

THE HOLY SPIRIT: PRESENCE, POWER, PERSON

RALPH DEL COLLE

[The author argues for the complementarity of impersonal and personal images of the Holy Spirit. A more robust and trinitarian pneumatology is gained by moving from presence to power to personhood. At issue is the specific manner in which the Holy Spirit is person. Others are enabled to emerge into the fullness of personhood through the self-effacing nature of the Holy Spirit's person. The author then introduces in an analogous manner the christological notion of the enhypostasis and applies it to pneumatology thereby positing an intrinsic pneumatological dimension to the graced process of personal perfection in Christ, Mary, and ourselves.]

IN HIS VOLUME ON PNEUMATOLOGY Jürgen Moltmann comments that “[f]rom the very beginning, the personhood of the Holy Spirit was an unsolved problem, and the problem is as difficult as it is fascinating.”¹ This remark could almost be taken as a latter-day echo of Gregory of Nazianzen’s observation about the gradual manifestation of the deity of the third Person. “The old covenant made clear proclamation of the Father, a less definite one of the Son. The new [covenant] made the Son manifest and gave us a glimpse of the Spirit’s Godhead. At the present time the Spirit resides among us, giving us a clearer manifestation of himself than before.”²

RALPH DEL COLLE is associate professor of theology at Marquette University. He received his Ph.D. from Union Theological Seminary, New York City, in 1991. Author of *Christ and the Spirit* (OUP, 1994), he has also contributed to several journals including an essay entitled “Postmodernism and Pentecostal/Charismatic Experience,” for the *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 17 (2000) 97–116. At the present time, he is preparing a monograph for Eerdmans, tentatively entitled *The Person of Christ*.

¹ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 10.

² *Theological Orations* 31.V.26, *On the Holy Spirit*, in *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of St. Gregory Nazianzen*, intro. and commentary Frederick W. Norris, trans. Lionel Wickam and Frederick Williams (New York: Brill, 1990) 293. For original Greek text, see Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours 27–31, Discours théologiques*, ed. and trans. Paul Galloway and Maurice Jourjon (Paris: Cerf, 1978) 32.

At the very least, both ancient and contemporary witnesses have wrestled with either the divinity or personhood of the Holy Spirit. While the Pneumatomachi or “enemies of the Holy Spirit” are no longer the concern of present-day theologians as they were for Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nazianzen—who today would deny the divinity of the Spirit?—the conception of the Spirit’s personhood certainly is. Yves Congar began his “theological mediation on the Third Person” with the observation that “[t]he Spirit is without a face and almost without a name. He is the wind who is not seen, but who makes things move. He is known by his effects.”³ This need not mean that a theological description of the Spirit be limited to a statement such as “God present to and at work . . . in the world of God’s creation”⁴ without reference to his personhood. Both the impersonal metaphors of the Spirit’s activity such as wind, fire, water, and the personal agency of the Spirit’s presence ought to be employed in order to arrive at a fully robust trinitarian pneumatology.

Indeed “God as Spirit” or the “Holy Spirit” may be posed as alternative pneumatological models. The former adverts to the modality and nature of God’s being both within God’s very self and toward the world in immanent action. The latter highlights the trinitarian identity of the Spirit, immanent and economic, as third Person related to Father and Son, and as gift sent into the world to sanctify and empower the community of believers in mission. The two models may be conceived as opposed to each other. For example, in the interest of presenting a more dynamic and experientially focused doctrine of God the hypostatization of Spirit as third Person may be considered inimical to such a project.⁵ More traditional trinitarian accountings would take issue with such a proposal as indeed I do. However, I propose to examine them as complementary aspects of a Christian pneumatology in which we proceed from “Spirit” to “Holy Spirit.”

The contours of this pneumatology take the form of three theses. In accordance with the Johannine testimony that “God is Spirit” (John 4:24) vis-à-vis contending versions of salvation history (e.g., between the Samaritans and the Jews) I suggest, firstly, that any affirmation of God such as

³ Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit 3: The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West* (New York: Seabury, 1983) 144.

⁴ Roger Haight, *Jesus Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1999) 448. Haight understands “Spirit” as a metaphor for God’s action “outside of the immanent selfhood of God.” He expresses great reservations about the “hypostatization” of the Spirit. “Spirit is no longer a constructive exercise of the human poetic imagination that metaphorically depicts the effects of God as the invisible power of the wind, but a literal something” (257).

⁵ In addition to Haight this same tendency guides the works of Geoffrey Lampe, *God as Spirit* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) and Paul W. Newman, *A Spirit Christology: Recovering the Biblical Paradigm* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1987).

“God is . . .” can be a formal statement about God only to the extent that it relates the human thinker/confessor as one who worships in spirit. Our clue to the divine being as Spirit is the human person being situated in spirit. Here an analogy of relation establishes the contours of our own self-transcendence relative to the divine while it simultaneously identifies the divine as elusively present. What “God is” may be conceived on different terms than God’s localized presence or self-presentation (whether it be Mount Gerizim, Jerusalem, or the flesh of Jesus) and yet God is unnamed apart from the revelatory act. Spirit designates both presence (as self-presentation) and the surpassability of presence in that “God is.”

