

Menchikov Andrei

**THE ATTITUDE OF THE LATIN AND ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS
OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY ('THE
SCHISM' PERIOD) TOWARDS EACH OTHER IN THE POLEMIC
TREATISES ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT (BY
PETER DAMIAN, ANSELM OF CANTERBURY, AND
THEOPHYLACT OF OCHRID).**

M.A. Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

June 2002

**The attitude of the Latin and Orthodox Christians of the
second half of the eleventh century ('The Schism' period) towards
each other in the polemic treatises on the procession of the Holy
Spirit (by Peter Damian, Anselm of Canterbury, and Theophylact
of Ochrid).**

by
Menchikov Andrei
(Russia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies
Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

Chair, Examination Committee

External Examiner

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Budapest

June 2002

I, the undersigned, Andrei Menchikov, candidate for the M.A. degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 1 June 2002

Signature

Table of Contents

Introduction.	IV
I. Peter Damian's argumentation on the double procession of the Holy Ghost.	9
II. The argumentation of Theophylact of Ochrid against the double procession doctrine.	23
I. Photius's <i>Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit.</i>	23
II. The <i>Panoplia</i> of Michael Cerularius.	26
III. Theophylact's <i>Letter to Nicholas on the charges of which the Latins are accused.</i>	28
III. Anselm's <i>De Processione Spiritus Sancti.</i>	35
Conclusion.	45

The attitude of the Latin and Orthodox Christians of the second half of the eleventh century ('The Schism' period) towards each other in the polemic treatises on the procession of the Holy Spirit (by Peter Damian, Anselm of Canterbury, and Theophylact of Ochrid).

Introduction.

To add another paper to the bulk of the studies already made on the so-called "Eastern Schism," that which supposedly came to head in 1054, perhaps would seem either a vain enterprise or maybe even too pretentious a venture. But the attempt to understand how at first a minor issue becomes the main factor of the breach between the Churches, still present and challenging, may find some justification. This study is quite restricted in terms of both the subject and the period. It will concern itself only with the period after the excommunications of 1054 till the beginning of the Crusade movement, which completely changed the relationships of the West and the East, of Orthodoxy and Catholicism. We may consider the dispute of 1112 as the turning point for this issue.¹ Thus, our study is limited to the period between 1054 and 1112, but even more strictly, to the time between the years 1061-1062 (the supposed date of the composition of Damian's treatise) and 1102 (the supposed date of the completion of Anselm's writing).²

The main objects of analysis are the treatises of Peter Damian and Anselm of Canterbury from the Latin side and the writing of Theophylact of Ochrid from the Greek side, inasmuch as they treat the question of the *Filioque*. Comparative analysis

¹ At Constantinople in 1112, in the presence of the Emperor Alexios I Comnenus, Peter Grossolano (Chrysolanus) delivered a speech on defending the double procession doctrine; after that, Latin (Peter) and Greek (John Phournes, Niketas Seides, Theodore Smyrneios, and the Patriarch Nicholas IV Mouzalon, and others) scholars held a discussion.

² I do not take into consideration a very significant treatise by Niketas Stethatos ("Synthesis on the *Filioque*," which is published in A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, teil 2, (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schönigh, 1930), as, firstly, it was written in 1053-4 and was presented to Humbert during the discussions of Humbert and Cerularius, therefore, it belongs to an earlier period than the one which

of the argumentation deployed in these works may help to understand the following: whether there was a real dialogue; whether the controversialists were acquainted with the other side's doctrinal developments; whether the purpose of the polemic was the search for the common ground for reconciliation (as sometimes scholars suggest)³ or whether it was the resolute defense of the doctrine which was considered as a *sine qua non* of the faith and as the fundamental part of each side's theological identity.

These treatises were composed in crucial periods of history for both Byzantium and the papacy. The second half of the eleventh century is marked in Western Europe by the papal reform movement under Gregory VII, while in Byzantium it was the time of the accession and the establishment of a new dynasty, that of the Comneni, whose reign became a golden age of Byzantine scholarship.

We are not going to touch upon the schism itself (beside the fact that enough studies have been devoted to it), because, as Runciman notes: "How small an effect was made at the time by the events of 1054 can be seen by the continuance of the negotiations between the Eastern Empire and the Papacy."⁴ The first date that concerns us is the year 1062, when the treatise of Peter Damian was written.⁵ During the search for an alliance between Rome and Constantinople, the Church question was also raised. As a result, the patriarch of Constantinople, Constantine III Lichoudes, sent a letter to the patriarch of Grado, inquiring as to which substantiation the Latin

interests me in this study, and, secondly, the analysis of it would extend the size of this study unsuitably for the given format.

³ See Runciman's overall opinion in Steven Runciman, *Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries*, (London: Panther Books, 1970).

⁴ Runciman, 68.

⁵ "In 1059 Pope Nicholas II signed a treaty with the Normans at Melfi. Guiscard was recognized as ruler of Apulia and Calabria and the Lombard principalities, which he was to hold under the suzerainty of the Holy See. The settlement was a direct attack on Byzantine claims and caused resentment at Constantinople. In 1062 the Emperor Constantine X joined with the Empress-Regent of the West, Agnes, in an intrigue to elevate Cadalus, bishop of Parma, to the papacy in opposition to the legitimate pope, Alexander II. But Cadalus, who called himself Honorius II, was unable to maintain himself in Rome, and recognition soon was withdrawn from him." (Runciman, 70). See also J. Gay, *L'Italie Méridionale et l'Empire Byzantine depuis l'Avènement de Basile Ier jusqu'à la Prise de Bari par les Normands, (867-1071)*, (Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1904), 516-519.

doctrine of the *Filioque* has.⁶ This letter reached the pope's notice, and Alexander asked his friend Peter Damian to write a response. But this letter allegedly remained in the papal chancellery and never reached its addressee, although Alexander sent an embassy of Peter, bishop of Anagni, to Constantinople in 1072, which failed, due to the counteracting influence of Patriarch John Xiphilinus, and of Michael Psellus.⁷ Omitting some attempts at contacts during the pontificate of Gregory VII, which also failed, we may turn to the set of negotiations prompted and steadily supported by Urban II. We know that the new negotiations started in 1089, when the circumstances once again induced both the Roman See and the emperor to look forward to mutual support and an alliance (Pope Urban II struggled against Clement III and the German Emperor Henry IV, while Alexios I Comnenos had to repulse the invaders alongside almost all the frontiers of his empire).⁸ At the synodos endemousa in Constantinople the emperor and the patriarch (Nicholas III Grammatikos) suggested, after the request of papal legates, to restore the pope's name in the diptychs.⁹ As a result Basileios of

⁶ See Joan Mervin Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 138; and also Jean Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien: l'Ermite et l'Homme d'Eglise*, (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1960), 222; and Runciman, 75.

⁷ The accession of Michael Ducas (in October) gave to Rome a good opportunity to renew the contacts with Constantinople. The embassy of Peter, the bishop of Anagni, arrived at Constantinople in 1072 with the greetings from the pope, but it achieved nothing, due to the opposition of the patriarch John Xiphilinus and Michael Psellos. Nevertheless, in the next year the emperor sent two monks, Thomas and Nicholas, to the new pope, Gregory VII, to propose a union. The pope in turn wanted to dispatch the patriarch of Grado, Dominique, to Constantinople for negotiations. It is uncertain why, but this attempt failed as well. The complicated political situation in Byzantium (the *coup* of Niketas Botaneiates, then the imposture designed by Robert Guiscard cooled down the negotiations. They were resumed after the enthronement of Urban II. (See the introduction by Paul Gautier to Théophylacte d'Achrida, "De Iis Quorum Incusantur Latini," in *Discours, Traités, Poésies*, ed. P. Gautier, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 16, v. 16/1, (Thessalonike: Association de Recherches Byzantines, 1980), 105-107. See also Runciman, 72.

⁸ "Alexius I, like Constantine IX before him, expected papal help against the Normans who were rapidly establishing themselves in the once Byzantine provinces in South Italy and were extending their ambitions to the Greek mainland." (Hussey, 168.)

⁹ "Il ordonna donc à la chancellerie patriarcale de rechercher le document officiel qui entérinait la radiation du nom du pape dans les diptyques, et convoqua un synode qui se réunit sous sa présidence au mois de septembre 1089. On constata alors qu'il n'existait aucun acte officiel attestant que l'Eglise de Rome avait été séparée de celle de Constantinople et motivant la suppression de l'anaphore du pape. Il fut alors décidé que le nom du pape serait rétabli dans les diptyques et qu'un concile, auquel le pape était prié d'assister ou de se faire représenter, se réunirait dans la capitale pour examiner les divergences existant entre Grecs et Latins. Aussitôt après, le basileus adressa au pape une lettre dont la teneur a été conservée par Malaterra: *imperator vero increpationem eius humiliter suscipiens, invitat*

Calabria and Romanos of Rossana represented the Greek Church in the synod of Melfi in September 1089, where the pope was present and where the envoys asked the pontiff for a systatic letter, and where also the possibility of the union of the Churches was debated. Apparently, they also discussed the points of division and related at least some of the arguments of the Greek side. After the synod, the Greek envoys were disappointed, and Basileios wrote a bitter letter to the capital, explaining that in fact the Latins had in mind only political ends.¹⁰ For a while the search for the union was suspended.¹¹ Nevertheless, the negotiations continued, which resulted in Urban's proclamation of the First Crusade in 1095 at Clermont, and later in the convocation of a new council (that of Bari) where the questions of divorce were also disputed.

It is not clear who represented the Greeks at this council and what argumentation they delivered, but it is certain that they were there and they defended the doctrine of the sole procession with arguments at least some of which originated in Photius' *Mystagogy*. Runciman concludes: "But all the same it should be said that any schism that there had been between the two Churches was closed. During the next decade [the last one of the eleventh century] there was an atmosphere of peace

eum per eosdem legatos chartulis aureis litteris scriptis, ut veniens cum eruditis catholice viris latinis, Constantinopolitano concilio congregato, disputatio fieret inter Graecos et Latinos, ut communi definitione in aecclesia Dei illud scindetur quod Graeci fermentato, Latini vero azymo immolabant, unaque aecclesia Dei unum morem teneret, dicens se libenter catholicae discussioni assentire, et quod authenticis sententiis, praesentibus Graecis et Latinis, assentiri definiretur sive azymo sive fermentato immolandum esset, se deinceps observare velle. Terminum etiam quo papa accedere deberet statuit, anni videlicet et dimidii (PL 149, 1192A-B)." (Gautier, 108). See also Holtzmann's article important for this issue: W. Holtzmann, "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089," *BZ* 28 (1928).

¹⁰ See the appendix to Holtzmann's article for the letter of Basileios.

¹¹ "Nous ne sommes pas informés du déroulement ultérieur des tractations, et nous ignorons si la communion fut provisoirement rétablie entre les Eglises. Mais il est bien certain que le pape ne se rendit pas à Byzance et que le concile projeté ne fut pas réuni. L' accord des esprits et des cœurs n' était pas réalisé, et il est en outre probable que les négociations ont été gênées par les incursions incessantes des Petchénèges en Thrace durant toute l' année 1090 et les premiers mois de 1091. Alexis s'est-il adressé au pape au début de 1091? Anne Comnène écrit que son père attendait, vers la fin d'avril 1091, l'arrivée d'une armée de mercenaires envoyée de Rome. On ne saurait en inférer que le basileus avait précédemment envoyé une ambassade en Italie, et d'ailleurs, si ambassade il y eut, on peut présumer qu' à cette époque elle avait moins pour objet de relancer les tratations pour l'union des Eglises que de réclamer des renforts militaires pour parer aux menaces du moment. Bref, la guerre

and friendship. This goodwill was reflected in the chief polemic writings of the period.”¹² The “chief polemic writings of the period” are two of our three treatises, which were composed at this time. Supposedly the Letter of Theophylact to Nicholas, deacon of Hagia Sophia, who asked him to explain the differences between the Churches’ usages and doctrines and refute the fallacies of the opposing side,¹³ was written at that time, around 1089-1091, but it is still uncertain.¹⁴ The *De Processione Spiritus sancti* of Anselm was designed at first as a speech for the Council of Bari in 1098 which after its discussion was worked out into the treatise which could be distributed to all who were willing to read it, who were not few.¹⁵

avec les Petchénèges et des motifs demeurés inconnus empêchèrent la réunion du concile dont les assises avaient été fixées aux premiers mois de 1091.” (Gautier, 110).

¹² Runciman, 76.

¹³ “The emperor Alexius’s reconciliation with pope Urban II was not altogether popular at Constantinople, where Gregory VII’s actions in excommunicating the emperor and encouraging the Normans against the empire had roused intense and lasting bitterness. But enlightened opinion supported the emperor. About the year 1090 a deacon of Constantinople called Nicholas, who apparently hoped to obtain a bishopric in Bulgaria, wrote to the archbishop of Ochrida, the head of the Bulgarian Church, to ask for a ruling on the errors of the Latins, which, in his opinion, were leading straight towards schism. The archbishop was Theophylact, who was one of the most distinguished scholars of the time. He was a Greek from Euboea who had been favorite pupil of Psellus at the University of Constantinople... Theophylact was shocked by the tone of the deacon’s letter; and his long and careful reply recommended a more charitable attitude.” (Runciman, 85-6).

¹⁴ See Gautier’s opinion and reservations.

¹⁵ “...the pope summoned Anselm to Rome. He would have preferred to stay at Lyons, but he set out at once in mid-March, and arrived in Rome about the end of April 1098. Here he learnt that the pope would not release him from the archbishopric, but wished him to expound the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit at a meeting with representatives of the Greek Church at Bari in October. Thereupon, Anselm went off to spend the summer months in the hill village of Liberi above Capua, and here he found a renewed peace of mind and spirit which he had not known since his days as prior of Bec. He put the finishing touches to his long-interrupted *Cur Deus Homo*, and he prepared his defense of the Latin doctrine of the Holy Spirit.” (Richard William Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 279).

“Mais la reputation de sa science l’amène à intervenir, comme malgré lui, dans des débats de l’assemblée, et c’est à lui que s’adresse le pape pour répondre aux représentatives du clergé grec, qui sont venu à Bari défendre leur doctrine sur la procession du Saint-Esprit.” Jules Gay, *Les Papes du XIe Siècle et la Chrétienté*, (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1926), 383.

“In the West pope Urban II’s influence was all for peace and understanding. He avoided as far as possible raising any controversial issue, and he never made any direct reference to his claim of supremacy over the Eastern churches. His friend, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he left the controversy, took an attitude parallel to that of Theophylact. The bitterness that had been shown in the time of cardinal Humbert seemed to be forgotten. In 1098 the pope held a council at Bari, in order to integrate the Greek churches of Southern Italy and Sicily with the Latin churches of the province. There was little difficulty over matters of ritual. The Greeks were apparently to be allowed to retain their own liturgy and usages, even the use of unleavened bread. But they raised a protest over the addition to the creed, and the pope’s discourse on the subject did not satisfy them. Anselm, who was in exile from England, had accompanied Urban to the council, and at Urban’s request he addressed the assembly. His speech was a model of reasonable and good-tempered argument. He understood that

The treatises differ not only in their doctrines, but also in the applied methods of reasoning. The fully exegetical exposition of Damian is sustained by the logical rigorism of Anselm; thus the Latins, beside their own theological tradition, have at their disposal both of the chief methods of reasoning for the Middle Ages, (though of course it was not yet *the* scholasticism in this period). The situation with the Greeks is more complicated. The style of Byzantine literature (both profane and ecclesiastical) is very different from that of the Latin. The treatises reflect a totally different level of knowledge of the other side's tradition. Jugie puts it in this way:

*Unum tantum Latinis deerat: accurate Graecorum Patrum byzantinaeque theologiae notitia. Proferunt quidem theologi Carolingiani ex sancto Cyrillo Alexandrino, ex Didymo, Athanasio et Basilio testimonia quaedam pro doctrina de processione ab utroque; sed ex his non pauca sunt spuria, praesertim ea quae sub Athanasii nomine citantur; quae vero genuina sunt, non semper rei conducunt et non nisi ex parte traditionem graecam referunt. Significatio specialis verbi graeci ἐκπορεύεσθαι apud theologos byzantinos coevos, praesertim apud S. Joannem Damascenum, illos omnino latet; neque clare perspiciunt Graecorum de Trinitatis mysterio conceptum in formula ex Patre per Filium expressum; subtilisque differentia, quae inter hunc et Latinorum loquendi modum existit, illos effugit.*¹⁶

*Graeci autem traditionem theologiumque latinam penitus ignorant. Patres doctoresque Occidentis non legunt, quorum linguam non intelligunt. Attamen in libris suorum patrum Didymi praesertim, Athanasii, Basilii, Gregorii Nysseni, Epiphanii, Cyrilli Alexandrini, doctrinam de processione Spiritus sancti a Patre et Filio expressis, vel aequivalentibus verbis propositam facile invenire possunt, quamvis Patrum ultimus, Joannes Damascenus de ha quaestione obscurius sit locutus. Caeterum neque hic, neque ex aliis ullus hoc diserte docuit, quod Photius mox praedicaturus est: Spiritum sanctum scilicet a Patre solo, Filio excluso, procedere.*¹⁷

Moreover, though their knowledge of the opponent side's tradition was quite obscure, modern scholars propose no less contradictory opinions: Jugie states that before

there was a slight difference between the western and the eastern conception of the trinity; and he confined himself to the western view, showing that the procession from the Son fitted logically into it. It was not an innovation but a doctrine that was inherent in the Latin interpretation of the creed... Soon afterwards Anselm was questioned by the bishop of Naumburg about the errors of the Greeks. He sent back a letter which clearly stated his views." (Runciman, 91)

¹⁶ Martin Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*, vols. 1-2, (Paris: Letouzey et Anè, 1926-1933), 178.

