

DOES THE EUCHARIST MAKE THE CHURCH? AN ECCLESIOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF STĂNILOAE AND ZIZIOULAS

Calinic (Kevin M.) Berger¹

The goal of this article is to attempt to answer a question: what is *unique* about Fr Dumitru Stăniloae's ecclesiology that can be helpful for us *today*? Stăniloae wrote extensively in the area of ecclesiology.² Unfortunately, the bulk of his work in this area (and that of

1 This article is an expansion of a paper presented to the annual meeting of the Orthodox Theological Society in America, Crestwood, NY, June 2005.

2 Key articles by Stăniloae include: "Sinteză ecclesio logică," *Studii Teologice* 7 (1955): 267–84; "Autoritatea Bisericii," *Studii Teologice* 16 (1964): 183–215 [henceforth cited as *Autoritatea*]; "Relațiile treimice și viața Bisericii," *Ortodoxia* 16 (1964): 503–25, English tr. R. Barringer, "Trinitarian Relations and the Life of the Church," *Theology and the Church* (Crestwood: SVS Press, 1980), 11–44 [henceforth cited as *TRLC*]; "Biserica universală și sobornicească," *Ortodoxia* 18 (1966): 167–74; "Din aspectul sacramental Bisericii," *Studii Teologice* 18 (1966) 531–62 [henceforth cited as *Din aspectul*]; "Criteriile prezenței Sfintului Duh," *Studii Teologice* 19 (1967): 105–13 [henceforth cited as *Criteriile*]; "Sfintul Duh și sobornicitatea bisericii," *Ortodoxia* 19 (1967): 32–48, English tr. R. Barringer, "The Holy Spirit and the Sobornicity of the Church," *Theology and the Church* (Crestwood: SVS Press, 1980), 45–73 [henceforth cited as *HSSC*]; "Temeiurile teologice ale ierarhiei și ale sinodalității ei," *Studii Teologice* 22 (1970): 165–78; "Rușăciunile pentru alții și sobornicitatea Bisericii," *Studii Teologice* 22 (1970): 29–38; "Sobornicitate deschisă," *Ortodoxia* 23 (1971): 165–80; "Spiritualizarea structurilor bisericești în epoca actuală și cauzele ei," *Ortodoxia* 24 (1972): 512–22; "Natura sinodicității," *Studii Teologice* 29 (1977): 605–14; "Biserica în sensul de locaș de largă comuniune în Hristos," *Ortodoxia* 34 (1982): 336–46; "Modurile prezenței Hristos în cultul Bisericii," *Mitropolia Banatului* 32 (1982): 429–56; "Realitatea tainică a Bisericii," *Ortodoxia* 36 (1984): 415–20. See also his *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. 2 (Bucharest: Biblical and Missionary Institute, 1997), 129–248. On Stăniloae's ecclesiology, see Ronald G. Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiology: The Contribution of Dumitru Stăniloae and Younger Colleagues* (Dissertation, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1988); Lucian Turcescu, "Eucharistic

his colleagues³) has yet to be translated, much less appropriated, by contemporary Orthodox theologians outside of Romania.

Stăniloae was very much a theologian responsive to contemporary thought. Ecclesiology was no exception: he read and referenced the writings of Khomiakov, de Lubac, Bouyer, Casel, Florovsky, Lossky, Afanasiev, Schmemmann, Nissiotis, Karmiris, the documents of Vatican II, and other works. He possessed a mastery of patristic sources which he used creatively in addressing contemporary ecclesiological issues. Both historically and theologically, Stăniloae's contribution not only deserves a place within the vast amount of work done in ecclesiology over the last century and a half, but as will be seen below, his contribution remains relevant for Orthodox ecclesiology today.

Perhaps at a risk of oversimplification, two general trends could be said to characterize this collective ecclesiological work. The first, typified mainly by the work of Orthodox ecclesiologists, emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. Pneumatology became an essential component of ecclesiology, along with Christology.⁴ The second emphasized the importance of the Eucharist, and later, of the bishop, which were seen as occupying the central place in ecclesiastical and Christian life. This latter "Eucharistic

Ecclesiology or Open Sobornicity?" in Turcescu, ed., *Dumitru Stăniloae. Tradition and Modernity in Theology* (Iași: Center for Romanian Studies, 2002), 83–103.

3 For an overview of this work, see Ronald G. Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiologists*.

4 Nikos Nissiotis, "Report on the Second Vatican Council," *Ecumenical Review* 18 (1966): 190–206; John Romanides, "Orthodox Ecclesiology according to Alexis Khomiakov," *GOTR* 2 (1956): 57–73; Georges Florovsky, "Sobornost: The Catholicity of the Church," *Collected Works*, vol. 1 (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1972), 37–55. Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1985) esp. "Concerning the Third Mark of the Church" (pp. 169–82), and "Catholic Consciousness: Anthropological Implications of the Dogma of the Church" (pp. 183–94) [henceforth cited as *Image*]; and his *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1976), esp. 135ff, 156ff and 174ff [henceforth cited as *Mystical Theology*].

Ecclesiology,” based primarily on Henri de Lubac and Nicolas Afanasiev, did not place a great emphasis on the Holy Spirit.⁵

An explicit attempt to *correct* the lack of Pneumatology in the eucharistic ecclesiology of Afanasiev has been made by Metropolitan John Zizioulas,⁶ who is perhaps the leading Orthodox ecclesologist alive today. In so doing, he has made many valuable contributions to Orthodox ecclesiology.⁷ Therefore, in order to identify what are the unique and valuable contributions of Săniloae for us today, one cannot avoid at least referencing the work of Zizioulas.

Unfortunately for us, and perhaps curiously, it would appear that Săniloae and Zizioulas did not seriously engage each other’s

5 See especially: Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church. Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993) and “The Eucharist, the Church and Evangelization: The Influence of Henri de Lubac,” *Communio* 23 (1996): 776–85. Nicolas Afanasiev, “The Church which Presides in Love,” in John Meyendorff, ed., *The Primacy of Peter* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1992). Aidan Nichols, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora. Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afansiev (1893–1966)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Richard R. Gaillardetz, “The Eucharistic Ecclesiology of Nicolas Afanasieff: Prospects and Challenges for the Contemporary Ecumenical Dialogue,” *Diakonia* 27 (1994): 18–44. Michael Plekon, “‘Always Everyone and Always Together’: The Eucharistic Ecclesiology of Nicolas Afansiev’s *The Lord’s Supper* Revisited,” *SVTQ* 41 (1997): 141–74.

6 “... the work of N. Afanasiev and his ‘eucharistic ecclesiology’ ... has not yet been justified in terms of Pneumatology. Let me make a first attempt here...” (“Christ, the Spirit and the Church,” in his *Being as Communion. Studies in Personhood and the Church* [Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1993], 132). Plekon argues that Afanasiev did develop a Pneumatology and role of Baptism to complement his view of the centrality of the Eucharist in his posthumously published work, *Church of the Holy Spirit* (Plekon, “Always Everyone,” 150–51).

7 In addition to *Being as Communion*, see John Zizioulas, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (Brookline: Holy Cross Press, 2001); “The Mystery of the Church in Orthodox Tradition,” *One in Christ* 24 (1988): 294–303; “The Church as Communion,” *SVTQ* 38 (1994): 3–16. On Zizioulas’ ecclesiology, see Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church. Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999); Gaëtan Baillargeon, *Perspectives orthodoxes sur l’Église — Communion. L’Œuvre de Jean Zizioulas* (Montréal: Les Éditions Paulines, 1989); Robert D. Turner, “Foundations for John Zizioulas’ Approach to Ecclesial Communion,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78 (2002): 438–67.

works.⁸ When meditating on this fact and reading the works of these two theologians, one cannot help but notice that Stăniloae, who developed his ecclesiology in the 1960s, has provided for Orthodox ecclesiology something which Zizioulas states is still awaiting treatment by Orthodox theologians: specifically, an integration or synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology, in order to ground Orthodox ecclesiology. Stăniloae not only did much to create such a synthesis within a highly developed Triadology, but also formed his ecclesiology on it.

From this perspective, two points summarize a fundamental difference between Stăniloae and Zizioulas: First, Stăniloae starts from a robust synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology within a highly developed Triadology, whereas Zizioulas understands the inseparability of the Son and the Spirit in the activities of God *ad extra*, but does not ground this in Triadology. Zizioulas' synthesis, as he acknowledges, is not complete (hence his repeated calls for such a synthesis). Second, Stăniloae develops his ecclesiology based on his synthesis, and in many points in contradistinction to Afanasiev's positions;⁹ Zizioulas begins with the pre-formed, so-to-speak, ecclesiology of Afanasiev, and then attempts to justify/adjust it by adding a pneumatological component.

These two basic differences between the ecclesiological foundations of Stăniloae and Zizioulas lead also to a difference of emphasis—and at times of content—in the implications that stem from them. Some of these will be discussed below. In general, by contrasting these thinkers it becomes apparent that Stăniloae's ecclesiology can provide a balance, if not a corrective, to certain aspects of contemporary Orthodox ecclesiology, which this article will seek to highlight.

8 Turcescu makes the same observation, "Eucharistic Ecclesiology," 96. Zizioulas does refer cursorily to Stăniloae in his article, "The Teaching of the 2nd Ecumenical Council on the Holy Spirit in Historical and Ecumenical Perspective," *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983) 45 n44.

9 Stăniloae expresses disagreement with Afanasiev's positions in his article *Biserica Universală și Sobornicească* [henceforth cited as BUS].

Approaches to Synthesis: the Appropriation of Vladimir Lossky

No one can deny the enormous contributions of Vladimir Lossky to Orthodox theology. Both Zizioulas and Stăniloae read Lossky carefully, yet each appropriated his thought differently. In Lossky's view, the pneumatological element of ecclesiology must be on equal footing with the christological, just as the Son and the Spirit are inseparable in their work. While maintaining their inseparability, however, Lossky also makes a distinction between the economy of the Son and that of Holy Spirit. Lossky extends his distinction between "nature" and "person" into his synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. In this scheme, the content of Christology refers to the "objective" (or, nature) aspect of the Church, whereas the content of Pneumatology refers to the "subjective" (or, personal) aspect.¹⁰ Lossky did not draw out the conclusions of this distinction for Church structure, and consequently he did not solve the problem of how to relate the institution of the Church to its charismatic ministries.

Zizioulas, like Lossky, acknowledges that there can be no division between Christology and Pneumatology, but leaves the question of priority to the realm of *theologoumenon*.¹¹ He asks specifically what would be the content of such a synthesis, and how ecclesiology would suffer if this content is deficient. Similar to Stăniloae,¹² Zizioulas did not fully accept Lossky's distinction between the economy of the Son and that of the Spirit. Zizioulas comments that a proper synthesis of Christology and

10 Lossky strove to maintain the patristic balance in his Triadology (e.g. between Persons and common Essence), yet he saw Son and the Spirit as having different roles in the economy, though united: Christ unifying, the Spirit diversifying (e.g. *Mystical Theology*, 159, 166–67, 174ff; *Image*, 108–9, 177–81).

11 *Being as Communion* [henceforth cited as BC], 129.

12 Though Stăniloae was indebted to and had the highest respect for Lossky, he took exception to Lossky's distinction of the roles of the Son and the Spirit in the economy (e.g., HSSC, 65–71; TRLC, 26–27). Like Stăniloae, Lossky was aware of the works of both Gregory II Cyprus (e.g. *Image*, 79, 93–95), and, of course, of Palamas, but he did not develop a theology of the interrelation between the Son and the Spirit in the Trinity, as did Stăniloae.