Secondly, the Christian experience of God is pneumatically mediated as the transformative event/process of sanctification and mission. Being “set apart” (holiness) and “being sent” (mission) constitute the shape of Christian life as life in the Spirit which endows the human self and community with power. With the transfigured humanity of Christ as exemplar and agent, the Holy Spirit is known essentially as gift and giftedness in the interrelatedness of (inter)personal formation and apostolic praxis. Here God as Spirit is revealed as Holy Spirit in pentecostal outpouring and the graced indwelling of the Church. The economy of salvation takes on an explicitly pneumatological character through the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, the economic mediation from God as Spirit to the gift of the Holy Spirit is revelatory of the recognition of Holy Spirit as “Person” within the trinitarian life of God. Initially restricting the meaning of Person to the non-identity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, I will argue for the distinct manner in which the Holy Spirit is Person. While implications for trinitarian theology will be evident, my major point will be to demonstrate that a robust pneumatology wherein divine agency is paramount will remain anemic unless pneumatology is also conceived as a theology of the third Person. The transition from the Spirit as Person in the divine economy to the Spirit as related to the Father and the Son is doxologically motivated and to that extent a proper task of pneumatology.

GOD AS SPIRIT: PRESENCE

The dialogue in the Gospel of John between Jesus and the Samaritan woman at the Jacob’s well evokes the most direct reference to God in pneumatological terms: God is Spirit (4:24). While by most accounts the Evangelist is not intending a metaphysical conceptualization of the divine nature, the phrase does provoke reflection about the God who is known through the giving of the Spirit. This latter more accurate exegesis is reflected throughout the Gospel especially in the Last Supper discourses (chapters 14–16) in which the other Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, is promised, and to be received later on Easter evening (20:22). The connection

between a metaphysical hermeneutic of the saying, God by nature is Spirit, and a theologically orientated one, God sends the Spirit in correlation with the sending of the Son whose work reaches its climax in the cross, sets the agenda for Christian pneumatology.

Before proceeding I need to take note of the received dogmatic tradition and its implications for our inquiry. By way of creedal affirmation, the Holy Spirit has been confessed as “Lord and life-giver” since the Council of Constantinople (381). The Spirit’s procession from the Father (and the Son) contrasts a basically passive modality of hypostatic origin with the more active economy of the third Person who spoke through the prophets and in whose provenance the creed also professes the ecclesiological and eschatological dimensions of the faith. How this active agency of the Spirit that is registered throughout the economy of creation and redemption correlates with the immanent procession in the Godhead, whether that be interpreted according to the *Filioque* or not, requires attention. Additionally, methodological questions that relate epistemological approaches with ontological realities are at issue, e.g. whether a trinitarian mission reveals an intratrinitarian procession. Finally, the dogmatic presentation on the eternal relation between the Son and the Holy Spirit that the division between East and West puts in sharp relief cannot be ignored. But this charts only some of the hurdles which classical Christian pneumatology poses. I propose to begin with the more basic question of what it means to be situated as a human person “in spirit” or “in the Spirit.”

To speak today of spirit, human or divine, is to witness the scene of postmodern dissolutions of a concept that has borne much freight in the Western metaphysical tradition. Upper and lower case presentations of S/spirit highlight the theological and anthropological possibilities that the concept engenders although not always within the framework of biblical pneumatologies. To project then a pneumatological starting point or pneumatological ground for the doctrine of God as rendered, for example, in the statement that “God is Spirit” is no guarantee that theology is bearing witness to the divine reality. The relation between absolute and finite spirit may reveal the analogical or dialectical (perhaps even metaphorical) character of theological discourse. As absolute Spirit, God is the horizon of the human-as-spirit, beckoning our finite intentionality toward the unlimitedness of the divine. Or, metaphorically imaging God as breath or wind which blows where it wills not only possesses biblical precedent (John 3:8) but also adverts to freedom and movement beyond conceptualization thereby insuring the transcendence of God in the divine-human relation. Dialectically, if Spirit can sublimate its experience of the other as a necessary moment in its unitive agency, it can account for a *theologia crucis*, essential for any Christian proclamation of the good news of Jesus Christ. However, I suggest that a fundamental pneumatology that serves as the framework for a

theology of the Holy Spirit, and initially eschews such foundations and bases. Indeed the metaphysical affirmation, however conceived (substance-subject-process), implied in the statement that “God is Spirit” must await the Holy Spirit as gift bestowed and received.

Biblical pneumatology emphasizes the donative and presentative dimensions of the divine being. The Spirit of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ—testimony may be gleaned from both testaments—presents the divine reality to creatures by gathering the community and the individual into the divine presence. Divine self-presentation and gathering into the presence of the divine bespeak the activity or the presence of the Spirit. The Spirit reveals or presents God to the creature and as such enlivens and enlightens the creature to be and act within and from the divine presence. Katabatic and anabatic modalities then are characteristic of the Spirit’s outpouring. That is, the Spirit descends from above and engages human epicletic praxis along liturgical, kerygmatic, and diaconal contours. From Spirit and in spirit mark the contours of the divine-human relation. Pneumatic presence, however, is nothing if not free and self-giving and therefore cannot be presumed upon. An important distinction is therefore noteworthy.

God’s presence in and to creation by immensity and by the divine attribute of omnipresence is a staple of classical theology; formally stated as the existence of God in things by essence, presence, and power (*Summa theologiae* 1, q. 8, a.3). One need not contest the truth of this traditional axiom. In fact, its truth is all the more important when one considers the doctrine of creation from a pneumatological perspective. Jürgen Moltmann’s contribution in *The Spirit of Life* describes the Spirit as the “immanent transcendence” of God in all things inclusive not just of self and community but of nature as well.⁶ But I do want to draw attention to the dominant mode of pneumatological presence in the biblical traditions that underscores God’s self-giving in sending the Spirit upon persons and communities in particular times and places and how this informs understanding of the Creator Spirit.

