

THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT*

ACCORDING TO CERTAIN GREEK FATHERS

BY

MARKOS A. ORPHANOS

CONCLUSION

If by way of summary we are to draw some conclusions we can say, on the account given, that the idea according to which the Holy Spirit derives His being equally and coordinally from the Father and the Son is foreign to Greek patristic theology. This is not accidental nor a mere obstinate attitude of the Greek Fathers towards the different Latin tradition, but the natural outcome of their theological insight and their approach to the mystery of the triune Godhead.

The earlier Greek Fathers — particularly after the Cappadocians made clear the distinction between *ousia* and *hypostasis*, common or natural and individual or hypostatic properties, which are not interchangeable or confounded — have steadfastly argued that the Father is the principle, cause and fountainhead of the Deity. Thus, the Father, deriving His being from Himself, brings forth from His essence, but in the capacity of His hypostatic property, the Son by way of generation, and the Holy Spirit by way of procession. He confers to them His whole essence but He does not communicate to them His hypostatic property of begetting and proceeding. Therefore, the Father remains the unique «cause» of being of the Son and of the Holy Spirit who are «caused».

On this basis the later Greek Fathers have discussed and developed further the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit and on this ground they have met the different approach on the subject by their Latin counterparts. Thus, the Latin doctrine of a twofold procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son was rejected by the Greeks because they felt that such a notion introduces two principles and two causes into the Holy Trinity. This of course was not possible to be reconciled with the idea of the divine Monarchia of the Father, which was a key-stone of faith.

* Συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 461 τοῦ προηγουμένου τεύχους.

The Latin's explanation that the Holy Spirit proceeds in a primordial sense from the Father, Who endowed the Son with the capacity to produce the Holy Spirit in a such a way that the Son is not the «cause» but a joint-cause, has not satisfied the Greek Fathers. They, in disagreement with the pro-unionists, thought that this idea leads to diarchy or to confusion of the hypostases. If the Father and the Son, they objected, proceed the Holy Spirit in their distinct hypostatic faculties then two causes and two principles are introduced into the Holy Trinity. If this occurs as from one Person then the confusion of hypostases is inevitable. If from their common essence, then the Holy Spirit on account of His common essence must participate in His own mode of Being.

The double procession of the Holy Spirit as from one cause, the Greek Fathers maintained, is impossible not only because the Father proceeds the Holy Spirit as a perfect «cause» and producer, but also because the capacity of being «cause» is a hypostatic and individual property, and as such uncommunicable. The hypostatic properties distinguish and by no means unite the Prosopa. On the other hand, the «cause» and that which is «caused» cannot be a joint cause, because their difference implies distinction and not unity.

The Greek Fathers were in agreement with the Latins who maintained that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit made jointly the created order acting as one cause and principle — and not three — without confusion of their own hypostases. They were, though, in disagreement with the Latins' inference that this can also be applied to the mode of being of the Holy Spirit. The conviction of the Greek Fathers was that the πατρική ἀρχή as the common cause of the creation must not be confused with the τριαδική ἀρχή which remains the unique cause of being of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Any induction of the mode of being of the Holy Spirit from the mode of being of the creation was felt by the Greek Fathers to confuse creation and Divinity.

The later Greek Fathers also were not prepared to accept the idea of the double procession of the Holy Spirit as a necessary consequence of His opposed relations of origin towards the Father and the Son. To their understanding it is not the opposite relations of origin that are the foundation and cause of the hypostatic existence and differentiation of the Divine hypostases but the different mode of being of the Son by way of generation and of the Holy Spirit by way of procession

from their unoriginated unique principle and cause, i.e. the Father.

The Greek Fathers were also cautious and rejected the Latin's conclusion that the «order» of manifestation and names of the Divine Prosopa, implies their existential and natural order as well. For the Greeks there is no ontological order whatsoever in the Holy Trinity. If in the formula of baptism, in the doxology and the confession of the Holy Trinity the Father comes first, the Son second and the Holy Spirit third, it is because the Father as «cause» possesses a logical priority to the Son and the Holy Spirit who are «caused». The Son naturally comes second and the Holy Spirit perforce third, because if He came after the Father then He must be Son.