Pneumatology for ecclesiology *still awaits treatment* by Orthodox theologians.¹³

Zizioulas himself attempts to form a synthesis. He does not create his synthesis based on the relation between the Son and the Spirit in the Holy Trinity, but goes straight to considerations of the activity of God *ad extra*.¹⁴ He notes that the activity of the Three Divine Persons is indivisible, particularly that of the Son and the Spirit. But, following Lossky, perhaps,¹⁵ Zizioulas makes a distinction between the Son's economy of becoming history and the Spirit's economy of liberating him from history.¹⁶ The contribution of the Spirit is precisely the bringing of the *eschaton* and of communion (*koinonia*) to the Church, and even to Christ himself. In so doing, the Spirit makes Christ a "corporate personality" (parallel to "Israel" in the Old Testament), the "one" that contains the "many," or in other words, not just an "individual" but a "person."¹⁷

Along the same line of reasoning, Zizioulas says that the Church is "in-stituted" by Christ, but "con-stituted" by the Spirit. He writes, that the "'institution' is something presented to us as a fact ... [a]s such it is a provocation to our freedom. The 'con-stitution'

13 BC, 125–26.

14 BC, 129.

15 Even though Zizioulas criticizes Lossky for doing this, he appears to do it himself. I say "perhaps," because McPartlan disputes this (McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 223). In other words, Lossky attributes the "personal" element of the temporal economy to the role of the Spirit; Zizioulas attributes personhood itself to the work of the Spirit.

16 "Both the Father and the Spirit are involved in history, but only the Son becomes history. ... Now if becoming history is the particularity of the Son in the economy, 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 ... in order to bring into history the last days, the *eschaton*" (BC, 130). To demonstrate his view, Zizioulas notes Rom 8.11 ("But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you"—although technically this verse, as others, attributes this action of resurrecting Christ to the Father [e.g., 1 Cor 6.14; 2 Cor 4.14]). The Spirit not only liberates the Son from history, but also allows him to become history (Lk 1.35).

17 On Zizioulas' ideas of "corporate personality" and "the one and the many" see his BC, 130, 135–57, 145–49, 182–83, 230. See also McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 166–86.

is something that involves us in its very being, something we accept freely, because we take part in its very emergence.”¹⁸

One can see the influence of Lossky in Zizioulas’ thought. It is the role of the Spirit or pneumatology, to give the personal element, the element of “freedom,” to the Church, whereas Christology gives the institutional, structural or “nature” element to the Church.¹⁹ Zizioulas enhances Lossky’s view by adding an emphasis on *eschaton* and *koinonia* as the way the Spirit brings this about. Zizioulas modifies Lossky’s underlying thought to say that the Spirit personalizes *Christ himself*.²⁰

In Zizioulas’ opinion, these two elements, eschatology and communion, and *not* spirituality and sanctification (also roles of the Spirit), have determined Orthodox ecclesiology.²¹ Thus, Zizioulas calls the integration of eschatology and communion as constitutive elements of ecclesiology. The first task Zizioulas undertakes with such a synthesis is to seek to correct Afanasiev’s “eucharistic ecclesiology” by conditioning it with these elements.²²

18 BC, 140.

19 In other words, Zizioulas appears to be following Lossky’s distinction: the “institution” based on Christology exclusively would be thereby based entirely on “nature” (deprived of the personal element), and “nature” is a “given” which inhibits personal freedom. However, Lossky, unlike Zizioulas, does not present the Church’s “nature” element as an inhibition to “freedom,” since the unity which the Church has christologically is based on the “human nature recapitulated by Christ” and is thus “free of sin, of all exterior necessity, of all *natural determinism*” (Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 176–77; emphasis mine). Yet even here, Lossky is similar to Zizioulas since Lossky infers that “determinism” is something based on “nature” (i.e., vis-à-vis the freedom of “person”). On the distinction of “person” and “nature,” see Ioan I. Ică, Jr, “Person and/or Ontology in Contemporary Orthodox Thought,” in Mircea Păcurariu, et al., *Persoana și Comuniune. Prinos de Cinstire Preotului Profesor Academician Dumitru Stăniloae* (Sibiu, 1993) 359–85 [in Romanian].

20 “He gives Christ his personal identity” (“The Mystery of the Church in the Orthodox Tradition” [henceforth cited as MCOT], 296). “... we can say without risk of exaggeration that Christ exists only pneumatologically, whether in his *distinct personal particularity* or in his capacity as the body of the Church and the recapitulation of all things” (BC, 111; emphasis mine).

21 BC, 131.

22 Zizioulas refers to the Orthodox criticism of Vatican II’s ecclesiology, which brought in pneumatology after ecclesiology was constructed based on christological

This leads to many fruitful contributions on behalf of Zizioulas regarding the conciliar nature of the Church. Using his notions of *eschaton* and communion, Zizioulas analyzes many liturgical and canonical traditions to show how their integration was understood in the early Church. His main concern is to show that no ordination, ministry or structure in the Church can be thought of as either self-sufficient or above or outside of the Body. Rather, all ministries and institutional aspects of the Church find their true expression only in the eucharistic assembly, where *eschaton* and communion meet. Thereby they are constantly conditioned by two factors: the *epiclesis* and the community. In this manner they exist in constant dependence on the Spirit and lose their self-sufficiency.

Zizioulas thereby is not only able to correct many of Afanasiev's conclusions as to the status of the local church, etc., but even transcend certain dichotomies of priority in the areas of the interrelation of local churches and ministry in general. But interestingly enough, these dichotomies between local and universal, and *even between Christology and Pneumatology*, are not overcome in Zizioulas's synthesis primarily by the relation of the Son and the Spirit in the Holy Trinity, nor their relation *ad extra* in the work of the temporal economy, but by the *Eucharist itself*.²³ This is a subtle yet important point. In a way, Zizioulas is falling back on the priority of the Eucharist in de Lubac and Afanasiev. But he uses Pneumatology to better explain this priority.

Stăniloae's Synthesis and Ecclesiology

Stăniloae approaches ecclesiology differently than Zizioulas from two perspectives. First, he begins with a highly developed synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology. Secondly, he develops his ecclesiology based on this synthesis, in other words, independently of and even in contradistinction to certain principles underlying

material (BC, 123; cf., Nissiotis' criticism of Vatican II) but Zizioulas does something similar by beginning with Afanasiev's ecclesiology (BC, 132).

23 E.g., "The dilemma 'local or universal' is transcended in the eucharist, and so is any dichotomy between Christology and Pneumatology" (BC, 133).

“eucharistic ecclesiology.” But that is not to say that he does not acknowledge and use valuable insights from the latter approach.²⁴ This leads to a difference in emphasis, and in some areas, of content as well.

Summary of Stăniloae’s Synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology

Stăniloae draws his Pneumatology from both early Fathers (including Irenaeus, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom and John Damascene), and most especially the later Byzantine theologians (Gregory II Cyprus, Gregory Palamas and Joseph Bryennios).²⁵ From these Fathers, Stăniloae elucidates a synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. For our purposes, it is enough to summarize Stăniloae’s synthesis and his key deductions, rather than show the specificity of how he draws from and interprets each of his patristic sources.

In summary, Stăniloae elaborates on the patristic teaching which interprets the phrase “through the Son” as referring not to a causal act (like procession), but to the “manifestation” or “shining forth” (*ἡ φανέρωσις*) of the Spirit through the Son. In Stăniloae’s interpretation, this “manifestation” is the expression of the eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit.

Thus, Stăniloae’s goal is to show that the Son and the Spirit have a unique eternal relationship between themselves, as each has with the Father. This eternal relationship is revealed in the temporal economy of salvation, where it is evident that the Son and the Spirit

24 E.g., BUS, 191, speaking of Afanasiev and Schmemmann.

25 Key sources for his Pneumatology are the studies mentioned above: “Relațiile treimice și viața Bisericii” (ET Barringer, “Trinitarian Relations and the Life of the Church”), “Biserica universală și sobornicească,” “Criteriile prezenței Sfintului Duh,” and “Sfintul Duh și sobornicitatea bisericii” (ET Barringer, “The Holy Spirit and the Sobornicity of the Church”). Also see, “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* (London: SPCK, 1981): 174–86; “The Holy Spirit in the Theology and Life of the Orthodox Church,” *Sobornost* 7.1 (1975): 4–21.

never work apart from one another.²⁶ Stăniloae elaborates in great detail on this specific relationship between the Son and Spirit, thereby providing the content of his synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. The main points of this synthesis, that will be used to define his ecclesiology, can be summarized with the following:²⁷

- (1) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son, who is his goal. He proceeds *no further* than the Son.²⁸ The Son is his fulfillment.²⁹
- (2) The expression that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and “*through* the Son” refers to his manifestation. The Holy Spirit is “manifested” or “shines out” from the Son, specifically *towards the Father*. This manifestation is a personal trait of the Holy Spirit. In this manifestation, the Son is not passive, but “avails himself” of the Spirit to the Father.³⁰ In other words, the Son too plays an active, personal role in the manifestation of the Spirit.
- (3) The Holy Spirit conveys the Father’s love to the Son, which is the goal of procession. The Holy Spirit in turn conveys the Son’s love to the Father, which is the goal of manifestation. In this, the Holy Spirit is the *hypostatic* bond, or personal *principle of unity* in the Holy Trinity.³¹

26 Stăniloae writes, “In the East the trinitarian relations are seen as the basis for the relation of the Trinity to creation and for the salvation of creation. . . . at the origin of the sending of the Spirit by the Son there is a special eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit, just as there is such an eternal relationship between the Father and the Son at the origin of the sending of the Son into the world” (“The Procession,” in Vischer, *Holy Spirit*, 178). “But there is a special reciprocity between the Son and the Spirit which is reflected in their contact with the world. The Son by himself transmits the Spirit to those who believe in him. But only through the Spirit is the Son known by those who believe” (ibid, 186).

27 These points are by no means an exhaustive summary of Stăniloae’s Triadology, but only the main points of his synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology as they will apply to ecclesiology.

28 HSSC, 67.

29 “... the Spirit rests in those who are united with the Son, since he rests in the Son. The Spirit does not go beyond the Son, even when we say improperly that he is sent to men. The Son is the only and ultimate resting place of the Spirit,” “The Procession,” in Vischer, *Spirit of God*, 179.

30 TRLC, 31.

31 Stăniloae writes, “[w]ithin the Trinity the Spirit is the one who brings the Father

- (4) The Holy Spirit prevents a selfish, exclusive love in the Trinity. By creating unselfish love, he preserves the Persons in their places. In other words, even in creating hypostatic unity, he keeps the Father and the Son distinct as Persons in this unity.³²
- (5) The procession/manifestation of the Holy Spirit is the foundation of the Trinitarian *perichoresis*. The Son could not possess the Holy Spirit if the Holy Spirit proceeded from him.³³ Thus, unity in the Holy Trinity is *hypostatic* and essential *simultaneously*.
- (6) The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son is generated from the Father simultaneously and *inseparably*—inseparably meaning *not alongside* of each other.³⁴
- (7) The Son and the Holy Spirit are inseparable. The Spirit reveals the Son, and the Son reveals himself in the Spirit. The Spirit never leaves the Son and is always found in him.³⁵

It should be noted that Stăniloae is careful not to depersonalize any Person of the Holy Trinity in this model.³⁶ The love of the Father

and the Son into unity (a unity of love, [that is, a personal unity,] not of being) [that is, distinct from the unity of essence which is simultaneous,] not the one who unravels this unity still more” (TRLC, 30).

32 E.g., “Thus the Spirit is the eternal joy of the Father and the Son . . . A joy that was itself impersonal would leave the other two still separated. Perfect joy between Two requires the presence of a Third who leaves all self-preoccupation behind, and allows the other two to get beyond not only solitary separation but also enclosed duality” (“The Holy Spirit,” 6–7).

33 TRLC, 30–32.

34 E.g., “The Spirit does not move beyond the Son within the Trinity, nor does he proceed in isolation from the generation of the Son thus remaining alongside the Son, as it were, without any personal relationship to him. . . . [the Son] possesses the Spirit as one who receives him from the Father and, as Son, possesses him” (TRLC, 30). Elsewhere Stăniloae explains that the Spirit proceeds from the Father not independently of the Son, nor does he manifest from the Son independently of the Father; manifestation is connected to procession, but is not an extension of it (e.g., see the discussion in TRLC, 17–21).

35 E.g., “According to Orthodox teaching the faithful can possess the Spirit only ‘in Christ’ and vice-versa. They are united with Christ through the Spirit who never leaves Christ, who ‘shines forth’ from him but does not ‘come forth’ from him. In this way the faithful participate in the ‘rest’ of the Holy Spirit who comes upon him” (TRLC, 26).