The most accessible biblical precedents in this regard in connection with explicit pneumatological language are the Wisdom traditions. Spirit and Wisdom (*Sophia*) manifest similar divine agencies and characteristics relative to presence and human responsiveness. For example, while one is incapable of fleeing from God’s Spirit (Psalm 139:7) and the Spirit in the Wisdom tradition fills the whole world (Wisdom 1:7), nevertheless, Wisdom, itself identified with the Spirit, is still a gift whose presence is not guaranteed. She deserts the foolish and the wicked (Wisdom 1:5). This may be extended to other metaphorical representations of the divine. The

⁶ *The Spirit of Life* 31–38.

Psalmist for instance draws a parallel between the present and hidden face of God and God's *ruah*:

When you hide your face, they are dismayed;
when you take away their breath (*ruah*), they die and return to their dust.
When you send forth your spirit (*ruah*), they are created;
and you renew the face of the ground (Psalm 104: 29–30).

Hence, the *Spiritus praesens* or self-presentation of the Spirit as the giving-gift of God⁷ identifies presence as bestowal to creation rather than intrinsic to it. A pneumatological ontology of gift and giftedness should then underlie the more metaphysical affirmation that God is Spirit.

In the more anabatic modality the self-presentation of God as Spirit elicits the self-awareness of human being as spirit or more accurately as having spirit. The presence of Spirit hearkens back to primordial origins—God breathes and Adam becomes a living being (Genesis 2:7) and generates the new creation of those in Christ, those born of the Spirit (John 3:6). Witnessing to spirit, the Spirit of God confirms filial relation to God and enables the emergence of the creation out of the death-dealings of the flesh and the bondage of futility (Romans 8:12–23). Receiving spirit, a new spirit, restores humanity to itself (“I will . . . give you a heart of flesh” Ezekiel 36:26); it is orientated to the reception of God’s Spirit because generated by the collaboration of prophetic word and divine breath (Ezekiel 36:27; 38:7–10); and it situates the orientation of the creature outside of itself toward God so that it might truly come to itself. If the animal creature looks to God for sustenance (“The young lions roar for their prey, seeking their food from God” Psalm 104:21), how much more does the human creature arise to its full stature when God’s breath enlivens it (“I prophesied [to the breath] as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood on their feet, a vast multitude” Ezekiel 37:10)?

God is Spirit, God is *pneuma*. Creatively and yet elusively present *pneuma* is divine agency in a presencing and donative modality. The self-presencing of God is Spirit and is characteristically self-giving vis-à-vis creation and creatures. It is neither innate to the creature nor already there by virtue of creaturely being or being in general. In this respect Spirit may be distinguished from the divine actuality by which the creature participates in the act of Be-ing. God’s being as *actus purus* is the source and ground of all that is, releasing an efficient causality that can never be reduced to the finite entitative actuality of what is created. Spirit is the efficacious, i.e., life giving, field of creativity by which finite actualities exist in and through the Logos or Word of God. Spirit, even as *Spiritus Creator*,

⁷ I utilize this characterization from Thomas Smail in his book of that title *The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988).

not only retains but also exemplifies the donative dimension of divine creativity. “What is” derives from the self-giving which Spirit and Word enact via the sheer actuality of the divine determination to freely create an other.

Also important to note are the same tendencies of divine self-giving and human response in the Johannine pericope just cited. Jesus’ unveiling of God as Spirit in his conversation with the Samaritan woman is correlated with the divine search for those who will worship in spirit and truth. Worship is indeed possible on other grounds the locus of which may be a subject of contention, e.g., at Mount Gerizim or Jerusalem. Jesus’ intervention (which acknowledges that salvation is of the Jews in contrast to the Samaritan cult) parallels the Prologue of the Gospel. God seeks worshipers in spirit and truth; so too, grace and truth come through Jesus Christ (1:17). The Mosaic Law is surpassed on the same scale as the Temple in Jerusalem. The latter, the place of privileged encounter with the divine presence, yields to the enfleshed Word who will send the Spirit of truth from the Father.

Worship in spirit and truth is christocentrically and pneumatically textured. Being in spirit coincides with the realization of the truth in Jesus. Johannine pneumatic modality mediates presence (14:17), memory (14:26), response (“to testify,” 15:26–27), and a relationality to the world and Jesus which includes the indictment of the former (16:7–11) and the glorification of the latter (16:12–15). Christological glorification engenders a dynamic process of hearing and speaking in which the self-effacement of Spirit (“he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears”) presages the intradivine communion in which the glory shared by Father and Son extends to the disciples, who are invited to share the divine life not as servants but as friends (15:15; 17:5, 22).

Surely, what “God is” is not exhausted by the presence of God as Spirit. Even the statement “God is” may be at best a tenuous predication of the divine if we are to take seriously some of the post-Heideggerian theologies emerging, e.g., Jean-Luc Marion,⁸ Robert Scharlemann.⁹ Likewise the pneumatological affirmation, God is Spirit, does not simply posit God’s incorporeity. The Johannine pericope rather highlights the contrast between Samaritan and Jewish claims to the temple’s sacred mediation of divine presence and the manifestation of that presence in Jesus as the Word enfleshed. His embodiment in person (the various “I am” sayings) of divine life (1 John 1:2) and its communication through word (6:63b: “the

⁸ Jean-Luc Marion, *God Without Being: Hors-Texte*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991).

⁹ Robert Scharlemann, *The Being of God: Theology and the Experience of Truth* (New York: Seabury, 1981).

words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life”) and deed (10:37: “believe the works, so that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father”) points to the new temple of his body (2:21) where the presencing of God is realized. In Johannine pneumatological terms Jesus’ reception of the Spirit without measure (3:34) substantiates the promised sending of the Spirit to his disciples (14:17) following his paschal glorification.