Photius the whole Christendom held the common doctrine¹⁸ which he calls “Catholic dogma” and it is clear which opinion he means by that. At the same time some Orthodox scholars with the same resoluteness announce that all the Fathers (both Latin and Greek) believed in the sole procession.¹⁹

The issue of the *Filioque* contains two charges: the first is the addition to the creed without the decision of an Ecumenical council; the second is that it implies a heretical doctrine. The scholars normally pay much more attention to the first accusation, since it reflects the struggle of the Sees for primacy and of the Empire and the Papacy for the leadership of Christendom,²⁰ while our main interest is the doctrinal content of this addition. Different explanations may be given to the addition of the *Filioque* (the fight with the heresies of the West,²¹ and so on), but it reflected the peculiarity of the Latin theology. How was this peculiarity realized, and how was

¹⁷ Jugie, 178-9.

¹⁸ “Quando Photius in sua encyclica epistola ad Orientales litem iterum movit, tota Ecclesia occidentalis fide explicita credebatur et palam profitebatur Spiritum Sanctum *aequaliter a Patre et a Filio procedere*, quamquam hoc dogma nondum omni ex parte elucidatum erat penitusque investigatum.” (Jugie, 77).

¹⁹ See George Dion. Fr. Dragas, “The Eighth Ecumenical Council: Constantinople IV (879/880) and the Condemnation of the *Filioque* Addition and Doctrine.” *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. 44, number 1-4, (1999), 361.

²⁰ “In a certain sense the schism was political but Byzantine distaste for Papal pronouncements on political and military matters had theological roots. Many Byzantine politicians including most of the emperors, were prepared to compromise. Stubborn resistance came from the monks, the parish clergy, and the lower classes in town and country, who loved their part in the liturgy, and could not believe that the Latins had the same religion as themselves.

The theological difference between East and West is elusive and difficult to state, but it may be safe to say that the difference in the doctrine of the Trinity implies a different idea of personality in God, and therefore of the personal action of the Holy Ghost in the Church and in the world. This underlies the difference in the doctrine of grace, which did not become explicit until the schism was an accomplished fact, as also the West’s need for a human focus and center of authority in the Church.” (George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*, (New York: AMS Press, 1980), 193).

“Given the nature of the Byzantine polity with its accepted interdependence of church and state it was inevitable that politics should involve the Church. The situation was increasingly dominated by the relationship between the needs of the empire and the attitude of papacy... Constantinople at first continued to act as it had done in the heyday of its tenth-century prestige, though in fact its political authority was being eroded both within and without. But in the western world the reformed papacy... was gradually assuming an authority over the other four ancient patriarchates which was far removed from the primacy of honor which had been so willingly, and still was, accorded to Rome.” (Hussey, 167).

²¹ “Latini enim illud Filioque addiderunt tum propter haeresim arianam in Hispania vigentem tum propter Photium eiusque assecclas, qui fidei christianae dogma in fontibus Revelationis contentum

it justified, defended and explained? It is this question that I will try to answer in the next chapters.

negaverunt, dum Spiritum sanctum esse suum substantiale a Patre solo, Filio omnino excluso, accipere docuerunt.” (Jugie, 189)

Peter Damian's argumentation on the double procession of the Holy Ghost.

Peter Damian²² wrote his small treatise²³ on the procession of the Holy Ghost in 1062 as a response to the request of the Byzantine patriarch, Constantine III Lichoudes.²⁴ Nevertheless, to estimate Damian's activity as a pioneering act of reconciliation²⁵ would be something of an exaggeration. We desperately lack information on the reception of his treatise at the papal court and the Church in general, and it is most likely that the opposing side, that is, the Greeks, had never heard of him at all. Damian procured his writings to be collected, and to be sent to Rome, Monte-Cassino, and other centers, but scholars concern themselves mainly with his canonical or exegetical works in so far as they concern or reflect his political career, monastic reform activity or monastic spirituality.²⁶ Very few studies are devoted to the theological, more or less, questions which occupied Damian's attention.²⁷ The voluminous work of A. Cantin may help us to elucidate the style and approach of Peter Damian when dealing with theological questions.

²² The biographical information is mainly accessible thanks to Damian's disciple Joannes Lodinensis (Joannes, "Vita B. Petri Damiani," in Peter Damiani, *Opera Omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, P.L. v. 144, 113-146). See also Kurt Reindel, *Einleitung*, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, Teil 1, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit, Band IV, (Munich: MGH, 1982), 1-32; Lester K. Little, "The Personal Development of Peter Damian," in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. William C. Jordan, Bruce McNab, Teofilo F. Ruiz, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 317-343; Giovanni Lucchesi, "Per una Vita di San Pier Damiani, Componenti cronologiche e topografiche," in *San Pier Damiano nel IX centenario della morte (1072-1972)*.

²³ The only article known to me on this treatise is Stefano Belli, "La processione dello Spirito Santo nell' Op. 38 di San Pier Damiano primo apostolo dell'unione dei Greci con Roma," in "Studi su S. Pier Damiano: in onore del Cardinale Amleto Giovanni Cicognani," (Biblioteca Cardinale Gaetano Cicognani 5, 1961), 21-38.

²⁴ Hussey, 138. Leclercq, 222.

²⁵ Cf. S. Belli's opinion.

²⁶ See the main and recent bibliography on Peter Damian in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, Teil 4, (Munich: MGH, 1993), XII-XXVIII.

²⁷ While for the antidialectical position and reproach for philosophy of Peter Damian we have lots of studies, on his theology, save the question of divine omnipotence, there are few: Jean Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien: l'Ermite et l'Homme de l'Eglise*. (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1960). André Cantin, *Les Sciences Séculières et la Foi. Le Deux Voies de la Sciences au Jugement de S. Pierre Damien (1007-1072)*. (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1975).

We know that Damian had studied, and later on he himself taught, liberal arts before he entered the Fonte Avellana monastery. Nevertheless, it is widely known that he detested dialectics and rhetoric after his conversion, and earned himself the fame of being an anti-dialectician, though his skills in both arts are evident for anyone who reads his writings.²⁸ Perhaps his personal disappointment in these led him to take his vows,²⁹ but whatever be his motives, we have his thorough criticism both of rhetoric and of dialectics.

Damian discredits rhetoric for its vain talkativeness (*scurrilitas*). It is the more to be blamed because every word has as its prefiguration and model the only Word, that of God.³⁰ Contemporary rhetoricians do not employ the rules and conventions of speech according to its highest purpose, but, rather, abuse and distort its own nature: “Ils ont abandonné la source d’eau vive, c’est-à-dire négligé le Verbe de Vie.”³¹

The scrutiny of dialectics shows that the dialecticians also abuse the nature of their art.³² First of all, they are too confident in their ability and in their skills as well

²⁸ “La simplicité, l’ingénuité, l’élégance, la propriété gagnées par la “sainte rigueur” sur le poids d’ornements tenaces imposé par la rhétorique de son temps.” Cantin, 372.

²⁹ Cf. Lester K. Little, “The Personal Development of Peter Damian,” in *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of Joseph R. Strayer*, ed. William C. Jordan, Bruce McNab, Teofilo F. Ruiz, (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1976, 317-343.

³⁰ “Il dénonce, jusque dans ses formes les plus châtiées, une parole dénaturée, oublieuse de son sens et de sa dignité naturelle. D’abord pour ce qui occupe cette parole, et surtout en raison de ce qui devrait l’occuper. Rappelons-nous sa parole et son jugement sur les “citermes qui fuient”: “Ils ont abandonné la source d’eau vive, c’est-à-dire négligé le Verbe de Vie (“...Sales... omnesque verborum inanum pestes...”).” (op. 20, P.L. 145, 454 A).” Toute parole que la bouche de l’homme profère prend part à ce Verbe. Comme il est créateur, vivifiant, elle est faite pour communiquer la vie, pour édifier. “Que la langue des docteurs s’exerce aux paroles de vie (“...in verbis vitae se exerceat lingua doctorum...”) (s. 24, P.L. 144, 640 A).” Cantin, 103.

³¹ Cantin, 103.

³² “Le témoignage découvre unilatéralement -- ô combien -- les traits de “l’arrogance” dialectique qui provoquent un spirituel à la colère et, quand il le peut, à la dérision: la duperie, parfois dupée par elle-même, de ceux qui vivent de sophismes: “ .. Où veulent-ils en venir, tous ces hommes trompeurs, introducteurs d’un dogme sacrilège, qui en tendant les pièges de leurs questions aux autres, ne s’aperçoivent pas qu’ils s’y précipitent eux-mêmes la tête la première...” (“Sed quid sibi volunt vani quilibet homines et sacrilegi dogmatis inductores qui, dum aliis quaestionem suarum tendiculas struunt, quod in eas ipsi ante praecipites corruant non attendunt; et dum simpliciter gradientibus scandala frivolae inquisitionis obiciunt, ipsi potius in lapidem offensionis inpingunt”. (op. 36, P.L. 145, 602 D)... Leur présomption impie: “Nos gens ..., impatientes qu’ils sont de connaître ce qui dépasse leur portée,

as in their art itself. The former is expressed in their *arrogantia*,³³ the latter in their breaking the limits of natural capacity of the art of dialectics.³⁴ Any understanding starts with external, that is, sensual, experience which can be either our own or received from another, hopefully a direct witness himself, on the basis of our trust and confidence in him.³⁵ Dialecticians (*sapientes huius saeculi*) are interested only in the right reasoning, in a formal sequence of propositions, which has hardly any relation to truth itself, to reality, as it were, to the true state of affairs. They step beyond the reliable usage of their art as soon as they begin to treat questions other than logic itself:

ne font en réalité que rendre moins pénétrant le regard de leur esprit, parce qu'ils ne craignent pas d'offenser l'Auteur même de la lumière ("Isti autem .. dum altiora gestiunt nosse quam capiunt, potius aciem suae mentis obtundunt, quia ipsum lucis Auctorem offendere non pavescent" (ibid, 604 A). Les effets ruineux des ruses dialectiques: la foi troublée, l'enseignement de l'Église corrompu, l'hérésie." Cantin, 158.

³³ "Ceux qui sont impatients d'aller à Dieu, non par le chemin de l'humilité, mais par les détours de l'arrogance ou de l'enflure, il est bien évident qu'ils ne reconnaissent pas le passage par où ils pourraient entrer. Mais, puisque la porte est le Christ... ils ne trouvent pas la porte. Ils se sont livrés au sens condamné... ("Qui enim non per humilitatis iter, sed per arrogantiae anfractus ad Deum accedere gestiunt, patet profecto quia unde ingressione aditus pateat non agnoscunt. Sed quia ostium est Christus, sicut ipse dicit: "Ego sum ostium" ..ostium non inveniunt. In reprobis autem sensum traditi sunt, quia dum reatus sui pondus in propriae mentis statera subtili consideratione non trutinant, gravissimam plumbi massam penarum inanum levitatem putant" (op.7, P.L. 145, 165 CD)." Cantin, 160.

³⁴ "Il leur [the dialecticians attacked by him in Monte-Cassino in 1066] reproche de passer les limites de l'art dialectique, ars disserendi, parce qu'ils en ignorent la nature et les pouvoirs (mera solius artis virtus). Ils osent l'appliquer à Dieu, et, par une objection dialectique, ils contestent sa tout-puissance. Ils oublient que l'art ne leur donne pas plus accès au mystère divin qu'à une réalité quelconque. Car s'il enseigne à enchaîner régulièrement des propositions ("verborum ex arte procedentium consequentia"), il ignore par nature si elles sont vraies; il apprend à raisonner juste, mais sur des prémisses empruntées et qu'il ne peut garantir. D'où vient que ses enchaînements les plus régulières sont toujours "extérieurs" à la réalité des choses ("exteriorum verborum consequentia"), et qu'une question qui appartient à la dialectique ("haec ... quaestio... ad artis dialecticae probatur pertinere peritiam") ne concerne pas cette réalité ("non ad virtutem vel materiam rerum"), quelque apparence qu'elle ait de s'y rapporter... Car si l'art ne peut justifier ses prémisses, en quoi un enchaînement "nécessaire" lui donnerait-il droit d'affirmer, sur quelque chose que ce soit, les conclusions qu'il en tire?" Cantin, 237-8.

³⁵ "Il [Damian] ne croit pas -- là est sa limite -- que la connaissance vraie ait d'autre source que l'expérience ("experimentum") ou le témoignage de qui possède l'expérience, dans la mesure de son autorité. Il "confond" et "détruit" les "raisons des dialecticiens" ("dialecticorum ... necessaria... atque inevitabilia.. argumenta") par ce qu'ils dédaignent d'observer: les témoignages de la Parole divine et les observations de "ceux qui attestent qu'ils ont vu (op.36, P.L. 145, 614 B.) Il renverse l'universalité de "savoir" qu'une science formelle se donne à trop bon compte au nom de l'universalité de ses principes. Il voit "l'enchaînement des mots extérieurs" "s'arroger le magistère" et décider seul du vrai, sans l'appui de la réalité. D'où il reconnaît dans l'art qui l'enseigne, invention pour prouver sa "propre opinion" en se libérant de l'attention qui la corrigerait, moyen de parler ("copia dicendi") sans consulter ce dont on parle, art de connaître une chose en en dissertant, instrument pour se passer du

Haec plane quae ex dialecticorum, vel rhetorum prodeunt argumentis, non facile divinae virtutis sunt aptanda mysteriis; et quae ad hoc inventa sunt, ut in syllogismorum instrumenta proficiant, vel clausulas dictionum, absit, ut sacris legibus se pertinaciter inferant et divinae virtuti conclusionis suae necessitates opponant. Quae tamen artis humanae peritia, si quando tractandis sacris eloquiis adhibetur, non debet ius magisterii sibimet arroganter arripere; sed velut ancilla dominae quodam famulatus obsequio subservire, ne si praecedat, oberret, et dum exteriorum verborum sequitur consequentias, intimae virtutis lumen et rectum veritatis tramitem perdat.³⁶

[Those which come from the arguments of the dialecticians and rhetoricians are clearly not with ease applicable to the mysteries of the divine excellence; and let us restrain from those which are invented for progressing in the syllogistic apparatus or in clauses of propositions, for they pertinaciously interfere in the divine laws and induce necessities of their conclusions to divine excellence. Which, however, skill of human art, if it is put to the treatment of the sacred sayings, should not arrogantly claim the right of teaching, but like a handmaiden of a mistress, be subservient for some obedience of the service, lest she get lost, if she precedes <the mistress>; and lest, while following the consequences of the external words, she lose the light of intimate virtue and due course of the truth.]

