

Four Books Against the Objections of the Greeks
by Ratramnus, a Monk of Corbie

NOTICE.

These words at the end of the fourth book suggest that Ratramnus composed these works at the urging or command of the bishops:

"We have done our best in response to your request.

If you find this pleasing, we thank God; but if it displeases you, we await your correction."

Indeed, the supreme hierarch of the Church, Pope Nicholas the First, had written to the bishops of Gaul, urging them to respond to the objections raised by the Greeks, who were adversaries of the Roman See.

As Frodoard relates in the Ecclesiastical History of Reims, Book 3, Chapter 17:

"Pope Nicholas sent a letter to Hincmar and the other archbishops and bishops in the kingdom of Charles, stating that the Greek emperors and Eastern bishops were slandering the holy Roman Church, and the entire Church that uses the Latin language.

They claim that we fast on Saturdays; that we say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; that we prohibit priests from anointing the foreheads of the baptized with chrism.

The Greeks say that we Latins make chrism from river water.

They criticize us for not ceasing to eat cheese and eggs for eight weeks.

They also say that at Easter we bless and offer a lamb on the altar along with the Lord's body, as the Jews do.

They are also angry with us because our clergy shave their beards; and they say that a deacon is ordained as a bishop among us without first being a priest, etc."

Then he includes the words of Nicholas's letter:

"Your charity, Hincmar, when you read this letter, should make every effort to ensure it is also delivered to the other archbishops in the kingdom of our glorious king Charles, so that each one, along with their suffragans, may properly address these matters in their own dioceses, and inform us of what they find.

Do not neglect to encourage them, etc."

This summarizes the schism in the East incited by Photius, the false patriarch of Constantinople, and supported by the Greek emperors Michael and Basil.

So, our Ratramnus took on this task and completed it skillfully and thoroughly in four books. In the first books, he focuses entirely on the Holy Scriptures and the teachings of the Greek and Latin Fathers to refute the heresies of the innovators and uphold the Catholic truth about the Holy Spirit. In the fourth book, he discusses various practices related to Lent, the different ways food is used, fasting on Saturdays among the Latins, the shaving and tonsure of clergy, clerical celibacy, the sacrament of Confirmation given only by bishops, the supreme authority of the Roman Pope over the Patriarch of Constantinople and all the bishops of the Christian world, and other church rituals—doing so very successfully. Anyone who reads these four books will easily see how well-versed Ratramnus was in the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the ancient Fathers and councils. This preface is too brief to fully praise such a great man, so I've decided to include some testimonies from other writers here. But before I go further, it's worth noting that Jacques Sirmond, a man of immortal memory, when publishing certain works of Saint

Fulgentius, mistakenly attributed Ratramnus' books to Hincmar of Rheims in a fragment at the end of his work. He even included Ratramnus' exact words as if they were Hincmar's. Why Sirmond made this mistake and misattributed these works to someone else is unknown to me, especially since he should have recognized this work as not being insignificant and added it to the other works of Hincmar, which he had diligently gathered for almost forty-eight years. Now, let us present the testimonies. SIGIBERT in his work on Church Writers, chapter...

Bertramus, also known as Ratramnus, wrote a book about the Body and Blood of the Lord and another on Predestination for Charles.

Johannes Trithemius, an abbot, mentions in the book about Notable Men of the Order of Saint Benedict, Book 2, Chapter 48, that Bertramus was a monk, knowledgeable in the Holy Scriptures, and well-educated in secular literature. He wrote significant works that showcased his genius. Among these, Trithemius found only the book about the Body and Blood of the Lord and the book on Predestination for Charles. Bertramus was prominent in the year 870.

Claudius Espenceus, a Parisian doctor, notes in his book about the Eucharist, Book 4, Chapter 19, that for 700 years, Bertramus was neither accused of heresy nor criticized for writing poorly. He was included in the catalog of ecclesiastical writers as a notable man for his life, teaching, genius, and eloquence.

Claudius de Saintes, bishop of Evreux, also emphasizes in his book, Controversies about the Eucharist, Book 2, Chapter 14, that for 700 years, no one accused Bertramus of heresy or criticized his writings. He is noted in the catalog of ecclesiastical writers for his life, teaching, genius, eloquence, and catholicity.

Aubertus Miraeus, in his notes to the aforementioned chapter of Sigibert, mentions that Bertramus's book about the Body and Blood of the Lord was printed in Cologne in 1532, in Basel at the Mycropresbytery, and elsewhere, but was condemned by the Tridentine censors. Molanus noted in the manuscript library that heretics first printed his works and seemed to have inserted obscure or seemingly perverse content.

In many places, Bertramus asserts the true presence of Christ and teaches transubstantiation, so much so that even the interpolator couldn't hide this, stating that many things do not cohere and precede contradicting the following. Bartholomeus Petrus Lintrensis, a doctor of theology, also observed this.

Dionysius Petavius S.J., in the volume of theological dogmas, Volume 2, Book 7, Chapter...

Before the end, he references Ratramnus, a respected and Catholic writer, to explain the term and the Son, which was added to the Nicene Creed.

Furthermore, Ratramnus, a monk of Corbie, in his second book for the Roman Church against the Greeks, written around 868 during the time of Photius, refutes the accusation of a corrupted creed.

He adds that Ratramnus wrote this after receiving an encyclical from Nicholas, which was sent to Hincmar and other bishops in the kingdom of Charles the Bald in 867. This encyclical urged them to counter the Greeks' slanders against the Roman Church, which were raised by Emperor Michael and Basil in a letter.

John De Launoy, a doctor of Paris, in his dissertation on the old selection of foods, mentions on page 13 that Ratramnus, a monk of Corbie, responded to the Greeks' objections in a work

written under the authority of the bishops. De Launoy excerpts a lengthy passage from Book 4 of this work.

Gilbert Mauguin, a royal counselor, in chapter 17 of his Historical and Chronological Dissertation, notes that in the year 850, Ratramnus, a monk of Corbie and a significant figure in the Church of Christ, composed two books on Predestination by royal mandate. He was the first to bring these books to light.

James De Sainte Beuve, a Sorbonne associate and royal professor, while lecturing on the Eucharist, defends Ratramnus with extensive erudition. He teaches that Ratramnus earned a place among ecclesiastical and orthodox writers after Sigebert, Trithemius, Espencaeus, and Sanctesius, and composed a Catholic work on the Body and Blood of the Lord, based on the testimonies of Sigebert and others, and compelling reasons.

Another point is that for seven hundred years, no writer has accused Ratramnus of heresy, let alone condemned him.

The other one, however, you will not find praised anywhere by Berengar the heresiarch himself, nor by his disciples. Additionally, the book by Ratramnus was free from the censure of the Council of Vercelli, where Berengar's impious doctrine and the works of John Scotus Erigena were condemned with eternal anathema.

Finally, Sanbovaeus adds: Even if that work "On the Body and Blood of the Lord," which bears Bertram's name, were genuinely his and not corrupted or altered, they still try in vain to persuade us that it is our Ratramnus or that it supports his heresy, due to the blemishes contained in that work. For he lived continuously within the Church and peacefully passed away in its communion.

Facundus says in book 10, chapter 5: The words are to be judged not by the mere sound, but by the intention of the speaker. And the intention of the speaker, when the person is already deceased, is judged by their religious communion.

And indeed, Ratramnus could be defended in a Catholic manner from the calumny of the heterodox, just as Athanasius once defended Dionysius of Alexandria. He presents a strong argument (he himself says in the letter about Dionysius's opinion against the Arians) that they are not even telling the truth here, but are pressing the man with slanders, because he was never convicted of impiety by other bishops, nor did he separate from the Church by advocating heresy. He peacefully passed away in it with piety, and his memory has been celebrated with the Fathers up to this time and has been included in the catalog.

If he had been of the same opinion as these men, or if he had not given an account of his writings, there is no doubt that he would have suffered the same fate as they did. Finally, with such clear and evident proof in the aforementioned work of Ratramnus of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ under the Eucharistic species and of transubstantiation, the more obscure and difficult parts can be explained in an orthodox sense, according to the Rule of Facundus, book.

Chapter 9, verse 5:

Just as slandering heretics tend to interpret doubtful and obscure things in a way that distorts what is certain and clear, it is wise and pious for Catholics to use what is indisputable and

evident to clarify and confirm the ambiguous and hidden. However, if some orthodox believers think otherwise, they should not be imitated by the wise.

These are the words of Acherius, who also notes that these books were published by him from the Thuaneus manuscript. This manuscript was later compared by Baluzius in the Colbertine library, and he reported that, in some places, he found that the scribe of Acherius had been too creative in copying Rattramus's work.

Book One

Chapter One

Response to the objections of Emperors Michael and Basil.

Objections of the Greeks.

The objections raised by Michael and Basil, emperors of the Greeks, against the Roman Church are known to be either false, heretical, superstitious, or irreligious.

Therefore, they rightfully deserve contempt, except that they could cause scandal and harm to the simple and less capable.

As it is written in the sayings of Solomon, spoken by the Holy Spirit: "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes" (Proverbs 26:5).

When they claim that we make chrism from water and place the lamb to be consecrated with the Lord's body on the holy day of Easter on the altar according to the custom of the Jews, are they not clearly lying?

They do not fear the words of the Psalmist, spoken by the Holy Spirit: "You destroy all who speak lies" (Psalm 5:7).

And what the Holy Spirit threatens elsewhere: "A false witness will not go unpunished" (Proverbs 19:5, 9).

Moreover, when they attempt to criticize not only the Roman but the entire Latin Church for confessing that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, according to the Catholic faith, while they say that He proceeds only from the Father, do they not condemn themselves with the perversity of heresy, remove themselves from the communion of the Church, and blaspheme against the Holy Spirit?

This sin, the Savior declares to be unforgivable in the Gospel (Mark 3:29).

Unless perhaps they can show that this was ever denied by their Catholic predecessors.

For indeed, when they say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, they do not deny that He also proceeds from the Son.

If they wish to follow their predecessors, they will embrace the Catholic teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, just as their predecessors did, who were well instructed by the sacred writings and knew perfectly well that the Spirit is of both the Father and the Son.

This will be demonstrated more clearly in the following.

Chapter Two

Again about the objections of the Greeks. What duties fall upon emperors.

Now, they argue that we fast on the Sabbath or that we do not celebrate the Easter fast the same way they do. Who cannot see the pride and foolishness in their claims? They criticize those who fast and reproach those who do not. If fasting is good, why do they accuse? If it is bad, why do they practice what they accuse?

Perhaps the matter is judged based on who is doing it, so that fasting by a Latin is criticized, but by a Greek is venerated. Thus, they judge either out of pride or ignorance. But who can bear their criticism when they pretend to be virtuous, distancing themselves from women, and emulating sanctity of both flesh and soul?

These virtues should be praised among all, especially in ministers of the sacred altar. It is their duty to attend to the sacred, offer constant service to the Divinity, and pray daily for the people entrusted to them.

Because our priests uphold these traditions, they are defamed for condemning marriage. What do they attack if not religion? What do they strive to destroy if not sanctity, without which no one can please God?

Who does not see the absurdity in criticizing the shaving of beards? Or that our priests leave the anointing of the baptized's foreheads with holy chrism to the bishops? Is there any divine command being transgressed in shaving or keeping a beard? If priests do not anoint the foreheads with sacred unction, do they not complete the grace of baptism by performing the triple immersion in the name of the Holy Trinity?

These criticisms are seen as superstitions, not matters of religious importance.

Why be surprised if such accusations come from men who are experts in sacred law, supported by worldly power, and confident in imperial pride? Matters of sacred doctrines and church rituals were for bishops to discuss, not emperors. They were entrusted with learning, not teaching, in the Church's ministry. Although emperors excel in imperial dignity, they are entrusted with public affairs, not the episcopal ministry. Emperors should handle secular laws; bishops, on the other hand, should discuss divine doctrines.

They should strive to keep to their own roles, not usurp the episcopal office, lest what happened to King Uzziah, who presumed the priestly ministry, happens to them; he was struck with leprosy by divine power and was cast out not only from the temple but also from the people's community Second Chronicles 26:17.

Why then do these recent teachers, and dare we say, monstrous instructors, now try to call into question what their predecessors, if indeed they are children of the Church and followers of Catholic unity, always deemed venerable? No new worship is practiced in the Roman Church now; no new religion, no new doctrine, no new institution. We hold to and preserve what our ancestors held, taught, and left to their descendants to observe, adding nothing and taking nothing away from it.

What they believed about the Holy Spirit, we also believe. They received it from the apostles, and the apostles received it from Christ. The Church in both the East and the West has always remained in the same faith. The apostles knew the saying that there is one faith, one baptism Ephesians 4:5. And although heresies frequently arose, which, like bad fish, broke Christ's nets, Christ's tunic remained intact.

The institutions of our ancestors, established in their respective places, did not divide the unity of faith, even though they were not the same in all churches; nor did they lose the communion of

mutual fellowship because of changes in customs. For it is one thing to distinguish in matters of habit and conduct, and another to have a similar understanding of the unity of faith.

But we will discuss these matters later. Now, let's get to the main points and talk about each of the gifts given by the grace of the Holy Spirit, without following the order of the proposed questions. The order seems to be less thoughtfully arranged, as it appears to be organized with a light mind rather than with the gravity of prudence.

First, let's talk about what the Holy Spirit has given us. This is the first and foremost thing, and it pertains to the foundation of the Catholic faith.

It is essential to show that we feel and confess the same about Him as our Fathers did, and they felt and professed the same as the apostles did.

If anyone chooses to argue against the teaching of the apostles, they must also refute the teaching of Christ and the prophecies of the prophets.

Chapter Three

It is proven that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

The Greeks are likened to Arius.

The Savior is the truth.

The Holy Spirit is the spirit of truth, that is, of Christ.

The Holy Spirit is called love.

You argue that we say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, while you say He proceeds from the Father only.

Let us consider the reading from the Gospel and take the essence of our response from it. For the Savior speaks in the discourse He made to the disciples on the night He was to be betrayed, according to John, as follows:

"When the Helper comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, He will bear witness about me" (John 15:26).

You read "who proceeds from the Father" and refuse to hear the Son saying, "whom I will send to you from the Father."

Explain how He is sent by the Son:

for you do not deny that the Son says this, if you read the Gospel or if you believe in the Gospel?

Therefore, either confess that this mission is the procession, or, which is impious, claim it is mere service; and you will be with Arius, who perversely asserted that the Holy Spirit is lesser than the Son.

Let it not be that you wish to support Arius;

let it not be that you wish to affirm the Holy Spirit is lesser than the Father and the Son.

Therefore, when the Son says He will send the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, He indeed admits that He says the Spirit proceeds from Himself, as He confirms He will send Him. Perhaps there is a question because the Savior did not simply say, "Whom I will send to you," but added, "from the Father."

The Arians first raised this, wanting to create a distinction within the Divinity.

But the truth of the Gospel shows the unity of the entire Trinity as consubstantial.

The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, because He flows from His substance. The Son also sends the Spirit of truth from the Father, because the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as He is born from the Father; and just as the Son received substance from the Father by being born, so too He received from the Father the ability to send the Spirit of truth from Himself.

When it says, "Who proceeds from the Father," it doesn't deny proceeding from Himself. This is because the mission of the Son is the procession of the Holy Spirit, to send the Spirit of truth—not as if commanding a lesser one, but showing that just as the Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father, He also proceeds from the Son.

And then, "But He will glorify me because He will take from what is mine and will announce it to you" (John 16:14). What will the Holy Spirit take from the Son when they are of one substance and one power? Clearly, He said, "He will take from what is mine," meaning He proceeds from me. Just as the Father and the Son share one substance, the Holy Spirit, proceeding from both, shares in that same consubstantiality.

Don't be troubled by the phrase "He will take" in the future tense. This refers to His future mission to the disciples, not to the fact that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and also from the Son, because the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three persons of the same substance.

Next, "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said, He will take from what is mine and will announce it to you" (John 16:15). If all that the Father has belongs to the Son, then the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. If He were only the Spirit of the Father, the Son wouldn't have everything the Father has. But since the Son has all that the Father has, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both.

We shouldn't think of this as diminishing or adding anything. It's simply declared that just as the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, He also proceeds from the Son.

Earlier, Christ said, "When the Spirit of truth comes," and before that, "When the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth." The Savior, who is the truth, testified to Philip, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6).

John 14:6.

If truth is the Savior, and the Savior is the Son of the Father, then what else could the Spirit of truth be but the Spirit of the Son? Thus, the Spirit of the Father, who proceeds from the Father, is also known as the Spirit of the Son, whom the Savior calls the Spirit of truth.

If you question where the Spirit of truth comes from, consider where the Spirit of the Father comes from: for by proceeding from the Father, it is the Spirit of the Father; and by also proceeding from the Son, who is truth, it is the Spirit of the Son.

This is not said to imply subordination but to indicate the unity of substance. Just as the Father and the Son share the same substance, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both.

Do not think that the Holy Spirit has two fathers because He proceeds from the Father and the Son; for the Holy Spirit is not the Son, and whoever is not the Son cannot have a father.

The Holy Spirit is also called love, as the blessed John says: God is love 1 John 4:16.

Commending this love, he writes to the faithful: And the anointing you received from Him remains in you; and you do not need anyone to teach you; but as His anointing teaches you about all things 1 John 2:27.

Similarly, the Savior says: When the Spirit of truth comes, He will guide you into all truth John 16:13.

Whether you say: God is love; or you say: His anointing teaches you about all things; or you say: the Spirit of truth, who teaches you all truth: you are referring to the Holy Spirit.

This love is the Father's love, by which He loved us; it is also the Son's love, by which He redeemed us.

But it is not a different love because it is said to be of the Father and of the Son: for with the same love with which the Father loves the Son, the Son loves the Father: for the Holy Spirit is the Father's love, and the Holy Spirit is also the Son's love.

The Father's love proceeds from the Father to love the Son; the Son's love proceeds from the Son to love the Father. Therefore, it is one love from both, because one Spirit proceeds from both.

Christ cried out, saying: If anyone is thirsty, let them come to me and drink. (John 7:37).

Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, streams of living water will flow from within them.

The evangelist adds: He said this about the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were to receive.

(John 7:39).

The streams of living water, as the evangelist explains, signify the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which the Savior teaches will refresh those who believe in him.

So where do the streams come from if not from faith in Christ?

And where does faith come from if not from Christ's teachings?

Just as Christ's teaching comes from Christ, and faith in that teaching comes from Christ, so too the streams of living water, that is, the Holy Spirit, proceed from Christ: for Christ is both perfect human and perfect God.

Because he is the perfect God, he grants and pours out the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from him, to those who believe in him; the streams of the Holy Spirit flood the hearts of believers with the fountain of eternal life.

He also said to the Samaritan woman: Whoever drinks this water will be thirsty again; but whoever drinks the water I will give them will never thirst.

The water I give them will become in them a spring of water welling up to eternal life.

(John 4:13).

What he previously called streams of living water, he now calls a spring of water welling up to eternal life; in both instances, he wants us to understand the Holy Spirit, whom he clearly says is given by him when he says: The water I give them will become in them a spring of water.

What he gives, he gives from himself: he gives the spring of water welling up to eternal life, that is, he abundantly grants the Holy Spirit to those who believe in him.

He demonstrates that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him, as he says that he gives it to believers.

After rising from the dead and appearing to the disciples who were gathered in a locked room, following the greeting of peace and the commission of peace, he breathed on them and said: Receive the Holy Spirit.

(John 20:22).

What does he signify by breathing on them if not the procession of the Holy Spirit?

It's not that the physical breath taken from the air and exhaled through the mouth with the help of the lungs is the substance of the Holy Spirit. Rather, He wanted to teach us that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself, and that the substance of the Holy Spirit also flows from the substance of the Son. Just as the Father, wanting to show that the birth of the Son originated from His own substance and that the Son is of the same substance as Himself, speaks to the Son in the Psalm: "From the womb before the morning star, I have begotten you" (Psalm 109:3). This doesn't mean that God the Father had a womb from which He begot the Son before the ages. Instead, it testifies that He begot the Son not from nothing, not from the substance of another thing, but from His own nature and substance. Similarly, the Son, by breathing out and giving the Holy Spirit to the apostles, showed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from His own substance, which He wanted to grant through such a breath. When speaking to the disciples about the sacrament of His body and blood, He said: "The words I have spoken to you are spirit and life" (John 6:64). So where do words come from, if not from the innermost mind? Therefore, the words that Christ speaks are spirit and life, because the Spirit, which proceeds from the heart of Christ, is life. Not that in Divinity there is a heart, as in a part of flesh; but by such a term, He wanted to show the sacrament of the inner substance, from which He says the Spirit, who is life, proceeds. Thus, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and is of one and the same substance with the Son.

Chapter Four

Testimonies are brought forth from the Gospel and the Letters of Paul.

In the Gospel of Luke, it is written: "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (Luke 4:14). It is read about the Savior that He is the power of the Father, and now the Spirit is called power. Is Christ one power and the Spirit another power? Certainly not: both are called power to show the unity of their substance.

What does it mean when it says: "In the power of the Spirit?" Did it mean to show the power of the Holy Spirit as greater than the power of the Son? Not at all. So, what does it mean when it says: "In the power of the Spirit?" It did not mean to show an external power to Christ, as if granted from elsewhere, but His own; which, while it is the Holy Spirit's, is also the Son's, as in one nature, not in different essence, and remaining together in one. The one proceeds from the other, namely, the Holy Spirit from the Son; but both from the Father: the Son by being born, the Holy Spirit by proceeding.

Not that at different times He proceeds from the Father or the Son, but that without any intervening time He proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Blessed Paul the Apostle writes to the Galatians: "Because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Galatians 4:6). He did not say: God sent His Spirit. If he had said that, it would not entirely exclude the Son; for the Son is also God, just

as the Father is God, and both are not two gods, but one God: for what the person separates, the substance unites. But wishing to remove all questions, he specifically mentioned the person of the Son, saying, "God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts."

Is the Spirit of the Son different from the Spirit of the Father? If it is the same Spirit of both, it surely proceeds from both; for the Spirit of the Son is not said to be less than the Son; whoever thinks or says this is not a Catholic. Therefore, it is not necessary to say the Spirit of the Son, except because He proceeds from the Son; just as He is called the Spirit of the Father because He proceeds from the Father.

To the Philippians, he writes, among other things, like this:

"For I know that through your prayers and the provision of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance"

Philippians 1:19.

Jesus Christ, God and man.

Was the Apostle speaking of the human spirit when he said these things?

For on the cross, Jesus Christ gave up His human spirit, as the evangelist testifies, who says of Him:

"He bowed His head and gave up His spirit"

John 19:30.

And He Himself also says:

"I have the authority to lay down my life and the authority to take it up again"

John 10:18.

But this Spirit, of whom the Apostle now speaks in First Corinthians, through whose provision he confidently hopes that he will not be put to shame in any way concerning the ministry of Christ, is God.

He is also called the Holy Spirit, to distinguish Him from the Father and the Son, of whom the Apostle testifies that He distributes the different gifts of grace and works all things as He wills. Therefore, this Spirit is Christ's, not by servile subjection, but by divine procession, equal to the Father and the Son in nature, majesty, and dignity.

Saint Luke writes in the Acts of the Apostles:

"When they came to Mysia, they tried to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus did not allow them"

Acts 16:7.

About which Spirit he narrates earlier, saying:

"They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia"

Acts 16:6.

The same Spirit he previously called the Holy Spirit, he later called the Spirit of Jesus, clearly indicating that the Spirit of Jesus is no different from the Holy Spirit.

Why is He called the Spirit of Jesus? It has often been said, because He proceeds from Jesus. Not from the nature by which He mercifully became man, but from the nature by which He is equal to the Father, being born of the Father.

He also speaks to Titus:

"He saved us, not because of works done by us in righteousness, but according to His own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior"

Titus 3:5-6.

How did He pour out the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ? Was it as if a lesser through a greater?

The Arians believed this: but it says that the Father poured out the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ, showing that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was done by Jesus Christ, not as if He received it from somewhere else, but by sending it from Himself.

This does not mean that the Father poured out the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ as if water were poured through a pipe, implying that the Son's role was merely one of service, conveyance, or transition. Thinking this way is impious.

Truly, the Father abundantly poured out the Holy Spirit on us through Jesus Christ our Savior because it proceeds from the Son, just as it proceeds from the Father. By saying it was poured out through the Son, it shows its procession from the Son while not denying that it also proceeds from the Father; as it proceeds from both.

Blessed Peter testifies about this outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, speaking to the Jews about the Lord Jesus Christ: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He has poured out this that you yourselves are seeing and hearing" (Acts 2:33).

Luke also testifies about this in the same Acts: "When the day of Pentecost arrived, they were all together in one place. Suddenly, there came from heaven a sound like a mighty rushing wind, and it filled the entire house where they were sitting. Divided tongues as of fire appeared to them and rested on each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1-4).

And later: "And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (Acts 2:17); and more.

And a bit further on: "Even on my male servants and female servants in those days I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy" (Acts 2:18).

We included all this so that, taught by blessed Peter, we might know that the Holy Spirit was poured out on the apostles and the other believers gathered together on the day of Pentecost by Jesus.

Hence it is written: God raised up Jesus, and we are all witnesses to this Acts 2:32.

Then he added: Exalted by the right hand of God, he poured out this, meaning the Holy Spirit, indeed Jesus, whom God raised up, whom you have seen and heard Acts 2:33.

You saw the tongues of fire, you heard the variety of languages: for the Holy Spirit in his own nature cannot be seen with bodily vision, nor heard with bodily hearing, but he took on the form and appearance of fire under the image of tongues, so that he could be seen, and possessed the voices of the disciples, so he could be heard.

But when he said: Having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, he poured out this Spirit, he commends the grace of humanity, not divinity. According to divinity, he did not

receive the promise, since everything the Father has is his, not by receiving it temporarily, but by having it eternally.

Chapter Five

What the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is. Who the Holy Spirit breathes on.

Let's compare this to Paul's statement where he told Titus about the Holy Spirit being poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.

Titus 3:6.

Paul testifies that the Father poured out the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ our Savior.

Peter, however, says that Jesus poured out this same Holy Spirit after rising from the dead.

From this, we learn that both the Father and Jesus Christ pour out the Holy Spirit, so we understand that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, as both pour it out.

We should not think of this outpouring as a local event, as if it flowed from the Father to Christ, leaving the Father behind, or as if it could come to the Son by extending itself so that one part reaches the Son while the other remains with the Father.

Similarly, when it was poured out from the Son to the disciples, it did not leave the Son to come to the disciples. Rather, in a certain proportion, it illuminated the hearts of the disciples and remained with Christ, like a ray of the sun that illuminates its sphere and touches the earth simultaneously.

But these things are in bodies. However, in the Divinity of the Holy Trinity, none of these things are found.

Instead, without the interval of time or place, the Holy Spirit is poured out by the Father and similarly by the Son.

It is poured out by the Father into the Son because the Father begot the Son, and also by the Son, because the Son has all that belongs to the Father.

The Holy Gospel also testifies that the Spirit breathes where it wishes.

John 3:8.

What does it mean to breathe? Clearly, it means that whenever and wherever it wishes, it pours itself out.

Let's observe the single operation of the entire Trinity.

The Father pours out, the Son pours out the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit, breathing where it wishes, pours itself out.

How fittingly the Apostle says that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit happened through Jesus Christ, through whom God the Father made everything.

The Apostle Peter also testifies that the Son poured out the Holy Spirit, about whom the Gospel says that everything the Father does, the Son does likewise.

Therefore, the Father pours out the Holy Spirit, and the Son pours out the Holy Spirit, because just as it is given by the Father, it is also given by the Son.

So, let the emperors of the Greeks not accuse the Latins of confessing that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as he proceeds from the Father, but rather let them learn the truth of the faith from Christ and his apostles.

Also, in the Acts of the Apostles, Peter says:

"And we are witnesses of these things, and so is the Holy Spirit, whom God has given to those who obey him."

Whom does he say gave the Holy Spirit, unless it is the same one about whom he said above:

"Exalted at the right hand of God, he poured out what you now see and hear";

showing that it is understood to be Jesus Christ.

But how did God give the Holy Spirit to those who obey him?

Was it as if he were lesser?

Not at all.

For the Son says:

"The Spirit blows where it wishes."

Therefore, God gives the Holy Spirit by infusing the hearts of those who obey him, not to leave himself where he remains in the unity of substance but to illuminate those whom he did not previously enlighten.

No one can give what they do not possess: thus the Son testifies to having the Holy Spirit, whom he gave to all who obey him.

And just as he has it by the unity of substance, not by the acquisition of possession, so when he gives, he does not bestow it as if it were someone else's right, but he imparts what is his own gift.

The Son would not do this if the Holy Spirit did not also proceed from him.

In the following passages, even the blessed Peter, teaching how Cornelius, a Gentile, and those who believed with him received the grace of baptism, says this:

"So if God gave them the same grace as He gave us who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to think that I could stand in God's way?" (Acts 11:17).

Although here God, or the Holy Spirit, who filled the hearts of the believers and gave them the knowledge of tongues, or certainly the Father could be understood; if we consider Peter's earlier words about the sending of the Holy Spirit upon believers, which the Son poured out, we see that here God the Son is also understood. He gave the same grace to Cornelius and his companions, as Peter mentioned, which He previously gave by pouring out the Holy Spirit upon the disciples in tongues of fire.

It is clearly shown that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, or the gift, pertains to both the Father and the Son, because it proceeds from both. Therefore, when Peter says He gave the same grace to the new believers as He gave before to the apostles, it clearly signifies the Holy Spirit, whom the Son could give, since He proceeds from Him. This would not be possible at all if He did not proceed from Him.

Chapter Six

Testimonies from Scripture.

Writing to the Romans, blessed Paul says to the faithful:

"But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him" (Romans 8:9).

Notice whose presence you accept when it says: "If the Spirit of God dwells in you."

If you accept the presence of the Father, then you also acknowledge that the same Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.

By this statement, it is clearly shown that the Spirit of the Father is also the Spirit of Christ. It indicates that the Spirit comes from both.

But if you understand this in reference to Christ, which the context supports (since Christ is God), we also learn that the Spirit of Christ is the Holy Spirit, affirming that it proceeds from Christ.

The presence of the Father is more clearly indicated later when it says: "But if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus Christ from the dead dwells in you."

Although it can also be understood that the Son, together with the Father, raised the man he assumed, as stated in the Gospel.

Either way, it is clear that the same Spirit belongs to both the Son and the Father.

Hence, what the holy Apostle says later: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Romans 8:14), can be understood without hesitation to refer to either the Father or the Son, as the Spirit is from both, proceeding from both, as has already been proven.

And later: "For you did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father'" (Romans 8:15).

Writing to the Galatians, he says: "And because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying out, 'Abba, Father'" (Galatians 4:6).

Notice that he refers to the same Spirit as the Spirit of adoption, whom he acknowledges as the Spirit of the Son.

The Apostle teaches us that the Spirit of the Father is also the Spirit of adoption and the Spirit of the Son, whom God sent into our hearts. Through this same Spirit, who is both the Spirit of the Father and the Son, we cry out, "Abba, Father."

We could not do this if the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Son as He does from the Father. In his second letter to the Corinthians, he writes: "You are our letter, written in our hearts; known and read by all men: you are shown to be a letter of Christ, delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God" Second Corinthians 3:2, 3.

When he says that the Corinthians are a letter of Christ, written by the Spirit of the living God, he demonstrates the single operation of the Holy Spirit and Christ. But whom does he call the living God in this passage? Clearly, Christ, whose letter he says the Corinthians are, revealing that the Spirit is Christ's, who wrote in the hearts of the Corinthians not with bodily ink but with his own illumination.

Therefore, because Christ and the Holy Spirit write the same letter, they are shown to be of one substance as they are of one operation. What Christ writes, the Holy Spirit also writes, and what the Holy Spirit writes, Christ also writes—not by alternation of time, nor by exchange of places, nor by variety of work. For as they have the same will, they have the same operation and not dissimilar power, because they are not of dissimilar essence.

As it has often been said, the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ; not as a part of him, or a quality, or a subject, but as proceeding from Christ. Again, to the Corinthians in the same letter: "To this day, when Moses is read, a veil lies over their hearts; but when one turns to the Lord, the veil is removed" Second Corinthians 3:15, 16.

He clarifies just above who he calls the Lord here, saying how the same veil is removed in Christ.

When the veil of old understanding is removed in Christ, it becomes clear that when someone turns to Christ, the veil is taken away. Blessed John also says in his Revelation: "And I wept much, because no one was found worthy to open the book, nor to look at it. And one of the elders said to me: Do not weep; behold, the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, has triumphed to open the book and its seven seals." Revelation chapter five, verses four to five. The opening of the book symbolizes the removal of the veil. It's clear that the lion of the tribe of Judah and the root of David signify Christ, who is also said to open its seven seals. These seven seals represent the Holy Spirit because of the sevenfold grace of His gift. He is the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, counsel and strength, knowledge and piety. He is also the Spirit of the fear of the Lord, as the prophet Isaiah speaks. Isaiah chapter eleven, verse two. The root of David, which is the Savior, opens the seven seals of this book because the spiritual mysteries contained within it are revealed in Christ when the veil written about in the Old Testament is removed. The Apostle adds: "Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." Second Corinthians chapter three, verse seventeen. Which Lord? Certainly, the one in whom the veil is removed, which remains hidden when the Old Testament is read. The removal of the veil signifies the removal of the servitude contained in the letter of the law, allowing for the freedom ministered through the Spirit of the Lord. This happens when one transitions from literal interpretation to spiritual understanding, and from the servitude of the flesh to the freedom of the Spirit. We see in these words that the Spirit of the Lord is called the Spirit of Christ. Hence, it follows: "But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Spirit of the Lord." Second Corinthians chapter three, verse eighteen.

Therefore, since the revelation of the face is made through Christ, and we are transformed from glory to glory by the Spirit of the Lord, the joint operation of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit is shown.

Hence, what is said: by the Spirit of the Lord, undoubtedly shows the person of Christ. Although He is the Spirit of Christ, together with the Savior, He accomplishes the revelation of the old reading.

Therefore, the fact that they work together shows the unity of substance.

The fact that He is called the Spirit of the Lord, because He proceeds from Him, is implied. The reading clearly suggests that the Lord and Savior is signified in this passage.

Chapter Seven Other Testimonies.