Confirmed too is the liturgical and sacramental contextualization by the evangelist of Jesus’ pneumatological confession. Worship’s authenticity “in spirit and truth” nicely sandwiches Jesus as the truth between the baptismal allusions of the third chapter (3:6: “being born of water and Spirit”) and the eucharistic ones of chapter six (6:55: “for my flesh is true food and my blood is true drink”). In all three of these cases of liturgical and sacramental interest the pneumatological dimension is constituent of the reality: “It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life” (6:63).

Finally, the proclamation of God as Spirit underscores the freedom of divine agency (3:8: “The wind blows where it chooses . . .”) and the gratuity of God’s self-donation via pneumatic presence (7:38: “Let anyone who is thirsty come to me . . . Out of the believer’s heart shall flow rivers of living water”). If there is an affirmation of an ontological nature to be derived from the saying that God is Spirit, it is simply the presupposition of the donative character of the God revealed in Jesus and the other Paraclete whom he will send. It is all the more proper then to speak of the Holy Spirit along these same lines.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD: POWER

Thus far I have emphasized the presentative and donative dimensions of pneumatology. By characterizing the Johannine phrase “to worship in spirit and truth” on the anthropological side as the creature being situated in spirit, I intend a mode of receptivity to presence and transcendence of the self in acknowledgement of and self-giving to the other. Faith, witness, and worship are the characteristic signs of the Spirit’s presencing of God to the human person. What form does this take in a more explicit theological rendering of the Christian life and what clue does this offer for our understanding of God as Spirit and of the Holy Spirit?

Sanctification and mission emerge throughout the rest of the New Testament as twin pneumatological foci for Christian life and ecclesial community. The so-called “Johannine Pentecost” (20:21–23) complements the Lukan Pentecost (Acts 2:1 ff.) by proffering the bestowal of authority to forgive and retain sins as constitutive of Christian mission. So too, in the Lukan setting, being “clothed with power from on high” (Luke 24:49; also

Acts 1:8) generates the preaching of the gospel and the proclamation of the mighty works of God. To be sent (John 20:21) by the risen Lord and to be designated his witnesses (Acts 1:8) are the stuff of ecclesial formation and apostolic praxis. The Acts of the Apostles is a pneumatological narrative plotting the scope of the Church's mission under the Spirit's guidance and power to the ends of the earth.

The epistolary literature, especially the Pauline corpus, focuses its pneumatological references in a variety of venues the most prominent of which may be identified under the heading of life in the Spirit. A number of Pauline texts (Romans 8:16; 1 Corinthians 2:10–11; 6:17; 14:15) surface an issue which is also present in the Johannine literature and which hearkens back to our basic premise concerning pneumatology, namely, the relationship between Spirit (upper case) and spirit (lower case). The diversity of their references range from assurance of adoption, knowledge of authentic divine wisdom, sanctity in body, and prayer (both personal and in the gathered assembly). In each case the empowering of the Spirit enhances the quality of human responsiveness to the divine and illuminates the nature of the divine/human relation.

One possible heuristic device to further our analysis is a focus on Christian formation. In Pauline terms formation is inclusive of both self and community. In fact, there is a dynamic reciprocity between the two as there is between the notions of sanctification and mission. In other words, for Paul to labor over the Galatians, for instance, until Christ is formed in them (4:19) cannot be separated from the injunction to bear one another's burdens and thus fulfill the law of Christ (5:2). Each infers the other and each and both together are christologically and pneumatologically construed. Pneumatological interest cannot eschew the christological in Paul's mind and for our purposes the distinction between the two may help clarify our progression from pneumatic power to pneumatic person. I will take each aspect of this inquiry in turn.

The christological and pneumatological aspects of Christian formation intersect in the liberation of the self relative to its own self-enclosure marred by sin and the slavery of the flesh. Paul's remarkable phrase that the Christian is not indebted to the flesh (Romans 8:12) presupposes the relationality of his anthropological references. Both *sarx* and *pneuma* in Paul are realms in which the person may exist and from which one is either enslaved into sin or empowered into freedom and holiness. The contrast in Galatians between the "works of the flesh" (5:19; see Romans 6:23: "the wages of sin") and the "fruit of the Spirit" (5:22; see Romans 6:23: "the free gift of God") bespeaks christological mediation and pneumatological orientation. "And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires. If we live by the Spirit, let us also be guided by the Spirit" (5:24–25).

By christological mediation I mean the emergence of the concrete self by its newly empowered agency in faith. Earlier in the letter a similar identification of the self with Christ crucified results in the paradox of Christian existential identity: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (2:19b–20). The "no longer I" and the "I now" flow from the baptismal enactment of the paschal mystery (cf. Rom 6). Paul's parallel between the Adam-Christ typology and the believer's old and new self is well known. Faith's reception to God's reconciling work in Christ generates the new self or person (2 Corinthians 5:17–21). The Apostle's exhortations to put away the old and put on the new (Romans 13:14; Ephesians 4:22–24) presuppose the divine indicative already accomplished in baptism (Romans 6:1–11). The concrete identity of the Christian self is the fruit of this paschal identification worked out amid the apostolic sufferings of the present age (2 Corinthians 4:7–18).

The analogy between Christ's identity, the one in whom the turn of the ages has taken place (2 Corinthians 5:17), and that of the believer is intended. The former is the source and exemplification of the latter. Thus Paul can summarize his own longing in the language of identification, process and hope. "I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead" (Philippians 3:10–11).

Christological mediation entails not only the grace of justification but conformity in life for the recognition of the self in Christ. Christ's own identity is a missioned one (Galatians 4:4), a being-sent that fashions his Person out of the crucible of kenosis and exaltation (Philippians 2:5–11). The Christian's identity is likewise elicited by the combination of call and conformity (Romans 8:29: "For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn within a large family"). Paul's understanding of sonship and daughterhood emerges from within this process of transition from call to glorification (Romans 8:30). But it is precisely here that the christological requires the pneumatological; otherwise, the fully orbed emergence of Christian identity and formation remains anemic.

