

**COMPLETE PHILOSOPHICAL AND  
THEOLOGICAL TREATISES  
of  
ANSELM of CANTERBURY**

Translated  
by  
**JASPER HOPKINS**  
and  
**HERBERT RICHARDSON**

**The Arthur J. Banning Press  
Minneapolis**

In the notes to the translations the numbering of the Psalms accords with the Douay version and, in parentheses, with the King James (Authorized) version. A reference such as "S II, 264:18" indicates "F. S. Schmitt's edition of the Latin texts, Vol. II, p. 264, line 18."

Library of Congress Control Number: 00-133229

ISBN 0-938060-37-6

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright © 2000 by The Arthur J. Banning Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402. All rights reserved.

**THE PROCESSION OF THE  
HOLY SPIRIT<sup>1</sup>**  
*(De Processione Spiritus Sancti)*

I

That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as we Latins confess, is denied by the Greeks. They also reject our Latin teachers whom we follow with respect to this [doctrine]. But together with us they revere the Gospels; and in other regards they believe about the trine and one God exactly the same thing as do we, who are firmly established in this very doctrine. Therefore, if they prefer to assent to a solid truth rather than to contend for a hollow victory, I hope that on the basis of what they confess without hesitation and by the help of this same Holy Spirit they can be led rationally to what they do not yet accept. There are many men who are capable of accomplishing this task better than I. Nevertheless, since it is imposed upon me by many whose request I dare not resist—not only because of the obligation to love the truth but especially because of their love and religious desire—I call upon this same Holy Spirit to deign to guide me to this end. In this hope, then, I shall undertake what these men request; and I shall use the faith of the Greeks, together with the doctrines which the Greeks both believe and confess unhesitatingly, as the most certain premises for proving what they do not believe. And on account of the lowliness of my knowledge I shall leave deeper matters to the more learned.

Indeed, the Greeks believe that God is one and unique and perfect, that He has no parts, and that He is as a whole whatever He is. They also confess that He is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the following way: Whether He is spoken of as Father or Son or Holy Spirit (one at a time), or spoken of (two at a time) as Father and Son or as Father and Holy Spirit or as Son and Holy Spirit, or (three at a time) as Father and Son and Holy Spirit, the same whole and perfect God is designated—even though the name “Father” or the name “Son” does not signify the same thing as does

---

<sup>1</sup>Completed in England no later than the summer of 1102. The Nicene Creed (i.e., the Nicene-Constantinople Creed of 381) is under discussion throughout this treatise. To this creed the Latin Church added the word “*filioque*”.

the name "God." For it is not the same thing to be God as it is to be Father or Son. Now, the name "Holy Spirit" is construed as a relational name, because the Holy Spirit is understood to be *someone's* spirit. Although the Father is a spirit and is holy, and although the Son is a spirit and is holy, nevertheless the Father is not anyone's spirit and the Son is not anyone's spirit—as the Holy Spirit is someone's spirit. For He is the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father and the Son. For although the Greeks deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, they do not deny that He is the spirit of the Son.

The Greeks also believe and confess that God exists from God by being begotten and that God exists from God by proceeding; for God the Son exists from God the Father by being begotten, and God the Holy Spirit exists from God the Father by proceeding. They do not think that the one who is begotten is a different God from the one from whom He is begotten, or that the one who proceeds [is a different God from the one from whom He proceeds]—even though God admits of plurality in accordance with the names signifying that there is one from whom someone is begotten and that there is one who is begotten from someone and one who proceeds from someone. In accordance with this plurality the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are plural and are distinct from one another. For when God is said to be Father, He is signified to be the one from whom someone is begotten. And when God is called Son, He is understood to be the one who is begotten from someone. And when God is called Holy Spirit, then because we mean thereby not simply spirit but the spirit-of-God, God is shown to be the one who proceeds from someone.

Now, when we say that the Son is from the Father and that the Holy Spirit is from the Father, we mean that what the Son or the Holy Spirit is He has from the Father. But the Son is understood to be from the Father in one way, and the Holy Spirit [is understood to be from the Father] in another way. For the Son is from His father (i.e., is from God who is His father); but the Holy Spirit is not from God *His* father but is only from God who is Father. Therefore, the Son, with respect to the fact that He exists from God, is called the Father's son; and the one from whom the Son exists is called the Son's father. But the Holy Spirit, with respect to the fact that He exists from God, is not the Father's son; nor

is the one from whom He exists *His* father.

It is also certain that God is not the father or the son or the spirit of anyone except of God; nor is God anything except the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And just as there is one God, so there is only one Father, one Son, and one Holy Spirit. Consequently, in the Trinity there is no father except of the Son; and there is no son except of the Father; and the Holy Spirit is the spirit of no one except of the Father and the Son. Hence, the sole cause of plurality in God is that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit cannot be called by one another's respective name but are distinct from one another because God is from God in the two ways mentioned above.

All of this can be expressed by the word "relation." For since the Son exists from God by being begotten and since the Holy Spirit exists from God by proceeding, by this very diversity of birth and procession they are related to one another as different and distinct from one another. Moreover, when a substance exists from a substance, two irreducible relations are produced if names are ascribed to the substance in accordance with these relations. For example, when a man exists from a man by being begotten, the man from whom the other is begotten is called father; and the other who is begotten from him is called son. Hence, it is impossible for the father to be that son of whom he is father, or for the son to be that father of whom he is son. Yet, nothing prevents a father from being a son or a son from being a father in the case where a man is both a father and a son because he is a father in relation to one man and a son in relation to another man. Assuredly, since Isaac is the father of Jacob and the son of Abraham, without inconsistency a father is a son and a son is a father. For Isaac is called father in relation to someone other than his own father, and he is called son in relation to someone other than his own son. But in the case of Isaac it is impossible for the father to be that son of whom he is father or for the son to be that father of whom he is son.

So then, with respect to God, since God is Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and since there is no father except of the Son, and no son except of the Father, and no spirit of anyone except of the Father and the Son: the Father is not the Son or the Holy Spirit; the Son is not the Father; and the Holy Spirit is not the Father.

Indeed, the Son exists from the Father, and the Holy Spirit exists from the Father; and the one from whom another exists cannot be the other who exists from him, nor can the one who exists from another be the other from whom he exists (as has been stated already). Therefore, the Father is neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit; and neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit is the Father. But the reason the Son is not the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit not the Son, is that (to state for a moment a different reason, since I have not yet established that the Holy Spirit exists, and proceeds, from the Son) the Son exists from the Father by being begotten, but the Holy Spirit exists from the Father not by being begotten but by proceeding. Moreover, the Son cannot be His own spirit, nor can the Holy Spirit be that one whose spirit He Himself is.

Having advanced these premises, let us inquire how, in God, the indivisible oneness and the irreducible plurality are related to each other. Now, alike, both we [Latins] (who say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son) and the Greeks (who do not agree with us in this matter) unhesitatingly believe and confess these premises which have been stated. Therefore, without any hesitancy we both ought to accept, with mutual consent, the conclusions which follow necessarily from these premises. Now, in accordance with the property of God's oneness, (which has no parts) it follows that whatever is said about the one God (who is as a whole whatever He is) is said about the whole of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, because each of them considered by Himself is wholly and perfectly God. But the aforementioned opposition of relation which originates from the fact that God is from God in the aforesaid two ways (1) prevents the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit from being called by one another's respective name and (2) prevents the distinguishing properties of any one of them from being attributed to either of the others. Therefore, the consequences of this oneness and of this relation are so ordered that the plurality which follows from the relation does not apply to cases in which the simplicity of the aforesaid oneness is signified, nor does the oneness restrict the plurality in a case where this relation is signified. Thus, the oneness never loses its own consequence in a case where no opposition of relation stands against it; and the relation does not lose what belongs to it except in the case where the inseparable one-

ness stands against it.

This point will become clearer if we examine it in terms of examples. Indeed, it is easy to recognize how the simplicity of oneness excludes from itself the plurality which is contained in the signification of the relational names. For we confess that the Father is not the Son or the Holy Spirit, that the Son is not the Father or the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit is not the Father or the Son. Therefore, it follows that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinct from one another and are plural. But the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. Hence, what would follow more logically—if the abovementioned plurality of persons retains its property—than that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are more than one God and are gods distinct from one another? But the inviolable simplicity of deity—a deity which we believe to be only one God—does not at all allow this [consequence]. Thus, the oneness of God's being repels the consequence of the relations.

We must also consider how the plurality of relations can oppose the consequence of oneness. But first let us posit some of those cases in which no opposition [of relation] opposes [the consequence of oneness]. We say (1) that the one God is Father and is Son and is Holy Spirit and (2) that they are one and the same God whether they are spoken of singly or two at a time or all three together. Therefore, if God is eternal, then because of the oneness of deity it follows of necessity that the Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, and the Holy Spirit is eternal. And since whether considered one at a time or more than one at a time they are one God, there is only one eternal God. The consequence is similar if God is called creator or just or any of the other names which do not signify any of the aforementioned relations. Let us now look at how relation restricts this consequence of God's oneness. We say that God is Father. Therefore, since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one God, God's oneness requires that the Son be the Father and that the Holy Spirit be the Father. But the relation which prevents the Son and the Holy Spirit from being the Father opposes [this consequence]. Indeed, nature does not allow, nor can understanding comprehend, that (1) the one who exists from another is identical with this other from whom he exists, or that (2) the one from whom another exists is identical with this

other who exists from him. Now, the Son and the Holy Spirit exist from the Father. Therefore, neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit can be the Father, even though God is Father and even though the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same God.

This same point is recognized if God is said to be Son. For the consequence of God's oneness demands that the Father and the Holy Spirit be the Son. But the Father, from whom the Son exists, cannot be this one who exists from Him. And the Holy Spirit, who exists from the Father by proceeding, is not identical with the one who exists from the Father by being begotten. Likewise, when God is said to be Holy Spirit, the aforementioned oneness requires that the Father and the Son be the Holy Spirit. But the Father, from whom the Holy Spirit exists, cannot be this one who exists from Him. And the Son, who exists from the Father by being begotten, is not identical with the one (viz., the Holy Spirit) who exists from the Father by proceeding. Now, when it will be evident that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son, it will also be clear that for this reason the Son cannot be the Holy Spirit or can the Holy Spirit be the Son.

