

# THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT\*

## ACCORDING TO CERTAIN GREEK FATHERS

B Y  
MARKOS A. ORPHANOS

---

### 11. MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

The most remarkable viewpoint concerning this issue remains to be that of Maximus the Confessor. Maximus, writing to Presbyter Marinus, explains that the Latin view, according to which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father (ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) bears an orthodox meaning, although it is strange and unacceptable to the Greeks<sup>1</sup>. Maximus goes on to say that the Latins have found some similar statements in some other Latin Fathers and even in Cyril of Alexandria<sup>2</sup>, but they are consistent with the Monarchia. The Latins have also assured Maximus that their doctrine does not imply that the Son is the cause of the Holy Spirit. By their statements, the Latins mean simply that there is one cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit: the Father, of the one by generation and the other by procession. But they also want to show that the Holy Spirit comes forth (προῖέναι) through the Son and in that way to establish the conjunction and the invariability of substance<sup>3</sup>.

---

\* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 107 τοῦ προηγουμένου τεύχους.

1. *Epistola ad Marinum Cypri presbyterum*, PG. 91, 133D-136AB.

2. *Epistola ad Marinum Cypri presbyterum*, PG. 91, 136A: «συμφώνους παρήγαγον χρήσεις τῶν Ῥωμαίων πατέρων· ἔτι γε μὴν καὶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, ἐκ τῆς πονηθείσης αὐτῷ εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν ἅγιον Ἰωάννην ἱερᾶς πραγματείας».

3. *Ibid.* PG. 91, 136AB: «Ἐξ ὧν, οὐκ αἰτίαν τὸν Υἱὸν ποιῶντας τοῦ Πνεύματος, σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀπέδειξαν· μίαν γὰρ ἴσασιν Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος τὸν Πατέρα αἰτίαν· τοῦ μὲν

Nevertheless, Maximus is not happy with Latin terminology and he regrets that he was not able to persuade them to withdraw it<sup>1</sup>. He has accepted though their explanation that the Holy Spirit derives His being from the Father alone as being satisfactory. Maximus' conviction on the issue remains that the Father is the only source and cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Father as γεννήτωρ and πηγὴ begets substantially the Son and proceeds simultaneously the Holy Spirit, who «τῷ Πατρὶ οὐσιωδῶς συνυφαστήκασι ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὄντα καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικῶς ὑπὲρ αἰτίαν καὶ λόγον»<sup>2</sup>. The Father and the Son on the other hand, in a common act, send the Holy Spirit to His mission.

---

κατὰ τὴν γέννησιν· τοῦ δέ, κατὰ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν· ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ προΐεναι δηλώσωσι· καὶ ταύτῃ τὸ συναφές τῆς οὐσίας καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον παραστήσωσι.

This statement of Maximus was discussed repeatedly in the official sessions and the private meetings at the Council of Florence. The Greeks had proposed to the Latins these words of Maximus as a basis for an agreement. Mark of Ephesus maintained that those patristic texts, referring to the procession of the Holy Spirit which agree with the letter of Maximus he accepted as genuine, and those that disagree he rejected. (V. LAURENT, *Les MEMOIRES du grand ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence*, Paris 1971, p. 334, 336, 394, 400, 414, 440-442). Nevertheless, the Latins appeared unwilling to accept Maximus' statement as a formula of union. Their objection was that although they «too did not hold the Son to be primary cause of the Holy Spirit, they did teach that with the Father He was the cause of the Spirit». (J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, p. 245).

About the meaning of Maximus' statement there is to the present disagreement among the scholars. While Western scholars take the words δι' αὐτοῦ προΐεναι, as pointing to the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit, Orthodox theologians following the Eastern patristic tradition apply these to the energetic procession and manifestation of the Holy Spirit. See on this topic S. BILALIS, *Op. cit.* pp. 115-118; M. GORDILLO, *Compendium Theologiae Orientalis*, pp. 103-104.

1. *Ibid.* 136BC: «Μεθερμηνεύειν δὲ τὰ οἰκεῖα..... παρεκάλεσα τοὺς Ρωμαίους· πλὴν ἔθους κεκρατημένος οὕτω ποιεῖν καὶ στέλλειν, οὐκ οἶδα τυχὸν εἰ πεισθεῖεν». Maximus goes on to say that the Latins are not able to satisfy the request of Greeks, because of the inadequacy of their own language.

2. *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, PG. 90, 672CD. Maximus in another statement explains the existing relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son as follows: Just as the Holy Spirit exists by nature and in essence from God the Father, He is also by nature and in essence of the Son, inasmuch as He proceeds essentially from the Father through the ineffably begotten Son. (*Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, PG. 90, 672D).

Again while the Latins understood this passage as implying the *Filioque*, the Greeks rejected it and applied it to the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit to the

## 12. PS- DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE

Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite has been often quoted by Byzantine authors<sup>1</sup> as an authority against the idea of the Holy Spirit's double procession. Pseudo - Dionysius indeed emphasizes the Monarchia of the Father in such strong terms that he excludes any notion of essential derivation of the Spirit from or through the Son. The Father is the only divine source of existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit. He, as «begetting God», plants the Son and the Holy Spirit who like shoots of flowers come forth from Him. «Μόνη, πηγὴ—Pseudo - Dionysius argues — τῆς ὑπερουσίου θεότητος ὁ Πατήρ, οὐκ ὄντος Υἱοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐδὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς Υἱοῦ... ὅτι μὲν ἔστι πηγὰς θεότης ὁ Πατήρ· ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς θεογένου θεότητος — εἰ οὕτω χρὴ φάναι — βλαστοὶ θεόφυτοι καὶ οἷον ἄνθη καὶ ὑπερούσια φῶτα παρὰ τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων παρειλήφμεν»<sup>2</sup>.

## 13. JOHN OF DAMASCUS

A comprehensive exposition of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit is given by John of Damascus. He gathers together the scattered and fragmentary teaching of the Fathers before him, putting them in a rather systematic manner.

Thus, according to John of Damascus, following the Cappadocian Fathers, the Father, in His hypostatic property, is the source, cause, and ground of the existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>. All that the Son and the Holy Spirit have, John argues, is from the

---

Father and the Son, or to the simultaneous procession of the Holy Spirit with the begetting of the Son. Cf. MARK OF EPHESUS, *Capita Syllogistica* 38, PETIT, PO, 15, p. 406.

1. See GREGORY THE CYPRIOT, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 260D-261A: *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 257CD; GREGORY PALAMAS, *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκλίνδων* 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΠ, 1, p. 207, 14-15; *Ibid.* 1.20, p. 235, 21-24; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.30, BOBRINSKY, ΣΠ, 1, p. 58, 16-20. MARK OF EPHESUS, *Capita Syllogistica* 10, PETIT, PO, 15, pp. 382-3; *Ibid.* 38, PETIT, PO, 15, p. 406; *Testimonia* 96, PETIT, PO, 15, p. 361.

2. *De divinis nominibus* 2, 5, PG. 3, 641D.

3. *Expositio fidei* I, 12b, KOTTER, p. 36, 53-54: «Ὁ πατήρ πηγὴ καὶ αἰτία υἱοῦ καὶ πνεύματος, πατήρ δὲ μόνου υἱοῦ καὶ προβολῆς πνεύματος». Cf. also, *Ibid.* I. 8, KOTTER, p. 19, 30-34.

Father, including their very being<sup>1</sup>. Unless the Father exists, the Son and the Holy Spirit cannot exist. Because of the Father's existence, the Son and the Holy Spirit exist<sup>2</sup>.

John of Damascus, describing the relations of the divine Persons in terms of a «cause» and those «caused»<sup>3</sup> remarks that the Father is without cause, for He is not derived from anything. The Son is not without cause, for He is derived from the Father. The Holy Spirit is also not without cause because He goes forth from the Father, not in the manner of sonship but of procession<sup>4</sup>.

Because the distinctive properties of the divine Persons are quite constant and by no means variable, moveable, and changeable each Person, despite their different modes of being, keeps His own property<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, the Father is alone the Father of the Son and the producer of the Holy Spirit<sup>6</sup>. The Son by no means can be considered as cause of the existence of the Holy Spirit<sup>7</sup>. Of course, the Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, but it is not meant that the Spirit proceeds from the Son because the Father alone is the cause of the Holy Spirit's being<sup>8</sup>.

1. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 26, 195-196: «πάντα οὖν, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι. Καὶ εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός ἐστιν οὐδὲ τὸ πνεῦμα».

2. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 27, 197-201: «Καὶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὸν πατέρα, ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. Καὶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει ὁ υἱός καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πάντα... πλὴν τῆς ἀγεννησίας καὶ τῆς γεννήσεως καὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως».

3. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 29, 250-254: «Ἐνα γὰρ θεὸν γινώσκουμεν, ἐν μόναις δὲ ταῖς ἰδιότησι τῆς τε πατρότητος καὶ τῆς υἰότητος καὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως κατὰ τε τὸ αἷτιον καὶ αἰτιατὸν καὶ τέλειον τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἦτοι τὸν τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόπον τὴν διαφορὰν ἐννοοῦμεν».

4. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 30, 274-279.

5. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 30, 279-285: «οὐτε τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκστάντος τῆς ἀγεννησίας, διότι γεγέννηκεν, οὐτε τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς γεννήσεως, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου (πῶς γάρ;) οὐτε τοῦ πνεύματος ἢ εἰς πατέρα μεταπίπτοντος ἢ εἰς υἱόν, ὅτι ἐκπεπόρευται καὶ ὅτι θεός· ἢ γὰρ ἰδιότης ἀκίνητος. Ἡ πῶς ἂν ἰδιότης μένοι, κινουμένη καὶ μεταπίπτουσα; εἰ γὰρ υἱὸς ὁ πατήρ, οὐ πατήρ κυρίως· εἰς γὰρ κυρίως ὁ πατήρ. Καὶ εἰ πατήρ ὁ υἱός, οὐ κυρίως υἱός· εἰς γὰρ κυρίως υἱός καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἅγιον».

6. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 19, 30-33.

7. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 30, 286-290: «Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγομεν καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζομεν, ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν».

8. *Expositio fidei* I, 12b, KOTTER, p. 36, 55-57: «Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον... καὶ υἱοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον· μόνος γὰρ αἷτιος ὁ πατήρ». Cf. also, *De hymno trisagio epistola*, 28, PG. 95, 60D.



The generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit as their modes of being from the Father are incomprehensible<sup>1</sup>, only a poor analogy can give us an idea of their relations of existence<sup>2</sup>. This is the well-known image of the mode of being of Adam, Eve and Seth. We have, says John of Damascus, an analogy in Adam, who was not begotten (for God Himself moulded Him) and Seth, who was begotten (for he is Adam's son) and Eve, who proceeds out of Adam's rib (for she was not begotten)<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the Father alone remains the cause of existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

John of Damascus maintains that there is a particular relation between the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit, as the breath of the Father, necessarily accompanies the Word, because the Word must also possess Spirit<sup>4</sup>. For even our word is not destitute of spirit<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, the Holy Spirit as an essential power existing in His own proper and peculiar subsistence, proceeds from the Father, but He rests in the Son and shows forth the Word<sup>6</sup>. Of course this relation is eternal, because as the Word was forever in the Father, the Son also abides in the Spirit, and the Holy Spirit in the Son, revealing the Son's energy<sup>7</sup>. In this context the Spirit is the image of the Son as the Son is the image of the Father<sup>8</sup>.

On account of this eternal relation, which does not apply to the *ad extra* mission of the Holy Spirit, but to the eternal life of the Holy Trinity, the Father is through the Son the *προβολεύς* of the revealing Spirit<sup>9</sup>. The Holy Spirit as the power of the Father, reveals the hidden mysteries of the Divinity, and proceeds from the Father through

1. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 23,115-117.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.* p. 23, 118-121.

4. *Expositio fidei* I, 7, KOTTER, p. 16,1-11. Cf. also, *De humno trisagio epistola*, 28, PG. 95, 60D.

5. *Expositio fidei* I, 7, KOTTER, p. 16,2-4.

6. *Expositio fidei* I, 7, KOTTER, p. 16,14-20: «δύναμιν οὐσιώδη, αὐτὴν ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ ὑποστάσει θεωρουμένην, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ἐκφαντορικὴν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* I, 13, KOTTER, p. 41,87-90.

7. *Expositio fidei* I, 7, KOTTER, p. 17,25-26: «οὐτε γὰρ ἐνέλειψέ ποτε τῷ πατρὶ λόγος οὔτε τῷ λόγῳ πνεῦμα». Cf. also, *Ibid.* p. 16, 15: «πνεῦμα... τὸ συμπαραομαρτοῦν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ φανεροῦν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν».

8. *Expositio fidei* I, 13, KOTTER, p. 40,75-76; *De imaginibus oratio* 3, 16, PG. 94, 1337BC; *Ibid.* 18-20, PG. 94, 1340ABC.

9. *Expositio fidei* I, 12b, KOTTER, p. 36,43-45.

the Son in a manner known to Himself. Also the Son, excluded from being in any sense the cause of the Holy Spirit, participates in the eternal manifestation of the Holy Spirit because He is the revealing power of the Father proceeding from the Father through the Son<sup>1</sup>.

The Holy Spirit, having in the Father His cause and principle of being, resting in the Son and shining forth eternally through the Son, also communicates to the created order and to mankind through the Son<sup>2</sup>. In His mission *ad extra*, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father because He proceeds out of the Father. He is also the Spirit of the Son, although he does not proceed out of the Son.

«We speak likewise», Damascenus says, «of the Holy Spirit as from the Father, and call Him the Spirit of the Father. And we do not speak of the Spirit as from the Son, but yet we call Him the Spirit of the Son. For if any one has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His, says the divine apostle. And we confess that He is manifested and imparted to us through the Son. For He breathed upon His disciples, says he, and said Receive ye the Holy Spirit»<sup>3</sup>.

John of Damascus illustrates the Holy Spirit's mission from the Father through the Son by the analogy of the sun, the sunbeam and the radiance. John's argument runs thus: «It is just the same as in the case of the sun from which come both the ray and the radiance (for the sun itself is the source of both the ray and the radiance) and it is through the ray that the radiance is imparted to us and it is the radiance itself by which we are lightened and in which we participate»<sup>4</sup>.

Making a clear distinction between the Spirit's causal procession from the Father and His manifesting energy as well as His mission from the Father through the Son, John says that the Holy Spirit is called Spirit of the Son, because He is manifested and bestowed to the creation through the Son and not because the Holy Spirit owes His cause of being to the Son<sup>5</sup>.

1. *Expositio fidei* I, 12b, KOTTER, p. 36,47-48: «Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῇ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος δυνάμει τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν δι' υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη».

2. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 26,182-184: «ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ δι' υἱοῦ μεταδιδόμενον καὶ μεταλαμβάνόμενον ὑπὸ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ κτίζον καὶ οὐσιῶν τὰ σύμπαντα καὶ ἁγιάζον καὶ συνέχον».

3. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 30, 286-312.

4. *Ibid.* p. 31,293-296. Cf. also, *De imaginibus oratio* 3, 22, PG. 94,1341B.

5. *Hom. in Sabbatum sanctum* 4, PG. 96, 605A: «Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ

According to the account given, we can maintain that John of Damascus with reference to the causal procession of the Holy Spirit accepts that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and that the Son is not cause of His existence<sup>1</sup>. But as far as the Holy Spirit's eternal manifestation and His temporal mission are concerned, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son<sup>2</sup>. John's statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son must not be restricted to His temporal mission, but it must also be extended to the Holy Spirit's eternal manifestation<sup>3</sup>.

#### 14. PHOTIUS

Until Photius' time the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit was a matter of theological speculation. With Photius, it becomes a highly controversial point<sup>4</sup>. Photius in his discussion of the subject,

---

Πατρός, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον, καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν». Cf. also, *Expositio fidei* I, 12, KOTTER, p. 30, 55-57.

1. Commenting on this statement of John of Damascus, THOMAS AQUINAS remarks: «Dicendum, quod Spiritum Sanctum non procedere a Filio primo fuit a Nestorianis introductum, ut patet in quodam Symbolo Nestorianorum damnato ab Ephesina Synodo. Et hunc errorem secutus est Theodoritus Nestorianus et plures post ipsum, inter quos fuit etiam Damascenus: unde in hoc hujus sententiae non est standum». (PG. 94, 831C, not. 28).

2. *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 30, 290-31, 296.

3. J. MEYENDORFF, has already pointed out: «Cependant, on ne peut pas dire que Saint Jean ne considère les relations entre le Fils et l'Esprit que sous l'angle de la mission temporelle, comme l'ont fait les polémistes byzantins postérieurs». («La procession du Saint-Esprit chez les Pères Orientaux», *Russie et Chrétienté* 2, p. 172).