Paul's pneumatological witness refers to the Spirit as the spirit of adoption (Romans 8:15) and the Spirit of God's Son (Galatians 4:4) eliciting the cry of Abba! Father! If the power of christological mediation instantiates the paradoxical emergence of concrete Christian identity ("Not I . . . but I") the pneumatological correlate engenders a formative process of ecstatic speech, being and service. By this I mean that distinct from the christomorphic process of centering the Christian self through the paradoxical and

processive emergence of new identity, the Spirit liberates and leads the new self into recognition and service of the other outside oneself. Hence my use of ecstatic, meaning to stand out of oneself, not necessarily to lose control of one's faculties. Whether it be the new speech of Christian recognition, Abba, the inexpressible speech of eschatological groaning shared with all creation (Romans 8:22–23; 26–27), the intelligible speech of either prayer with the mind or prophetic exhortation to the congregation (1 Corinthians 14:3,14), or the unintelligible speech of prayer with the spirit (i.e. *glossolalia* in 1 Corinthians 14:15), the self is exercised beyond self-enclosure and self-reference.

The reciprocity of sanctification and mission are realized within the ecclesial community where the spiritual gifts are exercised. “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good” (1 Corinthians 12:7). Consistent with the *theologia crucis* that frames both the content and the preaching of the gospel, Paul's exhortation concerning the spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12–14 contextualizes them by the “still more excellent way” of love (12:31–13:13), the most significant evidence of what it means to live under the cross. Life in the Spirit manifests gifts and bears fruit (Galatians 5:22–23). Personal transformation and communal edification reveal the public power of the Spirit. Michael Welker utilizes the image of force field to describe this outpouring of the Spirit: “The Spirit is a force field that constitutes public force fields. In turn, people can enter these fields or be drawn into them as bearers and borne, as constituting and as constituted.”¹⁰ Diversely sharing in the Spirit and bearing it to others signify the pneumatic empowering of self and community in which “concrete individuality and world-arching universality are held together.”¹¹ The centering of self and the extension of self anthropologically instantiate the christological and pneumatological energies of the God who activates varieties of works in everyone (1 Corinthians 12:6).

THE HOLY SPIRIT: PERSON

The *Spiritus praesens* manifested in public power and outpouring in inseparable distinction from the *Christus praesens* and the power of christological mediation reveals the formative agency of Christ and the Spirit for the Christian self and community. As Gordon Fee has recently argued, far from assuming their identity Paul presumes their distinction within the one divine agency.¹² A modalism, which pneumatically collapses the sec-

¹⁰ Michael Welker, *God the Spirit* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994) 242.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 248.

¹² Gordon Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994) 827–45.

ond and third Persons within one or the other, is excluded. So too, I would argue for their equal but distinct manner of being Persons in the Godhead. I retain the traditional trinitarian language to underscore the irreducibility of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ, or put differently to clarify that pneumatology is not simply immanent Christology.¹³

Here I proceed analogically without presuming a methodological procedure, which moves directly from the economic to the immanent Trinity. In describing the christological mediation of power as formative for the concrete if paradoxical emergence of the self in Christian identity and the power of the Spirit's outpouring as the extension of the self beyond self-enclosure and self-reference, it is evident that the Christian notion of human personhood requires both dimensions of divine agency. Actualizing the full potential of personhood is a christologically and pneumatologically textured affair. So too, this differentiation bespeaks the distinct manner in which the Son and the Spirit are Persons in the Trinity.

The manifestation of Jesus Christ as Person fully emerges only through his paschal passage, which still awaits parousia. The trajectory of christological identity, ontologically instantiated as Person moves from the increasingly concrete crucible of history to the eschatologically universal presencing of his glorified humanity. The Spirit, on the other hand, proceeds in the inverse, from the universal public outpouring to the transformation of the particular and concrete. For the Son, what is hidden in paschal suffering becomes increasingly manifest in his risen agency and in eschatological glory. The Spirit's Person, however, remains hidden in its presencing of the Father and the Son and in its intrapersonal and interpersonal manifestations which testifies to the other and forms the other. The Spirit's presencing is donative and life giving but self-effacing in regard to the Spirit's own Person. Nevertheless, it is also unitive through his active agency of glorifying the Father and the Son. As life-giver this self-effacement is consistent with his passive procession in the immanent Trinity. The Spirit's personification of God's self-giving corresponds to his economic creation of persons and community and the empowerment of their deification and consummation. Unlike the Son, the Holy Spirit does not become concretely incarnate but provides space for Incarnation and manifestation.

In the economic Trinity the Spirit's self-effacement is constitutive of this unitive and glorifying agency that manifests the Persons of the Father and the Son. So too, in the immanent Trinity the Spirit's passive procession

¹³ See James D. G. Dunn, "I Corinthians 15:45—Last Adam, Life-giving Spirit," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973) 139, cited in Fee, *God's Empowering Presence* 834, n.25.

manifests these same Persons as constituent of their distinction from each other. The Spirit is not the causative relation for the other two Persons. Rather, the entirely passive modality of the Spirit's procession is an immanent form of self-effacement that allows for the personalizing of Father and Son.

The recognition of the Spirit's Person is in direct correlation with his presencing and empowering agency in the divine economy. Only as Person can he recreate persons in community ecstatically oriented to the other. With Christ the Spirit provides the space for their concrete identities to emerge into the maturity of the full stature of Christ (Ephesians 4:13) and into the consummation of God's temple so that all of creation may be filled with the fullness of God (Ephesians 2:20–22; 3:16–19). This point needs further elaboration. Let me begin with some classical notions.

