

Mikonja Knežević

Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy
University of Priština with temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica, Serbia

Ἐξ ἀμφοῖν. Cyril of Alexandria and Polemics over filioque of Gregory Palamas

The hesychast controversy – is it a doctrinal conflict between the East and the West in the byzantine arena¹ or an inner-byzantine debate betwixt nominalists and realists, dogmatic development and theology of repetition?² Irrespective of how we opt to answer the posed question concerning the causes of the hesychast controversy, that is, regardless of whether we give advantage to the first or second aforestated interpretation, we will even-ly be obligated to acknowledge the fact that the relation between the East and the West was in great measure embroiled in this fairly significant and long-standing religious dispute³. This is particularly pertinent to the earliest phase of the aforementioned controversy, when the question of application of different methodologies as regards the doctrine on the Holy Trinity⁴ – primarily related to the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit – set the stage for other forms of dissention between Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory

¹ One of the main advocates of this thesis is certainly J. Romanides, “Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics”, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960–1961) 186–205, who believed that the main philosophical, theological and epistemological assumptions of Barlaam of Calabria are mainly based upon Augustine’s thought and Latin theology in general. This standpoint is going to be accepted, unconditionally and without engaging in further analyses, by many other authors, one of whom is also Σ. Γιαγκάζογλου, *Κοινωνία θεώσεως. Ἡ σύνθεση χριστολογίας καὶ πνευματολογίας στοῦ ἔργο τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ*, Ἀθήνα: Ἐκδόσεις Δόμος 2001, 16–17.

² So J. Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, translated by A. Fiske, Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press 1974, ²1998, who deems that the hesychast controversy actually reflects one “domestic” conflict between the byzantine humanists, whose ideas were implicitly advocated by Barlaam, on the one hand, and the byzantine monastic circles, on the other. Similar thesis is advocated by K. Ware, “Ἡ σημασία τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ γιά τήν σημερινή Δύση”, in: *Ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς στήν ἱστορία καί τό παρόν. Πρακτικά Διεθνῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν συνεδρίων Ἀθηνῶν (13–15 Νοεμβρίου 1998) καί Λεμεσοῦ (5–7 Νοεμβρίου 1999)*. Ἐποπτεία Γ. Ἰ. Μαντζαρίδη, Ἁγίου Ὁρος: Ἱερά Μεγίστη Μονή Βατοπαιδίου 2000, 159–166: 160, and B. Dupuy, “La pneumatologie de saint Grégoire Palamas”, *Istina* 44 (1999) 354–367: 358.

³ The intense and dynamic relationship between the East and the West within the hesychast controversy was sometimes accompanied by completely unexpected turn of events. This primarily refers to the discovery of Palamas’ borrowings from Augustine’s writing *De trinitate*, which somewhat altered the typical East-West confrontation established with regard to the hesychast dispute by the ideological interpreters from both ends of the christian world. For this issue and further references see: M. Кнежевић, “Mens-notitia-amor/Νοῦς-γνώσις-ἔρως. Σχολија на случај ‘Augustinus/Palamas’”, in: Б. Шијаковић, прир., *Српска ѿεολοгија у двадесетом веку: истраживачки проблеми и резултати II*, Београд: Институт за теолошка истраживања 2012, 42–61. (in Serbian, with summary in English)

⁴ For this issue, see synoptically: G. Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz. Der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jh.)*, seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung, Byzantinisches Archiv № 15, München: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung 1977, 124–173: 127–164.

Palamas. On this occasion, I will take into consideration only one aspect of the aforesaid problem, that is, the ever-intriguing question of *filioque*, to which Palamas dedicated his first writing of dogmatic nature, viz. his notable *Apodictic Treatises on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. In that writing, Palamas, compelled by the polemical objection put forward by the Latins, endeavours to provide an orthodox interpretation of certain passages from writings by Cyril of Alexandria, where he (referring to the Father and the Son) says that the Holy Spirit originates “from both” (ἐξ ἀμφοῖν), or, again, that he is from the “essence of the Son” (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ), that is, that he springs “from the Father through the Son” (ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ). These and similar passages, which the advocates of *filioque* already cited as a significant traditional argument in favour of their thesis, Palamas will have to interpret in an orthodox way and to substantiate the main, in his view, intention that Cyril on that occasion had. Hereinafter, (1) I will elucidate the manner in which Cyril himself formulates the aforementioned theses and addresses the passages that Palamas, whilst recapitulating the “Latin” objection, actually refers to; (2) I will provide a thorough representation of Palamas’ understanding of these cyrillican pericopes, which he elaborates upon in his *Second Apodictic Treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*; and finally, (3) I will examine, in general outlines, the interpretative credibility of Palamas’ reading of the disputable passages from Cyril’s writings.

1.

It is generally understood that there are several passages⁵ which earned Cyril the title of “one of the most authoritative defenders of the *filioque*”⁶ and led to his becoming the most prominent figure regarding this disputable issue⁷. However, only few of those passages are explicitly reflected upon by Gregory Palamas, which is why I will only take those into account here⁸. In point of fact, Palamas, initiating his response to the filioquistic reading of Cyril, condenses several different sections from his writings, expounding the main point of the Latin objection. Firstly, I will quote that passage, and then taxatively refer to Cyril’s writings which this Latin argument draws on. Also, for the sake of

⁵ To my knowledge, there is no article which provides a more thorough list of cyrillican passages regarding the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit than that drawn up by A. Θεοδώρου, “Ἡ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου”, *Θεολογία* ΜΔ 3–4 (1973) 561–582; ME 1 (1974) 80–101; ME 2 (1974) 276–308; ME 3 (1974) 478–510. However, I have to note that this composition is more a diligently drafted index than a (well-done) study. Specifically, for passages from Cyril’s opus which induce a filioquistic reading (eighteen of them in total), see 285–297.

⁶ H. du Manoir de Juaye, *Dogme et Spiritualité chez Saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie*, Paris 1944, 225 (I quote according to: A. E. Sicienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010, 48).

⁷ Therefore, he is the author who appears most frequently in Latin *florilegia* in support of the *filioque*; cf. A. E. Sicienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010, 47.

⁸ Naturally, I cannot go into details concerning Cyril’s teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit. With regard to that issue, I refer to the following studies: G. C. Berthold, “Cyril of Alexandria and the ‘Filioque’”, *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 143–147; M. O. Boulnois, *La paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d’Alexandrie: Herméneutique, analyses philosophiques et argumentation théologique*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 143, Paris: Institut d’Études Augustiniennes 1994; M. O. Boulnois “The Mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria: The Deployment of the Triad and Its Recapitulation into the Unity of Divinity”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, New York: T&T Clark 2003, 75–112: 103–108; B. E. Daley, “The Fullness of the Saving God: Cyril of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria...*, New York 2003, 113–148: 144–148; A. E. Sicienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010, 47–50.

plainer comparison of key phrases which I shall later employ, the original Greek text will be provided alongside an English translation:

But, Cyril of Alexandria, it is said, states that the Son has in himself by nature particular and exceptional [properties] of the Father, since the property of the begetter is naturally transferred onto him, and also states that the Spirit is from the essence of the Son and that he springs from the Father through the Son so as to sanctify the creation, and that he substantially comes forth from both. And, again, in the seventh letter of those sent to Hermias about the Son, he explains to us these [things]: “Having absolved of the sin the one who is devoted to him, he anoints him with his Spirit, whom he himself inspires as Logos from God the Father, and pours him out upon us from his own nature. And possessing the Spirit, he gives him not by measure”, according to John, “but inspires him from himself, as does the Father.”⁹

Ἄλλ’ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας, φασί, Κύριλλος, ἔχειν φησὶ τὸν υἱὸν φυσικῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδια καὶ ἐξάιρετα, διαβαινούσης εἰς αὐτὸν φυσικῶς τῆς τοῦ γεννήσαντος ιδιότητος, καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει· καὶ προχεόμενον ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ τὴν κτίσιν ἀγιάζειν, καὶ ἐξ ἁμφοῶν προχεόμενον οὐσιωδῶς. Καὶ αὐθις ἐν ἐβδόμῳ τῶν πρὸς Ἑρμείαν ἐξενηγεμένον λόγων περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ταῦθ’ ἡμῖν διατρανοῖ· ‘ἀπολύων γάρ, φησίν, ἁμαρτίας τὸν αὐτῷ προσκειμενον, τῷ ἰδίῳ λοιπὸν καταχρίει πνεύματι, ὅπερ ἐνήσι μὲν αὐτός, ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος καὶ ἐξ ἰδίας ἡμῖν ἀναπηγάξει φύσεως. Καὶ οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου ἔχον διδώσι τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τὴν Ἰωάννου φωνήν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἐνήσιν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ὁ πατήρ’.

As far as I was able to discern, Gregory Palamas, whilst recapitulating the Latin argument in favour of the thesis of *filioque*, has in mind at least six writings from the capacious oeuvre of Cyril of Alexandria. The *first* passage can, indubitably, be located in two of Cyril’s writings, namely: in his well-known *Thesaurus* and in his writing entitled *Commentary on John*. As regards *Thesaurus*, the 33rd paragraph is of vital importance here for us, bearing an indicative title: “That the Spirit is, by nature, God, and hence from the Father’s essence, and that he is bestowed upon the creation through the Son.”¹⁰ The chief objection that Cyril here comes to grips is, to use terminology dating from a later time, the objection of *pantheism*. Namely, Cyril’s adversaries affirm that if, due to the fact that the Spirit is from God (ἐκ Θεοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα), it is held as true that he is consubstantial with God, it will, since according to the apostle Paul the creation is also from God (τὰ πάντα ἐκ Θεοῦ), have to be acknowledged that the whole creation is also of divine essence. This will consequently be conducive to the fusion of two realms of existence as well as the multiplication of the sphere of the divine. Therefore, Cyril’s primary undertaking is to discern the dual causality related to the divine being, that is, to point out the double character of “ἐξ οὗ”, and to underline the fundamental ontological *hiatus* between the created and uncreated – which is, at the same time, the most fundamental distinction of reality he draws¹¹. Whilst the Holy Spirit is from God as the one who “exists

⁹ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β’ 62, in: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, *Συγγράμματα*. Ἐκδίδονται ἐπιμελείᾳ Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Τόμος Α’. Λόγοι ἀποδεικτικοί. Ἀντεπιγραφαί. Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς Βαρλαάμ καὶ Ἀκινδύνον. Ὑπὲρ ἡσυχάζοντων. Ἐκδίδουν Β. Bobrinsky, Π. Παπαευαγγέλου, Ι. Meyendorff, Π. Χρήστου, Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος 1962, ²1988 [further: ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [²1988]], 23–153: 134.11–22. I quote in parallel according to the edition: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, *Ἄπαντα τὰ ἔργα. 1. Λόγοι ἀποδεικτικοὶ δύο περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἀντεπιγραφαί. Ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς Ἀκινδύνον καὶ Βαρλαάμ*. Ἐπόπται Παν. Κ. Χρήστου, Θεοδ. Ν. Ζήσης. Ἐπιμεληταὶ Βασ. Δ. Φανουργάκης, Ἐλευθ. Γ. Μερετάκης. Εἰσαγωγή, Μετάφρασις-Σχόλια Ὑπὸ Π. Κ. Χρήστου, Ἐλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας № 51, Πατερικαὶ ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς, Θεσσαλονίκη 1981 [further: ΕΠΕ 51 [1981]], 68–336: 300.3–16.

¹⁰ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν περὶ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος ΑΓ’*, PG 75, 565B–573C.

¹¹ Cf. H. van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae № 96, Leiden, Boston: Brill 2009, 178.

in him by nature” (φυσικῶς ἐνυπάρχον αὐτῷ), and since the Holy Spirit is “embedded in his essence” (οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπεπηγός), created beings are, Cyril points out, only “inappropriately” (καταχρηστικώτερον) taken as “from” (ἐκ) God¹². Corroborating his theses with the scriptural pericopes and analogies of the co-naturalness of man and the spirit that dwells in him, and proving that “ἐξ οὗ” does not have to pertain to “consubstantiality”, Cyril emphasizes, through a rather meticulous interpretation of the eighth paragraph of *The Epistle to the Romans*, that the apostle Paul¹³ does not inadvertently refer to the Spirit as the “Spirit of God” and immediately thereupon as the “Spirit of Christ”. Cyril claims that Paul’s prime intention is to show how *all properties of the Father pass onto out of him naturally begotten Son* (πάντα τὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἴδια, διαβαίνει ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς γεννηθέντα Υἱόν), and to underscore that the Spirit is of one essence with the Son, whilst they exist one within another (ὡς αὐτὸ τε ὑπάρχειν ἐν Υἱῷ, καὶ Υἱὸν ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα)¹⁴. Also, in one of the following *aliuds*, Cyril talks about the theology of adoption by the Holy Spirit, where we become participants of the divine nature: the Holy Spirit, he says, *is granted to the saints through the Son* (τοῖς ἁγίοις δι’ Υἱοῦ χορηγούμενον), deifying them and inviting them to be adopted¹⁵.