But what higher testimony could there be than that of God Himself: Revelation? The only instrument of reasoning, therefore, and way of understanding becomes the minute perusal of the Holy Scripture, its attentive interpretation and steadfast following after its precepts. Cantin concludes his study of Damian's methodology in "la science sacrée":

Le soin d'une "attention exacte" paraît enfermer en soi l'ensemble des attitudes qu'il oppose, tant dans sa pratique que dans sa critique des sciences, aux complaisances formelles du trivium.³⁷... L'attention qu'il porte à l'Écriture, dans l'étude sacrée, y trouve la condition première de toute sciences: l'idée que tout ce qui tombe sous la connaissance de l'homme est intelligible étant ordonné par des lois qu'un "Auteur raisonnable" a disposées dans un ordre total et selon un sens; et l'invitation à rechercher dans ces lois les expressions diverse d'une loi unique d'où toute existence procède.³⁸... Une attention religieuse portée à la Parole divine, dans l'étude sacrée, et étendue aux oeuvres de la Parole, dans les sciences, semble avoir formé dans son esprit les habitudes qui donnent à sa pratique des sciences ce qu'elle a de rigueur et de fécondité.³⁹... L'étude sacrée réalise ainsi l'unité dans les sciences, à mesure qu'elle s'y étend, non par une prétention théorique à l'universalité,

langage divin des choses pour écarter les témoins de la vérité, ressource pour ne plus entendre que soi." Cantin, 238-9.

³⁶ Op. 36, 603 C-D.

³⁷ Cantin, 595.

³⁸ Cantin, 600-1.

³⁹ Cantin, 605.

mais par un retrait, au contraire, dans la pure étude de l'Écriture, d'où elle est comme reportée à toutes les oeuvres divines, avec les principes et les dispositions nécessaires pour les étudier.⁴⁰ ... C'est la solution d'un moine qui, en appliquant les vertus monastique aux sciences, intègre les sciences à la contemplation."⁴¹

Thus, the exegetical approach was the characteristic feature of Damian's style in the main body of his writings.

With specific regard to our treatise, of course, the very patriarchal request – to provide the scriptural evidence in favor of the double procession of the Holy Ghost – in a sense determined Damian's approach. Moreover, the question to be considered is of such a nature that no human reason or understanding can attain it without help from beyond:

Sed res ineffabilis quae nullo valet humanae rationis ingenio concipi, nullo potest mentis intuitus vel consideratione discerni, ex divinorum duntaxat eloquiorum debet sentiis colligi...⁴² qualiter intuitus humanus attingeret, nisi per organa prophetarum vel per incarnatum verbum suum Deus omnipotens hoc mortalibus revelaret?⁴³ ... Ad comprehendendum ergo summum et ineffabile verae fidei sacramentum, non humanae opinionis sequamur indaginem, sed solam amplectamur caelestis eloquii veritatem, ut hoc potissimum de Deo credatur, quod divinitus dicitur, et in his, quae summa et incomprehensibilis veritas perhibet, fidei nostrae constantia non vacillet.⁴⁴ ... Et quamquam nobis ignota sint archanae profunditatis occulta misteria, non tamen dubitamus in eo, quod Dominus loquitur, non ambigimus in eo quoque, quod in prophetarum vaticiniis invenitur."⁴⁵

[But the ineffable thing which can be conceived with no wit of human reason, which cannot be discerned with no intuition of mind or any consideration, it is what is to be elicited from the sentences of the divine sayings... How would the human intuition attain what omnipotent God has revealed to the mortal, if not through the prophets and His incarnated Word? ... So, in order to comprehend the highest and ineffable sacrament of the true faith let us not follow the inquiry of human opinion, but let us embrace the truth of the heavenly sayings alone; so that that would be staunchly believed about God what is said from divinity and [so that we believe] in these what the highest and incomprehensible truth expounds, [so that too] the perseverance of our faith may not stagger... And though the hidden mysteries of the secret depth

⁴⁰ Cantin, 614.

⁴¹ Cantin, 620.

⁴² Damian, N. 91, 6, 1-3.

⁴³ Damian, N. 91, 6,10-13.

⁴⁴ Damian, N. 91, 6,16-21.

⁴⁵ Damian, N. 91, 9, 2-4.

are unknown to us, however, we will not doubt what God says and we will not hesitate in what is revealed in the predictions of the prophets.]

Thus, Damian turned to the sources, the first of which of course was Holy Scripture,⁴⁶ but he also had a wide knowledge of the Church Fathers:⁴⁷ he drew extensively from Origen and Jerome as regards biblical commentaries, and from Cyprian as regards the unity of the Church.⁴⁸ It is to Augustine and Gregory to whom he is especially indebted as regards theology: *nos autem, quia beatorum doctorum Augustini atque Gregorii, aliorumque catholicorum patrum doctrinis instruimur.*⁴⁹

Since the only basis of ecclesiastical discipline is the testimony (first and foremost that of Scripture, but also that of the Fathers), and the opposing sides claim at the same time to have both scriptural and patristic substantiation in their favor, the question to be solved needs a judge, an arbiter who has an authority to decide, entrusted to him by the Lord Himself. That is why Peter starts his treatise with praise of the patriarch for his appeal to Rome for a solution. Damian demonstrates that St. Peter received, and his successors inherited from him, *magisterium*. From apostolic times onwards, namely from St. Paul who came to St. Peter and stayed for learning, if any question arises, it is to be directed for consideration and judgement of St. Peter's heir:

*hunc enim prae ceteris mortalibus de toto terrarum orbe conditor orbis elegit, cui cathedram magisterii principaliter in aecclesia tenere perpetuo privilegii iure concessit, ut quisquis divinum aliquid ac profundum nosse desiderat, ad huius praeceptoris oraculum doctrinamque recurrat.*⁵⁰

[It is him before all other mortals of the whole world whom the Creator has chosen and to whom He has principally conferred to hold for ever the teaching

⁴⁶ "Pierre Damine va aux sources: on a vu que la première d'entre elles est pour lui l'Écriture Sainte." (Leclercq, 218).

⁴⁷ "D'anciens inventaires nous renseignent sur les accroissements successifs de la collection de manuscrits de Font Avellane: elle est vaste, pour l'époque." (Leclercq, 218).

⁴⁸ Cf. Leclercq, 219.

⁴⁹ Op 1, 37.

⁵⁰ Damian, N. 91, 2, 22-24 – 3, 1. For details on the primacy of Rome, see F. Dvornik, *Byzance et la Primauté Romaine*, (Paris: Les Edition du Cerf, 1964). Cf. Gerd Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

chair in the Church for the right of privilege, so that if one were to wish to find out something divine and deep, he would turn to the sentence and the doctrine of this instructor.]

After having defined the highest level of authority for appeal and decision, Damian provides an account of scriptural and patristic texts on the basis of which Greeks deny Christ to be the source of the Holy Ghost's procession: *unde ignorantiae istius oriatur origo*.⁵¹ These texts (Matt. 10,20; Luke 24,49; John 14,16-17; 14,26; 15,26;⁵² etc.) assert the Holy Ghost to be of or from the Father (*Patris, a Patre, etc.*). Also Latin doctors (Jerome, Augustine, Pope Leo III, etc.) may be understood as confirming the sole procession. Nonetheless, neither Scripture nor the Fathers overtly forbid confessing that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. Jugie states that Damian believes that Greeks interpret Scripture in an exclusive, Latins in an inclusive sense.⁵³

If it is impossible to find an expressed ban on the double procession doctrine: *Nam cum vel ipse dominus vel sancti quoque doctores aecclesiae Spiritum sanctum a Patre procedere concorditer asserant, nusquam tamen perhibent, quod a Filio non procedat*,⁵⁴ then we have to look for indirect statements on the nature and source of the Holy Ghost. Damian follows Augustine's teaching: the trinity is one God, whose unity and uniqueness are assured in the simplicity of His essence (*sed tota illa divinitatis essentia ita simplici est naturae*).⁵⁵ Though one in essence, divinity has the properties of persons (*proprietates personarum*), which are distinguished by "*distantia*," not by essence (*in sancta vero trinitate personarum confitemur esse*

⁵¹ Damian, N. 91, 4, 6.

⁵² "Non enim vos estis, qui loquimini, sed spiritus Patris vestri, qui loquitur in vobis." (Matt. 10,20) "Ecce ego mitto promissum Patris mei in vos." (Luke 24, 49) "Cum venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis a Patre, spiritum veritatis, qui a Patre procedet, ille testimonium perhibebit de me." (John 15, 26). "Ego rogabo Patrem et alium Paraclitum dabit vobis, ut maneat vobiscum in aeternum, spiritum veritatis." (John 14, 16-17) "Paraclitus autem Spiritus sanctus, quem mittet Pater in nomine meo, ille vos docebit omnia." (John 14, 26) "Si ergo vos, cum sitis mali, nostis bona data dare filiis vestris, quanto magis Pater vester de caelo dabit spiritum bonum petentibus se?" (Luke 11, 13)

⁵³ Jugie, 354.

⁵⁴ Damian, N. 91, 5, 13-15.

⁵⁵ Op. 1, 23.

distantiam, non naturae.⁵⁶ But what kind of property could it be? Basil wrote that distinction of persons might be found either in specific manifestation, or in specific relation.⁵⁷ The former is directed outside, that is, towards creation, while the latter is internal interrelation inside the Godhead. During the trinitarian debates, the Cappadocian Fathers proved the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost (against the Pneumatomachian heresy).⁵⁸ However, the *person* of the Holy Ghost remained a vague and unspecified notion, unlike the persons of the Father and the Son, which are more or less conceivable. But if the Holy Ghost is a divine person, then His property is supposed to be eternal, that is, an internal trinitarian distinction. If, again, the Father and the Son's relation were more or less clear, that of the Holy Ghost to the Father and to the Son needed further clarification. The Latin fathers, namely Augustine, established the theory of procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son as their mutual relation to each other, that is divine Love uniting them both, in order to protect the divinity of Christ. In the East, John of Damascus proposed the formula of procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father through the Son (διὰ υἱοῦ, translated later in Latin as *per filium*) in order to protect the monarchy of the Father. Keeping in mind this background of the problem we may turn to the arguments of Damian.

I shall put the arguments and evidence provided by Damian in a more structured way, while following his own order. Damian wrote twice on the procession: our treatise and the chapter in his exposition of the faith for Ambrose. They were written approximately in the same period, the first half of the 1060s, and

⁵⁶ Op. 1, 28.

⁵⁷ Panagiotis Christou, *L'Enseignement de Saint Basil sur le Saint-Esprit*, (Π. Κ. Χρηστού, Θεολογικά Μελετήματα 2, Γραμματεία τοῦ Δ' αιώνα, Θεσσαλονίκη, 1975), on -line copy: http://www.myriobiblos.gr/texts/french/christou_basilesprit.html

⁵⁸ See J. Pelikan, "The Three and the One," in *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, (Chicago, 1992), 221-225.

he uses mostly the same biblical passages and citations⁵⁹ to make his point, but what is intriguing is that he reverses the order of them. In the response to the patriarch he proceeds in a logical way: from the argument of the divine essence through the arguments of the double mission and of the Son's Spirit to the exegetical (typological) interpretations, allegedly his own, and, in the end, the teachings of the Fathers. In the letter to Ambrose he starts with prefiguration of the Old Testament and proceeds through the Gospels to the Fathers (both Greek and Latin). We may start with the *argument of the essence*. The divinity has the same and simple essence. The Son states that "I and the Father are one." (John 10, 30) How then, could the Holy Ghost proceed from what is one and not proceed?

*...immo cum dicitur Spiritus sanctus a Patre procedere, a Filio quoque procedere credi necesse est, quia Pater et Filius unius eiusdem substantiae procul dubio est. Nam cum Filius dicat: Ego et Pater unum sumus, quomodo potest Spiritus sanctus ab eo, quod unum est, et procedere et non procedere?*⁶⁰

[Indeed when the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, it is necessary to believe that He also proceeds from the Son, since the Father and the Son are, no doubt, of the one and the same substance. For when the Son says: "I and the Father are one," how can the Holy Spirit proceed and not proceed from who is one?]

Damian's next argument is *that of the mission*. Scripture states that the Holy Ghost is sent and will be sent both by the Father and the Son.⁶¹ But from the double mission of the Holy Ghost obviously follows the double procession:

*Cum ergo Paraclitum et Pater mittat in nomine Filii, et Filius mittat a Patre, patet profecto, quia, sicut ab utroque, qui procul dubio unum sunt, mittitur, ita nichilominus et ab utroque procedit.*⁶²

[So, when the Father sends the Comforter in the name of the Son and when the Son sends Him from the Father, obviously follows that since just as He is sent from both who are doubtlessly one, so, anyway, He proceeds from both.]

⁵⁹ See the table in the appendix.

⁶⁰ Damian, N. 91, 5, 13-19.

⁶¹ "Paraclitus autem Spiritus sanctus, quem mittet Pater in nomine meo, ille vos docebit omnia." (John 14, 26) "Cum venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis a Patre..." (John 15, 26)

⁶² Damian, N. 91, 6, 28-31

The other one is the *argument of the Spirit's pertaining to the Son*, which is manifold.

- The Spirit is said to be the Spirit of the Truth,⁶³ but the Truth itself is Christ;⁶⁴ then it follows that the Spirit is that of Christ Himself:

*Et qui sepe spiritus veritatis dicitur, cum utique Christus sit veritas, qui spiritus est veritatis, spiritus est procul dubio Filii.*⁶⁵

- Another way of showing that the Spirit is of the Son is by the Spirit's being in Christ:

*Ille de me clarificabit, quia de meo accipiet. (John 16, 14) De meo scilicet accipiet, quia et in me est. Unde et in Isaia vox Patris ad Filium: Spiritus meus, inquit, qui est in te, et verba mea, quae posui in ore tuo, non recedant de ore tuo et de ore seminis tui usque ad aeternum.*⁶⁶ (Isa. 59, 21)⁶⁷

- The Spirit is also *virtus, quae de illo* [Christ] *exiebat*:⁶⁸ as for instance in the cases of healing.⁶⁹

But we have the expressed indication about the Spirit of the Son: Gal. 4, 6; Rom. 8, 9; Phil. 1, 19; 1 Pet. 1, 10-11; Ecclus 24, 27,⁷⁰ from what follows that whenever Scripture says about the Spirit it is implied that the Spirit has as His source and origin both the Father and the Son, whether they both are mentioned or not:

⁶³ "Cum venerit Paraclitus, quem ego mittam vobis a Patre, *spiritum veritatis*, qui a Patre procedet, ille testimonium perhibebit de me." (John 15, 26)

⁶⁴ "*Ego sum Via, Veritas et Vita.*" (John 14, 6)

⁶⁵ Damian, N. 91, 6, 31-33.

⁶⁶ Damian, N. 91, 6, 33-7, 3.

⁶⁷ Cf. Vulgata version: "Hoc foedus meum cum eis, dixit Dominus: Spiritus meus qui est *super te* et verba mea quae posui in ore tuo non recedent de ore tuo et de ore seminis tui et de ore seminis seminis tui, dixit Dominus, amodo et usque in sempiternum." (Isa. 59, 21)

⁶⁸ Damian, N. 91, 7, 3-7. "Et omnis turba quaerebant eum tangere, quia virtus de illo exibat et sanabat omnes." (Luke 6, 19).

⁶⁹ "At dixit Iesus: "Tetigit me aliquis; nam et ego novi virtutem de me exisse." (Luke 8, 49)

⁷⁰ "Quoniam autem estis filii, misit Deus *Spiritum Filii* sui in corda nostra clamantem: "Abba, Pater!" (Gal. 4, 6); "Vos autem in carne non estis sed in Spiritu, si tamen Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis. Si quis autem *Spiritum Christi* non habet, hic non est eius." (Rom. 8, 9); "Scio enim quia hoc mihi proveniet in salutem per vestram orationem et subministrationem *Spiritus Iesu Christi*," (Phil. 1, 19); "De qua salute exquisierunt atque scrutati sunt prophetae, qui de futura in vos gratia prophetaverunt, scrutantes in quod vel quale tempus significaret, qui erat in eis *Spiritus Christi*, praenuntians eas, quae in Christo sunt, passiones et posteriores glorias," (1 Pet. 1, 10-11); "*Spiritus meus* super mel dulcis, et hereditas mea super mel et favum," (Ecclus. 24, 27) Cf. Vulgata version: "*Doctrina enim mea* super mel dulcis, et hereditas mea super mel et favum." (Ecclus. 4, 27)

*Sicut ergo cum Filii vel Christi spiritus dicitur, non statim consequitur ut eum possimus a Patre disiungere, ita cum dicitur Spiritus Patris, non eum possumus a Filio separare.*⁷¹

The decisive argument on the Spirit's pertaining to the Son is the *infusion*,⁷² when Christ breathes out and confers (*mittit*) the Spirit on his disciples, which combines the arguments rendered above (that of the mission and that of the Spirit's belonging to the Son):

*Nec sane putandum est, quod flatus ille corporeus, qui tunc aerem percussit, Spiritus sanctus fuerit, sed per congruam hanc significationem convenienter ostensum est, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit ab ipso.*⁷³

[It is not reasonable to believe that that corporeal breath which at a time struck the air, was the Holy Spirit, but through this suitable signification that the Spirit proceeds from Him is fitly shown.]