Blessed Peter the apostle writes to the believers in his first letter:

"Concerning this salvation, the prophets, who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours, searched and inquired carefully, searching what or what kind of time the Spirit of Christ in them was indicating" (First Peter 1:10-11).

The leader of the apostles, to whom the Savior says, "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church" (Matthew 16:18), does not hesitate to call the Holy Spirit, who spoke in the prophets, the Spirit of Christ.

Yet, some, puffed up with worldly dignity, presume to criticize what the apostles of Christ's Church have learned!

If the Holy Spirit does not proceed from Christ, then how is He called the Spirit of Christ? He proceeds from Christ because He is said to be His, not by subjection or by a particular section, but because He proceeds substantially from His essence.

Also consider Blessed John, who agrees with this view and proclaims that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. He says in Revelation:

"And I saw in the midst of the throne and the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes" (Revelation 5:6).

Explaining this, he added: "These are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth."

No Catholic, I believe, will deny that the slain Lamb represents Christ, about whom John the Baptist said: "Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29).

This Lamb of God was sacrificed for the sins of the world and rose again for the justification of the world.

This Lamb is said to have seven eyes, which, according to John's teaching, signify the seven spirits of God. Not because there are seven distinct entities, but because of the sevenfold distribution of gifts; in substance, He is one.

Therefore, it is clear that when it says the lamb has seven eyes, it means that Christ possesses the Holy Spirit, not as a mere part or member of His body, but that the Holy Spirit is essentially in Him and also proceeds from Him.

We say that the Holy Spirit is in Him, not as in a place or a subject; for the Holy Spirit is not contained by Christ as something lesser, which is usually the case with things contained in places; the things that contain are greater than those contained.

We do not say that the Holy Spirit is in Christ in this way because He is equal, not lesser.

Nor do we say that He is in Christ as in a subject; for He is not an accident, which cannot exist without its subject: but He is in Christ as consubstantial; just as we see heat in the brightness of fire: for fire both shines and heats, it illuminates and ignites.

The prophet Zechariah also says: "For behold, I will bring forth my servant the Branch: for behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes" (Zechariah 3:8).

And further: "These seven are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth" (Zechariah 4:10).

This stone is the Savior, of whom the Psalmist speaks: "The stone which the builders rejected has become the cornerstone" (Psalm 118:22).

God the Father also calls Him His servant the Branch: servant because of His taking on human nature; the Branch, because He is the sun of righteousness.

And upon this stone, He says, the seven eyes of the Lord run to and fro through the whole earth.

In the eyes, the Holy Spirit is to be understood.

The seven are for the reason previously mentioned, that although there is one Holy Spirit, the gifts of grace are many.

What does it mean for there to be seven eyes upon the stone? Clearly, it means that the Holy Spirit remains in Christ.

And just as eyes are said to be in someone in whom they essentially are, so you should understand the Holy Spirit to be Christ's.

The same prophet also signified this under the figure of the lampstand, saying: "I saw, and behold a golden lampstand all of gold, with a bowl on the top of it, and its seven lamps on it" (Zechariah 4:2).

Behold the golden lampstand of Christ's incarnation; golden because it is without blemish, without any mixture of sin, entirely radiant and splendid.

The lamp above His head represents the Divinity in the man. For Christ's head is God, says the Apostle in First Corinthians 11:3.

The seven lamps above it, that is, above the lampstand or His head, symbolize the fullness of the Holy Spirit. This is in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah: And the Spirit of wisdom and understanding shall rest upon Him, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and piety, and He will be filled with the Spirit of the fear of the Lord (Isaiah 11:2).

Since the seven lamps of the Holy Spirit rest upon Christ, it shows that the Holy Spirit resides in Him. When He rests in Him by dwelling substantially, it is His Spirit in which He substantially rests. Hence, it is rightly called the Spirit of Christ.

It should be noted that regarding this Spirit signified by the seven eyes, it is said that they roam over the whole earth. And in Revelation, after mentioning the seven spirits of God are the seven eyes of the Lamb, it added: Sent out into all the earth (Revelation 5:6).

What Zechariah describes as roaming, John in Revelation describes as sent; the term mission suggesting the procession of the Holy Spirit. While being substantially in Christ, the Holy Spirit does not roam or get sent unless proceeding from Christ, not locally, but substantially.

To exist, He receives from both the Father and the Son, just as the Son essentially receives existence from the Father. However, it does not reciprocate, so that although the Holy Spirit proceeds equally from the Son and the Father, the Son is not born equally from the Father and the Holy Spirit; for the birth is only from the Father, but the procession is from both the Father and the Son together.

The seven Spirits sent by God, as mentioned in the Apocalypse, are described by Zechariah as the seven eyes of the Lord that run throughout the whole earth. This is because of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Through the apostles and their successors, these gifts have been spread among all nations, sanctifying the faithful who believe in Christ and cleansing them of their sins.

John also confirmed that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ when he said he saw one like the Son of Man in the midst of the seven lampstands Revelation 1:13. A few verses later, he said: "His eyes were like a flame of fire" Revelation 1:14.

Who is this Son of Man? Clearly, it is the Lord Jesus Christ, who often refers to himself as the Son of Man in the Gospel. For example, in the passage: "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" Matthew 16:13.

Ezekiel also frequently hears himself called the Son of Man. The eyes of this Son of Man, which are said to shine like a flame of fire, signify the Holy Spirit, as fire from heaven appeared over the apostles.

By calling his eyes the Holy Spirit, it signifies that the Spirit is of Christ. The Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ because it proceeds from him and is essentially in him.

John also says, when speaking of the future glory of the saints, that neither the sun nor any heat will affect them. He adds: "For the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne will shepherd them and lead them to springs of living water" Revelation 7:16-17.

What are these springs of living water? They are the streams of the Holy Spirit, by which the faithful are both cleansed and given life. Of these streams, the Savior says in the Gospel: "He who believes in me, out of his heart will flow rivers of living water" John 7:38, meaning the Holy Spirit, whom believers were to receive. This was first fulfilled in the apostles on the fiftieth day after the resurrection.

Therefore, the Lamb will lead them to the springs of living water because the streams of the Holy Spirit will refresh them, ensuring they never lose the eternal joys of life.

These sources of the waters of life should not be considered apart from Christ, for He Himself said to Philip:

"I am the life";

and:

"Whoever sees Me, sees the Father also"

(John 14:6, 9).

Thus, whoever sees Christ also sees the Holy Spirit, who is in Christ; and to lead believers to the sources of the waters of life is to lead them to Him. Those who believe in Him and behold Him are always satisfied by the fountains of the Holy Spirit proceeding from Him.

Blessed John also says in

(Revelation 8:5):

"And the angel took the censer, filled it with fire from the altar, and threw it to the earth; and there were noises, thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake."

This angel is Jesus Christ, who is read as the angel of great counsel. The censer represents His humanity; the altar, from whose fire the censer is filled, symbolizes the divinity of Christ; and the fire from the altar represents the Holy Spirit taken from Christ's divinity. Both the altar and the censer represent Christ.

The altar represents the place where the burnt offerings or sacrifices of the saints are offered, symbolized by the earthly altar. The offerings of the saints are not received unless they are placed on the altar of Christ. The censer is said to be because the prayers of the saints are received through it.

Alternatively, the censer can be seen as a gift of the Holy Spirit, as the Apostle testifies in (Romans 8:26):

"We do not know what we ought to pray for, but the Spirit Himself intercedes for us," making us intercede with inexpressible groanings.

The fire of the altar is the Holy Spirit, about whom the Savior said in

(Luke 12:49):

"I have come to bring fire on the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled!"

Therefore, the angel threw the censer filled with the fire of the altar to the earth; because, having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, the Savior poured out the grace of the Holy Spirit upon believers. Hence, it follows appropriately that there were noises, thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake, according to what the Savior says in the Gospel: "It is for your good that I am going away; unless I go away, the Advocate will not come to you. But if I go, I will send Him to you."

And when he comes, he will convict the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment.

John 16:7.

Revelation talks about the fire of the altar, which the angel threw to the earth, causing thunderings. This is what the Savior says:

I will send him to you; and when he comes, he will convict the world.

After the Holy Spirit comes, there will be thunderings and voices of preaching. Fear will shake the hearts of mortals, miracles will shine, and earthquakes will shake the hardness of mortals.

The whole world will recognize this.

The fire of the altar is the Holy Spirit of Christ, whom he promises to send to the apostles.

Revelation testifies that he sent him to the earth, clearly teaching that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son and was sent by him to the apostles after his ascension.

How is he sent by the Son unless by proceeding? And he proceeds from him, whose Spirit he is.

Also in the same Revelation, John:

And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse. He who sat on it was called faithful and true, and in righteousness, he judges and makes war. His eyes were like a flame of fire.

Revelation 19:21.

The white horse represents the body of Christ, filled with purity and holiness, having no stain. Its rider symbolizes the divinity of Christ, ruling and sitting in the man he assumed, making one Son from the divinity of the Father and from the humanity containing the substance of the mother.

His eyes are like a flame of fire because the divinity and fiery splendor of the Holy Spirit reside in him, and from his fullness, the light of the eyes shines forth.

This figure signifies and clearly teaches the divinity of the Spirit proceeding from the divinity of the Son. Just as the light of his eyes is said to be from whom they are the eyes, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, in whom he resides and from whom he proceeds.

Chapter Eight

Testimonies from the Gospel and Councils.

We believe that it has been sufficiently shown by divine testimonies of the Scriptures that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

Now, let's add two more testimonies from the Gospel, which will address those who contradict this belief.

When the woman was healed from the flow of blood, the Savior said: Who touched me?

But when everyone denied it, Peter and those with him said: Master, the crowds are pressing around you and crushing you, and you say: Who touched me?

And Jesus replied: Someone touched me, for I know that power has gone out from me.

What is this power that the Savior says has gone out from him?

Clearly, it is the grace of the Holy Spirit; for the Apostle says: To one is given the grace of healing through the same Spirit, to another, miraculous powers.

So what does it mean for the Savior to say: I know that power has gone out from me?

It means: I know that the Spirit proceeds from me, who is the giver of healings and the worker of miracles.

He says that the Holy Spirit has gone out from him in the same way that he says elsewhere: I came from the Father.

For the Son coming from the Father means being born from the Father.

Likewise, the Holy Spirit going out from the Son means proceeding from the same.

Also, in the same Gospel of blessed Luke: And all the crowd sought to touch him, for power came out from him and healed them all.

The power going out from Christ heals everyone because the Holy Spirit proceeding from him gives the grace of healing to all.

Therefore, let the critics, whether malicious or ignorant, stop reproaching the Church of Christ for confessing that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

This is what the Gospels teach, what the apostles profess, and what the prophets do not remain silent about.

First, let them learn what the Church has learned from Christ, and as disciples of the Truth, confess the Catholic faith, so they are not deceived by arrogance or trapped by ignorance, fostering an old heresy.

These errors lead to the madness of Arius, who denied the Son's equality with the Father and claimed the Holy Spirit is lesser than the Son, suggesting the Son was not born of the Father's substance and that the Holy Spirit is a mere creature.

Consider where your declaration leads, illustrious emperors, when you say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father but not from the Son.

You've never read this in divine writings or in the teachings of the Church fathers.

The holy council of Constantinople, refuting and condemning the madness of Arius, declared that the Son is consubstantial with the Father and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father.

Did it deny that He proceeds from the Son?

Or does it imply that if He proceeds from the Father, He does not proceed from the Son?

If you wish to be children of the Church and follow the doctrine of the Fathers, recognize that by saying the holy council gathered in Constantinople declared the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, it did not deny that He also proceeds from the Son.

Since the entire Trinity is consubstantial, and the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit is the love of both, no one can deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son unless they deny that the Son has the love by which He loves the Father.

Since this is madness, it must be firmly and faithfully professed that the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father, and this love by which the Father loves the Son proceeds from the Father, and the love by which the Son loves the Father proceeds likewise from the Son.

This love is the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

It is now time to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son with the testimonies of the holy Fathers, so that those with different opinions may respect and be corrected, lest they fall into the pit of destruction through foolish obstinacy.

Book Two

Chapter One

Proving from the Fathers that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

We are discussing the procession of the Holy Spirit, which the Greek emperors claim proceeds only from the Father, denying it comes from the Son. Because of this, they refuse to communicate with the Roman Church and reject the envoys of the apostolic see. They accuse the Latin Church of error because it professes and believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

First, we observe laypeople disregarding ecclesiastical rules by imposing decrees on the faithful. Those who are not authorized to establish statutes concerning ecclesiastical law, without consulting bishops, are attempting to establish laws of faith. According to their decrees, some are received into communion while others are excluded.

If they wished to establish anything regarding their faith, it would have been appropriate to call a council of bishops, seek the statutes of the Fathers, and consult the holy scriptures. By common agreement, the bishops would then decide what should be followed and what should be rejected.

If it was found that certain beliefs or practices existed in some Churches or regions that needed to be changed, it should have first been communicated to them, understanding the reasons behind these practices. Then, if just religion required it, judgment should be passed.

This should be done under their own governance and the provision of their empire, with Churches established accordingly. Otherwise, what right do they have to judge or discuss matters of faith, custom, or doctrine in people or Churches not under their jurisdiction?

And if there is disagreement, should they be excommunicated? Did the Savior grant the Greek emperors the power to bind and loose? Did He tell them, "You are the light of the world?"

Matthew chapter five, verse fourteen: "You are the light of the world."

Did He command them to teach all nations and baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit?

Matthew chapter twenty-eight, verse nineteen: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

If you claim that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father and refuse to acknowledge that He also proceeds from the Son, while the entire Latin Church, or indeed the whole Catholic world, professes that He proceeds from both, how do you justify your opinion as superior and backed by truth?

Or do you believe that the truth of the Gospel has reached only you and resides solely with you? The Apostle Paul describes himself as an apostle set apart for the Gospel of Christ, as mentioned in Romans, chapter fifteen, verse nineteen.

He spread the Gospel from Jerusalem all the way to Illyricum.

He also traveled to Rome and Spain, covering the entire Roman world, either in person or through his writings, preaching Christ.

Does he claim that he preached Christ only to the Greeks, revealing the truth of the Gospel exclusively to Greek emperors?

The Gospel of Christ shines throughout the entire world.

The writings of the apostles are read, and the prophecies of the prophets are recited.

Through these, the teachers of the Churches, established by the apostles from the beginning, continually learn what to believe about the Holy Trinity, what to profess, and what to teach the people in their care.

They learn how to instruct them in morals, shape their way of life, and form their religious beliefs.

Neither the holy scriptures, the teachings of the elders, the precepts of the apostles, nor the sayings and writings of any of the early Church fathers declare that the Greeks alone are to be the teachers of the entire Church of Christ.

Nor do they state that the emperors should learn from them what should be observed throughout the whole Church of Christ, whether in behavior, religion, or doctrine.

Recognizing such an idea as foolish and arrogant, the Roman Church should not be lightly criticized for preserving the traditions of its elders or for not adopting all the practices of the Greeks.

Because, whether it concerns the Holy Trinity or any religious observance, whatever it holds or practices has come from the teachings of Christ's disciples.

And what it believes, teaches, and practices is not contrary to or inconsistent with the holy scriptures.

So, you criticize us for saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, while you say He proceeds from the Father.

Chapter Two

The authority of councils addresses the objections of the Greeks.

First, we ask you to consider the authority of the elders, namely the Catholic bishops, by which you uphold the decree you strive so much to defend.

The Council of Nicaea, with 318 bishops gathered against Arius under the first Emperor Constantine, after dictating the Creed about the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, when it came to the Holy Spirit, said: We believe in the Holy Spirit: nothing more or less decreeing about His substance or procession.

So, where is the rule now, by which you think you are fortified or the Latins are bound, that you may say the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and the Romans may not say He proceeds from the Son?

If you wish to add nothing beyond what the authority of the Council of Nicaea decreed, then remove "proceeding from the Father," because it is not contained in the Creed of the Council of Nicaea: and perhaps it is allowable to remove what was added by the Romans, "proceeding from the Son."

But if you answer and say that this was established in the Council of Constantinople with 150 bishops gathered there, we respond that it was not allowed to remove, add, or change anything in the Creed of the Council of Nicaea regarding the faith.

However, if you argue that it was not allowed to add anything to what was determined in that council about the consubstantiality of the Son, but because little was said about the Holy Spirit, it was allowed due to future questions of heretics according to the authority of the Holy Scriptures:

we respond that the same allowance was given to the Romans, due to future questions of heretics according to the authority of the Divine Scriptures.

For you cannot prove that the authority of the city of Constantinople is greater than that of the city of Rome, which is the head of all the Churches of Christ, as is proven by the testimony of your elders as well as ours.

But the authority of one hundred and fifty bishops is not so great that it can dictate to all the bishops of the whole world. Therefore, what was allowed to them should also be allowed to the Roman Pontiff and all the Churches of Christ.

They also added to the aforementioned creed, stating that the Holy Spirit is to be worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the holy prophets, and many other things. By adding these, they did not prescribe to the Churches of Christ but set an example. If anyone wanted to add anything according to the Holy Scriptures about the Holy Spirit, to refute heretics and strengthen the faith of believers, they could.

But if you argue that what cannot be found written in the holy Gospels or other divine pages is this: the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and therefore you do not want to accept what is not found written in the Holy Scriptures; just as the Arians did not want to accept that the Father and the Son are of the same substance because the sacred Scriptures did not contain this: tell us where you have read that the Council of Constantinople put in the creed about the Holy Spirit, saying he is to be worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, and who spoke through the holy prophets.

But if you say that these are not found in the Holy Scriptures in plain words, but the power of understanding is contained in them, so that just as he is of the same substance with the Father and the Son, of one power, not a different majesty, and therefore to be worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son; grant the same to the Latin Churches. Although the Gospels do not plainly say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, they show in many ways that the Spirit is of the Son, just as he is of the Father, and proceeds from the Son, just as he proceeds from the Father: which we believe has been sufficiently demonstrated in the previous little book.

Given these circumstances, the Catholic faith, founded by the Savior and the apostles, has always held and preached that the Holy Spirit shares the same power and substance with the Father and the Son and proceeds from both. So why now do you criticize the Catholic faith and attempt to go against its teachings? Are you perhaps trying to revive Arius or Macedonius and bring their long-buried false doctrines back into the Church? Did your ancestors not know how the Roman Church spoke about the Holy Spirit? Yet they never separated themselves from the communion of the Roman See, knowing that what it holds and preaches is the truth of the

Catholic faith and is not open to criticism because it is based on the authority of the Holy Scriptures.

Until the time of Arius, there was no confusion among believers about the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, nor was the term homoousion (same substance) preached. However, the power of that word was deeply ingrained in the minds of believers, as they believed that the all-powerful Son was in no way different from the Father, recalling well the Savior's words: "Whoever has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9). And they knew from John that Christ was the creator of everything: "All things were made through him" (John 1:3). Yet in the Apostles' Creed, nothing more was included than what we all know: that we must believe in God the Father almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. This faith was sufficient for the salvation of believers, and it was approved and commended throughout the world by the blood of many martyrs and the testimony of countless confessors.

But when Arius, the attacker of truth, began to go mad against the divinity of Christ and to hurl many blasphemies, the minds of the faithful were moved to piety, and they drew the weapons of truth against the error of impiety. Together, they pierced the impious doctrine along with its author, which claimed that the Son of God was a creature and not begotten of the Father, and also blasphemed that the Holy Spirit was lesser than the Son.

After Macedonius rose up, agreeing with the Catholics about the Father and the Son, but not accepting the person of the Holy Spirit, Catholic bishops contended against him. They proved that the Holy Spirit is one in the Holy Trinity, consubstantial with both the Father and the Son, proceeding from the Father, and to be worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son.

Then, when Arian madness resurfaced, claiming it was incorrect to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father because it seemed blasphemous—suggesting two Fathers, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit—the Church's teachers decided to repel this blasphemy. They added to the creed that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son.

If He were said to proceed only from the Father, it might be thought that the Son was not the Spirit, nor would He be called the Spirit of the Son, which is impious and blasphemous, and against evangelical and apostolic doctrine. For if you say that the word "proceed" sufficiently distinguishes, so that the Holy Spirit is not thought to be the Son, know that it is also preached about the Son. For He Himself says in the Gospel of John:

John 8:42: "I came forth from God, and am here."

So, if the Son proceeds from God the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds as well, what will silence the Arians from blaspheming that the Holy Spirit is the Son of the Father?

Chapter Three

Testimonies from Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen.

Regarding this matter, the teachers of both the Latins and the Greeks have stated that the Son was begotten solely from the Father, but the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

They understood this through the teachings of the divine scriptures, recognizing that the Spirit is from both the Father and the Son, and therefore proceeds from both.

Hence, the blessed Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, who suffered much at the hands of the Arians for his steadfastness in the Catholic faith, was frequently exiled by their faction. He assisted his bishop Alexander as a deacon at the Council of Nicaea and fought singularly against the madness of Arius.

In his book on the faith, which he published and proposed to be held by all Catholics, he said among other things:

The Father is made by no one, neither created nor begotten.

The Son is from the Father alone; not made, not created, but begotten.

The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made, not created, not begotten, but proceeding.

The bishops of the Latins, confirming this truth of faith from the teachings of the doctors, and considering it a defense against the perverse dogma of Arianism, and understanding it to be derived from the holy Scriptures, added to the symbol of faith, saying of the Holy Spirit: Who proceeds from the Father and the Son.

This faith, from the times of Constantine, under whom the Council of Nicaea with 318 bishops was gathered, up to our times, has been held by the Western Church.

Nor has the Catholic Church of the Greeks renounced it, as it did not want to become alien to the doctrine of truth, as declared by their writings.

And now you accuse this faith, moved by some lightness or deceived by some error, I do not know.

Tell me, do you confess that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ?

If you deny it, the apostle Paul cries out against you, who says: If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to him (Romans 8:9).

And Luke cries out, who says: And the Spirit of Jesus did not permit them (Acts 16:7).

And Peter cries out: Therefore, being exalted at the right hand of God, he has poured out this which you now see and hear (Acts 2:33).

The Savior himself also cries out, speaking to his disciples: "If I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you" John sixteen verse seven. Similarly, after the resurrection, he breathed on the disciples and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit" John twenty verse twenty-two. All these things affirm that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.

Since you cannot deny this, you are compelled by necessity to admit, whether you like it or not, that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. You cannot claim he is a creature like Arius did, or that he does not exist like Macedonius suggested, as your profession states that he proceeds from the Father. When you say this, how can you try to deny that he proceeds from the Son? Since he is of the substance of both the Father and the Son, he cannot be of the substance of both unless he proceeds from both.

Let us hear what Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzus, says in his sermon on the Holy Spirit, which he delivered before the people in the Church of Constantinople on Pentecost:

"The Holy Spirit," he said, "always was, and is, and will be, having neither beginning nor end, but co-eternal with the Father and the Son. For it is not fitting that either the Son should have ever been absent from the Father, or the Spirit from the Son."

By saying that the Holy Spirit is co-eternal with the Father and the Son, he refutes the Arians, who taught that he was a creature. By saying that he always was, and is, and will be, he

confutes Macedonius, who denied his existence. But by professing that the Son was never absent from the Father, nor the Spirit from the Son, he refutes you, who deny that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

If, according to your opinion, the Holy Spirit were to proceed only from the Father, he ought to have said that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit were ever absent from the Father. But since he says that the Son was never absent from the Father, nor the Spirit from the Son, he clearly speaks of the Son as being born of the Father without any time interval, and the Spirit proceeding from the Son before all time. He did not, however, deny that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, since there was no question about that, but he said that the Spirit was never absent from the Son, which had come into question.

In the following passages, we'll talk about the Spirit:

The Spirit sanctifies but is not sanctified, makes gods but does not become God himself. He is unchangeable, immutable, always present to himself, the Father, and the Son; invisible, timeless, of his own power, and of all power.

When it is said that he is always present to himself, the Father, and the Son, it does not imply servitude, but rather that he is unchangeable and immutable. He retains his own nature as well as the essence of the Father and the Son: his own nature because there is no change in him; immutable to the Father and the Son because he shares the same essence as them. The Holy Spirit is of that same nature.

He is unchangeable and immutable to the Father, who is the source and origin of all things, and to the Son, from whom he proceeds. He is not unlike the Son, nor of a different essence. He is said to be of his own power and of all power because he exists in his own person and accomplishes whatever he wills in all creation.

Furthermore, he is life-giving, light and enlightening, good and goodness. He is the Lord of all, sending apostles and inspiring where he wills, distributing gifts as he wills. He is the Spirit of truth, the Spirit of wisdom; through whom the Father is known, and the Son is glorified.

We pass over many things, collecting only those that concern the present question. The Spirit is said to be life, and the Son says of himself: I am the life John 14:6.

The Spirit is said to be life-giving, and the Son says of himself: As the Father gives life to whom he wills, so the Son gives life to whom he wills John 5:21.

Therefore, if the Spirit is life, the Son is also life; and if the Spirit is life-giving, the Son is also life-giving. They are of one essence and one operation.

But the Son is life from the Father, and the Spirit is life from the Son; thus the Son is life-giving from the Father, and the Spirit is life-giving from the Son.

The Spirit is also light and enlightening, and the Savior says of himself: I am the light of the world John 8:12.

The evangelist John says of the Son: Who enlightens every man coming into this world John 1:9.

Therefore, if both the Son and the Holy Spirit are light and both are illuminating, they share the same substance and operation. The Holy Spirit receives light and illumination from the Son, as the Son himself testifies: "He will take from what is mine" (John 16:14). However, He receives not because He lacks, but because He proceeds from the Son.

Similarly, the Spirit is good, and the Son says of Himself: "I am the good shepherd" (John 10:11). No sane person will deny the goodness of Christ. Good and good are not two separate goods, but one; just as there are not two gods, but one God. The Deity does not multiply itself or increase in number.

Therefore, the good Spirit proceeds from the good Son, not by being born, but by proceeding. If the Spirit proceeds only from the Father and not from the Son, how can the things of the Son also belong to the Spirit? Or how does the Spirit receive from the Son? As Saint Gregory says, the Holy Spirit is the Lord of all, demonstrating His omnipotence because He is the Lord of all things created by the Father through the Son, proceeding eternally from both the Father and the Son.

The Holy Spirit is also said to send the apostles, and the Savior tells them: "Behold, I am sending you out as sheep among wolves" (Matthew 10:16). The operation of both the Son and the Holy Spirit is shown to be one, cooperating with each other. This makes it clear that they do not consist of different substances, wills, or powers, as their operation is the same in all things. The Son is referred to the Father, from whom He is born, and the Holy Spirit is referred to the Son, from whom He proceeds.

Blessed Gregory follows by saying of the Spirit: "He blows where he wills; distributing gifts as he wills." And of the Son: "He ascended on high, he took captivity captive, he gave gifts to men" (Ephesians 4:8).

The majesty of the Holy Spirit is shown to be equal to the Father and the Son in nature, greatness, power, and virtue—not subordinate, imperfect, or less powerful.

The Spirit distributes gifts just as the Son does, with the same gifts, at the same time, and to the same people. This clearly shows the effect of a single operation and the affection of the same will.

The Son cannot be without the Holy Spirit, nor the Holy Spirit without the Son, as both are of one substance, and the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

The Spirit is also called the Spirit of Truth. The Savior says of Himself: I am the truth (John 14:6).

Therefore, by saying that the Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, it is clearly taught that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, who is the truth.

The Holy Spirit is also called the Spirit of Wisdom. The Apostle Paul testifies that Christ is the power and wisdom of God (First Corinthians 1:24).

Thus, the Spirit of Wisdom is the Spirit of Christ, who is the wisdom of God. This clearly shows that the Spirit is of Christ by calling it the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Wisdom.

Why then is it the Spirit of Christ, if it is the Spirit of the Lord of all, as the blessed Gregory testifies?

Surely because it proceeds from Christ. If you deny this, you will admit that it is subordinate, and thereby either a creature or lesser than the Son.

Both of these are blasphemous and far removed from Catholic piety.

Therefore, it is said that what truth has is that the Spirit is of Christ; namely, both the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Wisdom, because it proceeds from Christ, that is, it proceeds from truth and wisdom.

It is added: Through whom the Father is known, and the Son is glorified, and by whom alone He is known.

The Son also says to the Father: Father, I have made your name known to the people you gave me (John 17:6).

If the Father is known through the Spirit, and the Son manifests the name of the Father to people, they are shown to be of a single operation.

He also says that the Son is glorified by the Holy Spirit, and the Son says:

"It is my Father who glorifies me"

(John 8:54).

And he speaks to the Father:

"Glorify me, Father, with yourself"

(John 17:5).

If the Spirit glorifies the Son, and the Father glorifies the Son, then the Father and the Spirit work as one.

And by working together, they show they have one will, one essence, and one power.

Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is known only by the Father and the Son, he certainly proceeds from both and is consubstantial with both.

Notice how it is said that the Son is glorified by the Spirit, just as the Son glorifies the Father. But what does it mean to glorify the Father? It means to make known to humans that he is begotten of the Father.

Similarly, the Son is glorified by the Spirit, showing that he proceeds from the Son.

Therefore, in many ways, the blessed Gregory proves that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and is of one substance with the Father and the Son.

Concluding, he says:

"What is the need for more words?

All that the Father is, so is the Son, except that the Father is unbegotten.

All that the Son is, so is the Holy Spirit, except that the Son is begotten."

What does this distinction and order of succession mean?

The Son is what the Father is, except that the Father is unbegotten.

The Holy Spirit is what the Son is, except that the Son is begotten.

He could have said, all that the Father is, so is the Son and the Holy Spirit, except that the Father is not begotten, nor proceeds from another.

But now he speaks of the Son being all that the Father is, and the Holy Spirit being all that the Son is, except the privilege of birth.

Evidently speaking thus, he shows that the Father is not from anyone, the Son is begotten only from the Father, and the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

But that he also proceeds from the Father, he said a little earlier, saying:

"And to the first origin of all, who is the Father,

as all things of the Only Begotten, so also all things of the Holy Spirit are referred."

By saying these things, he showed that everything belonging to the Son is connected to the Father, and everything belonging to the Holy Spirit also refers back to the primary origin of all things.

Even though the Spirit proceeds from the Son, the Son received this from the Father, so that by being born from the Father, the Holy Spirit would proceed from him.

So, everything that belongs to the Son belongs to the Father; and everything that belongs to the Holy Spirit also belongs to the Son; and thus to the Father, from whom the Son received that the Holy Spirit would proceed from him—not as created by the Father, but begotten; not diminished, but equal in power; not of another, but of the same nature.

Likewise, in the latter part: Since Jesus came to us in a bodily form, it was fitting that the Spirit should also appear to us in a bodily form. When Christ ascended to him, he descended to us; he came as the Lord in power, but was sent as one who is not contrary to God.

This teacher showed the unified operation and will of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, indicating that since Jesus came to us in bodily form, it was fitting that the Holy Spirit should also appear to us in bodily form.

This shows the similarity of their will, with the Holy Spirit willing to show himself bodily to mortals because Jesus willed to show his coming bodily to mortals. Because he proceeds from him, he is also of one will with him; he is not different in action from the Son, from whom he is not separated in nature; and he is always united in action with him, never lacking in coeternity, always cooperating with the one from whom he proceeds.

When he added, "And when Christ ascended to him, he descended to us," he did not want to show the diminution of the Son, but the assumption of humanity. Through this, Jesus ascended not only to the Holy Spirit but also to himself; because he who was made within all things from humanity, through Divinity was above all things.

He added, "Who indeed came as the Lord in power, but was sent as one who is not contrary to God."

Two things are mentioned: the Holy Spirit has come, and He has been sent. His coming is by His own power, hence it is said, "As the Lord." His being sent indicates He is from another, and it is said, "As one who is not contrary to the one who sends Him." The sending does not imply subordination, but procession.

He is sent by Christ, to whom Christ ascended; and He is sent as not contrary to God, that is, to Christ, who indeed is God, always united to His will. He is sent by Him because He proceeds from Him.

It is added: Therefore, after Christ, so that we may never be without one Advocate, that is, a defender or comforter. He is called another Advocate to recognize the equality of nature and power; for another means another self. Another self refers to someone of the same substance or nature, not someone different.

When Christ is called an Advocate, and the Holy Spirit is likewise called an Advocate, and the Spirit comes when Christ departs, it clearly shows that they have the same role and share the same name. They succeed each other mutually, as they are said to be of the same will and are shown to have the same operation. When Christ ascends, the Spirit descends, clearly sent by Christ, whose place He represents. This sending is a procession, not a diminishment or subjection.

Another, that is another self, is said of the Holy Spirit, demonstrating complete similarity: for another self cannot be said of someone different, but of someone of the same substance or nature. Therefore, it is shown that the Spirit proceeds from Him whose nature or substance He

shares. The Spirit cannot be of the same nature or substance as the Son unless He proceeds from Him.

It is also added below: Therefore, God is fire, and the Holy Spirit is fire. It is written that God is a consuming fire, not indeed natural and corporeal, but spiritual and invisible.

So, God the Father is fire, God the Son is fire, and God the Holy Spirit is fire. But God the Father is fire from no other fire because He takes His origin from no one. God the Son is fire from the Father because He is born from Him. And God the Holy Spirit is fire from the Son because He proceeds from the Son. Therefore, by saying that God is fire and the Holy Spirit is fire, it shows the one substance of the entire Trinity.

He indeed connects the persons of the Father and the Son by saying, "God is fire," and then adds the Holy Spirit by saying, "And the Holy Spirit is fire." But why did he place the persons of the Father and the Son together under the common name of God and prefer to distinguish the Holy Spirit separately? The reason is clear. He wanted to show by such a distinction that the Holy Spirit, who is fire, proceeds from the Father and the Son, who are also fire.

When Saint Gregory discussed such things about the Holy Spirit in the Church of Constantinople and wrote letters proving that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and proceeds from the Son, without denying or diminishing His procession from the Father, but equating His omnipotence and dominion with the Father and the Son in all things, was he rejected by the Church? Was his speech disapproved? Was he not received into communion by the citizens or the emperor? Certainly, this venerable doctor lived during the times of the Roman emperors Gratian and Theodosius the Great.