The Filioque controversy gave to the later Greek Fathers the opportunity to study thoroughly and develop the idea of difference between *ousia* and *energies* in the Triune God — a topic which rests in the insight of the earlier Greek Fathers — and in the light of this distinction to consider the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. This outlook enabled them to make a clear distinction between Holy Spirit's essential derivation and His energetic manifestation. On this ground they argued that the «*καθ' ὑπαρξιν*» procession of the Holy Spirit is quite different from His «*κατ' ἐνέργειαν*» procession. In His «*καθ' ὑπαρξιν*» procession the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, yet in His «*κατ' ἐνέργειαν*» or «*κατ' ἐκφανσιν*» He comes out from the Father through the Son and even from the Father and from the Son, because all divine energies are realised from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. Thus the prepositions «from» and «through» according to Greek Fathers, bear the same meaning and they can be interchanged only when referring to Holy Spirit's energetic manifestation. In respect to His essential derivation the Holy Spirit proceeds «from» the Father and by no means «from» or «through» the Son.

By this distinction between essence and energies the Greek Fathers were able not only to avoid any confusion between the mode of being of the Holy Spirit and His energetic manifestation or His activities, but also to point out that this «*κατ' ἐνέργειαν*» procession of the Holy Spirit «through» the Son is eternal and as such must not be restricted or confused with His temporal mission.

It is true, that not all Greek Fathers, particularly the ancient ones, dealing with the procession of the Holy Spirit are always explicit or clear cut in their account. We have to remember though, that the issue became a theological problem for the Greek Fathers only in the

9th century. Therefore early authorities such as Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Didymus of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria etc. in a time when the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit was undefined, unclarified and unsettled, have made statements which if they are to be evaluated in themselves and with later standards can be interpreted in the sense of Filioque. This conclusion, though, cannot be maintained when these statements are considered within the whole trinitarian thought of these Fathers.

In spite of certain ambiguities one point, I think, is beyond question, namely that the 'consensus' of the Greek Fathers never tolerated an hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit «*a patre Filioque*» even in the sense of «*ex utroque tanquam ab uno principio et una spiratione*».

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΙΣ

Ἡ ἐργασία αὕτη εἶναι ἀνατεθεωρημένη καὶ ἐπηξημένη ἔκδοσις μελέτης γραφείσης κατόπιν αἰτήσεως τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς «Πίσιτις καὶ Τάξις» τοῦ Παγκοσμίου Συμβουλίου τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν. Ἀποσκοπεῖ δὲ εἰς τὴν διὰ βραχέων ἔκθεσιν τῆς περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀντιπροσωπευτικωτέρων Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων. Ἡ ἔρευνα ἀρχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁριγένους, ὅστις φαίνεται εἶναι ὁ πρῶτος, ὁ ὁποῖος δέχεται ὅτι εἰς τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἐκτὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, διαδραματίζει ρόλον τινὰ καὶ ὁ Υἱός. Βεβαίως, ὁ Ὁριγένης δὲν εἶναι σαφῆς ὡς πρὸς τὴν συμμετοχὴν ταύτην τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐχ ἤττον, ὅμως, αἱ κατ' αὐτοῦ αἰτιάσεις ὅτι εὐνοεῖ τὴν περὶ διπλῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἰδέαν εὐρίσκουν ἐρείσματα εἰς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

Ἀντιθέτως, ὁ Γρηγόριος Νεοκαισαρείας ἀπορρίπτει τὴν ἄποψιν τοῦ Ὁριγένους καὶ ποιεῖται διάκρισιν μεταξὺ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ τῆς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ φανερώσεως αὐτοῦ. Ἡ διάκρισις δὲ αὕτη μεταξὺ τῆς ὑπαρκτικῆς προελεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τῆς φανερώσεως αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἀποκλείει τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ Filioque.