36 E.g., “The Son is the living, personal, spiritual ‘place’ of the ‘repose’ of the Spirit . . .

which comes to rest in the Son, and then shines forth or manifests from the Son to the Father, is the *Person* of the Holy Spirit. The Son, in being loved and loving in return, does neither as a passive object.³⁷ Nor does the Spirit himself become an impersonal “love.” There is nothing that is “object” or impersonal in the Holy Trinity.

This brings us to our final point. In Săniloae, the unity in the Trinity is based *both* on common divine “super-essence” *and* on the mutual indwelling of Hypostases. This mutual indwelling, which Săniloae calls “reciprocal interiority,” he equates to John Damascene’s “perichoresis.”³⁸ Thus, when Săniloae states that the relationship between the Son and the Spirit also serves to strengthen the unity of the Father and the Son,³⁹ he is not implying that there is a lack of essential identity or personal unity amongst any of the Divine Persons. Rather, he is making a distinction in two types of unity, which in reality are separable only in thought, as when he writes: “Thus a unity among the three Persons is manifested which is *distinct* from their unity of essence.”⁴⁰

the Son is begotten as a personal dwelling place,” (“The Procession,” in Vischer, *Spirit of God*, 181). See also, *The Experience of God*, vol. 1, 261.

37 Săniloae sees our relation to the Father in parallel terms: just because we are loved and in return love God in union with the Son and through the Holy Spirit does not imply that we ourselves are not the ones loving (TRLC, 31–32). cf., Rom 8.26: “the Spirit himself makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”

38 TRLC, 38.

39 E.g., TRLC, 23.

40 TRLC, 23, emphasis mine. The statement, “The Father causes the Spirit to proceed in order to unite himself with the Son and because he has begotten the Son” (TRLC, 23–24), shows how deeply interwoven is the essential and hypostatic unity in the Trinity. Though far beyond our discussion here, Săniloae sees the unity in the Trinity as both essential and hypostatic simultaneously. On the one hand, he feels that the avoidance of the paradox of the Trinity (existing as one God) implies that “the essence is considered to be the cause of the persons, which actually leads to an impersonal god” (Dumitru Săniloae, *Orthodox Spirituality*, trans. Archm. Jerome Newville and Otilia Kloos, St Tikhon’s Seminary Press, 2002) 47. On the other, he does not hold to the opinion that “person” brings the character of subject to the divine nature; e.g., “The fact that we speak of the divine Hypostases as subjects does not mean that we are reducing the divine nature to a nonsubjective reality. The person does not bring the character of subject as something new to divine nature” (*The Experience of God*, vol. 1, 257).

In order to distinguish Stăniloae's Triadology from that of other Orthodox theologians, much more could be mentioned but is beyond our scope here. It suffices to mention that Lossky seeks to maintain a patristic balance between "person" and "nature" in the Trinity, in which the common Divine Essence plays a role in the unity of the Trinity, enabling interpersonal communion.⁴¹ In Zizioulas, the common Divine Essence plays no role in the inner unity of the Trinity, which is a *koinonia* of persons willed by the Father. This latter point has been noted as a weakness in Zizioulas' Triadology.⁴²

For the discussion below, it should be noted that Stăniloae rejects two elements, found in different degrees, in the syntheses of Lossky and Zizioulas: (1) a reductionist approach to the person/nature distinction, which would make "person" the element of "freedom," and "nature" a "given" opposed to freedom;⁴³ (2) the view that "unity" or "nature" is a result of the role of the Son,

41 E.g., *Image*, 81, 93.

42 Zizioulas, of course, maintains that ecclesiology should be based on Triadology. But in seeking to do so, he only gathers the notion of *communion of persons* from Trinitarian theology. It is Zizioulas' notion that the *koinonia* of the Trinity is based exclusively on the Persons (to the exclusion of any role of the common super-essence) which has been noted by many as a weak point in Zizioulas' Triadology. In this he is different than Lossky, who strove to maintain a patristic balance between "nature" and "person" in the Holy Trinity. Ică ("Person and/or Ontology") points out that Zizioulas tends to follow Berdiaev's dialectical relationship between "person" (freedom) and "nature" (lack of freedom). On Zizioulas' Triadology, see esp. André de Halleux, "Personnalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères cappadociens? Une mauvaise controverse," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 17 (1986): 129–55, 265–92; Gaëtan Baillargeon, *Perspectives orthodoxes sur l'Église—Communion. L'Œuvre de Jean Zizioulas* (Montréal: Les Éditions Paulines, 1989): 242–53; Nicholas Sagovsky, *Ecumenism, Christian Origins and the Practice of Communion* (Cambridge, 2000), 168–69.

43 As Ică points out ("Person and/or Ontology," 374), this approach, espoused mainly by Berdiaev and Bulgakov, creates a reductionist approach to these realities in which essence = nature = substance = necessity = given = law, and person = relation = act = freedom = love = grace. Though beyond our discussion here, Stăniloae, following St Maximus, holds that *freedom* is a part of spiritual *nature*, in both God and man.

or Christology, and that “freedom” or “person” is a result of the Spirit, or Pneumatology.⁴⁴

Some General Characteristics and Themes of Stăniloae's Ecclesiology

As mentioned above, Stăniloae develops his ecclesiology from his synthesis and not from Eucharistic Ecclesiology, and in fact, at times in contradistinction to the latter. Consequently, Stăniloae has a broader view of the Church, and a different centrality of the Eucharist; in other words, defining the Church as simply a eucharistic community or a structure surrounding the Bishop is too narrow.⁴⁵ Stăniloae starts and ends at different points than do both Afanasiev (who saw the local church as autonomous) and Zizioulas regarding the centrality of the Eucharist/Bishop.

It can also be noted that Stăniloae makes the same observations that Zizioulas would later make regarding the *koinonic* nature of the Church; that is, the lack of self-sufficiency of any ministry, office or local church vis-à-vis the whole Church (believer/community, bishop/community, community/community, etc).⁴⁶

In synopsis, Stăniloae sees the continual abiding of the Holy Spirit in the Church (as the Body of Christ) and in all its members permeating *all* of its activities at *all* times (not just in its sacramental

44 E.g., in Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 166–67. Zizioulas will be discussed below.

45 It is rather a “universal sacramental community” in which each member is dependent on the others, and on the entire Church, in all the Church's work (*Din aspectul*, 546).

46 Succinctly, “The Holy Spirit conceived as relation between all believers and all ministries makes individualism or hierarchical exclusivism impossible” (HSSC, 70). Practical examples include: a bishop derives his teaching authority from the Church/community and from Christ present in his Body, not (as in Vatican II) from his consecration; therefore only a bishop of a local church may sit at a synod, since he witnesses the faith of his community (HSSC, 51; *Autoritatea*, 205–7), the Church's organic unity between clergy and laity is one of communion, not that of an institution superior or exterior to the Body (HSSC, 57; *Din aspectul*, 554–55); no community is isolated, for the people need the priest, the priest needs the bishop, the bishop the other bishops (*Din aspectul*, 546; “Teologia Euharistiei,” 357); the Holy Spirit is not given in individual isolation, hence the need of Chrism (HSSC, 62). Many more examples could readily be given.

life), as the basis of the Church's confession of faith and hence its unity. The presence of the Holy Spirit is, on the one hand, stable or permanent (through Baptism/Chrismation), and on the other, stands in a tension of constant need for renewal (through prayer, through Eucharist, etc.). Stăniloae likens the Church's dependence on Christ and the Spirit to a relationship between human persons, which, even when stable, yet needs constant renewal through interaction.⁴⁷ Before comparing Stăniloae to Zizioulas on several points, some key characteristics of Stăniloae's ecclesiology will be presented.

The Inseparability of the Son and the Spirit in the Church and its Structure

As noted above, in Stăniloae's synthesis, the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit do not happen *alongside* of each other, but both *simultaneously* and *within* one other. They are never absent from each other, essentially or personally, in their activities. Therefore, Stăniloae does not see Church structure (institutional priesthood) being exclusively christological, nor the *charismata* of the Church (non-institutional ministries) as exclusively pneumatological.⁴⁸ He writes:

The true Church is christological and pneumatological, institutional and spontaneous at the same time, or rather it is christological because it is pneumatological, and vice-versa.⁴⁹

Since the Spirit is inseparable from the Son, he cannot come into a pre-existent unity or structure in the Body of Christ.⁵⁰ The Spirit creates both structure and unity, rather than simply adding another element to them. Stăniloae writes:

⁴⁷ *Din aspectul*, 535.

⁴⁸ He writes, "Both in its unity and in its diversity the Church comes into being as much through the Holy Spirit as through Christ, and the Son and the Spirit do not work separately but in a perfect unity, bound together as they are both by their essential unity and also by their personal relations" (HSSC, 66).

⁴⁹ TRLC, 40.

⁵⁰ HSSC, 66.

The Spirit creates the grace-filled structures of the Church, but precisely as structures of the Church, as members of the body subordinated to the body . . . these structures are not independent of the Body nor does any structure exist which is superior to the Body.⁵¹

The Spirit is present at the incarnation of Christ, and at the founding of the Church, and consequently, the institution of the Church cannot be devoid of spirituality; but neither is spirituality devoid of structure and order. Both are expressions of the coordinated activity of the gifts of the Spirit, a variety of charisms and ministries that express the spiritual wealth of the Church.

At the same time, Christ is not divorced from a role in the Church's differentiation. He is the one *Logos* of the many *logoi* and as such, is not a simple, uniform unity, but a unity of a plenitude of meanings (*logoi*), of persons and the gifts they contain. It is precisely the Holy Spirit who brings them into a unity without confusing or merging them.⁵²

Moreover, Stăniloae is careful to maintain that the activity of "personalization" is not attributed exclusively to the Spirit or Pneumatology. Indeed, in a proper synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology this cannot be the case. The Son of God is also fully "person," whose "I" is united but never confused with others, and who relates to each member of the Church in a personal relationship, in the Holy Spirit, with all the dignity of his own personhood. Therefore, writes Stăniloae, the Son

does not simply represent either the unity of nature proper to the Holy Trinity, nor some impersonal human nature, but in addition to this he represents a Person as a distinctive principle and as such he enters into personal relations with those who form his Mystical Body, affirming their personal reality.⁵³

In this union with Christ, the "I" or self-hood of every member of

51 HSSC, 55.

52 HSSC, 68–69. Also, *Temeiuri Teologice*, 166.

53 HSSC, 66.

the Church, is never confused or lost—just as in Trinitarian *perichoresis*. This personal relation with Christ thereby affirms and deepens the personhood of each member.⁵⁴

The Holy Spirit as Wholeness, and as the Personal Principle of Unity

Stăniloae points out that the Fathers of the Church saw the Holy Spirit as the principle of *unity* in the Church (or rather, unity in diversity), and not of diversification, based mostly on their interpretation of the Pentecost event.⁵⁵

In Stăniloae's view, the Holy Spirit is the one who makes a single Body of all the faithful, each endowed with a specific gift. He creates a consciousness in each one that his gift is for the whole. Each person, by using his gift for all, helps the whole Body; but at the same time, he enriches himself by developing his gift. Stăniloae calls these "mutually interdependent gifts" through which no member of the Church remains unconditioned by the other.⁵⁶ The Holy Spirit in this way creates a *bond between men*, and is himself the bond, "the integrating force which unites the whole, the power of cohesion in the community."⁵⁷ Thus his role in the economy of uniting persons without confusing them is a reflection of his *hypostatic* role of uniting Persons in the Trinity.

Developing an idea of St Basil who sees the Spirit as a "whole" (ὅλον) who is "wholly" in everyone, Stăniloae calls the Holy Spirit the

constitutive force of the whole body, the *δύναμις τοῦ ὅλου*, or synthetic power, [which] exists in each of the parts and everywhere in the unity which together they constitute ... It is this [i.e. the Holy Spirit] which gives the Church the nature

54 "... the Spirit simultaneously accentuates in us what is specific to us as persons... union with Christ also accentuates our growth as persons" (TRLC, 27).

