

THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT*

ACCORDING TO CERTAIN GREEK FATHERS

B Y
MARKOS A. ORPHANOS

16. GREGORY PALAMAS

Gregory Palamas¹ discusses the issue of the Procession of the Holy Spirit mainly from two points of view: a) His καθ' ὑπαρξιν procession from the Father alone, and b) His procession κατ' ἐνέργειαν from the Father through or from the Son.

As far as the Spirit's causal procession is concerned, Gregory follows the Greek patristic tradition and argues that the hypostasis of the Father is the unique cause, origin and source of the Son's and the Holy Spirit's divinity and existence². The Father is the cause of the divine unity not only because His nature is one, but also because the Son and the Holy Spirit coming out from the Father, go back to this one and unique Person³.

* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 299 τοῦ προηγουμένου τεύχους.

1. On Gregory Palamas' doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, see: J. MEYENDORFF, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, pp. 228-232; A. RADOVIC, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶν*, pp. 143-201; M. JUGIE, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, Paris 1933, pp. 383-386. A. PAPADOPOULOS, «Ἡ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ», *Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα*, Thessaloniki 1974, pp. 70-84.

2. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.61. BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 133, 25-28: «μία πηγαία θεότης ὁ πατήρ καὶ μόνος ἀρχὴ καὶ μόνος ἀγέννητος... καὶ μόνος πηγὴ θεότητος καὶ μόνος θεότης θεογόνος». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1.30, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 458, 20-25; Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 207, 24-26; Ὁμολογία, MATSOUKAS, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 494, 20-22.

3. Gregory Palamas relying on Gregory of Nazianzus (*Oratio* 42, *Supremum*

According to Gregory Palamas, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone is based on John 15,26 and the Tradition of the Church¹. Of course, the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople, Palamas admits, does not say plainly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, as it does not state that the Son is begotten from the Father alone. Nevertheless, it is self-evident² because the Father is the only cause of being of the two other Persons of the Trinity who are caused (*αἰτιατὰ*)³.

The «ἐκπόρευσις», explains Gregory, is a property of the hypostasis of the Father and not of the divine essence⁴. If it is accepted as a common property of the nature, the Holy Spirit should then also proceed from Himself. In this case, however, the Holy Trinity becomes four Persons⁵. On the other hand, if this «ἐκπόρευσις» is a common property of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit is deprived of it, then the Holy Spirit is alienated from the divine nature⁶.

Gregory goes on to say that because the procession of the Holy Spirit is a hypostatic act of the Father, the double procession introduces two causes and origins into the Holy Trinity, since the Father and the

Vale 15, PG. 36, 476AB) asks Akindynos: «Πρὸς δέ, εἰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχει κατὰ σέ, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἕνωσις πατρὸς καὶ πνεύματος. Πῶς οὖν ὁ αὐτὸς μέγας ἐν θεολογίᾳ Γρηγόριος φησὶν... 'φύσις δὲ τοῖς τρισὶ μία' ἕνωσις δὲ ὁ πατήρ, ἔξ οὗ καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἑξῆς, οὐχ ὡς συναλείφουσαι, ἀλλ' ὡς ἔχουσαι»;». *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 37, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 52, 4-9; cf. also, *Ibid.* 1. 37, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 68, 23-26.

1. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 26-30.

2. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς*, 1.2, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 31, 4-17. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1. 3, BOBRINSKY, ΓΠΣ, 1, p. 31, 20-26.

3. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.37, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 66, 4. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1. 33, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 62, 25-26; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2. 15, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 92, 28-93, 1; *Ibid.* 2. 36, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 110, 18-25; *Ibid.* 2. 50, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 124, 19-22; *Ibid.* 2. 54, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 128, 10.

4. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.6, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 33-28-234,5: «Ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἕγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκ τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ αὐτὸ κατὰ τὴν πατρικὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐκπορευόμενόν ἐστιν· ἡ γὰρ οὐσία πάντη τε καὶ πάντως μία τῶν τριῶν. Οὐκοῦν τὸ ἐκπορεύειν τῇ πατρικῇ ὑποστάσει ἐφαρμόζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* p. 24, 10-15.

5. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 15, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 43, 23-26: «Ἐἰ μὲν κοινόν ἐστι πατρὶ τε καὶ υἱῷ τὸ ἐκπορεύειν, κοινόν ἐσται τοῦτο καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ τετραὸς ἐσται ἡ τριάς· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα γὰρ ἐκπορεύσει πνεῦμα ἕτερον».

6. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 4. 7, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 209, 15-19; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.14, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 43.

Son are two distinctive hypostases¹. The threat of introducing into the Holy Trinity two origins is in no way ruled out by the assertion that the Father and the Son constitute a sole origin of the Holy Spirit². This is absolutely contrary to the «θεογόνον» which is an incommunicable hypostatic property of the Father³. «Πῶς», Gregory states, «ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνωτάτω τριάδος αἱ δύο... τοῦ ἑνὸς ἁγίου πνεύματος μία εἰσὶν ἀρχαί, ἐν ᾗ μηδαμῶς ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ θεογόνον κοινωνία; Μόνος γὰρ τεθεολόγηται θεότης θεογόνος ὁ πατήρ... Μέχρι γὰρ ἂν ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων λέγασιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐκ ἔστι μίαν εἶναι τῆς θεότητος τοῦ ἑνὸς πνεύματος ἀρχή»⁴. On the other hand, if the «θεογόνον» were to be attributed to the Son, it would lead to another misconception, namely, that the Son is of the same hypostasis as the Father⁵.

Therefore, Gregory points out, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone safeguards the Monarchia and rules out the danger of introducing into the Holy Trinity two principles and causes⁶.

Gregory Palamas points out that it is necessary to distinguish between the origin of the Holy Trinity, which is the Father alone, and the origin of the creation, which is the Triune God. Palamas' argument runs thus: «'Αλλ' εἰς ἡμῖν θεὸς καὶ μοναρχία τὸ προσκυνούμενον... 'Η δημιουργικὴ ἀρχὴ μία ἐστίν, ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... 'Ο δὲ πατήρ πρὸς τῷ πηγῆ τῶν πάντων εἶναι διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ πηγῆ καὶ ἀρχὴ ἐστὶ θεότητος 'θεογόνος' ὧν μονώτατος»⁷.

According to this distinction, the Father alone is the origin and root of the Holy Trinity⁸. The Father sends out the Son by way of

1. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.7, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 34, 15-19: «οὐκοῦν ἐνι τι τῶν τῆς πατρικῆς ὑποστάσεως ἔχει τὸν υἱόν· εἰ δ' ἔχει, ἢ δύο ἔσονται τὰ αἰτία, ὡς ἐν δυσὶν ὑποστάσεσι τοῦ ἐκπορεύειν ἔντος, οὕτω γὰρ δύο καὶ τὰ αἰτιατά, ὡς τοῦ αἰτιατοῦ, ἐν δυσὶν ὑποστάσεσι θεωρουμένου, ἢ συνδραμοῦνται εἰς μίαν τὴν ὑπόστασιν ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱός».

2. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1. 6-7, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 208-210; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 37, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 68, 20-23; *Ibid.* 2. 67, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 136, 17-19.

3. Gregory Palamas remains adamant on this point. Cf. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 15, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 43, 16-44, 24; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2. 67-68, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 139, 16-29; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1. 7, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 210, 16-19.

4. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 14, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 42, 15-18, and *Ibid.* pp. 42, 28-43, 2.

5. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 22, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 81, 28-30.

6. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 40, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 70, 16-19.

7. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον*, 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 207, 14-26.

8. *Ὁμολογία*, 1, MATSOUKAS, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 494, 20-22: «μόνος αἰτία καὶ

generation and the Holy Spirit by way of procession¹. The Father as the unique «ἀρχή» is the cause of the unity of the Holy Trinity and its hypostatic differentiation². The three divine Prosopa as a trihypostatic principle³, Palamas argues, create together⁴, because they possess one sole energy and will⁵. Their activity from the Father through the Son is realized in the Holy Spirit⁶. On the basis of the distinction between the «πατρική ἀρχή» and the «τριαδική ἀρχή», the statement of Gregory of Nazianzus that the Son is «ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχή»⁷ does not

ρίζα και πηγὴ τῆς ἐν υἱῷ και ἁγίῳ πνεύματι θεωρουμένης θεότητος». Cf. also, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς*, 1. 44, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 41, 3-5; *Ibid.* 2. 26, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, 102, 12-15; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδωνον* 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 207-208.

1. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.41, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 115, 26-30; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 8, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 36, 15-20.

2. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.20, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 48, 25-30: «οὐδ' ἡ μονὰς εἰς μονάδα κινηθεῖσα και εἰς ἐτέραν αὐθις μονάδα ἡ δυάς, ἀλλ' ἡ μονὰς θεοπρεπῶς εἰς δυάδα κινηθεῖσα, μέχρι τριάδος ἔστη». Καὶ ἔϊς ἡμῖν θεός· οὐ μόνον ὅτι μία θεότης, ἀλλ' ὅτι και εἰς ἐν ἀμφοτέρα τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει». Gregory of Palamas again depends on Gregory of Nazianzus. (*Oratio* 29, *Theologica* 3, *De Filio* 2, PG. 36, 763D and *Oratio* 31, *Theologica* 5, *De Spiritu Sancto*, PG. 36, 148-149A).

3. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.12, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 39, 15; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδωνον* 1.3, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 205, 9-10.

4. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδωνον* 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 207, 14-24: «Ἡ δημιουργικὴ ἀρχὴ μία ἐστίν, ὁ πατήρ και ὁ υἱὸς και τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Ὅταν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος προηγμένα λέγωμεν, τὴν τε ἀγαθότητα, δι' ἣν τὸ εἶναι ἔσχον... ἀρχὴν και πηγὴν και αἴτιον και τὸν υἱὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι φαμέν, οὐχ ἐτέραν, ἄπαχε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν, ὡς τοῦ πατρὸς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι και προάγοντος και ἐπανάγοντος και συνέχοντος καλῶς τὰ πάντα». Cf. also, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.14, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 40, 24-41, 2.

5. *Περὶ ἐνώσεως και διακρίσεως* 21, MANTZARIDES, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 84, 13-15: «μία γὰρ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ θελήματος κίνησις ἐκ προκαταρτικοῦ αἰτίου τοῦ πατρὸς ὀρωμένη και διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ προϊοῦσα και ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι προσφαινομένη».

6. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδωνον* 1.5, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 207, 24-25; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.24, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 41, 4-4; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Βαρλαάμ* 1.21, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 237, 2-3.

7. *Oratio* 45, *In Sanctum Pascha* 9, PG. 36, 633C.

Among others Barlaam, recalling this statement of Gregory of Nazianzus, argued that the Son is a second cause and principle of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, because this second principle comes out from the first i.e. the Father, the Father remains the unique principle and for this reason the monarchia is safeguarded. For Barlaam's views see, BARLAAM CALABRO, *Epistole Greche*, Ep. 1, SHIRO, Palermo 1954, p. 77 and for Gregory Palamas' criticism, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 13, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 39ff; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδωνον* 1.2-3, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 204ff; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Βαρλαάμ* 1.14-16, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 232ff; *Ibid.* 1. 20, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 335.

mean that the Son is the origin of the Holy Spirit but the origin of the creation, which comes into being by the common act of the three divine hypostases¹.

Any confusion of these two principles results in the confusion between the divinity and the creation, for either the creatures have the same mode of being as the Prosopa of the Holy Trinity, or the divine hypostases — and particularly the Holy Spirit — come into being like the created order², namely, by the will and energy of God³.

The idea of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, Gregory maintains, leads to the same misconception, because the statement «tanquam ab uno principio» refers to the divine «economy», namely, the participation of the Son in the creation of the world, and not to «theology»⁴.

On the contrary, the clear distinction between the «πατρική ἀρχή» and the «τριαδική ἀρχή» presupposes the participation of the Son in the act of the creation and excludes any notion of the Son's participation in the causal mode of being of the Holy Spirit⁵. «Ἐκεῖ, Palamas goes on, μὲν ἡ δημιουργοῦσα δύναμις κοινή, ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐ κοινὸν τὸ θεογό-
νον»⁶.

Over and over again Gregory refers to the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit and His manifestation⁷. The mode of being and the

1. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1.5, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 207,28-21: «Ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσης ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἢ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχή... τῶν δημιουργημάτων νόει».

2. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.14, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 41,15-18: «Τοῦ δὲ πνεύματος τὸν υἱὸν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ τῆς σημασίας ταύτης πῶς ἂν φαίη τις, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα δοῦλον καὶ κτιστόν; Ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τοῦτο ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ἄρα ὡς θεότητος ἀρχή». Cf. also, *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1.5, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 208, 36; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.15, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 44, 29-34.

3. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1.2, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 24-5; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1, *Ἐπιλογος*, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 74.

4. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.15, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 44, 1-2; *Ibid.* 16, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 45,13.

5. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Βαβλαᾶμ* 1.21, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 236, 25-237,3. And Palamas goes on, «ἐπὶ γὰρ τὴν κτίσιν ἤλθε διὰ μέσης ὁ θεὸς θεότητος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ πνεύματος... τρόπος γὰρ ἕτερος δημιουργικῆς ἐστὶν ἀρχῆς καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν μοναρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ μοναρχίας ἐκείνης ἕτερος, ἢ τῆς θεογονίας ἐστὶν ἐπώ-
νυμον, ὃς καὶ σφίζεται τῷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχειν ἐκ πατρὸς, ὡσπερ ἐκεῖ-
νος τῷ δι' υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι δημιουργὸν εἶναι τὸν πατέρα».

6. *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Βαβλαᾶμ* 1.21, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 236, 15-16.

7. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.79, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 149,22-25: «Καλῶς ἄρ' ἐφημεν, ὡς τὸ ἐμπορευόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὐκ αἶε τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς προαι-
ώνιον ὑπαρξίν δηλοῖ, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ τὴν ὕστερον φανέρωσιν, καθ' ἣν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κοινωή-

manifestation of the Holy Spirit, Gregory argues, are two aspects of the mystery of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit derives His existence from the Father, yet He exists eternally in the Son and rests in Him¹. The Son participates in the «ἐκφανσις» and manifestation of the Holy Spirit². Therefore, Gregory continues, the Spirit pours Himself out from the Father through the Son and, if you like, from the Son³. Gregory, comparing the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit with His «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» procession, maintains that, the Holy Spirit belongs to Christ by essence and by energy, because Christ is God. Nevertheless, according to essence and hypostasis He belongs but not proceeds, whereas, according to energy, He belongs and proceeds⁴. Because of the perichoresis and the consubstantiality of the hypostases, the Son and the Holy Spirit are «τοῦ ἄλλου» but not «ἐξ ἄλλου»⁵. The Holy Spirit is of the Son but not from the Son.

On account of the difference between the causal and the ἐκφαντορικὴ procession of the Holy Spirit, Palamas explains, when certain Fathers assert that the Holy Spirit comes forth «from both» or «through the Son» or «from the Son», they are referring to the common energy of these hypostases and not to the mode of existence of the Holy Spirit⁶. Therefore, Palamas suggests, when you understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the two, because it comes essentially from

σει τῷ πατρὶ. Cf. also, *Ibid.* 2.82-83, p. 152; *Ibid.* 2.78, p. 148,15-18; *Ibid.* 2. 29, p. 105,1-2.

1. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.73, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p.144,14-21: «Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... ἰδιαιτάτον μὲν ἔχει τῆς ἰδιοτρόπου ὑπάρξεως τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι.... καὶ τῷ υἱῷ οὐχ ἦνται ἡνωταὶ οὐσιωδῶς τε καὶ ἀδιαστάτως, αὐτῷ τε ἐπαναπαυόμενον καὶ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχον καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικῶς διατελοῦν ἀεὶ». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 2.74, p. 146, 3-4; *Ibid.* 2.26, p. 103,10-20; *Ibid.* 1.25, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 52,25-53, 2.

This idea however, goes back to Gregory of Nyssa (*Oratio Catechetica* 2, PG. 45, 178) and John of Damascus (*Expositio fidei* I, 7, *KOTTER*, p. 16,15-21).

2. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.75, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 146,20-24: «ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὡς δι' υἱοῦ καὶ ἐξ υἱοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις χορηγούμενον... εἰ δὲ βούλει ἐκπορευόμενον, ἀλλ' ἦντα ληφθῆναι καὶ φανερωθῆναι εὐδόκησε καὶ ὡς εὐδόκησε διδόμενόν τε καὶ φανερούμενον». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 2.77-78, p. 148; *Ibid.* 2.60, p. 132 22-24; *Ibid.* 1.31, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 59.

3. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 1.29, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 54,23-24.

4. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.29, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 105,17-21: «οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν ὡς θεοῦ καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ κατ' ἐνέργειαν. Ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ».

5. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.29, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 105,2-3.

6. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.62, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 134-5.

the Father through the Son, you should understand this teaching in the following sense: it is the powers and essential energies of God which pour out and not the divine hypostasis of the Spirit¹.

The hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, Gregory continues, does not come out from the Son, nor is it «μεθεκτῆ», i.e. it is not communicated to any creature². Only the divine grace and energy are «μεθεκτά»³. On the other hand, when the Fathers speak about the procession of the Holy Spirit through or from the Son, they connect this procession with the divine essence and not with the hypostasis of the Son⁴. Everything, however, which comes out commonly from the divine essence is energy and not hypostasis⁵.

