

THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT  
ACCORDING TO CERTAIN GREEK FATHERS

By  
MARKOS A. ORPHANOS

ABBREVIATIONS

- AG = *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum concilii Florentini necnon Descriptionis cuiusdam eiusdem*, ed. by J. GILL, Rome, 1953.
- BOO = *Basilii Caesareae Cappadociae, opera omnia quae extant*, ed. by J. GARNIER, Paris, 1834.
- ΣΓΠ = *Συγγράμματα Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, ἐκδίδονται ἐπιμελείᾳ ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΟΥ ΧΡΗΣΤΟΥ*, Thessaloniki, 1962-1970.
- DTC = *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, ed. by A. VACANT - E. MANGENOT, Paris, 1909 ff.
- GCS = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig, 1897 ff.
- GNO = *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, ed. by W. JAEGER, Leiden, 1960 ff.
- MANSI = J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence, 1759 ff.
- PG = J. P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, Paris, 1857-1846.
- PL = J.P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, Paris, 1844-1864.
- PO = *Patrologia Orientalis*, ed. by R. GRAFFIN - F. NAU, Paris, 1903 ff.
- SC = *Sources Chrétiennes*, ed. by H. de LUBAC - J. DANIELÉ-LOU, Paris, 1941 ff.

## INTRODUCTION

This is a revised and augmented version of a study written for the «Faith and Order» Commission of the World Council of Churches, and partly read at a «Filioque Meeting» held at Klingental near Strassburg from 23rd till 27th of October 1978.

In writing this study I was asked: a) to treat the subject from the historical point of view and b) to give a brief and concise account of the Eastern Patristic tradition on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

On this ground my method has been deliberately and necessarily selective. I have restricted myself — according to my judgment—to the most representative Fathers, although I am aware that many other Fathers as well, have dealt with the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit<sup>1</sup>. I start with Origen because I think he was the first to be involved

---

1. On Greek Fathers' doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit see: H. B. SWETE, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne*, Cambridge 1876. A. KRANICH, *Der hl. Basilius in seiner Stellung zum Filioque*, Braunsberg 1882. A. PALMIERI, «Esprit Saint II. La Procession du Saint-Esprit du Père et du Fils», *DTC* 5,1, (1913) col. 762-869. L. LOHN, «Doctrina sancti Basilii Magni de processionibus divinarum personarum», *Gregorianum* 10 (1927) pp. 324-364; 461-500. M. JUGIE, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, Rome 1936. S. BOULGAKOV, *Le Paraclet*, Traduit du russe par Constantin Andronikof, Paris 1946. G. GUILIANI, *Divinità e processione dello Spirito Santo in S. Athanasio*, Rome 1950. J. MEYENDORFF, «La Procession du Saint Esprit chez les Pères orientaux», *Russie et Chrétienté* 2 (1950) pp. 158-178. V. RODZIANKO, «'Filioque' in Patristic Thought», *Studia Patristica* 2, Berlin 1957, pp. 295-308. E. STAIMER, *Die Schrift «De Spiritu Sancto» von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien. Ein Untersuchung zur altchristlichen Literatur und Dogmengeschichte*, Munich 1960. V. LOSSKY, «La Procession du Saint Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe» in *A l' Image et à la Ressemblance de Dieu*, Paris 1967. P. EVDOKIMOV, *L' Esprit Saint dans la tradition Orthodoxe*, Paris 1969. A. RADOVIC, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἄγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶν*, Thessaloniki 1963, pp. 143-176. A. THEODOROU, *Ἡ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου*, Athens 1974. M. ORPHANOS, *Ἡ ἐκπόρευσις τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν Φώτιον*, Athens 1979.

in a discussion about the derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Father, in which the Son also somehow participates. I go on with Gregory of Neocaesarea, Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyrus, Maximus the Confessor, Ps. Dionysius the Areopagite, John of Damascus, Photius, Gregory the Cypriot and Gregory Palamas. These Fathers represent different traditions and their views have a bearing on the issue of the Holy Spirit's procession. I finish with Mark of Ephesus, because he has summarised the whole discussion on the procession of the Holy Spirit in Eastern Patristic theology. After him the Orthodox theologians dealing with the subject more or less repeat and expound the traditional arguments.

During the discussion of this paper at the «Filioque Meeting», I was asked to extend it and also to provide some original material. I have done this in publishing this study. I have revised and extended the text and supplemented it with extensive footnotes which indicate the sources and the texts themselves on which my statements are based and sometimes some additional discussion is developed in them.

I have discussed the subject basing myself on the sources themselves, avoiding involvement in the endless discussion of the secondary literature. Nevertheless, I give some reference to it in the footnotes. The reiteration of certain ideas became inevitable because many Fathers share the same views and make the same points. I discuss somewhat at length the ideas of the Byzantine Fathers, because they deal extensively with the subject and provide more material than the earlier Fathers.

This study makes no claim to present a complete picture of the thought of the Fathers with whom it deals on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Its modest purpose is to trace the development and underline the main features of the subject, as much as the limitation of a study of this kind allows.