Since then, more than 500 years have passed up to our times, and never was the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son denied, nor was there any question among Catholics about this, except in your times now. Indeed, the profession of faith regarding the Holy Spirit remained the same and similar in both the Eastern and Western Churches. What has now caused this question to arise after so many centuries, you should see; however, there is no reason of either integrity or wisdom to justify why you have come to this, because by saying such things, you oppose the Catholic faith, resist the truth, and go against the holy scriptures.

Chapter Four From Ambrose

Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, a man adorned with the splendor of all virtues, fought many battles against the Arians and suffered many persecutions from them.

In the books he eloquently wrote on the Holy Spirit against Arian heresy and supported with the truth of the Gospel, he says (Book 1 on the Holy Spirit, Chapter 3):

"If you speak of Christ, you have indicated both God the Father, from whom the Son was anointed, and the Son Himself who was anointed, and the Spirit who anointed Him.

And if you speak of the Father, you have equally indicated His Son and the Spirit of His mouth, if you also comprehend this in your heart.

And if you speak of the Spirit, you have indicated both God the Father, from whom the Spirit proceeds, and the Son, because the Spirit is also of the Son."

Blessed Ambrose teaches that when one of them is named, whether the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, the entire Trinity is comprehended, showing such a similarity of equality in the three that one term encompasses the three persons, although not by the distinction of voice, yet by the equality of unity.

As for his statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, there is no question here; for you agree with us on this.

But when he says that when the Son is named, the Spirit is also named because the Spirit is of the Son, here we are divided from you.

For you who refuse to profess that the Spirit proceeds from the Son also refuse to say that the Spirit is of the Son: for if He does not proceed from Him, it is not rightly said that He is His Spirit. But He is called the Spirit of the Father because He proceeds from the Father.

Therefore, when the Son is named, the Holy Spirit is not simultaneously understood; for it cannot be shown that He is comprehended by the name of one of whom He is not the Spirit.

However, holy Ambrose says that the Spirit is of the Son, thus He proceeds from the Son.

In the following, he speaks similarly:

"He who denies the Holy Spirit also denies God the Father and the Son: for the Spirit of God is the same as the Spirit of Christ: no one should doubt that there is one Spirit."

The unity and consubstantiality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son is evident when it says: whoever denies the Spirit also denies the Father and the Son equally, because there is one Spirit of both. It is from the Father, because it proceeds from the Father, and equally from the Son, because it proceeds from the Son. It is not two Spirits, but one Spirit. It is not said to be the Spirit of the Father and another Spirit of the Son, but one Spirit from both; therefore, it proceeds from both.

In Chapter 10, it states: the Spirit is not sent from a place, nor does it proceed from a place when it proceeds from the Son. The Son himself says, "I came from the Father and have come." He clearly testifies that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. To ensure this procession is not measured by physical spaces, the Son excludes this notion by saying of the Father, "I came from the Father and have come" (John 8:42). The Son proceeds from the Father, not by spatial distance, but by the exit of birth. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, neither by spatial distance nor by the exit of birth, but by the process of existence.

When speaking about the procession of the Son from the Father, it is said: neither does he depart from a place when he exits from the Father, nor are they separated like a body from a body. When he is with the Father, he is not enclosed as a body within a body. Similarly, the Holy Spirit, when proceeding from the Father and the Son, is not separated from the Father, nor is he separated from the Son.

This chief teacher and renowned confessor of Christ, by saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and also from the Son, prevented the Arians he was disputing against from blaspheming. He ensured that those who claimed the Spirit was a creature and lesser not only than the Father but also than the Son, would not prevail. By hearing that the Spirit proceeds from both, they would understand the Spirit to be consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and equally worthy of worship and glorification with them.

Later, it testifies to the Son saying: "Whoever loves me will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him" (John 14:23).

The Spirit comes just as the Father comes; because where the Father is, there is also the Son; and where the Son is, there is also the Holy Spirit.

What does it mean when it says that where the Father is, there is also the Son, if not that the Son is born from the Father, from whom He is never separated? And what does it mean where the Son is, there is also the Holy Spirit? It means that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, from whom He is never separated, showing the ineffable shared essence of the entire Trinity. It testifies that the Son is always in the Father, and the Holy Spirit is always in the Son. So, where the Father is, there is also the Son; and where the Son is, there is also the Holy Spirit, not divided by place, time, will, action, or essence.

Later, in chapter 12: Just as the Father gave the Son, and the Son gave Himself, understand that the Holy Spirit gave Him. For it is written: Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil (Matthew 4). Therefore, the Spirit lovingly gave the Son: for there is one love of the Father and the Son. When it says there is one love of the Father and the Son, it testifies that there is one Spirit of both; for the Spirit is love. The Apostle says: For the fruit of the Spirit is love (Galatians 5:22). Therefore, it is shown that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, whose love it is: for the love of the Father cannot exist unless it proceeds from the Father; because He does not receive love from elsewhere. Nor can the love of the Son exist unless it proceeds from the Son: in the way that love loves, it proceeds from Him. As there is one love of the Father and the Son, there is one Spirit proceeding from both.

In the second book, chapter 12, it says: The Holy Spirit received from the Son. However, He received through the unity of substance, just as the Son received from the Father. By saying this, it clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit received from the Son. And what He received, He received by proceeding, just as the Son received from the Father by being born.

Could the Holy Spirit have received anything from the Son that it did not have before, since it is of the same substance and possesses the same power as the Son? Whatever the Son has, the Holy Spirit also has.

Saint Ambrose adds a testimony from the Gospel: He says, "He will glorify me, because he will take from what is mine and declare it to you. All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will take from what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:14).

He follows with: What could be clearer evidence of this unity? What the Father has belongs to the Son; what the Son has, the Spirit has also received.

These words of Saint Ambrose clearly show that the Holy Spirit proceeds substantially from the Son. He says: What the Father has belongs to the Son, that is, being substantially born of the Father, what is the Father's is also the Son's. Similarly, the Holy Spirit, substantially proceeding from the Son, has received from the Son, so that whatever the Son has, the Spirit also has, that is, it is of the same substance as the Son, just as the Son is of the same substance as the Father.

Moreover, in the following: What the Son speaks, the Father speaks; and what the Father speaks, the Son speaks: and concerning the Spirit, the Son of God said: For he does not speak from himself, that is, not without my and the Father's communion (for the Spirit is not divided or separated), but he speaks what he hears (John 16:13): evidently hearing through the unity of substance and the property of knowledge.

While this Catholic teacher confesses that the Holy Spirit does not speak without the communion of the Father and the Son, it is evident that when the Spirit speaks, the Father speaks, and the Son speaks. This testifies that the Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and of the same operation, neither divided nor separated.

And what he added: He speaks what he hears, implies his procession: for the Spirit does not hear the speech of the Father and the Son through certain intervening spaces or some openings, since he is of the same substance. And just as the Son says: "All things that I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you" (John 15:15).

By being born from the Father and remaining in the Father's substance, not by receiving the Father's speech at intervals: just as the Spirit speaks what He hears, proceeding from the Father and the Son, because He remains substantially in both, and proceeds from both, He hears what He speaks through the unity of substance and the property of knowledge.

The Son has everything from the Father, who said, "All that the Father has is mine" John sixteen, fifteen. What He received through the unity of nature, the Spirit received from Him through the same unity.

As the Lord Jesus Himself declares about His Spirit, saying: "Therefore I said, He will take what is mine and declare it to you" John sixteen, fourteen.

Saying that the Son has everything from the Father, and that the Spirit received everything from the Son through the unity of nature from the Father, doesn't He clearly declare that the Son is born from the Father, that is from the Father's substance, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, that is from the Son's substance?

Just as the Son received everything that belongs to the Father by being born, so too, the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Son, received whatever belongs to the Son.

Therefore, what the Spirit speaks is from the Son; what the Son gave is from the Father.

So, if what the Spirit speaks is from the Son, this teacher clearly testifies that whatever the Spirit has, He received from the Son, because He proceeds from Him; and if what the Son gave is from the Father, to whom did He give it?

Surely to the Holy Spirit who proceeds from Him: and if what He gave is from the Father, the Son received it from the Father by being born, so that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him.

He added: Thus, neither the Son nor the Spirit speaks anything on their own, because the Trinity speaks nothing outside itself.

The whole Trinity consists in the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.

However, the Son speaks nothing on His own, because He is not from Himself, but from the Father.

Similarly, the Spirit speaks nothing on His own, because He is not from Himself, but from the Son: only the Father is from no one.

Therefore, when the Son speaks, the whole Trinity speaks; and when the Spirit speaks, the whole Trinity speaks; and when the Father speaks, the whole Trinity speaks. The Trinity speaks nothing outside itself, as it is neither divided nor separated from itself.

Also, in the third book of the same work, Chapter 1:

According to divinity, the Spirit is not above Christ but in Christ. Just as the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are in the Father and the

Son. Blessed Ambrose, by saying that according to divinity the Spirit is not above Christ but in Christ, distinguishes Christ's humanity from His divinity. In the Gospel, we read that the Holy Spirit came upon the Savior and remained upon Him; and the Father speaks to John: "The one on whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him" (John 1:33).

Therefore, according to humanity, the Spirit came upon Christ and remained on Him; but according to divinity, the Spirit remains in Christ because He is equal to Him, sharing both substances with Him. As it is written about the Father, He remains in the Son, and the Son in the Father. The statement that the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ remain in the Father or the Son testifies to the unity of both Spirits, as they proceed from both and remain through consubstantiality in both.

He added: "For He remains in God, because He is from God," as it is written: "We have not received the spirit of this world, but the Spirit who is from God" (First Corinthians 2:12); and He remains in Christ because He received from Christ and is in Christ. It is written again: "He will take from what is mine" (John 16:14).

So, where is the Spirit from God? Clearly, because He proceeds from God. And where did He receive from Christ? Certainly, because He proceeds from Christ. And where does He remain both in God and in Christ? Absolutely, because He is consubstantial with both. In the following chapters 7 and 8, speaking of the Antichrist, it says: "Whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the Spirit of His mouth" (Second Thessalonians 2:8).

Here, grace is not acquired, but unity remains indivisible; because neither can Christ be without the Spirit, nor can the Spirit be without Christ. For the unity of the divine nature cannot be separated.

Saint Ambrose also discusses the relationship between the humanity and divinity of Christ. He clarifies that Christ isn't two separate beings—one human and one divine—but rather one perfect God and perfect human. As a human, Christ became God by grace, but as God, He exists by nature.

When Saint Ambrose said, "Whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the Spirit of His mouth," he emphasized that this grace is not acquired, thus highlighting the divine nature. The Spirit of the mouth that will destroy the Antichrist is understood to be the Holy Spirit, who is a person of the Holy Trinity. So, when he said, "Whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the Spirit of His mouth," it refers to the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the Lord Jesus.

It's also important to note that when it is said that the Spirit is the Spirit of the mouth of the Lord and now the Spirit of the mouth of the Lord Jesus, it clearly shows that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Jesus as well. This doesn't mean Jesus has a physical mouth in His divine nature, but that the Spirit proceeds from His substance. Just as the Spirit of the mouth of the Lord proceeds from the Father's substance, it is evident that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, as He is the Spirit of both.

Blessed Ambrose continues, showing that the unity of Christ and the Spirit remains indivisible. Neither Christ can be without the Spirit, nor the Spirit without Christ. Christ cannot be without the Spirit because He is consubstantial with Him, and the Spirit proceeds from Him. Similarly, the Spirit cannot be without Christ, as He is consubstantial with Christ and has received everything from Him. This emphasizes that the unity of the divine nature cannot be separated.

By saying this, he acknowledges that the nature of Christ is the nature of the Spirit, and the nature of the Spirit is the nature of Christ. The bond of unity cannot be separated in any way, except that the Son is born, and the Spirit proceeds. These do not create substance, but demonstrate a relationship.

He further explains: It is written that the sword of the Word is the Spirit. Similarly, it is written that the sword of the Holy Spirit is the Word of God Ephesians 6:17. After considering some assumptions, he concludes: Therefore, since the sword of the Word is the Holy Spirit, and the sword of the Holy Spirit is the Word, there is indeed a unity of power. But what is the sword of the Word if not the Word itself? And what is the sword of the Spirit if not the Spirit itself?

From this, we gather that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Word, whose sword it is, and the Word is the Spirit of the Holy Spirit, whose sword it is. Neither the Word can be without the Holy Spirit, nor the Holy Spirit without the Word, because they operate as one and share the same power. Since this is so, they cannot be separated in substance, nor divided in will. Therefore, the Son and the Holy Spirit, being of one substance and one will, proceed from one another. The Spirit proceeds from the Son, since the Son, born of the Father, gave everything he received by being born from the Father to the Spirit, not as to one lesser, nor as to an outsider, but as to one proceeding from himself.

However, it must be noted that when it is said that the sword of the Holy Spirit is the Word, and the sword of the Word is the Holy Spirit, it does not imply a union of persons, but rather shows the coupling of substance, so that they are of one substance, though they are not one person. One is from the other, namely the Spirit from the Son, but not the Son from the Spirit, but from the Father.

In this way, Saint Ambrose, in his reflections and debates on the Holy Spirit, did not appear ungrateful or heretical to the Greek emperors, namely Gratian and Theodosius the Great, in whose times he flourished. They loved the holy man with all their hearts and always held him in the highest veneration.

His debates and tireless work for the Catholic faith defeated, conquered, and suppressed the Arians attacking the Church.

Now, listen, you emperors who strive to either defend the faith or imitate religion: by denying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, you have opposed Catholic bishops who have overthrown the Arians with their misguided beliefs about the Holy Spirit.

You have overturned the piety of your ancestors—namely, the Roman emperors—who always upheld this faith, fought for it, and cherished it with great reverence.

Chapter Five
From Didymus.

Didymus of Alexandria, who was blinded from childhood but known for his spiritual insight, speaks in his book on the Holy Spirit as follows:

Whoever shares in the Holy Spirit immediately shares in both the Father and the Son.

And whoever has the love of the Father receives it from the Son through the Holy Spirit; and whoever partakes in the grace of Jesus Christ receives that same grace from the Father through the Holy Spirit.

From all of this, we see that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit work together as one.

Let's examine this carefully.

He says: Whoever shares in the Holy Spirit, and someone shares in the Spirit by partaking in Him, immediately shares in both the Father and the Son: for they have become a partaker of both the Father and the Son through sharing in the Spirit.

This shows that the Spirit is of the same essence as the Father and the Son, and so united that one cannot have the Spirit without also having the Father and the Son.

He adds: Whoever has the love of the Father receives it from the Son through the Holy Spirit. Earlier, he showed only the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, but now he begins to teach about the procession of the Spirit.

He calls the love of the Father the Holy Spirit, as shown by what follows, saying it is given through the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit does not give anything but His own gift when He gives love.

And it is written that love is God; therefore, when the Spirit gives love, He gives Himself, because He is love: but this love is said to be of the Father, because the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father. And why is He the Spirit of the Father?

Because He proceeds from Him, not as one of the creatures, but as of the same substance as the Father.

Therefore, He is not said to be of the Father as created by Him, but as of the same substance and proceeding from Him.

He says that having the love of the Father is given by the Son through the Holy Spirit: so how does the Son give the gift of the Holy Spirit?

Clearly, as a collaborator with the Father and the Spirit.

But how can one give oneself an equal, or the gift of another, that is, the Holy Spirit? Certainly, because love, which is from the Father and shared by the Son through the Holy Spirit, is also from the Son. Whatever belongs to the Father also belongs to the Son. But is the love, which is the Holy Spirit, so much the Son's, that it is a creature? Not at all; rather, it is given by the Son because it proceeds from Him, and it is the Son's because it is consubstantial with Him.

It is added: And who is a partaker of the grace of Jesus Christ. Here, he calls the grace of Jesus Christ what he previously called the love of the Father. But what is it that he now calls the grace of Jesus Christ, known to be the gift of the Holy Spirit? Without a doubt, he shows that it is shared by Jesus Christ, whose grace it is. Just as the love of the Father is said to proceed from the Father, so the same love, called the grace of Jesus Christ, is known to proceed from Jesus Christ. However, anyone who has this same grace of Christ says it is given to him through the Holy Spirit. Indeed, we see the whole Trinity working together and understand that the Holy Spirit, who is the love of the Father and the Son, proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

It follows: From all these things, it is clear that the same operation belongs to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. For those whose operation is the same, their will is also one. And those whose will is one, their substance is one. Hence, it is added: For those whose operation is one, their substance is also one. Because those of the same substance are homousious, they have the same operations. And those of another substance are dissonant and diverse. This shows that the Holy Spirit is of one substance with the Father and the Son, because it has the

same operation with them. It has been shown above that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son, because it proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

In the latter, it is said: For when he said, at the time of answering, undoubtedly the Son, that the disciples would be taught by the Spirit what they ought to answer, it follows: For I will give you a wisdom which none of your adversaries will be able to resist or contradict. Luke 21:15.

This demonstrates that the wisdom given to the disciples by the Son is the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, and that the teaching of the Holy Spirit is the teaching of the Lord.

But how is the wisdom given by the Son also the wisdom of the Holy Spirit?

It's because the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, whose wisdom is also that of the Holy Spirit.

And how can the teaching of the Holy Spirit be considered the teaching of the Lord?

It's because everything that belongs to the Holy Spirit also belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ, since it proceeds from Him.

Thus, it is stated: There is a unity of nature and will between the Spirit and the Son.

This testifies that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as the Spirit shares the same nature and will with the Son.

Otherwise, if the Spirit did not proceed from Him, it would not share the same will as the Son, since things that are separated in partnership are also separated in will.

It is also stated: And because it has been previously demonstrated that the Spirit is naturally united with the Only Begotten God and God the Father: the Son and the Father are one, according to the statement:

"I and the Father are one" (John 10:30); the Trinity is shown to be undivided and inseparable according to nature.

If the Spirit is naturally united with the Only Begotten God and God the Father, then it proceeds from the Only Begotten God.

If it only proceeds from God the Father and not from the Only Begotten God, it is united with the Father by nature, but not with the Only Begotten God: for it cannot be united by nature to Him from whom it does not proceed.

But the author testifies that the Spirit is naturally united with the Only Begotten God: therefore, he acknowledges that the Spirit proceeds from the Only Begotten God.

And because he states that the Trinity is undivided and inseparable according to nature, he acknowledges that the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

If you teach that the Spirit only proceeds from the Father, then the Trinity is no longer undivided and inseparable, because the Spirit is divided from the Son, from whom it does not proceed: it is separated from the Only Begotten, whose Spirit it is not.

It is far from the belief of the Catholic Church to hold this impious opinion:

the Holy Trinity is undivided and inseparable by nature; the Father is from no one, the Son is begotten from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Another Gospel states:

"For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you" (Matthew 10:20).

So, if the Spirit of the Father speaks through the apostles, teaching them what to say, and what is taught by the Spirit is wisdom, which we recognize as the Son, it clearly shows that the Spirit shares the same nature with the Son and the Father, whose Spirit He is.

Furthermore, the Father and the Son are one. The author says that the wisdom the Spirit of the Father teaches the apostles

is the Son. If the wisdom is the Son, and the Holy Spirit speaks this wisdom, which is the Son, through the apostles,

He receives it from the Son. But how does He receive it? Certainly by proceeding, not by participating in something He did not have before:

for there was never a time when the Spirit lacked wisdom. He received it from the Son to always be wise, proceeding from Him;

because He shares the same nature with both the Son and the Father, whose Spirit He is: which he also referred to as the Spirit of the Son; whose wisdom the Spirit speaks, but as he mentioned earlier:

"For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father" (Matthew 10:20).

He further states: The Father and the Son are one. If the Father and the Son are one, then the Spirit, who is of the Father,

is also of the Son; and therefore, He proceeds from both.

After discussing many aspects of the consubstantiality of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, he concluded:

From these points, it is clear, although the substance of the Trinity is undivided, that the Father is truly the Father of the Son,

and the Son is truly the Son of the Father, and the Holy Spirit is truly the Spirit of the Father and of God;

and moreover, the Spirit of wisdom and truth, that is, the Son of God.

If the Father is the Father of the Son because He begot Him, and the Son is the Son of the Father because He was begotten by Him, and the Holy Spirit is truly the Spirit of the Father because He proceeds from Him, then He is also the Spirit of wisdom and truth. In other words, He is the Spirit of the Son of God because He proceeds from the Son, from truth, from wisdom, and from God, which is the Son.

For this reason, when it was said that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, it was added that He is the Spirit of God, intending to be understood as the person of the Son. To avoid any confusion, it was later clarified that the Spirit of wisdom and truth is indeed the Son of God.

Later, it was stated: We have frequently shown that the Spirit operates in the same way as the Father and the Son. There is one substance in this operation, and the operation of those who share the same essence is not different. The Spirit's operation is the same as that of the Father and the Son because He is consubstantial with both, proceeding from both. He cannot be part of the same operation if He does not proceed from both. The substance is divided among those from whom it does not proceed coherently, and He cannot be substantially united to either the Father or the Son in any other way, because as substance, the Spirit is received from both the Father and the Son by proceeding.

Furthermore, in discussing the Spirit of truth who is sent by the Father, if He is the Comforter, the Savior said: For He does not speak from Himself (John 16:13); that is, without me, and without my and the Father's will; because He is inseparable from my and the Father's will. For this very reason, He subsists and speaks from the Father and me. I speak the truth, that is, I inspire what He speaks, since He is the Spirit of truth.

Clearly, this teacher instructs us that the Holy Spirit comes from the Son. When he says, "He does not speak on His own," he shows that the Spirit is not acting independently. Explaining further, he says, "This means without me, and without my and the Father's will," indicating that the Spirit comes from both the Father and the Son, and does not act without their will. By saying, "For this very thing which exists and speaks, I, the truth, speak," he shows that the Spirit's existence is from the Son. If, when the Spirit speaks, the truth speaks—that is, the Son—it demonstrates that what the Spirit communicates comes from the Son. Emphasizing this point more clearly, he adds, "I inspire what He speaks."

How does He inspire? Clearly, since the Spirit proceeds from Him and connects. Indeed, He is the Spirit of truth, which means He is the Spirit of the Son. All these points demonstrate that the Spirit is from the Son and is inspired by the Son, meaning He proceeds from Him. And since what the Spirit speaks and the Spirit's very existence come from the Son, it shows they are consubstantial and the Spirit proceeds from Him.

Therefore, the Father speaks, and the Son hears; or conversely, the Son speaks, and the Father hears. This signifies the same nature in the Father and the Son and their agreement. The Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of wisdom, cannot hear something the Son says without already knowing it, as it is expressed by the Son.

Saying that the Father speaks and is heard by the Son demonstrates the Son's origin from the Father. Similarly, when the Son speaks and is heard by the Father, it implies that He was begotten by the Father. Because the Father and the Son share the same nature, they are also in complete agreement. So, when the Father speaks to the Son or the Son speaks to the Father, it reflects a unified will and harmony.

The Holy Spirit, also known as the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Wisdom, is acknowledged as the Spirit of the Son. It's said that He cannot hear anything from the Son that He doesn't already know because, being of the same substance as the Son and proceeding from the Son, what the Son speaks, the Holy Spirit also speaks.

The Spirit is essentially the utterance of the Son, as explained by the current teacher. After stating that the Holy Spirit cannot hear anything from the Son that He doesn't know, it follows that the Spirit is the very thing that is spoken by the Son. In other words, the utterance of the Son is the substance of the Spirit. For it is said that since He is the very thing spoken, it is understood as the Spirit; what is spoken by the Son is what the Son speaks.

If what the Son speaks is the Holy Spirit, as this teacher asserts, it cannot be denied that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. Indeed, the utterance of the Son proceeds from the Son.

Therefore, since the Spirit is the same as what is spoken by the Son, the Spirit entirely proceeds from the Son.

It adds: Finally, lest anyone should separate Him from the will and fellowship of the Father and the Son, it is written: For He will not speak on His own, but will speak only what He hears (John 16:13). Similarly, the Savior says about Himself: I judge only as I hear (John 5:30).

The will of the Father is the will of the Son, and the fellowship of both is the Spirit of both, because love, which is the Spirit, unites the will of the Father and the Son. Nor can the will of the Spirit be separated from the will of the Father and the Son; just as there is the fellowship of both, so there is the same will of both. And just as the will of the Son is born from the Father, so the will of the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

Hence it is said about the Spirit: For He will not speak on His own, but will speak only what He hears. From whom does He hear? Clearly from the Son, from whom He proceeds. And to hear the Spirit is to proceed from the Son, just as to hear the Son is to be born from the Father. For to hear the Son and to be born are not different, but the same. Likewise, to hear the Spirit and to proceed are not different, but one and the same.

And below: It is written: Whatever he does (no doubt the Father), the Son does likewise. So, if the Father and the Son are working, not in the order of first and second, but at the same time doing the same and similar things, everything that is made exists: and the Son cannot do anything by himself because he cannot be separated from the Father.

Similarly, the Holy Spirit is in no way separated from the Son, because of the sharing of will and nature, and he is believed not to speak by himself; but according to the word and truth of God, he speaks everything. The Father and the Son do the same works, not at one time the Father and another time the Son, but at the same time together: and the Son cannot work separately, because he is not divided from the Father, since he is born from the Father and of the same substance as the Father: likewise, the Holy Spirit does not speak by himself separated from the Son; because proceeding from the Son, he shares the nature of the Son: and the will is the same as the Son's: for the will does not separate those whom nature joins, but according to the word and truth of God, he speaks everything; because proceeding from the word and truth, he understands what he speaks: for what proceeds is not different from the understanding of speaking, but the understanding of speaking is the existence of the proceeding, just as the proceeding of existence is the understanding of speaking.

And below: Just as we understood above when discussing incorporeal natures, so now we must understand that the Holy Spirit receives from the Son what is of his own nature, and this does not indicate a giver and a receiver, but one substance. Indeed, the Son is also said to receive the same from the Father, which he himself subsists as: for the Son is not anything else except what is given to him by the Father, nor is the substance of the Holy Spirit anything other than what is given to him by the Son.

He confirms that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and states that the Holy Spirit receives from the Son what is of His own nature.

This means that the nature of the Spirit comes from the Son, and receiving the Spirit from the Son is the same as proceeding from the Son.

He explains that the giver and the receiver should not be understood as being of different substances. Instead, the Son gives so that the Spirit exists, and the Spirit receives so that it proceeds from the Son.

He supports his view with the fact that the Son is said to receive from the Father. The Son is not different from what He receives from the Father; rather, the Son's reception from the Father is His existence.

He further clarifies this by stating that the Son is nothing other than what is given to Him by the Father.

This means it is not permissible to separate what the Father gives to the Son from the substance of the Son, because the substance given by the Father is the Son's, as He received everything that belongs to the Father through His birth.

Similarly, he acknowledges that the Holy Spirit does not have a different substance apart from what is given to Him by the Son.

The Holy Spirit is not different from what the Son gives to the Spirit; the gift of the Son is the substance of the Holy Spirit.

This clearly shows that the Holy Spirit is from the Son, not as a part, but as the whole, which is the Son; because whatever belongs to the Son also belongs to the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit receives from the Son, proceeding from Him as consubstantial, and having everything that belongs to the Son.

Later on, he explains how he said, "He will take from what is mine," and immediately added, "Everything that the Father has is mine; that is why I said, 'He will take from what is mine and declare it to you'" (John chapter 16, verses 13 and 14).

In a way, he is saying that although the Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father, and God gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him, nevertheless, because everything the Father has is mine, and this very Spirit of the Father is mine, He will take from what is mine.

This statement teaches that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, just as it proceeds from the Father. It is the Spirit of truth, specifically of Christ, who embodies the truth. Because the Son has everything that belongs to the Father, this very Spirit of the Father testifies that it is from the Son and receives from the Son.

What does it receive? It receives its existence by proceeding from Him. Consequently, the same Spirit is of God and of Christ, bringing and uniting those who have it to the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence, it is later said:

"But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him" (Romans 8:9).

If it is the Spirit of God, it is also the Spirit of Christ, as the author confirms. There is no doubt that there are not two Spirits, one of the Father and one of the Son, but one and the same of both.

And if the Spirit of Christ is the same as the Spirit of God the Father, just as it proceeds from the Father, so it proceeds from the Son. It is not otherwise called the Spirit of God the Father, except that it proceeds from God the Father. So it is not otherwise called the Spirit of Christ, except because it proceeds from Christ. For it is not a creature, to be possessed as inferior, but consubstantial.

Thus, when he adds that not having the Spirit of Christ means not being of Christ, he acknowledges that it proceeds from Christ. Nor can one be of Christ who does not have His Spirit. For in whom there is not the Spirit of Christ, there is not Christ. They are not separated by habitation, who are united by substance.

Hence, we learn that the relationship the Spirit has with Christ, it also has with God the Father. For it cannot lack the relationship with those to whom it is consubstantial and from whom it exists.

Further below: In the Epistle of Peter, the Holy Spirit is proven to be the Spirit of Christ: searching and inquiring (that is, the prophets about whom he had spoken earlier) into what or what kind of time the Spirit of Christ in them was indicating, testifying beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that would follow.

And shortly after:

This Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God, as it says: No one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God First Corinthians 2:11.

Therefore, he acknowledges the Spirit of Christ, who is the Spirit of God, and thus proceeds from both; because there is no other reason why it is called the Spirit of both: for it is equal and of the same substance.

Again, it speaks below: If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to him Romans 8:9.

And it continues: But if Christ is in you Romans 8:10. It very clearly shows that the Holy Spirit is inseparable from Christ; because wherever the Spirit is, there also is Christ: and wherever the Spirit of Christ departs, likewise Christ departs.

This union of the Spirit and Christ, which it teaches, is not only of will, but also of substance, and not only of substance, but also of procession: for things that are separate in substance can be united by will; as when Christ speaks to the disciples: Behold, I am with you all the days Matthew 28:20; or as he said in the present passage, where the Spirit of Christ is, there also is Christ.

In those in whom the Spirit of Christ is, Christ also is equally present: they are together indeed, but by will, not by substance. For God and man are not of one, but of different substances.

Again, they can be united in substance, and also joined by birth, as the Father and the Son.

Again, they are united in substance, not by birth, but by procession, the Son and the Spirit.

Therefore, when he says, wherever the Spirit is, there also is Christ; and wherever the Spirit of Christ departs, likewise Christ departs, he shows this union not only of will and substance, but also of procession; that the Spirit is not only of the same substance as Christ, but also proceeds from him.

Again, taking up the Apostle's testimony later, he says: You have not received a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear Romans.

Romans 8:15 tells us that we refrain from vices, not like servants out of fear and terror of punishments, but because we have been given the Spirit of adoption—the Holy Spirit, also known as the Spirit of the Son, Christ, truth, and wisdom.

What does this mean? Truth and wisdom are Christ, as the Scripture confirms multiple times.

Christ is undoubtedly the Son of the Father, which affirms the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, from Christ, from truth and wisdom. They are not different Spirits but the same substance.

Wisdom, truth, and Christ proclaim the Son. Christ represents the human nature He assumed; He is truth because He said, "I am the truth." He is wisdom as Paul testifies in First Corinthians 1:30, that He was made wisdom for us by God.

What do these points conclude? Without a doubt, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, whose Spirit He is said to be. He cannot be a part of or subject to the Son. So, where does He come from? By procession or consubstantiality. Consubstantiality shows equality, and equality is not subjected but conferred. Therefore, the Spirit of the Son undoubtedly proceeds from the Son. These points, briefly collected from the book of Didymus, should suffice. In Alexandria, holding such views about the Holy Spirit, neither the Greeks nor the emperors censured or suspended Didymus from communion. The emperors, reigning not only in Constantinople but also in Rome, understood that this was a Catholic doctrine—the apostolic faith—defeating heretic perfidy and affirming the doctrine of truth.

Now, modern emperors, establishing a new sect of error, consider whose faith you hold and who taught you the doctrine of Christ. You are shown not to be disciples of your predecessors who strengthened the Catholic faith and fought against false doctrines.

Chapter Six From Paschasius.

Let's explore what the Roman Church thought about the Holy Spirit during those times, to prove that the teaching he preaches is not a new sect, but one that has long been endorsed by the Fathers, upheld throughout the entire body of the Church, and opposed to those who think differently.

We will show that it is wrongly criticized as if it were a new doctrine, when it has always been preached by our predecessors.

Paschasius, an ancient teacher and deacon of the Roman see, following in the footsteps of Didymus of Alexandria, writes in his little book on the Holy Spirit (Book 1, Chapter 2):

"Do not probe into how God exists, whom it is clear exists as God.

Here the reasoning is hidden, the truth is not hidden.

Why do you ask how He is the companion and equal of the King, whom it is established is of royal honor and lineage?

The inquiry about the name is superfluous, where there is no doubt about the sublimity."

This is against the Arians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, unwilling to confess Him as consubstantial with the Father and the Son, but claimed He was a creature subject to the Son, as if lesser.

Truly refuting them, he preaches that the Holy Spirit is true God and consubstantial with the Father and the Son.

He also clarifies what he believes about the procession by adding:

"Therefore, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, he says: 'But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, they do not belong to Christ' (Romans 8:9).

And in another place: 'He breathed on them and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'" (John 20:22).

He bears witness that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; he strengthens his assertion both from the Apostle and from the Gospel, equally showing that the Spirit cannot be of Christ unless He proceeds from Him.

Nor does Christ otherwise give the Spirit by breathing, except by sending Him from His own substance, since when He is called the Spirit of Christ, He is shown to have a relation to Christ,

not as a servant (for He is not a creature), but as receiving existence by proceeding from Him, not by being created or generated.

Similarly, when he breathes into him by sending, he does not send a stranger, nor from anywhere other than his own nature. The process from the Son cannot be denied, as it is from the depths of his divinity that he sends.

He further adds, speaking of the same Spirit: Are you asking whether he is begotten or unbegotten? The holy scriptures have said nothing about this, and it is wrong to break the divine silence. What God did not indicate in his scriptures, he did not want you to inquire about or know out of unnecessary curiosity. He judged that what pertains to your salvation should reach your conscience.

He speaks against those who, disparaging the person of the Holy Spirit in the Holy Trinity, did not accept that he is God. They argue that if he were considered God, he would have to be either begotten or unbegotten. If begotten, there would be two sons, and the Savior could no longer be called the only-begotten. This would contradict the Catholic faith, which confesses belief in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son. Conversely, if he were confessed as unbegotten, there would be two Fathers, which also contradicts the Catholic faith. For we believe in one God the Father Almighty.

