

<Text 3>

(*Cat*, 10a)

<A Florilegium on the Trinity, Especially the Holy Spirit>

Blessed Fulgentius in a letter to the deacon Ferrandus on the peculiar property that distinguishes each person of the Holy Trinity, among other things says: For we say it is proper to the Father that he begot; we say it is proper to the Son that he alone from the Father alone was born; and proper to the Holy Spirit, that it proceeds from the Father and the Son.<sup>1</sup> In these distinguishing properties there is, certainly, no separation of nature, but a certain recognition of persons.<sup>2</sup>

And a little later the same holy teacher says: The divine nature of the Son was not able to receive the Holy Spirit, since the Holy Spirit itself proceeds from the Son, just as it proceeds from the Father, and may be given by the Son, just as it is given by the Father; nor could that divine nature, from which the Spirit itself has its origin, await or receive the Spirit's abundance. That Spirit is entirely the Father's, is entirely the Son's, because by nature it is the one Spirit of the Father and the Son. Consequently, it proceeds entirely from the Father and the Son, remains entirely in the Father and the Son, because it so remains that it proceeds, so proceeds that it remains. Whence by nature it has with the Father and the Son one fullness and full oneness, so that it possesses the Father entirely and the Son entirely, and is entirely possessed by the Father and entirely possessed by the Son.<sup>3</sup>

The same in the same:<sup>4</sup> The Son is, of course, eternal and without beginning, because, born from the nature of the Father, he has always existed. And the Holy Spirit is eternal and without beginning, because it proceeds from the nature of the Father and the Son.<sup>5</sup>

The same in the same: There is one Father, who alone in himself by nature begot the one Son; and one Son, who alone by nature is born from the one Father; and one Holy Spirit, who alone by nature proceeds from the Father and the Son.<sup>6</sup>

The same in the same: Therefore, just as, according to that divine nature by which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one, we believe that neither the Father was born, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son; so also catholic faith believes and declares that only the Son was born according to the flesh. For in that Trinity not only would it be proper to the Father alone that he himself was not born, but he begot the one Son; nor proper to the Son alone that he himself did not beget, but he was born from the essence of the Father; nor proper to the Holy Spirit that it itself was not born, nor begot, but alone proceeds with unchanging eternity from the Father and the Son.<sup>7</sup>

The same in the same: Hold most firmly, and in no way doubt that the same Holy Spirit who is the one Spirit of the Father and the Son, proceeds from the Father and the Son. For the Son says: *When the Spirit of truth comes, who proceeds from the Father* (Jn. 15, 26), in which he taught that the Spirit is his, because he himself is truth. Prophetic and apostolic teaching also points out to us that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. For Isaiah says about the Son: *He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath (spiritu) of his lips he will slay the wicked* (Is. 11,4). Concerning whom also the Apostle says: *Whom the Lord Jesus will slay by the breath of his mouth* (2 Thess. 2, 8). Also the only Son of God himself, indicating what was the “breath of his mouth”, breathing on his disciples after the resurrection, says: *Receive the Holy Spirit* (Jn. 20, 22). Indeed, John says in the Apocalypse that from the mouth of the Lord Jesus himself *<a two-edged sword proceeds* (Rev. 1, 16). Thus, the Spirit itself of his mouth is itself<sup>7a</sup> the sword which proceeds from his mouth.<sup>8</sup>

Blessed Augustine in his book of Questions, among other things says: Unerring faith declares that the Holy Spirit is neither unbegotten nor begotten, because if we say it is unbegotten, we will seem also to affirm that there are two Fathers; if, moreover, begotten, we might be compelled to believe that there are two Sons. But what unerring faith holds is that it is neither unbegotten nor begotten, but proceeding from both, that is, from the Father and the Son. And to prove this with testimonies, hear our Lord Jesus Christ himself teaching his disciples: *When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, it will bear witness about me* (Jn. 15, 16). And again, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, after his resurrection, in order to show that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him just as from the Father, breathing on his disciples, says: *Receive the Holy Spirit* (Jn. 20, 22). Thus, there is one Spirit of the Father and the Son, one Spirit of both. That it is the Father's, our Lord and Savior himself says to his disciples: *For it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father, who speaks in you* (Mt. 10, 20). That the same Spirit also is the Son's, the apostle Paul bears witness: *Anyone, he said, who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him* (Rm. 8, 9).<sup>9</sup>

Cassiodorus, from his tract on Ps. 50: For the Spirit, in as much as it pertains to the essence of divinity, is the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and is rightly called one God; but for the distinction of the persons it belongs to the Father that, by nature without a beginning, he begot the Son before the ages; it belongs to the Son that by nature he was begotten by the Father; it belongs to the Holy Spirit that it proceeds from the Father and the Son; whose consubstantial eternity and power, with ineffable love and their cooperation, does all that it wishes on heaven and earth.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, each person in the Holy Trinity has something proper by which, with inseparable equality, it shows some property peculiar to itself. The Father alone is Father, the Son alone is Son, and the Holy Spirit alone is the Holy Spirit. And this is proper to the Father, that of all that exists, he alone is who is not from another<sup>11</sup>: for this reason he is alone in the paternity of his person, not alone in the essence of

deity. And this is proper to the only-begotten Son of God, that from the one alone, that is, the Father, he alone is consubstantially and co-essentially begotten, and in this is the peculiar property of his person. And this is proper to the Holy Spirit, that it proceeds equally from the Father and the Son: it is the Spirit of both, and of the same substance and eternity with the Father and the Son.<sup>12</sup>