At the end a selective bibliography is cited. This will help the interested readers to find more about this subject.

## 1. ORIGEN

Origen, teaching that the Father eternally begets the Son<sup>1</sup>, just as the light continuously sends out its radiance, extends the same analogy to the Holy Spirit and argues that the Holy Spirit eternally comes forth from the Father<sup>2</sup>.

This eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father determines the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father, Who, being Himself the source of His own existence, also becomes the cause of being of the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>.

Yet Origen, referring to the existing relation between the Holy Spirit and the Son, accepts a certain dependence of the Holy Spirit's mode of being upon the hypostasis of the Son. Thus, commenting upon John 1,2 Origen remarks that the Holy Spirit is subject to a certain «γένεσις» through the Son, who is previous to Him. «Ἀναγκαῖον» - says Origen — παραδέξασθαι ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγένετο, πρεσβυτέρου παρ' αὐτὸ τοῦ Λόγου τυγχάνοντος<sup>4</sup>. Any rejection, Origen goes on to say, of the Holy Spirit's «γένεσις» through the Son, would lead to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit is «ἀγέννητον»<sup>5</sup>. But

1. *In Jeremiam homilia IX, 4*, KLOSTERMANN, GCS, 3, p. 70, 13-25. *De Principiis 1.2.3.*, KOETSCHAU, GCS, 5, p. 31,1-4.

2. *Fragmenta in Genesim ap. Eusebium contra Marcellum 1.4*, KLOSTERMANN, *Eusebii Werke*, GCS, 4, p. 22,18: «τὸ αὐτὸ μέντοιγε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λεκτέον».

3. *De Principiis 2.1*, KOETSCHAU, GCS, 5, p. 111,28-31: «utrum sicut unigenitum filium generat pater et sanctum spiritum profert, non quasi qui ante non erat, sed quia origo et fons filii vel spiritus sancti pater est, et nihil in his anteriorius posterioriusve intellegi potest». Cf. also, *Ibid. 1.2.13*, KOETSCHAU, GCS 5, p. 48,1-5: «principalis bonitas in deo patre sentienda est, ex quo vel filius natus vel spiritus sanctus procedens sine dubio bonitatis eius naturam in se refert, quae est in eo fonte, de quo vel natus est filius vel procedit spiritus sanctus». Origen makes the same point in his Commentary on Numbers. See *Homilia in Numeros 18,4*, BAEHRENS, GCS, 7, pp. 174ff.

4. *Commentarium in Joannem 2, 9-10*, PREUSCHEN, GCS, 4, p. 65,2-3.

5. *Ibid.* p. 65,4-5: «τῷ δὲ μὴ βουλομένῳ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ἔπεται τὸ ἀγέννητον αὐτὸ λέγειν».

this is not possible, because the Father alone, is «ἀγέννητος»<sup>1</sup>. Also the denial of a certain «γένεσις» of the Holy Spirit through the Son, could deprive the Holy Spirit of His own hypostatic individuality<sup>2</sup>.

Because the Bible clearly teaches that God is triune and the Father «unbegotten», Origen argues that the Holy Spirit must be considered among those who have received their being from the Father through the Son. Origen's argument runs thus: «As for us, persuaded as we are that there are three hypostases, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and believing that nothing is ungenerated but the Father, we admit as a more pious and truer belief, that all things were made through the Logos and that the Holy Spirit is the most excellent and the first in order of all that was made by the Father through the Son»<sup>3</sup>.

This participation of the Son refers to the Spirit's existential origin and the Son's bestowal upon the Spirit of certain of His own properties as well, i.e. wisdom, intelligence, righteousness etc.<sup>4</sup> In the same way, Origen goes on to say that the «charismata», which the Holy Spirit grants to those men who are worthy, come from the Father, through the Son in the Holy Spirit<sup>5</sup>.

Of course, Origen does not state clearly how he understands this «γένεσις» of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son. Two points, though, are beyond question: that a) the Holy Spirit is subordinated to the Son<sup>6</sup>, and b) the Son participates in the Spirit's mode

1. *Ibid.* p. 65,17-18: «ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες».

2. *Ibid.* p. 65,6-10: «τόν τε διὰ τοῦ λόγου παραδεχόμενον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον γεγενῆσθαι καὶ τὸν ἀγέννητον αὐτὸν εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντα, δογματίζειν μηδὲ οὐσίαν τινὰ ἰδίαν ὑφ' ἑστέρας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἑτέρας παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν».

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.* p. 65,21-27: «καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ μονογενοῦς φύσει υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρῆζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν καὶ λογικὸν καὶ δίκαιον καὶ πᾶν ἔπιποτοῦν χρῆ αὐτὸ νοεῖν τυγχάνειν κατὰ μετοχὴν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῶν χριστοῦ ἐπινοιών». Origen, discussing again in his Commentary on Romans the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, argues that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and also of the Son because according to John 15, 26 and 14,16 He 'proceeds' from the Father and 'receives' from the Son. Cf. *Commentarium in Epistola ad Romanos* 6. 12, PG. 14, 1098.

