

CH 310 (REL 399): READINGS IN LATIN ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE  
Topic for Spring, 2004: Four Carolingian Debates

Time: Wednesdays, 1:30 - 3:50

Instructor: Keefe

Office: 316 Old Divinity, 660-3469 or skeefe@div.duke.edu

Description

The primary purpose of the course is to read medieval Latin in order to increase your skill at it, for whatever use this may have in your planned academic goals and research and thesis work.

The secondary purpose of this course is to gain some knowledge of Carolingian theology by reading documents from four debates that arose in the late eighth and ninth century regarding 1) Spanish Adoptionism; 2) the adoration of images (icons); 3) the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and 4) predestination.

Requirements

1. Weekly preparation of assigned amount of Latin, which we will then read together in translation in class. You may wish to write out your translation. If you run into areas of difficulty, you are expected to attempt to solve the difficulty by recourse to Latin grammar books and medieval Latin dictionaries. Raise any unsolved questions in class.

2. The option of a final 3-hour exam in which you will be asked to do your best to translate a previously unseen passage **OR** a translation project in which you present a polished translation of a hitherto untranslated Latin text, perhaps even working directly from microfilm of a medieval manuscript, or a medieval manuscript in our Rare Book Room.

Your final grade will be determined by your weekly performance and effort, and by the degree of clarity with which you can translate the final exam or a Latin project.

Schedule

The following is a tentative schedule, and the amount of time we spend on each of the four debates may change depending upon your speed and interest in the topic.

1/14 Introduction

1/21 Alcuinus, *Liber contra haeresim Felicis*, ed. G. Blumenshine, pp. 55-69 (try to read 3 pp. a night: 3 pp. x 5 nights)

1/28 Alcuinus, pp. 69-83  
2/4 Alcuinus, pp. 83-99  
2/11 Theodulfus, *Libri Carolini (Opus Caroli regis contra synodum)*, ed. A. Freeman, *MGH Leges 4, Conc. 2, Supplementum I*, pp. 97-102, 277-280, 289-297 (try to read 4 pp. a night: 4 pp. x 5 nights)  
2/18 Theodulfus, pp. 297-316  
2/25 Theodulfus, pp. 316-322, 336-340, 489-493, 514-515  
3/3 Pascasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, CCCM 16, pp. 13-28 (try to read 3 pp. a night: 3 pp. x 5 nights)  
3/10 No class - Spring break  
3/17 Pascasius, pp. 28-43  
3/24 Pascasius, pp. 43-59  
3/31 Godescalcus, *De praedestinatione*, ed. D. C. Lambot, pp. 180-206 (try to read 5 pp. a night: 5 pp. x 5 nights)  
4/7 Godescalcus, pp. 206-232  
4/14 Godescalcus, pp. 232-258 (Last day of class)

## Some Historical Background to the Four Readings

### 1. Spanish Adoptionism

It took the church a long time before it came to official (conciliar) and final agreement about just who Jesus Christ was, but by the last of the seven great ecumenical councils (Nicea II, in 787) the church east and west taught that Jesus Christ was both the Son of God and Son of man, one person with two natures: human and divine. He was fully human, that is, he had a human body, soul, and spirit (or mind) and he was fully divine, being the incarnate Logos, or Word, the second person of the Blessed Trinity. He was not two persons, one divine and one human, but one person, the second person of the Trinity, who had assumed humanity. Nothing of his divinity changed when "became" a human, or assumed humanity. This event, called the incarnation, happened at a specific moment in time in the womb of a human being. The very moment that Mary conceived Christ's body, divinity came to dwell in it. There was not a single moment that a human existed in Mary's womb before it was united to the divinity, so that Jesus could never be called an adopted son of God, that is, an ordinary human whom God then choose to adopt as his son. Rather, Christ was the God-man from the very moment of his existence. Mary can truly said to be the Mother of God (Theotokos), as well as the mother of Jesus. This teaching refuted the ancient heresy of adoptionism, whereby some people believed that Jesus was conceived (and some also believed born) as a mere mortal human like anyone else, but then God adopted him, giving him divine status. That heresy must not be confused with Spanish Adoptionism.

Spanish Adoptionism arose in Spain in the late eighth century. Its adherents, believing with the universal church that Christ consisted of two natures in one person, attributed, as did also the universal church, some of his actions to his humanity and some of his actions to his divinity. For example, when he said, "The Father is greater than I" he was speaking as a human. When he

walked on the water, calmed the seas, and said, "I and the Father are one," he was exercising his divine nature.

