

THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT\*  
ACCORDING TO CERTAIN GREEK FATHERS

BY  
MARKOS A. ORPHANOS

---

6. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

Gregory of Nazianzus emphasizes more than Basil the unity and Monarchia<sup>1</sup>, and for the first time clearly distinguishes the distinctive properties of the three divine Persons<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the distinctive character of the Father is that «ἀγεννησία» of the Son «γέννησις» and that of the Holy Spirit «ἐκπόρευσις» or «ἐκπεμφσις» or «πρόδοξ»<sup>3</sup>. Although Gregory is aware of the fact that he has introduced the term «procession» as the hypostatic property of the Holy Spirit, he does not discuss further the doctrine of the procession. Generation and procession, are, as modes

---

\* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 778 τοῦ προηγουμένου (Ν') τόμου.

1. *Oratio* 40, *In sanctum Baptisma* 41, PG. 36, 417B; *Oratio* 29, *Theologica* 3, *De Filio* 2, PG. 36, 76B: «Ἡμῖν δὲ μοναρχία τὸ τιμώμενον».

2. Basil is explicit in considering as the hypostatic properties of the Father the ἀγεννησία, and of the Son the γέννησις. He, though, is reluctant and does not advance to define the mode of being of the Holy Spirit. Referring to the issue he makes a general remark to the Spirit's ἰδιώματα, without giving any further explanation. (*Hom. de Fide* 3, GARNIER, BOO, 2, 227E-228A). Elsewhere, attributing to the Father the property of ἀγεννησία and to the Son that of γέννησις, he applies to the Holy Spirit the ἀγιασμός (*Ep.* 236,6, COURTONNE, 3, p. 53,9; *Ep.* 214,4, COURTONNE, 2, p. 205,24). It is to Gregory's merit that has established procession as the hypostatic property of the Holy Spirit.

3. *Oratio* 25, *In laudem Heronis philosophi* 15, PG. 35,1221B: «Ἔδιον δὲ Πατρὸς μὲν ἡ ἀγεννησία, Υἱοῦ δὲ ἡ γέννησις, Πνεύματος δὲ ἡ ἐκπεμφσις». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1220B; *Oratio* 26, *In seipsum* 19, PG. 35, 1252C; *Oratio* 30, *Theologica* 4, *De Filio* 19, PG. 36, 128C; *Oratio* 21, *In laudem Athanasii* 15, PG. 35, 1096B; *Oratio* 39, *In sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 3478B; *Oratio* 42, *Supremum Vale* 17, PG.36, 377C.

of being, incomprehensible<sup>1</sup>. Any attempt to comprehend them will be done in vain, because this mystery is known by God alone<sup>2</sup>.

Gregory's purpose seems to be to establish the divinity of the Holy Spirit and for this reason he stresses over and over again His relation to the Father. Thus, the Father (*qua Pater*) is the origin and fountain of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Their ground of unity is the Father out of whom and towards whom are reckoned the subsequent Persons, not so as to confuse them, but so as to attach them<sup>3</sup>. The Father is γεννήτωρ and προβολεύς, the Son γέννημα and the Holy Spirit πρόβλημα<sup>4</sup>. The Holy Spirit comes forth from the Father not by way of generation but by way of procession<sup>5</sup>. He is neither ungenerated, because this would imply that there are two unoriginated principles and two Fathers, nor generated because there would be two Sons. He exists as a result of proceeding from the Father<sup>6</sup>. The ἐκπόρευσις as mode of being of the Holy Spirit, Gregory goes on, is a third state in God between the other two states, namely the ἀγεννησία and γέννησις. This state has been revealed to us by a theologian who is greater than the subtlest of mere human dialecticians, i.e. Christ Himself<sup>7</sup>.

Because the Father is the only cause of existence of the Son and the Holy Spirit, they are related to Him as the αἰτιατά<sup>8</sup>. On the other hand, because the hypostatic properties are incommunicably individual, there is no confusion or mixture in the eternal relations of the Divine Persons<sup>9</sup>. For this reason, they keep their own distinctive pro-

1. *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 8, PG. 36, 141B: «εἰπέ σὺ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ γὰρ τὴν γέννησιν φυσιολογήσω καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ παραπληρώσωμεν ἄμφω εἰς Θεοῦ μυστήρια παρακύπτοντες».

2. *Oratio* 25, *In laudem Heronis philosophi* 17, PG. 35, 1221; *Oratio* 20, *De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum* 10, PG. 36, 1077AB.

3. *Oratio* 42, *Supremum Vale* 25, PG. 36, 476B: «Ἐνωσις δὲ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἕξῃς». Cf. also, *Oratio* 39, *In Sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 348B.

4. *Oratio* 29, *Theologica* 3, *De Filio* 2, PG. 36, 76B.

5. *Oratio* 39, *In sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 348B: «ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γὰρ.... Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα, προϊὼν μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐχ υἱκῶς δὲ οὐδὲ γὰρ γεννητῶς ἀλλ' ἐκπορευτῶς».

6. *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 7-8, PG. 36, 140-141.

7. *Ibid* 8, PG. 36, 141AB: «ποῦ γὰρ θήσεις τὸ ἐκπορευτὸν εἰπέ μοι, μέσον ἀναφηνὲν τῆς σῆς διαίρεσεως, καὶ παρὰ κρείσσονος ἢ κατὰ σὲ θεολόγου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν εἰσαγόμενον;».

8. *Oratio* 20, *De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum* 7, PG. 35, 1073AB. Cf. also, *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 14, PG. 36, 149A.

9. *Oratio* 29, *Theologica* 3, *De Filio* 12, PG. 36, 89B.

perties incommunicable. «Οὐτε τοῦ Πατρὸς — Gregory writes — ἐκστάντος τῆς ἀγεννησίας... οὔτε τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῆς γεννήσεως... οὔτε τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢ εἰς τὸν Πατέρα μεταπίπτοντος ἢ εἰς Υἱόν... ἡ γὰρ ιδιότης ἀκίνητος<sup>1</sup>.

Gregory insists that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father is a strong evidence of His divinity, because since He proceeds from the Father, He is not a creature. Since He is not begotten, neither is He the Son. Because, though He has a different mode of being from being unbegotten or begotten, He is God<sup>2</sup>. Although Gregory deals in passing with the particular relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son, it is clear that he excludes any sense of His essential derivation either from or through the Son. Therefore, Gregory, illustrating the relations of the Holy Trinity, uses the analogy of the mode of being of Adam, Eve and Seth<sup>3</sup>. Adam is a type of the «unbegotten», Seth is of the «begotten» and Eve is of that which «proceeds»<sup>4</sup>.

1. *Oratio* 39, *In sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 348BC.

2. *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 8, PG. 36, 141B: «Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται· καθ' ὅσον μὲν ἐκεῖθεν ἐκπορεύεται, οὐ κτίσμα· καθ' ὅσον δὲ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ μέσον Θεός».

3. *Carmina moralia* I, 20-28, PG. 37,524:

«ἐκ μὲν ἀνάρχου  
Πατρὸς Υἱός... ἐκ δ' ἄρα Παιδὸς  
οὐκέτι παῖς ἀγαπητὸς ὁμοῖον εὐχος ἐφέλων'  
ὡς κεν ὁ μὲν μέμνη γενέτης ὄλος αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' Υἱὸς  
οἶον καὶ μούνοιο μονώτατος· εἰς ἓν ἰόντε  
Πνεύματι σὺν μεγάλῳ, τὸ βὰ Πατρὸθεν εἶσιν ὁμοῖον»

4. *Carmina dogmatica* III, PG. 37, 408:

«ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀρχεγόνοιο δάμαρ καὶ Σῆθ ἐγένοντο  
· · · · ·  
οὐ τεκτὴ τεκτός τε, βροτοὶ γε μὴν ἔσκον ὁμοίως».

