

## QUESTION 36

### The Person of the Holy Spirit: The Name 'Holy Spirit'

Next we have to consider the things that pertain to the person of the Holy Spirit (questions 36-38), who is called not only the Holy Spirit (question 36), but also the Love of God (question 37) and the Gift of God (question 38).

On the topic of the name 'Holy Spirit' there are four questions: (1) Is the name 'Holy Spirit' a proper name of a divine person? (2) Does the divine person who is called the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father and the Son? (3) Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father through the Son? (4) Are the Father and the Son a single principle of the Holy Spirit?

#### Article 1

##### Is the name 'Holy Spirit' a proper name of a divine person?

It seems that the name 'Holy Spirit' is not a proper name of any divine person (*hoc nomen spiritus sanctus non sit proprium nomen alicuius divinae personae*):

**Objection 1:** No name that is common to the three persons is proper to any one person. But the name 'Holy Spirit' is common to the three persons. For in *De Trinitate* 8 Hilary shows that 'Spirit of God' (a) sometimes signifies the Father, as when it is said, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me" [Luke 4:18], (b) sometimes signifies the Son, as when the Son says, "It is in the Spirit of God that I cast out demons" [Matthew 12:18], indicating that by the power of His nature He casts out demons, and (c) sometimes signifies the Holy Spirit, as when it is said, "I pour out my Spirit over all flesh" [Joel 2:28]. Therefore, the name 'Holy Spirit' is not a proper name of any divine person.

**Objection 2:** As Boethius says in *De Trinitate*, the names of the divine persons are predicated relationally. But the name 'Holy Spirit' is not relational (*non dicitur ad aliquid*). Therefore, this name is not a proper name of a divine person.

**Objection 3:** Since 'Son' is the name of a divine person, the Son cannot be called 'the Son of this man' or 'the Son of that man'. But 'spirit of this man' or 'spirit of that man' does occur. For Numbers 11:17 says, "The Lord said to Moses . . . 'I will take of your Spirit, and will give to them'." And 4 Kings 2:15 says, "The spirit of Elijah has rested upon Elisha." Therefore, 'Holy Spirit' does not seem to be the proper name of a divine person.

**But contrary to this:** 1 John 5:7 says, "There are Three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit." But as Augustine puts it in *De Trinitate* 7, if someone asks, 'Three what?', we reply, 'Three persons'. Therefore, 'Holy Spirit' is a name of a divine person.

**I respond:** As was pointed out above (q. 27, a. 4), even though there are two processions in God, the one that is in the mode of love does not have a proper name, and so, as was also pointed out above (q. 28, a. 4), the relations that derive from a procession of this sort are likewise unnamed. Because of this, the divine person who proceeds in this way likewise does not have a proper name.

However, just as certain names are adapted by the usage of speakers to signify the relations just alluded to—for we call them by the names 'Procession' and 'Spiration', which, according to their strict meaning, seem to signify the notional acts rather than the relations—so, too, the name 'Holy Spirit' has been adapted by the usage of Scripture to signify the divine person who proceeds in the mode of love.

There are two reasons why this is appropriate.

First of all, He is called the Holy Spirit by reason of the fact that He is common to [the other two persons]. For as Augustine says in *De Trinitate* 15, "Because the Holy Spirit is common to both of them, it is proper to call Him what both of them have in common. For the Father is a spirit and the Son is a

spirit, and the Father is holy and the Son is holy.”

Second, He is called the Holy Spirit because of the proper signification of the two names. For among corporeal things the name ‘spirit’ seems to signify a certain impulse and movement; for instance, we call breath and wind by the name ‘spirit’. And it is a property of love that it moves and impels the will of the lover toward the beloved. By the same token, holiness is attributed to those things that are ordered toward God. Therefore, since a divine person proceeds in the mode of the Love by which God is loved, He is appropriately named the Holy Spirit.

**Reply to objection 1:** The expression ‘holy spirit’, taken in effect as two words, is common to the whole Trinity. For the name ‘spirit’ signifies the immateriality of the divine substance, since a spirit is an invisible body and has almost no matter. That is why we attribute this name to all immaterial and invisible substances. By the same token, the name ‘holy’ signifies the purity of God’s goodness.

However, when the expression ‘Holy Spirit’ is taken to have the force of a single word, then, for the reason explained above, it has been adapted by the usage of the Church to signify just one of the three persons, viz., the one who proceeds in the mode of the Love.