For if the Holy Spirit is nowhere called unbegotten nor begotten, lest if it was called unbegotten like the Father, two Fathers might be understood in the Holy Trinity, or if it was called begotten like the Son, similarly there might be thought to be two Sons in that same Holy Trinity, it must be said, keeping the faith, only to proceed from the Father and the Son. Which Spirit, nevertheless, does not proceed from the Father into the Son, and from the Son proceed to sanctify creation, as some, understanding wrongly, think must be believed; but it proceeds from both at the same time, because the Father begot the Son such that in the same way the Holy Spirit proceeds from himself, thus also it proceeds from the Son.<sup>13</sup>

Here perhaps one of you might ask, whether the Holy Spirit also proceeds from the Son. For what else does that insufflation betoken, and that which he said about the woman: *Someone touched me, for I felt power go out from me* (Lk. 8, 46) (for the Holy Spirit is called by the name of power, where it says: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the most High* (Lk. 1, 35)), unless that, indeed, the Holy Spirit proceeds from him?

Gregory. *When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you from the Father* (Jn. 15, 26): if 'to be sent' ought only to be understood as 'to be incarnated', without doubt the Holy Spirit in no way would be said to be sent, who was never incarnated. But its sending is itself its procession, by which it proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore, just as the Spirit is said to be sent because it proceeds, so also the Son, not incongruously, is said to be sent, because he was procreated.<sup>14</sup> The coeternal Holy Spirit proceeding

from the Father and the Son is feebly grasped by our weak minds, but after this life we will see clearly how the Son comes forth equal to the Father who begot him, and how the Spirit of both proceeds coeternal to each; how by this fact that the Son comes forth, he is not subsequent to him from whom he comes forth; how the Spirit, which is produced by procession, is not preceded by those producing it.<sup>15</sup>

Isidore the Bishop. The Holy Spirit is the Father's and the Son's, because the Father has nothing that the Son does not have.<sup>16</sup>

Prosper the Bishop. Also we ought to instruct the faithful: about the Father, how he alone is taken as unbegotten; about the Son, how he is begotten from him; about the Holy Spirit, how, proceeding from the Father and the Son, it is not able to be called unbegotten or begotten.<sup>17</sup>

Boethius. Thus we believe that the Father has a Son begotten from his substance and coeternal to himself in knowledge;<sup>18</sup> who is confessed as Son so far as he is not the same one who the Father is, but is the same as what the Father is; and that the Father was not at any time the Son; and that the Son, in that same nature by which he is coeternal to the Father, at no time became the Father; and that, indeed, the Holy Spirit is not the Father <or the Son><sup>19</sup>, and therefore in that nature neither begotten nor generating, but from the Father also proceeding as well as<sup>20</sup> the Son. What manner of procession this is we are no more able to say than the human mind is able to evaluate the generation of the Son from the paternal substance.<sup>21</sup>

Ferrandus the Deacon. We believe in one God, Father and Son and Holy Spirit; the Father begotten by no one; the Son only-begotten from the Father; the Holy Spirit ever-proceeding from the unbegotten Father and the only-begotten Son; thus so that in this blessed Trinity, which we have called one God, the Father is not the Son or the Spirit, the Son is never the Father or the Holy Spirit, the Holy

Spirit never at any time is the Father or the Son; but the Father is the Father of the Son alone, and the Son is the Son of the Father alone.<sup>22</sup>

The faith of Jerome to Pope Damasus. We believe in one God, the Father almighty, and in our one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and in the Holy Spirit, God; not three gods, but we worship and confess one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Not one God as if solitary and the same, the very one who is the Father, that very one also the Son; but he is the Father, who begot the Son; he is the Son, who is begotten. And the Holy Spirit, not begotten nor unbegotten, not created nor made but proceeding from the Father and the Son, is coeternal and coequal and cooperator with the Father and the Son, since it is written: *By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, that is, by the Son of God, and by the breath (spiritu) of his mouth all their host* (Ps. 33, 6 [Vulg. Ps. 32, 6]). And in another place: *When you send forth your spirit, they are created, and you renew the face of the earth* (Ps. 104, 30 [Vulg. Ps. 103, 30]). And for this reason in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit we confess one God, because God is a name of power, not of propriety. The name proper to the Father is Father, and the name proper to the Son is Son, and the name proper to the Holy Spirit is Holy Spirit. However, we believe there is one God in this Trinity, because what is from the one Father is of one nature and one substance <and one> power with the Father. The Father begot the Son, not by will or necessity, but by nature. In the final age the Son, who never ceased to be with the Father, descended from the Father to save us and to fulfill the Scriptures. He was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born from the virgin Mary;<sup>23</sup> he received flesh, soul, and mind, that is, complete humanity. He did not lose what he was, but he began to be what he was not, in such a way, nevertheless, that he would be complete in his <divinity> and true in our <humanity>. For who was God, born a man, worked as God; and who worked as God, died as a man; and who died as a man, rose again as God. Who, having defeated the power of death, also rose with that flesh with which he had been born and suffered and died. He ascended to the Father and sits at his right hand in the

glory which he always had and has. In whose death and blood we believe we are cleansed and, resurrected by him on the last day in this flesh in which we now live and now possess, will receive from him either eternal life as a reward of good service or the penalty for our sins of eternal suffering. Read these words, remember them; subject your mind to this faith: from Christ the Lord you will receive both life and reward.<sup>24</sup>