Cf. also *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto* 11, PG. 36, 145A; *Oratio* 39, *In sancta Lumina* 12, PG. 36, 348C. This analogy is common among the Fathers. See GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Ad imaginem et ad similitudinem*, PG. 44, 1329BC; JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *Expositio fidei* I, 8, KOTTER, p. 23, 119-122; PHOTIUS, *Amphilochia quaestio* 28, PG. 101, 208CD; GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.14, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 42; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.53, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 169; *Ibid.* 66, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 138; MARK OF EPHESUS, *Capita Syllogistica* 38, PETIT, PO. 15, p. 406.

## 7. GREGORY OF NYSSA

The third of the Cappadocians, Gregory of Nyssa, follows the main line of thought of Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus. For him, the hypostasis of the Father is also the sole unoriginated principle, which brings forth eternally the Son by generation and the Holy Spirit by procession<sup>1</sup>. The Father's «Prosopon» is the only cause of the existence of the two other Persons Who are caused. Gregory's argument runs thus: «ἐν γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐξ οὐπερ ὁ υἱὸς γεννᾶται καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται. διὸ δὴ καὶ κυρίως τὸν ἕνα αἰτιον μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ αἰτιατῶν ἕνα θεὸν φαμέν»<sup>2</sup>. Because the hypostatic properties are incommunicable and unconfused, the unity of essence and the triplicity of Persons are safeguarded<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, on account of the identity of the essence and the coinherence of the hypostases, the Father cannot be considered apart from the Son and the Son apart from the Holy Spirit. The Son exists forever with the Father and the Holy Spirit with the Son<sup>4</sup>.

Gregory dealt with the immanent mutual relations of the divine Persons. Refusing the Eunomian notion that the Holy Spirit was created by the Father using as instrument the Son<sup>5</sup>, he recalls the idea of the divine monarchia and insists that the Son and the Holy Ghost have a causal dependence from the Father<sup>6</sup>.

In the famous 38th letter of Basil which some scholars with

1. *De oratione dominica*, in W. JAEGER'S, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom heiligen Geist*, p. 133: «Ἰδιον τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐξ αἰτίου εἶναι· τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος· ὁ τε υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθεν. . . . καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται».

2. *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 24-25.

3. *De oratione dominica*, JAEGER, *Op. cit.*, p. 133: «μία κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον ἀποδέδεικται τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ἡ φύσις, οὐ συγχεομένης ἐφ' ἐκάστης τῶν ὑποστάσεων τῆς κατ' ἐξάιρετον ἐπιθεωρουμένης αὐταῖς ἰδιότητος, οὐδὲ τῶν γνωρισμάτων ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀλασσομένων ὥστε τὸ σημεῖον τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα μετενεχθῆναι, ἢ τοῦ υἱοῦ πάλιν ἐνὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἐφαρμοσθῆναι, ἢ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἰδιότητα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἐπιφαίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ κοινότητι τῆς φύσεως ἀκoinώνητος ἢ τῶν ἰδιαζόντων θεωρεῖται διάκρισις». Cf also, *Contra Eunomium* 1, 278, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 107-108; *Ibid.* 1, 277, JAEGER, GNO, 1, p. 107.

4. *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 25,8-12; *De oratione dominica*, in JAEGER'S, *Gregor von Nyssas' Lehre vom heiligen Geist*, p. 133.

5. *Apologeticus liber*, 20, PG. 30, 856BC.

6. *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 25; *Ad Ablabium quod non sind tres dei*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 93.

convincing arguments attribute to Gregory of Nyssa<sup>1</sup>, the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son is plainly explained. Thus, according to Gregory of Nyssa the Holy Spirit, indeed, depends on the Son with Whom He is inseparably apprehended, but He has His Being dependent on the Father as cause from Whom He proceeds. The mark of the Holy Spirit's hypostatic individuality is that He is known after the Son and with Him. Yet, He subsists from the Father. On the other hand, Gregory goes on to say, the Son, knowing through Himself and with Himself the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, has no communion with the Father or the Holy Spirit as regards individuating marks but is known only by the above mentioned signs<sup>2</sup>.

As Gregory of Nyssa explains elsewhere, the Son is linked to

1. Although many scholars, such as P. MARAN, *Basilii opera omnia*, vol. 3, p. 146; F. NAGER, *Op. cit.* pp. 43-45; 54-65; A GRANDSIRE, «Nature et Hypostases divines dans S. Basile», *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 13 (1932) pp. 130-150; A. M. RITTER, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*, Göttingen 1965, p. 282; Y. COURTONNE, *Saint Basile, Lettres* 1, Paris 1957, p. 81 and others, still consider this letter as a work of Basil, it seems more probable that it has been written by Gregory of Nyssa. For the relevant arguments see H. RITTER, *Geschichte der Philosophie* VI (Geschichte der christlichen philosophie II) Hamburg 1841, p. 156; A von HARNACK, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 264-5; A. CAVALLIN, *Studien zu den Briefen des hl. Basilus*, Lund 1944, pp. 71-81; R. HUEBNER, «Gregor von Nyssa als Verfasser des sog. Ep. 38, des Basilus zum unterschiedlichen Verständnins der ούσια bei den kappadozischen Brüdern», *Epektasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris 1972, pp. 463-490.

This letter is quoted again and again by the Byzantines opposed to *Filioque*. See GREGORY THE CYPRIOT, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 259AB; *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG. 142, 296B; GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.20, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 46, 1-3; *Ibid.* 1.30, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 59, 11-21; MARK OF EPHEBUS, *Testimonia collecta* 36, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 347; *Capita Syllogistica* 6, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 377. For a different interpretation of this letter by Latins and Greeks at the Council of Florence, cf. J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge 1961, p. 291.

2. BASIL *Ep.* 38, 4, *COURTONNE*, 1, pp. 84-85: «Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀφ' οὗ πᾶσα ἐπὶ τὴν κτίσιν ἢ τῶν ἀγαθῶν χορηγία πηγάζει, τοῦ Υἱοῦ μὲν ἤρτηται ἢ ἀδιαστάτως συγκαταλαμβάνεται, τῆς δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς αἰτίας ἐξημμένον ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, ἔθεν καὶ ἐκπορεύεται, τοῦτο γνωριστικὸν τῆς κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ιδιότητος σημείου ἔχει, τὸ μετὰ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ γνωρίζεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑφεστάναι. Ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς ὁ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον Πνεῦμα δι' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ γνωρίζων, μόνος μονογενῶς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φωτὸς ἐκλάμψας, οὐδεμίαν κατὰ τὸ ἰδιάζον τῶν γνωρισμάτων τὴν κοινωνίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ἢ πρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εἰρημένους σημείοις μόνος γνωρίζεται».

the Father and receives from Him directly His hyparxis without being posterior in time; in the same way the Holy Spirit is attached to the Only Begotten. The Son though is only conceived as anterior to the hypostasis of the Spirit in logical thought, in respect to the principle of causation, because periods of time have no place with reference to the preeternal life of God<sup>1</sup>. This does not mean that the Holy Spirit is subsequent in His being to the Son, because the Only-Begotten was never without the Spirit<sup>2</sup>, Who abides in the World and manifests His energy<sup>3</sup>. Gregory goes on to say that the Holy Spirit, having the cause of His being in the Father as does the Son, shines forth from the light, i.e. the Son without any differentiation in their nature or any interval in time in their relations<sup>4</sup>.