Let us consider still further how the above-mentioned oppositions oppose the aforementioned consequence of oneness. God exists from God. Once this point has been accepted, then since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the same God, it follows in accordance with this identity that God the Father is both God from God and God from whom God exists. Likewise, [God] the Son is both God from God and God from whom God exists. And the same thing holds true for [God] the Holy Spirit. Now, to ask whether each one of them is God from whom God exists is no different from asking whether each one of them is God from God. For God cannot exist from God except as the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit [existing] from the Father or from the Son or from the Holy Spirit. Therefore, let us consider whether each one of them is God from God, and it will become evident whether each one of them is God from whom God exists.

Now, because of the previously cited opposition [of relation] the Father cannot exist from God. For God does not exist except as Father or Son or Holy Spirit, or as two or three of these together. And so, God the Father cannot exist from God unless [He



exists] either from the Father (i.e., from Himself) or from the Son or from the Holy Spirit, or from two or three of them together. But He cannot exist from Himself, because the one existing from someone and the someone from whom he exists cannot be identical. Nor does God the Father exist from the Son; for the Son exists from Him, and thus He cannot exist from the Son. Nor does God the Father exist from the Holy Spirit; for the Holy Spirit exists from the Father, and the Father cannot be that spirit which exists from Himself. And because of this principle of opposition the Father cannot exist from two or three of them together. Now, it is necessary that God the Son exist from God the Father because the Father does not exist from the Son. But God the Son cannot exist from the Son (i.e., from Himself), because the one who exists from someone and the someone from whom he exists are not identical. However, whether God the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or whether the Holy Spirit exists from Him will be shown subsequently. But first we shall determine with regard to the Holy Spirit whether, in accordance with the previously mentioned consequence [of oneness], He exists from the Father and from Himself. Indeed, it is necessary that He exist from the Father, because no opposition opposes this; for the Father does not exist from the Holy Spirit. But it is impossible that the Holy Spirit exist from Himself, since the one existing from someone and the someone from whom he exists cannot be identical. In all these cases nothing opposes the consequence of singular identity except some opposition from among the ones mentioned. And what is discerned in these cases must occur immutably in all things which are said of God.

On the basis of the foregoing irrefutable arguments we must now ask whether the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or whether the Holy Spirit exists from the Son. I say that just as through the foregoing reasoning either the Father exists from the Son or the Son exists from the Father (and, likewise, either the Father exists from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit exists from the Father), so either the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit exists from the Son. Anyone who denies this claim must also deny either that (1) there is only one God, or that (2) the Son is God, or that (3) the Holy Spirit is God, or that (4) God exists from God. For my claim follows from these premises. Furthermore, the Son

and the Holy Spirit exist from the Father only by existing from the Father's essence, which is common to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when it is said that the Son exists from God the Father, then if the Father and the Holy Spirit are one and the same God, it follows in accordance with the oneness of deity that the Son exists also from the Holy Spirit. In the same manner, when we confess that the Holy Spirit exists from God the Father, then if the Father and the Son are the same God, it follows in accordance with the oneness of deity that the Holy Spirit exists also from the Son. Therefore, from these considerations we discern clearly that "either the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit exists from the Son." For these alternates cannot both be true or cannot both be false. Accordingly, if it can be shown that the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit, then it is necessary that the Holy Spirit exist from the Son.

Now, suppose someone says: "Even if nothing is opposed hereto, it does not follow that the Son exists from the Father and the Holy Spirit simply because the Father and the Holy Spirit are one God." Or [suppose he says]: "Even though the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit, [it does not follow] that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son simply because the Father and the Son are one God." Let this person consider that when God exists from God, then either (1) the whole exists from the whole, or (2) a part exists from a part, or (3) the whole exists from a part, or (4) a part exists from the whole. But God has no parts. Therefore, it is impossible that God exist from God [in the following ways]: as a whole existing from a part, or as a part existing from a whole, or as a part existing from a part. Thus, it is necessary that if God exists from God, the whole exists from the whole. Hence, when the Son is said to exist from God, who is Father and Holy Spirit, [an alternative arises]: either (1) the Father will be one whole and the Holy Spirit will be another whole, so that the Son exists from the whole of the Father and not from the whole of the Holy Spirit, or else (2) if the Father and the Holy Spirit are the same whole God, then of necessity when the Son exists from the whole of God, which one whole is both Father and Holy Spirit, then the Son exists both from the Father and from the Holy Spirit—provided nothing opposes this. In the same manner, when the Holy Spirit is said to exist from the whole of God, who

is both Father and Son, [an alternative arises]: either (1) the Father will be one whole and the Son another whole, so that the Holy Spirit exists from the whole of the Father and not from the whole of the Son, or else (2) when the Holy Spirit exists from the Father He cannot fail to exist from the Son, if the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit. For on no other basis can the Holy Spirit be denied to exist from the Son.

Someone will argue:

Suppose that when the Son exists from the Father, then since the Father and the Holy Spirit are one God it follows that the Son exists from the Holy Spirit. Or [suppose that] if the Holy Spirit exists from the Father, then because the Father and the Son are the same God, the Holy Spirit also exists from the Son. [In this case], when the Father begets the Son He must also beget the Holy Spirit, because the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same God; and when the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, then because of the Son and the Holy Spirit's oneness of deity the Son also proceeds from the Father just as does the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, if the oneness of God in the Son and the Holy Spirit does not necessitate that each of them in like manner proceeds and is begotten, then it seems that from the fact of the Father and the Holy Spirit's being one God it does not follow that the Son exists from the Holy Spirit, or from the fact of the Father and the Son's being the same God [it does not follow] that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son—as you claim it does.

To this objection I reply: Assuredly, the Son and the Holy Spirit exist from the Father—but in different ways. For the one [exists from the Father] by being begotten, and the other [exists from the Father] by proceeding, so that for this reason they are distinct from each other—as I have said. Hence, when the one is begotten, the other who is distinct from Him by virtue of the fact that He is not likewise begotten but proceeds cannot be begotten with Him. And when the one proceeds, the other who is distinct from Him by virtue of the fact that He does not likewise proceed but is begotten cannot proceed together with Him. Hence, God's oneness does not necessitate the above consequence, because [that consequence] is opposed by the plurality which arises from the begottenness and the procession. For even if the Son and the Holy Spirit were not more than one for some *other* reason, they would be different for *this* reason alone. But when I say that from the fact of the Father's being one God with the Son or with the Holy Spirit it follows that either the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or the

Holy Spirit exists from the Son, I do not generate here a plurality which opposes the consequence of oneness. For I do not say that both alternates are true but only that one or the other is.

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

## 2

Perhaps the Greeks will deny that the Holy Spirit is God from God (as the Son is God from God) since through this doctrine we prove that the Holy Spirit exists and proceeds from the Son, and since it is not set forth in that creed wherein we are blamed by the Greeks for having added the Holy Spirit's procession from the Son. But anyone who denies this, denies either (1) that the Father, from whom the Holy Spirit exists, is God, or (2) that the Holy Spirit, who exists from the Father, is God, or (3) that the essence of the Holy Spirit exists from the Father. But no Christian denies that the Father or that the Holy Spirit is God. Let us see, then, whether what the Holy Spirit is essentially, He is from the Father. (I have noticed that a certain bishop in the city of Bari—a bishop

---

<sup>1</sup>Galatians 4:6.

who perhaps favors the Greeks—is unwilling to assent to this proposition.) Now, if it were not the case that what the Holy Spirit is essentially, He is from the Father, then since He is one and the same God as the Father, there could not be found a reason for His being distinct from the Father. For the reason the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Father is not that the Father has a son whereas the Holy Spirit does not have a son. Through this fact they can be *shown* to be different from each other; nevertheless, this fact is not the *reason* they are different persons. Indeed, suppose that there are two men, one of whom has a son and the other of whom does not. Although through this fact they can be shown to be different from each other, nevertheless this fact is not the reason they are different from each other. For no matter what their state is with regard to whether they have or do not have a son, they do not lose their differentiation. Thus, in the case of the Father and the Holy Spirit the fact that the one has a son whereas the other does not is not the reason they are different; rather, because they are different nothing prevents them from being unlike with respect to having and not having a son.

We can give a similar response if [the Holy Spirit] is called distinct [from the Father] because a holy spirit does not proceed from Him, as He Himself proceeds from the Father. Indeed, to speak after the fashion of those who deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son: just as the “fact” that the Son does not have a holy spirit proceeding from Him (as does the Father) is not the reason that the Son is distinct from the Father (for it would follow that if the Holy Spirit were to proceed from the Son, the Son would not be distinct from the Father), so also the reason that the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Father is not that the Holy Spirit does not have a son or a spirit proceeding from Himself, as does the Father. Moreover, just as the reason the Son is distinct from the Father is not that the Son has a father whereas the Father does not have a father (for if the Father were to have a father, He would still be distinct from the Son), so the reason the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Father is not that the Holy Spirit proceeds from someone whereas the Father does not proceed from anyone (for if the Father were to proceed from someone, the Holy Spirit would nonetheless be distinct from the Father, from whom He proceeds). Therefore, it is evident that the reason the Holy Spirit is distinct

from the Father is not (1) that He has no son or spirit proceeding from Himself, as does the Father, and is not (2) that He proceeds from someone, whereas the Father proceeds from no one.

If the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Father, He cannot be understood to be distinct from the Father simply by virtue of being the spirit of the Father. For someone can be understood to be distinct from another before he is of that other, although he cannot be of that other unless he is distinct [from him]. For example, when one man is said to be the lord of some other man or to be the vassal of another man, he is understood to be distinct from the other, of whom he is said to be, *before* he is his lord or his vassal. So then, if the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Father, nothing prevents Him from being understood to be distinct from the Father *before* He is of the Father. Hence, the fact that He is the spirit of the Father does not make Him distinct from the Father unless He is distinct from the Father for the very reason for which He is the spirit of the Father, just as the Son is distinct from the Father for the very reason for which He is the Son of the Father—a reason which is no other than that the Son exists from the Father by being begotten. Thus, we see that the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Father only because He has His essence from the Father—although He has it in a way distinctly other than [the way in which] the Son [has His essence from the Father].

But let us examine this matter more closely. Assuredly, either it was after the Holy Spirit was already what He is that He became other than the Father, or it is in the very fact that He exists that He has the reason for His being other. For it happens that someone is what he is *before* he is an “other,” and it happens that someone becomes an “other” in the very fact that he exists. But it is not possible for someone to be an “other” before he is that which he is. For example, the first human being—before there was any human being from him—was himself a human being; but he was not an “other.” But when first someone existed from him: this one from whom someone existed became, after he was already existing, an “other”; and that one who existed from him had, simultaneously, both his existing and his being other. Therefore, as I said, either the Holy Spirit after He was already existing became other than the Father, or else in the very fact of existing He has the reason for which He is called other. Now, if after He was al-

ready existing, it came about that He became other than the Father, then since He is *another* person only because He is other than the Father, these three persons would not always have existed; for just as the Holy Spirit would not always have been other than the Father, so the person of the Holy Spirit would not always have existed. Therefore, since these consequences are false, it is evident that in the very fact of existing the Holy Spirit has the reason for His being other [than the Father].