But the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son communally: we confess that just as it belongs to the Father alone to generate, and to the Son alone to be born, also it belongs to the Holy Spirit alone to proceed from both. We believe in the Holy Spirit.<sup>25</sup> We call the Holy Spirit God; nevertheless, we do not say the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are three gods, but one God, because there is one eternity, one majesty, one power. The Father is not the Son, but the Father. The Son is not the Father, but the Son of the Father. The Holy Spirit is not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son. There are three persons, but there is one God.

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.<sup>26</sup> The Holy Spirit is God, not less in respect to the Father and the Son, but there is one majesty, one power, an inseparable Trinity, indivisible<sup>27</sup> sanctity. At the same time God is Father, God is Son, God is Holy Spirit; not three gods, but the Trinity is one God.<sup>28</sup> Just as the Spirit proceeds from the Father, so it proceeds from the Son. It is finished. The work ends. Amen.

### Notes to Text 3

1. “*De Patre Filioque procedit*”; = *Symb. N.-C.* with the filioque.
2. FVLG. RVSP., *Epist.* 14 21 (p. 411, 836/840).
3. Cfr FVLG. RVSP., *Epist.* 14 28 (p. 420, 1162/1174).
4. What follows is not in the same letter to Ferrandus, but in Fulgentius’ letter to Peter, *De fide*, which means that the composer of Text 3 did not know Fulgentius’ works directly, but was dependent on some intermediary source, perhaps an anthology of Fulgentius (see, for example, *Cat*, 134) or a florilegium of patristic authors.
5. Cfr FVLG. RVSP., *Fid.* 4 (p. 714, 99/102).
6. FVLG. RVSP., *Fid.* 6 (p. 715-716, 139/143).
7. Cfr FVLG. RVSP., *Fid.* 7 (p. 716, 150/159).
- 7a. The ms omits by homoeoteleuton; I emended with Fulgentius.
8. Cfr FVLG. RVSP., *Fid.* 54 (p. 746-747, 1054/1068).
9. Cfr PS.-AVG., *Quaes.* 65 quaest. 2 (col. 734-735).
10. Cfr CASSIOD., *In Psalm.* Ps. 50, 14 (p. 463-464, 447/455 –CC SL 97), perhaps according to THEODULF., *Spir. sanct.* (col. 274C, 34/43); Text 3 is the same as Cassiodorus except for three places where Text 3 transposes the word order of Cassiodorus. Text 3 is even closer to Theodulf, because it only differs from Theodulf in having one of these three transpositions; however, there is a possibility that the manuscript in which Text 3 is preserved (St. Gallen, SB 125) was written before Theodulf wrote *Spir. sanct.*
11. The ms has “he alone is because (*quia* rather than *qui*) he is not from another.” I emended with Alcuin, but Hincmar of Reims, repeating Alcuin (*De una et non trina deitate* XVI; PL 125, 584D), does have *quia*.
12. Cfr ALCVIN., *Fid.* I, 11 (col. 19D, 55/57-20A, 1/12).
13. ALCVIN., *Fid.* I, 14 (col. 22B, 18/30).
14. Cfr GREG. M., *In euang.* 40 Homilia 26, 2 (col. 1198C).
15. Cfr TAI0, *Sent.* I, 6 (col. 737, 36/38; col. 738, 40/45); Taio is dependent on Gregory, *Moral.* V, xxxvi, 65 and XXX, IV, 17 (p. 264, 2/4 -vol. 143) and p. 1503-1504, 38/40 –vol. 143B), but Text 3 is closer to Taio than to Gregory.

16. Cfr ISID., *Sent.* I, xv, 2 (col. 568, 29/31) perhaps according to THEODULF., *Spir. sanct.* (col. 272B, 19/21); there is a possibility that the manuscript in which Text 3 is preserved (St. Gallen, SB 125) was written before Theodulf wrote *Spir. sanct.*
17. Cfr IULIAN. POM., *Vit. cont.* I, 18 (col. 432D-433A). It is Ps.-Prosper; see *CPL*, 998.
18. Our ms has “et sibi notitione coaeternum”; the edition of Boethius has: “et sibi nota ratione coaeternum,” which the editors translate: “coeternal with himself after a manner only he alone knoweth.”
19. It would seem from what follows that it is necessary to add these words. These words (*neque filium*) are present in the edition of Boethius.
20. Our ms has *uel*, not *et* or *ac*; the editors of Boethius point out that “by the sixth century *uel* had lost its strict separative force.” In fact, with *quoque* (also) in the sentence, *uel* is almost required. Since many places in Text 3 are very clear on the filioque doctrine, one cannot say that the composer of Text 3 was ambivalent about it.
21. Cfr BOETH., *Fid. cath.* (p. 52-54, 14/28).
22. Cfr FERRAND., *Epist.* Ep. 5, par. 2 (col. 911B).
23. Cfr *Symb. Ap.*
24. PS.-HIER., *Fid. cath.* (p. 271-272, 1/39); the editor of Ps.-Jerome omits the phrase ‘et filio’ where Text 3 says: ‘not created nor made, but proceeding from the Father and the Son.’ Three codd. used by the editor, nevertheless. In one of these (Karlsruhe, BLB, Aug. XVIII, s. IX) there are dots over the words ‘et filio’ as if they should be omitted. This shows the sensitivity of Carolingian compilers about the filioque (see my commentary to Text 3).
25. Cfr *Symb. Ap.* (“I believe in the Holy Spirit”); *Symb. N.*; *Symb. N.-C.* (“And in the Holy Spirit”).
26. *Symb. Ap.*
27. The ms has *inuisibilis* (invisible), but the source has *indiuisibilis* (indivisible), which makes far more sense.
28. Cfr QVODVLTDEVS, *Sermo 3, De symbol*, iii – ed. R Braun (*CC SL*, 60), p. 358-363, Turnhout, 1976. Also cfr *Symb. Athan.* (p. 5, sent. 15-16).