**Reply to objection 2:** Even though the expression ‘Holy Spirit’ is not predicated relationally, it is nonetheless used in place of a relational name insofar as it has been adapted to signify a person who is distinguished from the others only by a relation.

Still, a relation can also be understood in the name itself if ‘Spirit’ is taken for ‘one who is spirated’.

**Reply to objection 3:** What one grasps by the name ‘Son’ is just the relation to a principle on the part of the one who is from that principle. By contrast, what one grasps by the name ‘Father’ is the relation *being a principle of*, and the same holds for the name ‘spirit’ insofar as it implies a certain moving force. Now it does not belong to any creature to be a principle of a divine person, but it does belong to a creature to have a divine person as a principle. And so one can say ‘our Father’ and ‘our Spirit’, but one cannot say ‘our Son’.

## Article 2

### Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Son?

It seems that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son (*non procedat a filio*):

**Objection 1:** According to Dionysius, “No one should dare to say anything about God beyond those things that are divinely expressed to us in the sacred writings.” But Sacred Scripture does not say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, but says only that He proceeds from the Father. This is clear from John 15:26 (“... the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father”). Therefore, the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son.

**Objection 2:** The creed of the Council of Constantinople says, “We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father; with the Father and the Son He is to be worshiped and glorified.” Therefore, it should in no way be added to our creed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Rather, those who would add this seem to deserve condemnation.

**Objection 3:** Damascene says, “We say that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and we name Him the Spirit of the Father, but we do not say that the Holy Spirit is from the Son, even though we name Him the Spirit of the Son.” Therefore, the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son.

**Objection 4:** Nothing proceeds from that in which it comes to rest. But the Holy Spirit comes to rest in the Son. For the legend of St. Andrew says, “Peace be to you and to all who believe in the one

God the Father, and in His one Son, our only Lord Jesus Christ, and in the one Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and abides in the Son.” Therefore, the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son.

**Objection 5:** The Son proceeds as the Word. But, in our own case, our spirit does not seem to proceed from our word. Therefore, neither does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Son.

**Objection 6:** The Holy Spirit proceeds perfectly from the Father. Therefore, it is superfluous to claim that He proceeds from the Son.

**Objection 7:** As *Physics* 3 says, in the case of things that are everlasting, *is* (*esse*) does not differ from *can be* (*posse*), and so they differ all the less in God. But the Holy Spirit can be distinguished from the Son even if He does not proceed from the Son. For in *De Processione Spiritus Sancti* Anselm says, “The Son and the Holy Spirit do, to be sure, have *esse* from the Father, but in different ways; for the one has it by being begotten and the other has it by proceeding, so that they are distinct from one another because of this.” And later on he adds, “Even if the Son and the Holy Spirit were not distinct for any other reason, they would be distinct solely for this reason.” Therefore, the Holy Spirit is distinct from the Son without being from Him.

**But contrary to this:** The Athanasian creed says, “The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, neither made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding.”

**I respond:** It is necessary to say that the Holy Spirit is from the Son. For if He were not from the Son, then there could be no way of distinguishing them as persons.

This is clear from what was said above (q. 28, a. 3 and q. 30, a. 2). For it is impossible to claim that the divine persons are distinct from one another by something absolute [and not relational], since it would follow that there is no single essence common to the three persons. For whatever is predicated absolutely in God pertains to the oneness of the divine essence. Therefore, it follows that the divine persons are distinct from one another only by relations.

But the relations cannot make the persons distinct except insofar as they are opposed relations. This is clear from the fact that the Father has two relations, one of which relates Him to the Son and the other of which relates Him to the Holy Spirit. However, since these two relations are not opposed to one another, they do not constitute two persons but instead pertain just to the one person of the Father. Therefore, if in the Son and the Holy Spirit there were just the two relations by which each is related to the Father, then those relations would not be opposed to one another, just as the two relations by which the Father is related to them are not opposed to one another. Hence, just as the person of the Father is one, so it would follow that the person of the Son is one with the person of the Holy Spirit, and that this one person has two relations opposed to the two relations had by the Father. But this is heretical, since it undermines our faith in the Trinity.

Therefore, it must be the case that the Son and the Holy Spirit are related to one another by opposed relations. But as was shown above (q. 28, a. 4), the only opposed relations that there can be in God are relations of origin. Now opposed relations of origin involve a principle and that which is from the principle. Therefore, it follows that one must say either that (a) the Son is from the Holy Spirit—which no one says—or that (b) the Holy Spirit is from the Son—which is what we confess.