Gregory coming again to the same subject, says in an Origenistic fashion<sup>5</sup> that: While we confess the invariable character of the nature, we do not deny the difference in respect of cause and that which is caused, by which alone we apprehend that one person is distinguished from another, namely, by our belief that one is the cause and another is the caused. Again, in that which is of the cause we recognise yet another distinction. For one is directly from the first cause and another only mediately and through that which is directly from the first cause; so that the character of being Only-Begotten abides without doubt in the Son, and the mediation of the Son, while it guards His character of being Only-Begotten, does not exclude the Spirit from His natural relation to the Father<sup>6</sup>.

1. *Contra Eunomium* 1, 691, *JAEGER*, GNO, 1, pp. 224,21-225,4.

2. *Contra Eunomium* 1, 378, *JAEGER*, GNO, 1, p. 138,6-12: «ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ κατὰ τὸ προσεχὲς ἀδιαστάτως ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, τῷ πατρὶ συνεπινοεῖται, δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ, πρὶν τι κενόν τε καὶ ἀνωπόστον διὰ μέσου παρεμπεσεῖν νόημα, εὐθὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνημμένως καταλαμβάνεται, οὐχ ὑστερίζον κατὰ τὴν ὑπαρξιν μετὰ τὸν υἱόν, ὥστε ποτὲ τὸν μονογενῆ δίχα τοῦ πνεύματος νοηθῆναι».

3. *Oratio Catechetica* 2, PG. 45, 17B.

4. *Contra Eunomium* 1, 378-379, *JAEGER*, GNO, 1, p. 138,12-16: «ἀλλ' ἐκ μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχον τοῦ εἶναι, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ μονογενὲς ἐστὶ φῶς, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτὸς ἐκλάμψαν, οὔτε διαστήματι οὔτε φύσεως ἐτερότητι τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἀποτεμνόμενον. διάστημα μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προαιωνίου φύσεως οὐκ ἔστιν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1, 280, *JAEGER*, GNO, 1, pp. 108-9.

5. On Origen's opinion that the Logos participates in the mode of being of the Holy Spirit, see, pp. 6-7 of this study.

6. *Ad Ablabium, quod non sint tres dei*, *MUELLER*, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 55-56: «ἅτι τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον τῆς φύσεως ὁμολογοῦντες τὴν κατὰ τὸ αἰτίον καὶ αἰτιατὸν διαφορὰν οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα, ἐν ᾧ μόνῃ διακρίνεσθαι τὸ ἕτερον τοῦ ἐτέρου καταλαμβάνομεν, τῷ τὸ μὲν

In the same line, and indeed with an inadequate analogy, Gregory compares the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit to three torches of which the second has been lighted from the first and the third from the first but through the second<sup>1</sup>.

We must then ask: Does Gregory, according to the above notions, hold the idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son? Does the Son derive His being directly from the Father and the Spirit immediately from the Son and mediately from the Father as has been suggested?<sup>2</sup>

In the first passage it is clear that the cause of being of the Holy Spirit is the Father alone and only His shining forth comes through the Son. In the second and third, a kind of mediation of the Son is suggested. Is it a typical case of Filioque? If we are going to consider these evidences in themselves, it is possible to draw such a conclusion<sup>3</sup>. It is difficult, however, to maintain this conclusion, if we examine them within the whole Trinitarian thought of Gregory of Nyssa and bear in mind that Gregory's permanent conviction is that a) the Father Himself is the sole origin and cause of the Existence of the Son and of the Holy Spirit<sup>4</sup>. b) The Holy Spirit deriving His Being from the Father is manifested through the Son<sup>5</sup>.

αἴτιον πιστεύειν εἶναι τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ αἰτίου· καὶ τοῦ ἐξ αἰτίας ὄντος πάλιν ἄλλην διαφορὰν ἐννοοῦμεν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, ὥστε καὶ τὸ μονογενὲς ἀναμφίβολον ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ μένειν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ ἀμφιβάλλειν, τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ μεσετίας καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μονογενὲς φυλαττούσης καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα σχέσεως μὴ ἀπειργούσης».

1. *Adversus Macedonios, De Spiritu Sancto*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, p. 93,3-6: «ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ἐν τρισὶ λαμπάσι διηρημένῃν βλέπων τὴν φλόγα—αἰτίαν δὲ τοῦ τρίτου φωτὸς ὑποθώμεθα εἶναι τὴν πρώτην φλόγα ἐκ διαδόσεως διὰ τοῦ μέσου τὸ ἕκρον ἐξάψασαν—».

2. H. B. SWETE, takes this for granted and writes: «Thus from S. Gregory's point of view the Son is the μεστῆς in the Divine Triad, through whom the essential life of the Father eternally flows to the Holy Ghost. The Son and the Spirit have One cause αἰτία, the Father: but the Son derives His Being directly from the Father, the Spirit issues mediately through the Son». *Op. cit.* p. 103.

3. The same opinion share among others A. PALMIERI, *Op. cit.* col. 784-786; G. L. PRESTIGE, *God in Patristic Thought*, p. 252 and J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* 3, p. 287, who maintains that «Gregory with the other Greek Fathers conceives the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Son, i.e. immediately from the Son and mediately from the Father».

4. *De oratione dominica*, in JAEGER'S, *Gregory von Nyssa's Lehre vom heiligen Geist*, p. 113.; *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 24-25.

5. *Contra Eunomium* 1, 280, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 108-109: [καὶ ἐν τῷ τῆν

There is a fragment from Gregory of Nyssa's treatise, *De oratione dominica*, according to which, «The Holy Spirit is also said to be from the Father and is testified to be from the Son... Hence the Spirit that is from God is also Christ's Spirit»<sup>1</sup>. This fragment is interpolated and the preposition «from» referring to the Son does not belong to the original<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, the Son's mediate causation must be rejected.

On the other hand, the fact that Gregory of Nyssa himself illustrates the mode of being of the three divine Persons with the analogy of the mode of being of Adam, Eve and Seth<sup>3</sup> points to the fact that Gregory of Nyssa has accepted that the Holy Spirit owes His existence to the Father alone.

---

αἰτίαν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὄλων ἔχειν] ἀφίσταται πάλιν τῷ ἰδιάζοντι, ἐν τῷ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ πεφηγέναι». Cf. also, *Contra Eunomium* 1, 533, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 180-181: «οὐ χρονικῶ τιμ διαστήματι τοῦ γεννητοῦ φωτὸς ἀποτεμνόμενον, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτοῦ μὲν ἐκλάμπων». On this ground Byzantine Fathers such as Gregory the Cypriot, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142. 259BCD; 263C, Gregory Palamas, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.50, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 2, pp. 123ff, Mark of Ephesus, *Capita Syllogistica* 10, PETIT, PO. 15 p. 381, insist that this «through» the Son procession of the Holy Spirit is applied by Gregory of Nyssa to the Spirit's energetic manifestation and not to His essential derivation.