### Commentary on Text 3

Text 3 is known in one manuscript, St. Gall, SB 125, s. VIII/IX (Scherrer, *Verzeichniss*, p. 45), 276 p.; 242 x 156 mm.; Langobard script, many hands. Thus it is fairly small and light (= about 138 f., 9 ½" x 6 1/8"). Interestingly, Text 3 is entirely a separate heft, in a different hand than what precedes, at the end of the ms. I say interestingly, because Text 3 almost seems like a dossier on the filioque, as if something one would compile to gather as many authorities as possible on the subject against an opposing claim. (Did the Carolingians work from dossiers to compose books or letters to the Pope or the east on controversial subjects? How did Theodulf compose the *Libri Carolini*?) In any case, whoever compiled the ms saw Text 3 as useful clerical instruction, whether the compiler knew some previously composed dossier on the filioque, or compiled Text 3 himself. I have categorized the ms as "perhaps a clerical instruction reader" on the basis of the contents of the entire ms. The first half of the ms is taken up with Ps.-Jerome, *Expositio quattuor Euangeliorum*; the second half consists of patristic sermons and sentences, expositions on the Lord's Prayer, the mass, and the clerical grades, and excerpts from Isidore and Augustine. Following Text 3 (it ends in the middle of p. 273 and the last half of the page is blank), in a slightly different hand it seems to me, p. 274–75 contain two form letters, one to a prelate, the other to a king or a duke. The final page, p. 276, is blank. Thus, Text 3 is embedded in a study/instructional manual for a cleric, providing him with everything from interpretation of the Gospels, to explanations of his office, to how to write to a prelate for a request.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The form letter to a prelate might be to an abbot. It addresses a "dearly beloved Father in Christ" and the writer says that in the past year, "with these who are with me, joined by divine love, we have sung 30 Psalters for your prosperity." He requests clothes and shoes, because of the frigid place in which they are. (I haven't polished my transcription, but the Latin is more or less as follows: "Domino dilectissimo patrique in

Turning to the contents of Text 3 itself, this Text affords us an opportunity to talk about the teaching of the filioque generally across the Carolingian realm. Did the filioque controversy ever reach the grass roots level of society? First of all, it is clear from the Carolingian creed commentaries that the local clergy were being taught the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit simultaneously, from eternity, and perpetually, from the Father and the Son. But to the extent that the clergy had this understanding of the relationship of the three persons of the Trinity, did they also know it was a debated doctrine? Secondly, it is clear that the doctrine of the filioque is not a *sine qua non* in our Texts. Some of our Texts say nothing, and in others there is some evidence that in the kind of mss intended for the instruction of local priests the doctrine was a sensitive one. (This evidence consists, for example, of ‘filioque’ being deleted by a corrector, or a Text adding ‘filioque’ where the source the composer is using does not have it, or some mss of a Text having ‘filioque’ while others do not.) I think it is important that we lay out the evidence, because it might enable us to say more about the depth of reflection, at the popular level, on the doctrine of the Trinity beyond the idea of 3 yet 1, 1 yet 3 (with analogies such as a flame with its light and

---

Christo amaritissimo nempe optat seruulus uester in Domino saluatore sempiternam salute. Cur auram erga nos, pater dilectissime, cunctis uigilat horis uixnamque biniternique dies pertranseunt quod in uestris orationibus non sim libentissimo animo praeoccupatus quia uos estis spes mea, consolation mea in isto namque iam peracto anno cum illis qui mihi diuina caritate sunt coniuncti xxx psalteria pro uesta sospitate cantauimus quamuis minus sit quam debuerim sed tamen sicut iam prefatus sum cunctis diebus uitem esse quibus in hoc corpora uideor manere in uestris orationibus semper manere cupio, quia sicut uos optime scitis in locis?? Ubi me manere sis sunt frigidissima loca, ideo si poteritis humiliter atque simpliciter rogo mihi in omnibus adiuuetis quia et inde uobis ut credo non minima mercies apud deum succrescit. Multum namque de uestimentis atque calciamentis modo indigeo si mihi inde adiuuetis, deus omnipotens uobis in eterna beatitudine retribuat.” This does not mean St Gall 125 was intended for a monk, necessarily, although it could have been for a monk-priest in a monastic school, being trained to serve like a parish priest in the surrounding area. Or, the form letter could just teach how you address a prelate, that is, the words, titles, praises, and phrases of humility one is expected to use.