The nature of the two processions is consonant with this conclusion. For it was explained above (q. 27, aa. 2 and 4 and q. 28, a. 4) that the Son proceeds as the Word in the mode of the intellect, whereas the Holy Spirit proceeds as the Love in the mode of the will. Now it is necessary that the Love should proceed from the Word, since we do not love something except insofar as we apprehend it by the mind’s conception. Hence, in keeping with this, it is likewise clear that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

Again, the very way things are ordered teaches us this. For we never find many things proceeding from a single thing without some ordering. The sole exception has to do with things which differ solely in matter; for instance, a single blacksmith produces many knives that differ in matter from one another

and have no ordering with respect to one another. But in the case of things in which there is more than just a distinction of matter, we always find some ordering among the many things produced. Hence, the beauty of God's wisdom is revealed even in the ordering of the creatures that are produced. Therefore, if two persons, viz., the Son and the Holy Spirit, proceed from the single person of the Father, then there must be some ordering they have with respect to one another. But the only conceivable ordering here is an ordering of nature by which the one comes from the other (*quo alius est ex alio*). Nor can one claim that the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father in such a way that neither of them proceeds from the other, unless he posits a distinction of matter in them—which is impossible.

This is why even the Greeks themselves understand the procession of the Holy Spirit as having some ordering to the Son. For they admit that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son and that He is from the Father *through* the Son. What's more, some of them are said to concede that He *is from* the Son, or that He *flows from* the Son, but *not* that He *proceeds* from the Son. But they say this, it would seem, either out of ignorance or out of stubbornness. For if one considers the matter correctly, he will find that the word 'procession' is the most general of all the words that pertain to an origin, since we use it to designate any sort of origin at all. For instance, we say that a line proceeds from a point, that a ray proceeds from the sun, that a river proceeds from its source, and so on for all the other types of origin.

Hence, on the basis of everything else that pertains to origins, one can conclude that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

**Reply to objection 1:** We should not say about God anything that is not found in Sacred Scripture either word-for-word or implicitly. Now even though we do not find it said word-for-word in Sacred Scripture that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, it is nonetheless found implicitly in Sacred Scripture, and especially when the Son, at John 16:14, says of the Holy Spirit: "He shall glorify me, because He shall receive of me."

In addition, with Sacred Scripture we should follow the rule that whatever is said of the Father must also be understood of the Son, even if an exclusive expression is added—with the sole exception of those things in which the Father and the Son are distinguished by opposed relations. For instance, when our Lord says at Matthew 11:27, "No one knows the Son except the Father," this does not rule out the Son's knowing Himself. So, too, when the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, then even if it were added that He proceeds from the Father alone, this would still not exclude the Son. For the Father and the Son are not opposed with respect to being a principle of the Holy Spirit; rather, they are opposed only insofar as the one is the Father and the other is the Son.

**Reply to objection 2:** Every Council formulated a creed in light of some error that was condemned at that Council. Hence, subsequent Councils did not formulate a creed different from the first one; rather, what was implicitly contained in the first creed was made explicit by certain additions aimed at heresies which were gaining ground at that later time.

Hence, the determination of the Council of Chalcedon declares that those who met at the Council of Constantinople handed down a doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, and that they did this not by implying that their own predecessors, who had met at Nicea, had left something out, but rather "by making the meaning of their predecessors clear against the heretics." Therefore, since at the time of the ancient Councils the error of asserting that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son had not yet arisen, it was unnecessary to make an explicit pronouncement on this matter. But later on, because of an error that had arisen among some, and in a Council that met in the West, the teaching in question was declared explicitly by the authority of the Roman Pontiff, by whose authority the ancient councils had themselves been convened and confirmed. Nonetheless, the teaching was already contained implicitly in the very fact that the Holy Spirit had already been declared to proceed from the Father.

**Reply to objection 3:** The Nestorians first introduced the claim that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, as is clear from a Nestorian creed condemned at the Council of Ephesus. This

error was espoused by Theodoric the Nestorian and by many after him, among whom we find even Damascene. Hence, on this matter Damascene's position does not hold good. Still, some point out that even though Damascene does not confess that the Holy Spirit is from the Son, neither do his words strictly speaking deny this.