Gregory Palamas goes on to say that because the divine essence as well as the hypostases are «ἀμέθεκτοι» and only the divine energies «μεθεκτά»⁶, on Pentecost and in other cases where the Holy Spirit was bestowed by Christ, it was not the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit but His charismata that were transmitted⁷. The granting of the divine energies is a common act of the Holy Trinity which starts from the Father, comes through the Son and is realized in the Holy Spirit⁸.

On account of this distinction between the divine essence and the divine uncreated energies, the Holy Scriptures referring to the Holy

1. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.20, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 16,23-28. Cf. and J. MEYENDORFF, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, p. 230.

2. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς*, 2.27, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 102,24-26; Cf. also, *Ibid.* 2,64, p. 135,24-28: «ἀλλὰ καὶ πάρεστιν αἰεὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἡμῖν, πάντως δὲ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, κἄν ἡμεῖς τῆς οὐσίας ἢ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἡμῖστα μετέχομεν».

3. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.48, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 122,14-17: «μη τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος εἶναι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, μηδὲ διδοσθαι ταύτην, μηδὲ λαμβάνεσθαι παρ' οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ τὴν θεῖαν χάριν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν». Cf. also, *Hagiographic Tomos*, PG. 150, 1299D.

4. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.67-68, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 138-140.

5. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.69, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 140,19-141,3. Cf. also, *Ibid.* pp. 141-142. Gregory Palamas develops this notion by recalling similar views of ancient Fathers such as Athanasius (=PS. ATHANASIUS) *Contra Macedonianos dialogus* 1, PG. 28, 1308B; 1309A; 1312CD; 1316C, Dionysius the Areopagite (=PS. DIONYSIUS) *De divinis nominibus* 11, PG. 3, 953CD-956AB and CHRYSOSTOM, In *Joannem hom.*, 30,2, PG. 58, 174.

6. *Θεοφάνης*, 20, MANTZARIDES, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 245,13-16: «Εἰ κατὰ τοὺς ἡμῖν ἀντικειμένους ἢ οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχεται κατὰ ταῦτα παρὰ πάντων, μηκέτι τρισπόστατον αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ μυριοὑπόστατον ὑπάρχειν».

7. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.6, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 82-83.

8. *Περὶ ἐνώσεως καὶ διακρίσεως* 21, MANTZARIDES, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 84,10-15; *Περὶ θείων ἐνεργειῶν* 23, MANTZARIDES, ΣΓΠ, 2, pp. 113-114.

Spirit speak on the one hand of «the Spirit» with the definite article and on the other hand of «spirit» without the article. In the first case the essential derivation is implied while in the second the gifts of the Holy Spirit, i.e. His energies. Therefore, when our Lord infused the disciples with the Holy Spirit He did not say «receive ye the Holy Spirit¹, (as is commonly translated in English) but simply receive «Holy Spirit» that is to say «βραχὺ τι τοῦ Πνεύματος»², His energy and by no means His essence or hypostasis³.

Thus the participation of the Son can be accepted only in the sense of the «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» procession of the Holy Spirit and by no means can it be transferred by induction to His mode of existence. The energies of the Holy Spirit are a result of the common free will and activity of the Holy Trinity⁴; the hyparxis, however, of the Holy Spirit is an act of the hypostasis of the Father⁵. Therefore the Son participates in the mission and the energies of the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit owes His existence to the Father alone⁶.

According to Gregory Palamas, the «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son is eternal and it becomes temporal when the Father and the Son will. «Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πέμπειν ἔχειν τὸ πνεῦμα - Gregory states - τὸ ἅγιον πρὸς τοὺς ἀξίους κοινόν ἐστιν ἐξ αἰδίου τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ· πέμπει δὲ χρονικῶς ἐκάτερος, ἀμφοτέροι δὲ μᾶλλον ὁπότε δέοι»⁷.

The energy as uncreated pre-exists before its realization and manifestation, therefore, «ἐπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ προθεωρεῖται τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι, εἰ καὶ μὴ κατὰ χρόνον»⁸.

1. *John* 20,13.

2. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.6, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 83,3.

3. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.6, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 83,3-6: «Σαφές οὖν ὡς μερικὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνέργειαν διὰ τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος ἔδωκεν, οὐκ αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν ἢ τὴν ὑπόστασιν· ἀμερῆς γὰρ παντάπασιν ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος φύσις τε καὶ ὑπόστασις».

4. *Περὶ ἐνώσεως καὶ διακρίσεως* 21, *MANTZARIDES*, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 84,25-28; *Ἀντεπιγραφαὶ εἰς ἐπιγραφὰς Βέκκων*, 3, *PAPAEVAGELOU*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 105,5-15.

5. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. Εὐχὴ, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 25.

6. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.26, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 102,10-15; *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. Εὐχὴ, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 25,6-10: «πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευτῶς τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον, καὶ δι' υἱοῦ τοῖς ὁρθῶς πιστεύουσιν εἰς σὲ καὶ διδόμενον καὶ πεμπόμενον καὶ φαινόμενον». Cf. also, *Ὁμολογία* 3, *MATSOUKAS*, ΣΓΠ, 2, p. 495, 30-31.

7. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.14, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 92,1-3.

8. *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 2.74, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 146,7-9.

In order to illustrate the eternal existence of the common energies in the Holy Trinity and their temporal manifestation, Gregory Palamas uses for the first time in the Greek patristic tradition the analogy of «love» (ἔρωσ) which was introduced in the West by Augustine¹ and used by others². Thus, according to Palamas, the Spirit of the Word from on high is like a mysterious love of the Father towards the Word mysteriously begotten: it is the same love as that possessed by the Word and the well-beloved Son of the Father towards Him Who begat Him; this He does in so far as He comes from the Father conjointly with this love and this love rests, naturally, on Him³.

Gregory, referring to the Incarnate Logos argues that the Holy Spirit is indeed the Spirit of the Son as well, but He receives this, too, from the Father, because of His attribute as the Spirit of Truth, Wisdom and the Word; since truth and Wisdom are words appropriate to the Genitor⁴.

Gregory Palamas is here obviously referring on the one hand, to the eternal relations within the Holy Trinity and particularly to the mutual «χρῆσις» of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and on the other hand to the Holy Spirit's temporal mission. This «love», however, which «comes from the Father conjointly with this love», by no means is the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit coming into existence from the Father and the Son, because in His «χρῆσιν» the Son already possesses the Holy Spirit and this «love» abides in Him⁵. But the Son

1. *De trinitate* IX. 190. 15, PL. 142, 269: «Cum itaque se mens novit et amat, jungitur ei amore verbum ejus. Et quoniam amat notitiam et novit amorem et verbum in amore est, et amor in verbo, et utrumque in amante atque dicente».

2. Cf. ANSELM OF CANTERBURY, *Monologion* 49-54; ALBERT THE GREAT, *Summa Theologiae*, I. tr. 7. q. 31. 2; THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologica*, 1a. 27, 2-4.

3. *Capita physica theologica* 36, PG. 150, 1145A: «Ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνωτάτω Λόγου, οἷόν τις ἔρωσ ἐστὶν ἀπόβρυχτος τοῦ Γεννήτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν ἀποβρύχτως γεννηθέντα Λόγον· ὃ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐπέραστος Λόγος καὶ Υἱὸς χρῆται πρὸς τὸν Γεννήτορα· ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔχων αὐτὸν συμπροελθόντα, καὶ συμφυῶς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναπαυόμενον».

4. *Ibid.*

5. For a discussion on this topic see: A. RADOVIC, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον τὸν Παλαμᾶν*, pp. 168-174; IDEM, «Ὁ τριαδολογικός χαρακτήρ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πνευματολογίας», *Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος*. Εἰσηγήσεις, Athens, 1971, pp. 28-30.

possesses the Holy Spirit because He comes out from the Father in His existence¹.

If we take into account that, according to Palamas, every name applied to God refers to His energy and not to His essence or hypostasis², this characterization of the Holy Spirit as «love» which is used by the Father and the Son, applies not to the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit but to the common energy. This common energy is the love of the Triune God³. It exists eternally in God and is manifested in time coming out from the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.

That Gregory Palamas by this image of love, strange to the Eastern tradition, is referring to the procession «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» of the Holy Spirit and not to His causal existence is clear from his explanation that the Holy Spirit is the preeternal joy of both, i.e. Father and Son, as common to both as concerns its use «χρησις», hence it is sent by both only to those who are worthy, but being only of the Father, as far as its existence is concerned. Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds alone from the Father as concerns its existence⁴.