The second form letter begins: (Title: “R(?)ECLAMAT AD REGEM VEL AD DUCEM”). “Ad conspectum magni et gloriosissimi pussimique domni illi regis uel ducis festinanter magnam compulsi necessitate peruenimus implorantes humiliter gloriosam atque misericordem pietatem ...ad manentem in loco illo...

heat), to considering the inter-relationship between the 3 persons of the Trinity. Sermons on the Trinity today in local parishes may focus on the relational aspect of God, and the Trinity may be “preached” as a model for a renewed society that is interdependent (I am thinking of the talk by Nicholas Lash at the Divinity School some years back, and Fr. Dan’s and Fr. Steve’s sermons last Trinity Sunday.)

The Trinity as an architectural model for St. Riquier has been shown by Susan Rabe.<sup>2</sup> On the first page of her introduction, Rabe quotes Abbot Angilbert’s own words on why he wished to build Saint-Riquier the way that he did:

“So that, therefore, *all the people of the faithful* (my emphasis) should confess, venerate, worship with the heart and firmly believe in the most holy and undivided Trinity, we, with God cooperating and my aforementioned august lord helping, have been zealous to found in this holy place three principal churches with the members belonging to them, according to the program of that faith in the name of almighty God” (*De perfectione Centulensis ecclesiae* libellus I; *MGH SS* 15, p. 174; her translation, p. xiii; she gives the Latin on p. 157).

Rabe adds that Angilbert went on to say that ‘the program of that faith’ would be expressed not only in the architecture and art, but in the liturgical activities. There were not only “three churches in a triangular cloister, but three main altars covered by three liturgical canopies; three times ten priests said three times ten masses daily at the three times ten altars of the complex. Three hundred monks divided into three choirs sang antiphonally the office and prayers for the salvation and prosperous reign of Charlemagne. Even the many relics in the churches were arranged under the altars three by three” (Rabe, p. 81). According to Rabe, Angilbert acquired his understanding of the Trinity from Augustine’s *De doctrina Christiana* and the *De Trinitate*. The Trinity is a *signum* of God, revealed in creation. Rabe argues that Angilbert’s vision was cultural, uniting “politics, aesthetics and theology” (p. xiii), that Angilbert got from Augustine the idea that “recognition or intuition of the Trinity from the partial clues in the world stimulated love for the Trinity *and the ability to become like the Trinity through holy actions* (my emphasis). Here we can see the correlation

---

<sup>2</sup> Susan Rabe, *Faith, Art, and Politics at Saint-Riquier: The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert (Middle Ages Series)* (Philadelphia, PA: U. of Penn Press, 1995).

between the individual and society so important to Charlemagne's program of reform: the holy actions of an individual, springing from a pristine faith in the Trinity (particularly as mediated through Christ), contributed to the regeneration of a holy society. Thus a Trinitarian *signum* at Saint-Riquier in which threes were visible everywhere, and in which specific Christological doctrines were also made concrete, would bring about this belief, love, action" (Rabe, p. xvii). This is why knowledge of the Trinity is tied to the Carolingian Reform.

Rabe points out that Angilbert was intimately involved in the negotiations between the court and Rome on theological issues. It was Angilbert whom Charlemagne commissioned to carry the *Libri Carolini* to Hadrian in 792. It was around 790 that Angilbert started rebuilding St.-Riquier as a symbol of the Trinity "at Charlemagne's behest in order to put into concrete terms and to develop (and assert) the Carolingian position more fully," referring to the Carolingian position expressed in the *Libri Carolini* regarding images and the filioque (p. 75). If Angilbert rebuilt his monastery influenced by, and wishing to confirm, a particular court position on images and the Trinity, why could not architects of the page, that is, ms compilers, rebuild, that is, edit their texts to make a statement for or against the court position on images or the filioque? It seems to me that Angilbert offers support for my hypothesis that Text 1 and Text 6 were composed or edited at the time when images went out of favor (in the 790s), substituting mental images created by words for an illustration.

Rabe actually acknowledges (p. 89) that in Angilbert's creation of "a Trinitarian iconographical program" at St.-Riquier, "he disagreed with Theodulf's [the author of the *Libri Carolini*] overall formulation, and given his contact with [Pope] Hadrian on precisely this issue, it may well be that his own program was stimulated by the papal response to the *reprehensia*. What is clear is that he was not following the official position as expressed in the *Libri*, but was creating instead an alternative spirituality" (p. 89). Earlier (p. 50) Rabe said that the "overall formulation" of the *Libri* was that it "explicitly and unqualifiedly rejected physical

images as revealing spiritual truths” but that “Angilbert created an architectural and artistic structure which quite squarely expressed the theological positions that Charlemagne was so anxious to promote.” Again, I ask, were creed commentaries with mental illustrations recalling biblical scenes (Text 1) an alternative spirituality to gazing at a picture?