The traditional Thomistic definition of the trinitarian Persons as "subsistent relations" may be probed in regard to how the Holy Spirit subsists relative to the other two Persons. This implies processions and relations but must also refer to what subsists in regard to the distinctive notion that characterizes the Holy Spirit. Viewed from the perspective of the divine economy thus far pursued, it ought to be further elucidated that a fully robust and mature Christian pneumatology proceeds from presence and power to recognition of the inpersoned or enhypostatic nature of life in the Spirit. The employment of the christological term, *enhypostasia*, for pneumatology, with its trinitarian connotations as well, may offer some interesting insights.

The debate over *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia*, resurrected in part by Piet Schoonenberg,¹⁴ disputes the subject of personhood in the hypostatic union. Is Jesus' human nature in-personed in the hypostasis of the divine Son/Logos with the human nature being anhypostatic, that is, non-personal? Whether or not that displaces his humanity or enhances it is the subject of controversy much of it having to do with the definition of Person (or *hypostasis*) in all its culturally specific and philosophical nuances. I will not explore this subject specifically except to say that the theological construct of the hypostatic union inevitably provokes reflection on the matter. In addition to its positive affirmation that the hypostasis of the Son became flesh through the creation and assumption of human nature in the singular individual of Jesus of Nazareth, it also raises the analogous trinitarian issue as to whether the Son/Logos was the only Person of the Trinity who could become flesh. Karl Rahner in his critique of the Scholastic tradition faults

¹⁴ Piet Schoonenberg, *The Christ: A Study of the God-Man Relationship in the Whole of Creation and in Jesus Christ* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1971) 57–61. Schoonenberg's provocative thesis was to invert the enhypostasia by arguing for the "enhypostasia of God's Word or only Son in the human person of Jesus" (87).

its hypothesis (affirmed even by Thomas Aquinas) than any of the divine Persons could be the subject of the Incarnation. He by contrast requires a necessary connection between the economic missions and the immanent processions. For our purposes Rahner's thesis has all to do with the manner in which the Son is Person, how the Son subsists as Person, namely, as the expressed image or Word which the Father eternally generates. Similarly, the contention here is that the same sort of inquiry ought to be made about the Holy Spirit. It is the distinct mission of the Holy Spirit (and therefore the other Persons of the Trinity only by perichoresis) to indwell the just person and the Church. Hence, the thesis that the divine inhabitation of the just (to use the classical terminology) proceeds from the Spirit's presence and power and ultimately from the Spirit's Person. Furthermore, from the perspective of the theology of grace we may also describe the divine indwelling as our being in-personed in the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit's Person or hypostasis differs from the Son's Person or hypostasis, irreducibly so (perhaps even ineffably although we are trying to speak about it), in the distinction between what both East and West have described (picking up the biblical language) as the difference between generation and procession. The Latin trinitarian tradition utilizes even more precise terminology. The Son is generated; the Spirit is breathed forth or spirated. These are distinct modalities of procession and no theological representation of the issue (even if metaphorical language is the preferred manner of signification) ought to confuse the two. This is also consistent with both immanent and economic renderings of the Trinity no matter how the relationship between the two is conceived.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the divine economy. Jesus is born of the Virgin Mary, a generative image. The risen Jesus breathes forth the Holy Spirit on the disciples, obviously a spirative image. Each may be correlated with the immanent and eternal relations of the Son and Spirit to the Father. By virtue of this intratrinitarian processional distinction the in-humanation of both the Son and Spirit in the divine economy are also necessarily distinct but not inseparable. In-humanation, ordinarily applied to the Incarnation is also descriptive of the pneumatological mission,¹⁵ or in the language of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, it is pertinent to the "joint-mission" of the Trinity in both its christological and pneumatological dimensions.

The in-humanation attending the mission of the Son is necessarily incarnational. God's generative procession of self as the other becomes the other of a singular human being, whose very existence as created is an exemplification of the Son's eternal relation to the Father now missioned

¹⁵ See David Coffey, "The 'Incarnation' of the Holy Spirit in Christ," *Theological Studies* 45 (1984) 466–80.

into history as it was (from our temporal perspective) already structured into nature as the logos of creation. God creates through the mediation of his Word or Logos. The in-humanation of the Spirit is necessarily a presencing in power of persons in a life-giving and donative modality, which engages persons beyond themselves in communion. Being in-personed or enhypostasized in the Spirit is dogmatically conceivable because the Spirit's passive procession in the divine economy, namely, being-sent-as-gift allows for the emergence of the other(s) as person(s).

Specifically we begin with the emergence of the Word incarnate as Person ("conceived by the Holy Spirit" Matthew 1:20) processed within the crucible of history ("who through the eternal Spirit offered himself up unblemished to God" Hebrews 9:4) and transfigured in glory ("was made Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness" Romans 1:4). The subject of his personhood is the eternal Son now incarnate who in his human nature undergoes an in-personing in the Spirit. This latter enhypostasis is not redundant nor is it competitive with the enhypostasis of Jesus' human nature in the divine Son. That enhypostasis is essentially christological; this other enhypostasis is distinctly pneumatological, but still intrinsic to Christology, hence, the legitimate call in some quarters for Spirit Christologies.