The last section of his description of the scriptural evidence Damian devotes to a specific “typological” construction, where he juxtaposes and interprets in the light of the Gospels some fragments of the Old Testament, namely, the passages from Isaiah, from Job, and from the Psalms. (He also inserts the justification of his exegetical approach, for if he interprets something too literally, he does it only because the first interpreters, that is, the apostles, did it in this way.)⁷⁴ In this typology on the basis of Pentecostal descending of the Holy Ghost on the apostles, he identifies the sound of God's mouth with the Spirit, the mouth itself with Christ, and the one speaking with God Himself:

Isaia quoque, cum de Filio Dei loqueretur, adiecit: Percutiet terram virga oris sui et spiritu labiorum suorum interficiet impium. (Isa. 11, 4) Cui sententiae concinens Paulus in epistola ad Thessalonicenses ait: Tunc revelabitur ille iniquus, quem Dominus Iesus interficiet spiritu oris sui et destruet illustratione adventus sui. (2 Thess. 2, 8) Quod etiam in libro beati Job mystice designatur, cum dicitur: Audiet auditionem in terrore vocis eius, et sonum de ore illius

⁷¹Damian, N. 91, 7, 18-20.

⁷² “Et cum hoc dixisset, insufflavit et dicit eis: “Accipite Spiritum Sanctum.” (John 20, 22)

⁷³Damian, N. 91, 8, 3-5.

⁷⁴Damian, N. 91, 9.

procedentem.⁷⁵ (Job 37, 2) *Os denique Patris in hoc loco intellegitur Filius, per quem videlicet nobis divinae legis sanctio promulgatur. Sonus vero de illius ore procedens Spiritus sanctus est, qui a Filio veniens mirabiliter sonuit, cum super apostolos repentino in sonitu linguarum varietate descendit.* Factus est, *inquit*, repente de caelo sonus tamquam advenientis spiritus vehementis. (Acts 2, 2) *Hic nempe sonus, qui de ore Christi prodiit, ipse est proculdubio gladius bis acutus, quem Johannes in Apocalypsi ex eiusdem labiis exire conspexit. De quo per psalmistam dicitur: Verbo Domini caeli firmati sunt, et spiritu oris eius omnis virtus eorum.*⁷⁶ (Ps. 33, 6) *Quia ergo, sicut dictum est, quam spiritus Christi.*⁷⁷

[Also Isaiah, when he speaks about the Son of God, adds: “and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked.” To which St. Paul unanimously adds in his letter to Thessalonians: “and then shall that wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” That also is mysteriously designated in the book of the blessed Job, when he says: “hear attentively the noise of his voice and the sound that goeth out of his mouth.” Of course *the mouth of God* means here the Son, through whom clearly the sanction of the divine law is proclaimed to us. *The sound* of his mouth is the proceeding Holy Spirit who on his coming fore from the Son, sounds marvelously when he suddenly descends on the apostles in the variety of languages. “And, says the apostle, suddenly there came a sound from the heaven as of a rushing mighty wind.” Of course this very sound that comes forth from Christ’s mouth is no doubt that double-edged sword which John saw come out of his mouth in the Apocalypse. About which it is said also through the Psalmist: “the skies are established with the word of the Lord and with the spirit of his mouth all firmness of theirs.” For, as it is said, which is the Spirit of Christ.]

At the end of his compendium of evidence, Damian provides patristic statements in favor of the double procession, citing Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Pope Gregory I and also the Greek Fathers Athanasius and Cyril. He also solves the possible counterargument: if the Son nowhere confesses overtly that the Spirit proceeds from Him, that evidently means that the Spirit does not proceed from Him, but from the Father alone. The Son always calls His doctrine not His, but His Father’s (*Mea doctrina non est mea*, (John 17, 16), though it is a clear contradiction, the only account for which can be the difference of meaning ‘*mea*’: *secundum formam Dei*

⁷⁵ Cf. Vulgata version: “Audite fremitum vocis eius et murmur de ore illius procedens.” (Job 37, 2)

⁷⁶ Cf. Vulgata version: “Verbo Domini caeli facti sunt, et spiritu oris eius omnis virtus eorum.” (Ps. 33, 6)

*suam secundum formam servi non suam.*⁷⁸ Then, what is surprising is that He never asserts for Himself the procession of the Spirit:

*Cum ergo doctrinam suam, quam simul cum Patre dictat esse non suam sed Patris esse perhibeat, quid mirum si Spiritum sanctum dicat de Patre procedere, a quo scilicet habebat idem Filius ut etiam de se ipso procederet?*⁷⁹

Now we may make some conclusions. Damian, though proceeding at first sight and on the surface in very exegetical way, strictly keeps in his mind the logical structure of the argumentation, which is supposedly addressed towards and against the outside party. He develops his reasoning from the level of the essential understanding of the unity and simplicity of the divine essence, leads us through the demonstration of the Spirit's belonging to the Son (in different relations) and ends up with the typological illustration. But having demonstrated the Spirit's pertaining to the Son, and supposedly the double procession, Damian has to define the relation of the Spirit inside the Trinity. And that is what he fails to do in a more or less reasonable way (may be because he has to do it on his own, for Scripture remains silent on this very point):

*Quod si queritur, cum de substantia Patris sit Filius, de substantia Patris sit nichilominus et Spiritus sanctus, cur unus Filius, et alius non sit Filius, non incongrue respondetur: De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus sanctus, sed ille genitus est, iste procedens, ideoque ille Filius est Patris, de quo et genitus est, iste autem spiritus utriusque, quoniam de utroque procedit. Verumtamen et illa generatio et ista processio non modo ineffabilis, sed et prorsus incomprehensibilis est.*⁸⁰

From his argumentation we also can justly suppose that he was not acquainted with the real Greek theories on the subject. He does not know any of the Greek counterarguments; moreover, he ends up with the statement identical with what

⁷⁷ Damian, N. 91, 8, 3-22.

⁷⁸ Damian, N. 91, 12, 5-6.

⁷⁹ Damian, N. 91, 12, 13-16.

⁸⁰ Damian, N. 91, 8, 23-29. However in another treatise he writes expressly against John of Damascus formula and opinion: "Qui profecto non de Patre procedit in Filium et de Filio procedit ad

Greeks meant by the distinguishing of the terms *ekporeusis* and *proienai*: *sed quia ab ipso [Patri] datum est Filio, ut etiam ex ipso procedat*.⁸¹ That is, the Spirit has as His ontological and supreme source the Cause without a cause, but as His “sending” cause (*processio* in the strict sense) which is inseparable from the First one, also the caused Cause.

(There is an ecclesiological issue at stake also. Since the Church was founded through the (Pentecostal) mission, and the Spirit impenetrates the faithful, while Christ is the Founder and the ultimate end of it, it would be more decent (*dignum est*) to derive the Spirit both from the Father and from the Son.)

On the whole, Damian’s treatise was a *vox clamantis in deserto*: from the theological point of view it did not make much progress in the field, and his treatise hardly contributed to the future polemics; from the point of view of politics, it contributed even less. Nevertheless, in his treatise Damian approached the problem in a very specific way: on collecting and interpreting passages of authorities, he tries to treat the issue exegetically, unlike the later Western developments on the subject and unlike the Eastern approach too. Therefore his treatise is an important evidence of Western dealing with the problem of the *Filioque*.

sanctificandam creaturam, sicut quidam impie ac pestilenter intelligunt; sed simul ab utroque.” (op. 1, 22 A)

Photius's *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*.

We are here concerned with Photius inasmuch as his doctrine laid the basis for all further developments; moreover, until the dispute of 1112, held in Constantinople, no other original argumentation was produced, and Theophylact drew on his treatises.⁸² As Jugie rightly notes, the Photian treatise is far from being strictly arranged.⁸³ His quite sophisticated arguments, which are normally composed in the form either of rhetorical questions, or of conclusions and implications drawn from the Latin doctrine which clearly point out the absurdity of the premise (that is, the *Filioque*), are interwoven with exclamations of blame and wails of anathematizations. His turbulent style causes many problems in eliciting his arguments, which in fact are rather counterarguments, Photius does not even try to prove his own doctrine; he is quite satisfied with the demonstration of the invalidity of the opposing side's opinion.⁸⁴ We can reduce his charges to two basic elements: the introduction of the double causation and the contamination of the distinctive properties of the persons. All his further reasons come from these chief accusations. It is difficult to range them in a strict

⁸¹ Damian, N. 91, 12, 20.

⁸² On the Photian *Mystagogy* see the introduction by Joseph Farrell to the english translation of the treatise: St. Photius, *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, (Brookline Mass.: The Holy Cross Press, 1987). On the Photian council see Francis Dvornik, *The Photian Scism. History and Legend*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948); Johan J. Meiji, *A Successful Council of Union: A Theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879-880*, (Thessalonike: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1975).

⁸³ "Hunc tractatum in quo logicum rerum ordinem in vanum quaeres, in formam epistolae redactum ad non paucos episcopos et amicos misisse videtur auctor; quem ignoravere Latini usque ad saeculum XII. [which in fact is not true, Anselm at least knew some arguments, either by hearsay, or by discussion with some Greek envoys at the council] Primus Hugo Etherianus [the translator in the court of Manuel I, a Pisan by origin] in graeca lingua optime versatus, in suo opere inscripto: *De haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt*, excerpta quaedam photianorum argumentorum latine reddidit." (Jugie, 191).

⁸⁴ Cf. Jugie's opinion: "Quamquam theologi byzantini communiter sacram doctrinam via ac ratione scholastica perraro tractarunt argumentisque positivis ex sacra scriptura et Patrum traditione depromptis fere unice operam dederunt, quoties tamen de processione Spiritus sancti cum Latinis disputarunt, ad humana ratiocinia plerumque confugerunt hisque nimium momentum tribuerunt. Hoc autem fecerunt, quia Photius illis hanc viam aperuerat." (Jugie, 192).

order, so we relate their ramifications in the way of slipping from the one type to another.

- a) The doctrine of the *Filioque* implies double causation in the Godhead, which destroys the simplicity of the Godhead.⁸⁵
- b) Moreover, on introducing at least two causes into the Godhead, why should we not add another and another, something which would lead to polytheism and gnosticism, for if the Son is from the Father and the Spirit is from the Son, the Spirit may well be the “grandson.”⁸⁶
- c) The double causation of the Spirit produces a double effect, that is, if the Spirit has His existence from distinct two causes, He in turn is composite.⁸⁷
- d) Then since the Spirit is from both the Father and the Son, He is, according to the mode of His existence, both begotten and proceeding at once (which is a mixture of properties).⁸⁸
- e) Otherwise, if the procession from the Son is not included in the procession from the Father, it is different and either adds something to the Father’s procession (and this means that the Father’s procession is incomplete and imperfect) or it adds nothing, which is an even more awkward conclusion.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ “But since it is claimed that He proceeds from two persons, the Spirit is brought to a double cause, thereby obscuring the simplicity of the Most High.” (St. Photius, *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, (Brookline Mass.: The Holy Cross Press, 1987), chapter 4/ page 61).

“For if according to the principle of anarchy, the paternal principle and cause is established as consubstantial to all, and the Son is therefore a cause, how can you escape the conclusion that there are two interchangeable causes in the Trinity?” (Photius, 14/ 64).

⁸⁶ “If the Son is begotten from the Father and the Spirit proceeds from the Son, by what reason do you not accord the Spirit, Who subsists in the same identical essence, the dignity of another procession from Himself at the same time? Otherwise, you degrade Him Who is worthy of equal honor.” (Photius, 8/ 63).

“If the Son is begotten from the Father, and the Spirit proceeds from the Son, then how is it that this godless doctrine does not, according to its own line of reasoning, make the Spirit a grandson and thus drive away the terrors of theology into prolix and idle talk?” (Photius, 60/ 88).

⁸⁷ “Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that the Spirit has been divided into two? On the one hand, He (the Spirit) proceeds from the Father, Who is the First cause and also unoriginate. On the other hand, however, He proceeds from a second cause, and this second cause is *not* underived. This heresy fabricates a distortion of the Spirit’s distinction, not merely by arrangement, but also in the category of His origin; it makes us cast off our adoration of the Trinity for a fourfold rashness.” (Photius, 43/ 79).

⁸⁸ “...if they both proceed from the Father, the Son by generation and the Spirit by a procession within this very same generation, and if thus the Spirit is brought into existence simultaneously with the Son, then the Son is begotten, but the Spirit will be both begotten and proceeding.” (Photius, 63/ 89).

⁸⁹ “For the procession of the Spirit from the son is not contained in the procession from the Father. If we say this, then why the assumption that the procession is not complete goes unnoticed?” (Photius, 7/ 62).

“For if (O what you have accosted to the Spirit?) the procession from the Father is perfect – because Perfect God proceeds from Perfect God – then what specific and concrete thing does the procession from the Son contribute? For if it supplies something concrete and specific, then the procession from the Father would not be perfect and complete.” (Photius, 31/ 75).

“For if the Spirit’s procession from the Son is not any different than that from the Father, then this participation by the Son in personal properties of the Father brings the likeness of the Father upon the Son.” (Photius, 40/ 78).

- f) But all these double causation, and consequently, effects, and double procession end up in total mixture of the properties. For if the causation, which is the hypostatic property of the Father, is shared by another person, the Son, why do we deny the Spirit from sharing it too, since He has equal dignity and the same essence (otherwise, we degrade His dignity and destroy His consubstantiality)? So, each person should produce another either in succession (which leads to polytheism and gnosticism) or in the circle of the three given persons (and we turn the Holy Trinity into a confused hotchpotch).⁹⁰

Thus we see that Photius propagated the doctrine of a personal and *not* essential source of the procession of the Spirit,⁹¹ for he followed the line of Greek theology that had always been bent on an apophatic approach to the divine.⁹² For him the Son and the Spirit have their existence from the Father alone, who is the only uncaused cause. The persons share the divine essence, they are consubstantial with each other, but they do not proceed from the essence (neither the Son nor the Spirit), they are not caused

⁹⁰ “For if the Son and the Spirit came forth from the same cause, that is to say, the Father, and if – as this blasphemy cries out – the Spirit also proceeds from the Son, then why not simply tear up the Word and propagate the fable that the Spirit also produces the Son, thereby according to the same dignity to each person by allowing each person to produce the other person? For if each person is in the other, then of necessity each is the cause and completion of the other. And not according to any different manner – by no means – even if you say that the Spirit proceeds and the Son is begotten! For reason demands equality for each person so that each person exchanges the grace of causality indistinguishably.” (Photius, 3/ 60).

“For if each person is as great as the others, then the procession is common to all three persons by virtue of the simple indivisible essence. And if each person is as great as the others, then all share in a common and unique simplicity, and therefore the Spirit and the Father will be caused by the Son and the Spirit in the similar manner... If this is so, then the Spirit would participate in his own procession: on the one hand as causing Himself, on the other as being caused.” (Photius, 6/ 62).

“According to their sophistical deliberations, each person is God, and thus each person receives the features of the other two persons.” (Photius, 16/ 65).