Also V. LOSSKY generally remarks: «Il ne serait pas exact d'affirmer que la procession διὰ υἱοῦ signifie uniquement la mission temporaire du Saint-Esprit, comme le font parfois quelques polémistes orthodoxes... La mission temporaire est un cas spécifique de manifestation divine dans l'économie c'est-à-dire par rapport à l'être créé. En général, l'économie divine dans le temps exprime la manifestation éternelle, mais cette dernière n'est pas un fondement nécessaire des créatures... la Trinité se manifestait dans le rayonnement de la gloire». («La procession du Saint Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe», *A l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu*, Paris 1967, p. 91).

4. On Photius' teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit see: J. HERGENROETHER, *Photius Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Sein Leben seine Schriften und*

almost singles out the idea of the Holy Spirit's procession «through» the Son and mainly deals with the procession of the Holy Spirit «from» the Father alone<sup>1</sup>.

Photius treats the subject under the following presuppositions, which we have already found in other Fathers: a) A distinction must be made between the properties which belong to the divine nature and those belonging to the hypostases<sup>2</sup>. What is common in the Holy Trinity is common to all three hypostases. What is hypostatic is individual and belongs only to the corresponding hypostasis<sup>3</sup>. c) The hypostatic properties are uncommunicable and unconfounded<sup>4</sup> and d) the Father is related to the Son and to the Holy Spirit as their unique cause of being and it is by Him that they are caused<sup>5</sup>.

The faculty of proceeding the Holy Spirit, Photius argues, is a hypostatic property of the Father and not of the common divine na-

*das griechische Schisma*, Bd. 3, Regensburg 1867, pp. 399-427; 784ff. Z. ROSSIS, *Σύστημα Δογματικῆς τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. 1, Athens 1903, pp. 263-277; M. JUGIE, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, vol. 1, Paris 1926, pp. 179-223. Idem, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*. Rome 1936, pp. 285-300; M. ORPHANOS, *Ἡ ἐκπόρευσις τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κατὰ τὸν ἱερόν Φώτιον*, Athens 1979.

1. Cf. his treatise, important for the subject *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* through which Photius maintains that «Sicut Filius ex solo Patre nasci... ita et Spiritus Sanctus ex ipsa sola eademque causa procedere praedicatur». (PG. 102, 279-280). Cf. also, Photius, *Homilia* 37, *ARISTARCHOS*, 1, Constantinople 1900, pp. 294-5: «καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ μόνου προβέβηται».

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 30, PG. 102, 397; *Ibid.* 113,5, PG. 102, 392C; *Ibid.* 17, PG. 102, 296C-297A; *Ibid.* 27, PG. 102, 209A.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 30, PG. 102, 316AB: «Εἰ πᾶν ὃ μὴ ἐστὶ κοινὸν τῆς παντοκρατορικῆς καὶ ὁμοουσίου καὶ ὑπερφυῶς Τριάδος, ἐνὸς ἐστὶ μόνου τῶν τριῶν οὐκ ἐστὶ δὲ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος προβολὴ κοινῇ τῶν τριῶν, ἐνὸς ἕρα καὶ μόνου ἐπὶ τῶν τριῶν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 6, PG. 102, 288AB; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes*, PG. 102, 729 CD.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 9, PG. 102, 289AB; *Ibid.* 35, PG. 102, 315A; *Ibid.* 18, PG. 102, 297A; *Ibid.* 19, PG. 102, 297BC; *Ibid.* 32, PG. 102, 313AB; *Ibid.* 46, PG. 102, 323B; *Ibid.* 47, PG. 102, 325A; *Ibid.* 10, PG. 102, 292A; *Ibid.* 46, PG. 102, 324B; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes*, 16, PG. 102, 728D-729A.

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 3, PG. 102, 281BC: «ἐξ ἐνὸς αἰτίου, τοῦ Πατρὸς ὃ τε Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα προσάγεται, εἰ καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐκπορευτῶς, ὃ δὲ γεννητῶς. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 42, PG. 102, 320C - 321A; *Ibid.* 44, PG. 102, 321BC; *Ibid.* 52, PG. 102, 329BC; *Ibid.* 113, 7, PG. 102, 392D.

ture<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, it by no means belongs to another prosopon of the Holy Trinity. Any participation of another Person is contrary to the uncommunicability and the unconfusion of the hypostatic properties. Because the Father, as Father, begets the Son and proceeds the Holy Spirit, i.e. He makes the Holy Spirit to proceed, any share of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit would imply that the Son shares the hypostasis of the Father or stands for it, or that He is a part of the Father's hypostasis<sup>2</sup>. Such a notion, however, diverts the Holy Triad to a dyad and introduces the misbelief of «υἱοπατρίας»<sup>3</sup>.

Photius goes on to say that if the Father proceeds the Holy Spirit, not on the grounds of His hypostasis, but on the grounds of His nature, then not only the Son will participate in the procession of the Holy Spirit, but also the Holy Spirit Himself will take part in His own mode of existence<sup>4</sup>.

The double procession of the Holy Spirit, Photius continues, makes the Father a simple name, deprived of meaning and sense; the property characterised by that word no longer belongs exclusively to Him and the two divine hypostases are confused in one sole person. That is, however, the view of Sabellius, or rather of some other half-Sabellian monster<sup>5</sup>.

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, Photius says, results also in the opposite conclusion, namely, the plurality of the hypostases. If the Son is begotten from the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, then the Holy Spirit must

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 15, PG. 102, 293AB: «Εἰ δ' αἷτιος ὁ Πατήρ τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, οὐ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φύσεως, τῷ δὲ λόγῳ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ὁ δὲ λόγος τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως οὐδενὶ μέχρῃ νῦν περιορίζειν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑπόστασιν δεδυσσέβηται..... οὐ μὲν οὐκ ἂν εἴη οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐν τῇ τριάδι αἷτιος ὁ Υἱός». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 47, PG. 102, 325BC; *Ibid.* 14-15, PG. 102, 293BC-296A.

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 14-15, PG. 102, 293B-296A.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 15, PG. 102, 293AB; *Ibid.* 16, PG. 102, 296A.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 47, PG. 102, 325AB: «Εἰ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς φύσεως ὁ Πατήρ προβάλλεται τὸ Πνεῦμα, τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ φύσεως ἡ Τριάς, τότε δὴ τότε .....οὐ γὰρ μόνον εἰς προβολέα τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ Υἱὸς ἂν σοι μετεβάλλετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰς τε τὴν τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέννησιν καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν προβολὴν ἐτέμενέτο τε καὶ κατεμερίζετο».

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 9, PG. 102, 289AB: «κοινοποιηθέντος ἤδη τοῦ χαρακτηρίζοντος αὐτὸν ἰδιώματος, καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον τῶν δύο συναλειφομένων θεαρχικῶν ὑποστάσεων· καὶ ἀναβλαστήσει πάλιν ἡμῖν ὁ Σαβέλλιος, μᾶλλον δὲ τι τέρας ἕτερον ἡμισαβέλλιον».

produce something else, on account of the equality of the Divine Persons. This, of course, implies that instead of three we must have four hypostases and even more. Then the triune God is blemished and Christianity is diverted into the Greek polytheism<sup>1</sup>.

The Father, emphasises Photius, is the unique cause (αἴτιον) of the mode of being of the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are (αἰτιατὰ) and He by no means communicates His own particular property to the other two Persons. Any idea that the Son together with the Father are the cause of the Holy Spirit's mode of existence introduces into the Holy Trinity two causes and two principles. Of course, this can not be reconciled with the divine Monarchia of the Father<sup>2</sup>. Photius' argument runs thus: «Πῶς οὖν φατε τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ; Εἰ μὲν ἐξ αἰτίου, ἰδοὺ δύο αἴτια καὶ δύο ἀρχαί, Πατὴρ καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ δουαρχία μᾶλλον ἢ μοναρχία τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν πρεσβεύμενον»<sup>3</sup>.

Photius argues that the causal participation of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit introduces two principles and diverts the Orthodox faith to the gnosticism of Marcion and Manes<sup>4</sup>. Because, as Photius says, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son must be the same or a different one from His procession from the Father. If it is the same, then the Son communicates of the hypostatic property of the Father. If it is different, then it must be an opposition between the Father and the Son<sup>5</sup>. In this line of thought, Photius maintains that the Filioque introduces then two principles of which the one is unoriginated (ἀναρχος) and the other originated (ἀρχομένη)<sup>6</sup>. This introduces two causes: with two causes, however, the Trinity becomes of four hypostases, because the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit is subject to a kind of division. This is also because the Holy Spirit derives His exis-

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 37, PG. 102, 317A; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 19, PG. 102, 729BC.

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 11, PG. 102, [292AB; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 18, PG. 102, 729B.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 118, PG. 102, 397A. Cf. also, *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 3, PG. 102, 801C.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 4, PG. 102, 284A; *Ibid* 35, PG. 102, 316A; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 17, PG. 102, 729A.