In agreement with this understanding are modern scholars such as K. Holl, who says: «An der zuletzt angeführten Stelle ist besonders klar ersichtlich, dass dieses διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ etwas sehr anders ist, als das abenländische filioque. Nach Gregor bilden der Vater und der Sohn nicht, um mit Augustin zu reden, e i n principium, sondern die eigentliche αἰτία des Geistes ist der πατήρ; die Vermittlung des Sohnes hat nur die Bedeutung, die Kraft des Vaters weiterzuleiten. Deshalb kann auch Gregor, wo auf Vollständigkeit nichts ankommt, einfach sagen, das der Geist ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ist». (*Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern*, Tübingen-Leipzig, 1904, pp. 214-215). W. JAEGER, (*Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre von heiligen Geist*, pp. 141-153) makes similar remarks.

1. *De oratione dominica*, in JAEGER'S, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom heiligen Geist*, p. 133; «τὸ δὲ ἄγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγεται καὶ [ἐκ] τοῦ υἱοῦ εἶναι προσμαρτυρεῖται..... οὐκοῦν τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄν καὶ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα».

2. On the debate regarding the authenticity of this text see: A. MAI, «Patrum doctrina de verbi incarnatione», *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 7, Rome 1883, pp. 6-73. H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* pp. 104-105; K. HOLL, *Op. cit.* p.215; F. DIEKAMP, *Doctrina Patrum de Verbi incarnatione*, Münster W., 1907, pp. 4-5; J. DRAESEKE, «Zur Gregorios von Nyssa», *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 28 (1907), pp. 387-400; W. JAEGER, «Eine dogmatische Interpolation im Text von Gregors Schrift *De Oratione Dominica* und ihr kirchenpolitischer Hintergrund», in *Gregor's von Nyssa's Lehre von heiligen Geist*, pp. 122-153.

3. *Ad imaginem et ad Similitudinem*, PG 44, 1329C.



At the same time, Gregory makes clear that the Holy Spirit shines forth and fulfills His mission *ad extra* from the Father through the Son, because the activities of the three divine Persons are common<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, Gregory points out, every operation which extends from God to the creation has its origin from the Father, and proceeds through the Son and is perfected in the Holy Spirit<sup>2</sup>. It is noteworthy that Gregory of Nyssa refers to the causal procession of the Holy Spirit using the preposition «from»<sup>3</sup>, while in referring to His manifestation and His mission, he uses the preposition «through»<sup>4</sup>.

Gregory of Nyssa also calls the Holy Spirit «Spirit of the Son», or «Spirit of Christ», but, as he explains, this is due to His consubstantiality with the Son, or because according to John 15,24 He proceeds from the Father and receives from Christ<sup>5</sup>. On the account given, it is legitimate to say that according to Gregory of Nyssa the Holy Spirit proceeds in His hyparxis from the Father and in His manifestation and His energies from the Father through the Son.

## 8. EPIPHANIUS

In a discussion on the procession of the Holy Spirit according to the Greek Fathers, Epiphanius deserves his own place<sup>6</sup>. His trinitarian teaching is based on the Divine Monarchia<sup>7</sup>, the unity of essence, and the distinction of hypostases with their own distinctive particularities<sup>8</sup>. As far as the procession of the Holy Spirit is concerned,

1. *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 47-48.

2. *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 47,24-48, 2: «πᾶσα ἐνέργεια ἢ θεόθεν ἐπὶ τῇ κτίσει διήκουσα καὶ κατὰ τὰς πολυτρόπους ἐνοίας ὀνομαζομένη ἐκ πατρὸς ἀφορμάται καὶ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ πρόεισι καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ τελειοῦται».

3. *De oratione dominica*, 3, PG. 44, 1157D-1161A; *Ad Graecos ex communibus notionibus*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 24-25; *Contra Eunomium* 1, 378, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 108-109.

4. *Contra Eunomium* 1, 280, JAEGER, GNO, 1, pp. 108-109; *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 47-48;

5. *Adversus Macedonianos, De Spiritu Sancto*, MUELLER, GNO, 3, 1, pp. 89-90; *De oratione dominica* 3, PG. 44, 1160BC.

6. For a recent discussion on the procession of the Holy Spirit according to Epiphanius, see: A THEODOROU, 'Η περί ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου, Athens 1974, pp. 87-119.

7. *Panarion haer.* 62,3-4, HOLL, GCS 2, pp. 391,17-393,20.

8. *Ancoratus* 10, HOLL, GCS 1, pp. 17,24-18,23.

Epiphanius maintains that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, receives from the Son and is not alien to them<sup>1</sup>.

On account of the Monarchia of the Father, the Holy Spirit derives His Existence from the Father<sup>2</sup>. He is also the Spirit of the Son or the Christ because of the identity of Essence and the mutual indwelling of the Persons<sup>3</sup>. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son. He does not come forth from Christ, but is only given from Him<sup>4</sup>.

It is obvious that Epiphanius, by the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, understands the pre-eternal receiving of the Spirit's Existence, while, by His receiving and sending from the Son, he refers to the Spirit's mission in time<sup>5</sup>. This is clear because Epiphanius relates this mission with the illumination and sanctification of man<sup>6</sup>.

Epiphanius in another case seems to exclude any derivation of the Spirit's being from the Son, because it would imply that He is Grandson of the Father, a notion which Epiphanius was anxious to refute<sup>7</sup>.

Nevertheless, apart from these clear statements Epiphanius re-

1. *Panarion haer.* 48,12, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, pp. 236,28-237,2: «καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβάνον, οὐκ ἀλλότριον πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ ὄν». *Panarion haer.* 69,18, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 168,5-7: «τὸ δὲ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὡς οἶδεν αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ μονογενῆς, οὔτε γεννητὸν οὔτε κτιστὸν οὔτε ἀλλότριον πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβάνον». Cf. also, *Panarion haer.* 48,12, *HOLL*, GCS 2, pp. 236,28-237,2.

2. *Panarion haer.* 62,3, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, pp. 391,22-392,2.

3. *Panarion haer.* 62,3, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, pp. 391,27; *Ancoratus* 8, *HOLL*, GCS, 1, p. 15,12.

4. *Panarion haer.* 62,3, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, pp. 391,27-392,2: «πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ Χριστοῦ διδόμενον, ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβάνον». Cf. also, *Panarion haer.* 73, 16, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 288,26: «πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐκ πατρὸς, δι' υἱοῦ πιστοῖς διδόμενον».

5. *Panarion haer.* 74,11, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 329,18-20: «τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβάνον· ἔρουν τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναγγέλλον· τὰ υἱοῦ ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁγιάζον ἁγίους διὰ τῆς τριάδος». Cf. also, *Ancoratus*, 7-8, *HOLL*, GCS, 1, pp. 13,14-15,5.

6. *Panarion haer.* 74, 10, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 327,7-15: «Ἐἰ τοίνυν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, φησιν ὁ κύριος, λήψεται..... ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, μόνος ὁδηγὸς ἀληθείας, νόμων ἐξηγητὴς ἁγίων, πνευματικοῦ νόμου ὑφηγητὴς, προφητῶν καθηγητὴς, ἀποστόλων διδάσκαλος, εὐαγγελικῶν δογμάτων φωστὴρ, ἅγιον ἐκλογεὺς, φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἐξ ἀληθινοῦ φωτός».