Ὁ Μ. Ἀθανάσιος, ἐμμένων ἐπὶ τῆς Πατρικῆς Μοναρχίας, δέχεται τὸν Πατέρα ὡς τὴν μόνην πηγὴν καὶ ἀρχὴν τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς («ἐκλάμπει καὶ δίδεται καὶ ἀποστέλλεται διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ»). Τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲν εἶναι ξένον πρὸς τὸν Υἱόν, ἀλλ' ἔνεκα τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος («ἴδιον») αὐτοῦ. Ὁ Υἱὸς πέμπει καὶ χορηγεῖ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἡ πέμψις αὕτη οὐδόλως ἀναφέρεται εἰς τὴν ὑπαρκτικὴν ἐκπόρευσιν αὐτοῦ. Συνεπῶς ἡ ἰδέα τοῦ Filioque εἶναι ξένη εἰς τὴν τριαδικὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Ἀθανασίου.

Κατὰ τὸν Μ. Βασίλειον ὁ Πατὴρ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι καὶ γίνεται ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ὅσον δὲ ἀφορᾷ εἰς τὴν σχέσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν αὕτη εἶναι ἀνάλογος τῆς ὑφισταμένης μεταξὺ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοιαύτης. Οὕτω τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἶναι ἡ «εἰκὼν» τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ «ῥῆμα» αὐτοῦ, ὅστις εἶναι ὁ λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς. Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαρτᾶται ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐξάρτησις αὕτη δὲν εἶναι ὑπαρκτικὴ, διότι αὕτη ἀνήκει εἰς τὸν Πατέρα. Ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐξάρτησις ἀναφέρεται εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἐνέργειαν τῶν τριῶν θείων Προσώπων εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

Ὁ Γρηγόριος Ναζιανζηνὸς τονίζει ὅτι ὁ Πατὴρ εἶναι τὸ μοναδικὸν αἷτιον τῆς εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὑπάρξεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ προσδιορίζει μετὰ πολλῆς σαφηνείας τὸν τρόπον τῆς ὑπάρξεως αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ ὄρου ἐκ π ὀ ρ ε υ σ ι ς. Πλὴν ὅμως παρεμπιπτόντως ἐνδιατρίβει περὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως. Φαίνεται, πάντως, ἀποκλείων πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, διότι χρησιμοποιεῖ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδάμ κοινῆς προελεύσεως τῆς Εὐσας καὶ τοῦ Σήθ, προκειμένου νὰ δηλώσῃ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς προέλευσιν τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

Κατὰ τὸν Γρηγόριον Νύσσης τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ μοναδικὸν αἷτιον τῶν δύο ἄλλων προσώπων τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος ὄντων αἰτιατῶν. Πλὴν ὅμως ὑπάρχουν καὶ χωρὶα εἰς τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Νύσσης, εἰς τὰ ὁποῖα ὑπολανθάνει ἡ ἰδέα ὅτι προκειμένου περὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁ Υἱὸς εἶναι τρόπον τινὰ ἄμεσος αἰτία, τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος ἀπωτέρας. Ἡ «μεσιτεία» αὕτη τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐξεληφθη ὑπὸ τινων ὡς συνεπαγομένη τὸ Filioque. Ἐὰν τὰ χωρὶα ταῦτα θεωρηθοῦν καθ' ἑαυτά, δύναται νὰ ὀδηγήσουν εἰς τὴν ἀποψιν ταύτην, ἐντασσόμενα, ὅμως, εἰς τὴν καθόλου τριαδικὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Γρηγορίου Νύσσης ἀποκλείουν τοιοῦτον συμπέρασμα.