Now, the Holy Spirit is not able to exist except either from someone (as does the Son) or from no one (as does the Father). But if He exists from no one, as does the Father, [then an alternative arises]: either (1) each of the two so exists through Himself that neither has anything from the other, and the Father and the Holy Spirit are two gods; or (2), if each exists from no one, then since they are one God there can be found in the Christian faith no principle at all whereby they are distinct from each other, but the Father and the Holy Spirit are identical and are one person. But true faith abhors these consequences. Therefore, it is not true that the Holy Spirit exists from no one. Now, if He exists from someone He exists only from God, who is Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit cannot exist from the Holy Spirit, for no person can exist from himself. Hence, if someone denies that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son, He cannot deny that He exists from the Father.

Yet, if someone claims that although the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Father He can nevertheless be understood to be distinct [from the Father] on the basis of procession, then I think I must also reply to this claim, lest with regard to the question at hand an objection which our response does not successfully cope with can be raised against our assertion. And since that man whom I perceived not to think that the Holy Spirit has His essence from the Father was of no small authority among his own, and since I did not then have the opportunity to make a reply, let no one be surprised that I am dwelling so long on this topic. Accordingly, if someone wants to maintain that although the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Father He is distinct from the Father solely by virtue of procession: he understands "proceeding from the Father" to mean merely being given or sent by the Father (so that only when the Father gives or sends the Holy Spirit

does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father); or else [he understands] “proceeding [from the Father]” to mean existing from the Father.

Now, if “proceeding” meant being given or sent, then it would be as true that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as that He proceeds from the Father, since He is likewise given and sent by the Son. Similarly, if for the Holy Spirit to proceed were nothing else than for Him to be given or sent, then He would be distinct from the Father and would proceed from the Father only when He is given or sent—something which no one, it seems to me, takes to be the case. For the Holy Spirit is always—even prior to the creation—distinct from the Father. However, He is given or sent only to creatures. And yet, it must not be said that to be given or sent happens (*accidat*) to Him. Since the Holy Spirit is omnipresent and immutable: something indeed happens to the one who receives Him, since with respect to that one there happens something which was not previously the case and something which is able not to happen; but nothing which was not already the case happens with respect to the Holy Spirit. For example, when a blind man situated in the light does not perceive the light, nothing is added to or subtracted from the light; and if after his blindness has been removed the blind man perceives the light, there is a change in him, not in the light. Clearly, then, it is not the case that the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Father by means of a procession which is construed to be such that for Him to proceed is nothing else than for Him to be given or sent. Therefore, it is evident that by means of procession He *exists* from the Father and is thereby distinct from the Father, even as the Son is distinct from the Father by virtue of no other fact than that He exists from the Father. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is God from God and proceeds from God, because He Himself is God and because the Father, from whom He exists and proceeds, is God.

But if we say that two processions of the Holy Spirit can be distinguished—one when He exists from the Father, the other when He is given or sent—I do not think that this ought to be denied, provided each is understood in its proper sense. Indeed, we rightly understand the Lord to have been speaking about that procession by which the Holy Spirit is given or sent, [when He said]: “The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it and



do not know whence it comes and whither it goes.”<sup>1</sup> For, as we see, this statement could have been made as follows: “You do not know whence the Holy Spirit proceeds or whither He recedes.” For when He is given, He comes and proceeds as from concealment; and when He is withdrawn, He goes and recedes as into concealment. With regard to this procession it can be said that for the Holy Spirit to proceed is the same thing as for Him to be sent.

Consequently, whether (1) the Holy Spirit proceeds only by existing from the Father, or whether (2) He proceeds only when He is given or sent to sanctify creatures, or whether (3) He proceeds in both ways: it follows that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. For if (1') He exists from the Father, He is God from God; and from this fact He is proved (as I have already said) to exist and to proceed from the Son also. (For, indeed, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the one from whom He exists, and He exists from the one from whom He proceeds.) But if (2') the Holy Spirit proceeds only when He is given or sent, He proceeds from the Son, by whom He is given and sent. But if (3') He proceeds in both ways, then He is known to proceed from the Son in both ways equally.

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

But [the Greeks] will maintain: “When the Creed states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, then since the Father is God, the Creed sufficiently signifies that the Holy Spirit exists and proceeds from God.” And in like manner we maintain: When the Creed says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from God, then since the Son is God, the Creed indicates plainly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Now, I ask whether the reason the Holy Spirit must be understood to exist from the Father is that He exists

---

<sup>1</sup>John 3:8.

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

However, even if someone were to subscribe to this position, it would still follow that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son no less than from the Father. For, assuredly, the relation of father does not exist without the relation of son, even as the relation of son does not exist without the relation of father. So if the one relation does not exist without the other, a thing cannot exist from the relation of father without existing from the relation of son. Hence, if the Holy Spirit exists from the one relation, it will follow that He exists from both relations. Thus, if the Holy Spirit exists from the Father according to relation, He will likewise exist from the Son in this same respect. But since no one is so foolish as to hold this view, we must believe and confess that the reason the Holy Spirit exists from the Father is that He exists from God. But the Son is no less God than is the Father; indeed, the Father and the Son are the one and only true God. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit exists from the Father because He exists from God, who is Father, then since He exists from God, who is Son, He cannot be denied to exist also from the Son.

## 3

Let us also consider what the Lord says in the Gospel. For instance, He says: "But this is eternal life: that they know You, the

only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom You have sent.”<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the phrase “the only true God” must be construed to mean that neither when we name only the Father nor when we name only the Son do we signify the only true God; rather, the only true God is signified only when we speak of the Father and the Son together. Or else the only true God is signified when we name only the Father or name only the Son. But when we name the Father alone or the Son alone: if the only true God were not signified without the addition of the other's name, then the Father would not be perfect God and the Son would not be perfect God, but God would be a composite of Father and Son. But we believe that the Father is the perfect and only true God and that likewise the Son is the perfect and only true God. Therefore, when we name the Father alone or the Son alone, then—if we except the relation by which they are related to each other—we signify nothing other than the same only true God, whom we discern in the uttering of each [name].

Thus, when the Lord said, “This is eternal life: that they know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom You have sent”: had He added, “and the Holy Spirit proceeds from this only true God,” who would dare to separate the Son from that procession, since the Father is neither more nor less this only true God than is the Son? Therefore, if the same only true God is signified when the Father alone or the Son alone is spoken of and when both are named together, what is more clear than that when the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, He proceeds from the only true God, who is Father and Son? Accordingly, just as the Holy Spirit would be understood to proceed from the Son had the Son said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the only true God (when the Son said that He Himself and the Father are the only true God), so when the Son says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, then without doubt He signifies that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself.

## 4

The Lord also says: (1) “The Paraclete—the Holy Spirit—whom the Father will send in my name . . .”<sup>2</sup> and also (2) “When the

<sup>1</sup>John 17:3. <sup>2</sup>John 14:26.

Paraclete comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father ...”<sup>1</sup> Therefore, when He says “whom the Father will send in my name,” how is this to be interpreted? [Does it mean] that the Holy Spirit will have the Son's name, so that when the Father sends the Holy Spirit, it is the same as sending the Son? But His words “whom I shall send to you from the Father” do not admit of this construal—since the Son also sends the same spirit that the Father sends, and the Son does not send the Son. Furthermore, we nowhere read [in Scripture], and we wholly deny, that the Holy Spirit is the Son. So what does “whom the Father will send in my name” mean except that whom the Father will send the Son also will send?—just as when the Son says “whom I shall send from the Father,” nothing else is meant except “I and the Father shall send.” For “Son” is the name of Him who said “the Father will send in my name.” Therefore, “the Father will send in my name” means only “the Father will send in the name of the Son.” Hence, what does “the Father will send in the name of the Son” mean except that the Father will send as if the Son were sending, so that when the Father sends, the Son is understood to send. But how are the Son's words “whom I shall send from the Father” to be interpreted? Assuredly, the Holy Spirit is sent from Him from whom the Son sends Him. Now, the Son sends Him from the Father. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is sent from the Father. But the one from whom the Holy Spirit is sent sends [the Holy Spirit]. Hence, when the Son says “I shall send from the Father,” the Father is understood to send. So what does “I shall send from the Father” mean except “I shall send as if the Father were sending, so that my sending and the Father's sending are one and the same”?

Therefore, the Son shows very carefully that the Father's sending and His own sending are one, so that the Father does not send except when the Son sends, and the Son does not send except when the Father sends. Accordingly, what does the Son want to signify, or what does He want to be understood, except that the Holy Spirit is not related to the Father in one way and to the Son in another way, and that the Holy Spirit is not more [the spirit] of the one than of the other. Hence, it is exceedingly difficult—indeed, it is impossible—to prove that the Holy Spirit does not pro-

---

<sup>1</sup>John 15:26.

ceed from both. For how can the Father and the Son together give and send the Holy Spirit, and how can the Holy Spirit be [the spirit] of both, unless He exists from both? For why does the Son give the Holy Spirit rather than the Holy Spirit giving the Son, or why is the Holy Spirit [the spirit] of the Son rather than the Son's being [the son] of the Holy Spirit, except for the fact that the Son does not exist from the Father and from the Holy Spirit together, as the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and from the Son together? Therefore, if the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Son, let Him not be given by the Son or be said to be of the Son—even as the Son is not given by the Holy Spirit and is not said to be of the Holy Spirit, since He does not exist from the Holy Spirit. But if [the Greeks] say that the Holy Spirit does also send the Son—as the Son Himself says through the prophet:<sup>1</sup> “And now the Lord God and His Spirit have sent me”—this statement must be interpreted to apply to the human nature assumed by the Son, who by the common will and ordinance of the Father and the Holy Spirit appeared in the world and was going to redeem the world.