This relates to my question in the Introduction of the possible relationship between creed commentaries and Carolingian art and architecture. Does Rabe talk about the perception of St. Riquier by any but the architect? Would a visitor entering the monastery’s walls have looked around and reflected on the nature of the Trinity? He or she would have noticed the three prominent churches, and if he/she participated in liturgical activities, would have experienced their inter-connectedness and Angilbert’s intentional symbolism of 3 everywhere? Perhaps none of this would have sunk in, or been impressive, or instructive, if he/she had not been taught at some point about the filioque. Did the creed commentaries circulating in 100s of clerical instruction readers and monastic schoolbooks give Angilbert the confidence that his program could be read? Rabe does not talk about the impact of Saint-Riquier on “all the people of the faithful.” Do we have any accounts of people who visited it?

Angilbert’s Augustinian Trinitarianism intimately connects knowledge of the Trinity to love of the Trinity to loving imitation of the Trinity. I had not considered the doctrine of the filioque in terms of its beauty. But I admit, it is, indeed, a beautiful doctrine, giving us a triangular image of the relationship between the three persons rather than a linear image (the East said the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son). I had initially wondered if three churches at the three angles of a triangular cloister could teach the filioque, but I see now that Angilbert could have arranged the churches one behind the other. But the triangle *is* the filioque, because to imagine the Holy Spirit proceeding simultaneously and equally from both the Father and the Son you have to think of a triangular arrangement with the Father and the Son linked by Sonship, but the Holy Spirit linking all three by drawing a line from the Father to the Holy

Spirit and the Son to the Holy Spirit. If you lined up the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in a straight line: Fr-----  
----Son-----HS, the interconnectedness and intimacy of all three is somewhat lost. (Compare a social  
model.) Or: Fr-----HS-----Son, this would make the Sonship link unnecessary, because the Fr and Son  
could be linked simply by their common love for the HS. The doctrine of the filioque, both by insisting on  
Sonship (or Paternity) and double procession, keeps each person distinct, but necessarily related to the  
other two.

A triangular image suggests the interdependence of the Trinity, like Rublev's famous icon of the  
Trinity. It recalls the Father's prodigality, "Everything I have is yours" (Lk. 15, 31). So, it seems some  
Carolingian artists tried to capture this aesthetic of the mind in aesthetics of the eye.

Rabe says that St. Riquier reflected the doctrine of the Trinity in its liturgy as well as its architecture.  
She points out that of its three churches, the Mary chapel was where the monks sang the offices for all the  
Marian feasts and Holy Thursday, but also the office and even the mass itself of Pentecost was celebrated  
there. Apparently this was the only day that mass took place in the Mary chapel. The Mary chapel was  
apparently appropriate for the celebration of Pentecost because historically Mary was at Pentecost with the  
disciples, and the "architectural arrangement was particularly evocative of Pentecost, since the central altar  
of Mary was surrounded by those of the disciples" (p. 127). Did Angilbert intentionally plan the  
arrangement of the altars so that the chapel would recall Pentecost? Rabe seems to indicate he did:  
"Angilbert created an iconography akin to that which we have seen in the church of the Holy Savior: the  
liturgical space itself expressed the biblical event" (p. 127). Rabe connects Angilbert's architectural  
arrangement in the Mary chapel with the Carolingian concern about the filioque. She appeals to an  
illustration of Pentecost in the Drogo Sacramentary, in which all three persons of the Trinity are depicted. I  
am convinced that the illustrator was depicting the filioque: the dove (HS) is in the upper left corner sending

down his rays on the disciples; opposite the dove, in a cloud to the right, a waist-up Christ is in a cloud with his cross victory staff and crossed nimbus reaching out his hand and touching a divine hand that is being the dove, as if Father and Son together are sending the dove. Rabe acknowledges the Trinity, but doesn't go so far as to say it's the filioque, because she doesn't see the hand behind the dove as the divine hand. Farther to the right of Christ there is another divine hand coming down with an unrolled scroll in its hand.

In the Drogo Sacramentary there is, in fact, a depiction of the filioque. It is in Rabe's book that there is a picture of the Drogo Sacramentary where it depicts the filioque in a Pentecost scene. On p. 128 Rabe DOES NOT QUITE recognize that the scene is depicting the filioque. She says Christ's hand holding the dove is "a clear reference to the integral relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit. The hand of the Father emerged from the heavens holding the unrolled scroll of the Law." So, she doesn't see what is behind the dove as a hand, but it looks like one to me. Also, Jesus' hand is not really holding the dove, it seems, but holding the divine hand, in front of which is the dove. It is true, there is another hand to the right holding a scroll, but either this is a repeat of the Father's hand, or someone else's. I think this because of other pictures of the Pentecost scene with clearly the divine hand sending the rays of the Holy Spirit (for ex., the picture next to the Drogo Sac. Picture). In other art work, when the divine hand is shown (over the king, etc.) it is never holding a scroll?? I must see what W. Braunfels says about the Drogo picture in *Die Welt der Karolinger und ihre Kunst*, Munich, 1968, plate 261 is where Rabe got her picture. Also check Roger Reynold's article on the Drogo Sac. From Jean-Pierre Caillet, *L'Art Carolingien*, Paris, 2005, I Xeroxed quite a few pictures of the divine hand, and plate 93 looks just like Drogo. In none of them the divine hand is holding a scroll.