“If the Son is begotten and the Spirit proceeds from the Son (as this delirium of theirs would have it) then the Spirit of the Father is distinguished by more personal properties than the Son of the Father: on the one hand as proceeding from the equality of the Son and the Spirit, the Spirit is thus derived from the person of the Father; if the Spirit is further differentiated by two distinctions brought about by the dual procession, then the Spirit is not only differentiated by more distinctions than the Son of the Father, but the Son is closer to the Father’s essence. And this is so precisely because the Spirit is distinguished by two specific properties. Therefore He is inferior to each of the other two persons and therefore inferior to the Son, Who in turn is of the same nature as the Father! Thus the Spirit’s equal dignity is blasphemed, once again giving to the Macedonian insanity against the Spirit.” (Photius, 32/ 75-6).

“But if the procession from the Son is said not to be causal, then they reinforce their own poison...” (Photius, 36/ 77).

⁹¹ “...personal source of the processions...” (Photius, 36/ 77).

⁹² Cf. Jugie’s opinion: “Notatu dignum est Photium in modo concipiendi mysterium Trinitatis Latinis potius quam Graecis accedere. Etenim, Latinorum instar, in naturam divinam prius mentis oculum figit

by the essence, but only by the person (that of the Father). The divine essence has nothing to do with the Aristotelian “species-individual” distinction; in the divinity the essence is “essence-above-essence” and no rational comprehension can conceive its mystery.⁹³

The *Panoplia* of Michael Cerularius.

In fact, Patriarch Michael Cerularius (at least, in the text we have) adds nothing new to the accusation and fallacies discovered by Photius. He just restates the charge of introducing in the simple and one and the same Godhead a plurality of causes, which inevitably leads to the mixture of property distinction, and the destruction of the monarchy of the Father:

Ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐχὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὡς οἱ Λατῖνοί φασιν. Ὁμολογῶ πατέρα ἀγέννητον, υἱὸν γεννητὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἐκπορευτὸν. Ἴδιον τὸ ἀγεννητὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἴδιον τὸ γεννητὸν τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἴδιον τὸ ἐκπορευτὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Τὰ γὰρ ἴδια οὐ κοινά. Εἰ γοῦν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς οἱ Λατῖνοί φασιν, ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος γεννᾶται ὁ υἱός. ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀγέννητον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὡς ἄρα τοῖς ἰδίῳις ὡς κοινοῖς χρῶνται: καὶ ἰδοὺ τρεῖς ἀρχαί, ὅτι προβάλλονται τὰ ἴδια ὡς κοινά: σκότῳσις οὖν καὶ θόλῳσις τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα δοξάσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁμοουσίᾳς τριάδος καὶ μὴ διαιροῦσι, τί μὲν ἴδιον ἐκάστη τῶν ὑποστάσεων, τί δὲ κοινόν: εἰ προβάλλεται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ πνεύματος, δόξειεν ἂν εἰπεῖν καὶ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα λοιπὸν τὴν γέννησιν καὶ τὴν ἀγεννησίαν, ὥστε πολλαὶ ἀρχαὶ καὶ αἰτίαι καὶ τοῦτο πολὺ ὑμνητὸν τῆς μοναρχίας τοῦ πατρὸς.

παῦσαι οὖν, ὦ Λατῖνε, τὸ πολλὰς καὶ ἀρχὰς πολλὰ αἰτία λέγειν καὶ ἓν αἷτιον τὸν πατέρα λέγε. καὶ γινῶθι, πῶς σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος συλλογισμοῦ ἀπέδειξα, ὅτι καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τῆς γεννήσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ

quam in personas, dum Graeci communiter, si Antiochenos et Areopagitam excipias, personas *in recto*, naturam vero *in obliquo* considerant”. (Jugie, 179, fn.3).

⁹³ “But according to the myriads of voices who piously delivered the doctrine of the indescribable Godhead on high, the Spirit is of the essence-above-essence. His eternal incorporeal procession is therefore beyond the powers of reason.” (Photius, 6/ 62).

καὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ πνεύματος ὁ πατήρ ἐστίν· ὥστε, εἰ ἐπιστήμων ἀκριβὴς εἶ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς, γνωρίσεις ἂν τῶν προβλημάτων τὴν ἀληθείαν, τί γ' οὖν ἐστὶ τοῦ κατ' ἀληθείαν προσδιαλεγομένου ἢ προβλήματα ἀληθινά; διὰ τοῦτο ἑτέρας μαρτυρίας οὐ προσάγω σοι. εἰ βούλει, οἶδα καὶ αὐτὰς σύ.

[The syllogistic argument for the dialecticians as regards the idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and not from the Son as the Latins state. I confess the Father to be unbegotten, and the Son to be begotten and the Spirit to be proceeding. The distinctive property of the Father is His being unbegotten, the distinctive property of the Son is His being begotten, and the distinctive property of the Holy Spirit is His being proceeding. For the properties are not the common <features>. If indeed the Spirit proceeds from the Son as the Latins state, then we could say that the Son is begotten by the Holy Spirit. But <we could even say> that the Father's being unbegotten is also of the Son's and of the Spirit's, since certainly they treat the properties as if <they were> the common features. Thus, it is blindness and turbidity of those who believe so about the consubstantial Trinity and who do not discern what is property of each of the persons and what is common <for them>. If the Son brings forth the procession of the Holy Spirit one could say that He does also the Father's being unbegotten, and the Spirit does also of course the being unbegotten and the being begotten, as if many principles and causes. That is indeed a great praise of the Father's monarchy!]⁹⁴

In his letters to the patriarch of Antioch, Peter III, Cerularius pays much more attention to the questions of discrepancy of the rites and usages, especially to the usage of the leavened bread, than to the *Filioque*. Perhaps this difference had for him much greater importance and seemed more dangerous, since at the time he had to

⁹⁴ “**Demonstratio** syllogistica adversus dialecticos, quod e patre procedit spiritus sanctus, non etiam e filio, ut Latini affirmant. confiteor patrem ingenuum, filium genitum, spiritum sanctum procedentem. proprium est ingenuum esse patris, proprium genitum esse filii, proprium procedere ex spiritus sancti. propria enim non communia. si e filio quoque procedit spiritus, sicut Latini affirmant, potest dici e spiritu quoque sancto gigni filium, sed et ingenuum esse patris et filii et spiritus sancti, quia propriis tamquam communibus utuntur: et ecce, tria principia, quia propria tamquam communia producant. obscuratio igitur et turbatio eis, qui talia proclamant de consubstantiali trinitate neque distinguunt, quid proprium sit uniuscuiusque personarum, quid autem commune. si producit filius quoque processionem spiritus, placeat dicere eum etiam producere innascibilitatem patris, et spiritum reliquum generationem et innascibilitatem, ut multa principia et causae sint et haec sit valde laudata patris monarchia! desine igitur, Latine, de multis principiis multisque causis loqui et unam causam dicere patrem! et cognosce, quomodo tibi praesenti syllogismo demonstravi: et principium et causam generationis filii et processionis spiritus esse patrem! ut, si diligens investigator dialecticae artis es, veritatem obiectorum perspicias. quid aliud est eius, qui secundum veritatem disputat nisi obiecta vera? quare alia testimonia tibi non affero. Si vis, scio et ipsa tu <scies>.” “Die Panoplia des Michael Kerullarios,” In Anton Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios. Quellen und Studien zum Scisma des XI. Jh.*, (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 1930), teil 2, 207-282; 274.)

cope with the Oriental Churches which also followed this practice.⁹⁵ But concerning our study, if it is the only source for eliciting his opinion, then, as we said, this is just a rehearsal of Photius.

Theophylact's *Letter to Nicholas on the charges of which the Latins are accused*. ⁹⁶

It is uncertain when the treatise of Theophylact was composed; even the best specialist in his writings has doubts and restrictions.⁹⁷ We know that it was designed as a response to the request of Theophylact's student, Nicholas, who at the time was a deacon of Hagia Sophia, and we can suppose that this request was due to the resumed negotiations of 1089-1090. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that the work was revised later, around or after 1112 (since the date of Theophylact's death is also unknown, maybe 1125, maybe earlier), but this is a matter of conjecture.

What was the most intriguing and attractive in the treatise of Theophylact for many scholars was his attitude, rather than his argumentation. Of course, with the disposition of Cerularius, who seems to be stubborn and petty in his harsh attacks against the Latins on sometimes laughable points (the historians never get tired of mocking his mentioning of beards, for instance), the forbearance and latitude of

⁹⁵ "To understand the part that Cerularius played we must remember, first, that he had some knowledge of recent events at Rome and had derived from them a not unnatural contempt for the papacy. Secondly he personally disliked and distrusted Argyrus, whose influence over the emperor he resented, and whose parentage and past history roused his suspicion. Thirdly, with his tidy bureaucratic mind he was as eager as any reforming pope to introduce a uniformity of usages within his patriarchate. In this he may have been inspired by Western examples; but he was not primarily concerned with the Latin world. The empire had recently annexed the last independent Armenian Church into the official Church of the empire. The Armenians were mildly heretical. They had rejected the findings of the Council of Chalcedon, though their theology was Monothelite rather than Monophysite. Many of their usages differed from those of the Greeks. Apart from their occasional liking for animal sacrifices, they began Lent at Septuagesima; they approved of fasting on Saturdays; and, most important of all, they used unleavened bread for the Sacrament." Runciman, 53.

⁹⁶ See bibliography on Theophylact in PG edition (v. 124) and in Mullett's monograph.

⁹⁷ "...nous faisons remarquer cependant que nous proposons cette date sous toute réserve, comme une simple hypothèse à laquelle l'exposé précédent semble donner quelque consistance, mais que nous n'écarterons pas pour autant l'éventualité de sa rédaction vers 1090." (Gautier, 114)

Theophylact produce a pleasant contrast.⁹⁸ But we should not forget firstly that this tolerance was rooted in the loftiness of an erudite, highly ranked Byzantine ecclesiastic, who looked down on the Latins and their opinions,⁹⁹ and their language;¹⁰⁰ and secondly that this tolerance was quite limited: he was not going to put up with either the addition to the creed or with the teaching which he considered heretical.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Οὐ γὰρ ἀδελφικῶς δεχόμεθα τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἰσαγόμενα, ἀλλ' ἀντιθετικῶς προσφερόμεθα καὶ σπεύδομεν αὐτοὺς ἕκαστος δόξαι τις τὸν φθάσαντα παραγκωνισάμενος καὶ κριθῆσθαι παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ πρῶτα τῶν τὰ θεῖα σοφῶν οἰόμεθα, εἰ τοῖς πλουσίον αἱρεσίῃν τινα ἐπιτρίψαιμεν, καὶ φανήσθαι δοκοῦμεν ὅμματα ἔχοντες, εἰ τὸν Ἑωσφόρον μελαναυγῇ παρεισάξομεν. (Theophylacte d'Achrida, "De Iis Quorum Incusantur Latini," in *Discours, Traités, Poésies*, ed. P. Gautier, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 16, v. 16/1, (Thessalonike: Assosiation de Recherches Byzantines, 1980), 247, 14-18). ("For not as brothers do we receive the customs of <our> brothers, but rather we rush upon them with hostility; and we strive each one to seem to have elbowed back the front-runner; and we think that we will be awarded with the first prize among the wise in theology by the crowd, if we smear our neighbor with heresies; and we believe that we will seem perspicacious if we pretend that the morning star is jet-black.")

⁹⁹ Εγὼ δὲ καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν οὐδεμίας ἐπιστροφῆς δεῖσθαι νομίζω, τὰ δὲ μετρίως καὶ οἷας, εἰ μὲν ἀνύσειέ τι, μικρὰ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ χαρίζεσθαι, εἰ δ' οὖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ζημίαν γε τιθέναι τὸ ἀνεξάνυστον. (Theophylact, 251, 2-5). ("I believe that among these <errors> some deserve no attention, and some are worthy of moderate <interest>, such that if one succeeds <in their correction>, the Church will profit little, but if not, the failure will produce no harm.")

⁹⁹ Ἐοίκατε γάρ μοι, ὧ τὰ ἄνω φρονούντες ὑμεῖς, οὐ κακίᾳ γνώμης τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἀγνοίᾳ τῆς ὀρθότητος σφάλλεσθαι... (Theophylact, 253, 23-24) ("It seems to me very likely that you, o! those ones pondering over the high matters, err not because of your malignity of judgement, but because of your ignorance of the truth.")

¹⁰⁰ See his opinion on the Latin language in the next footnote. Cf. Photius's opinion: "Because the Latin language, frequently used by our holy fathers, has inadequate meanings which do not translate the Greek language purely and exactly, and often render false notions of the doctrines of the Faith, and because it is not supplied with as many words that can interpret the meaning of a Greek word in its exact sense, that God-inspired man fixed the concepts, decreeing and supplying the holy doctrines of the Faith in the Greek tongue. And the Romans said it in Greek ... Through these divinely inspired insights, the inadequacy of the Latin tongue is restored to harmonious perfection." (Photius, 86/ 103-4).

¹⁰¹ Εἰ γὰρ ἀληθῶς πτωχὸς εἶ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς γλώττης καὶ σοὶ ἀπορία τῶν ἱματίων τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῶν λέξεων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διελεῖν οὐκ ἔχεις τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γινομένην χύσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢ μετάδοσιν ἢ ὡς ἂν τις λέγειν ἑτέρως βούλοιτο, ἐκ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως καθ' ἣν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνου τὸ εἶναι τῷ Πνεύματι, ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις συγχωρήσω χρῆσθαι σε τούτοις ὡς ἡ γλῶττά σοι δίδωσιν, ἐν κοινοῖς λέγω λόγοις καὶ ὁμιλίαις, εἰ βουλῇσιν, ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τοῦ προσδιορισμοῦ τοῦ προσήκοντος, ὥστε μὴ ἀγνοεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὴν ἐν μιᾷ λέξει διπλόην τῶν νοημάτων: ἐν δὲ τῷ συμβόλῳ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν ἀνακηρύττειν ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ ὁμολογία τῆς πίστεως ... (Theophylact, 257, 11-21). ("For if you are poor as regards the opulence of your language and for your difficulties with the expression of thought and with words and because of it you cannot discern the effusion of the Spirit by the Son, or distribution, or whatever one would wish to call it, from the procession by which the Spirit's existence is from the Father alone, I will concede that you use these <words> in all other matters, as the language allows you, in public speeches I mean, and in the homilies, if you wish, and in ecclesiastical matters, but all this after the due definition, so that the audience be not ignorant of the ambiguity of the concepts in this one word, [in all these I concede], but

Now we may look at the argumentation more closely. It should be noted first that although Theophylact himself confesses that his arguments are of no originality,¹⁰² (and indeed, he repeats some Photian ones), he was, nevertheless, acquainted with the Latin counter-argumentation. He betrays his knowledge when he scrutinises the argument of the Spirit's belonging to the Son¹⁰³ (he hardly read any of the Latins' writings, but his position both in Constantinople and in Bulgaria could well have provided him with a chance to know their opinion and arguments). And, secondly, he presented his own arguments alongside with the old ones, which also were revised and expressed in a new form.

Theophylact as well as the others professes that the Scripture is the only basis for any doctrine, and that the Scripture clearly states the procession from the Father,¹⁰⁴ but he pays no attention either to the Latin exegesis (in an inclusive

in the Symbol <you are> to proclaim the procession from the Father alone, for that is our profession of faith...")

¹⁰² Εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τῶν τινι παλαιότερων σοφῶν, ὧν οὐδενὶ πρὸς τὸν παρόντα λόγον συνεχρησάμεθα, τοῦτό γε κατὰ Παῦλον φρονήσαντες τὸ μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίῳ θεμελίῳ οἰκοδομοῦντες εἰς τὰ ἔτοιμα καυχᾶσθαι, (Theophylact, 261, 3-6) ("Though the other <arguments> have been also expounded by some of the more ancient scholars, we have used none of them, regarding this according to Paul: not to boast of the ease of building on the foundations laid by another.")