Ὁ Ἐπιφάνιος Κύπρου ἀφορμᾶται ἐκ τῆς Πατρικῆς μοναρχίας καὶ διδάσκει ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται αἰδίως ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ λαμβάνει ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, πεμπόμενον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν χρόνῳ εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Παραλλήλως οὗτος ὁμιλεῖ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος «παρ' ἀμφοτέρων». Ἀλλαχοῦ χαρακτηρίζει τὸν Υἱὸν ὡς δευτέραν πηγὴν, τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος πρώτης, ἢ ὡς πηγὴν ἐκ πηγῆς, ἐξ ἧς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα «λαμβάνει». Αἱ ἐκφράσεις αὗται καὶ ἡ ἐνίοτε ἐμφανιζομένη σύγχυσις μεταξύ τῆς αἰδίου ὑπαρκτικῆς προελεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ τῆς ἐγγρόνου ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ ἠρμηνεύθησαν ὡς δηλωτικὰ τοῦ Filioque. Τοῦτο εἶναι ἐξεζητημένον. Ὁ Ἐπιφάνιος παρ' ὅλον ὅτι δὲν διακρίνεται διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ αὐτοῦ ὀρολογία, ἐν τῇ πραγματικότητι δέχεται δύο ἀρχὰς προόδου τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱόν, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πατὴρ ἐκπορεύει αἰδίως καὶ καθ' ὑπαρξιν τοῦτο, ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς λαμβάνει τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ πέμπει αὐτὸ ἐν χρόνῳ.

Ὁ Κύριλλος Ἀλεξανδρείας δέχεται ἀφ' ἑνὸς μὲν τὴν αἰδίον ὑπαρξιν καὶ ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος («ἐκ») ἢ («παρὰ») τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀφ' ἑτέρου δὲ τὴν ἐν χρόνῳ χορηγίαν καὶ πέμψιν αὐτοῦ («διὰ») τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ τοῦ Νεστορίου ἀγῶνι αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύριλλος ὑπερτονίζει ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἶναι «ἴδιον» τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ ὄχι ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτο δύναται νὰ ἐρμηνευθῇ κακοδόξως, ἐὰν ἐπεκταθῇ πέρα τοῦ ὁμοουσίου. Εἰς ἄλλας περιπτώσεις ὁ Κύριλλος ἀναφερόμενος εἰς τὰς ἐνδοτριαδικὰς σχέσεις τῶν προσώπων τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ δὴ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκφράζεται ἀσαφῶς ἢ κατὰ τρόπον εὐνοοῦντα τὸ Filioque. Τοῦτο συνετέλεσεν,

ὥστε ὑπὸ τῶν Δυτικῶν νὰ θεωρῆται ὡς θιασώτης τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Τοῦτο δὲν εἶναι ἀληθές. Βέβαιον, πάντως, εἶναι ὅτι ὁ Κύριλλος δὲν ἀκριβολογεῖ πάντοτε. Ἡ ὀρολογία αὐτοῦ ἐν τισιν εἶναι ἀσαφής. Ὑποτεταγμένη εἰς τοὺς ἀπολογητικούς αὐτοῦ σκοποὺς εἶναι ἐπιδεικτικὴ διαφόρων παρερμηνειῶν. Κατὰ τὸ περιεχόμενον, ἐν τούτοις, ἡ διδασκαλία αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος εἶναι ὀρθόδοξος, ἔχουσα οὕτω. Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορευόμενον κατὰ τὴν ὑπαρξιν αὐτοῦ ἀίδιως ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς χορηγεῖται τῇ κτίσει ἐν χρόνῳ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ἐνεκα τῆς ταυτότητος τῆς οὐσίας τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἶναι καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ, λόγῳ δὲ τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος ταύτης ὁ Υἱὸς πέμπει τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον Πνεῦμα εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

Ἐν ἀντιθέσει πρὸς τὴν ἀσαφῆ καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένην κατὰ τὴν ὀρολογίαν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, ὁ Θεοδώρατος Κύρρου διδάσκει σαφῶς ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς. Ἐλέγχει δὲ τὸν Κύριλλον ὅτι ἡ ἄποψις αὐτοῦ, καθ' ἣν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἶναι «ἴδιον» τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐπεκτεινομένη πέρα τοῦ ὁμοουσιίου, εἶναι ἐπιδεικτικὴ ἐρμηνείας ὀδηγούσης εἰς τὴν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὅπερ εἶναι κακόδοξον καὶ ἀπαράδεκτον.