5. *Commentarium in Joannem* 2. 10, PREUSCHEN, GCS, 4, p. 65,29-31: «τῆς εἰρημένης ὕλης τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐνεργουμένης μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, διακονουμένης δὲ ἀπὸ χριστοῦ, ὑφ' ἐστῶσης δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα».

6. On Origen's tendency towards subordinationism, see *De principiis* 1,3.5.

of being. It has been suggested that, according to the above quoted statements, Origen held the idea that the Holy Spirit was created through the Son<sup>1</sup>. But, bearing in mind that Origen rejects the idea that the Holy Spirit is a creature<sup>2</sup> and also that he accepts the procession of the Holy Spirit as an eternal act of the Father<sup>3</sup>, we must rule out this opinion.

Rather we have to accept that when Origen speaks about this «γένεσις» of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son, he had in the back of his mind the Holy Spirit's procession<sup>4</sup>. This procession, however, has to be understood as the derivation of the Spirit's being from the Father, as the unbegotten source, through the Son, Who participates in it.

This, of course, is the doctrine of Filioque. Therefore, the accusations against Origen that he teaches the double procession of the Holy Spirit are not without foundation<sup>5</sup>.

---

KOETSCHAU, GCS, 5, p. 55,4-56,9. Nevertheless his subordinationism has been both affirmed and denied. While Jerome, Epiphanius, Justinian etc., have accused him, Gregory of Neocaesarea and Athanasius have acquitted him. For a brief discussion and the relevant bibliography, see J. QUASTEN, *Patrology*, vol. 2, Utrecht-Antwerp, 1953, pp. 76-79.

1. Cf. H. B. SWETE, *On the History of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne*, p. 64.

2. Epiphanius' accusation (*Panarion haer.* 64.5, HOLL, GCS, 2, p. 415,5) that Origen has taught that the Holy Spirit is a creature cannot be proved. On the contrary, Origen seems to reject this idea by stating that according to the Scriptures the Holy Spirit is not «factura.... vel creatura» (*De Principiis* 1.33, KOETSCHAU, GCS, 5, p. 51,11). On this ground the similar charge of Justinian (*Ep. ad Mennam*, MANSI, 9, 489) against Origen, hardly can be justified.

3. *De Principiis* 2.1.2., KOETSCHAU, GCS 5, pp. 111-112.

4. H. B. Swete (*Op. cit.* pp. 64-65) is right in pointing out that «it is fair to suppose that... by the γένεσις of the Spirit he (i.e. Origen) means no more than His ἐκπόρευσις, the derivation of His essence from an ἀγέννητος ἀρχή».

5. On this agree both Western and Eastern scholars. A. PALMIERI (*Op. cit.* col. 774) writes: «Origène est le premier parmi les écrivains ecclésiastiques grecs qui, avec une suffisante clarté énonce la procession divine du Saint Esprit du Fils». The same opinion share among others M. JUGIE, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, pp. 99-101. P. TREBELAS, *Δογματική τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, vol. 1, Athens, 1959, p. 286. For more references cf. S. BILALIS, *Ἡ αἵρεσις τοῦ Filioque, ιστορική καὶ κριτική θεώρησις τοῦ Filioque*, vol. 1, Athens, 1972, pp. 99-103. Nevertheless, for an attempt to acquit Origen of this notion, cf. A. ZOERNIKAV, *Περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς, μετὰ φρασὶς Εὐγενίου Βουλγάρεως*, vol. I, Petrograd, 1779, pp. 10-12.

## 2. GREGORY OF NEOCAESAREA

Gregory of Neocaesarea, a student and admirer of Origen, does not share his master's viewpoint on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Gregory makes a clear distinction between the Holy Spirit's essential derivation from the Father and His manifestation through the Son. Thus, according to Gregory of Neocaesarea, the Holy Spirit is considered as having His subsistence from God and being made manifest by the Son in order to wit to men<sup>1</sup>. Probably the sentence 'to wit to men' is an interpolation made in order to underline the Holy Spirit's temporal mission<sup>2</sup>.

Nevertheless, and without these words, the mode of being of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His manifestation through the Son is clearly distinguished and considered as eternal, because the Holy Spirit, Gregory goes on to say, is the Image of the Son, and neither was the Son ever wanting of the Father, nor the Spirit of the Son<sup>3</sup>. Obviously, this distinction between the mode of being of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His eternal manifestation through the Son, rules out the

1. *Expositio fidei*, PG. 10, 985A: «ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον καὶ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ περὴνός δηλαδὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις».

2. Already M. LE QUIEN in his «Dissertationes Damascenicae» 1,3, in, *Sancta patris nostri Joannis Damascenus opera que extant*, Paris 1712, vol. I, p. 54, has questioned its authenticity and his doubt was shared by H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

For a general discussion on the authenticity of Gregory's work, *The Creed of Exposition of Faith*, see: C. P. CASPARI, *Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel*, Christiana 1879, pp. 25-64; C. M. FOUSKAS, *Γρηγόριος ὁ Νεοκαισαρείας ἐπίσκοπος ὁ θαυματουργός*, Athens 1969, pp. 162-3.