55 HSSC, 52–53, 71.

56 HSSC, 55.

57 HSSC, 54.

of a whole ... thereby giving it the character of 'sobornicity'
 ... [or,] notion of wholeness: catholicity (from *καθ' ὅλον*).⁵⁸

Through the Holy Spirit, the Church also becomes a "whole", and what gives it this quality of "wholeness" is precisely the Holy Spirit. Commenting on St Paul, Stăniloae writes that the "Spirit is the same; he is wholly in the whole Church and wholly in each member."⁵⁹ He is the "place"⁶⁰ where the Church gathers, the "atmosphere" in which the whole Church lives and moves and has its being spiritually, the "midst" in which Christ is present amongst believers. But he is not an impersonal "place" or milieu, but a living, personal one, since the Holy Spirit himself is Person, and sustains unity in personal relationships precisely as Person.⁶¹

Christ as the Head of the Church

The order of the Church, which the Spirit maintains, is "the order of symphony, an order of liberty and love, an order of sobornicity and brotherhood."⁶² This does not exclude hierarchy but only self-sufficiency and domination/subordination, as if one member was independent of, or external or superior to the other parts of the body.⁶³

In Stăniloae's thought, there is an ontological distinction between Christ and the members of the Church, even in their unity. Christ alone is *above* the Church, as its divine/human Head. He alone receives the Holy Spirit in his entire divine hypostasis, whereas the members of the Church partake of the uncreated grace of the Holy Spirit as each is able. In this, Christ has a permanent, ontological relationship with the Holy Spirit,⁶⁴ whereas we are sons

58 HSSC, 54–55. cf., Florovsky, "Sobornost," 40.

59 HSSC, 61; "Now there are a variety of gifts, but the same Spirit" (1 Cor 12.4).

60 This is an interesting interpretation, vis-à-vis other theologians, e.g., Zizioulas' *epi to auto* (BC, 21).

61 HSSC, 61–63.

62 HSSC, 71.

63 HSSC, 57.

64 "...the faithful participate with Christ in the 'rest' of the Holy Spirit... the faithful, unlike Christ, are not divine hypostases they have only a partial share in the energy

of God by grace, or adoption, but not by nature.⁶⁵ The filial consciousness of Christ before the Father is assimilated as our own.⁶⁶ Christ as the head of the Church is the source of the Holy Spirit, which flows unceasingly in the Church as a type of soul in the body.⁶⁷

Stăniloae's distinction between Christ and the Church, which does not negate their unity, carries several ecclesiological implications. For one, the authority of the Church is limited. The Church's teaching, for example, cannot contradict Christ's teaching. When the Church teaches, it participates in the teaching of Christ. But the Church is also itself *taught* by Christ, who "punishes ... advises, commands and comforts, as one who is higher than her."⁶⁸ Stăniloae puts it this way:

[T]he Church does not consider itself one with Christ in the knowledge and preservation of the truth. It is illumined by Christ, through the Holy Spirit, and thus is conscious that it is led by someone other than itself, that it receives this light from the depth of deification of Christ, which permeates it.⁶⁹

This implies that the Church is not an ultimate source of authority,

of the Spirit. Because the human hypostasis is not equal to the divine hypostasis, it cannot contain the fullness of the hypostasis of the Spirit ... The Spirit never leaves this position of resting upon Christ, for his rest as an hypostasis is in Christ as the incarnate Son of God. But the Spirit can cease to rest upon man for there is no eternal hypostatic relation between men and the Spirit" (TRLC, 27). We enter into communion with the Father, as sons in the Spirit, not by nature (as uncreated Hypostases) but by grace (TRLC, 28, 38).

65 "Through the Spirit we who have been united in the Son have a filial relation to the Father, not in exactly the same manner, obviously, as natural sons begotten by the Father, but in the manner of sons adopted through the Spirit... We are related among ourselves as brothers, and Jesus Christ is Brother to us all in our midst" (HSSC, 63).

66 "The Son of God became man not only to confer on us a general kind of divinity, but to make us sons of God. This is why the Son and no other Person of the Trinity became man ... [so that we may] be truly the sons of God and conscious of that fact" (TRLC, 33).

67 *Autoritatea*, 185.

68 *Ibid.*, 188.

69 *Autoritatea*, 189–90.

in the sense that it is either an absolute sovereignty or self-sufficient in itself. It has what Săniloae calls both an “interior” and “exterior” limitation: the former being “a conscious humility and responsibility towards its Lord and Master,” and the latter being its obligation to maintain the divine revelation, which “culminates in Christ, and is fixed in the Holy Scriptures and Holy Tradition.”⁷⁰ This external limitation shows that the Church is always connected with the revelation once given and implies the permanent presence of the same Spirit within her. The Church through the Holy Spirit maintains the teaching of revelation unchanged, since it lives and experiences unchanged the fullness of life in Christ.

This latter point is an important one. Săniloae is careful to point out that the limitation of the Church’s authority does not mean that the Church is limited in its life in God. On the contrary, it *ensures* its experience of the *infinite* life of God. He writes:

The Truth kept by her is the infinity of divine life placed at our disposal, which assures us an infinite development. Precisely due to the fact that the Church maintains it [the truth], the Church remains in the ambiance of the divine infinite and does not fall into the narrowness and impasse of limited horizons.⁷¹

Rather than oppress the Church in this manner, the fact that the Church is limited in its teaching authority implies the constant presence of Christ in the Church, guiding her. This can only be the case if Christ is *both* above the Church *and* active within it. This creates a humility in the Church, which is conscious of his presence and authority. In this manner, the Church is constantly taught by Christ, is always developing its life in the Spirit, always growing, always being called to a higher level.

The Church as Sacrament

Săniloae prefers to call the Church itself a sacrament, or Mystery, in its totality. Thus, while the Mysteries maintain and renew the

⁷⁰ Ibid., 190.

⁷¹ *Autoritatea*, 195.

Church continually, at the same time the Church is given the power to manifest itself through sacraments. “[T]he Church is not only the result of the sacraments, but also their condition... it could be said that the Mysteries are the continual respiration of the Church, through which it unceasingly inhales and exhales the Holy Spirit.”⁷² In other words, the Church both invokes the Spirit (“inhales”) and manifests the Spirit (“exhales”).

Stăniloae’s thought on this point is based firmly on his synthesis. The Church is a Mystery, because it *perpetually* contains Christ and the Spirit. This is because as the Spirit *rests* in the Son (and thus on the incarnate Christ⁷³), so also does he *rest* continually in the Body of Christ,⁷⁴ being united with Christ and uniting all in Christ, and manifesting all in a filial relation to the Father. Stăniloae writes, for example:

The shining forth of the Spirit from the Son is extended also on creatures, or rather, also fills the faithful with the filial affection of the Son towards the Father ... Thus, the Spirit with which the Son fills the faithful is the same Spirit of the Father which rests on the Son, and is returned by the Son to the Father. Only the Son is able to reveal the Spirit to creatures, because only on him does the Spirit rest ... The Spirit remains the Spirit of sonship in the divine plan, and in the plan of creation; only an extension of divine sonship to creation is given place, not an egress from sonship.⁷⁵

⁷² *Din aspectul*, 533.

⁷³ “Christ being the hypostasis who has made human nature his own, he [sic.] bears the fullness of the Spirit in his very humanity. In the Incarnation of the Son, the Spirit is hypostatically united to the Son, as he is from all eternity. Christ as man thus receives the Spirit for ever... The Spirit as hypostasis rests permanently on the Son during his Incarnation also.... The incarnation of the Son allows this manifestation” (“The Holy Spirit,” 9).

⁷⁴ E.g., “The Spirit ‘comes to rest’ (alights) upon the Church and in the Church because he comes to rest upon Christ, its head, and because the Church is united with Christ” (TRLC, 27). See also TRLC, 38.

⁷⁵ *Criteriile*, 117. Also, as cited above, “... the Spirit rests in those who are united with the Son, since he rests in the Son. The Spirit does not go beyond the Son, even when

But the Church, unlike Christ, does not contain the Spirit in the fullness of his hypostasis. The Spirit abides in the Church, but also transcends the Church. The Church stands in constant need of the renewal of the Spirit within her. Elsewhere he writes:

The Church, being full of divine power, at the same time lives with the sentiment of the Divinity which transcends it, which it calls, towards which it strives and is raised up through each Mystery it celebrates. In this sense, a continual tension of renewal is normal for the Church.⁷⁶

Where this tension towards renewal does not exist, the Church stagnates. Only by continually calling the Spirit, can the Church continually manifest him.

From this perspective, Stăniloae sees the Church not as the result of the sacraments but of the Spirit, who on Pentecost created the Church in an exclusively divine act. The Spirit, dwelling perpetually in the Church, maintains it as a sacrament in its totality. But at the same time, the Church renews itself through the sacraments, since through them it continually receives the Spirit, to be enriched, renewed and refreshed by him.⁷⁷ Again, the Spirit is in the Church, yet also *above* the Church. The Church calls perpetually upon the Spirit, not only because sinners are in the Church, but because the Church itself is not the source of divine life, but the repository or manifestation of it, and therefore has itself the need of constant renewal and growth.⁷⁸

Baptism and Chrismation in an Ecclesiological Context

For Stăniloae, the foundation of the perpetual abiding, or “rest,” of the Holy Spirit in the Church and in each one of its members is *Baptism* and *Chrismation*. Elsewhere he relates his synthesis directly to this sacrament of the Church:

we say improperly that he is sent to men. The Son is the only and ultimate resting place of the Spirit,” “The Procession,” in Vischer, *Holy Spirit*, 179.

⁷⁶ *Din aspectul*, 533.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 534.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 537.

The Spirit ... is the Person of relation between the Father and the Son, and thus he makes us who become through Baptism sons of the Father through our incorporation in Christ, such that we might feel the Father's love towards us and our love towards the Father, just as at his baptism, Christ, as soon as he comes up from the waters, receives the Spirit from the opened heavens, as a verification of the love of the Father, as the loving relation of the Father towards him, not only according to his divinity but also according to his humanity. This means that we too through Baptism are placed into a connection with the entire Trinity.⁷⁹

Stăniloae continues this reflection, stating that because we are given the likeness of the Son in Baptism, we are given the Spirit's gifts in Chrismation. We thereby can respond with our personal love, as sons, to the Father, through the same Spirit.

The importance of Baptism/Chrismation in Stăniloae's thought is evident in many of his works. For example, in his *Orthodox Spirituality*, Stăniloae often cites St Mark the Ascetic's teaching that baptism occasions the dwelling of Christ in the depth of the human heart, the "place behind the iconostasis."⁸⁰ This personal indwelling of Christ in the heart is the foundation of hesychastic struggle, the goal of which is to meet Christ within the heart, to commune with the Kingdom of Heaven which is "within you."⁸¹ The indwelling of Christ in the human heart is inseparable from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (the Son and the Spirit being insepa-

79 Ibid., 541.

80 *On Baptism*, PG 65.996BC, cited in Stăniloae, *Orthodox Spirituality*, 160–61. This Baptismal indwelling of Christ is so central to Stăniloae's approach to spirituality that he cites St Mark's teaching repeatedly throughout the cited work (see pp. 60, 97, 158, 160, 163, 259, 288, 292). Additionally, Stăniloae cites other Fathers, for example, Diodochus and St Maximus (cited *Orthodox Spirituality*, 293 n. 210). Stăniloae's teaching can be seen as following St Mark the Ascetic's teaching that baptism grants a divine "indwelling" (ἐνοίκησις) of Christ in the heart, which is given "mystically" (μυστικῶς) and which we must "energize" or "actively" (ἐνεργῶς) seek or perceive within us. See also, "Liturgia comunității și jertfa interioară în viziunea filocalică," *Orthodoxia* 30 (1978): 394–95.