Χαρακτηριστικὴ εἶναι ἡ ἄποψις τοῦ Μαξιμου τοῦ ὀμολογητοῦ, ὅστις, παρ' ὅλον ὅτι διαφωνεῖ πρὸς τὴν λατινικὴν θεωρίαν ὅτι «ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον», ἐν τούτοις δέχεται ὅτι αὕτη δύναται νὰ κατανοηθῇ καὶ ὀρθοδόξως, ἐὰν δηλαδή, ἡ ἐκπόρευσις αὕτη δὲν ἀποδοθῇ εἰς τὴν ἀίδιον κατ' αἰτίαν ἐκπόρευσιν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν αὐτοῦ.

Τὴν ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐξαίρει ὁ Ψευδο-Διονύσιος Ἀρεοπαγίτης, χαρακτηρίζων τὸν Πατέρα ὡς τὴν «μόνην πηγὴν τῆς θεότητος» καὶ ὡς «πηγαίαν θεότητα».

Πληρεστέραν ἔκθεσιν τῆς περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως εὐρίσκομεν παρὰ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Δαμασκηνῷ, ὅστις ἐν τινι τρόπῳ συστηματοποιεῖ τὴν ἀποσπασματικὴν καὶ ἐν τισιν ἀσαφῆ διδασκαλίαν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ Πατέρων. Οὕτω παρ' αὐτῷ καθίσταται σαφῆς ἡ διάκρισις μεταξὺ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τῆς «ἐκφαντορικῆς» διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύσεως αὐτοῦ. Ἡ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ «ἐκφαντορικὴ» ἐκπόρευσις αὕτη δὲν περιορίζεται μόνον εἰς τὴν ἐν χρόνῳ πέμψιν καὶ ἀποστολὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀνάγεται καὶ εἰς τὴν προαιώνιον ἐκφανσιν καὶ ἔλλαμψιν τοῦ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ ἀναπαυομένου ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

Ὁ Φώτιος εἶναι ὁ πρῶτος, ὅστις εἰδικῶς ἀσχολεῖται περὶ τὸ θέμα τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Οὗτος δὲ ἀπορρίπτει διαρρήδην τὸ Filioque, ὡς ἀντιτιθέμενον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Γραφήν, τὴν Παράδοσιν τῆς Ἐκ-

κλησίας και τὴν δογματικὴν αὐτῆς διδασκαλίαν. Κατ' αὐτὸν ἢ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπόρευσις τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος εἶναι τὸ φυσικὸν ἐπακόλουθον α) τῆς διακρίσεως μεταξύ τῶν ὑποστατικῶν καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν ιδιωμάτων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι καὶ τοῦ ἀκοινωνήτου αὐτῶν. β) Τοῦ γεγονότος ὅτι ὁ Πατήρ, ὡς ὑπόστασις, καὶ ὄχι ὡς κοινὴ θεία οὐσία, γεννᾷ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ ἐκπορεύει τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Ἡ δὲ καινοτομία τοῦ Filioque διασαλεύει τὸ θεμέλιον τῆς πίστεως, τουτέστι τὸ Τριαδικὸν δόγμα, καὶ ἀναβιοῖ τὰς παλαιὰς τριαδικὰς αἱρέσεις τοῦ Σαβελλίου, τοῦ Μακεδονίου, τοῦ Μάνητος καὶ Μαρκίωνος.

Ἡ διδασκαλία ἐπὶ τοῦ θέματος τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τοῦ Γεωργίου ἢ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου εἶναι πληρεστέρα τῆς τοῦ Φωτίου. Ὁ Γρηγόριος διδάσκει τὴν ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς «καθ' ὑπαρξιν» ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ τὴν «ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ» ἢ «δι' Υἱοῦ» κατ' «ἐκφανσιν» ἢ ἔλλαμψιν τοιαύτην. Ποιούμενος δὲ διάκρισιν μεταξύ τοῦ «ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν» καὶ «ὑπάρχειν» διατείνεται ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἔχει τὴν ὑπαρξιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ὑπάρχει καὶ ἀναπαύεται ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ ἐκφάνεται καὶ φανεροῦται «διὰ» ἢ «ἐξ» αὐτοῦ. Ἡ δὲ δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκφανσις αὕτη δὲν περιορίζεται μόνον εἰς τὴν ἐγχρονον ἀποστολὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὡς ἐγένετο δεκτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Φωτίου καὶ ἐξῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπεκτείνεται καὶ εἰς τὴν αἰωνίαν ζωὴν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος.