7. *Panarion haer.* 74,12, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 330,20-21; *Ancoratus* 7, *HOLL*, GCS, 1, p. 14,21.

lates the procession of the Holy Spirit to both Persons i.e. the Father and the Son. Thus, Epiphanius writes: «However, Christ is believed to be from the Father, God from God, and the Spirit from Christ, in other words from both, as Christ said: ‘Who proceeds from the Father’ and this ‘He will receive from mine’». Elsewhere, he says that the Holy Spirit is not alien to the Father and the Son but of the same divine nature<sup>2</sup>. He is between the Father and the Son and comes forth from the Father and the Son<sup>3</sup>. He is Spirit of Christ as well as Spirit of the Father<sup>4</sup>. The comprehension of the Holy Trinity is impossible and nobody knows the Holy Spirit apart from the Father and the Son «παρ’ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται καὶ οὗ λαμβάνει»<sup>5</sup>. Also nobody knows the Father and the Son apart from the Holy Spirit, «ὁ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ»<sup>6</sup>. On the basis of the above statements, does Epiphanius teach the double procession of the Holy Spirit and is it correct that «he regards the Son as being together with the Father... the one Source and Origin of the Holy Ghost»?<sup>7</sup> It seems less than probable.

The fact that Epiphanius always recalls John 15,26 implies that he has in the back of his mind the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His receiving and sending to the world from the Son<sup>8</sup>. It is true that Epiphanius in his zeal to refute the Arians and Pneumatomachians suggests the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>9</sup>. However, he is not careful in the use of his vocabulary and uses awkward expressions referring to the procession of the Ho-

1. *Panarion haer.* 74,4, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 318,4-7: «Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πιστεύεται θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων (ὡς φησὶν ὁ Χριστός, ‘ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται’ καὶ ‘οὗτος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται’)».

2. *Panarion haer.* 62,4, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 392,22-24.

3. *Ancoratus* 8, *HOLL*, GCS, 1, p. 15,12-14: «πνεῦμα γὰρ θεοῦ καὶ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πνεῦμα υἱοῦ· οὐ κατὰ τινα σύνθεσιν, καθάπερ ἐν ἡμῶν ψυχῇ καὶ σώμα, ἀλλ’ ἐν μέσῳ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τρίτον τῇ ὀνομασίᾳ». Cf. also, *Panarion haer.* 73,16, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 289,7: «ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ ὑφ’ ἐστῶς».

4. *Ancoratus* 9, *HOLL*, GCS, 1, p. 16,11-12. Cf. also, *Panarion haer.* 62,4, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, p. 392,24.

5. *Panarion haer.* 74,10, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 327,7-15.

6. *Ibid.* p. 327,12-13.

7. H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* p. 97.

8. A. Theodorou is fully justified in emphasizing this point. Cf. *Op. cit.* p. 98-119.

9. *Panarion haer.* 74,11, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 328,30.

ly Spirit like «παρ' ἀμφοτέρων»<sup>1</sup>, or «παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ», «ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ»<sup>2</sup>. These expressions, however, do not point to the double procession of the Holy Spirit. They refer rather to His mission in the world.

In the same line of thought, Epiphanius illustrates the relations of the hypostases by the metaphor of light and source. «Ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου—, writes Epiphanius — ὁψόμεθα φῶς ἵνα δείξῃ φῶς τὸν πατέρα καὶ φῶς τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν καὶ φῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ πηγὴν ἐκ πηγῆς, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· ἴσταμοι γὰρ ἐκ τῆς κοιτίας αὐτοῦ ρεῦσουσιν ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον»<sup>3</sup>. The statements «source from source» and the «light of the Only-Begotten», i.e. the Holy Spirit, have been understood as implying the double procession<sup>4</sup>. But it seems that they are used with reference to the Spirit's temporal mission from the Son. Epiphanius explains that according to John 15, 14, he who would receive the Holy Spirit, would be himself a source from which will flow rivers of water springing up into everlasting life<sup>5</sup>.

If this understanding is correct, then the meaning of the above passage will be that the Father is the source of everything. From the Father comes forth the Son and becomes second source. From this second source receives the Holy Spirit and sanctifies human beings. And in this Epiphanius relates the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father to His receiving and sending forth in time by the Son.

In this meaning can be understood the similar analogy according to which the Holy Spirit is the third light. Epiphanius' argument runs thus: «Ἄκουε, ὃ οὖτος, ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ἀληθῶς υἱοῦ ἐστὶ πατήρ, φῶς βλος, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀληθοῦς πατρὸς (υἱός), φῶς ἐκ φωτός, οὐχ ὡς τὰ ποιητὰ ἢ κτιστὰ προσηγορίᾳ μόνῃ· καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀληθείας ἐστὶ, φῶς τρί-

1. *Panarion haer.* 74,4, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 318,5.

2. *Panarion haer.* 74,10, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 327,12-13; *Panarion haer.* 74,8, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 324, 17; *Panarion haer.* 62,4, *HOLL*, GCS, 2, p. 392,23.

3. *Panarion haer.* 69,54, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 201,12-16.

4. H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* pp. 97-98: «It seems clear that he regards the Son as being together with the Father... the One Source and Origin of the Holy Ghost». A. PALMIERI, *Op. cit.* col. 788, goes further arguing that Epiphanius professes not only the double procession of the Holy Spirit but, «Il adopte aussi la formule qui est l' equivalent de la formule latine: a Patre Filioque». Cf. also, M. JUGIE, *Op. cit.* pp. 143-146.

5. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* pp. 110-111.

τον παρὰ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ»<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the Holy Spirit is light like the Father and the Son on the ground of their identity of essence. He is the third light after the Father and the Son, because He derives His existence from the first light (i.e. the Father) and receives from the second light (i.e. the Son). The Holy Spirit, manifesting that which He receives from the Son to the world, becomes the third light. This receiving and sending of the Holy Spirit from the Son applies to His mission and not to His mode of being<sup>2</sup>.

Epiphanius, despite his antiheretical ardor, lacks the theological insight of the Cappadocians and their care in using the proper terminology. For this reason, Epiphanius does not always use the prepositions «from» and «through» in the proper manner. On the other hand, sometimes, he does not clearly distinguish the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, from His mission from the Father and the Son.

Nevertheless, if we take into account that Epiphanius' doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit is based on John 15,26, and its two poles are the pre-eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, and the receiving and sending in time from the Son, we can hardly accept the idea of a causal derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Father and from the Son. Indeed, Epiphanius speaks about two issuings forth of the Holy Spirit and implies two origins i.e. the Father and the Son. The coming forth from the Father though, refers to His essential derivation, while the procession from the Son applies to His temporal mission. Epiphanius' teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, if this understanding and interpretation is correct, can be summarised as follows: On the ground of the very words of our Lord, the Holy Spirit comes forth from both, inasmuch as He for His existence proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son His mission<sup>3</sup>.

## 9. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

The doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit as it is expounded by Cyril of Alexandria is even more interesting<sup>4</sup>. As far as the re-

1. *Panarion haer.* 74,8, *HOLL*, GCS, 3, p. 324,14-17.

2. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* pp. 111-122.

3. Cf. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* pp. 115-119.

4. Theodorou's study is again valuable because it provides sufficient source material. Cf. *Ibid.* pp. 9-83. For a general discussion on Cyril's pneumatology

lations of the three Persons are concerned, Cyril repeats the common belief that the Father is the source of being of the Son and the Holy Spirit<sup>1</sup>. On the ground of the identity of the essence and the differentiation of the hypostases, the divine Persons keep unchanged their distinctive properties and they act commonly *ad extra*<sup>2</sup>.

With regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit, Cyril relies on John 15,26 and states clearly that He proceeds from the Father. «Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον»<sup>3</sup>. The same idea is repeated by Cyril indirectly when he says that the Holy Spirit is from the essence of the Father<sup>4</sup>, or that He is the Spirit Who comes forth from the Father<sup>5</sup> or that He is the unction Who comes from God the Father<sup>6</sup> etc. Cyril, apart from the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι, uses a variety of similar verbs referring to the coming forth of the Holy Spirit from the Father such as προχεῖσθαι<sup>7</sup>, προκύπτειν<sup>8</sup>, προῖέναι<sup>9</sup>. Thus,

with some points of his doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit see: P. GALTIER, *La Saint-Esprit en nous d'après les Pères grecs*, Rome 1946, pp. 217-272; B. de M. V. MONSEGU, «La teología del Espíritu Sancto según San Cirilo de Alejandria», *Revista Espanola de Teología* 7 (1947), pp. 161-220; N. CHARLIER, «La doctrine sur le Saint-Esprit dans de 'Thesaurus' de saint Cyrille d' Alexandrie», *Studia Patristica* 2, Berlin 1957, pp. 188-193.

1. *Commentarium in Joannem* 14,11, PG. 74,216C: «ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντα τὸν Υἱόν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ... Τὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ Θεοῦ· προῖόν δὲ μᾶλλον ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ μένον ἀεί, χορηγούμενον δὲ τοῖς ἁγίοις διὰ Χριστοῦ».

2. *Adversus Nestorium* 4,1, PG. 76, 172A; *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1056A; *Commentarium in Lucam* 22,29, PG. 72, 908B.

3. *Commentarium in Lucam* 3,21, PG. 72, 521C. Cyril returns again and again to this point. Cf. *Thesaurus* 34, PG. 75, 617B; *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1012C; *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII Capitibus*, PG. 76, 433BC; *Ep. LV, in Sanctum Symbolum*, PG. 77, 316D.

4. *Commentarium in Joannem* 14, 16-17, PG. 74, 257BCD; *Ibid.* 16,12-13, PG. 74, 444D; *Ibid.* 22,22-23, PG. 74, 716B; *Explanatio in Epistolam ad Romanos*, 6, 3, PG. 74, 792C.

5. *Ep. LV, In Sanctum Symbolum*, PG. 77, 316D; *Commentarium in Joannem* 14,11, PG. 74, 216C.

6. *Commentarium in Joannem* 7, 39, PG. 73, 756A: «τὸ παρὰ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἅγιον χρῖσμα, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα».

7. *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1012C: «καὶ Πνεῦμα μὲν ἀληθείας ἀποκαλεῖ, προχεῖσθαι γὰρ μὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ διωρίσατο τοῦ Πατρὸς». Cf. also, *Commentarium in Lucam* 5, 16, PG. 72, 536CD; *Commentarium in Joannem* 17,18-19, PG. 74, 540CD; *Contra Julianum* 8, PG. 76, 904D.

8. *Commentarium in Joannem* 1, 32-33, PG. 73, 209D.

9. *Contra Julianum* 4, PG. 76, 725C; *Ibid.* 8, PG. 76, 921C; *Commentarium in Joannem* 16, 15, PG. 74, 452CD.

the Holy Spirit προχεΐται μὲν οὐάπερ ἀπὸ πηγῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς<sup>1</sup>. He πρόβεισι and emerges from the essence of the Father<sup>2</sup>.

Cyril also relates this eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father to His temporal mission through the Son. Cyril as an Alexandrian theologian never loses sight of the «economy» and the salvation of man.

Therefore, the Holy Spirit «ἐκπορεύεται καθάπερ ἀπὸ πηγῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, χορηγεΐται δὲ τῇ κτίσει διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ»<sup>3</sup>. «Προχεόμενον, Cyril goes on to say, δὲ ὡσπερ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ», He brings sanctification to the creation<sup>4</sup>. The sanctification and perfection of man is achieved by the Holy Spirit Who is given from the Father through the Son<sup>5</sup>. It is obvious that in these cases Cyril maintains that the Holy Spirit derives His being from the Father and His mission from the Father through the Son. In accordance to this, Cyril goes on to say that the energy of the Triune God is common and it is realised from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. «Οὕτω πάντα γὰρ ἐνεργεΐται τὰ θεοπρεπῆ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι»<sup>6</sup>. And again «Πάντα γὰρ δι' ἀμφοῖν ἐν ἴσῳ, ἐνεργοῦντος μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἔχοντος δὲ Υἱοῦ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Πνεύματι τὴν ἐφ' ὅτῳ δι' οὖν τῶν δρωμένων ἐνεργειάν τε καὶ θέλησιν»<sup>7</sup>.

Cyril points out again and again in his arguments against Nestorius, who holds the opinion that Christ became God only after His baptism by the descent of the Holy Spirit, that the Holy Spirit is proper of the Son or Christ («ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ», «ἴδιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ»<sup>8</sup>. Everybody who

1. *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1072AB.

2. *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1072AB. Cf. also, *Commentarium in Joannem*, 1, 32-33, PG. 73,209D.

3. *Contra Julianum* 4, PG. 76, 725C.

4. *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1013B. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 2, PG. 75, 721D-724A; *Ibid.* 3, PG. 75, 840AB; *Thesaurus* 33, PG. 75, 569BC; *Homilia Paschalis* XVIII, PG. 77, 817AB.

5. *Thesaurus* 33, PG. 75, 569BC: «φορέσει δὲ μᾶλλον φυσικῶς τὸ τῆς θείας οὐσίας ἀξίωμα ἐξ αὐτῆς τε ὑπάρχον καὶ παρ' αὐτῆς τοῖς ἁγίοις δι' Υἱοῦ χορηγοῦμενον, διὰ τε τοῦτο θεοποιοῦν καὶ εἰς υἰότητα καλοῦν τοὺς ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο».

6. *Explanatio in Epistolam ad Romanos*, PG. 74, 820D. Cf. also, *Explanatio in Epistolam I ad Corinthios*, PG. 74, 885D; *De Trinitate* 5, PG. 75, 1000B; *Homilia Paschalis* IX, PG. 77, 601A.

7. *Explanatio in Epistolam ad Hebraeos* 12, 2, PG. 74, 996B.

8. *Commentarium in Joannem* 7,39, PG. 73, 753A: «Ἴδιον γὰρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξῶθεν, ὡσπερ ἡμῖν ἐπεισκρίνεται παρὰ Θεοῦ χορηγοῦμενον,

rejects this must be anathematized<sup>1</sup>. The Holy Spirit is ἕδιον to the eternal Son and Logos of God as well as to Christ, the incarnate Son of God<sup>2</sup>. In his apologetic ardor, Cyril seems not to be aware that his statement «ἕδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ» could involve the idea of the Spirit's derivation from the Son, as Theodoret was ready to warn him<sup>3</sup>. Cyril appears to be unwilling to be drawn off from his point and with reference to John 15,26, argues that indeed the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. There is though a sense in which the Spirit is ἕδιον and not alien to the Son Who has all together with the Father<sup>4</sup>. Obviously, Cyril's intention was to emphasize that Christ as God-man possesses the Holy Spirit as proper to Him. But the incarnate Logos, having the Holy Spirit as His own, is by no means together with the Father the Spirit's cause of being.

