From 325 Nicea to 381 Constantinople: The Role of Basil of Caesarea in the Pneumatological Elaboration

*Virgilio A. Ojoy, OP**

Faculty of Sacred Theology, Ecclesiastical Faculties,
University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines

Abstract: The Creed formulated by the Council of Nicea in 325, while offering a detailed affirmation of the divinity of the Son in response to Arianism, made only a brief statement about the Holy Spirit. This lacuna left important questions regarding the Spirit's nature, divinity, and relationship to the Father and the Son. This paper looks into the doctrinal development between the Councils of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381), focusing particularly on the contribution of Basil of Caesarea. It first situates Basil's thought within the wider context of post-Nicene Christological controversies, highlighting the efforts of pro-Nicene theologians in defending the unity of the Godhead. It then traces the emergence of theological reflection on the Holy Spirit, particularly the attempts of earlier Fathers to articulate the Spirit's role in salvation and sanctification.

The study moreover analyzes Basil's contribution and theological method. Special attention is given to Basil's defense of the Spirit's divinity through the baptismal formula and Pauline texts, and his account of the Spirit's sanctifying, illuminating, and revelatory activity within the life of the Church. Through these arguments, Basil demonstrated that the Holy Spirit is not a creature but shares in the divine life and operation of the Father and the Son. The paper argues that Basil's insights significantly influenced the creed of the Council of Constantinople in 381. A contribution that stands as an important moment

*Virgilio A. Ojoy, OP can be contacted at viraderiano@yahoo.com.

• *PHILIPPINIANA SACRA*, Vol. LXI, No. 185 (May-August 2026) pp. 255-270.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

in the formulation of a Trinitarian doctrine and the development of orthodox Christian pneumatology.

Keywords: Council of Nicea (325), Council of Constantinople (381), Christological Controversies, Pneumatology, Pro-Nicene Theology, Basil of Caesarea

Introduction

The (Original) Nicene Creed of 325 has so much to say about the Son, but has almost nothing to say about the Holy Spirit. This is how it was:

> I believe in One God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten, begotten of the Father before all ages. Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten not made, of one essence with the Father by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became man.

And he was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried. And the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead; whose Kingdom shall have no end. And in the Holy Spirit.

The only idea one can gather from such a one-liner about the Holy Spirit is that it exists. Who or what the Holy Spirit is? Not even a hint is offered by the credal statement.

The more than ten lines dedicated to the Son are understandable since the *raison d'etre* of the Council of Nicea was to counter the onslaughts of Arianism, which claimed that the Father alone is unbegotten and truly God. The Son was created by the Father before time as the first and greatest of all creatures. Thus, there was a time when He was not. He is divine but not in the same way as the Father. His divinity is received, not inherently possessed. He was used by the Father as an instrument in the creation of the world.

It was to address the foregoing erroneous doctrines that the Council of Nicea formulated the credal statements in 325. The matter should have been settled with the promulgation of the credal statements, but the situation of the Church in the fourth century onward was not characterized by strict control and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

obedience to the Pope, Bishop of Rome, who, by reason of distance, especially from the Eastern Churches, cannot fully impose his authority. Added to that is the fact that the Emperor also had authority over the Church, and sometimes, he could not agree with the bishops and the Pope on certain matters. As a result, many other Councils were convened after 325 Nicea, each purporting to arrive at an official and authentic interpretation of the credal statements of Nicea. This is why there were quite a number of views as regards how the Son is to be seen in relation to the Father.

Christological Controversies after 325 Nicea: Challenges of Understanding and Articulation

One of the main bones of contention in the original Nicene Creed is the statement "of one essence or substance with the Father." This gave rise to some interpretations. For example, in the dedication of the great and golden church of Antioch in 341, ninety-seven eastern bishops formulated a profession of faith that was henceforth called the Second Creed of Antioch. The second of the four creeds associated with the said council proclaimed their faith in a "Father who is truly Father, and a Son who is truly Son, and in the Holy Spirit who is Holy Spirit, the names not given without meaning or effect, but denoting accurately the peculiar subsistence (hypostasis) rank and glory of each named, so that there are three subsistence and in agreement only one."[1] In an obviously anti-Arian tone, the bishops of 344 Antioch continued:

> If any teaches contrary to the sound and right faith of the Scripture, that time or season or age either is, or has been before the generation of the Son – or if any says that the Son is a creature or one of the creatures – let him be anathema.[2]

Indeed, this Second Creed is a far cry from Arianism, yet it emphasizes, like Origen, the subsistence of the three, united only by agreement of wills, and makes no mention of the Nicene *homoousios*. This is an example of the Eastern Church's concern to safeguard the distinction of the three in contrast to the West's insistence on divine unity.[3]

A bishop, Marcellus of Ancyra, considered the Son as only a temporary projection of the Father for purposes of creation and redemption. This view was

[1] Quoted in Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology* (Collegevile, Minesotta: The Liturgical Press 1983), 83.

[2] Quoted in Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 83.

[3] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 83.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

not opposed by Athanasius of Alexandria and Julius of Rome. Such apparent concurrence from two other influential bishops gave rise to the suspicion of the East that the Nicene formulation smacks of Sabellianism.[4]

The bishops, using the 4th Creed of Antioch, rejected the two principal tenets of Arius that the Son is from nothing and that there was when he was not. They explained that their confession of three realities and three persons should not be taken to mean that there are three gods. This assertion is based on their acknowledgment of the self-complete and unbegotten, unbegun invisible God to be only one. Jesus Christ, "though he be subordinate to His Father and God, yet being before the ages begotten from God, He is God according to nature true God. He is to be 'perfect from the first and like in all things to the Father'."[5] Here we see that 'of the same substance' (*homoousios*) in 325 Nicea was taken to mean 'like in all things.'

The interpretation became even worse in Photinus, who diminished the divine element in Jesus, considering him a mere man whose eminent virtue merited the favor of special intimacy with God. For this, he was condemned, and the Western bishops considered him deposed from his see of Sirmium. At some point, when Athanasius realized that Marcellus and Photinus were compromising the doctrine of the 325 Nicea, he distanced himself from them, although he never condemned Marcellus personally. Athanasius sees the Son as "God's offspring and, since God is eternal and He belongs to God as Son, He exists from all eternity. His nature is always perfect.[6]

The Council of Nicea affirmed that the word 'God' connotes the same truth when one speaks of God the Father as it does when one speaks of God the Son. Athanasius went beyond what the Council intended to convey by saying that when one speaks of the truth of the Son, one speaks not only of the same truth about God, but also of the same actual God, the same being.[7] This is how Athanasius expresses and explains in his own words the main tenet of the Christology of 325 Nicea, which is *homoousios* or one substance with the Father.

As can be seen in the foregoing doctrines that arose in the aftermath of 325 Nicea, despite the lengthy presentation of the divinity and nature of the Son in the Credal statements of the very first ecumenical council, orthodox doctrine did not become clear to the whole Church, even to many bishops. A number of doctrines

[4] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 84.
[5] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 85-86.
[6] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 89.
[7] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 90-91.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

emerged that have veered away from the true meaning of *homoousios*. Some were propagated by individuals, others by local councils of the Church, and still others are supported by a group of bishops.

Among the prominent doctrines related to *homoousios* are *homoios*, *homoiousios* and *anomoios*. The proponents of *homoiousios*, like Hilary of Poitiers, Basil of Ancyra and Silvanus of Tarsus, forwarded in 359 by a gathering of 150 Eastern bishops in Seleucia the idea that the Son is like in divinity, similar in essence but not identical in essence with the Father. In the same meeting, George of Alexandria and Eudoxius of Antioch proposed *anomoios,* which claims that the Son is unlike the Father in essence. This is a radical stance of Arianism, also taught by Aetius and Eunomius. Another prominent doctrine about the Son in relation to the Father is *homoios*, which teaches that the Son is like the Father, without needing to discuss or mention essence. As far as the relationship of the Father and the Son is concerned, biblical language is sufficient. This idea, also found in the Fourth Creed of Antioch, was supported by Acacius and his bishop supporters, as well as by Emperor Constantius. However, the majority of the 150 eastern bishops in Seleucia rejected the Acacian position and the homoiousian doctrine of Basil of Ancyra. The imperial commissioner was so exasperated at the endless debates and the failure of the bishops to arrive at a consensus that he exclaimed, "Now go and quarrel with each other."[8]