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 35, PG. 102, 316A; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 17, PG. 102, 729A.

6. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 14, PG. 102, 293A.

tence from two causes, namely the Father as a first cause and the Son which is a cause which has been caused<sup>1</sup>.

If we are going to accept the notion that the Son as a cause produces the Holy Spirit, Photius continues, then we must acknowledge that the Holy Spirit's procession from the Father is imperfect<sup>2</sup>. This, however, contradicts the perfection of the Father<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, if to the perfect cause i.e. the Father, we add another one, i.e. the Son, this cause must be imperfect and inferior in comparison to the first cause. The insertion, however, of such *ἡμίτομον* cause within the internal relation of the Holy Trinity introduces into the Holy Trinity the Greek mythologies of hippocentaurs and makes the Holy Trinity a monster<sup>4</sup>.

According to Photius, the Son cannot be considered with the Father as a common cause of the Holy Spirit's procession because it would imply that the procession is a common property of the Father and the Son<sup>5</sup>. Since all things common to the Father and to the Son are in any case common to the Spirit, the Holy Spirit must thus proceed from Himself. Even He will be the principle of Himself and at the same time both cause and caused. Nevertheless, Photius says not without irony that such an idea even the myths of the Greeks never fabricated<sup>6</sup>.

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 43, PG. 102, 321AB: «Πῶς δ' οὐκ εἰς δύο αὐτοῖς διαμερισθήσεται τὸ Πνεῦμα; τὸ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ πρώτως αἰτίου προῖόν (ἀναίτιος γάρ)· τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ αἰτιατοῦ (οὐκ ἀναίτιον γάρ)· καὶ οὕτως δ' οὐ τάξει μόνῃ καὶ σχέσει καὶ αἰτία τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐτερότητα καὶ παραλλαγὴν ἢ αἰρεσεις δραματοῦργεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τετράδα ἀντὶ Τριάδος τὸ σέβας ἡμῶν ἀπωθεῖσθαι τολμᾷ».

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 7, PG. 102, 288BC.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 7, PG. 102, 288BC; *Ibid.* 31, PG. 102, 312C-313A; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 9, PG. 102, 725A.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 44, PG. 102, 321BC: «Καὶ μὴν εἰ αἴτιος μὲν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ Υἱός, ἀμφοῖν δ' αἴτιος ὁ Πατήρ, εὐρεθήσεται τι αἴτιον ἐν τῇ τελείᾳ καὶ τελειοποιῇ Τριάδι τοῦ μὲν κυρίως καὶ πρώτου αἰτίου τῆς τελείωτος ἀπεληλαμένου, ἀτελὲς δὲ καὶ ἡμίτομον ἢ σύνθετον, ἐξ ἀτελοῦς καὶ τελείου τὴν σύνθεσιν ἀναδεχόμενον. Καὶ σκοπεῖν ἔξεστιν, ὅπως ἡ μὲν μυθολογία ἐν τοῖς ἐν γενέσει καὶ φθορᾷ τοῖς ἵπποκενταύρους πάλαι παίζουσα ἀναπλάττει, ἡ δὲ θεομαχία ἐν τοῖς αἰδίοις καὶ ἀκαλλοιώτοις ἢ τὸ ἡμίτομον ἢ τὸν ἐξ αἰτίου τε καὶ αἰτιατοῦ συμπεπλασμένον αἴτιον οὐ φρίττει μετὰ σπουδῆς τερατολογούσα».

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 113,5, PG. 102, 392C: «Εἰ μὲν τὴν αὐτὴν προβολὴν ἔχει τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρί, κοινὴ τούτοις ἡ τῆς προβολῆς ἰδιότης, καὶ πῶς ἔσται τὸ κοινὸν ἰδιότης»; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 11, PG. 102, 728AB.

6. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 113, 7, PG. 102, 392D; *Ibid.* 44, PG. 102, 321C; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 12, PG. 102, 728C.



The procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son, Photius states, leads to another absurdity: it makes the Father a direct and an indirect cause of the Holy Spirit's procession. The Father is a direct cause because He begets directly (ἀμέσως) the Son and proceeds the Holy Spirit. He is an indirect one (πρόρω) because he proceeds the Holy Spirit, through the Son. But this does not happen even to the creation of the compound and changeable nature<sup>1</sup>.

The participation of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit, Photius continues not without a certain exaggeration, introduces the impious notion that the Holy Spirit is the Grandson of the Father<sup>2</sup>, an erroneous conception which the Fathers from Athanasius onwards have vigorously refuted<sup>3</sup>. Photius says that it leads also to the heresy of Macedonius, putting the Holy Spirit in a state of inferiority<sup>4</sup>. While, the Father and the Son possess the faculty of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit, despite His equality with the Father and the Son, is deprived of the possibility to beget the Son and to come out from Himself<sup>5</sup>.

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, Photius argues, is not supported by the Biblical evidence. The words of our Lord «for He (i.e. the Holy Spirit) shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you»<sup>6</sup> according to Photius, do not mean that the Holy Spirit re-

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 62, PG. 102, 340BC-341A: «Ἰδοὺς δ' ἂν κἀντεῦθεν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ δυσσεβήματος. Εἰ προσεχὲς μὲν ἔστιν αἰτιον τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ Πατήρ, ὥσπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ· ἀμέσως γὰρ ὁμοίως ἢ τε γέννησις καὶ ἡ ἐκπόρευσις· οὐδὲ γὰρ διὰ μέσου τινὸς ὁ Υἱὸς γεννᾶται· ἀμέσως δ' ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται· λέγει δὲ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ὁ λῆρος ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τὸ αὐτὸ ἂν αἰτιον ὁ Πατήρ καὶ πρόρω καὶ προσεχὲς αἰτιον εἶναι τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀναβρῆθῆι, ὅπερ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς βεούσης καὶ ἀλλοιουμένης φύσεως ἔστιν ἐπινοεῖν».

2. *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 9, PG. 102, 801D; *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 61, PG. 102, 340B.

3. ATHANASIUS, *Ep. ad Serapionem* IV. 5, PG. 26, 644AD; GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 7-8, PG. 36, 141AB; EPIPHANIUS, *Panarion haer.* 74. 12, HOLL, GCS, 3, p. 330,20.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 113,8, PG. 102, 393A; *Ibid.* 32, PG. 102, 313B; *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* 11, PG. 102, 728B.

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 40, PG. 102, 320AB: «Τί λέγεις; Ἐλάβεν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ διὰ γέννησεως προελθὼν καὶ προάγειν ἕτερον ὁμοφυῆς; Πῶς οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς προάγων ὁμοφυῆς τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ μετέδωκεν, ὡς μετέλαβεν, τῆς ὁμοίας δυνάμεως καὶ τιμῆς, ἵνα κάκεῖνο πάλιν ὁμοφυοῦς ἔχη προόδῳ καὶ ὑποστάσει ἐναγλατίζεσθαι;». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 37, PG. 102, 317B.

6. *John* 16,14.



ceives from the Son, but from the Father, «τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ συνεισάγει τὸν προάγοντα τὴν τοῦ λόγου περικοπήν, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἕτερον πρόσωπον ἐμφαίνει... διάφορον δὲ πάντως τῇ ὑποστάσει»<sup>1</sup>. The meaning of «receiving» is not the same as that of «proceeding» because «ἄλλο γάρ ἐστι τὸ λαμβάνειν καὶ ἀπαρρύεσθαι, ἀφ' ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἑτέραν ὑπόστασιν καὶ ἄλλο τὸ πρὸς οὐσίωσίν τε καὶ ὑπόστασιν ἐκπορεύεσθαι»<sup>2</sup>. In this particular verse «by receiving» does not mean the causal derivation of the Holy Spirit's being from the Son, but simply the proclamation of things to come<sup>3</sup>. Even Christ's declaration «He shall receive of mine»<sup>4</sup> implies that the Holy Spirit receives from the Father, as His cause, the accomplishments and He Himself bestows them on the disciples in order to encourage them for the sufferings to come<sup>5</sup>.

St. Paul's statement «God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father»<sup>6</sup> does not suggest that the Son is cause of the Holy Spirit's existence, but simply that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial and invariably of the same nature as the Son<sup>7</sup>. The Holy Spirit is called the «Spirit of the Son» because of His homousion with the Son<sup>8</sup>. He is also called «Spirit of the Christ» because He anoints Christ in His human nature<sup>9</sup>.

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 22, PG. 102, 301AB; Cf. also, *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 15, PG. 102, 808B.