In regard to Cyril’s second writing we have mentioned concerning Palamas’ formulation “ἔχειν φησι τὸν υἱὸν φυσικῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδια καὶ ἐξαιρέτα, διαβαινούσης εἰς αὐτὸν φυσικῶς τῆς τοῦ γεννήσαντος ιδιότητος”, namely, *Commentary on John*, his twelfth book is of the utmost importance for us, seeing that there we find a formulation which is even more similar to Palamas’ than the aforementioned one from *Thesaurus*: namely, πάντα τὰ τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἴδια φυσικῶς ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ. In the aforementioned passage, Cyril, talking about the renewal of matter into imperishability and glory by means of participating in the Holy Spirit, whose “grantor and donor” (χορηγός καὶ δοτῆρ) is Christ himself, explicitly states: “The Father has within himself and from himself the Spirit, the very same [Spirit] has also the Son, since he is consubstantial with him, and substantially originates him from himself, having all properties of the begetter naturally”¹⁶.

¹² Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βιβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΑΓ*, PG 75, 565C–568A.

¹³ The number of Cyril’s references to the apostle Paul is fascinating; so, it comes as no surprise when he is qualified as “Paulinist”; cf. N. Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, The Early Church Fathers, London, New York: Routledge 2000, 14.

¹⁴ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βιβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΑΓ*, PG 75, 568C. – The thesis that exactly this section from Cyril’s *Thesaurus* is one of the sources which Palamas here has in mind is testified by the chapter 30 of his first *Apodictic Treatise*, where the Archbishop of Salonica considers, granted somewhat deeper, precisely the chapter 33 of the aforementioned Cyril’s writing, with respect to the meaning of “ἐξ οὗ”. Generally speaking, in the said passage, Palamas, referring to Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria, deems that, if we accept the thesis that the Spirit gains existence “from” the Son, we will have to come to the paradoxical conclusion that the Spirit is one of the creatures – due to the fact that only in terms of non-beings (τὰ οὐκ ὄντα) is it taken that they have the Son as ἀρχή of their existence. The same way Palamas, in this passage, interprets the phrase “from both” (παρ’ ἀμοτέρων/ἐξ ἀμοτέρων): since the creation originated from the Father through the Son – thus, both the Father and the Son being origin of all (ἀρχή τῶν ὄλων) – the (Latin) objection that the Holy Spirit hypostatically proceeds “from both” (ἐξ ἀμοτέρων) necessarily implies that both the Son and the Father are the origin (ἀρχή) of the Spirit, which reduces the Spirit to the level of a creature and leads to the diarchy within the divine being. Palamas implicitly suggests that the phrase “from both” refers to the sphere of nature and natural properties, since that is the only way to preserve the hypostatic monocausality. See: *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Α’ 30*, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 57.14–32–58.1–21 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 136.6–31–138.1–16.

¹⁵ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βιβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΑΓ*, PG 75, 569C.

¹⁶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Εἰς τὸ Κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον XII*, PG 74, 716B: “Ἐχει δὲ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ἴδιον Πνεῦμα, ἔχει τοῦτο ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ὁ Υἱός, ἐπεὶ ἐστὶν ὁμοούσιος αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πέφηνεν οὐσιωδῶς, πάντα τὰ τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἴδια φυσικῶς ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ”.

The fact that *both* of these writings are the firsthand sources that Palamas on the given occasion had in mind is corroborated by the propinquity of formulations – bearing in mind that in *Thesaurus* it is said “ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς γεννηθέντα Υἱόν”, whilst in the *Commentary on John* “πάντα τὰ τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἴδια φυσικῶς ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ” is mentioned, whereby, due to a higher lexical similarity, the focus, of course, shifts to the latter. This is also corroborated by the ninth paragraph of Palamas’ writing *Against Bekkos*, in whose “Inscription” we find a formulation almost identical to that of Cyril’s from *Thesaurus*: “πάντα τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδια φυσικῶς διαβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννηθέντα υἱόν”¹⁷.

The *second* passage that Palamas on given occasion takes into consideration – at least in the case of the phrase “προχεῖται ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ” and its variations – can be encountered in miscellaneous Cyril’s writings, such as, for instance, his *Festal Homily*¹⁸ or his treatise *On Adoration in Spirit and in Truth*, where it can be read that the Holy Spirit comes forth from the Father through the Son (ἐκ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ προχεόμενον Πνεῦμα)¹⁹. However, if we compare more vigilantly the texts of the two christian authors and avoid those rather incomplete references found in critical edition of Palamas’ *Apodictic Treatises*²⁰, we shall discern that the most explicit source that Palamas on this occasion has in mind is actually Cyril’s *Dialogues on the Holy Trinity*, where the Archbishop of Alexandria, whilst enouncing that the Holy Spirit springs from the divine nature, says that he “comes forth directly from the Father through the Son, sanctifying the creation” (προχεόμενον δὲ ὡσπερ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ἀγιάζον τὴν κτίσιν). It is more than apparent to everyone that this formulation of Cyril’s is almost entirely transcribed in the aforementioned Palamas’ *Second Apodictic Treatise* 62, where Palamas, whilst paraphrasing Cyril, states that the Holy Spirit “comes forth from the Father through the Son so as to sanctify the creation” (προχεόμενον ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ τὴν κτίσιν ἀγιάζειν).²¹ Cyril’s assertion that the Holy Spirit is “from the essence of the Son”, which Palamas quotes in the aforementioned paragraph (see p. 3), can also be located in various Cyril’s writings, one of which is also *Thesaurus*, paragraph 34, one section of which bears an indicative title: “That the Holy Spirit is from the essence of the Father and the Son”. In that passage, interpreting in soteriological categories 1 Corinthians 12:3, where Paul says that Jesus cannot be called Lord except through the Holy Spirit, Cyril inversely proves the divine character of the Spirit: namely, if only through the Spirit, according to Paul, the divine character of the Son can be known, then the Spirit must be of the same essence as the Son. Thus, using, on this occasion too, the inappropriate category of quality (ποιότης) concerning the Holy Spirit – in sooth with certain restriction “so to speak” – Cyril accentuates that

¹⁷ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, *Ἀντεπιγραφαί* 9, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988], 161–175: 169.24–25 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981], 344–373: 360.17–18.

¹⁸ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ὁμιλία ἑορταστικά* 18, PG 77, 817AB: “Αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς δι’ αὐτοῦ προχεόμενον Πνεῦμα ζωοποιὸν ὠνόμαζεν ὕδωρ πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῇ Σαμαραίᾳ γυναικᾷ τὰς διαλέξεις πιούμενος”.

¹⁹ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Περὶ τῆς ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας Α΄*, PG 68, 148A.

²⁰ Here, of course, I have in mind ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988], 23–153, where, concerning our case, quite arbitrary references are provided, without a more concrete comparison of the texts (cf. 134).

²¹ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Πρὸς Ἑρμείαν πρεσβύτερον, κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν, Λόγος ΣΤ΄*, PG 75, 1013B.

“the Holy Spirit is from the essence of the Son” (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα), and consequently God himself, not a created entity.²²

The *third* passage, which also represents the main backing of the Latin perusal of Cyril of Alexandria and which Palamas in the mentioned paragraph from his *Apodictic Treatises* unequivocally has in mind, is located in the first book of Cyril’s *On Adoration in Spirit and in Truth*, his earliest exegetical writing, which was, in all probability, composed *ca.* 423²³. Written in the form of a dialogue between Cyril himself and Palladius, this writing mainly investigates the issue of compatibility between the Old and New Testament, i.e. between Judaism and Christianity. Actually, the major purpose of the writing in question is to show the concord of the two Testaments, which would lead to the conclusion that Christians, and not Jews, are actually the genuine heirs of God’s promises. However, in one passage, Cyril, whilst referring to the problem of inner-trinitarian relations, primarily to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, says that he “is the Spirit of God the Father, as well as of the Son, and *comes forth substantially from both*, that is, *from the Father through the Son*” (εἴπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τὸ οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἦγουν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ προχέμενον Πνεῦμα)²⁴. That this text is the very source that Palamas must have had in mind on the said occasion, is substantiated by the fact that the phrase “ἐξ ἀμφοῖν” appears, as far as I was able to deduce, in this particular form only in this passage of Cyril’s writings – with the exception of certain phrases, of course, such as “δι’ ἀμφοῖν”, which is to be found in Cyril’s *Second Treatise on the Right Faith*, where he, noting that the Son is equal in everything to the Father from whom he originates, emphasizes the fact that the life-giving Spirit flows forth through both, viz. through the Father and the Son (πρόεισι δὲ δι’ ἀμφοῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ζωοποιῶν)²⁵.

Finally, the *fourth* passage that Palamas takes into consideration is, *actually*, Cyril’s *Dialogue on the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten*, chapter 7, where Cyril, once again in a specifically economic context, talks about the sending of the Holy Spirit and underlines his consubstantiality with the Father and the Son. Palamas, as we have already seen, cites this passage well-nigh *verbatim*, erroneously locating it in Cyril’s writing *De Sancta Trinitate Dialogi*.²⁶

After we have, I believe, indubitably ascertained the major textual backing of the Latin objection Palamas had to face, let us now take a look at how the Archbishop of Salonica interprets these “filioquistic” passages from Cyril’s writings as well as the manner in which he develops his argumentation.

²² Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΑΑ'*, PG 75, 588A.

²³ Thus G. Jouassard, “L’activité littéraire de saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie jusqu’à 428: Essai de chronologie et de synthèse”, in: *Mélanges Podechard*, Lyons: Facultés catholiques 1945, 159–174; then, “La date des écrits anti-ariens de saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie”, *Revue bénédictine* 87 (1977) 172–178, whose chronology is followed by other scholars as well. Cf. L. J. Welch, *Christology and Eucharist in the Early Thought of Cyril of Alexandria*, San Francisco: Catholic Scholars Press, International Scholars Publications 1994, 6–7.

²⁴ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Περὶ τῆς ἐν Πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας Α'*, PG 68, 148A.

²⁵ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Λόγος δεύτερος προσηφνητικὸς ταῖς εὐσεβεστάταις βασιλίαις, περὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως ΝΑ'*, PG 76, 1408B.

²⁶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Μονογενοῦς*, PG 75, 1241A.

2.

Palamas' interpretation of Cyril's passages that are allegedly in favour of the thesis of *filioque* appears, to remind, for the first and only time in his *Second Apodictic Treatise*, starting with chapter 62, wherein the analysis of this inconvenient "Latin" objection is being programmatically undertaken, and ending with chapter 69 – of course, with some digressions and aberrations from the main topic. Unlike Maximus the Confessor, who finds a hermeneutical key for the filioquistic reading of Cyril of Alexandria, but also for the very stability of practice of *filioque* in the West, primarily in the linguistic limitations of the Latin language²⁷, showing on that occasion solid precision in his own formulations²⁸, Palamas' argumentation is somewhat more extensive and is, of course, molded so as to be favourable to his own polemical agenda. Synoptically, his argumentation is deployed evenly in three directions, since, Palamas believes, the attitude of Cyril, according to which the Holy Spirit comes forth from the Father and the Son, can denote three significant theological things. Let us see which ones.

a) Firstly, a thing completely expected, Palamas incorporates cyrillian "filioquistic" passages into his own prevalent interpretative matrix that is reflected in the distinction between two types of causality, determined according to whether they pertain to the "economic" or "theological" Trinity. In other words, it is referred to what Gregory Palamas, in his *Apodictic Treatises* 1, 29, explicitly calls "the double procession of the Holy Spirit" (ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος πρόοδος διττὴ [...])²⁹. As for causality in the *literal* sense of the word, Palamas states that we predominantly need to bear in mind the causality of economic type, since this kind of causality is precisely "for our sake", or "for a cause" (δι' αἰτίας), that is, "of temporal" (χρονικόν) character, which altogether means that it does not, in any way, refer to the absolute realm of the divine being. On the other hand, causality in the context of "theological" Trinity actually transcends the very concept of causality and it is referred to by that name only in an inappropriate sense: in other words, when the divine existence is taken *eo ipso*, it inevitably takes on characteristics of "noncausality" (ἀναίτιος) and "beyond time" (ὑπέρχρονος). Hence, Palamas deems that, when Cyril of Alexandria says that the Holy Spirit comes forth from the Son in order to sanctify the creation, he does imply the actual *temporal* outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the economic realm, which happens *for a cause*; namely, he, in Palamas' opinion, has in mind the bestowing of the Spirit from the Son in history, with the intention of absolving

²⁷ See: G. C. Berthold, "Maximus the Confessor and the *Filioque*", *Studia Patristica* XVIII, 1 (1989) 113–117: 115.