The conflicting ideas and doctrines can reach such depths when they spill over from discussion fora into the daily affairs of the Church and society. For example, to heal the breach with Emperor Constantius, who had exiled from Egypt pro-Nicene (pro-homoousios) bishops and priests, the West sent to him Vincent of Capua, a papal legate at the 325 Council of Nicea, and Euphates of Cologne. Stephen, the bishop of Antioch, who was supporting three *hypostases* in God, tried to compromise Euphates by sending a young prostitute to his room. The plan failed, and Stephen was deposed. In another instance, Pope Liberius was forcibly removed from St. Peter's Basilica in Rome and exiled to Thrace for defending Athanasius and refusing to condemn him. In Thrace, the Pope's jailer was an Arian bishop, Demophilus. Worst of all, because of differences in doctrine, imperial troops broke into the church of Theonas, where Athanasius, surrounded by his clergy and consecrated virgins, was conducting a vigil service. The troops shot arrows in the direction of the church of Theonas, and many fell dead and wounded. Athanasius managed to escape.[9]

[8] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 98.

9 Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 93.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

Despite the lengthy treatment of the Son in the credal statements of 325 Nicea, the difficulty of articulating his relationship with the Father took long, tumultuous years to overcome, yet it ended in the triumph of the pro-Nicene position (pro-*homoousios*). This was largely due to the efforts of Athanasius, whose torch was carried forward by Basil of Caesarea. Basil held together the different pro-Nicene factions and developed "an account of the distinctions between persons and essence of such power that the victory of pro-Nicene theology under Emperor Theodosius (reigned from 379-395) is inevitable."[10] Although some would attribute the triumph to Emperor Theodosius's political maneuvering, Basil, one of the architects of Nicene theology, also played an important role in the victory.

Filling the Vacuum Left by 325 Nicea

Articulating the relationship of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son should not be a less difficult road to travel. Only one line was devoted to the Holy Spirit in the original Nicene Creed: "And in the Holy Spirit." Nothing can be drawn from this statement except its existence. Many questions could be asked. What do we believe about the Holy Spirit? Is the Holy Spirit a creature created by the Son? Is the Holy Spirit divine? How can we describe the relationship of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son? Nothing significant was said of the Holy Spirit in 325 Nicea as is manifested in the credal statements of the Council. It is, thus, left to the Church to fill up the black gaping hole left by 325 Nicea about the Holy Spirit.

How could the vacuum left by 325 Nicea be filled with pneumatological content? Basil of Caesarea was again a focal theologian in the development of the understanding of the Holy Spirit. His pneumatology is closely intertwined with his Trinitarian theology, which means that his understanding of the Holy Spirit can be deduced from his views about the Trinity, particularly from his views about the relationship between the Father and the Son.

Basil's early theology did "not yet articulate the distinction between a unitary shared nature at one level, and the personal distinctions of the Father, Son and Spirit at another."[11] At this stage of his theology, he seemed to view the relationship between the Father and the Son in a homooiousian manner in that through the Father's generation of the being of the Son, a mysterious unity

[10] Ayres Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 187.

[11] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 190.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

exists between them, even though the Son's existence as generated qualifies as an existence that is in some way distinct from that of the Father.[12]

Through the epistemological concepts of *epinoia* and *idiomata*, Basil, in his work *Contra Eunomium* (563-564), slowly clarifies the mysterious unity between the Father and the Son and the differentiation through distinct properties. By *epinoia* (something the mind comes up after reflecting on an experience or data), we come to know that there is unity of *ousia* (essence) between the Father and the Son, although what the essence is remains unknown. At the same time, we also come to know the *idiomata* or *idiotetes* (distinct individual properties) of the Father and the Son. Basil thus speaks at one level of unity of essence, and differentiation at another level.[13] By this, Basil makes a distinction between the unknowability of the divine essence (*ousia*) and the knowability of the particular characteristics, the *idiomata*, of the Father and the Son. This is clearly discussed in *Contra Eunomium* 2:28:

> Particularities (*idiotetes*) being added into the substance (*ousia*) like marks or forms, distinguish what is common by means of individual characteristics (*tois idialousi Karaktersi*), but they do not cut (or break through) the identity in nature (*homophyes*) of the substance. For instance, deity (*Theotes*) is common, fatherhood and sonship are individualities (*idiomata*); from the intertwining of each, the common and the particular, there comes to us a grasp (*katalysis*) of the truth, so that on the mention of the unbegotten light we understand the Father, and on that begotten light we get the notion (*ennoian*) of the Son . . . for this is the character of individualities, to reveal in the identity (*tautoteti*) of the substance the otherness (*heteroteta*).[14]

Basil seems to have been the first to defend the distinction extensively and to describe the distinct persons as simply sharing an ontological status. Although the distinction is mentioned but not elaborated in earlier works, such as in Apollinaris of Laodicea, who spoke of three *prosopa* or *hypostases* and one divinity or *theotes*. George of Laodicea (359) and the Antiochene Tome stemming from the Alexandrian Council in 362 also spoke of three *hypostases* and one divinity or Godhead.[15]

---

[12] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 190-191.
[13] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 194.
[14] Quoted in Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 198-199.
[15] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 202-203.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

Up to the time of his work *Contra Eunomium* (363-364), Basil did not use *hypostasis* as a technical term for the three individual persons. *Hypostasis* was used interchangeably with essence (*ousia*) even by other bishops and theologians. It was after 364 that Basil used *hypostasis* more regularly to describe the individual persons. At this time, there is a clearer distinction between *ousia* (essence or substance) and *hypostasis* or *prosopon* (persons). Basil prefers *hypostasis* over *prosopon* because the latter smacks of Sabellianism.

Basil of Caesarea's Pro-Nicene Pneumatology

To be able to understand the ideas of Basil of Caesarea on the theology of the Holy Spirit, it is best to know the context from which his work, *On the Holy Spirit*, was conceived. In the process, the reader will get to track the evolution of Pro-Nicene pneumatology.

We begin with Athanasius, who, somewhere between 358 and 361, wrote three letters to Serapion, one of his supporters, who was bishop of Thumis in the Nile Delta. Serapion reported to Athanasius about a group of theologians who were 'orthodox' in their Christological views but who seemed to regard the spirit as a created though superior angel. Their basis was 1 Tim. 5:21: "Before God and before Jesus Christ and the angels he has chosen, I put it to you as a duty to keep these rules impartially and never to be influenced by favoritism." Athanasius's response was to defend the place of the Holy Spirit in the Godhead, drawing on the wealth of insights from the two decades of debate regarding the Son. A quote from his letter to Serapion 1:19 reveals Athanasius' view on the Spirit's place in the Godhead deduced from his being closely linked to the Son or from being present in or completing the Son's activity:

> As then the Father is light and the Son is his radiance . . . we may see in the Son the Spirit also by whom we are enlightened. 'That he may give you', it says, 'the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, having the eyes of your heart enlightened'. But when we are enlightened by the Spirit, it is Christ who enlightens us.[16]

Further elaborating on Athanasius' views on the Spirit's place in the Godhead, Ayres writes:

> The Spirit's dependence on Christ is the same as the Son's dependence on the Father; as the Father's own, the Son has the Father present in him:

[16] Quoted in Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 212.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

> just so the Spirit belongs to Christ and Christ is present in the Spirit's work. Once the Spirit has been implicated in the Son's work and been presented as completing that work, then all the arguments that have been used to link the Father and Son can be used of the Spirit.[17]

Origen offers a more specific role for the Holy Spirit. For him, the Spirit supplies the gifts of God to the saints, but he also argues that "the Spirit's existence and virtue come through participation in the Son and through the Son's constant ministry."[18] Reflecting on Gal 4:6 and 1Cor 6:11, Ireneus also "presents the Holy Spirit as a gift from the Father, coming through the Son and acting to transform and sanctify the saints."[19]

On the one hand, the work of the Holy Spirit seems to be clear from Origen and the Fathers of the Church we have mentioned: to deliver the gifts from the Father through the Son for the sanctification of man. The Spirit's ontological status, on the other hand, is characterized by uncertainty. However, at this time, the debate over the issue started to unravel and give clarity to the nature of the Holy Spirit.