However, I ask those who deny that the Holy Spirit exists and proceeds from the Son how they interpret His so being the spirit of the Son that the Son sends Him as His own spirit. Do they think that the Father gave His own spirit to the Son, as to one not having [a spirit] from Himself? (For the Son has [a spirit] either from Himself or from another. But He cannot have it from anyone else except from the Father.) In that case, the Son would have received [this spirit] from the Father, from whom He has it, and the Father would have given the Holy Spirit to the Son as to one not having [a spirit] from Himself. At this point let [the Greeks] show (since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are equal, and since each one of them is sufficient unto Himself) what reason there was—or what need the Son had—for the Father to give His own spirit to Him rather than giving His own son to the Holy Spirit. Now, we do not deny that the Son has the Holy Spirit from the Father in the following way: from whom the Son has existence, from him He has the fact that He has a spirit existing from Himself (as does the Father), since the being (*esse*) of the Father and

---

<sup>1</sup>Isaiah 48:16.

of the Son is the same. For it is not the same thing to receive from the Father the essence (*essentia*) from which the Holy Spirit proceeds and to receive from the Father the Holy Spirit. For when the Son is said to have from the Father the essence from which the Holy Spirit proceeds, no need is indicated in the Son. But when it is said that the Son receives from the Father the Holy Spirit, whom He does not have from Himself (as does the Father), we seem to signify that the Son has something less (so to speak) than does the Father and that the Holy Spirit is given to the Son as something supplemental. But it is not apparent why the Son would need the Holy Spirit rather than the Holy Spirit's needing the Son. Suppose that someone were to answer: "The Holy Spirit was given to the Son in order that an equal measure of gratitude would be given to the Son and to the Father, inasmuch as the Son as well as the Father would give the Holy Spirit." This belief that God assists God who is in need, as it were—similarly to a man's assisting a man—is earthy and very far from an understanding of deity. For, indeed, if the Father gives the Holy Spirit to the Son, God gives God to God. For the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God; and they are one and the same God. But we do not understand God to receive God from God unless this is said when God-exists-from-God as Son and as Holy Spirit. Hence, the Holy Spirit is said to be the spirit of the Son for no other reason than that He exists from the Son.

## 5

We read that after the Resurrection the Lord breathed upon His disciples and said to them: "Receive the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> What does this in-breathing signify? For we know that the breath (*flatus*) which at that time proceeded from His mouth was not the Holy Spirit; and we do not believe that the in-breathing occurred without any mystery. Hence, what can be a more accurate or more suitable interpretation here than that He did this so that we would understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him? [It is] as if He had said: "Just as you see that this breath—through which I signify to you the Holy Spirit (imperceptible things being able to be signified by perceptible things)—proceeds from the depth of my

---

<sup>1</sup>John 20:22.

body and from my person, so know that the Holy Spirit, whom I signify to you through this breath, proceeds from the hiddenness of my deity and from my person.” For we believe and confess that the person of the Word and of the man is one, and that in this one person are two natures, viz., a divine nature and a human nature.

But perhaps [the Greeks] will maintain: “Surely this breath was not from His *human substance*; nevertheless He breathed it out as His own breath. Therefore, we are taught by means of such a [symbolic] giving of the Holy Spirit that when the Son gives the Holy Spirit He gives and sends His own spirit but not from His *divine essence*.” Let them say, then—if any hold this opinion—that just as the breath is not the human nature when it is breathed out by a man, so the Holy Spirit is not the divine substance when He is given or sent by God the Son—a view which no Christian confesses. And let them also say—if when we hear that “the heavens were established by the word of the Lord, and by the breath [*spiritus*] of His mouth all their excellence,”<sup>1</sup> they do not deny that here “the breath of the Lord’s mouth” means the Holy Spirit—that the Holy Spirit does not exist from the essence of the Lord (of whose mouth He is called the breath), because the breath (*spiritus*) which customarily proceeds from the mouth of men is not from the substance of the one from whose mouth it proceeds. But if they do not dare to deny that the Spirit of God exists from the essence of God, and if they interpret “words for perceptible things” (i.e., “the breath of His mouth”) to mean that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the hiddenness of the essence of the one of whose mouth He is said to be the breath, then let them also confess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the essence of the one of whose lips He is said to be the breath. For in the prophet we read of Christ that “by the breath of His lips He will slay the wicked one.”<sup>2</sup> Therefore, let [the Greeks] show the difference between “the breath of His mouth” and “the breath of His lips” (something which cannot be done); or else let them concede that the Holy Spirit proceeds equally from Him of whose mouth and from Him of whose lips He is called the breath.

But suppose they maintain that “the breath of His lips” ought

---

<sup>1</sup>Psalms 32:6 (33:6).   <sup>2</sup>Isaiah 11:4.

not at all to be construed there as meaning the Holy Spirit but [ought to be construed as meaning] the words of Christ's preaching (which words He formed in a human manner from that breath of air), since He slays the wicked-one by His words when through His teaching He wards off wickedness from a man. Surely, audible words and perceptible breath do not do this; rather, [it is done by] the Holy Spirit, of whom God says through the prophet: "I shall remove from your flesh the heart of stone and shall give you a heart of flesh. And I shall put my spirit in your midst."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the Holy Spirit slays a wicked man when He converts his heart from wickedness to reverence. But if by "the wicked one" we understand the Antichrist, "whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of His mouth,"<sup>2</sup> I do not think that anyone would attribute that power to the breath of the human voice as much as to the Divine Spirit.

Thus, if the Holy Spirit is signified by these phrases, then since He is called, equally, (1) the breath of the Lord's mouth, by whose (i.e., by the Father's) word the heavens have been established and (2) the breath of the Lord Jesus' mouth, and (3) the breath of Jesus' lips, there is no apparent reason why the Holy Spirit ought to be understood to proceed from the Father's mouth rather than from the Son's mouth. And if we take "Father's mouth" to mean the Father's essence (for His mouth is nothing other than His essence, so that just as the word of the Lord is from His essence, so the breath of His mouth is only from His essence), what is clearer than that just as the breath of the Father's mouth exists and proceeds from the Father's essence, so the breath of the Son's mouth and lips exists and proceeds from the Son's essence? For when the text says "The heavens were established by the word of the Lord, and by the breath of His mouth all their excellence,"<sup>3</sup> no one, I think, will take this to mean simply transitory words and the breath which is taken in from the air and emitted through the mouth of the speaker.

But in whatever way anyone tries to interpret these texts, it suffices that the breathing of the Lord upon His disciples (of which I have made mention) was done in order to signify that the spirit whom He gave proceeded from the hiddenness of this person

---

<sup>1</sup>Ezekiel 36:26-27. <sup>2</sup>II Thessalonians 2:8. <sup>3</sup>Psalms 32:6 (33:6).



from whose hiddenness the breath which He was breathing out was proceeding. Furthermore, when Divine Scripture signifies a hidden thing by means of the likenesses to perceptible things, the things which signify and the things which are signified cannot be alike in all respects; for [otherwise] this would be not a likeness but an identity. Perhaps someone might want to say that that breathing was done in the way it was simply by the wisdom of God, without any spiritual significance; but no one, I deem, is really so senseless as to think this.

## 6

The Son also says about the Holy Spirit: “He will not speak on His own authority, but whatsoever He will hear that will He speak.”<sup>1</sup> What does “He will not speak on His own authority” mean except that what He will speak He will have from someone else? And what does “what He will speak He will have from someone else” mean except that He will have from someone else the knowledge of the things which He will speak? Thus, after the Son says “He will not speak on His own authority,” He adds: “but whatsoever He will hear that will He speak.” What is it for the Holy Spirit to hear except for Him to learn, as it were? And what is it to learn except to receive knowledge? Therefore, if the Holy Spirit's knowledge is nothing other than His essence (*essentia*), then since for Him to speak is the same as for Him to teach, He exists (*habet essentiam*) from the one from whom He hears what He speaks and teaches. Now, the Holy Spirit neither hears nor exists from anyone other than from either the Father or the Son. But if He exists (*habet esse*) from the Father, then according to the argument previously given He also exists from the Son. Accordingly, the Son also says: “He [the Holy Spirit] will glorify me because He will receive from me and will declare unto you.”<sup>2</sup> Indeed, what else does this mean except “He will hear from me (i.e., He will know from me) that which He will declare unto you”?

When the Son said “whatsoever He will hear that will He speak,” He did not specify from whom the Holy Spirit would hear. But when He says “He will receive from me,” He shows clearly that He Himself is the one from whom (just as from the Father) the

---

<sup>1</sup>John 16:13.   <sup>2</sup>John 16:14.

Holy Spirit receives His knowledge and essence. [He shows this] lest anyone should attribute to the Father alone that which the Holy Spirit hears from someone. Now, when the Son says “He will not speak on His own authority, but whatsoever He will hear that will He speak” and declare unto you, the Holy Spirit is signified to exist (*esse*) and to proceed from the one from whom He hears. Similarly, when the Son says “He will receive from me and will declare unto you,” He shows plainly that the Holy Spirit exists (*essentiam habere*) and proceeds from Himself (i.e., from His own essence). For what is not the divine essence is inferior to the Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit does not receive something from that which is inferior to Himself. Therefore, when the Son says “He will receive from me,” He signifies here nothing of His own except His own essence.

## 7

Perhaps [the Greeks] will attempt to interpret otherwise than I have done the statement which the Son made, viz.: “He will receive from me and will declare unto you.”<sup>1</sup> But how will they interpret the passage where [the Son] says: “No one knows the Son except the Father; and not anyone knows the Father except the Son or him to whom the Son chooses to reveal [this knowledge]”?<sup>2</sup> We hear that no one knows the Father or the Son except the Father or the Son and him to whom the Son reveals [this knowledge]. Now, the Son does not mean “no one” in the sense of “no human being”; rather, it is as if He had said: “no one at all.” Indeed, had He meant “no human being” He would not have added the words “except the Father,” because the Father is not a human being. And when He says “not anyone (*quis*) knows the Father,” the monosyllabic word “*quis*” signifies not only any human person but also any person whatsoever. Hence, no one whatsoever has this knowledge except the Father and the Son and him to whom the Son reveals it. Accordingly, either the Holy Spirit does not know the Father and the Son (something which it is impious to suppose), or else the Son reveals to the Holy Spirit the knowledge of Himself and of the Father (which knowledge is nothing except the essence of the Holy Spirit).