The leaders of Spanish Adoptionism were Elipandus, the Archbishop of Toledo (the head of the church in Spain, which was then under Muslim rule) and Felix, Bishop of Urgel, a see in the Spanish March of Charlemagne's empire. They taught that Jesus Christ, in respect to his humanity, was the son of God by adoption.

This is the way Elipandus put it in a letter to the bishops of Frankland:

"We confess and we believe in God the Son of God, born without beginning of the Father before all ages, co-eternal and consimilar and consubstantial not by adoption but by generation, and not by grace but by nature...But, toward the end of time, for the salvation of the human race, appearing to the public view out of the hidden and ineffable [bosom] of the Father- the invisible assuming a visible body from the Virgin- he came forth, ineffably, through the inviolably virgin members of his mother. We confess according to the tradition of the fathers, and believe, that he was made of a woman, under the law, Son of God not by generation but by adoption, and not by nature, but by grace...thus [God the Son of God] is in nature Only-begotten (unigenitus) and in adoption and grace First-born (Primogenitus). (Cavadini, p. 32-33)

His concern, apparently, was to insist that he truly was human. If God the Son of God was human in any other way except by adoption and by grace, then his humanity wouldn't be a true humanity, but it would be part of his divine nature. That would be the heresy to Apollinarianism, to mix the divine and human natures. The two natures became inseparably joined in Jesus Christ, but they remained two distinct natures.

All humans become Sons of God by adoption in baptism. They, too, are Sons of God, but by adoption, not by nature. Christ's incarnation was his "baptism" in the sense that this is the moment when Christ's humanity received the status of Son of God. Speaking strictly of his humanity, his relation to God as Son can only be Son by adoption or grace.

Humans simply are not divine; they are not naturally children of God. If Christ truly became human, then, in so far as he was a human, he too can only be an adopted son of God.

This seems comprehensible, but such teaching set off protest, first by Beatus of Liebana in Spain, then by Pope Hadrian and in the Frankish kingdom. Despite the confusion it might create in ignorant people to call Jesus Christ the adopted son of God, the

protest was not on pastoral grounds, but theological. Elipandus' theology was incorrect. Christ was fully human, but he was NOT human like every body else. He was an absolutely unique human, with the capacity to be a mediator between man and God, which no other human has.

We are each one person, and Christ, too, is one person. Our one person can become adopted by God, but Christ's one person is already true Son by nature: there is no person left to be adopted. If you call him adopted, you create two persons in Christ. That is the ancient heresy of Nestorianism. Alcuin, in the treatise we will be reading, chose to see Felix's teaching as a revival of the heresy of Nestorianism.

Alcuin builds his case for why Jesus cannot be called "adoptivus" by an impressive array of authorities who were refuting Nestorius and his teaching that Mary could not be the mother of the true, or proper son of God, but only the mother of Jesus. But by saying that, Nestorius was creating two persons, separating the divine and the human in Christ. The "hypostatic union," as the oneness of the person of Christ came to be called, is, indeed, a miracle, an article of belief, not rationally conceivable. How the two nature of Christ operated in him is a mystery.

Elipandus sought support for his position by writing to Felix of Urgel, in the Spanish March (only recently conquered by Charlemagne in 789); Felix may have wanted to show his independence from Carolingian control by siding with Elipandus of Toledo (Cavadini, 72). The only way to explain the rapid spread of adoptionism in the march and border areas was that it was viewed politically, as a protest. Charlemagne addressed the problem at two councils and sent preachers to stamp it out. We have no complete writings of Felix, only extracts or paraphrases of his opponents, chiefly Alcuin. But Pope Hadrian was the first to respond:

ca. 785: 1st letter of Hadrian to bishops of Spain: Elipandus is "not ashamed to confess that the Son of God is adoptive."

ca. 793 2nd letter of Hadrian to bishops of Spain: Hadrian labels the position "Nestorian." "that perfidious Nestorius, who confessed that the Son of God was merely and only a human being [purum hominem]"

797-8 Alcuin's letter to Felix charges him with using "adoption."

797-8 a little, later, Alcuin's *Liber Contra haeresim Felicis*.