²⁸ Maximus uses the term προῖέναι, and not ἐκπορεύεσθαι concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son; to him, thus G. C. Berthold, "Maximus the Confessor and the *Filioque*", *Studia Patristica* XVIII, 1 (1989) 113–117: 115, the terms "from the Son" and "through the Son" are synonyms in that sense. Likewise, Cyril of Alexandria does not say, in any of his presumed filioquistic sections, that the Spirit "proceeds" (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) from the Father and the Son; as instead, he claims that the Spirit "comes forth" or "flows forth" (προῖέναι, προχέεται) from the Son, which is something rather different; thus A. E. Siecienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010, 49. See also note 44.

²⁹ For this, see synoptically: C. B. Scouteris, "The Double Procession of the Holy Spirit according to Saint Gregory Palamas", in: *Der Heilige Geist im Leben der Kirche. Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glaubens. Pro Oriente-Studientagung "Der Heilige Geist bei den griechischen und lateinischen Kirchenvätern im ersten Jahrtausend"*, Wien, Juni 2003. Herausgegeben von Y. de Andia, P. L. Hofrichter, Pro Oriente XXIX. Wiener Patristische Tagungen II, Innsbruck, Wien: Tyrolia-Verlag 2005, 329–338.

sins and sanctifying the creation. Therefore, in that economic context the Spirit is given *from the Son* in the same way as he is given from the Father. This economic emission of the Spirit pertains to, according to Palamas' opinion, "*the divine grace and energy of the Spirit*" (τῆς θείας χάριτος καὶ ἐνεργείας τοῦ πνεύματος) and it occurs not only from the Father *and the Son*, but also from the *Holy Spirit himself*.³⁰ The act of the outpouring of the Spirit – when by Spirit we mean energy – actually belongs to all three hypostases of the Holy Trinity, since the energy or grace is a property of divine nature as such, rather than some of the hypostases³¹. That, of course, does not mean that the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit owes its existence to the Son in a strictly triadological plane³²: unlike the economic emission of the Spirit, his eternal procession is deprived of the temporal conditionality and any derived causality, since it occurs, Palamas says, "neither for something, nor towards someone, and by no means in time" (οὐ διὰ τι οὐδὲ πρὸς τινὰ οὔτε ὑπὸ χρόνον ὅλως). In the context of that which can be labelled "triadological causality", the Spirit does not come forth from the Son, but immediately, causelessly, and eternally proceeds *ex Patre solo*. Intensifying the matter completely, Palamas will, in this passage – with the aim of showing that the Father is the only cause (μόνος αἴτιος) in a triadological context – even renounce something that he will elsewhere resolutely claim³³: namely, that the procession of the Holy Spirit *also* in the triadological realm occurs "through" (διὰ) or even "from" (ἐκ) the Son: "the Son does not have from (ἐκ) himself the Spirit, nor does the Spirit have through (διὰ) the Son the being (τὴν ὑπαρξιν), but the Father has the Spirit from (ἐκ) himself, proceeding [him] out of himself directly, causelessly and pre-eternally"³⁴.

b) Secondly, Gregory Palamas, endeavouring to wrest Cyril from the filioquistic interpretative matrix, presents one particularly important, I think, review of the phrase "οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἦγουν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ προχεόμενον Πνεῦμα", especially of the word "substantial" (οὐσιωδῶς) which occurs in this frequently cited pericope. Firstly, Palamas endeavours to neutralize, or at least mitigate, this unpleasant Latin objection in one strictly psychological sense, stating that Cyril's claim according to which the outpouring of the Spirit occurs "substantially from both" is not "unusual at all" (οὐδὲν

³⁰ See: *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς* Β' 65, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 136.19–30–137.1–3 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 304.14–29; Β' 69, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 140.17–20–141.1–24 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 312.10–31–314.1–9; Β' 79, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 149.22–28 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 330.14–20.

³¹ *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς* Β' 69, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 141.9–10 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 312.23–24.

³² In certain passages, although before explanations of disputable Cyril's passages are to be programmatically assailed, Palamas reads the phrase "ἐξ ἀμφοῖν" solely in terms of energetic transmission in the economic framework: "Whenever you, therefore, hear him say that the Holy Spirit pours forth from both of them, as from the Father substantially through the Son, do understand reverently that he teaches the transmission of these natural powers and energies of God, but not the pouring forth of the divine hypostasis of the Spirit"; *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς* Β' 20, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 96.23–28 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 220.23–27: "Ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσῃς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ὡς ἐκ πατρὸς οὐσιωδῶς δι' υἱοῦ προχεόμενον, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον λέγοντα, τὴν τῶν φυσικῶν τούτων δυνάμεων τε καὶ ἐνεργειῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ μετάδοσιν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν θείαν τοῦ πνεύματος ὑπόστασιν προχεῖσθαι διδάσκειν, εὐσεβῶς νόμισον". Cf. note 93.

³³ For the use of prepositions "from" and "through" in Palamas' triadology I refer to my paper: M. Knežević, "“Ek” и “dià” у ‘Аподиктичким словима о исхођењу Светог Духа’ Григорија Паламе”, *Смисао. Часопис Одјељења за друштвене науке Матице српске – Друштво чланова у Црној Гори* 1/1 (2012) 39–59. (in Serbian, with summary in English)

³⁴ *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς* Β' 64, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [1988] 136.6–9 | ЕΠΕ 51 [1981] 302.31–304.1–3: "[...] οὐκ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ μὲν ἔχει τὸ πνεῦμα ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν τὸ πνεῦμα ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμέσως ἐκπορευόμενον ἀνατίτως καὶ προαιωνίως [...]".

καίνόν). However, this polemical trick of Palamas', which is, it should be mentioned, just one in a series of his noteworthy "byzantine" manners³⁵, can be plainly opposed with the thesis that this and similar modes of expression are not encountered frequently in patristic literature, referring to which Palamas deems one of the main regulations of proper theologization. Secondly, Palamas refers to an argument *ex traditio*, relying on Gregory the Theologian, which is here of paramount importance: videlicet, what Cyril means when he says that the Holy Spirit comes forth "substantially from both" relates to the outpouring of the Spirit onto the apostles, which is, Palamas deems, wholly compatible with the statement of Gregory the Theologian, according to which the Holy Spirit is "substantially present and co-dwelling with the apostles, we can say" (οὐσιωδῶς ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις παρὸν καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον). Thirdly, Palamas, as in some prior instances, and utterly in accordance with the byzantine theological tradition, christologically funds pneumatology, in the sense that he performs the teaching on the Holy Spirit *per analogiam* with the teaching on the Son³⁶. Actually, on the subject of cyrillian phrase "οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἄμφοῖν", Palamas underlines that the same mode of expression can be used apropos the Son as well, primarily in the context of his incarnation: the sending of Logos towards us was precisely of the "substantial" (οὐσιώδης) character, in view of the fact that it occurred from *the Father and the Spirit*, therefore, *from both* (ἐξ ἄμφοῖν τοῦ πατρὸς γενομένη καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος)³⁷. Palamas declares that the sending of the Spirit should be interpreted in the same direction: the Spirit was also *substantially* sent out and outpoured from both. Accordingly, the Spirit outpours forth substantially for us and after us (ἐκκέχυται τοίνυν οὐσιωδῶς δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ μεθ' ἡμᾶς), since he manifested himself bestowing the divine power through himself (δι' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν θεῖαν δύναμιν παρέχον). However, this being of vital importance, the Spirit, Palamas says, *always* comes to us *substantially* (πάρεστιν ἀεὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἡμῖν), but in the same way *hypostatically* as well (πάντως δὲ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν) – despite the fact that we do not participate in the essence nor in the hypostasis, but only in the grace³⁸. All of this, of course, should be reflected upon economically: just like the sending of the Son is not the same as his eternal generation – in the sense that the Son was not born eternally "from both", that is, *ex Patre Spirituque*, nor was he born "for our sake", but only and solely from the Father – in the same manner, the Spirit does not, in the strictly triadological context, proceed "from both", that is, *ex Patre Filioque*, since his pre-eternal procession occurs causelessly from the Father only (πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἀναιτίως ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς). I will get later to this significant passage, which could – in principle at least – disprove the assertions of some scholars of Gregory Palamas who explicitly confront him with Gregory of Nazianzus in order to push him completely into pseudo-dionysian and, thereafter, neoplatonic framework.

³⁵ For Palamas as a skilled polemicist see Γ. Α. Δημητρακόπουλος, *Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς. Τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας*, Ἀθήνα: Παρουσία 1997, 102–104, 107–110.

³⁶ Cf. *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Α'* 34, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [21988] 65.33–35–66.1–9 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 154.14–25. See also: M. Knežević, "The Order (τάξις) of Persons of the Holy Trinity in 'Apodictic Treatises' of Gregory Palamas", *Philothéos. International Journal for Philosophy and Theology* 12 (2012) 84–102: 89–90.

³⁷ This would mean not only that pneumatology is funded christologically, but also *vice-versa*, that is, that christology is funded pneumatologically; see: Α. Јевтић, "Православно богословље о Светом Духу", in: Α. Јевтић, *Χριστός Αλφα и Ομεγα*, друго, допуњено издање, Савремено православно богословље, Врњачка Бања, Требиње: Манастир Тврдош, Братство Св. Симеона Мироточивога 2004, 201–222: 213–215.

³⁸ *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β'* 64, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [21988] 135.24–28 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 302.15–19.

c) Last but not least, Palamas construes cyrillian passages with potential filioquistic overtones under the prism of differentiation between *nature* and *person* in the domain of triadology, during which the notion of *consubstantiality* and the distinction between *natural* and *hypostatic* properties of divine persons emerge as key concepts. In that direction, Palamas neutralizes the Latin objection vis-à-vis cyrillian thesis that “the Holy Spirit outflows from the divine nature *and of the Son*”, by claiming that some implicit causality on the Son’s part is not the question at issue, but only and solely the affirmation of *consubstantiality* of the Spirit with the Son, and hence with the Father. Therefore, cyrillian “from the Son”, according to Palamas, means “from the Son’s nature”, *ergo* the preposition “ἐκ” in the context of relationship between the Son and the Spirit always pertains to the plane of *nature*, and not in the slightest to the plane of hypostases, since the Son’s hypostasis can never be taken as the cause of the Spirit’s hypostasis. “Whenever”, Palamas categorically claims, “this divinely contemplating Cyril says that the Spirit is from the essence of the Son, he indicates that the Son is consubstantial with the Spirit and not his cause”³⁹. Palamas continues in the same direction a few paragraphs later:

[...] it could be well said that the Spirit does not proceed from the hypostasis of the Son, but naturally from the Father and from the essence of the Son, due to the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, so that – since this shows the consubstantiality of the divine Spirit with the Father and the Son, and not the different existence of the Spirit from the Father –, due to the consubstantiality, it is the same to say the Spirit is also from the essence of the Son and to say the Spirit is of the same essence with the Son. Therefore, the consubstantiality of the Spirit is shown from the Son’s [consubstantiality], which is more apparent and previously promised and established [...]⁴⁰.

According to Palamas, this kind of reading of cyrillian “filioquistic” theses has a historic and systemic foundation. Namely, it is conditioned by both the historical context of Cyril’s time as well as the conceptual framework of the tradition where he belongs. In other words, the fact that Palamas reads the abovementioned pericopes by highlighting the *consubstantiality*, is vindicated, according to him, by the fact that the Archbishop of Alexandria, whilst presenting the aforesaid views and formulations, actually addressed those who opposed this quite substantial (and today rather neglected) dogma⁴¹. On the other hand, the Eastern tradition, Palamas claims, is not familiar with the mode of expression in relation to which the Son would be taken as *the hypostatic cause within the triadological milieu*. This foundation of Palamas’ reading of cyrillian pericopes

³⁹ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β΄ 64, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 136.11–13 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 304.6–8: “Καὶ ὁσάκις ὁ θεόφρων οὗτος Κύριλλος ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει, τὸ ὁμοούσιον παρίστησιν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ αἴτιον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πνεύματος”. See also: Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β΄ 76, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 147.24–29 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 326.10–15.

⁴⁰ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β΄ 67, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 139.5–13 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 308.32–33–310.1–9: “Τοιγαροῦν εὖ ἂν ἔχοι λέγειν οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἐξ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, διὰ τὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὁμοούσιον, καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ὁμοουσιότητος ἐντεῦθεν δεικνυμένης, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ τῆς διαφορῆς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ πνεύματος, ἴσον δέ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα διὰ τὴν ὁμοουσιότητα, καὶ ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶν οὐσίας τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα. Ἐκ δὲ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ ὁμοουσιότης δεικνύεται τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς φανερωτέρας καὶ προκατηγελεμένης καὶ προπεπιστωμένης [...]”.

⁴¹ The reintroduction of the term ὁμοούσιον will especially be insisted upon by the significant contemporary theologian Nikolaos Loudovikos. Cf. N. Loudovikos, *Ἡ κλειστή πνευματικότητα καὶ τὸ νόημα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ. Ὁ μωστικισμὸς τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια φύσεως καὶ προσώπου*, Ὁρησκαιολογία 21, Ἀθήνα: Ἑλληνικά γράμματα 1999; idem, *Ἡ Αποφατικὴ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ὁμοουσίου. Ἡ ἀρχέγονη Ἐκκλησία σήμερα*, Ἀθήνα: Ἀρμός 2002; idem, *Οἱ τρόμοι τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τὰ βάσανα τοῦ ἔρωτα. Κριτικὸι στοχασμοὶ γιὰ μιὰ μετανεωτερικὴ θεολογικὴ ὀντολογία*, Ἀθήνα: Ἀρμός 2010.

is obviously summarized in his assertion that “no one of pious theologians of all centuries ever said that the Spirit is from the hypostasis of the Son, but from the hypostasis of the Father” and that “if someone ever said that he is from the nature of the Son and naturally from him, that was because the nature of the Father and the Son is one and the same”⁴². Moreover, Palamas states that Cyril’s unequivocal affiliation with such a tradition is undoubtedly substantiated by the fact that, in his writings, he “*never* says that the Holy Spirit comes forth from the hypostasis [of the Son]”⁴³ – ascertainment for which the defender of hesychasts must be given full credit and regarding which, at least when it comes to the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι, he is granted enough backing even by the contemporary scholars of Cyril’s thought⁴⁴.

Therefore: cyrillican phrases “from the Son”, “from the essence of the Son”, “from both”, and the like, are of the same meaning, according to Palamas, with the phrases “from *the nature* of the Son” and “*consubstantial* with the Son”. Accordingly, they can never relate to the plane of *hypostatic* causality. That type of causality will remain an exclusive privilege of the Father – something that Palamas will repeatedly apostrophize with the thesis that the coming forth of the Holy Spirit, albeit from the divine nature *and of the Son*, occurs “according to the hypostasis of the Father only” (καθ’ ὑπόστασιν μόνην τὴν πατρικήν)⁴⁵.

Running parallel to this is Palamas’ interpretation of cyrillican phrase, according to which the properties of the Father pass onto his naturally begotten Son. As said by Palamas, “properties” in question here need to be considered in terms of particularities of the divine *nature*, particularities which are common to all three persons of the Holy Trinity, and which do not fall within the scope of the “hypostatic” or “incommunicable” properties that characterize only and solely each of the hypostases individually:

⁴² Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β’ 65, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 137.7–11 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 306.2–7: “Διὸ οὐδεὶς οὐδέποτε τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος εὐσεβῶν θεολόγων ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως εἶναι τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα εἶπεν, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ὑποστάσεως· ἐκ δὲ τῆς φύσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ φυσικῶς εἶναι ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶπερ τις φαίη, ἀλλ’ ὡς μᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως οὐσης τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ”.

⁴³ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β’ 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 139.20–25 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 310.16–22: “Καὶ τοῦτο διὰ πολλῆς ποιούμενος σπουδῆς ὁ θεὸς Κύριλλος, τὸ μηδένα παραχθέντα δοξάζειν ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐκ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ φυσικῶς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ὡςάκις λέγει, τὸ πνεῦμά φησι τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ πηγάζειν, καθ’ ἣν ὁ αὐτός ἐστι μετὰ πατρός, ἀλλ’ οὐδαμοῦ τῶν λόγων ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως [...]”.

⁴⁴ Despite the indubitable fact that Cyril never considers the question of personal procession of the Holy Spirit extensively or in isolation, nor does he directly search for the personal and ontological role that the Son plays in all of this, it is still evident that he is predominantly careful in terms of restricting the use of the word ἐκπορεύεσθαι for the Spirit’s ultimate origin in the Father, who is the “source of divinity” (cf. note 28), that is, he never uses it in the sense that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, or even from the Father and the Son. On the other hand, Cyril uses the verb προΐεναι in a more “relaxed” manner, with the aim of emphasizing that the Spirit comes forth “from the common essence of God”, “from the essence of the Father”, “from the essence of the Son”, “from the Father and the Son”, “from the Father through the Son”, “through the Father and the Son”, “through the Son”, etc. See: B. E. Daley, “The Fullness of the Saving God: Cyril of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria...*, New York 2003, 113–148: 144–145; N. Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, London, New York 2000, 29, 213–214, note 92. For references with regard to Cyril’s use of the verb προΐεναι concerning the Holy Spirit see: M. O. Boulnois, *La paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d’Alexandrie...*, Paris 1994, 525. Whilst Daley and Boulnois think that Cyril is along the lines of the synodical definition in this terminological choice, that is, Cappadocians and John 15:26, Russell finds such a viewpoint problematic.

⁴⁵ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Α’ 6, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 33.25–26–34.1–2 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 88.17–18, 21–22; Β’ 65, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 137.6–7 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 306.2; Β’ 73, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 144.17, 26 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 318.31–32, 320.9; Β’ 74, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 146.6 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 322.23–24; cf. Β’ 76, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 147.24 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 326.9–10.

“The Son has in himself by nature particular and exceptional [properties] of the Father, since the property of the begetter is naturally transferred onto him”: not hypostatic particularities of the Father and exceptional [properties] – hence, neither does he have beginninglessness, nor unbegottenness, nor begetting – but has natural and distinctive characteristics of the Father’s nature, which the Holy Spirit also naturally possesses.⁴⁶

Cyril, in other words, claims that the Son has the same properties as the Father – and like the Spirit, we might add – “naturally and substantially and always according to the nature” (φυσικῶς τε καὶ οὐσιωδῶς καὶ κατὰ φύσιν αἰεὶ)⁴⁷, which, actually, in another fashion confirms the divinely equal character of each of the three persons of the Holy Trinity.

As a supplementary corroboration of (a) the attitude that cyrillican “ἐκ” refers to the plane of *nature* and, in the first place, to *consubstantiality*, and consequently (b) the interpretation that the properties, which are discussed in the aforementioned cyrillican pericopes, are to be interpreted as *natural*, and in no way as hypostatic properties, Palamas adds two more arguments. One of them is contained within Cyril’s response to criticism directed at him in his day, in which, Palamas says, the Archbishop of Alexandria was “defamed” for supposedly advocating the view that the Spirit has existence from the hypostasis of the Son as well. The second argument is summarized, as we shall soon see, in the paragraph 34 of the *Thesaurus*. With regard to the “defamation” to which Cyril was exposed, it presumably refers to (somewhat justified) distrust of Theodoret of Cyrus⁴⁸ regarding the ninth out of twelve of Cyril’s anathemas that we find at the end of his *Third Letter to Nestorius*⁴⁹. Generally speaking, Cyril’s somewhat unconventional speech about the Holy Spirit present in the ninth anathematism, where it is defined as “ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ”, raised suspicions in the mind of the Bishop of Cyrus, suspicions which he did not hesitate to reveal publicly, and even to call some of Cyril’s attitudes nothing less than “blasphemous”⁵⁰. Crucial to our case are, I think, two of Theodoret’s writings, one of which is *Reprehensio duodecim anathematismorum Cyrilli*, composed at the be-

⁴⁶ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 67, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 139.13–19 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 310.9–15: “ἔχει τε ὁ υἱὸς φυσικῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδια καὶ ἐξαιρετά, διαβαινώσης εἰς αὐτὸν φυσικῶς τῆς τοῦ γεννήσαντος ιδιότητος· οὐ τὰ ὑποστατικὰ ἴδια τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐξαιρετά – οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ ἀναρχον ἔχει καὶ ἀγέννητον ἢ τὸ γόνιμον – ἀλλὰ τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ ἴδια τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς φύσεως αὐχμήματα, ἅπερ ἔχει φυσικῶς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον”.

⁴⁷ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 139.26–27 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 310.22–23.

⁴⁸ For the blessed Theodoret, see: Th. Urbainczyk, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. The Bishop and the Holy Man*, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press 2002; I. Pásztori-Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus*, London, New York: Routledge 2006.

⁴⁹ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Τῷ εὐλαβεστάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Νεστορίῳ Κύριλλος καὶ ἡ συνελθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως ἐν κορίῳ χαίρειν*, in: Cyril of Alexandria, *Select Letters*. Edited and Translated by L. R. Wickham, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1983, 12[33]: 30.24–29: “Εἴ τις φησὶ τὸν ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς ἄλλοτρία δυνάμει τῇ δι’ αὐτοῦ χρώμενον καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημείας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμά φησιν, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐνήργηκε τὰς θεοσημείας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω”. For this, see: Δ. Λιάλιου, “Πνευματολογικὴς ἐπισημάνσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ Θ’ Ἀναθεματισμοῦ τῆς Γ’ Ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ Αγ. Κυρίλλου πρὸς Νεστόριο”, in: *Πρακτικά Θεολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου με θέμα “Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα” (11–14 Νοεμβρίου 1991)*. Πρόνοια καὶ Προεδρία τοῦ Παναγιωτάτου Μητροπολίτου Θεσσαλονίκης κ. κ. Παντελεήμονος Β΄, Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Θεσσαλονίκης, Μέλισσα 1992.

⁵⁰ As mentioned by J. F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon*, London: Methuen and Co. 1903, 216, Theodoret is the first to definitely negate that the Holy Spirit receives his essence from both the Father and the Son. For a detailed discussion of what was involved in Theodoret’s and Cyril’s views regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit see: A. de Halleaux, “Cyrille, Théodoret et le ‘Filioque’”, *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 74 (1979) 597–625.

gining of 431 at the request of John of Antioch as an antiochian refutation of Cyril's anathematizations. In response to the prominent ninth anathema of Cyril and after procuring enough patristic and scriptural pericopes, which should undoubtedly show that the "careful researcher of divine dogmas" (ὁ ἀκριβῆς τῶν θεῶν δογματῶν ἐξεταστής), the way Theodoret ironically calls Cyril, anathematizes not only the prophets, apostles, and the archangel Gabriel, but the Savior of all himself, the Bishop of Cyrus puts forward the following attitudes:

We say that it was not God the Word, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Spirit, who was formed by the Holy Spirit and anointed, but the human nature which was assumed by him at the end of days. We shall confess together that the Spirit of the Son was his own if he spoke of [the Spirit] as of the same nature and proceeding from the Father, and shall accept the expression as consistent with true piety. But if [he would speak of the Spirit] as being of the Son, or as having [his] origin through the Son, we shall reject this as blasphemous and impious. For we believe the Lord when he says, "The Spirit which proceeds from the Father" and likewise the most godly Paul saying, "We have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God".⁵¹

The second writing that must be borne in mind here is Theodoret's *Epistola 151*, directed at Eastern monks, where the Bishop of Cyrus summarizes his critique of Cyril's anathemas, including the disputable ninth one⁵². In one passage, Theodoret, with regard to the disputable issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, categorically claims that Cyril even "blasphemes" (βλασφημεῖ) when it comes to this issue and he directly brings him, in the best traditions of the byzantine polemical strategies, into direct connection with some of the infamous heretics:

He even blasphemes the Holy Spirit: he does not say, in keeping with Lord, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, but that he has existence from the Son. And that is the fruit of Apollinarius' seed; and it resembles Macedonius' cunning plough.⁵³

In his response to these more than open admonitions which, were they to be interpreted in the light of what was said in Matthew 12: 31–32⁵⁴, really assume immense polemical and ecclesiological proportions, Cyril, Palamas says, "proclaimed that he was defamed"

⁵¹ Θεοδορήτου Κύρου, *Reprehensio duodecim anathematismorum Cyrilli*, PG 76, 432CD: "Διαπλασθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ χρισθῆναι οὐ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον φαμέν, τὸν τῷ Πατρὶ ὁμοούσιον, καὶ συναΐδιον, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ληφθεῖσαν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν. Ἴδιον δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφύες, καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον ἔρη, συνομολογήσομεν καὶ ὡς εὐσεβῆ δεζόμεθα τὴν φωνὴν. Εἰ δ' ὡς ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο, καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀπορρίψομεν. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγοντι· 'Τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται'· καὶ τῷ θεοστάτῳ δὲ Παύλῳ ὁμοίως φάσκοντι· 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ'". For a similar attitude concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit cf. also Θεοδορήτου Κύρου, *Ἐρμηνεῖα τῆς Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῆς Η'*, PG 82, 132C: "Τὸ γὰρ πανάγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ Θεοῦ προσηγόρευσε, καὶ Χριστοῦ· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ, κατὰ τοὺς δυσωνίμους αἰρετικούς, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δεδημιούργηται· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ὁμοούσιόν ἐστι Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν ἐκπορεύεται κατὰ τὴν τῶν Εὐαγγελίων διδασκαλίαν, ἢ δὲ τούτου χάρις τοῖς ἀξίοις διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χορηγείται".

⁵² This epistle was written in the same period as *Reprehensio*; its (christological) contents are summarized in P. B. Clayton, Jr., *The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus. Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the Council of Chalcedon (451)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2007, 136–141. For a more detailed review of Theodoret's *Reprehensio* see: *Ibid.*, 141–153.

⁵³ Θεοδορήτου Κύρου, *Ἐπιστολαί 151*, Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῇ Εὐφρατησίᾳ, καὶ Ὀσσορηγῇ, καὶ Συρίᾳ, καὶ Φοινικῇ καὶ Κιλικίᾳ μονάζοντας, PG 83, 1417D: "Βλασφημεῖ δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτὸ λέγων ἐκπορεύεσθαι, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου φωνὴν, ἀλλ' ἐξ Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχειν. Καὶ οὗτος δὲ τῶν Ἀπολλιναρίου σπερμάτων ὁ καρπός· γεινιᾶζει δὲ καὶ τῇ Μακεδονίου πονηρᾷ γεωργίᾳ".

⁵⁴ Cf. Mark 3:29; Luke 12:10.

and he also accentuated the fact that the Spirit is “ἴδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ” in the sense that he is “not alien” (οὐκ ἀλλότριον) to the Son, but also emphasized that the Spirit “is not from the Son” (οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ)⁵⁵. As regards the sources, it can be established that, besides *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII capitibus*, where Cyril says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from God and the Father (ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός) and that he is “not alien to the Son” (οὐκ ἀλλότριόν ἐστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ)⁵⁶, Palamas probably has in mind one of famous Cyril’s writings entitled *Laetentur caeli*, that is, *Epistle 39*, addressed to John of Antioch and composed in a conciliatory tone in springtime (April 23th) 433⁵⁷. In that rather important document, Cyril, albeit quite incidentally, whilst talking about the unwavering determination in relation to which not a single word or a syllable of Nicene Creed ought to be changed, points out that the fathers who convened in Nicaea were “being talked to by the Spirit of God the Father, who [the Spirit] proceeds from him, but who is not alien to the Son in terms of his essence”⁵⁸. Such Cyril’s manner of speaking was apparently satisfactory, if we might add, to Theodoret as well⁵⁹, judging at least by his *Epistle 171*, where he expresses delight as a result of Cyril’s confession that “the Holy Spirit has no existence from nor through the Son, but [as] proceeding from the Father, being called, as consubstantial, the property of the Son”⁶⁰. However, if we compare what Cyril actually said there with the formulation that Theodoret provides, we will notice that his “delight” was just partially founded in Cyril’s text itself⁶¹. On the other hand, if we compare what Cyril, in these two passages, explicitly states with the formulations with which Palamas paraphrases Cyril, we shall observe that there is really no absolute textual concordance there as well: namely, the crucial “οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ” is missing, in spite of the fact that such an inference must inevitably arise from Cyril’s statement that the *Spirit proceeds from the Father*, without any mention that this procession occurs *and from the Son*⁶².

⁵⁵ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [1988] 139.28–29–140.1–2 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 310.24–27. Cf. Β΄ 76, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [1988] 147.24–29 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 326.10–15.

⁵⁶ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, Ἐπιστολὴ Πρὸς Εὐδόκιον. Πρὸς τὴν παρὰ Θεοδώρητου κατὰ τῶν δώδεκα κεφαλαίων ἀντιρρήσιν. Πρὸς τοὺς τομῶντας συνηγορεῖν τοῖς Νεστορίου δόγμασιν, ὡς ὀρθῶς ἔχουσι, κεφάλαια ΙΒ΄, PG 76, 433BC.

⁵⁷ See: A. de Halleux, “Cyrille, Théodoret et le ‘Filioque’”, *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 74 (1979) 597–625: 606.

⁵⁸ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, Ἐπιστολαὶ XXXIX, *Ad Ioannem Antiochenum episcopum, missa per Paulum episcopum Emesae*, PG 77, 181A: “Ὁ γὰρ ἦσαν αὐτοὶ οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός· ὃ ἐκπορεύεται μὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἐστὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀλλότριον τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον”.

⁵⁹ The teaching of the blessed Theodoret on the Holy Trinity is summarized in his short writing *Περὶ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ζωοποιῶν Τριάδος*, PG 75, 1147A–1190A, which was, up until the study of A. Ehrhard, “Die Cyrill von Alexandrien zugeschriebene Schrift περὶ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ein Werk Theodorets von Cyrus”, *Theologische Quartalschrift* 70 (1888) 179–243, 406–450, 623–653, ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria himself. For Theodoret’s triadology, see: I. Pásztori-Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus’s Double Treatise “On the Trinity” and “On the Incarnation”: The Antiochene Pathway to Chalcedon*, Kolozsvár, Cluj: The Transylvanian District of the Reformed Church in Romania 2007, 50–107.

⁶⁰ Θεοδώρητου Κύρου, Ἐπιστολαὶ POA΄, Πρὸς τὸν Ἀντιοχείας Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὰς διαλλαγὰς, PG 83, 1484C: “[...] καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ἢ δι’ Υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν ἔχον, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἴδιον δὲ Υἱοῦ ὡς ὁμοούσιον ὀνομαζόμενον”.

⁶¹ I. Pásztori-Kupán, *Theodoret of Cyrus’s Double Treatise “On the Trinity” and “On the Incarnation”*..., Kolozsvár, Cluj 2007, 97.

⁶² For the passages within Cyril’s opus where the Holy Spirit is defined as “ἴδιον τοῦ υἱοῦ”, see: Ἀ. Θεοδώρου, “Ἡ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ

Finally, I shall quote the passage from the paragraph 34 of Cyril's *Thesaurus* that I announced a while ago. This passage, Palamas reasons, Cyril *anticipatively* juxtaposes with the latter reasoning of the "Latins", according to which – on the basis of his statement that the property of the begetter is naturally transferred onto the Son – it is to be inferred that the hypostasis of the Son is the cause of the hypostasis of the divine Spirit⁶³. In the said passage, primarily with the purpose of proving the divine character of the Spirit, Cyril explicitly states that the *Spirit* substantially possesses within himself all the *distinctiveness* of God the *Father*, whose *Spirit* he actually is, bestowing himself on the creation through the Son ([...] πῶς οὐκ ἔσται τὸ Πνεῦμα Θεός, ὅλην ἔχων οὐσιωδῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ιδιότητα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Θεοῦ, οὗ καὶ Πνεῦμά ἐστι δι' Υἱοῦ τῇ κτίσει χορηγούμενον;)⁶⁴. Palamas gathers that this attitude of Cyril's should represent the hermeneutical key to understanding his thesis that "the *Son* has in himself by nature particular and exceptional [properties] of the *Father*, since the property of the begetter is naturally transferred onto him", as it can be clearly inferred from it that *natural*, not *hypostatic*, properties are those which are transferred from the *Father* onto the *Son* – and then, as we have seen, onto the Holy Spirit as well⁶⁵. The conclusion that *that* is actually the only interpretation which can be resorted to, Palamas infers *a contrario*: namely, if it is to be assumed that the *hypostatic* properties of the *Father* are those which are transferred onto the *Spirit*, it would be inevitable, Palamas underscores, to come to a paradoxical thesis that the Holy Spirit is at the same time the begetting one, since this – i.e. begetting – is the hypostatic characteristic of the *Father*⁶⁶. Therefore, just as the *Spirit* cannot be taken as the hypostatic principle of the *Son*, on the basis of the statement that he substantially possesses within himself all the distinctiveness of the *Father*, so neither the *Son* cannot be taken as the hypostatic cause of the Holy Spirit, on the basis of the statement that the property of the begetter is naturally transferred onto him.

Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου", *Θεολογία* ME 1 (1974) 80–101: 89–92. – Actually, the terms ἴδιον, ἴδιος, ἰδιότης do not have an unambiguous use in Cyril: namely, sometimes they are used to denote the *hypostatic* particularities of the three persons of the Holy Trinity, and sometimes to denote their *common* characteristics. For the use of these terms in Cyril, see in details: H. van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, Leiden, Boston 2009, 185–189, 279–282, 299, 311–312, 332, 393–395, 450–451, 470–471, 517–518.

⁶³ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β' 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [21988] 140.5–7 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 310.31–32.

⁶⁴ Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΛΔ'*, PG 75, 576C. See also note 65.

⁶⁵ Cyril repeatedly states that the *Son* is τὸ ἴδιον of the *essence of the Father*, therefore pointing out their *consubstantiality*. Cf. Κυρίλλου Ἀλεξανδρείας, *Ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΙΒ'*; *ΙΓ'*; *ΚΔ'*; *ΑΒ'*, PG 75, 181A ([...] ἔστι τῆς τοῦ γεννήσαντος οὐσίας τὸ ἴδιον [...]); 181B (Τὸ γὰρ ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας ἐν Υἱῷ κείμενον [...]); 185A (Τὸ γὰρ ἴδιον τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας ἀπαραλλάκτως ἔχων ὁ Υἱός [...]); 185B ([...] τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας τὸ ἴδιον ὑπάρχων ὁ Υἱός [...]); 204C ([...] διὰ τὸ εἶναι με τῆς σῆς [τοῦ Πατρὸς] οὐσίας τὸ ἴδιον [...]); 225CD ([...] τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ ἴδιον ὑπάρχων ὁ Υἱός [...]); 396B ([...] καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ [τοῦ Πατρὸς] τὸ ἴδιον [...]); 421C ([...] τὸ ἴδιον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ [τοῦ Πατρὸς] οὐσίας [...]); 461C ([...] τῆς πατρώσας οὐσίας ὅλον ἔχων τὸ ἴδιον [...]). – When, for denoting the common nature of divinity, he uses the noun ἰδιότης, as in this case, it is used as a collective noun; hence, this way it denotes the entire set of natural properties. Thus, in *Ἡ βίβλος τῶν θησαυρῶν... ΣΤ'*, PG 75, 80C, the *Son* is described as an "impress and likeness of his [Father's] distinctiveness ([...] χαρακτήρ ἐστὶ καὶ ὁμοίωμα τῆς ἰδιότητος αὐτοῦ [τοῦ Πατρὸς] [...])". The fact that the term ἰδιότης is used here precisely in terms of denoting the fullness of the *natural* properties, as it is suggested by Gregory Palamas, is corroborated by H. van Loon, *The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria*, Leiden, Boston 2009, 187 (to whom I owe references in this note). In that sense, alongside the cited passage from *Thesaurus* (note 64), *De Sancta Trinitate Dialogi VI*, PG 75, 1009D ought to be read as well, where it is said that the *Son* "possesses the entire distinctiveness of the *Father* within himself" (τὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἰδιότητα πᾶσαν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ).

⁶⁶ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β' 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [21988] 140.13–16 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 312.6–9.

In this fashion, Palamas deems, Cyril anticipatively refutes the Latin filioquistic reading of certain formulations from his writings. In other words, in utilizing those same arguments with which they justify their erroneous⁶⁷ interpretation of Cyril, pursuant to which the hypostasis of the Son is the cause of the hypostasis of the divine Spirit, “Latins” ought to actually distance themselves from their “malicious thinking” (κακόνοια) and should, by means of the very Cyril’s writings, discard their own misinterpretation of Cyril’s ideas. Truth be told, Palamas himself, in one segment, also counterfeits Cyril’s *Thesaurus*, since he cites the specified passage as “ὅλην ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ οὐσιωδῶς τὴν ιδιότητα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ”⁶⁸ instead of “ὅλην ἔχων οὐσιωδῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ιδιότητα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Θεοῦ”, as stated in the original Cyril’s text. This, so to speak, “displacement”, which surely favoured Palamas’ polemical intention, did not, however, affect his intended aim in this presentation of evidence: even if he had cited *verbatim* Cyril’s *Thesaurus*, Palamas would have been able to draw the same conclusion properly, which he actually drew.

Summa summarum: when Cyril of Alexandria asserts that the Spirit originates, comes forth, or is poured forth *and from the Son*, he implies (a) energetic derivation of the Spirit from the Son, (b) substantial coming forth of the Spirit from the Father and the Son in terms of his substantial (and hypostatic) presence in the economic realm, c) consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Son and in general consubstantiality of the three persons of the Holy Trinity.

3.

After I have referred to the sources in Cyril’s oeuvre which Palamas, summarizing the Latin objection, invokes, as well as the ways of his own interpretation of the aforesaid cyrillian passages, I will now consider, *grosso modo*, the interpretative credibility of Palamas’ reading of Cyril of Alexandria with regard to the “disputable” passages in his opus which allegedly support the thesis of *filioque*.

a) Firstly, it can be easily discerned that the Archbishop of Salonica, unlike many of today’s western researchers, addresses the “filioquistic” passages in Cyril’s opus *contextually*, which means that he interprets them within the *historic* and *conceptual* framework in which the Archbishop of Alexandria expounded his ideas and, above all, in the context of discussions of which he partook actively. Following that methodological principle, Palamas, as we have seen, interprets the cyrillian passages in the context of proving the *consubstantiality* of the Spirit with the Father and the Son⁶⁹. In other words, all of cyrillian passages that Palamas takes into consideration regarding the rebuttal of the Latin reading are either of economic character, thus suggesting the temporal bestowing of grace or energy of the Spirit which occurs *through* or *from* the Son, or aim at displaying the co-equal divinity and consubstantiality of the three persons of the Holy Trinity⁷⁰. That was

⁶⁷ Cf. Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β’ 48, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 122.20–22 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 274.26–29.

⁶⁸ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β’ 68, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 140.11–12 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 312.4–5.

⁶⁹ Cf. J. Meyendorff, *Initiation à la théologie byzantine. L’histoire et la doctrine*. Traduit de l’anglais par A. Sanglade avec la collaboration de C. Andronikof, Coll. Initiations, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1975, 125–126.

⁷⁰ G. C. Berthold, “Cyril of Alexandria and the ‘Filioque’”, *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 143–147: 143, notes that, concerning the teaching on the Holy Spirit, we find two contexts of argumentation in Cyril, with an obvious transition from *triadological* towards *christological* one: namely, the first is concerned with showing the divine character of the Spirit, whilst the second pertains to examining the ways in which the incarnate Son possesses and manifests the Spirit.

exactly the primary undertaking of Cyril and it was a priority on his theological agenda⁷¹, something that Palamas himself suggests when he claims that Cyril directed the aforementioned formulations at “those who opposed consubstantiality” (ἐπεὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα γέγραφεν)⁷².

Thus, Palamas, whilst interpreting Cyril in the context of tradition to which he belonged and in the context of historic controversies of his age, effectively eludes the trap of *anachronism*⁷³ into which the authors, who are prone to see Cyril as an advocate of *filioque* on the eastern side, undeniably fall⁷⁴. Precisely speaking, Palamas provides here adequate instructions for avoiding one *post factum* reading, in the sense that an idea, which was already accepted once, is interpreted as if it originated much earlier in time than what it actually is. Hence, Cyril’s texts, instead of having ideas of the later period projected upon them, ought to be read in the context of this author’s prevalent interpretative motives, which were mainly of christological and soteriological character⁷⁵. The latter conflict over *filioque* was completely alien and unknown to Cyril.⁷⁶ So, the appropriate line of reasoning is the one which indicates that, without later pneumatological disputes between the East and the West, the critique which – starting with Theodoret of Cyrus – was directed at Cyril regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit “and from the Son”, would be actually thrust aside⁷⁷.

⁷¹ Cf. Γ. Φλωροβски, *Источни оци V–VIII века*. Са руског предео М. Р. Мијатов, Хиландарски путокази № 28, Манастир Хиландар 1998, 60.

⁷² *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄* 64, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [1988] 136.14–15 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 304.8–10. Moreover, as a supplementary corroboration for such a reading of Cyril, Palamas quotes two more passages from his writings: firstly, from Cyril’s *Dialogues on the Trinity*, where it is said that “the Son cannot be imagined as being different from the Father in terms of *natural identity*, the same as the Holy Spirit” (οὐχ ἕτερος ἂν ὁ υἱὸς εἶναι νοοῖτο παρὰ τὸν πατέρα, ὅσον εἰς ταυτότητα φυσικὴν, πάντως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), and then from the *Commentary on John*, where the Archbishop of Alexandria accentuates that “the Holy Spirit is not different from the Son in terms of *identity of nature*” (οὐδὲν ἕτερον παρὰ τὸν υἱὸν ὑπάρχει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅσον εἰς ταυτότητα φύσεως); see: *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄* 65, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [1988] 137.13–15, 17–18 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 306.9–11, 13–14.

⁷³ Cf. G. C. Berthold, “Cyril of Alexandria and the ‘Filioque’”, *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 143–147: 147: “It would be anachronistic to insert a fifth century doctor into a ninth century discussion and expect him to give a clear and unambiguous answer to a question he never faced as such. The problem of the *filioque* developed in a specific historical framework which was not Cyril’s”. M. O. Boulnois, *La paradoxe trinitaire chez Cyrille d’Alexandrie...*, Paris 1994, 527–529, also thinks that Cyril, despite the fact that he provides one of the most lucid Greek testimonies for the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and/through the Son, does not directly address this disputable issue, since he uses a set of mutually correcting formulations so as to describe the procession of the Holy Spirit.

⁷⁴ So, E. B. Pusey, “Preface”, in: *Commentary on the Gospel According to S. John* by S. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria. Vol. I, S. John I–VIII, A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the division of the East and West. Translated by members of the English Church, Oxford: James Parker & Co. MDCCCLXXIV, vii–lx: ix, claims that Cyril’s teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit is “identical” to the western teaching on the *filioque*, that is, “to the words we now repeat, *Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son*”.

⁷⁵ A. E. Sicienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010, 48.

⁷⁶ B. E. Daley, “The Fullness of the Saving God: Cyril of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria...*, New York 2003, 107. Cf also: B. Bobrinskoy, *The Mystery of the Trinity: Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition*, translated by A. P. Gythiel, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press 1999, 254.

⁷⁷ A. de Halleux, “Cyrille, Théodoret et le ‘Filioque’”, *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 74 (1979) 597–625: 597. Cf. Σ. Β. Στολίγκα, “Η διδασκαλία τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ γιὰ τὴν ἐκπόρευση τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ οἱ πηγές της”, *Εκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* 76 (2005) 165–193: 184.

b) Nevertheless, notwithstanding the fact that Cyril cannot be regarded as an advocate of *filioque*, it is beyond doubt that he, in a more distinct way than his theological predecessors, insisted on formulating a closer relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, his opulent theological speculation, which gives a major role to the relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Son both within the framework of theology, as well as economy⁷⁸, provides “a fertile field for deeper investigations into the mystery of God three in one.”⁷⁹ The resonance of such an attitude of Cyril’s can be indubitably discerned in Palamas’ formulations in his *Apodictic Treatises* where it is explicitly underlined that, despite having the hypostatic causality excluded, the procession of the Holy Spirit is most closely related to the person of the Son. To elaborate further, Gregory Palamas, right along the lines of Cyril’s views, according to which the Spirit “naturally and substantially rests on the Son”⁸⁰, openly persists in his effort to establish the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit not only in the economic plane, but also in the *sphere of triadology*⁸¹. This irrefutable fact is clearly evident in Palamas’ tendency – which, truth to tell, was not without certain tensions and hesitations – to attribute not only the preposition “through” (διά), but even the preposition “from” (ἐκ) with regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit *and to the Son* – even in the domain of the immanent trinitarian existence. Upon a closer inspection of certain passages in his *Apodictic Treatises*, it becomes obvious that Palamas’ interpretation of Cyril’s usage of the preposition “ἐκ” is definitely broader than its exclusive pertaining to the energetic and economic plane, which means that the Spirit’s “and from the Son” is attributable *also* to the milieu of inner-trinitarian relations. Actually, it has the purpose of pointing out the co-naturalness and affiliation of the Spirit with the Son:

And if someone, because of the latter descent [of the Spirit] towards us, and especially out of opposition to those who estrange the Spirit from the Son, said that he [= Spirit] shines from both, or from the Father through the Son, or from the Son, or something similar, he did so in a sense that he [= Spirit] exists also in the Son and that he belongs to him and that he is not alien to him⁸².

For this tendency of Palamas’, save for the testimonies in the passages we have already had the chance to encounter, we find the paradigmatic confirmation also in the explicit and important interpolation in the *Second Apodictic Treatise* 65, where the defender of the hesychasts, talking about the coming forth of the Spirit from the Son’s nature, categorically adds that it occurs “if you wish, *according to the eternal*

⁷⁸ M. O. Boulnois “The Mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria...”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria...*, New York 2003, 75–112: 103, 106–107.

⁷⁹ G. C. Berthold, “Cyril of Alexandria and the ‘Filioque’”, *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 143–147: 147.

⁸⁰ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β΄ 71, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 143.29–32 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 318.9–12.

⁸¹ Cf. regarding this: J. D. Zizioulas, “Pneumatology and the Importance of the Person: A Commentary on the Second Ecumenical Council”, in: J. D. Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness. Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Edited by P. McPartlan, London, New York: T&T Clark 2006, 178–205: 193–195. See also: В. В. Болотовъ, *Къ вопросу о filioque*. Съ предисловіем проф. А. Бриллиантова, С.-Петербургъ: Типографія М. Меркушева 1914, 46–52 (theses 3 and 4).

⁸² Λόγος ἀποδεικτικός Β΄ 76, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 147.24–29 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 326.10–15: “Εἰ δὲ διὰ τὴν γενομένην ἐπιφοίτησιν ὑστερον ἡμῖν, καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλοτριούντας τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐνιστάμενοι, ἐξ ἀμφοῖν εἴπε τις αὐτό, ἢ ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ ἢ ὅτι τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκλάμπει καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις, ἀλλ’ ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ὑπάρχον καὶ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατ’ οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον”.

existence as well” (ἔστω δὴ, εἰ βούλεσθε, καὶ κατὰ τὴν αἰδίον ὑπαρξιν)⁸³. It is clear that this structural apposition of Palamas’ unequivocally suggests that neither he nor Cyril separate completely eternal relations from temporal sendings⁸⁴ – although neither of them identifies these two realms of divine existence⁸⁵.

One direct consequence of such an approach to the procession of the Holy Spirit is that “the Son [...] has co-existent before all the ages the Holy Spirit” as the one that “exists in him”⁸⁶ and rests upon him and, consequently, the one that is “by nature attached and accompanied” ([...] συνὸν καὶ συμπαρομαρτοῦν [...] κατὰ φύσιν [...])⁸⁷ to him. Being from one and the same principle, the Son and the Holy Spirit are in the closest and most direct relationship: the Spirit, Palamas says, as “the one that comes forth from the Father is never separated from him, being as much united with the Son substantially and inseparably, as the one who rests upon the Son and exists in him, and always naturally (φυσικῶς) dwells in him”⁸⁸. Formulations by which Palamas denotes the inner-trinitarian connection between the Son and the Spirit, and which, in the manner of Cyril, suggest that the Son is not excluded *tout court* from the procession of the Spirit from the Father⁸⁹ – like, for instance, the ones where Palamas says that the Spirit is the “property” (ἴδιον) of the Son; that he rests on the Son (ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ἀναπαύεσθαι); that he from eternity naturally dwells in the Son (ἐν τῷ υἱῷ φυσικῶς ἐξ αἰδίου ὄν/ἐν τῷ υἱῷ διήκει αἰδίως/ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ὑπάρχον φυσικῶς καὶ αἰδίως); that he is in no way alien to him (κατ’ οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον), etc. – all of these together suggest that between the Son and the Spirit exists from eternity a circuminsession (περιχώρησις), meaning that these two caused divine hypostases are mutually inseparable and inconceivable one without the other⁹⁰. Furthermore,

⁸³ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 65, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 137.5 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 304.31–306.1.

⁸⁴ M. O. Boulnois “The Mystery of the Trinity according to Cyril of Alexandria...”, in: Th. Weinandy, D. Keating, eds., *The Theology of Cyril of Alexandria...*, New York 2003, 75–112: 106; G. C. Berthold, “Cyril of Alexandria and the ‘Filioque’”, *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989) 143–147: 144.

⁸⁵ Especially in the sense of rejecting the “umgekehrt” from the famous Rahner’s formula “Die ‘ökonomische’ Trinität ist die ‘immanente’ Trinität und umgekehrt“. See: K. Rahner, “Der dreifaltige Gott als transzendenter Urgrund der Heilsgeschichte”, in: *Mysterium Salutis. Grundriß heilsgeschichtlicher Dogmatik. Band II: Die Heilsgeschichte vor Christus*. Herausgegeben von J. Feiner, M. Löhrer. Unter Mitarbeit von K. Rahner, H. U. von Balthasar, H. Fries, K. Lehmann, A. Diessler, u. a., Einsiedeln, Zürich, Köln: Benziger Verlag 1967, 317–401: 328.

⁸⁶ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 28, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 103.12–13 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 234.20–21; Β΄ 29, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 104.15 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 236.32.

⁸⁷ Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ, *Αντιρρητικοὶ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον* 3, 7, 17, in: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ *Συγγράμματα*. Ἐκδίδονται ἐπιμελεῖα Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Τόμος Γ΄. *Αντιρρητικοὶ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον*. Προλογίζει Π. Χρήστου. Ἐκδίδουν Α. Κοντογιάννης, Β. Φανουργάκης, Κυρομάνος, Θεσσαλονίκη 1970, 174.11–12 | Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ *Ἄπαντα τὰ ἔργα. 5. Πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον λόγοι ἀντιρρητικοὶ (Α–Γ)*. Εἰσαγωγή, Κείμενο-Μετάφρασις-Σχόλια Ἀπὸ τὸν Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Ἐπόπτης Ἐκδόσεως Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Ἐπιμελητὴς Ἐκδόσεως Ἐ. Γ. Μερετάκης, Ἑλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας № 87, Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς οἶκος Ἐλευθερίου Μερετάκη Τὸ Βυζάντιον, Πατερικαὶ ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς 1987, 392.1–2. Cf. Α. Ράντοβιτς, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶν*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων № 16, Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν 1973, 21991, 163.

⁸⁸ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β΄ 73, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 144.20–24 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 320.3–6: “Οὕτω δὲ ὄν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐτ’ αὐτοῦ διίσταται ποτε, καὶ τῷ υἱῷ οὐχ ἦττον ἦνται οὐσιωδῶς τε καὶ ἀδιαστάτως, αὐτῷ τε ἐπαναπαυόμενον καὶ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχον καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ φυσικῶς διατελοῦν ἀεὶ”.

⁸⁹ Cf. N. Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, London, New York 2000, 29.

⁹⁰ Cf. Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Α΄ 33, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 63.12–15 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 148.19–21: “[...] μὲν γὰρ ἅμα ἐξ αἰδίου ὁ υἱὸς τε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐν ἀλλήλοις τε ὄντα καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενα καὶ δι’ ἀλλήλων ἀφύρτως τε καὶ ἀμίγως χωροῦντα [...]”.

we could eventually say that Palamas accepts almost any relation between the Son and the Spirit except the “causal” existential relation (καθ’ ὑπαρξιν)⁹¹. In Palamas’ view, the Son and the Holy Spirit

[...] not only come from the same principle but are also inseparable one from the other, dwelling one into another, showing each other and manifesting one through another, but they are not one through the other nor [one] from the other nor [one] of the other: since the cause is one.⁹²

This way, Palamas goes a lot further than those interpreters of Cyril who are prone to reduce his “ἐξ ἀμφοῖν” *exclusively* to the energetic outpouring of the Spirit in the economic context⁹³. Upon close examination, it becomes apparent that the outpouring of the Spirit as energy is possible exactly due to the existence of the unbreakable relationship between the Spirit and the Son in the inner-trinitarian context, where it can be said that the hypostasis of the Spirit comes “from the Son” in terms of his coming forth *from the essence* of the Son. To put it otherwise, the inner-trinitarian relation between the Son and the Spirit, owing to which the Spirit, as naturally existing from the Father in the Son, has all the energy of the Son, and thanks to which the Son is called “the treasurer of the divine Spirit” (ταμίαις τοῦ θείου πνεύματος)⁹⁴, is a key prerequisite for the possibility of giving the Spirit on the part of the incarnated Son in the domain of the economy of salvation⁹⁵.

Therefore, if all of these and similar attitudes of Gregory Palamas are taken into consideration, an inescapable conclusion that is to be reached is that the Archbishop of Salonica is right along the lines of the Archbishop of Alexandria not only in terms of establishing a more firm relationship between the Son and the Spirit in the domain of divine existence *per se*, but also – only far more emphasized – in terms of strict renunciation of any hypostatic causality on the Son’s part. Following the abundance of formulations and further elaborations, it can be said that Palamas – which was natural – went even further in this respect than Cyril himself⁹⁶.

⁹¹ See: Α. Ράντοβιτς, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμῶν*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1973, ²1991, 159–166: 166. In this sense, the insistence of V. Lossky, *Théologie mystique de l’Église d’Orient*, Les religions № 13, Paris: Aubier, Éditions Montaigne 1960, 166, on “l’indépendance de l’hypostase du Saint-Esprit vis-à-vis du Fils, quant à son origine éternelle” appears problematic to me. (italics added)

⁹² *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β’* 41, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 115.17–21 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 260.28–30–262.1–2: “[...] ὡς ἂν εἰδῶμεν μὴ μόνον ἐκ μιᾶς ὑπάρχοντα ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀδιαστάτως ἔχοντα πρὸς ἄλληλα καὶ ἐνυπάρχοντα ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἄλληλα δεικνύοντα καὶ δι’ ἀλλήλων προφανόμενα, ἀλλ’ οὐ δι’ ἀλλήλων ἢ καὶ ἐξ ἀλλήλων ἢ ἀλλήλων ὄντα: ἐν γὰρ τὸ ἐξ οὗ”.

⁹³ Thus Α. Θεοδώρου, “Ἡ περὶ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου”, *Θεολογία* ΜΕ 1 (1974) 80–101: 88. Cf. also: J. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. Translated by G. Lawrence, [London: The Faith Press 1964, Wing Road, Bedfordshire: The Faith Press 1974] Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press 1998, 230–231.

⁹⁴ *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Α’* 29, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 56.11 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 134.6–7. Cf. Β’ 73, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 144.24 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 320.7.

⁹⁵ Cf. J. Lison, “L’énergie des trois hypostases divines selon Grégoires Palamas”, *Science et Esprit* 44, 1 (1992) 67–77: 69.

⁹⁶ Naturally, if Cyril is not credited with the latter teaching of Gregory of Cyprus on the “eternal shining of the Holy Spirit from the Son” as “the central term between the eternal procession and temporal sending of the Holy Spirit” – as it is, if I understood correctly, implicitly done by J. Lison, “L’énergie des trois hypostases divines selon Grégoires Palamas”, *Science et Esprit* 44, 1 (1992) 67–77: 75. For a possible contribution of Gregory Palamas to the contemporary discussion concerning this problem, see: D. Staniloae, “The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and his Relation to the Son, as the Basis of our Deification and Adoption”, in: *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy*, ed. by L. Vischer, Faith and Order Paper № 103, London: SPCK, Geneva: World Council of Churches 1981, 174–186.

c) For the very end, lest I remain indebted for something I mentioned earlier, I will return to Palamas' reference to Gregory the Theologian from the chapter 63 of his *Second Apodictic Treatise*. This passage, I repeat, can be of great importance not only for gaining a proper understanding of Palamas' reading of Cyril of Alexandria, but also for an accurate evaluation of the significant and crucial background of his teaching on energies. First and foremost, let me cite the quotation itself again and offer an explanation regarding its origin. As regards the quotation (or the paraphrase, more precisely), it refers to Nazianzen's statement that the Holy Spirit, during his outpouring onto the apostles, is "substantially, associated with them, and dwelling in them, we may say". The passage which Palamas on this occasion has in mind, and which the editors of the critical edition of his *Apodictic Treatises* marked as unfamiliar (χωρίον μὴ ἀντιχνευθέν)⁹⁷, is to be found, actually, in the eleventh paragraph of the famous *Oration 41* at Pentecost, which was pronounced by Gregory of Nazianzus on the Feast of Pentecost 379 in Constantinople. On that occasion, Gregory of Nazianzus, after having briefly imparted his interpretation of the mystical meaning of the number *seven*, as part of the tale of the divine and consubstantial character of the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit⁹⁸, who acted in the angelic and heavenly powers as well as in the fathers, prophets, and Christ's disciples, says that the Holy Spirit, in these latter ones, acted triply and in three periods: namely, before Christ's glorification (that is, during his *sufferings*) then, after Christ's glorification (that is, after his *resurrection*) and, finally, after Christ's return to himself (that is, after his *ascension*). Of these three operations of the Spirit, each one is, Nazianzen muses, "more noticeable" than the former one ([...] τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ἀμυδρῶς· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, ἐκτυπώτερον· τὸ δὲ νῦν τελεώτερον [...]), which means that, and now we arrive at a crucial passage for us, after Pentecost the Spirit "is no longer present only in energy, but as we may say, substantially, associating with us, and dwelling in us" ([...] οὐκέτι ἐνεργεῖα παρὸν ὡς πρότερον, οὐσιωδῶς δέ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, συγγινόμενόν τε καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον)⁹⁹. This "substantial" coming forth of the Spirit as the Second Comforter ought to be, Gregory contends, taken as an acknowledgement of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, since the "Second" is used precisely for the consubstantial ones (ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοουσίῳν). To paraphrase, this substantial co-dwelling of the Spirit with the apostles, and generally with the Christians, in a way represents a "bodily" appearance of the Spirit which resembles the bodily sojourn of the Son on Earth: "For it was fitting that as the Son had lived with us in bodily form – so the Spirit too should appear in bodily form; and that after Christ had returned to his own place, he should have come down to us – coming because he is the Lord; sent, because he is not a rival God"¹⁰⁰.

Therefore, we can ascertain with ease that Palamas' formulation "οὐσιωδῶς ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις παρὸν καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον" and Gregory's construction "οὐκέτι ἐνεργεῖα παρὸν ὡς πρότερον, οὐσιωδῶς δέ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, συγγινόμενόν τε καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον" unam-

⁹⁷ *Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β' 63*, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α' [21988] 135, note 1 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 302, note 147.

⁹⁸ Cf. a series of qualifications that Gregory of Nazianzus uses for the Holy Spirit: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, *Λόγος ΜΑ'*, *Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν*, PG 36, 441BC.

⁹⁹ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, *Λόγος ΜΑ'*, *Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν*, PG 36, 444C.

¹⁰⁰ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, *Λόγος ΜΑ'*, *Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν*, PG 36, 444C: "Ἐπρεπε γάρ, Υἱοῦ σωματικῶς ἡμῖν ὀμιλήσαντος, καὶ αὐτὸ φανῆναι σωματικῶς· καὶ Χριστοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπανελθόντος, ἐκεῖνο πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατελθεῖν· ἐρχόμενον μὲν ὡς Κύριον, πεμπόμενον δὲ ὡς οὐκ ἀντίθεον".

biguously show that the Archbishop of Salonica, on the given occasion, invokes actually the aforementioned passage from *Oration 41* of the famous Archbishop of Constantinople¹⁰¹.

So much, therefore, for the source itself that Palamas had in mind. As regards the interpretation, whose outlines I already laid out earlier (see p. 9–10), it is useful, in the function of a *preludio*, to remind that the critical literature contains a thesis, advanced primarily by Reinhard Flogaus – and who presented it, by his own admission, along the lines of Dorothea Wendebourg and Gerhard Podskalsky – according to which Gregory Palamas is one of the main representatives of the late byzantine trend that was characterized by not regarding Gregory of Nazianzus as the highest theological authority anymore, but an unknown author from the fifth century who wrote under the pseudonym of Dionysius the Areopagite¹⁰². As one of the arguments supporting that thesis, which implies that in Palamas the divine hypostases in their importance for the salvation of man fade into background in regard to the divine energy – insofar as man can participate only in the divine energy, whilst divine hypostases remain imparticipable and transcendent¹⁰³ – Flogaus points exactly at a theological dissonance which, he thinks, exists between the two Gregories concerning the mentioned passage from the *Oration 41*. Namely, Flogaus avers, while Palamas advocates the thesis that the Holy Spirit is generally present within the apostles and christians *only* through his energy, Gregory of Nazianzus advocates something quite opposite, that is, the attitude that the *energetic* presence of the Spirit is characteristic of the period *before* Pentecost, after which he, as we have seen, is in a more “perfect” way present amongst people. In other words, for Gregory of Nazianzus the Spirit is *after* the Pentecost present not in energy (οὐκέτι ἐνεργεία), as advocated by Gregory Palamas, but is, conversely, present “substantially” (οὐσιωδῶς). Thus, Flogaus implicitly argues that Palamas counter-positions himself in this respect not only in regard to the great Cappadocian, but also in relation to the early christian-johannine and ancient ecclesiastical understanding, according to which the Holy Spirit *himself* is the one who was sent by the Father and the Son into the world (John 14:26; 15:26). Flogaus concludes that for Palamas, “ist an Pfingsten nicht der Hl. Geist selbst, seine *Person*, mitgeteilt wor-

¹⁰¹ That Palamas, amongst others, also read the famous *Oration 41* of Gregory of Nazianzus is also notable in his direct invocation in four of his other writings, regarding Nazianzen’s interpretation of the seven spirits the prophet Isaiah talks about (11: 2–3) in terms of *energies*, that is, *operations* of the Holy Spirit. Cf. *Περὶ ἐνώσεως καὶ διακρίσεως* 33, in: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, *Συγγράμματα*. Ἐκδίδονται ἐπιμελείᾳ Π. Κ. Χρήστου. Τόμος Β΄. Πραγματεῖαι καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ γραφεῖσαι κατὰ τὰ ἔτη 1340–1346. Προλογίζει Π. Χρήστου. Ἐκδίδουν Γ. Μαντζαρίδης, Ν. Ματσούκας, Β. Ψευτογκᾶς, Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος [1966] ²1994, 69–95: 94.2–4, 10–12 | ΕΠΕ 61 [1983] 76–129: 126.16–18, 24–27; *Ὁρθοδόξου Θεοφάνους δι’ἀλλεῖς 9*, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Β΄ [1994] 232.15–18 | ΕΠΕ 61 [1983] 390.8–10; *Ἀντιρρητικοὶ πρὸς Ἀκίνδυνον Ε΄*, 15, 58, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Γ΄ [1970] 330.16–30 | ΕΠΕ 88 [1987] 204.21–206.1–13; *Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα 70*, in: *Saint Gregory Palamas, The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*. A Critical Edition, Translation and Study by R. E. Sinkewicz, Studies and Texts № 83, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 1988, 164.9–11. For Gregory of Nazianzus and the passage in question, see: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, *Λόγος ΜΑ΄*, *Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν*, 3, PG 36, 432C.

¹⁰² Cf. G. Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*, München 1977, 61: “Erst im Palamitenstreit wird Gregorius von Nazianz durch Ps.-Dionysios Areopagites aus seiner Stellung als führender Autorität verdrängt”.

¹⁰³ It is what D. Wendebourg, *Geist oder Energie. Zur Frage der innergöttlichen Verankerung des christlichen Lebens in der byzantinischen Theologie*, Münchener Monographien zur historischen und systematischen Theologie № 4, München: Chr.-Kaiser-Verlag 1980, 10, 244, and elsewhere calls “defunctionalization” (*Entfunktionalisierung*) of the persons of the Holy Trinity.

den, sondern nur die eine göttliche *Energie* der Trinität, die freilich auch schon zuvor, wengleich in beschränkterem Maße, in der Welt gegenwärtig gewesen war”¹⁰⁴.

After such an introduction, let us go back to the chapters 63 and 64 of Palamas’ *Apodictic Treatises*. In those two brief paragraphs, as we have already seen, Palamas explicitly brings into connection Cyril’s “οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν” with “οὐσιωδῶς ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις παρὸν καὶ συμπολιτευόμενον” of Gregory of Nazianzus, openly suggesting that both of these phrases relate to the level of *economy*. For this *substantial* character of the *economic* coming forth of the Spirit, Palamas finds an analogy in the sending of Logos from the Father and the Spirit upon his incarnation, the sending which was also “οὐσιωδῆς”, but which must not be confused by any means with the Son’s (pre-eternal) birth from the Father only. However, a thing of the utmost importance now is the new emphasis which Palamas gives here: namely, notwithstanding the fact that he advocates the thesis that “we do not partake in the essence or the hypostasis [of the Spirit] at all, but in the grace”, he also underscores in the same powerful fashion that the Spirit, manifesting himself by means of bestowing the divine power, “*always* makes present himself to us *substantially*” ([...] ἀλλὰ καὶ παρέστιν αἰεὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἡμῖν [...]), “as well as *hypostatically*” ([...] πάντως δὲ καὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν [...])¹⁰⁵. Outpouring of the Spirit from the Son (παρὰ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ) occurs, Palamas continues, only insofar as the Son (economically) receives him from the Father; and when Cyril of Alexandria says that the Spirit is “from the essence of the Son”, it ought not be interpreted in terms of the relationship of causality between these two persons of the Holy Trinity.

If we now judge from what was explicitly stated in this passage, which Flogaus and some other scholars utterly disregard or deftly misplace, it turns out that, according to Palamas, the energetic presence of the Spirit by no means excludes but, on the contrary, implies his *substantial* and *hypostatic* presence in the economy of salvation. In other words, Palamas holds that despite the fact that the energy of the Spirit is not to be equated with the person of the Spirit¹⁰⁶, it is nevertheless inseparable from the very operator and grantor of the energy¹⁰⁷. This passage may be, of course, opposed to plenty of other ones – e. g. the one that we find already in the chapter 69 of *Apodictic Treatises*¹⁰⁸ – but this does not have to mean that Palamas’ thought concerning this matter is laden with contradiction or some tension. If any tension exists at all, it is my firm belief that it is reflected in the absence of clear articulation of his attitude, and not in the implicit advocacy of such an attitude; in other words, when Palamas claims that the worthy do not unite themselves substantially or hypostatically with God, he does not suggest that the presence of the Holy Spirit is not substantial or hypostatic, but presumably makes a distinction between the *presence* of the Holy Spirit, which is *substantial* and *hypostatic* – as is the presence of the incarnate Son – and between *that which we receive* and which is

¹⁰⁴ R. Flogaus, “Die Theologie des Gregorios Palamas – Hindernis oder Hilfe für die ökumenische Verständigung?”, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 47, 2–3 (1998) 105–123: 114–116 (115).

¹⁰⁵ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Β’ 63–64, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 134–136 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 300–304.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. V. Lossky, *Théologie mystique de l’Église d’Orient*, Paris 1960, 169.

¹⁰⁷ Α. Јевтић, „Православно богословље о Светом Духу“, in: Α. Јевтић, *Χριστος Αλφα и Ομεγα*, Врњачка Бања, Требиње 2004, 201–222: 214–215.

¹⁰⁸ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Α’ 69, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α’ [21988] 141.13–16 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 312.28–31.

the grace or energy of the Holy Spirit. Hence, the energy in question here is the one that we receive “partially” (μέτρῳ) and which the Son possesses “wholly” (ὀλόκληρον)¹⁰⁹, but which includes *personal* and complete presence of the Spirit himself¹¹⁰, who constitutively partakes of sanctification and deification. All of this, with a plethora of other passages from the voluminous literary corpus of the Archbishop of Salonica, makes it clear enough how wrong it is to depict Palamas’ theological portrait on a specifically neoplatonic background. It also elucidates the fact that his teaching on energetic presence of the Spirit ought to be subsumed under a patristic tradition¹¹¹ rather than indirectly to be connected with the respective teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia¹¹².

Therefore, to finally draw a conclusion, in the case of Cyril of Alexandria, but also in the case of a brief and more incidental, but remarkably symptomatic reference to Gregory of Nazianzus, it is shown that Palamas fathomed the tradition to which he belonged much better than some of his interpreters are willing to acknowledge. Truth be told, all of this will not mean that certain aberrations and extravagances of various types are not present in Palamas; however, those aberrations and extravagances must be, partially at least, ascribed both to the polemical framework in which the defender of the hesychasts worked as well as to the speed of developments in the byzantine intellectual – and political – arena of the age, all of which did not allow for a more nuanced theological discourse. Nevertheless, despite the imbalance of the theological expression, qualification *plus platonizans quam christianizans* can hardly be applicable to Palamas. The same holds true for the assertion that his thought lacks or is completely devoid of a christological – or even ecclesiological – nerve, and that it has insufficient concordance between the “theology of person” and “theology of energies” (despite the undeniable fact that the mentioned concordance is not always apparent). The given example from the chapters 63 and 64 of his *Apodictic Treatises*, along with some other passages in his writings, clearly and openly show that, according to Palamas, the theology of energies does not exclude the constitutive role of the divine hypostases in the economy of salvation, but, on the contrary, necessarily implies it.

¹⁰⁹ Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς Α΄ 69, ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ Α΄ [21988] 141.22–23 | ΕΠΕ 51 [1981] 315.6–8.

¹¹⁰ See: D. Coffey, “The Palamite Doctrine of God: A New Perspective”, *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 32 (1986) 329–358: 336, who states that “for him [Palamas], therefore, when the Holy Spirit dwells in us, while he does so by virtue of the divine energies and not the divine essence, it is nevertheless *he himself* who indwells”. Cf. also: J. Lison, “L’*énergie* des trois hypostases divines selon Grégoires Palamas”, *Science et Esprit* 44, 1 (1992) 67–77: 71.

¹¹¹ The assumed opposition of Palamas to Gregory of Nazianzus with regard to “energetic *versus* hypostatic” presence of the Spirit at Pentecost, which is, the way I see it, significantly assuaged by Palamas’ emphasis on the “substantial” and “hypostatic” presence of the Holy Spirit (see note 105), is additionally shaken by the contents of the twelfth paragraph of the *Oration 41*, where the famous Cappadocian explicitly states that the diversity of the tongues of fire, viz. the Holy Spirit, refers to the diversity of *gifts* (χαρισμάτων διάφορον); see: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, *Λόγος ΜΑ΄*, *Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν*, 12, PG 36, 445A.

¹¹² Cf. D. A. Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004, 218, 227: “Where Theodore repeatedly teaches that it is the grace of operation, not the person or nature of the Spirit who inhabits the saints, Cyril insists that it is the Holy Spirit himself who dwells in us as the source of all grace and working”. – Naturally, the real question here is – question that I shall, of course, put aside – how much the understanding of Theodore of Mopsuestia *actually* differed, in this regard, from the patristic tradition; so, for example, J. McWilliam Dewart, *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia*, Washington: Catholic University of America Press 1971, 146, claims that “it is in fact open to question whether Theodore understood the indwelling of the Spirit in the same sense that the other patristic writers did”. It is also worth mentioning that Palamas repeatedly accentuated that the unity with the divine energy does not mean anything different than the unity with God himself.