But what if [the Greeks] make the following claim?: “As far as

<sup>1</sup>John 16:14. <sup>2</sup>Matthew 11:27.

regards the wording of the text the Son admits no one to this knowledge except Himself, the Father, and him to whom the Son reveals it. Nevertheless, the Holy Spirit must not be said either to be excluded from this knowledge or to receive it from the Son; for the Father and the Son know each other only insofar as they are one with the Holy Spirit. And so, when [the text] says that the Father and the Son know each other, the Holy Spirit must be meant at the same time. And when the Son reveals, He reveals not to the Holy Spirit but to creatures.” If, I repeat, [the Greeks] make this claim, then we immediately and firmly draw the following inference: In a case where Truth clearly denies (according to what the words of His mouth declare) that the Holy Spirit knows the Father and the Son unless the Son reveals this knowledge, [the Greeks] might say that we ought not so much to pay attention to the words as to the oneness of essence which is one and inseparable for the three. If so, then we ought all the more to preserve the consequence of this oneness (a consequence about which I spoke earlier) in the case where no authority (either in writing or in thought) denies this consequence and where no authority sets forth anything which is contrary to it or in any respect opposed to it.

If the Greeks are unwilling openly to resist the truth, then let them choose one of the two alternatives: either (1) the Holy Spirit does not know the Father and the Son unless the Son reveals [this knowledge to Him], or (2) because of the fact that insofar as the Father and the Son know each other they are one with the Holy Spirit, then when they are said to know each other, it follows necessarily that the Holy Spirit is included in this knowledge. Surely, there is no middle course—provided [the Greeks] do not want altogether to take away this knowledge from the Holy Spirit or altogether to take away truth from the words of Truth, both of which things true confession curses. For Truth speaks as follows: “No one knows the Son except the Father; and not anyone knows the Father except the Son and him to whom the Son chooses to reveal [this knowledge].”<sup>1</sup> Now indeed, if they opt for the Holy Spirit's knowing the Father and the Son by means of the Son's revelation, then the Holy Spirit has this knowledge from the Son,

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 11:27.

and this knowledge is, for the Holy Spirit, nothing else than His being. Hence, He exists and proceeds from the Son, since He proceeds from the one from whom He exists. On the other hand, suppose they [opt for] maintaining: when the Father and the Son are said to know each other, then because the essence through which they know each other is the same for the Holy Spirit, it follows that the Holy Spirit shares this knowledge. [In that case], when they read that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, about whom the Son says “I and the Father are one”<sup>1</sup>: let them confess with us, because of the essential identity of the Father and the Son, that the Holy Spirit without doubt proceeds also from the Son.

## 8

Now, when we state that the Son is begotten from the Father and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, someone may make the following objection: that (1) we are establishing grades and intervals (as if the Holy Spirit could not exist unless the Son were first begotten from the Father, so that the Holy Spirit is later than the Son), and thus that (2) it is more correctly said that they both exist equally from the Father—the Son by being begotten and the Holy Spirit by proceeding—so that the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit nor does the Holy Spirit exist from the Son (even as brightness and heat exist equally from the one sun—the brightness not existing from the heat, and the heat not existing from the brightness). If someone makes this objection to our assertion, then we reply [as follows]: We do not posit grades of dignity in God, who is one; nor do we establish intervals in eternity (which is outside of all time) [when we affirm] that the Son exists from the Father or that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son. For all of us who hold the Christian faith confess alike that the Son is neither lesser nor later than the Father (even though the Son exists only from the Father). So also, we who say that the Holy Spirit exists and proceeds from the Son confess that He is neither lesser nor later than the Son. To be sure, although brightness and heat proceed from the sun and are not able to exist unless the sun from which they come exists, nevertheless

---

<sup>1</sup>John 10:30.

we discern nothing earlier or later in these three—viz., in the sun, the brightness, and the heat. Thus, since this holds true in the case of temporal things, how much less in the case of eternity (which is not confined by time) can the previously mentioned three persons be understood, in existing, to be susceptible to an interval.

Now, as for its being said that the Son and the Holy Spirit can so exist from the Father alone that the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit from the Son (even as brightness and heat proceed together from the one sun, so that neither exists from the other): it is wrong to raise this objection against us. For when we say that the Son exists from the Father and that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father, we maintain that God the Son and God the Holy Spirit exist from God the Father, and that these three persons are only one God, and that this very being exists from this very same being itself. But in the case of the sun we do not say, when brightness or when heat exists from the sun, that the sun exists from the sun, or that the sun and what exists from the sun are the same thing, or that the three things are one sun. For if the sun and the brightness were one sun, or if (likewise) the sun and the heat were one sun: it would be necessary for either the brightness to exist from the heat (since it would exist from the whole of the sun, which would be identical with the heat) or the heat to exist from the brightness (since it would exist from [the whole of] the sun, which would not be different from the essence of the brightness).

Nevertheless, let us suppose that the Son and the Holy Spirit exist equally from the Father alone, in the way that heat and brightness exist from the one sun. Now, if this were the case, what basis would those who say this have for affirming that the Holy Spirit is [the spirit] of the Son and denying that the Son is [the son] of the Holy Spirit? For just as there is no reason to admit that the heat is the brightness' [heat] or that the brightness is the heat's [brightness], so truth would not allow that the Holy Spirit is the Son's [spirit] rather than that the Son is the Holy Spirit's [son]. Therefore, if [the Greeks] do not dare to deny that the Holy Spirit is [the spirit] of the Son, let them deny that the Son and the Holy Spirit exist equally from the Father alone in the way that brightness and heat exist from the sun alone. Hence, if they raise against us this objection which I have mentioned regarding the brightness

and heat of the sun, it counts neither for them nor against us.

9

In order not to separate the Son altogether from participating with the Father in the procession of the Holy Spirit, [the Greeks] maintain (as we are told) that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son (*per filium*). But it is not clear how this can be understood to be the case—especially since they nowhere read any text from which they can prove it clearly. Suppose they think that the following text which we read about God supports them: viz., that “all things are from Him and through Him and in Him,”<sup>1</sup> so that (1) the Father is the one from whom all things exist, and the Son is the one through whom all things exist, and the Holy Spirit is the one in whom all things exist, and so that (2) the Holy Spirit is included among all the things which exist through the Son. Now, indeed, we accept without scruple the view that all things exist from the Father and through the Son and in the Holy Spirit. But it is exceedingly difficult to maintain that the Holy Spirit is included among all the things which the apostle states to exist through the Son. For it is impossible to include any one of the three persons among all these things and to exclude the other two. But if it were the case that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are among all the things which exist from the Father and through the Son and in the Holy Spirit, let a rational mind behold how much confusion would follow. Therefore, when the apostle says “All things are from Him and through Him and in Him,” surely we ought to understand [“all things” to mean] all divinely created things—which exist from God and through Him and in Him as one thing exists from another thing and through another and in another. For whatever has been created is not identical with God but is other than God. However, the Holy Spirit is not something other than God but is the same being as the Father and the Son.

Assuredly, no other way can be discerned by means of which they can show that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, as they say. Now, the Father and the Son do not differ in oneness of deity; and the Holy Spirit proceeds only from

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 11:36.

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

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

[The Greeks] will ask:

Just as we say that all things were created by the Father *through* the Word, which is the Son, why can we not also say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son? For when the Father creates through His word, He creates through no other than through what He Himself is—viz., through the essential power which is the same as the Word's—and yet He is said to create through the Word. Why can we not say likewise that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Word, since He proceeds from the Father only from and through what is common to the Father and the Son (even though the Holy Spirit proceeds not as does creation but as that which proceeds from itself)?

Let us see what follows if we make the foregoing claim; and let there be peace between us. Assuredly, what has been created by the Father through the Word has been created by the Word. For,

indeed, the Word says: "Whatever the Father does, this the Son also likewise does."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, let us say that He proceeds also likewise from the Son, even as what has been created by the Father through the Word has been created likewise by the Word. Or do [the Greeks] perhaps judge that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son in the way that a lake is said to exist from a spring through a river, when a spring flows into a river and the river accumulates into a lake? Now, in this example the river is not in the spring but is outside the spring, whereas the Son is in the Father and not outside the Father. Therefore, it is not the case that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father through the Son in the way that a lake exists from a spring through a river. Nevertheless, even if it were the case, then even though the Holy Spirit existed from the Father through the Son, He could not be denied to exist from the Son—just as even though the lake exists from the spring through the river, it must be said to exist from the river. For if anyone denies that the lake exists from the river simply because the river first exists from the spring, then let him say that he exists from Adam and not from his own father, since through his own father he exists from Adam. Let him also deny—on the ground that they first existed from Adam—that the Son of the Virgin exists from Mary and from David and from Abraham. And let him claim to be false what was said to Abraham, viz., "In your seed all nations will be blessed," and what was said to David, viz., "From the fruit of your loins I will place one upon your throne," and what was said to Mary, viz., "Blessed is the fruit of your womb."<sup>2</sup> And let him say that Christ is the seed or the fruit of Adam and not of them, since they descend from Adam. But according to this line of reasoning the Son of the Virgin is not even from Adam but is from the clay from which Adam was created.

But [the Greeks] will reason as follows:

Although the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son (just as you say that the lake exists from the spring and from the river), we are correct in saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Son but from the Father through the Son. For, indeed, the dispute between us

---

<sup>1</sup>John 5:19. <sup>2</sup>Genesis 22:18. Psalms 131:11 (132:11). Luke 1:42.



is over the word “procession”: you affirm and we deny that the [Holy Spirit's] procession is from the Son. For, lo, you see that the river proceeds from the spring as from its source of origin. But even though the lake exists from the river, it does not proceed from the river; rather it accumulates from the river. So, then, even if the Holy Spirit exists from the Son, He is not properly said to proceed from the Son but is properly said to proceed from the Father, as from His source.

Perhaps this reasoning would be correct if in being begotten from the Father the Son proceeded outside the Father, and if there were then a small spatial interval, and if the Holy Spirit were understood to exist from the Father before existing from the Son. For the river flowing from the spring proceeds outside the spring and after an interval accumulates into a lake; and the lake exists from the spring before existing from the river, and thus the lake exists from the spring through the river, not from the river through the spring. But in being begotten from the Father, the Son does not pass outside the Father but remains within Him and does not differ from the Father spatially or temporally or essentially; moreover, that from which the Holy Spirit proceeds is one and the same for the Father and the Son. Therefore, it cannot be comprehended, and it ought not to be said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father but not from the Son. Hence, there is no apparent reason to say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son but proceeds from the Father *through* the Son. For even if He [proceeds] *through* the Son, He cannot avoid [proceeding] *from* the Son.

Nevertheless, what if someone—in order not to concede that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, from whom He exists (as a lake exists from a river)—wants to say that the Son proceeds more properly from the Father than the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, even though the Holy Spirit exists from the Son? (For the river seems to him to proceed more properly from the spring than the lake proceeds from the river.) Well, we do not deny that the one who is begotten does proceed in a certain respect from the one from whom he is begotten. And we affirm that the Holy Spirit in His unique way proceeds not as from two springs but truly from one spring. He proceeds in such way, however, that the Son's procession does not lose, and the Holy Spirit's procession does not acquire, the name “begottenness.” Therefore, there is no reason why the Son ought to be said to proceed from the Father

rather than the Holy Spirit's being said to proceed from the Son.