798            Felix's response: in so far as Jesus is human, he is God  
in                name only "nuncupative."

Leidrad, Nebridius, and Benedict of Aniane are sent to Felix in Urgel to persuade him to come to Aix for a debate

Paulinis writes *Three Books against Felix*

Alcuin writes *Seven Books against Felix of Urgel*

Felix does not debate but recants and retires under custody of Leidrad to Lyons, where he dies in 818

One can ask what importance this fairly brief flare of controversy had in church history, and why it should be given any attention. The historical importance of this affair is the literature that it called Alcuin and others to write in order to refute it. These works contributed to the on-going synthesis of the patristic tradition under the Carolingians, the tradition that shaped the thought of western Christianity down to today. Even if Alcuin misunderstood what Felix was saying, Alcuin's initial treatise against Felix, his *Liber contra haeresim Felicis*, is a compendium of orthodox teaching on the person of Christ, a theological handbook apt for any age, an introduction to Christology, employing the works of a number of Church fathers east and west. For us, reading this treatise has value for seeing how people "did" theology before the modern age.

#### Some Historical Background on the Libri Carolini

The "Caroline Books" were completed at the court of Charlemagne, ca. 793-794. A more accurate title given the work by its most recent editor, Ann Freeman, is "Opus Caroli Regis Contra Synodum." (Work of King Charles Against the Synod). It refers to the response of Charlemagne's court to the decision of the synod, or council of Nicea II in 787, otherwise known as the 7th Ecumenical Council, held at Nicea, near Constantinople. The occasion of this Council was the victory of the iconodules over the iconoclasts in a controversy that had started in 72 in the east over the veneration of icons. At that time the eastern emperor ordered the destruction of all icons. Many motives have been given, but what particularly enraged the monks who led the opposition was the theological

reasons given for not permitting the veneration of icons.

The iconoclasts said that when you paint a picture of Christ, you can only paint one of his two natures, his human nature. Thus, an image separates the two natures of Christ. You may recall this sounds like Nestorianism, as Alcuin thought Felix was reviving in his adoptionism. In the east, the extreme reaction to Nestorianism back in the 5th century, was the opposite heresy of Monophysitism (Eutychianism). They were so concerned to insist on the unity of the person of Christ that they said he really had only one nature (mono-physis), which was his divine nature, who simply took on a human "appearance." Although monophysitism was condemned at the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451, Monophysites were not at all quenched. They fled to the East and infested it. Almost all of Egypt became Monophysite (and has been till 1988!) It was the Monophysites who opposed icons in the 8th century.

7th Ecumenical Council: Nicea II, 787: ICONOCLASM CONDEMNED

(all the official documents favorable to the iconoclasts have perished, that is, the acts of the emperors, the acts of the councils of 753 and 815, and theological treatises. For sources we have:

Chronologies:

Theophane the confessor, d. 817. His *Theophanis Cronographia* goes from 284-813.

Nicephorus the Patriarch, d. 829, *Chronique universelle*.

Chronicle of George the monk, stops in 843.

Anonymous Life of Leo the Armenian

Saints' Lives:

Stephan the Younger

Andrew of Crete? (in Crisi)

Nicephorus the Patriarch

Theophane the Confessor

Tarasius

Theodore the Studite

Theological, polemical treatises:

Theodore the Studite

We saw in the council of Elvira of 300, canon 36, that it condemned images in churches. Hefele (3, 2, p. 608, says this was because it was a practice of the heretics (like carpocratians), even before it was a practice of the orthodox.

Emperor Leo III (the Isaurian), b. 675-741 started iconoclasm.

Why?

Born of humble parentage in Isauria, joined the army, rapid success in it. When the Emperor Anastasius II abdicated in 716 and left a feeble Theodosius on the throne, Leo forced him to retire, seized the throne for himself, and declared a new dynasty. He had no culture or education or aesthetic appreciation. He was persuaded that the veneration of images was a return to paganism and an offense against the OT. Hefele says we don't know how Leo acquired these ideas. At the same time, he says in a footnote, p. 617-618, that Leo's true motive was not perhaps images, but monks. Not from the point of view of recruiting their vast number for his army, but for seizing their wealth. To finance his battles on the frontiers. He quotes one historian who considered the enormous wealth and influence and great number of monasteries of the monks, which was paralyzing the living forces of the nation, and said that it was the plan of the iconoclast emperors to break the power of the monks in order to give the central administration sole power in the State. In short, Leo was a politician and a soldier, trying to diminish the church to the profit of the state and the army. Other historians have said that Leo wished to abolish images to facilitate the entrance of Jews and Arabs to Christianity, who held images as a major stumbling block. Hefele points out the errors of these ideas, esp. the idea of a separation of church and state: Leo didn't consider the church as something separate, but as its head. Hefele gives Leo credit for having true religious concerns and being a religious reformer in seeing a true decadence of religious life attached to the veneration of icons, and yet without dismissing political and psychological factors which explain his animosity to the monks.