For Cyril, the Homoousion determines the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other two divine Persons. Thus, on the ground of their consubstantiality, the Spirit proceeds from the Father and goes forth through the Son<sup>5</sup>, but He is not alien to the Son in respect to the substance. Because of the identity of the essence, He proceeds from the Father and is distributed from the Son<sup>6</sup>. Although Christ as man is anointed by the Holy Spirit, He as God consubstantial to the Fa-

---

ἀλλ' ἐνυπάρχει φυσικῶς αὐτῷ καθάπερ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ». This idea is a favourite one for Cyril and he comes to it again and again. Cf. *Commentarium in Joannem* 1, 13, PG. 73,157AB; *De Trinitate* 3, PG. 75, 840C; *Argumentorum de S. Spiritu capita*, PG. 75, 1137C; *Scholia de Incarnatione unigeniti*, PG. 75, 1372B. For more references, cf. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* pp. 39-40.

1. *Explicatio duodecim capitum*, PG. 76, 308C.

2. *Scholia de Incarnatione unigeniti*, PG. 75, 1372B: «Λέγεται τοίνυν Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος ὁ δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ δούλου μορφῇ· καὶ χριόμενος μὲν ἀνθρωπίνως κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, χρίων δὲ θεϊκῶς τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας».

3. See p. 46.

4. *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII Capitibus*, PG. 76, 433BC: «Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνήν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ· πάντα γὰρ ἔχει μετὰ Πατρὸς».

5. *Commentarium in Joannem* 26,22-23, PG. 74, 716B; *Ibid.* 15,26-27, PG. 74, 420CD; *Ibid.* 14,16-17, PG. 74, 257BCD; *Ibid.* 17,18-19, PG. 74, 540D-541A.

6. *Commentarium in Joannem* 17,18-19, PG. 74, 540D-541A: «Ὅτι δὲ τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς Πνεῦμα, Πνεῦμα φαίνεται τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς πέμπτοντος..... διαδίδωσι πάλιν ὡς ἴδιος ὁ Υἱός, διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς οὐσίας ἧς ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα».



ther, sends the Holy Spirit to the created order<sup>1</sup>. The Holy Spirit is called by Cyril «Spirit of the Father and the Son»<sup>2</sup>, «image of the Son»<sup>3</sup>, «prosopon of the Son»<sup>4</sup>, on account of His homoousion to the Father and the Son. Most of these statements, however, and analogies are related to the activities of the Trinity *ad extra* and do not refer to the mode of being of the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless, Cyril, dealing with the internal relations of the divine Persons and particularly to the causal procession of the Holy Spirit is not always clear and some of his expressions can be considered as conveying the idea of the essential derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.

Thus, Cyril speaking about the restoration of human nature by Christ says that Christ as second Adam has renewed man, because he was God and Son of God begotten from the nature of the Father. He had «ἄδιον αὐτοῦ τε, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα... καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ νοεῖται τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς»<sup>5</sup>. This statement is striking. Of course, Cyril's remarks that the Holy Spirit is proper to the Son or in Him are in accordance with his idea of homoousion as determining the relation of the divine Persons. Cyril's notion though that the Holy Spirit is from the Son in a similar way as He is from the Father could easily be interpreted as having the meaning of the Filioque<sup>6</sup>.

In his commentary on St. John's Gospel Cyril considers the Holy Spirit as being of the Son and having His nature in Him. «Οὐ γὰρ—Cyril

1. *Explanatio in Lucae Evangelium* 5,16, PG. 72, 536C; *Adversus Nestorium* 5, 7, PG. 76, 246B; *Expositio in Psalmum* 44, 8, PG. 69, 1040A.

2. *Commentarium in Joannem* 14,23, PG. 74, 289D; *Ibid.* 14,16-17, PG. 74, 257D; *De Trinitate* 6, PG. 75, 1012C.

3. *Commentarium in Joannem* 17,18-19, PG. 74, 541C; *Ibid.* 17, 20-21, PG. 74, 553CD; *Thesaurus* 33, PG. 75, 572B.

4. *Thesaurus* 34, PG. 75, 577B; *Commentarium in Joannem* 14, 11, PG. 74, 221A; *Commentarium in Joelem prophetam* 2,27-30, PG. 71, 377D-385A.

5. *Commentarium in Joelem prophetam* 2, 28-29, PG. 71, 377D-380A.

6. H. B. SWETE, basing himself on this notion of Cyril remarks: «this relation of the Spirit to Christ involves an immanence in the Son, and a dependence upon the Person of the Son, with which the procession from the Father does not interfere». *Op. cit.* p. 149. M. JUGIE, in the same line maintains: «Hujus loci pondus animadvertas velim: Primum quidem personam ipsam Spiritus, et non tantum ejus gratiam nobis communicari diserte edocer contra communem recentiorum Graecorum opinionem; Secundo, formula Latinorum: *A Patre Filioque procedit* ad verbum nobis exhibet. Tertio demum, assertit Spiritum Sanctum *ex essentia divina* prodire et non solum *ex hypostasi Patris*». *Op. cit.* p. 139.

says — δὴ που πρὸς τοσαύτην ἀλογίαν καταβησόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὡς οἶσθαι μεθεκτὸν ἐν τῷ κατὰ φύσιν Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑπάρχειν, καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον οὐσιωδῶς ἐκπεφυκός, ὡσπερ οὖν ἀμέλει καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Πατρὶ. "Ὡσπερ γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὕτω καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· οὕτω καὶ ἀνέγνωμεν παρὰ ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς"<sup>1</sup>. This natural growth of the Holy Spirit from the Son which, according to Cyril, is similar to His growth from the Father, points to the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from both. A. Theodorou, on philological and theological grounds, proposes a different reading: namely instead of «οὐσιωδῶς ἐκπεφυκός» he reads «οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπεφυκός»<sup>2</sup>. If Theodorou is correct and his proposal is confirmed by the manuscripts tradition, then Cyril's statement can be understood in the meaning of consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit to the Father and to the Son. Otherwise, the causal derivation of the Spirit from the Son could be alleged again<sup>3</sup>.

Cyril, on the other hand, from the essential relation of the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, concludes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and goes forth not only through, but also from and out of the Son or from both<sup>4</sup>. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son, seeing that He is poured forth substantially from both or in other words, from the Father through the Son<sup>5</sup>. And Cyril goes on «πρόβεισι δὲ φυσικῶς ἐξ αὐτῆς (i. e. οὐσίας) οὐδὲν ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχον ὅσον εἰς ταυτότητα φύσεως εἰ καὶ νοοῖτο τυχὸν ἰδιοσυστάτως»<sup>6</sup>.

Now the crucial question arises: does Cyril appear as a partisan of Filioque? Many Western scholars maintain this<sup>7</sup>. If we confine our-

1. *Commentarium in Joannem* 1, 32-33, PG. 73, 208C.

2. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* pp. 62-63.

3. See. M. JUGIE, *De processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes*, p. 142.

4. *De adoratione in Spiritu et veritate* 1, PG. 68, 148A; *Ad reginas de recta fide oratio altera*, PG. 76, 1048B: «Πρόβεισι δὲ δι' ἀμφοῦν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ζωοποιῶν».

5. *Adversus Nestorium* 5, 3, PG. 76, 184D.

6. *Commentarium in Joannem* 16, 12-13, PG. 74, 44B. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1,31, PG. 73, 212B: «Πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ φύσιν προχέμενον Πνεῦμα».