By this clear distinction between the «καθ' ὑπαρξιν» procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and His «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» from the Father through the Son or from the Father and the Son, Palamas excludes the idea of Filioque. The double procession of the Holy Spirit to Palamas' judgment introduces confusion or relativism of the Hypostases and their hypostatic properties. In the case in which the Father and the Son, as one principle, proceed the Holy Spirit, then they are confused into a φυσικῆ ἀδιακρισία and the Holy Spirit Himself—as the unity of the two hypostases—is not clearly distinguished as a hypostasis.

1. Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς 2.26, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 102, 12-15.

2. Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἠσυχάζοντων 3. 2. 10, CHRISTOU, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 664, 25-27; *Ibid.* 3. 2. 9, p. 662, 25-28; Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκινδύνον 3. 4, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 296, 5-6.

3. This notion of 'love' was also interpreted in this sense by the Council held at Constantinople in 1722. Thus in its Encyclical letter to the Orthodox people of Antioch, it remarks: «ὁ ἔρωσ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τριῶν προσώπων λέγεται... Εἰ δ' ὁ Θεὸς Ἀγάπη, εὐδηλον ὅτι καὶ τὰ τρία πρόσωπα». (I. KARMIRIS, *Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Vol. 2, Athens 1953, p. 847).

4. *Capita physica theologica* 36, PG. 150, 1145A: «Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ Πατὴρ ἢ καὶ Υἱὸς προαιώνιος χαρὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐστίν, ὡς κοινὸν μὲν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν χρῆσιν (δι' ὃ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄξιους πέμπεται) μόνον δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς καθ' ὑπαρξιν ὑπάρχον. Δι' ὃ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνον ἐκπορεύεται καθ' ὑπαρξιν».

On the other hand the distinction between the «καθ' ὑπαρξιν» and «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» procession of the Holy Spirit safeguards man's participation in the uncreated grace i.e. the common energies of the Triune God and at the same time excludes the danger of polytheism¹.

17. MARK OF EPHEBUS

Mark Eugenicus², Metropolitan of Ephesus, arguing against the Latins and the pro-unionists at the Council of Florence³ and after it against those who had subscribed to its Decree or accepted its pronouncement that the Holy Spirit has His essence and His subsistent being from the Father and the Son simultaneously, and proceeds from both eternally as from one principle and one spiration⁴, insists that the Holy Spirit derives His hypostasic hyparxis from the Father alone⁵.

In Mark's opinion the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone is suggested by the words of our Lord Himself who is the Divine Word and the first theologian and the Head of all theologians⁶. Thus Mark, commenting upon John 15,24, remarks that by the words «when the Paraclete cometh» is suggested the coming of the Holy Spir-

1. Θεοφάνης, 20-21, *MANTZARIDES*, ΣΙΤΙ, 2, pp. 245-248.

2. On Mark of Ephesus' doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, cf. V. GRUMEL, Marc d' Ephèse, *Vie-écrits-doctrine*, *Estudios Franciscans* 19 (1925) pp. 438-442; J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, pp. 227-269; C. TSIRPANLIS, *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence. A historical re-evaluation of his personality*, Thessaloniki 1974, pp. 85-94; M. JUGIE, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, vol. 2, pp. 403-6.

3. The long discussions on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit are preserved in the minutes of the Council of Florence. See a critical edition of the version given by the *Greek Acts*, in J. GILL, *Quae supersunt actorum Graecorum concilii Florentini necnon Descriptionis cuiusdam ejusdem*, Rome, 1953. J. GILL, in his book, *The Council of Florence*, pp. 180-269 provides a comprehensive but not always objective account of this discussion and the relevant events.

4. The decree of the Council of Florence runs thus: «Ὁρίζομεν, ἵνα αὕτη ἡ τῆς πίστεως ἀλήθεια ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν χριστιανῶν πιστευθεῖ τε καὶ ἀποδειχθεῖ, καὶ οὕτω πάντες ὁμολογῶσιν· ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ αἰδίως ἐστὶ, καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ ὑπαρκτικὸν αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἅμα καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων αἰδίως ὡς ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἀρχῆς καὶ μοναδικῆς προβολῆς ἐκπορεύεται». (AG., 2, p. 462, 12-20).

5. *Capita Syllogistica* 31, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 401; *Ibid.* 32, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 401; *Confessio fidei* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 435.

6. MANSI 31A, 845E; 848ABCD; 849A.

it to the world, in freedom and dignity. By the words «Whom I will send you from the Father», is stated the mission and manifestation of the Holy Spirit. In this sending of the Holy Spirit both Father and Son participate. While by the words «Who proceedeth from the Father» is indicated the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone¹.

To Mark's judgment, it is not accidental that Christ, when referring to Holy Spirit's mission and manifestation, considers Himself as taking part in it, while when referring to His hypostatic existence Christ confines it to the Father alone, precisely because the Son has no part in it whatsoever². Otherwise Christ would reveal it³.

Continuing, Mark points out that in the Creed it is stated that the Holy Spirit «proceeds from the Father» and not from the Father alone, and also the fact that the Fathers repeat this statement of the Creed, by no means contradicts the idea of Holy Spirit's procession from the Father alone, as the Latins argued⁴, because it is self-evident. Not only because none of the Greek Fathers say that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son⁵, but also because in the Creed, with reference to the begetting of the Son, it is stated that He is «born from the Father» and not from the Father alone, precisely because it is self-evident⁶. Thus, Mark, considering the silence of the Creed as a positive argument insists that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, Mark goes on to say, is the only sound doctrine because, according to the tradition of the Eastern Church and the teaching of the Fathers⁷, the Fa-

1. MANSI 31A, 848A.

2. MANSI 31A, 848CD.

3. BESSARIONIS, *Refutatio Marci Ephesini* 4, PG. 161, 181BC.

4. *Epistola Encyclica contra Graeco-Latinos ac Decretum Synodi Florentinae*, 3, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 451: «Οὐδέποτε, φησίν, ἡ τῶν Γραικῶν Ἐκκλησία τὸ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἔλεγεν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι· τοῦτο δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως· ὥστε κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρότερον ἤμεν καὶ νῦν ἐσμὲν ἡνωμένοι».

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.* GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.2, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 31,18-30, puts forward the same argument.

7. Mark, in a collection bearing the title, *Testimonia a Marco Ephesio collecta quibus probatur ut ait Spiritum Sanctum e solo Patre procedere*, PETIT, PO., 15, pp. 342-367, collects the relevant passages from the Scriptures and the Greek Fathers and insists on this point.

ther in His hypostatic faculty as Father is the unique principle, source and cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit¹. Indeed, the Father begets the Son and proceeds the Holy Spirit from His essence but by His hypostasis². Thus begetting and procession are hypostatic acts of the Father and not of the common divine nature³. Since the hypostatic properties are not communicable⁴, the Father remains the unique cause of being of the Son and the Holy Spirit⁵.

If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, as from two distinct hypostases, Mark argues, then two principles and two causes and two producers are introduced into the Holy Trinity⁶. If He proceeds from the common essence then the Holy Spirit sharing the same essence must cause His own procession⁷. Again if He proceeds from a certain common productive power (προβλητική δύναμις), then this power must be identical with the divine essence, otherwise another θεογόνον element must be accepted in the Holy Trinity apart from the essence and the hypostases⁸.

I am not going to discuss the implications of the twofold proces-

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 32, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 401: «Μόνος ἄρα ὁ Πατήρ ἀρχὴ μία τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος... Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ θεῖος Διονύσιος διαρρήδην φησί: 'Μόνη πηγὴ τῆς ὑπερουσίου θεότητος ὁ Πατήρ'». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 5, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 376; *Ibid.* 48, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 413; *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 436-7.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 10, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 381.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 5, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 376: «'Πνεῦμα', φησὶν ὁ Νυσσαεὺς θεολόγος, 'τὸ τῆς Πατρικῆς ἐκπορευόμενον ὑποστάσεως'. Τίτι δῆλον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι τὸ προβάλλειν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔστιν ὑποστατικὸν εἶτ' οὐδ' προσωπικὸν ἰδιωμα;». Mark quotes here and elsewhere (*Ibid.* 1, *PETIT*, PO, 15, p. 371) from a lost work of Gregory of Nyssa entitled, *De Theognosia*. Parts of this treatise are preserved by E. ZYGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica* VIII, PG. 130, 257-6, but not the above quoted passage. The same quotation is to be found in Gregory Palamas (*Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 9, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΠ, 1, p. 47,2-3).

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 15-16, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 386.

5. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 376; *Ibid.* 15, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 386; *Ibid.* 24, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 393.

6. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 368-70: «'Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν ὡς ἐκ δύο ὑποστάσεων, δύο ἀρχαὶ προδήλωσ καὶ δύο τὰ αἰτία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας Τριάδος καὶ δύο οἱ προβολεῖς, καὶ ἡ μοναρχία ἀνήρηται».