¹⁰³ Ἀλλὰ γέγραπται, φασί, Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ· κἀγὼ τίθεμαι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ Πνεῦμα τῆς ζωῆς, ἃ ὁ Υἱός, προσθήσω δὲ καὶ σοφίας καὶ ἰσχύος, καὶ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου προίον, ἀλλ' ὡς οἰκείον αὐτοῦ, συγγενὲς γὰρ καὶ οὐκ ἀλλότριον, καὶ ὡς αὐτῷ ἐνανταπαυόμενον καὶ ὡς παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀξίοις πεμπόμενον καὶ χορηγούμενον καὶ μεταδιδόμενον. (Theophylact, 253, 15-21). ("But it is written, they say, *the Spirit of the Son* and *the Spirit of Christ*, and I accept it too; moreover, since <He is also> *the Spirit of Truth* and *the Spirit of Life*, which are the Son, I would even add *the Spirit of Wisdom* and *of the Power*, for all these He is, but not as proceeding from Him [the Son], but as akin to Him [as consubstantial] and not another, and as He [the Spirit] rests on Him, and is sent and bestowed and distributed by Him.")

¹⁰⁴ Επεὶ δὲ οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ Λογοῦ τοῦτον αὐτὸν παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ἀληθείας λέγοντα Πνεῦμα καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἀπλοῦς ὁ λόγος· ἢ ἄλλον διδάσκαλον ἀντεισάγαγε τοῦ Λόγου τρανότερα λέγοντα καὶ τῆς Σοφίας σοθώτερα, παρ' οὗ τὸ νέον τοῦτο δόγμα λαβὼν ὑπερφυῶς ἔστερξας, ἢ τοῦτον μὴ ἔχων, δέξαι τὸν ἐνα καὶ διηγητὴν ἡμῶν τὸν Χριστὸν περὶ τοῦ συγγενοῦς διδάσκοντα Πνεύματος ἐκ τίνος καὶ πῶς ἔχει τὸ εἶναι καὶ μαρτυροῦντα τῷ αὐτοῦ μάρτυρι ὅτι παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. (Theophylact, 251, 20-24; 253, 1-3). ("Since from the beginning the eyewitnesses and the attendants of the Word have conveyed to us that He said about the Spirit that 'truly the Spirit proceeds from the Father' – the argument is simple: either bring forward another teacher who speaks more clearly than the Word and more wisely than the Wisdom, that one from whom you have taken this new dogma and found delight in; or if you do not have such a one, accept 'the only teacher of ours', Christ, who teaches

sense)¹⁰⁵ or to the Latin tradition of interpretation of the procession.¹⁰⁶ But on answering another Latin argument (that of infusion) Theophylact introduces a new, and quite elegant, exegetical motif. Indeed the Son breathed the Spirit onto His disciples after the resurrection, but that could be neither infusion of the Holy Spirit Himself, nor even any signification of the Spirit's procession from the Son, as the Latins speculate. It was the bestowal of one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit (that of the remission of sins); otherwise, how would one explain what happened on the day of Pentecost? For it was then that the Spirit *wholly and essentially* descended onto the apostles.¹⁰⁷

about the Spirit consubstantial with Him, from whom and how He [the Spirit] has His existence and who testifies for His Testifier [the Spirit] that proceeds from the Father.”)

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Photius's opinion on exegesis: “And yet if these voices all burst forth with the same divine words, saying to us that the Spirit's procession is from the Father – for myriads presupposed the same thing, accurately perceiving that the Spirit proceeds from the Father – then why do they not simultaneously indicate that He proceeds from the Son? For none of them say this, nor do they even imply it, because it is not once spoken of in any text, neither divine texts, nor in Spirit-bearing human texts, that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.” (Photius, 89/ 106).

¹⁰⁶ Εἰ δὲ τινι τῶν ἐγκεκριμένων πατέρων τοῦτο ἐπέσθης, δείξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν. Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις δεῖξαι, κἂν πολλὰ κάμοις, ἢ γὰρ ἐγκεκριμένος οὐκ εἴπειν, ἢ εἰπὼν οὐκ ἐγκέκριται. (Theophylact, 253,7-9). (“If you are convinced about this by one of the acknowledged fathers, show us this father and that is enough. But you would not be able to show, however hard you may labor, for either the acknowledged <ones> do not say, or if one says, one is not acknowledged.”)

In this context it seems appropriate to mention also the Photian attitude. Although Jugie believes that Photius knew some of the Latin counter-argumentation (“Ex hac epistola illum [Photium] constat aliqua habuisse notitia responsionum theologorum occidentalium ad suas obiectionibus.” (Jugie, 190)), Photius himself seems quite ignorant of any Latin doctrine. He either states that all Latin fathers confirm his opinion and corroborate this statement that if they were such reverend fathers they just could not pronounce such a heresy: “You call Ambrose, Augustine and other good men your fathers. But does this make it any more tolerable, since you suppose them to be armed against the Master's teaching, to draw the condemnation on yourselves and also on these men.” (Photius, 68/p.92); “Admittedly, those things were said. But if such a man, whether in some crisis, or Greek rage, or while fighting heresy, or through some weakness of discipline falls into some unseemliness, then why do you still dismiss their testimony, and take as a lawful dogma what they did not mean as a dogma?” (Photius, 71/ 93), -- or simply suggest neglecting the Latin opinion, for it contradicts the opinion of the whole world: “You cite Western fathers. But this simply pours the West down the abyss, because it contends with the whole world.” (Photius, 77/ 97); “Consequently, you should produce this double dilemma and strive against all of these men as well: either pervert that which is already written by them, or subscribe to a single saying of theirs which is already perverse.” (Photius, 75/ 95).

¹⁰⁷ Οὕτω καὶ ἐμφυσᾶν λέγεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὁ Κύριος μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, οὐχ ὥς προβολὴς αὐτοῦ -- ... ἄλλως τε μηδὲ ὅλου τότε δοθέντος, ἀλλ' ἐνὸς χαρίσματος τοῦ τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὸ γὰρ ὅλον τοῖς τῆς πεντηκοστῆς καιροῖς ὥριστο -- ἀλλ' ὥς ἔχων καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὸ οὐσιωδῶς καὶ ὅτε βούλεται τοῦτο διδοὺς καὶ οἷς βούλεται καὶ ὥς βούλεται ... (Theophylact, 255, 18-24). (“So, the Lord is said to breathe the Spirit into the disciples after his resurrection, not as a producer of Him [the Spirit] – ... besides, at the time He had not been given

If the Scriptural evidence would seem to someone (because of stubbornness, obviously) insufficient, Theophylact presents the Photian argument of double causation, as an example of a blasphemous and absurd doctrine:

Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ χορηγεῖσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα ἕτερόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι, δυοῖν ἀνάγκη θάτερον, ἢ καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν αἴτιον εἶναι τοῦ Πνεύματος ἢ τὸν Πατέρα χορηγὸν μόνως ὥς καὶ τὸν Υἱόν. Εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος αἴτιος, δύο ἀρχαὶ τοῦ ἐνός: τὸ δὲ πλειόνων δεόμενον εἰς τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἢ μείζον ἐστὶ τοῦ ἐξ ἐνός τὸ εἶναι ἔχοντος ἢ ἴσον ἢ ἔλαττον, ἀλλ' ἴσον μὲν οὐκ ἂν εἴη, ἦν γὰρ ἂν ἐξ ἐνός καὶ αὐτό. Λείπεται τοίνυν εἶναι ἢ μείζον ἢ ἔλαττον, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἄρα ἢ μείζον ἐστὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ -- καὶ ὅρα τὴν τῆς ἀσεβείας καινοτομίαν: οὐδεὶς γάρ πω τοῦτο τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ θρασυνθέντων εἰπεῖν ἐτόλμησεν ἢ ἔλαττον ἐστὶ καὶ ἀναζῆ Μακεδόνιος. Εἰ δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς χορηγεῖται μόνως ὥς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἢ ἀναρχον ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτό -- καὶ ποῦ τῷ Πατρὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα; Πῶς δὲ ἡ ἰδιότης κεκοίνωται; -- ἢ ἄλλον τούτου ζητήσομεν αἴτιον, καὶ τετρας μὲν ἡμῖν εἰσαχθήσεται προσώπων, δυὰς δὲ θεότητος, ἑτέρα μὲν ἡ τῶν τριῶν, ἑτέρα δὲ ἡ τοῦ ἐπεισάκτου τετάρτου, ὅς ἐκ τῆς θαυμαστῆς σου καινοτομίας ἡμῖν ἐκπεπόρευται.¹⁰⁸

[If the bestowal of the Spirit by the Son is not any different from the procession from the Father, then this difference leads of necessity into two [alternatives]: either the Son is a cause of the Spirit or the Father is a bestower as well as the Son is. So, if the Son is a cause of the Spirit, then, there are two causes of the one: further, what needs many <causes> for existence would be either greater than what has existence from the one <cause>, or equal, or less; but it cannot be equal, for it itself would have been existing from the one. Well, it remains to be either greater or less; and the Spirit certainly would be either greater than the Son – but look what a blasphemous innovation, for nobody out of all the audacious against the Son has ever dared to say this – or He would be less, and then, Macedonius rises to life. But if the Spirit is bestowed by the Father as well as by the Son, He Himself would be either uncaused – and where, then, the dignity of the Father? Why is the distinctive property shared? – or we have to look for another cause for Him, and both the four of the persons and the two of the divinities are introduced to us, one <divinity> of the three, the other <divinity> of the four introduced, who proceeds to us from your extraordinary innovation.]

wholly, but only one grace of the remission of sins [was given], for He was wholly dispatched on the day of Pentecost -- but as one who has Him [the Spirit] and as one who is coessential with Him [the Spirit], and one who gives Him [the Spirit] when He [the Son] wants, to whom He wants and how He wants.”)

¹⁰⁸ Theophylact, 259, 1-16.

Furthermore, these arguments clearly demonstrate that no reasonable Christian can follow such a doctrine; then why are the Latins inclined to pronounce double procession? Apparently, explains Theophylact, it is so because of the ambiguity of the Latin language which cannot properly express the inner Trinitarian relation¹⁰⁹ and discern the existence from God (that is, from the Father) and the bestowal, distribution, or whatever term to choose, by the Son who receives the Spirit from the Father for all these operations:

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τοῦ πῶς ἔστι τὸ Πνεῦμα δηλωτικόν: ὡς γὰρ ὁ Υἱὸς ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, γεννητῶς δὲ καὶ οὐ κατ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς μὲν ἀρχῆς, τοῦ Πατρὸς δὴ λέγω, οὐ γεννητῶς δὲ -- οὐ γὰρ δύο Υἱοί, -- ἀλλ' ἐκπορετῶς. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐκπορεύεσθαι τρόπος ἐστὶ κατ' ὃν ἔχει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅπερ δὴ καὶ ἰδιότης αὐτοῦ γινώσκεται. Τὸ δὲ πέμπεσθαι καὶ χορηγεῖσθαι καὶ μεταδίδοσθαι οὐ τοῦ πῶς ἔστι τὸ Πνεῦμα δηλωτικόν, ἀλλὰ πλουτισμός τις ἐν τούτοις δηλοῦται καὶ οἷον χύσις τῆς ἀγαθότητος, τῆς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μὲν ἐχούσης τὸ εἶναι, παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους ἐκχεομένης, οἷς καὶ δι' ὃν Υἱοῦ πεφηνέναι λέγεται...¹¹⁰

[For the procession signifies how the Spirit exists, because as the Son exists from the Father, being begotten and not in any other way, so the Spirit exists from the same principle, the Father, I mean, not being begotten (if so, there would have been two sons), but by proceeding. Thus the procession is the mode according to which the Spirit has His existence from the Father, it is that which is considered His distinctive property. The mission and bestowal and distribution do not signify how the Spirit exists, but an abundance is manifested in these and as effusion of goodness which is from the Father and poured by the Son onto those worthy to whom we know it was manifested through the Son.]

In fact Theophylact's treatise is a very nice piece of Byzantine rhetoric which provides a real delight in reading it, but from the doctrinal point of view his exposition of the *Filioque* problem contributed to the future polemic only with the

¹⁰⁹ τὸ γὰρ ἐκπορεύεσθαι νομίζοντες ἴσον εἶναι τῷ χορηγεῖσθαι καὶ μεταδίδοσθαι, ἐπειδὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα εὑρίσκεται παρὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ πεμπομένον καὶ χορηγούμενον καὶ μεταδιδόμενον, οὐδὲν ὀφείθει προσκόπτειν, εἰ καὶ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ φαίητε (Theophylact, 253, 24-25, 255 1-3). ("For you, believing that the procession is the same as bestowal and distribution, since you find that the Spirit is sent and bestowed and distributed by the Son, do not see the error in saying that He also proceeds from the Son.")

distinction of the Greek terms: ἐκπορεύεσθαι as signifying the existential and causal procession of the Spirit from the Father and all other terms (προβάλλειν, προιέναι, χορηγεῖσθαι, μεταδίδοσθαι, and so on) as signifying the bestowal, dispatching, distribution and infusion by the Son.¹¹¹ Though the Greeks had pointed to the simplifying nature and insufficiency of the Latin language for theology from the time of Maximus the Confessor, Theophylact was the first to lay a specific emphasis on this issue. Theophylact ascribes a difference of the doctrines to a difference of the languages rather than to a discrepancy between the traditions. He still believes that both sides of Christendom have the common background of *the* Tradition (not speaking about common faith, of course), though he himself completely ignored any Latin Father.

The Latins chose another approach. They studied the Greek Fathers as well, but only of the early period, and with reservations. Moreover, they really were interested in the Greeks' arguments and took pains to refute them. In contrast with Peter Damian, who seems to be aware of the Greek doctrine only by hearsay and without any of the details, Anselm, due to his participation in the council, was indeed acquainted with the other side's doctrine, and elaborated a profound and consistent theory of the procession in the response to it.

¹¹⁰ Theophylact, 255, 4-13.

¹¹¹ Jugie states that Photius did not know this distinction and used the terms interchangeably.

Anselm's *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*.

The text to be analyzed here was composed for the debate that took place at Bari in 1098.¹¹² Apparently Anselm at first presented his defense of the Latin doctrine in the council and later developed his argument into a treatise in which not just the defense is given, but also (perhaps, the first time in the Latin Christendom) the counterarguments of the opponent side were presented and refuted. Though the attitude of Anselm towards the Greeks is not so clearly expressed as it is in Theophylact's treatise, his approach reveals much more respect than any declarations. Anselm proposes to solve the theological problem of the *Filioque* in a discussion (quite a scholastic method);¹¹³ moreover, he proposes to build the argumentation on foundations acceptable for both parties, to try to infer the conclusions on whether the *Filioque* is justified and orthodox or indeed whether it is heretical as the Greeks claim, from the common premises, for both the Greeks and the Latins have common faith in the one and the same God as well as in the same triune Holy Trinity.¹¹⁴

¹¹² See bibliography on Anselm in Southern's monograph.

¹¹³ "These are three characteristics which are to be found in nearly all his later, as well as in these earliest works: an origin in talking – mostly Anselm's – and the questions arising therefrom; a method which excluded the quotation of authorities; and a determination to leave no objection unanswered." (Southern, 118). "In this freedom, Anselm developed a method of his own, following the model of Augustine. Fundamentally, Anselm's was not a dialectical method, though he made full use of dialectic. There is never in his works a moment of poise between two opposites, with the final solution emerging from the confrontation. He reached his conclusions in private, and used the literary device of debate, not to arrive at his conclusions, but to sharpen the formulation of his answers. Everywhere he aimed at precision of language, of argument, of definition: but only when prolonged meditation had already brought him to see the truth with instantaneous clarity." (Southern, 114).

¹¹⁴ "Qui quoniam evangelica nobiscum venerantur et in aliis de trino et uno Deo credunt hoc ipsum per omnia quod nos, qui de eadem re certi sumus." (Anselmus Cantuariensis. "*De Processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos*," in *Opera Omnia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, Patrologiae Latinae, 158-159, v. 158, (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1853-1854; Reprint of Paris edition: Turnhout: Brepols, 1982-1992), 158, 285 A). ("But together with us they revere the Gospels; and in other regards they believe about the triune and one God exactly the same as do we, who are firmly established in this very doctrine." Anselm of Canterbury, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, tr. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson, (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 466-514. 466. "Et Graecorum fide atque his, quae credunt indubitanter et confitentur pro certissimis argumentis ad probandum quod non credunt, utar." (PL, 158, 285 B). ("And I shall use the faith of the Greeks, together with the doctrines which the Greeks both believe and confess unhesitatingly, as the most certain premisses for proving what they do not believe." Anselm, 466).