To those contriving such perverse ideas, this Catholic teacher replies piously and cautiously, stating that the Holy Spirit should be called neither begotten nor unbegotten, as the holy scriptures do not speak of this. Instead, it should be professed what they affirm, namely that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and proceeds from both.

In later writings, it is said: In the Acts of the Apostles, Peter, speaking of the Lord Jesus Christ, says: Therefore, being exalted by the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, he poured out what you see and hear. Acts 2:33. The Son is at the right hand, the Father is in God, and the Holy Spirit is designated by the property of his name.

This testimony confirmed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, who said it was poured out by Him. He poured out what He contained within Himself, not as if confined to a place, but while substantially remaining in Himself. He did not pour out in such a way as to empty Himself, like a vessel becomes empty when its contents are poured out. This is the case with physical things; it is not the same with divine things.

When either the Father or the Son pours out the Spirit, they do not empty themselves but share the grace of their gift without losing anything.

And further down, presenting the Apostle's testimony:

"You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him" (Romans 8:9).

When he says the Spirit of God and consequently the Spirit of Christ, notice that he designates the person of Christ under the name of God. Or if he signifies the Father, whose Spirit it is, under the name of God, behold the Spirit is declared to be, by the unity of substance, the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. Rightly, it is known to proceed from both, and in the bond of the Trinity is seen to have a distinct person. Whoever does not have the Holy Spirit is shown not to have Christ.

Therefore, the Holy Spirit is God, who, if denied, also denies Christ, who said:

"No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6).

Whoever is empty of the Holy Spirit is not of Christ and has lost the way to reach the Father. He showed with many reasons that the Holy Spirit is God, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, proceeding from both, and cannot be separated from the bond of the Trinity, being of the same nature as the Father and the Son. He emphasizes that one cannot have Christ without having the Holy Spirit. Since the Holy Spirit is God, whoever denies the Spirit consequently denies Christ, which would not happen if He did not remain in Christ and was not consubstantial with Him.

To remain in Christ and be consubstantial with Him, the Spirit proceeding from Him demonstrates this: for it cannot proceed from Him unless it remains in Him and is consubstantially attached.

Since Christ is the way to the Father, whoever does not have the Spirit cannot have Christ as the way: for one cannot have one without the other, as they are neither divided in substance nor in dwelling.

Therefore, one who is empty of the Holy Spirit is also found empty of Christ; because whoever does not have the source is not inundated by the source's watering.

By all these things, it is clearly shown that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Christ.

And later (chapter 11): Nothing in the Holy Spirit should be considered half-full, because it is compared to fullness: for He who is given as a pledge in place of God must not be believed to be anything other than God.

Whoever denies that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son considers the Holy Spirit half-full, and whoever does not attribute the procession to the Son denies that He is given as a pledge in place of God.

For God cannot be understood as full, to whom the consubstantiality of the Son is denied; nor can He represent the place of God, to whom the Son is not consubstantial.

But no Catholic feels this way; instead, they confess that God is full and consubstantial with the Father and the Son: they know that the Son proceeds from where He also takes substance; and He who is united in substance to the Father and the Son must necessarily proceed from both. Again, he adds, citing a chapter from the same Apostle to Titus: He saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit, which He poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ (Titus 3:5).

Behold, even here under the manifest Trinity, the Father through the Son pours out the abundance of the Holy Spirit.

And, what is most noteworthy, he attributes the power of regeneration and renewal to the Holy Spirit Himself.

The Father poured out the Holy Spirit on us abundantly through Jesus Christ: to show that He proceeds from both the Father and Jesus Christ.

While it is poured out for us, the Father pours out the Holy Spirit because He is sent by the Father. He pours out through Jesus Christ because He works with the Father in this act. It is not said that the Father pours out through Jesus Christ as if Christ does not participate, for the Father and the Son are unified in action. The Father pours out through Jesus Christ because

when the Father pours out, Jesus Christ also pours out, since He is sent by both. He proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

This author testifies to the power of the Holy Spirit, equal to that of the Father and the Son. He states that the power of regeneration and renewal is attributed to the Holy Spirit to show that He possesses the same power as the Father and the Son. Thus, He is affirmed to be consubstantial and to proceed from both.

Later, in chapter twelve, the Psalmist gives testimony, saying: "Where can I go from Your Spirit?" (Psalm one thirty-nine, verse seven). This means, where can I hide from His presence, which is undoubtedly everywhere, both inside and outside?

And further, it is clearly understood: "Nor is there anyone who can hide from His heat" (Psalm nineteen, verse six). His ineffable greatness enters, fills, and encompasses everything, and He is said to be sent by the Father and the Son, proceeding from their substance, and recognized as working as one with them.

By all these things, the majesty and procession of the Holy Spirit are shown. Since it is testified that no place is remote from the presence of the Holy Spirit, He is compared to the divinity of the Father and the Son, penetrating and containing all things. Consequently, adding that no one is untouched by the heat of His fire, it is testified that this is also said of the Son: "Who enlightens every man coming into this world" (John one, verse nine). This shows that He has the same power as the Son, since the Son enlightens every man, and no one is exempt from the heat of the Spirit.

When it is said that He is sent by both the Father and the Son, and that He proceeds from their substance, it shows from whom the Spirit comes and whose power He possesses. This indicates that He is God, equal to the Father and the Son in both power and substance, because He proceeds from both.

Furthermore, when the Son says: The Advocate who proceeds from the Father (John 15:26), He does not say who is created by the Father, but proceeds from the Father, meaning from the fellowship of the Father's power and the property of His nature. This statement shows that when He proceeds from the Father, He has no beginning with the Father.

Do not think that He wanted to deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son because He said that He proceeds from the Father. Earlier, He said that He is sent by the Father and the Son, that He proceeds from their substance, and works as one with them. Now, He also says that He proceeds from the fellowship of the Father's power and the property of His nature.

Just as the Father and the Son are not separated in power or nature, they are not separated in the existence of the Spirit. Since He is the Spirit of both, He proceeds from both, and those who are equal in nature and power are not separated by procession.

He says below: But what is it that the Son is said to be born of God the Father, and the Holy Spirit is indicated to proceed? The difference between being born and proceeding is that one is born from one, while the other proceeds from both.

He also professes that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The reason given is that if we say He proceeds only from the Father, we risk endangering the faith. How can the Son be called the only begotten of the Father when the Spirit is also of the same? And how can it be proven that He is not the Son, who exists from the Father like the Son? Such blasphemy must be avoided to protect the Catholic faith from the attacks of enemies.

It should be said, therefore, as our ancestors did:

The Son is born from the Father, the only one from the only one, and thus the only begotten.

But the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, yet not from the Father alone.

If we confess that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, we might seem to preach two Sons.

Therefore, this teacher, following the doctrine of his elders, passed down to his successors what he had received from his predecessors.

Although he proved that the Roman Church holds the same belief about the Holy Spirit as it does today, he did not show that it was ever divided from the Eastern Churches in such faith.

Nor that it ever thought or taught differently about the Holy Spirit.

But now it is astonishing what the discoverers of new doctrine argue.

Why do they separate themselves from the communion that their ancestors always held?

Why do they pass judgment before understanding?

Why do they accuse before hearing?

This is not a judgment of fairness, but a prejudice of injustice.

But if they think it is enough that they know for sure that the Roman Church preaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and therefore do not want to inquire what they evidently know to be said,

let them know that they judge their ancestors along with the Romans.

While they wish to deprive the Romans of their communion, they equally excommunicate themselves from the society of their own ancestors.

They prove to communicate with no Catholic Church while they make themselves strangers to Roman communion.

Let them quickly consider whose evil deed this is, and not delay in correcting their error.

If they do not wish to communicate with the Romans, they fear being excommunicated from the whole Catholic Church.

Book Three

Chapter One

On the procession of the Holy Spirit.

The universal Church encompasses the entire world.

Scripture says: "Do not move the ancient boundary stones set up by your ancestors," Proverbs 22:28.

If the leaders of the Greeks had followed this commandment, the Roman Church would not have faced criticism regarding the Holy Spirit, nor would they have tried to create new doctrines. Instead, they should be content with the boundaries of faith established by the Catholic Fathers and set forth by the Scriptures written through the Holy Spirit.

However, suffering from vanity or envy, they are not satisfied with the boundaries of their ancestors and seek their own glory, crossing the lines set by their predecessors.

But while they attempt to undermine the glory of their ancestors, they fall into the pit they have dug, as the Psalmist says Psalm 7:16.

They should not have raised any questions about the procession of the Holy Spirit in our times if they had either paid attention to the teachings of their ancestors or diligently studied the holy scriptures.

What we should believe about the Holy Spirit is clearly demonstrated by the Catholic teachers, who, through frequent discussions and numerous writings, have not only understood but also refuted the erroneous comments of heretics about the Holy Trinity, including the procession of the Holy Spirit.

We have already presented a considerable part of their authority above, which we believe clearly shows what we should believe about the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Anyone who tries to contradict or refuses to accept this is clearly shown to be an opponent of the Catholic faith and a blasphemer of the Holy Spirit.

We have learned from the mouth of Truth Himself what punishment such a person will suffer: "Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come," Matthew 12:32.

It was also decided to include the writings of Father Augustine, an outstanding teacher and one of the most eloquent among ecclesiastical scholars. He constantly engaged in battles against heretics. His teachings and eloquence subdued not only the impiety of the Arians but also quelled the ferocity of other remaining heretics, such as the Macedonians, Manichaeans, and Pelagians.

Perhaps the pride of the Greeks will refuse to accept the authority of the Latins. But what will they say about their own authors that we mentioned earlier? What about the authors of the Holy Scriptures? Will they refuse to accept them too, just because they see them as severe enemies of their errors and fierce opponents of their impiety?

It would be foolish to say that they do not wish to accept the authority of the Latins and, by not agreeing with them, create a schism, making themselves alien to the Catholic Church. But may it never be that they say or believe such things, or wish to prefer their own opinion or custom over the universality of the entire Church. For it is such wicked arrogance to even think or decide such a thing. It cannot be tolerated and must be struck down by the authority of the universal Catholic Church.

As the Savior said to his Apostles: "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). He did not commend only the Greeks but mentioned the fullness of the entire world to whom the Gospel must be preached. It is extremely arrogant to claim as a special privilege for oneself what is clearly granted to all nations, peoples, and languages universally.

For the Holy Spirit, speaking through the prophet to Jerusalem, says: "I will bring your offspring from the east, and from the west I will gather you. I will say to the north, 'Give them up,' and to the south, 'Do not hold them back'" (Isaiah 43:5).

Are these things said about the Greeks alone? Or is the people of Jerusalem prophesied to be gathered only from Constantinople? The universality of the nations spread throughout the whole world is proclaimed, from which the heavenly Jerusalem is taught to be gathered.

Therefore, let them not claim for themselves what has been granted to all nations, nor should they take pride in a special privilege that is meant for all. They should look at the Catholic

Church of Christ, spread across the entire world, expanding from the East to the West, from the North to the South.

They should rejoice that Christ rules over the whole world, as foretold by David, where he portrays the Father speaking to the Son:

Ask of me, and I will make the nations your inheritance, and the ends of the earth your possession

Psalms 2:8.

And as another psalm speaks in the person of Christ:

He will rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth

Psalms 72:8.

Nowhere does it mention either the Greeks or Constantinople; yet it does not completely exclude them, because it includes them in universality. It removes any special privilege to prevent arrogance and places them in generality to encourage humility, so that they may understand that they are not the entirety of the Church's body, but a part of it.

They should honor the mother Church, exalted in royal magnificence from the rising to the setting of the sun, and rejoice in being her children, not boast in being her fathers. For the Savior says:

And do not call anyone on earth 'father,' for you have one Father, and he is in heaven

Matthew 23:9.

The Savior also, ascending to the heavens, promises his disciples:

And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age

Matthew 28:20.

We hear Christ's promise to all believers, that is, to the entire Church, not specifically to the Greeks or the people of Constantinople.

Whatever language or nation Christ speaks in, let the emperors of the Greeks receive it with reverence.

If they despise it, they will be judged as despising the truth and thus become deprived of salvation, since they would have rejected Christ speaking the truth.

When the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles in tongues of fire, He did not teach them only the Greek language but granted them the knowledge of all languages of all nations.

This was to show that the Church would speak to all peoples in all their languages and that the distribution of the Holy Spirit would be divinely given to all nations.

Therefore, let the glorious princes receive the Holy Spirit through the Teachers of the Church, speaking in the Latin language, so that they may learn with humility where they can make progress.

Otherwise, by looking down on the light of truth with pride, they will fall into the darkness of error.

Chapter Two

Heretics are refuted by the authority of Augustine.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, an outstanding teacher and defender of the Catholic faith, in his book of Questions, written to the priest Orosius, says the following about the Holy Spirit (question 2):

"Faith clearly declares that the Holy Spirit is neither unbegotten nor begotten.

If we say unbegotten, we might seem to affirm two Fathers; but if we say begotten, we might be accused of believing in two Sons.

However, faith clearly holds that the Holy Spirit is neither unbegotten nor begotten, but proceeds from both the Father and the Son."

To support this with testimony, we hear our Lord Jesus Christ teaching His disciples:

"But when the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, he will testify about me" John 15:26.

And again, after His resurrection, to show that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself just as from the Father, Jesus breathed on His disciples and said:

"Receive the Holy Spirit" John 20:22.

Therefore, there is one Spirit of the Father and the Son, one Spirit of both.

Our Lord and Savior Himself says to His disciples:

"For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you" Matthew 10:20.

And that it is also the Spirit of the Son, the Apostle Paul testifies:

"But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him" Romans 8:9.

What here, O leaders of the Greeks, do you judge worthy of reproach?

He says the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

He proves this with testimony from the Gospel.

He says the Spirit belongs to both the Father and the Son; he affirms this from both the Gospel and the Apostle.

If you do not want to believe the Latins, believe the Gospel.

If you do not want to listen to Augustine, listen to Christ and the Apostle.

But if you disregard Christ and the Apostle, beware that you are not disregarded yourselves.

Because anyone who does not follow their teaching is indeed rejected by the society of Christ's disciples and will not be a part of the Church if they reject ecclesiastical teaching. Nor will they share in Christ if they do not embrace Christ's teaching.

Gregory, bishop of the Roman see during the times of Tiberius Constantine, was an apocriary, then a deacon, and later an outstanding prelate, most beloved and intimate with the emperors Tiberius, Maurice, and Phocas. While he was a deacon and envoy of the Roman see residing in Constantinople, he defeated and refuted Eutyches, the bishop of Constantinople, who was teaching falsely about the resurrection of the flesh. This was done in the presence of the emperor, by the authority of the divine books and the catholic truth of the matter itself.

Concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, he speaks in a homily given to the people on the eighth day of Easter (Homily 26 on the Gospel). "For the Holy Spirit, who is equal to the Father and the Son, was not incarnate, but the Son declares that He will send Him from the Father, saying: 'When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father' (John 15:26). For if being sent should only be understood as being incarnate, then the Holy Spirit would by no means be said to be sent, since He was not incarnate; but His sending is His procession, by

which He proceeds from the Father and the Son. Just as the Spirit is said to be sent because He proceeds, so also the Son is not inappropriately said to be sent because He is begotten." If you endeavor to scorn the authority of this prelate, see to what heights of pride you are being raised. Your predecessors were most reverent in both holiness and wisdom. When he was the envoy of the see and serving in the office of deacon, Gregory crushed with great authority the erroneous doctrines of the bishop of your Constantinople. He not only defeated him but also so thoroughly overthrew the strength of that doctrine that it never regained its power.

What he says about the procession of the Holy Spirit is supported by reason, stating that the sending of the Comforter by the Son is the same as proceeding, just as the Son, when He is said to be sent by the Father, implies His birth.

Augustine, the bishop, in his Treatise on the Gospel according to John (Treatise 99), says: Someone might ask whether the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son. The Son is the Son of the Father alone, and the Father is the Father of the Son alone; however, the Holy Spirit is not the Spirit of just one of them, but of both.

You have Him saying: For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you (Matthew 10:20).

You also have the Apostle: God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts (Galatians 4:6). Are there two Spirits, one of the Father and another of the Son? No way.

For we are one body, he says, referring to the Church, and immediately adds: And one Spirit (Ephesians 4:4).

He then provides several testimonies to prove that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son; not two separate Spirits, but the same Spirit who is of the Son and also of the Father.

Here, with clear testimonies, anyone who tries to oppose will be shown to contradict the Holy Scripture.

And below: If the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, why did the Son say, He proceeds from the Father? (John 15:26).

Why do you think, except in the same way that He usually attributes to the Father even what is His own, from whom He Himself is.

Hence, He says: My teaching is not mine, but His who sent me (John 7:16).

If His teaching is understood here, which He nonetheless said was not His, but the Father's, how much more should it be understood that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him, when He says, He proceeds from the Father, so as not to say, He does not proceed from me.

With the clearest reasoning, Doctor Augustine shows that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, affirming His view with that testimony from the Gospel where the Son says about the Spirit that He proceeds from the Father.

For he says this should be understood in the way he said: "It proceeds from the Father," meaning it also proceeds from the Son. He did not want to deny that it proceeds from himself, but by presenting the person of the Father, he also wanted his own involvement to be understood, just as when he said, "My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me."

By saying this, he showed that it is also his own, but he says it is the Father's because, just as it is from him, his teaching is also said to be the Father's. Whatever the Son has, he received by being born from the Father.

Similarly, when he says the Spirit proceeds from the Father, he does not deny that it also proceeds from himself. He shows from where the Son has what the Spirit proceeds from him, namely from the Father, from whom he was begotten and received so that the Spirit proceeds from him.

Consequently, Saint Augustine says: But from whom does the Son have that he is God (for he is God from God)? Surely, he has it from him, so that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from him.

Through this, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as he proceeds from the Father, which he has from the Father himself.

With remarkable subtlety, the excellent teacher suggests both the birth of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit. He says that the Son received from the Father, as God from God, and that the Spirit proceeds from him. Nevertheless, he also received the Holy Spirit from the same Father to proceed from the Son, as he proceeds from the Father. By saying this, he confesses both the Son and the Holy Spirit from the Father, who is the source of divinity. The Son received generation from the Father, and the Holy Spirit's procession from both the Father and the Son. However, the Holy Spirit only received procession, not generation, which is only of the Son from the Father alone.

Here, he adds that question, which usually stirs some who read: if the Holy Spirit is said to be born? He says: Here, however, it is understood, as much as it can be understood by those like us, why it is not said to be born, but rather to proceed as the Holy Spirit.

If the Son were also called the Son of both the Father and the Son, it would be absurd because no one is the son of two parents, except a father and a mother. But let's be clear, we should not suspect anything like this between God the Father and God the Son.

A human son does not proceed simultaneously from both the father and the mother. When he proceeds from the father into the mother, he does not proceed from the mother at that time. And when he is born into this world, he does not proceed from the father at that time.

However, the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father into the Son and then from the Son to sanctify the creature. Instead, the Holy Spirit proceeds simultaneously from both. The Father has given this to the Son so that, just as He proceeds from Himself, He also proceeds from the Son.

We cannot say that the Holy Spirit is not life, since the Father is life and the Son is life. Just as the Father, having life in Himself, has given the Son to have life in Himself, He also gave Him life to proceed from Him, just as it proceeds from Himself.

It is proven by the most true reason that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, yet is not the Son of both, since He is the Spirit of both. The Son is of two— the mother and the father— but spiritual procession knows nothing of this kind.

There is no distinction of sex here because it is not a physical propagation made of flesh or bones. This procession does not occur through intervals of time, so it does not proceed from the Father at one time and from the Son at another time, but simultaneously from both.

Nor does it happen in the way carnal generation usually does. There is no outflow, such as the seed from the man into the woman, and no propagation from the mother into the generation of

the son. All these involve a movement of change, which is far removed from the spiritual procession.

The Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son without any movement, change, or flow. This procession happens through the power of the will, not through any temporal change, extension, or creation from a father or mother, but rather like one light from two sources.

The Father and the Son are not inferior to the Spirit. They are two persons of one essence, from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds—not as a quality of the two, but as the consubstantiality of both. As the blessed Augustine says, the Father is life, the Son is life, and the Holy Spirit is life.

However, the Father is life not by taking life from any other; the Son is life by taking life from the Father; and the Holy Spirit is life by proceeding from the Father and the Son. The Trinity, in its perfect consubstantiality, could not exist if the Holy Spirit were not what the Father and the Son are.

Indeed, there is no question now that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. But that it proceeds from the Son, the Son himself bears witness, saying: "He will take from what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:14).

However, heretics wanted to construct degrees in divinity, saying: If the Son receives from the Father, and the Holy Spirit receives from the Son, then the Holy Spirit is lesser than the Son.

Blessed Augustine counters this perverse proposition in Tractate 100, near the end, saying: "But what he says: 'He will take from what is mine and declare it to you,' listen with Catholic ears, perceive with Catholic minds. For the Holy Spirit is not lesser than the Son because the Son receives from the Father, and the Holy Spirit from the Son, by certain degrees of natures. God forbid to believe this, God forbid to say this, God forbid to think this in Christian hearts."

Finally, he immediately resolves the question and explains why he said this: "All things that the Father has are mine; therefore I said that he will take from what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:15). What more do you want?

Therefore, the Holy Spirit receives from the Father, from whom the Son also receives: because in this Trinity, the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father.

However, the one who is neither born from anyone nor proceeds from anyone is the Father alone. It is not contradictory to say now that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, as stated earlier, where it was said that the same Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. This removes the diminishment that the heretics babbled about and emphasizes the equality that the Catholics believe. For if the Holy Spirit were said to receive only from the Son and not also from the Father, it would provide a basis for the Arians to imagine degrees in divinity. But now, by saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, there is no basis for them to imagine a diminishment. The Holy Spirit also receives from the Father in order to proceed, just as the Son receives from the Father in order to be born. Since both receive from the Father—the Son his birth, and the Holy Spirit his procession—there is no reason for one to be preferred over the other. However, this does not mean that it should be denied that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son. For the Son says: "All that the Father has is mine. Therefore I said that he will take from what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:15). The Father has it that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him, and consequently, the Son also has it that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him as well. Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both.

Chapter Three

Also, testimonies from Augustine.

In the first book on the Holy Trinity, chapter 4, he says:

"Although the Father begot the Son, and therefore the Son is not the Father; and the Son is begotten by the Father, and therefore the Father is not the Son: the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Spirit of the Father and the Son, coequal with the Father and the Son, and belonging to the unity of the Trinity."

However, the same Trinity was not born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, buried, risen on the third day, and ascended into heaven, but only the Son.

This clearly indicates the distinct properties of each person in the Holy Trinity, and that the Incarnation pertains only to the Son.

The Father is not the same as the Son, because He begot the Son; and the Son is not the same as the Father, but only the Son who is begotten by the Father; and the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Spirit of the Father and the Son.

Since He is called the Spirit of both, He must be confessed to proceed from both.

Just as He is said to be of the Father, because He proceeds from the Father, so He is also professed to be of the Son, because He proceeds from the Son.

Since the reason for being of both is similar, it is similarly confessed that He proceeds from both; and since He is coequal with the Father and the Son and belongs to the unity of the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son does not pertain to the Father or the Holy Spirit.

It pertains to the Father alone to have begotten the Son;

to the Son to have assumed perfect humanity;

and to the Holy Spirit to have proceeded from the Father and the Son.

Also, in the following, chapter 5:

It raises the question of how the Holy Spirit is in the Trinity, whom neither the Father nor the Son nor both together have begotten, since He is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son.

With these words, he clarifies that the Holy Spirit is not begotten by the Father alone, nor by the Son alone, nor by both together. Yet, the Holy Spirit is of both the Father and the Son. This indicates that the one who is not the Son by birth is the Spirit of both by proceeding. Where birth is ruled out, and it belongs to both, it signifies procession, not from one alone, but from both, as it is the Spirit of both, not just one.

Further below in chapter twelve:

We have shown through many divine speeches that in this Trinity, what belongs to all is said of each individual, due to the inseparable operation of the one and the same substance.

As it is also said of the Holy Spirit: "When I go, I will send him to you" (John 16:7).

He did not say "we will send," but as though only the Son were to send him, and not the Father.

While in another place, he says: "I have spoken these things to you while I remain with you; but the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things" (John 14:25).

Here again, it is said as though only the Father would send him, and not the Son.

It is frequently said that the sending of the Spirit is his procession; therefore, when it is testified that the Son will send him, it signifies his procession from the Son.

Likewise, when it is said that the Father will send the Holy Spirit in the name of the Son, it signifies his procession from the Father.

And when it is said that he is sent by both, it proves that he proceeds from both.

He gives a general rule of the Holy Trinity, saying that what belongs to all is said of each individual, due to the inseparable operation of the one and the same substance.

With this statement, we are taught that when it is said that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, it should be understood that he proceeds equally from the Son.

Likewise, when it is said that he is sent by the Son, it should be understood that he is sent by the Father, because the Father and the Son, just as they are of one and the same substance, so they are of one and the same operation.

Because of this, anyone who denies that the Spirit is sent by the Son, while admitting that He is sent by the Father, undoubtedly denies that the Son works together with the Father. By doing so, they claim that the Father and the Son do not share the same operation. Consequently, they deny that the Father and the Son are of the same substance.

The same goes for the Son's testimony that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. Whoever denies that the Spirit also proceeds from the Son equally denies that the Son shares the same operation with the Father. By this, they claim that the Father and the Son are not of the same substance, but of different substances.

Seeing this as stemming from Arian impiety, let us profess with the Catholics that the whole Trinity works together. Understand that what is said about each should be understood about all: since the whole Trinity is of the same substance, it cannot be separated in operation. Because of this, when it is said that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, it should equally be understood that He proceeds from the Son.

Also, in book fifteen, chapter six, of *De Trinitate*:

It is said in the Holy Scriptures that Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. How this should be understood, so that the Son does not appear to make the Father wise, is discussed in book seven.

Reason has concluded that the Son is wisdom from wisdom, just as light from light, God from God. We could not find anything else about the Holy Spirit except that He is also wisdom, and together they are all one wisdom; just as one God, one essence.

What are we taught from this, except that the Spirit's procession is from both the Father and the Son; and that this Trinity is of one substance?

It says that the Father is wisdom, the Son is wisdom, and the Holy Spirit is wisdom as well. But the Father is wisdom from no wisdom. For He did not receive it from the Son to be wise; since He is the source and beginning of all things, He is wise from Himself, not by participation from anyone.

Just as God is light from Himself and not from anyone else—since He has nothing above or before Him, otherwise, He would not be the source of the universe; neither is God imperfect or in need of anything, but He is full, true, and perfect—therefore, He is wise from Himself.

The Son, however, is wisdom, but wisdom from the Father; for the Father begot what He is. The Spirit is also wisdom, but not from no wisdom: for only the Father is from no one. So then, from where if not from wisdom? The Father is wisdom, the Son also is wisdom, therefore the Spirit is wisdom from the Father and the Son. For the Father and the Son are not separated by diversity but united by unity. Thus, both send the Spirit, wisdom proceeding from both.

Furthermore, behold then those three, that is, memory, understanding, love or will, in that supreme and unchangeable essence that is God, not the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but the Father alone. And because the Son is also wisdom begotten from wisdom, just as neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit understands for Him, but He understands for Himself, so neither does the Father remember for Him, nor does the Holy Spirit love for Him, but He remembers, understands, and loves for Himself: for He is His own memory, His own understanding, His own love; but He has this from the Father, from whom He was born.

The Holy Spirit, also because He is wisdom proceeding from wisdom, does not have the Father as memory, the Son as understanding, and Himself as love: for He would not be wisdom if another remembered for Him, and another understood for Him, and He only loved for Himself; but He has these three; and He has them in such a way that He Himself is these things: nonetheless, to be this way, He has it from where He proceeds.

Subtly and divinely indicating the distinctions of the persons of the Trinity, he says that the Father is wisdom, the Son is wisdom, and the Holy Spirit is wisdom; but the Son is begotten, who is wisdom from the Father who is likewise wisdom; and the Spirit proceeds, who is also wisdom, but from the Father who is wisdom, and the Son who is likewise wisdom.

And to make it more clear, let's use the previously mentioned analogy. He defines three things: memory, understanding, and love, as a likeness of the Trinity within the inner man. He discusses this extensively, both in the fifteenth book and in other books of the same work, affirming that in memory are contained both understanding and love. From memory arises understanding, and from both memory and understanding proceeds love. These three are together and of one substance.

We remember what we understand, and when we want to look at our understanding, we cannot do so unless it comes from a certain secret of memory, as if it were generated. When we affirm that our understanding is born from memory, a certain love is created, embracing both understanding and memory. For both the understanding, which it approves, and the memory from which it knows the understanding is born, delight. Hence, it comes about that this love is born both from memory and from understanding. If there were no understanding, there could be no love for it. If there were no memory, there would be nothing from which understanding could exist. For we understand nothing of which we have no memory.

Yet these are distinguished by their own intellectual boundaries. Memory does not understand by itself but through understanding. Nor does understanding remember by itself but through memory. Thus, love does not love without memory or understanding. If understanding is removed, there is nothing for memory to retain. If memory is removed, love remembers nothing. For this reason, love will no longer exist since there is nothing to love or remember to spread itself upon. Thus, these three are together, are born from one another, and are distinguished by their own boundaries, and mutually require each other.

But the Holy Trinity is not considered in the same way, as this venerable doctor suggests. For the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the whole Trinity, like memory, understanding, and love.

And the Father, like a source from which the Son is born, exists as a kind of principle from which understanding is formed, just as memory exists.

The Son, being wisdom, is born from the Father, like understanding is generated from memory. The Holy Spirit, who is also wisdom and love, proceeds from the Son and the Father, just as love proceeds from understanding and memory.

However, even though it is like this, the distinction of persons is not such that the Father is wise only through the Son, and the Son loves only through the Holy Spirit. Just as in the trinity of a human being's inner self, memory does not understand by itself but through understanding, and understanding does not remember by itself but through memory. Similarly, understanding does not love by itself but through love, and love does not understand or remember by itself, but remembers through memory and understands through understanding.

For the Trinity, which is the supreme and unchanging essence, that is, God, is not memory, understanding, and love in such a way that these three are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as if the Father is memory, the Son is understanding, and the Holy Spirit is love. Instead, the Father alone is all three, the Son is similarly all three, and the Holy Spirit is also all three equally.

For the Father remembers, understands, and loves from Himself; He did not receive understanding from the Son, otherwise, He would be said to be born from the Son, which is not orthodox; nor did He receive love from the Holy Spirit, otherwise, He would seem to proceed from Him, which is incorrect. Rather, He remembers, is wise, and loves from Himself.

The Son, being wisdom born of wisdom, does not have the Father remember for Him, but He remembers for Himself. Just as the Father does not understand for Him, but He understands for Himself, nor does the Holy Spirit love for Him, but He loves for Himself. For He remembers, understands, and loves from Himself.

The Holy Spirit, who is wisdom proceeding from wisdom, does not have the Father as memory, the Son as understanding, and only love for Himself. Instead, He possesses all three: memory, understanding, and love.

He remembers by Himself, understands by Himself, and loves by Himself. However, the fact that He has these three qualities comes from where He proceeds, that is, from both the Father and the Son. For He proceeds from both.

It has been shown with very subtle and true reasoning, which no prudent person can contradict, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. Since He is the Spirit of both, He is not, however, the Son of either, because the love that we say is born from memory and understanding is not called the daughter of either.

Now concerning the Holy Spirit, as much as God allows us to see, we must differ. According to the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Spirit is neither of the Father alone, nor of the Son alone, but of both. Therefore, He signifies the mutual love between the Father and the Son, indicating the Trinity.

The Holy Spirit is not of the Father alone, nor of the Son alone, but of both, because He proceeds from both. Therefore, He signifies the mutual love of the Trinity, binding together the Father and the Son, as proceeding from both—not as a quality of both, but existing in the Trinity as the third person, consubstantial and coequal.

For the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and all together are one God. Yet it is not for nothing that in this Trinity it is said that only the Son is the Word of God, only the Holy Spirit is the gift of God, and the one from whom the Word is begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds, is God the Father.

However, I added "principally," because it is also found that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. But this too the Father gave to Him, not when He already existed and did not yet have it, but whatever He gave to the only-begotten Word, He gave by begetting.

Thus, He begot Him in such a way that a shared gift also proceeded from Him, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of both.

This testimony proves that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. He assigns something unique to each person of the Holy Trinity: the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and all together, they are one God.

It is unique to the Word of God to be called the only Son, and unique to the gift of God to be called the Holy Spirit. The one from whom the Word is begotten and from whom the Spirit primarily proceeds is only called God the Father. These are the unique properties of each person in the Holy Trinity.

He primarily said that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, but it is also found that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

The Father gave this to the Son not as to one existing before and not having this, but gave it by begetting. Whatever the Son has, He received from the Father by being begotten.

The Father did not first beget Him and then give that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, but conferred it upon Him by begetting, so that a shared gift also proceeded from Him. The Holy Spirit, whom He says is the gift of both the Father and the Son, is the Spirit of both.

Also below (chapter 19):

If there is nothing greater among the gifts of God than love, and no gift of God is greater than the Holy Spirit, what follows more logically than that He Himself is love, who is called God from God?

And if the love by which the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father, ineffably demonstrates the communion of both, what is more fitting than that He is properly called love, who is the common Spirit of both?

Earlier, He called the Holy Spirit the gift of God, and by this property, distinguished the person of the Holy Spirit from the persons of the Father and the Son.

Now, He calls this gift of God love, which is the chief gift among the gifts of divinity. Because according to the Apostle, First Corinthians chapter thirteen verse three, other gifts are nothing without love.

He calls this love God from God, signifying the Holy Spirit proceeding from God.

Since the term "God" refers to both the Father and the Son, and it is unclear from whom He proceeds, he clarifies by saying:

If the love with which the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father, shows their ineffable communion, what could be more fitting than to call the Spirit of both, love itself? By saying this, he calls the Holy Spirit love and confirms that He proceeds from both the Father and the Son, for He could not be common to both unless He proceeded from both.

Later, in chapter 23, he explains:

In that supreme Trinity, which surpasses all things, there is such unity that, unlike the trinity of men which cannot be called one man, in that Trinity, He is called and is one God. In one God, there is that Trinity, but it is still one God.