7. *Ibid.* p. 369: «ἡ γὰρ ἂν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα προέβαλλεν ἑτερον ἢ αὐτό, τῆς αὐτῆς κοινωνοῦν φύσεως». I read προέβαλλεν instead of Petit's reading προέβαλλιν which makes no sense.

8. *Ibid.*

sion of the Holy Spirit to which Mark comes over and over again. I should like to underline briefly Mark's criticism of the presupposition and theological foundations of Filioque as they were presented by his contemporaries in order to justify it.

The first point which draws Mark's criticism is the Latin theory that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, but as from one principle and cause and by one Spiration¹. Mark argues that this is unacceptable, because the twofold procession of the Holy Spirit yet as from one principle makes the Father and the Son two principles or confuses their Persons².

Since the Father is the unique «cause» and the Son «caused», the Son can never be αἴτιον. Not only because it contradicts the uniqueness of Father's causality³, but also because it makes the Son cause and at the same time caused (αἴτιο-αἰτιατόν) which is absurd⁴. On the other hand the «cause» and the «caused» cannot be put together and make one principle and cause, just as the Father cannot be Father

1. This notion goes back to Augustine who argued that the Father and the Son are the principle of the Holy Spirit but not as two principles, because the Son's capacity to participate in the Holy Spirit's procession was given to Him by the Father, who 'principally' proceeds the Holy Spirit. (*De Trinitate* 15. 29; 15. 47; 5.15). This idea became traditional in the West. Latin Fathers and Doctors such as ANSELM OF CANTERBURY (*De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos*, 18), ALBERT THE GREAT (*Summa Theologiae* tr. 7, q. 31. m 3, ad q. 1). THOMAS AQUINAS (*Summa Theologica* 1α, q. 36, α, 2-4), DUNS SCOTUS (*Oxon.* 1. d. 12. q. 1, n. 2) share it. This was officially sanctioned by the IVth Lateran Council (1215) and the Second Council of Lyons (1274). Thus in the first Constitution on the procession of the Holy Spirit of the II Council of Lyons it was promulgated: «Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit». (*Conciliarum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (JEDIN), Freiburg i. Br. 1962, p. 290, 9-11). This doctrine was endorsed by the Council of Florence (1438-1445) in which it was solemnly declared: «Spiritus sanctus... ex utroque aeternaliter tanquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit» (AG., 2, p. 462).

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 11, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 383; *Ibid.* 12, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 384; *Ibid.* 24, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 393.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 18, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 388: «οὕτω δὴ καὶ μόνον αἴτιος, (i.e. Father) ἄλλ' οὐκ αἰτιατός· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν προσώπων ἄρα μόνον αἰτιατὰ καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων αἴτιον. Εἰ γὰρ τι τούτων καὶ αἴτιον εἴη, τὸ μόνον ἀναιρεθῆσεται, καὶ οὔτε μόνον καὶ κυρίως αἴτιον ἔσται οὔτε μόνον καὶ κυρίως αἰτιατόν· οὐ τούναντίον ἀνάγκη εἶναι προσαποδέδεικται».

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 34, PETIT, PO., 15, pp. 402-3.

and Son or the Son Son and Father¹. The notions of «cause» and «caused» imply logical opposition, but according to the Latin tradition the opposition of relations produce distinction and differentiation of the Persons and not unity of them².

Mark also objects to the Latins' argument, that just as Father, Son and Holy Spirit in creating the world are not three principles but one without loosing their hypostatic individualities, in the same way Father and Son proceeding in common the Holy Spirit are not two principles but one without confusion or mixture³. Mark, following Gregory the Cypriot⁴ and Gregory Palamas⁵, explains that there is a difference between the *τριαδική ἀρχή* which is the principle and cause of the creation and the *πατρική ἀρχή* which is the principle of the Divinity⁶. As far as the creation of the world is concerned, the three Divine Persons on the ground of their common energy, power and will create jointly as one principle⁷. But it is not so with the existential

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 16, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 368.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 19, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 389.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 41, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408: «Καὶ πῶς, φησὶν, ἡ κτίσις ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι τὸ εἶναι λαβοῦσα, οὐ τρία ἔχει τὰ αἷτια, ἀλλ' ἐν αἷτιον καὶ ἓνα δημιουργόν;». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 46, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 411; *Ibid.* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370; This notion is common to the Latin tradition. AUGUSTINE, (*De Trinitate* 5, 13) argued that: «Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus Sancti, non duo principia; sed sicut Pater et Filius unus Deus, et ad creaturam relative unus Creator et Dominus, sic relative ad Spiritum Sanctum unum Principium». ANSELM OF CANTERBURY, (*Op. cit.* 18) on the same ground maintained that just as Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not three principles or three creators in creating the world but one principle, in the same way Father and Son in proceeding the Holy Spirit are not two but one principle. THOMAS AQUINAS, (*Summa contra Gentiles*, 4. 25. 15) shares the same view, and the Council of Florence has declared: «Spiritus sanctus quicquid est aut habet, habet a Patre simul et Filio. Sed Pater et Filius non duo principia Spiritus sancti, sed unum principium, sicut Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus non tria principia, creature, sed unum principium» (*Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, p. 547).

4. GREGORY OF CYPRIOT, *De processione Spiritus sancti*, PG. 142. 294CD-295A.

5. GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1.13-14, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΓΗ, 1, pp. 39-42.

6. *Capita Syllogistica* 32, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 401: «Μόνος ἄρα ὁ Πατήρ ἀρχὴ μία τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡσπερ καὶ μόνῃ ἡ Τριάς ἀρχὴ μία πάσης τῆς κτίσεως».

7. *Capita Syllogistica* 41, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408: «Ἡ κτίσις... οὔτε ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας εἴρηται τοῦ Πατρὸς ἢ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὔτε μὴν ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς

procession of the Holy Spirit, which is a hypostatic faculty of the Father alone¹. The induction of the mode of being of the Holy Spirit from the mode of being of the created order would cast the Holy Spirit down to the rank of the creation².

On the ground of the distinction between these two principles the statement of Gregory of Nazianzus that the Son is «ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχή»³ does not mean that the Son is principle of the Holy Spirit but principle of the creation because conjointly with the Father and the Holy Spirit, He created it⁴. It is noteworthy, Mark says, that Gregory referring to the existential relation of the Divine Prosopa calls them «ἀναρχον καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς»⁵. Thus, he makes clear that the Holy Spirit comes forth not from the ἀρχή i.e. the Son, but with the ἀρχή from the Unoriginated ἀρχή i.e. the Father⁶.

The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, as from one joint principle and cause, Mark maintains, is impossible because the faculty of being principle and cause is an hypostatic or Personal property⁷. As such, however, it distinguishes the Persons and does not unite them⁸. Therefore, as long as the Son is considered as a principle of the Holy Spirit's procession, in no way can diarchy be excluded from the Holy Trinity, since everything which naturally owes its being to the two cannot be considered as coming from one⁹.

θελήσεως καὶ δυνάμεως, ἥτις ἐστὶ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ τῶν τριῶν· ὅθεν καὶ τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν αἴτιον ἔχει καὶ δημιουργόν». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370.

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 41, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370: «Ἐὶ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἢ τε κτίσις ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, τί γε ἄλλο ἢ κτίσμα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον; ». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 46, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 411.

3. *Oratio* 45, *In Sanctum Pascha* 9, PG. 36, 633C.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 371; *Ibid.* 41, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408; *Ibid.* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370. For a similar argument of Barlaam and a refutation by Gregory Palamas, see GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 12-15, *BOBRINSKY*, ΣΠΙ, 1, pp. 39-43; *Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 1. 4-8, *MEYENDORFF*, ΣΠΙ, 1, pp. 206-211.

5. *Oratio* 42, *Supremum Vale* 15, PG. 36, 476A.

6. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 372.

7. *Capita Syllogistica*, 11, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 383; *Confessio fidei Florentinae* 2, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 439.

8. *Confessio fidei Florentinae* 2, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 439: «ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ προσωπικὸν ὑπάρχει καὶ διακρίνον τὰ πρόσωπα».

9. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370: «Τὸ δὲ φυσικῶς ἐκ δύο τῆν

On the other hand, the diarchy and the danger of introducing two causes cannot be avoided by considering the Son as the ἄμεσον or πόρρω or προσεχές cause and the Father as ἔμμεσον or πορρωτέρω or διὰ τοῦ προσεχοῦς¹. These notions indicate opposed relations which result in the distinction of these principles and not in their identity². Therefore, Mark concludes, «οὐκ ἄρα ἐν αἴτιον ὁ Πατήρ ἔσται καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἀντικείμενα αἰτία ὄντα»³.

Also the twofold procession of the Holy Spirit as from one principle is not possible even if He proceeds «from» the Father «through» the Son. Everything which derives its existence from someone through some other owes its existence to two causes⁴. Every human being coming into existence from a «man» through a «woman» has two causes and two principles⁵. Just as Jacob born from Abraham through Isaac has two causes of his being in spite of the fact that the one is ἔγγιον and the other ἑγγύτερον⁶. Thus, Mark, concludes as long as the Son is a principle of the Holy Spirit's procession in no way can diarchy in the Holy Trinity be avoided⁷.