7. H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* p. 150. A. PALMIERI, appears more emphatic and argues: «La doctrine de saint Cyrille sur la procession du Saint Esprit ab utroque est donc exprimée avec une telle clarté qu' il ne serait pas hasarde de dire que le saint docteur prévoit et réfute d' avance les objections photiennes lorsqu' il soutient l' identité absolue des deux formules: procedit ab utroque et procedit a

selves to these particular passages and some others similar to them, a positive conclusion can be drawn. On the other hand, if we examine these awkward statements within Cyril's whole trinitarian thought, and if we compare them to other statements in which a clear distinction is made between the Holy Spirit's causal procession from the Father and His mission through or from the Son, we have to reject this conclusion<sup>1</sup>. Some of these statements run thus: «ἐκπορεύεται καθάπερ ἀπὸ πηγῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, χορηγεῖται δὲ τῇ κτίσει διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ»<sup>2</sup>, οἱ «προῖδν δὲ μᾶλλον ἐξ αὐτοῦ (i. e. Πατρὸς) καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ μένον ἀεί, χορηγούμενον δὲ τοῖς ἁγίοις διὰ Χριστοῦ»<sup>3</sup>. Again, «οὐκοῦν ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, χορηγεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ τῇ κτίσει καὶ δίδωσι τοῖς ἁγίοις ὡς φύσει τε καὶ ἀληθῶς Υἱός, ὁ μονογενῆς αὐτοῦ Λόγος, καὶ τοῖς τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀξιώμασι διαπρέπων»<sup>4</sup>.

It is true that sometimes Cyril is not accurate in his terminology and his strong apologetic interest prevents him sometimes from making a clear distinction between the essential derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His temporal mission through or from the Son. Nevertheless, considering Cyril's views on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit within the framework of his trinitarian doctrine, we can argue that according to Cyril the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally and causally from the Father and He is sent through or from the Son «in time» to the world. On account of the identity of essence, the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son to men for their sanctification, but this mission is not His mode of existence, which of course is His procession from the Father. Thus, the Holy Spirit derives His existence from the Father and His mission from the Father and the Son.

---

Patre per Filium». *Op. cit.* col.793. To this agree M. GORDILLO, *Op. cit.* p.122, who maintains that: «Et iure quidem; nam Doctor Alexandrinus non solum asserit Spiritum Sanctum a Filio quoque procedere, verum etiam identitatem commendat utriusque formulae: «ex utroque» et «ex Patre per Filium». And of course, M. JUGIE, *Op. cit.* p. 138, who points out: «Inter omnes Ecclesiae Patres qui doctrinam catholicam de processione Spiritus Sancti disertis verbis docuerunt, Cyrillus Alexandrinus primas certo tenet, quatenus et *frequentius et explicatius et loquendi modis ac formulis magis variatis* in suis scriptis hanc doctrinam passim expressit».

1. A. THEODOROU, *Op. cit.* p. 83, comes to the same conclusion.

2. *Epistola LV, In Sanctum Symbolum*, PG. 77, 316D.

3. *Commentarium in Joannem* 14, 11, PG. 74. 216C.

4. *Commentarium in Lucam* 3, 17, PG. 72, 521C; *Epistola LV, in Sanctum Symbolum*, PG. 77, 316D.

## 10. THEODORET OF CYRUS

Cyril's antagonist, Theodoret of Cyrus, holds the tradition of the School of Antioch and together with Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>1</sup> rejects the idea of the double procession of the Holy Spirit. He states plainly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father without participation of the Son.

Theodoret, criticising Cyril's statement that the Holy Spirit is proper to the Son («ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ»), says that if Cyril means that the Holy Spirit has His existence from or through the Son, this doctrine is blasphemous and impious<sup>2</sup>. Theodoret goes on to say that the Holy Spirit is «ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ» only in the sense of consubstantiality. The origin and source of the Spirit's existence is the Father alone. The procession of the Holy Spirit is an eternal act of the Father and for this reason St. John has written «proceeds» and not «is going to proceed»<sup>3</sup>. This hypostatic procession from the Father is the distinctive mode of being of the Holy Spirit and in this He differs from the Son who comes from the Father by generation and from the creation which was created<sup>4</sup>.

1. Theodore of Mopsuestia, commenting on John 15,16, clearly distinguishes the mode of being of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and His mission in the world from the Father through the Son. Cf. THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA, *In Evangelium Joannis Commentarii Fragmenta*, PG. 66, 780B: «Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῖς λεγομένοις, ὃ ἐξ αὐτῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς τῆς οὐσίας ἔχει τὴν ὑπαρξίν. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ φυσικὴν ἐκεῖθεν πρόοδον ἔλεγε διὰ τοῦ ἔκπορεύεται, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἔξωθεν γινομένην, ἄπορον περὶ τίνος λέγει, πολλῶν ὄντων κοινῶς τῶν κατὰ διακονίαν ἀποστελλομένων πνευμάτων... Ἐναυῖθα δὲ ἰδικόν τί φησι, καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖνο γνωρίσαι ἱκανὸν ὃ μόνον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος φωνῇ κυρίως καλούμενον ἐν τῇ θεῖᾳ Γραφῇ».

2. *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII Capitibus*, PG. 76, 432D: «Ἴδιον δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφυῆς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον ἔφη... καὶ ὡς εὐσεβῆ δεξιόμεθα τὴν φωνήν. Εἰ δ' ὡς ἐξ Υἱοῦ ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο, καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀπορρίψομεν. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγοντι, ἴδιον Πνεῦμα ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται' καὶ τῷ θειοτάτῳ δὲ Παύλῳ ὁμοίως φάσκοντι, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ». Cf. also, MANSI, 5, 876: «καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐξ Υἱοῦ ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχον, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορευόμενον, ἴδιον δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὡς ὁμοούσιον ὀνομάζομεν».

3. *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium* 5, 3, PG. 83, 453D-456A: «Τὸ Πνεῦμα τοίνυν τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἔχει τὴν ὑπαρξίν μεμαθήκαμεν.... Τῷ δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἴδιον τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται' ἔδειξε πηγὴν ὄντα τοῦ Πνεύματος τὸν Πατέρα. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἐκπορεύεται, ἀλλ' Ἐκπορεύεται, δεικνὺς καὶ τῆς φύσεως τὴν ταυτότητα καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τὸ ἄκμητον.... Τὸ γὰρ ἐκπορευόμενον, ἀχώριστον ἐξ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται».

4. *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII Capitibus*, PG. 76, 432CD.

Indeed, the Holy Spirit is called «Spirit of God» and «Spirit of Christ» but it is due to their consubstantiality and does not imply that He has His origin from both (i.e. Father and Son)<sup>1</sup>.

Theodoret also argues that the Holy Spirit is called «Spirit of God», because He derives His existence from the Father. He also is called «Spirit of Christ» because of His mission to men which is derived from Christ<sup>2</sup>. For this reason, H. B. Swete is justified when he writes that «there is no room in this Pneumatology for an eternal procession, either from or through the Son»<sup>3</sup>.

*(To be continued)*

---

1. *Interpretatio Epistolae ad Romanos* 8, 11, PG. 82, 132C.

2. *Ibid.*: «καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορεύεται ..... ἡ δὲ τοῦτου χάρις τοῖς ἀξίοις διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χορηγεῖται».

3. H. B. SWETE, *Op. cit.* p. 148. On this ground Thomas Aquinas accuses Theodoret not only as an opponent of *Filioque* but also as a Nestorian. Cf. PG. 94, 831C note 28.