**Reply to objection 4:** The fact that the Holy Spirit is said to 'rest in' or 'abide in' the Son does not rule out His proceeding from the Son, since the Son is likewise said to abide in the Father, even though He nonetheless proceeds from the Father.

Again, the Holy Spirit is said to 'rest in' the Son either (a) in the sense that the love of the lover rests in the beloved or (b) insofar as this applies to Christ's human nature, and this because of John 1:33 ("He upon whom you shall see the Spirit descending and remaining upon Him, He it is that baptizes)."

**Reply to objection 5:** 'Word', as said of God, does not come from a likeness to a *spoken* word, from which no spirit proceeds, since this is said only metaphorically. Rather, it derives from a likeness to a *mental* word, from which love proceeds.

**Reply to objection 6:** The fact that the Holy Spirit proceeds perfectly from the Father not only does not make it superfluous to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, but in fact makes it altogether necessary to say this. For the power of the Father is the same as the power of the Son, and whatever is from the Father is necessarily from the Son as well, unless it is something incompatible with the property of Filiation—for instance, it is not the case that the Son is from Himself, even though He is from the Father.

**Reply to objection 7:** The Holy Spirit is distinguished as a person from the Son by the fact that the origin of the one is distinct from the origin of the other. However, this difference of origin itself stems from the fact that the Son is from just the Father, whereas the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son. Otherwise, as was shown above, the two processions would not be distinct from one another.

### Article 3

#### Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father *through* the Son?

It seems that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father *through* (*per*) the Son:

**Objection 1:** What proceeds from someone through another does not proceed from the first one immediately. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, then He does not proceed immediately from the Father—which seems wrong.

**Objection 2:** If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, then He does not proceed from the Son except because of the Father. But if a thing is such-and-such because of something else, then the latter is more such-and-such. Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father more than from the Son.

**Objection 3:** The Son has *esse* through generation. Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is from the Father through the Son, it follows that the Son is generated first and that the Holy Spirit proceeds afterwards. And so the procession of the Holy Spirit is not eternal—which is heretical.

**Objection 4:** When someone is said to operate through someone else, the converse can likewise be said. For instance, just as we say that the king operates through the magistrate, so too we can say that the magistrate operates through the king. But there is no sense in which we can say that the Son spirates the Holy Spirit through the Father. Therefore, there is no sense in which we can say that the Father spirates the Holy Spirit through the Son.

**But contrary to this:** In *De Trinitate* Hilary says, "Preserve, I beg of you, this religion of my faith,

that I may always possess the Father, viz., you, and adore the Son along with you, and be deserving of your Holy Spirit, who is through your Only-begotten.”

**I respond:** In all the expressions in which someone is said to operate through someone else, the preposition ‘through’ (*per*), as a causal expression, designates some cause or principle of the act in question.

Now since an action lies between the doer and the thing done, sometimes the causal [element] to which the preposition ‘through’ is joined is a cause of the action *insofar as the action goes forth from the agent*. And in such a case it is a cause of the agent’s acting, whether this be (a) a final cause or (b) a formal cause or (c) an efficient, i.e., moving, cause—(a) a *final* cause, as when we say that it is through the craftsman’s desire for money that he works, or (b) a *formal* cause, as when we say that it is through his craft that he works, or (c) a *moving* cause, as when we say that it is through the command of someone else that he works.

On the other hand, sometimes the causal [element] to which the preposition ‘through’ is joined is a cause of the action *insofar as the action is terminated in the thing done*, as when we say that it is through the craftsman’s hammer that he acts. For this does not mean that the hammer is a cause of the craftsman’s acting, but rather that (a) it is a cause of the artifact’s proceeding from the craftsman and that (b) its being a cause is itself a feature it has from the craftsman. This is why some claim that the preposition ‘through’ (a) sometimes takes the source (*auctoritas*) of the action in the nominative case, as in ‘The king operates through the magistrate’, and (b) sometimes takes it in an oblique case, as in ‘The magistrate operates through the king’. Therefore, since the Son has from the Father the fact that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him, one can say that it is through the Son that the Father spirates the Holy Spirit or—what amounts to the same thing—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son.

**Reply to objection 1:** In every action there are two things to consider, viz., (a) the *suppositum* that acts and (b) the *power* by means of which the suppositum acts. So, for instance, a fire gives warmth by means of its heat.

Therefore, if we consider the *power* by which the Father and the Son spirate the Holy Spirit, then there is no mediation here, since this power is one and the same power [for both of them].