Unlike the image of a man having three parts and still being one person, that Trinity is three persons: the Father of the Son, the Son of the Father, and the Spirit of the Father and the Son. When he says the Father of the Son is only the Father, and the Son of the Father is only the Son, but the Spirit is the Spirit of both the Father and the Son, he indeed affirms that He proceeds from both.

For the Father is the Father of the Son because He begot Him, and the Son is the Son of the Father because He was begotten by Him. Consequently, the Spirit of the Father and the Son is called the Spirit because He proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

In this Trinity, he teaches such unity that, while the trinity of men cannot be called one man (as it consists of three men, just as the trinity of bodies consists of three bodies), one man cannot be called a trinity, for it is an indivisible singularity of one number.

In the supreme Trinity, both the Trinity and the one God are referred to as God. However, this doesn't mean that each person individually is the Trinity. In other words, neither the Father alone, the Son alone, nor the Holy Spirit alone is the Trinity.

Since the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one God, the Trinity is one God. Just as the image of this Trinity has three elements—memory, understanding, and love—and thus exists in one person, it's not because one man is the Trinity, but because these three elements are in one man. Similarly, in the supreme Trinity, the three persons are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one God. Therefore, the Trinity is one God.

There is such unity among the three persons and such consubstantiality that the three are one, and one God is proclaimed from the three. They are separated only by relation but united in substance. The Father is relative to the Son, the Son is relative to the Father, and the Holy Spirit has a relation to both the Father and the Son. Hence, it is proven that He proceeds from both. In chapter twenty-six, it states that in the supreme Trinity, which is God, there are no intervals of time to question whether the Son was born of the Father first and later the Holy Spirit proceeded from both. Holy Scripture calls the Spirit of both.

The Apostle says, "And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts" (Galatians 4:6). The Son Himself says, "For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you" (Matthew 10:20).

Many other testimonies of divine words confirm that the Spirit belongs to both the Father and the Son and is properly called the Holy Spirit in the Trinity. The Son says, "Whom I will send to you from the Father" (John 15:26), and in another place, "Whom the Father will send in My name" (John 14:26). This teaches that He proceeds from both because the Son says, "He proceeds from the Father."

And when He had risen from the dead and appeared to the disciples, He breathed on them and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22), to show that the Spirit also proceeds from Him. It is the power that came from Him, as written in the Gospel, which healed all (Luke 6:19). What room is there for contradiction here?

The authority of the divine Scriptures shows that the Holy Spirit is from both the Father and the Son and proceeds from both. If this is disputed, then let the Apostle be disputed, and let it be disputed that the Son said this.

We believe the Son who says that the Spirit proceeds from the Father; let us also believe that He sent the Spirit from Himself when He breathed on them and said to the disciples, "Receive the Holy Spirit."

Likewise, the power that healed all, coming out of Jesus, testifies that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Therefore, it is clearly shown that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

The most evident testimony of this procession from both is that He is said to be the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. He is the Spirit of both: not because He was created by the Son from the Father, which is impious, but because He proceeds substantially from both.

Nor can any intervals of time be shown when He proceeded either from the Father or from the Son, or if the Holy Spirit proceeded from both after the Son was begotten; for what precedes all time is contained by no measure of time.

Therefore, the order of procession is not to be sought in time, which encompasses all time. The Father was never without the Son, the Son was never without the Father, the Holy Spirit was never without the Father and the Son, and the Father and the Son were never without the Holy Spirit.

Similarly below: Can we then ask whether the Holy Spirit had already proceeded from the Father when the Son was born, or had He not yet proceeded? And after the Son was born, He proceeded from both, where there are no times. Just as we might ask where we find times, whether the will proceeds first from the human mind, so that what is found may be called offspring. By which the will is perfected once it is already produced or born, resting in that end. So that the desire of seeking becomes the love of enjoying, which now proceeds from both, that is, from the generating mind and the generated notion as from parent and offspring.

These things cannot be asked there at all, where nothing is started in time to be perfected in time. Therefore, whoever can understand the generation of the Son from the Father without time, let him understand the procession of the Holy Spirit from both without time.

Blessed Augustine testifies that the procession of the Holy Spirit is from both the Father and the Son. But he raises the question discussed earlier, whether the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father before the birth of the Son, and after the Son was born, He also proceeded from Him.

This question is compelled by the analogy, which says that the will proceeds from the human mind before the word is formed from the mind. So that a certain desire of the will arises to seek, which when found, is called the offspring of the mind, by which the will is perfected from which the desire to seek proceeded. But this will was also first born from the mind before what was desired to be found was sought, and when found, it is fully perfected, while it multiplies from what is found; for it rejoices to have found what it sought. Hence the will, born from both, namely

from the mind and from what was found, proceeds from both; but first from the mind, and then from what was found; from there, namely to seek; but from here, to delight in what was found.

However, this will is not twofold, as if there is an earlier will of the mind and a later one of the discovered thing. Instead, it is a singular will focused on one thing: the discovery. It starts with the mind's intention to seek and concludes with the perfection of what was sought.

First, there is a desire to seek, and later it becomes a love of enjoying what was found. But these things happen in created beings that are bound by time; in divinity, where no time exists, such things cannot be found.

It is not said that the Father existed before, nor that the Son was born afterward, but that the Father has always remained in the Son, and the Son in the Father; nor could the Holy Spirit, by proceeding, precede the birth of the Son: for where no time exists, neither before nor after can be found.

It cannot be perfected in subsequent time, that which has no beginning in time. Therefore, whoever can conceive of the generation of the Son from the Father without time, should also conceive of the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son without time. Just as we should not ask when the Son was born from the Father, in the same way, we should not ask when the Holy Spirit proceeded from both; nor if the Holy Spirit preceded the Son's birth from the Father by proceeding. Where eternity exists, the order of time does not.

No law of divinity should be judged by the condition of human creation; for created things made under time follow the order of time: but the creator of time is not governed by any law of time. It precedes all things that are contained by time.

He adds another point to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son without time, just as it is established that the Son is begotten from the Father without time. He says: And who can understand what the Son says: Just as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son to have life in himself.

John 5:26

It's not that the Father gave life to the Son, who already existed without life, but that He begot Him timelessly. So, the life the Father gave to the Son by begetting Him is co-eternal with the life of the Father who gave it.

Understand it as the Father having life in Himself, and the Holy Spirit proceeding from Him. He gave this to the Son, so the same Holy Spirit proceeds from Him as well, both without time.

Thus, it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and it is understood that He also proceeds from the Son, being from both the Father and the Son. For whatever the Son has from the Father, He has it from the Father, including that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him.

But let no time be considered here, for there is no before and after, absolutely none.

The Holy Spirit proceeding from the Son, as He proceeds from the Father, is testified. He proceeds from the Son because the Father gave to the Son, not to one who existed previously, but by begetting. Whatever the Father gave to the Son, He did not give to a lesser being or one who existed previously but gave by begetting.

And He provides a comparison to clarify: Whoever can understand what the Son says: As the Father has life in Himself, so He gave to the Son to have life in Himself.

It's not that the Father gave life to the Son, who already existed without life. The Son would exist without life if He had somehow existed before He lived, so that life would later be granted to Him already existing.

As Genesis speaks of the first Adam, saying: Therefore God formed man from the dust of the earth Genesis 2:7. And then it is added: And He breathed into his face the breath of life.

First, it says that he was formed, and then, already formed and evidently existing through the quality of his formation, the breath of life was granted.

But the Father did not give life to the Son in such a way as to beget first, to whom He would later give life after being begotten. By begetting, He gave life, because the Son is substantially life, to whom He gave life by begetting.

Finally, man existed first formed, and later received life because he received life by participation, not by birth. For he was not substantially life but lived by participation in life.

But the only begotten Son of the Father did not receive life by participation, but was substantially begotten of the Father as life. For life was not given to one who existed as if remaining without life, but he was begotten entirely coequal and consubstantial with the life of the Father, who gave him life by begetting.

It follows that the Father begot him without time, so that the life which the Father gave to the Son by begetting is co-eternal with the life of the Father who gave it. By saying this, it shows that the Father is life, and the Son is life; but the Son received life from the Father, so that he might be life; not existing previously without life, but begotten as life, which is co-eternal and consubstantial with the life of the Father, who gave life to the Son by generating.

Whoever is able to understand how this is, should also understand that just as the Father has in himself the Holy Spirit proceeding from him, so he gave to the Son that the same Holy Spirit proceeds from him. For he wants to affirm that the Son received from the Father, just as by begetting life, so also by begetting the Holy Spirit proceeds from him, not another, but the same who proceeds from the Father.

And since no one of sound mind can deny that the Son received life from the Father to be life just as the Father is, thus from the Father he could receive the Holy Spirit to proceed from him; and this both without time; because just as he proceeds from the Father without time, so also he proceeds from the Son without time; because this procession is not temporal, but eternal.

For just as the birth of the Son from the Father excludes all time, so the procession of the Holy Spirit, which is from both, acknowledges no time. He adds: And thus it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, so that it is understood that he also proceeds from the Son, from the Father and the Son.

He wants it to be understood that when it is read or said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, it is equally meant that he proceeds from the Son; and therefore in the mention of the Father, the Son must be understood; because it is from the Father to the Son that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him.

Because it is attributed to the Father, the source from whom the Son received the Holy Spirit, it follows that when it is said the Spirit proceeds from the Father, it should also be understood to proceed from the Son.

It adds, if whatever the Son has, He has from the Father, then He certainly has from the Father that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him as well.

We know from what the Son says that all things belonging to the Father also belong to the Son. These things are rightly attributed to Him from whom they were given.

Therefore, when it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, it is attributed to the Father, from whom it was given to Him to proceed.

Hence, when the Son says in the Gospel: The Spirit who proceeds from the Father (John 15:26), He intends to be understood that He also means it proceeds from Himself, but without any notion of time.

It should not be questioned whether the Holy Spirit first proceeded, and then the Son was born, or after the Son was born, the Holy Spirit then proceeded from both. It should not be considered here first or later, because time is not to be estimated here.

Consequently, how then would it not be most absurd to say that the Son is of both? Just as the generation gives the Son essence without beginning of time and without any change in nature, so too the Holy Spirit is given essence without any beginning of time and without any change in nature from both.

It shows that the procession of the Holy Spirit is from both the Father and the Son, but it should not be asked if first from the Father or later from the Son.

Rather, it should be considered that just as generation gives the Son substance without intervening time or any intervening change, so the procession gives the Holy Spirit substance without any time and without any change.

Nor should it be debated what is before or after. The birth of the Son from the Father should be understood, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from both.

Since we do not say that the Holy Spirit is begotten, we also do not call him unbegotten. This avoids suggesting that there are two Fathers in the Trinity, or two who do not originate from another.

The Father alone is not from another, which is why he is called unbegotten—though not explicitly in the Scriptures, but by those discussing this profound topic to the best of their ability. The Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds primarily from the Father and also from both the Father and the Son, without any interval of time.

If both the Father and the Son had begotten the Son, which is an idea rejected by all rational minds, the Son would be called the Son of both. Therefore, he is not begotten by both but proceeds from both as the Spirit of both.

This supports the idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son. Yet, he opposes the argument that if the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, he would be the Son of both. First, he addresses whether the Holy Spirit should be called begotten or unbegotten and concludes that he should not be called either. He explains that if the Holy Spirit were called begotten, he would be the Son of both the Father and the Son, which is contrary to Christian belief.

He also cannot be called unbegotten, as this term is specifically attributed to the Father, who is from no other and is the beginning of everything, the source and origin.

Therefore, since the Holy Spirit cannot be accurately called either begotten or unbegotten, he is properly described as proceeding. He does not proceed from the Father alone, as the Son is

born alone from the Father alone. Instead, he proceeds from both the Father and the Son timelessly, or eternally. This is why he is not said to be begotten by them; he is neither the Son of the Father nor the Son of the Son, but the Spirit of both.

Thus, it is clearly shown that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both. It is plainly taught that He does not proceed from the Father alone, meaning the Son is not solely from the Father; nor from the Son alone, so the Son is not mistakenly said to be the Father. But the Holy Spirit is said to proceed, and to proceed from both.

Chapter Four

From the same source.

Many people wonder about the difference between generation and procession. Since this question seems to be inexplicable in the context of the incorporeal and invisible Trinity, we must explain what the distinguished author Augustine thought. He adds in his book "On the Trinity," Book 15, Chapter 27, saying:

"However, because in that co-eternal, co-equal, incorporeal, ineffably immutable, and inseparable Trinity, it is very difficult to distinguish generation from procession, it is enough for now for those who cannot grasp more, what we said on this matter in a certain sermon addressed to the ears of the Christian people, and what we wrote down.

Among other things, since I taught through the testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both.

If, therefore, I say, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, why did the Son say: 'He proceeds from the Father'? Why do you think, except that He often refers to Him, and what is His, from whom He Himself is?

Hence that statement: 'My teaching is not mine, but His who sent me' John 7:16.

If, therefore, His teaching is understood here, which He still said is not His but the Father's, how much more should it be understood there that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him too, where He said: 'He proceeds from the Father': so that He did not say, 'He does not proceed from me'?

From whom does the Son have it to be God (for He is God from God), He certainly has it from Him that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him: and through this, the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son, as He proceeds from the Father, He has it from the Father Himself.

Here, as much as we, such as we are, can understand such matters, why it is not said that the Holy Spirit is born, but rather proceeds; because if He were also called the Son, He would certainly be called the Son of both; which is most absurd.

For no son is from two, except from a father and a mother.

But let it not be suspected that such a relationship exists between God the Father and God the Son. The Son of Man does not proceed from both the Father and the mother simultaneously. When He proceeds to the mother from the Father, He does not proceed from the mother. And when He enters this light from the mother, He does not proceed from the Father. However, the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father into the Son, and then from the Son to sanctify the creature. Instead, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both at the same time. The

Father has given this to the Son, so just as the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, He also proceeds from the Son.

We cannot say that the Holy Spirit is not life, since the Father is life and the Son is life. Just as the Father has life in Himself, He has also given the Son to have life in Himself. He also gave the Holy Spirit to proceed from Him, just as He proceeds from Himself.

Blessed Augustine transferred this from a sermon he delivered before the people into the fifteenth book on the Holy Trinity. We have already provided evidence and briefly stated our thoughts on this sermon, which we believe is not necessary to repeat now.

It should be noted: he states there is a difference between generation and procession.

Generation pertains to the Son because He is said to be born of the Father, while procession pertains to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit cannot be said to be generated, for if He were said to be born, He would be from both the Father and the Son, which he argues is utmost foolishness and does not align with divine generation. For when has anyone ever been born of both the Father and the Son?

Therefore, since these ideas are most absurd, let it be said that the Son is born of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from both. This is not inconvenient, for it has been said: the Father alone is from no one, but the Son and the Holy Spirit are from the Father. The Father is life, the Son is also life, and the Holy Spirit is life too.

But life comes from no one but the Father. The Son, however, has life from the Father alone, as He is begotten. The Holy Spirit also has life, not from the Father alone, nor from the Son alone, but from both. It's not that the Spirit proceeds from the Father to the Son and then from the Son to sanctify the creature. There are no moments of time or order to consider here.

Finally, the Spirit proceeds from both at the same time. When He proceeds from the Father, He also proceeds from the Son, and when He proceeds from the Son, He also proceeds from the Father, with no time or order intervening. However, this difference remains: the Father received from no one, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him. But the Son received from the Father, so the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him.

Likewise, in the book of disputation against five heresies, ending his speech about the Holy Spirit, he says:

What else shall I say, to the weary? Whoever separates the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, in eternity, substance, or communion, and denies that He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, is filled with an unclean spirit and empty of the Holy Spirit.

Let the attackers of truth hear this: those who deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. For when they deny this, they deny that He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son. They should fear that they are full of an unclean spirit and empty of the Holy Spirit. Nor can they obtain forgiveness if they do not renounce such great blasphemy. But if the wicked do not want to listen, let the friends of piety hear and shudder at the blasphemy of impiety, so that they may be filled with the Holy Spirit.

Also, in the book against Maximinus the Arian (book 3, chapter 5):

You say that you honor the Holy Spirit as a teacher, a guide, an illuminator, a sanctifier. You worship Christ as the creator. You adore the Father with sincere devotion as the author. If you call the Father the author because the Son is from Him, but He is not from the Son; and because the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son in such a way that He gave

this to the Son by begetting Him, so that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him. If you call the Son the creator in this way, do not deny the Father or the Holy Spirit as creator.

If you call the Holy Spirit the teacher, guide, enlightener, and sanctifier in such a way that you do not dare to take these roles from the Father or the Son, these words are ours as well as yours. These are the words of Saint Augustine against the Arians. Let those decide for themselves whether they want to be of the faith of the emperors or the Arians. If they deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, they oppose the Catholic faith and become proponents of Arian doctrine. But if they are Catholics and hate the falsehood of the wrong doctrine, they do not accuse the Latins but rather confess the Catholic belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; denying this is clearly agreeing with Arian disbelief.

Again, in the same book, chapter 14: You ask me, addressing Maximinus the Arian, to whom he was speaking, if the Son is from the substance of the Father, and the Holy Spirit is from the substance of the Father, why is one the Son and the other not the Son?

Here is my answer, whether you understand it or not: The Son is from the Father, the Holy Spirit is from the Father; but the Son is begotten, the Spirit proceeds. Therefore, the Son is the Son of the Father because He is begotten; the Spirit, however, is the Spirit of both because He proceeds from both.

Maximinus the Arian, against whom blessed Augustine argues, denied that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. He claimed that the Spirit was lesser than the Son and not consubstantial with the Father, attempting to nullify the Catholic faith which holds that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. And so he said: If the Holy Spirit were from the substance of the Father, just as the Son is from the substance of the Father, there would consequently be two sons.

To this, blessed Augustine responded, saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father because He is of the same substance as the Father; however, He is not the Son because He is not begotten but proceeds. The Son, who is begotten, is from the substance of the Father and is therefore the Son because He is begotten. But the Holy Spirit, although from the substance of the Father, is not the Son because He is not begotten. However, He proceeds from the substance of the Son because He is the Spirit of both and consubstantial with both.

Whoever denies this agrees with the Arians and contradicts the Catholic faith. It follows: When the Son spoke about Him, He said, "He proceeds from the Father" (John 15:26) because the Father is the author of His procession. The Father begot such a Son, and by begetting, gave Him so that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him. For if He did not proceed from Him as well, He would not have said to the disciples, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22) and by breathing on them, He gave it, signifying that the Spirit also proceeds from Himself, clearly showing by breathing what He was giving secretly by inspiring.

If He were born, He would be born not only from the Father but also from the Son, and undoubtedly, the Son would be called the Son of both. Since the Son is in no way the Son of both, He did not need to be born from both. Therefore, the Spirit is of both, proceeding from both.

This confirms that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, and that the Son wanted to signify this when He said, "He proceeds from the Father." He did not deny that the Spirit proceeds from

Himself but referred the authority of the procession to the Father, who begot such a Son. By begetting, He conferred upon Him that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son.

He affirms this with another testimony, where after the resurrection, appearing to the disciples, the Savior said, "Receive the Holy Spirit." Not only by words but also by breathing, He gave what He commanded them to receive. He spoke to the disciples by breathing on them to receive the Holy Spirit, signifying clearly by breathing that it proceeds from Himself, which He was giving secretly by inspiring.

Likewise, resolving the question, lest the Son be of both since He proceeds from both, as the Arian impiety slandered, saying, "If the Holy Spirit were born, He would not be born only from the Father, nor only from the Son; because He proceeds from both." He proceeds, not born: but undoubtedly, He would be born from both since He proceeds from both; and without a doubt, He would be called the Son of both.

Now, however, the generation of the Spirit is removed, because He is neither the Son nor of the Father, nor of both; and therefore, it was not fitting for Him to be born of both.

Because he who does not have a birth rejects sonship, and he who is not a son should in no way be born. However, the Spirit proceeds from both.

Therefore, it overturns the Arian slander, which is concocted out of the envy of falsehood and born of the wickedness of impiety, desiring to assert that the Spirit is not from the substance of the Father.

Because if He were, He would be the Son. But this Catholic man, with a Catholic argument, demonstrates indeed that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father, yet is not the Son; because proceeding is not the same as being born.

Consequently, he inferred: Who can explain what the difference is between being born and proceeding, speaking of that most excellent nature?

Not everything that proceeds is born, although everything that is born proceeds; just as not everything that has two legs is a human, although every human has two legs.

This I know: but to distinguish between that generation and this procession, I do not know, I am not able, I am not sufficient.

The eminent doctor, and the most vehement conqueror of heretics, testifies that the Holy Spirit is not the Son, who is not born but proceeds, not only from the substance of the Father but also from the Son.

Since He shares in the substance of both, as being consubstantial, and is said to proceed from the Father from whom the Son is also born, a significant question arises: what is the difference between birth and procession?

And he confesses that distinguishing between being born and proceeding in that most excellent nature is not only impossible for him but for any mortal; although it is understood that not everything that proceeds is born; nonetheless, everything that is born proceeds.

For nothing can be born unless it proceeds from that of which it is born, like a son from a parent. For when he proceeds from the secret of the mother's womb into the light, he is said to be born, but not so when he proceeds from the secret of the father into the mother.

We can't deny the procession, as it involves the flow of seed into the mother's womb, from which the son is later said to be born.

We're not saying that the Spirit proceeded from the Father at one time and from the Son at another; rather, we want to show that not every procession is a generation, but every generation is a procession.

For example, not everything that has two feet is a human, although every human has two feet. This example distinguishes between birth and procession, but it doesn't specifically explain what it means to be born or to proceed, much like when we discuss what a species or a genus is. Having two feet is the genus for the species that is a human, and a human is the species of the genus that has two feet.

If you consider the genus, both humans and birds with two feet fall under it; if you consider the species, a human has two feet.

Hence the saying: not everything with two feet is human, because this general term also includes birds.

But when you say human, you include every human, but not everything with two feet: the term means more than just human; and so this definition doesn't specifically mean human, nor specifically two feet, just like with procession and birth.

In procession, birth is shown, but not always, like when it is said: Honey comes from the mouth of the wise.

And the Psalmist about the sun: And he is like a groom coming out of his chamber.

The sun's chamber signifies a certain secret place, hidden from human sight, from where it comes out each day to give light to mortals.

However, birth always shows procession because it can never happen without procession: whatever is born also proceeds.

Therefore, Blessed Augustine indeed describes what generation and procession are, but in terms of genus or species, not in their own proper sense; he admits he does not know these things properly, nor can he distinguish them by their proper boundaries.

And why is this?

He gives the reason, saying: Because both of these are ineffable, that is, the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit.

As the prophet speaks about the Son, he says:

"Who can describe His generation?"

Isaiah 53:8.

In the same way, it can very truly be said about the Holy Spirit:

"Who can describe His procession?"

These words show that the birth of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit cannot be explained, because they are ineffable.

Therefore, we should not investigate what cannot be explained, because it cannot be comprehended in any way.

It should be enough for us that the Holy Scripture testifies about these things:

the Son was born from the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds, not only from the Father, but also from the Son.

This is indicated when it says:

"It is enough for us, because the Son is not from Himself, but from Him from whom He was born. The Holy Spirit is not from Himself, but from Him from whom He proceeds."

And because He proceeds from both, as we have already shown, He is called the Spirit of the Father, as it is read:

"But if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you"

Romans 8:11.

And He is called the Spirit of the Son, as it is read:

"But if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him"

Romans 8:9.

Here, against Maximinus the Arian, Doctor Augustine shows that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Those who deny this reveal themselves to be Arians and do not acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Son.

For if He does not proceed from Him, He is not of the same substance as the Son.

Thus, they either blaspheme the Holy Spirit as a creature or deny that the Son has all that the Father has.

They cannot deny that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, for the Apostle says:

"Because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba, Father'"

Galatians 4:6.

If He is the Spirit of the Son, as the Apostle confesses, He is either subject, as the Arian wants, who counts Him among creatures, or He proceeds from the Son, as Catholics confess.

Let the emperors of the Greeks choose what they will: they cannot deny that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son.

Therefore, let them explain how He is the Spirit of the Son if He does not proceed from Him.

If they deny the procession, they are essentially proclaiming creation, which is clearly the heresy of Arius. The Spirit cannot belong to the Son unless it is either created or proceeds from Him.

In the following chapter:

What does "In the beginning was the Word" mean except that the Son was in the Father?

When the Jews asked the Son who He was, He answered: "The beginning, who also speaks to you."

The Father is the beginning, not from a beginning; the Son is the beginning from a beginning. But together, they are not two, but one beginning. Just as the Father is God and the Son is God, together they are not two Gods, but one God.

I will not deny that the Holy Spirit, proceeding from both, is the beginning. These three together, just as one God, are one beginning. He denies that the Holy Spirit is a creature, saying it is the beginning just as the Father is the beginning, and the Son is the beginning. The Father is the beginning from no beginning, the Son is the beginning from the Father as the beginning. The Holy Spirit is the beginning, not from no beginning, nor from the Father alone, but from both the Father and the Son. Yet, not three beginnings, but one beginning; just as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are not three Gods, but one God.

In later chapters: Light from light, the Son from the Father, both together are one light. Just as God from God, both together are indeed one God, and all this not without the Spirit of both. By

saying this, he testifies that it proceeds from both. If the Spirit is of the Father because it proceeds from the Father, then the Spirit is also of the Son because it proceeds from Him. There is not a different reason the Spirit is called the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son, but one and the same; because it proceeds from both, just as it is the Spirit of both. For if you say it is the Spirit of the Father because it proceeds from the Father, what reason remains for it to be called the Spirit of the Son, unless it also proceeds from Him?

Here, the blessed Augustine, opposing Maximinus the Arian, spoke and wrote about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. He condemned Arian deceit and affirmed the piety of the Catholic faith. Anyone who tries to contradict this is found to be an enemy of the Catholic faith.

In his dialogue disputing with Pascentius the Arian Pascentius (Pascentius' Argument with Augustine, Letter 178, middle), he also said:

For if we believe that the whole of God dwells in a believer, how can we not believe that the Father fully encompasses the Son, or the Son fully encompasses the Father? Therefore, the Father remains in Him, and He in the Father. We must believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son, and always proceeds to carry out the works of the Trinity.

He says that the Holy Spirit is one with the Holy Trinity as a cooperator, united not only in substance but also in operation with the Father and the Son, as proceeding from both and cooperating with both. This He could not do if He did not, by proceeding from both, receive and continue to receive substance.

Chapter Five

From Gennadius and Fulgentius.

Gennadius, the bishop of Constantinople, a scholar well-versed in ancient texts, discusses the procession of the Holy Spirit in his book "Ecclesiastical Dogmas":

We believe in one God: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father, because He has the Son; the Son, because He has the Father; the Holy Spirit, because He proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Therefore, the Father is the source of divinity, the principal name. Just as He has always been God, He has always been the Father, from whom the Son was born, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds; because He is neither the Son nor unbegotten, as He is not the Father; nor is He the created Holy Spirit, for He comes from God the Father and God the Son, proceeding as God.

Gennadius clearly states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, meaning He comes from their substance. He could not proceed from both in any other way if He did not substantially come from both. Hence, he says that the Holy Spirit proceeds as God from God the Father and God the Son.

Though he says the Holy Spirit proceeds, he denies that He should be called either born, because He is not the Son, or unbegotten, because He is not the Father.

Fulgentius, another bishop, known for his literary scholarship and sanctity, who endured much from the Arians for the Catholic faith, writes in his book "Questions on the Procession of the Holy Spirit":

Thus, everything that is of the very nature is common to the three persons, yet each person is uniquely identified by something that is neither separable nor common.

We say it is proper to the Father that He begot; it is proper to the Son that He alone was born of the Father alone; and it is proper to the Holy Spirit that He proceeds from the Father and the Son.

In these properties, however, there is no separation of nature, but a distinct personal recognition.

The author explains what is common and what is unique to each person of the Holy Trinity. Common to all three persons is the consubstantiality of one nature. Unique to each is that the Father alone begets, the Son alone is begotten from the Father alone, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

Therefore, those who accept that it is unique to the Father to be the begetter and unique to the Son to be the begotten must also accept that it is unique to the Holy Spirit to proceed from both the Father and the Son. If they deny this, they must explain what is unique to the Holy Spirit. For the procession from the Father is also common to the Son, because everything that is born also proceeds.

Thus, according to this teacher's view, it is unique to the Holy Spirit to proceed from both the Father and the Son, which is not common to either the Father or the Son. The Father proceeds from no one, the Son from the Father alone, and the Holy Spirit from both.

Also consider the following:

The divinity of the Son could not receive the Holy Spirit, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son just as He proceeds from the Father and is given by the Son just as He is given by the Father. Nor could that nature, from which the Holy Spirit originates, either await or receive generosity.

The Holy Spirit is entirely of the Father, entirely of the Son; because He is naturally the Spirit of both the Father and the Son. Hence, He proceeds entirely from the Father and the Son and remains entirely in the Father and the Son; because He remains as He proceeds and proceeds as He remains. Thus, He naturally has with the Father and the Son the fullness of unity, and the unity of fullness, so that He is entirely from the Father and entirely from the Son.

Therefore, the divinity of the Son did not receive the Holy Spirit, with whom the Holy Spirit shares one nature, and from whom He has whatever He has, indeed from whom He is what He is; because what He naturally has is what He is.

This passage discusses the fullness of Christ's divinity and His humanity. It explains that His humanity received the Holy Spirit, not in a limited way, because the fullness of divinity resides in Him. As the Gospel testifies about Christ: "And we saw His glory, the glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (John 1:14).

"Truth" refers to divinity, and "grace" refers to the gift. For the man born of the Virgin to be perfect God, as He is perfect man, He received this not by merit but by the gift of divine grace.

However, divinity naturally possesses fullness and perfection, lacking nothing, incapable of diminution, and not subject to increase.

According to this fullness of divinity, the Son of God, Christ, could not receive the Holy Spirit since the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him just as from the Father and is given by Him just as by the Father. Therefore, the divinity of the Son, from which the Holy Spirit originates, cannot receive the largesse of the Holy Spirit, who is the cause of its existence. For the Holy Spirit is entirely of the Father and entirely of the Son; and being entirely of both or entirely of either, it does not follow that the Father and the Son are to be called the Holy Spirit as if receiving the cause of existence from Him.

Nor is the Son alone the Son of the Holy Spirit as if receiving existence from Him, because naturally, the Spirit is one of both the Father and the Son, receiving essence from them.

Consequently, as the blessed Fulgentius testifies, He proceeds entirely from the Father and entirely from the Son. For no part of Him proceeds from the Father and another part from the Son; nor does part of Him remain in the Father and part again in the Son. He is indivisible and inseparable, not composed of different parts. Thus, He remains as He proceeds and proceeds as He remains.

For He naturally has with the Father and the Son the fullness of unity and the unity of fullness, and He is entirely from the Father and entirely from the Son.

Therefore, the Son's divinity did not receive the Holy Spirit as something it did not already possess, since the Holy Spirit shares the same nature as the Son, from whom He received everything He has, and indeed, from whom He is what He is.

Because He substantially comes from the divinity of the Son, this clearly shows that the procession of the Holy Spirit is no less from the Son than from the Father.

Anyone who tries to deny this will also deny the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, because He cannot subsist unless He receives His essence from the one from whom He subsists by proceeding.

Saint Fulgentius spoke about the procession of the Holy Spirit against the Arian heresy, affirming the true statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, because He is the Spirit of both, receiving His essence from both.

Anyone who denies this is shown to be subject to Arian heresy.

Chapter Six

From Athanasius.

Let's return to Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria, whom we mentioned first among the witnesses of the Catholics at the beginning, so that he can conclude the testimony about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, who was there from the start.

In the second book on the distinct Persons and the united name of divinity against the Arians, he states:

The Father is different in person because He truly begot; and the Son is different from the Father because He was truly begotten by Him.

The Holy Spirit, the main comforter, is different in person from the Father and the Son, as He was poured out on the apostles at Pentecost, truly proceeding from the united divinity of the Father and the Son.

This author distinguishes the unique properties of each person and unites them in divinity, showing what is unique to each and what is shared.

It is proper to the Father that He begot; neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit share this, otherwise, it wouldn't be unique to the Father. The Son is distinguished from the Father because He was begotten, and the Father begot; but the Holy Spirit doesn't share in the property of generation at all, since He is begotten, proving He is not begotten.

The Holy Spirit has this unique property: He neither begot nor was begotten, but proceeds from the united divinity of the Father and the Son; in which He doesn't share with the Father or the Son.

For the Father is from no one, the Son is from the Father alone, but the Holy Spirit is from both the Father and the Son.

Whoever denies this must show from where the person of the Holy Spirit is distinguished from the properties of the Father and the Son.

These three persons of the Holy Trinity are distinguished by their own properties, yet united by the unity of divinity. They have no difference in the communion of divinity, but there is property in the persons and undifferentiated unity in divinity.

Again, in the seventh book: Why, if you see me, do you also see my Father (John 14:9)? Does it indicate that there is one invisible image of the nature of truth in these?

Why do you read, keeping the truth of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Ephesians)?

Section 4, 3): If you do not accept that he is from the united divinity of the Father and the Son, why do you read that the chosen vessel said, "We have all drunk of one Spirit," First Corinthians 12:13, if you separate him from the united true nature of the deity?

It testifies that the Son is of the same nature as the Father, which the Arians denied, because there is one invisible image of the nature of truth in the Father and the Son. It also testifies that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Son because he exists from the united divinity of the Father and the Son. This clearly shows that he proceeds from both. Since the divinity of the Father and the Son is so united that it cannot receive any difference, the Spirit cannot proceed from the divinity of the Father unless he also proceeds from the Son.

Likewise, he cannot proceed from the divinity of the Son unless he also proceeds from the Father. Otherwise, the united divinity of the Father and the Son will no longer be indifferent if the Spirit proceeds from the divinity of the Father and does not equally proceed from the divinity of the Son. Thus, it will no longer be united, which is impious and Arian. Therefore, according to the Catholic faith, let it be said, as blessed Athanasius confesses, that the Holy Spirit is from the united divinity of the Father and the Son.

He also testifies that we have drunk of one Spirit. In saying this, he approves that the Spirit of the Father is not different from the Spirit of the Son. The one who is of the Son is also of the Father, and he is from the united true nature of the deity, that is, the substance of the Father and the Son, which consists in such unity that it is divided by no separation. Since the Holy Spirit is also one of this substance, it is evidently approved that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, to whom he is joined in the united nature of the deity.