81 The same teaching is adopted by the hesychasts, notably Gregory of Sinai and Kallistos and Ighantios Xanthopoulos. See Kallistos Ware, "The Sacrament of Bap-

able) and so Stăniloae likewise often cites the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria that Baptism makes us temples of the Spirit. Underlining this notion, Stăniloae writes that Baptism makes us “the place or temple of the Holy Spirit ... not only partakers of a simple or non-hypostatic grace but the temple of the truly subsistent [i.e. Personal] Spirit.”⁸² This implies that the Church, through all its members, bears Christ and the Spirit *continually* in its existence, and hence in all of its activities, and not just in the eucharistic gathering. In Stăniloae’s view, all the struggles, labors, ministries and gifts of the members of the Church are an unfolding of Christ’s presence and the grace of the Spirit, received in the sacraments. He writes that the

Holy Spirit is the continual laborer in the Church and in its members in all the good they tend to do, that is, not only in acts which are strictly-speaking Mysteries. In this sense, we can speak of a sacrament of reading the Scriptures, of prayer, of word and deed in the Church, not in the sense that these are strictly-called Mysteries, but the actualization of their grace, of the working of the Spirit of the Mysteries, as a prolonging of the Mysteries.⁸³

The Son and the Spirit perpetually abide in the Church primarily through Baptism. In this way, for Stăniloae, Baptism becomes a foundational principle not only for ecclesiology, but for the entire spiritual life of the Church.

The perpetual abiding of the Son and the Spirit in believers is also fundamental for understanding what Stăniloae means by the “Universal Church.” There is a universal Church, he affirms, because when we are baptized—or partake of the Holy Eucharist—we are united not just with our community, but with all communities, and all particular persons, partaking of the same Christ and the

tism and the Ascetic Life in the Teaching of Mark the Monk,” *Studia Patristica*, vol. X (Berlin, 1970): 441–52.

82 *Criteriile*, 112.

83 *Din aspectul*, 553.

same Spirit.⁸⁴ In this sense, the Church is “universal” both because it extends spatially or geographically,⁸⁵ but also because through the indwelling of Christ and Holy Spirit in all its members it has an universal unity: both internal unity, manifested through a oneness of heart and mind; and an exterior unity, manifested both in forms (such as confession of the faith and sacraments) and in the mutual interdependence of all believers, orders, and communities.⁸⁶

Oneness of Faith as the Foundation of Ecclesial Unity

As mentioned above, the internal unity of the Church has an objective, empirical manifestation: the confession of the one Apostolic Faith. Stăniloae sees this in an integral manner: an all-encompassing confession in the totality of its declarative and practical manifestations, in which is contained the Church itself.⁸⁷ From this perspective, the faith is more than a theoretical declaration, but something which is inseparably tied to the possession of the Spirit and the celebration of the Sacraments, and hence the life of the Church. Hence the confession of faith before Baptism and before partaking of the Eucharist.⁸⁸ If the faith is divorced from sacraments it becomes theory with no power, and, inversely, the sacraments become acts without content, or with altered content.⁸⁹

In Stăniloae, the understanding of the faith leads to living it, and

84 BUS, 186. “The universality of the Church is based on the recapitulation of all in the same Christ, and the work of the same Spirit in everyone, manifested empirically through the confession of the same faith maintained unchanged from the Apostles” (ibid., 191). Each limb of the body has the same life of the body and breathes the same Spirit (ibid., cf. Eph 4.4–5).

85 BUS, 186; citing Cyprian of Carthage and the Shepherd of Hermes. Also, “Teologia Euharistiei,” 357.

86 Ibid., 187.

87 Ibid., 192.

88 *Din aspectul*, 561. This unity is even expressed in the sameness in which sacraments are celebrated, as an objective manifestation of common faith (*Criteriile*, 120). Also: “... the unity of the Church also consists of its unity in sacraments and in its hierarchy ... which celebrates all the sacraments without differences, and preaches the same dogmatic faith” (TDO 2:265–66, cited in Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiologists*, 78).

89 BUS, 192.

likewise, living the faith increases one's understanding of it. Both the living and understanding of the faith are simultaneous and feed one another, and both occur in the Holy Spirit.⁹⁰ Hence, holiness of life is inseparable from the understanding and preservation of truth. The very notion of "preservation" takes on a positive, and not a negative, aspect: it implies a striving towards the infinite of divine life which simultaneously resists any false teaching that would impede its advancement. Holiness is thereby the foundation of the Church's preservation of Truth.⁹¹ Confession of faith is a *gift of the Spirit*,⁹² and as such is both the *foundation* and *outcome* of the unity manifested in Baptism and Eucharist. For example, Stăniloae writes:

The Eucharistic sacrifice seeks, in order to be offered, and produces, a "renewal of the mind," as writes the Holy Apostle Paul (Rom 12.1). But this means a new thought, a certain new content of the mind, with which the faithful come to Holy Communion and which is clarified and deepened through Holy Communion. Because of this they sing after Communion, 'We have seen the true light, we have received the Heavenly Spirit, we have found the true faith ...' ... and before the transformation of the Eucharist, 'Let us love one another, that with one mind we may confess.' Only in measure with the correct orientation of faith with which they come are they deepened even more in this correct orientation through Holy Communion.⁹³

Thus each community has a responsibility to maintain this faith and thereby ensure that all partake of the same Christ and breathe the same Spirit, and vice-versa. Because it is inseparable from the

90 Ibid., 192. Elsewhere, Stăniloae, citing a passage from St Gregory of Nyssa ("He who wills to touch the Son through faith is touched by him through the Spirit"), speaks of a "bilateral movement" between faith and the Spirit: "Without the Spirit there is no access to the Son through faith, but without the effort of believing in the Son, the help of the Spirit is not possible" (*Criteriile*, 120).

91 *Autoritatea*, 197–98.

92 Cf. 1 Cor 12.3: "... no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit."

93 BUS, 197–98. Also, e.g., "Holy Communion is not able to create unity in magical way, without the preliminary common faith, as a voluntary, spiritual act, helped by the same Spirit that transforms the gifts ..." (*Din aspectul*, 562).

entire life of the Church, the confession of faith is “the criterion and foundation of the Mysteries.”⁹⁴ In other words, the Sacraments constitute a *part* of the manifestation of the truth of the Church.

Comparative Analysis (I): The Exclusive Identification of “koinonia” and “eschaton” with the Eucharistic Liturgy

We can now begin to compare Stăniloae and Zizioulas directly on several points. As mentioned, in emphasizing “koinonia” and “eschaton,” Zizioulas makes many valuable reflections regarding the role of eschatology in ecclesiology. For example, he brings into relief the eschatological character of the Eucharist and draws implications from this for ecclesial institutions, which thereby are seen as reflections of the Kingdom. Zizioulas, like Stăniloae, is concerned that they not be seen as self-sufficient in an exclusively historically-based ontology. The institutions become sacramental by their being placed in a dialectic between history and eschatology, the already and the not yet. By being conditioned by a constant dependence on the Holy Spirit, they lose their self-sufficiency and exist epiclestically.⁹⁵ In his reflections, Zizioulas is careful to state that between history and eschaton there is not an ontological dualism.⁹⁶ But he is also concerned to preserve “their dialectical relationship.”⁹⁷

However, having made these valuable reflections, Zizioulas seems to fall back on an exclusive primacy of the Eucharist, instead of a Son/Spirit or even Holy Spirit/Body of Christ synthesis, to account for the eschatological character of the Church’s institutions. That he tends in this direction is indicated by the fact that, in Zizioulas’ thought, this synthesis between the historical and eschatological appears to occur *exclusively* in the Eucharist.⁹⁸ On the one hand, he states that the Church’s eschatological realities should be

94 BUS 192–93; because the faith renders authentic the reality of Christ, and is the power which conforms us to his image.

95 BC, 138; see also, 185–87.

96 BC, 186–87; though he does not explain how.

97 BC, 20.

98 E.g., “Consequently, the eucharist had the unique privilege of reuniting in one

reflected in her institutions all the time, but on the other, he states that “[t]his can hardly be achieved outside the context of worship. . . . The Church is an *event*, taking place again and again . . .”⁹⁹ This, in Zizioulas’ thought, means that the “eucharistic community constitutes a sign of the fact that the *eschaton* can only *break through* history but never be identified with it.”¹⁰⁰ From this perspective, Zizioulas refers to the eschatological character of the Church as only “momentary,” a grace which is “acquired only to be lost again” and therefore leads to an ebb and flow that McPartlan calls a “rhythmic” Christian existence.¹⁰¹ In this model, Zizioulas does not explain how the Church manifests the presence of the Spirit outside of the Eucharistic assembly.¹⁰²

Leaving aside a full philosophical discussion of Zizioulas’ time/*eschaton* distinction,¹⁰³ the danger inherent in this view is that

whole, in one unique experience, the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit . . . the institutional with the charismatic . . . For it was *only* in the eucharist the dialectical relationship between God and the world, between *eschata* and history, was preserved without creating dangerous polarizations and dichotomies” (BC, 21; emphasis mine). “There is, indeed, no other experience in the Church’s life in which the synthesis of the historical with the eschatological can be realized more fully than in the Eucharist” (BC, 187).

99 MCOT, 301.

100 BC, 161

101 McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 266–72, 287.

102 For example, Zizioulas acknowledges the necessary inter-relatedness of the Church’s ministries and institutions, but then says “in the Orthodox Church, *the Eucharist alone* has preserved the interdependence of the Church’s ministries” (“The Eucharist and the Kingdom of God,” *Sourozh*, 60 (1995) 36; emphasis in original). Elsewhere he mentions the activities of the Church *ad extra* (i.e. to the non-baptized) as “para-eucharistic” forms of ministry, but does not explain how they are so (BC, 225).

103 Though beyond our discussion, Stăniloae does explicate the relation between time, aeon and eternity. In this, Stăniloae elaborates on St Maximus’ view that “the *logoi* of time are in God.” In other words, time has its source and goal in eternity/aeon, and this source/goal is the *perichoresis* or interpersonal love of the Holy Trinity offered to created persons. Thus, the *eschaton* does not simply “break through” time at the moment of the Eucharistic *epiclesis*, as Zizioulas seems to hold (see BC, 20–21; McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 151), but is integrally related to time (as logos/symbol), such that that time “grows” to eternity as our interpersonal communion with God grows. In other words, time is filled with eternity as we grow closer to God. Thus, in

it tends towards a division in the spirituality of the Church, in which it would be difficult to find value in the personal prayers, good works or ascetic labors of believers outside of the eucharistic celebration. That Zizioulas tends in this direction (of placing the Church's experience of communion and *eschaton* exclusively in the celebration of the Eucharist¹⁰⁴), is also evident by his not seeing spirituality (monasticism in particular) and sanctification as essential components *for ecclesiology*.¹⁰⁵ This perspective runs the risk of creating the "dangerous polarizations and dichotomies" which Zizioulas himself is seeking to avoid.

Stăniloae appears to avoid this potential dilemma by grounding the experience of both *koinonia* and *eschaton* in the *Persons* of the Son and the Spirit, not *only* in the Church's eucharistic liturgy. Moreover, as we saw above, Stăniloae sees the perpetual abiding of the Spirit and Christ in the Church and all its members primarily through Baptism and Chrismation. These two factors of his approach thereby allow him to say that the "Church is continuously supplicating and praying: it is in an uninterrupted *epiclesis*. Prayer is her unceasing breathing, through which she is inspired and breathes in Christ in an unceasing movement."¹⁰⁶

Because the Holy Spirit is wholly in the Church and wholly in each of its members, Stăniloae can say that the "prayers of believers in their homes and in any other place are also prayers within the

Stăniloae's view, some saints begin to participate in eternity while still on earth, that is, still in time. See discussion in *The Experience of God*, vol. 1., 153–78.

104 E.g., BC, 21, cited above. Though beyond our scope here, it could be pointed out that in the Orthodox theological tradition the dialectical relationship between God and the world, etc., has been contended with in the thought of Dionysius, St Maximus and St Gregory Palamas (e.g., the Logos/logoi/symbol relation and the uncreated energies).

105 "The Orthodox tradition has attached particular significance to ... the idea of sanctification, perhaps because of the strong Origenist influence that has always existed in the East ... But monasticism—and the notions of 'sanctification' and 'spirituality' that lie behind it—has never become a decisive aspect of ecclesiology in the East. Ecclesiology in the Orthodox tradition has always been determined by the liturgy, the eucharist ... *eschatology and communion*" (BC, 131).

106 *Autoritatea*, 188.