Ὁ Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς ἐμβαθύνων καὶ συστηματοποιῶν τὴν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατερικὴν παράδοσιν διδάσκει ὅτι ἡ ἐκπόρευσις τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κατὰ μὲν τὴν ὑπαρξιν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελεῖται ἐκ τῆς θείας οὐσίας κατὰ τὴν Πατρικὴν ὑπόστασιν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς «διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ», ἢ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ «ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ». Εἰς μὲν τὴν καθ' ὑπαρξιν ἐκπόρευσιν ἀποκλείεται πᾶσα συμμετοχὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, διότι τὸ «γεννᾶν» καὶ «ἐκπορεύειν» εἶναι ἀκοινωνήτον ὑποστατικὸν ἰδίωμα τοῦ Πατρὸς. Εἰς δὲ τὴν καθ' ἐνέργειαν τοιαύτην συμμετέχει καὶ ὁ Υἱός, διότι πᾶσα ἐνέργεια τοῦ Τριαδικοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι κοινὴ καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.

Ἐντεῦθεν, ἐπεξηγεῖ ὁ Παλαμᾶς, ὁσάκις οἱ Πατέρες λέγουν ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται «ἐξ ἀμφοῖν» ἢ «ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ» ἢ «διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ», οὗτοι ἀναφέρονται εἰς τὴν «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» ἐκπόρευσιν αὐτοῦ. Αὕτη δὲ εἶναι αἰωνία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγχρονος. Τῆς «κατ' ἐνέργειαν» ταύτης ἐκπορεύσεως μετέχων ὁ ἄνθρωπος θεοῦται.

Ὁ Μᾶρκος Ἐφέσου ὁ Εὐγενικός συνοψίζει καὶ ἀναπτύσσει τὴν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατερικὴν παράδοσιν. Οὕτω καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν τὸ Filioque εἶναι ἀπαράδεκτον ὡς ἀντιτιθέμενον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Γραφήν καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Τοῦτο δὲ εἰσάγει δύο ἀρχὰς καὶ καταλύει τὴν Μοναρχίαν ἢ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν συναλοιφήν τῶν ὑποστάσεων. Ἡ δυαρχία δὲν ἀποφεύ-

γεται διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύσεως εἰς μίαν ἀρχήν, τὸν Πατέρα. Τὸ Filioque εἶναι ἀπόρροια τῆς συγχύσεως τῆς δημιουργικῆς καὶ τῆς προβλητικῆς ἀρχῆς. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐπιφέρει σύγχυσιν τῶν ὑποστατικῶν ιδιωμάτων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι.

Αἱ ὑποστατικαὶ σχέσεις τῶν προσώπων τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος δὲν ἰδρύνουν τὰς ὑποστάσεις ἀλλὰ διακρίνουν ταύτας καὶ χαρακτηρίζουν τὴν διαφορὰν αὐτῶν. Ἐντεῦθεν ἡ σχέσις αὐτῶν δὲν εἶναι σχέσις ἀντιθέσεως, κατὰ τὴν Θωμιστικὴν ἀντίληψιν, ἀλλὰ σχέσις διαφορᾶς καὶ διακρίσεως.

Κατὰ τὸν Μᾶρκον τὸν Εὐγενικὸν ἡ φράσις «διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ» εἶναι ταυτόσημος πρὸς τὴν «ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ» μόνον ὅταν αὕτη ἀναφέρεται εἰς τὴν κοινὴν δημιουργικὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος καὶ οὐδέποτε εἰς τὴν καθ' ὑπαρξιν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἐντεῦθεν οἱ Ἑλληνας Πατέρες οὐδέποτε λέγουν ὅτι τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται «ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ», ἀλλὰ «διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ», ἐνῶ τονίζουν οὔτοι πάντοτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκπορεύεται «ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς» καὶ οὐδέποτε «διὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς».

Ἐν συμπεράσματι ὑπογραμμίζεται ὅτι ἡ ἰδέα τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἶναι ξένη πρὸς τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων.