

Anne-Sophie Vivier-Mureşan

# The eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son: a hypostatic or energetic reality?

## Inquiry in the works of Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas

**Abstract:** The theological formulation of the “eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son”, developed by the patriarch of Constantinople Gregory of Cyprus in the 13th century, has been the subject of numerous studies in the 20th century and played an important role in the renewal of Trinitarian Orthodox theology. The interpretations are however diverging. Most theologians see in this formulation the manifestation of the uncreated energy, which would have been formalized later by Gregory Palamas. Others understand it as a hypostatic reality concerning the third Person of the Trinity. This paper contributes to the discussion by re-analyzing the main texts of Gregory of Cyprus and of Gregory Palamas on this matter. In a first step, we defend the thesis that in the thought of the Byzantine patriarch, this expression truly concerns the hypostasis of the Spirit. In a second step, we question the existence of the theme of an “eternal manifestation” of the uncreated energy in the work of Gregory Palamas.

---

**Adresse:** Anne-Sophie Vivier-Mureşan, ISEO, Institut Catholique de Paris, 21 rue d’Assas, 75006 Paris, FRANCE; as.viviermuresan@icp.fr

The 20th century witnessed renewed interest in late Byzantine writers. The works of Gregory of Cyprus (1241–1290) and Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), among others, have been extensively re-examined, edited and translated. This rediscov-

---

We would like to thank Michel Stavrou, whose remarks and advice have been very helpful in the elaboration of this study. – This research is extracted from my PhD Thesis (*Le dialogue de l’amour trinitaire. Perspectives ouvertes par Dumitru Stăniloae*), written under the direction of the Pr. Jean-Louis Souletie and defended at the Institut Catholique de Paris in February 2019.

ery of late Byzantine thought stimulated the Trinitarian reflection of many Orthodox theologians. In this context, the theme of the eternal “shining forth” (ἐκλαμψις) of the Spirit through (διὰ) the Son, developed by Gregory of Cyprus, was highlighted as a necessary complement to the Photian formulation of the Spirit’s procession from the Father alone. It is also regarded by many as the right understanding of the Spirit’s procession by/through (διὰ) the Son as stated by the Greek Fathers, and appears as the most advanced Orthodox position in the *Filioque* discussions. This issue, however, is marked by a divergence of interpretation. Most Orthodox theologians and Byzantinists<sup>1</sup> consider that the eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son does not concern the very hypostasis of the divine third Person, but the uncreated energy stemming from the essence, which in divine economy reaches humans from the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit. This interpretation, which is based on the distinction, actually present in the works of Gregory of Cyprus and of Gregory Palamas after him, between the hypostasis of the Spirit and his gifts assimilated to uncreated energies, seems to have been formulated for the first time by V. Lossky:

The distinction between the unknowable essence of the Trinity and its energetic processions, clearly defined by the great councils of the 14th century, allows the Orthodox theology to firmly affirm the different character of the tri-hypostatic existence in itself and in the common manifestation outside the essence. In his hypostatic existence, the Holy Spirit

---

1 V. LOSSKY, La procession du Saint-Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe, in idem, *A l’image et à la ressemblance de Dieu*. Paris 2006, 67–93. This text was first delivered at a conference in Oxford in 1947; J. MEYENDORFF, Introduction à l’étude de Grégoire Palamas. Paris 1959; O. CLÉMENT, Grégoire de Chypre, “De l’ekporèse du Saint-Esprit”. *Istina* 17/3–4 (1972), 443–456; V. PALACHKOVSKY, La controverse pneumatologique. *Messenger de l’Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe occidentale* 85–88 (1974), 71–99; A. RADOVIĆ, Le ‘Filioque’ et l’énergie incréée de la Sainte Trinité selon la doctrine de Saint Grégoire Palamas. *Messenger de l’Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe occidentale* 89–90 (1975), 11–44; G. PATACSI, Palamism before Palamas. *Eastern Church Review* 9 (1977), 64–71; M. ORPHANOS, La procession du Saint-Esprit selon certains pères grecs postérieurs au VIIIe siècle, in L. Vischer (ed.), *La théologie du Saint-Esprit dans le dialogue entre l’Orient et l’Occident*. Paris 1981, 29–53; B. BOBRINSKOY, Le mystère de la Sainte Trinité. Paris 2003, 298–300; A. PAPADAKIS, *Crisis in Byzantium*. Crestwood, NY 1997; J.-C. LARCHET in his introduction to: *La vie et l’œuvre de Georges/Grégoire de Chypre*. Paris 2012, 126; A. THEODOROS, The eternal manifestation of the Spirit ‘through the Son’ (‘διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ’) according to Nikephoros Blemmydes and Gregory of Cyprus, in M. Habets (ed.), *Ecumenical perspectives on the filioque for the twenty-first century*. London/New York 2014, 65–86; M. STAVROU, Une réévaluation du *Tomos* du II<sup>e</sup> Concile des Blachernes (1285): commentaire, tradition textuelle, édition critique et traduction, in C. Gastgeber et al. (eds.), *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in context and comparison*. Vienne 2017, 47–93. This reading is adopted by the Dominican J. LISON in *L’Esprit répandu, la pneumatologie de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris 1994, 95–96.

proceeds from the Father alone and this ineffable procession allows us to confess the absolute diversity of the three Persons, that is our faith in the Tri-Unity. In the framework of the natural manifestation, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son διὰ υιοῦ, after the Verb, and this procession reveals us the common glory of the Three, the eternal splendor of the divine nature.

It is interesting to note that the distinction between the hypostatic existence of the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father alone, and his eternal shining forth – εἰς ἄδιον ἔκφανσιν – through the Son, has been formulated during the discussions which took place in Constantinople at the end of the 13th century, after the Council of Lyon. We can grasp here the doctrinal continuity: the defence of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone requires clarification on the διὰ υιοῦ, and that latter opens the way to the distinction between essence and energies. It is not a “dogmatic development” but one and same tradition defended on different points by the Orthodox theologians, from saint Photius to Gregory of Cyprus and saint Gregory Palamas.<sup>2</sup>

Some theologians, on the other hand, read in the eternal shining forth of the Spirit through the Son a manifestation of the very hypostasis of the Spirit. The young J. Meyendorff and S. Verkhovsky, in studies published in 1951<sup>3</sup>, understand in this way the texts of Gregory of Cyprus and recognize a development of this theme in a passage of *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* of Gregory Palamas: the Spirit is described as “love” (ἔρωσ) of the Father for the Son, which the Son uses in turn towards the Father. According to them, this “use” of the Spirit by the Son towards the Father must be considered as the eternal shining forth of Spirit’s hypostasis. The same reading is largely developed by D. Stăniloae in several studies.<sup>4</sup> Recently and more briefly, J. Van Rossum also defends the thesis

---

**2** LOSSKY, Procession (as footnote 1 above), 90–91. Personal translation. Note that Lossky is very elliptic and does not detail his reference to Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas. Other Byzantinists will develop later his reading, notably A. Papadakis for the works of Gregory of Cyprus, and J. Meyendorff for the works of Gregory Palamas. We will discuss them later.

**3** J. MEYENDORFF, La procession du Saint-Esprit chez les Pères orientaux. *Russie et Chrétienté* 3–4 (1950), 158–178; S. VERKHOVSKY, La procession du Saint-Esprit (as footnote 1 above), 197–210. As noted in footnote 2 above, the position of J. Meyendorff seems to have changed after this study. In his book on Gregory Palamas, he adopts the idea that Gregory of Cyprus and Palamas distinguish between the eternal procession (from the Father alone) of the Spirit’s hypostasis and the eternal procession (from the Father through the Son) of the Spirit as divine energy: J. MEYENDORFF, Introduction (as footnote 1 above), 312–316.

**4** D. STĂNILOAE, Trinitarian relations and the life of the Church, in idem, *Theology and the church*. New York 1980, 11–44; IDEM, La procession du Saint-Esprit et sa relation avec le Fils comme base de notre déification et adoption, in L. Vischer (ed.), *La théologie du Saint-Esprit dans le dialogue entre l’Orient et l’Occident*. Paris 1981, 190–202; IDEM, *Le Saint Esprit dans la théologie byzantine et dans la réflexion orthodoxe contemporaine*, in: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*. Atti del Congresso teologico internazionale di Pneumatologia I. Vatican 1983, 661–679.

that, in the writings of Gregory of Cyprus, the eternal shining forth of the Spirit concerns his hypostasis.<sup>5</sup>

In this paper we propose to compare these two divergent interpretations and their arguments by re-exploring in turn the works of Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas. This way, we will defend the theory that the second reading seems nearer to the literal sense of these Byzantine texts. Our study will first analyze the theological writings of Gregory of Cyprus; for Gregory Palamas' work, we will essentially focus on the texts mentioned in the debate, which also seem, after research, the ones more directly concerned by our investigation: *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* and the *Apodictic Treatises on the Holy Spirit*.

## The eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son in the work of Gregory of Cyprus

Gregory of Cyprus, in several texts, evokes an eternal shining forth, also called manifestation, of the Spirit through the Son, distinct from the procession of the Spirit from the Father alone. Here is one of the most significant passages, extracted from the *Tomus*:

To the same, who affirm that the Paraclete, which is from the Father, has its existence through the Son and from the Son, and who, again, propose as proof the phrase "The Spirit exists through and from the Son". In certain texts [of the Fathers], the phrase denotes the Spirit's shining forth and manifestation. Indeed, the very Paraclete shines forth and is manifest eternally through the Son, in the same way that light shines forth and is manifest through the intermediary of the sun's ray; it further denotes the bestowing, giving and sending of the Spirit to us. It does not, however, mean that it subsists through the Son and from the Son, and that it receives its being through him and from him.<sup>6</sup>

What does the Spirit mean when evoked in eternity? The hypostasis of the third Person or the uncreated energy? We will begin by listening to the different arguments.

At the start of his study of Gregory of Cyprus, D. Stăniloae briefly rejects the hypothesis that the eternal manifestation of the Spirit would not designate the hypostasis of the third Person. Taking the counterpoint of V. Rodzianko, who af-

---

5 J. VAN ROSSUM, Gregory of Cyprus and Palamism. *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001), 626–630.

6 Gregory of Cyprus, *Tomus*, PG 142, 240C–D, trans. PAPADAKIS, *Crisis* (as footnote 1 above), 219.

firmed that the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son is based on their unity of essence<sup>7</sup>, the Romanian theologian shows that Gregory of Cyprus clearly recognizes in this manifestation a characteristic of the third divine Person: the very hypostasis of the Spirit is therefore truly involved. We quote this important text:

Before we attempt any such explanation we should not neglect to mention that according to Gregory the shining forth of the Spirit through the Son is not the expression of the identity of essence between Son and Spirit but the expression of a personal relation. If it were true that this relation resulted exclusively from their essential identity, it would no longer distinguish the Spirit from the Son and the Father, because there could then be a shining forth of the Spirit from the Father, or of the Son from the Spirit and the Father or of the Father from the Spirit and the Son. Gregory is categorical about this, however, and appeals to St. Gregory of Nyssa for support: “Now Gregory of Nyssa adds to the individual personal attributes of the Spirit which distinguish him from Father and Son the fact that he is manifested and shines forth through the Son”. He goes on to say: “If, therefore, you never know the Paraclete apart from his individual personal attributes (τῶν αὐτοῦ ἰδιωμάτων χωρὶς), you will not deny, if you are sensible, that his manifestation through the Son as a proper characteristic of himself as eternal (ὡς ἴδιον ἀντὶ τῷ αἰδίῳ προσόν) is itself also eternal”.<sup>8</sup>

These lines support the statements of the Romanian theologian in a decisive way. Nevertheless, we must also listen to the arguments presented by A. Papadakis<sup>9</sup>, whose interpretation differs on this point. On the one hand, A. Papadakis emphasizes that Gregory of Cyprus’ work mentions in fact the dual definition of the Spirit as hypostasis and as energy. On the other hand, he stresses that the terminology and the expressions used by the patriarch, belonging to the lexical field of the light and the radiance, must be related to the theology of uncreated light, which is the manifestation of the divine life; a theology that Palamas’ work formalized afterwards.

If the distinction between the Spirit as hypostasis and as energy is really present in the Cypriot’s work, we must note that it is never mentioned concerning the eternal manifestation of the Spirit. Its use aims at explaining the patristic formulations of the Spirit as the “Son’s energy” or the “Son’s gift”, or of the Son as “Spirit’s source”, interpreted by the latinophrones in a way supportive of the *Fil-*

<sup>7</sup> See V. RODZIANKO, Как разрешить проблему ‘Филиокве? *Messenger de l’Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe Occidentale* 24 (1955), 259–291.

<sup>8</sup> STĂNILOAE, Trinitarian relations (as footnote 4 above), 20.

<sup>9</sup> PΑΡΑΔΑΚΙΣ, Crisis (as footnote 1 above), 126–129. The arguments of A. Papadakis are also developed by M. Stavrou and J.-C. Larchet in their works on Gregory of Cyprus: STAVROU, Réévaluation (as footnote 1 above), 47–93. See in particular his commentary, p. 50; LARCHET, more polemical, in: Vie (as footnote 1 above), 123.

*ioque*. This distinction relates therefore to the context of a possible causal relationship between the Son and the Spirit: in this frame, the Spirit is considered as meaning divine energy. All these texts concern an economic perspective. In other words: the Spirit can mean the divine energies in the economic gift of the Spirit by Christ to the apostles; it is only in this context that the Fathers have recognized in the Spirit “the Son’s energy” or in the Son “the Spirit’s source”.

To support our statements, we will quote just one passage, the most decisive because it is extracted from the *Tomus*, but all are along the same lines.<sup>10</sup> Discussing the latinophrones’ use of the patristic expression of the Son as “source of life”, Gregory of Cyprus comments, in a parallel with Mary, who *became* source of life by the birth of her son:

As for the Son, he is the fountain of life, because he became the cause of life for us who were dead to sin; because he became as an overflowing river to everyone; and because, for those who believe in the Son, the Spirit is bestowed as from this fountain and through him. This grace of the Spirit is poured forth, and it is neither novel nor alien to Scripture, were it to be called by the same name as Holy Spirit. For, sometimes, an act [ἐνέργεια] is identified by the name of the one who acts, since frequently we do not refuse to call “sun” the sun’s own luster and light.<sup>11</sup>

Admittedly, in the *Antirrhetic discourse*, Gregory of Cyprus indiscriminately uses the term “manifestation” (φανέρωσις) on the eternal level on one hand, on the economic level on the other as a synonym for “bestowing, sending, giving”.<sup>12</sup> We can therefore understand that many theologians may have inferred a strict correspondence between the economic manifestation and the eternal one and may have related the latter to the uncreated energy. Nevertheless, a crucial passage of the same *Discourse* shows that Gregory distinguished in fact between the manifestation of the Spirit in the economy, and his eternal one. Commenting on the expression “by/through the Son”, the Byzantine theologian states:

Thus, the Holy Spirit, because of the bestowing and the sharing of the charisms which emanate from him, could be said to be derived from the Father through the Son. Indeed, what the Spirit bestows to humans, [Gregory of Nazianzus] says, is bestowed from the

---

**10** See the *Antirrhetic discourse*, § 27, 28, 40, 56, 66, 70. We refer to the recent French edition, in LARCHET, Vie (as footnote 1 above).

**11** Gregory of Cyprus, *Tomus*, PG 142, 242D–243A, trans. PAPADAKIS, Crisis, 222.

**12** Gregory of Cyprus, *Antirrhetic discourse*, § 26 et § 32, in LARCHET, Vie (as footnote 1 above), 196 and 204.

Father through the Word. But we could conceive him also just as the light derived from the sun in its rays and through its rays for it can make obvious the eternal union of the Spirit with the Son from the Father. And it would reveal also the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son, in any manner you conceive this manifestation: as aiming at revealing itself for us by its benefits, or as the shining forth and the distinction, so to speak indiscernible, and the illumination of the Spirit through the Son; that is by this illumination, the other Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, that we receive the light, as far as we can conceive it.<sup>13</sup>

Here, Gregory distinguishes between the “charisma” and “benefits” “which emanate from” the Spirit, are “bestowed by him” and which undoubtedly must be understood as the divine energies, and the manifestation of the Spirit himself. The fact that the eternal manifestation concerns the Spirit’s hypostasis appears in the expression mentioning the union of the Spirit to the Son and his procession from the Father. Certainly, the temporal gift of the Spirit’s charisma by the Son and his eternal manifestation are linked, as Gregory clearly writes at the end of this passage, but the distinction between the Spirit as hypostasis and as energies (in its charisma, benefits), seems to become operative in the transition from theology to economy. We understand in this way Gregory’s statement: the eternal manifestation of the Spirit’s hypostasis through the Son extends on the economic level in the bestowing, by the Son, of the Spirit’s benefits, or energies, to those who are worthy to receive them.

Secondly, Gregory’s use of the image of the light does not necessarily constitute the clue to an “energetic” understanding of the Spirit. On one hand, he never expressly affirms such an equivalence, on the other hand, in his writings this image often refers to the hypostasis of the Spirit. We give here two quotes which illustrate this:

The Spirit is another light similar to [the Son’s] in the same way: he is not separated by a time interval from the unbegotten light, but it is through it [Son’s light] that he shines forth and that is from the archetypal light that he has the cause of his hypostasis.<sup>14</sup>

As one says that the light comes from the sun through the ray, light which has the sun as its natural principle, cause and source of its being; yet the light passes, emerges and shines through the ray, from which it has not its existence [ὑπαρξις] nor its essentialization [οὐσιωσις]; on the one hand the light emerges from the ray, as we said, but on the other hand it does not receive from it or through it the principle of its being but it receives it purely and without intermediary from [ἐκ] the sun, from which [comes] the ray itself, through which the light is manifest and emanates.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Gregory of Cyprus, *Antirrhetic discourse*, § 56, in LARCHET, Vie (as footnote 1 above), 234–236. Personal translation.

<sup>14</sup> Gregory of Cyprus, *Apology*, PG 142, 264C, personal translation.

<sup>15</sup> Gregory of Cyprus, *Confession of faith*, PG 142, 251A–251B, personal translation.

In the first passage, the distinction established between the light of the Spirit and the “Son’s one” or the “archetypal light” clearly shows that the term “light” refers to the respective hypostatic reality of the three divine Persons. In the second quotation, applying the terms “existence” and “essentiation” to the light indicates in the same way that this light means the very hypostasis of the Spirit, especially that this existence and this essentiation are said to stem directly from the sun and not from the rays (while the divine energy, emanating from the essence, is tri-hypostatic). In other words, the image of the light is not reserved to the manifestation but also concerns the coming into being of the Spirit (from the Father alone). It does not seemingly refer to a “manifestation of God” (understood as the manifestation of the triune God in his energy)<sup>16</sup>, distinct from the hypostatic procession of the Spirit.

Finally, and this is our main argument: since Gregory knows the distinction between the Spirit’s hypostasis and energy and is not reluctant to use it in some texts, we may legitimately wonder why he does not put it at the heart of his demonstration, if that constitutes the base of his doctrine. Why does he strive instead to subtly distinguish between “to have his existence” (ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν) (from the Father) and “to exist” (ὑπάρχειν) (through the Son), between “coming into being” and “manifestation”/ “revelation”/ “shining forth” (φανέρωσις, ἔκφανσις, ἔκλαμψις), endorsing here the argumentation of Nicephore Blemmydes, whereas he knew his work was disputed?<sup>17</sup> Could we not say that the distinction between hypostasis and energy does not hold, in his theology, the key role that A. Papadakis and others give to it? We tend to think that the Byzantine patriarch does not distinguish between a “hypostatic” and an “energetic” procession of the Spirit.<sup>18</sup> From our reading emerges instead the idea (non explicated by

---

**16** PAPADAKIS, Crisis (as footnote 1 above), 126. Note that the words “God’s manifestation”, used by him, can not be found in the text of Gregory of Cyprus, who does not know any other manifestation than that of the Spirit

**17** See M. STAVROU, Le théologien Nicéphore Blemmydès (1197–v. 1269), figure de contradiction entre Orthodoxes et Latinophrones. *OCP* 74 (2008), 165–179 (here 169 et 176). See also PAPADAKIS, Crisis (as footnote 1 above), 114–115, who notes that Blemmydes did not distinguish, in his formulation, between hypostasis and energy of the Spirit.

**18** In support of his proposition, A. Papadakis quotes a text of the *Confession*, which he translates by introducing a distinction between “immediate procession” and “procession through the Son”: “We say that the Holy Spirit exists immediately from the Father and through the Son. Whatever our opponents may say, the fact remains that we do not abolish the procession through the Son by accepting the immediate procession, any more than we suppress the immediate procession by accepting the procession through the Son” (PAPADAKIS, Crisis, as footnote 1 above, 125). However, a return to the Greek text shows that this double use of the term “procession” is not noticeable. Gregory of Cyprus writes, in an elliptical way, “the immediately” (τὸ

Gregory, which makes his interpretation difficult), that in economy divine energies reach the human from the Father by the Son in the Spirit because, in eternity, the hypostasis of the Spirit, who – with the Father and the Son – holds the energies, shines forth and manifests himself from the Father through the Son.

As we believe, another passage, extracted from the *Apology* and on which A. Papadakis, among others, relies, must be understood in this sense. While he seeks to demonstrate the eternity of the Spirit's manifestation, Gregory of Cyprus explicitly links the economic gift of the Spirit to its eternal manifestation:

The Spirit is imparted, given, and sent through the Son, to those who are well-disposed to accept him; and he manifests himself, shines forth and reveals himself eternally.<sup>19</sup>

Certainly, Gregory of Cyprus affirms in another text of the *Apology* that the Spirit, in his economic bestowing, refers to divine energies. We then understand that A. Papadakis may infer that the eternal manifestation also relates to these energies. However, two objections may be made. First, Gregory of Cyprus, here, does not explicitly introduce the topic of divine energies. Secondly, he continues with

---

ἀμέσως), and “the through the Son” (τὸ δι’ Υἱοῦ) (PG 142, 250D–251A). He means here, according to us, the two verbal expressions *per se* (as two complementary aspects of a same procession), and not two “processions” which should be distinguished. The French translation of F. Vinel, closer to the literal sense of the text, makes it apparent: “Quant à nous, nous affirmons à la fois que l’Esprit existe sans intermédiaire à partir [ἐκ] du Père, et [qu’il est] par le Fils. Et en disant que l’Esprit est sans intermédiaire, nous ne refusons pas de dire, comme nos adversaires, [l’expression] ‘par le Fils’, mais nous ne récusons pas non plus l’expression ‘sans intermédiaire’ en reconnaissant qu’il est ‘par le Fils’” (Confession de foi, in LARCHET, Vie, as footnote 1 above, 307). – In the same page a formulation appears that could support A. Papadakis’ reading: indeed, Gregory of Cyprus specifies that the Spirit has its existence immediately from the Father “in terms of hypostasis” (καθ’ ὑπόστασιν). Nothing shows, however, that we should oppose this immediate procession from the Father in terms of hypostasis to an energetic procession which would be mediate. The following words, indeed, state straightaway “and totally his very being” (καὶ ὅλως αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ εἶναι) then continue to affirm the fact, for the Spirit, to be both immediately from the Father and through the Son, without introducing any mention of the notion of divine energy. In these lines, we find in particular the image of the light derived from the sun by the ray, that we have analyzed above, showing that it does not mean the uncreated energy but the very hypostasis of the Spirit.

**19** Gregory of Cyprus, *Apology*, PG 142, 266C. We give here a personal translation, distinct from Papadakis’ one, that we will discuss below (footnote 22). See PAPANAKIS, Crisis (as footnote 1 above), 129. We rely on the French translation of Françoise Vinel: “[L’Esprit] est dispensé, donné et envoyé par le Fils quand sont à même de l’accueillir ceux à qui Il est envoyé, dispensé et donné; et Il se manifeste, brille et Se révèle éternellement”. See LARCHET, Vie (as footnote 1 above), 299.

patristic quotations which clearly concern the Spirit's hypostasis. Indeed, we find, among them, the lines cited by D. Stăniloae in support of his reading:

The Son, St. Basil says, makes known through himself and with himself the Spirit who proceeds from the Father. Therefore if the Spirit is always known with the Son, from whom he is never separated, then he is always through him. Now Gregory of Nyssa adds to the individual personal attributes of the Spirit which distinguish him from Father and Son the fact that he is manifested and shines forth through the Son. If, therefore, you never know the Paraclete apart from his individual personal attributes, you will not deny, if you are sensible, that his manifestation through the Son as a proper characteristic of himself as eternal is itself also eternal.<sup>20</sup>

We must admit that this passage, as a whole, presents a difficulty. We can understand that the economic gift of uncreated energies in the Spirit through the Son is linked to the eternal manifestation through the Son of the Spirit's hypostasis. Such an interpretation can rely on the fact that Gregory, in the verbs used (and to a lesser extent in the grammatical voices), distinguishes the economy from the eternity: in the economy, the Spirit is said imparted, bestowed (χωρηγεῖται), given (δίδοται), sent (ἀποστέλλεται), while he is manifested/manifests himself (ἐκφαίνεται)<sup>21</sup>, shines forth (ἐκλάμπει), is revealed/reveals himself (φανεροῦται)<sup>22</sup> in eternity. To reserve the vocabulary of the manifestation for eternity may be the means of subtly distinguishing, while articulating, between divine energies in economy and the Spirit's hypostasis in eternity. A distinction that would strengthen the syntactic parallelism introduced by the prepositions ...μὲν ...δὲ, which articulates the two sentences.<sup>23</sup>

---

**20** Gregory of Cyprus, *Apology*. PG 142, 266D–267A, personal translation.

**21** According to A. BAILLY, *Dictionnaire grec-français*. Paris 1950, 635, this verb in the passive voice can take an active and reflexive meaning. The translation of F. Vinel takes it into account (cf *supra*).

**22** For this verb, we can hesitate between the passive voice and the middle one. Here also, F. Vinel adopts the active reflexive meaning (cf translation *supra*).

**23** We rely on F. Vinel, who opts for the active voice in her translation of the three verbs which concern the divine eternity (cf *supra*). A. Papadakis prefers the passive voice (except for the verb ἐκλάμπει, of course). Furthermore, he introduces the adverb “likewise” between the two parts of the phrase, interpreting this way the Greek words ...μὲν ...δὲ, whose meaning is more open and can indicate a distinction between the two propositions which are paralleled. F. Vinel opts for a more neutral translation, by the simple coordinating conjunction “et” (cf *supra*). See PAPANAKIS, *Crisis* (as footnote 1 above), 129: “The Spirit is [economically] imparted, given, and sent through the Son to those who are well disposed to accept it... Likewise, it is manifested, shines, and revealed eternally [in its eternal existence]”.

It is noteworthy that in the *Tomus*, we find a very similar formulation: a similar balancing introduced by ... $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  ... $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$  draws a parallel (while distinguishing) between the eternal manifestation and shining forth of the Spirit through the Son, on one hand, and his sending, giving, bestowing in the economy, on the other hand. The terms used are exactly the same:

To the same, who affirm that the Paraclete, which is from the Father, has its existence through the Son and from the Son, and who, again, propose as proof the phrase “the Spirit exists through the Son and from the Son”. In certain texts [of the Fathers], the phrase denotes [ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ] the Spirit’s shining forth and manifestation – indeed, the very Paraclete shines forth and is manifest eternally through the Son, in the same way light shines forth and is manifest through the intermediary of the sun’s rays; it also [ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ ] denotes the bestowing, giving, and sending of the Spirit to us. It does not, however, mean that it subsists through the Son and from the Son, and that it receives its being through Him and from Him.<sup>24</sup>

The same parallelism introduced by ... $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  ... $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ , accompanied by the same lexical distinction, is also to be found in the *Confession of Faith*. Commenting on the expression “by/through the Son”, Gregory affirms:

We know that [these words] mean for the saints [Fathers] [ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ] the eternal manifestation [of the Spirit] by the Son, his shining forth and his revelation, and [ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ ] the bestowing, sending and giving [of the Spirit] to us.<sup>25</sup>

From these texts we can infer – but this remains an assumption – that Gregory of Cyprus has been gradually led to clarify a terminology still loose in the *Antirrhetic discourse*.<sup>26</sup> He ultimately reserved the vocabulary of manifestation and shining forth to eternity (and to the hypostasis of the Spirit) and clearly distinguished, while articulating, which refers to eternity on the one hand, and to economy on the other. At the end of this inquiry, we would rather join the voices that are raised to affirm that the said Palamite doctrine of a double eternal procession of the Spirit as hypostasis and as energy cannot be found in the writings

---

**24** *Tomus*, 4.4. Our translation relies on A. Papadakis’ one, but is personal in some points (PAPADAKIS, *Crisis*, as footnote 1 above, 219). For translating “ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ ”, we preferred “also”, which is used in the French translation by STAVROU, *Réévaluation* (as footnote 1 above), 76–77.

**25** Gregory of Cyprus, *Confession of faith*, PG 142, 250B et C, personal translation.

**26** In the light of more recent research, the *Antirrhetic discourse* appears to be the first work of Gregory on this subject. See C. Sabbatos, Introduction au *Discours antirrhétique*, in LARCHET, *Vie* (as footnote 1 above), 131–164 (here 150–152).

of Gregory of Cyprus.<sup>27</sup> From there, we can, like V. Palachkovsky<sup>28</sup>, consider the thought of Gregory as incomplete. But we can also, like D. Stăniloae, take it as it is and assume it as such. We are not entitled to decide this question but we believe to have shown that the reading of D. Stăniloae and others does not betray the text of the Byzantine patriarch.

## The eternal relationship of the Spirit to the Son in the works of Gregory Palamas

We will continue our inquiry by analyzing the writings of Gregory Palamas, which are also interpreted in different ways.

### The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters

We will start with the text of *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters* which is in the centre of the discussions. In these lines, Gregory Palamas “describes” a double orientation of the Spirit, from the Father to the Son, and from the Son to the Father:

But that Spirit of the supreme Word is like an ineffable love [ἔρωϛ] of the Begetter towards the ineffably begotten Word himself. The beloved Word and Son of the Father also experiences [χρηται = “uses” in litt. sense] this love towards the Begetter, but he does so inasmuch as he possesses this love as proceeding from the Father together with him and as resting connaturally in him.<sup>29</sup>

---

**27** PALACHKOVSKY, *Controverse* (as footnote 1 above), 93; and above all J. van Rossum, who, in a brief study, precisely seeks to show that the texts of Gregory of Cyprus have been inappropriately interpreted according to a Palamite reading grid; he explicitly recognizes that the shining forth of the Spirit through the Son concerns the person of the Spirit and not the divine energy: VAN ROSSUM, *Gregory of Cyprus and Palamism* (as footnote 5 above), 626–630. J.-C. Larchet answers him that he has not taken into account the first writings of the Cypriot, and especially the *Antirrhetic discourse*, where it is clearly stated the distinction between the uncreated energies and the hypostasis of the Spirit (LARCHET, *Vie*, as footnote 1 above, 124, footnote 222). The criticism, however, is unfounded because J. van Rossum notes this distinction made by Gregory of Cyprus but does not consider relevant to apply it to the eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son.

**28** PALACHKOVSKY, *Controverse* (as footnote 1 above), 93.

**29** Gregory Palamas, *The one hundred and fifty chapters*, trans. R. E. SINKEWICZ, § 36. Toronto 1988, 123.

We mentioned in the introduction that (the young) J. Meyendorff, S. Verkhovsky and D. Stăniloae read in this passage an expression of the eternal shining forth of Spirit's hypostasis, who rests from the Father on the Son and returns to the Father through the Son.<sup>30</sup> On the contrary, A. Radović recognizes in the "Spirit" which is mentioned in these lines the uncreated energy.<sup>31</sup>

Therefore, Palamas, when he names the Spirit "love" of the Begetter for his Word ineffably begotten, "by which" the Son also "is in relation with the Begetter", just formulates a fundamental Biblical truth: "God is love" (agapè). [...] It is clear that this charity (agapè) can not be a hypostatic property. It is common to the Trinity ("God's return to himself"), it is one and in the same time "threefold" eternal glory, energy, and flame of the divine Being, that is of the one and tri-hypostatic essence of God.<sup>32</sup>

To argue his point, A. Radović first emphasizes that according to Palamas, "God's work without beginning", that is the dynamism of divine life understood as "God's return to himself", corresponds to the "movement" of "the eternal common energy".<sup>33</sup> We do not pretend to question this specific point of the Palamite doctrine. However, we can notice that Palamas also describes a return to the Father of the hypostases of the Son and the Spirit themselves. In the prologue of his first *Apodictic Treatise*, Palamas addresses a prayer to the Trinity, where he states, evoking the "only principle, beyond all principle" (hence the Father): "the only monad without cause from which come [litt. "are produced, brought to the outside": προάγεσθον] and to which return [litt. "are brought back": ἀνάγεσθον], outside time and without cause, the Son and the Spirit".<sup>34</sup>

---

**30** MEYENDORFF, *Procession* (as footnote 3 above); VERKHOVSKY, *Procession* (as footnote 1 above); STĂNILOAE, *Trinitarian relations* (as footnote 4 above). – Note that J. Lison considers this text as concerning the hypostasis of the Spirit, even if he adopts the views of V. Lossky about an eternal manifestation of the divine energy (in the Spirit) through the Son: LISON, *L'Esprit répandu* (as footnote 1 above), 86–90.

**31** Just mention that, more recently, M. Orphanos has developed a reading similar to that of A. Radović (and referring to him): ORPHANOS, *Procession* (as footnote 1 above), 42.

**32** A. RADOVIĆ, *Le mystère de la Sainte Trinité selon Saint Grégoire Palamas*. Paris 2012, 233. Personal translation. Note that Radović gives a translation different to Sinkewicz's one. Indeed, the word "χρηται" also means "avoir commerce" (in French), that we have translated: "to be in relation with".

**33** RADOVIĆ, *Le Filioque* (as footnote 1 above), 36; See also RADOVIĆ, *Mystère* (as footnote 32 above), 227–228. We do not develop the position of M. Orphanos, who just repeats the arguments of A. Radović on this point: ORPHANOS, *Procession* (as footnote 1 above), 29–53.

**34** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise I*, prologue, personal translation; E. PERRELLA (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas, Atto e luce divina. Scritti filosofici e teologici*. Milan 2003, 10.

Secondly, A. Radović relies on the metaphor of love (ἔρωϝ) used to name the Spirit (“as a love [τιϝ ἔρωϝ] of the Father to the Son”): in Palamas’ work (as more generally in the doctrine of uncreated energy inherited from his predecessors), the names can refer to the energy but not to the essence nor to the hypostases, transcending all knowledge. These lines concern then “not the person of the Spirit but his eternal and manifested power”.<sup>35</sup>

The argument is not without force. However, it is weakened if we admit that the term *eros*, here, does not name the being of God as “love” (usually rather named by the word ἀγάπη in reference to 1 Jn 4,8) but only constitutes a “deficient image” (to use the words of A. Radović himself), that aims at describing the person of the Spirit in his relations to the Father and to the Son. Indeed, the patristic tradition does not ignore the use of images to describe the divine persons and their reciprocal relations within the Trinitarian life. We can mention, for example, Cyril’s image of the Spirit as *nous* (νοῦϝ) of the Son, that Palamas himself assumes<sup>36</sup>, or, in different terms, the *nous – logos – pneuma* triad developed by the Cappadocians to enlighten the relations of the three Persons<sup>37</sup>, or lastly the image of three nested suns pouring a single light, used by Gregory of Nazianzus to describe the paradox of Trinitarian unity.<sup>38</sup>

Moreover, a precise analysis of the context of this text makes the hypostatic character of the Spirit unmistakable in his very designation of *eros* of the Father and the Son. Indeed, the two preceding chapters are precisely concerned with representing the Person of the Father as *nous* (§ 34) and the person of the Son as *logos* (§ 35), and defining in this framework the bond that unites them. Chapter 36 concludes this Trinitarian development by presenting in turn the person of the Spirit as *eros* in his relationship to the Father-*nous* and the Son-*logos*. We

---

**35** We quote here the whole passage: “If we take into account the view of the saint, according to which every name applied to God refers to what is ‘participated’, that is to the ‘energy’ of the Trinity – the essence can absolutely not have any name (the essence and the hypostasis are named from the energy which reveals them), we will easily understand that the Spirit “like an ineffable love” does not refer to the hypostasis of the Spirit but to his eternal and manifested power.” RADOVIĆ, *Mystère* (as footnote 32 above), 231. Personal translation.

**36** Indeed, Palamas takes on and comments on this image in his *Apodictic Treatise* II, § 30: PERRELLA, *Gregorio Palamas* (as footnote 34 above), 172. He refers to Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaurus*, § 34.

**37** On the historical development of this analogy and its reception, see M. STAVROU, *L’Esprit Saint accompagne le Verbe. Réurrence d’une formule pneumatologique dans l’histoire de la théologie byzantine*, in G. Vergauwen / A. Steingruber (eds.), *Veni, Sancte Spiritus! Contributions théologiques à la mission de l’Esprit*. Festschrift für Barbara Hallensleben zum 60. Geburtstag. Münster 2018, 395–410 (ici 397 *ssq.*).

**38** Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 31, § 14.

quote here the first lines introducing the chapter 36, lines sufficiently explicit in themselves. In particular, the illustrative status that Palamas gives here to the term *eros* is visible:

Since the goodness which proceeds by generation from intellectual goodness [τῆς νοεῶς ἀγαθότητος] as from a source is the Word [λόγος], and since no intelligent person could conceive of a word without spirit, for this reason the Word, God from God, possesses also the Holy Spirit proceeding together with him from the Father. But this is spirit not in the sense of the breath which accompanies the word passing through our lips (for this is a body and is adapted to our word through bodily organs); nor is it spirit in the sense of that which accompanies the immanent and the discursive words within us, even though it does so incorporeally [...]. But that Spirit of the supreme Word is like an ineffable love [τις ἔρωσ] of the Begetter towards the ineffably begotten Word himself.<sup>39</sup>

The reading of the chapter 37 confirms this analysis. Indeed, by repeating this designation of the Spirit as *eros*, Palamas can state:

Therefore, this love [ἔρωσ] is the Holy Spirit and another < name for the > Paraclete and is so called by us, since he accompanies the Word, in order that we may recognize him as perfect in a perfect and proper hypostasis, in no way inferior to the substance of the Father but being indistinguishably identical with both the Son and the Father, though not in hypostasis – a fact which indicates to us that he is derived from the Father by way of procession in a divinely fitting manner – and in order that we may revere one true and perfect God in three true and perfect hypostases, certainly not threefold, but simple.<sup>40</sup>

Here, the word *eros* can hardly refer to a reality other than the hypostasis of the Spirit, since the text develops the paradox of the one God in three Persons. Moreover, the mentions of the name of Paraclete and of the procession from the Father (alone) can only apply to the hypostasis of the third person. Lastly, our analysis is confirmed by an evident parallel with the end of the chapter 35: this latter, which aims at characterizing the person of the Son-*logos* in his relation to the Father-*nous*, concluded indeed in an almost identical formulation:

Therefore, the supreme Word is also the Son and is so named by us, in order that we may recognize him as being perfect in a perfect and proper hypostasis, since he is derived from the Father and is in no way inferior to the Father's substance but is indistinguishably identical with him, though not in hypostasis, which indicates that the Word is derived from him by generation in a divinely fitting manner.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Translation of Sinkewicz, The one hundred (as footnote 29 above), 121 – 123.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 125.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 121.

We must admit that Palamas develops here, perhaps under Augustine's influence<sup>42</sup>, an analogical representation of the Trinity as *nous-logos-eros*; therefore, the metaphor of the *eros* of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father clearly refers to the person (hypostasis) of the Holy Spirit.<sup>43</sup>

## The Apodictic Treatises on the Holy Spirit

More broadly, what about the distinction between the hypostatic procession and an eternal energetic manifestation of the Spirit in the *Apodictic Treatises on the Holy Spirit*? The question is delicate and should be studied in detail.

The texts which mention the Spirit as divine energy (and they are numerous) visibly concern only the economy, that is the gift and the sending of the Spirit to humans<sup>44</sup>. A crucial passage shows it clearly by drawing a parallel between the procession of the Spirit as energy (in the economy) and the procession of the Spirit as hypostasis (in eternity):

Indeed, the procession [ἐκπόρευσις], in every way we talk about it, is *processio* [πρόοδος] and movement [κίνησις] related to who is the source of procession and to who is proceeded. The *processio* [πρόοδος] of the Spirit is proclaimed double by the divinely inspired Scripture: indeed, the Spirit comes from the Father through [διὰ] the Son but also, if you want, from [ἐκ] the Son, upon all those who are worthy, on whom he rests and in whom he dwells. [...] Concerning the *processio* [πρόοδος] of the Spirit from the Father through the Son, that we talked about, it is also named benevolence of the Father and the Son, because it is totally done for the love of humans, but also mission, gift, descent, and it always happens in time in favour of some, for a specific cause, to sanctify, to instruct, to remind and to admonish the rebels; this movement, this *processio* [πρόοδος] of the Spirit is one [of both movements/*processio*/processions].

There is also the procession [ἐκπόρευσις], the movement [κίνησις], the *processio* [πρόοδος] of the Spirit, which is eternal, without cause, free, superior to benevolence and

---

**42** It is now proved that *The one and hundred chapters* contains, in chapters 125–135, some quotes from the Greek translation of Augustine's *De Trinitate*. R.E. Sinkewicz therefore concludes that the chapters 34–37 “must be considered also now to bear the imprint of Augustine's influence”: R.E. SINKEWICZ, Gregory Palamas, in C.G. Conticello / V. Conticello (eds.), *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition II*. Turnhout 2002, 131–182.

**43** The analogical dimension of the development is then verified: in chapter 38, Palamas applies the tripartition of mind, word and *eros* to the angelic structure.

**44** For the Greek text see PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 6–267. – *Apodictic treatise I*, § 29, 70; *Apodictic treatise II*, § 6 à 10, 126–136; § 14, 142–144; § 16–17, 148–150; § 25 and 27, 162–164 and 166–168; § 47–48, 202–206; § 57, 222; § 60, 226–228; § 63, 230–232, § 75, 254; § 77, 256–258, § 81, 262–264.

love for human, because it emanates eternally from the Father, not by an act of will, but by nature.<sup>45</sup>

Examining how to understand this “indescribable and incomprehensible movement”, Palamas relies on the episode of baptism in the *Gospel of John*, in which the Spirit is said to “descend upon” and to “abide in” Christ (Jn 1: 32–33), to affirm that it refers to the rest of the Spirit on the Son. Quoting John of Damascus<sup>46</sup>, he also relies on Gregory the Theologian to describe the Son as “intendant” (ταµίας) of the Spirit.<sup>47</sup> He immediately distinguishes this eternal procession, from the Father alone, from the *processio* of the energies, from the Father and the Son, which belongs to the economy.

Therefore, in this procession, this eternal and incomprehensible *processio* from the Father, the Holy Spirit, who rests on the Son, how would he have this *processio* [πρόδος] through [διά] the Son on whom he rests? Then, if you say, from a doctrinal point of view, that he comes [προέρχεται] also from the Son, it can not mean the same *processio*, but an other, which is a manifestation [φανέρωσις] directed to us and a gift to those who are worthy to receive it.<sup>48</sup>

Palamas uses here the word “manifestation” (φανέρωσις) for the procession on the economic level, which concerns the divine energies. In other lines, he clearly states:

For we know that the manifestation (φανέρωσις) is temporal and that all that is temporal has come through the Son; and this is precisely why we say that the Spirit manifests himself (φανερούσθαι), but does not proceed from him and through him.<sup>49</sup>

---

**45** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 29, in E. PERRELLA (ed.), Gregorio Palamas, Atto e luce divina (as footnote 34 above), 70–72. The translation is a personal one. Note that the French translation of the same page by Yvan Koenig is not exact: indeed, this latter translates sometimes ἐκπόρευσις or πρόδος by “revelation”, “manifestation”, which does not help to clarify Palamas’ thought. We have opted for remaining as close as possible to Greek terminology. To translate πρόδος, we have chosen the Latin word “*processio*”, which can designate the origin of the Son as well as the origin of the Spirit. For the Greek text: PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 70 and 72.

**46** “We also believe in one Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life: who proceeds from the Father and rests in the Son”: John of Damascus, An exact exposition of the Orthodox faith, I, 8.

**47** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 29, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 76.

**48** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 29, in PERRELLA, 74–76; personal translation.

**49** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 60, in PERRELLA, 226; personal translation.

Palamas thus distinguishes a double procession of the Spirit, as hypostasis and as energy, but it does not correspond exactly to the “double procession” evoked by V. Lossky. For the latter, there is a double *eternal* procession: hypostatic procession of the Spirit from the Father alone and ‘manifesting’ (or energetic) procession of the Spirit from the Father through the Son<sup>50</sup>. In fact, we find in Palamas’ text the distinction between an eternal procession, from the Father on the Son, which concerns the hypostasis of the Spirit, and an economic procession (or rather a “*processio*”<sup>51</sup>) – also called manifestation – from the Father through the Son, which concerns the (tri-hypostatic) energies of the Spirit.<sup>52</sup>

On this point, J. Meyendorff, who developed later in his book on Palamas the argument of V. Lossky, has visibly also overlooked the temporal aspect of the Spirit’s procession “through the Son” as energy. Indeed, when he states that Palamas takes over in the *Treaties* the topic of the eternal shining forth of the Spirit (understood by J. Meyendorff as divine energy),<sup>53</sup> first developed by Gregory of Cyprus, he relies on quotes that, accurately translated and seen in their proper context, clearly refer to the economic giving of the Spirit:

The hesychast doctor explains in that sense the patristic passages, notably those of saint Cyril of Alexandria, where it is affirmed that the Spirit comes from both (“ἐξ ἀφοῦν”), or “from the Son” or “through the Son”. “When you hear him [Cyril of Alexandria] say, Palamas writes, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both because he comes essentially from the

---

**50** In the above-mentioned pages (as footnote 2 above), V. Lossky writes: “The poverty of the vocabulary makes sometimes difficult to know if is mentioned the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit or the manifesting procession: both are eternal [...]” Personal translation.

**51** To qualify the origin of the Spirit as energy, Palamas uses rather the term “*processio*” (πρόοδος). However, he accepts, in a brief passage, that it may be called “procession” (ἐκπόρευσις) “since we will not argue for words”. Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise I*, § 29, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 70 and 72.

**52** The purely economic dimension of the *manifestation* of divine energies as formulated in the *Apodictic Treatises* is also noted by PALACHKOVSKY, La controverse (as footnote above 1), 92; and RADOVIĆ, Le mystère (as footnote 32 above), 216 and 218 (note that Radović precisely comments this passage and the “double procession” of the Spirit it describes). More recently, M. Knežević has highlighted it more precisely by analyzing the distinct use of “ἐκ” and “διά” in Palamas’ writings. He shows that the use of “ἐκ” is generally restricted to the theological level to mean the hypostatic origin (of the Son and the Spirit) from the Father, and the use of “διά”, generally restricted to the economic level, to describe the mediation of the Son in the gift/manifestation of the Spirit (as uncreated energy): M. KNEŽEVIĆ, Ἐκ and διά in ‘Apodictic treatises on the procession of the Holy Spirit’ of Gregory Palamas, in C. Athanasopoulos (ed.), *Triune God: Incomprehensible but knowable – the philosophical and theological significance of St Gregory Palamas for contemporary philosophy and theology*. Newcastle 2015, 268–295 (here 274).

**53** MEYENDORFF, Introduction (as footnote 1 above), 312–314.

Father through the Son, you must understand his teaching in this way: what is given [‘ce qui s’épanche’ in J. Meyendorff’s translation] are the powers and the essential energies of God, not the divine hypostasis of the Spirit”. “The hypostasis of the very Holy Spirit does not come from the Son; it is not given nor received by anyone, but only the divine grace and the divine energy”.<sup>54</sup>

The first quote, which is taken from the second *Treaty*, § 20, refers in fact to an economic context. It concludes a passage in which Palamas explains that each one of the three divine Persons has manifested himself successively in time and has granted the divine energies to mankind in that manifestation. It is worth noting that J. Meyendorff translates only approximately, with the French word “épanchement” (which could refer to the eternal procession of the energy), the Greek word μετάδοσις, which accurately means “gift”, “sharing” and therefore clearly refers to the economy of salvation.

The verbs used in the second quote (δίδοσθαι, λαμβεσθαι) also obviously refer to economy. Moreover, this phrase is taken from a passage of the second *Treaty* (§ 48), where Palamas unambiguously writes about the gift of the energy to mankind. Indeed, in the previous lines of the same paragraph, Palamas states:

“Therefore, while it is often said of the divine-human Word, and then of the theophore men, that the Spirit is sent and given by/through the Son, he [the Spirit] has never be said without cause nor without a person to receive him, a person for whom he has also been sent.”<sup>55</sup>

However, since the energies are uncreated, it is legitimate to suppose that their economic manifestation may be transposed on the eternal level. A single text in the *Apodictic Treaties* addresses this question. It is part of a long comment on a representation of the Spirit as mind (νοῦς) of the Son, according to an image inherited from Cyril. We quote these lines because their correct understanding is crucial:

In the same way, the Holy Spirit belongs to Christ as God, as well in essence as in energy. But this is in terms of essence and hypostasis that he is to him [αὐτοῦ], but not from him [ἐξ αὐτοῦ]; in terms of energy he is to him [αὐτοῦ] and from him [ἐξ αὐτοῦ]. [...]

---

54 MEYENDORFF, Introduction (as footnote 1 above), 314.

55 Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 48, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 206. Personal translation.

Do you see that the Spirit is said from the Son as bestowed [χορηγούμενον] and manifested [φαινόμενον] by him? Thus, the Spirit is and is said from the Son without beginning; but the Son has also the power to bestow [αὐτὸ τὸ χορηγεῖν ἔχειν ἔχει] without beginning, because there is here no addition nor deletion, as for the beings subject to time, who assumed in time the ability to bestow.<sup>56</sup>

The Son is here called the eternal bestower of the Spirit and we could therefore infer a transposition of the economic manifestation of the energy through the Son into eternity. This may be the step taken by V. Lossky and his heirs, notably J. Meyendorff.<sup>57</sup> However, it is difficult to affirm it from this brief passage alone. Indeed, the Byzantine author does not write that the Son eternally bestows the energy of the Spirit but rather, in a quite awkward phrase, that he has the power to do so (αὐτὸ τὸ χορηγεῖν ἔχειν ἔχει), as if he wanted to avoid formally recognizing an eternal manifestation of the Spirit through the Son. In this formula (αὐτὸ τὸ χορηγεῖν ἔχειν ἔχει), should we not rather see the image, borrowed from Gregory the Theologian, of the Son as “intendant of the Spirit”?<sup>58</sup> In this case, reference is made to the eternal rest of the Spirit on the Son. In other words, the articulation between the theological level and the economic one is here designated: that is because the Spirit, in his hypostasis, rests eternally on the Son and abides in him that, in the economy, the divine energies are sent in the Spirit from the Father through the Son.<sup>59</sup> Other texts seem to confirm it:

---

**56** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 30 et 31, in PERRELLA, 172–174. Personal translation.

**57** V. Lossky, on this point, does not detail his reference to Palamas. J. Meyendorff explicitly refers to these lines and then concludes: “The distinction between the essence and the energy allows the hesychast doctor to be more tolerant than many other Greek theologians towards the Latin formulations: as energy, ‘the Spirit comes from the Father through the Son but also, if you want, from [ἐκ] the Son, upon all those who are worthy’ [...] It is the Orthodox meaning that we can give to the Latin *Filioque*: while saving the personalism of the Fathers and the traditional position of the Byzantines concerning the ‘economic’ procession of the Spirit from the Son, Palamas, because he regards the energies as uncreated and eternal, does not limit this ‘economy’ to a temporal order”. MEYENDORFF, Introduction (as footnote 1 above), 315–316. Personal translation.

**58** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 29, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 76.

**59** It is in this sense that D. Stăniloae understands Palamas in his study of 1981: “La procession du Saint Esprit du Père et sa relation avec le Fils comme base de notre déification et adoption”. STĂNILOAE, Procession (as footnote 4 above), 195–198. A. Radović develops similar views: “D’une part, la manifestation et la dispensation de l’Esprit s’accomplit dans le temps, du Fils et par le Fils, d’autre part, le fait de dispenser est la propriété éternelle du Fils, qui a l’Esprit éternellement reposant en lui”. He then quotes Palamas, who stresses the equal power to bestow the Spirit of the Father and the Son: “The power to send the Holy Spirit on those who are worthy

In fact, the Son sends the Spirit and gives him to us precisely because he co-exists with him [ἔχων συνυφρασεώς τὸ πνεῦμα] from all eternity.<sup>60</sup>

On the one hand, the Spirit has eternally from the Father the existential *processio* [τὴν ὑπαρκτικὴν πρόοδον], while, on the other hand, existing in the Son eternally, he comes from him to manifest himself [εἰς τοῦμφανέξ] to us and among us by a coming which is revealing but not existential [κατ'ἐκφαντικὴν καὶ οὐχ ὑπαρκτικὴν προέλευσιν].<sup>61</sup>

A variant of the formula mentioned above, as it appears in the first *Apodictic Treatise*, brings out the distinction between the economic and theological levels. After having presented the Spirit as mind (νοῦς) of the Son and the implications of this image for the distinction between hypostasis and energy, he concludes:

On the one hand, in terms of energy, he [the Spirit] is to him [the Son] and from him, as breathed [ἐμφυσώμενον], sent [πεμπόμενον] and manifested [φανερούμενον]; but on the other hand, in terms of existence and hypostasis, he is to him without being from him, but from the one who begot him.<sup>62</sup>

Placing on the same level the terms “manifested”, “insufflated” and “sent” shows that this manifestation is economic. The word “insufflated” directly refers to the text of the Gospel of John where Jesus breathes the Spirit on the apostles (John 20, 22). Let’s remember that Palamas, following Gregory of Cyprus, relies on this text to demonstrate that the economic gift of the Spirit concerns the divine energies and not his very hypostasis.<sup>63</sup> Unless we consider that the thought of Palamas has marked a stage in the second *Apodictic Treatise* – which is not

---

is eternally common to the Father and the Son. Each of them sends him in time, but both send him rather when it is appropriate” (Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 14, in PERELL, Gregorio Palamas, as footnote 34 above, 146); RADOVIĆ, *Mystère* (as footnote 32 above), 223. More recently, M. Knežević, analyzing the *Apodictic Treatises*, reaches the same conclusion: “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’, 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 salvation”: M. KNEŽEVIĆ, Ἐξ ἁμφοῖν. Cyril of Alexandria and the polemics over filioque of Gregory Palamas, *International Journal for Philosophy and Theology* 15 (2015), 167 – 194 (here 112).

<sup>60</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 28, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above),

<sup>61</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 77, in PERRELLA, 258; personal translation.

<sup>62</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 9, in PERRELLA, 34; personal translation.

<sup>63</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 6, in PERRELLA, 126 – 128.

impossible<sup>64</sup> – the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son here clearly appears limited to its economic dimension.<sup>65</sup>

Even while remaining within the framework of the second *Treatise*, other elements question the interpretation given by V. Lossky and J. Meyendorff. In fact, Palamas emphasizes that the manifestation of energies was done first by the Father in the history of the Old Covenant, later by the Son at the Resurrection, and then by the Spirit at Pentecost:

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who wants to reveal his consubstantiality with the Father and the Spirit in his divinity, gives to his disciples by grace the natural energy of the divinity, as the Father had previously given to the prophets some of these energies. And the Spirit, for its part, came down after the ascension of the Saver and gave also such energies to the disciples, revealing that he is also consubstantial with the Father and the Son.<sup>66</sup>

In other texts, Palamas states that the Spirit as energy sends himself as much as he is sent by the Father and the Son, since the energy, coming from the divine essence, is tri-hypostatic.<sup>67</sup> Even if we recognized with V. Lossky and J. Meyendorff the idea of an eternal “energetic” procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, this one would be only the incomplete assertion of an eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father, the Son and himself and could not be assimilated to the theme of the manifestation of the Spirit through the Son devel-

---

**64** That is neither impossible, nor evident. Indeed, in the “Epilogue” of the first *Treatise*, where he summarizes his thought chapter after chapter, Palamas takes, for the chapter 9, the same phrase without its economic frame (“the Spirit [...] in terms of energy (ἐνέργεια) is to him and from him, but in terms of hypostasis, he is naturally to him but not from him, but from the Father alone”. Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, Epilogue, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 108), then strictly similar to the lines he writes in his second *Treatise*. We can therefore consider that when he writes these words, either in the “Epilogue” or in the second *Treatise*, he naturally presupposes the economic dimension, already explicit in the full text of the first *Treatise*.

**65** That is this way that A. Radović comments on these texts of Palamas, understanding the words “from him” as related only to economy: A. RADOVIĆ, *Mystère* (as footnote 32 above), 216–217 and 221. Let us remember, to read him rightly, that according to him Palamas evokes a manifestation of the Spirit only in the frame of economy.

**66** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 12, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 140; personal translation. See also Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 14, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 146: “The power to send the Holy Spirit on those who are worthy is eternally common to the Father and the Son. Each of them sends him in time, but both send him rather when it is appropriate”.

**67** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 21 and § 65, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 166 and 234.

oped by Gregory of Cyprus, in which the relation of the Spirit to the Son appears specific, structuring.<sup>68</sup>

Finally, Palamas does not formulate any eternal relationship in God involving a “by/through” the Son, where “through” is understood in its literal sense. He unequivocally affirms, commenting on what he sees as the first patristic occurrence of a “being” of the Spirit through/by the Son (and here we are in the second *Apodictic Treatise*)<sup>69</sup>:

Do you see to what extent we must understand and say that the Spirit is through the Only Son ? Only to the extent that he is manifested to men through him. [...]

But if instead of “through” [διὰ], you wanted to put the preposition “from” [ἐκ], we would not blame you at all, as long as you think and presuppose only the truth: it is from the Son that the Spirit has manifested himself to us.<sup>70</sup>

If Palamas accepts the equivalence developed by the Latins between “by/through” (διὰ) and “from” (ἐκ) provided that it is restricted to the economy, he refuses, on the theological level, to understand the “by/through” other than in

---

**68** See some lines of the *Apology*, mentioned above, where the manifestation of the Spirit is said to be related to the hypostatic properties of the Spirit: Gregory of Cyprus, *Apology*, PG 142, 266D–267A. – To be exhaustive, we must add to our discussion the analysis of some lines of another Palamite text, which could support the views of V. Lossky and J. Meyendorff (but are not quoted by them): “One is in fact the movement of the divine will, which comes from the causality of the Father – which is the principle of everything – and moves forward through the Son and manifests itself [προφαινομένην] in the Holy Spirit”: Gregory Palamas, *Unity and distinction*, § 21 (personal translation); for the Greek text see PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 960. “The divinity is in a true sense the divine energy, which comes from the Father through the Son in the Spirit and reveals itself [ἀποκεκαλυμμένη] through the works accomplished”: Gregory Palamas, *Unity and distinction*, § 22 (personal translation.); for the Greek text see PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 962. In these lines, it is not clear if the movement of the energy from the Father through the Son in the Spirit is eternal. It may be. But we must note two things: 1. These lines are isolated and appear in the framework of the distinction between essence, hypostasis and energy; the context is not at all a discussion on the *Filioque* and on the patristic formulations which affirm a procession of the Spirit through the Son. Palamas does not conclude anything concerning this matter here. 2. The energies are not identified with the Spirit. These lines describe a procession of the energy ‘through the Son in the Spirit’ and not a procession of the Spirit as energy through the Son. Therefore we can not conclude that Palamas has identified on the theological level the procession of the energy with a procession of the Spirit (through the Son) as energy.

**69** It is a phrase of Gregory Thaumaturgus: “One is the Holy Spirit, who has also his existence from the Father and who has been manifested through the Son, that is to humans”: Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Expositio fidei*. PG 10, 985A; personal translation.

**70** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise II*, §57 and 58, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 222; personal translation.

the sense of a “with”. Commenting on a sentence of Gregory of Nazianzus defining the Spirit as “being with the principle”<sup>71</sup>, he writes:

Therefore, when you hear that the Spirit proceeds through the Son [διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι], understand that he accompanies the Word [ὡς συμπαραμαρτοῦν τῷ λόγῳ]. For thus you will understand the “through” [διὰ] not in the sense of “from” [ἐκ], which is false, but in the sense of “with” [μετά], in agreement with the eponym of the theology [follows a quotation of John of Damascus, *An exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, VII: “the Spirit of God, who is the companion of the Word and the revealer of his operation”].<sup>72</sup>

In this “being with” the Son of the Spirit<sup>73</sup>, we must see the rest of the Spirit on the Son as indicated by the lines that immediately follow.<sup>74</sup> M. Knežević has shown more largely that when διὰ is used by Palamas on a theological plan (and not in economy), it means the co-existence and consubstantiality of the Son and the Spirit<sup>75</sup>. Indeed, other passages of the *Apodictic Treatises* develop the interdependence of the Son and the Spirit in eternity, interpreting the “being with the Son” of the Spirit in terms of consubstantiality and circumcinsession:

“simultaneously from the eternity are both the Son and the Holy Spirit, [as] the one existing within the other and [as] the one belonging to the other and [as] the one dwelling within the other, without any confusion and blending [...]”.<sup>76</sup>

---

71 “The being without principle, the principle and the being with the principle are one God”: Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 42, 15.

72 Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 25, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 64; personal translation. The same argument is repeated in the same terms in the *Treatise* II, § 58, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 224.

73 Gregory Palamas refers to a consecrated formulation (“the Spirit accompanies the Word”), elaborated by Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa and adopted by John of Damascus in the *Exact exposition of the Orthodox faith*. On this issue and for these references, see STAVROU, L’Esprit saint (as footnote 37 above).

74 Indeed, Palamas quotes Cyril who writes that “the Spirit passes from the Father in the Son [παρὰ πατρός διήκειν ἐν υἱῷ]”. Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 58, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 224.

75 KNEŽEVIĆ, Ἐκ and διὰ (as footnote 52 above), 292–293.

76 Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* I, § 33, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 88. Translation of KNEŽEVIĆ, The order (τάξις) of persons of the Holy Trinity in ‘Apodictic treatises’ of Gregory Palamas. *International Journal for Philosophy and Theology* 12 (2012), 84–102 (here 101). See also *Apodictic treatise* II, § 41.

As M. Knežević highlights it, Palamas understood in the same terms the Cyrilian words “ἐξ ἀμφοῖν”<sup>77</sup>. On this point, the reading of J. Meyendorff is visibly inaccurate. Indeed, the Russian theologian writes, in the already mentioned lines arguing the topic of an eternal “energetic” procession of the Spirit through the Son:

He [Palamas] notes that the patristic passages which seem to be supportive of the Latin doctrine do not affirm that the Spirit proceeds from the hypostasis of the Son, but “from the nature of the Son”, “that he naturally (φυσικῶς) comes from the Son”. Yet, what proceeds from the nature is the energy, not the hypostasis.<sup>78</sup>

The last phrase is a comment of J. Meyendorff, which, in fact, does not reflect exactly Palamas’ thought. We have not found in Palamite texts any equivalent assertion in this context. To comment the words “ἐξ ἀμφοῖν” on a theological level, Palamas refers rather to the consubstantiality of the Son and the Spirit. The following passages are clear:

Everytime that Cyril, this theophore man, says that the Spirit is from the essence of the Son, he refers to the consubstantiality [τὸ ὁμοούσιον] of the Son, and not to the fact that the Son would be the cause of the Spirit.<sup>79</sup>

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.<sup>80</sup>

Our first conclusions are therefore confirmed: for Palamas, the eternal procession of the Spirit “through the Son”, as it was formulated by the Fathers, concerns not the energy but his hypostasis and must be understood as the close connection between the begetting of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, indissociable from one another. This connection corresponds to the rest of the Spirit on and in the Son. Note in passing that Palamas recognizes a dynamic dimension to this rest, as a movement from the Father to the Son, as indicated by this commentary on Cyril of Alexandria:

<sup>77</sup> KNEŽEVIĆ, Ἐξ ἀμφοῖν (as footnote 59 above), 102–104.

<sup>78</sup> MEYENDORFF, Introduction (as footnote 1 above), 314.

<sup>79</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic Treatise* II, § 64, in PERRELLA, Gregorio Palamas (as footnote 34 above), 234. Personal translation.

<sup>80</sup> Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic Treatise* II, § 67, in PERRELLA, 240. Translation of KNEŽEVIĆ, Ἐξ ἀμφοῖν (as footnote 59 above), 102.

The divine Cyril also concludes in his *Treasure* that the Spirit physically exists in the Son from the Father and he concludes that he passes in the Son from the Father [παρὰ πατρός διήκειν ἐν υἱῷ] naturally and essentially, and that it is through him and his anointing that the Son sanctifies everything.<sup>81</sup>

Therefore, the triadology of Palamas appears to be distinct from the Cypriot's view. More precisely, Palamas seems to step back since he assumes a position that the latter claimed to move beyond. As he refuses to take into account the literal sense of the preposition “by/through” (διά), considered as only synonymous with the prepositions σύν and μετά meaning “with”, he aligns with a theology that the patriarch explicitly rejected as being insufficiently faithful to the tradition of the Fathers.<sup>82</sup> He does not evoke any eternal “manifestation” (ἐκφανσις, φανέρωσις) of the Spirit through the Son; he formally recognizes that the Son has the eternal power to bestow the Spirit (understood as uncreated energies) but does not use the term “manifestation” nor “procession” on this matter. Moreover, this idea is only briefly mentioned and does not allow us to draw any parallel with the wide developments of Gregory of Cyprus on the eternal shining forth of the Spirit through the Son. On the contrary, Palamas obviously does not assume this last theme and is more generally hostile to the formulation of an eternal existence of the Spirit through the Son<sup>83</sup>.

In that sense, the way (the young) J. Meyendorff, S. Verkhovsky and D. Stăniloae interpret the chapter 36 of *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*, as describing the eternal manifestation of the Spirit, can be questioned. However, since Palamas describes in these lines a “use” of the Spirit by the Son inherent in his hypostatic procession and understood as an extension of the Spirit's rest on the Son, there is no inconsistency in reading this text in tune with the thought of the Cypriot<sup>84</sup>, but it must be done with great caution.

Moreover, if on a general level Palamas has completed the theology of uncreated energy inherited from the Cypriot and his predecessors, on the precise point which concerns us, he just takes over an argument present in the work of the patriarch, which he values by placing it at the centre of his demonstration. In-

---

**81** Gregory Palamas, *Apodictic treatise* II, § 71, in PERRELLA, 248; personal translation.

**82** Gregory of Cyprus, *Apology*. PG 142, 257A.

**83** On this matter, see again KNEŽEVIĆ, Έκ and διά (as footnote 52 above), who shows that in the *Apodictic Treatises* Palamas tries to restrict the use of διά to economy.

**84** Note that Radović himself, while recognizing that the manifestation of the Spirit in Palamas' works always concerns economy, links up this text with the theme of the eternal shining forth of the Spirit developed by Gregory of Cyprus, placing them in “the same mode of thinking”. However, we must remind that he considers this “movement” of the Spirit as referring to uncreated energy: RADOVIĆ, Filioque (as footnote 1 above), 42–43.

deed, as shown above, the patriarch already distinguished between the economic level, in which the Spirit bestowed by the Son must be understood in the sense of the divine energies, and the theological one, which concerns the Spirit's hypostasis. This point, however, remained marginal in his writings because his attention was focused on the theological level, that is on the eternal manifestation of the Spirit. On the other hand, Palamas, who refuses to develop triadological speculation too far, refocuses his defense of the Orthodox position on the distinction between theological and economic plans, that is between the hypostasis and the gifts of the Spirit.

To conclude, the theme of a double eternal procession of the Spirit, hypostatic and energetic, first noted by V. Lossky, is visibly absent from the works of the Cypriot and of Palamas. The reading of (the young) J. Meyendorff, S. Verkhovsky and D. Stăniloae seems to be right when describing the eternal shining forth of the Spirit as concerning his very hypostasis. The implications may be important, both for Orthodox trinitarian theology and for ecumenical research. Just mention the fact that D. Stăniloae himself led the way in two late studies<sup>85</sup>, where he offered thought-provoking views concerning Orthodox triadology as well as the sensitive issue of *Filioque*.<sup>86</sup>

---

**85** STĂNILOAE, Procession (as footnote 4 above); IDEM, Saint Esprit (as footnote 4 above).

**86** For a critical evaluation of his propositions, see our book, to be published: *Le dialogue de l'amour trinitaire. Perspectives ouvertes par Dumitru Stăniloae*. Paris 2020. See also V. COMAN, *Le Saint-Esprit comme liaison de l'amour éternel entre le Père et le Fils: un cas de 'sobornicité ouverte' dans la théologie orthodoxe moderne*. *Irenikon* 89/1 (2016), 25–51.