Eusebius of Caesarea emphasizes the Spirit's status as only first among those things created by the Son. Cyril of Alexandria considers the Spirit as a 'power' and a 'sanctifying principle' who inspired the prophets and apostles and illuminates the souls of the just. "He includes the Spirit in the Trinity but it is not clear what this inclusion means. In an ambiguous statement he claims that the Spirit has come down from heaven, is honored with the Father and the Son but is also 'made by God through the Son'. With this statement, a question could be asked: Should the Spirit be placed on a different ontological plane?"[20]

In his Letter to Serapion, Athanasius reworked these earlier traditions to demonstrate that the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit could be directly God's work. He lists various texts which would show that the work of the Spirit is also the work of the Son (e.g., comparing 1Cor 1:13 and 1Cor 10:4). Moreover, the texts also indicate that just as the Son's presence is also the presence of the Father,

---

[17] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 212.

[18] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 212.

[19] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 212. Gal. 4:6 reads, "The proof that you are sons is that God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts: the Spirit that cries Abba Father;" and 1Cor 6:11 says, "These are the sort of people some of you were once, but now you have been washed clean and sanctified, and justified through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and through the Spirit of our God."

[20] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 213.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

so too the Spirit's presence is the presence of God (1John 4:12-13).[21] In the texts, it is apparent that just as the Son declares that his works are the Father's, so too Paul declares that the works of the Spirit are works of Christ.[22] Through all these texts, Athanasius wants to show the Father, Son and Spirit working together in an orderly, harmonious manner, which betrays a close coordination and unity within the Trinity.

From the foregoing development of insights about the Holy Spirit, a further step is taken towards a clear statement of inseparable operation, which was used as an argument to prove that the Holy Spirit's sanctifying action reveals it to be God:

> The Son, like the Father, is creator, for he says 'What things I see the Father doing, these things I also do,' . . . But if the Son, being like the Father, creator, is not a creature; and if, because all things were created: then, clearly, neither is the Spirit a creature. For it is written, concerning him in Psalm 103: 'Thou shalt take away their spirit, and they shall die and return to their dust. Thou shall put forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' As it is thus written, it is clear that the Spirit is not a creature, but takes part in the action of creation. The Father creates all things through the Word in the Spirit… the Father himself, through the Word in the Spirit, works and gives all things.[23]

Another interesting idea in Athanasius that would show the closeness of the Spirit to the Son is '*energia*'. In his words, "As the Son, the living Word, is one, so must the sanctifying and enlightening life-giving activity (energia), his gift, be one perfect and complete, which is said to proceed from the Father, because it is from the Word, who is confessed to be from the Father."[24] However, the Cappadocians deem this terminology problematic because it seems to indicate a lack of real existence.

Having had a glimpse of the context from which Basil's insights developed, we now embark on exploring his ideas about the Holy Spirit. His main contribution to Pro-Nicene pneumatology is his work *On the Holy Spirit* (*Peri tou Hagio Pneumatos*). To understand Basil's insights into the Holy Spirit, it would help to know the theological method he used.

---

[21] See Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 213.

[22] Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 213.

[23] Athanasius, Serap. 3.4-5 as quoted in Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 213-214.

[24] Athanasius, Serap 1.20 as quoted Lewis, *Nicea and its Legacy*, 214).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

The theological method of Basil is rooted in exegesis.[25] He recognizes that the scriptural texts dedicated to the Holy Spirit are meager compared to texts dedicated to the Son. For this reason, the exegetical proof for claims about the Holy Spirit needs to be complemented by the religious experience of the believers and the tradition of the Church. The religious experience of the believers, which Basil also calls 'practice of the pious,' provided keys that unlocked the depths of meaning of the Scriptural passages. Regarding the appeal to the unwritten tradition, Basil did not consider it apart from Scriptures as another source of revelation because, for him, there is harmony between the two inasmuch as the Fathers who are the origin of the unwritten tradition themselves followed the meaning of Scriptures.[26]

Using the foregoing method, Basil arrived at some important insights that were used to elaborate the one-line credal statement about the Holy Spirit in the original Nicene Creed. Considered as the cornerstone of the Orthodox claim for the Spirit's divinity by Basil is the baptismal formula in Mt. 28:19, "Go therefore, make disciples of all nations in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit." As is clear, this formula, which ranks the Holy Spirit on the same level as the Father and the Son, necessarily determines the form of the Church's confession of faith and doxology.[27]

Basil's *On the Holy Spirit* (Spir. 9) is a clear witness of the harmonious use of Scripture, religious experience, and tradition in the exploration of the common conceptions about the Holy Spirit drawn from Scriptures and the unwritten tradition of the Fathers. There are three closely related themes that provide a glimpse of Basil's pneumatological thought:

1. The names which are used to describe the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures indicate one of glorious majesty e.g., Spirit of God in Mt. 12:28; Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father in Jn. 15:26, among others.