3. *Expositio fidei*, PG. 10, 985A: «Εἰκὼν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τελείου τελεία ..... οὔτε οὖν ἐνέλιπέ ποτε Υἱὸς Πατρί, οὔτε Υἱὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα». In a treatise entitled, 'Ἡ κατὰ μέρους πίστις, and attributed to Gregory of Neocaesarea, the eternal manifestation of the Holy Spirit through the Son and His essential derivation from the Father is clearly stated. On account of the consubstantiality of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, it is said, the Holy Spirit comes forth from the essence of the Father and He is revealed through the Son (*Fidei Expositio*, PG. 10, 1103-1124). Although Byzantine Fathers, such as Gregory the Cypriot, Gregory Palamas, Mark of Ephesus and others, quote it as a work of Gregory of Neocaesarea, it does not belong to him. Photius had already indicated this (*Bibliotheca*, cod. CCXXX, PG. 103, 1040B), and modern scholarship has so established. See on this topic, A. MAI, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 7, Rome, 1881, pp. 170-178. H. LIETZMANN, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, Tübingen, 1904, pp. 129-133. G. BARDY, «Gregoire de Neocaesaree», *DTC*, 6, (1920), col. 1846. C. FOUSKAS, *Op. cit.*, pp. 200-201;

possibility of Filioque. This is the reason why the Byzantine authors, opposing the doctrine of Filioque, quote Gregory's statements again and again<sup>1</sup>.

### 3. ATHANASIUS

Likewise, Athanasius<sup>2</sup> does not discuss extensively the existing relations between the Persons of the Holy Trinity, as his targets are the Divinity of the Logos, His Incarnation and, through His Incarnation, the redemption of man. Nevertheless, his emphasis upon the Monarchia of the Father certainly implies that he considers the Father as the unique principle and source of the causal being of the Son and the Holy Spirit. The existence of another principle, within the Holy Trinity, apart from the Father, would introduce more principles and more Fathers, and thus divert Christianity to the gnosticism of Marcion or to Manichaeism. Therefore, Athanasius points out: «οὐ γὰρ τρεῖς ἀρχαὶ ἢ τρεῖς Πατέρας εἰσάγομεν, ὡς οἱ περὶ Μαρκίωνα καὶ Μανιχαίων»<sup>3</sup>.

Athanasius illustrates the essential derivation of the Son and the Holy Spirit from the Father by the well-known analogies of the sun, its radiance and its light, and the source, its river and its water<sup>4</sup>.

On this ground, Athanasius argues that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father but lies eternally in the Son. The Holy Spirit is related both to the Father and to the Son because as the Son is proper to the essence of the Father because He is of the Father, so also the Holy

1. See GREGORY THE CYPRIOT, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 259D-260A. *Ibid* 267A; GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικός* 2. 57; BOBRINSKY, ΣΠΠ, 1, p. 130,17-19; MARK OF EPHESUS, *Testimonia collecta, quibus probatur ut ait Spiritum Sanctum a Patre procedere*, PETIT, PO. 15, p. 366.

2. On Athanasius' doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit, cf. the following recent studies, G. GUILIANI, *Divinità e processione dello Spirito Santo in S. Athanasio*, Rome, 1950; C.R.B. SHAPLAND, *The Letters of St. Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit*, New York, 1951; A. LAMINSKI, *Der Heilige Geist as Geist Christi und Geist der Glaubigen*, Leipzig 1969; T. C. CAMPBELL, «The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius», *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 27 (1974) pp. 408-440.

3. *Oratio contra Arianos* 3. 15, PG. 26, 352C-353A.

4. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 19, PG. 26, 573B-576A. Both analogies are common among the Fathers: For a discussion on this issue and patristic references to these images, cf: F. J. DOELGER, «Sonne und Sonnenstrahl als Gleichnis in der Logos-theologie des christlichen Altertums», *Antike und Christentum* I (1929) pp. 271-290.



Spirit is proper to the essence of the Son, because the Holy Spirit is said to be from God<sup>1</sup>.

The Holy Spirit, deriving His existence from the common source, i.e. the Father, is the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father<sup>2</sup>.

With reference to the «economy» of creation and salvation, Athanasius explains that the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father, shines forth and is sent and given by the Son<sup>3</sup>. This mission of the Holy Spirit by the Son is not restricted to the time after the Incarnation, but is extended before it. The divine Logos, always possessing the Holy Spirit as His own, has sent Him forth<sup>4</sup>. And it is precisely this faculty of the Son in sending forth the Holy Spirit eternally and in time that proves His divinity<sup>5</sup>.