Strictly speaking the pneumatological enhypostasis is predicated analogously in two respects. First, the christological or, more specifically, filiological enhypostasis is properly so relative to the personhood of Jesus Christ as the divine Son incarnate. Jesus Christ is the Person of the Son enfleshed not that of the Spirit. Second, the enhypostasis of the Spirit bespeaks the nature of the Holy Spirit as Person who enables the emergence of already existing persons into the fullness of their own personhood. Even though the divine Son bears the humanity of Jesus as subject, nevertheless, the human Jesus in the Spirit is in-personed into the fullness of his human being as person, an enhypostasis of Jesus in the Spirit. To distinguish my proposal from that of Schoonenberg I am not suggesting a mutual enhypostasis of Jesus in the Logos and the Logos in Jesus but rather a double enhypostasis of Jesus in the Logos and in the Spirit.¹⁶ The former concerns the ontological bearing of his person; the latter depicts the maturation of his humanness in the historical crucible such that he existentially becomes the Person of the incarnate Son of God. It is the particular modality of the Spirit's Person that enables this second enhypostasis.

We attain further clarity when we turn to the other(s). The others, namely brothers and sisters of the first born of the dead, these others are

¹⁶ "Trinity—The Consummated Covenant: Theses on the Doctrine of the Trinitarian God," *Studies in Religion* 5 (1975–1976) 115.

also called to an enhypostasis in the Spirit.¹⁷ The Holy Spirit's self-effacing personhood as gift, what the Eastern Fathers understood by their designation of the Holy Spirit as the image of the Son, enables the emergence of persons without detriment to the ontological subject of their personhood. Nor am I suggesting any monophysitism of the Spirit or what Yves Congar refers to as an ecclesiological monophysitism. In fact, precisely the opposite is the case. The self-presencing of God in the Holy Spirit whose self-effacing empowerment of the Church glorifies the Father in and with the Son via the manifestation and transformation of the Church as persons-in-communion, constitutes the Church as the people of God, the Body and Bride of Christ, and the Temple of the Holy Spirit. The latter christological and pneumatological metaphors do not supplant the plurality and diversity represented in the first two but enriches them within the *koinonia* of the gathered assembly and its life as a community.

¹⁷ A similar proposal is offered by Reinherd Hütter, *Suffering Divine Things: Theology as Church Practice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 132–33. There he argues for an analogous predication of the “enhypostasis” from Christology to pneumatology. Specifically, it is the relationship of the Holy Spirit in both his hypostatic being and economic mission to the “core practices of the Church,” that requires this move. This “pneumatological enhypostasis” is intended to suggest that the practice of the Church, hence distinct human activities subsist enhypostatically in the Spirit as *poiemata* of the Spirit. While I am sympathetic to his proposal mine extends beyond it to include not just the ecclesial activities of human performance in the Church but the very persons of those who act as well. Since the persons-in-communion constitute the Church within the joint-mission of the Son and the Holy Spirit and since sanctification or deification and mission are inseparable one must account for the ontological basis of Christian maturation in the interpersonal communion between God and humanity that is the Church. Therefore, I suggest not only an enhypostasis of human persons in the Spirit but also the double enhypostasis of Christ's sacred humanity in the Son and in the Spirit. We share only in the second because of the mediation of that grace by the first, namely the Incarnation of the divine Son as Jesus Christ. I must stress the *analogous* nature of the pneumatological enhypostasis in Christ, Mary and ourselves. In the case of Christ his human nature subsists in the divine Son and in the case of Mary and ourselves our human nature subsists in our human hypostases. The pneumatological enhypostasis is not a subsistence in a *suppositum*, that is, *in facto esse* (as already constituted) but *in fieri* (in the process of becoming). For some the notion of a secondary *enhypostasia* seems untenable since I am not positing a substantial *esse* as the basis for the *suppositum* of the individual existent as is true of the primary *enhypostasia* in Christ and all others who bear their own *suppositum* by virtue of creation. The pneumatological dimension of becoming persons in the perfecting work of grace might better be expressed by positing an accidental *esse* as the more accurate ontological predication. However, I am arguing for the secondary pneumatological enhypostasis precisely on the grounds of how the Holy Spirit is person both in the immanent Trinity and in economic mission. Because of the Spirit's self-effacing personhood others are enabled to enter into the fullness of their personhood. It is specifically the personhood of the Holy Spirit that is at issue here.

The conception of the Holy Spirit's in-humanation as the enhypostasis of believers and the Church in the Person of the Holy Spirit emphasizes that the teleology of presence and power culminates in love. That requires the relatedness of those whose existential subsistence as persons derives from the transformative act of loving. This is a love enabled by the divine personhood that in the Spirit's self-effacing modality of being person constitutes the Church as persons-in-communion. In this regard as well the christological and the pneumatological are distinct but not separate. Let me summarize.

I am arguing that the modality of the Spirit's being Person, his being breathed forth in the trinitarian life of God and poured forth from the enhypostasic risen *Kyrios* and his *Abba* in the divine economy of salvation reflects the transformative and perfecting telos of Christian and ecclesial life. From the realm of christological reflection I have utilized the notion of in-humanation and to elucidate the work of the Holy Spirit as Person. In-humanation, not Incarnation, identifies the manifestation of the gift of the Holy Spirit as presence and power. "There are many gifts, but one Spirit" (1 Corinthians 12:4). This in-humanation is not the revelation of a divine Person in and as flesh but the manifestation of a divine Person in the othering of enfleshed persons in communion. Enhypostasis or being in-personed in the Holy Spirit as a divine Person identifies for the creature the formative and perfective dimensions of personhood. Distinct from the christological expression of enhypostasis personhood does indeed subsist in the Spirit but the latter is not the subject of that personhood as the divine Son is relative to Jesus. Rather our becoming-present as persons, ontologically borne by our own subsistence as subjects is processively enacted as we attentively live in the Spirit. By the Holy Spirit we presence ourselves in empowerment for others in a communion of love. The Spirit's in-humanation is gift; our being in-personed in the Spirit is the perfecting work of love. Both are inseparable from the christological mission but distinctly and integrally related to it. The Christmas and Easter mysteries are pneumatologically informed and constituted and in the event the Holy Spirit is inhumanized in and through the humanity of Jesus, earthly and crucified. Christ's glorification releases the same Spirit who transfigures a new humanity in Christ.