Also, below: Hypocrites, how do you accept, "All these things are worked by one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one as he wills," First Corinthians 12:11, if you separate him from the united operation of the deity? The united deity is of the whole Holy Trinity, in which equally consists the person of the Holy Spirit, without whom there would not be a Trinity.

Therefore, by stating that divinity is united through a single operation, it confirms that the Holy Spirit, the Father, and the Son work together; and that those united by the same operation cannot be separated by nature. Consequently, it is clear that the nature of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit is united, both in substance and in operation.

Again: Hypocrites, how do you understand the statement: The same Spirit, the same Lord, the same God, if you do not accept Him as the true God from true nature, performing wonders in all things? He calls the Spirit Lord and God: and truly God from true nature. By saying 'from true nature,' he acknowledges that the Holy Spirit is not from Himself, but from the true nature of the Father and the Son. Just as the Father and the Son are not separated by the truth of nature, so too the Holy Spirit subsists from the true nature of both: because it cannot proceed from the nature of the Father if it does not also proceed from the nature of the Son: because what is the nature of the Father is also the nature of the Son.

And by saying that blessed Athanasius called the Holy Spirit true God from true nature, without adding 'of the Father' or 'of the Son,' it certainly implies that the Holy Spirit is true God from the true nature of both, performing wonders in all things.

Again: Hypocrites, through whom is the word of wisdom given, or the word of knowledge, or faith, or the gift of healing, or the working of miracles, or prophecy, or the discernment of spirits, if not from the united fullness? No faithful person doubts that all these mentioned are gifts of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, by concluding that the Holy Spirit is capable of these things because He is from the united fullness, it indeed acknowledges that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. For the united fullness of the divinity of the Father and the Son is such that it is neither increased nor divided; and this united fullness of the Father and the Son proceeds, complete and full God Himself, because He cannot receive an increase in quantity.

If, according to the new heresy, the Spirit proceeds only from the Father and not from the united fullness, then the community of the Son is not present, and singularity lies with the Father. This is false and full of heretical depravity.

Therefore, according to the blessed Athanasius, it should be said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the united fullness, since He consists of the true deity of both the Father and the Son, true God.

Again, below: Therefore, because it says, "By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their power by the breath of His mouth" (Psalm 33:6), recognize that this substantive Word was truly born from the Father; and the breath of His mouth means the Spirit, who proceeds from the same united substance.

The Arians denied that both the Son and the Holy Spirit were consubstantial with the Father. Thus, throughout the present text of this argument, it is contended to prove that both the Son and the Holy Spirit are consubstantial with the Father. As in the present passage, saying "By the word of the Lord the heavens were established," signifies the divinity of the Son; and "by the breath of His mouth all their power," signifies the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit. To this, it is

also added that He proceeds from the same united substance, indicating indeed that He proceeds from both the Father and the Son, whose substance is united.

Hence it is consequently said: "Thus we find not from another nature but from the same." It is understood to refer to the Holy Spirit.

The Arians blasphemed, saying that the Holy Spirit was of a different nature than the Father, for they contended that He was a creature. Blessed Athanasius refutes them, saying that He is not of a different nature than the Father, and that He proceeds from the united substance of the Father and the Son. Thus, he testifies that the substance of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is united, which the Greeks call οὐσίαν (ousia), and that the operation of the Trinity is united and the same.

In the eighth book: Just as two pieces of wood joined together and thrown into a fire produce an inseparable flame from the two pieces of wood, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from the power of the Father and the Son, having the same power of divinity.

No one should think that God the Father and God the Son are like two pieces of wood with one flame, suggesting that blessed Athanasius was subject to the Holy Spirit. Instead, they used this analogy from material things to explain something that is not material or divisible by place. They did this partially because a creature cannot be entirely similar to the Creator, and we must understand the meaning more deeply.

It is not said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son like one fire from two pieces of wood, making the Holy Spirit seem separable. Nor is it like two spirits, one from the Father and one from the Son. Rather, it is one and the same Holy Spirit, sharing the same divine power as the Father and the Son, from whom He proceeds. This should not seem impossible or unbelievable, since even in material things, something can come from two sources and still remain singular without becoming dual.

Also, in the same book: The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father; and the Holy Spirit is the union of divine power and the unity of the Trinity. This shows that the Holy Spirit is the love of the Father and the Son. Nothing else more powerfully and fittingly perfects the unity of the Holy Trinity. However, we must not understand this love, which is the Holy Spirit, as a quality and not a substance, since He is one person of the Holy Trinity. The Holy Spirit is called the union or unity of the Father and the Son because He proceeds from both and unites both, remaining undivided, inseparable, and consubstantial, as one of the Holy Trinity.

Also in the booklet of Faith.

In his second letter about the unity of faith to Theophilus, he says:

The true Father begot the true Son, God from God, light from light, life from life, perfect from perfect, whole from whole, full from full; not created, but begotten, not from nothing, but from the Father, of one substance with the Father.

And the Holy Spirit, the true God, neither unbegotten nor begotten, not created, nor made, but of the Father and the Son, always in the Father and the Son.

He explains that the Holy Spirit is neither begotten nor unbegotten because the Son is begotten, as mentioned before, and the Father is unbegotten. However, the Spirit is not created or made, since He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, always present in both.

By saying that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son, yet not created or made, he shows that the Spirit proceeds from both, being consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and always with the Son. This indicates that the unity of the Holy Trinity cannot be separated by place or time.

Likewise, in the tenth book, he cites the testimony of the Apostle saying:

For who has known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him? But we have the mind of Christ.

First Corinthians 2:16.

Upon this he adds:

The Apostle has declared that the mind of Jesus Christ, in its own substance, is the Holy Spirit. Blessed Athanasius refers to the proper substance of Christ as His divinity and asserts that the mind of this substance is the Holy Spirit. This is not to be understood in terms of human bodily senses like hearing or sight, but in terms of what we call the sense of the mind, meaning His intellect.

He says the intellect of Jesus Christ is the Holy Spirit, not implying that Jesus does not understand by Himself, but that His intellect is the Holy Spirit; for He is the wisdom of the Father: Reaching from one end to another mightily, and sweetly ordering all things.

Wisdom of Solomon 8:1.

He wants us to understand the Holy Spirit as the essence of Christ, so that we may know the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as Christ.

Just as the sense of the mind cannot be separated from the mind, nor does it originate from anywhere else but the mind, the Holy Spirit, when described by the Apostle as the sense of Jesus Christ, is not separate from the substance of Christ's divinity, nor does it proceed from anywhere else but from it.

The Holy Spirit is consubstantial with the Son, having his procession from the divine substance.

Therefore, hearing the Savior say: "I am the life" (John 14:6);

and Paul writing: "For the law of the Spirit of life" (Romans 8:2);

and again: "God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts" (Galatians 4:6);

also seeing the Only Begotten breathing on the apostles and saying: "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20:22); we are taught that the Spirit, remaining in his own life and substance, is the Spirit.

We understand that he is neither begotten nor created by the Son.

From all these things, we are instructed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and remains in his own life and substance.

And although he is inspired by the Son, meaning he proceeds from the Son, he is neither created nor begotten by him.

The Holy Spirit is neither the Son nor a creature.

By these teachings, it is clearly shown that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Son, as he proceeds from him; and he is not one of the creatures, but the sanctifier of the creatures.

When he is called the Spirit of the Son according to the Apostle, it does not mean he is subordinate, because he is not created; but it means he is proceeding, yet not begotten, because he is not the Son.

However, he has received his own existence from the substance of the Son, as he is one person of the Holy Trinity.

Also in the book Disputation Against Arius, it appears that the Holy Spirit is not different in substance from the Father and the Son. Since He does not act or speak on His own as if He were a stranger and foreign, but as a partner of one and the same nature, He speaks and acts on what is common to the Father and the Son.

For if He spoke of His own things, He would undoubtedly be considered not only alien to the Father but also deceitful and a deceiver. Because, as the Son says:

"Everyone who speaks a lie, speaks from his own things"

(John 8:44). Therefore, He speaks the truth because He does not speak from His own, that is, not on His own, but speaks what needs to be spoken from the Father and the Son:

"He will take from what is mine and declare it to you"

(John 16:14).

And to show that this taking from Him is also taking from the Father, He said:

"That is why I said, 'He will take from what is mine,' because all that the Father has is mine"

(John 16:15). Therefore, you see that the Holy Spirit is not separate from the Father and the Son, as He speaks what is known to be the property of the Father and the Son.

It shows more clearly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son and is consubstantial with both. For He says that He is not different in substance from the Father and the Son, since He does not act on His own, but from those from whom He proceeds. Since He is of the same nature and substance as the Father and the Son, He does not speak of His own things, but what is common to the Father and the Son.

For He is not from Himself, and therefore what He speaks is certainly from those from whom He received it, so that He may be, act, and speak. Just as He does not speak of His own things, but received from the Father what He speaks.

"Everyone who speaks a lie, speaks from his own things"

(John 8:44). Therefore, blessed Athanasius says the Holy Spirit speaks the truth because He does not speak from His own, for He is not from Himself, but speaks what is of the Father and the Son. For just as He is consubstantial with them, so He received from them what He speaks, not existing first and then receiving, but receiving as He proceeds.

And He brings in the Son saying:

"He will take from what is mine and declare it to you"

(John 16:14).

And why he said this, he explains when he adds:

This means, he says, that receiving from the Son is the same as receiving from the Father because the Father and the Son, just as they are not separated in substance, are also in no way divided in the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, he adds that the Son said: For this reason, He said, He will take from what is mine, because everything the Father has is mine John 16:15.

Showing that the Holy Spirit, when proceeding from the Father, also proceeds from the Son; and when proceeding from the Son, also proceeds from the Father.

Hence, concluding at the end, he says that the Holy Spirit is not separated from the Father and the Son, to whom he is united both by nature and by action.

For he speaks and says things that are known to belong to both the Father and the Son, proceeding from both, receiving from both as essence, so also operation, undivided from them in both will and power, as being one of the same Holy Trinity.

Blessed Athanasius, teaching about the procession of the Holy Spirit, approves that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

If the emperors of the Greeks want to contradict this, let them see which authors they follow in the profession of the Holy Trinity.

For the authority of this most blessed and most catholic man is embraced, venerated, and defended by the whole catholic Church of Christ.

Let these things we have said about the Holy Spirit be sufficient, following the authority of the elders and imitating the teaching of the holy Scriptures, we indeed wish to approve that he is God and consubstantial with the Father and the Son, co-eternal, and in all things similar in power, similar in virtue, of one and the same majesty.

For this question has been discussed and determined by the holy disputation of the Fathers, refuting the perfidy of heretics, who, thinking badly about the Holy Spirit, denied that he was true God:

however, we did not have much necessity to dispute this, although many things have been said by us on this matter, when the opportunity arose.

Regarding the procession itself, much has been discussed, raising a question; we believe it is sufficient for those who cherish devotion and truth, and who follow the light of wisdom rather than the darkness of error.

The Holy Spirit speaks of both in Solomon's words: Do not argue with a mocker, or they will hate you. Rebuke the wise, and they will love you. Proverbs 9:8. And again: Do not speak to fools, for they will scorn your prudent words. Proverbs 23:9.

Therefore, let the detractors of the Holy Spirit see that by refusing to accept the discipline of wisdom, they are like those who prefer their own folly to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

These modern individuals, however, are not true debaters; they neither refute nor prove anything with reason, but simply assert novelty. Who can we say they resemble? When they deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, they present neither reasoning nor authority to support their claims: it seems more like the swelling of frivolity than the weight of prudence.

They are so arrogant that whatever they assert seems authoritative: they are like those who, being blind and not seeing the light, swear that the sun is not present on the earth, even when the day shines brightly. But let us say to them what the Savior says to the Jews: Search the Scriptures, for they are the ones that testify about me. John 5:39.

So too, let them search the sacred volumes of the Scriptures. For these are the ones that testify to the Holy Spirit, that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. Let them examine the doctrines of the Catholic Fathers; they will find where to correct their error and lay down the swelling of foolishness, by which they believe in themselves rather than the truth, and replace the authority of the elders with their own madness: let them first learn what they seek to teach, lest, while boasting of their ignorance as the highest expertise, they become like the one who, after being exalted to a high place, as Solomon says, appeared foolish.

But now, it's time to move on to the rest of their accusations. While they eagerly criticize the Latins, they clearly reveal their own reprehensible behavior.

Book Four

Chapter One

About the different customs of the Church.

What should be uniformly held by everyone in the Church.

Customs sometimes change.

The following objections, though they may seem unwise and ignorant, could have been left out if they did not risk causing confusion among the less discerning.

They might appear pious, but they can easily mislead those who cannot distinguish between true and false religion.

Since these objections do not concern the doctrine of faith, which is the essence of Christianity, but merely describe the customs of their own Church, there was nothing for our Church to either endorse or oppose.

As the Apostle says: "I urge you to all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you" First Corinthians 1:10.

He clarifies elsewhere what he means by this, saying: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all" Ephesians 4:5-6.

In these essential matters, there is no diversity among believers. We all confess the Holy Trinity, the birth of our Savior Jesus Christ from the Virgin, His passion, death, resurrection, ascension into heaven, and His sitting at the right hand of the Father.

We believe in our hearts for justification and confess with our mouths for salvation.

We also believe that He will come to judge the living and the dead, and we uphold one baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, regardless of who we are as Christians.

In these matters, the Apostle urges us to be of the same mind and not to think differently.

However, the customs of different Churches are not all the same and cannot be uniformly held by everyone.

At the beginning of the emerging Church, the Acts of the Apostles tell us that those who believed in Jerusalem owned nothing as personal property.

Instead, they sold their possessions, and the proceeds were laid at the apostles' feet and distributed to each as needed.

Everything was shared among them.

(Acts 4:34-35)

However, the same religious practice did not bind the Gentiles who believed.

It is written in the Acts of the Apostles that they received the commandments through the apostles, which, if followed, would make them partakers of eternal salvation.

These commandments were to abstain from idol worship, fornication, blood, and meat from strangled animals.

The apostles did not want to impose anything beyond these essentials, as confirmed by the letters sent to the Gentile believers:

"It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us not to burden you with anything beyond these essential things: that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, etc.

And in conclusion: If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well."

(Acts 15:28-29)

Who cannot see the different religious practices?

To possess nothing of one's own but to live communally versus retaining all personal property and being bound by only a few commandments?

One thing is to achieve the highest level of perfection, as those who sold everything they had and distributed it to the poor, following the example of poor Christ.

Another thing is to follow just a few commandments at the beginning of the religion, not being excluded from those who aimed for the highest, even if they followed the least of the commandments.

Although the observances differed in quality, they were united in faith.

Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, writes in his Ecclesiastical History about the believers in Alexandria, noting their religious fervor and the excellent philosophy of their conduct.

(Ecclesiastical History, Book 2, Chapter 16)

He said: First of all, those who have devoted themselves to this kind of philosophy renounce all their possessions and give up their goods.

Then they cast away all the worries of life and leave the city to live in gardens or small plots of land, avoiding the company of those with different goals and lifestyles, knowing that these are obstacles for those who want to walk the difficult path of virtue.

And furthermore, he said: In each place, there is a house dedicated to prayer, which is called a semnion or monastery.

Semnion can mean a gathering place of honorable people, where they retreat to celebrate the mysteries of an honest and pure life.

They bring nothing related to food or drink, or other bodily needs, but only the books of the law, the volumes of the prophets, hymns to God, and similar things.

Trained in these disciplines and practices, they unite in continuous study towards a perfect and blessed life.

From sunrise to sunset, they spend all their time in the exercises of study, in which they are instructed in divine philosophy through sacred writings, interpreting the laws of the Fathers allegorically, believing that the things written in the letter of the law are forms and images of some hidden deep and divine mystery.

And in conclusion: They first place continence as a foundation in the soul, and then proceed to build other virtues upon it.

None of them take food or drink before sunset, combining the time of light with philosophical study, and bodily care with the night.

Some even go so far as to share food only after three days, driven by a greater hunger for study.

Now, those who are deeply engaged in the teachings of wisdom and in understanding the holy scriptures, much like those who eagerly reach for abundant feasts, cannot be satisfied. Instead, they become more inflamed by what they learn. They do not allow themselves food on the

fourth or fifth day, but only on the sixth day, and even then, it's not so much out of desire but out of necessity for the body.

Writing about the lifestyle of the believers, he shows how much their way of living differed from that of other believers around the world, not only in Alexandria but throughout Egypt. These believers were so fervent in their desire for the heavenly homeland that it could be rightly said to them: "But our citizenship is in heaven" Philippians 3:20.

Although they lived in the flesh, they led, so to speak, an angelic life on earth. It is said that they were instructed in this way by the blessed Mark the Evangelist, whom the apostle Peter sent from Rome to Alexandria to preach the Gospel of Christ. However, did they exclude other Churches of Christ around the world, who lived differently, from their fellowship or eagerly seek to convert them to their own rites and customs? They knew that grace was given to each, not only to individuals but also to the Church, according to the measure of Christ's gift.

Yet, because they had established continence as a foundational principle to be consecrated first, they did not condemn marriage. Unless one might think that among them, bishops and priests had wives, while it is known that even laypeople among them abstained from marriage. Nor did they have lunch on every Sabbath, as they extended their fasts until evening; and many of them barely provided food for their body on the third or sixth day.

Therefore, let the wise men of the Greeks, or at least their leaders, see how justly they reproach the Romans for fasting on the Sabbath. Then let them also reproach these people who fast every day; let them also reproach those who continue fasting the entire week.

Since it is clearly foolish,

I would like them at least to recognize the error of their imprudence or frivolity and strive to be imitators of virtue rather than disparaging those who fast.

For the kingdom of God is not about food and drink, but about righteousness and godliness, as the Apostle says in Romans 14:17.

And the Savior defeated the devil not by eating, but by fasting, as mentioned in Matthew 4.

Nor should all the Churches of Christ desire to follow their own custom;

since they see that both in the times of the apostles and their disciples, there were different practices observed;

yet they were not different in faith, even if they differed in observance.

Chapter Two

On the various customs of the Church.

The Lenten fast has been observed differently in the past, with variations in foods and rites.

There were also many sects among the Jews.

The Apostle writes to the Thessalonians:

"For you became imitators, brothers, of the churches of God in Judea that are in Christ Jesus" (First Thessalonians 2:14).

By saying this, he shows that even the churches of Gentile believers had different strengths, roles, and customs.

This is also confirmed by blessed Jerome in the Prologue to Paul's letters, saying:

"They do not follow the order in which they were written, but follow a certain progression of ranks; so that the first place is held by the letters sent to churches with lesser observance of doctrine or virtue.

The middle place is held by those sent to churches that had deviated from the beginnings but had not yet reached the peak of perfection.

The last place is held by those sent to churches that had attained perfection, excelling in both knowledge and virtue, having many below them, but none above them."

This shows that where there was a difference in the knowledge and virtue of the churches, there was also a difference in religious customs.

Indeed, those in Jerusalem who lived communally, sharing in the breaking of bread and persevering in prayer, possessing nothing of their own, behaved very differently from those who retained their possessions and commended the Gospel of Christ through their life, morals, and faith according to the grace given to them.

The Apostle greatly praises the Thessalonians, who were granted to suffer the same as those in Jerusalem suffered from the Jews.

Regarding the various customs of the churches, Socrates in Ecclesiastical History (Book 5, Chapter 21) says:

"What is celebrated as Easter according to a certain custom throughout the provinces, I think, stems from the fact that no religion seems to observe the same festivals."

Since there is one faith, many rules regarding Easter are established, so a few things need to be mentioned.

For example, you will find different fasting practices among different peoples: The Romans fast for six weeks before Easter, excluding Sundays, continuously. However, the people of Illyricum, all of Greece, and Alexandria fast for six weeks before Easter; they call these fasts Lent. Others begin their fasts seven weeks before Easter.

But they also do not have the same abstinence from foods:

some abstain completely from animal products; others eat only fish.

Some eat fish and birds, saying these according to Moses have their substance from water.

Others are known to abstain from vegetables and eggs as well.

Some eat only dry bread; others do not even do this.

Some fast until the ninth hour and then eat without distinguishing between foods.

There are countless customs among different peoples. Since no ancient text is found on this matter, I believe the apostles left this to each person's judgment, so that each may do what is good, not out of fear or necessity.

Even regarding the celebration of gatherings, certain differences are found. While sacrifices are celebrated weekly on the Sabbath in the churches established throughout the world, this is not done in Alexandria and Rome by some ancient tradition. The Egyptians near Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebes, hold gatherings on the Sabbath but do not receive the sacraments in the usual way: after they have feasted and filled themselves with all kinds of foods, they communicate in the evening after an offering is made.

In Alexandria on Wednesday and Friday, Scriptures are read and interpreted by teachers; and everything is done except the formal prayer practice. Also, in Alexandria, readers and psalm

reciters, whether catechumens or already Christians, are chosen indiscriminately, while all the churches seem to have faithful members in these roles.

I also learned about another custom in Thessaly: when a cleric had lawfully taken a wife before becoming a cleric, if he remained intimate with her after becoming a cleric, he was deposed. In the East, however, all bishops abstain voluntarily, not out of necessity. Many of them even had children with their lawful wives while serving as bishops.

Additionally, in Thessaly, baptism is only performed on Easter, so many die without being baptized.

In Antioch of Syria, the altar is not towards the East of the Church but rather towards the West. In Greece, Jerusalem, and Thessaly, they have evening prayers similar to those of the Novatians in Constantinople.

In Caesarea of Cappadocia and Cyprus, on Sabbath and Sunday evenings, bishops and priests interpret the Scriptures with lamps lit.

In Alexandria, a priest does not give a sermon; this practice began when Arius troubled the Church.

In Rome, they fast on all the Sabbaths.

In Caesarea of Cappadocia, those who sin after baptism are suspended from communion.

The Novatians around Phrygia do not accept those who have married twice. In Constantinople, they neither openly accept nor openly remove such people; but in the western parts, they openly accept them.

It would take too long to gather all the diverse practices observed throughout the Churches around the world or to understand what has been observed since ancient times. However, it should suffice to briefly compile these from the history of a single writer, and this Greek: so that the emperors may understand how unjustly and ignorantly the Greeks criticize the Romans for not observing their customs in everything. Let them compel the whole body of the Churches of Christ spread throughout the world into the laws of their customs, and then, if they can, judge the Romans for the diversity of their religion, because they seem to be different from the customs of Constantinople.

Are they truly more knowledgeable than the apostles, or can they prove that their Roman customs are superior based on ancient writings? Interestingly, one of their own historians notes that the holy apostles left these decisions to individual judgment, so no one would act out of fear or necessity but rather by their own free will.

Although they all share the same faith, they practice different customs when it comes to celebrating Passover and observing fasts. Some observe more days of fasting, while others observe fewer. They don't follow the same kinds of food, timing, or duration for their fasts, but each group is content with the customs of their province, their elders, or their personal abilities. Churches also don't hold gatherings, or assemblies of people, at the same time or in the same way. For example, the Alexandrians and Romans conduct their gatherings differently from the Egyptians and Thebans. The Romans and Alexandrians don't hold assemblies on the Sabbath, unlike the churches of Christ throughout the entire East, which are proven to do so.

The Egyptians and those living in the Thebaid hold assemblies on the Sabbath, but they don't receive the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ while fasting. Instead, they receive them in the evening after having eaten, which is contrary to the custom of the entire world.

The Alexandrians also add Wednesday and Friday to their custom, during which they hold assemblies to read the Holy Scriptures and have teachers interpret them, but they don't perform the solemn rite of offering on these days. Despite these differences, they are not excommunicated by the other Eastern churches, even though their practices seem to differ.

Thessaly has customs that differ from other Eastern regions.

For instance, after taking holy orders, they do not allow anyone, as a historian testifies, to even acknowledge his own wife, whom he lawfully married before ordination.

If he does, he is deprived of his ministry.

However, in other Eastern Churches, no one is bound by this rule; it is left to their own judgment and free will.

Not only other ecclesiastical ranks but also priests and bishops can retain their lawful wives, whom they had before ordination, if they wish.

However, it is not permitted for those who do not have wives to marry, nor to enter into a second marriage if their previous wife has died.

Yet, this difference does not separate anyone from communion, as custom differentiates.

At the time of baptism, the Church of Thessalonica also differs from others.

They only baptize at Easter, although there are two times decreed by the elders for baptism: Easter and Pentecost.

Why should I mention Antioch in Syria, where it is customary to have the altar not facing the east of the Church, but rather the west?

The same historian reports that the people of Constantinople are divided on accepting or rejecting those who have been married twice, with some accepting and others disagreeing. Meanwhile, the entire Western Church openly accepts without contradiction.

Yet despite their different customs, they are not separated in the unity of communion.

I ask, what is this wisdom or sacred zeal that Greek emperors do not allow among the Romans what the universal Church endures throughout the whole world?

They want neither the Romans nor the Westerners to differ from their custom, although the Easterners are separated by a variety of customs.

Is Constantinople itself content with one custom?

It is not enough to speak of the different customs among believers in Christ if I do not also show that the religious observance of the Jews was not uniform.

Even though they worshipped one God and followed the Mosaic law, their way of living and moral rules were not uniform.

As the historian Josephus recounts in Book 18, Chapter 2:

"The Jews," he says, "had three philosophical sects stemming from their ancestral traditions: the Essenes, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees. The Pharisees live modestly and humbly, avoiding luxury and comfort, and follow what their reason and judgment deem necessary. They do not oppose their leaders and honor their elders with respect, never responding contrary to them.

They believe that fate governs everything but do not deny human free will. They believe in God's judgment, where everyone will receive according to their deeds, whether they lived virtuously or succumbed to wickedness.

They say that souls are immortal and that in the afterlife, each soul is assigned a dwelling based on their merit, whether of virtue or vice, reflecting their pursuits in life. Some souls are confined to eternal prisons, while others are granted the ability to revive. For these reasons, they are credible and accepted by the people.

They also emphasize worship practices, the celebration of prayers, and the establishment of temples in their teachings. This dedication has earned them such a reputation that many cities and a great multitude, driven by the belief that they are superior to others, flock to them with great zeal."

The Sadducees, however, believe that souls are mortal and perish along with the bodies. They observe no other rules beyond the law. They consider it glorious to contest and resist the teachers of their philosophy, but their doctrine and practices reach very few."

However, the leaders among them are celebrated for their ranks and honors.

The Essenes, on the other hand, attribute everything to God. They believe the soul is immortal and preach that justice is a precious thing worth fighting for until death.

But in the temple, they prohibit offerings. They do not celebrate sacrifices or offerings with the people because they believe they differ greatly from them in purity and holiness.

They distinguish themselves from the common congregation by performing sacrifices in remote places. They are considered the best in moral conduct and behavior, dedicating all their effort to cultivating the land and practicing every form of diligence.

They also have a remarkable and unique trait, not found among other nations, whether Greek or barbarian: all their possessions are held in common, and they share everything among themselves. No one among them enjoys more wealth, and nothing is kept from the poor, as if no one owns anything personally.

They number more than 4,000 men. They do not marry wives, nor do they hurry to acquire servants, as they consider it a source of injustice and strife.

They help each other in isolation, serving one another with mutual assistance. They appoint those who manage their income and establish caretakers to administer all the produce of the land for necessary uses.

They select the best men as priests. Their food is simple, their clothing unadorned and clean. Josephus further describes, at the end, a fourth type of philosophy practiced among the Jews, whose leader he says was Judas. We have omitted this either due to its brevity or because, being newly discovered, it was considered inferior to the others.

We have included these details about the Jews to show that in their worship of the Divine and observance of the Mosaic Law, they had similar practices and were equally fervent; however, in moral conduct and religious habits, they maintained a distinctly different way of life.

We don't approve of their religion in our times, but we want to show that even though they believed in one Divinity, their way of life was different.

They did not separate themselves from each other's communion.

Instead, they remained in the union of society, patiently tolerating that not all customs were the same.

They knew that the diversity of morals did not oppose their faith, since they shared the same belief about God and followed the commandments of the law.

The emperors of the Greeks are deeply offended that the Romans do not live in the same manner as they do, nor follow their customs—that is, the customs of the Greeks.

This cannot be found in the Churches of Christ, nor among the Jews, who, before the preaching of the Gospel, had a distinguished worship of Divinity.

Therefore, it is proven that such a reproach did not arise from a zeal for piety, but from the malice of envy and the arrogance of pride.

Let us now come to each point they seem to have made, by which, while they seem to boast either of their wisdom or religion, they reveal their own foolishness and irreligion.

Chapter Three

The Greeks blame the Romans for fasting on the Sabbath.

Why the Romans fast.

Purpose of Sabbath fasting.

Greek objection.

Response.

The Greeks criticize the Romans and Westerners for fasting on the Sabbath, because they, the Easterners, dine on this day.

They don't realize that not all Western Churches follow this tradition, but the Roman Church and some other Western Churches do.

In fact, most Westerners do not fast on the Sabbath.

They do not criticize the Romans for fasting, nor do the fasting Romans criticize them.

They understand the Apostle's words: "Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains judge the one who eats" Romans 14:3.

However, not all Eastern Churches fast on the Sabbath.

The Church of Alexandria follows the ancient Roman tradition of fasting on this day.

There are no gatherings in Alexandria on the Sabbath, just like in Rome.

This indicates that the Alexandrians, like the Romans, do not dine on the Sabbath.

On gathering days, it is customary to perform sacraments and break fasts.

Among the Thebans and Egyptians, they break the fast on the Sabbath but only receive the sacraments of the Lord's body and blood in the evening after eating.

They are not criticized by other Churches for this, even though they do not follow any specific Church's tradition.

We are unsure if these new objectors criticize them, but we know that the Romans were instructed by the Apostle Peter, according to ancient tradition, to fast on the Sabbath.

It is said that apostles Peter and Paul fasted on the Sabbath before confronting Simon the Magician.

This established the custom of fasting every Sabbath among the Romans.

This is documented by the historian Eusebius in the booklet "Life of Pope Sylvester".

The Greeks approached Blessed Sylvester with a question about why the Romans fast on Saturdays. In response, he said:

It should suffice that we know the early apostles practiced this; however, because you seek a reason, I will provide one.

If every Sunday is kept in honor of the Lord's resurrection, then it is fitting that every Saturday is observed with fasting because of His burial. By mourning with the apostles over the death of Jesus Christ, we can rejoice with them over His resurrection.

The Greeks argued that fasting should only be observed on one Saturday each year, marking the burial.

To this, Pope Sylvester replied:

If every Sunday is celebrated for the resurrection, then every preceding Saturday should be devoted to fasting. This way, those who mourn His death can rightly rejoice over His resurrection.

However, I would say that to sympathize is to weep, without denying that the Lord's passion is the peak of our joy.

The Greeks, accepting this reasoning, remained silent.

We mention this to show that the Roman practice of fasting on Saturdays is neither new nor insignificant, as it is supported by apostolic authority and sound reasoning.

It's surprising that the wisdom of the new scholars does not align with what their elders agreed upon.

Since the time the chief apostles, Peter and Paul, taught in Rome and affirmed their teachings with their martyrdom, it has been customary for Romans and some Westerners to fast every Saturday.

Nonetheless, the Eastern churches that do not follow this custom have not judged the Romans as estranged from their communion, even though they themselves refrain from fasting on Saturdays, just as on Sundays.

Doctor Augustine writes about this to the presbyter Casulanus (letter 86) and to Januarius (letter 118), addressing the same question and responding thus:

Saturday follows, on which day the flesh of Christ rested in the tomb, just as God rested on that day from all His works during the creation of the world.

This led to different practices in the Church regarding eating habits. Some, especially in the East, preferred to break their fast to symbolize rest. Others, like the Roman and some Western Churches, chose to fast to honor the humility of the Lord's death.

On the day when Easter is celebrated, everyone fasts to remember the time when the disciples mourned the Lord's death. Even those who usually eat on Saturdays throughout the year devoutly observe the fast on this particular Saturday, signifying both the mourning of the disciples on this day and the rest on other Saturdays.

Two things inspire hope for the happiness of the just and the end of all misery: death and the resurrection of the dead. In death, there is rest, as the prophet says: "My people, go into your rooms and shut the doors behind you; hide yourselves for a little while until his wrath has passed by" (Isaiah 26:20). In the resurrection, there is perfect happiness in both body and spirit.

Therefore, it was thought that both of these should not be signified by the labor of fasting but rather by the joy of refreshment, except on Easter Saturday, where, as we mentioned, the mourning of the disciples was marked by a longer fast to remember the event.

But since, as I mentioned earlier, we do not find in the Gospel and apostolic writings any clear command that certain days should be observed with fasting, this matter, like many others, allowed for variety in the practices of the Church. I will share what the venerable Ambrose, the bishop of Milan who baptized me, answered when I asked him about this.

Since my mother and I were living in the same city, and both of us were still catechumens without much concern for these matters, she was unsure whether to fast on Saturday according to our city's custom or to have lunch as per the Church of Milan's tradition.

To resolve this uncertainty, I sought advice from the man of God I mentioned earlier. He said, "What more can I teach you than what I do myself? When I am here, I do not fast on Saturday; when I am in Rome, I do fast on Saturday. Wherever you go, follow the custom of that church to avoid causing or enduring scandal."

I relayed this answer to my mother, and she accepted it without hesitation, believing it should be followed. We also adopted this practice. However, in Africa, it is common for different churches, or even churches within the same region, to have varying practices—some people have lunch on Saturday while others fast. I believe that the custom of the congregation, as determined by its leadership, should be observed.

Blessed Augustine, the Catholic doctor, thought and wrote about fasting on Saturday, suggesting that no serious dispute should arise over this issue. Instead, each church's custom regarding fasting or having lunch on Saturday should be followed. Those who have lunch on Saturday seem to have a pious reason for doing so: they signify that on that day, God rested from all His works or they reflect the rest of believers, who will rest in the resurrection and enjoy eternal peace with the Lord.

Similarly, those who fast have a pious reason: because on that day, the disciples were physically saddened by Christ's death, and in wanting to imitate their sorrow, some faithful fast on Saturday. Others choose not to fast, to demonstrate the joy of the Lord's resurrection by having lunch, just as the apostles did when they witnessed the Lord's resurrection.