On the other hand, if we consider the *persons themselves* who spirate the Holy Spirit, then, even though the Holy Spirit proceeds in common from the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father (a) *immediately* insofar as He is from Him and (b) *mediately* insofar as He is from the Son (*immediate a patre procedere inquantum est ab eo et mediate inquantum est a filio*). And this is the sense in which He is said to proceed from the Father through the Son. In the same way, Abel proceeded from Adam (a) *immediately* insofar as Adam was his father and (b) *mediately* insofar as Eve was his mother, because Eve had proceeded from Adam—though this material example of procession seems inadequate for signifying the immaterial procession of the divine persons.

**Reply to objection 2:** If the Son had received from the Father a numerically distinct power for spirating the Holy Spirit, then it would follow that the Son is a secondary and instrumental cause and that the Holy Spirit proceeds more from the Father than from the Son. However, numerically one and the same spirating power exists in the Father and the Son, and so the Holy Spirit proceeds equally from both of them. Still, He is sometimes said to proceed ‘principally’ or ‘properly’ from the Father by reason of the fact that the Son has this power from the Father.

**Reply to objection 3:** Just as the generation of the Son is coeternal with the one who generates Him, so that the Father did not exist prior to begetting the Son, so too the procession of the Holy Spirit is coeternal with His principle. Hence, the begotten Son did not exist prior to the Holy Spirit’s proceeding from Him. Instead, both are eternal.

**Reply to objection 4:** When someone is said to operate through something, the converse does not

always hold true. For instance, we do not say that the hammer operates through the craftsman. On the other hand, we do say that the magistrate operates through the king. For it belongs to the magistrate to act, since he is the master of his own actions. By contrast, it does not belong to the hammer to act; instead, what belongs to the hammer is only to be acted upon. This is why it is designated only as an instrument.

Now the reason why the magistrate is said to operate through the king, even though the preposition ‘through’ denotes a means, is that to the extent that a suppositum is prior in acting, its power is more immediate to the effect. For the first cause’s power conjoins the secondary cause to the first cause’s effect, and this is why in the demonstrative sciences first principles are said to be ‘immediate’. So, then, insofar as the magistrate is intermediate in the order of *acting supposita*, the king is said to operate through the magistrate, whereas in the order of *power* the magistrate is said to act through the king, since the king’s power makes the magistrate’s action attain to its effect.

Now the ordering that exists between the Father and the Son is not an ordering of power, but only an ordering of *supposita*. And this is why the Father is said to spirate the Holy Spirit through the Son, but not vice versa.

#### Article 4

##### Are the Father and the Son a single principle of the Holy Spirit?

It seems that the Father and the Son are not a single principle of the Holy Spirit (*non sint unum principium spiritus sancti*):

**Objection 1:** The Holy Spirit does not seem to proceed from the Father and the Son insofar as they are one—i.e., either (a) insofar as they are one in *nature*, since if that were so, the Holy Spirit would also proceed from Himself, given that He is one in nature with them, or, again, (b) insofar as they are one in some *property*, since, as is evident, it cannot be the case that one property belongs to two *supposita*. Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son insofar as they are many. Therefore, it is not the case that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

**Objection 2:** When it is claimed that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, this cannot mean a oneness of *person*, since in that case the Father and the Son would be a single person. Nor can it mean a oneness of *property*, since if it were due to a single property that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, then, by parity of reasoning, the Father, it seems, would be two principles of the Son and the Holy Spirit in virtue of the two corresponding properties—which is absurd. Therefore, it is not the case that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

**Objection 3:** The Son’s oneness with the Father is no greater than the Holy Spirit’s oneness with the Father. But the Holy Spirit and the Father are not a single principle with respect to any divine person. Therefore, neither are the Father and the Son.

**Objection 4:** If the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, then either this single principle is the Father or it is not the Father. But neither of these alternatives is possible. For if the single principle is the Father, then it follows that the Son is the Father, whereas if the single principle is not the Father, it follows that the Father is not the Father. Therefore, one should not say that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

**Objection 5:** If the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, then it seems, conversely, that the single principle of the Holy Spirit is the Father and the Son. But this seems false,

since the expression ‘principle’ must supposit either for the person of the Father or for the person of the Son. And either way, the proposition is false. Therefore, ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit’ is likewise false.