On this ground the Holy Spirit is said to be the instrument of the Son in the divine economy of creation and sanctification, and to this extent the Holy Spirit is considered as being given and sent by (παρά) the Son as the vital activity and the gift by Whom the Word sanctifies and enlightens<sup>6</sup>. But this «sending» and «mission» of the Holy Spirit by the Son must not be confused with His hypostatic derivation from the Father:

The Son as God-man on the one hand sends and on the other receives the Holy Spirit<sup>7</sup>. On this account the Holy Spirit receives His mission from the Son because everything that the Holy Spirit has comes forth from the Son. But according to His human nature also, the Son receives the Holy Spirit because it is receptive of it.

With reference to the infusion of the Holy Spirit by Christ to

1. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 25, PG. 26, 588C-589A: «Εἰ δὲ ὁ Υἱός, ἐπεὶ δὴ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐστίν, ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ λεγόμενον, ἴδιον εἶναι κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ Υἱοῦ».

2. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 20, PG. 26, 577B.

3. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 20, PG. 26, 580A: «Ἐνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τοῦ ζῶντος Λόγου, μίαν εἶναι δεῖ τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τὴν ἀγιαστικὴν καὶ φωτιστικὴν ζῶσαν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ δωρεάν, ἥτις ἐκ Πατρὸς λέγεται ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ ἐκ Πατρὸς ὁμολογουμένου ἐκλάμπει, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται καὶ δίδεται».

4. *Oratio contra Arianos* 1. 48, PG. 26, 112B.

5. *Oratio contra Arianos* 2. 18, PG. 26, 184B.

6. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 25, PG. 26, 589B; *Ep. ad Serapionem* III, 5, PG. 26, 632BC.

7. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 20, PG. 26, 580A; *Ep. ad Serapionem* IV, 3, PG. 26, 641BC; *Oratio contra Arianos* 3. 24, PG. 26, 373B.

the disciples, Athanasius makes clear that the Holy Spirit, proceeding eternally from the Father, was given to the disciples by the Son<sup>1</sup>. This also applies to the mission of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification and deification of man<sup>2</sup>.

On the account given we are permitted to maintain that, according to Athanasius, this «shining forth», «sending», «mission» of the Holy Spirit *by or through* the Son is not related to His mode of being but to His energies which are common to the three divine Persons of the Holy Trinity<sup>3</sup>.

The Father is considered by Athanasius as the source not only of the being but also of the activities of the Godhead. The Father creates and renews all things, through the Word, in the Holy Spirit<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Son. And those things that are given from the Son in the Spirit are gifts of the Father<sup>5</sup>. And when the Spirit is in us, the Word also, Who gives the Spirit, is in us, and in the Word is the Father<sup>6</sup>. On this ground Athanasius argues that Divine Grace, being one, is granted from the Father and, passed through the Son, is fulfilled in the Holy Spirit<sup>7</sup>.

That Athanasius is hesitant to accept an essential derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Son is also clear from the fact that he mainly confines the use of the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι and of the preposition ἐκ to the essential derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Father, while for the Holy Spirit's mission he uses the preposition παρά<sup>8</sup> or διά. Thus,

1. *Ep. ad Serapionem* IV. 3, PG. 26, 641B: «Ἀμέλει τοῦ Πατρὸς πέμποντος τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὃ Υἱὸς ἐμφυσῶν δίδωσιν αὐτὸ τοῖς μαθηταῖς».

2. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 30, PG. 26, 660C; *Ibid.* I. 20, PG. 26, 577C.

3. *Ep. ad Serapionem*, I. 30, PG. 26, 660B: «Ἄ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκαστῷ διαιρεῖ, ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου χορηγεῖται. Πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστὶ· διὸ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι διδόμενα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐστὶ χάρισματα».

4. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 28, PG. 26, 596A.

5. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 30, PG. 26, 600B.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 30, PG. 26, 600C: «Ἡ γὰρ διδομένη χάρις καὶ δωρεὰ ἐν τριάδι διδοταὶ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι ἀγίῳ».

8. See the relevant remarks of H. B. SWETE: «to preserve the μοναρχία S. Athanasius carefully avoids the use of ἐκ and ἐκπορεύεσθαι». *Op. cit.* p. 92. C. SHAPLAND, follows suit by saying, «nor does Athanasius use ἐκπορεύεσθαι in any sense whatever of the Son». *Op. cit.* p. 64 note 13. With reference to the prepositions παρὰ and ἐκ, Shapland points out: «The preposition παρὰ is generally preferred here».

despite certain ambiguities<sup>1</sup> and the fact that Athanasius does not develop the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the idea of a double procession of the Holy Spirit cannot be squared with Athanasius' Trinitarian theology<sup>2</sup>.

#### 4. THE CAPPADOCIANS

The Cappadocian Fathers approach the mystery of the Holy Trinity and the existing internal relations between the divine Persons from a different angle. They do not confine themselves to biblical evidence but, while they start their explanation from it, they try with some philosophical terminology to understand — as far as it possible to man — this great mystery of the Holy Trinity<sup>3</sup>. The main points of Cappadocian theology regarding the relations of the divine Persons are: a) there is a distinction made between *ousia* and *hypostasis* which is

---

Athanasius also says, from John 16,14, that the Spirit receives ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. A close examination of the passages in which these and analogous expression occur suggests that in using them, he thinks, primarily, if not exclusively, in terms of the Spirit's mission in the world». *Op. cit.* p. 41. T. C. CAMPBELL, also makes the same point. *Op. cit.* p. 436.