In 722 he forced the Jews and the Montanists to receive baptism. The Montanists preferred to commit suicide (this from Theophanes' Chronicle).

In 723 the Caliph Iezid II forbade images in the Christian provinces he had seized. A bishop from Phrygia, Constantine of Nacolia, went to Constantinople with his iconoclast ideas (he had tried to impose iconoclasm in his diocese, ag. his metropolitan). so did a few others. Hefele thinks a combination of factors: easier conversion of Jews and Saracens, true religious concern about idolatry, these iconoclast bishops, and the Caliph's actions explain the origin of imperial iconoclasm.

In 725 iconoclasm burst. Germanus was Patriarch of Constantinople. It seems Leo issued an ordinance probably only forbidding honoring and kissing images, without consulting him, but Theophanes and other primary sources speak of the destruction of them. Germanus resisted Leo until 729, when Germanus retired and Anastasius was consecrated, Germanus had written to Pope Gregory II to tell him what was going on. The response of the Pope

is in our Percival, read at 7th Ecum. Co.

Pope Gregory II was the first Italian, non-Greek Pope since 685. He sat 715-731. The chroniclers say he performed an act of revolt by refusing to allow an imperial tax imposed on the Italian provinces after 725

The iconoclastic controversy perhaps helped the rupture of the West from Byzantium, but Hefele says this shouldn't be pushed, because of contacts with Constantinople. The tax was resisted simply because of its burden, not as political revolt.

The new patriarch now gave ecclesiastical sanction to iconoclasm, with a new edict in 729 ag. icons.

John Damascene

Leo III died 740. His son, Constantine Copronymus pursued iconoclasm. He had a rival in Artavasde, who claimed Copron. was a heretic. But copron. defeated him in 742.

Conciliabulum of 753 under Copron., who called a great synod of the bishops to Hiera across the Bosphorus

The Acta of Nicea II were sent to the Pope in Rome, telling how the veneration of images had been restored. The Pope sent Charlemagne a copy, or somehow the Frankish court got one, but in a badly translated form from the Greek which led Charlemagne's court to think that images should be adored in a way that was blatant idolatry. Scholars now generally agree it was Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, who was commissioned to write the LC, virulently condemning the Council of Nicea II. Wrote first draft, 790-793.

It is a treatise reflecting Carolingian theology, why it would be wrong to give adoratio to images. Theodulf has to make the argument that images, being material objects, are inferior to what they represent and detract us from God rather than lead us to Him. He has his work cut out for him, because the Bible itself says Christ is the image of God.

But it is not as simple as saying Theodulf sided with the iconoclasts. In fact, if you read LC carefully, he says that "we neither destroy with the iconoclasts or adore with the iconodules." His main concern is the priority of the spiritual over the material.

You will read first the flowery prologue of the LC (which is in 4 Books), referring to two synods, one in 754 that condemned images,

confusing them with idos, and the complete reversal in 787, praising images. Then, I have only chosen selections:

II. 23: Pope Gregoy's view

II. 27 On equating the Body and Blood of Christ (Eucharist) with an image

II. 28 On equating the cross of Christ with an image

The Dagulf Psalter was written at the court of Charlemagne ca. 794 by the scribe Dagulf. It is entirely in gold letters, and was intended as a gift from Charlemagne to Pope Hadrian (d. 795).

Before the Psalter proper comes a set of creeds.

- Nicene Creed (original)
- Ps.-Ambrosius, "Fides S. Ambrosius" (143)
- Ps.-Gregorius I papa, "Fides S. Gregorii papae" (55)
- Gregorius Thaumaturgus, "Confessio fidei" (266)
- Pelagius (Ps.-Hieronymus), "Confessio fidei" (26)

What stimulated someone at the court to select these creeds for inclusion in the Dagulf Psalter and thus for presentation to the Pope?"