Let us consider more carefully how the lake exists equally from the spring and the river, so that we may recognize by means of this example—inasmuch as what is eternal can be understood by means of something spatial and temporal—that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son. For as I wrote to Pope Urban (of venerable memory) in my letter on *The Incarnation of the Word*, we find in the examination of these three many things which apply, by virtue of a certain likeness, to the one God and the three persons. It is evident that what is called the spring and the river and the lake is one and the same water, not three waters, even though the spring, the river, and the lake are three. So let us distinguish between the spring and the river and the lake, and let us see why these separate things, although they are three, are understood to be one water. Indeed, in the spring the water bubbles up from the depths; in the river it flows down from the spring; in the lake it accumulates and remains. Therefore, “spring” signifies water bubbling forth from the depths; “river” signifies that the water flows from the spring; and “lake” signifies that the water accumulates there. However, we see that the river does not exist from that with respect to which the water is called a spring; instead it exists from that which the spring is, viz., from water. And the lake does not exist from that with respect to which the water is called a spring or a river; instead, it exists from the water itself, which is one and the same water in the spring and the river.

Therefore, the lake does not exist from that in virtue of which the spring and the river are different but exists from that in virtue of which they are one. Thus, if the spring is no more that from which the lake exists than is the river, the lake cannot be understood to exist from the spring rather than from the river. Similarly, then, when God is called Father or Son or Holy Spirit, one essence and one God is understood to be present in these three; and the name “God” signifies this essence. But “Father” signifies the one who begets, “Son” the one who is begotten, and “Holy Spirit” the one who proceeds in a unique and ineffable manner. Therefore, just as the lake does not exist from that in virtue of which the spring and the river differ from each other but exists from the water, in virtue of which they are one, so the Holy Spirit does not exist from that in virtue of which the Father and the Son differ

from each other but exists from the divine essence, in virtue of which they are one. Therefore, if the Father is no more that from which the Holy Spirit exists than is the Son, we cannot understand why the Holy Spirit would exist from the Father rather than from the Son.

## 10

But if [the Greeks] argue that the Holy Spirit cannot exist from two causes or two sources, then we make the following reply. Just as we believe that the Holy Spirit exists not from that in virtue of which the Father and the Son are two but from that in virtue of which they are one, so we say not that He has two sources but that He has one source. Indeed, when we call God the source of creation, we understand the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be one source, not three sources; similarly, although the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are three, [we understand them to be] one creator and not three creators. For the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the source or the creator through that in virtue of which they are one, not through that in virtue of which they are three. Therefore, although the Father is the source and the Son is the source and the Holy Spirit is the source, there are not three sources but is one source. Similarly, when the Holy Spirit is said to exist from the Father and the Son, He exists not from two sources but from one source, which is Father and Son—even as He exists from one God, who is Father and Son (if God can properly be said to have a cause or a source).

Indeed, a source is seen to be [the source] only of a thing's beginning, and a cause is seen to be [the cause] only of an effect. But the Holy Spirit never began to exist; nor is He the effect of anything. What begins to exist advances from not-being to being; and the word "effect" is seen to be properly applied to something which is brought about. However, since it is true that the Son exists from the Father and that the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son: then—provided it is taken in a certain unique and ineffable sense, because otherwise it cannot be asserted—the Father can acceptably be called the source (in some sense) of the Son, and the Father and the Son can be called the source of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, we do not acknowledge two sources—the one source being the Father in relation to the

Son and the other source being the Father and the Son in relation to the Holy Spirit—just as we do not believe that the Father, from whom the Son exists, is one God and that the Father and Son, from whom the Holy Spirit exists, is another God. Yet, each of them exists in His own way from the same God and from the same source. The one exists by being begotten; the other exists by proceeding—provided this procession is construed in a certain unique and ineffable manner. For procession is spoken of in many ways; of these ways this one is understood to be unique, even as the Son's begottenness is recognized to be unique. This same thing is understood to be the case if we say (1) that the Father is the cause of the Son and (2) that the Father and the Son are the cause of the Holy Spirit. For we cannot say that there are two causes—viz., the cause of the Son and the cause of the Holy Spirit—but [can speak only of] one cause, just as there are not two gods but is one God, from whom the Son and the Holy Spirit exist.

## 11

Someone may ask: “At the time the Lord used the words ‘When the Paraclete—the Spirit of Truth—comes, who proceeds from the Father...’<sup>1</sup> why did He not add ‘and from the Son’ or ‘and from me’ if He meant for it to be interpreted in this way?” But in His sayings it is not unusual that when He attributes something as if to the Father alone or to Himself alone or to the Holy Spirit alone, He intends for what is said in the case of the one to be understood to hold true in the case of the other two as well. For instance, when He says “Blessed are you, Simon bar Jona, because flesh and blood has not revealed it to you but my father who is in Heaven,”<sup>2</sup> must not the Son and the Holy Spirit be understood to have revealed together with the Father? For since the Father does not reveal with respect to the fact that He is Father but with respect to the fact that He is God, and since the Son and the Holy Spirit are this same God, it follows that what the Father reveals the Son and the Holy Spirit also reveal. Likewise, the Son says “No one knows the Son except the Father; and not anyone knows the Father except the Son and him to whom the Son chooses to reveal [this knowledge]”<sup>3</sup>—

---

<sup>1</sup>John 15:26. <sup>2</sup>Matthew 16:17. <sup>3</sup>Matthew 11:27.

as if only the Son knew and revealed the Father and Himself, and as if only the Father knew the Son. [When he says this], we must take it to mean that revealing and knowing are common to the three persons; for the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit know and reveal with respect to the fact that they are one, not with respect to the fact that they are distinct from one another.

Moreover, when the Son says that the Father knows the Son and that the Son knows the Father and reveals Himself and the Father, clearly He intends for it to be understood that the Father knows the Holy Spirit and that the Son knows and reveals the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit, too, is the very same thing that the Father and the Son are. Likewise, when the Son says “He who sees me sees the Father also,”<sup>1</sup> the Holy Spirit must not be excluded; for he who sees *that* with respect to which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one cannot see one of these three without seeing the other two. Furthermore, the Son says to the Apostles regarding the Holy Spirit: “When He, the Spirit of Truth, comes He will teach you all truth”<sup>2</sup>—as if only the Holy Spirit would teach all truth, although in fact He does not teach all truth independently of the Father and independently of the Son. For it is not with respect to the fact that He is someone's spirit (viz., the Father and the Son's spirit) but with respect to the fact that He is one with the Father and the Son (i.e., with respect to the fact that He is God) that He teaches all truth.

So do you see how, in the examples I have presented, what the Son attributes as if to one person alone cannot be excluded from the other two persons? In Sacred Scripture we read many texts of this kind, so that what is said of one person singularly is understood to apply to all three indifferently. For whatever is said of one person should be understood to hold true of the other two as well—except when that in virtue of which they are distinct from one another (as I said) is known to oppose it. Consequently, when we believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father: since God exists from God (i.e., since the Holy Spirit's essence exists from the Father's essence, which is understood to be common to the three), we must also confess that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son if the Son does not exist from the Holy Spirit. For the Holy

---

<sup>1</sup>John 14:9. <sup>2</sup>John 16:13.

Spirit exists from that which the Son is and which the Father is.

But someone will say:

Because what we read in one place about one of them alone is elsewhere clearly indicated to hold true of the other two, we know (1) that the Son and the Holy Spirit reveal what the Father alone is said to reveal, (2) that the Father and the Holy Spirit reveal and know what the Son alone is said to do, and (3) that the Father and the Son teach what the Holy Spirit alone is promised to be going to teach. But when [the Lord] says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, we do not read elsewhere that He proceeds from the Son. Hereby we are cautioned against asserting by our own discretion that which has nowhere [in Scripture] been stated.

To this argument we reply: It is rather the case that by means of those things which have thus been said, we are taught to understand similarly, in similar sayings, those things which have been left unsaid. This is especially the case where we see very clearly that the things which are not said follow by rational necessity (and without any other rational considerations contradicting them) from the things which are said. For when the Lord says to the Father: “This is eternal life: that they know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom You have sent,”<sup>1</sup> ought we to exclude the Holy Spirit from this health-giving and life-giving knowledge simply because we nowhere read: “This is eternal life: that they know the Father, the only true God, and also the Holy Spirit,” or “This is eternal life: that they know the Son, the only true God, and also the Holy Spirit”? Or when we read “Just as the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted to the Son to have life in Himself”<sup>2</sup> shall we deny that the Holy Spirit has from the Father, from whom He exists, the fact of having life in Himself (as the Father and the Son have) simply because the Son nowhere says this about the Holy Spirit (as He does say it about Himself)? Moreover, when He says “The Father is in me and I in the Father”<sup>3</sup> and “He who sees me sees the Father also”<sup>4</sup>: shall we deny (1) that the Holy Spirit is in the Father and the Son and that the Father and the Son are in the Holy Spirit, or (2) that He who sees the Son sees the Holy Spirit as well as seeing the Father—if these statements are not read in the same passage in which they are made about the Father and the Son?

---

<sup>1</sup>John 17:3. <sup>2</sup>John 5:26. <sup>3</sup>John 14:10-11. <sup>4</sup>John 14:9.

Rather, since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same God, then when eternal life is said to consist in knowing the Father and the Son—the only true God—the Holy Spirit must be taken to be inseparably included in this knowledge. And when we read that “as the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted to the Son to have life in Himself,” we ought not to think that this life is alien to the Holy Spirit or that the Holy Spirit does not have it in Himself. And when we hear “The Father is in me and I in the Father” and “He who sees me sees the Father also”: we ought to know, by means of what is thus said, that the Holy Spirit is not outside the Father and the Son, that the Father and the Son are not outside the Holy Spirit, and that in seeing the Son one sees the Holy Spirit as well as the Father. For as the Father is not one God, the Son another God, and the Holy Spirit still another God, so God does not have within Himself anything other than God, and God does not exist outside of God, and God is not unlike God.