Because of the disciples' show of sadness, all the Churches around the world fast on one Saturday each year, which is the Saturday before Easter, even though they may eat or not eat on other Saturdays. However, the Romans chose to remember it by fasting every Saturday, just as the memory of the Lord's resurrection is celebrated by all Churches every Sunday.

Since both those who fast on Saturday and those who eat have their reasons for their piety, and since there are no commands in the New Testament that either require or prohibit this, no serious disagreements should arise in the Churches of Christ because of it. Instead, it should be left to each individual's choice what they prefer to do, while following the authority of their elders and their Church's custom.

If the Greek emperors had considered this, they would not have started a dispute, but would have followed what their ancestors held. Should anyone be judged for fasting out of piety? Indeed, there are other days on which some Churches have the custom of fasting each week, such as Wednesday and Friday. There is a reason for this, as the blessed Augustine says,

because on Wednesday the Jewish leaders gathered and conspired to capture and kill Jesus by deceit. On Friday, they crucified Him.

Augustine speaks in Epistle 86: Why does the Church fast especially on Wednesday and Friday? The reason seems to be this: according to the Gospel, on Wednesday, which is commonly called the fourth day of the week, the Jews are found to have held a council to kill the Lord. After one day passed, on the evening of which the Lord ate the Passover with His disciples, which was the end of that day, which we call the fifth day of the week: then He was handed over that night, which already belonged to the sixth day of the week, which is clearly the day of His passion. This day was the first of Unleavened Bread, beginning from the evening.

But Matthew the evangelist says that the fifth day of the week was the first day of unleavened bread, and that in the evening following, the Passover meal was to take place. During this meal, the unleavened bread began to be eaten, and the lamb was sacrificed. From this, we gather that it was the fourth day of the week when the Lord said, as recorded in Matthew chapter 26, verse 2 and following,

"You know that after two days the Passover is coming, and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified."

Because of this, that day was designated for fasting, as the evangelist continues and says, "Then the chief priests and the elders of the people gathered in the courtyard of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and they conspired to arrest Jesus by trickery and kill him."

After one day had passed, as the Gospel says,

"On the first day of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus saying, 'Where do you want us to prepare for you to eat the Passover?'" (Matthew chapter 26, verse 17).

Therefore, after this day had passed, the Lord suffered, which no Christian doubts, on the sixth day of the week. Hence, the sixth day is rightly designated for fasting. Fasting, indeed, signifies humility; hence it is said,

"I humbled my soul with fasting" (Psalm chapter 35, verse 13).

Blessed Augustine writes these things about fasting on the fourth and sixth days of the week to the priest Casulanus, explaining why it was instituted. However, this fasting, observed on the fourth or sixth day of the week, is not practiced by all churches, whether Eastern or Western, but only by some who choose to observe it. Those who fast on these days are not criticized by those who eat, and each church follows the custom it has received from its ancestors.

Thus, it is surprising why the Romans are criticized by the Greeks for fasting on the Sabbath, when they are not criticized for fasting on the fourth and sixth days, nor are other Christians throughout the East. It is evident that the people of Constantinople are not bound by any law or custom to fast on the fourth or sixth day of the week. In the British Isles, fasting is observed on every sixth day of the week, yet those in the West who do not have the custom of fasting on that day are not excommunicated.

The Scottish nation, inhabiting the island of Ireland, has a custom of fasting through monasteries of monks, canons, or any religious people at all times except on Sundays and feast days. They do not indulge in food for the body except either at the ninth hour or in the evening: at the ninth hour in summer, and in the evening in winter.

Although no church, whether Western or Eastern, is bound by this custom, those who fast in this manner are neither excommunicated nor reprov'd by those who do not fast in this way.

It was previously mentioned how fervent the believers in Alexandria were about fasting when the Christian religion first began there. No one ate before sunset; many ate on the fourth day, some on the sixth day of the week, not because it was desirable for the body, but because it was necessary. Yet, those fasting were neither excommunicated nor reprov'd by others who did not follow this fasting custom.

Behold, the Romans who fast on Saturday are reprov'd either in memory of the Lord's burial, because of the disciples' sadness over the Lord's death, or because the apostles are said to have fasted on that day to combat the tricks and deception of Simon, to fight against the devil, and the madness of Nero.

Some also observe the fifth day of the week, refraining from fasting on that day, just as they do on Sunday. This practice is approved by Eusebius, the bishop of Caesarea, in a book he wrote about the deeds of Pope Sylvester, where he states: "Pope Sylvester said: We ought to regard the birthday of the chalice as a solemn day like Sunday, on which the celebration of the Lord's body and divine blood began from the Lord himself."

On this day, holy chrism is made throughout the entire world; indulgence is granted to penitents; those in discord return to concord; the angry are pacified; princes grant indulgence to criminals; masters grant indulgence to bad servants; judges spare thieves, and prisons are opened worldwide.

On this day, those who had shut themselves away because of the severity of their sins come out to celebrate joyfully. They had committed these sins through crying, laughing perhaps, or getting angry, or transgressing in other ways.

When Saint Sylvester spoke many things like this and similar, all contradiction ceased. The most Christian and learned Greeks are said to have opposed, saying:

Truly, the apostolic seat learned this from Peter, which cannot be refuted by any reasoning.

If the Romans are judged for fasting on the Sabbath day, why are they not judged for fasting on the fifth day of the Sabbath? Or why do the modern Greeks prefer to consider themselves more learned than their ancestors, so that what their ancestors received and praised with worthy praises, these people seek to criticize? They are neither proven to be more religious nor more learned than them. They should see that they might rather be criticized for being more insolent. Why can what has been observed with Christian peace for so many centuries not be maintained now? Instead, contradictions are heaped up, causing scandal and discord. Are they so wrapped in the darkness of imprudence that they think they want to change the Churches of Christ by the criticism of the insolent, what has been firmly maintained for many centuries?

Melchiodorus, the thirty-third apostolic of the Roman seat from the apostle Peter, decreed about the fifth day of the Sabbath, that by no reasoning should any of the faithful fast on Sunday or Thursday, because those days were celebrated by pagans as if with sacred fasting.

Although the reason for dining on the Lord's Day, which the whole Church holds, seems more important, because on that day Christ rose from the dead, and because the rest of the future age is signified by it. Also, about the fifth day of the Sabbath, which blessed Sylvester discussed with the Greeks, it should not be disregarded what Melchiodorus, the Roman bishop, taught. For the Catholic Church ought rather to destroy than to imitate the fasts of the pagans, just as it

ought to destroy all their festivals, in which it is known that they serve demons rather than the true God.

Therefore, it has been appropriately decided that Christians should not fast on the same days as pagans, so that the holiness of the pious religion is not tainted by the superstition of demonic worship.

While the first day of the week is generally observed by all Christians as a day not for fasting, the fifth day of the week isn't observed in the same way by everyone. Many choose to fast on that day, especially during the Lenten season.

Nonetheless, there is no dispute among the Churches of Christ over this; each community follows the fasting or dining customs they have inherited from their ancestors.

If the leaders of the Greeks considered this, they wouldn't criticize the Latins or Romans for fasting on the Sabbath so lightly. They would be content with their own customs and admire the Queen standing before Christ in a golden garment, adorned with variety. They wouldn't try to impose strict rules on a matter for which they have no authority from either the New Testament or the Old Testament.

Chapter Four

The Romans are criticized for not observing Lent like the Greeks. The reason for the forty days of fasting before Easter. The number of weeks is observed differently. Why some Westerners fast for thirty-six days. The explanation of the forty days.

Let's now address the issue regarding the Paschal Lent. Critics say that we do not fast like those who abstain from meat for eight weeks before Easter and from cheese and eggs for seven weeks according to their custom. They speak as if all Eastern and Western Churches, except the Romans, maintain this practice. Yet, there is much diversity found in both Eastern and Western Churches, as already shown above. Some Churches fast for six weeks, excluding Sundays, before Easter; others start six weeks before Easter; some begin their fast seven weeks before Easter. That is, some start the Paschal fast in the sixth week before Easter, some in the seventh, many in the eighth, and others even add a ninth week.

Let these critics consider who they follow or imitate. They do not agree with the Romans, who fast for six weeks continuously before Easter, excluding Sundays; nor with those who start fasting in the seventh week. These critics say they refrain from eggs and cheese during that week but have not yet fully observed the fast, which is done by those who dedicate seven weeks to the Paschal fast. They also claim to abstain from meat for eight weeks before Easter, practicing a partial, not complete, fast, thus differing greatly from those who start the fast in the eighth week without changing their fasting pattern.

Moreover, these critics seem to have no connection with those who fast for nine weeks before the Paschal time, since they do not abstain from eggs, cheese, or meat in the ninth week.

Therefore, when they are found to differ in the observance of the Easter fast, not only from the Westerners but also from the Easterners, they ask why they criticize the Romans and are not afraid to be criticized by other Churches with whom they do not seem to agree in the Easter fast.

Or certainly, let them produce commands from either the Old or New Testament or authority to defend their custom, or let them rightly criticize the Roman practice. Since they cannot do this, let the custom of the Churches teach them about the various ways of fasting, showing that this observance is not done based on any divine command that requires fasting out of necessity, but should remain a matter of personal intention or will.

So that with the joy of the Holy Spirit, one offers to God what seems right and possible, and not out of necessity, but as a voluntary good. Yet, this should not be left to each person's individual choice alone, but the authority and custom of each Church's elders should be observed, so that everyone keeps what each Church received from its founders to be kept.

Unless perhaps it should be thought that the Greeks are to be preferred in this matter, because in the seventh week they neither eat eggs nor cheese, even though they are far surpassed by those who do not eat anything cooked throughout Lent, and by those who only eat bread. They also appear much inferior to those who do not even eat this but are refreshed only by eating herbs. Nor can they be compared at all to those who, throughout Lent, barely allow themselves food once or twice a week.

Let them cease to exalt themselves lest they fall, but rather humble themselves so that they may rise and recognize that the concord of peace and the unity of love are better than the observance of fasts.

Let them also consider why this variety of fasting before Easter has occurred. Finally, we are taught by both gospel and legal authority that a fast of forty days should be observed: for it is read in the Gospel that the Savior fasted continuously for forty days and nights.

In the Old Testament, it is written that Moses completed this number of fasting days twice. He did this once before receiving the Ten Commandments from the Lord, and a second time after being provoked by the people's transgression and breaking the tablets at the base of the mountain. He fasted for forty days and nights for two reasons: to make amends for the people's offense to divinity, and to be deemed worthy of receiving the law from the Lord again.

Elijah also fasted for forty days and nights while fleeing Jezebel's wrath, walking through the wilderness until he reached the mountain of God, Horeb. This led to the custom in the Churches of a continuous forty-day fast.

Therefore, while almost all of Christ's Churches strive to observe this number of fasting days, they do not all agree on the number of weeks due to variations in the days. It is known that people observe the forty-day number of the Paschal fast, but not everyone fasts on each day of every week. Some people only eat on Sundays, others do not fast on Saturdays or Sundays, and some break their fast on Thursdays. Because they do not fast on Sundays, and others fast on specific days of the week, they do not complete the forty-day number.

To achieve the forty-day count, they fast for not just six but seven weeks before Easter, even though six weeks contain not just forty but forty-two days. By subtracting the six Sundays from the forty-two days, thirty-six fasting days remain. To complete the forty-day count, four days are fasted in the seventh week. Hence, in the seventh week, only four days are fasted instead of six, which, when added to the thirty-six days, complete the forty-day count.

Those who do not fast on either Saturday or Sunday but still strive to complete the forty-day fast before Easter must begin their fast on the eighth week. This is because they fast only five days

each week, and eight times five equals forty, which completes the forty-day fast prescribed by law over eight weeks.

However, if they add Sunday and Saturday, days on which fasting is not observed, and prefer to add the fifth day of the week, they cannot complete the forty-day fast before Easter unless they fast for nine weeks. Removing three days from seven (Sunday, Saturday, and the fifth day of the week), they are left with four fasting days each week. Multiplying four by nine results in thirty-six, not forty. Since they do not fast for forty days, they claim to complete the forty-day fast.

For this reason, the Greeks have no grounds to criticize the Romans for the difference in weeks, because what the Greeks achieve in eight weeks by fasting only five days each week, the Roman and Western Churches accomplish in six weeks, adding four days in the seventh week. If the Greeks fasted six days in eight weeks like the Romans or almost all Latins do, they would fast much more than forty days before Easter: eight times six equals forty-eight. Therefore, the Greeks should consider the authority they follow if they fast so many days before Easter.

Neither the Savior, nor Elijah, nor Moses observed this number of fasting days. If they complete their fast in forty days to align with the New and Old Testament, they find nothing to criticize in the Western Churches, as both fast for the same number of days before Easter.

If fasting is an act of humility, as the Psalmist confesses, "I humbled my soul with fasting" (Psalm 35:13).

Not only the people in Constantinople, but also Romans and Westerners, fast for weeks.

In the weeks leading up to Easter, the Western Church refrains from solemn songs, like "Alleluia," and the celebrations of martyrs.

They avoid all celebratory glorification, which they usually enjoy throughout the year, so that they can rejoice more gloriously on Resurrection Day, having prepared themselves by humbling for a longer period for holy Easter.

The Lord commanded the children of Israel through Moses, after the making of the calf, to lay down their ornaments, so He would know what to do with them.

This wasn't because He was unaware of their guilt of idolatry, which deserved punishment, but so that through the affliction of humility, the people would show how they acknowledged their guilt and how they preferred to atone for their wrongdoings.

So, what do the ornaments that the people were commanded to lay down represent, if not the splendor of joy they were used to before their idolatry?

Similarly, both the Roman and Western Church lay down their ornaments by humbling themselves, abandoning the joyful feasts and hymns they usually celebrate throughout the year. By adopting an attitude of humility, they set aside the glory of exultation, so that when they come before the Lord, they can receive the Easter celebrations with true joy.

Therefore, the Greek emperors have no reason to criticize the Romans or Westerners if they do not fast as many weeks before Easter as they do.

By fasting for forty days, they are equal in the number of days.

Fasting signifies humility, which means laying down joy, taking on affliction, adopting a habit of sorrow, and removing delight.

In fact, the Romans or Latins can be said to fast more than the Constantinopolitans, because by humbling themselves for nine weeks, they prepare for Easter, which is the main focus.

Critics of the Romans should reconsider if they truly wish to adhere to the laws of discipline. The tradition of fasting before Easter varies among Churches, and there's no divine commandment binding them to a uniform practice. Each Church has the freedom to follow the traditions of its elders. If critics were aware of this, they wouldn't appear so arrogant, especially towards those who follow apostolic teachings and reasonable considerations.

Romans, for instance, fast for six weeks before Easter continuously, except on Sundays when they break the fast. So, if they're known to fast for 36 days, which is four days short of 40, there's a pious and honest reason for this practice for those willing to understand it. The solar year has 365 days; if you take one-tenth of these days, you get 36 days. We are commanded to offer a tenth of our labors to the Lord. Therefore, it's reasonable to offer even a tenth of our days to the Lord, living for Him by dedicating a tenth of the year's days and purging the sins committed throughout the year during these days.

However, because very few in the West complete 40 days of fasting before Easter, the reason must also be given for why they are content with 40 days. Setting aside the authority of either the Gospel or the Law, which clearly teaches us to fast for 40 days: there are ten commandments in the Old Testament, and four Gospels, leading us to a new life. Four times ten makes forty; and each person serving the Lord is seen to reach the height of perfection by combining the legal Decalogue with the perfection of the Gospel. It's also evident that a human consists of four elements, just as the world does.

Because we often break the Ten Commandments, it is necessary for us to seek forgiveness for our sins by afflicting ourselves forty times.

This is why the Romans or Latins decided to fast for forty days before Easter; it is both a religious and mystical practice, as shown above.

Therefore, criticizing the practice of fasting for more weeks before Easter is both unjust and baseless. It should be disregarded, except that charity, which endures all things, compels us to respond to such unreasonable objections.

By understanding the reason behind this practice, people may stop criticizing what is observed for the sake of honesty and religious dignity, and may peacefully return to unity and concord, from which they had strayed due to foolish presumption.

Chapter Five

On the cutting of the beard or head.

Let's explore how clerics are criticized for cutting their beards, not only by the Romans, but by all Western Christian Churches.

This issue is seen as so trivial that it was considered unworthy of a response, to avoid appearing as frivolous as those who raise it without reason.

What does the cutting or keeping of a beard have to do with the beginning, let alone the perfection, of justice?

Let those who criticize show what command is found about this in either the New Testament or the Old Testament.

Going further, what can they suggest is determined in the writings of the apostles or the decrees of ecclesiastical teachers?

This matter, like many others, is left to the custom of individual Churches, so that out of respect for their elders, they may either grow or cut their hair or beard.

Indeed, some have the custom of cutting the beard or head:

some do not cut the beard but shave the entire head:

some prefer to shave all the hair on the face and cut the hair on the crown of the head, leaving a part of the hair between the shaved crown and the temples.

But some do not cut the beard, only partially shave the head, and leave the other part unshaven.

This habit of clerics is not uniform across all churches, but varies according to the custom of their elders.

There has never been any contention among either Western or Eastern churches about this, as each has held to what they received from their elders or what the practice of the provinces has approved.

The apostle Paul reproached the Corinthians because the men were either growing their hair or covering their heads, while the women were neither covering their heads nor growing their hair. This custom was rightly condemned by the Apostle, because although it seemed acceptable to the Corinthians, it appeared contrary to nature.

And why he reproves it, he clearly shows the reason, saying:

A man should not cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God.

But why a woman should grow her hair or cover her head, he similarly explains, saying:

A woman should have authority over her head because of the angels.

Therefore, clerics who grow their beards but completely shave their heads and, unable to endure either cold or heat, or wishing to hide such disfigurement of appearance, cover their heads with a garment, should consider if they are going against the apostolic command.

Indeed, they cannot deny that they act against Paul's statement:

Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head.

We do not say this because we prefer to criticize such a custom: for we know that such a habit is a sign of humility; but to advise that Greek emperors have something nearby that they can either criticize or correct; and not lightly criticize those far away, whether Romans or Latins: who, if they shave their beards, neither grow their hair nor cover their heads when they pray or prophesy: although they have authoritative Scripture to defend their custom excellently.

And in the Old Testament, the custom remained for Nazarenes to shave their heads and beards during the time of consecration and to put it in the sacrificial fire: signifying that they consecrated not only their actions but also all their thoughts to the Lord.

Hence, the divine word speaks to the prophet Ezekiel:

And you, son of man, take a sharp sword, a razor, take it and pass it over your head and your beard.

For he was not a priest of foreign origin, but born of the priestly lineage: hence he is commanded, according to the custom of the Nazarenes, to shave both his head and beard.

In the Acts of the Apostles, it's written that Priscilla and Aquila, Jews who believed in Christ, shaved their heads in Cenchreae because they had taken a vow, as the Scripture indicates. In Jerusalem, the elders spoke to the Apostle Paul:

"We have four men who have taken a vow upon themselves. Take these men, purify yourself with them, and pay their expenses so they may shave their heads. Then everyone will know that what they have heard about you is false, but that you yourself are living in obedience to the law." And a little later:

"Then Paul took the men, and the next day he purified himself along with them and went into the temple to give notice of the date when the days of purification would be fulfilled."

Following this custom, the clergy of Rome and almost all the churches in the West shave their beards and cut their hair, taking their example both from those who were called Nazarites in the Old Testament and from those in the New Testament who are recorded as having done such things. But they do not completely shave their heads; rather, they signify with this partial cutting the royal and priestly dignity.

For it is a royal honor to wear crowns on the head, and priests used to wear tiaras in the temple. The tiara has the shape of a hemisphere, while the crown, which is circular, customarily surrounds the head.

Blessed Peter the Apostle speaks to the believers:

"But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood."

The clergy of Rome or the Latin Church wish to signify this by the partial shaving of the head, which resembles a tiara and hints at the priestly dignity. Moreover, the remaining hair surrounding the head, without touching the crown, represents the shape of a crown, which shows royal dignity.

Thus, this dual form signifies the royal priesthood.

Christ is also represented as both king and priest, as the prophet testifies:

"The Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king."

Also:

"You will break them with a rod of iron."

The fact that He is a priest, the Father testifies to the Son, saying: "You are a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek" Psalm 109:4.

Therefore, whether signifying the priesthood and royal throne of Christ or the clergy of the Latins, they wear this type of headgear.

Because every Christian nation should excel in royal and priestly dignity, they designate this in such a form.

In the uncovering of the face, they show the purity of the heart, alluding to that apostolic saying, where it states:

"But we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image" Second Corinthians 3:18.

For the face of the head implies the face of the heart: just as the head is the citadel of the heart, so the mind in this place, which is called the heart, exists as the pinnacle of the soul.

The face of the heart must continually be stripped of earthly thoughts, so that with a pure and sincere sight, it may behold the glory of the Lord and be transformed into it through the grace of contemplation.

Blessed Apostle Peter, as well as many others from the number of apostles and even of Christ's disciples, are recorded to have shaved both their beards and heads.

Indeed, images of Peter, which are still depicted today in such a form by the art of painters, testify that he did this.

Neither the Apostle nor the rest of Christ's disciples feared the reproach of the Greeks, who did not disapprove of assuming such an appearance.

Since no one has raised this question either before the law or after the Gospel until now, let the emperors of the Greeks see why they attempt to criticize something that by no means deserves reproach.

For if shaving the beard is some sin or any transgression of divine law, let them say why the prophet, at the Lord's command, shaved his beard.

Why this custom existed among the Nazarenes.

And finally, why the apostles did not abhor this practice.

But let's set aside this objection, as it neither stands on strong reasoning nor carries any serious weight.

Unless we thought it could mislead the less cautious, we wouldn't even consider responding to this argument.

Chapter Six

The celibacy of the clergy is defended against the Greeks.

The celibacy of the clergy is upheld by ecclesiastical laws.

We need to address the claim that the Romans condemn marriage because they not only refuse to let priests marry, but outright forbid it.

While some of their other objections may seem overly superstitious, this one either seems astonishing or very lamentable.

It's astonishing if they are so far from the light of wisdom that they do not see that the Romans, in this matter, actually stand praiseworthy, not blameworthy.

The virtues of continence and chastity are so clearly excellent that even non-Christians admire them; and while they are admirable in all ranks, they are especially so in priests and other ministers of the sacred altar.

Other virtues make them illustrious, but the splendor of holiness and the noble honor of chastity make them even more so.

It is truly lamentable if, knowing such things, they dare to criticize what they know to be praiseworthy, going against their own conscience.

They should have feared what the Holy Spirit speaks through Isaiah:

Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil, who put darkness for light, and light for darkness (Isaiah 5:20).

If they conclude that the Romans condemn marriage because bishops or priests do not marry, then the same judgment must apply to the Fathers of both the Old and New Testaments.

The prophet Elijah, who commanded the heavens to open and close and was taken up to heaven by angels, did not take a wife.

The prophet Jeremiah, sanctified in the womb, preferred the good of virginity and the purity of chastity over marriage.

Daniel, called the man of desires, chose continence over conjugal union.

Yet they did not condemn marriage, even though they did not marry.

The Savior chose to be born of a virgin; while He approved of sacred marriage, He did not refuse to attend weddings.

John earned the love of Christ by choosing discipleship over marriage. The Apostle Peter, before being elevated to apostleship, did not disdain marriage. However, after becoming an apostle and dedicating himself to evangelical preaching, he abstained from marital relations, though he did not reject his wife. It is believed that the other apostles did the same. Yet, no rational person would say they condemned marriage, even if they embraced the sanctity of continence.

Furthermore, how can the Romans be accused of condemning marriage when marriages are celebrated among them and children are born from legitimate unions?

The blessed Apostle Paul writes to the Corinthians: "I wish that all men were even as I myself. But each one has his own gift from God, one in this manner and another in that" First Corinthians 7:7.

He explains this a bit earlier when he established rules for married couples on how they should serve each other, not having authority over their own bodies, but yielding it to the other.

Thus, he concludes: "But I say this as a concession, not as a commandment" First Corinthians 7:6.

He immediately adds: "I wish that all men were even as I myself," and so on.

By this, he clearly signifies that he is celibate and not bound by marriage.

Elsewhere he writes: "Do we not have the right to take along a believing wife?" First Corinthians 9:5.

In this, he does not deny that Barnabas shares this right with him, saying: "Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working?" First Corinthians 9:6.

Even though the blessed Apostle professes this about himself, he does not condemn marriage at all.

He gave instructions to the married and urged those who could not control themselves to marry. Both the Savior and the blessed Paul do not reject the bonds of marriage; they even decree that a wife should not leave her husband, nor a husband leave his wife, except for the cause of fornication.

And if they do separate, they should remain unmarried.

However, desiring to persuade them towards self-control, Paul writes to the Corinthians:

So I say this, brothers: The time is short.

From now on, those who have wives should live as if they do not; those who weep, as if they do not weep; those who rejoice, as if they do not rejoice; those who buy something, as if it were not theirs to keep; those who use the things of the world, as if not engrossed in them.

For this world in its present form is passing away.

First Corinthians seven, twenty-nine through thirty-one.

Earlier, he had granted the incontinent permission to marry, offering it as a remedy for their weakness, saying,

For it is better to marry than to burn with passion.

First Corinthians seven, nine.

Now, he commands to restrain excessive desires even with one's own wife.

What else does he mean by saying, Those who have wives should live as if they do not, except to suggest that even within marriage, restraint over passions is needed, and that love should serve children more than bodily desires?

For he had previously said:

It is good for a man not to touch a woman.

First Corinthians seven, one.

But since not everyone possesses this virtue, he therefore says,

But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband.

First Corinthians seven, two.

What is allowed here due to weakness, he later seeks to minimize, saying,

Those who have wives should live as if they do not.

Advising that we should not always serve our weaknesses, but rather accustom ourselves to the sanctity of chastity; for the world in its present form is passing away.

The world's form sought carnal posterity, rejoicing in the progeny of children, and exulting in the multitude of relatives.

But because the world is now at its end and awaits its conclusion; and as blessed John says, It is the last hour.

First John two, eighteen.

Spiritual succession should be sought more than carnal progeny: So that those who live might no longer live for themselves but for him who died for them and was raised again.

Second Corinthians five, fifteen.

Therefore, he says that those who weep should do so as if they did not weep, so that they may console themselves with the hope of eternal joys amid the ruin and tribulations of this world.

Similarly, those who rejoice in worldly goods should act as though they do not, so that by disregarding the joys of temporal things due to their fragility and changeability, they may instead find joy in eternal things and attain everlasting happiness. Those who buy should not desire to possess here on earth, but should aim for their possessions to be in heaven, echoing the Psalmist: "For what do I have in heaven, and what do I desire on earth besides you?" Psalm 73:25.

Therefore, those who use this world should act as though they do not, letting it be something they pass through, not something they desire; as a journey, not a destination; and as something seen from the side, not held or enjoyed with possession.

The text continues: "I want you to be free from concern: the one who is unmarried is concerned about the things of the Lord, how to please God. But the one who is married is concerned about the things of this world, how to please his wife, and is divided: and the unmarried woman, and the virgin, thinks about the things of the Lord, so that she may be holy in body and spirit. But the one who is married thinks about the things of this world, how to please her husband." First Corinthians 7:32-34.

Therefore, let the leaders of the Greeks, who strive to criticize the Romans about the continence of priests, consider how they intend to establish ministers of the altar in this matter; whether they want them to be free from concern, as the Apostle wishes, or entangled in worldly

concerns, which the Apostle does not wish. For if they are without a wife, free from worldly concerns, they can handle the concerns of the Lord, always seeking to please God; keeping in mind this apostolic saying: "Whatever you do, do it always in the name of the Lord." Colossians 3:17.

But if they live with a wife, they are necessarily entangled in the concerns of the world, seeking to please their wife rather than God. Those who are in this situation are divided, torn between the love of their wife and the love of God, unable to say with the Prophet: "My portion, Lord, I said, is to keep your law." Psalm 119:57.

Neither with blessed Jeremiah, who said:

"The Lord is my portion," said my soul, "therefore I will wait for Him" Lamentations 3:24.

The Apostle says: An unmarried woman or virgin is concerned about the Lord's affairs, to be holy both in body and spirit First Corinthians 7:34.

Is it therefore fitting for the priests of the Lord and the ministers of the altar to be inferior to unmarried and virgin women, who think of the things of the Lord, preserving holiness in both body and spirit, while these priests think of worldly things, rejecting bodily and spiritual holiness? They are deprived of both types of holiness, those who have their minds on worldly things, eager to please their wives; for, as the Apostle says: "A married woman is concerned about the affairs of this world, how to please her husband" First Corinthians 7:34.

The Savior said that no one can serve two masters Matthew 6:24.

Therefore, either bishops or priests, thinking about fulfilling their marital duties, cannot think about fulfilling their duty of service to the Lord.

And since clerics are said to be the Lord's portion (for this is indeed what the name means) and their portion is none other than the Lord;

priests serving their wives and thinking of worldly things reject the Lord's portion, to which they ought to cling specially; and their only possession is no longer the Lord; because by adhering to the world through constant meditation, they cannot cling to the Lord.

A mind embracing the world with its thoughts and clinging to the world cannot in any way embrace or cling to the Lord.

Because of this, it is remarkable that the Greek leaders strive to criticize priests of the Lord for distancing themselves from the company of women, so that they are not bound by worldly needs, but rejecting the world, they may be free to constantly cling to Christ.

How much the marital bond impedes the continuous supplication to the Lord, blessed Paul indicates, when he subsequently says: "I am saying this for your own benefit, not to impose a restriction on you, but for what is proper and gives you the opportunity to devote yourselves to the Lord without distraction" First Corinthians 7:35.

By clearly stating these things, he demonstrates that those who serve their wives cannot continually pray to the Lord, but only temporarily. Therefore, let those who criticize marriage consider what kind of priests they desire: those who, by maintaining purity, can pray to the Lord without hindrance, remain holy, dwell always in sacred places, despise worldly matters, and contemplate heavenly things; or those who are bound by marital ties, unable to continually dwell in holy places, despise the world, or pray to the Lord at all times for their people, and whose understanding is far from the apostolic sense.

He advocates for continence, but they interpret the holiness of priests (without which no one will see God) as condemning marriage, forgetting what the Apostle says: I say this for your own benefit, persuading continence. However, immediately considering human weakness, he adds: Not to put a noose around your neck. He shows his preference but acknowledges that each person has their own gift from God, one in this way, another in that way. Again, encouraging what is better, he adds: But to what is honorable; it is understood as an invitation. By speaking in this manner, he places continence above marriage: not condemning marriage, but clearly stating that while marriage is good, widowhood is better, and virginity is the best. Therefore, neither Romans nor Latins should be blamed if they suspend bishops or priests from the marital bed; for neither is the Apostle considered worthy of blame, who, while advocating chastity, encourages not entering into the bond of marriage so that the ability to continually pray to the Lord may remain for the faithful. Indeed, those who must handle the sacraments of the Lord's body and blood at all times, how can they serve in marriage? For David, when he came to the priest Abimelech, did not deserve to touch the sacred bread until he confirmed that he and his young men had been purified from the touch of women for three days.

And who doesn't know that the mystery of the body and blood of Christ is far more sublime than the bread set out each Sabbath on the temple table?

If it wasn't allowed for those who had not been sanctified by women to touch them, how is it appropriate for women serving at sacred moments and those bound to marriage to touch holy things on Sundays?

The Church in Thessalonica, carefully examining this mystery, decreed that clerics who had known their wives before their ordination should be deposed. It's surprising that the leaders of the Greeks criticize the Romans for this when they patiently allow it among the Thessalonians. If, in modern times, they have perhaps agreed to their superstition, they may hold their convictions in any way they want, but they should know that such was the custom of their ancestors. But let's come to the ecclesiastical decrees, so we can understand what they preferred to decide on these matters.

In the Council of Nicaea under Emperor Constantine the First, it was decreed by three hundred and eighteen bishops (canon 3, according to the version of Dionysius Exiguus):

The great synod completely forbade bishops, priests, deacons, or anyone in the clergy to have a woman living with them, unless perhaps a mother, sister, aunt, or those persons alone who are beyond suspicion.

Let the emperors of Constantinople hear this and judge whether those in such positions, for whom this chapter was decreed, should enter into marriage, when they are not allowed to live with women, except those who are beyond any suspicion.

For whoever takes a wife cannot have other women in the house besides his wife to fulfill domestic needs and household care. Where the introduction of all women is forbidden, except for those completely free from suspicion, it is clear that marital union is also forbidden, which cannot happen without the presence of other women.

In the Council of Neocaesarea, it was decreed (canon...

From the same version: A priest who takes a wife should be removed from office. But if he commits fornication or adultery, he should be expelled even more and brought to repentance.

These canons have been diligently observed by the Roman Church and all Western churches, knowing that what is evidently religious and worthy of divine worship must be maintained by all. Let the Greeks consider if they insist on holding any statute; if they do, they wrongly criticize the Romans, whom they clearly see as their equals in observing ecclesiastical councils.

But if they freely transgress this constitution, they are found guilty of violating ecclesiastical laws. While this was established in the East, it should indeed be observed by the Easterners, as it is proven to be sanctioned for the discipline of the Church. It is strange why they strive to blame the Westerners, who do not hesitate to observe what the Easterners do.

If they are ignorant of ecclesiastical laws, who does not know that they deserve to be rightfully disregarded, driven to speak not by the weight of wisdom, but by the lightness of ignorance? In the Council of Carthage (African Council, year 424, canon 37): When the incontinence of some clerics towards their own wives was reported, it was decided that bishops, priests, and deacons, according to earlier statutes, should refrain from their wives. If they do not, they should be removed from ecclesiastical office.

In this chapter, not only are the aforementioned ranks prohibited from taking wives, but they are also commanded to abstain from their own wives, whom they had before being ordained. If they do not, they are ordered to be deposed. This decree is agreed upon in both the Nicene and Neocaesarean councils, as both command priests to be separated from their wives.

Therefore, let the imperial criticisms consider how it is just for priests to take wives contrary to the decrees of the elders, who are prohibited from their own wives, whom they had taken before ordination.

If they choose to keep these laws, they should know they are wrongly accusing the Romans. But if they refuse, they should also criticize the bishops of the entire province of Africa, along with the Romans, and their own Eastern bishops who, following the established rules, decree that bishops, priests, and deacons must live celibately—unless they choose to violate their own decrees.

