



***The Byzantine Synthesis of Christology and
Pneumatology.***

P Parginos



Orcid.org/0000-0002-5904-6252

Thesis accepted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree *Doctor of Philosophy* in *Church and Dogma
History* at the North-West University

Promoter: Prof N Vorster

Graduation: May 2020

Student number: 29811198

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my supervisor, Professor Nico Vorster, for his professionalism, his guidance and his patience. I thank Professor Rodney Moss for encouraging and pointing out that the undertaking of a doctoral dissertation is like sharing in the Passion and Resurrection of the Lord. I thank Saheti School and my Church for giving me the luxury of time in which to complete this undertaking. I thank God for everything.

Την διατριβή μου την αφιερώνω στον Σεβασμιώτατο Μητροπολίτη Σύρου, κ.κ. Δωρόθεο Β', σαν ελάχιστη ένδειξη ευγνωμοσύνης για την πατρική του αγάπη και τις ευεργεσίες του προς το πρόσωπό μου και την οικογένειά μου.

KEY WORDS

Filioque, Byzantine Theology, Orthodox-Catholic Dialogue, East-West Schism, Pneumatology, Trinitarian Theology, Maximus the Confessor, Photius the Great, Gregory of Cyprus, Gregory Palamas.

ABSTRACT

Orthodox objections to the filioque clause are often countered by the position that the Orthodox have not adequately dealt with the relationship between the Son and the Spirit, the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. This study argues that it was precisely because of these objections to the filioque, that the Orthodox Church was forced to work out such a synthesis.

The study approaches the topic historically and systematic- theologically. After a brief exposition of the filioque controversy, it will explore the contributions of the relevant Byzantine theologians culminating in Gregory Palamas who not only presents a viable synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology, but also a potentially reconciliatory ecumenical interpretation to the Filioque.

The answer is to be found in the distinction between divine essence and divine energies that characterizes the Patristic thought of the East. It is the result of many centuries of theological debate and deliberation. The foundation was laid by the Early Fathers, supported by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus, expounded upon by Gregory of Cyprus and taken-up by Gregory Palamas.

The *monarchy* of the Father, the Father as sole source and cause of the other two Persons within the Trinity, was a commonly-held belief among the Greek Fathers. Likewise, Palamas insisted on this, but also recognized that certain Fathers allowed for some kind of procession of the Spirit from the Son too. Yet this procession is not a personal one. That comes from the Father alone. Rather, it belongs to the eternal outpouring of the divine energies. The participation of the Son in the procession of the Spirit, can be accepted only in the sense of *energetic* procession, and not applied to the mode of existence.

The existence of the Holy Spirit is an act of the hypostasis of the Father. The Son participates in the mission and the energies of the Holy Spirit. This energetic procession is, however, eternal and becomes temporal at the will of the Father and the Son. This

distinction between *causal* procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, and the *energetic* procession from the Father and the Son eternally and in time is Palamas' contribution and represents the apex of Byzantine theology dealing with the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

And, if Gregory Palamas represents the apex of the theological thought of Byzantium on the issue, it is his theology that ultimately is the 'orthodox' interpretation of the filioque that remains to date, the only two-fold procession acceptable to the Orthodox.

ABBREVIATIONS

1Apol = *'First Apology'* by Justin Martyr

1C = *'First Epistle'* by Clement of Rome

A = *'Ancoratus'* by Epiphanius

AA = *'Against the Arians'* by Athanasius

AA = *'Against the Arians'* by Marius Victorinus

AC = *'Against Celsus'* by Origen

AE = *'Against Eunomius'* by Gregory of Nyssa

AG = *Acta Graeca*

AH = *'Against Heresies'* by Irenaeus

AM = *'On the Holy Spirit against the followers of Macedonius'* by Gregory of Nyssa

ANF = *Ante-Nicene Fathers*

Agrino = <http://agrino.org/cyberdesert/zizioulas.htm>

AN = *'Against Noetus'* by Hippolytus

AP = *'Against Praxeas'* by Tertullian

BH = *'Byzantina Historia'* by Nicephorus Gregoras

CCC = *Catechism of the Catholic Church*

CJ = *'Commentary on the Gospel of John'* by Origen

CPG = *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*

CS = *'Capita Syllogistica Adversus Latinos'* by Mark of Ephesus

Diff. = *'Difficulties'* by Maximus the Confessor

DS = *Denzinger-Schonmetzer*

EH = *'Exhortation to the Heathen'* by Clement of Alexandria

Ep = *'Epistles'* by Fulgentius of Ruspe

EP Sal = *'Epistle to the Philadelphians - Salutation'* by Ignatius

ES = *'Epistle to Serapion'* by Athanasius

EWTN = Eternal Word Television Network

FP = *'On First Principles'* by Origen

FR = *'The Fragments'* by Amphilochius of Iconium

HJ = *'Homilies on the Gospel of John'* by John Chrysostom

Hom. = *'Homilies'* by Gregory the Great

Hom. = *'Homilies on the Dormition'* by John of Damascus

HS = *'On the Holy Spirit'* by Ambrose of Milan

HS = *'On the Holy Spirit'* by Basil of Caesarea

LG = *'Liturgies'* by Basil of Caesarea

MR = Montreal Review

NPF = Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers

Orat. = *'Orations'* by Gregory of Nazianzus

OF = *'Exposition on the Orthodox Faith'* by John of Damascus

ORTH = <http://orthodoxa.org/GB/orthodoxy/canonlaw/canons3econcileGB.htm>

PG = *Patrologia Graeca* or *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. J.P. Migne. ed. 1841-64. Paris.

PL = *Patrologia Latina* or *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina* J.P. Migne. ed. 1841-64. Paris.

SA = *'Second Apology'* by Justin Martyr

SC = *'Supplication for the Christians'* by Athenagoras

Serm = *'Sermons'* by Leo the Great

SJT = *Scottish Journal of Theology*

ST = *'Summa Theologica'* by Thomas Aquinas

TA = *'To Ablabius- On Not Three Gods'* by Gregory of Nyssa

TF = *'The Faith'* by Ambrose of Milan

TO = *'The Orthodox Faith'* by Gregory Nazianzus

TR = *'The Triads'* by Gregory Palamas

TT = *'The Trinity'* by Augustine

TT = *'The Trinity'* by Didymus

TT = *'The Trinity'* by Hilary

TT = *'the Trinity'* by Novatian

USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops). 2003. *The Filioque: a church dividing issue? An agreed statement.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARIES

Acknowledgements	i
Key Words and Abstract	ii
List of Abbreviations	iv

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Problem Statement	1
1.2 Research Questions	2
1.3 Literature Study	3
1.4 Aims and Objectives	8
1.5 Central Theoretical Argument	9
1.6 Methodology	9
1.7 Ethical Considerations	10
1.8 Schematic Representation of Correlations	10

CHAPTER TWO – THE THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE DISPUTE 13

2.1 The Pre-Nicene Fathers	14
2.2 The Cappadocian Fathers	28
2.3 Augustine	34
2.4 Concluding Remarks	41

CHAPTER THREE – THE APPEARANCE OF THE FILIOQUE 43

3.1 Maximus the Confessor	47
3.2 John of Damascus	53
3.3 Photius and his legacy	60
3.4 The Great East-West Schism	66
3.5 Concluding Remarks	71

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

CHAPTER FOUR – LYON AND ITS AFTERMATH	73
4.1 The Second Council of Lyon	73
4.2 John Beccus the Latinizer	81
4.3 Gregory of Cyprus	90
4.4 Concluding Remarks	102
CHAPTER FIVE – THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY AND GREGORY PALAMAS	103
5.1 The Westernizers of the Fourteenth Century	104
5.2 Gregory Palamas	108
5.2.1 Palamas' Theological Thought	108
5.2.2 Trinitarian Particularities	113
5.2.3 Responding to the Filioque	119
5.3 Nilus Cabasilas	123
5.4 Concluding Remarks	124
CHAPTER SIX – FLORENCE AND BEYOND	126
6.1 The Council of Ferrara – Florence	126
6.2 The Council continues in Florence	130
6.3 The Significant Greek Theologians of the Fifteenth Century	137
6.3.1 Bessarion of Nicea	137
6.3.2 Mark of Ephesus	139
6.3.3 Gemistus Plethon	142
6.3.4 Gennadius Scholarius	144
6.4 Concluding Remarks	145
CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSION	146
BIBILOGRAPHY	155

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Problem Statement

The First Ecumenical Council, that of Nicea, was held in 325 in order to address the Arian controversy and drew up a statement of faith regarding particularly, the Person of the Son. The Second Council, held in Constantinople in 381, expounded on this statement. By the time the Third Council took place in Ephesus in 431, the specific Creed had attained such ecumenical acceptance and authority that changes to it were forbidden.

In this Creed, the article referring to faith in the Holy Spirit stated "And in the Holy Spirit... who proceeds from the Father, who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified". The Church of Rome unilaterally added the Latin *Filioque*, meaning "and the Son". With this inclusion, the Creed as used by the Church in the West, thus stated that the Spirit "proceeds from the Father *and the Son*," an addition found unacceptable by the East on doctrinal and canonical grounds. It became the major theological difference between the Church in the East and that of the West, contributing greatly to the Great Schism, and remains today the primary theological obstacle to reunion.

Objections to the filioque clause often produce the counter-argument that the Orthodox have not adequately dealt with the relationship between the Son and the Spirit in Orthodox theology. Thus we find the "Agreed Statement of the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation, 'The Filioque- A Church-Dividing Issue'."(USCCB:2003), stating that "Greek theologians, too, have often struggled to find ways of expressing a sense that the Son, who sends forth the Spirit in time, also plays a mediating role of some kind in the Spirit's eternal being and activity." In the conclusion to his article, *The History of the Filioque Controversy*, Dietrich Ritschl states,

'If Orthodox theologians point to the fact that the western doctrine of the Trinity makes impossible the spiritual transformation of the believer in a participation of the Father in the Spirit, western theology can counter with the criticism that the operation

of the Spirit does not in the Orthodox doctrine of the Trinity appear clearly enough as co-ordinated with the entire work of Christ... what is awaited from Orthodox theology is some help towards a clarification of the Spirit's relation to the Son.' (As cited in Kung 1981:63)

In addition, surprisingly, Metropolitan John Zizioulas (1985: 139) at the end of the third chapter of *Being as Communion* makes, among others, this surprising point:

"Orthodox theology needs to work on the synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology, without which it is impossible to understand the Orthodox Tradition itself or to be of help in the ecumenical discussions."

Is this however a fair assessment? Didn't reaction and response to the Filioque necessitate such a synthesis? Is there no "synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology" in Orthodox theology?

1.2 Specific Research Questions

In researching this problem, I have had to address specific questions that emanate from it:

- Orthodox theology is characteristically *patristic*. Were there no attempts in the early Fathers of the Church at formulating such a synthesis? Was there no clearly defined doctrine in the patristic era dealing with the relationship between the Son and the Spirit?
- The filioque became "the greatest Church-dividing issue". What prompted its development? How did it achieve such apostolicity and ecumenicity in the West? What were the initial reactions from the East?
- How did political conditions affect and influence theological issues? Could these be the reason for Photius' conservative views and inflexible stance on the relationship between Son and Spirit? Did he further orthodox theology on the issue?
- Were any attempts made to show the Greek and Latin views regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit, were possibly compatible? Or were they perhaps 'forced' compromises? What attempts were made to advance Photius' doctrine further and thus express the eternal and permanent relationship existing between Son and Spirit as divine hypostases?
- Does Palamas' theological thought have any relevance to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology? Does he have a position on the filioque, presenting anything viable in response?

- Why was Palamas' *via media* not given a voice in the Council of Florence? Why did views on the filioque become so entrenched shortly after this Council?
- Lastly, is there a synthesis in Orthodox theology between Christology and Pneumatology? And, if so, does this hold any ecumenical potential today?

1.3 Literature Study

Numerous Fathers and theologians have preoccupied themselves with the topic of the Trinity and could have, directly or indirectly, provided towards the synthesis. Christopher Beeley's (2008) study on Gregory of Nazianzus looks at, among other theological and practical issues, Gregory's doctrine of the Trinity. Steven Hildebrand (2007), explores Basil's Trinitarian thought. Anthony Meredith (1995) encapsulates the thought of the Cappadocian Fathers who were instrumental and normative in defining Trinitarian thought. Thomas Weinandy (2003) examines the whole of Cyril of Alexandria's theological thought.

Augustine of Hippo has had a significant influence on western theology and has often been accused of being too much of an essentialist, undermining the distinction of the Persons within the Trinity. Lewis Ayres (2010), however, demonstrates how Augustine offers one of the most refined and comprehensive Trinitarian theologies following the Council of Nicaea. Eleonore Stumpe (2010) presents numerous essays on the work of Augustine. George E. Demacopoulos (2008) presents Eastern Orthodox readings of the Latin theologian and illustrates the theological consensus in ecumenical dialogue, using the early, significant Fathers as reference. Luigi Gioia (2008) describes and analyses Augustine's work, *De Trinitate*, while Matthew Levering (2013) introduces Augustine's theology through seven of his most important works.

Louth's (1996) is probably the best single-volume, general introduction to Maximus the Confessor available in English today. Also of interest is Siecienski's doctoral dissertation *The use of Maximus the Confessor's Writings on the filioque at the Council of Ferrara-Florence* (2005). Maximus the Confessor, in the *Letter to Marinus*, claimed the Western Church (PG 91:13):

do not make the Son the cause of the Spirit, for they know that the Father is the one cause of the Son and the Spirit, the one by begetting and the other by procession, but they show the progression through him and thus the unity of the essence.

His *Letter*, with so much irenic potential, was presented several times at Florence but was unfortunately read within the setting of the prevailing Photian-Carolingian dialectic. Those in favour of union saw in it a justification of the Filioque, but since the decree of the Council attributed causality to the Son also, it provided those against union with yet another proof of Latin error. Yet, as Siecienski (2005: ii) maintains, the *Letter to Marinus*:

properly understood, provided the hermeneutical key to resolving the ancient question of the *filioque*, and that even in the fifteenth century there existed a school of Byzantine Trinitarian theology capable of providing this interpretation.

Louth also wrote on John of Damascus (2003). John was a prolific writer. His writings included polemical and apologetic works aimed against the heresies of his time, works of philosophy, and the systematic exposition called “On Orthodox Theology”, which outlines the Christian understanding of God.

Gilles Emery (2007), Timothy L. Smith (2003) and Matthew Levering (2004) made an important contribution by providing a historical and systematic handling of Thomas Aquinas’ views on the Holy Trinity.

Gregory Palamas, Archbishop of Thessalonica in the fourteenth century, is the most important father of late Byzantine theology, on a par with the greatest theologians of the medieval West, and of significant importance to the study. John Meyendorff’s works (1983 and 1998) are the first comprehensive presentations of his life and theology to appear in English.

With regard to Christology and/or Pneumatology, there are numerous works that deal with either issue individually, but few that deal with the relationship between the two. This survey could not find any that relates specifically to the relationship between Christology and Pneumatology in the Byzantine Fathers in response to the filioque.

Burgess provides a useful presentation of the doctrine on the Holy Spirit in the three Christian Traditions. In the first volume (Burgess, 1984), researches the early development and expounding of views concerning the Spirit, from the first century well into the fifth A.D. The second volume, (Burgess, 1989) concentrates on the resources of the Christian East on the Spirit. The concluding volume (Burgess, 1997) looks at the medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation attitudes toward the Holy Spirit. These include the works of medieval Catholic theologians like Gregory the Great and Aquinas, the contributions of influential women like as Catherine of Siena and even ‘fringe’ figures such as Joachim of Fiore; the

leading reformers Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin; Catholic counter-reformers such as Ignatius of Loyola; and the 'radical' reformers like Menno Simons.

Duncan Reid (1997) examines recent theologians, both Eastern and Western, on the doctrine of energies in God, a topic prevalent in Palamite theology and important in the formulation of the synthesis. Contrary to prevailing Western views, Reid sees this otherwise controversial teaching positively. He furthermore attempts to find common ground in the doctrine of essence and energies specific to the East, and the distinction between the inner and the economic trinity that characterizes the West.

Vladimir Lossky is a significant and well-known Orthodox theologian of the last century. Lossky considered the Filioque to be the origin of all the differences between the Western Church and that of the East, He considered the legalism of the Roman Church as the single most important reason preventing union of the Churches (1974: 71f). His essay on *The Procession of the Holy Spirit* has particular interest. Metropolitan John Zizioulas rivals Lossky in fame and importance, both within and outside the Orthodox world. His works (1985 and 2008) provide a comprehensive view of the place of the Holy Trinity as doctrine and experience of the Orthodox Church.

Since this study believes the Orthodox Synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology to be a direct result of and a response to the filioque controversy, books were consulted that dealt specifically with the historical context and growth of the filioque controversy.

In *The Melody of Theology*, (1988: 90) Jaroslav Pelikan notes:

If there is a special circle of the inferno described by Dante reserved for historians of theology, the principal homework assigned to that subdivision of hell for at least the first several eons of eternity may well be the thorough study of all the treatises--in Latin, Greek, Church Slavonic, and various modern languages--devoted to the inquiry: ***Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father only, as Eastern Christendom contends, or from both the Father and the Son (ex Patre Filioque), as the Latin Church teaches?*** Futile or even presumptuous though it may seem to pry into such arcane matters within the inscrutable life of the Godhead, the problem of the *Filioque* or "double procession," in the framework of the total doctrine of the Trinity, manages to touch on many of the most central issues of theology and to display, more effectively than any other of the "questions in dispute" (*quaestiones disputatae*), how fundamental and far-reaching are the differences between the Orthodox Christian East and the West, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant.

As such, numerous works have been written on the issue and any reputable work on Church History, Trinitarian theology or ecumenical issues tackles the topic in varying degrees. Among these, mention ought to be made of a work by A. Edward Sicienski (2010) in which he places the Filioque debates throughout the history of the Church, in their political, ecclesial, social, and theological contexts.

In his five-volume opus Jaroslav Pelikan traces the development of Christian doctrine from its origins to the twentieth century. For our purposes, the second volume (1977), *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*, is significant. As an introduction to the historical development of the Trinitarian controversy and the ensuing doctrine, it was necessary to do some background reading. Among the most useful books were John Behr's books (2001 and 2004) on the Nicene faith. Lewis Ayres (2006) also deals with Nicea and the development of the doctrine of the Trinity, surmising that modern Trinitarian theologies fall short in their appreciation of Nicene Trinitarianism. On the same subject, Khaled Anatolios (2011) researches the expounding Trinitarian doctrine, looking particularly at how Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine contributed to this.

It's safe enough, in this case, to generalize and say that in most cases, available books on Church History concentrate almost exclusively on the history of Western Christianity. Their handling of the History of the Church in the East is often brief and superficial. Two volumes specifically, provide a more balanced approach.

Louth's work (2007) deals with the period dating from the Sixth Ecumenical Synod in 681 to the Battle of Manzikert in 1071. The author treats Greek East and Latin West concertedly, looking at the points at which their paths converge or clash, noting developments within the Church as a whole. Following on from this, Aristeides Papadakis (1994) tackles later developments in the history of both Eastern and Western Churches.

Henry Chadwick (2003) also provides an objective description of the development of the divisions between Rome and Constantinople. He locates the roots of this divergence in apostolic times, and sees it through to the Council of Florence. Joseph Gill's book (1959) on the Council of Florence has weaknesses. Gill is uninterested in the Franciscan theologians of the Council. Several were famous theologians and regarded as saints in their own day (e.g. Bernardine of Siena, John Capistran, Francis of Marches). Whilst he acknowledges that the Franciscans were in charge of the Palamite question of the essence and energies, as well as papal supremacy, he provides little on the salient points of these theologians and their contribution to the Council. Gill's work is nonetheless important for understanding the

Latin perspective and Thomistic theologians' approach to the Council. A more positive view of the Greek position is offered by Ivan N. Ostroumov's work (1861).

Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople has, for a millennium, been regarded by the Western Church as a heretic and a schismatic. In juxtaposition, in the East he is revered as a saint, respected as scholar and raised-up as a model churchman. Francis Dvornik (1948) looks at the case, re-examines the factors, reviews the facts and concludes that the West was truly unfair to him and that Photius was indeed a significant theologian and church leader.

Aristeides Papadakis (1996) gives us a short overview of the brief career of Patriarch Gregory II of Cyprus. The immediate context was responding to the Council of Lyons where Byzantine Unionists sought Papal political aid against the Turks in return for acknowledging several papal claims. This book provides an historical study on the only official orthodox answer regarding the Filioque, the Council held in Blachernae palace in 1285, under the patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus. The council needed to respond to Lyon and Beccus theologically. It had to modify the traditional stance of Photius namely, that it is from the Father alone that the Spirit proceeds. Gregory recognized there were passages in the Fathers that referred to more than an economic mission from the Son. In light of this, the Council then affirmed the Spirit proceeding from the Father, but also being eternally manifested by the Son. This doctrine was not immediately accepted, but had a great influence in the Palamite theology. Not much else is available on Gregory of Cyprus and his theology. Leading on from this, Meyendorff's work (1974) presents a synthesis of Byzantine Christian thought, its ability to transcend Western paradigms and to survive under adverse historical circumstances.

Information on ecumenical issues and contemporary dialogues is not as plentiful as one would imagine. The primary texts are however available for examination and assessment.

Timothy (Bishop Kallistos) Ware's book (2015), is, as its cover says, "a clear, detailed introduction to the Orthodox Church written for the non-Orthodox as well as for Orthodox Christians who wish to know more about their own tradition." The chapter entitled "The Orthodox Church and the Reunion of Christians," includes differing opinions and attitudes among the Orthodox regarding the Ecumenical Movement and the World Council of Churches. It also briefly discusses dialogues between the Orthodox Church and other Churches.

The book edited by Theodore Stylianopoulos and M. Heim (1986), represents a part of the larger ecumenical project as churches search for unity in the Trinitarian faith. The

background for this particular consultation on the Holy Spirit includes the labours of the Apostolic Faith study of the W.C.C. and works of scholars and bilateral dialogues. The papers reflect the diversity of participants and views of the consultation.

Lukas Vischer's compilation (1981) contains various Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant scholarly writings on the Filioque controversy. It also presents some suggested directions for ending the struggle and re-uniting the Western and Eastern halves of the worldwide Christian Church, which has been divided since the year 1054. Besides Vischer's compilation this study also probed statements of Churches that are relevant to the issue, most notably from the World Council of Churches and the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation.

While one might expect, based on the historical sojourn, that these dialogues and studies are merely a rehash of old arguments and positions. The more recent meetings and works have, however, displayed a genuine effort and willingness, not only to explain their doctrines in a language free of polemics and animosity, but to present it in a way that is understandable to the other party and to find common ground between the various traditions. Contemporary dialogues display a respect and spirit of goodwill that had been absent among the Churches for centuries. As such, they allow for hope and reason for perseverance and they create a sense of unity, even if not quite 'union'.

1.4 Aims And Objectives

This study maintains that **Orthodox theology has worked on the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology**. The main aim of this study will be to show that there is a definite and acceptable teaching in Orthodox theology dealing with the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Thus, this study's objectives are to:

- Present noteworthy examples of early Fathers who, while regarding the Father as unoriginated origin of all reality, attempted to define what relationship existed between the divine Son and the Holy Spirit.
- Analyse the manner in which such definitions were expounded further, giving rise to the filioque and how attempts were made to explain what this meant.

- Elucidate how escalation of political tensions exacerbated theological differences and led to the hard-line position of Photius defining and insisting that the Spirit proceeds 'from the Father alone'.
- Argue that, while theological 'compromises' failed, there were sincere attempts made by Gregory of Cyprus to express the permanent and eternal relationship existing between the Son and the Spirit.
- Explore how these attempts were taken-up by Gregory Palamas who presented a viable and acceptable position on the filioque by drawing a distinction between the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and the energetic procession from the Father and the Son, eternally and in time.
- Show that, regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit, the fifteenth century saw Byzantine theologians belonging to three distinct schools of thought. The unionist position accepted that 'from the Son' was substantially the same as 'through the Son'. The school championed by Photius insisted on procession from the Father alone and, a *via media* was presented by the two Gregories. This school, however, was not given a voice at the Council of Florence.
- Present the Orthodox synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology and suggest a way forward.

1.5 Central Theoretical Argument

The central theoretical argument of this study is therefore, that there is a synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology in Orthodox theology, a relationship between the Son and the Spirit, eternally and in time. The filioque controversy, in fact, necessitated this. If this synthesis responds to the accusations from both Orthodox and Catholic persons or groups that see it as lacking in the Orthodox tradition, or if it could even, somehow, offer an 'orthodox' interpretation to the filioque, then this study would have great potential and even positive ramifications for Orthodox-Catholic relations specifically and relations with Western Churches generally.

1.6 Methodology

My method will be grounded in an historical exposition of the filioque controversy. It will briefly trace its origins and development and then interject with the sections on the relevant Byzantine theologians, in their chronological context. It goes without saying that restraints of

space and of logic, render it impossible to present a comprehensive analysis of every Father and theologian, whether of the Church in general, or of Byzantium. The justification for choosing and referring to particular persons, is the universal recognition they enjoy as foremost within, or representative of, their tradition and period. Studying them offers us a comprehensive, but not exhaustive, picture of the historical and theological developments regarding the filioque controversy.

The study will then continue by elucidating the synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in the Byzantine theologians covered, exploring whether it presents an orthodox interpretation to the filioque. Based on these findings, the thesis probes whether this “Byzantine Synthesis” has any ecumenical potential in seeking a solution to the filioque impasse.

Research will thus be within the framework of a literary study of primary and secondary theological, liturgical and historical texts. Literature will be analyzed, compared and evaluated within the research parameters of this study.

1.7 Ethical Considerations

Sources and authors used are given due recognition and the study has passed authentication through TurnItIn. No empirical research was done, and no human subjects were studied. The ethical risk factor of this study is therefore minimal.

1.8. A Schematic Representation of the Correlation between Points 3, 4, 6 and 8.

Problem Statement	Aim & Objectives	Methodology
Is there no attempt at synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in Orthodox theology? Didn't reaction and response to the <i>Filioque</i> necessitate such a synthesis?	The main aim of this study will be to show that there is a definite and acceptable teaching regarding the relationship between the Son and the Spirit in Orthodox theology.	The thesis approaches the topic historically and systematic- theologically.
Were there no attempts in the early Fathers of the	To show that there was a doctrine in the patristic era	The study presents

Church at formulating such a synthesis?	regarding the relationship between the Son and the Spirit.	noteworthy examples of early Fathers who attempted to define the relationship between the Son and the Spirit.
The filioque became the 'greatest Church-dividing issue'. What prompted its development? What were the initial reactions from the East?	To show how the filioque achieved such apostolicity and ecumenism in the West and how some attempted to explain what it did, or did not mean.	The thesis analyses how some patristic definitions were expounded further, giving rise to the filioque. Attempts made to explain what the filioque meant is investigated.
Did political conditions affect and influence theological issues? Did they further theology?	To research whether this could have been the reason for Photius' conservative and inflexible views on the relationship between the Son and the Spirit?	The work elucidates how the escalation of political tensions exacerbated theological differences and led to the hard-line position of Photius that the Spirit proceeds 'from the Father alone'.
Were any attempts made to show that the Latin view regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit did not differ from the Greek view on the subject?	To show that attempts were made to advance Photius' doctrine further to express the permanent relationship existing between the Son and the Spirit as divine hypostases.	The thesis presents constructive arguments that, while theological compromises failed, there were sincere attempts made by Gregory of Cyprus to express the permanent relationship existing between the Son and the Spirit.
Does Palamas' theological thought have any relevance to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology?	To show that Palamas does have a position on the filioque and presents a viable an acceptable orthodox interpretation.	The thesis explores how these attempts were taken-up by Palamas by drawing a distinction between the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and the energetic procession from the Father and the Son eternally and in time.
Why was Palamas' <i>via media</i> not given a voice in the Council of Florence?	To claim that the fifteenth century saw Byzantine theologians belonging to three distinct schools of	The research illustrates that the unionist position accepted that 'from the Son' was substantially the

	<p>thought regarding the procession of the Spirit and that views on the filioque became entrenched shortly after the Council of Florence.</p>	<p>same as 'through the Son'; the school championed by Photius insisted on procession from the Father alone and; a <i>via media</i> was presented by the two Gregories. However, this <i>via media</i> could have highlighted further differences between East and West.</p>
<p>In conclusion, is there a synthesis in Orthodox theology between Christology and Pneumatology? If this is the case, does this hold any ecumenical potential today?</p>	<p>To present the Orthodox synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology and suggest a way forward</p>	<p>The thesis presents a synopsis and conclude the findings of this research by demonstrating possible ways in which it can assist in the dialogue on the issue of the filioque.</p>

CHAPTER TWO

THE THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE DISPUTE

Before delving into the subject of this research, it is necessary to look at whether there were attempts by the early Fathers¹ of the Church at formulating a synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology, that is, the intersection of the Church's doctrine of Christ and that of the Holy Spirit, to examine the relationship between the Son and the Spirit. In this chapter, I will present a few noteworthy examples of such an effort. Beginning with the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, I will go on to look at Athanasius and the Cappadocians. The chapter will end with Augustine. Later Fathers will be dealt with in more detail in the subsequent chapters.

When quoting Patristic texts, certain cautions should be exercised: (Valentine 2005).

First, Patristic writings can be used as proof-texts as easily as the Scriptures. The 'agenda', whether a conscious one or unconscious, often determines how these proof-texts are used, resulting in them being misapplied to a specific issue or taken out of context. This is aptly illustrated in the use of proof texts by the various denominations of Christianity to support conflicting and mutually exclusive teachings.

Second, the Orthodox Church does not hold any specific individual to be infallible in issues of dogma. There are cases in which Church Fathers have been in error about a specific issue. What is therefore sought, is the *consensus patrum*, the consensus among the

¹ The Fathers are, generally speaking, the influential Christian theologians and teachers of the faith. They defended the faith against accusations, they explained it, they expounded-upon and generally guided the faithful in matters of doctrine and Christian living. Not all were ordained and not all are honoured as "saints". Also, the Roman Church considers that the theological foundations of Christianity had, to a large extent, been defined by the eighth century A.D. Thus, only the early teachers of Christianity are considered Fathers. On the other hand, for the Orthodox Church the 'Age of the Fathers' has not come to an end. As Kallistos Ware asserts, "to say there can be no more Fathers is to suggest that the Holy Spirit has deserted the Church." (Ware 1997: 204)

Fathers. In issues that were not dogmatic in nature, this is not always clear and easy to find. They sometimes have varying and diverse views. However, when it comes to the dogma, it is not difficult to find that which has been, according to Vincent of Lerins, “believed everywhere, always, and by all ... i.e. in universality, in antiquity, and by consent” (CO. 2:6). Views restricted to a specific region or group, or those that contradict views held by the Church through the ages, or opinions not espoused by the vast majority of Fathers do not satisfy the criteria.

Third, texts are often presented in a language apart from the original one in which they were written. Translations inevitably provide interpretations of the original texts. Unless these texts are examined in their original language and **in context**, they may easily be misinterpreted.

2.1 The Pre-Nicene Fathers

When looking at the earliest Fathers, the Spirit’s procession primarily from the Father, is admittedly more implicit than explicit. The Spirit in Scripture is, with very few exceptions, the Spirit “of God” (i.e. “the Father”). We are therefore, even if only by implication, directed towards viewing the Father as origin of the Spirit. Paulson illustrates this in *Figuring out the Filioque* (Tektonics 2008).

‘Triad’ was not originally used to express the unity of God. In fact, it expressed the primary issue Christian monotheists faced. More suitably, the term that expressed monotheism, was ‘monarchy’.² Monarchy, *mono* and *archē* can mean either ‘single rule’, ‘single ruler’ or it can also mean ‘single source’ or ‘sole origin’. Where it means ‘sole rule/ruler’, ‘monarchy’ is naturally a metaphor from kingship and portrays a strong sense of sole and absolute dominion. The Fathers applied the term, almost every time, to the absolute monarchy of

² The use of ‘monarchy’ here is not to be mistaken for having any connection to the heresy of ‘Monarchianism’. Towards the 3rd century the Church faced a heightened awareness of problems posed by the Trinitarian doctrine. The teaching that God is Three Persons could be taken as implying that there were three gods. In an effort to correct this polytheistic possibility, two forms of Monarchianisms sprang up. First is the dynamic Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata (200-275 AD), who regarded the Holy Spirit as a divine influence and the Son as adopted by God the Father. The second form of Monarchianism—advocated by Praxeas (end of 2nd century – beginning of third), Noetus (c.230 AD), and Sabelius (c. 215)—taught that God is one Person who manifested Himself in three names in historical succession. This is also commonly called modalism. In *Against Praxeas*, Tertullian mocked Praxeas as “crucifying the Father and casting out the Paraclete.” (AP 3:87) He further stated that,

The unity in a Trinity, setting in their order three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—three, however, not in condition but in relation, not in substance but in mode of existence, not in power but in special characteristics; or rather, of one substance, one condition, and one power, inasmuch as it is one God from whom these relations and modes and special characteristics are reckoned in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (874-875)

God. It became synonymous with omnipotence and, since omnipotence can be wielded only by one ultimate power, it consequently became synonymous with monotheism.

Early Christian theology followed the Scriptures in speaking of God as Father and described him simply and without qualification as 'the Father' (Kasper 2005: 144). Whenever reference is made to 'God', that 'God' is the Father. In the Apologists, (SA 6; SC 10) this primacy or *monarchy* of the Father is clear. Origen (185-254 AD) approaches the matter more critically and draws a distinction between *ho Theos* (using the article) and *Theos* (without the article). *Ho Theos* refers to the Father. The Father is *autotheos*, 'God Himself' or 'truly God', God in the true sense. On the other hand, the Son is *Theos*; of divine origin. In Origen, this reflects a subordinationist inclination that finds expression in his characterization of the Son as *deuteros Theos* – a second or secondary God (AC V: 39; J VI: 39; 202).

With Tertullian (AP 8), and Novatian (TT 31), the doctrine becomes a little more explicit. Thus, while the monarchy of the Father remains a theological 'given', we see them affirming the part the Son's has in the procession of the Spirit. Origen stresses Paternal primacy further and with much more clarity (FF 4:4). Paulson (Tektonics 2008), in examining the importance of the form given by Origen, concludes that:

This core datum of Christian theology passed into the teaching of the Nicenes, especially Athanasius (AA 3:3), and the Cappadocians (O 20:6-7; L 125:3), not to mention Hilary (TT 2:6), Didymus (TT 1:31), and Ambrose (TF 1:2:16). Marius Victorinus (AA 1:13-14), though it seems he operated in a theological context less dependent on Tradition (and more dependent on his own speculative power) also affirms the monarchy of the Father. Following Ambrose and the faith of the Church, Augustine (4: 20: 28) teaches the same.

Paulson thus deduces that the monarchy of the Father is a central tenet in the theology of the early Fathers, whether Eastern or Western, regarding the Trinity. The basic conviction that 'God' means firstly and foremost the Father, also finds expression in the Church's early professions of faith. In these early professions, we are always directed to 'God, the Father almighty'. Correspondingly, the Father alone is regarded as the unoriginated origin (*archē*) of all reality, the *principium sine principio*.

The monarchy of God, both as 'single' or 'sole rule' and 'single origin' or 'sole source', is therefore an essential part of Christian doctrine. As 'single' or 'sole rule' it aims at maintaining the unity and integrity of the Trinity. As 'single origin' or 'sole source', the Father is identified as the source of divinity as well as the unity. This affirmation, particularly dear to

the Orthodox, has to be acknowledged and respected as we examine the Son's role in the Spirit's origin. (Tektonics: 2008).

The sole principle of Divinity is thus the Father, "*the Origin behind which nothing more can be sought*" (Von Baltazar 2000: 32). To neglect this fundamental Trinitarian tenet is to invite controversy. The Western Tradition has tried to not lose sight of this fact. It has nevertheless expressed its Trinitarian theology in a way that has eclipsed it to such an extent, with the result that, particularly regarding dialogue between East and West, rapprochement has been complicated. The Fathers, however, also taught that the Spirit's procession, however undefined, somehow also involved the Son. Greek Fathers, as Paulson points out in Part Two, section five of his article, have often been accused of neglecting this.

Orthodox readers are familiar with the texts that follow. So familiar, in fact, that even though it may seem an exaggeration, Brehier's statement that "nothing can surpass the monotony of these erudite treatises on the Procession of the Holy Ghost ... which repeat over and over again the same arguments and appeal continually to the same authorities," holds some truth and expresses a popular sentiment (Pelikan 1974:184). Nevertheless, the passages ought not to be neglected and deserve to be taken into account for their contribution in seeking unity. They are not used to vindicate any one specific tradition, i.e. in defence of the filioque or against. Rather, they show that the relationship between the Son and the Spirit preoccupied Church thinkers since the Apologists, if not the Gospel writers themselves.

While early Christian writers are not particularly exact in expressing the relationship of the Trinity, Clement often speaks of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit together, regarding them distinguishable and the Spirit as divine. And so, we find Clement (c.35-99) express the following:

Having therefore received their orders, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and established in the word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand. (ANF 1: 15)

Likewise, Clement expresses his exasperation at the disagreements and divisions that had developed among the followers. He reminds them, in no uncertain terms, that there is "one God, one Christ and one Spirit of grace poured out" on the faithful (ANF 1:17). Yet, what of the Spirit in relation to Christ? Regarding this, he says that all promises find their confirmation in our faith in Christ. It is this same Christ that calls to us "through His Holy

Spirit..." (1C 22). In like manner, Ignatius (35-108), sees the Spirit, as being from God, and appointed after approval and confirmation by Jesus Christ (EP Sal.).

These texts, by two of the earliest post-Apostolic Fathers don't make explicit theological statements. It is doubtful whether unpacking them further, would yield something of consequence. Of course, one must consider that a division between *theology* and *economy* did not really exist in the view of the Pre-Nicene Fathers, nor was there a clear distinction between the two. Echoing what we see in the New Testament, what is ultimately hinted at here, is that the Spirit of the Father is also considered Spirit of the Son.

Justin (103-165), earliest of the Apologists, shows ambiguity and inconsistencies in his pneumatology (Swete 1912: 38-39). He refers to the Spirit on a number of occasions and is probably a pioneer among Christian writers in attempting to define the relationships within the Trinity. He is successful in coordinating the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This emerges in numerous statements in which he names the three distinct persons as objects of Christian belief: "For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing of water." (1Apol.1:11) Likewise he writes:

We worship the Maker of the Universe... our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ... and we will show that we worship Him rationally, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in second place and the prophetic Spirit in the third rank. (1Apol. 13:1, 3)

His belief in a personal entity named the *Pneuma (Spirit)*³ as distinct from the Logos/Son and God/Father seems certain. His manner of describing this entity is, however, inconsistent. Lacking a distinct role for the Holy Spirit in the economy, Justin sometimes subsumes the Spirit into the Logos. In fact, Justin appears to consider the Son subordinate to the Father, while the Spirit subordinate to the Son, "having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third." (1Apol 1:11) Yet this subordination seems to be of function and rank only (Burgess 1984: 28). It is possible that this is due to Justin's interest in establishing the Logos as a divine being alongside the Most High God in order to affirm God's creative and salvific purposes. He displays "a profound tendency to concentrate in the Logos every manifestation of the Father" (Martin 1971: 184). According to Barnard (1967: 106), "In strict logic there is no

³ Justin speaks variously of the 'Holy Spirit', 'Prophetic Spirit', 'Divine Spirit', simply 'the Spirit' or combinations of these titles. (Martin: 1971, 316-320),

place in Justin's thought for the Person of the Holy Spirit because the Logos carries out his functions". The Spirit remains for Justin, a distinct yet undefined afterthought.

Athenagoras (133-190) too reveals a strong conviction in the existence of a distinct and personal entity called the Spirit. His pneumatology shows an important development that allows him to establish the Spirit's personality to a degree not present in Justin's work, namely, his discussion of the generation or origin of the Spirit from God. This allows him to give the Spirit parallel status to the Logos in relation to God, and to attribute to the Spirit his own work in the economy.

In *Supplication* 10, 4, following his detailed statement about the generation of the Logos, he writes,

The Holy Spirit Himself also, which operates in the prophets, we assert to be an effluence of God, flowing from Him, and returning back again like a beam of the sun. Who, then, would not be astonished to hear men who speak of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and who declare both their power in union and their distinction in order, called atheists?

The similarities between this and describing the generation of the Logos suggest that Athenagoras intentionally parallels the two. The Spirit has his source in God, from whom the Spirit emerges. The Spirit, like the Logos, comes forth to perform a function. In this case, it is prophecy. Also, it appears that he is teaching, at least implicitly, a doctrine of essential procession (Burgess 1984: 31).

Athenagoras relies on Scripture to support his view of the Spirit's origin. The passage in *Supplication*.10, referred to above, contains an allusion to *Wisdom of Solomon*, "For she (Wisdom) is a breath (*atmis*) of the power of God, and a pure emanation (*aporroia*) of the glory of the Almighty..."⁴ In *Supplication*.24.2, he writes, "the Son [is] the Mind, Logos and Sophia of the Father, and the Spirit [is] the effluence [of the Father] as light from a fire." Nevertheless, the lack of an eternal distinct nature of the Spirit in Athenagoras is illustrated by his analogy (SC.10, 4) that the Spirit "flows forth [from God] and returns [to God] like a ray of the sun." The Spirit does not seem to be separated from the Father for eternity, but only for a certain amount of time. Nevertheless, his insights on the generation of the Spirit and the parallels to the Son's generation, suggest that Athenagoras understood the nature of the Spirit as distinct from the Logos.

⁴ *Wisdom of Solomon* 7:25.

Theophilus (died 183 AD) identifies the Spirit with the Wisdom or Sophia of God present in Jewish Wisdom literature. Earlier writers had identified Wisdom with the Son. This represents an important development because it provides him the logic of establishing the Spirit as distinct yet alongside, the Father and the Son. The Spirit is no longer some vague figure subsumed into the Person of the Logos or an entity that emanates from the Father, like a ray from the sun, and returns to Him. Being the Sophia of God, the Spirit parallels the Son's identity as the Logos of God. Both entities are eternal attributes of the Father and both stand in equal relationship to the Father, allowing him in *to Autolyucus* 2.18 to refer to them as "the hands of God." At his generation before the creation of the world, he comes forth from the Father with the Logos allowing both entities to work as the agents of God in the world.

Irenaeus (130-202) too, in *Against Heresies* 4.20.1, makes the connection between Sophia and Spirit, leaving no doubt regarding the identity of the Sophia and Spirit as the same being, the third alongside the God and Father and the Logos and Son in the teaching of the Apostles. The use of the same title 'Sophia' offers Irenaeus the logic that establishes the Spirit as distinct alongside the Father and the Logos. The Holy Spirit, as 'Sophia' of God, exists as an eternal, personal attribute of God parallel to the eternal Logos. Both have their source in God. Both eternally exist with God and both do the work that God wills them to do. The Spirit eternally coexists with the Father alongside the eternally coexistent Logos/Son. Irenaeus, in fact, uses the expression "the two hands of God" when speaking of the work, in creation, of the Son (Logos) and the Spirit (Sophia). "For by the hands of the Father, that is, by the Son and the Holy Spirit, man was made in the likeness of God" (AH 5.6.1).

As we have seen, the Person of Holy Spirit begins to take on a separate identity. It is no longer 'subsumed' by the Logos, but becomes distinct. It is eternal and generated by the Father alongside the Logos. Yet what of the relationship between the two?

(The Father) is ministered to in all things by his own Offspring, and by the latter's Likeness: that is, by the Son and by the Holy Spirit, by the Word and by the Wisdom, whom all the angels serve and to whom they are subject." (AH 4:7: 4)

If Irenaeus identifies the Son as the Logos, and the "Offspring" of the Father, then referring to the Spirit as His "Likeness" bears some consequence to our research. Tertullian also saw the Son as involved in the Spirit's procession.

I believe that the Spirit proceeds not otherwise than from the Father through the Son (AP 4:1) Anything which proceeds from another must necessarily be a second to that from which it proceeds; but it is not on that account separated from it. Where

there is a second, however, there are two; and where there is a third, there are three. The Spirit, then, is third from God and the Son, just as the third from the root is the fruit from the stem, and third from the fountain is the stream from the river, and third from the sun is the apex of the ray. (AP 8:7) Thus, the connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, produces three who, though coherent, are distinct one from another (AP 25:1).

The same can certainly be said for Origen, although as Swete (1912:31) has correctly pointed out, his teaching regarding the Holy Spirit's relationship to the Father and the Son is not fully consistent throughout his writings. Influenced by Neoplatonism that recognized the One from whom all things emanate and the existence of intermediaries between the One and the world, we find a tension between keeping the equality and a tendency to subordinate certain members of the Godhead. Origen invented the necessary technical terms for constructing the doctrine of God. He called the Father *agennetos* or "ingenerate", and the Son *gennētos* or "generate", thereby stating that the Son derives eternal existence from God the Father who alone is *autotheos* and *pēgē tēs theotētos* or fount of divinity.

In Origen's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, he begins from the premise that all things were created through the Word. Yet, if this is so, would this include the 'creation' of the Holy Spirit. Here there are three possibilities; The Holy Spirit may have been 'created' through the Word like everything else. If it is not created through the Word, the possibility thus is that He is uncreated. The third possibility is that the Spirit has no essence of its own, but that there is one essence common to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Among these three, Origen sees only the Father as unbegotten. He sees the Word as producing all things, including the Holy Spirit as, "first in order of all that was produced by the Father through Christ" (CJ 2:6).

Much has been said regarding his apparent subordinationism, yet other passages seem to establish an equilibrium within the Trinity. He often seems to tightrope walk between the two. (FP. 1:4)

Third, they handed it down that the Holy Spirit is associated in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son (FP 1:4).

For these very words 'when' and 'never' are terms of temporal significance, while whatever is said of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is to be understood as transcending all time, all ages, and all eternity. For it is the Trinity alone which exceeds every sense in which not only 'temporal' but even 'eternal' may be

understood. It is all other things, indeed, which are outside the Trinity, which are to be measured by times and ages (FP 4:4:1).

That Origen is a subordinationist is still a matter of debate. Jerome (347-420) openly accuses him of it.⁵ On the other hand, Gregory Thaumaturgus⁶ (c 213-270) and Athanasius (ES IV: 12) argue against it. Recent writers such as de Regnon and Prat find him innocent of the charges (Quaston 1995: 2, 77). With regard to the Holy Spirit, Origen assuredly places it on divine side of the creator/creature distinction. Saying the Spirit is “the most excellent and the first in order of all that was produced by the Father through Christ” does not imply that he saw the Spirit as a 'creature'.

In his work *On First Principles*, Origen seems to be more in agreement with Tradition on the Trinity, stating:

Nothing in the Trinity can be called greater or less, since the fountain of divinity alone contains all things by His Word and Reason, and by the Spirit of His mouth sanctifies all things which are worthy of sanctification... (FP 1.3.7)

Origen also recognizes that each Person of the Trinity has a special ministry. The Father bestows the gift of life on all. The Lord Jesus Christ confers the gift of reason, while the Holy Spirit's bestows grace through the working of the Father and through the ministry of Christ. Origen struggled with the issue of the Spirit's mode of existence. He asks whether the Spirit is “generate” like the Son, or “ingenerate” like the Father. Certainly, he says, the Word and the Wisdom were not generated by “prolation”⁷ of the Father, since “prolation”, whether by He who prolates or He who is prolated, is a term best suited to corporeal beings. ‘Corporeal conceptions’ don't apply here.

We say that the Word and Wisdom was begotten out of the invisible and incorporeal without any corporeal feeling, as if it were an act of the will proceeding from the understanding. (FP: 4.1.28)

It would seem that Origen is moving towards a conception of procession, but is ahead of his time and lacking in those terms and definitions necessary for adequate expression of theological insights.

⁵ Regarding this orthodoxy of Origen, a controversy occurred between Jerome and John II of Jerusalem and Rufinus. Some of Jerome's most polemical and comprehensive works belong to this time in his life: *Against John of Jerusalem* (398 or 399); the two *Arguments against Rufinus* (402); and the *Third or Final Book written in Response to the Writings of Rufinus*.

⁶The *Panegyric Oration* in honour of Origen.

⁷ 'Prolation' is the term used to signify a physical kind of generation as that of animals and humans.

Does Origen cast further light on the Son-Spirit relationship? The context of the above passages shows that Origen is referring to the *theology*. One could even surmise that Origen holds to “the eternal procession of the Spirit through the Son.” (Congar 1983: 3, 21) The passages are thus of interest, but not definitive in their contribution. Like Tertullian, we can see that Origen views the Spirit as proceeding from the Father, yet recognizes that the Son is key to the Spirit’s mode of being. Paulson believes that it would be anachronistic to deduce anything further (Tektonics 2008).

And one Holy Spirit, having substance from God, and who is manifested to men, that is-through the Son; Image of the Son, Perfect of the Perfect; Life, the Cause of living; Holy Fountain; Sanctity, the Dispenser of Sanctification; in whom is manifested God the Father who is above all and in all, and God the Son who is through all (Gregory *in* Jurgens 1978: 251).

When speaking of the Spirit as manifested “through the Son” to humankind, Gregory Thaumaturgus appears to refer to the Son's role in the economy. Yet reference to the Spirit as 'Image of the Son' should only be taken in a theological sense (Paulson V: B). These passages may be relevant, yet not definitive to that point:

Wherefore there is nothing either created or subservient in the Trinity, nor anything caused to be brought about, as if formerly it did not exist and was afterwards introduced. Wherefore neither was the Son ever lacking to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but without variation and without change, the same Trinity forever. (Gregory *in* Jurgens 1978: 251)

In the early 4th century, Arius (256-336) argued that the Son had a beginning because the Father through an act of his will created him. His intention was similar to Sibelius in that the monarchy of Father must be maintained over against the co-equality of the Son. Although Arius did not explicitly mention the Spirit, he regarded the essence, nature, and honour of the Father and the Son as infinitely dissimilar. Taken to its logical conclusion, the Spirit cannot be co-equal with the Father since He also had a beginning. Just as the Church had to think through the being of the Son and His relationship with God the Father, it needed to develop a theology of the Holy Spirit. Two questions had to be answered. First, who (or what) is the Holy Spirit. Second, how He relates to the Son and the Father. Thus, while the passages appear to become more forceful because of their context, is there anything definitive in them that will settle the issue?

Didymus the blind wrote two works relevant to this research: *On the Holy Spirit*, a response to the heresy of Macedonianism, subordinating the Spirit and denying His divinity; and his three books *On the Trinity*. Didymus asserts that the Spirit is present in both Testaments. The one and the same Spirit is holy, good, infinite and immutable (PL 23: 103-5). He is immutable, not created by the Logos. The Spirit is God's great gift to man, "the common gift of the Father and the Son, the gift of love" (PL 23:111). Being one in essence with both, the Spirit is one in operation with both. He goes forth from the Father and is sent by the Son, yet remains indivisible from Him who sent Him. Subsistence is given to Him by the Son and He has no other apart from this (PL 23: 133-35). Didymus appears to approximate the filioque yet in *On the Trinity*, he asserts that the Son and Spirit coexist and proceed from the Father simultaneously. For Didymus, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God is from God, not posterior to Him (PL 69: 545-464).

Since baptism is "the Sacrament of the Spirit", (Burgess, 1984:106) it provided the occasion for Cyril of Jerusalem (c.313-386) to speak to the catechumens and neophytes regarding the Holy Spirit. Thus, he adds in his *Catechism*, 16: 24:

The Father gives to the Son, and the Son shares with the Holy Spirit. For it is Jesus himself, not I, who says, 'Everything is delivered to me by my Father,' and of the Holy Spirit, he says, 'When he, the Spirit of Truth shall come,' and so forth, 'he shall glorify me, for he shall receive of what is mine, and shall announce it to you.' The Father through the Son with the Holy Spirit gives every gift.

The discussion here is, again, on the economic level.

The affinity of Hilary to the Filioque is well attested. It is, in fact, argued that "only the doctrine of the Filioque can make sense of the theology in Books II and VIII of Hilary's *On the Trinity*" (Pelikan 1969: 126f). Although his language is often confusing, and his views seem consistent with the Filioque doctrine, one has to take note that Hilary understood the filioque as proceeding *through* the Son, or *sent by* the Son. The Spirit is "through Him through Whom are all things (i.e., the Son), and from Him from Whom are all things (i.e., the Father)." (Burgess 1984: 169).

Concerning the Holy Spirit, however, I ought not remain silent nor yet is it necessary to speak. Still, on account of those who do not know him, it is not possible for me to be silent. However, it is not necessary to speak of him who must be acknowledged, who is from the Father and the Son, his sources (2:29).

How does he understand the Spirit in relation to the 'sources'? The Father's existence is "existence in itself, not deriving existence from anywhere else. He possesses the actuality of his being in himself and from himself" (2:6). For Hilary, this is intrinsic to His nature as 'Father'. It is what is expressed by that name.

In the fact that before times eternal Your Only-Begotten was born of you, when we put an end to every ambiguity of words and difficulty of understanding, there remains only this: he was born. So too, even if I do not grasp it in my understanding, I hold fast in my consciousness to the fact that your Holy Spirit is from you through him (12:56).

All that exists owes its origin to the Father. The Father is "in Christ and through Christ, He is the source of all things" (8:19). The Spirit "proceeds from the Father, but receives from the Son". The Spirit is also sent by Him. As we have seen, the Father is the source of all things. Since the Spirit is also in the Son, receiving from the Son is, essentially, receiving from the Father. Thus, while the Spirit may receive from the Father and the Son, 'receiving', should not be confused with 'procession' that Hilary asserts is from the Father.

The principle of *perichorēsis*⁸ as evident in the above quote, is also worthy of note at this point.

Those properties, therefore, which are in the Son, are from those properties in the Father. ... That which is in the Father is in the Son also; that which is in the Unbegotten is in the Only-Begotten also; one from the other, and both are one; not one made up of two, but one in the other ... The Father is in the Son, because the Son is from him. The Son is in the Father, because his Sonship has no other source—the Only-Begotten is in the Unbegotten, because the Only-Begotten is from the Unbegotten (3:4).

The same is echoed in the Marius Victorinus: "To live, then, is Christ; and to understand is the Spirit. Therefore, the Spirit receives from Christ, Christ himself is from the Father—and in this way the Spirit too is from the Father. All, therefore, are one, but from the Father "(AA 1:13-14). Again, even if the Spirit *receives* from the Son, it is from the Father that He *originates*. The Father as source and cause is thus not compromised, but respected. The

⁸ The Greek term *perichorēsis*, mutual indwelling or coinherence, describes the relationships within the Trinity. *Perichorēsis* "allows the individuality of the Persons to be maintained, while insisting that each Person shares in the life of the other two. An image often used to express this idea is that of a 'community of being', in which each person, while maintaining its distinctive identity, penetrates the others and is penetrated by them." (McGrath 2001 :325)

statement made by Victorinus is not taken further though, so as to enable us to make any deductions of note. Also, he has been accused of being too audacious in his theological views and thus they cannot be seen as mirroring those of the Church at large. Nevertheless, when we consider that views on the Holy Spirit were only in their infancy, we would have to admit that his views were within the parameters of the pneumatological reflection of the times. (Paulson V: B)

Epiphanius (c.310-403) refers to the Spirit as "begotten". We cannot, however, infer from this that he saw the Spirit as another "Son".⁹ Rather, he simply means, 'generated'. The

Only-begotten Holy Spirit has neither the name of Son nor the appellation of Father, but is called 'Holy Spirit', and is not foreign to the Father. For the Only-begotten himself calls him 'the Spirit of the Father', and 'will receive of mine', so that he is reckoned not being foreign to the Father nor to the Son, but is of their same substance, of the same Godhead; He is Spirit divine ... of God, and he is God. For he is Spirit of God, Spirit of the Father, and Spirit of the Son, not by some kind of synthesis, like soul and body in us, but in the midst of the Father and Son, of the Father and of the Son, a third by appellation. (A. 8)

According to Hanson (1988:788-9), Epiphanius is among those early writers that can be viewed as supporting the Filioque. He saw the Spirit as being from Christ, or even "from the Father and the Son". God is spirit. Epiphanius therefore sees the Holy Spirit as proceeding from both, as from the common spirit, that God *is*. The Spirit also proceeds and receives from the Son, thus proceeding from the Father and the Son, with the Father and the Son.

Nevertheless, as Hanson also states (1988:789), Epiphanius' seemingly acceptance of the Filioque, is not in a manner rejected by the East. The Father remains the "eternal monarch" and maintains the unity within the Trinity and simultaneously projects "through the begetting of the Son" and the "procession of the Holy Spirit" (PG 42, 33A). In begetting the Son and processing the Spirit, neither were deprived of His "essence.... Dignity...and equality" (PG 42, 593 D). Epiphanius holds fast to the doctrine of the Father's monarchy.¹⁰ One cannot project Epiphanius' views into a context that would develop in years to come. As Paulson asserts, the only thing we could conclude decisively and fairly, is that Epiphanius allowed "that the Son is intrinsic to the procession of the Spirit" (Tektonics 2008). The Father, as sole source and cause, remains absolute.

⁹ cf. *ibid.* 7 ("The Holy Spirit is ... not begotten ... not a brother ...").

¹⁰ This is shown in in the numerous studies mentioned by Nikos Nikolaidēs, in his *Themata Paterikēs Theologias*, (2009:175-182).

Ambrose says that to even mention the Spirit is to refer to the Father since it is from the Father that the Spirit proceeds. It is also to refer to the Son whose Spirit He is (HS 1:5). Because of the unity of their essence, while the Son receives from the Father, the Spirit receives from the Son. As Holy Trinity there is thus one operation and one will. The gifts of the Spirit are “from the Father through the Son”. (HS 10-12). “The Son Himself was sent by the Spirit’. It was ‘the Spirit who anointed Him to office. The Son in turn sent the Spirit. Both were given by the Father.” (HS 1). We have another example of perichorēsis at work here. “The Son is the Father’s right hand, the Spirit His Finger. This don’t necessarily imply subordination, but only cooperation. The Right Hand, the Finger of God, is God *in operation*, the Father working by the Son, and the Son by the Spirit.” (HS 3-5)

Ambrose confesses the Father to be ‘fount of life’, but recognizes that the Son too, has been seen as that, since the Holy Spirit is life and the Son is ‘the fount of the Holy Spirit’ (HS 1:15:152). Also, just as the Son comes out of the Father without division, so too the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, suffers no separation either or from both (1:2:120).

It seems that with Ambrose, we may have an affirmation of the Filioque. Burgess cautions us, however, that in such cases Ambrose has the mission of the Spirit in mind, and that scholars disagree whether he literally means the procession (1984:177). The same care must therefore be exercised, as with Epiphanius.

Athanasius’ *Letters to Serapion* was the first doctrinal exposition on the Holy Spirit. Athanasius’ method was scriptural, and his foundation was the God as Triad, as confessed in Tradition.¹¹ The Divinity, *ē Theotēs*, includes the Three Persons of the Trinity as equal in divinity, honour and *dunamis* or power. Denying or rejecting the divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit is blasphemy, a denial of the Son (I: 1, 3).

Athanasius’ Pneumatology shared the same starting point with his Christology. He first proved from Scripture that the Son and the Spirit are divine and not creatures. He then appealed to the Son’s and the Spirit’s inseparable relationship with the Father, demonstrated by the coordinated works of the three Persons in creation and redemption. The Spirit cannot be separated from the Son, while the latter cannot be divided from the Father (I.14, 16, 25, 33, III.1, 5, IV.4). It is only through knowledge of the Son that Christians can know the Spirit.

¹¹ Tradition, *paradosis*, generally signifies that which is ‘passed down’ over generations. The Orthodox Church holds Holy Tradition to be the memory of the Church, that which is passed down through the ages, guided by the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures form a vital component of this Tradition since Scripture itself was passed down, whether orally or in written form. Holy Tradition is thus the paramount source of doctrine for the Orthodox Church. Other components of this Tradition include the dogmatic and canonical decisions of the Councils, particularly the Ecumenical Councils, and the writings of the Church Fathers.

The Spirit has the same relationship to the Son, as the Son has to the Father. This is foundational in the Christocentric Pneumatology of Athanasius.

The peculiar relationship of the Son to the Father, such as we know it—we will find that the Spirit has this to the Son. And since the Son says, 'everything whatsoever that the Father has is mine,' we will discover all these things also in the Spirit, through the Son. (III: 1)

At first glance, it seems that Athanasius is dealing with the Spirit on the level of theology. Is it possible to surmise from the citation of Jn. 16:15 that Athanasius saw the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and from the Son as a single principle? Athanasius later dealt with the challenge that if the Spirit *also* proceeded from the Father, would this make the Spirit a second Son. To this he responded simply:

It is enough to know that the Spirit is not a creature and is not listed along with created things, for nothing alien is associated with the Trinity, but it is inseparable and consistent in itself. This doctrine is enough for believers. Beyond that the cherubim cover with their wings (I: 11).

Based on this, Athanasius' dealings with the Spirit seems restricted to the realms of the economy, and that he doesn't provide a clear definition of the eternal mode of the Spirit's subsistence. Nevertheless, I believe that he almost certainly sees a relation between the *missions* in the economy and the way in which the hypostases subsisted in eternity. "Indeed, if the Trinity is eternal, the Spirit is not a creature, because he co-exists eternally with the Word and in him." (3:6) Athanasius teaches us that there is a relationship between the Son and Spirit, an eternal one. While accepting the Son as being somehow involved in the origin of the Spirit, seeing Athanasius as teaching anything beyond the Spirit proceeding *through* the Son, would, as Paulson would assert, lack support from the writings available (Tektonics 2008).

John Chrysostom (347-407), was known as the 'golden-mouthed' due to his eloquent and impassioned sermons. While being the greatest preacher of the early Church, his contribution to pneumatology is limited, focusing on the influence of the Spirit on human ethical behaviour. His understanding of the Holy Spirit's place in the inner life of God echoes largely what earlier Nicene Fathers had written. He too deals with the standard issues of equality and consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son, all three possessing a common dignity. The Holy Spirit is involved in every step in the great plan of redemption. He reveals Christ (HJ: xvii). Christ, in turn, possesses the entire operation of the Spirit and it

is made manifested immeasurably in him. It is made available to the Christian to the extent that he is able to contain him. His work and teachings are the same as Christ's and he gives life, knowledge and Christlikeness. (HJ: 1xxviii)

Thus, as we have seen, the earliest Fathers sought to protect the *monarchia*, the Father as sole principle of the Godhead. The origin of the Spirit was therefore consequently viewed primarily in reference to the Father. They did, however, affirm that the procession of the Holy Spirit, somehow involves the Son. This would be particularly evident in the economy where the Spirit could even be said to proceed *through* the Son. Admittedly, less is said about the procession of the Spirit on the level of theology.

2.2 The Cappadocian Fathers

Clement of Alexandria (150-215) called Christ 'the New Song' (EH 1:7:3), but it is the Cappadocians that teach us that "God is also Eternal Dance" (Paulson. V: B). One wherein, "our thought must be in *continuous motion*, pursuing now the one, now the three, and returning again to the unity; *it must swing ceaselessly* between the two poles of the antinomy, in order to attain to the contemplation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." (Lossky 1997: 46).

With the Cappadocians "the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is brought to a new pitch of development" (Burgess 1984: 132). They borrowed both from Origen and Athanasius. They were concerned both for the *homoousios* of the Spirit with the Father and the Son, but also hypostatic distinctiveness. They were therefore able to reconcile many of the *Homoeans* who believed the Son had a similar nature to the Father, by emphasizing the distinction of the three hypostases within the one essence.

The Cappadocian teaching of the Holy Spirit's divinity is based upon *the Spirit proceeding from the Father, as the Son is generated or begotten by the Father*. What is begotten and what proceeds, of necessity is of the same essence or *ousia* with that which begets and from which it proceeds. It is therefore consubstantial and coeternal. Gregory Nazianzus explains:

How then are they not alike unoriginate, if they are co-eternal? Because they are from him, though not after him. For that which is unoriginate is eternal, but that which is eternal is not necessarily unoriginate so long as it may be referred to the Father as

its origin. Therefore, in respect of cause they are unoriginate, but it is evident that the cause is not necessarily prior to its effects for the sun is not prior to its light (TO 160).

They argued for the oneness of the *ousia* but distinction of *hypostases*. They retained *ousia* for the common essence, one nature – where the Godhead is one; and used *hypostasis* to express the difference, the distinction – where the Godhead is three.

Is the Holy Spirit God? Most certainly. Well then, is he consubstantial? Yes, if he is God... we assert there is nothing lacking – for God has no deficiency. But the difference of manifestation... or rather... their mutual relations one to another has caused the difference in their names. For indeed it is not some deficiency in the Son which prevents his being the Father (for the Sonship is not deficiency) and yet he is not Father... this is not due to deficiency or subjection of essence; but the very fact of being unbegotten or begotten, or proceeding has given the name of Father to the first, Son to the second, and to the third, him of whom we are speaking, the Holy Spirit, that the distinction of the three Persons may be preserved in one nature and dignity of Godhead (TO 199).

Do the Cappadocians add anything new to defining the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit?

Basil, Archbishop of Caesarea (330-379) wrote a seminal work *On the Holy Spirit*, arguing for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. His work was in response to the *pneumatomachoi*, or 'Spirit-fighters' that taught that the Spirit was a creature and therefore, not divine. In this, according to Paulson, Basil chooses to explain the “*functions and properties so as to perceive the Person of the Spirit as He is encountered in Scripture, salvation history, and Tradition*” (Tektonics 2008). This theological method is due to Basil's monastic background. In the mystical tradition of Eastern monasticism, theology is not an academic exercise or a process of deduction. It is experiential, a matter of perception.

In *Liturgies*, he links the Holy Spirit inseparably to the Son. Yet the Spirit's existence is from the Father, Who is the source from which the Spirit proceeds and subsists. Any perception of the Father, however, is a perception of Him *and* of the Son. Likewise, a perception of the Son is a perception of Him *and* of the Spirit, sequentially.

And since the Spirit is of Christ and of God, as Paul says, just as a man who grasps one end of a chain at the same time draws the other end to himself, so too, anyone who draws the Spirit, as the Prophet says thereby draws also the Son and the

Father. ... It is quite impossible to conceive of any sort of separation or division by which the Son could be thought of apart from the Father, or the Spirit disjoined from the Son; rather, the communion and the distinction apprehended in them, are, in a certain sense, inexpressible and unimaginable, since the continuity of their nature is never broken by the distinction of persons, nor are their notes of proper distinction ever confessed in their community of essence (LG 38:4).

For Basil, the Father remains the sole cause of the Spirit. Any reference to the Spirit as "Spirit of Christ" does not alter the Father's position and role. Yet, "for Basil *each of the Persons entails the other two and is presupposed by them as well.*" (Tek. V: B). According to this *perichorēsis* the Son necessarily plays a part in the Spirit's being. How does this, however, impact on the *procession* of the Spirit? In the absence of a succinct reply, can we infer anything regarding Basil's communion ontology?

The words of baptism are the same, and they declare that the relation of the Spirit to the Son equals that of the Son with the Father. If the Spirit is ranked with the Son, and the Son with the Father, then the Spirit is obviously ranked with the Father also. (HS 17:43)

This refers to the level of theology. Is the relation between Spirit and Son, equal to that between the Son and the Father? What can safely be surmised, is that the above is based on the *homoousios*, the Three sharing the same essence, and not that the Spirit "comes into being" from the Son as the Son does from the Father. Is there any significance to the order?

To begin with, Basil does not see this as the only proof of the of the Holy Spirit's divinity. When the Spirit is referred to as 'of God', he does not see this as the same way as all else is of God. Also, the Spirit is the 'Spirit of Christ', since they are naturally related. The Spirit glorifies the Lord as 'Spirit of Truth' and 'Spirit of Wisdom'. For Basil, the Spirit is glorified by His communion with the Father and the Son. Jesus' words regarding blasphemy against the Holy Spirit add weight to this (Mt. 12: 18:46).

Is the order then of any significance? No, it is the common essence that is of importance, as shown in the following illustration:

The way to divine knowledge ascends from one Spirit through the one Son to the one Father. Likewise, natural goodness, inherent holiness and royal dignity reaches from the Father through the Only-begotten to the Spirit. Thus, we do not lose the true doctrine of one God by confessing the Persons. (18:47)

Here Basil may also be seen as describing the role of the Son in the Spirit's being, even in the inner life of the Trinity. Nevertheless, the all-important monarchy of the Father continues to be upheld. There is also here a correlation between the theology and the economy, between the ontological Trinity and the economic Trinity. This allows us to make some cautious inferences. The *being* of each Person is, even though in different ways, intrinsic to the *being* of the other Two. The Father is *archē* and *pēgē*, source and fountainhead of both the Son and the Spirit, the Son by generation, the Spirit by procession. Yet, the Son has some part to play in the procession of the Spirit.

Gregory of Nazianzus' (329-390) use of analogies may be seen to imply some sort of order amongst the three Persons. We would do him greater justice though, by highlighting his stress on the *mystery* inherent in the manner of subsistence (Tektonics 2008).

The Father is the begetter and producer, but I mean without passion, timelessly and incorporeally. The Son is the offspring, and the Spirit the product. I do not know how to name them, altogether removing visible things Thus, stopping at our limits, we introduce the unbegotten and the begotten and the one which proceeds from the Father, as somewhere God himself, also the Word, says. (Orat. 3:2)

What, then, is procession? Tell me first what the unbegottenness of the Father is, and then I will physiologize for you on the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, and we will both be stricken mad for prying into God's mysteries. (Orat. 5:31:8).

For Gregory, however, the Persons are somehow defined by the relation to one-another.

Therefore, he did not later become a Father, for he has no beginning. Rightfully he is Father because he is not also Son. Just as rightfully he is Son because he is not also Father. (5:4) ... the Father is a name neither of a substance, O most clever ones, nor of an action, but that the Father is the name of the relation in which the Father is to the Son or the Son to the Father. (Orat. 5:16)

Augustine, as we will see shortly, gives this theme further attention. For the present, Paulson notes, we should note that Gregory did not make more of this than he thought was warranted. The Father, regardless of 'relation', also remains sole 'source'. The part the Son might play in the procession of the Spirit is not explicit in any of his writings (Tektonics 2008).

Like Basil and other ante-Nicenes, Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-395) does not distinguish clearly between the theology and the economy. In fact, we often find Gregory projecting what is said regarding the economic Trinity, onto the ontological or immanent Trinity.

Thus, also in reference to the word for deity, Christ is the power of God and the Wisdom of God. The power of oversight and beholding-which we say is deity, the Father, the God doing all things in Wisdom-effects through the Only-begotten, the Son who perfects all power in the Holy Spirit and judges (PG 45: 128).

For, as it has been stated above, the principle of the power of oversight and beholding in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is one. It starts off from the Father as from a spring; it is effected by the Son, and by the power of the Spirit completes its grace. ... No postponement occurs, or is thought of, in the movement of divine will from the Father through the Son to the Spirit. But deity is one of the good names and thoughts, and not reasonably is the name to be used in the plural, since the unity of activity prevents a plural counting (PG 45: 128)

For Gregory of Nyssa, how the Trinity operates *ad extra*, forms the foundation of perceiving the Trinity *ad intra*. We may speak of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, but are not naming three Gods, because the Three share a common divine essence. Three Persons are named, each with an individual work. No One, however, operates separately from the other Two. There is a unity of operations.

But in the case of the Divine nature we do not similarly learn that the Father does anything by Himself in which the Son does not work conjointly, or again that the Son has any special operation apart from the Holy Spirit; but every operation which extends from God to the Creation, and is named according to our variable conceptions of it, has its origin from the Father, and proceeds through the Son, and is perfected by the Spirit (PG 45: 125).

The Three Persons are distinguished then, by their origin. In *Against Eunomius*, he states:

Father conveys the notion of unoriginate, unbegotten, and Father always; the only-begotten Son is understood along with the Father, coming from him but inseparably joined to him. Through the Son and with the Father, immediately before any vague and unfounded concept interposes between them, the Holy Spirit is also perceived conjointly. ... since the Spirit is from the God of all things, he has for the cause of his being that from which the Only-begotten is light, through which True Light he shines

forth. Neither on grounds of duration nor by reason of an alien nature can he be separated from the Father or from the Only-begotten (Jaeger 1960: 138)

By linking the economic with the ontological Trinity, he "not only teaches the divinity and consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit and his proceeding from the Father, but Gregory also makes a deeper study of his relation to the Son than the two other Cappadocians." (Quaston 1995: 3, 287) In fact, Kelly (1985:262-3) goes as far as to argue that for Gregory of Nyssa (AM 2; 10; 12; 24),

The Spirit is out of God and is of Christ. The Spirit proceeds out of the Father and receives from the Son; He cannot be separated from the Word. It is their origin that distinguishes the Three Persons. The Father is the cause (*to aitton*), the other two, each one of them, is caused (*to aitraton*). These 'caused' Persons are distinguishable further, as one is produced directly (*prosexōs*) by the Father, while the other proceeds from Him through an intermediary.

According to this view, it is the Son alone that can be termed Only-begotten, while the relation of the Spirit to the Father is not compromised because He derives His being from the Father through the Son. Elsewhere, Gregory speaks about this as cause to effect. He uses the illustration of torches imparting their light to one another; the first to the second, and then the first, through the second to the third.

Kelly maintains that Gregory sees the Father as the only source within the Trinity. He also sees the Son, who is subordinate to the Father, playing a part in the procession of the Spirit. He also believes that from this point onward, the teaching of the Eastern part of the Church regarding the procession of the Spirit, is that it is *out* of the Father *through* the Son. Yet Kelly's accusation of subordination is unfair when the entire doctrine of the Cappadocians is founded on the *homoousion* of the Son and Spirit with the Father. Also, he boldly characterizes and defines the 'regular teaching of the Eastern Church' when that teaching is not always so clear and defined.

Mention should be made of one more Cappadocian, Amphilochius of Iconium (373-?). A few extracts will show the clarity of his position.

"The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father; the Holy Spirit we confess to be in the Father and the Son" (FR15). "The Spirit proceeds timelessly (*axronōs*) from the Father, and is co-eternal (*sunanarchon*) with the Father and the Son" (FR13). "I believe the Holy Spirit to proceed eternally (*aīdīōs*) from God the Father. I do not

speak of the procession of the Spirit as a 'generation', or of the generation of the Son as a 'procession'. When I use the word 'consubstantial', I refer not to one Person but to Three" (FR13).

We have here, the essentials of Cappadocian theology, expressed in a manner compatible with what is acceptable to the Christian East.

Cappadocian teaching regarding the Holy Spirit's divinity, is based on the Spirit's procession from the Father, just as the Son is begotten of the Father. They argued for oneness of ousia but distinction of hypostases – a common essence in three Persons. They accept that within the Trinity, the Father is the sole source of both the Son and the Spirit, while some role regarding the procession is attributed to the Son in the economy. The Son seems to have some role in the procession of the Spirit in the economy and there is some correlation between the economy and the theology. Also, there is a very definite distinction between what is 'begotten' and what 'proceeds' and that the Three Persons of the Trinity are somehow defined by their relations.

Cappadocian doctrine was, of course, instrumental in the 381 Council of Constantinople. Even though it could be seen as conciliatory in tone, not explicitly stating that "the Holy Spirit is God", it did refer to His divine attributes that that He has equal standing with the Father and the Son. Thus, to Nicea's Creedal Statement, Constantinople added, "And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the life-giver, who proceeds from the Father, who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets." (Kelly 1972: 297-8). The implicit recognition of the Spirit's deity is evident in its defining the Holy Spirit, "*Lord and life-giver*". The Holy Spirit is equal with the Father, who is God, and the Son, who is God.

The Creed also presents the Father as divine Monarch, from whom the Son and the Spirit derive their being. This is evident in the use of '*ek tou Patros*' to describe the origin of the Son and the Spirit. However, significantly, one is *begotten of*, whereas another *proceeds from*. Thus, the Spirit relates to the Father by *procession* in a parallel manner as the Son relates to the Father by *begottenness*.

There is, however, no mention of a clearly defined relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

2.3 Augustine

Pelikan had commented on “the ‘theological lag’ of the West behind the East.” (Pelikan 1974:184). The early theological controversies took place in the East. The West seemed more concerned with issues of order and structure. Perhaps that is why the Eastern Fathers display a “theological vitality” that, during this time at least, is absent in the West. Since the rule is often proven by exception, mention must be made of Augustine and his Trinitarian theology. Alongside being one of the greatest Western theologians in the patristic era, Augustine is one of the most significant contributors on the issue of the Trinity and the Spirit specifically. His *The Trinity - De Trinitate* represents what Adam Kotsko regards as “a particularly pregnant moment in the formation of Trinitarian doctrine” (SJT 2011:1). He was advantaged in that, by the time his treatise was completed, the boundaries of orthodox Trinitarianism had been defined and its basic content and vocabulary formulated. Yet, this doctrine was underdeveloped enough, particularly in the sphere of pneumatology, to allow for creative theological work.

His Trinitarian thought is not dominated by abstract philosophical thought. Augustine relies on Scripture, Tradition, and the faith of the Church, and then uses philosophical speculation.¹² Augustine takes up the theme we saw earlier in Gregory Nazianzus and the other Cappadocians. What distinguishes the Persons is the manner in which they are related to one another. One may detect, however, a difference of emphasis here.

So, we are left with the position that the Son is called being by way of relationship, with reference to the Father. And this leads us to the most unexpected conclusion that being is not being, or at least when you say "being" you point not to being but to relationship ... (TT. 7:1:2)

For Augustine, the Persons are distinguished by their relations alone, while for the Cappadocians this is not the case.¹³ It should be mentioned at this point that differences are often made out to be greater than they merit. The two views are not mutually exclusive, or necessarily contradictory. Augustine may not have developed the “communion aspect” of relationality fully, yet this doesn’t detract from his affirmation of the divine unity. It might even be said that the Cappadocians did not ‘tease-out’ fully the inferences and potential of their doctrine. They could, for example, have looked closer at the homoousios and explored

¹² This is evident even in the way *The Trinity* has been laid-out. He deals first with evidence from Scripture, then with logical coherence and only later with philosophical speculation.

¹³ As Paulson explains, “for Augustine it would seem that the Father is not the Son because the Son is begotten; for the Cappadocians the Son who is begotten *is* the Son and *because he is the Son* (and not because he is begotten) he is not the Father.” (Tek. V: B)

possible consequences of this further. This needn't necessarily have contradicted the distinctions between the Persons that they were trying to affirm.

This theory of relationships poses a challenge when characterising the Spirit. 'Father' and 'Son' are terms expressing a reciprocal relationship. But, according to the testimony of Scripture, the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son. How does the Spirit then relate to the two Persons by reciprocal opposition? Augustine overcame this difficulty by attributing the personal title of *Gift* to the Spirit and, quoting Scripture,¹⁴ the title *givers* to both the Father and the Son. According to Augustine, "He comes forth, you see, not as being born but as being given" (TT. 5:15).¹⁵ Since the Holy Spirit is the "gift of God" (TT.5.10-17), He is both "the gift of the Father and of the Son". By extension then, the Spirit '*going out*' from God, '*goes out*' from the Father and the Son, while never ceasing to be God. Augustine thus uses the economy to formulate his view of the eternal procession of the Spirit from both the Father *and* the Son, not because they are *Father* and *Son*, but because they are the *givers*.

Since that which is *given* or *gifted* has the *giver* as its source, both Father and Son, as one source, are the source of the Holy Spirit. Since in relation to the world, Father and Son are one God and one Lord, it follows then that they are a single source in relation to the Holy Spirit (TT. 5:14:15). Also, in God there is no chronological periods (15: 26:45). We should therefore not think that the Spirit proceeds from the Father first, then from the Son towards creation. Even though the Father gives that ability to the Son, the procession from both.

This 'double procession' (TT.15:26:45) of the Holy Spirit also, somehow, distinguishes between generation and procession. Since the Holy Spirit is of both the Father and the Son and proceeds from both, it cannot be thought of as *begotten* or *generated*. The Spirit would have to be considered a son of the Father and the Son, something considered wrong (TT.15:27:48). The double procession is, therefore, the reason the Spirit cannot be considered another son. The Spirit is not 'begotten' but neither is it 'unbegotten' since this attribute belongs to the Father. The double procession affirms the monarchy of the Father since it excludes the 'begetting' of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, as well as the begetting of the Son by the Holy Spirit (TT. 15:26:47). The Holy Spirit is thus neither *Son*, nor *Only-begotten*, nor a son adopted through grace as are humans.

Since "God is spirit", (Jn 4: 24), and God is Trinity, the Trinity is Spirit and can be called 'spirit' and 'holy'. The title is used specifically for the third Person of the Trinity, because it "is so called relationship-wise, being referred to both Father and Son, since the Holy Spirit is the

¹⁴ Acts 8:20. Romans 5:5 and John 4:7

¹⁵ *Exeo*, describing the generation of the Spirit, literally means to 'go out'.

Spirit of the Father and of the Son” (TT. 5:12). The name or title ‘Holy Spirit’ has no particular connotation of relation, but the use of ‘gift’ describes this, since the giver is God, the giver is ‘the Father and the Son’.

The Holy Spirit is a kind of inexpressible communion or fellowship of Father and Son, and perhaps he is given this name just because the same name can be applied to the Father and the Son. He is properly called what they have in common, seeing that both Father and Son are holy and both Father and Son are spirit. So, to signify the communion of them both by a name which applies to them both, the gift of both is called the Holy Spirit. (TT. 5:12)

So, the Holy Spirit is something common to Father and Son, whatever it is, or is their very commonness or communion, consubstantial and coeternal. Call this friendship, if it helps, but a better word for it is "Love". And this too is substance because God is substance, and "God is Love". (TT. 6:1:7)

Within the unity of the Trinity, the Spirit *is* the unity. We could assert that this precisely because it *is* love. God’s substance is therefore somehow determined by God being love, and the Holy Spirit, “as that which is shared between the Father and the Son”, is love. Western Trinitarian theology has located the unity of the Trinity in the divine substance, risking a creation of a ‘fourth’ within the Trinity. Augustine seems close to identifying the Holy Spirit as that divine substance, thus locating the unity of the Trinity not in ‘spirit’ but in the Holy Spirit.

In itself, these templates have come under major criticism from the East. They are seen as a depersonalisation of the Holy Spirit, reducing it to some ‘affection’ or ‘gift’ between Father and Son, resulting in a binitarianism that is then subsequently ‘reinforced’ by the filioque.

It should be pointed out again though, that by affirming the Filioque, Augustine does not reject the Father’s monarchy. “But the Son is born of the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *principally*, and by the Father’s wholly timeless gift from both of them jointly.” (TT. 15:6:47). In his affirmation, Augustine relied on the evidence of Scripture.

He saw that there were occasions when Jesus said, ‘I will send Him to you’, meaning the Holy Spirit, as though the Father were not involved in the action at all. At other times, it seemed as though the Father would send the Comforter, almost without the Son’s involvement. Augustine sees this contradiction but interprets it as Jesus wishing Himself to be understood together with the Father.

This procession *principally* from the Father, does not refer to time, but to source or cause. In other words, it is the Person of the Father alone that is the source or cause of the Holy Spirit. The same sense would apply to the "In the beginning was the Word" of John 1:1. The "in the beginning", (*in principio*) does not mean chronological time, but that the Word was with His source from all eternity (TT. 6: 2:3). The term *principaliter* guarantees the causal procession from the Father. If the Son too is a source, it is not in the sense of *principaliter*.

Thus, for Augustine, if the Holy Spirit is the gift of God, He proceeds from the Father. Yet, if the Holy Spirit is sent by Christ, then He proceeds from Christ too. It follows then, that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son. Besides, He is both the Spirit of the Father *and* the Spirit of the Son. What else, argues Augustine, would Christ have intended when he said "Receive the Holy Spirit"?

... By saying then, "Whom I will send you from the Father," the Lord showed that the Spirit is both the Father's and the Son's. Elsewhere too, when he said, "Whom the Father will send," he added, "in my name." He did not however say, "Whom the Father will send from me" as he had said "whom I will send from the Father," and thereby he indicated that the source of all godhead, or if you prefer it, of all deity, is the Father. So, the Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son is traced back, on both counts, to him of whom the Son is born. (TT. 4:5:29)

Since his starting point is almost always Scriptural, Augustine affirms the double procession of the Spirit precisely because it is biblical. Again, this theological view does not entail the denial of the Father as *only* source of all divinity. But, philosophical speculation can only be brought into the service of theology *after* considering Scriptural testimony.

So, because Father and Son and Holy Spirit are one God, and because God of course is holy and "God is spirit", the triad can be called both holy and spirit. And yet that Holy Spirit whom we understand as being not the triad but in the triad, insofar as he is properly or peculiarly called the Holy Spirit, is so called relationship-wise, being referred to both Father and Son, since the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son. (TT. 5:3:12.)

Augustine also tackles the following challenge: "If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, why then does the Son say: 'The Spirit proceeds from the Father'." (TT. 15:48) He answers by asserting that the Father communicated all that He is to the Son. This excludes only His 'being Father'. Anything the Son has, is of and from the Father. Hence, the Spirit proceeds from the Son because the Father makes this possible. Augustine explains

that Christ, speaking to His disciples after the resurrection, breathes on them and says, “Receive the Holy Spirit” (Jn 20:22). This air exhaled by Him and felt by the disciples was not the essence of the Holy Spirit since we have no hypostatic union between the Spirit and air as we do between the Logos and human nature (TT. 4:21:30). It was rather, an illustrative revelation by God that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son too. Augustine also maintains that Christ revealed the procession of the Holy Spirit from Himself too, so as to help us understand the consubstantiality between Father, Son and Holy Spirit as well as His own divinity (TT. 15:26:46).

Augustine wished to protect the consubstantiality of the three Persons. In trying to do this, he made their correlatively-opposing relationship their distinguishing factor. The relationship between Father and Son poses no problem and is defined by ‘generation’. The Spirit also, within the unity of the common essence, is relationally distinguished from the two by proceeding from them. This relationship defines what distinguishes the Spirit. By extension then, if the Spirit does not also proceed from the Son, nothing distinguishes the Spirit from the Son, or protects the consubstantiality within the Trinity. Thus, according to Swete, “the Western Filioque, as Augustine states it, is almost a necessary inference from the *homoousion*.” (Swete 1912: 353)

At this point I wish to state briefly what will be made explicit in further chapters. Vocabulary has a role to play in the issue that is being researched. The same Latin verb *procedere* translates the Greek *proeimi* and *erchomai* (Jn 8:42), as well as *ekporeuomai* (Jn 15:26). Greek tradition distinguishes between them. *Ekporeuomai* used for the procession of the Holy Spirit, denotes the Father as the source of origin, as original and absolute principle. Greek thought safeguarded consubstantiality in the monarchy of the Father as source and cause, the *perichorēsis* of the Persons and their inter-relationships. The monarchy of the Father, in itself, does not preclude the Son having a role in the Spirit’s derivation. Yet, the Latin dismisses the significance the Greeks attributed to the *ekporeuesthai* of John 15:26.

Augustine held that Christ attributed the *ekporeuesthai* of the Holy Spirit to the Father alone (Jn 15:26). This was not because He had no role in the procession, but to show that the Father was source of all that the Son has. This is also what was meant in “my teaching is not my own, but the teaching of Him who sent me” (Jn 7:16). Because the Son is God, His teaching and that of the Father cannot be different. It follows then that the Son is involved, with the Father, in the Spirit’s procession. Since He is “True God of true God”, He receives His involvement in the procession from the Father.

Concluding with Augustine and while recognising the significance of his contribution, particularly to Western theology, one could consider his relational ontology, although valid, to be incomplete. This may have contributed to Latin Trinitarian thought tending towards modalism and making rapprochement with the East more difficult. It would be erroneous to posit Augustine as the point of division between East and West. While Augustine can be read as a proponent of Filioquism, he cannot be viewed as the point of division on the subject of procession or on the Trinity in general. The dictum that Latin philosophy and, by extension theology, first considers the nature in itself and proceeds to the agent, whereas Greek philosophy and, by extension theology, considers the agent first and then the nature, has been used by Orthodox as well as Catholics to show the inherent incompatibility of Augustine's approach to that of the Cappadocian Fathers.

This hermeneutical model first made its appearance with Theodore de Regnon (De Regnon 1892-8). The model was not, however, referring to the modern trend to contrast Eastern and Western Trinitarian models. De Regnon distinguished between *patristic* and *scholastic* periods in Trinitarian theology. The Patristic period, represented in its fullness by the Cappadocians, saw an emphasis on the Persons. The Scholastic period, inaugurated by Augustine, was characterised by a preoccupation with the nature of God. De Regnon recognised that while they may have had different emphases, the two eras were not in conflict. In fact, the scholastic era derived *from* and *contained* the patristic insights.¹⁶

De Regnon's paradigm has unfortunately become entrenched as the clichéd Eastern/Threeness and Western/Oneness paradigm. Numerous theologians have reduced thought on the Trinity to *starting* points, rather than primary historical texts. In this regard, the paradigm may be of relevance. Yet, patristic scholars and even a few systematic theologians,¹⁷ give little credence to this modification of de Regnon's model. Edmund Hill, for example, suggests that it "ought simply to be thrown into the theological dustbin" (Hill 1982: 115).

In the early Church, the great theologians of the western and eastern sides of the Roman Empire felt free to draw on one another's writings. In seeking to expound the doctrine of the Trinity, each say some things that are quite distinctive, and each build on the work of those before them wherever they are located.

¹⁶ Michel René Barnes presents an extensive description of de Regnon's model and its acceptance by modern theologians. (AS 26) and, (TS 56) *Theological Studies* 56 (1995), 237–50.274.

¹⁷ Respected scholars have criticised the cliché regarding Augustine's point of origin being the unity of the divine essence. Ayres, L. (JECS 8); Barnes, M. in Davis 1999, 145-6; Clark, M. (D13); Hill, E. (AS2) and (1985; 115); Williams, R. (A40), Muller, E. (AS 26). Among these are systematic theologians like Congar, Y. (1983: 1. 77-8). O' Collins (1999:135) and Weinandy, T. G. (1995:55-64).

Tertullian was a western theologian, but George Prestige notes his dependence on Eastern Theology (Prestige 2008: xxv). It is the same with Irenaeus. His thinking was enriched both by theologians from the West and East. Athanasius was from the East but was exiled to Rome more than once. Hilary of Poitiers was from the West and was exiled to the East and knew at least the writings of Basil. The Cappadocians follow Athanasius in some matters and in others take their own path. Augustine did not read Greek with ease but knew the works of the Eastern theologians and Hilary. He did not see himself as moving in a new direction. Even his reflections on the soul as an image of the Triune God is a development of what Gregory of Nyssa had first suggested (Ayres 2006: 291). Lewis Ayres convincingly argues that Augustine stands squarely in the pro-Nicene tradition exemplified by Athanasius and the Cappadocians (364-5).

2.4 Concluding Remarks

The Early Fathers seem to concur that the Father is the only cause and source of Divinity. This common thread runs through Tertullian, Origen, Hilary, Athanasius, Ambrose, the Cappadocians and Augustine. This was a fundamental tenet of Trinitarian theology of the whole patristic period. It was understood by all as significant in maintaining the *monarchia* (Swete 1912: 368).

The Creed of Nicea confessed the Son as “true God of true God”, begotten of the Father’s essence – *ousia*, and deriving His being by a unique generation as “only-begotten”. A corresponding clause in the Creed of Constantinople defined the Holy Spirit’s derivation as “proceeding from the Father”. Thus, the explicit teaching was that the Father is the source and the cause of both the Son and the Spirit. The two derivations are different only because the Son is derived by generation, while the Spirit is derived by procession.

Like the generation of the Son, the Spirit’s procession has reference, not only to mission, but to essential life. While the ministering spirits are sent by God, the Spirit alone is the One who proceeds from God, who derives His being from God. Thus, both the Son and the Spirit are eternally and essentially from God. This God is the Father, the only *archē* or *aition* within the Trinity. Both eternally coexist with and ‘go out’ from God. On this premise it follows that the eternal ‘going out’, the ‘procession’ of the Spirit’, is like the ‘going out’, the ‘generation of the Son’, from the Father alone.

Alongside the belief in the monarchy of the Father, is a recognition of the Son’s involvement in the procession of the Spirit. Some even saw that the *order* of the Son, necessarily meant

that he played a role in the Spirit's procession. If one conceives the First Person as giving being to the Second, and that the Divine Essence passes eternally through the Second Person into the Third, the Second can be seen as mediating the procession of the Third.

The Greek fathers were generally content to express or even imply that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and "receives from the Son". Alternatively, they expressed that "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son." The Latins before Augustine generally followed these Greek views. Augustine, perceiving the obscurity, gave the solution that was to mark Western theology (Swete 1912: 370). The Father and the Son are the common source of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit proceeds from both as from one source and by one spiration. And, since the Father and Son are one in essence, this procession from the Father necessarily involves procession from the Son. The Son is given the power, by the Father, to communicate the essence to the Holy Spirit. In this way, Augustine avoids creating two 'principles', two sources of Divine Life.

Thus, while the Son's part in the Spirit's procession cannot be denied, there is no definite indication that this role has anything to do with the Spirit's 'coming into' being, its 'origin'. There is no indication that the Son is considered, 'source' or 'origin' or 'cause' as is the Father. ¹⁸ It was necessary that this doctrine be expounded and elucidated according to the witness of the Fathers and the experience the Church. We now turn our attention to this endeavour.

¹⁸ Any substantive disagreement precluding an agreement on the Spirit's procession must be dated sometime after the patristic era. In fact, the theology of double procession only became normative after the rise of Adoptionism and Arianism in Spain. This is normally associated with persons like Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgel. To counter the teachings of these heresies, the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son was stressed in all things, that they share everything, including the role in the procession of the Spirit.

CHAPTER THREE

THE APPEARANCE OF THE *FILIOQUE*

As we have seen in Chapter One, the early patristic era does not provide us with a clearly defined doctrine regarding the relationship between the Son and the Spirit, the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology. This doctrine had to be tackled and defined, and as so frequently happened in the Church, it began to be defined in response to a controversy. Doctrine was defined to meet challenges. This chapter deals with the emergence of the filioque controversy and initial responses that it elicited.

The Creed of the First Ecumenical Council was directed mainly against the teachings of Arius and dealt with Christological issues. Consequently, not much attention was given to the Third Person of the Trinity, asserting simply its belief “in the Holy Spirit”. Half a century later, the teachings of Macedonius, denying the divinity of the Holy Spirit, made it necessary to hold another such gathering. The Second Ecumenical Council was held in Constantinople in 381. Here the Creed of Nicea was confirmed and clauses were added to the words “and in the Holy Spirit”. It now read, “and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spoke through the prophets...” (Davis 1983: 122)

The Third Ecumenical Council, held in Ephesus in 431, decreed that “no one should henceforth speak, write or compose another faith beside that defined by the Councils”, and contained in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.¹⁹ Twenty years later the Fourth Ecumenical Council re-iterated the prohibition, affirming that the Creed “teaches that which is perfect concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit” (Percival 1900: 265). For a hundred and forty years after the Council of Chalcedon, the Church seemed relatively undisturbed by another controversy. Yet, what has been termed the ‘greatest church-dividing issue’ was developing.

Leo the Great became Pope in 440 and, while his attention was focused on the doctrine of the Incarnation, the few sermons for Pentecost do show his handling of the issue of the Holy

¹⁹ Canon VII in The Canons of the Two Hundred Blessed Fathers who met in Ephesus (ORTH.2018)

Spirit. In attacking Priscillianism²⁰ and upholding the distinctiveness of the Persons, he accuses them of denying “that there is one who begat, another who is begotten, another who proceeds from both” (Serm. 75:1). Yet, the letter to Turribius in which the filioque is championed, is of doubtful authenticity. What is important to note is that Leo accepted the canons of Chalcedon including its reaffirmation of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the original.

On the subject of the procession Leo is thus non-committal. Leo affirms the common western belief that it is the same essence, not the Persons, which explains the unity of the Trinity. Within the Trinity thus, there is no inequality nor dissimilarity. Yet, regarding distinctions, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are not one and the same Person. “The Holy Spirit is begotten of the Father and the Son” because he subsists eternally from their common essence (Leo 1996:332).

It was in the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa that the Augustinian teaching regarding the procession was incorporated into Western Trinitarian doctrine (Siecienski: 2010:65). We find the filioque present in a number of African and Gallican treatises long before it had received official recognition and sanction.

Eucherius of Lyon (d.454), writes, “The Holy Spirit is neither generate nor ingenerate, but rather He proceeds from the Father and the Son, as a harmony, we may say, of both.” (PL 50: 774). Gennadius of Marseilles (d. 495), affirmed that there is “one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; Father in that he has a Son; Son, in that he has a Father; Holy Spirit in that he proceeds from the Father and the Son”. (PL 58: 980) Julianus Pomerius (d. 498), instructs that the faithful be taught that “the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and therefore cannot be said to be either generate or ingenerate.” (PL 59: 432) In his argument against the Arian Goths, Avitus of Vienne affirmed “that we say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and the Father.... it is the property of the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son.” (PL 59: 385).

Pope Hormisdas (d. 523) allegedly authored a confession of faith to Emperor Justin, in which he taught that “it is characteristic of the Spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son in one substance of deity”. (PL 59: 385) Boethius (d. 524), following the example of Augustine, wrote in his *The Trinity* concerning the terms ‘Father’, ‘Son’, and ‘Holy Spirit’, that they were predicates denoting relation, and therefore, while the Father was always the Father, the

²⁰ Priscillianism is a belief system that made its appearance in the 4th century, in the Iberian Peninsula. It was developed by a certain Priscillian and founded upon the Gnostic-Manichaeic teachings of the Egyptian, Marcus. Leo attacked their modalism, the belief that the Three Persons of the Trinity are actually one Person who “is called at one time Father, another Son and another, Holy Spirit”.(Serm. 75:1)

predicate was still a relative term. Thus, he admits that: "God the Son proceeded from God the Father and the Holy Spirit from both.... but since there are in God no points of difference distinguishing Him from God, He differs from none of the others." (Boethius 1926: 27).

The same acceptance of the procession of the Spirit from the Son, can be seen certain North African authors of this period. Fulgentius of Ruspe (*d.* 526) repeatedly urges the filioque, "the Holy Spirit, the One Spirit of the Father and the Son, proceeds from the Father and the Son. That He proceeds also from the Son is supported by the teaching both of the Prophets and the Apostles." (PL. 65: 695). Regarding the Spirit, he asserts that He "proceeds wholly from the Father and the Son, and abides wholly in the Father and the Son; for He so abides as to proceed, and to proceed as to abide." (PL 65: 418) As with Augustine, he maintained that the Spirit proceeds *principaliter de Patre* yet went further to describe the double procession from the Father and the Son as one of the Spirit's hypostatic properties, proceeding from the nature of the Father and the Son, as the one Spirit of the Father and the Son (Ep. 14:28).

The only reservations regarding the filioque seem to be voiced by Rusticus alone. He was nephew to Pope Vigilius and his objection regarded not so much the doctrine itself, but rather the *manner* of the Spirit's procession. Could this procession be said to be the same as that from the Father? Rusticus argued that since the Spirit does not eternally beget the Son with the Father, could it be said that the Spirit proceeds from the Son in like manner to how He proceeds from the Father? (PL 67:1237). Rusticus, unfortunately left this question unanswered.

When Latin theology began to concern itself with addressing *how* the Spirit proceeds from the Son, how He actually *does* so, was firmly established. By the middle of the sixth century, this belief was so entrenched that it was assumed to have always been part of the apostolic faith. But what of ecumenicity? Could it assume to be universal?

The Athanasian Creed, believed for centuries to be the work of Athanasius of Alexandria, became an important proof text for the filioque among the Latins. Regarding the Holy Spirit it read:

The Father was made by no one, neither created nor begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made, neither created nor begotten, but proceeding. Therefore, there is one Father, not three fathers, one Son, not three sons, one Holy Spirit, not three holy spirits (Pelikan 2003: 676).

Given its alleged authorship by an early Eastern Father, the filioque, having already achieved 'apostolicity', now achieved 'ecumenicity' through Athanasius. It was a matter of time before it appeared in the Creed.

The sixth century provides the first known instance in which the filioque was inserted in the Creed. This was done in Spain in 589. This Third Council of Toledo presents some interest in that it seems clear that it had no intention to add anything to the Creed, that it mandated that the Creed should be chanted in all the Churches of Spain and Galicia according to the form of the Eastern Church, and yet in his opening speech, King Reccard asserted that "in equal degree must the Holy Spirit be confessed by us and we must preach that He proceeds from the Father and the Son." (Kelly 1973: 361). Even the 'Nicene-Constantinopolitan' Creed, as recited at Toledo, stated that the Spirit "proceeds from the Father and the Son." (Kelly 1973:362). Apparently, Reccard and those assembled at the Council, thought this was the original form of the Creed, its 'Eastern form'. There was an absolute lack of awareness that any alteration or addition was, or had been made in the faith of the universal Church. Within a few short years the interpolated Creed was firmly established in both the liturgy and theology of the Spanish Church.²¹ The filioque had taken such root that its exclusion from the Creed would have seemed nothing less than the abandonment of the faith itself (Swete 2004:175).

The position of Gregory the Great on the issue is still a subject for debate. In the *Morals* he asserted the Spirit "proceeds from the Father." (PL 75:419). Elsewhere in the same work he claimed that the Spirit "even in substance flows from the Son" and "the Spirit of the Father and the Son who issues from both... proceeds ever from the Father." (PL 2:93; 30:17). In his Homily on John 20:21, Gregory related the economic manifestation of the Spirit with its eternal procession:

The Son is said to be sent from the Father from the fact that He is begotten of the Father. The Son relates that He sends the Spirit... the sending of the Spirit is that procession by which it proceeds from the Father and the Son. Accordingly, as the Spirit is said to be sent because He proceeds, so too it is not inappropriate to say that the Son is sent because He is begotten. (*Hom.* 2.26).

²¹ In 633, Isidore of Seville presided over the Fourth Council of Toledo, which declared that the Holy Spirit proceeds "from the Father and the Son". Nine subsequent Councils held at Toledo during the seventh century reaffirmed this teaching, including the sixth (638), eighth (655), eleventh (675), twelfth (681), thirteenth (683), fourteenth (688), fifteenth (688), sixteenth (693), and seventeenth (694).

Gregory's true views on the issue are difficult to discern. Given the widespread acceptance of the filioque, it may be safe to assume that he embraced it and advocated it in some way. The same can be said of his successor, the Greek-speaking Theodore, who included the filioque in his synodical letter to Constantinople, occasioning the first Eastern reaction to the doctrine. In this initial encounter, it was another Greek who took up the case, explaining what the filioque meant or didn't mean. That man was the monk, Maximus.

3.1 Maximus the Confessor

According to the Greek *Life of St Maximus*,²² he was born in 580 A.D., in the city of Constantinople. He received a good, classical education and found employment in the service of the emperor Heraclius, eventually attaining the position of head of the imperial chancellery. He resigned that position in 613/4 and entered the monastery at Chrysopolis. He was elected abbot but later left for the monastery of St George in Cyzicus. It was there that he wrote his *Book of Difficulties (Ambigua)*, explaining difficult passages in the works of Gregory Nazianzus and Pseudo-Dionysius.

The Persian invasion forced the monks to flee and, sometime between 628-30 they settled in North Africa. It was here that Maximus met Sophronius, later Patriarch of Jerusalem, and became involved in what became known as the *monothelite* (one will) controversy.²³ What must be noted, is that the theological debates were complicated by political and military developments of the time. The precarious conditions of Christians of the Middle East exposed the dangers caused by religious disunity. Heraclius was eager to unite the opposing factions and so maintain the integrity of the Empire.

In 633, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, together with Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, drafted a formula that initially appeared to be a success. It was based on the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius and spoke of *one theandric energy* operative in Christ. The assertion of one, unique activity in Christ (*monoergism*), was to appeal to the non-Chalcedonians, while the affirmation of two natures would appease the Chalcedonians. Sophronius opposed this and forced Sergius to write to Pope Honorius for his opinion on the matter. Demonstrating a lack of awareness of the theological issues at stake, the Pope's letter contained the

²² The Syriac *Life* tells a very different story. This account may be contemporary with Maximus and, although the details may seem credible, Maximus' easy entry into court-life and evidence of his higher learning are not explained.

²³ Monothelitism developed in the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon which left the Church and the Empire divided between those that accepted its legitimacy and others that viewed it as a violation of the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria, who spoke of "the one incarnate nature of God the Word." Monothelitism was an attempt at a compromise, teaching that while there were two natures in Jesus Christ, there was only one will.

infamous statement that confessed the 'one will of our Lord Jesus Christ' (CPG 9377). Thus, the Pope was later credited for being the inventor of the monothelite heresy. The debate quickly shifted from the *one energy* or *activity*, to the issue of the *one will*.

Maximus saw in both monoergism and monothelitism a camouflaged monophysitism. In his *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, he states:

And if he has two natures, then he must surely have two natural wills, the wills and essential operations being equal in number to the natures. For just as the number of natures of the one and same Christ correctly understood and explained, do not divide Christ but rather preserve the distinction of natures in the union, so likewise the number of essential attributes, wills and operations attached to those two natures do not divide Christ either (*Disp.4*).

Maximus participated in the Lateran Synod that was convened to settle the monothelite issue. The synod publicly endorsed the *dyothelite* (two wills) position of Maximus, condemning Pyrrhus and Sergius. The council was to spark an angry imperial reaction from Constantinople. Pope Martin was arrested in 652 and, after trial, was sent into exile at Cherson, where he died as a confessor in 655. Maximus and his disciple Anastasius were also arrested and exiled. Six years later he was recalled for a second trial. He refused to enter into Communion with the Patriarch and, for his stubbornness and so that he could no longer defend the dyothelite teaching, Maximus had his tongue torn out and his right hand removed. He died in exile in Lazica on August 12, 662.

The Sixth Ecumenical council, while making no specific mention of Maximus, possibly to save imperial embarrassment for the way he had been treated, finally upheld the teaching he and Pope Martin had worked tirelessly to promote. The orthodox doctrine of two wills in the one person of the incarnate Christ, that is, one human will and one divine, distinct but not contrary to each other, was vindicated. What had been upheld by the Lateran Synod of Rome, was confirmed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council and Maximus achieved acclaim and recognition in the Church, both East and West.

Does this universally-recognized Father of the Church have something to contribute to our subject of study? Let us begin by looking, firstly, at his Trinitarian thought.

With regard to the terms *Monad* and *Triad* (Trinity), he teaches that these do not signify quantity or quality or relationship. The Monad does not increase to a Triad, nor does the Triad decrease to a Monad. Both terms describe the Divinity that is "beyond any division and synthesis, part or whole" (*Diff. 59*). The Trinity is a Triad in Monad and a Monad in Triad. The

Triad-in-Monad is at once both united and distinguished and there is no confusion or separation in it. Toronen explains that “The principle of essence is what is common to all the particulars but the particulars have some characteristic features of their own which individuate them in relation to one another” (Toronen 2007: 53).

A balance between essence and hypostasis is at the heart of this doctrine. He teaches the one nature and power of the divinity, one God, understood as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, a “Trinity in unity and a unity in Trinity” (DS: 254). The Trinity is ‘*enhypostatos ontotēs*’ of the consubstantial Trinity. The Triad is the ‘*enousios hyparxis*’ of the tri-hypostatic Monad (*Diff.* 1). The divine has both a natural quality and a hypostatic quality (*phusikē poiōtēs kai hypostatikē poiōtēs*). Its natural quality is the All-holiness, the Omnipotence etc. while the hypostatic qualities are the Father’s *unbegottenness*, the Son’s *begottenness* and the Spirit’s *ekporeuton* or *procession*. All Three are united since the Son and the Spirit coexisted in essence with the Father from all eternity. They are, however, distinct in function. The Logos is the agent of God’s revelation to mankind. Through the Holy Spirit, Christ leads mankind, reconciled to Himself, back to the Father (Burgess 1989: 42)

Maximus avoided the pitfall of apophatic theology – “the speculative nihilism that was its potential outcome” (Heinzer 1982: 398). He is, in the words of Heinzer, “profoundly aware of the intimate and inseparable link between what the Greek Fathers called theology and economy, between the mystery of the Trinitarian God and the mystery of the incarnation and redemption” (Heinzer 1982: 159). On the one hand, he upholds the distinction but, on the other, he relates the one to other intimately, establishing a connection between the two. ‘Shadows’ of the Trinity could thus be discerned within the natural order and even within the constitution of the human. Thus, the Trinity is seen reflected in the structure of the human soul or as an archetype of the mind (*nous*), the reason (*logos*) and the spirit (*psychē*).

For Maximus, the revelation in Christ is the revelation of God Himself, revealed as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. By incarnating, the Word shows in Himself both the Father and the Holy Spirit. Both are present fully even though themselves not becoming incarnate. With regard to the Incarnation, “the Father gives approval, the Spirit cooperates and the Son effects it.” (Berthold 1985: 103). Even in the Incarnation, it is the Trinity at work, revealing God’s subsistence in three hypostases. In the Incarnation God has revealed Himself as Trinity. Humankind, through *perichoresis*, can enter into the mystery and share something of the Trinitarian life itself.²⁴

²⁴ In the same way there is a *perichorēsis* between Christ’s divine and human natures, Maximus invites us, in our human nature, to penetrate into the divine nature, to participate in the divine life.

Being unoriginate, and cause of the Son, the Father is greater though not in nature, because they share the single, common nature. The Son is eternally related to the Father and this relationship determines their hypostatic identities. "The name of the Father is neither the name of an essence nor the name of an energy but rather the name of a relationship and it says how the Father is towards the Son and how the Son is towards the Father." (*Diff.* 26) With regard to the Spirit, the One who spirates, is always the Father of the Son. The Spirit's procession from the Father thus takes the Son's existence for granted (Siecienski 2010: 77). Thus in *Questions to Thalassius* 63, he professes the procession of the Spirit to be "essentially from the Father through the begotten Son." (Laga & Steele 1980:155).

Christ, as Incarnate Logos and the head of the Church, by his nature and according to his essence, has the Spirit and bestows the Spirit's gifts on the Church. As such, he has a pivotal mediatory role. Here, of course, the reference is to the economic manifestation of the Spirit. Yet, he had already established that the relationship of the Son to the Spirit is an eternal one.

The Spirit proceeds from the Father who is the sole cause of the Spirit's hypostasis. While hypostatic origin is not derived from the Son, the procession from the Father, as 'Father of the Son', presupposes the Son's existence (Siecienski 2010: 78). A relationship between the two is thus not excluded. It is, rather, expressed in speaking of the procession as *dia tou You*, through the Son. This is expressed further in Maximus' *Letter to Marinus*.²⁵

In this Letter, Maximus defended the Latin teaching's orthodoxy, citing witnesses and then explaining the position as he understood it. Maximus argued that the Latins are not positing that the Son is the cause of the Spirit. The Father remains the sole source and cause of both, of the Son by begetting and of the Spirit by procession. Maximus argues that, in trying to show the unity of essence, the progression of the Spirit is seen as *through the Son* (PG 91, 136). The monarchy of the Father, so dear to Eastern theology, was thus not compromised by the Latin teaching. The Father remained sole cause, the *mia aitia* of the Son and the Spirit and only principle of unity in the Trinity.

In his *Chapters on Theology and the Economy*, he writes:

There is one God, because the Father is the begetter of the unique Son and the fount of the Holy Spirit: one without confusion and three without division. The Father is the

²⁵ The *Letter to Marinus* is a problematic text with regard to dating, establishing authenticity and discovering clear intent. Yet, it is thoroughly consistent with his theology. It provides a unique summary of his doctrine of the Trinity and has positive ecumenical potential (Siecienski 2005:19). In this Letter, Maximus responds to the attacks against the orthodoxy of Pope Theodore, with whom he shared common Christological views, and addresses the filioque specifically.

unoriginate intellect, the essential Begetter of the unique Logos, also unoriginate, and the fount of the unique everlasting life, the Holy Spirit. (PG 90, 1180)

Defending the Father as source of the Son and Spirit and as principle of unity within the Trinity, he was in accordance with the Cappadocian teaching on this issue and generally what defined orthodoxy with regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Maximus may have been supporting Rome for his own interests – for the sake of his Christological views that were at odds with Constantinople. It is evident, however, that Maximus upheld the monarchical principle and that, should the Pope have viewed the Son as a cause, whether unique or secondary, Maximus would have objected. It is unlikely that he would have supported one heresy in order to better fight another. As Edward Siecienski pointed out, “It is logical to maintain that Maximus genuinely believed that the Latins held the Father to be the unique cause of the Son and the Spirit because, in the seventh century, that *is* what the Latins themselves believed.” (Siecienski 2010: 81). The attribution of causality to the Son appears to be, as we shall see later, a post-Carolingian phenomenon.²⁶

The monarchical principle protected the unique position and role of the Father but at the same time, had to answer for the unity of essence and the relationship, eternal or otherwise, between the Son and the Spirit. The Father shares a common nature and will with the Son and cannot be isolated from Him. Both Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria had spoken of the “eternal *flowing forth* of the Spirit from the Father *through* the Son”, within the economy of salvation, and also to the manifestation of the Spirit eternally, as Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ (Siecienski 2010: 81).

Maximus, like Gregory and Cyril before him, expressed this using a terminological distinction between *ekporeuesthai* and *proienai*. The former is used both in Scripture and in the original Creed for the Spirit’s *coming forth*. The Fathers, in their writings, used *Ekporeuesthai* to refer only to the origin of the Spirit *hypostatically*. The latter includes the element of progression or advance. What flows from the source, retains a sense of continuity with the source. *Proienai* is not restricted to the economic manifestation of the Son and the Spirit, but also used to refer to “the eternal communication of the divine nature which flows from the Father, through the begotten Son to the Spirit” (Siecienski 2010: 82). Maximus could thus refer to the Spirit’s *procession* from the Father and his eternal *progression* through the Son.

²⁶ Maximus’ understanding of the filioque does not allow for the Father’s hypostatic qualities to be transferred to the Son, allowing for Him, albeit in a secondary sense, involved in the Spirit’s *ekporeusis*. A *perichoresis* among the three Persons of the Trinity would not ever imply a confusion of hypostatic properties. Attributing any causality to the Son would have been a deviation from the Church’s tradition as Maximus knew it.

Subsequently, if Pope Theodore's statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son too, should be seen as a clumsy attempt at expressing the Spirit's *proienai*, the eternal progression from the Father *through* the Son. The issue was a linguistic rather than a substantive one. The intention, Maximus argued (Siecienski 2010: 83), was not to deny the Father's unique role but rather to express what already had a long tradition in Byzantine thought – the role of the Father as only *aitia* and *pēgē* of both the Son and the Spirit, but also the flowing forth of the Spirit from “the Begetter through the Begotten, sharing the common nature of both” (Siecienski 2010: 83).

In lieu of what has been mentioned above, we can now ask what Maximus contributed to the Byzantine synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology.

Maximus does not draw a clear divide between the economy and theology. There is a relationship, a continuity between the two. The economy reflects something of theology. The Incarnation reveals God's mode of existence and each Person, through *perichoresis*, is present in the actions of the other. All Persons share the same nature and are thus equal.

The Father is the source of unity and is greater, not by nature, but as the cause of the Son by generation and of the Spirit by procession. Personal hypostatic qualities are determined by this. It is an attribute, a hypostatic quality of the Father, as source, to beget and to process. The Son, as Son of the Father is, however, not impartial to the Spirit. Thus, for Maximus, while the Spirit *-ekporeuetai-* from the Father, the Spirit *-proienai-* through the Son, flowing forth within the economy and also within the theology.

Maximus represents an irenic response to the filioque and an attempt to interpret it in an acceptable way for the East. According to Siecienski,

for the Latins, here was an eastern Father who acknowledged both the antiquity and essential orthodoxy of the filioque. For the Greeks, the Letter to Marinus was an affirmation that causality could not be attributed to the Son as the Latins seemed to suggest” (Siecienski in Allen 2015: 549).

Both sides used it as a weapon against one-another. There were those, however, that saw this text as a means of reconciliation. Anastasius, the Librarian of Rome, referred to it in explaining the filioque in such a way that was fully compatible with eastern thought.

Moreover, we have the letter written by the same Saint Maximus to the priest Marinus concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, where he implies that the Greeks tried, in vain, to make a case against us, since we do not say that the Son is a cause or principle of the Holy Spirit, as they assert. But, not incognizant of the unity

of substance between the Father and the Son, as he proceeds from the Father, we confess that he proceeds from the Son, understanding *processionem*, of course, as 'mission'(PL 129.560-1).

Yet, as relations between East and West worsened politically, as the rift between the two grew larger, so theological debate became more inflexible and conservative. Theology began to serve politics as each side sought to justify itself politically by proving its own orthodoxy and the other's heresy. Subsequently, historical and political developments have much bearing on theology in general, and on the development of our topic specifically.

The Roman Empire lost its western half in 476 A.D. What remained was in the East, centered on the person of the emperor whose capital was Constantinople, the New Rome. The Empire's subjects, although Greek-speaking, continued to call themselves Romans. 'Byzantine' and 'Byzantium' are recent inventions and would have been totally foreign to the inhabitants of the Roman Empire in the East. In 533 Justinian overcame the Ostrogoths and brought Italy, once again, within the sphere of the Empire. It was however a precarious tenure. When, 200 years later, Leo the Isaurian demanded that religious imagery be destroyed, his edict was met with open defiance by Pope Gregory II. When Leo attempted to quell the revolt by force, his army was routed under the walls of Ravenna. But the Popes used their victory with moderation and the government of Southern Italy was carried on in the name of the Eastern Emperor until A.D. 800, when Charlemagne was crowned Emperor of the West.

Pepin and his son Charlemagne had steadily been extending their conquests and increasing their territory in central Europe. When in the middle of the eighth century, the Popes found themselves threatened by the Lombards, they turned for assistance to the rising power of the Franks. The Pope rewarded Pepin with the crown of France, while the latter handed over the Exarchate of Ravenna and other of the Eastern Empire's territories, to the Pope (Gibbons 1994: XLIX). Emperor Copronymus in 766 had sent a representation requesting the return of confiscated dominions. A Council was called in Gentilly the following year where, apart from the political issues, two theological issues were discussed- the issue of Images and that of the procession (Swete 1876: 201).

John of Damascus was an Eastern Father that preoccupied himself with both these issues.

3.2 John of Damascus

While John of Damascus is well-known in the Eastern Church as a champion for the use of Images, for the purposes of this paper we will restrict our research to his Trinitarian theology and his contribution to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology.

Almost all the information we have regarding the life of John of Damascus, comes from the records of the Byzantine chronicler Theophanes and John, Patriarch of Jerusalem (Louth 2003:16). He was born around 676 A.D. and brought up in Damascus when the city was already under Muslim rule. This fact did not affect his or his family's Christian faith, nor was it an issue with the Muslim overlords who regarded him highly. His father served the caliph as chief financial advisor, a hereditary public office (Louth 2002: 5). A Sicilian monk, a man of great knowledge and wisdom, was chosen as John's tutor. With Cosmas' guidance, he progressed and excelled in music, astronomy and theology. He succeeded his father as *protosymbullus* or chief councillor. It was at this time that Iconoclasm became an issue (Louth 2002: 17).

In 726, ignoring the pleas and objections of Germanus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Emperor Leo the Isaurian proceeded to issue a law forbidding the use and veneration of religious Images, including their display in public places. With his talent for writing, and safely outside Byzantine borders, John of Damascus launched a response to Leo in his "Against those decrying the Holy Images". The treatises earned him a reputation. With them he attacked a monarch, but it was his employment of simpler language that took the arguments to the level of the people, thus inspiring them to resist the decree of the emperor (Louth 2003:16).

John, secure in Damascus, could not be called to order. However, Leo the Isaurian managed to have John's signature forged on a letter that offered to betray Damascus into the hands of the emperor. The caliph, furious at the treachery, dismissed him from his position and ordered his right hand, the one used for writing, to be cut-off at the wrist. His biography mentions how his hand was miraculously restored after he prayed earnestly in front of the Image of the Virgin Mary. This remarkable event convinced the caliph of his innocence and he offered to reinstate him (Louth 2003:17). John, however, withdrew to the Monastery of Saint Sabbas in the Judean Desert. From there he produced numerous commentaries, hymns and apologetic writings, among which is *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, summarizing patristic wisdom. He had, what Louth calls, "a genius for selection" (Louth 2003: 13). His intention was to assist Christians understand and articulate their faith in contrast to heretical teachings. John died in 749 and is a revered and celebrated Father of the Church.

The first fourteen chapters of the *Exposition* contain John Damascene's account of the Christian faith in God as Trinity. The first few chapters raise general considerations regarding human knowledge of God. He begins his book with the usual theological clarification that God is incomprehensible. John asserts that the knowledge of God is possible only because God has made Himself known as the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (Louth 2002: 90). Theological explorations are not an effort to comprehend what God *is*, but rather to understand the truths of His revelation. We are unable to grasp His nature but are still able to have knowledge of God as implanted in all by nature, and as disclosed through Scripture.²⁷

Chapter 8, one of the longest chapters of the *Exposition*, presents a more technical account of Trinitarian doctrine. It consists of four sections. The first of these (8.2-95) begins by stating Christian belief in one God, ineffable and transcendent, and then introduces the notion of the Trinity, expounding the doctrine in relation to the Father and the Son, discussing also the difference between begetting and creation.

We therefore, both know and confess that God is without beginning, without end, eternal and everlasting, uncreate, unchangeable, invariable, simple, uncompound, incorporeal, invisible, impalpable, uncircumscribed, infinite, incognisable, indefinable, incomprehensible, good, just, maker of all things created, almighty, all-ruling, all-surveying, of all overseer, sovereign, judge; and that God is One, that is to say, one essence and that He is known and has His being in three subsistences, in Father, I say, and in Son and Holy Spirit; and that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one in all respects, except in that of not being begotten, that of being begotten, and that of procession.... and that the Only-begotten Son... is at once perfect God and perfect Man, of two natures, Godhead and Manhood..." (O.F. 2:124)

The second section (8.96-171) discusses the nature of divine generation and procession, using traditional analogies and expounding the distinction between *agennētos* (unbegotten) and *agenētos* (unoriginate). John states his faith in "one Father, the beginning and cause of all", who is the begetter of "one only by nature," the Son, and the "producer" of the Holy Spirit. The Son is God's Word. God is creator and *communicator*. He cannot be without his Word who has the same absolute actuality as God's essence. John gives the analogy of

²⁷ John's declaration of belonging to the tradition and the expressed awareness of the inability of human reason to acquire knowledge about God was a widespread, almost stylistic requirement of the theological tracts of the era. This was partly due to the intellectual humility insisted on by the Christian faith, the need to express allegiance to the orthodox faith and the authority of the Scriptures as opposed to heresy and the admission of the feebleness of the human mind to comprehend divine truths and of the inadequacy human language to express them. This intellectual humility is not as evident among the scholastics for whom theology is the "Queen of Sciences". (MR :2013)

human mind and language. The human mind begets language which may not be totally identical with the mind, but is neither totally separate from it. Mind and language, like light and brightness, are both the same and different. One might beget the other, but they are both simultaneous.²⁸ In subsistence they are different, but this does not mean they are separate (8:129). Moreover, this Word must possess Spirit that is in the Word and in the Father. The Spirit is thus “the companion of the Word and the revealer of his energy” (8:130).

The third section (8. 172-222) is on the Holy Spirit and the nature of the procession and, therefore, more relevant to our study. It begins by recalling what the Creed says of the Holy Spirit. To this John makes three additions so that it would read: “We believe in the One Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, as consubstantial and co-eternal”²⁹ (Louth 2003:107). Of interest to us is the addition “and rests in the Son”. Even though the Spirit is called “Spirit of the Son”, John later denies He is “from the Son”. He derives this from the fact that he is “made manifest and bestowed upon us through the Son” (*OF*. 8: 289-3). He seems unaware of the filioque and explicitly addresses the relationship of the Spirit to the Son, with the premise that the Father is sole *archē*, or principle, in the Trinity. John is making a distinction between what is true in the *theologia* and what is true in the *economia*: The Spirit proceeds from the Father but in the economy the Spirit is bestowed by the Son, therefore also called ‘Spirit of the Son’ (Louth 2003: 108).

Previously, John had spoken of the Spirit as “proceeding from the Father and resting in the Word and being his manifestation, being separated neither from God, in whom he is, nor the Word, whom he accompanies” (*O.F.* 7.19-22). John brings together refinements regarding the procession of the Spirit that have been definitive for later orthodox theology. In his reflection on John 1:32 that deals with the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit upon him, he speaks of an eternal resting of the Spirit in the Son, that is manifest in the *economy* as the Spirit abiding, or resting, on the Son. The Spirit manifests the Son in the *economy*, but this in itself depends on the eternal self-manifestation of the Son in the Spirit. Staniloae indicates the parallelism between the begetting and the procession:

²⁸ Elsewhere John gives the analogy of fire and light. There is not one without the other. Both exist simultaneously and even though light is the product of fire, at no time does it exist separate from it.

²⁹ This notion of the Spirit in the Son is found in Athanasius and Didymus. The latter uses the verb ‘*menei*’ to say that the Spirit abides in the Son. He also uses the verb ‘*anapauein*’, to say that he rests in the Son. In his commentary on the baptism of Jesus, he sees the Spirit as resting on the incarnate Word. Cyril too takes up this suggestion, but is concerned to show that the Spirit rests permanently on the Son in his incarnate state.

It is only if the begetting of the Son by the Father is accompanied by the procession of the Spirit from the Father, that the begetting of the Son can also be accompanied by the manifestation or shining forth of the Spirit... There is an inner dynamic presence of the Spirit in the Son. The shining out of the Spirit through or from the Son, constitutes the basis for the shining out of the Spirit through or from the Son to the created world (*in Vischer 1981:183*).

In the treatise *On the Thrice Holy Hymn*, John asserts that “the Word is a real offspring, and therefore Son. The Spirit is a real procession and emanation from the Father of the Son, but not of the Son, as breath from the mouth, proclaiming God the Word.” (28: 40-3). In one of his sermons he refers to the Spirit as “the Holy Spirit of God the Father, as proceeding from him, who is said to be of the Son, as through him manifested and bestowed on creation, but not as taking his existence from him” (*Homilies 4:21-3*).

The remaining section is concerned with affirming that the Trinity is one simple *ousia* in three perfect *hypostases*, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.³⁰ John finds it necessary to explain how a Deity that is simple and uncompound can simultaneously be Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The most proper name for God is, as John asserts “He that is” (*Exodus 3:14*). God, as different to the material world, is an existing essence, the only possible existing essence, absolute being, unchanged and unconnected to anything else, yet penetrating all dimensions of the universe without mixing with its stuff. The difficulty of explaining essence without its bearer, makes the task of explaining God as essence impossible. Yet we have God’s three hypostases that reveal, according to John, some “mutual relationship” within the essence and also the “manner of God’s existence”. (*O.F. 10: 143*) These three cannot exist separately from their essence.

I know one perfect God. For the Godhead is not compound but in three perfect subsistences, one perfect indivisible and uncompound God. And when I think of the

³⁰ Basil and, following him, the two Gregories sought to clarify the language used in relation to the Trinity by confining the word *ousia* (being, essence) to the one Godhead, and using the word *hypostasis* for the three members of the Trinity. They characterised hypostasis as ‘mode of existence’ (*tropos hyparxeos*) in contrast to what was to ‘be’ (*einai*, from which verb the word *ousia* is derived). The different modes in the Godhead were identified with the ‘unbegottenness’ for the Father, ‘begotten’ for the Son, and ‘proceeding’ for the Spirit. The three hypostases had the same being, or *ousia* in common (Louth 2002: 96). The suggestion that the use of *ousia* for the oneness of God was analogous to the generic use of *ousia*, might seem to imply that divine *ousia* means the kind of being that God is, was a suggestion that the Cappadocian Fathers resisted. The *homoousion* does not mean that there is a divine *ousia* that is anterior to the divine persons, or that there is some divine *ousia* underlying them; rather, the divine *ousia* is the Father’s *ousia*, which he shares with the Son by begetting him and with the Spirit through procession. The unity of *ousia* which the term *homoousios* safeguards is manifest in the single divine *energeia* that comes from the Father, through the Son, and is received in the Holy Spirit. It is in response to this single divine *energeia* that human worship of God originates in the Holy Spirit, and passes through the Son to the Father (Louth 2002: 97).

relation of the three subsistences to each other, I perceive the Father is super-essential Sun... begetter of the Word, and through the Word the producer of the revealing Spirit. (O.F. 12: 148)

There is “no spatial distance, as with us in the uncircumscribable Godhead”, the hypostases “are in one another, not so as to be confused, but in accordance with the word of the Lord, ‘I in the Father and the Father in me’ (Jn 14.10).” (O.T. 8: 253-6.) This ‘being in one another’ of the divine hypostases, he terms *perichorēsis* or *coinherence*, so that “they have *coinherence* one in another without any coalescence or mixture.” (O.T. 8”. 263-4). The term itself, in a Trinitarian context, is an innovation of John’s. The verb had been used to describe the interpenetration of the two natures, divine and human, united in Christ. John uses it for to the realm of the *theologia*. It describes the eternal being of the Trinity, in which the distinction of the *hypostases* has no adverse effect on the integrity of the Godhead’s unity. The *hypostases*, although distinct in their modes of existence, remain totally one. This unity of *hypostases* is manifested in *perichorēsis*, in interpenetration (Tsingos 2014:105).

John’s exposition of the Trinity is a synthesis of patristic theology. He draws on developments in Christological reflection, particularly *perichoresis*, to secure a Trinitarian theology that is free from logical abstraction and the consequent tritheism that Christian theology was in danger of fostering (Louth 2003: 115). In terms of his contribution to the Byzantine synthesis, John stresses the Father as cause of the hypostatic being of the Spirit. John wrote that the Spirit should not be thought as being from him (the Son) but “as proceeding through him from the Father – for the Father alone is the cause.” (Louth 2003: 196) Yet, he acknowledges there is “an eternal relationship between the Father and the Son. The Father is ‘Father of the Son’. Hence, the Son is a condition of the Spirit’s coming forth from the Father both in time and on the level of theology” (O.F.1.12, 178).

In 768 Pepin died and was succeeded by Charles who was to make the acceptance of the filioque into a criterion of orthodoxy. After coming to the assistance of the Pope, he was rewarded by being crowned Holy Roman Emperor in Rome in A.D. 800. Needless to say, tensions escalated between the two “Roman” Empires and the two “Roman” Emperors. The same tensions were felt in ecclesiastical circles as Patriarchs of Constantinople resented the self-aggrandisement of their Roman counterparts, with whom they considered themselves equal in all but primacy of honour. Theology and theological disputes became convenient weapons in the power play between East and West.

When Tarasius (730-806) was elevated to the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople, and following the proceedings of the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787, he sent the announcement to the other Patriarchs, along with a customary confession of faith. In this, he

wrote of the Holy Spirit as “proceeding from the Father *through* the Son” (Mansi 1759-98: VIII, 760). While Pope Hadrian (700-795) accepted the confession and the outcome of the Council, Theodulf of Orleans, (c.750-821) at the king’s request undertook to refute a list of co-called heresies. Particular exception was taken to Tarasius’ confession that stated “*through* the Son” and not “from the Father *and* the Son”. While Hadrian defended this as being on a par with filioque and according to the view of many Holy Fathers, Theodulf’s views were accepted as doctrine at the Council of Frankfurt in 794. He rejected “through the Son” as not being equivalent to the “from the Son”. Significantly, he saw the phrase as novel and argued that the original Creed should be adhered to. The “original Creed”, he presumed, included the filioque (Siecienski 2010: 92).

In 797 a Council was held in Friuli under the presidency of Paulinus of Aquileia to deal with the adoptionist heresies of Elipandus of Toledo. It was here that Paulinus stated his fidelity to the Creed of the first Two Ecumenical Councils that stated that the Spirit “proceeded from the Father.” Yet, he also maintained that it was acceptable to expound this further should it become necessary.³¹ Thus, after reciting the Creed with the filioque, he added, “the Spirit is true God, not begotten, nor created, but proceeding from the Father and the Son intemporally and inseparably”. (Labbe 1728: ix 31). This was again affirmed at the Council of Frankfurt three years later. (Labbe 1728: ix 96, 97).

In 803 Alcuin of York composed his *De Fide Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis* defending the filioque. He accepted the Spirit as bond of communion between the Father and Son, stressing unity in the essence of the Persons (Siecienski 2010: 95). The Son and Spirit are not distinguished by their manner of coming into being, the one begotten and the other proceeding, but in the Son’s coming from the Father while the Spirit proceeds from both.³²

The question of procession was raised again by monks from Jerusalem who heard the Creed being recited *with* the filioque. It was also, by now, common practice among the Franks. A Council was held in Aachen in 809 but the issue was left unresolved. Legates were despatched to Pope Leo III by Charlemagne to seek clarification. In fact, he wrongly accused the Greeks of *dropping* the filioque from the Creed While there is little doubt that Leo accepted the double procession, he rejected the interpolation of the phrase in the Creed. In fact, after this consultation Leo urged them to remove the filioque, stop singing the Creed in the Palace and had the Creed engraved, without the filioque, on two silver tablets,

³¹ The filioque was added to combat those “manifest heretics who whisper [that] the Holy Spirit exists from the Father alone and proceeds from the Father alone”. It was seen as ‘supplementing’ the teaching and of the Fathers. (Siecienski 2010: 94).

³² In this he relied heavily on the Trinitarian theology of Augustine and Fulgentius of Ruspe and ignored the Cappadocian understanding. (Siecienski 2010: 95).

one in Greek and the other in Latin and displayed prominently in the Church of St Peter in Rome. It was also Leo's way of reminding Charlemagne that Rome, not Aachen decided for the faith. The Franks though, remained adamant in the use of the filioque and spread the interpolated Creed in their missionary work among the Slavs. This addition to the Universal Creed of the Church, was later criticised sharply by Photius. (Haugh 1975: 89).

3.3 Photius and his Legacy

Animosities between East and West, particularly due to encroachment of Westerners on territories viewed as 'eastern', were exacerbated by complications in the ecclesiastical realm. Rivalries concerning missionary access and jurisdiction over Bulgaria, and the events surrounding the appointment of Photius as Patriarch of Constantinople faced these to the fore. The displacement of Ignatius and his replacement by Photius was considered irregular by Pope Nicholas I who excommunicated Photius. The latter retaliated by accusing the Roman Church of heresy because it taught the procession from the Father *and from the Son*.

Although renowned for his great learning, his knowledge of Latin theology seems limited and thus, in his *Encyclical to the Eastern Patriarchs*, his attacks on the "double procession" from the Father and the Son, are arguments based on logic. He does not try to refute any Latin patristic evidence. (Siecienski 2010: 101).

Photius accuses the Latins of ruining the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, of distorting it by adding the procession of the Holy Spirit "from the Son". Thus, they introduced two sources into the Trinity, the Father being one source of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the Son another source of the Holy Spirit. *Monarchia* is thus transformed into a "dual divinity". (Photius 1983:50-51).

"Since the Spirit is perfect God from perfect God, His procession from the Father is perfect and complete". (Photius 1983: 51). If so, then what need is there for Him to proceed from the Son too? This implied that the procession from the Father is imperfect. The Spirit cannot proceed from both, with the Son as an intermediary, because the Spirit is not a property of the Son. Having two sources within the Trinity destroys the unity of the Godhead (Orphanos *in Vischer* 1981: 286). Since the 'begetting' and the 'processing' are properties of the Father's hypostasis, if the Son were to participate in this, it would blur personal distinctions and the result would be a semi-Sabellianism (Orphanos *in Vischer* 1981:284). The Christian

conception of God is shaken by the existence of two principles, one independent and the other receiving His origin from the first (Orphanos *in* Vischer 1981: 285).

Within Divinity, the Father is the principle, not by nature, but by property of His hypostasis. The Son may share in His nature, but not in His hypostasis and can therefore not Himself be a source. The filioque thus blurs the hypostases of Father and Son, either breaking that of the Father into two, or merging that of the Son with the Father's. Additionally, the filioque 'degrades' the Holy Spirit to a lower rank than that of the Son, He alone having more than one origin or principle. The distinction between the Father and the Son is confused. The Son would now possess, not only the Father's nature, but the property of the Father's Person. The Son's contribution to the procession would injure His 'Sonship' and damage His hypostatic quality. He would become a source of what already has a source and is equal to Him. Would that, Photius asks, make the Spirit a grandson? (Photius 1983: 52). The Father being one source of the Son and the Son a second source of the Spirit implies the Father becomes both an immediate and a mediated source of the Spirit. Two sources would give a dual outcome. The Holy Spirit's hypostasis would thus be dual, which is absurd (PG 102: 284, 316).

Within the Trinity, what the Three do not have in common, is the exclusive property of One. Dual procession comes into conflict with this. Besides, if the Spirit proceeds also from the Son, what, in turn, proceeds from the Spirit? Wouldn't it make sense that if procession was due to common nature rather than hypostatic property, the Son would have to be 'begotten' or proceeding from the Spirit too? The balance would thus be maintained. But this is not so.

In response to this, Pope Nicholas requested a response from the Carolingian theologians.³³ The summary of arguments in favour of the filioque can be found in Ratramnus' comprehensive response, *Against the Objections of the Greeks who slandered the Roman Church*. (PL 121: 225-346). He upheld the filioque on biblical, patristic and conciliar grounds.

³⁴

Basil the Macedonian came to power in 867 and a Council, initially considered the Eighth Ecumenical Council, restored Ignatius as Patriarch. On his death in 878, Photius was again

³³ Hincmar of Reims, Aeneas of Paris and Ratramnus of Corbie.

³⁴ According to Ratramnus, in the Scriptures, Jesus claims to possess 'all that the Father has' (Jn 16:15). This must include the Father's ability to generate the Spirit. As with Theodulf, he views procession as a property of the divine substance and not of the Father's hypostasis. He repeated Alcuin's stance that the distinction between Son and Spirit was not, as the Greeks believed, in the manner of their coming out from the Father, but in the Son's coming out from the Father alone while the Spirit proceeds from both (Siecienski 2010: 95). His use of the Fathers, especially Augustine and Athanasius, was extensive. For Ratramnus and his contemporaries, scriptural and patristic references to the Holy Spirit as the 'Spirit of the Son', were affirmations of His economic and eternal procession from the Son. (Siecienski 2010:106-7)

appointed, this time with the approval of Pope John VIII. A Great Council held the following year nullified the Acts of the previous council. This new Eighth Ecumenical Council forbade any addition or alteration to the Creed and condemned all those who impose on it illegitimate words, additions or subtractions (Siecienski 2010:104). Photius was again deposed in 886 and sent into exile. It was there that he wrote his most influential regarding the filioque, *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. In this he repeats the arguments he had put forth in the *Encyclical* and then addresses the Latin theology of the procession and the Latin patristic testimony.

In his *Mystagogy* Photius refers to that “voice which says the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father.” (PG 102: 280-1.) It is the Son himself “who established in his own sacred teaching... the fact that the Spirit proceeds from the Father” (PG 102: 280-1). He thus appeals that it is necessary “to become aware of impieties and to conform in thought to the teaching of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.” (PG 102: 324).

One of the most repeated arguments, expressed also in his *Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia*, is that if Son and the Spirit are caused by the same uncaused Father, and if the Son is also a the Spirit’s cause, one would be logical forced to assert “that the Spirit must also produce the Son” (PG 102: 801). Photius’ idea is that there should be reciprocity of cause between the Son and the Spirit. If the Spirit is caused by the Son, why is the Spirit not also a cause of the Son? (PG 102: 320).

Connected with the above argument is that if the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, He would be both generated and proceeding.

If the Spirit proceeds from the Son, but not earlier or later than the Son is generated from the Father... at that same moment the Spirit certainly proceeds from the Son. If then, while the Son comes forth by generation, the Son produces the Holy Spirit by procession. It would then follow that he... came into being with the Son... while then the Son is generated, it would follow that at the same moment the Spirit was also being generated together with the Son and was proceeding from him. The Spirit would therefore be simultaneously generated and proceeding. Generated because he would be coming forth together with the generated Son but proceeding because he would undergo a double procession (PG 102: 341).

One argument, not present in the *Encyclical*, but added in the *Mystagogy* was in response to the Latin claim that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Person of the Father, but rather, from His substance. However, the Father is the uncaused cause by His hypostatical character not by his essence. Procession is a not an essential, but a personal hypostatic

quality, belonging to the personal property of only the Father. Since it is not related to essence, it cannot be held in common. The proponents of the Filioque consider the procession of the Holy Spirit to be a common activity of the Father and the Son. If so, then the Spirit would participate in his own procession. He would be partially producer and partially produced, partially the cause and partially caused. If the principle of procession is the common essence, not only would the Spirit proceed from himself, but he would also have to participate in the generation of the Son and, why could another person not be said to proceed from the Spirit?

According to Photius, if Spirit's procession is not the property of the Father, then it will assuredly not be the Son's. If the principle of procession is essential and not personal, the Triadic principle of persons is destroyed. The property of the person of the Father is dissolved in nature, suppressing the unique un-caused Cause in the Trinity of Persons. Logically, if there is an interchange of the properties of the Persons, the Father must in some way be the object of generation, since the Father and the Son share the same properties. (Haugh 1974:144).

An idea which Photius previously touched upon is further developed in the *Mystagogy*. If the Spirit were to proceed from the Son, "what then does he gain that he does not already possess in his procession from the Father?" (PG 102:288) If the Spirit receives something additional from this procession from the Son, one must consider that the Spirit was somehow lacking without it. Was his procession from the Father then imperfect?

With regard to the Biblical texts used by the Carolingians in support of the Filioque doctrine, Photius concentrates on the main ideas and the most frequently used texts. His first concern is the text from John which states that the Spirit "will take of mine and announce it to you". (Jn 16:14) Photius asks, "Is taking something from someone the same as to proceed...?"

The Lord did not say "he will receive from me" but "he will receive from that which is mine." There is a great and profound difference between the two expressions "of mine" and "of me" ... in fact, the expression "of me" introduces in the action the same subject who pronounces the phrase; the expression "of mine" introduces another person, different from the subject of the phrase. And who is this, if not the Father from whom the Spirit "takes" something?... in fact, school children know that the expression "of me" implies the same subject who pronounces the phrase, while the expression "of mine" announces another Person united by intimate bonds to the subject but personally different from him. (PG 102:301)

Photius is aware that the Carolingians stressed the idea that the Son received authority from the Father to produce the Spirit. However, asks Photius, “why did the Son receive this privilege of being a cause in the procession of the Spirit, while the Spirit being in equal rank and honour and same nature is stripped of equal privileges?” (PG 102:320). Photius deals at length with those texts used to support the Spirit proceeding from the Son because the Spirit is referred to as the “Spirit of the Son”. Speaking of Paul, Photius maintained that;

He said ‘the Spirit of the Son’- he could have said nothing better. The Spirit is of the same essence as the Son; consubstantial with him.... in saying ‘the Spirit of the Son’ Paul affirms their complete identity of nature, but has no intention of introducing an idea about the cause of the procession of the Spirit....he gives not a glimpse of any idea of cause. (PG 102: 330)

Photius finds the Latin interpretation of ‘of the Son’ both grammatically and conceptually primitive. To be consistent, he says, they would have to argue that the “Father is begotten” of the Son, since the Father is ‘of the Son’. According to the Greek position, the Father is ‘of the Son’ not because he is born from him, but because he is consubstantial with him (Haugh 1974: 150).

When we affirm that the Spirit is of the Father and the Son, we declare that he is entirely consubstantial with each of them. We know he is consubstantial with the Father because he proceeds from him; (we know) he is consubstantial with the Father not because he proceeds from the Son.... but because each of them comes forth equally from a unique, indivisible and eternal Cause (PG 102: 329).

Besides, as Photius continues, the Spirit is also called the Spirit of wisdom, of intelligence, of love etc. Does the Spirit proceed from any of these? (PG 102: 333)

Did Photius contribute to the synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology? No, but that was not his intention to begin with. The *Mystagogy* was never intended to be a complete exposition of Trinitarian thought. It was a reaction to the perceived heresies of the Latin missionaries in Bulgaria and the Carolingian theologians, who he believed were theologically unsound and even disobedient to their own Pope, given that John VIII recognized the Council of 879. It is for this reason that Photius insisted on the Spirit’s procession *from the Father alone*. He did not even delve into the tradition of the “*through the Son* nor explore the eternal relationship of the Son and the Spirit that was taught by numerous Greek Fathers” (Orphanos *in Vischer* 1981: 25).

The Gospels were not always vocal on the point of the Spirit's procession. Many Greek Fathers were silent on the issue too. Did Photius, in a sense, use this to the extreme? There were cases in the *Mystagogy* where his arguments seemed to be based on this same 'argument from silence'. He claimed, for example, that the heresy of the Holy Spirit's procession 'from the Son' was anathematized by the Seven Ecumenical Councils (Metaxas 1988: 26-7).

The terminology 'from the Father alone' may have been rather novel, but in essence, it was simply yet another expression confirming the Father's monarchy. The emphasis on the procession of the Spirit *from the Father alone* "helped create a dialectical tension between the procession *ek monou tou Patros* and procession *filioque*," that some claimed was the faith of the universal Church (Siecinski 2010: 104). Nevertheless, his emphasis on *from the Father alone* discounted the Trinitarian synthesis of Maximus and John Damascene, and was to characterize the Orthodox position on the Filioque for centuries to come.

Photius' tradition was continued by his disciples. Nicetas of Byzantium³⁵, for example, expresses the same approach in his treatise in the last chapter of Hergenrother's *Greek Annals Pertaining to Photius and His History*. Not only does he remain silent with regard to patristic texts dealing with the mediation of the Son in the Spirit's procession, but he maintains resolutely, that the Spirit proceeding from the Father and from the Son is not supported by patristic writings or the Church's tradition (Jugie 1926: 291). As if this in itself were not enough to convince,

... worthier by far than all these things is the Son of God the Father himself and the Word, who knows everything which is of the Father, and everything which is of the Spirit; who...in promising to his disciples the advent of the Holy Spirit said: 'And I will send to you another Helper, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father.' (John 1-5:26) He did not say 'who proceeds from the Father and out of me, the Son.' Therefore, since it is not said like that, but only 'who proceeds from the Father' and there is not added to our Lords speech: 'out of the Son himself', the dogma of the Holy Spirit's procession is clear and beyond any doubt (Jugie 1926: 292-3).

Nicetas followed the classical Cappadocian approach with regard to describing relations between the Persons of the Trinity: "The Son and the Holy Spirit come from God the Father, the former by generation, the latter by procession according to the nature from the substance of the Father without time and eternally, just as if they arose together as 'twins'

³⁵ Hergenrother edited Nicetas' twenty-four syllogistic principles, written sometime between 842-886, in the *Greek Annals Pertaining to Photius and His History* (Demetracopoulos 1872:3).

from God.” (Jugie 1926-35: 291). He also used the term ‘to go forth’, indicating a procession in descent, and treating it identically with terms like ‘send forth’ (*proienai*), ‘shine forth’(*eklampein*), and ‘put forward’ (*proballesthai*). And, while Photius almost ignored the formula “through the Son”, Nicetas accepted it, albeit as referring to the mission of the Holy Spirit in time alone. (Metaxas 1988: 44)

The Holy Spirit has everything which the Father and the Son have, except for not being able to be born and generated; He proceeds from the Father but He is communicated through the Son and is received from every creature...For in the same way the sun is the origin and cause of its ray and its light, but through the ray the light is communicated to us, and it is that very thing which illuminates us and is possessed in participation by us: So God the Father is the source and cause of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, whilst the Spirit, proceeding from the Father, is given and manifested through the Son.” (Jugie 1926:291).

The issue abated for a while and Byzantine churchmen and theologians preoccupied themselves with other “Latin errors” like the use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist or the imposed clerical celibacy in the West. The controversy seemed to be revived when the deceased Photius’ *Encyclical Letter to the Eastern Patriarchs* was published anew in the end of the tenth century. The beginning of the eleventh century brought a revival of Photius’ teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit. It had, by now, become widespread and generally accepted as the official orthodox position on the issue.

3.4 The Great East-West Schism

The Churches continued to be in outward communion during the whole of the tenth century and half of the eleventh. It was apparently during this time that the Filioque became a recognised clause of the Creed as said or sung in the West. It is not certain whether this happened as a result of a formal Act of a Pope, or of gradual adoption by local Churches throughout the West. The Roman party at Ferrara asserted the former, but without reference to time and name.³⁶

Michael Cerularius became Patriarch in 1043 and some ten years later, in an Encyclical addressed to the Bishops in Apulia, over which he claimed jurisdiction, among other things he mentions with some displeasure certain matters in which the Roman Church differed from

³⁶At the Bonn Conference in 1875, the formal insertion of the Filioque in the Creed was attributed to Pope Benedict VIII, on the demand of the Emperor Henry II, in 1014.

the Greeks. Among these was the Latin use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, fasting on Saturdays, enforced clerical celibacy and the Dogma of Procession from the Son. The Encyclical came into the hands of Leo IX, who addressed a letter of remonstrance in return. The Papal Legates arrived in Constantinople. Michael remained unflinching in his resolve and a Papal Sentence of Anathema against him and his followers was placed on the Altar of Hagia Sophia. It was July 1054, the date traditionally assigned to the Schism between East and West. (Will 1861:153-4)

Cerularius' response was swift. He took up Photius' arguments against the Latin theology of procession. Following the Greek tradition, he maintained that proceeding was an act of the Father alone, and that He alone was principle or cause within the Trinity. Later polemicists would use his arguments against the Franks, adding little else of value to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology.

There were, however, some Byzantines that tried to move beyond mere polemics and examine the deeper theological issues. Theophylactus of Ochrid was one such. He certainly believed that the Filioque was theologically incorrect and a Frankish innovation. Yet he believed that this was due to the Latins confusing procession with economic manifestation and mission. He maintained this was due to the inadequacy of Latin, its inability to convey theological subtleties. Since their error was due largely to ignorance rather than wickedness, he urged his fellow Easterners to allow the Latins to express their faith in their way, as long as they accepted the original Creed (PG 126:224).

Theophylactus was perhaps too vociferous in attributing so much blame to the inadequacy of Latin to express theology, specifically matters of doctrine:

Because of this, the Latins suppose that proceeding (*ekporeuesthai*) is identical with being imparted (*chorēgeisthai*) and with being conferred (*metadidosthai*), because the Spirit is discovered to have been sent and imparted and conferred from the Son (PG 126:229).

Essentially, Theophylactus argued that 'procedere' is the only word that the Latins have and can use that expresses four Greek words '*ekporeuesthai*', '*cheesthai*', '*diadidosthai*' and '*proballein*' (PG 126:229-31). The otherwise irenic Hierarch pointed out that Latin had an insufficient distinction of words – and was thus unable to distinguish between a relation of origin or to express a means of supply or even something given. It seems he genuinely believed that the Latins did not view the Father and the Son as origin and cause of the Holy Spirit in the same sense.

But if procession means no more than that Father and Son supply the gift of the Spirit, the Spirit must either be without any source or principle of origin, or have some other source than the Father, in some principle that is and is not Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (PG 126:230)

To all this, Theophylactus presented the orthodox patristic view, comparing “the Father to the sun, the Son to the rays of the sun and the Spirit to the light or heat given by the sun” (Metaxas 1988:59). He wrote: "We can talk of the light of the rays, but the sun remains the principle." (PG 126:232).

Anselm of Canterbury wrote his *De Processione Spiritus Sancti* maintaining that the Filioque was a logical necessity if one was to hold simultaneously both to the unity of the substance within God and the distinctiveness of the persons, each of whom can only be understood in terms of their ‘relational opposition’. Anselm responded to the Greek charge that speaking of the Spirit’s procession from the Father and the Son necessarily posited two causes or sources within the Godhead. He argued that just as Christians say that God is one cause of creation although there are three persons, the Father with the Son is the single cause or source. This did not introduce two causes within the Godhead, “but one cause, just as there are not two Gods but one God, from whom the Son and Holy Spirit are” (Anselm *in* Davies 2008: 420).

The debate between Anselm of Havenga and Nicetas of Nicomedia is of interest to our research. The latter’s chief complaint was that the Latins proposed this doctrine with no rational thought, no authority of the canonical Scriptures, and finally no general council says or teaches it. Nicetas argued that the Filioque was contrary to reason because it introduced many principles- *polyarchia*- into the Godhead (PL 188:1165).

Anselm was aware of this objection and tried to convince Nicetas that the Filioque did not necessarily create two principles. He believed that the term *principium* was a relative term- in one sense, while the Father alone was without principle, the Son and the Spirit were also without principle since they were consubstantial and coeternal with the Father and thus did not have a beginning. In another sense, the Son and Holy Spirit were both *de principio*, one by begetting from the Father, the other by procession from the Father and Son. In a similar sense, while the Trinity was ‘a single omnipotent *principatus*’, the Father is the principle of the Son as cause, and the Father simultaneously with the Son is the principle of the Holy Spirit as cause. This did not, in Anselm’s thought, lead to the existence of simultaneous principles, in the Trinity but one principle, who is God (PL 188:1168).

Nicetas asked the question, “What, or rather, what sort of thing do you think is that procession of which we speak? Does it seem true to you that the Holy Spirit should be said to proceed according to the common substance or according to a separate and individual person?” (PL 188:1171).

If Anselm had answered that procession was from the substance, he would open himself to the critiques of Photius. If he claimed it was the property of the hypostasis, he would open himself to the charge of Sabellianism. Anselm skirted the issue by claiming that as “the bond of love” between Father and Son, the Spirit proceeds not from their person or substance, but according to their mutual relation “and is the one sent by both sending, a gift from both giving, a love from both loving” (PL 188:1179).

The debate assumed a positive direction as Nicetas recognized that a number of Greek Fathers had spoken of the Spirit as proceeding *through* the Son. He gave his interpretation to this as procession properly from the Father, but not properly from the Son. The Son is neither from his own self, nor is he a cause of his own self. He can, therefore, not be a primary cause of the Holy Spirit. Anselm agreed completely, adding that the Latins also affirmed that the Father is principle author and causal principle both of the generation in relation to the Son and of the procession in relation to the Spirit. The encounter ended on a note of agreement that has some consequence to our topic. Nicetas allowed that the Son had a role in the procession of the Spirit and Anselm affirmed that the Father remained principle source (*arche*) of the divinity (Siecienski 2010: 123).

Another irenic hierarch, Nicetas of Maronea, later Archbishop of Thessalonica, did not object *theologically* to the ‘Filioque’. He could not comprehend why the Orthodox were insistent on the formula ‘through the Son’, when it basically had the same meaning. He saw Greeks and Latins as agreeing in substance, but expressing things differently. However, also of importance and somehow generally an unspoken issue, was that he viewed Rome’s presumption adding to the Creed and insisting on the addition to be wrong. He believed that the wording of the Creed not be altered from what was defined by the Holy Fathers. He urged that the Filioque be dropped so that both sides would desist from offensive language and confess a common belief. As quoted by Dvornik (1948:400):

The Latins are not to add the word ‘Filioque’ to the Creed, and the Greeks are to make explicit confession that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, or even from the Father and the Son, understanding this in the way the Fathers understood it, i.e. as not from an immediate principle, but as from the Father through

the Son - recognizing that the Son, as principle, has himself got another principle, the Father.

Yet the widening cultural, political and theological divide conspired against future exchanges building on the consensus reached. (Siecienski 2010:123) Feelings favouring a reconciliation with Rome were few and far between during this period. The majority of Eastern theologians did not hesitate to openly voice their opposition the innovations of the Latin Church. Also, they were highly suspicious of an institutional Church whose hierarchy involve themselves in religious wars, (Crusades) offering monetary incentive, gathering armies and, so sentiment held, misleading the people to serve their own purposes. And, as if to confirm this, if any specific event cemented this estrangement, it would have to be the Fourth Crusade that sacked and occupied Constantinople in 1204. According to Aristeides Papadakis, "Byzantine xenophobia, anti-Latin sentiment and hostility", received new impetus, and were compounded by the proselytizing by Western priests and monks that responded to Pope Innocent's call to "bring the Greeks into the fold" (Papadakis 1991:234).

Attempts were made to heal the Schism and these, of course, focused on the issue of the Filioque. Emperor Michael Palaeologus was in favour of union so as to gain the support of the Pope and curb the expansionist plans of Charles of Anjou. Michael was all too aware of the manifold and very real psychological impediments as well as the theological difficulties that had to be addressed and resolved, or at least reconciled if he was to achieve the desired union of the Churches. The Emperor was also aware of the difficulties that surfaced regarding the holding of such doctrinal discussions. Chief among these was that he knew the Church of Rome was opposed to debate to begin with. Clement IV (1265-1268) had made the point very clear to Michael.³⁷ "The Emperor", he wrote,

may ask for the convocation of a council and seek to have it assembled in his own dominions. But we by no means propose to summon such a council for discussion or definition of the faith; not because we fear to lose face or are afraid that the Holy Roman Church might be outclassed by the Greeks, but because it is neither proper nor permissible to call into question the purity of the true faith, confirmed as it is by the authority of so much holy writ, by the judgement of so many Saints, and by the firm definition of so many Roman Pontiffs (Nicol 1969:71).

On the other hand, Patriarch Joseph I (1267-1275; 1282-1283), stated that the desired reconciliation could only take place if doctrinal differences dividing West and East be debated in council (Pachymeres 1935:1-3). And so it was that the shameful sequence of

³⁷ Clement had been in correspondence with Michael VIII regarding the issue in both 1267 and 1268.

those endless negotiations and disputes continued, devoid of any real desire for unity. Animosity and rigidity characterized the age and the inflexibility of Rome's stance to dialogue unfortunately, formed the foundation of the Council of Lyons. "The result therefore was that 1274 like 1054 became one of the great years in which nothing happened" (Chadwick 1970:78). Chapter III will deal with this at greater length as well as the events that took place surrounding the Council, the theological views that ensued and the parties that emerged.

3.5 Concluding Remarks

The filioque, although not as yet officially sanctioned by Rome and inserted into the Creed, provoked reaction and elicited responses. On the one hand, it was the West's effort to articulate the relationship between the Son and the Spirit that was left undefined by the Council of Constantinople. On the other hand it met resistance from the East, both as an uncanonical insertion to the Creed, and as being theologically unsound in compromising the monarchy of the Father and making the Son to be a second source within the Trinity (Siecinski 2010: 101).

Among the most irenic responses to the filioque, was that by Maximus the Confessor. He defended the orthodoxy of the Latin view, arguing that the Latins recognize the Father as only source and cause of both Son and Spirit, the Son by begetting and the Spirit by procession. They wished then, in their way, to show the progression of the Spirit *through the Son* (Orphanos 1981: 276). He expressed this distinction using the terms *ekporeuesthai* and *proienai* – the former expressing the coming forth of the Spirit and referring to the hypostatic origin, the latter used not only in the economic manifestation of the Spirit, but also in the eternal progression through the Son.

What is of significance is that Maximus did not clearly divide or make distinction between the economy and the theology, thus allowing for the Son to have some mediatory role in the Spirit's progression in the theology (Siecinski 2010: 85-6). Each Person, through *perichoresis*, is present in the action of the other. The hypostases, while distinct, are wholly one.

This *perichoresis* is taken-up by John of Damascus. The Father is the cause of the hypostatic being of the Spirit. As Father *of the Son* though, the Son necessarily has some role in the Spirit's progression. The Spirit may not be from the Son, but nevertheless proceeds from the Father *through the Son* eternally and in time (Siecinski 2010: 91).

Photius, on the other hand, seems to ignore the positions of Maximus and John. He insisted on the Spirit's procession *from the Father alone*, almost indifferent to or ignorant of the tradition of *through the Son*, neither exploring the eternal relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit that was present in the Greek Fathers (Siecienski 2010: 104). In Photius' defence, Kallistos Ware writes:

When Photius and others maintained that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father 'alone', in their minds they distinguished clearly between the 'eternal procession' and the 'temporal mission' of the Spirit. The Nicene Creed differentiated between the 'eternal generation' of the Son - his birth from the Father 'before all ages' - and his Incarnation or birth from the Virgin Mary at a particular moment in time. A distinction then, must likewise be made between the 'eternal procession' of the Spirit - which is something that concerns the inner life of the Godhead and takes place outside time - and the 'temporal mission', the sending of the Spirit to the world, which concerns the 'manifestation and activity of the Holy Trinity outside itself and within time (Ware 1978:209).

Nevertheless, Photius' position became the definitive orthodox position on the filioque for centuries to come.

CHAPTER FOUR

LYON AND ITS AFTERMATH

4.1 The Second Council of Lyon

A Council was called for and in preparation Thomas Aquinas (1225 - 1274) was requested to prepare the defence of Western beliefs and Papal supremacy. Thomas never made it to Lyon, dying on his way to the council. While flawed on many levels³⁸, an effort towards ecumenicity and conciliation is detectable in his work. He made ample use of Greek patristic literature and also recognized that certain theological concepts used by the Greeks, while unfamiliar to the Latins, did not denote an essentially different faith. This was especially true of the Greek use of *aitia* or *causa* to speak about the Trinity. Thomas felt this might imply that the Son and Spirit were created beings, as being 'products' of a first cause. The Latins preferred the broader term *principium*. Thomas also believed that the *di' Yiou* (through the Son) formula was substantially on a par with the Latin formula *ex Filio*.

His arguments in defence of the Filioque were basically those employed earlier by Anselm. All three persons of the Trinity enjoyed a common essence and the only distinction was in their relations. These were necessarily opposite relations- one being a principle and the

³⁸ Many citations of the Greek Fathers are corrupted or spurious. He also made extensive use of the Athanasian Creed, attributing it to Athanasius of Alexandria.

other from a principle. If both Son and Spirit proceeded from the Father alone, they would lose their identifying hypostatic characteristics, since both would have the same relationship of origin to the Father. Also, since there is an eternal relation between the Son and the Spirit, an opposition in origin must also exist (ST I, 36).

Thomas explicitly defined the Son as *auctor* (author), *principium* (principle) and *fons* (source), yet the Father was affirmed to be *principium totius deitatis* since he alone was without principle (ST 1, 73) yet he also held that the Son has the same spirative power that belongs to the Father. The Holy Spirit therefore, he maintained, proceeds equally from both, although it is principally from the Father, since it is from the Father that the Son has His power to spirate. There was therefore a single spiration and a single spirative power- that of Father *and* Son. There may be two *spirating*, but not two *spirators*, not two principles or causes, but one.

According to Thomas 'procession' is applied to all terms denoting any sort of origin. Consequently, the Holy Spirit that also somehow originates from the Son, could be said to proceed from the Son. He argued that if the Greeks admitted *progression through the Son*, they must, as a consequence accept the Filioque, since 'proceeds' can be used to refer to originating in any way at all (Torre 1994:312). Yet, *ekporeuō* in Greek does not mean that at all.³⁹

Pope Gregory X (1271-1276), opened the Council of Lyon on 7 May 1274. The Orthodox delegation, however, arrived almost two months later, on 24 June. The *Notitia brevis* or *Ordinatio*, the Latin account of the proceedings, reports little regarding the Greek representation and contribution to this ecumenical gathering (Papadakis 1986:16). The Greek delegation consisted of three persons. George Acropolitis, an accomplished diplomat and a respected scholar with some theological knowledge was the Emperor's representative. The clergy included Germanos III, the former Patriarch of Constantinople and Theophanes of Nicea. According to Nichol (1972:60), "neither had any special qualifications or commanded any great respect; and Theophanes at least had private doubts about the whole affair."

As mentioned earlier in the correspondence of Pope Clement IV and Emperor Michael VIII, while Rome was prepared to call a council, it was not prepared to debate what it considered the 'true faith'. That was not up for discussion. Subsequently, no debate on the theological

³⁹ *Ekporeuō* more specifically, means to 'proceed from' or 'proceed out of' as from a source or cause, a point of origin.

issues took place at Lyon and, ultimately the Greeks had no choice but to accept the orthodoxy of the Filioque. It must be noted, that while the Church of Rome was fully represented at the Lyon, the same does not apply to the Churches of the East. If draw a comparison between the Council of Lyon with that of Florence in 1439, at the latter Greek and Latin Bishops literally convened as Fathers and Doctors, on equal footing. This was not what had happened at Lyon. Aristeides Papadakis states it categorically: "If historians differ about the way in which union was achieved at the Council of Florence, they do not differ about the Council of Lyon." (Papadakis 1986:16).

On 6 July 1274, at the fourth session of the Council, union was solemnly proclaimed in the cathedral. Considerable attempts were made by both the Latin and Greek unionists to show that the Latin position was not essentially different to the Greek one. As an example, paramount among the Greek objections to the Filioque clause, one voiced particularly by Patriarch Joseph, was that this might well insinuate two causes for the Holy Spirit and two spirations. This fear, was however, adamantly rejected by the West, illustrated in the Council's first Canon (Metaxas 1988: 79).

The Canon asserts that the Roman Church,

Confesses faithfully and devotedly that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one principle; not by two spirations, but by one single spiration. This the holy Roman church, mother and mistress of all the faithful, has till now professed, preached and taught; this she firmly holds, preaches, professes and teaches; this is the unchangeable and true belief of the orthodox fathers and doctors, Latin and Greek alike (Gill 1974:23).

In Augustine's passage, possibly the foundation of the canon mentioned above, "the Father is said to be *principium non de principio*, the Son *principium de principio* but both together *non duo, sed unum principium*" (Lossky 1948:25). Others disagree that Augustine was the primary proponent of the Latin doctrine. George Every, for example, indicates that William of St Thierry, among other defenders of the Filioque, cannot strictly be characterised as Augustinian, and that those that followed Augustine, may well have been far more 'Augustinian' than he was. (Every 1965: 44-7).

By stressing "not as from two principles but as from one principle, not by two spirations but by one single spiration", Lyons asserted that the Filioque, instead of ignoring the Father, in fact is founded on the presupposition that He is viewed as sole source. The Father gives the

Son the spirative power. The Son being a cause cannot thus be viewed in the same way as the Father. His causal character is not the first cause, the *aitia*, so dear to the Greeks. De Halleux explains this point:

Thus, although at Lyons the Latins may have persuaded the Orthodox to acknowledge Filioquism without formally conceding their counter position, nevertheless, the radical intention of the monarchy of the Father, which constitutes the profound truth of Photian monopatrism, is clearly respected, objectively speaking, in the decree of the Council (De Halleux in Vischer 1981: 77).

Kallistos Ware, a respected scholar, refutes this, indicating that the 'monarchy' of the Father is affirmed in Augustine's teaching. It is the Father who is ultimately still '*pēgē*' and '*archē*'. As we have seen, the Spirit, in his teaching proceeds "principally from the Father." This procession may be from the Son too, but in a secondary sense, only by derivation.

There is a considerable difference between this earlier western view and the later Scholastic doctrine, as upheld by the West at Lyons, whereby the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son 'as from one principle'. This Scholastic theory, in contrast to that of Augustine, no longer affirms a personal principle of unity in the Godhead, the source of unity is now the divine essence, and the Cappadocian notion of the Father's 'monarchy' is abandoned. The difference in teaching between Augustine and the Scholastics is probably greater than that between Augustine and the Cappadocians (Ware in Cunliffe-Jones 1978:210).

At the Second Council of Lyon, Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus eventually professed his faith "in the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father *and the Son*". The Creed, containing the Filioque, was intoned by all present. The Council also condemned "all who presume to deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, or rashly to assert that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from two principles and not as from one." (Tanner 1990:314).

The Union of Lyon and its decisions were ill-received in Constantinople. The Greek delegation was chosen specifically to serve a unionist and imperial agenda. They were of no theological distinction and they did not represent the general doctrinal position of the Church. They were also not representative of the whole Eastern Church, but only of Constantinople, if at all. Eastern objections to the Latin version of the Creed were not only theological; but also because the addition had been unilaterally decided upon of the Pope alone, with no

regard to his peers of the Patriarchal Pentarchy⁴⁰ (Metaxas 1988: 82). This was, in itself, an indication of the resentment and reaction of the Eastern Church to the assertion of papal primacy and supremacy, and the increasing claims of universal jurisdiction of the Church of Rome.

Additionally, most Eastern Christians, still recovering from the Fourth Crusade's sack of Constantinople and subsequent dismemberment of the Eastern Empire, felt loathing and disgust and were not ready to accept an agreement with the Latins. The populace quickly divided into unionist and anti-unionist camps, each led by two of the most influential theologians of the period. Each served, successively, as Patriarch: John XI Beccus (1275-82) and Gregory II, of Cyprus (1283-89). It is with the latter specifically, that we move away from the Photian impasse regarding the relationship between the Son and the Spirit. The present study will deal with both at length later.

This was the period in which Latin scholasticism had reached a peak. The movement attracted many Greeks, as numerous theological and philosophical works were translated into Greek. Consequently, this attraction and the familiarization with Western works, cultivated some sympathy and solidarity for Rome (Metaxas 1988: 83). A party of *Latinophrones*⁴¹ or Western-minded were a definite element at Court that lasted until the fall of Constantinople. It was this group who, shortly after the Council of Lyon, took up the task of challenging the anti-unionists and laboured for the acceptance of the Filioque and its Latin understanding.

Among these were George Acropolites (1217 – 1282), effectively Michael's 'foreign minister' and previously an outspoken critic of the errors of the Latin Church (Heisenberg 1913: 30-66). Yet, just before the meeting of the Council of Lyon, he had a change of mind and even represented the Emperor at the Council. As spokesman and highest-ranking delegate, once he made his statement, the union between the two Churches was considered attained. Nicephorus Choumnos, who later became chief minister of state for Andronicus II, acquiesced to the union but afterwards renounced and condemned it vehemently.

The historian George Pachymeres (1242-1310) briefly embraced the Union of Lyon, but was later to change views and even challenge the views of the Latinizing Patriarch, John Beccus.

⁴⁰ The Church, historically, was administered in five broad jurisdictions, or "Patriarchates"- Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Any major decision, or for any Council to be recognized as 'Ecumenical', the presence of, or at least the acceptance, by each Patriarchate was necessary.

⁴¹ 'Latinophron' may be a technical term; yet it is also used as a derogatory term against an Orthodox Christian displaying Western sympathies and affinities, particularly in matters of theology. (Gilbert 2009: 3)

His views are often unfairly passed over in favour of the greater theologians. Yet, had it not been for the uninterrupted tradition, expressed even in the lesser theologians, the more prominent ones would have found it more difficult to convey their message to their audience (Makarov 2008:228). In his work on the procession (PG 140, 924-929), he expresses favour for the phrase contained in the works of John Damascene (PG 94, 805), stating the Spirit proceeds "through the Son."

Pachymeres tackled the question: can we possibly have recourse to a relation in time between the Son and the Spirit, originating in sending forth the Spirit through the Son,⁴² in the search for the link in their timeless connection? Can we, based on this, consider the Spirit to be the Son's "property" eternally? Pachymeres asserted that since the Son gives the Spirit to the Saints within time, we cannot speculate regarding *eternal* modes of existence of the Trinity (PG 144, 925C). Although, similarly, in chapter I.8 of his *Exposition*, John of Damascus had made use of the verb *metadidosthai*, Pachymeres prefers *chorēgeisthai*, with the proposition *para*. This echoes the influential tradition of Athanasius the Great, (PG 26, 580, 588) which also featured as an important part in the arguments of Nicephorus Blemmydes and Gregory the Cypriot (Makarov 2008:237).

The illustration of sun, ray and light, central in Pachymeres' treatise, was seen to be in line with the teaching and metaphor of John of Damascus. Tradition from the time of Photius, did not allow for the creating of any confusion at all between the eternal intra-Trinitarian distinction in eternity, and the mission within time of the Holy Spirit. In line with Eastern tradition, he would not allow for the Ray to be viewed as the Light's cause. He expressed it unequivocally thus: "saying that the light is from the sun through the ray, we declare the ray to be an intermediary and the sun to be the cause" (PG 111, 928D).

The term *mesiteia*, is used in the same fashion as Gregory of Nyssa, particularly expounded in his *Letter to Ablabius*. In this, Gregory uses *mesiteia* to signify the "intermediary presence of the Son" in the hypostatic procession (PG 45,133). Thus, from Pachymeres' point of view, calling sunlight the light of the ray is wrong. The specific metaphor thus creates confusion between each Person's hypostatic properties within the common essence. Scripture may refer to the Spirit as "Spirit of the Son"⁴³ but this by no means implies that He causes, eternally, the Spirit's procession from His own Hypostasis. Pachymeres' argument emphasizes that consubstantiality has nothing to do with causality: "Peter is homoousios to Paul and Paul to Peter. But neither is Paul Peter's nor Peter, Paul's." (PG 144, 928). The

⁴² Jn 20:22.

⁴³ As examples, see Mk 2,8 and Rom 8,9

shining forth of the Spirit establishes their consubstantiality. This consubstantiality, however, must not lead one to view the Son as the cause of being of the Spirit.

Constantine Meliteniotes (1240-1307), archivist of Hagia Sophia, and George Metochites (1250-1328) the Archdeacon, remained faithful to the Union even after it had been repudiated. They were satisfied, within themselves at least, that the Latin teaching was supported by the writings of the Greek Fathers (Gilbert 2009: 12). An illustration of this was how John Damascene used *proboleus* or 'projector'. They saw this as synonymous with the term *aitios* or 'cause'. John had said, "The Father is the projector, through the Word, of the manifesting Spirit" (PG 94, 849).

Metochites thus concluded that

"if 'projector' is understood to mean 'cause', then the Father is, perforce, through the Son, the Spirit's cause, or source of existence" (cited in Papadakis 1986:66). Even so, the Son was neither the Spirit's cause nor joint-cause.

We do not consider the Son as being cause in the procession of the Spirit, or even joint-cause; on the contrary; we condemn and excommunicate any who say so. What we do say is that the Father is cause of the Spirit through the Son; for the word *proboleus* is understood in the sense of *aitios* (Metochites in Mai 1871:158).

The Filioque could thus, in his understanding, not be considered something innovative or even, technically-speaking, heretical.

It should be noted that the Westernizers of the Eastern Church could tap into theological resources refined by the application of Aristotelian metaphysics. Scholasticism and the subsequent intellectual movement in the West, represented by, among others, Thomas Aquinas, revitalized the theology of the Middle Ages, and created a logical and unified thought-system based on Aristotelian categories (Metaxas 1988: 86).

Gilbert de la Porree (1076-1154) had previously addressed the problem of relations. He made a distinction between a thing's essence and the means whereby it came to be. The value of a thing cannot be lower than the value of the means by which it came to be. 'Means' acquired objective reality. "In theological terms, it could be said that the relations constituted the essence, since it was by these that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit acquired their substantiality. The relations were therefore subsistent in God." (Gilson 1955:140-44; 620-1)

Gilbert however, saw the relations as prior to the Persons. The latter were constituted by the relations. Aquinas later was to see the Persons themselves as the relations (ST 1:40, 2).

This however, confirmed Eastern suspicions that Western Trinitarian thought compromises the hypostatic individuality of the Persons by seeing nothing more than the relations. The Persons are no more than the relations. Relations though, need each other to exist. The Persons would thus lack the self-sufficiency of God. All this leads many Orthodox to the suspicion that God in the Western view may well be an impersonal essence (Lossky 1948:36).

So, perfected by Aristotelian metaphysics or not,

When the Greek Westernizers sought to translate this theology into their own tradition, they came up against two main obstacles. First, the West did not distinguish between being (essence) and existence, and therefore regarded the relations not as hypostatic properties distinct from the essence, but as hypostatic principles of the essence. Secondly, the West distinguished principle from cause in a way which the East could not grasp. It was this problem which was to be the undoing of the Westernizing Patriarch John Beccus (1235-1297) (Bray 1983: 131).

Nicephorus Blemmydes' (1107-1272) saw that there was a real relationship of consubstantiality between the Son and the Spirit, one of possession, of being "of the Son", one of donation "the Son giving the Spirit", mutual likeness and even of a certain dependence (Metaxas 1988:88). This dependence he likened to "fingers (the Spirit) on the hand (the Son) which is of the Person (the Father); loosely expressed as a 'finger of the hand of the Person'" (Heisenberg 1896: 69). "Of the hand" does not imply a cause, but "of the Person" does.

In his *Letter to James*, Blemmydes strongly rejected the Latin doctrine of co-causality and affirmed the Father as cause of both the Son and the Spirit:

He, who says that the Spirit is from the Father through the Son, obviously confesses the Father alone to be the cause of the procession of the Spirit. For all that the Son has, he has so, as having received them from the Father, i.e., he has it substantially and naturally as a Lord Son from a Lord Father (PG 142, 536).

He asserted that 'through the Son' was the commonly-held view of the Fathers, ancient and recent, denied by none. As evidence, Blemmydes had amassed a large collection of texts ranging from Athanasius to Cyril of Alexandria. He argued further that for the Fathers, 'through' did not refer merely to a relationship of appearance between Son and Spirit, nor only of a mission to creatures. Rather, "the Spirit proceeds essentially from the Father through the Son" (PG 142, 557). In Blemmydes, we thus have the view of the Spirit's shining forth *eternally* through the Son (Makarov 2008:238).

When presenting his exposition, and referring to the verse "All that the Father has is mine" (Jn. 16:15), Blemmydes differed from the Latins, not being able to accept that this could also include the power to produce the Holy Spirit (Metaxas 1988:89). Thus, on coming across phrases in the Greek Fathers such as this one Cyril of Alexandria: "The Holy Spirit being in us shows that we are conformed to God, and since He comes forth both from Father and Son it is obvious that He is of the divine substance, coming forth substantially in it and from it" (PG 75, 585), he added to Cyril's "He comes forth from the Father and the Son, that is from the Father through the Son" (PG 142, 544).

John Beccus, while incarcerated in the prison of Anemas, was deeply influenced by Blemmydes' writings. Yet, he displayed "an ill-conceived pattern of a truncated and fairly inadequate assimilation of Orthodox tradition- a process accompanied by rejection of many of its vital elements" (Makarov 2008: 240).

4.2 John Beccus the Latinizer

The thirteenth century was a pivotal period for the history of the West. In 1204 the armies of the Fourth Crusade took Constantinople and established Latin kingdoms throughout the land that was previously the Eastern Roman Empire. The Emperor Michael Palaeologus retook the City in 1261 but the Empire was left fragmented, weakened and vulnerable to Western and to Ottoman ambitions. John Beccus was born around the year 1225 to Greek refugees in what was then the Empire of Nicea. He was educated in rhetoric and philosophy by the respected George Babouskomites (Gilbert 2009: 7).

In the 1260s and 1270s Beccus worked as *chartophylax*⁴⁴, as patriarchal archivist. His abilities did not go unnoticed and he was sent on official state representations by the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus⁴⁵ (Gilbert 2009: 7). The Empire was, at that time, threatened by the expansionist dreams of Charles, duke of Anjou. He sought an alliance with Baldwin II, pledging him the throne of Constantinople that he had lost to the Greeks. Seeking to address this, Michael began negotiations with the Pope with the intention of uniting the Churches. He realized that one way of frustrating Charles' plans, was to win papal influence against him and remove his pretext of a war against the 'heretics', or at best 'schismatics' (Gilbert 2009: 8).

To this end he tried to enlist the support of the bishops but his efforts made the majority of them very uncomfortable. The resentment, even hatred, felt by the Byzantines towards those in the West was very much alive. This was exacerbated by the popularly-held belief that the West had corrupted the Faith, specifically through the addition of the Filioque (Gilbert 2009: 9.) The chartophylax was commissioned to respond to these imperial demands⁴⁶. In due course, Beccus paid for this by being imprisoned, accused of negligence in his ambassadorial duties some years before. It was there that he had the opportunity to become better acquainted with patristic texts and was convinced that Latins and Greeks share the same faith, albeit expressed in different ways. It is quite possible that this 'conversion' was genuine and not ascribed solely to political considerations and self-interest, since it determined the subsequent course of his life, positively and adversely (Gilbert 2009: 11).

After his conversion to the unionist side, he was set free and later even appointed and ordained Ecumenical Patriarch on 27 May 1275. Beccus argued, not only for the orthodoxy of the Filioque, but for the views and claims of the Latin Church. This defence has earned

⁴⁴ This role was one of great responsibility, requiring skills of organization and a superior level of literacy. A *chartophylax* combined legal, secretarial and scholarly abilities and was expected to source and present exact texts regularly and to assess the authenticity of texts.

⁴⁵ It could be argued that Michael Palaeologus loved his empire and was genuinely concerned about its well-being, but his methods for trying to attain that were often ignoble. He became sole emperor by blinding John Laskaris, the legitimate heir (Gilbert 2009:7). For this he was excommunicated by Patriarch Arsenius. Michael summarily removed him from office and replaced him with Joseph, who was more amenable to granting him absolution. An internal schism subsequently developed between the 'Arsenites' and the 'Josephites', enduring through the tenure of Beccus' patriarchate and lasting decades after. It too exerted an influence in the events regarding the Church union that focused Beccus' attentions. (Gilbert 2009:7)

⁴⁶ Beccus, fearing both wrath of God and that of the Emperor, chose to risk temporal punishment rather than the eternal and answered the emperor thus: "For any given class of things, there exist four alternatives. Either the things are, and are said to be; or they are not, and are said not to be; or again, they are said to be, but are not; or, finally, they are said not to be, but in fact are. In this final division the Latins must be placed: they are said not to be, but in fact are, heretics." (Pachymeres V, 12).

him the reputation in the East, of being a traitor to Orthodoxy and even its persecutor, although this latter accusation may be unfounded and based on legend (Riebe 2005: 113).

In the customary profession of faith newly-elected Primates sent to one-another after their election, to Pope John XXI, Beccus openly stated acknowledgement of the primacy of Rome and of the Latin doctrine of the Filioque. For one stigmatised as *Latinophron*⁴⁷ or 'Latin-minded', Beccus displayed little knowledge of Latin culture and theology. He had no knowledge of Thomas Aquinas or his works. His education was specifically Greek.

Much of Beccus' writings are of a refutative nature and aimed either at Gregory of Cyprus or Photius. Since we have already addressed Photius, it is from here that we start our analysis of Beccus' theology. In his work *Against Andronicus Kamateros* (PG 141, 400), Beccus lists five premises to Photius' teaching which, according to him, are unsubstantiated in patristic works:

The invented principles of these doctrines would be, first, the proposition which says: "It is the property of the Father - *idion tou Patros* - to produce the Spirit." Another says: "Everything said about the Trinity is said either of one, or of the three." A third one says: "All that which is said about the divine hypostases is either hypostatic or natural." A fourth one states: "The Father is cause of those who are from him by reason of his hypostasis, not by reason of the nature." Again, a fifth one says: "The Spirit is directly and immediately from the Father." None of these postulates would anyone ever find in the writings of the holy fathers, not even if he should search through them a thousand times. The promoters of schism made them all up.

It would not be easy proving there is no evidence of these principles in the writings of the Fathers, but Beccus knows that "a universal statement is disproved by a particular one." (Gilbert 2009: 25). So, when for example, Photius claims that "everything said about the Trinity is said either of one or of the three," all Beccus needs to do is find a counter-example to disprove the universal claim. Nicephorus Blemmydes had already provided such

⁴⁷ Scholars have recently begun to rethink Beccus' reputation of arch-*latinophron*. Halina Evert-Kappesowa has taken the view that Beccus' motive was one of peaceful tolerance of Latin Christianity and not one of submission to it. He viewed both traditions as equally valid, not supplanting Greek theological and liturgical practices with Latin ones (1952:68-92). Gerhard Richter asserted that Beccus "never considered himself anything other than a faithful Orthodox Christian, and never transferred his ecclesiastical allegiance" (1990: 167-217). Alexandra Riebe (2005: 341), argued that Beccus "was an advocate not of union, but of communion of the churches". "Beccus' explicit statements of submission to the Holy See", she argues, "need to be taken in context, as occurring in diplomatic writings *ad extra*, conditioned by the needs of diplomacy, and do not necessarily express his deepest personal convictions".

examples in his *“Dogmatic Letter to Theodore Laskaris on the Procession of the Holy Spirit”* (PG 142). He addresses those that say that everything said about God can be said about the whole Trinity, or can be said only of one hypostasis. Thus, procession would, according to them, belong either to the three hypostases or to one of them – the Spirit cannot be said to proceed from himself, neither then can it be said to proceed from the Son (PG 142: 577). Procession will thus be left to the hypostasis of the Father. To these Blemmydes replies:

First that we do not teach the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is from the Son as from the first cause, but from the Father through the Son. Next, just as he can in no way proceed from himself, so also he cannot be sent from himself, lest the same thing be, in the same respect, both sender and sent. But since he is both sent from the Father and sent from the Son, as the Son of the Father has himself taught in the Gospel (Jn. 15:26; 16:17): Behold! We have acknowledged the sending of the Spirit as a mean term between a natural and a hypostatic property. From this, the foundation of their position has been shaken and rendered rotten. And what would they say, again, when, even from the very name ‘Spirit’ itself, their unknown middle term is known? For the Holy Spirit both is and is called the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son, but he neither is nor is called the Spirit of himself — just as neither is the Father his own Father, nor the Son his own Son (PG 142, 577).

Beccus uses this same argument in *The Union of the Churches* (PG 141, 104).

You say: If the individuating character of the person [of the Spirit] is common to the Father and the Son, how does something common individuate? ... But since the Spirit is not also the Spirit of the Spirit, the Father and the Son’s possessing one, undivided Spirit is, to them, an individuating characteristic; and the Father and the Son’s sharing in this characteristic, which is eternally observed in two persons only, dispenses with the conundrum you proposed when you said, How can something common be what individuates?

To qualify this, Beccus quotes Gregory of Nyssa:

For both the Son ‘came forth from the Father,’ as the Scripture says, and the Spirit proceeds ‘from God’ and ‘from the Father.’ But just as being without cause pertains to the Father alone, and cannot be made to agree with the Son and the Spirit, so also, conversely, being from a cause, which is something proper to the Son and the Spirit is not of such a nature as to be contemplated in the Father. Now, as it is

common to the Son and the Spirit to exist in a not-ungenerated way, in order that no confusion arise as to the underlying subject, one must again seek out the unconfused difference in their properties. (PG 141, 104)

Beccus further writes that while the Roman Church confesses the Son to be from the Father alone, the Holy Spirit is from the Father but also from the Son. Even so, it recognizes a single principle in the Holy Trinity since all that the Son has, is from the Father who is first cause (PG 141: 25). In support, Beccus uses Basil's *Against Eunomius II.34*:

But to whom of all people is it not apparent, that no activity of the Son is separated from the Father, nor does there exist anything among the things in the Son that is alien from the Father? For, he says, "all that are mine are thine, and thine are mine" (Jn. 17:10)..... but if the statement that "all things came to be through" the Son connects existing things to a single cause, it implies a reference back to the first cause. So that, even though we believe that all things were brought into being through the Word of God, nevertheless we do not deprive the God of the universe of being the cause of all things (PG 29, 652).

Beccus cited this passage from Basil to support his argument concerning the origination of the Holy Spirit. He claimed that authoritative texts ascribed causality to the Son, without setting him up to be another, separate cause to that of the Father. The activity and causality of the Son was, in such cases, in reference to the unoriginated Father, the source from whom all being and activity flow (Gilbert 2009: 29). Beccus also saw the Son as the means of the Father's causality as this causality operates through the Son. This, he claimed, is what is expressed by the patristic "through the Son" and he tried to reconcile with the Latin Filioque the works of the Greek Fathers that referred to the Spirit's procession as "through the Son" (Gilbert 2009: 29).

According to Xexakis (1981:32), Beccus held that 'from the Father through the Son', as in Greek use, indicated clearly in which order the Father and the Son are the Spirit's principle. Yet it only insinuated their equality as principle. The equality of Father and Son as principle was indicated clearly by the Latin formula, while the order was insinuated. The Son, begotten of the Father, receives from the Father everything, including being Himself the Spirit's principle. The Father thus remains the only *aitia anarchos prokatartikē* (preliminary, beginningless cause), while the Son is an intermediate principle. Thus, Xexakis continues, for Beccus the two prepositions, *ek* (from) and *dia* (through), did not imply anything more.

'From' would, however, be more suitable to the first Person, the cause of the other two, while 'through' more suitable to the second Person, as coming from the Father.

His view was that *ek* and *día* could be interchangeable. He tried to show this using examples from Scripture. He referred, specifically to the writings of Paul, which used "born of (*ek*) a woman" (Gal. 4:4), meaning "through a woman" (*día*); also "all things were created through Him and for Him" (Col.1:16), meaning "from God" (*ex*). Thus, Beccus maintained that:

'Through', as all agree, implies a medial position of the Son between Father and Spirit - but of essence, not of ministry only. The Spirit is said to be from the Father through the Son, and from the substance of the Father and since he is from the substance of the Father, who will not admit that the substance is- of the hypostasis? So then, with the Spirit essentially and in hypostasis proceeding from the substance of the Father through the Son, who will affirm that 'through the Son' is to be accepted as an expression with a non-essential meaning and not as an affirmation of an essential intermediatorship? For what is essentially from the essence of the Father and is not from the Father immediately, has the Son as a medium, in every sense substantially in harmony with his being from the Father (PG. 141, 64).

In Xexakis' study (1981: 124), Beccus made mention of numerous instances that mention the Spirit proceeding from the Father, making use of several verbs which show the Spirit's existence is "from God essentially":

"No one", observed Beccus, "from our theologians has ever said that to proceed denotes that the Spirit exists from God essentially and that to go forth, (*proïenai*) to issue forth, (*proerchesthai*) to pour forth, (*procheisthai*) as well as to send forth, (*ekpempesthai*) denote something else than that the Spirit exists essentially from God" (PG 141: 41).

Attempting to show the equality of the words *proïenai*, *proerchesthai* and *ekpempesthai* with the word *ekporeuesthai*, (to proceed) Beccus produced verses from the Fathers, that led him to conclude "they are taken brightly and without shadow as referring to the essential existence of the Spirit from the Father" (PG 141, 52).

It is asserted by Xexakis that Beccus, making use of a view of Nicholas, the twelfth century bishop of Methoni, "The Father is cause of what are from Him by reason of the hypostasis

and, not by reason of the nature," (1981: 25) concluded erroneously that "it is the same to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and that He proceeds from the essence of the Father" (1981: 25). Beccus' assertion that "In reading the Creed which was handed down to us by our holy Fathers, we cry aloud without any hesitation: 'and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, Giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father...,' (PG 141, 25) bears no significance, because although he confesses the Orthodox doctrine concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, he does not seem to understand what the specific teaching of the Eastern Church is on the subject." (1981:125).

This is due, partly, to the conviction that "the Son is meant without being mentioned" (PG 141, 113) while also, due to the conscientious effort to obscure the Orthodox view on the Filioque. These views, predictably, clashed with the traditional faith of Eastern Christianity and its teachings. Beccus thus tried, unsuccessfully, to discover a means of bringing the two views into accord.

It is of interest to see how he tries to explain that procession "from the Father *and* the Son", nevertheless precludes the Spirit having two causes.

If the Latins in saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son refer to a double cause, since the Father and the Son are two different hypostases, then the Fathers of the Church who taught that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, should also refer to a double cause. Such a thing however does not occur; in other words, there is no double cause for the Holy Spirit if we take into consideration the saying of Basil the Great: "Whatever is said to be through the Son and by the Son has its reference to the Father." (PG 141, 80)

The Early Fathers of the Church did indeed reject the two causes implied in "from the Father through the Son". Their rejection relied, not on what Beccus believed after his misinterpretation of Basil of Caesarea, but rather that they held that the Son cannot be the Holy Spirit's cause. According to Gregory Nazianzen: "All that the Father has are of the Son, except of being the cause; and all that the Son has are of the Spirit except of Sonship." (PG 36, 252) Beccus could ultimately not overcome the impediment present in "except of being the cause", believing "those who wrote after the schism altered the books of Gregory the Theologian" rejecting that "except of being the cause" was present originally (PG 141, 993).

Beccus stated his faith in the Creed of the Fathers and vehemently denied that there were two causes; he did, however, believe the Spirit's source to be both in the Father and in the Son:

The Father is the source of the Spirit and is said to be such inasmuch as he is the originating Godhead and the cause without beginning; whereas, the Son is the source inasmuch as it is through him that the Spirit who is from the Father springs forth and issues forth naturally and essentially. (PG 141, 928)

He attempted explaining this causality by asserting the existence of a filial cause, *huikē aitia*, of the Holy Spirit leading to the paternal cause *patrikē aitia*. There is thus "only one cause of the Holy Spirit." (PG 141, 753). This view was common among the Latins. They maintained that, regardless of the Son's causal involvement in the procession of the Holy Spirit, the one primordial source and cause is the Father, while the Son is a joint cause (Orphanos 1981: 26). Confusing the actions obscures the distinction between the hypostases of the Father and the Son.

A question now arises. Can John Beccus be justified in his reading of the fathers? Lewis Ayres expresses a caution and a judgment: "If one's analysis of fourth-century pneumatology turns upon the question of whether or not the *Filioque* is implied by a given author's statements, it shows how far one is from understanding those fourth-century debates in their own terms" (Ayres 2004: 217). That statement might apply equally to Beccus and his opponents. Yet it seems that Ayres' attention on the persons' *activity* can be seen as being in support of Gregory the Cypriot who argued that the Greek fathers used "through or from the Son" when referring to the Spirit's manifestation. This meant the Spirit's activity, temporal or eternal, and not the Spirit's hypostatic existence. That they saw as being from the Father alone (Gilbert 2009: 14).

Patristic scholar André de Halleux comes to the same conclusion in "Manifesté par le Fils' aux origines d'une formule pneumatologique", "Made Manifest through the Son' The Origins of a Pneumatological Formula" (1989; 3-31). He believes that Gregory of Nyssa does not hold to the Son's mediation of the Spirit regarding hypostatic existence, but on manifestation only. Alexander Alexakis (2000: 154), expands on the view of Michel van Parys (1967: 6-14) who asserted that the text used by the Latins actually contained, whether intentionally or not, Eunomian material. Michel Stavrou (2007: 517) argues that John Beccus did not only misread the ancient Church Fathers, but Blemmydes too, whose works influenced him to embrace the unionist cause.

There are other scholars too, who need to be taken into account. The significance of Alexandra Riebe's *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel*, cannot be overstated. It is one of the most significant studies on Beccus ever written. Other favourable assessments include: Henry Chadwick (2003: 250), J. M. Hussey (1986: 236), Joseph Gill, (1975: 251-266) and (1979) and Yiannis Spiteris (1998:459-491). Mention must also be made of the evaluation by Sergius Bulgakov in his *The Comforter* (2004:103-4). Bulgakov gives Beccus credit for the 'establishment' of the patristic *dia*. Beccus' interpretation of it may show his excessive dependence on Latin theology, yet he managed to collect, sometimes rather indiscriminately, a substantial number of quotes from the Fathers in which this *dia* was found. Such compendia were not without their value. Bulgakov believes that Beccus' work revealed the "true status of the question of the Holy Spirit in patristic literature" (2004: 104).

As an Orthodox priest, he would not be prejudiced in Beccus' favour. His last sentence conflicts not only with most Orthodox assessments of Beccus, but also most contemporary academic work (Gilbert 2009: 16). Despite recent scholarship taking a negative view of his reading of patristic evidence, some suggest that there is some merit to his work. The verdict is, therefore, not unanimous (Gilbert 2009: 17).

It is clear though, from the Xexakis' research, that Beccus seemed incapable of integrating the methodology of Augustinian Trinitarianism within Greek thought. According to Joseph Gill, Beccus tried to find support in the Greek Fathers. He thus relied on the weight of Tradition for his defence. Beccus was familiar with the Fathers, not only through his 'anthology' of quotes, but also obvious in his readings of the complete texts. Gill sees this in the manner in which Beccus dealt with the texts and from the succinct way in which he refers to them (1979: 264). It seems though, that Beccus' main issue was the inability to comprehend the deeper issues in the schism between Rome and Constantinople. Beccus believed it was, literally, a division caused by a matter of semantics, not substance. Significantly, Beccus' view did not receive great acclaim among Western unionists. At most, it brought the 'conversion' of a small number of Greeks towards a Latin theological framework.

So, can anything positive be obtained from Beccus?

The mystery of the Trinity has been articulated in different ways. In some cases these differences were significant yet the early Fathers strove to maintain communion with each other. Maximus, for example, believed the Church of Rome expressed the Holy Spirit's procession in a different manner to that of most Greek-speaking Christians; yet with his

irenic position, he maintained and strengthened the bonds of communion, arguing maintaining that even though the fathers may disagree with each other *in words*, they nevertheless do not disagree *in thought*. John Beccus believed that “Christian truth and love oblige him to imitate these holy men” (Gilbert 2009: 35). He was aware of the differences between the two traditions. He did not assert that they were identical. He did, however, try hard to prove they were at least compatible.

Beccus could be seen as a pioneer of what is now called ‘ecumenism’ (Spiteris 1998). This term would have been foreign to him and he may even have disapproved of some modern expressions of it (Gilbert 2009: 4). Regardless of opinion, John Beccus was not a doctrinal relativist. He based his ecumenism on the Fathers. He recognized their ability to transcend verbal differences to an awareness of a basic agreement in faith. The Christian faith is not fundamentally a faith in words, but a faith in things (PG 141, 28–40),—and it is sometimes necessary to put effort in getting past the words, to the realities they signify. The fathers often engaged in that intellectual effort for the sake of unity (Gilbert 2009: 5).

Yet, before his importance is overstated and taken out of context, the rejection of his views and the condemnation of Beccus at the Second Council of Blachernae, recognized as authoritative among the Orthodox, render his reading of patristic texts incapable of serving a reconciliatory function (Gilbert 2009:3). While some in the West may view Beccus favourably, the Orthodox tradition has been moulded by his rejection. This reality and the prevailing anti-Beccus sentiments among the Orthodox, founded or unfounded, give impetus to viewing the thought of Beccus’ opponent, Gregory of Cyprus, more positively (Gilbert 2009: 3)

4.3 Gregory of Cyprus

The strongest opposition to Beccus’ labours came from Gregory of Cyprus (1241-1290), who served as Patriarch between 1283 and 1289. Gregory was born in Cyprus at a time when the island was occupied by the Latins. His opponents often used this against him, particularly, as Pachymeres informs us, by Beccus labelling him "a non-Greek", "one born and raised among Latins" thus "one whose theology was not in line with Greek patristic thought" (Bekker 1835:88-9). Subsequently, after his appointment to the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople, great effort was made for his ordination to be by a non-unionist bishop.

He was enthroned as Ecumenical Patriarch on 28 March 1283, taking the name Gregory II (Sopko 1979: 94-6).

This was a volatile period in the imperial capital. Anti-unionists were demanding that the traitors of Orthodoxy at Lyon be brought to trial and conviction. Some years before he was called to the Patriarchal Throne, Gregory had shown sympathy for the union. In fact, he had even been requested by the Emperor to compile material in its support (Bekker 1835: 374). His method was different to that of his predecessor. Gregory acknowledged that the Trinitarian doctrine of the Latins were, not only the obstacle to union between the Churches, but actually the cause of the schism. Instead of diminishing and excusing the differences, he thus made an effort to address them. Gregory realised that the success of any union would depend on sincere and honest dialogue.

Gregory believed that the Photian formulation 'from the father alone', did not sufficiently express and encompass the tradition of the Greek Fathers regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit (Metaxas 1988: 96). Photius' arguments, even if theologically sound, were inadequate in response to the Latins. Subsequently, although he could have stuck to the formulas of "eternal procession from the Father alone", while "emission in time by the Son", he went beyond Photius' teaching, attempting to complete or at least to 'complement' it (Metaxas 1988: 96). To begin with, he saw the necessity of expressing the eternal relationship present between the Son and the Holy Spirit. Then, secondly, of the "eternal manifestation (*aïdios ekphansis*) of the Spirit by the Son" (Ware, K. in Cunliffe-Jones, H. 1978: 210).

Papadakis' work "*The Filioque controversy during the Patriarchate of Gregory of Cyprus (1283-1289)*", from the outset asserts "the starting point in Gregory's theology is the fundamental Cappadocian distinction between the one essence and the three hypostases in the deity." (1986: 87). One essence allows for no separation or division since the three Persons are consubstantial, sharing in the common essence. "As such, it is theologically correct to say that the Spirit is of the essence of the Father, just as it is to say that the Spirit as also of the essence of the Son." (PG 142, 270-1). One cannot, however, say the same regarding the three hypostases, "the three states of God's manner of existence: the unbegotten, the begotten and the proceeding" (PG 142: 272). These three particularities represent the manner of transmission and presentation of the divine essence and are expressed by the phrase, *tropos hyparxews* - mode of existence. (Prestige 1981: 245-9). Thus it was that Gregory, as received from the Fathers, confessed his faith in:

One God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, who, being without principle (*anarchos*) and begotten, and without cause, is the natural principle and cause of the Son and of the Spirit... in His-only begotten Son, who, being consubstantial with Him, was begotten eternally and without change from Him, through whom all things were made... in the all-Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the same Father, who, with the Father and the Son together is worshipped as co-eternal, co-equal, co-essential, co-equal in glory, and as joint-creator of the world (Cited in Papadakis 1986: 156).

Thus, "the Father's mode of existence is without principle or beginning (*anarchos*) in character, while the Son's is generative and the Holy Spirit's is processional." (PG 142, 235). According to this model, the Father is cause, (*aitia*) of both other hypostases. This image of causality expresses that the Father, as Person, is cause of the other two consubstantial Persons (Metaxas 1988: 97).

It is not because we say that the Son and the Holy Spirit are of the essence of the Father as their principle and cause; on the contrary, it is because He is the natural principle and cause of those who subsist essentially from Him - in an impassable and eternal manner - that they are of His essence (PG 142: 272).

Regarding the Father, causality sees Him as a divine Person because He is the cause of both other Persons and personal principle of unity. The Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial to the Father, distinguished from Him and yet equal to Him. If the Son and the Spirit possess the same essence, it is because He is the source of that common possession, the pledge of their unity. "It is the opinion of the Church and the Saints that the Father is the root and source of the Son and the Holy Spirit and the eternal fountain of divinity, and the eternal source." (PG 142: 241).

This actually contradicts the teaching of Augustine teaching that sees the Holy Spirit, as '*vinculum caritatis*', as the Love flowing between "the Lover and the Beloved", as what binds the Father and the Son together (TT 15: 27). Augustine's Trinitarian theology did not begin with the Father as source. Instead, it begins with the one, single essence which subsists as Trinity. With respect to the Spirit, this meant that He proceeded as truly from the Son as from the Father. This placed the common essence above, or before, the Persons of the Trinity, subordinating them to the essence. This confounded the Father and the Son, resulting in making the Holy Spirit, the link between them.

Scholasticism took this doctrinal trend further. Lossky maintains (1974:76) that the principle of relations of opposition set forth by Aquinas, provided the means to explain double procession in precise detail. When the double procession is admitted, it presupposes: 1) that the relations forming the basis of the Persons are to be defined by their mutual opposition, the First to the Second, the First and the Second to the Third; 2) The First and Second Persons together are a non-personal unity, creating a further relation of opposition; 3) their origin is therefore not personal, but has its foundation in the common essence. What distinguishes the Persons here, is the internal relations. Pre-eminence is thus given to the unity of the essence rather than to the Trinity of the Persons and the equality between the essence and the Persons is upset. The result is no longer an orthodox view of the Trinity but Sabellianism, in which the Persons are modes of the essence (Sopko 1979: 135).

In the East, the relations of origin signify the Personal diversity of the Three but also indicate the identity of the essence. The Son and the Spirit, while distinguished from the Father, are still one in their consubstantiality with Him (Sopko 1979: 135). By emphasizing the monarchy of the Father, equilibrium is maintained between the Nature and the Persons. To demonstrate this, Photius in his *To Amphilochius*, compared the Trinity to a scale. The needle of the scale would be in place of the Father, while the arms in place of the Son and the Spirit respectively (PG 101, 896).

Gregory asserted that the Spirit's source is solely the Father's hypostasis. Yet his term 'eternal manifestation' caused some discomfort. Many saw this as implying the Son participated in the Spirit's eternal procession, the actual 'coming into being', His *proodos eis to einai* (Sopko 1979: 139). Beccus capitalized on this to assert the similitude of *proodos* (procession) and *aidios ekphansis*. In response to this, Gregory poses a series of questions and answers that then allow him to conclude that:

The Fathers, saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, did not mean by this that the Spirit has His origin through the Son. They call the Father the one origin, root, source and originator of the Son and the Spirit and other similar names which reveal all thought concerning the origin of the Spirit from the Son and through Him, these show that the Father is the origin of the Son and the Spirit (PG 142, 255).

The second point, and that of great interest established by Gregory, involved the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit in eternity. This he did while avoiding the implication of the Son's responsibility for the Spirit's origin. Photius had looked at the Son and Spirit,

respectively, and their relationship to the Father, but had not really delved into the eternal relationship between the two (Orphanos 1981:27). Gregory was willing to accept what post-Nicene Fathers had expressed about the Spirit existing “through the Son”, even “from the Son”, but only with regard to the Spirit’s *manifestation*. The hypostatic existence, so vehemently emphasized by Photius, is caused by the Father only.

The ancient Fathers, enlightened by the Spirit, said the Holy Spirit is through the Son, but not one of these continued... that He proceeds through the Son but that through the Son, He shines (*eklampein*), is manifested (*phanerousthai*), has appeared (*pephēnenai*), goes forth (*proïenai*), is made known (*gnōrizesthai*) and similar terms which simply indicate his manifestation or shining through the Son but not (His) existence which the Holy Spirit possesses only from the Father as they all confess. (PG 142, 258)

Gregory described the Spirit’s manifestation using the terms *ekphansis* (manifestation) or *phanerōsis* (appearance) and it had no dependence on the “eternal procession of the Spirit from the hypostasis of the Father, who is the only source of divinity” (Metaxas 1988: 99). *Ekphansis* (manifestation) is not *ekporeusis* (procession). *Ekphansis* is *manifestation*, *ekporeusis* regards the Spirit’s mode of being or existence (Papadakis 1986:90). In wanting to define this ‘procession’ and the ‘manifestation’, Gregory significantly distinguished between ‘existing’, (*hyparchein*) and ‘having existence’, *hyparxin echein*). This distinction is of great importance if we are to understand Gregory’s conception of the eternal manifestation (Papadakis 1986:90). It assists in differentiating between two realities in God – firstly, regarding the cause of the Spirit and His sole source from the Father; secondly, regarding the eternal manifestation involving the Father and the Son (Metaxas 1988:99).

The recognised doctrine is that the existence of the All Holy Spirit is from the Father. This is what is meant whenever ‘procession’ from the Father is used; it signifies that the Spirit has its natural and eternal existence from Him. This is unquestionably - so we maintain and believe - the meaning of the term ‘procession’. As for the prepositions in the phrase ‘from the Father through the Son’, the first ‘from’ denotes existence-procession, while the second ‘through’ denotes eternal manifestation and splendour, not existence-procession...‘through’, then, denotes eternal manifestation in contradiction to eternal procession (Papadakis 1986:71).

The Spirit’s cause of existence is Father. Nevertheless, He exists in the Son and shines forth and is revealed ‘through’ or ‘from’ the Son. Thus, the distinction between *hyparxin echein*

and *hyparchein* clarifies that while in His hypostatic being, the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, in His manifestation He may be said to proceed from the Father *and* from the Son. His very existence is from the Father yet the Holy Spirit abides in the Son and from there shines forth and is bestowed (Orphanos 1981:28). While Beccus' asserted that 'through the Son' meant the same as 'from the Son', Gregory, using the writing of John of Damascus, argued that the Fathers did not use 'through the Son' for the Spirit's procession, but rather for His manifestation.

The phrase of John Damascene, 'The Father is the projector through the Son of the manifesting Spirit...', (PG 94:849) clearly denotes the manifestation - through the intermediary of the Son - of the Holy Spirit, whose existence is from the Father. Those who affirm that the Paraclete, which is from the Father, has its existence (*hyparxin echein*) through the Son and from the Son...propose as proof the phrase that the Spirit exists (*hyparchei*), through the Son and from the Son. In certain texts [of the Fathers] the phrase, denotes the Spirit's shining forth and manifestation (PG 142: 240).

To emphasise the point, the Spirit's eternal existence in the Son and the manifestation through Him, is of no consequence to the eternal causal mode of the Spirit's existence. Illustrating the distinction, he associated "the Father to the sun, the Son to the rays of the sun and the Spirit to the light of the rays given by the sun" (PG 142, 251; 285; 287).

Indeed, the very Paraclete shines forth and is manifest eternally through the Son, in the same way that light shines forth and is manifest through the intermediary of the sun's rays; it further denotes the bestowing, giving and sending of the Spirit to us (PG 142: 241).

This illustration was used to explain theology since the time of Tertullian who, in *Against Praxeas* wrote: "The Spirit is third from God and the Son, just as the fruit from the branch is third from the root, and as the stream from the river is third from the spring and as the light from the ray is third from the sun." (Quoted in Evans 1948: 139). Such illustrations were adopted by a number of writers in later centuries. Gregory of Nazianzus in his *Oration 31* (PG 36, 169) is an example of this.

This concept of light is the key to an understanding of eternal manifestation. His works are filled with allusions to light and it is through the concept of the radiance of light that Gregory arrives at the term 'manifestation'. Since *ekphansis* has the verb *phainō* as its root, it bears

close resemblance to the noun *fōs*, light. Drawing upon the metaphor of the sun, light becomes more than a representation of the Trinity. Gregory saw the Holy Spirit shining forth and manifesting eternally by means of the Son, as it is through the rays that light shines from the sun. Hypostatic existence, however, is not through or from the Son. The origin or existence of the light is the sun, the only cause, and not its rays (PG 142, 240; 285). “The Paraclete ... manifests Himself through the Son in the way the sun’s light shines through the intermediary of the sun’s rays, giving and communicating Him to us.” Even if man does not perceive this light, it still shines: “Clearly, the Spirit is imparted, given and sent through the Son ... But He is manifested, shines and revealed eternally.” (PG 142, 266).

According to the common mind of the Church and the aforementioned Saints, the Father is the foundation and the source of the Son and the Spirit, and the only source of divinity, and the only cause. If, in fact, it is also said by some of the Saints that the Spirit proceeds through the Son, what is meant here is the eternal manifestation of the Spirit by the Son, not the purely [personal] emanation into being of the Spirit, who has his existence from the Father (Quoted in Papadakis 1986:91).

The Holy Spirit’s manifestation through the Son thus relates to the Godhead’s inner and eternal life, as well as the Holy Spirit’s mission in time. “Clearly, the Spirit is imparted, given and sent through the Son to those who are in a fit state to receive Him, by which He is sent (*apostelletaī*), imparted (*chorēgeitaī*), and given (*didotaī*). But He is manifested (*ekfainetaī*), shines (*eklampein*) and is revealed (*phaneroutaī*) eternally” (PG 142,266). This manifestation is eternal because the Son’s sharing in the essence of the Holy Spirit is eternal

However, there is a difference here in the Spirit’s mode of existence, dependent on the hypostasis of the Father, and His emission in time that results from the common will and energy of the three divine Persons, acting together. John Beccus and his supporters attempted, incorrectly, to transfer “the idea of the Son’s participation in the divine energies to the internal relations of the Trinity, particularly to the mode of being of the divine Persons” (Metaxas 1988:102). Thus it was that the members of the Council of Blachernae commissioned Gregory to draw up the official document of its decision that stated, among other things,

To John Beccus and to those who follow him, to Constantine Meliteniotes, and to George Metochites, who teach that the Father and the Son - not as two principles and two causes - share in the causality of the Spirit, and that the Son is as much a participant with the Father as is implied in the preposition 'through'. According to the

distinction and strength of these prepositions, they introduce a distinction in the Spirit's cause, with the result that sometimes they believe and say that the Father is cause, and sometimes, the Son. This being so, they introduce a plurality and a multitude of causes in the procession of the Spirit, even though this was prohibited on countless occasions. As such, we cut them off from the membership of the Orthodox, and we banish them from the flock of the church of God (PG 142, 252).

According to Papadakis,

Gregory is making an important distinction between the essence and the energy, or between the incommunicable and unknowable essence of God and his participable and perceivable energy of life. The former denotes the internal life and nature of the Trinity while the latter denotes the external life or self-revelation of God as it reveals the glory and splendour shared by the three Persons (1986: 91).

Sopko, (1979b: 142) indicates that while Gregory was not preoccupied at length with how man receives the divine manifestation, he stressed the paradox of essence and manifestation by using the human condition as an illustration. Within this condition, both are present at the same time, the divine manifestation distinguishable, while the essence always hidden. In order to make this point clear, the term 'energy' was used by him in place of manifestation, synonymously.

“And if the greater *enhypositised* essence of the Paraclete is energy, are we, who receive the gift and resplendence, participating and caught in the essence? And what truth have those shown who say that the Divine is participable by the energies themselves and the resplendence? How is it that St. Athanasius says the way of the Spirit is made by energies and resplendences?” (PG 142, 290).

Gregory's argument might appear rather inconsequential and obscure, but was of great significance in the fourteenth century movement of spiritual revival in the Eastern Church (Metaxas 1988: 103). For Gregory, God was not limited to His essence but is manifested through the energy to humankind. This was developed further by Palamas who taught that God does not interact with creation through His essence, but through His 'uncreated energies'

(Papademetriou 1973: 43).

Since the Holy Spirit comes forth, or is manifested from the Son as 'energy' or 'God in action', He is both the Spirit of the God and the Spirit of Christ. This does not imply that He receives existence from the Son, rather "having proceeded from the Father, He rests in the Son and acts or proceeds from Him into the world of men." (PG 142: 275-6). Consequently, the Spirit's grace is mediated 'through' or 'from' the Son. This grace, while distinguished from God's Person and essence, is nevertheless not a created grace but rather, the manifestation of God.

Gregory's teaching is contained in the *Tomus*, the result of the Council of Blachernae⁴⁸, convened, in Constantinople, during Great Lent of 1285. It was here that the Latin views, accepted at Lyon by the Latinizer faction, were officially renounced. John Beccus and his followers, Meliteniotes and Metochites, were also condemned for attempting firstly, to show that procession and generation were the same thing and that the Spirit proceeds from the Father in the same manner as the Son, secondly, that the prepositions 'from' and 'through' were interchangeable in patristic use. Gregory asserted that since the Son was not the cause of the Spirit, whether on His own or even with the Father, 'through the Son' was not another way of expressing 'from the Son'. "And since it is not a question of identity, the great foundation of Beccus's thesis - along with the other absurdities that followed, collapses." (PG 142: 236).

Both issues, the one regarding prepositions and their meanings and the other concerning procession and generation, were argued. George Moschabar, referring to the text from John of Damascus, 'the Father is the emitter, or producer of the Spirit through the Son', even argued that 'through' was synonymous to *syn*, *meta* (when followed by the genitive case) and *ama* which mean 'together' and 'with'. Consequently, saying 'the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son' was equivalent to 'the Spirit together with the Son proceeds from the Father' (Jugie 1926-35: Tom 2, 255-6). He was rebuked for this, both by Theodore Muzalon and by Gregory who argued that purely as a grammatical issue 'together' or 'with' are not equivalent to or the same as 'through'. Moschabar's interpretation confused the procession and the generation. "To say 'the Spirit with the Son proceeds from the Father' is tantamount to saying the Son 'proceeds' from the Father. In fact, the Son can only be

⁴⁸ Papadakis asserts that, "Although the official text of the Acta of the Council of Blachernae has not survived, we are reasonably well informed about its deliberations, from the lengthy contemporary testimony of Pachymeres and Metochites, and the short (but misleading) summary of the historian Gregoras." (1986: 62).

generated. Granted: this error is concealed when 'with the Son' is said to denote existence from the Father; but even this is madness, for it would then follow that the Son had his existence from the Father as well." (PG 142: 257).

Finally, after six months of debating and deliberation, Beccus with his two unionist friends, were excommunicated and Council ratified Gregory's *Tomus*, considered by many scholars as an extremely important document in the development of Orthodox doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit (Meyendorff 1974: 94). The East is often accused of responding inadequately to the Filioque due its conservatism and its fidelity to Photian doctrine. (Jugie 1926-35: I, 310-11). Yet Blachernae makes an important contribution since it represents the medieval Orthodox Church's most significant conciliar debate on Trinitarian issues in response to the Filioque. The importance of this Council in the conscience of the Church, can be seen in Patriarch Gennadius Scholarius (1453-1456; 1458-1463) including it among the Councils regarded 'Ecumenical'. The West may have argued that the Council lacked ecumenicity since Rome was absent or not even represented. Regarding this, Scholarius wrote:

I receive with all my heart, the Holy and Great Council that condemned the Latinizer Beccus, and firmly believe it to be Ecumenical, since the absence of the West does not remove its ecumenicity...Note how the Council of Florence (1439) differs from that which met in Constantinople against Beccus (1285). The latter agrees completely with the faith of the Ecumenical Councils, both with the Eighth [the union Council of Constantinople, 879] and the rest, while Florence disagrees with them all, with both that one and the rest. In Constantinople, the Patriarch of Alexandria was present, and the other Patriarchs agreed with and approved of the result as a sound and lawful decision (Quoted in Papadakis 1986: 141).

The publication of the *Tomus* provoked an intense reaction from unionists and Orthodox, the two factions Gregory had hoped to reconcile. Representatives on both sides considered it heretical. Council participants refused to sign, unable to distinguish between the "coming into being of the Spirit" and His "eternal manifestation". These seemed to them a rephrasing of Beccus' teachings in which the Son was seen as a cause in the procession of the Spirit (Runciman 1977: 150).

Responding to the criticism, particularly from Beccus himself and from Moschabar, Gregory defended his teaching of the Spirit's procession by writing the *Apology*. He condemned Beccus' teaching regarding the double procession of Holy Spirit and argued that "the

expression 'through the Son' indicates the shining forth, the revelation or simply the disclosure or manifestation of the Holy Spirit by the Son; it never denotes existence, which the Spirit receives from the Father alone". (Papadakis 1986: 110). He believed the Fathers to be adamant on this point. He asserted that nowhere in the *Tomus* is manifestation identified with procession or existence. Manifestation is expressed by the phrase 'through the Son', whereas procession never. Also, the nouns *phanerōsis* and *hyparxis* are derived from the verbs 'to make manifest' and 'to exist'. The verbs do not resemble one another since 'to manifest', which means 'to reveal', cannot also mean 'to exist'. Gregory accuses those who assert that manifestation means existence, of knowing either "little grammar or no theology, or both" (PG 142: 265).

Unfortunately, one of Gregory's students asserted that he accepted 'procession' (*ekporeusis*), "could be used to signify the hypostatic character of the Spirit as he emerges into being, as well as his eternal manifestation" (Papadakis 1986: 116). Mark argued that *ekporeusis* basically functions synonymously with other terms designating the eternal manifestation of the Spirit- '*eklamptsis*', '*proodos*', '*ekphansis*' and '*phanerōsis*'. This was contrary to what Gregory had intended to show (PG 142: 247-252).

For Gregory, the Holy Spirit proceeds from God the Father. He has His being, his existence in all its perfection, from the Father. The Spirit is consubstantial with the Father as is the Son who, as begotten of the Father, accompanies the Spirit. The Spirit is revealed through the Son and it is through the Son that the Spirit is manifested (PG 142: 249). Procession 'through the Son' therefore denotes the Spirit's eternal manifestation. Mark had misunderstood this to be the meaning of 'procession', but this was certainly not the case. Gregory was using 'manifestation' to explain the genuinely patristic expression 'through the Son'. (Papadakis 1976: 152). Gregory wrote:

For the Fathers never said the Spirit proceeds through the Son but from the Father through the Son. Thus, the term procession must not be altered, transformed or modernised. This is both dangerous and daring. Simply put, procession must be ascribed to the Father; the only cause of the Spirit's hypostasis, while the term 'through the Son' must be ascribed to the inseparable oneness and sharing of nature. This is what the Fathers meant to say - not, 'through the Son' but 'from the Father through the Son' (Papadakis 1976: 126-7).

Mark's misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Gregory's teaching caused great turmoil within the Church. Many did not accept that the blame lay solely on Mark. Several hierarchs

stopped commemorating Gregory's name in the Divine Liturgy, in practice showing they were no longer in communion with him or accepted him still as Ecumenical Patriarch. Faced with this, Gregory voluntarily abdicated and retired to a monastery, where in 1290 he died.

Having said all this, the breach that occurred between East and West resulted from the fact that each side regarded its own representation of the truth as absolute. Gregory's solution upset many in the East because it attempted a dialogue with the West, a *rapprochement* that threatened the absoluteness of the Byzantine position. They were not prepared for the pneumatology of Gregory. Their solutions involved the repeating of a position that existed since the time of Photius, ignoring the prior patristic heritage as a source of answers. The Fourth Crusade hardened Byzantine hearts further, making distrust of the West commonplace, and a reluctance and aversion to embrace or even approach anything remotely Western in origin. Gregory of Cyprus, drawing upon the classical patristic tradition, risked everything in his attempts to extend beyond certain formulas. The consequences, in the interests of peace, were his resignation and isolation.

So, in summary, what was Gregory's specific contribution to the synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology? Gregory differentiated three 'modes' of the Spirit's procession, and the role the Son plays in each (PG 142: 251-300).

- Eternal existence: the Spirit's hypostatic existence is only from the Father, the 'begetting deity'. The Father is the deity's sole source, Divinity who is the source of divinity, or the divinity-birthing Divinity, the *theogonos theotēs*.
- Eternal manifestation: The Spirit's eternal illumination or manifestation is *through* the Son. This in no way applies to the Spirit's hypostatic existence. That remains the sole property of the Father.
- Temporal manifestation: within the economy of salvation, the Spirit can be seen as proceeding from the Father *and* the Son (Siecinski 2010:141).

For Papadakis, Gregory's interpretation is possible because while The Spirit exists from or through the Son (this) did not mean, however, that it also had its existence from or through him. A distinction had to be made between existing (*hyparchei*) and having existence (*hyparxin echein*) (1976:123).

The Spirit thus obtains its hypostatic existence from the Father alone, but eternally manifested this existence through the Son with whom he is consubstantial (PG 142: 272).

The progress here is that Gregory demonstrated an eternal relationship between the Son and the Spirit while not making the Son a cause (either immediate or proximate) of the Spirit's being. He is thus able to uphold the Father as Divinity's source and cause, while integrating the insights of those fathers like Maximus who spoke of the Spirit's eternal manifestation through the Son (Sieciensky 2010: 141).

Is Gregory's contribution specifically orthodox? Chistodoulos Christodoulou (2013: 111-114) sets out what he considers to be the theological preconditions and fundamental principles of what would constitute and define his orthodoxy.⁴⁹

According to this schema, Gregory's teaching on the Holy Spirit's procession is a plausible one (Christodoulou 2013: 113). While both sides analyse texts, Gregory employs the *kata pneuma hermēneia* of the texts placing them in the historical and philological context. Respecting the unions and distinctions of orthodox theology, his interpretation depends on the distinction and the association of theology and economy which the Filioque was accused of blurring, as well as the identity of the divine essence and distinction of the divine hypostases. The divine energy is natural and common in the Trinitarian Godhead. What is distinct is the work that each divine Person performs during the manifestation of the common energy.

Stressing the Father's monarchy excludes the Son's participation as the Spirit's cause. He therefore perceives that 'the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son' in two ways. 'Proceeding from the Father' refers to existence, whereas 'proceeding from the Son' is understood not only as *ek Patros di' Hiou pempsis*, the "sending forth from the Father through the Son" in creation and history, but also as the 'eternal shining forth' or 'manifestation' *āidios eklampsis* or *ādios ekphansis* or *phanerōsis* (Christodoulou 2013: 113). Gregory explains that 'proceeding from the Son' cannot be identified with the Filioque. Rather, based on the monarchy of the Father, "it establishes the eternal relation of the divine Persons caused by the consubstantiality and the manifestation of the Trinitarian energies" (Christodoulou 2013: 113).

49

- The accurate interpretation of biblical and patristic texts where that correct interpretation depends also on the study of historical and philological elements of the texts, as well as on the author's theological learning.
- Maintaining the apophatic approach to the mystery of the Trinity.
- Respecting the distinction between the theology and the economy as well as that between the essence and energies.
- Maintaining the unity of the divine essence and the distinction of the hypostases, where the monarchy of the Father is the most important precondition for the description of the relations of the Trinitarian Persons.

4.4 Concluding Remarks

The contribution of Gregory to elucidating and, in fact, expanding on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's procession, is of great significance. Regarding this, John Meyendorff expresses it thus:

Instead of simply repeating Photius' formulas about the 'eternal procession' of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and the 'emission in time' by the Son, Gregory recognized the need to express the permanent relationship existing between the Son and the Holy Spirit as divine hypostases and he spoke of an 'eternal manifestation of the Spirit by the Son' (1964: 13).

In clearly distinguishing between the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone and His eternal manifestation from the Son, he presented an alternative interpretation to the Filioque and also a way of in which the divine and the created order relate (Metaxas 1988: 110). His contribution was the foundation for Palamas' synthesis that was to follow. According to Sopko, "It is in the context of 'immediate forerunner' of Gregory Palamas, that we can best appreciate Gregory's theological and historical significance" (Sopko 1979: 146). Gregory's doctrine as defined and accepted by the Council of Blachernae, the only official, conciliar Orthodox response to the filioque to date, was developed further by another Gregory.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY AND GREGORY PALAMAS

The Unionist group that was instrumental in the abdication of Gregory failed to secure one of their own as his successor. Emperor Andronicus II chose Athanasius to be Patriarch (1289-1293; 1304-1310), a “pious and simple monk” (Maffrey-Talbot 1973: 17), hoping that he would restore the peace and bring unity. Athanasius was anti-western in his outlook and took measures to curtail the influence of the Western Church in Constantinople. Yet, his primary concern was not doctrine, but ethics, particularly that of the clergy (Maffrey-Talbot 1973: 15). On the other hand, the priority among Emperors at the time, both Andronicus II (1282-1328) and Andronicus III (1328-1341), was the procurement of military assistance against the Turks. To this end, they corresponded with Pope John XXII regarding the union of the Churches, knowing full-well that military aid would be dependent on their submission to the Roman Church.

Remarkably, this age is marked by the intellectual flowering known as the ‘Palaeologan Renaissance’ and a marked interest in Western learning. Maximus Planudes translated Augustine’s *Trinity*, but rejected his arguments in favour of the filioque even if only, as Bessarion was to cynically observe, “to escape prison and chains” (PG 161. 312). Latin polemicists later claimed that he was a forger, not a translator, and had purposefully suppressed the Spirit proceeding also from the Son (Siecinski 2010: 143). George Scholarius argued that Planudes misrepresented Augustine in translating every instance of *procedere* with *ekporeuesthai*, this would mean that either he was inept in theology, holding to the single expression, or had the Latin understanding of the issue that tainted his translation. Rather,

When *procedere* is applied to the Father alone it should be translated with *ekporeuesthai* and when applied to the Son, or to the Father and the Son, with *proienai* ... for the assemblage of the teachers proclaims aloud that the Spirit both is of the Son and goes forth (*proienai*) from the Son (Siecinski 2010: 143).

Nicephorus Gregoras (1295-1360) reports the arrival in Constantinople of two Latin prelates in 1334 to discuss the relations between the Churches (BH I: 507). Public demand was for a debate to take place with these representatives and Patriarch Isaiah (1323-1334) requested that the layman Gregoras defend the Orthodox position. Gregoras managed to convince the assembly of Bishops that debating with isolated representatives of the Western Church would really not result in any substantial outcome or even progress. (Nicol 1969: 75). This was an issue belonging to the whole Church. The issue of procession had long been decided at the Ecumenical Councils and the Filioque had no such sanction. Issues impacting

on the Church's Creed would only be resolved in an assembly of the primates and representatives of the universal Church, an Ecumenical Council.

The custom, when disputes about dogma in the Church arise, is to summon by public decree and edict all the spokesmen of the Church, not merely those appointed as Metropolitans to spread the Gospel over the world, but also those of patriarchal rank, the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, if these are not summoned, then the harmony of the Church is in peril of being upset (BH I: 506-7).

Gregoras' own views on the issue of the procession were particularly apophatic. He saw little point in debating such matters since, "to know God is difficult; to express Him is impossible" (BH I: 509).

5.1 The Westernizers of the Fourteenth Century

The debate with the Latin legates was taken-up by Barlaam the Calabrian (1290-1350), without positive results. Barlaam had the patronage of Ioannes Cantacuzenus who secured for him a teaching position at the Patriarchal University in Constantinople. His Orthodoxy was initially beyond reproach. He was vociferous in denouncing both the Filioque and Papal primacy and was an ardent critic of Thomas Aquinas and his view that the Persons differed only with respect to relations. However, the sincerity of his position has been questioned⁵⁰ and his lack of familiarity with both Greek and Latin Fathers, have characterized him rather as a "manipulator of ideas, and probably influenced by Nominalism" (Meyendorff 1974: 103).

Barlaam is probably best known for his conflict with Gregory Palamas⁵¹ and *hesychasm*.⁵² Palamas championed traditional Byzantine mysticism and Barlaam illustrated Hellenistic philosophical thought, conflicting methods in the discussion regarding the 'theory of the knowledge of God' (Cheng 1998: 66). One represented apophatic mystical conservatism, the other cataphatic intellectual liberalism. Barlaam was a prolific author and a scientist of some repute. He was consulted in a variety of topics including 'astronomy, philosophy, theology and diplomacy' (Meyendorff 1974: 42). Barlaam was a philosophical theologian with little time for the mystical element of Christianity (Meyendorff 1983: 118). He concentrates on the

⁵⁰ M. Jugie (1933: 372) asserts that Barlaam, a native of Italy, never actually renounced his faith even while in Constantinople. Rather, he realized that in order to be seen as 'orthodox' he had to subscribe to the Photian doctrine of procession. J. Romanides (1963-4: 225-70) has pointed out that 'anti-Thomists' were not, by extension, automatically Orthodox.

⁵¹ Gregory Palamas will be dealt with extensively in this chapter.

⁵² 'Hesychasm' is a school of mystical prayer practiced by Orthodox monastics. Using various prayer forms, contemplation or union with God is reached. Gregory Palamas became the champion and theologian of hesychasm, partly in response to the attacks on the method and theory by Barlaam.

mind's intellectual power, not accepting that it can truly transcend itself and attain the vision of God (Sinkewicz 1982: 219-222). God is identical with His essence and being transcendent, it is impossible for us, in this life, to have a 'direct, real and unmediated personal union' with Him (Meyendorff 1983: 21). Knowledge of God is attained by reflection on His works. Theology thus requires scholarly pursuit, traditional faith seeking intelligent, rational understanding (Meyendorff 1983: 118) Barlaam is thus characteristic of scholastic humanism which has integrated philosophical elements with the Christian faith.

Barlaam's arrogance claiming to know more about Orthodoxy than the Greeks themselves, his clash with Gregory Palamas and subsequent condemnation in 1341 earned him few admirers. He retired to his native Italy and the fold of the Latin Church. Once a proponent of Orthodoxy, he now had to explain his rejection of the Greek position. In one of his letters to Demetrius Cydones (PG 151: 1301), he states the three main reasons as being; firstly, that many learned Fathers, by reading the Scriptures, became familiar with the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, consequently teaching it as well as expressing it themselves⁵³; secondly, the Church of Rome, which he considered to be greatest among Churches, has taught this doctrine from the beginning; and thirdly, the general council of Lyon affirmed it and declared heretics all those opposed to it.

In the same letter he argues that asserting the Spirit proceeds from the Son doesn't deny procession from the Father, nor does it contradict it. In fact, it confirms something which has been implicit all the time:

For if the Roman Church had not said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, yet believed that He proceeds from the Son, it would have been necessary to conclude that He proceeds from the Father as well. For if He proceeds from the Son, but everything He has is from the Father, He must also proceed from the Father as well (PG 151: 1306).

Barlaam thought Revelation 22:1 was of significance in supporting the double procession, "Then He showed me the river of the water of life, bright as crystal, flowing from the throne of God and of the Lamb through the middle of the street of the city." The river he identifies with the Holy Spirit, the Lamb with the Son. Since the Lamb shares the throne of God, it follows that the Lamb as co-ruler and consubstantial with the Father, also causes the Spirit. (PG 151: 1327). Barlaam though, did not adequately distinguish between theology and

⁵³ Here he makes mention particularly of Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria.

economy,⁵⁴ confusing the Son as God with the Incarnate Son, thereby concluding that the Spirit's procession is from both the Father and the Son.

Demetrius Cydones (1342-1397), a leading statesman during this time, became a proponent of the union of the Churches. The Emperor John Cantacuzenus (1347-54), believing that knowledge of Latin was vital in relations with the West, encouraged him to learn the language. He thus had access to and was impressed by scholasticism, translating Aquinas' *Contra Gentiles* into Greek in 1354. So enamoured did he become by the work, that he entered into communion with Rome (Siecienski 2010: 143). Before his conversion, he had expressed serious doubts regarding the Latin interpretation of the procession and whether it could be supported biblically and by patristic testimony, yet he was to later write to Barlaam: "I see that it is more daring to deny the procession of the Spirit from the Son than to confess it" (PG 151: 1299).

He quotes Dionysius' *The Divine Names*, a work of apophatic theology, claiming that nothing more should be said regarding the Holy Trinity than what Scripture has revealed. Since there are passages that hint that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, it is the Latins who treat Scripture reverently, whereas the Greeks ignore the testimony "driven by daring and pride". Likewise, they ignore the teaching of many great Saints. He therefore concludes that, while both views may be wrong in trying to define God, the Latin view is the "safer one", adding "something that glorifies God and does not take anything away from Him. Nor does it take anything away from the Spirit, or make Him of lesser dignity than the Son. So, taking nothing away from either the Father or the Son, the Latin teaching adds that not only is the Father the perfect spirator, He is also the generator of another spirator" (PG 151: 1299-1300).

Cydones tried, without success, to bridge the two views maintaining that even though they differed in their forms of expression, they agreed in substance (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 122). He cited many instances in the Greek Fathers, in which the Spirit "is poured forth", "appears", "comes", "is given", "shines forth" from the Son, attempting to lessen importance of the word 'proceed'. He ultimately declared, like Beccus before him, that the prepositions 'from' and 'through' meant the same thing. Cydones, sees how the Latins believe in a single procession of the Spirit, in other words, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from a single principle. He sees also how the Greeks view the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, sharing in His essence, yet through the Son, yet poured out by the Son "as if He

⁵⁴ Theology, *theologia*, literally 'words about God', refers here to what can be said about God in Himself, God's inmost life, whereas the economy, *oikonomia*, refers to all of God's dealings with the world and creation, to all the works by which He reveals Himself (CCC: 236). This distinction, a common one in the Greek Fathers and in the Byzantine tradition, corresponds with that between the 'Imminent Trinity' and 'Economic Trinity' or the Trinity *ad intra* and the Trinity *ad extra*.

were coming also from God the Father". He therefore concludes that trying to show that "proceeding from the Son" and "being from the Son", is a waste of time (Jugie 1933: 379).

Cydonos understood Augustine and Cyril's statements concerning the relationship between the Son and the Spirit in the economy, as being identical to that in eternity. He was thus unable to see the deeper reason the Orthodox opposed the Filioque, the patristic distinction between theology and economy (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 123).

Manuel Calecas (1360-1410) was a disciple of Cydonos and another influential member of the westernizing faction. His line of arguments followed the rhetoric of his teacher. *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, to those who say that the Son of God is not from the substance of the Father*, (PG 154) is an anti-Palamite work often attributed to Cydonos. As he saw it, the Palamites distinguish between the divine essence, the hypostases and the properties of the hypostases. They are, however, unwilling to accept that the Holy Spirit is from the essence of the Father and the Son. This consubstantiality, i.e. that the Spirit is from the same essence, meant for Calecas that He proceeds from both. Furthermore, he believed they taught that the Son is not from the Father's essence, but that the Son was begotten by the Father (Metaxas 1988: 124). As a Person He is distinct from Him, but exists from the Father's hypostasis (PG 154: 863-958).

After Calecas criticised the distinctions Palamite thought makes between the essence, the hypostases and the properties of the hypostases, he attempted illustrating how all these, even though distinguishable, are one and the same. As to the similarity and difference between the prepositions *ek* and *dia*, he asserted that since the Father and Son are one and the same God, one by nature, with one operation common to both, no real difference can exist between *dia*, used for the Son, and *ek*, used for the Father (PG 154: 926-28).

Both mean the same thing, and both express that the Son is the principle of the Holy Spirit, together with the Father, and that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. All the Saints state explicitly that it is wrong to find a distinction between these terms, and they teach that when the Father and the Son are being discussed, there is no real difference at all between *ek* and *dia*, except in so far as they distinguish the hypostases from one another and establish some order of Persons in the Godhead.

Thus, by establishing this order, priority of rank is given to the Father, while the Son occupies the middle place. This does not imply superiority of one or inferiority of the other. The use of *ek* and *dia* respectively, precludes confusing the Father with the Son. The Father remains ultimate source, while both can be seen as principle of the Holy Spirit.

While Calecas shows awareness of both traditions, his reasoning was devoid of any meaningful compromise and unacceptable to the East (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 126).

5.2 Gregory Palamas

Gregory Palamas was born in Asia Minor and received an excellent education in Constantinople. He decided to abandon prospects of a civil career and withdrew to Mount Athos to become a monk. He later retired to a hermitage where, in 1337 he became familiar with the writings of Barlaam. Most of the next twelve years were spent in Constantinople at the heart of the controversy. In 1350 he was enthroned Archbishop of Thessalonica, where he died in 1359. He was canonised in 1368 and his importance for the Orthodox Church and the high esteem with which he is held, is evident in that his commemoration was appointed for the Second Sunday of Great Lent, the Sunday after the “Feast of Orthodoxy”, the feast of true faith and dogma, as a continuation of that celebration.⁵⁵

His conflict with Barlaam was originally over the issue of hesychasm, a form of prayer that claimed to give the practitioner a direct experience of the divine light of Tabor. Barlaam criticised the hesychast monks and their claim to know and experience God, an assertion that violated his apophatic position. For Palamas, this issue touched at the heart of Orthodox life and spirituality and he felt compelled to clarify what had long been implicit in Eastern Christian thought. In doing so, this insight greatly influenced his writings on the Trinity and, subsequently, on the issue of the filioque (Siecienski 2010: 145).

Before delving into this, I will provide a basic overview of Palamas’ theological thought and then establish its relevance to the issue of the filioque and the subsequent synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology.

5.2.1 Palamas’ Theological Thought

In Chapter 75 of his *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*. Palamas states “There are three realities in God: essence, energy and the sacred persons of the Trinity” (PG 150:1173). This statement summarises the theological thought of Palamas. To many Trinitarian theologians the element of energy might seem novel or out of place. Yet his teaching is considered to be

⁵⁵ Material regarding the life and times of Gregory Palamas is from John Meyendorff’s *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. 1998.

the development of the Sixth Ecumenical Council and in line with Patristic thought (Hussey 1972: 12). The notion that we cannot communicate with, or participate in, the divine essence had already been expressed by many Fathers. While God's essence remains inaccessible to us, He does reach out to us by means of His energy.⁵⁶ This is the core of Palamas' teaching. "Do not think that God lets himself be seen in his superessential essence, but rather according to his deifying gift and according to his energy..." (Triads III, 1, 29)

Palamas' thought is certainly a development of Maximus' theology (Hussey 1972: 15). Contrary to Origen's concept of motion, Maximus saw it as an upward movement with God being both initiator and goal. God creates all things (*genēsis*). All things are designed to move towards him (*kinēsis*). It is in him that they find their perfection (*stasis*). Parallel to this is the triad of essence that has power (*dynamis*) for action (*energeia*). Nature therefore is a dynamic concept and energy is the essential manifestation of that nature. These concepts were primarily applied to Christology by Maximus. The Chalcedonian doctrine of Christ's two natures necessarily led to the conclusion of the two operations and two energies in Christ, since energy flows from the nature and not from the person (Hussey 1972: 17).

Palamas, following Maximus, asserted that according to Maximus, the Fathers teach that no nature can exist or become known without essential energy. In Chapter 136 (PG 150:1216) he says, "The essence which does not have an energy flowing out from it is completely non-existent and is only a figment of our imaginations." Whereas Maximus applied this to Christology, Palamas was concerned with the one divine nature of the three persons of the Trinity. Thus, he consistently affirms that there is only one divine energy flowing from the one divine essence.

In Chapters 112, he says:

The three persons naturally, entirely, indivisibly, but also without mixture or confusion, possess one another in such a way that they possess only one energy. We do not find this in any creature, for the proper energy of being of the same species is similar, but with each person acts on his own. This is not so with the three divine and adored persons who have truly one and the same energy.... Therefore, we are taught by the holy fathers to attribute one and the same divine energy to the three divine persons, and not a proper and similar energy to each (PG 150:1197).

⁵⁶ Theologians have seen Palamas' essence-energy distinction as a prototype of the immanent-economic Trinitarian distinction. God is "independent of, yet willingly implicated in, the created order" (Williams 1999: 151). Meyendorff though, has insisted that to equate energies with the economy is incorrect: "While preserving the personalism of the Father and the traditional Byzantine position concerning the 'economic' procession of the Spirit from the Son, Palamas, because he considers the Divine energies as uncreated and eternal, does not limit that 'economy' to temporal existence" (1964:232). The economy thus extends to the inner life of God.

The Three Persons, Palamas maintains, have only one energy. Thus, any divine action is, of necessity, a single action of all Three Persons. The divine energy has its source in the common essence. This unity of action is a fundamental tenet of Palamas' thought.

In a certain sense the one divine energy can be multiple, and Palamas often speaks of it in the plural. Thus, we read:

Neither the uncreated goodness, nor the eternal glory, nor the life and all such things are simply the superessential essence of God, for God, as cause, transcends these things; nevertheless, we say that he is life, goodness, and other such things... As God is completely present in each of the divine energies, each serves as his name. (TR. III, 2, 7)

But Palamas makes it clear that the energy is multiple primarily from the viewpoint of the many who participate in the energy in varying degrees according to their capacity. "The energy and power common to the three-person nature is distributed differently and appropriately to those who participate" (CH 68). These energies, then, are multiple manifestations and exteriorizations of the one God. But energy is also simple and inseparable from God, somewhat like warmth and light radiated from the sun, an undivided activity eternally flowing from God. This activity is multiple primarily from the viewpoint of its effects.

Thus, for Palamas, the energy of God is not his essence, but flows from it. He calls it "essential and natural energy" (*Triads*, III, 3, 6). Since the energy has its source in the essence, and the essence is the common possession of all Three Persons, this energy is also the one common energy of the Three Persons. This 'essential' energy is thus also a 'personal' energy and great emphasis is placed on the divine Persons in Palamas' thought.

The Greek Patristic tradition generally tends to see the Father, rather than the divine essence, as the source and principle root of unity in the Trinity. He is the source and the goal of the divine processions (Hussey 1072: 23). The nature is not in any way divided among the three persons, but is possessed equally by them without any temporal priority or essential superiority. Palamas also affirms the monarchy of the Father, that personal attribute that is the unique source both of the unity and of the Trinity. The Father "alone is the cause, the root and the source of the divinity contemplated in the Son and the Holy Spirit" (PG 150: 764).

In the *Logoi Apodeiktikoi*, Palamas argues that the Spirit cannot proceed from the Son because both the actions of begetting and of spirating, belong to the Father personally and not to the divine essence:

We do not say that the Son is from the Father in as much as he is begotten by the divine essence, but rather in as much as he is begotten by the Father as a person. For the essence is common to the three persons, but begetting is proper to the Father personally. That is why the Son is not begotten by the Spirit. Consequently, the Spirit is also from the Father; he possesses the divine essence, proceeding from the person of the Father. For the essence is always and absolutely common to the three persons. Therefore, the act of spiration is proper to the Father as a person and the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, for the Son does not have the personal properties of the Father (LA I, 6).

The divine essence is not, however, totally irrelevant to generation and procession. In fact, in the *Chapters*, Palamas does speak of generation and procession as belonging to the divine essence in some sense:

If, as our adversaries and their followers foolishly assert, there is no distinction between the divine essence and the divine energy, then there would be no distinction between creation, which belongs to the energy; and generation and spiration, which belong to the essence (CH 96).

The fundamental difference between the divine Persons and creatures, rests on the fact that the Persons of the Son and of the Spirit are not the results of the divine energy as creatures are. Palamas is not abandoning his insistence on the Father as a source of divinity, (*pēgaia theotēs*) rather he is distinguishing between the divine persons who spring from the Father by way of 'natural' processions and creatures who are brought into existence by the divine 'natural' energy. In the *Logoi Apodeiktikoi* we find the explicit acknowledgement that the divine essence is indeed a source of divine unity, but it is coupled with a strong insistence on the Father as the principle source: "God is one, not only because there is one essence, but also because the persons who proceed go back to one person" (LA. I, 37).

It is by generation and by procession that the Son and the Spirit share in the one essence possessed also by the Father, whereas the energy does not communicate the divine essence to us in creation. In this sense generation and procession belong to the essence and creation belongs to the energy. However, the *pēgaia theotēs* – the source of divinity, is the Father, for the Son and the Spirit receive the divine essence from Him. In fact, Palamas proclaims the Father origin of the divine essence itself. If that were not so, he suggests,

Christian personalism would yield to the essentialism of the ancient philosophers (In Meyendorff 1998: 215).

In *Against Gregoras* he explains, “The essence of God would produce itself, and God would be his own Father, as the boasting of men famous among the Greeks formerly proclaimed; in fact, God himself exists and to him belong the divine essence and the divine energy” (In Meyendorff 1998: 215).

Yet, in spite of the apparent emphasis on the divine essence he is careful to show that he is not an essentialist theology. In the *Triads* we find this striking statement: “When God was speaking to Moses, He did not say ‘I am the essence,’ but ‘I am who I am.’ It is not therefore, He-that-is who comes from the essence, but the essence comes from He-that-is, for He-that-is embraces in himself all being” (TR III, 2, 12).

God is not an essence, Palamas declares, but He is a person who has the divine essence; and Palamas again affirms that the person is somehow the source of the essence, not its product. He devoted much effort to clarifying the divine energy as essential energy, distinct and yet inseparable from the divine essence, yet it is Trinitarian personalism that is still the key feature in his thought. He says, “in fact, God himself exists and to him belongs the divine essence and the divine energy” (in Meyendorff 1998, 215) and further, “the holy fathers do not say that all this (essence and energy) is only one thing, but that it belongs to only one God” (AA. V: 13).

Thus, the uncreated energy that he speaks of belongs to a person. It is *enhypostasized*. (AA. V, 13). The energy is real and it is a personal communication. It does not, however, have its own personal existence. *Enhypostasized* denotes the permanent, stable reality but also its dependence. “This then, is properly an *enhypostaton*: something which is contemplated, not in itself, not in an essence, but in a person (hypostasis)” (*Triad III*, 1, 9). The uncreated energy cannot manifest itself, or be manifested by the divine essence even though it is “essential” energy. It can only be manifested by a person.

Enhypostaton has a double focus (Hussey 1972: 40). Not only does the energy belong to the divine persons as *enhypostaton*, but when it is communicated to us, it becomes an *enhypostaton* of our persons also. “The divine life is a light given in an indescribable illumination and recognized only by those who are worthy. It is said to be *enhypostasized* because it does not exist independently, but the Spirit sends it into the person of another in which it is contemplated” (*Triad III*, 1, 9).

This concept of the communication of the energy from one Divine Person to our persons is the principle by which Palamas resolves the whole problem of deification with which he was grappling (Hussey 1972: 41). The natural energy of the Three Divine Persons is communicated to us in a manner in which we possess it personally but not naturally. While the divine energy becomes an *enhypostaton* of our persons, “our own nature and natural energy remain intact” (Hussey, 1072: 41). The energy, being transmissible, grants us the possibility of a personal communion with God, yet without the confusion of natures. The concept of enhypostasized, or personalized, energy enabled Palamas to affirm that the uncreated and eternal activity which flows from the divine essence is possessed, used and manifested by the divine persons and can be communicated to our persons so that we can have communion with God without a confusion of divine and human natures.

The essential energy of God is thus also a personal energy. It is common to all three persons so that there is always a unity and community of divine action: “The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one source and Lord relative to creation, one creator, one God and Father, Provider, Custodian and all the rest” (CH 132).

5.2.2 Trinitarian Particularities

Palamas’ work provides us with some indications as to how he perceived the inner works of the Trinity. As this has some bearing on our subject, I will explore this further before delving into his response regarding the filioque. It is Chapters 35, 36 and 37 specifically, of the Chapters that we will look at.

In Chapter 35, among other things, he says that God, who is also ‘mind’ or ‘intelligence’ (*nous*) is naturally expected to be the source of word (*logos*). This ‘word’ is not the word that we express or even think. We must understand *logos* as the point of contact with God. Rather, it is like that word which naturally dwells within us, in our intelligence, by which we have been made according to the very image of the one who created us. Similarly, the Word of God naturally accompanies that supreme intelligence and always co-exists with it. For Palamas the expression ‘*Logos Theou*’ – Word of God - is not just a psychological figure modelled after our means of communication or the concepts that frame our ideas.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ ‘Logos’, most-often translated as ‘word’, has many other possibilities in Greek. In a sense it is ‘logic’, ‘reason’, ‘purpose’, even ‘meaning’. In the Logos doctrine of the Greek fathers, especially as developed by Maximus the Confessor, each created being has an ‘idea’, a ‘reason’, a *logos*, which is in a way both its origin and goal. The *logoi* of creatures are God’s dynamic creative decisions or “willings” which at once establish us in existence, give us the purpose of our existence, and inaugurate the motion for that purpose. They are the very goal to which we move. They are God’s

In Chapter 36, Palamas goes on to say that we cannot conceive of a word without an accompanying breath (*pneuma*). Similarly, the divine Word also has a Holy Spirit always proceeding with him from the Father. He once again distinguishes that this breath or spirit that accompanies the divine word is not like the breath which accompanies the words from our lips or even our thoughts.

In simple language, what we have here is the figure of a man who expresses himself by a word which is manifested by breath. The man is sole source of both the word and the breath. The breath is necessary for the articulation of the word. It completes and manifests the word. The word too, sends forth the breath in order that it may be effective. By extension, “the divine Logos is somehow a natural and perfect expression of the Father and is naturally and perfectly or ‘articulated’, as it were, by the divine *Pneuma* of the Father” (Hussey 1972: 52).

Palamas’ thought even utilized Augustine’s ‘love analogy’ which sees the Spirit as a bond of love between the Father and the Son (Siecienski 2010: 146). It was not, however, applied to the hypostasis of the Spirit. It was rather applied to the common energy of the Trinity, which is love (Orfanos 1981: 33). One could thus speak of the Spirit as being eternally from Christ, as long as this referred to the uncreated energies and not the hypostasis. Thus “the Holy Spirit is of Christ, as of God, both in essence and in energy. According to essence and hypostasis he is of him, but not from him; according to energy, he is both of him and from him” (LA. 2.30).

The Spirit is, “Like a mysterious love of the Father towards the mysteriously begotten Word, the same love that the beloved Word and Son of the Father has for him who begot him“(PG 150: 1144). The love proceeds from the Father simultaneously with the Son and naturally rests on Him. This love is then sent to those who are worthy by the Father and the Son. Palamas cautions that the Spirit has his origin in the Father alone because it is from the Father alone, that He receives His Person, or *hypostasis*. This bond or love⁵⁸ between Father and Son is applied to the “common energy which is the love of the Triune God.” (Orfanos 1981: 34).

In Chapter 37, Palamas speaks of the Spirit as the Companion of the Word and says that man’s insatiable desire for knowledge is a sign or mark of the Spirit. (PG 150: 1145). In this

design for us. These logoi of each created being are all somehow summed up or contained in the Logos Theou, through whom all things are made. For a summary of the patristic logos-theology, see V. Lossky’s *Mystical Theology*, chp 5, 91-113.

⁵⁸In *Study*, p 232, J. Meyendorff comments, “It seems somewhat surprising to find there a psychological simile rather like that used by St Augustine... It seems unlikely that one could find another passage similar to this in Byzantine theological literature”. In his entry, ‘Palamas’ (1931), M. Jugie called Palamas’ model of divine processions “a theory identical to that of St Augustine and St Thomas”. The characterization of the Spirit as love was, however, not foreign to the East.

case we have the model of a man whose knowledge is made known and completed by desire or love. Again, the one person is the sole source of both the knowledge and the love. The love is necessary in order that the knowledge can effect anything. The love completes the knowledge and is in a sense, sent out by it. The divine Logos is, in this case, the perfect knowledge or truth of the Father and is made 'effective' or known by the Love of the Father.

In these illustrations, Palamas safeguards the monarchy of the Father- He alone is the *pēgaia theotēs*. Yet in both these illustrations he also accepts and establishes an intimate relationship between the Son and the Spirit who naturally and eternally proceed from the Father. While the Eastern tradition has avoided the use of models in 'teasing-out' a Trinitarian theology and over-emphasizing some over others; their presence in the Palamite corpus warrants consideration to their consistency with the rest of his thought (Hussey 1972:54).

One further particularity need to be addressed here. Patristic literature makes a distinction between the divine 'economy' and theology. Lossky explains the distinction thus: "In the thought of the Fathers, theology proper is always the teaching about the divine being itself- the Holy Trinity; whereas the external manifestations of God- the Trinity known in its relation to the created being- belonged to the realm of economy." (Lossky 1976: 71).

The inner life of the Trinity is eternal and not contingent on any external factor. The economic realm is directed to the temporal and contingent because the saving action of God takes place within place and time and depends on his will. The gulf between the two has caused Eastern theologians to be hesitant in making deductions about the inner life of the Trinity from its economic activity, or vice versa. The objection may thus be raised that the Palamite Trinitarian models have no value in helping us see how Palamas views the relationship of the individual divine persons to the divine energy, which seems to belong to the realm of the economy.

Yet, the uncreated energy is precisely uncreated and *eternal*. The effects of the divine energy which we experience may belong within time, but the energy itself is the *eternal* outpouring of divine activity. Even if there were no creation, God would still have natural energy flowing from the divine essence. The energy is thus the 'bridge' between the two realms and cannot be placed squarely within one or the other.

While certainly being cautious in making deductions about the divine energy from Palamas' Trinitarian theology, it can be said that his analogies reflect an order of activity from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. Consequently, one is able to see in them an indication of Palamas' view regarding the relationship of the divine energy with the individual

divine persons and of the relationship between the individual divine persons, particularly that of the Son and the Spirit.

To re-capitulate, there is only one divine energy common to all three persons. This unity is not a mere figure of speech but a true identity, and we cannot speak of three divine activities, or of three separate effects of divine activity. “The three divine persons naturally, entirely, indivisibly, but also without mixture or confusion, possess one another and compensate each other in such a way that they possess only one energy” (CH 112). Likewise, “The energy of the three divine persons is not one in the same sense that it is similar as among us human beings; rather it is truly one in number (CH 138). And, “The whole of creation is the work of the three persons” (CH 112), of “the one uncreated and co-eternal energy of God” (CH 140).

If each of the divine persons possessed a proper and individual energy, each would possess a proper and individual essence. There would then be three divine natures and the unity of God would be destroyed, resulting in tritheism. The work of God, the divine energy and activity is always one, because God is one.

What place is there then for the special relationship between us and each of the divine persons: The Father, who is source and goal of life; the Son, in whose Sonship we share; and the Spirit who sanctifies us? Specifically, how can one, identical activity permit any special work for the Spirit sent by Christ to lead us to the complete truth? Do not the gifts of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22) belong to the Spirit in any special way? Palamas himself often speaks of the energies of the Spirit, of “the processions, manifestations and natural energies” (CH 71). Is all this not in contrast with what Palamas asserts regarding the activity and energy being always one and common to all persons?

There does seem to be a way of eliminating the contradiction between the community of divine action on the one hand and a special personal involvement of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit on the other. Palamas indicates this possibility in several places: “We see the proper accomplishment of the three persons, of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; but all creation is the one work of the three” (CH 112). Later he says, “In all these energies God is known to us not in one, but in three persons” (CH 137). The work of the Trinity is one and identical; yet there does seem to be an individual manner in which the Father, Son and Spirit are involved in this work. The one divine energy belongs to all three persons, but also belongs to each in an individual and personal way. The clarification of the possession and use of the energies by each person can be found in the traditional patristic formula used by Palamas, “from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.”

God is in himself. The three persons naturally, entirely, indivisibly, but also without mixture or confusion, possess one another in such a way that they possess only one energy. One does not find this in any creature. For the proper energy of beings of the same species is similar, but each person acts on his own. This is not so with the three divine persons who have truly one and the same energy, for the movement of the divine will is initiated by the primary principle, the Father, and goes out through the Son, and is manifested by the Holy Spirit. This is clear from its effects, from which all natural energy becomes known. For example, different, not identical nests are being built by different swallows. Or different pages are written by different scribes, even though the letters are the same. In the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we see the proper accomplishment of each person; but all creation is the work of the three persons. Therefore, we are taught by the Fathers to attribute one and the same divine energy to the three divine persons, and not a proper and similar energy to each (CH 112).

An identical energy is possessed and used by the three persons. All three persons are involved in this. In creation we see the proper effects of each person. He further specifies that the source and initiator of the divine energy is the Father, who is the source of unity and being in the Trinity; the energy 'goes out' or is 'effected' by the Son; and it is manifested or shown for what it is, by the Holy Spirit.

In his treatise on the filioque, Palamas applies this formula to deification and at the same time provides a clear expression of his Trinitarian theology:

O God of all, sole giver and guardian of true theology and of its dogmas and sayings, sole and supremely ruling Trinity, not only because you alone rule all things, but also because you have within yourself the one and only beginning without beginning, the only uncaused unity from which come forth and into which return eternally and uncausedly the Son and the Spirit, - the Holy Spirit, the Lord, who has his existence from the Father by procession and who is given, sent and manifested through the Son to those who correctly believe in you; O only begotten Son, you have your existence from the Father by generation; through the Holy Spirit you are formed and dwell and are invisibly seen in the hearts of those who believe in you (LA I, 1:25).

The Trinity has within itself the Father, the source from whom the Son and Spirit come and into whom they return in an uncaused manner (Siecinski 2010: 145). The Son, having his existence by generation from the Father, gives the Spirit, sending it into the heart of the saints. The Spirit, having His existence from the Father by procession, causes the Son to be

formed, to live and to be seen in those hearts. The conviction is thus that the Spirit is sent by the Father through the Son to manifest divine life within the faithful.

A clearer expression of this formula is found in the *Confession of the Orthodox Faith*:

The Father is without beginning, not only because he is eternal, but also because he is uncaused in every way. He alone is the cause and root and source of the divinity which is contemplated in the Son and the Holy Spirit... He is greater than the Son and the Spirit, but only in as much as he is their cause... From him there is one Son who is without beginning in as much as he is eternal, yet he is not without beginning in the sense that he has the Father as his beginning and root and source.... but he is the cause and beginning of all things that have been made, because all things have been made through him.... the Holy Spirit, like the Father and the Son, is without beginning in as much as he is eternal, yet he is not without beginning in the sense that he has the Father as his beginning and root and source; ... he is also the cause of all things that have been made because all things have been brought to completion in him (PG 150: 764-5).

The Father is thus, once again, the sole source of the Son and the Spirit, and with them is cause of all created beings. The source is the Father, but all things are created through the Son and perfected in the Spirit. We have here a confirmation of the formula “from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.”

In the section on Palamas’ “Trinitarian Particularities” we looked briefly at some of his illustrations of the Trinity. In these the Son is the only begotten Word who is somehow a natural expression of the Father. Consequently, Palamas sees the energy as ‘going out’ from the Son, as being expressed and put into effect by Him. The Spirit is the ‘Father’s breath’ which makes the Word ‘audible’, or like the love which completes knowledge and makes it effective. The Spirit ‘goes out into the open for us and on account of us in a manifesting, but not an existential, procession’ (LA II, 77; 148). Palamas is consistent in saying that the energy is manifested and completed in the Spirit.

Thus, Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, having an identical energy, have also communal activity. The one divine essence can only be expressed and communicated through its natural energy, which makes all three persons known to us. Yet each of the divine persons is made known to us individually for each is involved in the divine activity in a different way. The Father remains the source, the initiator. The Son acts as the effecting agent, while the Spirit, the completing touch of all divine activity. Yet divine activity always remains mysteriously one and simple.

As we have seen, Palamas' Trinitarian thought suggested a line of activity that runs "from the Father through the Son in the Spirit" (Hussey 1972: 75). This will be made even clearer by investigating his position on the filioque.

5.2.3 Responding to the Filioque

The issue of the filioque was dealt with in the early treatises, the *Logoi Apodeiktikoi*. Palamas basically recognizes two aspects to the question. The first deals with the legitimacy and canonicity of the insertion. He maintains that it is wrongful since the ancient and venerable creed of the Church cannot be tampered with. Nor should anyone argue that the clause is merely making explicit what is implied by not specifying that the Spirit does not proceed from the Father *alone*. (LA I, 4; 32-3). The second aspect relates to the *understanding* of the filioque. Can it be understood in a truly orthodox way? It is in addressing this that Palamas utilizes the distinction between the personal procession of the Spirit and his procession by divine energy.

Palamas recognised that many of the fathers had spoken of procession 'through the Son' or even 'from the Son' (Siecinski 2010: 146). In addressing Maximus' *Questiones ad Thalassium*, Palamas wrote:

Whenever you hear him say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, because it comes from the Father essentially through the Son, understand reverently that he is teaching that the natural powers and energies of God are poured forth, but not the Spirit's divine hypostasis (LA. 2.20).

When we speak of personal procession it is the Father, Palamas argues, that is sole source and cause of the Son and the Spirit:

We do not say that the Son is from the Father in as much as he is begotten by the divine essence, but rather in as much as he is begotten by the Father as a person. For the essence is common to the three persons, but begetting is proper to the Father personally. That is why the Son is not begotten by the Spirit. Consequently, the Spirit is also from the Father; he possesses the divine essence, proceeding from the person of the Father. For the essence is always and absolutely common to the three persons. Therefore, spiration is proper to the Father as a person and the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, for the Son does not have the personal properties of the Father (LA I, 37; 68).

It is necessary to draw a distinction between the Father, as cause and origin of the Holy Trinity, and the Holy Trinity as the cause of creation (Meyendorff 1998:207). Within the Trinity, the Father alone is origin, sending “out the Son by way of generation, and the Spirit by way of procession” (Bobrinskoy 1999: 43). The Father, the sole *archē*, “is the cause of the unity of the Holy Trinity and its hypostatic differentiation” (Orfanos 1981: 31). Possessing a common will and energy, the Three Persons create together, “their activity from the Father through the Son is realized in the Holy Spirit” (Bobrinskoy 1999: 41). Distinguishing between the Fatherly principle (*patrikē archē*) and the triadic principle (*triadikē archē*) prevents confusion between the divinity and creation, since creatures do not share the manner of being as the Persons of the Trinity (Siecienski 2010: 145). Also, the Divine Persons do not come into being like creation, namely, through God’s will and energy. This means that, while the Son participates in the act of creation, He is excluded from participating in the causal mode of being of the Holy Spirit (Orfanos 1981: 31).

Palamas makes reference to both the hypostatic procession of the Spirit, and His manifestation, two differing facets of the Spirit’s mystery. While “the Spirit derives existence from the Father, He exists eternally in the Son and rests in Him” (Bobrinskoy 1999: 144). Also, the Son participates in the Spirit’s manifestation (ekphansis). This leads him to surmise that “the Spirit pours Himself out from the Father through the Son”, or even “*from the Son*”. (LA I. 29, 54, 23-4) Contrasting causal with energetic procession, the Holy Spirit, belongs in essence *and energy* to Christ and thus proceeds from Him. However, in essence *and hypostasis*, it does not proceed from Him. Coinherence and consubstantiality of Persons mean that the Son and Spirit are ‘*of the other*’ but not ‘*from the other*’ (Orfanos 1981: 32).

Palamas argues that if the procession of the Spirit is directly from the Son and indirectly from the Father, then it becomes necessary either to posit two sources and two effects, or else to unite the two sources, the Father and the Son (Hussey 1972: 70). The first alternative would give us four persons. The second would lead to *patropaschitism*.⁵⁹ Furthermore, if the essential properties are confused with the personal properties, then the Spirit would proceed not only from the Son, but also from himself. In such a case we would have a *tetrad* instead of a trinity (LA I, 7; 34-36 and I, 15; 43).

Yet Palamas also acknowledges that many Fathers allowed for a procession of the Spirit from the Son too.

In that eternal and incomprehensible procession and outpouring, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and rests on the Son. How then can he have a procession

⁵⁹ A form of Modalism or Monarchianism which, because it denies the distinction between Father and Son within the Trinity, maintains that God the Father suffered Christ’s passion and death.

from the Son on whom he rests? If theologians say that he proceeds from the Son, it is certainly not according to that procession we have spoken about, but rather in another one: the manifestation to us and the communication to the worthy (LA. I, 29; 56-57).

This procession thus, is not a personal one. That comes from the Father alone. This procession belongs to the eternal outpouring of the divine energies. Palamas writes: “When you understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, because he proceeds essentially from the Father through the Son, you should understand the pouring out of the essential powers and energies of God, but not that the divine Spirit is imparted ”(LA, II, 20; 96).

Consequently, when as some Fathers have asserted, the Spirit comes ‘*from both*’ or ‘*through the Son*’ or even ‘*from the Son*’, it is the common energy that is being referred to and not the mode of existence (Bobrinskoy 1999: 134-5). This ‘procession’ refers not to the Spirit’s hypostasis but to His powers and essential energies. The hypostasis of the Spirit does not proceed from the Son. Procession from the Son is connected to essence, not hypostasis. “And what comes out from the essence is energy and not hypostasis” (Orfanos 1981: 32).

The divine essence and the hypostases are not ‘shared.’ What are shared are the divine energies alone. The times during which Christ ‘gave’ the Holy Spirit do not imply that He gave the hypostasis of the Spirit. They refer to His giving of the Spirit’s charismata. This is what, in effect, happened at Pentecost. The Scriptures make a distinction between essence and energies, speaking either of “the Spirit” with a definite article, or of “Spirit”. The first instance refers to the Spirit in its derivation. The latter refers to the gifts of the Spirit.⁶⁰ The Son’s participation is thus only as energetic procession and has no implication on the manner of being. While the energies of the Spirit are an action of the whole Trinity, the Spirit’s existence is “an act of the hypostasis of the Father”. And, while “the Son participates in the mission and the energies of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit owes his existence to the Father alone” (Orfanos 1981:33).

Significantly, this energetic procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son is eternal (Hussey 1972: 73) and is expressed in the economy by the will of the Father and Son. Since it is eternal and uncreated, the energy exists before it is realized and manifested. It is here that Palamas uses the analogy of love, illustrating the existence, in eternity, of the common energy and its manifestation in time. The Spirit is thus “like a mysterious love of the

⁶⁰ In *Logos Apodeiktikos*, II.6. Palamas gives the example of the Lord bestowing the Spirit to his disciples by saying, “Receive Holy Spirit”, not “Receive *the* Holy Spirit”. The Lord bestowed the Spirit’s energy, not the essence or hypostasis.

Father towards the Word mysteriously begotten. It is the same love as that possessed by the Word and well beloved Son of the Father towards him who begat him. This he does insofar as he comes from the Father conjointly with this love and this love rests, naturally, on him” (CH 36). The Spirit is thus Spirit of the Son too. This, however, the Son receives from the Father since the Spirit’s attributes as “Spirit of Truth, Wisdom and the Word”, are “appropriate to the Genitor” (Orfanos 1981:34).

Palamas here refers to the external relations within the Trinity, more specifically to the Spirit’s use by both the Father and the Son, and also to its mission within time. However, the love “coming from the Father conjointly” does not imply the Holy Spirit, as hypostasis, “coming into existence from the Father and the Son” (Orfanos 1981: 34). Palamas sees the Son as already possessing the Holy Spirit and this ‘love’ abiding in Him. Yet, this possession of the Holy Spirit by the Son is “because He comes out from the Father in His existence” (LA II. 26). It is common to both with regard to its use, sent by both to those worthy of receiving it, “but being only of the Father as far as its existence is concerned” (Orfanos 1981: 34). “The Spirit has his existential procession from the Father before all ages. And he eternally inheres in the Son. From the Son, he goes out into the open for us and on account of us, according to a manifesting, but not an existential procession” (LA II, 77; 148).

All names we apply to God, refer to His energy, not His essence or hypostases. ‘Love’ as a characterization, does not refer to the Spirit’s hypostasis. It refers to the common energy of the Trinity, existing eternally and made manifest temporally, proceeding not only from the Father, but through the Son and through the Holy Spirit.

Photius had always contrasted the Spirit’s eternal procession from the Father to the Spirit’s temporal procession from the Son. This was seen as a natural consequence of the Incarnation. He thus placed the latter squarely in the realm of the economy and excluded it from the life of the Trinity, or the theology. Palamas, however, saw this economic, temporal procession as an eternal procession, since he placed it in the realms of the uncreated energy which flows *eternally* from the divine essence. The distinction between essence and energy enables him to see an eternal as well as temporal procession of the Spirit from the Son, strengthening the association within the Trinity and expressing a permanent relationship between the Son and the Spirit, while still preserving the traditional eastern position of the monarchy of the Father.

Palamas drew an important distinction. On the one hand, he remained faithful to the causal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone. On the other, he allowed for the Spirit’s energetic procession from the Father *and* the Son eternally *and* in time. This is Palamas’

response to the filioque and remains, to date, the only two-fold procession and the only interpretation to the filioque acceptable to the Orthodox.

5.3 Nilus Cabasilas

Nilus Cabasilas (1285-1363) was another significant voice in the Orthodox faction of the fourteenth century. He was a well-learned professor of rhetoric and successor to Palamas as Archbishop of Thessalonica. He had full knowledge of Latin, was familiar with the works of Thomas Aquinas and wrote against his views on the Filioque. He criticized the Latin use of the syllogistic arguments⁶¹ of the scholastics and likened its use in vindicating divine realities, to colours being disputed about by blind people (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 138).

He rejected the Filioque as incompatible with numerous accepted principles of theology, believing that one should hold to the traditional distinction between Father and Son in the *pēgaia theotēta*. He assembled many proof-texts to this purpose, maintaining that the Latins has strayed from patristic teaching. Among these was Maximus' *Letter to Marinus* showing that the Latins once held the orthodox position that "the Father is the cause of the Son and the Spirit... if formerly some heard of the Roman fathers say that the Spirit proceeds also from the Son, one must not believe that the Son is the cause, but rather believe that they are expressing his flowing forth through the Son" (FD 5. 6-7). The authenticity of the *Letter* was now being doubted by the Latins because, as Nilus believed, it was contrary to their teaching (FD 5:12). Also, he stated, no decree of an Ecumenical Council had ever defined that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (Candal 1945: 208). Cabasilas thus limited himself to refuting the Filioque, but providing no constructive alternative or further development on the issue.

Thus, as Meyendorff (1974: 94) observes, by the end of the fourteenth century, the

Filioque dispute was not a discussion on words but on the issue of whether the hypostatic existence of the Persons of the Trinity could be reduced to their internal relations, as the post-Augustinian West would admit, or whether the primary Christian experience was that of a Trinity of Persons whose personal existence was irreducible

⁶¹ A *sylogistic argument*, any more than any other *argument*, is the explanation of the fact of the conclusion in terms of the facts of the premises. For no *argument* ever is explanation to begin with. (Peterson 1999: 185)

to their common essence. The question was, therefore, whether tri-personality or consubstantiality was the first and basic content of Christian experience.

5.4 Concluding Remarks

The end of the fourteenth century thus saw Byzantine theologians belonging to three distinct schools of thought regarding the procession of the Spirit.

The unionist position, championed by John Beccus, accepted that *dia tou Yiou*, 'through the Son,' was substantially the same as procession *ek tou Yiou*, or 'from the Son'. They argued that since the former formula had been used by so many of the Greek fathers, it supported the orthodoxy of the Latin position. The number of patristic texts did add a certain credibility to this position yet, regardless of the increase in influence of the so-called Latin-minded and the desperate situation of the Turkish threat, it was not embraced by many Byzantines.

The second school, championed by Photius, attempted to defend the Cappadocian Trinitarian model against the perceived Sabellianism of the Latin model. It argued that the latter had introduced two causes in the divinity and, since the ability to spirate is a unique property of the Father's hypostasis, the Latin model confused the hypostatic properties of Father and Son. It therefore insisted on procession from the Father alone. Photius also argued that the filioque belittled the Spirit, since He alone did not share in the attribute of bringing forth another person.

The third school, a kind of *via media* presented by Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas, while greatly influential today within the Orthodox tradition, seemed to be ahead of its time and, in the fourteenth century at least, was not very popular in ecclesiastical circles. Both Gregories attempted to move beyond the hard-line position of Photius. They both denied any causal role to the Son in the Spirit's hypostatic origin, but at the same time, tried to establish an eternal relationship between them. They rejected the theology of double procession yet recognized that many Fathers had spoken of the Spirit proceeding *dia tou Yiou*. They thus affirmed a possible orthodox interpretation to the filioque as an expression of the Spirit's eternal 'flowing forth' through or even from the Son. The third school presents a remarkable continuity with the Trinitarian thought of Maximus the Confessor and the Cappadocian

tradition as he understood it.⁶² Owing to the controversial theology of Palamas, this third school was never permitted a hearing at the Council of Florence.

The need for a Council between the Latin and Greek Churches had, over time, been voiced by numerous Church leaders and theologians, hoping that this would, on the basis of Scripture and Tradition, provide the necessary solution to the filioque impasse. The Church would then unite and a united Christendom could then turn its attentions towards repelling the Turkish threat. It may, however, be suggested that Popes of this period may not have considered the Greeks worthy of the effort. In fact, contrary to the Greek position, they saw little need for another Ecumenical Council. The situation, however, changed, with the election of Oddo Colonna as Martin V (1417-1431) to the Papal Throne (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 141).

Martin, who agreed in principle to such a Council, died rather suddenly and was succeeded by Gabriele Condulmaro, Cardinal of Siena, as Eugenius IV. Shortly before his demise, Martin had summoned the Council of Basel (1431) which was open to the possibility of an Ecumenical gathering. Being the result of the Western Schism and the Conciliar Movement that ensued, Basel considered itself superior to Eugenius. He therefore closed that Council and called for another at Bologna, which would include the Greeks and the issues related to the East-West Schism. During these disputes between Pope and Council members, both had been negotiating with Constantinople. Emperor John Palaeologus (1425-1448) as well as Patriarch Joseph II (1416-39) were positive in their replies. Eugenius, although previously insisting that a Council be held in Constantinople, eventually decided that it should be held in Ferrara in January of 1438 (Gill 1959: 46-130).

The Greeks arrived at the Council divided into pro- unionists and anti-unionists, without the possibility of a constructive alternative that would also be acceptable to the West. They could thus either accept the union on Latin terms⁶³ or reject it and return home awaiting Constantinople's conquest by the Turks.

⁶² In his *Apologia*, Gregory of Cyprus stated that his distinction between hypostatic existence and eternal manifestation was prefigured by Maximus' use of *ekporeuesthai* and *proïenai* in the *Letter to Marinus*. Palamas too, used *Questiones ad Thalassium* 63 as support for the energetic manifestation of the Spirit through or from the Son. Both Gregories made an attempt to ground themselves in Maximus' understanding of the Trinity, and thus preserved the fullness of the tradition as Maximus had elaborated it centuries earlier.

⁶³ Latin terms dictated the equivalence between the prepositions *dia* and *ek*, and also the Son as cause of the Spirit's hypostasis. Acceptance of this would also imply acceptance of Papal supremacy as above that of the Ecumenical Councils.

CHAPTER SIX

FLORENCE AND BEYOND

6.1 The Council of Ferrara-Florence

The Council was opened in April 1438, in Ferrara. It was only later moved to Florence. The issue of purgatory was addressed and after no satisfactory agreement was reached, was left unresolved. While it was unanimously accepted that the filioque was to be the next issue on the agenda, the opinions of the Orthodox representatives differed regarding how the debate should start. Should it be by regarding the illegitimate *addition* of the Filioque, or by tackling the dogma itself? Most, including Mark of Ephesus and George Gemistus, voted to begin discussion with the *addition* on the grounds that, "It was not rightfully made and ought never to have been made, for it was the original reason for the schism" (Gill 1959: 145). Others, like Bessarion, Metropolitan of Nicaea, George Scholarius and George Amiroutzes were in favour of the initial debates discussing the filioque as *dogma*, hoping that should the filioque as a dogma be discredited, it would then be unnecessary to argue regarding the addition. The Emperor approved what the majority had expressed and Bessarion and the others were thus outvoted (Popoff 1861: 62).

Mark of Ephesus, as representative of the Eastern committee on doctrinal issues, began with addressing the legitimacy of the insertion to the ecumenical Creed. His argument was straightforward: Inserting the Filioque was an audacious move by Rome, ignoring and even opposing the decrees of the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431) forbidding any alteration to the Creed, whether in words or syllables for ever. The Seventh Canon had proclaimed:

The Holy Synod enacted that it was lawful for no one to put forward, that is, to write or compose, another faith than is defined by the Holy Fathers congregated in the Holy Spirit at Nicaea. Those who dared either to compose, or to proffer, or put forward another faith to those wishing to return to the acknowledgement of the truth, whether from paganism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, such, if they were bishops or clerics should be alienated, bishops from the episcopacy and clerics from the clergy, but if laymen they should be under anathema (Gill 1959: 149).

Mark treated the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in use by the Eastern Church as the Nicene, discreetly overlooking that, while the Creed referred to in the Seventh Canon was undoubtedly the Nicene, the Church as a whole had been using not quite that, but rather the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. He attempted to provide reasons for the assertion, stating that those Fathers assembled at Chalcedon for the Fourth Ecumenical council in A.D. 451, decreed that all faithful accept and regard the Nicene and Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creeds to be inseparable. As asserted by Mark, "for the Fathers of this Council, on reading both these Creeds said: This holy Creed is sufficient for the full knowledge of the truth, for it contains in itself the full doctrine on the Father, Son and Holy Spirit" (Popoff 1861: 68).

Mark was well-equipped and prepared to refer to any definitions and other decrees of Ecumenical Councils after Chalcedon, presenting the tradition of the Church regarding the issue. He therefore referred to many relevant quotations sourced from patriarchal letters and epistles, supporting the view that any addition to the Creed would be considered illegitimate. Patriarch John II of Constantinople (518-520) encouraged his faithful to "keep to the holy Creed drawn up by the Council of Nicaea by the grace of the Holy Spirit, approved of by the Council of Constantinople and confirmed by that of Chalcedon" (Gill 1959: 124). Eutychius (552-565; 577-582), assured Pope Vigilius (537-555), that the Eastern Church "always kept and continues to keep the faith explained by the Fathers present at the Four Ecumenical Councils and follows those Councils in everything" (Gill 1959: 129).

At this point, the Latins put forward to the Council, a forgery found in the *Acts* of the Seventh Ecumenical Council that asserted the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son*. Enough evidence exists that the Fathers who met in Nicea in 787, would not have introduced this phrase. Besides, the Roman Church read the original Creed, without the addition, well after the Seventh Ecumenical Council was held. One of the representatives of the Orthodox doctrinal committee, George Gemistus Plethon responded to the Latin claims thus:

If the testimonies of your copy and your historian were just, or at least had been long ago known in the Church of Rome, then no doubt your Thomas Aquinas and the Divines preceding would not have made use of so many arguments to prove the validity of the addition. Instead of this, they might have simply referred to the addition made to the Creed by the Seventh Ecumenical Council. But your Divines are silent about this (Gill 1959: 129).

Mark, Metropolitan of Ephesus, added:

Thus, the Greeks, obeying the decrees of the Councils and the exhortations of the Fathers, and mindful of their oath, cannot admit the addition to the Creed to be a right and lawful one. Nevertheless, they are ready to listen to the proofs brought forward by the Latins to attest the justness of their addition (Popoff 1861: 72).

Defending the Latin position, Andrew of Rhodes and Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini argued that Ephesus' prohibition was referring to the *faith* of Nicaea, not to how it was formulated. The Filioque should thus be seen, not as illegitimate insertion to Creed, but rather as a natural development in the doctrine of the Trinity. "And from the Son" was introduced so as to explain and clarify the preceding "who proceeds from the Father". (Popoff 1861: 73). The insertion was made necessary in combatting heresies like Arianism that made an appearance in Spain in the fifth century. (Gill 1959: 153). Such insertions are necessary explanations in combatting heresy and safeguarding the members of the Church from false teachings (Popoff 1861: 75).

According to Syropoulos, the formal Orthodox response to Andrew on the issue was written by George Scholarius and delivered by Metropolitan Bessarion of Nicaea (Syropoulos in Creyton 1660: 174). Bessarion, however, boasted that he had produced the response in defence of the Orthodox position (PG 161: 341). Regardless, he repeated Mark's argument involving Ephesus' prohibition of additions to and subtractions from the Creed. This prohibition was certainly binding on the Church of Rome too. Ephesus forbade any alteration to the Creed even if this was deemed necessary:

We wish Your Reverence to know that we withhold this permission from every Church and Synod, even Ecumenical and not from the Roman Church alone, since no matter how great is the Roman Church, it is notwithstanding less than an Ecumenical Synod and the Universal Church; and we withhold it from the whole Church, much more so then, from the Roman Church do we withhold it. But we

withhold it not as by ourselves, but we consider that this has been forbidden by the decrees of the Fathers (quoted in Gill 1959: 155).

For Bessarion, the Fathers of the Council refused the Church Catholic possibility of altering the Universal Creed. How is it possible that an individual Church could now unilaterally take the right upon herself? Cesarini took up the defence of the addition. He too, like Andrew, argued that it was added, not as some new teaching, different to the faith of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, but rather as an explanation, a clarification of the Spirit's procession. The Seventh Canon of the Ephesus Council, he repeated, concerned a change in the *meaning* of the Creed, not the wording. It therefore applied to the formulation of heterodox Creeds (Gill 1959: 158).

In support of his argument, he referred to the personal confession of faith composed by Patriarch Tarasius of Constantinople (784-806), accepted as orthodox although not worded exactly in the same way as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. Tarasius had sent this, on his election, to Hadrian I (772-795) mentioning the Holy Spirit as "proceeding from the Father by or through (*dia*), the Son" (Mansi: 13, 760). The *Acts* of the second Council of Nicea, held in 787, mention the reading of Tarasius' confession and its unanimous acceptance as orthodox by all assembled there. This, for Cesarini, meant that creeds differing from the original form are acceptable as long as they are orthodox. The prohibition to 'altering' the creed referred to altering the faith expressed therein, making it heterodox and unorthodox. Ephesus, he argued, did not intend to tie the Church's hands forever.

This argument influenced and even convinced a number of members of the Eastern delegation, including Bessarion, that the argument over the addition to the Creed was worthless. Mark disagreed and responded that Ephesus was not referring to personal confessions of individuals, as in the case of Tarasius. It was referring to the Universal Creed in use by the Church in the Sacraments (Gill 1959: 161). The confession of faith of Tarasius was a private one, insisted Mark:

The addition of a word seems to you a small matter and of no great consequence. So then to remove it would cost you little or nothing; indeed, it would be of the greatest profit, for it would bind together all Christians. But what was done was in truth a big matter and of the greatest consequence, so that we are not at fault in making a great consequence of it. It was added in the exercise of mercy; in the exercise of mercy remove it again so that you may receive to your bosoms brethren torn apart who value fraternal love so highly (quoted in Gill 1959: 216).

Cesarini, in closing the session, proposed the following:

Let us, holy Father [Mark] examine the very dogma itself, and if the addition to the Creed proves to be contrary to the Orthodox doctrine, then, we shall drop the subject and erase it from the Creed. If, on the contrary, it shall be proved that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, then we must conclude that the addition is a correct one, and we must retain it in the Creed (Syropoulos 1660. vii, 22).

It was, however, becoming apparent that the Orthodox were not willing to approve of the addition to the Creed. A number started to seriously doubt whether union was possible and resigned themselves to leaving for Constantinople unsuccessful. The Emperor, though, was adamant. He desperately needed the reconciliation and union and was not prepared to see his efforts failing (Popoff 1861: 85).

6.2 The Council continues in Florence

Pope Eugenius IV now transferred the Council to Florence. According to Joseph Gill this transfer happened for two reasons: a) Ferrara had been hit by the plague and it was dangerous to continue there; and b) Feeding the delegates and their entourages became difficult in an area that had been ravaged by war. A different reason is given by Silvester Syropoulos, who mentions that two months had elapsed since the end of the plague (Syropoulos 1660 vii, 14). According to Syropoulos, the Council was purposefully transferred in order to prevent the Greeks impulsively packing-up and returning to return to Constantinople. Being further from the sea, the move to Florence was intended to discourage this from happening. The plague had taken its toll on many Italians and had not left the Greeks untouched. Dionysius of Sardis and the entire entourage of Isidore of Kiev were among its victims. The Orthodox party begrudgingly agreed to the move on condition that four months be the maximum duration of their stay (Gill 1959: 217).

At Florence, Eugenius was determined that proceedings should be hastened. The first session at Florence opened on February 26, 1439. The two parties had decided to restrict the debates to forty members per side. For the next nine sessions, the main topic of discussion was the Filioque' as a doctrine, not an addition. The spokesman for the Greek side was Mark of Ephesus, while for the Latin side, it was the Dominican Provincial of Lombardy, Giovanni Montenero. Both made sincere efforts to present the positions of their

respective Church on the issue at hand. Soon, however, difficulties began to emerge, chief among which was the disagreement of patristic texts they used in supporting their positions (Siecinski 2010: 157).

Since this dissertation deals specifically with the *Byzantine* synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology we will not explore at length the *Latin* arguments supporting the Filioque. I shall be looking at the issues raised by the Orthodox delegation and Mark of Ephesus specifically.

Mark's views on the Filioque were in accord with the patristic tradition of the Greek East which firstly viewed God subsisting as a Trinity of Persons within the divine essence, and then as essentially one God. (*Acta Graeca*: 62). Also according to this tradition, the Father provides the principle of unity within the Trinity without compromising the equality of the Three.

He thus began his argument with the statement that God the beginningless Father (*ho anaxos*), is not the Son nor is He the Holy Spirit. In like manner, the begotten Son is not the Father nor the Holy Spirit. By extension, the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son (PG 161, 28). The relations are not relations of opposition between the Persons, but of diversity. (PG 161: 189-193). The Father's hypostasis is the origin of the hypostases of the Son and the Spirit, and is thus, according to Metaxas (1988: 155) "the eternal source of all being and action in the internal life of the Trinity" (PG 161: 217). "The Father is the unique 'cause' and the Son 'caused'... the 'cause' and the 'caused' cannot be put together and make one principle and cause" (Orfanos in Vischer 1981: 35), since, as already mentioned, "The Father cannot be Father and Son or the Son, Son and Father" (PG 161: 36). Labels and understandings of 'cause' and 'caused', point to an opposition, yet for Latin theology, particularly the Thomist school of thought, it is the opposition of relations that distinguishes the Persons, not their unity (Orfanos in Vischer 1981: 36). To support this further, Mark quotes Basil of Caesarea writing to Gregory of Nyssa:

Thus, whereas the Holy Spirit, from whom all good gifts are distributed among created beings, depends upon the Son, with whom He is inseparably received, and has His existence from the Father, as from the cause from which He proceeds, then in this He has a distinguished attribute of His difference in Person, namely, that He is known by the Son and with Him and is from the Father (PG 161: 100-101).

Mark continued by asserting

The Persons of the Holy Trinity, of necessity, exist in some order between themselves. The only Son, who shines forth after the fashion of the Only-Begotten, from the uncreated Light, must be placed after that very Light; and therefore the Holy Spirit must be reckoned third, in order that he should not be taken for the Son, when not distinguished from him in order (PG 161: 100).

During the fifth session Montenero asked Mark: "Is this Holy Spirit which God poured richly upon us through Jesus Christ a creature?" (Gill 1959: 205). Montenero asserted that only two things exist in creation, the Creator and the created, and that the Holy Spirit is Creator but his energies are created. He received no reply from Mark even when the question was repeated leading the writer of the *Acta Graeca* to erroneously conclude that he had no answer. Mark's silence was for a reason. What Montenero asserted regarding the Spirit's energies being creatures, or created, clashed with the outcome of the Synod of Constantinople in 1351. This Synod had decreed that God's energies are uncreated and distinct from the divine essence. To answer Montenero, Mark would necessarily raise the subject of the distinguishing between the divine essence and the energies, an issue also disputed between East and West. Raising this issue had been forbidden by the Emperor who did not want to complicate things further. The Emperor intervened and called for this discussion to cease. (*Acta Graeca*. 1959: 345-46).

Most of the sixth session involved Mark showing that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. He reminded those present that the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council, those that completed the Creed and gave it its authority, were those same Fathers that defined not that the Spirit, "proceeds from the Father and the Son", but that He "proceeds from the Father, and is together worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son" (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 157). As consubstantial with the Father and the Son, the Spirit has equal honour with them. If this same Council considered the Spirit to proceed from the Father and the Son, it would have stated regarding the Spirit as One "Who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who with Father and Son is together worshipped and glorified."

The Fathers excluded the Son as a cause of the procession. He was mentioned, and then only in the second place, asserting how He is equal of honour and of the same essence. One can therefore surmise that they did not consider the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Son as well (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 157). No subsequent Council of the Universal Church

came up with a new expression to the formulation. No such Council added the filioque clause, or anything else for that matter, to the Greek text (Siecienski 2010: 159).

Gregory of Nazianzus was quite explicit when he said that: "Everything the Father has belongs to the Son, with the exception of causality" (Acta Graeca 1959: 377). If this distinction is made between the Son and the Father with regard to cause, the Son is neither Father nor the cause of the Spirit's procession. His 'coming into being' is through generation, while the Spirit's is through procession. This distinguishes both from the Father as cause as well as from one-another. Thus, Mark continued, "while the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, the two are really distinct both by their constitution and by their mode of being" (Metaxas-Mariatos 1988: 157). This, according to Mark, is what Cyril of Alexandria meant saying "though the Spirit proceeds from the Father, still He is not alien to the Son, for the Son has everything jointly with the Father" (Acta Graeca 1959: 381).

Mark concluded thus:

For all these reasons we showed ourselves that we agree with the Holy Scriptures and with the Fathers and Teachers, and that we have neither changed nor falsified, not added or removed or introduced any innovations in the divine dogmas which were given from above. We beseech once more your love and honour to agree with us and the Holy Fathers, and not to recite in the Churches or accept anything beyond what they have said but to be satisfied with them alone, so that by saying and thinking the same, with one voice and one heart, we may together glorify the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit to whom all glory and worship is due to the ages of ages (Acta Graeca 1959: 345-46).

This was his final speech. Mark was not present at the final two sessions of the Council. Syropoulos surmises that Mark had resigned himself to the fruitlessness of the discussions and the inflexible stance and attitude of the Latins. It is possible that because of his own inflexibility, the Emperor had actually encouraged him to be absent (Syropoulos, VIII, 394). From his final speech, it is evident that Mark remained true to his original position, maintaining that the addition was not compatible with Scripture or the Councils. Union necessitated the removal of the Filioque by the Latins. The

words of the Western Fathers and Doctors, which attribute to the Son the cause of the Spirit, I never recognise (for they have never been translated into our tongue nor

approved by the Ecumenical Councils), nor do I admit them, presuming that they are corrupt and interpolated (Gill 1959: 274).

Montenero in turn, repeated the Latin Church's adherence to the definition of the Council of Lyon, accepting that the Spirit has only one principle and cause. Lyon had also pronounced the anathema on all who accepted there were two principles and two causes. His assertion provoked no reaction from the Eastern hierarchs, indicating to Syropoulos that they were, in fact, substantially ignorant of Orthodox doctrine. He expressed his indignation in a letter to the Patriarch:

I know the prelates and, with one or two exceptions, the rest - what are they worth? Or do you bid me follow the one who said: 'I affirm the Filioque provided that the Holy Trinity be preserved unharmed,' and, being interrogated three times, three times he repeated the same unchanged and made everybody laugh, having fallen into opposition with his chorus leader. No. I said, it is not for me to follow prelates whose theology is of that standard (Syropoulos 1660. viii, 394).

Almost a century before this, Gregory Palamas, dealing with Barlaam making a similar statement, wrote: "As long as the Latins say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son or from both, but not only from the Father, then the Holy Spirit's principle of deity cannot be one" (Palamas in Bobrinskoy 1962: 209).

The Emperor, realising that no positive outcome was to come from the debates between Montenero and Mark, called a meeting of the Greeks, seeking to find alternative possibilities for reconciliation. It was then that the Eastern hierarchs and delegates studied a letter written by Maximus the Confessor to Marinus which said:

Adducing the testimony of the Roman Fathers and of Cyril of Alexandria, the Romans do not affirm that the Son is the cause of the Spirit, for they know that the cause of the Son and of the Spirit is the Father of One by birth, and of the other by procession; but only show that the Spirit is sent through the Son, and thereby express the affinity and the indifference of their essence (PG 90: 672).

Based on this it was concluded by some that expressions found in the Greek patristic texts, such as through (*dia*) the Son, meant the same as the Latin from (*ek*) the Son and were interchangeable. Of course, the Latin themselves had never thought this to be the case (PG 141:25). This was not the first time this view was expressed among the Greeks. Beccus

taught that *ek* and *dia* had equal meaning and were interchangeable. Gregory of Cyprus, in his *Tomus*, vehemently denied that the Holy Spirit could exist 'through' or 'from' the Son (PG 142: 236). He bravely introduced the term 'the eternal manifestation' reconciling with Orthodox doctrine, what John Damascene had written regarding the Father being the "projector of the manifesting Spirit through the Word" (PG 94: 848).

Gregory's theology and his new term had caused such a reaction among the conservative factions that he was forced to resign as Patriarch. His explanation of 'through the Son' would not have assisted much in discussing the Filioque issue at the Council. Syropoulos mentions how Anthony of Heraclea attempted to present the *Tomus* during the discussions the Greeks were having among themselves. Gregory Mammas, the Emperor's confessor attacked him fiercely, as did other pro-unionists (Syropoulos 1660. ix, 9. 442-44).

Bessarion, in his *Oratio Dogmatica*, which he delivered to the Orthodox hierarchs, argued that since it was the same Holy Spirit that inspired all Fathers, their teachings, although different the way they are expressed, should essentially agree. Yet, as far back as the ninth century, Patriarch Photius of Constantinople had cautioned "one must be very careful in handling the texts of the Fathers. If ten or twenty Fathers said that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, many innumerable hundreds did not" (PG 102: 809).

In his speech, Bessarion asserted that the schism was caused because the Latins, without consulting their sister Churches, unilaterally added to the Creed. (PG 161: 548). Here he was mistaken. While the Eastern Churches were certainly offended at the unilateral move of the Western Church, they rejected the addition considering it heretical. He tried to bridge the differences between the two sides by stating, "The Holy Eastern Fathers say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and from the Father through the Son. What then are we saying? Are the two statements mutually exclusive? God forbid! For to 'proceed from the Father' is neither against nor contrary to the 'proceed from the Father and the Son'" (PG 161: 555). His attempt was of course, contrary to Orthodox tradition. He then, rather bluntly, added what he thought would add weight to the severity of the situation and remind his fellow hierarchs of the reason they were there: "The only refuge from the dangers left to us is the Latins and the union with them" (PG 161: 609). In closing, he made an urgent appeal to his compatriots to agree to the union, or suffer the dire consequences of being left to fight the Turks alone (PG 161: 611-12). Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Mytilene, sided with Bessarion, not objecting to the Filioque and urging his compatriots to agree to the union. He saw both Creeds, the original Creed and the interpolated Creed, as saying essentially the same thing. He believed both to be correct (Acta Graeca 405-6).

Mark could not, however, leave Bessarion's arguments unchallenged. He firmly believed they were a misrepresentation of the teaching of the Fathers regarding the issue:

The Greek Fathers, in referring to the procession of the Holy Spirit never went as far as saying that he proceeds 'from the Son' or 'through the Father.' This proves that the two prepositions, *ek* and *dia* cannot be regarded as interchangeable. The 'through the Son' procession of the Holy Spirit, Mark went on to say, does not refer to his origin, but rather to his external procession, which is simultaneous with the begetting of the Son from, the Father as the unique source of Godhead (Dositheus II 1985: 598).

The Orthodox eventually capitulated to the Latin demands. When it came to the vote, thirteen accepted the Filioque and union. Five opposed it (Syropoulos, IX, 454). These five were Dositheus of Monembasia, Sophronius of Anchialus, Anthony of Heraclea, Dorotheus of Trebizond and Mark of Ephesus. The Abbots, also against the union, were kept from voting (Gill 1959: 262). It was at this crucial time, June 10, 1439, that the Orthodox lost their elderly and frail Patriarch, Joseph II. (Syropoulos, IX, 16). It was asserted that the Patriarch left a last will and testament, which read:

Joseph by God's grace Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch. Since I am come to the end of my life and shall soon have to pay the debt common to all, by God's grace I write openly and sign my profession for my children. Everything, therefore, that the Catholic and Apostolic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ of the elder Rome understands and teaches, I too understand and I declare myself as submitting in common on these points; Further the most blessed Father of Fathers and supreme Pontiff and Vicar of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Pope of elder Rome. I confess for the security of all. Further, (I confess) the Purgatory of souls. In assurance of which is signed on 9 June 1439 in the second indiction (*Acta Graeca* 444-445).

The authenticity of the Patriarch's last will is widely doubted within the Eastern Church. The Council participants did not know of its existence, Syropoulos does not refer to it at all (Syropoulos, IX, 16); while later, Gennadius rejects the Council being 'ecumenical' arguing that Patriarch was dead before anyone signed.

On Sunday, July 5, 1439, union was signed. Syropoulos mentions that many of the Eastern delegates signed reluctantly, possibly even because they feared the Emperor (Syropoulos, X, 13, 492-94). The decree was signed by the Emperor, John VIII and the hierarchs excluding two, Mark of Ephesus and Isaias, the Metropolitan of Stavroupolis. The two Georgian representatives managed to leave before being requested to sign (Syropoulos, X 12,490-492). The Council had achieved its aim and the representatives of the Chalcedonian Churches⁶⁴ departed for their homes.

It is possible to attribute the union of the two Churches at Florence to Bessarion's masterful scholarship and the persistence of Isidore of Kiev. The challenge was now, however, to confirm the acceptance of the Council in the East. To facilitate this, Isidore was made a Cardinal and sent back to Russia. There he found a hostile welcome and a refusal to accept the decrees of the union. No better headway was made in Constantinople. Cardinal Isidore went there as papal legate to facilitate the desired acceptance of the union, but his efforts were in vain, as the City soon fell to the Turks (Catholic Encyclopaedia 1996).

The subsequent stance of the three Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs regarding the union with Rome confirmed the general view that the Orthodox delegation at Florence had not acted in accord with biblical teaching and the patristic tradition of the East. In April of 1443, Philotheus of Alexandria (1437-1459), Dorotheus of Antioch (1436-1454) and Joachim of Jerusalem (1431-1450), held council, condemning the Union of Florence⁶⁵. According to Archbishop Chrysostom I of Athens (1923-1938): "As is well-known, this synod did actually meet, but the documents about it that are preserved are not genuine" (Papadopoulos 1937: 149).

The Council of Ferrara-Florence failed to solve the Filioque impasse. Did it, however, provide anything of value *theologically*? Did it contribute anything to the search for a synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in Byzantine theology? In order to explore this, we have to look once again, at the protagonists of the Greek delegation, unionists and non-unionists, and their positions.

6.3 The Significant Greek Theologians of the Fifteenth Century

⁶⁴ The union with the Armenians and the Copts also had limited appeal among the majority of clergy and faithful.

⁶⁵ In *Orientalium Documenta Minora*. (Rome, 1953), doc. 45.

In this section, we will be looking specifically at the Greek churchmen and theologians associated with the Council of Florence and its aftermath. Bessarion representing the unionist position, while Mark of Ephesus and the two lay *archontes* Gemistus Plethon and George Scholarius, represent three rather different forms of opposition to the Union. These theologians, in a sense, refined their thought during the Council of Florence and even after, in one case even resulting in a radical change in outlook. The Council failed in its aims and did not contribute much to the research problem. It is, however, worth exploring whether any of these theologians provided anything of value to the issue.

6.3.1 Bessarion of Nicea

Bessarion took part in the Council as Metropolitan of Nicea and was an ardent proponent of the Union. His works written during this time and following the union, show his evolving attitude towards the Filioque issue and the union in general. Among these are the *Oratio Dogmatica de unione* (PG 161: 543-612); the *De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Palamam pro Becco* (PG 161: 243-310) and *De Spiritus Sancti processione ad Alexium Lascarin Philanthropinum* (Candal: 1961).

Within these we see Bessarion sharing with his Church the traditional approach to matters concerning the Trinity. Philosophy is the handmaid of theology. Revelation has primacy over metaphysical speculation, while both are viewed through the apophatic approach. Matters of faith are not adequately expressed through discursive reasoning. Words and concepts cannot describe divinity. This apophatic approach allowed Bessarion to harmonise the two teachings on the procession of the Spirit (Hankins 1990: 1, 221-6).

Prior to Bessarion, Cabasilas had made use of this approach in his refutation of the Latin doctrine. He had stressed that God's true nature could not be grasped by anyone and consequently, the modes of generation and procession are unknowable. While Cabasilas aimed at refuting the Latin position, Bessarion argued differently. He used the apophatic approach of the Eastern Fathers to assert that ultimately the Holy Trinity was a mystery. All knowledge of the Trinity is based on revelation and syllogisms are inadequate to express it. Having established the priority of revelation, he then focused his attention to the metaphysical demonstration.

Bessarion asserted that many Fathers had made use of the preposition "through" in order to illustrate a 'mediating cause'. When it comes to the Holy Spirit, this cause is not imperfect, not reliant on space and time. If the Father and the Son share the same, single productive ability, the Holy Spirit could be said to proceed from both. The examples from the Fathers he

provided, were intended to illustrate the various expressions used by them conveying the same meaning.⁶⁶

Using the apophatic approach, he turned his attention to the relations of origin which distinguish the names within the Trinity.⁶⁷ After having established the consubstantiality of the Persons in the manner of the Cappadocian Fathers, he refers to Gregory of Nazianzus who in *Orations* 31.9, equated 'manifestation' with 'mutual relationship' (Pg. 36.141). He expands on this by using what Pseudo-Dionysius had said in *Divine Names* (II.2) that in God there were both unities and distinctions (*Oration* VI.42.15-16).⁶⁸ Dionysius had questioned the validity of essential terms used for the Trinity, maintaining that everything regarding the Incarnation was beyond reason and explanation (PG.3: 648). Bessarion applied this to the attempts of both East and West to explain the Trinity by producing extensive quotations from the Fathers, attempting to show that both doctrines expressed the one truth in two different ways. Bessarion appealed "to Holy Tradition, referring to Scripture, to the Fathers, the Ecumenical Councils and the apophatic theology which permeates all theological considerations in that tradition" (Martin 2000: 128).

Bessarion arrived at the Council armed with both the Patristic tradition of the East as well as the heritage of the classical world. He had an admiration for western scholarship and was open to cultural and ecclesiastical integration. He found in the apophatic tradition of the Orthodox Church, a means of addressing the different views on the procession. He accepted that the filioque addition to the Creed was one of necessity at the time.⁶⁹ He was particularly disappointed to see the union fail and dreams of cultural and spiritual reintegration of Christendom suffer serious failures. For his own efforts, he was awarded a Cardinal's cap by Rome and, even after Constantinople fell to the Turks, spent his efforts defending his position at the Council and calling for another crusade to free his homeland.

6.3.2 Mark of Ephesus

⁶⁶ These are contained in *Oratio* VI, 27-39 and were based on the florilegia of quotations from Beccus.

⁶⁷ Regarding this aspect as it relates to the Trinity, in his *Mystical Theology*, Lossky stated: "It is above all a negation, showing us that the Father is neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit; that the Son is neither the Father nor the Spirit; that the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son... understood apophatically, the relation of origin describes the difference but nevertheless does not indicate the manner of the divine processions" (1997: 54-5)

⁶⁸ Dionysius had stated that the Bible refers to God as sometimes having distinctions, whereas other times not. "All instances of unity or differentiation are a mystery". The mind is not capable of comprehending them and they are known only through revelation (PG. 3: 645).

⁶⁹ To the Greeks the addition had been made unilaterally and uncanonically. Even if the Filioque was found to be sound doctrine, it was felt that it should be removed from the Creed and rather kept as a decree.

Mark, like Photius and Palamas, are largely victims of misunderstanding and misrepresentation in the West (Fortesque 1911: 208-220). Mark's approach to the Council and to union was not clouded by personal or other bias. His beliefs were not compromised by political necessity and he remained true to what he considered to be the authentic and original patristic Tradition. Mark's labours at the Council and what ensued after, his loyalty to the Eastern Tradition and his unwillingness to consider compromising, created for those in the West the impression of a conservative and narrow-minded churchman, unable to see the merits of his opponents and their views. The Eastern Church, not surprisingly, honours him and regards him as one of the pillars of Orthodoxy. Mark's work, *The Encyclical Letter of Saint Mark of Ephesus 1440-41*, is considered by Ware to be one of the "chief Orthodox doctrinal statements since 787" (Ware 2015: 197).

Not surprisingly, we find Mark insisting that the Holy Spirit's hypostatic existence is derived solely from the Father. Adding 'from the Son', even if defined as by one spiration and as from one principle and cause, is unacceptable to him. This would, in essence, create two principles and confuse the Persons (C.S. 24:393). The Father is always the unique cause. This is the unique attribute of the Father. The Son is never a cause. This would make Him *aition-aitiaton*, 'caused' and 'cause', which is nonsensical (C.S. 34:402-3). That which is cause and that which is caused cannot together constitute one principle. Cause and caused imply logical opposition, and opposition of relations produces distinction, not unity.

The property of being cause or principle is a hypostatic one. Thus, if the Son is to be regarded as a principle, *diarchy*⁷⁰ cannot be excluded. That which owes its being to two, cannot be considered as coming from one (C.S.1:370). The same would apply even if He were to proceed *from* the Father, but *through* the Son. Here he draws an analogy with the human being. Everything that may proceed from someone through someone else, has two causes of his being. Humans, since they come into being 'from man' and 'through woman', have two principles and causes. If the Son is in any way a principle of the Holy Spirit, *diarchy* cannot be avoided.

The fact that the Trinity acted as one principle in creating the world, without losing their hypostatic individualities, does not imply that, in the procession of the Holy Spirit, Father and Son are one principle. According to Mark, the *triadikē aitia*, the cause of creation, and the *patrikē aitia*, the principle of divinity, are two different things and are not to be confused or read into one-another. With reference to the creation, all three Persons act as one energy, power and will. Yet, the procession of the Holy Spirit is a sole property of the Father's

⁷⁰ Having two sources or causes.

hypostasis. To imply otherwise, would be to demote the Holy Spirit to the created order (Vischer 1981: 36).

The Council of Florence accepted that 'ek' and 'dia' are synonymous prepositions when referring to the manner of the Spirit's procession. The filioque could thus be seen, not as something new, but as expressing the teachings of both East and West, albeit in differing ways. Mark argued that these prepositions bear the same meaning in the Greek Fathers only when referring to creation, or even to the Spirit's energetic manifestation, not its manner of existence (Vischer 1981:38). Certain Greek Fathers, Mark admits, have referred to the Spirit's procession 'from the Father through the Son'. They were, Mark asserts, referring not to its mode of existence, but its consubstantiality with the Father and the Son (C.S. 10:381).

Also, certain Fathers have suggested that 'from the Son' does not refer to the Spirit's origin. It refers rather, to the procession from the Father, simultaneous with the begetting of the Son. Gregory of Nyssa clarified this as 'through' meaning not 'from' but rather 'with' or 'together' (C.S. 38: 406-7). Besides, do the Greek Fathers ever say that the Spirit proceeds 'through' the Father or 'from' the Son? These two prepositions are thus not synonymous and interchangeable. When they do use 'through the Son', it is in reference to the energetic manifestation of the Spirit and not the hypostatic (C.S. 20-1: 389-391). Also, it is never used alone. It is always used connected to the Father's participation. Thus 'from the Son' does not refer to the cause. It refers rather, to the manner through which the Spirit is manifested or given (Vischer 1981:38).

The Trinity has no ontological order. Any 'order' of enumeration within the Trinity does not correspond to their origin. Being third after Father and Son, does not mean deriving His being from them. The Holy Trinity is above ordering (C.S.6: 377). The Divine Persons, according to Gregory of Nazianzus, are pronumerated and connumerated and subnumerated (*Oratio 34*, 15, PG 36: 243). Basil of Caesarea says, "even if the Holy Spirit is third in dignity and order, why need He be third also in nature?" (*A.E.* 3.1) This is to emphasise the equality in nature rather than the order of Persons. Even in the baptismal formula things are enumerated because they are mentioned one after another. The Father is mentioned first, because as cause He has logical priority. The Son, as caused, is mentioned second. The Spirit, as 'completion' of the Trinity is mentioned third (C.S. 6: 376-7). Even if we were to accept a certain 'order' within the Trinity, this would by no means justify the Filioque. Any attempt to see it in this light introduces into the Trinity subnumerations and degradations which lead to the subordination of the hypostases (C.S. 43: 409)

Mark also criticised Aquinas' theory that opposite relations of origin distinguish the Persons. According to this, only

“Opposite relations exist between Father and Son as well as between Father and Holy Spirit because paternity and procession produce opposite relations and consequent distinctions. But as the Holy Spirit cannot be really distinct of 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 Son” (Vischer 1981: 40).

According to this view, the Son is a necessary origin of the Spirit and the Filioque is this justified (C.S.43:409). Mark, however, maintains that the hypostatic distinction is based, not on opposite relations, but on different modes of being stemming from the Father. The Son’s mode of being is by generation, the Spirit’s is by procession. These acts distinguish them from their origin and cause and from among themselves.

Mark also tackles the difference between the hypostatic procession of the Spirit, and His energetic manifestation. The Spirit’s mission, a common act of the three Persons, refers to the *ad extra* activities of the Spirit and not to its hypostatic properties. John 16: 7 is a case in point. It refers to the Spirit’s grace, power and manifestation, rather than to its hypostatic procession (C.S. 4: 375). Christ, after the resurrection did not give His disciples the essence or the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit. He gave them its energy. At Pentecost, what was bestowed was the Spirit’s energy, “from the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit” (C.S. 4: 375-6). The energy is common to all three Persons. Thus, one again, the issue of the distinction between *ousia* and *energeia* is important in addressing the procession of the Holy Spirit. Yet, discussion on this was limited due to imperial censorship on the issue.

6.3.3 Gemistus Plethon

“When it comes to philosophy, Byzantium can hardly claim a prize for distinction. The enigmatic Gemistus Plethon is one glaring exception and interest in his work has never been greater” (Siniossoglou: 2015). George Gemistus (c. 1355/1360 – 1452/1454), later called Plethon, was one of the most eminent philosophers of late Byzantium, a pioneer of the revival of Greek philosophy in Western Europe and thus a forerunner of the Italian Renaissance.

Much has been written regarding Plethon’s religious beliefs with many concluding that he was a Neoplatonist or pagan⁷¹, while others held that he was an Orthodox Christian. Hladky sees Plethon’s position at Florence and in his public writings as evidence that he “was a firm

⁷¹ Plethon’s paganism is attested to by both Christians and Hellenists who were his contemporaries and familiar with his works. Among these are Demetrius Kabakes, Michael Apostoles, George Scholarius and Matthew Kamariotes.

Christian” (2014: 280). Also, when Plethon was pressured, “he declared himself publicly an Orthodox Christian, and we should accept and respect this as the most plausible statement about his faith” (2014: 285). Siniossoglou is more guarded on the issue, regarding Plethon’s response as one of convenience and necessity (Siniossoglou: 2015). He believes that in opposing union, he was expressing the sentiments of the majority of the populace in Byzantium and not providing proof of the sincerity or rigidity of his Orthodoxy.

Gemistus was asked to defend his position regarding the Council. To begin with, he felt that the union was not based on conviction but on necessity. He criticised his compatriots for thinking it would be in the interests of the Empire and not rather leaving things to God’s providence. Gemistus was a “convinced determinist” and could not accept that “either Western help or faithfulness to Orthodoxy could do anything to change the predetermined fate of the Hellenes” (Meyendorff 1999:113). He recognised that the Latin position regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son was an attempt of ensuring consubstantiality of Father and Son. The Son’s participation in the procession of the Spirit was seen as necessary, since a different potentiality of the Son would also imply a different essence. It is this axiom, compatible with ‘Hellenic’ or pagan theology but incompatible with the tradition of the Church, that he criticised harshly.

Hellenic theology posits one God above all. This God is one and indivisible whereas his children are many. These children are diverse, each occupying a different level in the hierarchy and a different place in the cosmos. None are equal or similar to the father since their essences are lower in divinity. Yet they too are ‘gods’ since Hellenic belief does not distinguish between activity and essence. They are different because their essences are lower in divinity. The greatest difference in potentialities “may be found between something that exists itself through itself, and the one that exists through something different” (Hladky 2014:241). If this axiom were to be applied to Trinitarian theology, it would imply that the first two Persons have different essences. The Father has the potentiality to be himself through himself, but the Son is himself through the Father.

Gemistus recognises the existence of one essence of the Father, son and Holy Spirit but three Persons, distinguished by their individual properties – *idiotētes*. While some features are held in common (essence, nature etc.), others are not, but may belong to one or even two of the Persons alone. Among these is that of ‘having been caused’ which is common to the Son and the Spirit but not the Father. Subsequently, Gemistus posits an axiom which he finds compatible with Church Tradition. Nothing can produce itself and that which is being produced is different to the producer. What is being caused is different from what has caused it. The deduction is then that the Spirit cannot be produced by the common divine

essence, but by one or even two of the other Persons. Being produced by the essence would mean that the Spirit would also produce Himself, otherwise He would have a different essence to that of the other Two. Also, if the Spirit was produced by Father and Son, the distinction of Persons would fall away and we would have a Holy Dyad. Likewise, if the Father was incapable of producing the Spirit and required the assistance of the Son, or if He were produced by the Son acting as a by-cause to the main production by the Father, the integrity of the Spirit would be harmed and this would result in a Tetrad. The Spirit would have something different from the Father to what it had from the Son.

Bessarion, of course, rejects this axiom. According to Hladky, (2014: 244) he claims that “what might be attributed to one divine Person in the Trinity must be indeed common also to the other two, but only under the condition that it is not in contradiction with some of their individual properties.” According to Bessarion, this should rather be restated as “what has the same essence, has indeed the same potentiality too, unless this potentiality contains something which is in contradiction with the individual property of one of them”, meaning the Persons.

Gemistus has been accused of trying to win favour with the anti-Unionists and having no real interest in the matter himself. Scholarius seemed to think that Gemistus’ treatise was an attempt to dispel suspicions regarding his pagan leanings (Woodhouse 1986: 278-82)). If this, however, had been the case, he would not have made mention of Hellenic theology in his treatise at all. It is possible, regardless of his alleged paganism that he sincerely wished to contribute to the discussion on the procession. If we look at Syropoulos’ account of Gemistus’ contribution to the Council, albeit small in comparison to other protagonists, his treatise on the procession and his later *Reply to Scholarius*, we would be justified in believing that we are dealing with someone who has genuine religious motives. Regardless, his opinion and contribution is worthy of note.

6.3.4 Gennadius Scholarius

Scholarius was present at the Council as the layman George. His initial pro-unionist stance is attributed to his interest in protecting the political integrity and security of what was left of the Empire. Union with the Roman Church was, after all, the prerequisite to any military assistance from the West. He therefore advocated policies that were directed by the Emperor. His change to an anti-unionist position can be explained by his gradual realisation of the political reality of the time (Penel 2014: 274).

While at Florence, Scholarius was charged to compose a statement of faith to present to the Latins. Syropoulos records it as:

We Greeks confess and believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds (*ekporeuesthai*) from the Father, is proper to the Father and the Son and gushes forth (*anabluzein*) from him, and we affirm and believe that he flows forth (*procheisthai*) substantially from both, namely from the Father through the Son.

Both Greeks and Latins found it vague and inadequate. That may, of course, have been his intention, as well as that of trying to subtly introduce the views of the 'third school' of Trinitarian thought in Byzantium, that of Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas.

Scholarius succeeded Mark of Ephesus as champion of the position against the Union. His premier tracts and anti-Latin works are "*On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*" and his "*Neophron*", the response to the Unionist Patriarch Gregory Mammias'. His theology regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit is in the tradition of Mark's, not presenting much innovation or further development.

6.4 Concluding Remarks

Concluding this chapter, did the Council of Florence and the theologians of the fifteenth century provide anything new with regard to our study? The answer, unfortunately, is a negative one. Florence did provide an opportunity that was not correctly utilised. While subtly alluded to by the Greek spokesmen, they were expressly forbidden by the Emperor to refer to the essence-energies doctrine for fear it would create further controversy. Modern scholars consider that an open discussion of the Palamite doctrine might have presented the solution to the procession issue⁷². It would have given the *Filioque* an interpretation acceptable to the Orthodox, while addressing "the legitimate Western concern about the ultimate relation of Son and Spirit without confusing the persons, i.e. without making the worship of God the Trinity into an impersonal monotheism" (Erickson 1991: 164-5).

⁷² Refer to the articles in *Spirit of God*, (ed. Vischer), particularly those by D. Staniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and his relation to the Son, as the basis of our deification and adoption," (174-86), and B. Bobrinsky, "The Filioque yesterday and today,"(133-48), including references to earlier discussions by Lossky and Meyendorff.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The purpose in undertaking this research was dual. Firstly, it was in response to the claims of both Catholic and Orthodox theologians that the Orthodox Church has not adequately dealt with the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

The Latin filioque was a well-intended attempt to solve one of the deepest mysteries of the Christian faith. Revelation and Tradition have sufficiently identified the relationship between the Father and the Son, and the Father and the Holy Spirit. To the former it gave the term 'begetting'. To the latter 'proceeding' or 'spirating'. These terms tell us nothing more than that the Holy Trinity is a communion of Persons, a communion that affirms oneness while at the same time upholds otherness, and that the source of the communal relations is the Person of the Father whom the Creed identifies as the *One God*.

Catholic theology, traditionally paying greater attention to definition and clarity than its Orthodox partner, sensed early on that a third relation, the one between the Son and the Holy Spirit, remained unidentified. Its answer to this ambiguity was to duplicate the relation, that of 'procession', and apply it to the Son and the Holy Spirit. In this it relied on Scriptural testimony and taking the way in which the Holy Trinity was revealed to us in the plan of salvation as the model for the Trinity's inner life (Manoussakis 2015: 16).

The procession of the Holy Spirit became a controversial issue between East and West as the Churches began falling apart on other matters, not least of which involved jurisdiction

and territory. Orthodox theologians, generally speaking, reacted polemically against its proposed solution, either denying the Catholic position of the Holy Spirit proceeding also 'from the Son', or affirming procession *'from the Father alone'*, thereby leaving the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit fundamentally untouched.

Both parties recruited the issue into their arsenal of weapons that was to be used not to provoke, but rather to *justify* an estrangement that had been underway for a while. It came to serve as an accusation that either side could throw at the other, precisely when such an accusation was needed. It became an excellent example of theology at the service of political differences. Reading the polemical works on either side of the debate, it is difficult to find much that is positive.

Yet, at the same time, it would be wrong to think that this is solely the case and that the Orthodox had nothing to contribute to the issue, that they merely 'dug-in' heels, so to speak, without presenting any proposal of their own or any solution to an orthodox reading and understanding of the filioque. To present and argue this was the primary purpose of this thesis- to show that the Orthodox Church does have its doctrine regarding the relationship of the Son to the Holy Spirit, albeit necessitated by responding to the Latin West.

The secondary purpose was then to see whether this Orthodox 'synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology' has anything to offer the filioque debate, to explore whether in elucidating the Orthodox doctrine on the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit, an element could exist that contributes to an Orthodox understanding of the filioque, thereby helping to solve an age-old impasse.

The study looked firstly at the Early Fathers of the Church. While they saw the Father as the only cause and source within the Trinity, 'begetting' the Son and 'spirating' the Spirit, there also exists a recognition of the involvement of the Son in the Spirit's procession. This does not, however, mean that He is 'fount' or 'cause' as is the Father. Maximus the Confessor, in his irenic explanation, maintains that while the Father is the only cause of the Son and the Spirit, one by begetting, the other by 'proceeding', the Spirit can be affirmed as flowing forth 'from the Father through the Son'. The 'flowing forth' through the Son while pertaining to the realm of the *economy*, yet also expresses a truth regarding the *theology* (Manoussakis 2015: 17).

John of Damascus too, while stressing the Father as cause of the Spirit's hypostatic being, also sees the Spirit as proceeding from the Father *through the Son*. Besides, He cannot rightly be 'Father' without the Son. Hence, the Son can be thought of as a precondition of the Spirit's coming forth from the Father, whether in the economy or when speaking of the level

of theology. These positions, of Maximus and John of Damascus, were almost entirely discounted by Photius' insistence on the Spirit proceeding 'from the Father alone'. While his view characterized the Orthodox position on the filioque for many years, it was not to be the only view. While many theologians preoccupied themselves with the issue, it was to be the two Gregories that made the most significant contribution.

Gregory of Cyprus, Patriarch after the failed Council of Lyon, differentiated between three 'modes' of procession and the role of the Son in each. 'Eternal existence' is the hypostatic existence of the Spirit, being solely from the Father. The 'Eternal manifestation' is the Spirit's eternal illumination or manifestation *through the Son*. This in no way applies to the Spirit's hypostatic existence. Finally, in the 'Temporal manifestation', one could even say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son* (Siecienski 2010: 141).

While His hypostatic existence is obtained from the Father alone, the Spirit eternally manifests this existence through the Son. Gregory demonstrated an eternal relationship of the Son to the Spirit without making the former a 'cause' of the Spirit's being. He thus upheld the monarchy of the Father, the Father as source or cause while simultaneously integrating those insights of Maximus and John who had written regarding the eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son. Gregory saw the necessity of expressing the permanent relationship that exists between the Son and the Holy Spirit as divine hypostases. By referring to an 'eternal manifestation of the Spirit by the Son', he thus presented an alternative solution to the filioque.

Gregory's teaching was taken up and developed by Gregory Palamas, who in turn insisted that the Father is the sole source or cause, but also recognised that certain Fathers allowed for some kind of procession of the Spirit from the Son too, one that is not, however, personal. A personal procession comes from the Father alone. It is rather one that belongs to the eternal outpouring of the divine energies. The participation of the Son can be accepted only in the regarding the energetic procession of the Holy Spirit. It cannot be applied to the mode of existence.

The coming into being of the Holy Spirit is an act of the Father's hypostasis, while the Son participates in the mission and the energies of the Holy Spirit. This energetic procession is, however, eternal and becomes temporal at the will of the Father and the Son. This distinction between procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father as sole cause, and energetic procession from the Father and the Son both eternally and within time is Palamas' contribution that represents the apex of Byzantine theology regarding the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Has this study contributed to an understanding of the filioque that is not 'heretical', but rather acceptable to the Orthodox?

I believe so. To begin with, the efforts of the Fathers of the Orthodox Church to formulate a synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology have, almost always, been in response to the filioque. Whether polemical or irenic, this synthesis, directly or indirectly, addresses the filioque. Any synthesis has something to contribute to the understanding of the filioque, whether positive or negative. A positive one would assist understanding, acceptance and rapprochement. A negative one would at least define things further but cement differences, an understanding with a tragic consequence.

Can Latin theology incorporate an 'orthodox explanation' of the filioque?

Here we have to be careful not to force the issue. Where, in the past, agreements have been forced or 'made to fit', they did not have a long duration. The irenic solution proposed by Garrigues in his work "*L'Esprit qui dit 'Pere': L'Esprit-Saint dans la vie trinitaire et la problême du Filioque*" is worth mentioning. He upholds that the Father is both the source of consubstantial communion and hypostatic otherness in the Holy Trinity (Manoussakis 2015: 18). The implications of this simple yet indispensable principle for the controversy of the filioque can be far-reaching, as it differentiates between three senses in which the Father is the source within the Trinity: (a) as source of the divine nature, (b) as source of the consubstantial communion of the persons, and (c) as source of the hypostatic diversity of the Son and the Spirit. Sense (b) is expressed in the Western Creed, while sense (c) is articulated in the Greek Creed. These senses are not necessarily contradictory; they are, rather, complimentary (Nichols 1992: 265).

If we now add to this the linguistic differentiation between the Latin term *procedere* and the Greek term *ekporeuesthai*- two terms that, as we have seen, cannot be taken as synonymous, as the former implies a connection and continuity, while the latter denotes a distinction, already alluded to by Augustine as a procession strongly qualified, then it may be possible that the two views regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit could be harmonized. Augustine, as we have seen distinguishes between two kinds of processions, for which unfortunately, the same term is used. On the one hand, we have the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *principaliter*, a qualification that reserves this kind of procession exclusively for the Father as the only *principium* of the Holy Trinity. Here, the Greek insistence on the monarchy of the Father is upheld and preserved. The Spirit's 'procession' from the Son cannot thus be understood as a procession strictly speaking, not an *ekporeusis*, but rather as a *proodos*, a 'going forth'.

Does this doctrine of the Holy Spirit's double 'going forth' - one hypostatically from the Father, the other communicatively from the Father *and the Son*, find any resonance in Orthodox theology? Is there something in Orthodox theology that can provide for an 'orthodox understanding' of the filioque?

The answer may be found in the ancient Eastern, Cappadocian and Palamite distinction between divine essence and divine energies, the result of many centuries of theological debate and deliberation. It is the foundation laid by the Early Fathers, supported by Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus, expounded upon by the two Gregories. And, if Gregory Palamas represents the apex of the theological thought of Byzantium on the issue, it is his theology that ultimately is the 'orthodox' interpretation of the filioque that remains to date, the only two-fold procession acceptable to the Orthodox. And, since Gregory Palamas is held in such high esteem, celebrated as 'champion of orthodoxy', his views ought to be highly acceptable within Orthodox circles.

Question is, would Gregory's views find the same acceptance within Western circles? Unfortunately, this seems highly unlikely.

Will the Orthodox ever accept the filioque?

There are two issues here. The first is whether the Orthodox will ever accept the filioque as doctrine. I believe that, if it is read in the sense of Palamite teaching, the Orthodox will definitely see it more positively. In the very least, they will refrain from seeing it as 'heretical'.

Will the Orthodox ever accept it in the Creed?

Here the answer is assuredly negative. The addition of the filioque touches on other issues, chief of which is ecclesiology- how the Orthodox Church sees the Church and more specifically, how the Orthodox Church sees the Papacy and Primacy. Fact is, that the filioque was a clause that was uncanonically inserted into the Creed. The Creed is the result of deliberations of Ecumenical Councils, and as such, belongs to the whole Church. The Orthodox will not accept a clause that has been unilaterally inserted by one group within the Church, or even less so, by one person, be he a Pope or whoever.

Should the Orthodox even go as far as to accept that the filioque is not heretical, it is difficult indeed to imagine a situation where Orthodox and Catholics may one day worship together and where the Creed is recited *with* the filioque. What then is required further?

The addition itself was a harmful decision in the history of the Church. It is a well-known fact that Pope Leo III refused the addition of the filioque officially proposed by Charlemagne. He

had the Creed, without the filioque, engraved in both Latin and Greek on two silver plaques that were hung on either side of St Peter's Altar. Today, the filioque clause is not obligatory for Eastern-rite Catholics, and it has been omitted from the text of the Creed by a decision of the Greek Catholic hierarchy. Both Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI omitted the insertion on occasion when reciting the Nicene Creed together with the Ecumenical Patriarch, or in the presence of representatives of the Ecumenical Throne. A few illustrious Catholic theologians and Bilateral Dialogues⁷³ have been in favour of a universal suppression of the clause. The Theological Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches held two meetings at Klingenthal, in which Catholic theologians also participated, that discussed the old controversy and came to the resolution of restoring the Nicene Creed in the original, without the filioque.

Of course, that may not be as easy as it sounds. The filioque has a long and respected tradition in the West and removing it may cause dissatisfaction among theologians and confusion among believers. Yet, this action is precisely what may be necessary, particularly in light of the recent Pan-Orthodox Council held in Crete in June of 2016. The Patriarchate of Serbia, as well as some Orthodox Hierarchs, chief among whom is the outspoken hardliner Metropolitan of Piraeus, Seraphim, had proposed that the Council officially recognize the Eighth and Ninth Ecumenical Councils as such. The issue was might not have been included on the agenda, yet it is worthy of note.

One often hears that the Orthodox Church recognises seven Ecumenical Councils. The specific number, however, was defined in Russia under Jesuit influences and for political expediency. The Encyclical of the Eastern Patriarchs of 1848 makes repeated references to an Eighth Ecumenical Council. Metallinos of the University of Athens has stated:

Blessed Justin Popovich, a confessor of our Faith, has written an important critical treatise on the upcoming synod. The cause that leads to an ecumenical synod is always a specific problem, and the question is, what is the key problem today? If we look at the agenda of the Synod, it seems [as if] we want to formulate a new dogmatic [theology]. Traditionally, the holy Fathers brought three main problems to the Council: issues concerning the Trinity, issues concerning Christology, or issues concerning the grace of God and man's salvation. (Of the nine Ecumenical Synods of the Orthodox Church, the Eighth (879-880) and the Ninth (1341) dealt with these

⁷³ Among others, Yves Congar; the dialogue with the Old Catholics of 1969 that considered it 'an offence against love as the bond of unity' and the Lambeth Conference of 1978 that requested its member Churches to consider omitting the filioque. Moltmann too believed that once the filioque was removed from the Creed, theological agreement would soon follow.

problems. The Trinitarian problem expresses Orthodox sociology, which is ecclesiology, and the Christological problem expresses Orthodox anthropology.) We do not need anything new today; we only need to live and experience our Orthodox Tradition. (Metallinos 1997: 59-60)

Fr. John Romanides, held by some to be among the most significant Orthodox theologians of our time, often referred to the Eighth and Ninth Ecumenical Councils. To illustrate this point, one could look at his essay: *Augustine's Teachings Which Were Condemned as Those of Barlaam the Calabrian by the Ninth Ecumenical Council of 1351* (Romanity 1996).

One might notice that, while Metallinos mentions the date of the Ninth Ecumenical Council as 1341, Romanides' essay title mentions the date as 1351. Councils were held in Constantinople in 1341, 1347, and 1351. These are often referred to as the 'Palamite Councils', focusing as they did on hesychasm and, more specifically, on the dispute between Gregory Palamas and Barlaam the Calabrian. The different dates betray a confusion regarding which of these three Councils is characterised as 'ecumenical'. It does, however, also demonstrate that their decisions, regardless, enjoy the acceptance of all the Orthodox. Papadakis writes:

Significantly, all Orthodox scholars who have written on Palamas, such as Lossky, Krivosheine, Papamichael, Meyendorff, Christou, assume his voice to be a legitimate expression of Orthodox tradition. Mutatis mutandis the same is true of Gregory of Cyprus. As one of these scholars has recognized, what is being defined is "one and the same tradition ... at different points, by the Orthodox, from St. Photius to Gregory of Cyprus and St. Gregory Palamas. Western scholars who have dealt with Gregory II and with Palamas, Jugie, Cayr, Laurent, Candal, have seen fit to attack both of them as revolutionary 'innovators'. (1986: 205).

There is more certainty involved with regard to the Eighth Ecumenical Council, held in Constantinople in 879-880. It was characterised 'ecumenical' by all five Patriarchates as well as Emperor Basil I. The 1848 Encyclical of the Eastern Patriarchs mentions it as 'ecumenical' explicitly. Orthodox writers have found it natural to refer to it as such. Among these, Clark Carlton states:

Remember that it was this Photius who was reconciled to Pope John VIII at the Eighth Ecumenical Council held in 879. At that council the Roman Church condemned the addition of the Filioque to the Creed (2007: 64).

Significantly, the council condemned any additions to the Creed as well as those denying the validity of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and its decisions regarding images. It also included an agreement between the patriarchates that they would not interfere in each other's internal affairs.

Up until the eleventh century, the Church of Rome recognised this council as the Eighth Ecumenical Council. It was then replaced with the council held in 869. This earlier council never found acceptance among Easterners and was, in fact, later condemned by the Council of 879-880. The eleventh century was, coincidentally, around the time the Roman Church officially started using the filioque in the Creed. Why does all this matter? Is it of consequence?

Both these Councils and their decisions, as previously mentioned, are not accepted by the West. The recognition of the Eighth Ecumenical Council that condemned the filioque insertion and the Ninth Ecumenical Council that makes Palamite teaching official dogma, will cement the Orthodox Church's approach to the filioque further. It will, on the one hand, officially define the clause as uncanonical, heretical and unacceptable while, on the other hand, provide the only orthodox reading to it in a way that is not acceptable to the West.

What then does this study propose?

The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed is the Creed of the whole Church and should thus contain the absolute minimum, the least common denominator shared by all denominations and confessions of the Christian family. By maintaining the most basic definition that constitutes Christian dogma, it would allow for the possibility of different views within this common faith that might be considered as *theologoumena* and not doctrine, as such. An example of this is the use of the same Creed by Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Churches but with different ways of expressing the Christological mystery, that nevertheless, according to recent dialogues and Christological agreements, express the same truth. In like fashion, the West could resort to the original Creed, without the filioque clause, and keep the filioque as a *theologoumenon*.

Alternatively, in similar light, should this proposal appear too unrealistic, the West could agree to temporarily and indefinitely 'suspend' the use of the filioque and then both sides could embark on a dialogue regarding the Holy Spirit's procession, combine the wisdom accumulated over the ages- the monarchy of the Father, the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity and the role of the Son in the Spirit's progression- and call an Ecumenical Council to define the issue.

In this, my personal opinion is that the *dia tou Yiou* clause, the *through the Son*, may be acceptable to both. It is certainly in line with the Palamite view of the Spirit's production and progression and, is something the West has for ages affirmed to be equivalent to the filioque. It safeguards the authenticity of monopatrism while recognizing the role of the Son in the Spirit's mediation. It is also both concise and open enough to allow for subtle differences in theological interpretation *within* the orthodox parameters. No further definition should be sought.

Going forward, we need to realise that the millennial theological conundrum may, ultimately, have something to do with the person of the Holy Spirit himself, who, even though he glorifies the Son and together with the Son reveals the Father, never seeks his own, never calls attention to himself, but remains modestly inconspicuous and discreet. It also has something to do with the circumstances under which it was investigated. The matter pertaining to the sustainer of the Church's unity was approached in the spirit of animosity and dissention among brothers. Whenever love has grown cold, one cannot find goodwill or the consent of minds.

Truth is, that for over one thousand years the filioque has provided occasion for argument and used to justify division. It would be unrealistic to think that it will be solved in the immediate future. In this, one must always be aware of the sentiments of the faithful that have always been, in the Orthodox view, the bastions or guarantors of the word of truth. Anti-western sentiments still run high among Eastern Christians. Events like the Fall of Constantinople to the Crusaders in 1204, the setting-up of rival Latin 'patriarchates' in traditionally Orthodox lands, the role of Uniatism, the massacres of Orthodox Serbs at the hands of church-backed Croatian militia in living memory, might seem events of the past for the average Westerner, but are deep wounds that have yet to heal for the Orthodox faithful. No Orthodox bishop will risk alienating his flock or causing widespread dissent and schism among them by 'forcing' an agreement.

The spirit of Ecumenism is only fifty years old and already much good has been achieved. One can only hope that in the present context of fraternal relations, of a spirit of reconciliation and earnest dialogue, without political agendas and rivalries, churchmen will want to serve the Truth and not egos.

It is not accidental that before the profession of faith, of reciting the Creed, the Orthodox Liturgy asks us to "love one another that with one mind we may confess Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Trinity one in essence, and undivided."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexakis, A. 2000. The Greek patristic Testimonia presented at the Council of Florence (1439) in support of the Filioque reconsidered. *Revue des Études Byzantines* 58: 149-165.
- Allen, P. and Neil, B., eds. 2015. The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ambrose. 1841-64. The Faith, the Holy Spirit. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 14. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 551-731; 731-850).
- Amphilochius of Iconium. 1841-64. Fragments. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 39. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 109-114).
- Anastasius Bibliothecarius. 1841-64. To John the Deacon. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 129. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 557- 562).
- Anselm of Canterbury. De Processione Spiritus Sancti. (*In Davies, B. 2008. Anselm of Canterbury*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 390-435).
- Anselm of Havelburg. 1841-64. Dialogi. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 188. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1139-248).
- Athanasius. 1841-64. Against the Arians, Letters to Serapion. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 26. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 12-680).
- Athenagoras. 1841-64. Supplication for the Christians. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 6. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 890-974).
- Augustine. 1841-64. The Trinity. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 42. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 819-1100).
- Avitus of Vienne. 1841-64. Fragments from the Book of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 59. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 385-387).
- Ayres, L. 2000. Remember you are Catholic (Serm 52.2): Augustine on the Unity of the Triune God. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8, 69-80.
- Ayres, L. 2006. Nicea and its Legacy: An approach to fourth-century Trinitarian theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ayres, L. 2010. *Augustine and the Trinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnard, L.W. 1967. *Justin Martyr: His life and thought*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnard, L.W. 1972. *Athenagoras: A study in second century Christian apologetic*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Barnes, M.R. 1999. Rereading Augustine's theology of the Trinity. (*In* Davis, S.T, Kendall, D & O' Collins G. *The Trinity: An interdisciplinary symposium on the Trinity*. New York: Oxford University Press, p.145-76).
- Barnes, M.R. 1995. De Regnon reconsidered. *Augustinian Studies* 26:51-79.
- Barnes, M.R. 1995. Augustine in contemporary Trinitarian theology. *Theological Studies* 56, 237-50.
- Barlaam of Calabria. 1841-64. Letter to Demetrius Cydones regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit. (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 151. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1255-1283).
- Basil of Caesarea. 1841-64. Orations, Liturgies, (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 31. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 163 – 619; 1630-1678).
- Basil of Caesarea. 19841-64. On the Holy Spirit. (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 32. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 67-218).
- Beccus, John. 1841-64. The union of the Churches. (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 141. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 13-275).
- Beeley, C. 2008. Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the knowledge of God. (*In* *Your Light We Shall See Light*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 187-235).
- Behr, J. 2001. *The way to Nicea*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP.
- Behr, J. 2004. *The Nicene Faith (vols. 1 & 2)* Crestwood, NY. SVSP.
- Bessarion. 1841-64. Against the Syllogisms of the Monk Maximus Planudes concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit according to the Latins. (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 161. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 309-18).
- Bessarion. 1841-64. De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Palamam pro Becco (*In* *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 161. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 243-310).

- Bessarion. 1961. De Spiritus Sancti processione ad Alexium Lascarin Philanthropinum. Manuscript item no. 34 in Venice Biblioteca Marciana Graecus 533. Edited by E. Candal. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum.
- Bessarion. 1841-64. Oratio Dogmatica de unione (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 161. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols 543-612*).
- Blemmydes, Nicephorus. 1841-64. Dogmatic Letter to Theodore Laskaris on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 142. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 553- 84*).
- Blemmydes, Nicephorus. 1841-64. Letter to James, Archbishop of Bulgaria. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 142. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 533 -583*).
- Bobrinskoy, B. 1999. The Mystery of the Trinity. Crestwood, NY: SVSP.
- Boethius. 1926. The Trinity. Translated by H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand, E.K. Loeb Class. Lib. NY: Putnam & Sons.
- Burgess, S.M. 1984. The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publications.
- Burgess, S.M. 1989. The Holy Spirit. Eastern Christian Traditions. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publications.
- Burgess, S.M. 1997. Medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation Traditions. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publications.
- Candal, E. 1945. Nilus Cabasilas and St Thomas' Theology of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church. 2000. Libreria Editrice Vaticana; 2nd edition. Vatican City. USCCB Pub.
- Catholic Encyclopedia. 1913. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/>
- Chadwick, H. 1970. The Pelican History of the Church. London: Pelican.
- Chadwick, H. 2003. East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church: From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence. Oxford: Pelican.
- Cheng, J. 1998. The Distinction between God's Essence and Energy: Gregory Palamas' idea of Ultimate Reality and Meaning. *Ultimate Reality and Meaning*. 21(1): 56-75.
- Christodoulou, Chr. 2013. Η περι Αγίας Τριαδος διδασκαλία του Γρηγορίου Κυπριου. Thessaloniki: Aristoteleio Panepistimio. (Thesis – MTh.).

- Clark, Mary T. 1989. Augustine's Theology of the Trinity. Its Relevance. *Dionysius* 13. 76.
- Clement of Alexandria. 1841-64. Exhortation to the Heathen. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 8. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 49 – 247*).
- Clement of Rome. 1841-64. First Epistle. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 1. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 199 – 329*).
- Congar, Y. 1983. I believe in the Holy Spirit. NY: Crossroads Pub Co.
- Cunliffe-Jones, H. and Drewery, B., eds. 1978. A History of Christian Doctrine. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Cyril of Alexandria. 1841-64. Treasury on the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 75. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 9 – 656*).
- Cyril of Jerusalem. 1841-64. Catechism. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 33. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 331 – 1059*).
- Davis, L.D. 1983. The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.
- De Halleux, A. 1989. «Manifesté par le Fils». Aux origins d'une formule pneumatologique, *Revue Theologique de Louvain* 20. Louvain. p. 3-31.
- Demacopoulos. George. E. ed. 2008. Orthodox Readings of Augustine. NY: SVSP.
- Demetrius Cydones. Letter to Barlaam. 1841-64. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 154. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 863 – 959*).
- Denzinger-Schonmetzer. 1965. Enchiridion Symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum. Friburg: Herder.
- De Regnon, T. 1892/1898. Etudes de Théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité, 4 vols. bound as 3. Paris: Victor Retaux.
- Didymus. 1841-64. The Trinity. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 39. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 269 – 1033*).
- Dvornik, F. 1948. The Photian Schism: History and Legend. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epiphanius. 1841-64. Ancoratus. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 41. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 11 – 236).

Epiphanius. 1841-64. Panarion (cont.) (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 42. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 9 - 515).

Emery, G. 2007. *The Trinitarian Theology of St Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, J. 1991. *The Challenge of Our Past*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP.

Eternal Word Television Network. 1995. "The Greek and Latin Traditions Regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit." By the Pontifical Council promoting Christian unity.

<https://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/PCCUFILQ.HTM>

Eucherius of Lyon. Instructions to Salonius. 1841-64. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 50. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 773 - 827).

Evans, E. 1948. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*. London: SPCK.

Evert-Kappesowa, H. 1952. Une page de l'histoire des relations byzantinolatines: Le clergé byzantin et l'Union de Lyon (1274–1282). *Byzantinoslavica* 13(1). 68-92. Prague.

Fortesque, A. 1911. *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London: Catholic Truth Society.

Fulgentius of Ruspe. 1841-64. On the Faith. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 65. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 671 – 707).

Fulgentius of Ruspe. 1997 Epistle 14.28, translated by R. Eno. (*In Fulgentius of Ruspe, Selected Works*). Washington D.C. Catholic University of America Press. p. 499- 546.

Geerard, M. and Noret, J. 1998. *Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Supplementum, Corpus Christianorum*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Gemistus Plethon. 1989. Reply to Scholarius' Defence of Aristotle. (*In Lagarde, B. 1989. Ed. Byzantion*, 59: 355-507).

Gemistus, Plethon. 1994. *Reply to the Treatise in Support of Latins*. (*In Alexandre, C. Corrections by J. Monfasani in Monfasani*).

Gemistus Plethon. 2007. Letter to my Sovereign and Brother, Lord George Scholarius. Edited and translated by F. Baccheli. In Baccheli 2007 *UnoMolti* 1. p. 129-87.

Gennadius of Marseilles. 1841-64. Of Church Doctrine. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 58. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 979 – 1053*).

Gibbons, E. 1994. *The History of the Decline and fall of the Roman Empire*. 6 vols. NY: Penguin Books.

Gilbert, P. 2009. Not an Anthologist: John Bekkos as a Reader of the Fathers. *Communio* 36(2) p. 259-304.

Gill, J. ed. 1959a. *Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini*. Rome. Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum

Gill, J. 1959b. *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gill, J. 1974. The Church union of the Council of Lyon (1274) portrayed in Greek documents. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* vol. 40.

Gill, J. 1975. John Beccus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1275–1282. *Byzantina* 7.

Gill, J. 1979. *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198–1400*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Gilson E. H. 1955. *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Gioia, L. 2008. *The Theological Epistemology of Augustine's De Trinitate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gregory of Cyprus. 1841-64. In Defence of the Tomos, the procession of the Holy Spirit, Exposition of Faith against Beccus. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 142. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 233- 300*)

Gregory the Great. 1841-64. *Morals in Job*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Volume 75-6. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 509 – 1161; 9 – 781*).

Gregory the Great. *Homilies on the Gospels*. Translated by D.D. Hurst. 1990. *Forty Gospel Homilies*, Kalamazoo, Mich: Cistercian Publishers.

Gregory Nazianzen. 1841-64. *Orations*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 35. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 393*).

Gregory Nazianzen. 1841-64. *The Orthodox Faith*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 36. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 674 - 734*).

Gregory of Nyssa. 1841-64. To Ablabius on 'not Three Gods', On the Holy Spirit against the followers of Macedonius. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 45. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 243 – 1122*).

Gregory Palamas. 1841-64. One Hundred and Fifty Chapters, Confession of the Orthodox Faith. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 150. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 771 - 1225*).

Gregory Palamas. 1962. *Logoi Apodeiktikoi Duo, Epistles I-III to Akindynos*. Edited by B. Bobrinskoy. *Gregoriou tou Palama Suggramata vol. 1. Thessaloniki*.

Gregory Palamas. 1970. *Antirrhetics I-VII. Against Akindynos*. Edited by L. Kontogiannis and B. Fanourgakes. *Gregoriou tou Palama Suggramata vol. 3. Thessaloniki*.

Gregory Palamas. 1983. *The Triads*. Edited by J. Meyendorff, J. and translated by N. Gendle. New York: Paulist Press.

Gregory Thaumaturgus. 1841-64. *Oratio Panegyrica*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 10. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols.1049 - 1103*).

Hankins, J. 1990. *Plato in the Italian Renaissance. Vol 1-2. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*. Leiden and New York: Brill Academic Publisher.

Hanson, R.P.C. 1988. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Haugh, R. 1975. *Photius and the Carolingians- the Trinitarian Controversy*. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Pub.

Heinzer F. and Schonborn C. 1982. *Maximus Confessor. Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Fribourg, 2-5 September 1980. Paradosis 27. Fribourg-en-Suisse: Editions Universitaires*.

Heisenberg, A. ed. 1896. *Nicephori Blemmidae curriculum vitae et carmina*. Lipsiae. B.G. Teubneri.

Hildebrand, S. 2007. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.

Hergenrother, J. 1867-9. *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel, vol. 1-3*. Ratisbon: Forgotten Books.

- Hill, E. 1982. *The Trinity. Works of St Augustine- A translation for the 21st century*. 2nd edition. New York: New City Press.
- Hill, E. 1985. *The Mystery of the Trinity - Introducing Catholic Theology 4*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Hilary. 1841-64. *The Trinity. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Volume 10. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 9 – 471).*
- Hill, E. 1971. Karl Rahner's 'Remarks on the Dogmatic Treatise De Trinitate and St Augustine'. *Augustinian Studies 2*, 67-80.
- Hladky, V. 2014. *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon: Platonism in Late Byzantium, Between Hellenism and Orthodoxy*. London: Routledge.
- Hormisdas. 1841-64. *Epistle 79 to Justin Augustine. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Volume 63. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 512 -15).*
- Hussey, E.M. 1972. *The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Theology of Gregory Palamas*", New York: Fordham University. (Thesis – PhD).
- Hussey, E.M. 1972. *Palamite Trinitarian Models. St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 16: 83-89.*
- Hussey, E.M. 1974. *The Person-Energy Structure in the Theology of St Gregory Palamas. St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 18: 22-43.*
- Hussey, J.M. 2010. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ignatius of Antioch. 1841-64. *Epistle to the Philadelphians. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 5. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 625 - 640).*
- Irenaeus. 1841-64. *Against Heresies. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 7. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 433 – 1225).*
- Jaeger, W. ed. 1960. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera, Vols. I–II; 2nd edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jerome. 1841-64. *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum, Apologia contra Rufinum, Liber tertius seu ultima responsio adversus scripta Rufini. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Volume 23. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 355 - 495).*

- John Chrysostom. 1947. Homily on John. 1947. The Fathers of the Church. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.
- John Damascene. 1841-64. Dialectics, Concerning Heresy, An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, Against those decrying the Holy Images, On Right Thinking, Against the Jacobites, Against Manichaeans (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 94. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 518 – 585).
- Jugie, M. 1926-35. *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium Ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*. Vol. 1-5. Paris: Parisiis Publishers.
- Jugie, M. 1931. Gregory *Palamas*, 'Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique', vol. 11. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.
- Jugie, M. 1933. *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium Ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*. Tom. II. Paris. Parisiis Pub.
- Julianus Pomerius. 1841-64. On the Contemplative Life. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 59. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 415 – 519).
- Justin Martyr. 1841-64. First Apology, Second Apology. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 6. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 327 – 471).
- Kaspar, W. 2005. The God of Jesus Christ. New York: Crossroads Pub Co.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1964. The Athanasian Creed. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1972. Early Christian Creeds. 3rd Edition. London: Longman.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1985. Early Christian Doctrines. 5th Edition. London: A & C Black.
- Khaled, A. 2011. Retrieving Nicaea: the development and meaning of Trinitarian doctrine. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press.
- Kotsko, A. 2011. Gift and Communio: the Holy Spirit in Augustine's 'De Trinitate'. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 64. (1)1-12.
- Kung, H. ed. 1979. Conflicts about the Holy Spirit. New York: Seabury Press.
- Labbe & Cossart. 1728. (*In Coletti, J. Illyricum Sacrum Venice. Vol 1-8. Venice: Faucher Ch.*)
- Laga, C. & Steele, C. eds. 1980. Maximi Confessoris Quaestiones ad Thalassium. CCG 7. Brepols, Belgium: Turnhout.

Leo the Great. 1996. Sermon 75.3. Translated by J.P. Freeland and A. J. Conway. (*In Leo the Great, Sermons*. Washington D.C: Catholic University Press. p. 330-352).

Levering, M. 2004. *Scripture and Metaphysics: Aquinas and the Renewal of Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

_____. 2013. *The Theology of Augustine: An Introductory Guide to His Most Important Works*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press.

Lossky, V. 1974. In *The Image and Likeness of God*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP. p. 71-96.

Lossky, V. 1976. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP.

Lossky, V. 1979. John Beccus, Patriarch of Constantinople 1275-1282. *Church Union: Rome and Byzantium 1204-1453*. London: Variorum Reprints.

Louth, A. ed. 1996. *St Maximus the Confessor*. New York: Routledge.

Louth, A. 2003. *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.

Louth, A. 2007. *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681-1071*. Crestwood, NY: SVSP.

Maffrey-Talbot, A.M. 1973. The Patriarch Athanasius (1289-1293; 1303-1309) and the Church. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 27. P. 13-38. Washington D.C: Harvard University.

Makarov, D. 2008. The Target of George Pachymeres' Polemics in his Treatise on the Holy Spirit. *Scrinium*, vol. 4(1): p. 228-241.

Manoussakis, J.P. 2015. *For the Unity of All: Contributions to the Theological Dialogue between East and West*. Eugene, Oregon. Cascade Books.

Mansi, J.D. 1759-98. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. (31 Vols.) Florence-Venice: H. Welter Pub.

Marius Victorinus. 1841-64. *Against the Arians*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina* Volume 8. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1039 - 1137).

Mark of Ephesus. 1841-64. *Capita Syllogistica Adversus Latinos*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 161. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 12 – 138).

Martín, J.P. 1971. *El Espíritu Santo en los Orígenes del Cristianismo: Estudio sobre I Clemente, Ignacio, II Clemente y Justino Mártir*. Zürich: Pas-Verlag.

- Maximus the Confessor. 1841-64. Difficulties (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 91. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols.1031 - 1418).
- Maximus the Confessor. 1841-64. Chapters on Theology and the Economy. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 90. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1083 - 1462).
- Maximus the Confessor. 1841-64. Letter to Marinus (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. 1841-64. Volume 91. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 9 – 287).
- Maximus the Confessor. 1990. Disputation with Pyrrhus. Translated by J. Farrell. *The Disputation with Pyrrhus of our Father among the Saints Maximus the Confessor*. South Canaan: St Tikhon's Seminary Press.
- Maximus the Confessor. 1985. *On the Lord's Prayer*. Translated by G.C. Berthold.
- Maximus the Confessor: *Selected Writings*. Mahway, N.J. Paulist Press.
- McGrath, A. 2001. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Meredith, A. 1995. *The Cappadocians*. NY: SVAP.
- Metaxas-Mariatos, I. 1988. *The Filioque Controversy. Chapters from the Eastern Orthodox Reaction: An Historical-Theological Perspective*. Durham: Durham University. (Dissertation – M.A.).
- Meyendorff, J. 1974. *Byzantine Theology*. NY: Fordham University Press.
- Meyendorff, J. ed. 1983. *Gregory Palamas. The Triads*. NY: Paulist Press.
- Meyendorff, J. 1998. *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. Translated by L. G. Crestwood. NY: SVSP.
- Monfasani, J. 1994. 'Pletone, Bessarione et la processionne dello Spirito Santo: un testo inedito et un falso'. (*In Paulo Viti Firenze et il Concilio del 1439: Covegno di Studi, Firenze 29 Novembre – 2 Dicembre, Firenze; L.S. Olschki, pp. 833-59*. Reprinted in Monfasani: *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and other Emigres*, Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum 1995, VIII.
- Montreal Review. God and Trinity in John Damascene's on the Orthodox Faith. <http://www.themontrealreview.com/2009/God-and-Trinity-in-John-Damascene-On-the-Orthodox-Faith.php> Date of access, 6 Mar. 2018.
- Muller, E. 1995. The Dynamic of Augustine's *De Trinitate*: A Response to a Recent Characterization, *Augustinian Studies* 26, 65–91.
- Nicephorus G. 1829-1855. *Byzantina Historia*. Edited by L. Schopen. Bonn: C.S.H.B.

- Nichols, A. 1992. *Rome and the Eastern Churches*. Collegeville, Minn. Liturgical Press.
- Nicol, D. 1969. *Byzantine Requests for an Oecumenical Council in the Fourteenth Century. Annuario Historiae Conciliorum, 1*. Edinburgh. p. 69-95.
- Nilus Cabasilas. 2001. *Five Discourses against the Conclusions of the Latins on the Matter of the Holy Spirit*. Kislas. Th. ed. *On the Holy Spirit*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- Novatian. 1841-64. *The Trinity. (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina.. Volume 3. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 911 - 981).*
- O' Collins, G. 1999. *The Tripersonal God: Understanding and Interpreting the Trinity*. NY: Paulist.
- Origen. 1841-64. *Against Celsus (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 11. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 637 – 1225).*
- Origen. 1841-64. *Commentaries on John (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 14. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 21 - 831).*
- Origen. 1841-64. *Exhortation to Martyrdom, (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 11. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 563 – 637).*
- Origen. 1841-64. *On First Principles, (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 11. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 116 – 415).*
- Origen. 1841-64. *Orations, (In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca. Volume 11. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 414 – 563).*
- Orphanos, M. 1981. *The Procession of the Holy Spirit According to Certain Later Greek Fathers. (In Lukas Vischer ed. Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy. London: SPCK. p. 21-45).*
- OCE. (Orthodox Church of Estonia). 2018. *The Canons of the Two Hundred Blessed Fathers who met in Ephesus.*
<http://orthodoxa.org/GB/orthodoxy/canonlaw/canons3econcileGB.htm> Date of access: 20 Feb. 2018.
- Orthodox Study Bible. 2008. *Septuagint and New King James Version*. Elk Grove, California: St Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology.
- Pachymeres, G. 1935. *(In Bekker, I. De Michaelle et Andronico Palaeologis libri trecedim. Bonn: Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae.*

- Papadakis, A. 1976. Gregory II of Cyprus and Mark's Report. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 21. p. 147-57.
- Papadakis, A. 1986. *Crisis in Byzantium. The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)*. NY: Fordham University Press.
- Papadakis, A. 1991. Byzantine Perceptions of the Latin West, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 36. p. 231-42.
- Papadakis, A. 1994. *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy: The Church 1071-1453 A.D.* Crestwood, NY: SVSP.
- Papademetriou, G. 1973. *Introduction to Saint Gregory Palamas*. NY: Philosophical Library.
- Papadopoulos, Chrys. 1937. *The State of the Orthodox Church of Antioch in the 14th and 15th Centuries. Epetiris Hetairias Byzantinon Spoudon XIII.* (s.l).
- Paulson, M. 2008a. Trinity – *Ekstasis*: A Theology of God the Father and a Response to Kevin Giles by Pantaz Sunlyck. <http://www.tektonics.org> Date of access: 15 April 2017.
- Paulson, M. 2008b. Rejoinder to Kevin Giles. <http://www.tektonics.org> Date of access: 15 April 2017.
- Paulson, M. 2008c. Figuring out the Filioque. <http://www.tektonics.org> Date of access: 30 April 2017.
- Pelikan, J. 1969. *Development of Christian Doctrine: Some Historical Prolegomena*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pelikan, J. 1974. *The Christian Tradition 2: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pelikan, J. 1988. *The Melody of Theology: A Philosophical Dictionary*. Washington D.C: Harvard University Press.
- Pelikan, J. & Hotchkiss, V. 2003. *Creeds and Confessions of faith in Christian Tradition I*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press.
- Penel, V.H.A. 2014. *An Investigation of the Change in Position of George Scholarius from Pro-Union of the Western and Eastern Churches to Anti-Union*. Cambridge: Anglia Ruskin University. (Dissertation – M.A.).
- Percival, H.R. ed. 1900. *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Translated by Percival H.R. New York: Scribner's.
- Peterson, J. 1999. *Introduction to Scholastic Realism*. N.Y: Peter Lang Inc.

Photius. 1841-64. Dogmatics: Against the Manichaeans, The Holy Spirit, Homilies, Epistles. (In *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 102. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 9 - 585).

Photius. 1983. *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. Translated by Holy Transfiguration Monastery. Astoria, NY. Studion Publishers.

Photius. 1987. *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*. Translated by J.P. Farrell. Brookline, Mass. Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Photius. 1841-64. To Amphilochius. (In *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 101. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1171 – 1187).

Podskalski, G. 1977. *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*. Munchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagbuchhandlung.

Popoff, B. 1861. *The History of the Council of Florence*. London: John Masters.

Prestige, G. 2008. *God in Patristic Thought*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Pub.

Quaston, J. 1995. *Patrology*. London: Thomas More, Christian Classics Inc. (Now Simon and Schuster).

Ratramnus of Corbie. 1841-64. *Contra Graecorum Opposita Romanam Ecclesiam Infamantium*. (In *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 121. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 223 - 1153).

Read, D. 1997. *Energies of the Spirit: Trinitarian Models in Eastern Orthodox and Western Theology*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.

Richter, G. 1990. Johannes Bekkos und sein Verhältnis zur römischen Kirche, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 15.

Riebe, A. 2005. Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel: Patriarch Johannes Bekkos als Verteidiger der Kircheunion von Lyon (1274), Wiesbaden.

Runciman, S. 1977. *The Byzantine Theocracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Romanides J. 1960-1. Notes on the Palamite Controversy *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 6.

Romanides, J. 1963-64 Vol. 9.

Rusticus. 1841-64. Dispute with Acephalus. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. Volume 11. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 1163 - 1254).

Siecienski, E.A. 2005. The Use of Maximus the Confessor's Writings on the Filioque at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1439). NY: Fordham University. (Dissertation- PhD.)

Siecienski, E.A. 2010. The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, T. L. 2003. Thomas Aquinas' Trinitarian Theology: A Study in Theological Method. Washington. Catholic University Press.

Sinkewicz, R.E. 1982. The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian. *Medieval Studies* 44, 181-242.

Sopko, A.J. 1979a. Gregory of Cyprus: A Study of Church and Culture in late thirteenth century Byzantium. London: Kings College. (Dissertation: M.A).

Sopko, A.J. 1979b. Palamism before Palamas and the Theology of Gregory of Cyprus. *St. Vladimir's Theological Review*, 23, (3-4) p. 139- 47.

Spiteris, Y. 1998. Giovanni Beccos: Un convinto sostenitore dell'unità tra la chiesa Greca e quella Latina. A sette secoli dalla sua morte (1297–1997). *Studi Ecumenici* 16: 459–491.

Stavrou, M. ed. 2001. *Nicéphore Blemmydès: OEuvres Théologiques, Tome I* [= SC 517] Paris.

Stumpe, E. ed. 2010. The Cambridge Companion to Augustine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 60-80.

Stylianopoulos, Th. and Heim, M. S eds. 1986. "Spirit of Truth: Ecumenical Perspectives on the Holy Spirit". Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

Swete, H.B. 1912. The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. London: MacMillan and Co.

Swete, H.B. 2004. On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.

Syropoulos, S. 1660. Memoirs. Creighton R. ed. The Hague: Comitis.

Tertullian. 1887. *Against Praxeas*, Anti-Nicene Fathers 3. Translated by M. Dods. Roberts A. and Donaldson eds. Reprint. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson Publishers. p. 597 ff.

Theophylactus of Ochrid. 1841-64. *On the Things of which the Latins are accused*. (*In Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*. Volume 126. J.P. Migne: Paris. Cols. 222 – 250).

Theophilus of Antioch. 1887. *To Autolycus*. Anti-Nicene Fathers 2. Translated by M. Dods.. Roberts A. and Donaldson J. eds. Reprint. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Toronen, M. 2007. *Union and Distinction in the Thought of Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops). 2003. *The Filioque: a church dividing issue? An agreed statement*. <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/ecumenical/orthodox/filioque-church-dividing-issue-english.cfm> Date of access: 23 Mar. 2017.

Valentine, T.R. 2004. *An Orthodox guide to the Filioque*. (Third edition) http://www.oocities.org/trvalentine/orthodox/workinprog_filioque.html Date of access: 30 March 2017.

Van Parys, M. 1967. *Quelques remarques à propos d'un texte controversé de Saint Basile au concile de Florence*. *Irenikon* 40. Amay: Chevetogne Monastery.

Vischer, L. ed. 1981. *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ*. London: SPCK.

Von Baltazar H.U. 2000. *Credo*. San Francisco: Ignatian Press.

Ware, K. 1978. *Christian Theology in the East, 600-1453, The Filioque dispute*. (*In* H. Cunliffe-Jones and B. Drewery eds. *A History of Christian Doctrine*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. p. 206-215.

Ware, K. 2015. *The Orthodox Church: An Introduction to Eastern Christianity*. 3rd edition. London: Penguin.

Weinandy, T.G. 1995. *The Father's Spirit of Sonship: Reconceiving the Trinity*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Weinandy, T.G. 2003. *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*. London. T & T Clark.

- Will, C. 1861. *Acta et Scripta*. Leipzig-Marburg: Helbert Academic Books.
- Williams, A.N. 1999. *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, R. 1990. *Sapientia and the Trinity: Reflections on the De Trinitate, Augustiniana*: 40, 317–32.
- Woodhouse, C.M. 1986. *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Xexakis, N. 1981. *Ioannes Beccus and His Theological Thoughts*. Athens. (In Greek) p. 132-140.
- Zizioulas, J. 1985. *Being as Communion*. London. Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Zizioulas, J. 2008. *Lectures in Christian Dogmatics*. London. T & T Clarke.
- Zizioulas, J. (s.a) "One Single Source: An Orthodox Response to the Clarification on the Filioque" <http://agrino.org/cyberdesert/zizioulas.htm>. Date of access: March 23, 2017.