Thus, Anselm's main reasoning is presented in the form of a strict logical argument which after the definition of premises, develops its implications, and after pruning the false possibilities, reaches the necessary conclusion. As we said, the personality of the Spirit causes much trouble for the understanding. If the Father and the Son's relation resembles more or less a human condition, that of the Spirit is obscure, but in any case it is clear that the Spirit is always *someone's* spirit.¹¹⁵ On this idea the whole argument is based, for if the Spirit is someone's spirit, we have to define whose spirit the Holy Spirit is and the problem will be solved. For this we should determine what relations are in the Trinity among the persons, and indeed what the notion of "person" means at all. (We see that the solution of the question demands that the whole trinitarian doctrine be involved.)

Thus, both the Greeks and the Latins confess the same faith: that there is God, that He is one and the same, that God is in the three persons, who are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. So that all persons are one God, equally divine, equally eternal, equally good, and so on, but unsociable and distinctive. Thus, the indivisible oneness and the irreducible plurality exist in the divinity in such a way that the oneness opposes the plurality and thereby does not allow any multiplication (or division) of the divinity into three gods, whereas the plurality opposes the oneness and does not allow any confusion of the persons.¹¹⁶

"It is rather the case that by means of those things which have thus been said, we are taught to understand similarly, in similar sayings, those things which have been left unsaid. This is especially the case where we see very clearly that the things which are not said follow by rational necessity (and without any other rational considerations contradicting them) from the things which are said." Anselm, 501).

¹¹⁵ "Nomen autem Spiritus sancti, ideo quia Spiritus sanctus intelligitur spiritus, pro relative nomine ponitur... sicut Spiritus sanctus alicuius est spiritus, est enim spiritus Dei, et spiritus Patris et Filii." (PL, 158, 286 A). ("Now, the name "Holy Spirit" is construed as a relational name, because the Holy Spirit is understood to be *someone's* spirit." Anselm, 467).

¹¹⁶ "Haec itaque sola causa pluralitatis est in Deo ut Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus dici non possint de invicem, sed alii sint ab invicem quia praedictis duobus modis est Deus de Deo." (PL, 158, 287B) ("Hence, the sole cause of plurality in God is that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit cannot be called by one another's respective name but are distinct from one another because God is from God in the two ways mentioned above." Anselm, 468).

The persons are designated by relational names: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which signifies the fact that God exists from God (not another God, but the same God in three persons). So, the name “Son” signifies that the Son exists from the Father (by being begotten) and the Father begets the Son; and the same as regards the Father. The name “Holy Spirit” signifies that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son (as will be demonstrated later) and that the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit. Of course, it is clear that both the Son and the Spirit are from the Father in no other way than from the Father’s essence,¹¹⁷ but the Spirit exists from the Father not in the respect that the Father is *the Father* (for then the Spirit would be the Son), but in the respect that the Father is God.¹¹⁸ Thus it is not a personal property of the Father that the Spirit exists from Him, and then we must establish the relation of the Spirit and the Son distinctly, apart from the relation of the Son with the Father, since the Spirit and the Son are equally divine.

“Sic ergo huius unitatis et huius relationis consequentiae se contemperant ut nec pluralitas quae sequitur relatio nem transeat ad ea in quibus praedictae simplicitas sonat unitatis, nec unitas cohibeat pluralitatem ubi eadem relatio significatur. Quatenus nec unitas amittat aliquando suam consequentiam ubi non obviat relationis oppositio; nec relatio perdat quod suum est nisi ubi obsistit unitas inseparabilis.” (PL, 158, 288C). (“Therefore, the consequences of this oneness and of this relation are so ordered that the plurality which follows from the relation does not apply to cases in which the simplicity of the aforesaid oneness is signified, nor does the oneness restrict the plurality in a case where this relation is signified. Thus, the oneness never loses its own consequence in a case where no opposition of relation stands against it; and the relation does not lose what belongs to it except in the case where the inseparable oneness stands against it.” Anselm, 469).

¹¹⁷ “Non est Filius aut Spiritus sanctus de Patre nisi de Patris essentia, quae una est illi cum Filio et Spiritu sancto.” (PL, 158, 291B). (“Furthermore, the Son and the Holy Spirit exist from the Father only by existing from the Father’s essence, which is common to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.” Anselm, 473).

¹¹⁸ “Spiritus sanctus vero non est de Deo patre suo, tantum de Deo qui est Pater. Ergo secundum quod est de Deo, dicitur Filius eius et ille de quo est, Pater eius; Spiritus sanctus autem non secundum quod est de Deo, est filius eius, nec ille de quo est pater eius.” (PL, 158, 287A). (“For the Son is from His father (i.e., is from God who is His father); but the Holy Spirit is not from God His father but is only from God who is Father. Therefore, the Son, with respect to the fact that He exists from God, is called the Father’s son; and the one from whom the Son exists is called the Son’s father. But the Holy Spirit, with respect to the fact that He exists from God, is not the Father’s son; nor is the one from whom He exists His father.” Anselm, 467-8). “But anyone with sense comprehends that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father or of the Son not with respect to the fact that the one is the Father and the other is the Son but with respect to the fact that both are one and the same God. Therefore, when the Holy Spirit is called the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father and the spirit of the Son, the signification is the same.” Anselm, 503.

Further, if God exists from God, then since it is clear that the Son is from the Father and the Spirit is from the Father, we have to discern whether the Spirit is from the Son or whether the Son is from the Spirit:

*Omnimoda igitur et inexpugnabili necessitate concluditur, quia si vera sunt quae supra dixi nos pariter cum Graecis credere, aut Filius est de Spiritu sancto, aut Spiritus sanctus est de Filio. Quod autem Filius non sit de Spiritu sancto palam est ex catholica fide. Non enim est Deus de Deo nisi aut procedendo, ut Filius, aut procedendo, ut Spiritus sanctus. Filius autem non nascitur de Spiritu sancto: si enim nascitur de illo, est filius Spiritus sancti, et Spiritus sanctus est pater eius, sed alter alterius nec pater, nec filius est. Non ergo nascitur de Spiritu sancto Filius; nec minus apertum est quia non procedit de illo. Esset enim spiritus eiusdem Spiritus sancti. Quod aperte negatur, cum Spiritus sanctus dicitur et creditur Spiritus Filii. Non enim potest esse spiritus sui spiritus. Quare non procedit Filius de Spiritu sancto. Nullo ergo modo est de Spiritu sancto Filius. Sequitur itaque inexpugnabili ratione Spiritum sanctum esse de Filio, sicut est de Patre.*¹¹⁹

[Therefore, by absolute and irrefutable necessity we reach the conclusion that—provided those premises are true, which I said above we believe alike with the Greeks—either the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit exists from the Son. But that the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit is evident from the Catholic faith. For God exists from God only by being begotten (as is the Son) or by proceeding (as does the Holy Spirit). But the Son is not begotten from the Holy Spirit. For if the Son were begotten from the Holy Spirit, He would be the son of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit would be His father. But the one is neither the father nor the son of the other. Therefore, the Son is not begotten from the Holy Spirit. And it is no less clear that the Son does not proceed from the Holy Spirit. For [in that case] He would be the spirit of the Holy Spirit—a doctrine clearly denied when the Holy Spirit is said and is believed to be the spirit of the Son.¹ For the Son cannot be the spirit of His own spirit. Therefore, the Son does not proceed from the Holy Spirit. Hence, the Son in no way exists from the Holy Spirit. And so, it follows by irrefutable reasoning that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son, even as He also exists from the Father.]¹²⁰

And further in his work Anselm puts it more clearly:

Nam, quoniam, ut dictum est, aut Filium est de Spiritu sancto, aut Spiritus sanctus de Filio; si non esset Spiritus sanctus de Filio, sequeretur de spiritu sancto Filium esse. Apparet itaque per supradictas rationes, quia Pater est Deus de quo Deus est, et non est Deus de Deo; et Filius eest Deus de Deo, et Deus de quo Deus est; et Spiritus sanctus est Deus de Deo, nec est Deus de quo est Deus. Et quamvis de Patre sint duo, id est Filius et Spiritus sanctus, non tamen dii duo sunt de Patre, sed unus Deus qui est Filius et Spiritus sanctusqui. Et licet duo sint, de quo est Filius et qui est de Filio; id est Pater

¹¹⁹ PL, 158, 293 AB.

¹²⁰ Anselm, 475.

*et Spiritus sanctus, non tamen duo dii sunt, sed unus Deus, qui est Pater et Spiritus sanctus. Et quamquam Spiritus sanctus sit de duobus, id est de Patre et de Filio, non tamen de duobus est diis, sed de uno Deo, qui est Pater et Filius. Si autem Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus bini considerentur, liquet ex his quae dicta sunt, quia necesse est alterum ex altero aut esse, quia ille non ex se est: aut non esse quia ille est ex se. Nam si conferamus Patrem et Filium, videmus Filium esse de Patre, quia Pater non est de illo; et Patrem non esse de Filio, quia Filius est de Patre. Et similiter si consideramus Patrem et Spiritum sanctum esse de Patre; quia non est de illo Pater; et Patrem non esse de Spiritu sancto, quia Spiritus sanctus est de illo. Ita quoque si Filius et Spiritus sanctus quomodo sint ab invicem, speculamur; intelligimus Spiritum sanctum esse de Filio, quia Filius non est de illo; et Filium non esse de Spiritu sancto, quia Spiritus sanctus est de Filio. Apparet igitur, quod supra dixi, quia relationes praedictae licet sint in uno, non possunt unitati immittere pluralitatem suam; nec unitas relationibus singularitatem suam.*¹²¹

[...necessarily, either the one exists from the other (because the other does not exist from him) or else He does not exist from the other (because the other exists from Him). For if we compare the Father and the Son, we see that the Son exists from the Father because the Father does not exist from the Son; and the Father does not exist from the Son, because the Son exists from the Father. And likewise if we consider the Father and the Holy Spirit, we find that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father because the Father does not exist from the Holy Spirit; and the Father does not exist from the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit exists from the Father. So too, if we examine how the Son and the Holy Spirit are related to each other, we will recognize that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son because the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit; and the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit exists from the Son. Therefore, it is evident (as I said earlier) that although the previously mentioned relations are present in one being, they cannot introduce their plurality into the oneness, nor [can] the oneness [introduce] its singularity into the relations.]¹²²

So, by this strictly logical reasoning we have proven that the Spirit proceeds from the Son just as He proceeds from the Father, since His procession is caused not by the relation of the Father and the Son, and, consequently, not by either of them distinctly, but it is caused by God. Further, since God is both the Father and the Son indistinguishably,¹²³ we do not merely have the right to say, but we are obliged to

¹²¹ PL, 158, 321-322.

¹²² Anselm, 510-11.

¹²³ “Accordingly, the phrase “the only true God” must be construed to mean that neither when we name only the Father nor when we name only the Son do we signify the only true God; rather, the only true God is signified only when we speak of the Father and the Son together.” Anselm, 482. “Therefore, if

profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. The accusation of the Greeks that the Latins made an addition to the Creed is preposterous, for:

Behold! We see that the Holy Spirit is God from God and proceeds from God — something which is not stated in the aforementioned creed. Therefore, if [the Greeks] deny that He exists and proceeds from the Son because the Creed is silent about this point, let them likewise deny that He exists and proceeds from God — something which is also not stated in the Creed. On the other hand, if they cannot deny this latter view, then let them not hesitate —simply because they do not find it stated in the Creed—to confess with us that the Holy Spirit exists and proceeds from the Son.¹²⁴

When the Creed says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from God, then since the Son is God, the Creed indicates plainly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Now, I ask whether the reason the Holy Spirit must be understood to exist from the Father is that He exists from God or whether the reason He exists from God is that He exists from the Father. Although either fact is proved from the other (for if the Holy Spirit exists from the Father He exists from God, and if He exists from God He exists from the Father—since none of the previously cited relations opposes this), it is not likewise the case that either fact is the reason for the other. Suppose that the Holy Spirit's existing from the Father were the reason for His existing from God. Then, when He is said to exist from the Father we could not take this to mean that He exists from that in virtue of which the Father is God, i.e., from the divine essence; rather, [we would have to take it to mean that He exists] from that in virtue of which God is the Father, i.e., from that in virtue of which the Father is related to the Son. But in that case the divine essence in the Holy Spirit would exist not from the Father's deity but from the Father's relation—a thoroughly foolish statement to make.¹²⁵

the same only true God is signified when the Father alone or the Son alone is spoken of and when both are named together, what is more clear than that when the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, He proceeds from the only true God, who is Father and Son? Accordingly, just as the Holy Spirit would be understood to proceed from the Son had the Son said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the only true God (when the Son said that He Himself and the Father are the only true God), so when the Son says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, then without doubt He signifies that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself.” Anselm, 482. “as although the Son exists from the Father, the Son is no less God than is the Father, so although the Son has from the Father the fact that the Holy Spirit exists from Him, the Holy Spirit exists no less from the Son than from the Father. For insofar as the Son is one and the same God as the Father - i.e., insofar as the Son is God - He is not distinct from the Father and does not have any dissimilarity.” Anselm, 507.

¹²⁴ Anselm, 480.

¹²⁵ Anselm, 480-1. “Moreover, where in the Prophets or the Gospels or the Apostles do we read in these very words that the one God is three persons, or that the one God is a trinity, or that God exists from God? Not even in that creed in which the [doctrine of] the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is *not* set forth do we find the word “person” or “trinity.” Nevertheless, since these statements follow very clearly from the statements we do read, we steadfastly believe them in our hearts and confess them with our mouths. Therefore, we ought to accept with certainty not only those things

Now, having dismissed the charge of uncanonical addition, Anselm starts answering the doctrinal objections of the Greek side. First of all, the Greeks interpret Scripture in an exclusive sense, but this is not the right way: many things are not explicitly stated in Scripture, nevertheless, we do believe in them, especially when reason says to us that these things logically fit it.¹²⁶ The Greeks attribute, for instance, to the Son only the mission of the Spirit and deny the procession, but if we examine the meaning of the Lord's words we will see the following:

So what does “whom the Father will send in my name” mean except that whom the Father will send the Son also will send? — just as when the Son says “whom I shall send from the Father,” nothing else is meant except “I and the Father shall send.” For “Son” is the name of Him who said “the Father will send in my name.” Therefore, “the Father will send in my name” means only “the Father will send in the name of the Son.” But how are the Son's words “whom I shall send from the Father” to be interpreted? Assuredly, the Holy Spirit is sent from Him from whom the Son sends Him. Now, the Son sends Him from the Father. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is sent from the Father. But the one from whom the Holy Spirit is sent sends [the Holy Spirit]. Hence, when the Son says “I shall send from the Father,” the Father is understood to send. So what does “I shall send from the Father” mean except “I shall send as if the Father were sending, so that my sending and the Father's sending are one and the same”? ...Accordingly, what does the Son want to signify, or what does He want to be understood, except that the Holy Spirit is not related to the Father in one way and to the Son in another way, and that the Holy Spirit is not more [the spirit] of the one than of the other.

Therefore, the Son shows very carefully that the Father's sending and His own sending are one, so that the Father does not send except when the Son

which we read in Sacred Scripture but also the statements which follow from them by rational necessity and which no other rational considerations contradict.” Anselm, 502.