Church, because the Church is present wherever one of her members is.”¹⁰⁷ We could take Stăniloae’s words as a literal application, or deepening, of Irenaeus’ *dictum*, “Where the Spirit is, there is the Church.” Because each prays in the Spirit, the Church is present even outside the liturgical gathering. Even Christ went off to pray alone. But simultaneously Stăniloae sees the Liturgy as the most pronounced expression of the Church’s prayer and direct experience of its *epicletic* character.

Stăniloae describes the Church’s prayer as “a synergy with the Spirit.” For this reason, every prayer, of the Church and of her members, “constitutes in a broad sense an *epiclesis*.” The Church invokes the Spirit at the beginning of each service, and the believer invokes the Spirit at the beginning of each day, of each activity, with the prayer “O Heavenly King,” and thereby asks for the Spirit and the power of God.¹⁰⁸ This constant *epiclesis* grounds the fellowship of communion in the Church in *all* of its activities.

The Spirit is “the power of fellowship in prayer, the common experience of Christ who wills to unite all men in himself.”¹⁰⁹ The Spirit seeks to gather all men into a communion with Christ. The key here is that the *koinonia* given by the Spirit is not an abstract *koinonia*. Rather, it is oneness of mind and heart which is concretely manifested in the Church as *both* common prayer *and* as mutual responsibility of each towards the other, which includes material needs.¹¹⁰ For this reason, the believer invokes the Spirit, who in turn gives him the gift he needs, “for himself, for the strengthening of the community of the Church, for the enrichment of the Body of Christ.”¹¹¹ In this manner, this constant *epiclesis* results in the gifts and good works of those in the Church, which are given specifically to strengthen the whole Body, to make its *koinonia* real in all aspects of life. The Holy Spirit becomes the

107 “The Holy Spirit,” 12.

108 *Ibid.*, 14–15.

109 *Ibid.*, 14.

110 *Ibid.*, 13.

111 *Ibid.*, 15.

personal bond between men additionally through their use of his gifts for one another.

In Săniloae's view, the *epiclesis* permeates all of *human life*, not just the eucharistic celebration.¹¹² The "life of the Church in the Spirit ... is obtained not only in communal worship, but also in private prayer." Hence we are called always to be in the presence of the Spirit and to "pray without ceasing" (1 Thess 5.17). Those who are leading a more intense life of prayer, who have purified their passions, who experience a greater presence and power of the Holy Spirit, thereby live in eschatological perspective, such that they radiate an immense love for all and exert a great influence on their fellow men. In this they spread the *koinonia* of the Church with all whom they come into contact.¹¹³ In this manner, Săniloae sees the effects of personal prayer as aiding the Church's eucharistic celebrations.

This leads to the point: spirituality and holiness should not be ignored as integral components to ecclesiology. To do so is based on an assumption that personal prayer, good works and ascetic labors (monasticism in particular), lead to individualism.¹¹⁴ In fact, the opposite is true in Orthodoxy. Săniloae points out that the purpose of asceticism is not only to remove passions, but specifically to

112 Cf. The first prayer of the faithful, Divine Liturgy of St Chrysostom: "That we may call upon Thee at all times in every place." Also, the prayer before the Creed: "... that Thy good Spirit may rest upon us."

113 "The Holy Spirit," 17, 21. In the spiritual tradition of the Orthodox Church, writes Săniloae, "without asceticism one cannot kill the passions, and that without the purification of the passions, man cannot become sensitive to God through the Holy Spirit. Through this transference, these great ascetics live even here on earth in an eschatological perspective, that is to say, 'in heaven.' ... They are men of continual prayer... Thus they remain within the spiritual atmosphere of the Church, in communion with the company of believers, and in the spirit of Orthodox tradition," (ibid., 21).

114 Zizioulas' opinion is unclear as to the status of monasticism. On the one hand, he attributes its emphasis on "spirituality" and "sanctification" to Origenist influence, thereby not being a part of the mainstream Church's ecclesiology (see above citation from BC, 131). On the other, he states that "[t]he event of communion that characterizes all charismatic life lies at the heart of monasticism" (cited McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 277).

remove egotism, of which they are just the manifestations. The removal of egotism is what opens us to both God and our neighbor and prepares us for interpersonal communion by removing the passions (such as pride, greed, etc.) which create divisions between us and our neighbors and thereby enclose us in ourselves. Opening ourselves to the communion of the Spirit is a lifelong process which cannot occur only in the Liturgy, though there it may be more pronounced. Moreover, the personal struggle to overcome egotism is the only valid preparation for the Eucharist.¹¹⁵ For example, the Church asks us to fast before communion. From this perspective, holiness and ascetic struggle *enable* interpersonal communion,¹¹⁶ and influence the Eucharistic celebration of the community of the Church, and vice versa.¹¹⁷

When seen from this all-embracing perspective, spirituality and holiness, as manifestations of the *power of the Spirit* and *eschatological life*, both arise from and strengthen the practical *koinonia* of the Church. Thus they are essential for a balanced ecclesiology. Monasticism itself is based on principles which are essential for ecclesiology, among which may be included the personal respect

115 Stăniloae goes into detail as to why St Maximus the Confessor felt that contemplation of the *logoi* of the one Logos (as an ascetic struggle to see the world as gift) was a necessary preparation for the communion with the Logos in the “rational [logical] sacrifice [τήν λογικήν ... λατρείαν]” of the Eucharist (“Teologia Euharistiei,” 349); we note this, though the details are beyond our discussion here.

116 As holiness is a fruit of the Holy Spirit, it cannot be a manifestation of individualism, and Stăniloae says as much: “The Holy Spirit is not the spirit of individualism ... but the Spirit of communion ... holiness is opposed to individualism. It is not indifference to men, but is one with enthusiasm for brotherhood, one with fervent love for humanity in God, one with sincerity and openness, with communication, with sacrificial generosity and with purity of intentions and deeds towards each man” (*Criteriile*, 127; see Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiology*, 79–80). Hence, holiness is also needed to know the truth (*Autoritatea*, 197–98).

117 Hence Stăniloae feels that the spiritual life of the hesychast is not developed in isolation from the eucharistic community, and the celebration of the Eucharist is not uninfluenced by the spiritual life of the persons participating in it. These are not two separate orders of the spiritual life. See his article, “Liturghia comunității și jertfa interioară în viziunea filocalică [“The Liturgy of the Community and Internal Sacrifice in the Vision of the Philocalia”] *Orthodoxia* 30 (1978).

given to one's peers through humility and mutual blessing; or again, the loving obedience to one's elders and trust in their wisdom and experience—manifested as the abiding faithfulness to the Apostolic rule of faith amongst the hierarchy and councils of the Church.

Situating the *eschaton* in the Holy Spirit as Person, who “is everywhere present,” and not *only* in his manifestation in the Eucharist, also prevents what some theologians have called a triumphalist view of the Liturgy.¹¹⁸ Stăniloae also sees the worship of the Church as manifesting “eschatological intensity and openness” to the dynamic presence of God. The experience of God's power in the Liturgy, especially the Eucharist, is such that it “makes the community live in the transparence of the final Consummation towards which it is *tending*, sustained as it is by the Spirit”¹¹⁹ The key word here is *tending*. Stăniloae sees the Church as advancing in the Spirit towards the resurrection. In his view, the Eucharistic Liturgy shows that we are travelling. We pray to Christ who “is here invisibly present” that we may inherit “the Kingdom which is to come.” Stăniloae thus is careful to make a distinction between this foretaste and the final *eschaton*, which will be “the full revelation of the Spirit as divine and divinizing energy and glory.”¹²⁰ The foretaste of union with Christ in the Eucharist now serves as an assurance, preparation, and incentive towards our more perfect union with him in the future age.¹²¹

118 E.g., John Erickson, “The Local Church and Catholicity: An Orthodox Perspective,” *The Jurist* 52 (1992): 507: “Eucharistic ecclesiology all too easily lends itself to triumphalism. Our popular presentations speak so often of the Eucharist as the banquet of the Kingdom, as the point at which history intersects with the eschaton, that we lose sight of its proleptic nature, forgetting that the Eucharist is but a foretaste of the Kingdom, not its final realization.”

119 “The Holy Spirit,” 15 (emphasis mine).

120 Ibid., 15. He cites St Basil (*On the Holy Spirit* PG 32:186–91) who described worship as an opening into eschatology; i.e., but not a full opening. We could also see this distinction between the “now and the not yet” in the Paschal prayer recited when placing the Holy Body into the Chalice: “grant that we may more perfectly partake of Thee in the never-ending Day of Thy Kingdom.”

121 “Liturghia comunității și jertfa interioară în viziunea filocalică,” 399.

Only if the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church is an abiding one, in which he rests in the Church, as on Christ and on every believer (through Baptism and Chrismation), can the Church's various ministries and dimensions be fully integrated into its eschatological existence. When *both* Baptism/Chrismation *and* Eucharist are seen as an integration into eschatological life, the *koinonia* of the Church takes on a multifaceted depth. Stăniloae writes:

This communion is achieved in a multiplicity of forms: by the common faith in Christ, by the prayers we offer for one another, above all in common worship, by a life cleansed of egotism and offered in love to God and to our fellow human beings, by various practical forms of mutual assistance, and pre-eminently by the sacraments or mysteries. ... in these forms, the quality of the unitary mystery of the church is manifested. *Through these forms, Christ communicates his Holy Spirit ...* By all these means our spirit is strengthened and prepares us for our resurrection ... in a renewed, transfigured universe ... This universe will become nothing other than the climactic mystery or global church, the supreme communion and transparence of all in Christ, God incarnate.¹²²

The main point of Stăniloae's approach is that if the Holy Spirit is to permeate every aspect of the Church's existence with his own Person and his own work, then this abiding presence must be grounded in the Church sacramentally. This grounding occurs through Baptism and Chrismation, as well as through Eucharist. The Church's direct experience of and life in the Spirit cannot be limited only to the Eucharist. Moreover, the Church cannot lose the grace as soon as it receives it—as in Zizioulas' approach, which risks polarizing the Church's life between "history" and "eschaton"—because the Spirit rests in the Church as he rests in the Son. Rather, it could be said that Stăniloae grounds the Church's experience of the *eschaton* and *koinonia*, not in the event of Eucharistic

122 "The Mystery of the Church," in Gennadios Limouris, *Church, Kingdom, World* (Geneva: WCC, 1986): 56 (emphasis mine).

celebration,¹²³ but directly in the Person of the Holy Spirit, who rests in the Son and is thereby present in believers through Baptism, and indeed is “everywhere present and fills all things.” Stăniloae thereby sees the Church as experiencing a *continual epiclesis*, and is thereby *being unceasingly transformed into the Body of Christ*, in all its members, and through all their gifts, ministries, labors and sufferings.

Comparative Analysis (II): The Over-identification of the Church with Christ

A stronger Pneumatology prevents what appears to be in Zizioulas’ thought an over-identification of Christ with the Church. In Stăniloae’s synthesis, the Holy Spirit not only unites the Father and the Son by conveying the love of one to the other, but he also prevents a selfish love between them, a love in which they are enclosed upon themselves to the exclusion of others, resulting finally to the confusion of their personal distinctiveness. The unity which the Holy Spirit creates in the Trinity is *perichoretic*: it is not a union of personal identification.

Likewise in the Church, the Spirit creates a union of persons with the person of Christ in which the personal distinctiveness of each is wholly preserved even in the most profound union. The *koinonia* that the Spirit creates is on the level of the dignity of personhood. Likewise, as Stăniloae points out, the Spirit has a similar role in creation: He keeps all the *logoi* of the one Logos in a harmonious symphony, which simultaneously maintains their distinctiveness.

Zizioulas also sees this fundamental role of the Holy Spirit as the provider of *koinonia*. But in the schema of eucharistic ecclesiology, Christ/Christology/Eucharist provides the basis of unity in the Church. In other words, the Holy Spirit/Pneumatology does not have this primary role. In Zizioulas’ *correction* of eucharistic ecclesiology, Pneumatology plays an inseparable role in realizing

123 As in Zizioulas, e.g. MCOT, 301.

the Church's catholicity.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, unity is still a christological reality, though brought about, dependent on and conditioned by the Spirit. This is a very subtle yet important difference in emphasis. It can be seen in the fact that, even though Zizioulas does qualify Christ as the head of the Church and as a divine hypostasis,¹²⁵ at times he tends to *over-identify* Christ with the Church. Stăniloae's synthesis has a stronger pneumatological emphasis and a specific Son/Spirit relation, which would help in this area of Zizioulas' synthesis. We will take two instances of Zizioulas' thought as examples below.