In the book of the Constitutions of Emperor Justinian, it is decided in chapter 24 as follows: "It is necessary that he who becomes a bishop should neither have a wife nor a concubine, nor children, nor those unknown to the laws. And if anyone acts against these rules, both he who was made and he who made him shall be expelled from the honor of the episcopate."

Let the Greek emperors see now, who accuse the Romans of condemning marriage because they do not allow bishops, priests, or deacons to marry, where they want to place their laws, that is, those established by their ancestors.

Behold, Emperor Justin of the Romans decreed by law that he who is to become a bishop should neither have a wife nor a concubine. But you, on the contrary, establish that both bishops and priests should have the rights of marriage.

The laws established by your ancestors instruct that those who do this should be deprived of the honor of their rank. But you blame those who do not do this for condemning marriage, and you do not wish to admit them to your communion.

Therefore, it appears that both by ecclesiastical laws and by your own sanctions, you are in opposition:

hence, you bind yourselves with the guilt of a double offense, as transgressors of both divine and human law, as well as ecclesiastical constitution.

(Justinian, as cited above, Novel 123, chapter 29).

Furthermore, we also forbid priests, deacons, and others in the clergy who do not have wives according to divine rules from having a woman in their house, except for a mother, daughter, sister, or other persons who avoid all suspicion.

If anyone has a woman in his house, raising suspicion of impropriety, and he is advised by his clerics to not live with such a woman but refuses to remove her; or if an accuser emerges and proves he is living dishonorably with her, then the bishop, according to church canons, should remove him from the clergy and hand him over to the court of the city where he serves.

This law was specifically decreed for bishops, but it equally applies to priests and deacons.

What is forbidden for bishops is also forbidden for ministers of the altar and those handling the mysteries of the Lord's body and blood.

Even if there is no strict decision concerning priests and deacons, the present decree removes all doubt, clearly forbidding not only priests and deacons but also subdeacons and any other clergy members from marriage. They are only allowed to live with their mothers or others free of any suspicion of impropriety.

If they are found guilty of violating this, they are to be removed from the clergy and handed over to the court for punishment.

We do not believe that the Greek Churches hold the same views on the marriages of priests as the leaders of Constantinople. Therefore, they should not presume to go against church regulations or attempt to criticize those which are observed by the Churches and maintained by perpetual law.

If the powers of the world reject such things with their presumption, which both ecclesiastical and human laws prohibit and condemn, it's strange why they don't realize that their sanction is not only condemned by the Western Church but also not accepted by the Eastern Church, unless perhaps some part in the East, worn out by tyranny, is going to accept it.

But they should be frightened by the Lord's statement:

Whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a large millstone hung around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea (Matthew 18:6).

But the fixed statement of the Savior to Peter stands:

You are Peter, and on this rock, I will build my Church (Matthew 16:18).

Also, in the same book at the end of the same chapter:

No bishop should live with a woman at all; but if he is found not to have observed this, he should be deprived of the honor of the bishopric because he shows himself unworthy of the priesthood.

Let the glorious princes of the Greeks then explain with what audacity and presumption they dare to go against the established traditions, the laws of the Church, and the customs observed up to now, criticizing the Romans and Latins for not allowing bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons to marry.

Behold, they are indeed refuted by imperial laws, which, while being enacted for Romans and Latins, undoubtedly condemn those who contravene them.

In the Old Testament, Levites or priests serving in the tabernacle or temple did not approach their wives, nor did they presume to enter or touch the holy things unless they were sanctified. And you say that priests, whose duty it is to celebrate the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord daily and never withdraw from the sacred things, should marry wives, and that there should be no difference between laypeople and ministers of the sacred altar. If asked where such an opinion originated, you can undoubtedly show no other authority than ignorance and boasting, from which the audacity of light-mindedness usually arises.

Chapter Seven

The Greeks argue that the sacrament of confirmation can be administered by priests.

The author refutes them.

The difference between a priest and a bishop.

Now let's address the objection that among the Romans, priests do not anoint the foreheads of the baptized with chrism.

This objection, like the others, is proposed more out of lightness than reason.

They are simply following the custom of their own Church, not some authority from divine law. However, it is clear that this practice is derived both from the Gospel and from the Acts of the Apostles, among the Romans and all Westerners.

The grace of the Holy Spirit is given through the anointing of the forehead with chrism by the bishops, which evangelical authority testifies has been granted to no one except bishops.

For the Lord, rising again and appearing to the disciples, breathed on them and said:

Receive the Holy Spirit:

If you forgive anyone's sins, their sins are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven.

(John 20:22)

Therefore, if the forgiveness of sins is granted through the Holy Spirit, and this gift is known to have been given specifically to the apostles, then rightly this grace is reserved for bishops alone, who clearly have inherited the succession and ministry of the apostles in the Church. We also read in Exodus that Moses anointed Aaron and his sons with holy chrism for the priestly ministry.

Furthermore, in the Old Testament, kings and priests were anointed with holy oil by the high priests, representing the true King and High Priest, our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom the Psalmist sings:

God has anointed you, your God, with the oil of joy above your companions.

(Psalm 45:7)

It is clear that the entire Church is the body of Christ, namely, the King and Priest, hence all Christians are a royal and priestly race.

For this reason, after the washing, we are anointed, so that we may be called by the name of Christ; and only by the high priests, by whom kings and priests were anointed under the law.

In the Acts of the Apostles, it says:

When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them.

When they arrived, they prayed for them to receive the Holy Spirit.

For the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon any of them; they had simply been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Then Peter and John placed their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.

Acts 8:14 and following.

Notice that they were first baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, which is in the name of the Lord Jesus; since the invocation of the entire Trinity is contained in the name of the Lord Jesus. Yet they had not received the Holy Spirit.

But after the apostles laid their hands on them, they received the Holy Spirit.

This practice is still observed today in the Church: believers are baptized by priests, but the grace of the Holy Spirit is given by the laying on of hands by bishops, which happens when the foreheads of the baptized are anointed with holy chrism by bishops.

Also, in the same Acts:

While Apollos was in Corinth, Paul traveled through the interior regions and came to Ephesus. There he found some disciples and asked them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?"

They answered, "No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit."

So Paul asked, "Then what baptism did you receive?"

"John's baptism," they replied.

Paul said, "John's baptism was a baptism of repentance. He told the people to believe in the one coming after him, that is, in Jesus."

On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

When Paul placed his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied.

Acts 19:1 and following.

Here, too, you see that Paul did not baptize them himself, but had them baptized.

Then Paul laid his hands on them, and the Holy Spirit came on them.

We are taught that the grace of baptism can be conferred by priests.

However, the gift of the Holy Spirit, given through the laying on of hands when the foreheads of those being baptized are anointed with holy chrism, can only be granted by bishops.

The difference between priests and bishops is significant.

Priests, like other ecclesiastical ranks, are consecrated through the ministry of bishops; but bishops are not blessed by priests.

Bishops also sanctify the holy chrism and consecrate the oil.

All ecclesiastical ranks operate under their direction.

Considering this, ecclesiastical authorities decreed that the foreheads of those being baptized should be anointed with holy chrism by bishops, not priests.

As it is written about Saint Sylvester in the Apostolic Acts, The Book of the Popes by Pope Damasus states:

"He decreed that the chrism should be made by a bishop; and it should be the privilege of bishops to anoint those baptized with holy chrism, due to the accusation of heresy."

Pope Innocent also decrees this in his Decretals, Letter One, Chapter Three.

Regarding the anointing of infants, it is clear that only a bishop is permitted to do this.

Although priests are clergy, they do not hold the highest rank of the episcopate. This should be reserved for bishops alone, to either anoint or bestow the Holy Spirit, as ecclesiastical custom dictates.

And the Acts of the Apostles asserts that Peter and John were sent to bestow the Holy Spirit on those who had already been baptized.

Priests, whether in the absence or presence of a bishop, can baptize and anoint the baptized with chrism consecrated by a bishop.

However, they are not allowed to mark the forehead with the same oil, which is reserved for bishops alone when they bestow the Holy Spirit.

From here, all Western bishops, following the tradition of their elders, adopted the custom of anointing the foreheads of the baptized with chrism.

They reserved this privilege for themselves, not allowing priests to perform it. However, they do not make the chrism, as the Greeks falsely claim, from the baptismal font, but from the juice of balsam or olive oil.

This practice is followed not only by the Greeks but by all the Churches of Christ.

Chapter Eight

The Greek emperors tried to place the Patriarch of Constantinople above the Roman Pope.

The Roman Church holds a higher rank than all others. They falsely accuse us of this, just as they do with the consecration of the lamb. They also argue that deacons become bishops without first being ordained as priests, not considering that they undermine their own faith authority in other matters when they lie so blatantly in these. They are not afraid of what the Holy Spirit says:

"The Lord abhors the bloodthirsty and deceitful man"

(Psalm 5:7).

And, "You destroy those who tell lies"

(Psalm 5:6).

And in Solomon:

"A false witness will not go unpunished"

(Proverbs 19:5).

As for their accusation that a deacon is being consecrated as a bishop, why don't they notice what is said against them, who make laymen who have just been tonsured into bishops, against church rules and imperial decrees? For the Apostle

(First Timothy 3:6) explicitly forbids a novice from becoming a bishop.

Emperor Justin also decrees in his ecclesiastical constitutions

(Novella 6, Chapter 1, at the beginning):

"Neither is it permissible for a layman to immediately ascend to the episcopate, nor is it sufficient to have held the honor of clerical office simultaneously. It is necessary that he who becomes a bishop neither has a wife, nor a concubine, nor children, nor grandchildren, whether legitimate or unknown to the law. And if anyone acts against these, both he who was made a bishop and he who made him should be deprived of the honor of the episcopate. Nor is it permissible to become a bishop by paying money. He who becomes a bishop must be either a

monk or a cleric: but he must have appeared in the clerical state for no less than six months," etc.

We see that not only ecclesiastical but also imperial constitutions are being opposed, so that someone is taken immediately from being a layman to the honor of the bishopric, when he should first be tested in the Church and taught according to ecclesiastical constitutions; so that by ascending through the succession of ranks in the royal way, he may be found worthy to obtain the peak of the highest summit.

However, the emperors of the Greeks, violating both divine and human laws, suddenly appoint laymen as bishops, even those with newly shaven heads. They promote individuals who were not even worthy of the lowest rank to the highest peak of power. They do this without fearing to slander the Church of Christ, speaking falsehoods as if they were truths, dismissing what the Savior said in the Gospel:

"Whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it would be better for him to have a large millstone hung around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea" (Matthew 18:6).

That the punishment of death may be exacted upon them, and they may be swallowed by the waves of destruction, for charity did not make them subject to holy fear.

But where does such innate presumption come from that they do not fear to attack the Roman Church with false accusations? Clearly, it comes from the fact that, ignorant of their status, they seek to claim leadership that neither Christ, nor the apostles, nor the teachers of the churches, nor any custom has granted them. Instead, they imitate him who said in his heart:

"I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will exalt my throne above the stars of heaven; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far reaches of the north. I will make myself like the Most High" (Isaiah 14:13-14).

What else do these Greek leaders proclaim with the arrogance of their hearts, who usurp the leadership of the Church and the exalted status of the apostles (whom the prophet Isaiah calls flying clouds) and claim the throne of their dignity above the stars of heaven? That is, to be preferred above all the assembly of saints, and to usurp the veneration of the patriarchs, so that with the whole Church subject to them, they may become like Christ. When no authority of the elders grants this to them, nor do ecclesiastical laws permit it, nor do human laws assign it. They strongly prove their desire to claim all these things for themselves, by striving to place the patriarch of Constantinople above the Roman pontiff, and to prefer the city of Constantinople over Rome, as if it were within their rights to change ecclesiastical laws and arrange the pinnacle of kingdoms.

They should have remembered that Christ is the head of the entire Church, and that the Father said to Him through the Prophet:

"I will give you the nations as your inheritance; and the ends of the earth as your possession." (Psalm 2:8)

He is the stone cut from the mountain without hands, which will break and crush to dust all the kingdoms of the world.

(Daniel 2:34-35)

He also said to Peter:

"You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell will not prevail against it. And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

(Matthew 16:18-19)

Paul also testified:

"He who worked through Peter for the apostleship to the circumcised worked through me for the Gentiles."

(Galatians 2:8)

Both were placed in leadership in the Church by Christ and sent to Rome, as both ecclesiastical truth and the authority of their martyrdom reveal. Both leaders were sent to where the leadership of the world was prominent: so that the Roman city, having subjected the whole world to itself by imperial power, might also preside over the kingdoms of the whole world by the summit of religion and the dignity of the apostleship.

Just as the Savior wanted to elevate Jerusalem by His birth, teaching, miracles, death, burial, and resurrection, He also chose to make the Roman city glorious by the blood, tomb, memory, and teaching of the chief apostles: so that as Christ, seated at the right hand of the Father, is honored in the heavenly Jerusalem as King and Lord with the service of angels and all the saints, Peter and Paul hold the leadership of the earthly Jerusalem, with Christ's Churches throughout the world subject to them.

This is confirmed both by antiquity itself and by the records of writings.

Socrates, writing in Ecclesiastical History, mentioned the Arians who gathered a synod in Antioch, Syria, aiming to subvert and destroy the Nicene Council and condemn Athanasius. After listing the bishops who authorized the synod, he added:

"But neither did Julius, the chief bishop of the great city of Rome, attend, nor did he appoint anyone in his place; as the ecclesiastical rule indeed commands that councils should not be held without the judgment of the Roman pontiff."

Here we have a Greek historian who does not claim that Constantinople holds as much authority as Rome; he testifies that without the consent or command of the Roman pontiff, no councils can be held.

In the Council of Sardica (chapter 7, from the translation of Dionysius Exiguus), it is decreed:

"It was decided that if a bishop has been accused and all the bishops of that region, having gathered, judge and depose him from his position: if the deposed appeals and flees to the most blessed bishop of the Roman Church and wishes to be heard: if he deems it just that the examination be reopened, the Roman bishop should be pleased to write to the bishops who are in the nearest and neighboring province, so that they may diligently seek all things out and define everything according to the truth of faith."

"And if the one who asks for his case to be heard again moves the Roman bishop by his appeal to send presbyters from his side, it will be in his power to decide what he wants and what he deems appropriate. And if he has decided that those who are sent should judge in person with the bishops so that they also have the authority of the person by whom they were sent, it will be at his discretion."

"If, however, he believes that the provincial bishops suffice to bring the matter to an end, he should do what his most wise counsel has judged."

This council, held by the Eastern bishops in the province of Asia, thus decreed about the dignity of the Roman pontiff under the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great, who built the city of Constantinople and wished it to be called New Rome.

Is there any record of the Patriarch of Constantinople being given such authority by bishops? We clearly see that the authority of the Roman Pope stands above all the Churches of Christ. All bishops regard him as their head, and whatever is arranged in ecclesiastical matters depends on his judgment. Whether something remains established, a mistake is corrected, or whatever needs to be renewed is sanctioned by his decision.

Eusebius of Caesarea, a bishop, also testifies to this in his history of the life of Silvester. He says: On the fourth day, Emperor Constantine granted the privilege to the Pontiff of the Roman Church, so that priests throughout the entire Roman world should regard him as their head, just as judges view a king.

This matter is confirmed by the acts of the councils. Every council, whether held in the East or in Africa, either always had the vicars of the Roman Pontiff presiding or received firmness from his authoritative letters for whatever was decreed. For example, the council of Nicaea, which is revered by all the Churches of Christ, placed Victor and Vincentius, presbyters of the city of Rome, who were acting on behalf of the Roman Pontiff, first in the bishops' subscriptions. This was right after Hosius, bishop of the city of Corduba in the province of Spain, who had been sent there by the Roman Pontiff because he was unable to come due to old age.

Thus, the remaining councils always had Roman Pontiffs or their legates in the first place, as vicars of the apostles. And truly, all the Eastern and Western Churches have always revered the bishop of the city of Rome as the head of the bishops and looked to his judgment. They endured whatever decisions he made on doubtful matters and obeyed his decree. Whatever councils were strengthened by his decision remained valid; those he condemned were regarded as nothing and could have no authority.

Here is the translation you requested:

Although our statements are verified by the monuments of the ancient Fathers, we still find it fitting to illustrate our point with a letter from a Roman pope. When Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, condemned Eutyches, the Archimandrite of Constantinople, for his incorrect beliefs about the Incarnation of the Lord, Flavian was himself condemned by a synod held in Ephesus, which went against ecclesiastical rules. Flavian appealed to the Roman Pope Leo regarding this matter. Leo then wrote to Emperor Theodosius, requesting a review of the synod and the annulment of the wrongful decisions.

Since this could not be accomplished under Emperor Theodosius due to his death, it was achieved under Emperors Valentinian and Marcian, who succeeded him. Their letters, sent to the venerable Leo, Bishop of Rome, read as follows, before the Council of Chalcedon, letter 33: "Victorious Valentinian and Marcian, glorious conquerors, always Augusti, to the most reverend Leo, Archbishop of the glorious city of Rome. We have come to this highest rule by the providence of God, and the most excellent Senate, and all the military.

Therefore, for the revered and catholic religion of the Christian faith, by whose help we trust our power is governed, we believe it right to address your sanctity, possessing the leadership in the episcopate of the divine faith, by sacred letters at the outset, inviting and requesting that for the

firmness and state of our empire, your sanctity may pray to the eternal divinity, so that we may have such purpose and desire, that with all impious error removed, through the celebrated synod, with you as the author, the greatest peace may be established among all the bishops of the catholic faith."

Likewise, in a second letter, after the greeting and preface, it is written as follows, letter 34: "It remains that if it pleases your Beatitude to come to these parts and celebrate the synod, you may deign to do this out of religious affection; your Sanctity will indeed satisfy our desires and decree what is useful for the sacred religion."

If, however, it is too burdensome for you to come to these parts, let your Holiness inform us through your own letters.

So that sacred letters from you may be sent throughout the entire East, and to Thrace and Illyricum, so that all the most holy bishops may gather at a specific location.

And so that they may declare, by their own arrangements, those things that will benefit the religion of Christians and the Catholic faith, as your Holiness will have determined according to ecclesiastical rules.

These letters from the emperors of Rome do not indicate that the Patriarch of Constantinople is considered superior to the Roman Pontiff.

Rather, they show that the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy of the bishops, by whose judgment a synod should be convened, and the matters to be discussed should be arranged by his disposition.

The letters of Emperor Valentinian to his father, Emperor Theodosius the Great, also testify to the dignity and honor that the Roman Pontiff should hold over all bishops.

These are known to be as follows:

"To the Lord Theodosius, most glorious victor and most excellent conqueror, emperor and father, Valentinian, glorious victor and conqueror, always Augustus and son."

When I arrived in the city of Rome to seek divine favor, the next day I visited the basilica of the apostle Peter. After a venerable night celebrating the apostle's day, the Roman bishop and others gathered from different provinces asked me to write to your gentleness about the faith. Although it should protect all faithful souls, it is said to be disturbed.

This faith, handed down to us by our ancestors, must be defended with proper devotion and its honor preserved for the blessed apostle Peter in our times. Thus, the most blessed bishop of Rome, who has been granted the primacy of the priesthood by antiquity, should have the authority to judge matters of faith and priests.

Most sacred Father and venerable Emperor, for this reason, according to the solemnity of the councils, the bishop of Constantinople has also appealed to him through written petitions due to the controversy about the faith. Galla Placidia, mother of the Emperor, also sent a letter to her son Augustus on this matter, saying:

"It is no small loss that the faith, which had been faithfully kept for so many years by our most sacred father Constantine, the first Christian emperor, has recently been disturbed by the whims of one man. This man is said to have caused hatred and contention at the council in Ephesus, using the presence and fear of soldiers to target the bishop of Constantinople, Flavian. He sent a petition to the apostolic see through those directed to the council by the most reverend bishop

of Rome, who, according to the definitions of the Council of Nicaea, are accustomed to be present. Most holy son, venerable Emperor."

With this grace and gentleness, standing against such great crowds, you should ensure that the immaculate truth of the Catholic faith is preserved. According to the form and definition of the Apostolic See, which we also regard as preeminent, it should remain intact within the priesthood, unharmed in every way by Flavianus, and sent to the judgment of the council and the Apostolic See.

The first to receive the heavenly keys established the leadership of the episcopate. Therefore, it is fitting for us to show reverence in all things towards this greatest city, which is the mistress of all.

Take greater care, however, that what our generation preserved in ancient times does not diminish under us, and that current examples do not create schisms among bishops and holy Churches.

From this, it is clear that the Roman pontiff was never subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Rather, whenever necessary, he sought the Apostolic See and requested that his case be judged accordingly. Since the city of Rome is more honorable than all cities of the Roman Empire, and the Roman pontiff holds the primacy of the priesthood over all bishops, it is for this city to be the mistress of all. Whoever has been the bishop of that city is considered, by ancient constitution, to be the prince of all Churches.

Therefore, with this authority, Leo, the venerable bishop of the city of Rome, wrote to Anatolius, the bishop of Constantinople.

What form of the council should have been held, condemning Nestorius and Eutyches, writing thus:

Although I hope your love is dedicated to every task, so that your efforts may be more effective, it was necessary and convenient to send my brothers, Bishop Licentius and Priest Basil (as we promised), to whom your love may be united, so that nothing concerning the state of the universal Church may be done either doubtfully or sluggishly.

With you residing, to whom we have entrusted the execution of our orders, all things may be done with moderation; so that neither the parts of benevolence nor of justice may be neglected, but the divine judgment may be considered in all things without favoritism.

And after some interjections:

And because the evangelical and apostolic faith defeats all errors, and on one side casts out Nestorius, and on the other side crushes Eutyches and his followers, remember to keep this rule:

That whoever was in that synod, which cannot and does not deserve to bear the name of a synod, in which Dioscorus showed his ill-will and Juvenal his diligence, brotherly peace should be granted to their satisfaction:

So that Eutyches, with his doctrine and his associates, may be condemned with the consecration of anathema by clear professions.

Concerning those who have sinned more gravely in this matter, and for this reason claimed a higher position for themselves in the same unfortunate synod, to burden the simplicity of humble brothers with the prejudices of arrogance:

If perhaps they repent and renounce the defense of their actions, converting to the condemnation of their own error, such satisfaction should be added, which may not seem to be rejected, but should be reserved for the more mature advice of the apostolic see;

So that, after all things have been examined and weighed, it may be judged what should be established according to their recognitions.

And no name of such persons (as we have already written to you) may be recited at the altar in the Church, over which the Lord willed you to preside, until the course of events shows what should be established regarding them.

And after a few words: Therefore, dear brother, strive to faithfully and effectively perform the duties that align with the Church of God, consistently with these brothers whom we have chosen as suitable authorities.

These letters show that the Roman Pontiff presides over the Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom he entrusts the duty of holding the synod.

He prescribes how to carry out each task and indicates what should be reserved for his own judgment.

He defines what he himself should determine.

However, he is not permitted to have the power of judgment alone but is joined by those sent from the Apostolic See to assist in determining matters.

The same blessed Leo, bishop of the holy synod of Chalcedon, also writes to condemn the Second Ephesian Synod, where the venerable Patriarch of Constantinople, Flavian, was condemned not by justice, but by violence.

These are his words, after the greeting: Indeed, my beloved, I had wished, for the love of our fellowship, that all the Lord's priests would persist in one devotion to the Catholic faith, and that no priest would be corrupted by favor or fear of secular matters, or stray from the path of truth.

But because many things often happen that can cause regret, and the mercy of God surpasses the faults of wrongdoers, and punishment is delayed so that correction can take place, we should embrace the plan of the most merciful prince, full of reverence. He preferred to call your holy brotherhood to destroy the snares of the devil and reform ecclesiastical peace, maintaining the rightful authority and honor of the seat of the most blessed apostle Peter.

He even invited us through his letters to give our opinion to the venerable synod. Although neither the urgency of the time nor any custom could permit it, nonetheless, in these brothers—that is, Bishops Pacasius and Lucentius, and Priests Boniface and Basil, who were sent by the apostolic seat—let your brotherhood consider me as presiding over the synod. My presence is not separate from you, as I am now present through my vicars, and I have long supported the preaching of the Catholic faith.

And after other matters: Since we are not unaware that the status of many churches has been disturbed by corrupt rivalries, and many brothers, because they did not accept heresy, have been expelled from their seats and deported into exile, and others have been installed in their place, let the medicine of justice be applied first to these wounds. No one should be deprived of their own, so that another may use what belongs to others. If, as we hope, everyone abandons error, no one should lose their honor, but it is appropriate to restore their own with all privileges to those who have labored for the faith.

The decrees of the earlier synod of Ephesus, which the bishop Cyril of holy memory then presided over, remain specifically against Nestorius. So that the impiety condemned then may not flatter itself in anything, Eutyches is rightly struck down. For the purity of faith and doctrine, which we proclaim with the same spirit as our holy Fathers, condemns and persecutes both the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies along with their authors.

We certainly notice that the bishop of the Roman seat is not to be subordinated or compared, but rather preferred over the patriarch of Constantinople. We see that the Chalcedonian synod was convened with his permission, and he chose to preside over it through his legates. He also provided instructions through his letters on what should be determined about the second synod gathered in Ephesus.

Additionally, he addressed the situation of those who were expelled from their own seats and exiled because of their faith, as well as those who, under threats and terror, issued judgments against the faith and consented to them. If they chose to return from their error and profess the truth of the faith, he decreed that the first synod of Ephesus, conducted by the blessed Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, should be preserved in every way, condemning both Nestorius and Eutyches who held erroneous views about the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

From all these actions, it is clear that the Roman pontiff is not only preferred in honor over the bishop of Constantinople, but over all Eastern bishops. He should have full concern for all bishops and bear special vigilant care for all the Churches.

To further demonstrate the superiority of the Roman bishop over all Eastern bishops, we turn to the letter of the blessed Leo, bishop of Rome, directed to Anastasios, bishop of Thessalonica.

After greeting him, he spoke as follows:

If you had truly considered with reason and weighed justly the responsibilities entrusted to your brotherhood by the authority of the most blessed Apostle Peter, and also what has been entrusted to you by our favor, we could greatly rejoice in the devotion of the care assigned to you.

Just as my predecessors delegated duties to your predecessors, so I, following their example, have delegated my guidance to your affection.

This way, by imitating our gentleness, you might help fulfill the care we owe to all Churches primarily by divine institution, and extend our presence to provinces far from us.

With continuous and timely foresight, it would be easy for you to recognize what you should arrange on your own or reserve for our judgment in each matter.

While you are free to suspend greater and more difficult cases for our decision, neither reason nor necessity requires you to deviate beyond your measure.

You have ample writings from our advisors, in which we have frequently instructed you about the moderation of all actions.

This way, you might encourage the Churches of Christ entrusted to you towards healthy obedience through the exhortation of charity.

After other complaints of this sort, he further says:

While they seek to dominate rather than counsel their subjects, honor pleases, pride inflates, and what was meant for harmony tends towards harm.

That we have to speak this way comes from great pain of mind.

I feel somehow drawn into guilt when I recognize that you have excessively deviated from the rules handed over to you.

If you were careless about your own reputation, you should have at least spared mine; lest what was done solely by your mind might seem to have been done by our judgment.

Your brotherhood should review our pages and all the writings sent to your predecessors by the bishops of the apostolic see.

You will find that what you have presumed has already been addressed by me or my predecessors.

Our brother Atticus, the metropolitan bishop of Old Epirus, came to us with the bishops of his province.

He tearfully complained before your present deacons about the unworthy affliction he endured. Your deacons, by not countering his mournful complaints, showed us that his claims were credible.

It was also read in your letters, which the same deacons brought to me, that Brother Atticus had come to Thessalonica.

Your letter confirmed the aforementioned complaints.

This revealed that the prefecture of Illyricum and the highest worldly power had been incited to act against the innocent bishop.

With the terrifying execution sent, all public offices were commanded to act, and the priest, falsely accused of no crime, was dragged out from the holy Church's premises.

He was given no respite due to illness or the harshness of winter and was forced to undertake a harsh and perilous journey through pathless snows.

This journey was so arduous and dangerous that some of those accompanying the bishop are said to have perished.

My dear brother, I am greatly astonished and deeply pained that you could have acted so harshly and violently against him.

Especially since, if he deserved such treatment, you should have awaited my response to your inquiries.

You have judged my character well and anticipated how I would respond to maintain priestly harmony. Therefore, you acted without delay, ensuring you had permission to proceed without needing further instructions from me.

Perhaps you had learned of some wrongdoing by your brother, and the weight of a new accusation against the metropolitan bishop was pressing upon you. However, you confirm that's not the case by not accusing him of anything. Even if he had committed something serious and intolerable, it would have been necessary to await our judgment, so you wouldn't make any decisions yourself before knowing what pleased us.

We have entrusted our responsibilities to your care, calling you to share in the concern, not in the fullness of power. While we are greatly pleased by the things you have managed piously, we are deeply saddened by those that have been improperly handled.

Therefore, after many trials, it is necessary to look more carefully and guard more diligently.

Through the Spirit of charity and peace, all sources of scandal must be removed from the

Churches of the Lord, which we have entrusted to you. Your episcopal authority should prevail in those provinces, but all forms of usurpation must be cut off.

According to the canons of the holy Fathers, established by the Spirit of God and consecrated by the reverence of the whole world, we decree that the metropolitan bishops of each province, to whom we extend the care of your fraternity by our delegation, should retain their ancient dignity. They must not deviate from established rules, whether by negligence or presumption. Additionally, all ecclesiastical matters for the Thessalonian bishop should be preserved.

We see that the bishop of Constantinople is not given preference over the Churches of Christ, except within his own diocese. The Roman pontiff has been entrusted with this responsibility from ancient times, and all the Churches of Christ look to him. It is his duty to manage ecclesiastical matters and maintain the form of ecclesiastical causes for each province, either established or permitted by the Roman pontiff. This is approved by the decrees of the Roman pontiffs and is directed to all the Churches of Christ in both the East and the West, observed and respected by all the Churches as if they were laws of ecclesiastical affairs.

But who would allow the patriarch of Constantinople to be preferred over all the Churches of Christ? Antiquity has not granted him this, nor have any decrees of the elders established it, nor is it upheld by ecclesiastical or human law. Perhaps the modern emperors of the Greeks, not those of the Romans, think it is permissible for them to do what was not permissible for others, and to dispose of the Roman Church, which they revered as a mother, at their own will. They seek to change the authority that Christ, the whole Church, and the principality of the entire world conferred on blessed Peter.

Since they see that the city of Rome, which holds the principality of all the Churches, is removed from their empire, and all the West, as well as Africa and almost the whole East except for a few provinces of Europe and Asia and a few islands, has been taken from them. However, the respect that the bishop of Constantinople should hold, not by his own merit but because it is called the second Rome, is testified by the pragmatic of Emperor Justinian. This document states: "The Roman Pope sits before all bishops and patriarchs, and after him, the archbishop of the city of Constantinople." Here, the patriarch of Constantinople is neither preferred nor compared to the Roman pope but is placed below.

Consider also that the honor given to this seat does not grant any peak of power.

In the History of Socrates, Book 5, Chapter 8, it is written as follows:

"Then they also preferred a rule, namely the bishops who appointed Nectarius as bishop of Constantinople, that the bishop of Constantinople should have privileges of honor after the Roman pontiff, because it is the new Rome.

But here, privileges of power are not granted to him, which are proven to remain with the Roman pontiff.

So where do the Greek leaders get the authority to prefer the bishop of Constantinople over all the Churches?

No antiquity supports them, no decrees of synods, no pragmatic sanctions of emperors, which even if some were shown, could not obtain the weight of authority without the approval of the Roman pontiff.

The right of power remains endowed by such antiquity, that without his authorization, neither Constantinople nor any city of the East or West can obtain privileges of power, except those which were either granted or confirmed by the Roman pontiff.

Indeed, the power and concern of all Churches remain with him, to grant or arrange whatever has been proven to serve ecclesiastical benefits according to ecclesiastical rules.

This is approved by many monuments of Scriptures, sent throughout all Churches by the Roman pontiff."

Hence, Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, writing to Simplicius, bishop of the city of Rome, says:

"To the holy father Archbishop Simplicius, Acacius.

You continually encourage us, bearing the concern of all Churches according to the Apostle, although we watch and act willingly.

But you demonstrate your concern with divine zeal, more certainly inquiring into the state of the Alexandrian Church, so that for the paternal canons you may undertake the labor, shedding the most pious sweat for these things, as always approved, and the rest."

We know that Acacius, the bishop of Constantinople, acknowledges that the Roman bishop holds responsibility for all the churches, as stated by the Apostle, and that this role has always been assigned to him since ancient times. By saying this, he does not claim the management of all the churches for himself; he understands that this is far from his duty and does not presume to take on a role that he knows is not his.

When Acacius was found to have acted against church rules, doing something that no valid reason could justify, Felix, the bishop of the holy Catholic Church of the city of Rome, wrote to him as follows:

"You are guilty of many transgressions and have often acted in contempt of the venerable Council of Nicaea, recklessly claiming the rights of other provinces for yourself. You have received into your communion heretics and subversives, and those ordained by heretics, and even those whom you yourself condemned and asked to be condemned by the apostolic see. Not only did you accept them into your communion, but you also made them preside over other churches, which could not even be done with Catholics, and you elevated them to honors they did not deserve."

After writing many things about his transgressions, he concluded with this:

"Therefore, have your portion with those whom you willingly embrace, and by the present sentence, which we have directed to you through the defender of your Church, recognize that you have been deprived of sacerdotal honor and Catholic communion, and also separated from the number of the faithful. Recognize that the title and office of priestly ministry have been taken from you, condemned by the judgment of the Holy Spirit and our apostolic authority, and that you shall no longer be released from the bonds of excommunication."

Does this now prove that the Roman bishop is subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, through whom he is not lightly rebuked for his transgressions and condemned by the sentence of excommunication? It would be immense if we gathered all the evidence that proves the Roman bishop is superior to the bishop of Constantinople.

What we've discussed should be enough to clearly show that the Patriarch of Constantinople should not be placed above all other Churches of Christ. He should be content with the honor that is rightfully his, without going against the decrees of the Council of Nicaea, which could diminish his own honor.

We've done our best to respond to what you have written to us.

If these words are agreeable, we give thanks to God. If not, we await your correction.