1. See on this point, T. C. CAMPBELL, «The doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the theology of Athanasius», pp. 434 ff.

2. On this issue there is disagreement among the various scholars. MONT-FAUCON, in his prolegomena to the 25th volume of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, has already argued that Athanasius teaches the double procession of the Holy Spirit, (PG. 25, p. XXIX). The same opinion share among others H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* p. 92; TIXERONT, *History of Dogmas*, vol. 2, St. Louis, 1914, p. 74; M. JUGIE, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, p. 135. On the contrary MACINTYRE, *Op. cit.* p. 371, finds the idea of *Filioque* foreign to Athanasius' thought and to this agree, A. LAMINSKI, *Op. cit.* pp. 153-155, 181. J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* 3, p. 77, admits that Athanasius «nowhere states explicitly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son», but he thinks that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son or from the Father through the Son is a necessary corollary of Athanasius' whole argument. C. SHAPLAND, thinks that Athanasius' purpose was not more than to «establish that the Spirit derives His existence from the Father as truly as the Son, and that he stands in as close and unitive relation to the Son as the Son to the Father». *Op. cit.* pp. 41-42. T. CAMPBELL, in agreement with Shapland, says that Athanasius was not involved in the question and he was content «to leave the final correlation and adjustment of this problem to others». *Op. cit.* p. 438.

3. For an assesment of the Cappadocians' contribution to this issue see, G. L. PRESTIGE, *God in Patristic Thought*, London 1952, pp. 233, 242-245.

analogous to the existing relation between common and particular<sup>1</sup>; b) the Father is related to the Son and the Holy Spirit as the cause (αίτιον) to those who are caused (αἰτιατά)<sup>2</sup>; c) the Father alone is the source and principle of the existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>.

The distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis*, corresponding to the difference between common and particular, implies that the common properties of the nature do not apply to the hypostasis, and the distinctive properties of each of the hypostases do not belong to the common divine nature or to the other Persons<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the Father, on account of His hypostatic property, deriving His being, from Himself brings forth the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Son comes forth by generation and His hypostatic property is to be begotten, and the Holy

1. BASIL, *Ep.* 236, 6, COURTONNE, 3, p. 53; *Ep.* 214, 4, COURTONNE, 2, p. 205: «ὁν ἔχει λόγον τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον, τοῦτον ἔχει ἡ οὐσία πρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν..... ὁ μὲν τῆς οὐσίας λόγος κοινός..... ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις ἐν τῷ ἰδιώματι τῆς πατρότητος ἢ τῆς υἰότητος ἢ τῆς ἀγιαστικῆς δυνάμεως θεωρεῖται»; *Adversus Eunomium* 2, 28, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 265BC. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 21, *In laudem Athanasii* 35, PG. 35, 1124; *Oratio* 39, *In Sancta Lumina* 14, PG. 36, 345. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *De oratione dominica* 3, PG. 44, 1160BC.

2. BASIL, *Hom. de Fide*, 2, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 131E-132A; *Adversus Eunomium* 1, footnote 5, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 236CB; *Adversus Eunomium* 2, 26, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 262D-263A. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 20; *De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum* 7, PG. 35, 1073A; *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 14, PG. 36, 148-149. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 25, 4-8: «ἐν γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ αὐτό, τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐξ οὐπερ ὁ υἱὸς γεννᾶται καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται διὰ δὴ καὶ κυρίως τὸν ἕνα αἰτιον μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ αἰτιατῶν ἕνα θεὸν φάμεν τεθαρηγκότως»; *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 56, 1-5; *Adversus Macedonianos*, *De Spiritu Sancto*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 93, 4-6; *De oratione dominica*, in W. JAEGER'S, *Gregory von Nyssa's Lehre vom hl. Geist*, p. 133.

3. BASIL, *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 4, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 193DE: «Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ, τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνευθεός, ῥίζα καὶ πηγή τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος»; *Hom. de Fide* 2, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 131E; *Adversus Eunomium* 2, 33-34, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 270DE. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 20, *De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum* 7, PG. 35, 1073A; *Oratio* 2, *Apologetica*, 38, PG. 35, 445B; *Oratio* 25, *In laudem Heronis philosophi* 45; PG. 35, 1220BC; *Oratio* 34, *In Aegyptiorum adventum* 10, PG. 36, 252A. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Contra Eunomium* 3, 2, JAEGER, GNO, 2, p. 57, 17-21: «ἀλλ' ἀντὶ μὲν πατρὸς ἀρχὴν ὀνομάζει».

4. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 39, *In Sancta Lumina*, 12, PG. 36, 348C: «Ἡ γὰρ ἰδιότης ἀλλήτης. Ἡ πῶς ἂν ἰδιότης μένοι, κινούμενη καὶ μετακλιπτούσα»; GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Contra Eunomium* 1, 278, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 107-108; *De oratione dominica*, 3, PG. 44, 1160C.