2. *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 15, PG. 102, 809A. Cf. also, *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 21, PG. 102, 300C. For a criticism of Photius' interpretation see: J. VECCOS, *Refutatio Photiani libri de Spiritu Sancto*, PG. 141, 761-765.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 29, PG. 102, 309C: «Εἴτα εἰπὼν, ὅτι λήφεται, λαμπρῶς ἀνακηρύττει, καὶ ἐφ' ᾧ λήφεται· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἵνα ἐκπορευθῇ, φησὶν, οὐδ' ἵνα ὑποστῇ (πρόσχε ταῖς Δεσποτικαῖς, ἄνθρωπε, φωναῖς) ἀλλὰ διὰ τι λήφεται; διὰ τι; Ὡστε τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν».

4. *John* 16,14.

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 30, PG. 102, 312B. «Ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήφεται, πρὸς τὸ Πατρικὸν παραπέμπει πρόσωπον καὶ ὡς τὴν τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐνέργειαν ὡς αἰτίου παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἱερολογεῖται τὸ Πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν, τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐκείνων, οἷς ἐνισχύσει τοὺς μαθητάς τῶν ἱρχομένων μὲν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν σὺν εὐσταθεῖ καὶ ἀπεριτρέπτῳ φρονήματι φέρειν».

6. *Galatians* 4,6.

7. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 51, PG. 102, 329B.

8. *Ibid.* «Τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τῆς φύσεως μὲν ἐκδιδάσκει τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον, τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν οὐδαμοῦ συνεισάγει τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως· καὶ τὴν μὲν κατ' οὐσίαν οἶδεν ἐνότητά, τὸν δ' ὁμοφυῶς προαγαγόντα τὴν ὑπόστασιν οὐμενοῦν οὐδαμῶς συνανακηρύττει, οὐδὲ τὸν αἴτιον ὑποδείκνυσιν».

9. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 93, PG. 102, 388A.

Nevertheless Photius admits that there is only one sense, according to which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, not, of course, in the mode of His being, but in His temporal mission to the world<sup>1</sup>. It is the result of the perichoresis of the divine hypostases and their common energies. Photius' argument runs thus: «Εἰ... ὡς ἐκ φεραλλήλου διὰ τὴν εἰς ἄλληλα τούτων ἀντιπεριχώρησιν καὶ ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἐξαποστελλόμενον· ἐξαποστέλλει γὰρ ὥσπερ ὁ Πατὴρ τὸν Υἱόν, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... εἰ κατὰ ταύτην τὴν διάνοιαν ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγετε, ἔρρωσθε μὲν τὸν νοῦν»<sup>2</sup>.

The innovation of the «Filioque», Photius goes on to argue, is not supported by the Tradition of the Church, because neither in the divine words of the Scripture nor in the human words of the Fathers was it verbally enunciated that the Spirit proceeds from the Son<sup>3</sup>. Photius, of course, was aware that according to the partisans of «Filioque» certain Latin Fathers such as Ambrose<sup>4</sup>, Augustine<sup>5</sup>, Jerome, have

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 13, PG. 102, 388AB.

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 118,20, PG. 102, 377BC. Cf. also, *Amphilochia, quaestio* 75, PG. 101, 465.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 5, PG. 102, 285A: «τίς εἶπε, Photius asks, τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ περιωνύμων Πατέρων ἡμῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι; ποία Σύνοδος οἰκουμενικαῖς ὁμολογίαις στηριζομένη καὶ διαπρέπουσα;... Τίς ἱερῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέων θεόλεκτος σύλλογος;»

4. On Ambrose's teaching see his treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* I. 25, PL. 16, 739; II. 134, PL. 16, 765-766. To what extent Ambrose teaches a twofold procession of the Holy Spirit is a matter of disagreement among the scholars. Commenting on Ambrose's statement «Spiritus quoque Sanctus, cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur». (*Ibid.* 11, 120, PL. 16, 762-763). A. PALMIERI, argues that «il est vrai que ce dernier texte se rapporte à la mission temporelle du Saint Esprit, mais celle-ci ne saurait se concevoir sans la procession éternelle». (*Op. cit.* col. 801). P. CAMELOT though, maintains that «Il s'agit évidemment ici de la mission temporelle de l'Esprit-Saint envoyé par le Père et le Fils». («La tradition Latine sur la Procession du Saint-Esprit 'a filio' ou 'ab utroque'», *Russie et Chrétienté* 2, p. 185). J. ROMANIDES, referring to the meaning of verb *procedere* in Ambrose says that: «In any case when St. Ambrose uses *procedere* he does not mean either manner of existence or hypostatic property. This is clear from his insistence that whatsoever the Father and the Son have in common the Holy Spirit also has. When the Father and the Son send the Spirit, the Spirit sends Himself». (*The Filioque*, Athens(?) no date of publication, p. 22).

5. For Augustine's views on the procession of the Holy Spirit see his treatises: *De Trinitate* 4.20. 29, PL. 42, 908; 5. 14.15, PL. 42, 1081; 15.26.45, PL. 42, 1092; 15.16.47, PL. 42, 1094-5; *Contra Maximinum* 2. 14. 1, PL. 40, 770; 2. 17.4, PL. 40, 784-785; That Augustine has introduced the idea of *Filioque* is commonly

taught that the Holy Spirit [proceeds from the Son<sup>1</sup>. But he maintains that they were falsified<sup>2</sup> or that they have not spoken in dogmatic terms<sup>3</sup>, or that they, as human beings, were fallible<sup>4</sup>. In the last case it will be better to gloss over their error and not to glory in it<sup>5</sup>.

Even if Ambrose or Augustine have taught in the West the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, Photius continues, a great number of Roman Pontiffs such as Celestine, Leo the Great, Vigilius, Agatho, Gregory the Great, Hadrian, Leo III<sup>6</sup>, Benedict III, John VIII

---

accepted by modern scholars. Cf. M. SCHMAUS, *Die Phychologische Trinitatslehre des hl. Augustinus*, Munster 1927, pp. 95ff; R. SEEBERG, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1. 4. Auflage, Darmstadt 1953, p. 160; A von HARNACK *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 304-307; P. CAMELOT, *Op. cit.*, pp. 186-191; P. TREBELAS, *Op. cit.*, pp. 286 ff; J. ROMANIDES, *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-20; E. J. FORTMAN, *The Triune God. A historical study of the doctrine of the Trinity*, London-Philadelphia, 1972, pp. 145ff.

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 78-79, PG. 102, 360B — 384A. Cf. also, *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 24-26, PG. 102, 817A-820D.

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 71, PG. 102, 352B.

3. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 71, PG. 102, 352C-353A.

4. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 70, PG. 102, 352A; *Ibid.* 68, PG. 102, 348A; *Ibid.* 77, PG. 102, 357A.

5. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 70, PG. 102, 252A; *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 17, PG. 102, 812A.

6. Photius recalls again and again Pope Leo's action to put in the facade of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome two silver shields with the text of the Creed in Greek and Latin without the *Filioque* addition and insists that Leo III opposed the theology as well as the addition of *Filioque*. See, *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 87-89, PG. 102, 376A-380A; *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 5, PG. 102, 800AB.

The position of Pope Leo III towards *Filioque* is differently evaluated by the various scholars. Most of them maintain that the Pope in his discussion with the emissaries of Charlemagne had agreed with the theology of *Filioque* and had only refused to sanction an addition to the Creed, on the ground that its wording has been drawn up by an Ecumenical Council. See among others, J. N. D. KELLY, *Early Christian Creeds*, London 1961<sup>2</sup>, pp. 365 ff; H. BINDLEY, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*. Fourth Edition, Revised with introduction and Notes by F. W. GREEN, London 1958, p. 58; B. STEPHANIDES, *Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία*, Athens 1959<sup>2</sup>, pp. 299, 344. Nevertheless, J. Romanides, basing himself on the minutes of the discussion between Pope Leo III and Charlemagne's delegates, preserved by Abbot Smaragdus (SMARAGDI ABBATIS, *Acta Collationis Romanae inter Leonem III Papam et legatos Caroli imp. de Symbolo fidei*, PL. 102, 971-976) maintains that «Pope Leo III is actually telling the Franks in no unclear but diplomatic terms that the *Filioque* in the Creed is a heresy. What else can Leo's claim mean that the Second Ecumenical Council and the other Councils left the *Filioque*

and Hadrian III, held the opposite view, namely, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father<sup>1</sup>.

The same teaching was also pronounced by six of the seven Oecumenical Councils, which clearly implies that the clause of «Filioque» has no foundation either in Scripture or in the Tradition of the Church<sup>2</sup>.

