice perihoretice. În acest fel, Biserica devine un capitol de teologie trinitară, depășind binomul hristologie-pnevmatologie.