The second point of Mark's criticism concerns the meaning of the prepositions «from» (ἐκ) and «through» (διὰ) in respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit. At the Council of Florence⁸ they were accepted as synonymous⁹ and on this ground the notion that the Holy Spirit proceeds «from the Father through the Son» was considered as identical to the notion that proceeds «from the Father and from the

ὑπαρξιν ἔχον οὐκ ἔν τις ὅλωσ ἐξ ἑνὸς εἶποι ποτέ· καὶ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐκάτερον εἰς τὸ εἶναι συμβάλλειν».

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 370; *Ibid.* 10, PO., 15, p. 382; *Ibid.* 42, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 19, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 389.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 42, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 408.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 40, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 407.

5. *Capita Syllogistica* 40, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 407-8.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 2, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 439.

8. For the discussion held at the Council on this point, see: J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, pp. 227-269. V. LAURENT, *Les MEMOIRES du grand ecclésiastique de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos*, 8, 31, p. 418; 9, 10, p. 444.

9. Mark says that: «ἤδη δέ τις καὶ περὶ τῆς διὰ φιλοσοφεῖν ἤρξατο παρὰ τοῖς ἡμετέροις διδασκάλους εὐρισκομένης, ὡς ταῦτόν τῃ ἐκ δυναμένης καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος τῷ Υἱῷ διδούσης». (*Relatio de rebus a se gestis* 5, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 447).

Son». Thus the Latins have argued and the Latinizers have accepted that the procession of the Holy Spirit «through» the Son implies that the Son as well as the Father is the cause or principle of the Holy Spirit¹. Therefore, the Filioque clause was not an innovation, but the common faith of East and West, expressed only by two slightly different formulas, lawfully added to the Creed for good and sufficient reasons².

Mark in refuting this idea argues with the previous Greek Fathers³, that the prepositions «from» and «through» bear the same meaning and imply causality only when they refer to the creation⁴ or to the energetic manifestation of the Holy Spirit and never to His mode of being⁵. Indeed, Mark admits, certain Greek Fathers in referring to the procession of the Holy Spirit have said that He «proceeds from the Father through the Son». They, however, have meant not the mode of being of the Holy Spirit but His consubstantiality with the Father and the Son⁶. Maximus the Confessor underlines this by stating that the Holy Spirit proceeds substantially from the Father through the ineffably generated Son⁷.

1. In the Decree of Florence signed on Sunday, July 5th of the year 1439 by the Latins and the Greeks, but not by Mark of Ephesus, it is promulgated: «προσκομισθεισῶν δὲ μαρτυριῶν ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς καὶ πλείστον χρήσεων τῶν ἁγίων διδασκάλων ἀνατολικῶν τε καὶ δυτικῶν, τῶν μὲν ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, τῶν δὲ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ λεγόντων τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ἀποβλεπόντων ἀπάντων ἐν διαφόροις ταῖς λέξεσιν» (AG., 2, p. 481).

2. *Ibid.*

3. Cf. GREGORY THE CYPRIOT, *Scripta apologetica*, PG. 142, 256-8; GREGORY PALAMAS, *Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικὸς* 1. 25-26, BOBRINSKY, ΣΓΠ, 1, pp. 52-53.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 10, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 380: «Ἐνθα μὲν οὖν ἰσοδυναμεῖ περὶ δημιουργίας ὁ λόγος, ὅτε καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τίθεται». Cf. *Ibid.* 10, PETIT, PO., 15, pp. 380-381.

5. *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 436. Mark recalls the similar statements of JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *Expositio fidei* I, 7, KOTTER, p. 16,15-16 and GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Contra Eunomium*, 1, 378, JAEGER, GNO, 1, p. 138,5-20.

6. *Capita Syllogistica* 38, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 406: «Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ θεολόγοι, ὅταν μὲν τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπλῶς ὅθεν ἔχει τοῦ εἶναι, παραστῆσαι βούλωνται, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον λέγουσιν... ὅταν δὲ ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν ὁμοουσιότητα δηλοῦν ἐθέλωσι, τότε καὶ τὸ δι' Υἱοῦ προστίθεται καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον λέγουσιν». Cf. also, *Capita Syllogistica* 10, PETIT, PO., 15, pp. 382-3; *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 436.

7. *Capita Syllogistica* 38, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 406. For Maximus' statement Cf. *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, PG. 90, 672C.

On the other hand by the formula «through the Son» certain Fathers have suggested not Holy Spirit's origin but His procession which is simultaneous with the begetting of the Son from the Father¹. Therefore, «through» here means not «from» but «with» or «together»² as Gregory of Nyssa makes clear³.

That these prepositions bear a quite different meaning, Mark argues, is proved by the fact that the Greek Fathers referring to the procession of the Holy Spirit, never say that He proceeds «from» the Son or «through» the Father but «from» the Father «through» the Son⁴. This procession of the Holy Spirit «through» the Son is applied by the Fathers to the Holy Spirit's energetic manifestation⁵. Therefore, they do not use it alone but always in connection with Father's participation in it and in the formula «from the Father through the Son»⁶. Thus, Mark concludes, the phrase «through the Son», bearing a different meaning from the phrase «from the Son»—with reference to the procession of the Holy Spirit⁷—implies not principle or cause but channel through or with which something is manifested, conveyed, known or given⁸.

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 10, *PETIT*, PO., 15, 381; *Ibid.* 34, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 402; *Ibid.* 38, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 406.

2. *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 436-7: «διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι δι' Υἱοῦ λέγεται, τουτέστι μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ... τὸ μετὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ γνωρίζεσθαι». Cf. also, *Capita Syllogistica* 10, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 381; *Ibid.* 38, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 406-7.

3. GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Contra Eunomium*, 1, 378, *JAEGGER*, GNO, 1, p. 138,5-20.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 20, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 389: «Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀπατήσωμεν αὐτοὺς ἀναγκαιῶς ἡμῖν ἐπιδειξάι, εἰ καὶ διὰ Πατρὸς προιέναι ἢ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εὐρηταί που φερόμενον. Εἰ γὰρ ταῦτόν καὶ ἀδιάφορον ἦν, ἔδει καὶ τοῦτο λέγεσθαι». *Ibid.* 20, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 390: «δι' Υἱοῦ προιέναι λέγεται, δι' Υἱοῦ χορηγεῖσθαι τῇ κτίσει, ἐν Υἱῷ μένειν, ἐν Υἱῷ ἀναπαύεσθαι, οὔτε δὲ διὰ Πατρὸς προιέναι, οὔτε διὰ Πατρὸς χορηγεῖσθαι, οὔτε ἐν Πατρὶ μένειν, οὔτε ἐν Πατρὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 20, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 391; *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 436-438.

5. *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 437: «Λέιπεται ἄρα τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὕτω λέγεσθαι κατὰ τὸν τῆς συνεπτυγμένης θεολογίας τρόπον, ὡς ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον δι' Υἱοῦ φανεροῦσθαι ἢ γνωρίζεσθαι ἢ ἐκλάμπειν ἢ πεφηνέναι νοεῖσθαι». Cf. also, *Capita Syllogistica* 10, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 381; *Ibid.* 20, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 390.

6. *Capita Syllogistica* 10, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 380-1; *Confessio fidei Florentiae* 1, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 436-438.

7. *Capita Syllogistica* 39, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 407.

8. V. LAURENT, *Les MEMOIRES du grand ecclésiarque de l' Eglise de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos*, 8, 31, p. 418; 9,10, p. 444.

The third point to which Mark comes to over and over again is the Latin view that the existing «order» in the enumeration of the Divine Prosopa of the Holy Trinity corresponds to their order of origin and nature. Thus the Holy Spirit being third in order after the Father and the Son derives His being from both¹.

To Mark's opinion such an ontological order does not exist in the Holy Trinity: Not because the Holy Trinity is *ἄτακτος* but because it is above any kind of order². Therefore, the Divine Prosopa, as Gregory of Nazianzus has already said, are pronumerated and connumerated and subnumerated³. When the Latins recall Basil's statement, «even if the Holy Spirit is third in dignity and order, why need He be third also in nature»?⁴ to prove their case, they misintepret it. Basil

1. According to Mark the Latins argued that: «τρίτον εἶναι μετὰ τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον... ἐκ τῆς τάξεως ταύτης οἴονται δεικνυσθαι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ τάξιν εἶχε, φασί, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν κατὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν σχέσιν, οὐκ ἂν ἐλέγετο τρίτον, οὐδὲ ἐξῆς μετ' αὐτόν». (*Capita Syllogistica* 6, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 376. Cf. also, *Ibid.* pp. 377-8).