Moreover, where in the Prophets or the Gospels or the Apostles do we read in these very words that the one God is three persons, or that the one God is a trinity, or that God exists from God? Not even in that creed in which the [doctrine of ] the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is *not* set forth do we find the word “person” or “trinity.” Nevertheless, since these statements follow very clearly from the statements we do read, we steadfastly believe them in our hearts and confess them with our mouths. Therefore, we ought to accept with certainty not only those things which we read in Sacred Scripture but also the statements which follow from them by rational necessity and which no other rational considerations contradict.

## 12

Although what has already been said above can suffice, I will add still another consideration on the basis of which the Holy Spirit is known to exist from the Son. The Greeks confess with us that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father and the spirit of the Son. Therefore, I ask whether they understand Him to be the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father and the spirit of the Son in the same way or in different ways. Now, it is certain that He is not called God's spirit in the sense of [God's]

possession—as, for example, when a horse is called someone's [horse] or when a house is called someone's [house]. For the one who possesses is greater than what is possessed. But God is not greater than the Holy Spirit—because the Holy Spirit is God, and God is not greater than God. Nor is the Holy Spirit called God's spirit in the sense of being God's member—as a man's hand or foot [is a man's member]. For God does not have a member or any part. In what sense, then, is the Holy Spirit to be understood to be the spirit of God except in the sense that what He is He is from God? Now, the name “Father” signifies nothing other than either God who is the Father or else the Father's relation to the Son, from which relation He has the name “Father.” A similar thing must be said about the Son. For, indeed, what is understood by the name “Son” except either God who is the Son or else the relation by which the Son is related to the Father and because of which He is called the Son? But anyone with sense comprehends that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father or of the Son not with respect to the fact that the one is the Father and the other is the Son but with respect to the fact that both are one and the same God. Therefore, when the Holy Spirit is called the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father and the spirit of the Son, the signification is the same.

Now, the Holy Spirit is called the spirit of God and the spirit of the Father because He exists and proceeds from God and from the Father. Thus, He exists and proceeds also from the Son, because He is called the spirit of the Son in this same sense. Now, when the Holy Spirit is called the spirit of God and the spirit of the Lord: if we do not there understand “spirit of the Son” in the same sense as “spirit of the Father,” then either we will be excluding the Son from being called God and Lord, or else “the spirit of God” or “the spirit of the Lord” will be understood to have a twofold sense. But from where do [the Greeks] get this latter view? Or—when we read “the spirit of God” or “the spirit of the Lord”—where in Sacred Scripture do we read something which is not understood in the same sense regarding the Father and regarding the Son? Or what do we find from which this conclusion follows? Suppose [the Greeks] say: “When the Holy Spirit is called the spirit of the Father, this is understood in two ways, for He is the spirit of the Father both because He exists from the Father and



because He is given by the Father; but He is the spirit of the Son only because He is given by the Son.” This is the view about which I am asking: where do they get it? Suppose they answer: “This view is not stated in any authentic passage [of Scripture], and it does not follow from what is written in Scripture.” Well, then, when we say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son: since we recognize that this doctrine follows of necessity from that which they read and believe, why do they find fault with us on the ground that they do not read these words in Scripture?

Therefore, let [the Greeks] themselves judge which one of the following views ought to be adopted, even though the Sacred Page does not say anything about either: (1) our view that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son (a view which we prove to follow from those things which we rightly believe); or (2) their view that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father in one way and the spirit of the Son in another (a view which they cannot prove either by authority or by reason or from things which are certain). If indeed they say (as I hear) that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Son in a way different from His being the spirit of the Father: assuredly, either they ought to cease holding this view since they nowhere read it itself or anything else from which to prove it; or at least they ought not to reproach us, who say (even though we do not read this in these very words) that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, for we demonstrate that this view follows from those things which we believe equally [with them]. Now, if they cease making this assertion, let them believe equally with us that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father and—in the same sense—of the Son, and let them recognize that He proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father. And if they cease to reproach us, let them acknowledge with us the basis upon which they know that we ought not to be reproached.

## 13

[The Greeks] reproach us for having added, in that creed which both we and they equally accept and affirm, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. And they ask why this addition was made, and why it was not first shown to their church, so that what needed to be added could be considered jointly and could be added

by mutual consent. To this reproach, however, we have a sufficient reply. For if we are asked why it was done, we say: It needed [to be done] on account of certain men, lacking understanding, who did not see to be contained among the things which the universal church believes, [the doctrine] that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and who did not see that the doctrine follows from the things believed. [It needed to be done] in order that these men would not, perchance, hesitate to believe this doctrine. Just how necessary this addition was is recognized by reference to those who deny this doctrine simply because it was not placed in the Creed. Therefore, since need urged this addition and since no rational consideration prevented it and since true faith allowed it, the Latin Church faithfully asserted what it knew ought to be believed and confessed. For we know that not all the things that we ought to believe and confess have been recorded there. Nor did those who composed this Creed intend for the Christian faith to be content to believe and confess only those things which they set down in it. For to mention only one instance: in the Creed the Lord is not said to have descended into Hell—a doctrine which, nonetheless, both we and the Greeks believe. But if they say that a creed fixed by such great authority ought not at all to have been corrupted, we do not judge to be a corruption a case where we add nothing contrary to what has already been stated therein. And although we can defend this addition as not being a corruption, still if someone wants to insist contentiously that it is a corruption, we reply that we have not corrupted the Creed but have added something new. For with the Greeks we keep and venerate intact the version translated in accordance with the nature of the Greek text. But the version which we regularly use in the hearing of the people, we publish with the above addition as prescribed by the Latin tradition.

Now, as for the question why this addition was not made with the consent of the Greek Church, we answer: (1) it was especially difficult for the Latins to gather the Greek bishops for consultation on this matter, and (2) it was not necessary for the Latins to call into question that about which they had no doubt. For what church is there which, extended throughout a single kingdom, is not permitted to establish in accordance with right faith something which is usefully read and sung in the assembly of the people?

How much more, then, the Latins were permitted to proclaim steadfastly that doctrine agreed upon by all the nations and kingdoms using the Latin language!

## 14

Let us briefly summarize what we have accomplished above on the basis of many considerations. By incontestable reasoning we have established that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son (as well as from the Father) and that, nevertheless, the Holy Spirit exists not as from two different [sources] but as from one [source]. For the Holy Spirit exists from the Father and the Son's oneness—i.e., from their deity—and not from that in virtue of which they are distinct from each other. But God, from whom the Holy Spirit exists, is Father and Son; therefore, the Holy Spirit is truly said to exist from the Father and from the Son, who are two. Now, the Father is not earlier or later than the Son, or greater or lesser; and the one is God neither more nor less than is the other. Consequently, the Holy Spirit does not exist from the Father before existing from the Son, or from the Son before existing from the Father; nor is He greater or lesser as He exists from the Father than as He exists from the Son; nor does He exist more or less from the one than from the other. For suppose He existed earlier or later from, were greater or lesser [as He exists from], or existed more or less from, the one than from the other. Then, of necessity, it would follow that either (1) the Holy Spirit would not exist from that in virtue of which the Father and the Son are one or else that (2) this oneness would not be perfectly and absolutely one but would contain some diversity from which would occur the difference which I said the Holy Spirit [would have] in existing from this oneness. But it cannot be denied that the Holy Spirit exists from that in virtue of which the Father and the Son are one, for otherwise He would not exist from God. And it ought not to be believed that in this oneness there is anything with respect to which there is any diversity. Therefore, it is not the case that the Holy Spirit exists earlier or later from, is greater or lesser [as He exists from], or exists more or less from, the Father than from the Son or from the Son than from the Father. For it is not possible for one and the same Holy Spirit, who exists once and as a whole

from God as a whole, to exist in greater or lesser degree from the one and supremely simple God.

But if it is said that the Holy Spirit exists principally from the Father—as if He existed from the Father more than from the Son—then it must not be said in such way that any one of the aforesaid differences is understood to be present. But since that which the Son is He has from the Father, it is not unacceptable to assert that the Son has from the Father, from whom He exists, the fact that the Holy Spirit exists from Him. Nevertheless, the Son so exists from the Father that He is in every respect the same thing as the Father and is one and the same God as the Father. Thus, just as the sole and simple God cannot be greater or lesser than Himself, nor earlier or later than Himself, and just as He has no diversity within Himself, so the Son is neither earlier nor later, neither greater nor lesser, than is the Father. Nor does the Son have in Himself anything different from the Father; rather, just as the Son has it from the Father to exist perfectly, so He has it from the Father to be equal and similar to the Father in every respect—indeed, to be the very same thing [as is the Father]. Hence, just as although the Son exists from the Father, the Son is no less God than is the Father, so although the Son has from the Father the fact that the Holy Spirit exists from Him, the Holy Spirit exists no less from the Son than from the Father. For insofar as the Son is one and the same God as the Father—i.e., insofar as the Son is God—He is not distinct from the Father and does not have any dissimilarity. For the Father is not one God and the Son another God, nor are they dissimilarly that which they are; rather, the one is distinct from the other insofar as the one is the Father and the other is the Son. And just as the Son is not a God other than the Father, so with respect to the fact that the Son is God He does not have anything from any other than from Himself.

Now, when we say that God exists from God and that the Son exists from the Father, we construe this to mean not that one God exists from another God but that the same God exists from the same God—even though we say “The one exists from the other,” i.e., that the Son exists from the Father. For (as was said earlier) just as in accordance with the name signifying oneness God receives no diversity, so in accordance with the names signifying that God exists from God, necessarily He admits of plurality. There-

fore, if it is said that the Holy Spirit exists principally from the Father, nothing else is signified than that the Son, from whom the Holy Spirit exists, has from the Father the fact that the Holy Spirit exists from Him—since that which the Son is He has from the Father. There is no parallel here with the case of created things, where when we assert that something exists principally, we intend to signify that what is said to exist principally is greater than that other to which it is compared. For example, when a steward of some lord feeds, by the lord's command, the members of the household, the lord principally and more than the steward is rightly said to feed the household. For it is not the case that all the things which are the lord's are equally the steward's, as it is the case that whatever is the Father's is equally the Son's.

Perhaps someone will marvel and ask: "How can it be comprehended that one thing exists from another without the other from which it exists somehow existing more principally and more valuably, and without the thing which exists from this other somehow existing inferiorly and as something secondary? [Is this not] especially the case when that which exists from something else is seen to need, in order to exist, the other from which it exists, though that other from which it exists does not at all need this thing which exists from it?" To this query we must reply: Just as the existence of God is vastly different and diverse from created existence, so when we say that God exists from God by being begotten and by proceeding, this begottenness and this procession must be understood in a far different way from when, in other cases, we say that something proceeds or is begotten. For in the case of God neither naturally nor temporally nor in any respect is anything earlier or later, more or less, or at all in need of anything. Rather, the whole of what God is is not so much equal to and similar to and co-eternal with itself as it is identical with itself and altogether sufficient unto itself through itself; in the case of God nothing proceeds or is begotten in the sense of passing from not-being to being. Therefore, just as our intellect cannot pass beyond eternity in order to pass judgment on God's source, so to speak, so it cannot and ought not to conceive of or to judge God's begottenness and procession after the likeness of creation. Now, [in God] that which is begotten or that which proceeds is no other than that from which it proceeds or is begotten, viz., the

one and only God. Consequently, just as God is not greater or lesser than Himself: so in the case of the three (viz., the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit) there is not anything greater or lesser; and no one of them is what He is any more or less than is another of them, even though it is true that God exists from God by proceeding and by being begotten.

Behold! We have seen from how much truth and by how great a necessity it follows that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Now, if [this doctrine] is false, then either one or more of the premises from which we said that it follows is false (a consequence which goes against the Christian faith which we affirm with the Greeks), or else we have not argued consistently. But it cannot be shown [that we have argued inconsistently]. Thus, if [this doctrine] is false, the Christian faith is destroyed. Moreover, to someone with understanding, it is obvious that if [this doctrine] is assumed to be false, no truth follows from it. Now, let us also consider what happens when [this doctrine] is propounded as true. Surely, if it is true that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, it follows (1) that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Son as well as of the Father and (2) that He is sent and given by the Son as well as by the Father (both of which things Divine Authority teaches and from which things no falsity at all follows). So, on the one hand, to deny [the doctrine of ] the procession of the Holy Spirit leads to such great falsehood that (contrary to the Christian faith) it destroys the premises from which we have shown this [doctrine of] procession to follow, and it begets no truth. And, on the other hand, to affirm [this doctrine] establishes very much truth (as we have shown) and does not entail any falsehood at all. Accordingly, let a rational mind ask itself on what rational basis it could exclude from the Christian faith this [doctrine of] procession.

Moreover, if it is an error to believe in the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, then Divine Authority itself leads us into this error when it teaches us both the premises from which the [doctrine of] procession follows and those conclusions which follow from it. And Divine Authority nowhere either denies it or in any way states anything which contradicts it. Therefore, if the objection is raised that because Divine Authority nowhere affirms the [doctrine of] procession, it ought not to be affirmed, then likewise let the claim be made that because Divine Authority nowhere

denies the [doctrine of] procession or says anything contradictory to it, it ought not to be denied. Furthermore, we claim that Divine Authority does sufficiently affirm [this doctrine] when (1) it makes those assertions from which [this doctrine] is demonstrated and when (2) it in no way expresses anything on the basis of which this doctrine can be denied.

## 15

As I promised, then, it has become clear that (1) the Son and the Holy Spirit cannot be called by each other's name, because of the fact that the Holy Spirit exists from the Son (as well as because of the fact that the Son exists by being begotten, whereas the Holy Spirit exists by proceeding) and that (2) by reason of this fact alone the Son cannot exist from the Holy Spirit. For since (as was said) either the Son exists from the Holy Spirit or the Holy Spirit exists from the Son: if the Holy Spirit did not exist from the Son, then it would follow that the Son existed from the Holy Spirit.

Hence, on the basis of the aforementioned rational considerations it is evident that: (1) the Father is God from whom God exists but is not God from God; (2) the Son is God from God and also God from whom God exists; (3) the Holy Spirit is God from God but is not God from whom God exists. And although two—viz., the Son and the Holy Spirit—exist from the Father, nevertheless they are not two gods existing from the Father; rather, they are one God, who is Son and Holy Spirit. And although the one from whom the Son exists and the one who exists from the Son—viz., the Father and the Holy Spirit—are two, they are not two gods; rather, they are one God, who is Father and Holy Spirit. And although the Holy Spirit exists from two—viz., from the Father and from the Son—He does not exist from two gods; rather, He exists from one God, who is Father and Son.

However, if the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are considered in pairs: then from those things which have been said it is evident that, necessarily, either the one exists from the other (because the other does not exist from Him) or else He does not exist from the other (because the other exists from Him). For if we compare the Father and the Son, we see that the Son exists from the Father because the Father does not exist from the Son;

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

## 16

Moreover, among the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit there are six differences which arise in accordance with their names: viz., (1) having a father, (2) not having a father, (3) having a son, (4) not having a son, (5) having a spirit proceeding from oneself, and (6) not having a spirit proceeding from oneself. Each [of the persons], considered by Himself, has one of these differences which is proper and by which He differs from the other two [persons]; and He has two differences which are both common and proper in such way that by the difference which He shares with the one [person] He differs from the other [person]. For (A) only the Father has a son; and in this respect He differs from the other two. The Father has a holy spirit proceeding from Him; and this characteristic is common to Him with the Son but is that by which He differs from the Holy Spirit. But, like the Holy Spirit, the Father does not have a father; and in this respect He differs from the Son. (B) Only the Son has a father; and in this respect He differs from the Father and the Holy Spirit. And, as has been said, the Son has it in common with the Father that a holy spirit proceeds from Him; and in this respect the Son differs from the Holy Spirit. But, like the Holy Spirit, the Son lacks a son; and in this respect the Son differs from the Father. (C) It is only the Holy Spirit from whom someone else does not proceed. The Holy Spirit has it in common



with the Father (as I said) that He does not have a father; and in this respect He is unlike the Son. Moreover, the Holy Spirit has it in common with the Son (as has already been shown) that He does not have a son; and in this respect He is unlike the Father.

Accordingly, it is the Father alone who exists from no one else and from whom two others exist. And, inversely, it is the Holy Spirit who exists from two others and from whom no one exists. And it is the Son alone who exists from one other and from whom one other exists. But it is common to the three that [each one] stands in relation to both of the others. For the Father is related to the Son and the Holy Spirit in that they exist from Him. And the Son [is related] to the Father and the Holy Spirit because the Son exists from the Father and because the Holy Spirit exists from the Son. And the Holy Spirit [is related] to the Father and the Son because He exists from them both.

Thus, each [of the three persons] possesses His distinguishing properties; and, after the fashion of different human persons, the collection of distinguishing properties is not the same in the other [two persons]. Indeed, human persons are different from one another by virtue of the fact that the collection of distinguishing properties which each person has is not the same in the case of another person. Nevertheless, there is a difference [between the persons of God and human persons]. For in the case of human persons, if there is one person there is one man; and if there is one man there is one person. Likewise, if there are several persons there are also several men; and if there are several men the persons also do not escape plurality. But in the case of God, even though there are three persons there is one God; and even though there is one God the persons do not at all lose their plurality. Thus, insofar as God is spoken of in relation to God He admits of a difference of persons, just as do several men. But in that which God is in Himself—i.e., in His deity—He retains an inseparable oneness, after the likeness of a single man. For there is a plurality of human persons only in case there are several men; one man does not have a plurality of persons. But the one God is three persons; and the three persons are one God. In this way, then, God does not wholly retain the characteristic feature of one or more other persons.

Although in the previously mentioned epistle on *The Incarna-*

*tion of the Word* I have said a little about why this last point is true, I will repeat it briefly here. It often happens that several things harmonize into one thing which has the same name and the same quantity as each of them had before they became one. Suppose we add a point to a point without any space in-between; or suppose we place one line on another line which is equal to it [in length], or place one surface on another surface which is equal to it [in length and breadth]. Surely, what results is only one point or one line or one surface. If someone cares to make an investigation, he will find similar results in many other examples. In this way, then, if—although there is not a plurality of eternities—eternity is said to be within eternity, there is only one eternity. And light within light is only one light. Similarly, whatever is ascribed to God's essence does not increase His quantity or admit of plurality should it be repeated within itself. But since God is eternity: just as nothing at all is external to eternity, so nothing at all is external to God; and just as eternity within eternity is only one eternity, so God within God is only one God.

However, we learn from true faith that God exists from God by being begotten and that God exists from God by proceeding. But since there is not anything external to God: when God is begotten from God or when God proceeds from God, the one who proceeds or is begotten does not pass outside of God but remains within God. So since God within God is only one God: when God is begotten from God, the one who begets and the one who is begotten are only one God; and when God proceeds from God, the one who proceeds and the one from whom He proceeds are only one God. Hence, since God has no parts but is wholly whatever He is, it follows inescapably that the Father is God as a whole, the Son is God as a whole, and the Holy Spirit is God as a whole—and they are one and the same God, not different gods. When God exists from God, God is within God and there is only one God. So because of this fact, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit retain in their deity a singularity after the fashion of a single human being. But when God exists from God either by being begotten or by proceeding, He who exists from another cannot be one and the same as the other from whom He exists. Because of this fact [the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit], in accordance with the names signifying these relations, retain a plu-

rality, which is like the plurality of different human persons.

However, we must note that (1) the deity does not exist apart from the person, nor the person apart from the deity. And [we must also note] that sometimes we ascribe to each of the persons their respective distinguishing properties, whereas sometimes [we ascribe] to one of the persons, as if it were His distinguishing property, a property which He shares with the other two. For example, when we say “Among the three persons it is only the Father who exists from no other; it is only the Son who exists from one other and from whom one other exists; and it is only the Holy Spirit from whom no other exists,” we name each of the persons and attribute to each His respective distinguishing property. But when we read that “No one knows the Son except the Father; and not anyone knows the Father except the Son,”<sup>1</sup> and read that “No one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God,”<sup>2</sup> then although what Scripture says of the one person it seems to deny of the others, nevertheless the respective property which Scripture ascribes to each of them (as if it were His distinguishing property) is common to all three. For neither the Father nor the Son lacks knowledge of Himself and of the things which are God's; nor does the Holy Spirit [lack knowledge of] the Father or of the Son. But we have already adequately discussed both why and when what is said about the one, as if of Him alone, is taken to be true of the other two as well.

At the urging of others, and on behalf of the Latins against the Greeks, I have presumed to write these things about the procession of the Holy Spirit, relying not on myself but on the Holy Spirit. And on this occasion I have presumed to add something about the oneness of deity and about the trinity of persons, even though among those using the Latin language there are countless others who could do this better than I. Therefore, let whatever I have said that is worthy of acceptance be attributed not to me but to the Spirit of Truth.<sup>3</sup> But if I have set forth anything which must be corrected in certain respects, let [these errors] be imputed to me and not to the judgment of the Latin Church.

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 11:27. <sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 2:11. <sup>3</sup>See John 16:13.