2. The activities which are assigned to him by the Scriptures could only be ascribed to one who is divine, especially the fact that he sanctifies the soul within which he dwells.

[25] Jaroslav Pelikan, *Basil of Caesarea: Christian Humanist, Ascetic*, edited by Paul Jonathan Fedwick (Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979), 337-360.

[26] Michael Hagkin, *The Spirit of God: the Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 116-117.

[27] Pelikan, *Basil of Caesarea,* 346-347; also in Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 117.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

3. The fact that he reveals to the purified the Son and in the Son, as in an image, the Father.

In reply to Eustathius' warning to Christians, based on 1 Cor 10:2, that sacramental gifts do not guarantee salvation, owing to the fact that although Israel was 'baptized,' many fell in the desert, Basil points out the 'real presence' of the Holy Spirit in the waters of Baptism, which imparts new life to the soul enslaved by sin and the devil. The benefits of new life and sanctification in Christian baptism imply that the Spirit is not a creature like Moses, but one who forms an essential part of the Blessed Trinity.[28]

This insight on the Spirit's divinity deduced from his activities is bolstered by Basil's analysis of 1Cor 12:3 and 2:10. 1 Cor 12:3[29] indicates that the Spirit enables the human person and angels to recognize the true identity of Christ as God and to offer true worship to God. In 1 Cor 2:10,[30] Basil reads that the Spirit is enabling man and angels to have insight into the divine mysteries. The ability of man and angels to abide in God and sing praises to Him comes from the Spirit. This was shown by the fallen angels who turned away from God and thus were able to utter the statement "curse Jesus". In the absence of the Spirit, chaos would reign among the angels and in the Church, and none would remain true to God.[31]

Hagkin, describing Basil's insight on the Spirit's divinity, writes:

> As it is, the Spirit produces and preserves order in the Church through the distribution of spiritual gifts 'as he wills' (1Cor. 12:11). Such an activity, one that is natural to a lord, differentiates him from the creatures, whose activity is always characterized by servanthood. Here, the crucial axiom of Cappadocian theology comes into play: within the universe, there are basically two types of entities, which can be characterized as "Lord" and "servant". In the true sense of the term, only God is Lord. That the Spirit naturally acts as Lord thus indicates his divinity. Proof that the Spirit's lordship, hence his divinity, is recognized by the Scriptures is afforded by 2 Cor 3:17-18, where the Spirit is named as Lord, and, in a more

[28] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 166.

[29] It is for that reason that I want you to understand that, on the one hand, no one can be speaking under the influence of the Holy Spirit and say 'Curse Jesus', and on the other hand, no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' unless he is under the influence of the Holy Spirit (1Cor 12:3).

[30] These are the very things that God has revealed to us through the Spirit, for the Spirit reaches the depths of everything, even the depths of God (1Cor 2:10).

[31] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 167.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

> allusive manner, by 1 Cor 3:16, where the believer who is indwelt by the Spirit is called a temple of God.[32]

It is not only the divinity of the Spirit that is described by Basil. Through 1 Cor 3:16 and 2 Cor 3:17-18, Basil describes the activities of the Spirit which are radically different from those engaged by man and angels. On this, Hagkin writes:

> 1Cor 3:16[33] indicates that the saint is the "proper place for the Spirit". In other words, the Spirit, whose distinctive attribute is that of sanctifying power, transforms the believer into a temple of God, where God can be properly contemplated and worshipped, 2 Cor 3:17-18[34] and the verses immediately preceding it, indicate that the purified soul who rivets his attention on the Spirit becomes like a transparent and shiny object beneath sunlight, he is irradiated by the Spirit's glory and becomes a 'reflector', as it were, of the Spirit. It is characteristic of Basil's biblicism that he sees this transformation occurring, at least in part, as the believer searches the Scriptures.[35]