Donald Bullough has suggested one hidden agenda, related to relations between the Frankish court and the Pope over the issue of image worship. Briefly, in 790/1 a Latin version of the acts of Nicea II (787), reaffirming the veneration of images, reached the Frankish court, where they were read and stirred angry disagreement. A reply to them was prepared, and in 792 a preliminary outline of chapters of the Frankish stance on image worship was carried to Rome to be read by the Pope, while at Aachen work started on a definitive reply in four books, the *Libri Carolini* or "Caroline Books," as Percival calls them.

But the debate on images came to an abrupt end when a detailed reply to the preliminary outline of chapters from Rome showed that "Pope Hadrian identified himself wholly with the Byzantine position." (Bullough, *Aula Renovata*, p. 146) With the arrival of the Pope's letter, plans for the publication of the final version of the *Libri Carolini* were abandoned, and instead the final version was made ready for deposit in the Royal Archives in Aachen.

The Franks, however, had not given up their opposition to image-worship entirely. One Carolingian historian named Bullough says that "a well-established tradition of depicting Christ, the Evangelists, and so on" stopped for a while in the 790s (*Images*, p. 57) He notes that some years ago a German scholar, Schnitzler,

argued that the criticism of images in the *Libri Carolini* directly influenced artistic activity in the Frankish court in the mid 790s. (Idem.) Bullough relates this to the Dagulf Psalter, which was begun at the same time as the final version of the *Libri Carolini*: while it is "in every other respect a luxury manuscript, [it] has no illustrations of any sort, merely two ornamented pages." (*Imagines*, p. 56 f.) Bullough goes on to say that a rigorist view against images was already being abandoned at the time of the completion of the Dagulf Psalter, because its ivory cover has images of David and also of Jerome receiving Pope Damasus's command to revise the Latin Psalter text.

"But," says Bullough, "the inclusion in the Psalter of a creedal collection of this kind is most fully comprehensible only in the light of the assertion by the leading Frankish theologian [a bishop named Theodulf, who wrote most of the *Libri Carolini*] of the absolute primacy of word over image for the exposition of the dogmas of the Christian faith.

In short, although the Franks could not send the *Libri Carolini* to the Pope once they knew his views, they did not give up their own position on images, and planned to remind him of it in a Psalter-gift without images, but instead a set of creeds. The creed collection begins with the Creed of Nicea I (universally accepted, in contrast to Nicea II opposed by the Franks), and is followed by four more expositions of the catholic faith attributed to unquestioned orthodox authorities: St. Ambrose, Pope St. Gregory I, St. Gregory martyr and bishop of Neocaesarea, and St. Jerome.

Perhaps a creed by Pope Gregory was also a subtle jab at the Pope, because Pope Hadrian, in a diplomatic attempt to win Charlemagne over in his reply to the preliminary outline, praises him for his citation of Pope Gregory the Great on images, and expounds on Pope Gregory's stand on images, that in kneeling before them not the image, but God is worshipped.

Some Historical Background on Paschasius Radbertus, De Corpore et sanguine domini

Radbertus, born end 8th c. near Soissons. Became a monk at Corbie. In order to dedicate all his time to learning, he did not become ordained, but remained a deacon, or as he calls himself, a "Levite" all his life.

(Wow! Here he is writing the 1st extensive treatise on the Eucharist and he never even himself became a priest and consecrated it or said a mass!)

842-847 he was Abbot of Corbie. Then, renouncing this office he gave himself entirely to scholarly studies and writing till death in 859.

De corpore et sanguine domini (CSD) written between 831-833. It is the most important, and later the most widespread work of Rad. It is the first extensive tract on the sacrament of the Eucharist. He composed it for the monks of Corvey, a daughter house of Corbie, at the request of Corvey's abbot, Warinus. He gave a revised edition of CSD to Charles the Bald ca. 843. It is not on all the ceremonies of the mass, but rather he discusses the sacramental nature of the Eucharist. One of his points is his insistence that what is eaten in the consecrated bread and wine is the very historical flesh and blood that suffered on the cross, was buried in a tomb, rose three days later, became glorified, and ascended into heaven. It was in opposition to this (orthodox) belief spelled out by Rad, that a quarrel over the "real presence" in the

Eucharist arose some time after the publication of CSD, attested no earlier than the late 840's. Rad defended his teaching in 2 more treatises on the Eucharist at the end of his life, before 859.