The significance of this proposal may be underscored by briefly examining three related issues. The first connection is mariological. Mary, I suggest, is an instance, the exemplary instance, in her person of the in-humanation of the Spirit, an enhypostasis in the Spirit. Her personhood is exemplary of what it means to be with the other. She is an icon of life in and by the Spirit. Here my proposal is similar to that of Leonardo Boff who suggests as a theologoumenon that the Holy Spirit pneumatized or spiritualized her to such intensification that we may "deduce a mission proper

to the Holy Spirit, that is, a personal (hypostatic) self-communication to the Virgin Mary.”¹⁸ More specifically, “the Virgin Mary, Mother of God . . . is to be regarded as hypostatically united to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.”¹⁹ He clearly proposes this as an analogical complement to the hypostatic union of the Second Person of the Trinity with Jesus Christ. Much could be developed concerning how Mary fully embodies a self formed by faith, hope, and love in orientation to the other which actualizes the self as person.

For now I emphasize one distinction which is rather significant. Namely, the Marian manifestation of the Spirit’s work is a distinct but inseparable dimension of Christ’s saving mystery. If the human mediation and manifestation of God’s saving mystery, its iconographic representation and illumination, is to be fully diaphanous to the joint mission of the Son and the Spirit then that human mediation communicates an ontology of personhood that is both for us and with us. I suggest that the sacred humanity of Jesus and the blessed humanity of Mary respectively embody these graced realities in the clear recognition of the essential priority of the former over the latter (by virtue of its mediation) and the necessary complementarity (in the sense of the triumph of divine grace) of the latter for the former. What is essential here is the creaturely mediation of the ontology of personhood within the divine communication of the trinitarian Persons.

The second connection is to the *Filioque*. It would be a fair commentary on what I have proposed to observe a filioquist construct of intratrinitarian relations. My distinctions within the modalities of personhood applied to the divine Trinity, especially between the Son and the Spirit, is dependent in part on the Western rendering of active and passive modalities in the trinitarian processions. The Father is entirely active, the Spirit is entirely passive, the Son is both active and passive in order to maintain the distinction of the Spirit as Person, therefore, the requirement of the *Filioque*. One may suggest that the *per Filium* in the East can assume an active modality on the part of the Son vis-à-vis the Spirit as long as it is not interpreted as a share in the origination of the Spirit from the Father alone.²⁰ This really

¹⁸ Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society*, trans. Paul Burns (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988) 210.

¹⁹ Leonardo Boff, *The Maternal Face of God: The Feminine and Its Religious Expressions*, trans. Robert R. Barr and John W. Dierckmeier (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) 93.

²⁰ The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity’s letter “The Greek and the Latin Traditions regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit” (*Information Service*, no. 89 [1995/II–III] 88–92) attempts this from the Catholic perspective by upholding the monarchy of the Father as the “sole trinitarian cause (*aitia*) or principle (*principium*) of the Son and the Holy Spirit,” while simultaneously allowing for an intratrinitarian relation between the Son and Holy Spirit which the

must be left to further discussion. The point I prefer to make is the constructive affirmation that the construal of the Spirit's notion as a purely passive modality in correlation with the manner in which the Spirit is Person does not preclude the Spirit's being with the Father and the Son in their own being for the other via the Father's generation of the Son and the Son's personal responsiveness to the Father. The personalization of the Father and the Son assumes the Spirit's being breathed forth without any implication of causality in his spiration except in regard to creation. A *Spirituque* is not implied.

Finally there are doxological implications. To return to the beginning of this essay I suggested that we must reason from what it means to be "in spirit" as confessor and worshipper. Certainly, I would affirm that the doxological posture of the human person, to worship, is not only proper but also indigenous to life in the Spirit. My concern here is to argue with Basil the Great that this posture is indeed in the Spirit and through the Son to the Father. But with him (and with the creedal symbol as well) I would also add that unto the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit is required for that the perfection of that doxological posture into full stature. The transformation of persons-in-communion into the divine perfection bestowed on the creature engenders the recognition of the other in the repose that is worship and praise. This recognition indeed does not stop with the Spirit or even the Son but certainly it neither bypasses them nor forgets them. The supreme recognition by the creature of the divine other, essential to worship, acknowledges how the other, the divine other in all the density of personal engagement, assumed our humanity and in doing so, blessed and transformed it. The creature in God, proper to God, and because of God is the object of worship enacted in the adoration of the sacred humanity of Jesus and by lesser analogy in our Marian veneration as well. Persons-perfected-in-communion, with and for each other, do not shy away from this consummation of love.

document defines as "signifying the communication of the consubstantial divinity from the Father to the Son and from the Father through and with the Son, to the Holy Spirit." Eastern Orthodox expressions of an innertrinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit of course exclude participation of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit but may suggest an innertrinitarian manifestation of the Son in the Spirit. One example is Boris Bobrinskoy in his remark that "the Eternal Son is not extraneous to the procession of the Holy Spirit." This presupposes the added injunctions that this is so in: "(i) in an ineffable manner, (ii) without bringing in the idea of causality, (iii) without calling into question the untransmissible character of the Father's hypostatic property of being the one Source and Principle of the Divinity of the Son and the Spirit" ("The Filioque Yesterday and Today," in *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy*, ed. Lukas Vischer, Faith and Order Paper No. 103 [Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981] 142-43).