Intimately linked to the transformation of the purified soul is another theme close to Basil's heart, which is the image theology. This theology develops the insight that "the Spirit illumines the purified soul, enabling him to contemplate the Son, and in the contemplation of the Son, to ascend to the vision of the Father."[36] Basil explains that "the Spirit enables the purified soul to know the Son since he is inseparable from the Son and unveils the glory of the Son within himself."[37] He drew this insight from the implications of the preposition 'in' for the Spirit's divinity in his analysis of 1 Cor 12:3.

The foregoing exposition of Basil's ideas has established the divinity of the Holy Spirit and his activities which lead to the conclusion that he is closely united to the Father and the Son as he is equally to be recognized and worshipped as God. The next question that needs to be dealt with is 'How did Basil come to distinguish three Persons in one and the same God?' Basil's concrete experience of the Spirit's activity in his own life enabled him to emphasize the differences between the persons in the Godhead. Although he was not able to conceive of

[32] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 167.

[33] Didn't you realize that you were God's temple and that the Spirit of God was living among you? (1 Cor 3:16).

[34] Now this Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom (2Cor 3:17).

[35] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 167-168.

[36] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 168.

[37] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 168.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

the idea of 'procession in order to describe the Spirit's existence, he was able to determine the distinguishing characteristics of the Father, Son and Spirit as "fatherhood, sonship and sanctification."[38] The closest statement to procession that Basil made was that the Spirit proceeds from God the Father as the breath of his mouth (Jn. 15:26; 1Cor 2:12; Ps. 33:6). This statement clearly indicates the natural community of being between the Father and the Spirit and, by inference, the Son. However, the statement was ambiguous enough to preserve the ineffable nature of the Spirit.

From the insights of Basil of Caesarea, one may claim that,

> Enough is known for the believer to confess that each of the persons of the Godhead has his own hypostasis and on the basis of this confession he is able to glorify the Father, the Son, and the Spirit as inseparable members of one Godhead. For Basil, this question about the doxology is not at all a marginal issue. For both the refusal to concede that the Spirit has his own hypostasis, the error of the Sabellans, and the refusal to confess that the Spirit is an essential member of the Godhead, the error of the Pneumatomachi make it impossible to offer the doxology. Only in the Spirit that Jesus can be glorified as Lord (1Cor 12:3) and only in the Spirit can the Father receive true adoration (Jn 4:23-24).[39]

Conclusion

The Council of Constantinople in 381, when it adapted and enhanced the one-line credal statement of 325 Nicea regarding the Holy Spirit, came up with the following credal statements of its own:

> And in the Holy Spirit,
> the Lord and Giver of Life
> who proceeds from the Father
> who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified
> who has spoken through the prophets.

[38] See Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 168, note 332. Cf. Gilles Emery OP, *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*, translated by Francesca Aran Murphy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 151 ff.

[39] Hagkin, *The Spirit of God*, 169.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

This was a huge pneumatological elaboration from 325 Nicea to 381 Constantinople. Much of that enhancement drew inspiration from the insights of Basil of Caesarea. PS

References

Ayres, Lewis. *Nicea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford University Press, 2004.

Davis, Leo Donald. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1983.

Emery, O.P., Gilles. *The Trinitarian Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by Francesca Aran Murphy. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hagkin, Michael A.G. *The Spirit of God: The Exegesis of 1&2 Corinthians in the Pneutomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Basil of Caesarea: Christian Humanist, Ascetic.* Edited by Paul Jonathan Fedwick, 337-360. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55997/2004pslxi185a4

El Salue Regina es vno
de los deuotos cantares
que dezimos a nuestra
señora la virgen sancta
maria. Dize assi.

Salue regina mater misericordia vida
dulcedo y esperança nuestra. Dios
te salue reyna madre de misericordia
vida dulçura y esperança nuestra. A ti
llamamos los desterrados hijos de Eua. A ti
suspiramos gimiendo y llorando en
aquesta valle de lagrimas. Ea
pues abogada nuestra buelue
a nosotros essos tus misericor
diosos ojos. y despues de es-