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 6, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 377: «Οὐκ ἔχει γὰρ, φασί, τάξιν ἡ ἅγια Τριάς, οὐχ ὡς ἄτακτος, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ τάξιν». Mark quotes here PS. CHRYSOSTOM'S, *Homilia: in illud Abraham dictum: Pone manum tuam sub femar meum*, PG. 56, 555 and changes the *θεία φύσις* to the *ἅγια Τριάς*. Cf. *PETIT*, *Op. cit.* p. 377 note α'.

3. *Oratio* 34, *In Aegyptiorum adventum* 15, PG. 36, 253D-256A.

4. *Adversus Eunomium* 3, 1, *GARNIER*, 1, 172BC. At the Council of Florence this passage provoked a long discussion and disagreement between Mark of Ephesus and John of Montenero, the chief spokesman of Latins. The reason was that the text used by Mark differed substantially from that used by John. The text upheld by the Latins plainly supported the double procession of the Holy Spirit, while that upheld by the Greeks did not. Mark at once questioned its authenticity and accused the Latins of its falsification. John of Montenero vindicated its verosity by arguing that his version was supported by many manuscripts held at Constantinople. The differing versions of this particular text read thus:

Text upheld by the Latins:

Τίς γὰρ ἀνάγκη, εἰ τῷ ἀξιώματι καὶ τῇ τάξει τρίτον ὑπάρχει τὸ Πνεῦμα, τρίτον εἶναι αὐτὸ καὶ τῇ φύσει; Ἀξιώματι μὲν γὰρ δευτέρου τοῦ Υἱοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχον καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον καὶ ἀναγγέλλον ἡμῖν καὶ ὅλος τῆς αἰτίας ἐκείνης ἐξηγημένον, παραδίδωσιν ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος, φύσει δὲ τρίτη χρῆσθαι, οὔτε παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν δεδιδάγμεθα, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον δυνατὸν συλλογίσασθαι... Οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῇ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι, οὐκέτι ἂν εἰκότως, ὡς ἀλλοτρίως ὑπάρχει φύσεως ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐκεῖθεν δῆλον».

Text upheld by the Greeks:

Τίς γὰρ ἀνάγκη, εἰ τῷ ἀξιώματι καὶ τῇ τάξει τρίτον ὑπάρχει τὸ Πνεῦμα, τρίτον εἶναι αὐτὸ καὶ τῇ φύσει; Ἀξιώματι μὲν γὰρ δευτερεύειν τοῦ Υἱοῦ παραδίδωσιν Ἰσως ὁ

does not say that there is an order of nature in the Holy Trinity, but arguing in a supposition he allows for the sake of argument that if the Holy Spirit is third in order and dignity, even so He is not third in nature¹.

If in the formula of baptism², Mark goes on, the Father comes first, the Son second and the Holy Spirit third, it is because things which are to be enumerated have to be mentioned one after another. The Father, possessing as cause a logical priority over the Son, comes first; the Son as caused comes second, and the Holy Spirit perforce comes third³. He comes third not only because He is συμπληρωτικὸν of the Holy Trinity, but because if He were to come second it would imply that He was also a Son of the Father⁴.

To Mark's judgment, even if we accept that there is a certain «order» in the Trinity on account of the triune Deity, it by no means leads to Filioque because «μη πᾶν τὸ ἐχόμενόν τινος κατὰ τάξιν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχειν ἀνάγκη»⁵. This is made clear by Basil⁶ who

τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος· φύσει δὲ τρίτῃ χρῆσθαι, οὐτε παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν δεδιδάγμεθα, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον δυνατὸν συλλογισασθαι..... οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῇ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι (ἵνα καὶ ὁλωσὶ συναρῶσιν), οὐδέτι ἂν εἰκότως, ὡς ἄλλοτριας ὑπάρχον φύσεως, ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐκεῖθεν δῆλον». (*Adversus Eunomium* 3,1, GARNIER, 1, 272BC).

Nevertheless, the debate on the authenticity of the above text still continues A. KRANICH, *Op. cit.* pp. 61-81; F. NAGER, *Op. cit.* pp. 85-89; L. LOHN, *Op. cit.* pp. 461-500; P. MARAN, *Op. cit.* pp. XVI—XX, accept the text upheld by the Latins as genuine. On the other hand K. HOLL, *Op. cit.* p. 142; O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Bd, 3, Freiburg i. Br., 1923, p. 161; C. JOHNSTON, *The Book of Saint Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, On the Holy Spirit, Written to Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium against the Pneumatomachi*, Oxford 1892, p. 90, consider it as falsificated. For a recent discussion on this topic see: J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, pp. 194-226; J. DECARREUX, «L' Union des Eglises au Concile de Ferrare — Florence», *Irenikon*, 39 (1966) pp. 47-72, 177-220; M. van PARYS, «Quelques remarques à propos d' un texte controversé de Saint Basile au concile de Florence», *Irenikon*, 40 (1967) pp. 6-16; M.A. ORPHANOS, «Ο Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἰς τὴν τριαδολογίαν τοῦ Μ. Βασιλείου», Athens 1976, pp 147-8, footnote 2.

1. MANSI 31A, 869CD-872AB.

2. *Matth.* 28,19.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 6, PETIT, PO., 15, pp. 376-7.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 6, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 377.

5. *Ibid.*

6. BASIL, (=GREGORY OF NYSSA), *Ep.* 38,4, COURTONNE, 1, pp.

states that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone and depends on the Son, that is to say, He is placed in order after Him, not because He proceeds from Him, but because He is apprehended with Him¹. «Dependent on» and «be caused of» are two quite different things. The first implies not more than «ordered with» while the second points to the cause, and principle of being². Thus, Mark concludes, while the «order» of confessing or pronouncing the names of the divine Prosopa and their enumeration does not point to the double procession of the Holy Spirit, the Latin notion of ontological and natural order introduces to the Trinity ὑπαριθμήσεις and ὑποβαθμίσεις which could easily lead to the subordination of the Hypostases³.

The fourth point of Mark's criticism refers to the theory of Thomas Aquinas according to which only opposed relations of origin distinguish the Divine prosopa⁴. These opposite relations exist be-

1. See the original text on p. 31, footnote 2 of this study.

2. AG., 2, p. 303-304; 310; 349.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 43, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 409.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 13, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 384: «Θωμᾶς ὁ τῶν λατίνων διδάσκαλος, ἀξιῶν μᾶ τῶν ἀντιθέσεων ἀνάγκην εἶναι τὰ θεαρχικά πρόσωπα διακρίνεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ (φησιν) ἡ ὕλική διάκρισις ἐν τοῖς θείοις χώραν οὐκ ἔχει, τὴν κατὰ σχέσιν ἀντίθεσιν βούλεται μόνην εἶναι τὴν διακρίνουσαν, ὡς ἐτέρας τῶν ἀντιθέσεων οὐκ ἐχούσης χώραν». Of course Thomas Aquinas is not the author of this theory. Anselm of Canterbury had already argued that «unity does not lose its consequence unless some opposition of relation stands in the way» (*De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos* 2). On this ground Anselm suggested that the Holy Spirit, in order to be really distinct from the Father and the Son, must proceed from both. (*Ibid.* 4). Albert the Great followed suit and maintained that in God «there is distinction only according to the opposition of relation». (*Summa Theologiae*, tr. 9. q. 41, m. 2, a. 3) and therefore the Persons of the Holy Trinity without such opposed relations are not distinct. (*Ibid.*) Thomas Aquinas by accepting that «Personae divinae distinguntur relationibus originis» and «Solus ordo processionum qui attenditur secundum originem processionem multiplicat in divinis» (*De Potentia*, q. 10, a. 2) has developed this theory in its fullness.

Don Scotus Erigena protested in vain that not only opposite relations but disparate relations as well distinguish the Divine Persons. And also that in the case in which the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Son, both are nevertheless really distinct because of their constitution. (*Oxon.* 1. d. 11, q. 2, n. 9). Anselm's and Thomas' authority influenced the decision of Council of Florence, which in the Decree of the Jacobites has solemnly promulgated that: «everything is one where opposition of relation does not intervene». (*Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, p. 547, 1-2).

This of course implies that only opposed relations distinguish Father, Son and Holy Spirit as distinct Persons of the Holy Trinity.

tween Father and Son as well as between Father and Holy Spirit because paternity and filiation and paternity and procession produce opposite relations and consequently distinctions¹. But as the Holy Spirit, Thomas goes on, cannot be really distinct from the Father unless He proceeds from the Father, in the same way He cannot be really distinct from the Son unless He proceeds from the Son². On this ground the idea of the Son as an origin for the procession of the Holy Spirit—indeed connected to the first origin, the Father — is necessary and the Filioque clause well founded³.