Spirit comes forth by procession which is His own distinctive property<sup>1</sup>. Because these individual properties are not interchangeable or confused, the Father is the sole cause of being of the Son and of the Holy Spirit<sup>2</sup>. If one of those who have been caused by the Father becomes another cause apart from the Father, then Christianity is diverted to polytheism<sup>3</sup>.

### 5. BASIL OF CAESAREA

Basil, following these principles, teaches that the Father, deriving His being from Himself and having no cause of His own Existence, brings forth the Son and the Holy Ghost by conferring upon them His nature. The Son comes forth by generation and the Holy Spirit by procession<sup>4</sup>. Both generation and procession have to be understood not as temporal but as eternal and incomprehensible divine acts in accordance with God's eternity<sup>5</sup>.

Basil, in order to illustrate the procession of the Holy Spirit<sup>6</sup>

1. BASIL, *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 7, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 196CD. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 39, *In sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 348B. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 25,10-15.

2. BASIL, *Ep.* 125,3, COURTONNE 2, p. 34,28-74: «οὔτε ἀγέννητον λέγομεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἕνα γὰρ οἶδαμεν ἀγέννητον καὶ μίαν τῶν ὄντων ἀρχήν, τὸν Πατέρα ..... οὔτε γεννητὸν, ἕνα γὰρ Μονόγενῆ ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τῆς πίστεως δεδιδαγμεθα· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ..... ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι ... ὁμολογοῦμεν».

3. BASIL, *Adversus Eunomium* 2,33, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 271A. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 7, PG. 36, 140D-141A; GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3,1, pp. 19-33.

4. *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 7, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 196CD.

5. *Adversus Eunomium* 2,17, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 247BC; *De Spiritu Sancto* 16, 38, JOHNSTON, p. 80,10-14.

6. For Basil's teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit see: A. KRANICH, *Der hl. Basilius in seiner Stellung zum Filioque*, Braunsberg 1882; F. NAGER, *Die Trinitätslehre des heiligen Basilius des Grossen*, Paderborn 1912; L. LOHN, «Doctrina S. Basilii Magni de processionibus divinarum personarum», *Gregorianum*, 10 (1929) pp. 329-364; 461-500; M. JUGIE, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, pp. 147-154; B. CAPELLE, «La procession du Saint Esprit d'après la liturgie de Saint Basile», *L' Orient Syrien*, (1962) pp. 67-77; B. PRUCHE, *Basile de Césarée. Sur le Saint Esprit*. Introduction, texte, traduction et notes, SC, 17 bis, Paris 1968. pp. 205-212. These studies ne-

from the Father, uses the analogy of a breath, and argues that the Holy Spirit is the breath of the Father eternally proceeding from Him<sup>1</sup>. In order to exclude any idea of time in the Spirit's procession, Basil remarks that the Spirit is not a vapour emitted by the organs of respiration, but an eternal act of the Father from Whom the Spirit of truth proceeds<sup>2</sup>.

Against Eunomius, who maintained that the Son was the cause of being of the Holy Spirit<sup>3</sup>, Basil argues that this idea introduces into the Trinity a second cause<sup>4</sup>. Basil, replying against the Pneumatomachians, who accepted the Holy Spirit as a creature made by the Father using as instrument the Son<sup>5</sup>, says that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and we confess Him to be without creation<sup>6</sup>.

As far as the Spirit's relation to the Son is concerned, Basil agrees with Athanasius<sup>7</sup> that this relation is similar to the relation which the Son bears to the Father<sup>8</sup>, and as the Son is the Image of the

cessitate a cautious reading because they are written not with due objectivity towards the Greek Patristic tradition. Capelle's essay on the other hand is based on a work the authenticity of which is highly disputed.

1. *Hom. in Psalmos* 32,4, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 135E-136A: «οὐτω τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (τούτέστιν, ὃ ἐκ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἵνα μὴ τῶν ἔξωθεν.... καὶ τῶν κτισμάτων αὐτὸ κρίνης, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν δοξάζης)». Cf also, *De Spiritu Sancto* 16,38, JOHNSTON, p. 80, 104-15.

2. *De Spiritu Sancto* 16,38, JOHNSTON, p. 80,9-15.

3. Eunomius' argument runs thus: «Ἐἴτ' ἐκ τῶν δημιουργημάτων σκοπούμενος, ἐκ τούτων ἐπὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἀνάγοιτο, τοῦ μὲν ἀγεννήτου τὸν Υἱὸν εὗρισκων ποιήμα, τοῦ δὲ Μονογενοῦς τὸν Παράκλητον». (*Liber Apologeticus* 20, PG. 30, 856BC and by Basil, *Adversus Eunomium* 2,32, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 269A).

4. *Adversus Eunomium* 2,33, GARNIER, BOO, 1,271A: «Πῶς οὖν τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν αἰτίαν τῷ Μονογενῇ μόνῳ προστίθῃσι;...Εἰ μὲν οὖν δύο ἀρχὰς ἀντιπαρεξάγων ἀλλήλαις, ταῦτα φησί, μετὰ Μανιχαίου καὶ Μαρκιανῶς συντριβήσεται· εἰ δὲ μίᾳ ἐξάπτει τὰ ὄντα, τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεγενῆσθαι λεγόμενον, πρὸς τὴν πρώτην αἰτίαν τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει».

5. About this common teaching of Pneumatomachians and Arians see: ATHANASIUS, *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 1, PG. 26, 529A; *Ibid.* I. 9, PG. 26, 551B; BASIL, *De Spiritu Sancto* 34, 31, JOHNSTON, p. 68,10-13; GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto*, PG. 36, 137C; GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Adversus Macedonianos*, *De Spiritu Sancto*, MUELLER, GNO, 3,1, p. 101-8-10; EPIPHANIUS, *Panarion haer.* 74,1, HOLL, GCS, 3, p. 313,10-12; DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *De Spiritu Sancto* 14, PG. 39, 1046C;

6. *Ep.* 125,3, COURTONNE, 2, p. 34,32-34.

7. *Ep. ad Serapionem* I. 21, PG. 26,582B.

8. *De Spiritu Sancto* 17,43, JOHNSTON, p. 89,6-8: «ὡς τοίνυν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς

Father, the Holy Spirit is the Image of the Son<sup>1</sup>, which implies that the Father alone remains the cause and origin of both.

Basil goes on to say that the Holy Spirit is attached to the Son and with Him the Holy Spirit is inseparably apprehended and has His being attached to the Father, as cause, from Whom He also proceeds<sup>2</sup>. The Holy Spirit has as mark of His proper hypostatic nature that He is known after the Son and together with Him, but has His subsistence from the Father<sup>3</sup>. The Son declares the Spirit, Who proceeds from the Father, through Himself and with Himself, shining forth.

Basil, dealing with the relation of the Spirit to the Son with reference to the «economy» and particularly to man, maintains that the knowledge of God is possible to man only through the Holy Spirit's illumination<sup>4</sup>. He, like the sun, enlightens the eyes of the soul to show in Himself the image of the invisible and, in the blessed spectacle of the image, the unspeakable beauty of the archetype<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, the energies of God, common to the three Persons (i. e. the natural Goodness and the inherent Holiness and the Royal Dignity) extend from the Father through the Only-begotten to the Spirit<sup>6</sup>.

Basil, dealing with the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son in their common energies, uses the expression «through the Son»<sup>7</sup>, while when he speaks about His causal procession from the Father, he uses the preposition «from», ἐκ or παρά<sup>8</sup>.

Indeed, the idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds causally from

πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, οὕτω πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι παραδεδομένην τοῦ λόγου σύνταξιν».

1. *De Spiritu Sancto* 26,64, JOHNSTON, pp. 123-4.

2. *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 4, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 195E: «Καὶ συνῆπται μὲν ὁ Υἱὸς τῷ Πατρὶ ἀδιαστάτως συνῆπται δὲ τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα»; *Ibid.* 7, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 196C: «Καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται».

3. *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 6, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 194D; *Ep.* 105, COURTONNE, 2, p. 7,27-28.

4. *De Spiritu Sancto* 26, 64, JOHNSTON, pp. 123-4.

5. *Ibid.* 18,47, JOHNSTON, pp. 94,16-95,15.

6. *Ibid.* p. 95,16-20: «ἡ τοίνυν ὁδὸς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἐστὶν ἀπὸ Ἐνὸς Πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ Ἐνὸς Υἱοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἐνα Πατέρα, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν ἢ φυσικῆ ἀγαθότης καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν Ἀγασμός καὶ τὸ Βασιλικὸν Ἀξίωμα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς διήκει».

7. *Ibid.*

8. *Hom. in Psalmos* 32,4, GARNIER, BOO, 1, 135E; *De Spiritu Sancto* 16, 38, JOHNSTON, p. 80, 14; *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos* 7, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 196C.

both would be a strong argument of Basil in his defence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, because the Pneumatomachians did not deny the divinity of the Father and the Son. Basil, however, is very cautious and avoids this step. Basil's conviction was that the Father alone is the root and fountain of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

(To be continued)

1. *Hom. contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomæos 4*, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 195E; *Ep.* 105, COURTONNE, 2, p. 6,22. Apart from the Orthodox theologians some Protestants such as A. von HARNACK, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Die entwicklung des kirchlichen Dogmas I*, vol. 2, Darmstadt 1964, p. 302ff; H. HOLL, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern*, pp. 140-142, are in agreement on this point.

On the contrary, Roman-Catholic scholars insist that according to Basil the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father through the Son, in some sense owes His *hyparxis* also to the Son. Cf. A. KRANICH, *Op. cit.* pp. 65ff; L. LOHN, *Op. cit.* pp. 364-364; J. QUASTEN, *Patrology*, vol. 3, p. 233; M. JUGIE, *Op. cit.* p. 154; A. PALMIERI, *Op. cit.* col. 783.