The Church and Christ in the Eucharistic Prayer

In the first, Zizioulas asks a question, "When the Church prays to God, who prays?" In answering, Zizioulas faces a dilemma of how the community's offering, if it is not the Son's offering, is taken to the Father. On the one hand, he states that the "Eucharist does not remove entirely the dialectic Christ-Church,"¹²⁶ but on the other, he wishes to avoid a trialectic of Father-Christ-Church, and maintain a dialectic of Father-Christ. He writes that

the Son-Christ *has identified himself so much with the ecclesial community* that any separation, or even distinction in this particular case, would render these prayers meaningless and fruitless... Unless the two are identified, the eucharistic prayer will lose its meaning as a prayer of the Church addressed to the Father by the Son. ... the prayer ... cannot be otherwise understood apart from *a total—at that moment—identification of Christ with the Church*. Any other conception will turn Christ into a sort of go-between mediator, a third

124 Zizioulas sees the Church's catholicity as a christological reality. "It is Christ's unity and it is his catholicity that the Church reveals in her being catholic." He explicitly states that this "should not be understood as a negation of the pneumatological or triadological aspect of the Church" (BC, 158 n. 67). Zizioulas qualifies this catholicity as being conditioned and effected by the Holy Spirit, i.e. having an inseparable pneumatological dimension (BC, 160–61), and constantly depending on the Holy Spirit.

125 E.g., MCOT, 298–99.

126 MCOT, 298.

person, who listens first to the Church speaking to him and then like a messenger transmits the prayer to the Father.¹²⁷

In this discussion, the Holy Spirit is *not mentioned*. We can make an important observation: in Zizioulas' Pneumatology, believers are united to Christ in the Holy Spirit (or rather, become part of Christ's "corporate personality" in the Spirit), but the Holy Spirit does not play a role in uniting Christ to the Father. Hence, when trying to explicate how the Church's prayer is brought to the Father, Zizioulas is forced to make a total identification of Christ and his body.¹²⁸ This is an evident weakness in Zizioulas' Pneumatology.

However, this scenario is avoided in Stăniloae's synthesis, in which the Holy Spirit is the Person-bond between the Father and the Son. He both unites believers to Christ, or is united to them with Christ, and brings them together with Christ as adopted sons to the Father. This perspective both avoids Zizioulas' trialectic dilemma and results in a much different interpretation of the moment of consecration. We start with Stăniloae's explicit distinction between Christ and the Church in this moment:

Certainly the Church is only the Body of Christ, for as much as Christ remains its head. It is not one with the head. From this, it is mistaken to identify the Church with Christ without any reservation, as does the more recent thought of Catholicism, following the example of Blessed Augustine. There must be observed a certain dialectic in thought in the relation between Christ and the Church: as the Body of Christ, it completes Christ, but as the Body only, it is distinct from him. If it would be totally identified with Christ, the Church would no longer need to pray to him ... 'Again we entreat Thee: Remember, O Lord, Thy Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church ... give peace to her whom Thou hast obtained with the precious Blood of Thy Christ ...' If there would be a

127 MCOT, 297 (second emphasis mine).

128 McPartlan points out that this identification occurs only in the Eucharist: "Zizioulas proposes the view that bishop and people are Christ, in their respective orders, in the web of the Eucharist, *and only then*" (*Eucharist*, 280).

total identification with Christ, there would not be in her a tension towards perfection ...¹²⁹

We saw above the Stăniloae has a more integral view of the Church being a continual *epiclesis* as a whole. But this continual *epiclesis* implies a continual transformation. In this sense, Stăniloae can maintain this distinction between Christ and the Church, even in the Eucharistic *epiclesis*, because he does not see the transformation of the gifts and of the faithful into the Body and Blood of Christ as *simply a momentary occurrence* at the Liturgy. Continuing the above citation:

In reality, the Body and Blood of Christ do not remain static in the Church, but 'transform' it into themselves, as says Nicholas Cabasilas, but this transformation need not be understood as performed in a single instant, but is continual. The tension between identification with Christ and distinction from him must be understood as a potential which is able to be realized unceasingly... its full goal realized in the future life.¹³⁰

Having made these distinctions, we come now to the Pneumatological basis of Stăniloae's views. Three basic points can be identified in his discussion: First, it is the Holy Spirit that maintains the Church and the Eucharist in a mutually conditioned balance of each other. Only in response to the Church's *epiclesis* does the Spirit descend and transform the gifts; yet only the Church community, as the Body of Christ in which Christ dwells through the Holy Spirit, can continually receive the Holy Spirit.¹³¹ Second, the Spirit is given only ecclesially: "The reception of the Spirit in view of the transformation and communion [of the gifts] is not individualist, but *personal*, that is, *ecclesial*."¹³² Thirdly, the Holy Spirit transforms the gifts offered by the community into the Body and Blood of Christ, but at the same time tightens and transforms the

129 *Din aspectul*, 545, citing the Liturgy of St Basil, prayer after the consecration. We could extend Stăniloae's observation to the entire anaphora.

130 *Ibid.*

131 *Ibid.*, 546.

132 *Ibid.*, 546, emphasis in original.

community itself, represented through the gifts, in a rejuvenating way, into the Body of Christ.¹³³ In this manner, he writes,

Christ transforms the lamb and assimilates it and even more the community represented by the lamb, into his Body, but also his Body, which is the community, contributes to the transformation of the lamb into the Body of Christ. The Church cannot be divided from Christ in the performance of this complex mystery.¹³⁴

Which leads to our point: the Eucharist is *of* the Church, *and of* Christ, through the Spirit, who is both in the Church, and is called down to the Church. But the Spirit is called because, even though he fills the Church with his power, he is above the Church. In all of Săniloae's points above, the Spirit is primary. The Church lives in this sentiment of both the presence and transcendence of the Spirit, and therefore, in Săniloae's view, the tension the Church feels towards continual renewal and dependence on the Spirit is natural for it.¹³⁵ This bilateral, complex mystery cannot be transcended, because the union of the Church with Christ (and with the Spirit) is *not one of hypostasis*, but of grace and adoption. At all times, the Church remains the Body, not the Head.

Therefore, in response to Zizioulas' dilemma, Săniloae has a much different approach. The Eucharistic sacrifice does not require the total, *personal* identification of the Church with the *person* of Christ. But this is not to say that the Church is separated or divided from Christ. He writes:

Even in the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, Orthodoxy sees the necessity of the community's cooperation, which as such is itself added to the sacrifice of Christ, or Christ himself gathers the community into his sacrifice. The personal and ecclesial Body of Christ are also tightly joined in *reciprocity of action*. Christ is higher than the community, but is also in the community. The priest the same. The community does not re-

133 Ibid., 547.

134 Ibid., 547.

135 Ibid., 533.

main separated from Christ ... the fact that Christ is above her means that he raises her up continually. ... *Because the sacrifice is also of the community, the Holy Spirit is invoked, Who, transforming the offered elements, transforms them as those offering them, in order to assimilate and renew them into the Body of the Lord ... The Eucharist is a dynamic factor in the Church, or the Church itself is through it in a continual growth.*¹³⁶

Hence, in Stăniloae's synthesis, Christ is inseparable from his body, but he is not personally identified with it. The Church has the Holy Spirit, being united to Christ, but must invoke the Holy Spirit, being distinct from him hypostatically. Christ, on the other hand, has the Holy Spirit in him, totally, as a full Divine Hypostasis, and does not need to invoke him, possessing the Spirit as Son. This difference between Christ and the Church cannot be transcended. For example, Stăniloae writes:

In the act of sacrifice [i.e. consecration], the faithful become united with Christ, but have always a consciousness that they are united with the source of their power of sacrifice, as limbs with the head. This union *does not produce a state of indistinction between them and Christ*. From this, *they desire to unite all the more* with this source of sacrifice. ... in the act of communion, beginning from the consciousness of their distinction in this unity, they seek to reduce this distinction, that is, to be unified even more with Christ.¹³⁷

We note that this distinction between Christ and the faithful has a positive meaning in Stăniloae: in realizing their distinction from Christ even in their union with him, the faithful are motivated to seek ever greater union with Christ.

In light of this, the Eucharistic sacrifice, before the transformation, is indeed the offering of the community. After the transformation, it is united to the sacrifice of Christ.¹³⁸ But being in the community as well as above it, Christ is at the same time the sacri-

¹³⁶ Ibid., 550; emphasis mine.

¹³⁷ "Teologia Euharistiei," 355.

¹³⁸ See discussion, in "Teologia Euharistiei," 351–58.

fice of the community and his own sacrifice. The “reciprocity of action” that brings this about is precisely the invocation and sending of the Spirit. Through the Eucharist as through the other Sacraments, both Christ and the Church act, or Christ acts in and through the Church.¹³⁹

Christ as a “Corporate Personality”

The second example is Zizioulas’ use of the concept of “corporate personality,” in which “one” person contains the “many,” as “Israel” is spoken to by God in the Old Testament. Zizioulas uses this concept to refer to Christ and the Church. In Zizioulas’ view, the Holy Spirit makes Christ a corporate personality, which allows him to be the “one” of the “many.” This infers Christ has priority over us, not as an individual, but as the one including over those being included.¹⁴⁰ This inclusion is so strong that we cannot speak of Christ without his body.¹⁴¹

Zizioulas is quite correct in these beautiful reflections. Stăniloae too speaks of a reciprocal fulfillment of Christ with the Church along the same lines.¹⁴² But, as with his interpretation of the Eucharistic prayer seen above, there are times in which Zizioulas tends to make a *personal* identification of Christ with his body.¹⁴³ He writes for example that the Church’s identity is Christ’s identity,

This is why there is no hypostasis of the Church. The Church has no hypostasis of its own. This makes Christ’s identity dependent on the existence of the Church, which is paradoxical, for though the Church has no hypostasis of its own, it is a factor which conditions Christ’s identity: the one cannot exist without the many.¹⁴⁴

This citation comes after Zizioulas explicitly states that Christ’s is

139 *Din aspectul*, 533; see also Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesio-logists*, 89, 95.

140 BC, 183.

141 E.g. BC, 183.

142 BUS, 185.

143 See also McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 142–43, 280.

144 MCOT, 302–3.

the divine hypostasis of the Son, and that he cannot be “head” without a “body.”¹⁴⁵

Fortunately we have Stăniloae's precise response to this idea, because it was first mentioned—though not in a developed synthesis, like Zizioulas'—in an article written by Ioannis Karmiris which Stăniloae read. Karmiris writes: “Just as a head cannot exist without a body (in its quality as head), so Christ cannot exist without his Church, or his Church without Christ.” Following Blessed Augustine, Karmiris writes that Christ and the Church “form somehow one person; Christ is the so-called ‘I’ of the Church, which does not have a ‘persona’ proper or ‘hypostasis’ proper, but is a unified ‘person’ or a unique ‘hypostasis’ of Christ and the members of his Body.”¹⁴⁶

Stăniloae takes exception to this notion, even though he also sees the relationship of Christ and the Church so tightly interwoven that the Church becomes a theandric constitution. One cannot be seen or spoken of without the other, though Christ has the position of source of the Church's life, and hence the “reciprocal fulfillment” between Christ and the Church.¹⁴⁷ However, in responding to Karmiris' reflections, he writes,

But the unity between Christ and the Church does not mean . . . a transformation of the Church into Christ. The humanity of believers, however divinized it may be, is not transformed into Christ the head. The head, even though he also has his per-

145 There is a certain terminological imprecision in what is meant by “hypostasis” in Zizioulas' thought in general, in which he seems to equate “hypostasis” with “tropos hyparxeos” (“mode of existence,” e.g., BC, 41 n. 37), and which could render the meaning of this passage differently. For example, his distinction between the “biological hypostasis” before baptism, and the “ecclesial hypostasis” afterwards (BC, 50–59)—yet one does not become a new hypostasis after baptism but takes on a new “mode of existence” (*tropos hyparxeos*—a term which St Maximus applies to persons (e.g., *Op. theologica et polemica*, PG 91: 136D–137A; also *Disputatio* PG 91:292D–293A), but Zizioulas applies to the *logoi* of creation). Ică alludes to the same imprecision (“Person and/or Ontology,” 365). A clearer terminology would be “biological tropos” and “ecclesial tropos.” Dalmais correctly uses the same terminology in the patristic sense (see McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 152).