Ratramnus of Corbie took an opposite view of the Eucharist, but he does not show any knowledge of CSD or directly refer to Rad, his abbot. Eucharistic doctrine was tied to another argument going on at the same time about predestination. Gottschalk rejected Rad's doctrine of the "historical" presence of Christ in the Eucharist because he rejected the idea that Christ died for all of humanity. Archbishop Hincmar of Reims sided with Rad on the Euch and also opposed Gottschalk on predestination. (Thus, how you believe about the Eucharist should effect how you believe about predestination! Consider! If the Euch is His real flesh and blood, it has to be salvation for anyone who eats it. If it is only figuratively his body, and you only receive him spiritually when you eat him in faith, then he can have died only for the elect given that faith!)

We do not get into the controversy, all we read is the opinion of Rad. (If you do go back and trace all the opinions of the church fathers and their sporadic teachings on the Eucharist, it is, in fact, Rad's teaching. "Rad in his teaching on the Eucharist stands entirely on the ground of the tradition" (B. Paulus, ed. of CCSL) In his prologue he says he used Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, Isidore, Chrysostom, Gregory I, Jerome, Hesychius of Jerusalem, and Bede. In the margins of his work he actually only uses AM, AG, HIL, YS, HIE (they appear only in the oldest mss, and get scarcer as work proceeds, whether this is copyists' omissions or Rad himself stopped citing. In the CCSL edition they are given).

For our purposes, what is important is to see the language he uses to actually talk about the elements of bread and wine and in what mode or fashion they become/contain Christ's historical flesh and blood.

There are over 120 extant mss, in 4 editions, two different editions by Rad himself. Our CCSL edition uses 18 mss. and 4 printed editions. You have xeroxed the prologue of Rad's 2nd edition to King Charles the Bald, not the prologue of his 1st edition to Abbot Warinus.

Some Historical Background on Godescalc d'Orbais, 'De Praedestinatione'

The edition we will read is by D. C. Lambot (*Oeuvres de Godescalc d'Orbais*, Louvain, 1945) who used the only known ms of this work, Bern, BM 584, s. IX<sup>ex</sup>, ff. 57r-96v, probably written at Reims (Lambot, p. xii).

From OCC: Gottschalk, ca. 804-ca. 869, was a heterodox monk. He began at Fulda (under Rabanus Maurus; where the Boniface ms is that Bart is working on), then he was at Corbie in France under Ratramnus (who opposed Paschasius Radbertus on the Eucharist we are reading). Then he was at Reims, and then at Orbais in the diocese of Soissons. Here he devoted himself to theology and formed an extreme doctrine of predestination, based on the anti-

pelagian writings of Augustine. (We will see how often he quotes Augustine.) He taught a double predestination (the phrase came from Isidore), by which the elect are predestined to heaven and the others are predestined to hell, but not to sin. To do this he has to insist that God does not will everybody to be saved.

He was ordained and did travel to Rome. He spread his ideas in Italy and in the Balkans, where he preached to the Bulgars. Rabanus (his archbp., of Mainz) tried to stop his activities. When he returned to Germany in 848 a synod at Mainz condemned his teaching; in 849 a synod at Quierzy again condemned him, deprived him of his priestly orders (he had been ordained uncanonically by a chorepiscopus), beat him and sentenced him to perpetual imprisonment, which he lived out at the monastery of Hautvillers. Despite this, Gottschalk continued to write and engage in controversy. Hincmar of Reims warned the simple folk of his diocese against his writings and called on a number of church leaders and theologians for their consultation. Their responses complicated the issue, and started the controversy. In 859 Hincmar found a formula to satisfy all of them. Gottschalk would not back down, hoping his case would be heard by Pope Nicholas, but the Pope died in 867 and Gottschalk himself died about 2 years later still unreconciled.

Gottschalk was involved in other debates, defending the use of "trina deitas" ag. Hincmar, and with Ratramnus on the Eucharist. In 1930 G. Morin, a famous liturgist, discovered a whole collection of his theological writings in the library of Bern. His writings show a strong sense of independence in criticizing not only classical authors like Priscian (in Gottschalk's grammatical works), but also criticizing Jerome and Gregory the Great, as we will see when we read his attacks on Jerome in 'De Praedestinatione.'

- most important of all the Carolingian debates.

-longest, involved the most theologians, inspired the most letters and treatises, led to a participant's confinement

-why its vigor? 1) personal animosity between Gottschalk and his mets, Rabanus and Hincmar and Hincmar's unpopularity south of the Loire. 2) the issue raised profound ethical questions and threatened pastoral work and the sacraments of baptism, penance, Eucharist as means of salvation. 3) exposed problems with biblical exegesis: did Christ die for everyone or not?