If Angilbert had learned to associate Pentecost with a testimony of the filioque, he may have thought that simply depicting architecturally Pentecost by the arrangement of the altars might have taught the filioque doctrine, or at least reminded people of it who had been taught the filioque doctrine with

Pentecost as proof of it. That is where creed commentaries might come in, if we find in them teaching of the filioque with Pentecost as proof. The filioque is not, in fact, about the sending of the Holy Spirit in the external/economic Trinity, but about the internal constant relation of the 3 persons; but Pentecost could be used to illustrate that internal relationship, since how would you illustrate it, unless you used some corporeal figures, whether Rublev's 3 angels or a hand, dove, and incarnate Christ. So, what do our 43 creed commentaries say about the filioque (if they say anything at all)? I have presented a survey below, but in order to avoid digressing and stick with my question about the influence of the creed commentaries on art and architecture, and whether St-Riquier's is an example, the short answer is that none of the 18 out of 43 of our Texts that mention the filioque give any Scriptural defense of the doctrine. We would have to look at more creed commentaries than our 43 before saying this lack of Scriptural support is significant.

One question Rabe could not ask in her book was the impact on Saint-Riquier on the people. Yet she does say, p. 130, that "Angilbert's order for Rogations continued the three-day tradition in an elaborate ritual that involved not only the monks and local populace of Centula, but participants from seven neighboring towns...on the first day they all convened in the atrium of the basilica...the lay participants followed in the same ordering by sevens: the lay *scholae* with seven red standards, the noble men, the noble women, the seven crosses from nearby towns, and boys and girls who chanted the Lord's Prayer. Then came men and women from honorable local families, and finally the *mixtus populus* of the old and infirm...on this day they processed around the monastery chanting specified prayers. While the monks sang Psalms, all the others sang the three Creeds (Apostles', Constantinopolitan, Athanasian), the Lord's Prayer, and the general litany" (p. 130). Rabe says "there were two striking innovations in this Rogations liturgy. First was the singing of the three Creeds by all of the laity" (p. 130). Rabe says all other recorded rogations liturgies prescribe only the chanting of the Constantinopolitan, and not the other two Creeds, and not the Lord's Prayer, but that these four (the three Creeds and the Lord's Prayer) echoed Charlemagne's

capitularies that the laity be able to recite them all by heart (she references MGH Capitularia I, p. 103, no. 30 and p. 110, nos. 9 and 13). So, we seem to have evidence that the local population of all walks of life did see the architectural design of St. Riquier and observed all the attention to the number three (beginning with the 3-day Rogations as opposed to the Roman one-day), but even more, that the people chanted all three creeds. Recall that the Constantinopolitan (the Frankish version) and the Athanasian Creeds both have the filioque doctrine. Whether or not they noticed they were processing in a triangle as they went from one church to the next in the monastery, and that this symbolized the triangular relationship (rather than linear) of the three persons of the holy Trinity, the model which is necessary in order to imagine the filioque mentally, it is at least possible, given that they were actually chanting the doctrine as they processed. Granted, I do not know how realistic it is to think the entire local population knew all three Creeds by heart, or understood their Latin words, but presumably when they originally were taught these Creeds, the words were explained to them in Old High German.

The two literary sources for the appearance and the liturgy of Angilbert's St. Riquier are: 1) the *Libellus*, also called *De perfectione Centulensis ecclesiae*, traditionally written by Angilbert himself (extant only in Vat. Reg. lat. 235, s. XII); and 2) the *Institutio* (a series of liturgical directions for what the monks were to do). My question is: does Angilbert himself or these sources authors, say, in so many words, that this or that architectural design or liturgy symbolizes the filioque doctrine? For example, the number 7 is highly important in the Rogations liturgy. Angilbert says: "And we determined for this purpose to walk seven at a time, so that in our work we reveal thanks for the septiform grace of the Holy Spirit" (p. 131). So 7 symbolizes the Holy Spirit. Now, in the *Libri Carolini* a passage says: "in these 7 eyes the Spirit of septiform grace who proceeds from the Father and the Son (ex Patre filioque) is clearly revealed" (p. 131), but Angilbert doesn't say this about the septiform Spirit. The most we can say is that perhaps Angilbert assumed that Pentecost, depicted architecturally in the Mary Chapel, taught the filioque, since Pentecost was the

sending of the Holy Spirit, and both the Son and the Father sent the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. I read the *Libellus* in its entirety and Angilbert says nothing about the symbolism of the architecture or the liturgy except that “the three principal churches” are founded in honor of “the most holy and inseparable Trinity” because “all the people of faith ought to confess, venerate, worship in mind, and firmly believe” this Trinity. “Worship in mind” (“mente colere”) might be a caution against image-worship. The rest of the *Libellus* is a description of all the altars in the 3 churches and the relics they hold.

I have also gone through the whole of the *Institutio*, (*Institutio sancti angilberti abbatis de diuersitate officiorum* in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, 1, ed. K. Hallinger, Siegburg, 1963, p. 291-303) and found no symbolic explanation for the way the liturgies are directed to be carried out, except 1) in the *Prefatio*: “Quapropter ob uenerationem sanctae trinitatis centum pueros in hoc sancto loco in scolam congregare studuimus” (p. 291),but it does not say why 100 signifies the Trinity (these are boys for the scola, not the 300 monks for the monastery; and 2) under *De rogationibus*: “Et ideo eos septenos ambulare decernimus, ut in nostro opera gratiam septiformem sancti spiritus demonstremus” (p. 297).