Photius' doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit as being only from the Father is vigorous, comprehensive and convincing. It is, however, a pity that Photius, because of his strong polemical manner in discussing this issue, was prevented from treating the subject thoroughly. Thus Photius does not fully discuss the procession of the Holy Spirit through the Son, even though it was a traditional teaching of the previous Greek Fathers. On the other hand, Photius' interpretation of the relevant Biblical passages seems sometimes to be far-fetched. The same can be argued with regard to Photius' criticism and refutation of the arguments of his opponents and partisans of the doctrine of Filioque. Nevertheless, Photius' doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit has had a tremendous influence upon the Byzantine theology of the Filioque. The authors who oppose the doctrine of Filioque turn again and again to Photius' treatises and derive from them arguments and ideas<sup>3</sup>.

## 15. GREGORY OR GEORGE THE CYPRIOT

Among the numerous Byzantine theologians who have been involved in the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, Gregory or George the Cypriot, patriarch of Constantinople<sup>4</sup>, deserves a note-

---

out of the Creed neither by oversight nor out of ignorance, but on purpose by divine inspiration?». (J. ROMANIDES, *The Filioque*, pp. 10-11). For some more references to other scholars holding similar views, cf. S. BILALIS, *Ἡ αἰρεσις τοῦ Filioque*, pp. 81-86.

1. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 78-79, PG. 102, 376A-380; *Ep. ad archiepiscopum et metropolitam Aquileiensem* 24, PG. 102, 817A-820A.

2. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia* 5, PG. 102, 285AB: «Ἐδογματίσεν εὐθὺς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ ἀγίων ἐπὶ συνόδων ἡ δευτέρα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι, διεδέξατο ἡ τρίτη, ἐβεβαίωσεν ἡ τετάρτη, σύμφηρος ἡ πέμπτη κατέστη, συνεκήρυξεν ἡ ἕκτη, ἐπεσφράγισε λαμπροῖς ἀγωνίσμασιν ἡ ἑβδόμη· καθ' ἑκάστην αὐτῶν ἔστι περιφανὴς καθορᾶν παρῥησιαζομένην τὴν εὐσέβειαν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦ Υἱοῦ θεολογούμενον ἐκπορεύεσθαι».

3. See on this point M. ORPHANOS, *Op. cit.* p. 25 note 1.

4. About Gregory the Cypriot and his doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit see: K. TROITSKI, «istorii sporov po voprosu ob iskhodzhenii Sviatago Du-

worthy place. Gregory in his dispute with John Veccos, first an opponent and then a defender of Filioque, was able to clear up some points in regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit which have been vague.

Gregory follows the Greek patristic tradition and argues that the Father, on account of the divine Monarchia and the unconfounded of the hypostatic properties<sup>1</sup>, is the sole source and principle of the Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>2</sup>. The Father causally sends forth the Holy Spirit on the grounds of the common essence, because the Father alone is «θεογόνος θεότης καὶ πηγαία θεότης καὶ μόνη πηγὴ τῆς ὅλης θεότητος»<sup>3</sup>. The Father, Gregory goes on to say, is the principle and cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit, not because they derive their existence from the essence of the Father but because they owe their mode of being to the hypostasis of the Father, through which the divine essence is conferred<sup>4</sup>.

kha» *Khristianskoe Chtenie*, LXIX (1889) vol. 1, pp. 338-377; vol. 2, pp. 280-352; 520-70; M. JUGIE, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, vol. 2, pp. 358-36. J. MEYENDORFF, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, London 1964, pp. 13-17; 229-230; A. RADOVIC *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἄγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶν*, pp. 174 ff; O. CLÉMENT, «Grégoire de Chypre: 'De l'ekporèse du Saint Esprit'», *Istina*, 27 (1972) pp. 443-456.

1. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 269D-270B: «Μοναρχία τὸ τιμώμενον ἡμῖν, ὅτι καὶ εἰς Θεὸς ἀληθής· μοναρχία δὲ οὐχ ἦν ἐν περιγράφει πρόσωπον. Ἰουδαϊκὸν γὰρ τοῦτο, ἡ καὶ Σαβέλλειον· τρία δέ, ἃ καὶ ὑποστάσεις καλεῖν οἶδεν ὁ λόγος».

2. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 283A: «Μόνη γὰρ πηγὴ τῆς θεότητος ὁ Πατήρ, ἀρχὴ καὶ ρίζα Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος». Cf. *Ibid.* PG. 142, 296A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 290C; *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 235C; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 241A; *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 271C.

3. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 271A: «Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ἡ πατρικὴ ὑπόστασις πηγαία θεότης, καὶ ἀρχὴ φυσικὴ καὶ ρίζα Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος». Cf. also, *Ibid.* PG. 142, 271C: «καὶ τὸ αἰτίαν εἶναι Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος τῆς πατρικῆς ἐστὶν ὑποστάσεως ἡ τοιαύτη». Cf. also, *Ibid.* PG. 142, 275B; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 240. Veccos on the contrary argued that while the Son was begotten from the hypostasis of the Father the Holy Spirit proceeds from the hypostases of the Father and of the Son. (*Refutatio* 1,11, PG. 141, 881CD; *Ibid.* 1,12, PG. 141, 884B).

4. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 270D-271A: «ὥς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας λεγόμενον τοῦ Πατρὸς... καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεσθαι. Διότι δὲ μία, τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὁμολογούμενον τοῦ Πατρὸς Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑπάρχον ὁμολογεῖται. Πλὴν οὐ διὰ τοῦτ' ἤδη καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑποστάσεως τὸ Πνεῦμα, κὰν ὅτι μάλιστα καὶ ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ τῆς οὐσίας λέγεται τοῦ Πατρὸς». Gregory comes again and again to this point. Cf. *Ibid.* PG. 142, 272A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 282C; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 241BC. Veccos, criticising Gregory's view, accuses him of dividing the essence of the Father from the essence of Son and in this case sharing the misconception of Arius. That this was not Gregory's point is obvious.

Indeed, because of the identity of essence, the Holy Spirit is also from the essence of the Son but not from His hypostasis<sup>1</sup>. Any derivation of the Holy Spirit's mode of existence from the hypostasis of the Son is contrary to the teaching of the Fathers, who plainly teach that the Father is the θεογόνος θεότης from whom come forth the Son by way of generation and the Holy Spirit by way of procession<sup>2</sup>.

Gregory also repeats the well-known patristic argument<sup>3</sup> that the Father is the unique cause of being of the Son and the Holy Spirit who are caused (αἰτιατά). Thus, none of the αἰτιατά can be a cause in itself or with the Father and produce Himself from another αἰτιατόν. «Μόνος αἷτιος, Gregory argues, Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος, (i. e. Πατὴρ) τοῦ μὲν κατὰ γέννησιν τοῦ δὲ κατὰ ἐκπόρευσιν. Τὰ δὲ αἰτιατά καὶ ἄμφω ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Οὐδὲν δὲ ὅλως αἷτιον θατέρου θάτερον οὔτε μόνον, οὔτε μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς»<sup>4</sup>.

Gregory the Cypriot argues with Photius in saying that the procession in the Holy Spirit from both introduces two principles and two causes into the Holy Trinity<sup>5</sup>. This even makes the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father imperfect, an idea which is contrary to the perfection of the Father<sup>6</sup>.

Gregory was aware that John Veccos rejected that there are two principles or two causes in the Holy Trinity and argued that although the Son participates in the causal derivation of the Holy Spirit there is only one principle and cause, namely, the Father. Veccos continues that it is due to the fact that the υἱικὴ αἰτία leads up to the πατρικὴ αἰτία<sup>7</sup>. This notion was also common to the Latins who maintained that

1. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 271ABC.

2. *Ibid.* PG. 242, 272D.

3. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 294A. Cf. also, *Ibid.* PG. 142, 279 BCD-280A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 292CD; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 293A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 298A.

4. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 281B; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 271 CD; *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 255C.

5. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 281B: «Καὶ πῶς, φησί, βεβαιῶ, εἴπερ εἰς ἓν τὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν συνάγομεν αἷτιον; καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν αἷτιος παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ Πατήρ, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀληθῶς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἀλλ' εἰς αἷτιος καὶ οὐ δύο». Cf. also J. VECOS, *Refutatio Photiani libri de Spiritu Sancto*, PG. 141, 740A. Nevertheless, it seems certain that Veccos, at least for a certain time, held the idea that the Son is a second cause and principle of the Holy Spirit's being. Therefore in his *Libellum*, which Gregory the Cypriot quotes, J. Veccos admits that he had held such erroneous ideas which he was prepared to renounce. Cf. GREGORY THE CYPRIOT, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 237BC.

6. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 254BC.

7. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 253C.

despite the Son's participation in the causal procession of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit comes out only from one cause, because «κατ' ἄμφω ταῦτα τὰ πρόσωπα ἐν εἰσὶν αὐτοῦ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αἷτιον»<sup>1</sup>.

Gregory, however, does not accept the force of this argument and insists that the notion that the Holy Spirit derives His being from the two causes or from one, because the second is referred to the first, is blasphemous; that it is not founded biblically and is not supported in the teaching of the Fathers<sup>2</sup>. Gregory's argument runs thus: «ἔστω δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς καθὰ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐφρόνησαν, ἐπὶν παρὰ Πατρός τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεσθαι λέγοιτο, ἢ παρὰ Πατρός τὸ Πνεῦμα δι' Ὑιοῦ, οὕτω γὰρ ἂν, ἢ ὥς ἐκ δυοῖν αἰτίαι Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ, ἢ ὥς ἐκ μιᾶς ἀμφοῖν τὸ πανάγιον ἔσται Πνεῦμα, φέροι δὲ εἰς μίαν βλασφημίαν ἀμφοτέρω, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐναντίοις εὐρίσκεται. Μόνος ὁ Πατήρ αἷτιος»<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, Gregory says, as far as the Holy Spirit's causal procession is concerned, it is neither from nor through the Son, but only from the Father alone<sup>4</sup>.

Speaking against the assertion of Veccos that the expression «through the Son» implies the Filioque because the preposition «through» bears the same meaning as the preposition «from»<sup>5</sup> Gregory maintains that this is a misconception. Indeed, the Holy Spirit proceeds «through» the Son, but this procession refers to His eternal manifestation (ἀίδιον ἔκφανσιν) and not to His essential derivation<sup>6</sup>. When Veccos identifies the expression «δι' Υἱοῦ» to the expression «ἐκ

1. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 253D.

2. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 295C. Cf. also, *Scripta apologetica* PG. 142, 241CD.

3. *Ibid.* PG. 142, 295C.

4. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 256AB: «Ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ μὲν ἴσως μηδαμῶς, δι' αὐτοῦ δέ. Οὐκ οὖν οὐδὲ δι' αὐτοῦ. Καὶ γὰρ τελεία τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑπόστασις, καὶ τέλειον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἔχον τὸ εἶναι. Τελεία δὲ καὶ ὁ Υἱός. Ὡστε εἴπερ ἦν δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ τε καὶ ὁμοφρεῖ Πνεύματι ὑπαρξίς, ἦν ἄρα καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος αἷτιος, καὶ οὐκ ἂν εὐσεβῶς εἶχεν ἡμῖν μόνον αἷτιον τὸν Πατέρα δοξάζειν.... Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Διὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲ δι' αὐτοῦ ἄρα. Καὶ ἔοικέ γε μήτ' ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῷ Παρακλητῷ, μήτε διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑπαρξίς εἶναι, ἔοικεν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου». Cf. also, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 249A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 251A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 236C.

5. Cf. J. VECOS, *Refutatio libri Gregorii Cyprii, Oratio 1.3*, PG. 141, 860BC: «Τί ξένον ἡμεῖς καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀλλότριον διεπραξάμεθα, τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ θεολογίᾳ ἰσοδύναμον τῆς ἐκ καὶ τῆς διὰ πάντη εὐρίσκοντες ἀναμφίβολου;». Cf. also, *Refutatio Photiani libri de Spiritu Sancti*, PG. 141, 828D.

6. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 250 A: «ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ ἡ ἐξ ἐκείνου, τὴν εἰς ἀίδιον ἐκλαμψιν, οὐ τὴν εἰς τὸ εἶναι καθαρῶς σημαίνειν βούλεται πρόοδον, τοῦ ἐκ Πατρὸς τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχοντος Πνεύματος».



τοῦ Υἱοῦ» he commits himself to a great blasphemy against the Spirit<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, while from Photius onwards the formula «δι' Υἱοῦ» was confined to the mission of the Holy Spirit in time, it is to Gregory's merit that he applies it also to the eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son. Gregory explains that many Fathers have taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds through the Son, but they apply this procession not to the Holy Spirit's causal mode of being but to His manifestation<sup>2</sup>. The Father alone remains the cause of the hypostatic existence of the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>.

This manifestation which Gregory describes with many similar terms such as ἐκφανσις, φανέρωσις, πρόεισις, ἐκλαμψις, refers not to the Holy Spirit's causal mode of being (τρόπος ὑπάρξεως) but to the manner according to which His being exists (ὑπάρχει). The «ἐκφανσις» is different from the «ὑπαρξις». The first applies to the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, the second to His very mode of being<sup>4</sup>.

In order to distinguish the procession as mode of existence of the Holy Spirit from His manifestation, Gregory the Cypriot makes an important distinction between the verbs «ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν» and «ὑπάρχειν»<sup>5</sup>. Thus, the Holy Spirit has His cause of existence in the Father alone, but He exists in the Son and rests in Him, shining forth and revealing Himself through or from the Son<sup>6</sup>. «Ὑπάρχει», Gregory argues, «ἐκ

1. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 250B; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 240D; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 241A.

2. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 258D: «Ἐἶπον μὲν οὖν κάκεῖνοι, παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐλλαφθέντες, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐκπορεύεσθαι μέντοι διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐπῆλθεν εἰπεῖν οὐδενί, ἀλλ' ἐκλάμπειν, φανεροῦσθαι, πεφηγνέναι, προϊέναι, γνωρίζεσθαι, τὰλλα ὅσα φανέρωσιν ἀπλῶς, εἴτουν ἐκφανσιν διὰ τὸν Υἱοῦ παρίστησιν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπαρξιν, ἣν μόνως ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔχειν ὁμολογεῖται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον».

3. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 250A.

4. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 265D-266AB: «Ἐκφανσις καὶ ὑπαρξις ὁνόματα μὲν δύο, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ὀνομάτων, ἐκ δὲ ρημάτων δυοῖν, τὸ μὲν τοῦ φαίνω τὸ δὲ τοῦ ὑπάρχω, γεγένηται... τὸ ἐκφαίνω, αὐτό γε προχειρῶς τὸ φανερῶ, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ ὑπάρχω σημαίνειν γινώσκεται... Τίμη λοιπὸν τέχνη τις κεχρημένος τὴν ἐκφανσιν ὡς ὑπαρξιν αἰ νοεῖν ἡμῖν ἐπιτάξει;». Cf. also, *Ibid.* PG. 142, 265C; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 264B.

5. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, 142, 275D-276A: «Μὴ δὴ αὖ λέγε, ὥς ἐπειδὴ ὑπάρχει, φησὶν, ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἔχει· οὐ γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπανταχοῦ καὶ αἰ σφύρουσι δύναμιν αἱ φωναί». J. VECCOS with enough irony considers this distinction of Gregory as absurd (*Refutatio libri Gregorii Cyprii, Oratio*, 1. 10, PG. 141, 880BC) but he seems to oversimplify the matter.

6. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 275C.



τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τὸ Πνεῦμα... ἀλλ' οὐ δι' αὐτὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν οὐσίωσιν, ἐκ μόνου γὰρ αὕτη τοῦ Πατρὸς»<sup>1</sup>.

This distinction between «ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν» and «ὑπάρχειν» makes plain that, according to Gregory, the Holy Spirit proceeds in His hypostatic being from the Father alone. Yet, in His manifestation in the «economy» the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and also from the Son<sup>2</sup>. The Holy Spirit having His very being from the Father, rests and abides in the Son, from Whom He shines forth and bestowed<sup>3</sup>.

The Holy Spirit, Gregory explains, exists eternally in the Son and is manifested through the Son. But this existence and manifestation must not be confused with the Holy Spirit's eternal causal mode of existence, which is due to the Father alone<sup>4</sup>. In order to illustrate this distinction, Gregory uses the well known analogies of the sun, its radiance and its light as well as of the spring, its river and its water<sup>5</sup>.

1. *Ibid.* Cf. also, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 265A: «Ὅθεν καὶ λεγόντων ἐκείνων, δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, λέγομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, δι' Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται. Νοούντων δὲ πάλιν ὑπαρξιν τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ πρόδοον εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐφανέρωσιν, ἐκλαμψιν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὕτω νοοῦμεν καὶ φρονοῦμεν ἡμεῖς καὶ οὐδὲν οὕτω φρονοῦντες, τῇ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως ῥῆσει, τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως σημαινούσῃ, λυμαινόμεθα. Τὸ τοίνυν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅπερ εἶπον αὐτοί, οὐκ ἂν εἴη τὸ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν σημαίνον». Cf. also the relevant remarks of J. Meyendorff: «La distinction qu'il fait entre ces deux termes équivaut à peu près à la distinction que l'on peut faire en français entre l'idée de cause et celle de 'raison d'être'».

Ainsi, la cause de l'Esprit serait l'Hypostase du Père, alors qu'il trouverait sa «raison d'être» dans le Fils. Cette «raison d'être», consisterait à manifester le Fils». («La Procession du Saint Esprit chez les Pères Orientaux», *Russie et Chrétienté*, 2, p. 177).

2. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 275C.

3. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 266CD: «Χορηγεῖται μὲν διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ δίδοται, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται, ὁπνηνίκα δηλονότι ἐπιτηδεύωσιν ἂν ἔχωσι δέξασθαι οἷς ἀποστέλλεται καὶ χορηγεῖται καὶ δίδοται· ἐκφαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐκλάμπει ἀδίδως, καὶ φανεροῦται». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 267AB.

4. This seems to refer to J. VECOS who by identifying the mode of being of the Holy Spirit to His manifestation argued that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son in the same way as He is manifested from the Father through the Son. (*Refutatio libri Gregorii Cyprii* 1.5, PG. 141, 872D; *Ibid.* 1. 9, PG. 141, 877D-880AB).

5. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 251AB: «καθ' ὃν δὴ τρόπον καὶ τὸ φῶς εἰρηται διὰ τῆς ἀκτίνος ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου, ἔχον μὲν πηγὴν καὶ αἰτίαν τοῦ εἶναι τὸν ἡλίον ὡς ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ φυσικὴν διὸν δ' ὅμως καὶ προϊὼν καὶ ἐκλάμπων διὰ τῆς ἀκτίνος, ἐξ ἧς οὐχ ὑπαρξιν τῷ φωτι, οὐδ' οὐσίωσιν· ἀλλ' ἥκει μὲν αὐτῆς, ὡς εἴρηται, ἔχει δὲ ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι δι' αὐτῆς ἢ ἐξ αὐτῆς οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμέσως ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου, ἐξ οὗ δὴ καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀκτίς, δι' ἧς περ τὸ φῶς φαίνεται προϊὼν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* PG. 142, 287BC; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 285AD.

Gregory argues that it is recognized that the very Paraclete shines and manifests itself eternally by the intermediary of the Son, as light shines from the sun by the intermediary of rays. But that does not mean that it comes into being through the Son or from the Son<sup>1</sup>. And again Gregory states: «Εἰ τοίνυν ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν τῷ ἀπαυγάσματι φωτὸς ὑπαρξίς, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος τὸ φῶς λέγει τις, οὐκ ἂν πάλιν ὡς ἐκεῖθεν ὑπαρξὶν λαμβάνον δικαίως λέγοι· εἰ μὴ τις τὸ ἐκεῖθεν ἐκλάμπειν (ἐπειδὴ σύγκρατόν ἐστι διόλου τῷ ἀπαυγάσματι) οὐσίωσιν καὶ ὑπαρξὶν νομίζοι, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθές. Μᾶλλον γὰρ φανέρωσις τοῦτο ἤπερ ὑπαρξίς. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὕδωρ, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὡς ἐξ αἰτίας τοῦ εἶναι οἶεται τις, καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς θαυμάζοιμ' ἂν ἐγώ»<sup>2</sup>.

This manifestation of the Holy Spirit through the Son, Gregory explains, refers to the eternal life of the Holy Trinity, but also to the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>. Yet, a clear distinction must be made between the Holy Spirit's mission and His mode of existence. The temporal mission is a common act of the three divine Persons resulting from their common will and energy. The mode of the Holy Spirit's existence, however, depends upon the Father's hypostasis<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, Veccos and his followers are erring because they transfer the idea of the Son's participation in the divine energies to the internal relations of the Holy Trinity and particularly to the mode of being of the divine Persons<sup>5</sup>.

Gregory distinguishes between the principle and cause of the Holy Trinity which is the Father alone, and the principle and cause of the creation which is the whole Holy Trinity<sup>6</sup>. These two principles must not be confused, because it would result in a confusion between the Holy Trinity and creation<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, Gregory continues, as far

1. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 240BC.

2. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 285AB.

3. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 267A; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 250C.

4. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 282D-283A: «Ὑπέρκειται γὰρ καὶ ἐνεργείας ἀπάσης καὶ βουλήσεως... ἡ ἐκ Πατρὸς... τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐκπόρευσις..... Ὡστε καὶ μάταιοι ἔμοιγ' οὖν οἱ τὴν πέμψιν καὶ δόσιν καὶ χορηγίαν, σαφῶς θελήματος ὄντα πληρώσεις, θελήματος δεύτερα, τρόπον τοῦ εἶναι τῷ Παρακλήτῳ ἐκ παραλλήλου τιθέμενοι... ὡς ἂν ἐντεῦθεν σκαιῶς τε καὶ ἀμαθῶς ἐκεῖθεν ὑπαρξὶν τῷ Πνεύματι νεύωσιν, ὅθεν ἐκχεῖσθαι καὶ χορηγεῖσθαι καὶ πέμπεσθαι λέγεται».

5. *Ibid.* PG. 142, 283A.

6. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 281CD; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 294BCD; *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 242BC.

7. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 281C; *Ibid.* PG. 142, 281D-282A.

as the creation of the world is concerned, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, on the ground of their common nature, will, power and energy, create in common as one principle and one cause the created order<sup>1</sup>. This common energy is a property of the divine nature and does not confound the hypostatic properties. However, with regard to the mode of being of the Holy Spirit, the unique principle and cause is the Father in His hypostatic property. Any participation of the Son in the mode of being of the Holy Spirit implies that either this procession is imperfect or that the two Persons are confounded into one because the property of proceeding the Holy Spirit is a hypostatic property of the Father<sup>2</sup>.

It is obvious that Gregory considers the question of the Holy Spirit's hypostatic procession from the Father and His manifestation from the Father through the Son, from the point of view of the distinction between the divine essence and the eternal uncreated energies of God. Of course, Photius, following other Fathers, has accepted this distinction between the essence and the energies of God, but he has restricted these energies to the gifts of the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>. Photius, by opposing the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father to the Spirit's temporal mission from the Son, has accepted the procession of the Holy Spirit through the Son as a consequence of the Incarnation<sup>4</sup>. Gregory the Cypriot, however, accepts this «ἐκφανσις» of the Holy Spirit through the Son as an eternal act<sup>5</sup>. Gregory continues that it is His eternal manifestation as an energy, coming out from the Father and through the Son, that the previous Fathers had in their mind when they said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father «διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ» or «διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου» or that the Holy Spirit is «ἐξ ἀφοῦν, or He is «ἕδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ»<sup>6</sup>.

1. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 294D-295A: «ἄλλην σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πανάγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀρχὴ μία καὶ αἰτία τῆς τῶν ὄντων παραγωγῆς καὶ συστάσεως. Ὅτι ὥσπερ οὐ μεμέρισται τῇ φύσει τὰ τρία, οὔτε τῇ δυνάμει, οὔτε τῇ βουλήσει, οὔτε μὴ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ μεμέρισται. Κάνταῦθα ἐν ὄντα τὰ τρία καὶ λεγόμενα αἰτίων, εὐσεβῶς καὶ νοηθήσεται καὶ βηθήσεται, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἐν οὐχὶ συγχέει τὰ πρόσωπα. Ἐκεῖ δὲ εἰ συμπαραλήψεται ὁ λόγος τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν αἰτίων ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσει οὐ λέγω ὅπως ἀτελεῖ τὴν ἐκ Πατρὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος δηλώσειν ὑπαρξιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς αἰτίας. Λέγω δ' ὅτι καὶ εἰς ἐν συνέλοι τὰ δύο».

2. *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 271A-272D.

3. *Amphilochia, quaestio* 75, PG. 101, 465.

4. J. MEYENDORFF, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, pp. 13, 229.

5. *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 267B.

6. Gregory obviously has in the back of his mind Fathers such as Gregory

Gregory's contribution to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's procession is remarkable. In underlining this, J. Meyendorff is right in writing: «Instead of simply repeating Photius' formulas about the 'eternal procession' of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and the 'emission in time' by the Son, Gregory recognized the need to express the permanent relationship existing between the Son and the Holy Spirit as divine hypostases and he spoke of an 'eternal manifestation' of the Spirit by the Son»<sup>1</sup>. Gregory's doctrine was taken and developed by his namesake, Gregory of Palamas, to whom we must now turn our attention.

*(To be continued)*

---

of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria, John of Damascus, Maximus the Confessor etc.

1. J. MEYENDORFF, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, p. 13. Cf. also, O. CLÉMENT, *Op. cit.* p. 452ff.