**Objection 6:** Oneness in substance makes for sameness. Therefore, if the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, it follows that they are the same principle. But many deny this. Therefore, one should not concede that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

**Objection 7:** Because the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are a single principle of creatures, they are said to be a single creator. But the Father and the Son are not a single Spirator; instead, as many insist, they are two Spirators. This is also consonant with the words of Hilary, who says in *De Trinitate 2* that the Holy Spirit should be confessed to be “from the Father and the Son as sources (*auctoribus*).” Therefore, it is not the case that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

**But contrary to this:** In *De Trinitate 5* Augustine says that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit and not two principles.

**I respond:** The Father and the Son are one in all things in which no relational opposition makes for a distinction between them. Hence, since they are not relationally opposed in being a principle of the Holy Spirit, it follows that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit.

However, some claim that the proposition ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit’ is improper. For when the name ‘principle’ is taken in the singular, it signifies a property rather than a person, and so they claim that here it must be taken adjectivally. And since an adjective is not determined by another adjective, it cannot be appropriate to say that the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, unless the term ‘single’ is understood as if it were posited adverbially, in which case the meaning of ‘are a single principle’ would be that they are principles in a single way.

However, one could reply along the same lines that the Father is two principles of the Son and the Holy Spirit, i.e., that He is a principle of them in two ways.

Therefore, one should reply that even though the name ‘principle’ signifies a property, it nonetheless signifies it in a substantival mode—just as the names ‘father’ and ‘son’ do even among created things. Hence, the grammatical number is taken from the form that is signified, just as with other substantival expressions. Therefore, just as the Father and the Son are a single God because of the oneness of the form that is signified by the name ‘God’, so too they are a single principle of the Holy Spirit because of the oneness of the property signified by the name ‘principle’.

**Reply to objection 1:** If one considers the *spirative power*, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son insofar as they are one in the spirative power, where, as will be explained below (q. 41, a. 5), ‘spirative power’ signifies the divine nature in a certain way along with a property. Nor is it absurd that one property should exist in two supposita that share a single nature.

On the other hand, if one considers the *supposita* involved in the spiration, then the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son insofar as they are many. For He proceeds from them as the Love who unites the two of them (*ut amor unitivus duorum*).

**Reply to objection 2:** When one says, ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit’, a single property is designated, viz., the form signified by the name ‘principle’. However, it does not follow that the Father can be called more than one principle because of the plurality of principles. For this would imply that He is a plurality of supposita.

**Reply to objection 3:** In God, likeness and unlikeness have to do not with the relational properties, but with the divine essence. Hence, just as the Father is not more similar to Himself than He is to the Son, so too the Son is not more similar to the Father than the Holy Spirit is.

**Reply to objection 4:** The two propositions ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle that is the Father’ and ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle that is not the Father’ are not opposed as



contradictories. Hence, it is not necessary to grant either one of them. For when we say, ‘The Father and the Son are a single principle’, the expression ‘principle’ does not have determinate supposition, but instead has confused supposition for both of the persons together. Hence, the inference [to one of the two propositions just mentioned] commits the fallacy of a figure of speech, since it goes from confused supposition to determinate supposition.

**Reply to objection 5:** The proposition ‘The single principle of the Holy Spirit is the Father and the Son’ is in fact true. For the term ‘principle’ does not supposit for just one person; instead, as was just explained, it supposits indeterminately for two persons.

**Reply to objection 6:** It is appropriate to say that the Father and the Son are the same principle, as long as ‘principle’ is suppositing confusedly and indeterminately for the two persons together.

**Reply to objection 7:** Some claim that even though the Father and the Son are a single principle of the Holy Spirit, they are nonetheless two spirators, and this because of the distinction between the supposita. Likewise, they are two who are spirating, since acts are attributed to supposita. The same line of reasoning does not hold in the case of the name ‘creator’. For, as has been explained, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son insofar as they are two distinct persons. By contrast, creatures proceed from the three persons not insofar as they are distinct persons, but insofar as they are one in essence.

However, it seems better to reply as follows: Because ‘spirating’ is an adjective, whereas ‘spirator’ is a noun (*substantivum*), we can say that the Father and the Son are two who are spirating, and this because of the plurality of supposita, but that they are not two spirators, because there is just a single spiration. For adjectival names derive their grammatical number from the number of supposita, whereas nouns derive it from themselves in accord with the form that is signified.

Now as for the claim made by Hilary, viz., that “the Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son as sources,” he should be interpreted as using a noun in place of an adjective (*exponendum est quod ponitur substantivum pro adiectivo*).