146 Karmiris, “Soma Christou,” *Ekklesia*, no. 15–16, 1962; cited *Autoritatea*, 186.

147 BUS, 185.

sonal human nature, is also God according to essence. The en-churched humanity of believers under no circumstances becomes a constitutive part of the head, as is his personal human nature, but remains the Body of the Head. It is not hypostatically united with him who is divine according to nature, but through the energies which flow out from him, believers assimilate his uncreated energy, not his hypostasis or nature.¹⁴⁸

Stăniloae then offers an elaboration on the unity of Christ with Church which follows the model of *perichoretic* personal unity of the Holy Trinity. He writes:

... in the Church, the human persons of the faithful are united with the person of Christ all the more in action and will and through a unity which includes them, without the persons being merged into a single person. Each of them moves around the others and within the others, in a *perichoresis*, in a reciprocal interiority, which preserves the existence of each and yet develops it ... in this reciprocal interiority between us and Christ, he is the center of gravity for us, as the same unifying sun, since we all are in him.¹⁴⁹

Stăniloae calls the Church a “pluripersonal symphony” in which each person plays his notes, but all is conducted, coordinated, unified under the direction of Christ, each making a concrete contri-

148 *Autoritatea*, 186; cited Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiologists*, 57. Elsewhere he writes, “Christ as man thus receives the Holy Spirit for ever, as the great leaders and prophets of Israel received him. But at the same time he receives the Spirit in his completeness, as they did not receive him” (“The Holy Spirit,” 9). And again, “on the one hand, we form, in a certain sense, one person with Christ; and on the other hand, because, unlike Christ, we do not possess the Spirit in his hypostatic fullness” we do not (TRLIC, 27).

149 *Autoritatea*, 187. cf., “nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me” (Gal 2.20).

bution and each profiting reciprocally from all the others.¹⁵⁰ But this does not discount the need for a real distinction between Christ and the Church—not as oppression, but, as noted above, so that the Church can always be taught by Christ, always inspired to a higher level, and through this never stagnate.¹⁵¹ Moreover, because the Holy Spirit rests in the Church and manifests from the Church in filial relation to the Father, there is no dilemma of how the Church's offering is assumed and united to Christ's offering. We could say that the two offerings become one in a Chalcedonian manner, united but unconfused.¹⁵²

Conclusion: Stăniloae's Contribution to Contemporary Ecclesiology

Both Lossky and Zizioulas have made invaluable contributions to Orthodox ecclesiology. However, neither one explicated the precise relation between the Son and the Spirit in the Holy Trinity, which is the foundation of any synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology, and which in turn grounds ecclesiology. It is Stăniloae's primary contribution that he has explicated this relation, and has provided a robust synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology, firmly based on Patristic Triadology, upon which his ecclesiology is built.

As seen above, Zizioulas criticizes Lossky's division of the economies of the Son and the Spirit as "alongside of" one another.¹⁵³ Zizioulas correctly notes in several places that Pneumatology is more pronounced in the East, and that this has given its liturgical ethos a

150 Ibid., Lossky also uses the image of "symphonic structure" for the Church (e.g., *Image*, 180).

151 *Din aspectul*, 533; "Teologia Euharistiei," 355.

152 "Each one of us enter into a symphony of feeling and action of one for the other, we become one body of feeling and of intention in distinct bodies ["materiale"], filled with the same Christ. At the same time, this does not mean a confusion of my 'I' with the 'I' of Christ, nor with our 'I's' themselves" ("Liturgia comunității și jertfa interioară în viziunea filocalică," 391. See also, 396).

153 BC, 124–25, see discussion above.

feel of “meta-history”¹⁵⁴ and saved it to a large degree from Western problems of clericalism, anti-institutionalism, and even Pentecostalism.¹⁵⁵ He rightly sees the interrelatedness of church ministries, none of which can be self-sufficient or placed above the Body.

But in the final analysis Zizioulas does not provide an adequate synthesis. He does not correct Lossky’s division of the economies of the Son and the Spirit because he does not complete Lossky’s Triadology. Zizioulas does not explicate the relation between the Son and the Spirit in the inner life of the Trinity, that is, beyond their work in the temporal economy, and therefore places the locus of his synthesis in the Eucharist. Moreover, starting from the ecclesiology of Afanasiev, with its centrality of the Eucharist and weaker Pneumatology, Zizioulas thereby does not let his ecclesiology be formed freely from the implications of Triadology. Hence, following de Lubac and Afanasiev with corrections, Zizioulas sees the Eucharist/bishop/structure as the fundamental *principles* of synthesis and unity in the Church, instead of the Trinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit. In this approach, the risk is that the other sacraments are seen only as “partial” sacraments, that there is a “rupture” in the ecclesiological status of the parish, and that spirituality (asceticism, prayer, good works, etc.) outside of the Eucharist are not incorporated fully into the life of the Church, nor seen as fully part of its eschatological existence. The Church is “Mystery” *only* in the event of the Eucharist.¹⁵⁶

As we saw above, Stăniloae’s synthesis allows him to maintain that the Church and its faithful partake of Christ and the Holy Spirit simultaneously and continuously.¹⁵⁷ This is reflected in his

154 BC, 129.

155 BC, 140.

156 Other “institutions are of historical significance alone and do not pertain to the true identity of the Church, they are not part of the Mystery of the Church ... the Church as event and Mystery, precisely in the celebration of the Eucharist” (MCOT, 301). In this, Zizioulas tends to follow Afanasiev’s “tendency to absolutize the identity between the eucharistic celebration and the Church” (Gaillardetz, “Eucharistic Ecclesiology,” 36).

157 E.g., *Din aspectul*, 536.

integral view of all the Church's aspects and activities, as in his interpretation of Baptism and Chrismation. Thus, for example, we are given the likeness of the Son in Baptism (by the Spirit), we are given the Spirit's gifts in Chrismation (by the Son).¹⁵⁸ Through these Sacraments, the believer is placed into relation with the Father, or indeed, the entire Trinity.

In Săniloae, Baptism takes on a greater meaning than simply a death to the world or a preparation for the Eucharist, as in Zizioulas,¹⁵⁹ though it encompasses these as well. Rather, it is both a death and a resurrection, which occasions the personal indwelling of Christ and the Spirit in the believer. Săniloae grounds the abiding presence of the Spirit in all believers as members of the Body of Christ through *both* his synthesis *and* his emphasis on Baptism/Chrismation (i.e., as adopted sons, the Spirit "rests" in them, as he does in the Son). By balancing the Eucharist with Baptism/Chrismation, Săniloae thereby provides a sacramental basis for the continual abiding and activity of the Holy Spirit in *all* of the Church's activities, *not only* the Eucharist or the "sacraments" strictly speaking. The sacraments allow the Church to refresh or strengthen itself for its other activities, and likewise these other activities serve to prepare the faithful for the sacraments. Both are done in union with the Church and in the Spirit. The result is an integral and extensive view of the Church as a *continual epiclesis* in all of its aspects: it is an extension of the saving work of Christ and the Spirit through all its ministries, members, aspects, and activities, a view expressed by the litanies and priestly prayers of the Eucharistic Liturgy itself. Both in the Eucharist and in the use of all

158 *Din aspectul*, 541.

159 "The new life that is born out of Baptism is made manifest *only in the Eucharist*" (EPL, 192; cited McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 273; emphasis mine.). Zizioulas separates the death to the world and offering to God into Baptism and Eucharist, respectively (BC, 221). On baptism, see BC, 56, 113, 153, 221; McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 268–73. Săniloae unites the two movements (death and offering to God) in Baptism. The believer remains the same subject, yet in a mystical manner undergoes a sort of "enhyposiasization" into Christ, and vice-versa, and is simultaneously filled with the Spirit (see his *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. 3, Bucharest, 1997, pp. 28–29).

the gifts of the Spirit outside of the Eucharist, the Church strives for a continual *epiclesis* and thereby is *continually transformed* into the Body of Christ.

This continual epiclesis/transformation, moreover, implies a distinction between the Church and Christ, not a personal identification of the two. This is seen not primarily from a perspective of any sinfulness of the Church, but as a need for its continual growth and renewal. The distinction between the Head and the Body both exalts the Church and gives it humility: for example, the Church participates in the teaching of Christ, but is also taught by Christ. Similarly, the Church both manifests the Holy Spirit (“exhaling” the Spirit), yet must constantly invoke his descent (“inhaling” the Spirit). This tension towards perfection and growth, seen as a call to ever deeper union with Christ, is natural for the Church.

In summary, Stăniloae’s approach provides for an ecclesiology which avoids “dangerous polarizations and dichotomies,” as Zizioulas calls them, which would restrict the *epicletic* action of the Church to the Eucharist celebration *alone*. Through his synthesis and through his balancing Eucharist with Baptism/Chrismation, he grounds the indwelling of the Son and the Spirit in the believer, his incorporation into the life of the Trinity, and thus into the *epicletic*, eschatological and *koinonic* life of the ecclesial community as a whole.

Returning then to our initial question, and without attempting to be exhaustive, we could say that three key elements form the essential core of Stăniloae’s contribution to Orthodox ecclesiology for us today: (i) Foremost, a dogmatic foundation, consisting of a strong synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology, in which the relations between the Son and the Spirit are explicated, and which is grounded in patristic Triadology. (ii) Second, a balancing out of any over-emphasis on Eucharist with an emphasis on Baptism and Chrismation, as the sacramental foundation for the integration of the faithful in the Church into the life and interrelations of Persons of the Holy Trinity, and the continual “rest” of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ. (iii) Thirdly, an integral approach to

ecclesiology based on the two elements above; or in other words, a starting point for an ecclesiology which provides a way of integrating all of the activities and ministries (charitable, missionary, monastic, etc.), and all the gifts, talents, labors and sufferings of each member of the body, and the role of the other sacraments, into the life and the renewal of the Church. The Church is thus seen as an *epicletic*, eschatological and *koinonic* reality in its *totality*, in all its activities and in the life of every believer, and not exclusively in its Eucharistic celebration. Through its continual *epiclesis*, the Church is being *continually transformed* into the Body of Christ.

The dilemma of the “Church makes the Eucharist” or the “Eucharist makes the Church,” even if integrated in Zizioulas,¹⁶⁰ would not make sense in Stăniloae’s ecclesiology, since the Church owes its beginning to an exclusively divine act of the Spirit on Pentecost. Moreover, Stăniloae prefers to call the Church a sacramental community since its activities in the Spirit are diverse and mutually interdependent.¹⁶¹

We could then ask: would Stăniloae accept de Lubac’s *dictum* that “the Eucharist makes the Church”? Fortunately, we have his answer to this. Although connected indissolvably to the Truth and the community, the Eucharist may be central, but it is not exclusive, to the Church’s experience of the Holy Spirit (*koinonia* and *eschaton* included). Stăniloae therefore prefers the broader definition of St Irenaeus, “For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace. For the Spirit is the Truth.”¹⁶²

160 McPartlan, *Eucharist*, 304. e.g., “Thus the Eucharist was not the act of a pre-existing Church; it was an event *constitutive* of the being of the Church. enabling the Church to *be*. The Eucharist *constituted* the Church’s being” (BC, 21).

161 In other words, the Church’s activities cannot really be prioritized without running risks of polarization. Thus Stăniloae does not see Church as a eucharistic community, but a sacramental one (*Din aspectul*, 546; see also Roberson, *Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiologists*, 101–2).

162 *Adv. Haeres.* 3.24:1, PG 7:966C, BUS, 189; see also BUS, 197; *Autoritatea*, 202–4.