Mark opposing this theory remarks, with the Fathers previous to him, that the distinction of hypostases is grounded not in their opposite relations and even more not in their different origins, but only in their different mode of being from the one principle and origin i.e. the Father⁴. The mode of being of the Son by way of generation and that of the Holy Spirit by way of procession, as perfect acts of the Father's hypostatic faculty, clearly distinguish them from their own origin and cause i.e. the Father, as well as from among themselves⁵. For this reason, Mark continues, although the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, the two are really distinct both by their constitution and by their mode of being⁶.

In opposition to the Thomistic theory of different origin and opposite relations Mark underlines the distinction of hypostases «κατὰ τὴν ἀντίφασιν», which is the result of their different mode of being and their individual properties⁷. Thus between «Unbegotten», «Begotten» and

1. *Summa Theologica* 1a, 28.3 ad 1.

2. *De Potentia*, q. 10, a. 2-5. And for a brief discussion see: F. DONDAINE, «Theologie latine de la procession du Saint Esprit», *Russie et Chretienité* 2, pp. 211-216.

3. GREGORY PALAMAS, 'Επιστολή πρὸς Ἀκλίνδων, 1. 7, MEYENDORFF, ΣΓΗ, 1, p. 209, 29-30.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 13, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 384: «Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐκεῖνο δῆλον ἐπὶ τῶν θείων, ὡς ὁ ἐκάστου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τρόπος αὐταρκέστατος πρὸς τὴν ἀφ' ἑτέρου διάκρισιν τρόπους δὲ ὑπάρξεως ἐπὶ τῶν θείων προσώπων οἱ θεολόγοι τὸ ἀγέννητον καὶ τὸ γεννητὸν καὶ τὸ ἐκπορευτὸν λέγουσιν, ἥτοι καθολικώτερον φάναι, τὸ ἀναίτιον καὶ τὸ αἰτιατόν, ἅπερ ἀλλήλοις δῆλον ὡς ἀντιφατικῶς ἀντίκεινται». Cf. also, *Ibid.* 3, PETIT, PO. 15, pp. 372-3.

5. *Capita Syllogistica* 25, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 396: «Ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ αὐτοῦ Πατρὸς προελθόντα κατὰ διάφορον τρόπον, αὐτῷ τούτῳ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς διακρίνεται καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐκείνου μὲν, ὅτι περ ἐξ ἐκείνου... ἀλλήλων δέ, ὅτι κατὰ διάφορον τρόπον, εἰ καὶ ἄγνωστος ἡμῖν οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ἀπόρητος».

6. *Ibid.* 26, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 397.

7. *Capita Syllogistica* 3, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 373: «δῆλον ὅτι πρὸς μὲν τὸν Πα-

«Proceeding» or the «cause» and those «caused» there is a distinction according to the «ἀντίφασις», but not according to their opposite relations and their different origin¹. This distinction «κατὰ τὴν ἀντίφασιν» on the one hand safeguards the hypostatic differentiation of the divine Prosopa and on the other is in accordance with the teaching of the Eastern Fathers, who consider the Father as the unique principle of the Holy Spirit and reject any participation of the Son in the Spirit's mode of being².

Mark does not leave unnoticed the existing difference between the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit and His mission or energetic manifestation, and criticizes the partisans of Filioque that their failure to pay the required attention to it leads them to the confusion of the «καθ' ὑπαρξιν» and the «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» procession of the Holy Spirit³.

Mark following the other Greek Fathers, says that the mission of the Holy Spirit is a common act of the three Divine Prosopa and takes place in time and for a particular purpose⁴. This mission does not belong to the eternal hypostatic properties, but to the *ad extra* activities of the Holy Trinity⁵. Thus John 14,7 is applied not to the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit but to His grace, power and manifestation i.e. His energetic procession⁶.

Christ, Mark goes on to say, by His infusion of the Holy Spirit to His disciples after the resurrection gave to them neither the essence nor the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, but His energy⁷. Also on the day

τέρα τῶ τῆς σχέσεως διακρίνονται λόγῳ καὶ ὡς αἰτιατὰ πρὸς αἴτιον ἔχουσι, πρὸς ἄλληλα δέ, τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀντίφασιν ἀντιθέσει· τὸ γὰρ Υἱὸν εἶναι τῶ μὴ Υἱὸν εἶναι δῆλον ὡς ἀντιφατικῶς ἀντίκεινται. Οὐκ ἄρα καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων, Υἱοῦ λέγω καὶ Πνεύματος, ἀναγκαῖα ἢ κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν ἀντιθέσεις πρὸς διάκρισιν, εἴπερ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀντιφατικῆς ἀντιθέσεως δύνανται διακρίνεσθαι».

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 13, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 384-5.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 13, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 385.

3. *Capita Syllogistica* 4, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 373.

4. *Capita Syllogistica* 4, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 374.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*, p. 375: «Διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τῶν ἤδη προεγνωσμένων ἀπεστάλθαι λέγεται, τουτέστι πεφανερῶσθαι· τίς γὰρ ἑτέρα πέμψις καὶ ἀποστολὴ Θεοῦ τοῦ πανταχοῦ παρόντος καὶ μηδαμοῦ μεταβαίνοντος; Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν· Ἐὰν πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐ τὴν αἰδίον πρόοδον δηλοῖ πάντως· οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἐὰν ἐγὼ μὴ ἀπέλθω, οὐ προβαλῶ τὸν Παράκλητον, ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, τότε προβαλῶ, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἔὰν αὐτὸς ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν ὑμῶν γένομαι, τὴν ἐκεῖνου χάριν καὶ δύναμιν ὑμῖν φανερῶσω».

7. *Capita Syllogistica* 8, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 378-9.

of Pentecost neither the essence nor the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit were manifested and bestowed but His energy¹, which coming from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit is common or rather identical to the three Divine Prosopa². Therefore, to Mark's judgment, the distinction between ousia and energies in God is of cardinal importance for the proper answer to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Mark Eugenios summarises successfully the Greek Patristic tradition on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, not by simply repeating the arguments of the previous Fathers, but by advancing their reasoning and putting the problem in the perspectives of his own time. Indeed, his explanation bears a polemical nuance. It is because he has advanced his arguments in a difficult situation fighting against the Latins and the Greek pro-unionists, acting as the main defender and representative of the Greek patristic traditional line. For this reason he sometimes goes to extremes and discredits his opponents' arguments. He reacts to the Definition of Florence by his insistence upon the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, basing his arguments upon the teaching of ancient Fathers. Tracing the implications of Filioque he follows to a great degree the line of Photius³ and in refuting the foundations of Filioque and the arguments of his opponents in favour of it, he mainly follows the line of reasoning used by Gregory Palamas⁴.

Mark's discussion on the distinction between ousia and energies and its implications for the question of the Procession of the Holy Spirit is rather limited, because he was prevented by the Emperor from discussing this topic at the Council of Florence⁵. Nevertheless,

1. *Capita Syllogistica* 4, *PETIT*, PO., 15, pp. 375-6.

2. *Capita Syllogistica* 21, *PETIT*, PO., 15, p. 376: «Πνεῦμα ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἐν-ἐργειαν λέγει· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ μεριζομένη· αὕτη τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡ πεμπομένη· πέμπεται δὲ παρὰ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, κοινῇ τῆς Τριάδος οὐσα, μᾶλλον δὲ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτή». Mark quotes here Chrysostom's 32nd, *homilia In Joannem*, PG. 59, 183.

3. Cf. *De S. Spiritus Mystagogia*, PG., 102, 280-391.

4. Cf. A. SCHMEMANN, «Ὁ ἄγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός» in *Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς* 34 (1951), pp. 34-43; 230-241.

5. AG., 2, p. 346. According to S. Syropoulos: «Ἦν δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς προαναπεφωνημένοι καὶ προστεταγμένοι παρὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως, ἵνα εἰ ζητηθῆ τὸ τοιοῦτον, μηδὲως ἀπολογῆσεται τις περὶ αὐτοῦ». (V. LAURENT, *Les MEMOIRES du grand ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos, sur le concile de Florence*, 2, p. 292.

it is quite clear that he does treat the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit from this angle and the existing difference between the divine essence and the divine uncreated energies determines his whole discussion on the subject of the Holy Spirit's procession.

Mark himself was considered by theologians belonging to the traditional patristic theology as the «criterion» of the sound doctrine¹ and the «bright and great and godly wise herald of truth»²; therefore it is not surprising that his teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit has had a tremendous influence among his contemporaries as well as upon later Orthodox Theologians even to the very present.

(To be continued)

1. MARK OF EPHEBUS, *Morientis oratio ad amicos, Responsio domini Scholarii*, PETIT, PO., 15, p. 487.

2. J. EUGENICUS, *Antirrhethikos*, quoted by C. TSIRPANLIS, *Op. cit.*, p. 107.