¹²⁶ “So do you see how, in the examples I have presented, what the Son attributes as if to one person alone cannot be excluded from the other two persons? In Sacred Scripture we read many texts of this kind, so that what is said of one person singularly is understood to apply to all three indifferently. For whatever is said of one person should be understood to hold true of the other two as well—except when that in virtue of which they are distinct from one another (as I said) is known to oppose it.” (Anselm, 500). Also “It is rather the case that by means of those things which have thus been said, we are taught to understand similarly, in similar sayings, those things which have been left unsaid. This is especially the case where we see very clearly that the things which are not said follow by rational necessity (and without any other rational considerations contradicting them) from the things which are said.” (Anselm, 501). And “Moreover, where in the Prophets or the Gospels or the Apostles do we read in these very words that the one God is three persons, or that the one God is a trinity, or that God exists from God? Not even in that creed in which the [doctrine of] the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is *not* set forth do we find the word “person” or “trinity.” Nevertheless, since these statements follow very clearly from the statements we do read, we steadfastly believe them in our hearts and confess them with our mouths. Therefore, we ought to accept with certainty not only those things which we read in Sacred Scripture but also the statements which follow from them by rational necessity and which no other rational considerations contradict.” (Anselm, 502).

sends, and the Son does not send except when the Father sends. Accordingly, what does the Son want to signify, or what does He want to be understood, except that the Holy Spirit is not related to the Father in one way and to the Son in another way, and that the Holy Spirit is not more [the spirit] of the one than of the other. Hence, it is exceedingly difficult—indeed, it is impossible—to prove that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from both. For how can the Father and the Son together give and send the Holy Spirit, and how can the Holy Spirit be [the spirit] of both, unless He exists from both?¹²⁷

Also the Greeks' speculation that the Son only receives the Spirit from the Father is unacceptable, because of the following reasoning:

Now, we do not deny that the Son has the Holy Spirit from the Father in the following way: from whom the Son has existence, from him He has the fact that He has a spirit existing from Himself (as does the Father), since the being (*esse*) of the Father and of the Son is the same. For it is not the same thing to receive from the Father the essence (*essentia*) from which the Holy Spirit proceeds and to receive from the Father the Holy Spirit. For when the Son is said to have from the Father the essence from which the Holy Spirit proceeds, no need is indicated in the Son. But when it is said that the Son receives from the Father the Holy Spirit, whom He does not have from Himself (as does the Father), we seem to signify that the Son has something less (so to speak) than does the Father and that the Holy Spirit is given to the Son as something supplemental.¹²⁸

Although the Greeks forbid us to profess the *Filioque*, they themselves introduce a formula (*per Filium*) which cannot be sustained after an examination:

Now, the Father and the Son do not differ in oneness of deity; and the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the *deity* of the Father. Therefore, if the Son has the same deity [as the Father], then it is impossible to understand how the Holy Spirit could proceed from the deity of the Father *through* the deity of the Son but not *from* the deity of the Son. [This view is impossible to understand, that is,] unless perhaps someone were to claim that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father's deity but from His paternity, and proceeds not through the Son's deity but through His sonship. But this view is stifled by its own obvious foolishness.¹²⁹

...there is no apparent reason to say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son but proceeds from the Father *through* the Son. For even if He [proceeds] *through* the Son, He cannot avoid [proceeding] *from* the Son.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Anselm, 483.

¹²⁸ Anselm, 485.

¹²⁹ Anselm, 493-4.

¹³⁰ Anselm, 496.

Finally, as we have already mentioned, Anselm rejects some of the Greek side's arguments which clearly have a Photian origin. First of all, the argument of double causation:

But if [the Greeks] argue that the Holy Spirit cannot exist from two causes or two sources, then we make the following reply. Just as we believe that the Holy Spirit exists not from that in virtue of which the Father and the Son are two but from that in virtue of which they are one, so we say not that He has two sources but that He has one source...Similarly, when the Holy Spirit is said to exist from the Father and the Son, He exists not from two sources but from one source, which is Father and Son— even as He exists from one God, who is Father and Son (if God can properly be said to have a cause or a source).¹³¹

Another Photian *sophisma* as regards the Holy Spirit 's procession from Himself, (if we make the Son a cause, we also should ascribe this dignity of causation to the Spirit, but, then, the Spirit would be the cause of Himself), does not impress Anselm much. He answers:

But suppose someone argues that when I say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the deity of the Father and of the Son, I am unable to separate the deity of the Holy Spirit from the deity of the Father and the Son, since the three have one and the same deity.[And suppose he alleges] it to follow that if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the deity of the Father and of the Son, then He proceeds as well from His own deity and therefore proceeds from Himself. Now, to this objection I recall having above already adequately given the answer that no person can exist from Himself. Now, when the Son exists from the essence of the Father: then although the essence of the Son is the same essence as (and not a different one from) the essence of the Father, nevertheless the Son does not exist from Himself but exists only from the Father. Similarly, although the Holy Spirit exists from the essence of the Father and the Son, which is identical with His essence, He does not exist from Himself but exists only from the Father and the Son.¹³²

To estimate Anselm's work from the general point of view would be easy, as Jugie justly says: *Sine ulla controversia opus sancti Anselmi quamquam notitia theologiae Patrum Graecorum in eo desideratur, est omnium quae a Latinis de processione Spiritus sancti ante saeculum XII conscripta, gravissimum atque ad controversiam*

accomodatissimum.¹³³ Anselm elaborated a profound and consistent, and I even would add, elegant doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit; but not only this, a whole trinitarian theology was expounded (alongside with and parallel to the *Cur Deus Homo* where another difficult problem, that of christology, is treated).

¹³¹ Anselm, 498.

¹³² Anselm, 494.

Conclusion.

During this period of polemic between the excommunications of 1054 and the dispute of 1112, both sides in order to substantiate their opinions deployed the whole set of arguments. In short, the Latins presented the following: the argument of the same essence (the Father and the Son are of the same essence; therefore, they both are the causal origin of the Spirit); that of mission (the Son sends the Spirit from the Father; the Father sends the Spirit in the Son's name; this clearly indicates that they both are the source both of mission and of procession); that of the Spirit's belonging to the Son (Scripture not once calls the Spirit "the Spirit of the Son," the Spirit of Christ," *etc.*, therefore, if the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, it is clear that the Son is the "producer" of the Spirit as well as the Father is); and, finally, Anselm's main argument that the Spirit proceeds not from the *paternity* of the Father, but from the *deity* of the Father, thus, since the Father and the Son are the same deity, the Spirit proceeds from both equally, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, and His procession has nothing to do with the relation of the Father and the Son, that is, with each one of them distinctly, apart from another.

The Greeks arrayed the following reasons against the *Filioque*: to introduce the *Filioque* means to introduce double causation into the one and the same Godhead, thereby splitting the Godhead, and bringing the Spirit to compositeness; if we attribute the procession to the Son, that means that procession from the Father is incomplete and imperfect, which is nonsense; it is necessary to distinguish plainly the procession (as regards the existence of the Holy Spirit, His very *esse*) from all other operations (mission, infusion, bestowal, distribution, *etc.*) the first may belong to the Father alone, all the others may be shared with the Son; we should clearly discern the

¹³³ Jugie, 367.

properties of the persons and never indulge in any contamination of each of them with the others.

Thus, we see that behind these arguments a very different theological sensibility underlies, which only gradually, slowly did the controversialists realize. For the Greeks, it is obvious that causation is a personal property of the Father, and it never can be shared with anyone, especially in the case of eternal procession, since if we derive the Spirit not only from the Father, but also from the Son, we make Him closer to a creation and distance Him by the Son's mediation from the uncaused cause of divinity. For the Latins, causation belongs to the divinity in its essence; therefore, in this respect the Father and the Son as one God may be the source of the Holy Spirit, as well as the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit as one God may be the creator of this world. For the Greeks, all speculations on the divine essence are too pretentious, because the notion of "essence" may be applied to God only with serious reservations (God is "essence-above-essence"), while the Latins (especially Anselm) used all the apparatus of logic (essence, relation, *etc.*) in order to determine the transparency of the concept of the divinity.

Further, we have seen how the controversialists acknowledged and reacted on the opponent side's arguments. The Latins wondered why the Greeks did not accept what evidently had followed from scriptural exegesis, though it had not been explicitly pronounced. At the same time the Greeks were astonished by what the Latins read into Scripture.

The uncanonicity of the addition annoyed the Greeks who had got used to accepting, and approving of, only what the Ecumenical councils had declared; as to the Latins, for whom the councils were something very distant in this period, they felt themselves in their right to clarify what had seemed to them needing clarification.

And, of course, among all these differences that of the languages has played not the last part in causing the ignorance and misunderstandings.¹³⁴ The further study will elucidate more deeply the problems of the *Filioque* discussions and clarify the points which I could not touch upon in this essay, but, I hope, may be this work will be useful for this purpose, at least, to some extent.

¹³⁴ “Das Schlimmste aber war, daß keine einheitlichen Übersetzungen aus dem Latein ein Bild von der Gedankenwelt des Westens gaben. Was hatte ein Augustinus, der schöpferische Geist, der selbst vom Neoplatonismus der Griechen gespeist war, dem Osten zu sagen gehabt. Der erste, der wenigstens die Gedanken des großen Denkers über die hl. Trinität den Griechen unmittelbar nahezubringen suchte, war wohl erst Kardinal Humbert, der sie in seinem *Rationes* über das *Filioque* (1054) seitenlang dem griechischen Kaiser selbst vorlegt.” Anton Michel, *Sprache und Schisma*, (1949), 45; “Das größte Ärgernis bot für Griechen über tausend Jahre die Lehre der Lateiner, daß der hl. Geist auch vom Sohne (ex patre filioque) ausgehe, weil sie darin die Behauptung von zwei Urprinzipien des Geistes sahen, der deshalb gespalten sein müsse (Photios). Aber dieser Vorwurf geht von einer unrichtigen Übersetzung aus. Denn das lateinische *ex* deckt sich nicht ganz mit dem griechischen *ἐκ*, das auf das letzte Prinzip, den letzten Urgrund einer Person oder Sache hinweist, am wenigstens, wenn sie durch ein Verb wie *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* gedoppelt erscheint. Man könnte nicht im eigentlichen Sinne (*κυρίως*) sagen, meint Nikolaos von Methone, daß die Frucht vom Zweige ausgehe, sie gehe vielmehr von der Wurzel aus. Wenn deshalb die Lateiner den hl. Geist auch vom (ex) Sohne ausgehen lassen (*ἐκπορεύεσθαι* ist schärfer als *procedere*) so wird der Sohn als letzter Ausgangspunkt des Geistes erklärt, also dem Vater gleichgesetzt, statt als vermittelnde Ursache (*διὰ*) zu erscheinen.” Anton Michel, *Sprache und Schisma*, 66; So hat die Unkenntnis der Sprache, die der Schlüssel zum Geistesleben eines Volkes ist, die Spaltung zwischen Ost und West im Großen und im Kleinen gefördert, statt daß der Austausch des lebendigen Wortes die wirksamen Ursachen entkräftet oder wenigstens abgeschwächt hätte. Anton Michel, *Sprache und Schisma*, 68.

Appendix.

<i>Opusculum 38 (De profectione)</i>	<i>Opusculum 1 (De fide catholica)</i>
(on the right of <i>magisterium</i>) Matt. 16, 17 Acts 10, 32 Acts 9, 7 Gal. 1. 1 Gal. 1, 18 (on the sole profection) Matt.10, 20 Luke 24, 49 John 15, 26 John 14, 16-17 John 14, 26 Luke 11, 13 1 Cor. 2, 10-13 Heb. 11, 1 1 John 3, 2 (on the double mission) John 14, 26 John 15, 26 (on the Son's Spirit) John 16, 14 Isa. 59, 21 Luke 8, 46 Gal. 4, 6 Rom. 8, 9 Phillip. 1, 19 Eccle 24, 27 1 Pet. 1, 10-11 Acts 2, 33 John 20, 22 Isa. 11, 4 2 Thess. 2, 8 Job 37, 2 Acts 2,2* Rev. 1, 16* Ps. 32,6	(on the double profection) Isa. 11, 4 2 Thess. 2, 8 John 20, 22 Isai. 59, 21 Rom. 8, 9 Gal. 4, 6 1 Pet. 1, 10-11 John 15, 26 1 John 4, 13 Job 37, 2 Acts 2, 4* Ps. 32,6 Matt.10, 20 2 Cor. 1, 21-22 1 Thess. 4, 8 Titus 3, 5-6 Act. 2, 33 Joel 2, 28

* – indirect, but clear use of a passage; in **bold** – the citations used in both letters.

Selected Bibliography.

Primary sources.

- Theophylactus of Ochride. “*De Iis Quorum Incusantur Latini.*” In *Opera Quae Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia.* ed. J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Graeca, 123-126. v. 126. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1864 (Reprint of Paris edition: Athens: Centre for Patristic Publications, 1989-1990).
- Théophylacte d’Achrida. “*De Iis Quorum Incusantur Latini.*” In *Discours, Traités, Poésies.* Ed. P. Gautier. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 16. v. 16/1. Thessalonike: Assosiation de Recherches Byzantines, 1980.
- Anselmus Cantuariensis. “*De Processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos.*” In *Opera Omnia.* ed. J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Latina, 158-159. v. 158. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1853-1854. (Reprint of Paris edition: Turnhout: Brepols, 1982-1992).
- Anselm of Canterbury. The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury. ed. by Walter Fröhlich. (Three volumes) Cistercian Publications: Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1990-1994.
- Humbert. “*Rationes de Spiritus Sancto Processione a Patre et Filio.*” In Anton Michel. *Humbert und Kerullaros. Studien.* Teil 1. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schönigh, 1924. 97-112.
- Michael Cerularius. “*The Panoplia.*” In Anton Michel. *Humbert und Kerullaros. Quellen und Studien zum Scisma des XI. Jahrhunderts.* Teil 2. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schönigh, 1930. 207-282.
- Peter Damiani. “*De Processione Spiritus Sancti.*” In *Opera Omnia.* ed. J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Latina, 144-145. v. 144, opusculum 38. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1853. (Reprint of Paris edition: Turnhout: Brepols, 1994-5).
- Petrus Damiani. “*Der Brief Numer 91*” (“*De Processione Spiritus Sancti.*”) In *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani.* ed. by Kurt Reindel. Teil 3. Monumenta Germania Historica. Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit. Band IV. München: MGH, 1989.
- Petrus Damiani. “*Der Brief Numer 81*” (“*De Fide Catholica ad Ambrosium.*”) In *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani.* ed. by Kurt Reindel. Teil 2. Monumenta Germania Historica. Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit. Band IV. München: MGH, 1989.
- Peter Damiani. “*De Fide Catholica ad Ambrosium.*” In *Opera Omnia.* ed. by J.-P. Migne. Patrologia Latina, 144-145. v. 144, opusculum 1. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1853. (Reprint of Paris edition: Turnhout: Brepols, 1994-5).

Secondary literature.

- Beck, Hans Georg. *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlungen, 1959.
- Cantin, André. *Les Sciences Séculières et la Foi. Le Deux Voies de la Sciences au Jugement de S. Pierre Damien (1007-1072)*. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1975.
- Darrouzes J. "Les Documents Byzantins du XII-e Siècle sur la Primauté Romaine." *Révue des Études Byzantines* 23 (1965).
- Draeseke, J. "Theophylactos' Schrift gegen die Lateiner." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 10 (1901): 512-523.
- Dragas Fr., George Dion., "The Eighth Ecumenical Council: Constantinople IV (879/880) and the Condemnation of the *Filioque* Addition and Doctrine." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, vol. 44, number 1-4, (1999).
- Dvornik, Francis. *Byzance et la Primauté Romaine*. Paris: Les Edition du Cerf, 1964.
- Dvornik, Francis. *The Photian Schism. History and Legend*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- Every, George. *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*. New York: AMS Press, 1980.
- Jugie, Martin. *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*. Vols. 1-2. Paris: Letouzey et Anè, 1926-1933.
- Gay, Jules. *L'Italie Méridionale et l'Empire Byzantine depuis l'Avènement de Basile Ier jusqu'à la Prise de Bari par les Normands (867-1071)*. Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1904.
- Holtzmann W. "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089". *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 28 (1928).
- Hussey, Joan Mervin. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1990.
- Koyre A. *L'Idée de Dieu dans la Philosophie d'Anselm d'Aosta*. Paris: Vrin, 1984.
- Leclercq, Jean. *Saint Pierre Damien: l'Ermite et l'Homme d'Eglise*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1960.
- Michel, Anton. *Humbert und Kerullaros. Quellen und Studien zum Schisma des XI. Jahrhunderts*. Teil 1-2. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1924-1930.

- Mullett, Margaret. *Theophylact of Ochrid. Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1997.
- Nordern, Walter. *Das Pappstum und Byzanz. Die Trennung der Beiden Mächte und das Problem Ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergange des Byzantinischen Reichs (1453)*. New York: Burt Franklin, c. 1903.
- Obolensky, Dmitri. "Theophylact of Ochrid." In *Six Byzantine Portraits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Pelikan Jaroslav. "The Three and the One." In *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 221-225.
- Runciman, Steven. *Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries*. London: Panther Books, 1970.
- Southern, Richard William. *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.