In sum, the kind of thing we are looking for, the influence of creed commentaries on actual artists and architects in the Carolingian realm, was possibly manifest at St. Riquier. Angilbert’s intent was that the architectural and liturgical program teach all the faithful the Trinity. The opening of his (so-thought) *Libellus* states: “So that, therefore, all the people of the faithful should confess, venerate, worship with the heart and firmly believe in the most holy and undivided Trinity, we, with God cooperating and my aforementioned august lord helping, have been zealous to found in this holy place three principal churches with the members belonging to them, according to the program of that faith in the name of almighty God” (Rabe, p. xiii). Does Angilbert go any further? Does he want to teach simply that God is a Trinity, or does he also want to teach the doctrine of the filioque? As I argued above, the triangular arrangement of the three churches in and of itself teaches the filioque. Also, indirectly the

filioque doctrine, if not taught, is at least recalled by the Mary chapel, with its altar arrangement recalling Pentecost, the coming of the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father and the Son, since the Son said “I will send the Paraclete” and also said “The Spirit proceeds from the Father.” But Angilbert himself, in the *Libellus*, makes no reference to the filioque. He could have: we saw that this was done in the *Libri Carolini*. Also we saw that the *Drogo Sacramentary* illustrated the filioque doctrine in its illustration of Pentecost.

One thing that cannot be denied is the overwhelming concern to teach the doctrine of the Trinity (with or without the filioque; see survey below) in Carolingian creed commentaries (beyond the 43 of this study), and the overwhelming message of St. Riquier that God must be known as three. As Rabe says (p. 133-134): “The three’s in Angilbert’s complex were everywhere. Three churches stood in a triangular cloister. Three main altars designated by three stone canopies were the sites of the main liturgies. The atrium contained three portals with three chapels and the three altars of the three archangels. Worshipers entered the basilica through three doors. There were three aisles in the basilica and three lecterns. Three towers surmounted the basilica at the west end, and three at the east. Three-tiered lanterns capped the towers. Three modules of thirty by thirty-seven feet made up the nave, and three of thirty by thirty feet made up the eastern transept. One module of thirty by thirty feet made up the crypt. There were thirty altars in the complex. Three altars in the chapel of St. Benedict each contained the relics of three saints. In the Mary Chapel, the central altar contained the relics of three times three saints, and the Apostle altars each held the relics of three saints. Three hundred monks in three choirs chanted the offices with three choirs of thirty-three boys. Thirty priests sang thirty masses at the thirty altars daily. Three crosses were adored on Good Friday. Three crosses were followed with three holy water vases and three thuribles during the three-day processions in times of trouble. The three Creeds were sung at Rogations.”

One cannot help but be impressed at Angilbert's imagination and his didactic intent. And yet I still wonder if "all the people of the faithful" could have appreciated Angilbert's program unless they had first been taught the triune faith in the creed.

Were other doctrines taught architecturally at St. Riquier's? The title of the Mary Chapel was "Sancta Maria Dei Genetrix et Apostoli". Rabe says (p. 136) that to entitle the church "Dei Genetrix" was to confirm orthodox Christology against the Spanish Adoptionists. "Dei Genetrix" was her true title and not by appellation only, just as God was Jesus true title and not by appellation only. The doctrine of Mary as *nuncupativa genetrix* was to be rejected as Nestorian, just as the doctrine of Jesus as *Deus nuncupativus* must be (p. 42).

Rabe says (p. 126) "The Mary church was the liturgical setting of other feasts. As we have seen, anti-Adoptionist arguments, and especially those of Paulinus of Aquileia, placed a new importance on Mary in the development of their christological argument. She was the Mother of God, Theotokos, in the traditional title of the Council of Ephesus, Dei Genetrix in Carolingian parlance...For Angilbert to name his Mary chapel *Sancta Maria Dei Genetrix et Apostoli* was in itself a significant doctrinal statement. He built his church in honor of the true Mother of God and surrounded her altar with those of the apostles who were the witnesses to the Incarnate Word." And on p. 136, "Thus to entitle the church *Dei Genetrix* was to forward the Carolingian Christology."

Rabe points out that there were other examples in the Carolingian realm of architects and liturgists making theological statements with their artistic programs. Would these programs have been read and understood by the people? Again, is there any connection between the

creed commentaries, which trained the people how to perceive God as Trinity and Jesus as God-man, and these artistic programs? Rabe takes as a comparison to St. Riquier the monastery of Aniane in Septimania. Benedict began to build it probably in 782, and it was during its construction that “the perverse dogma of Felix invaded Septimania” and Benedict “took up the fight against it at Charlemagne’s instigation” (Rabe, p. 139 and quoting Heil, “Adoptionismus”). This was a physical campaign, although he also wrote two anti-Adoptionist treatises, probably in the late 790s, the *Opuscula* and the *Disputatio aduersus Felicianum impietatem*. In short, we know he was heavily involved in the Adoptionist controversy while building the monastery. Benedict did have a Trinitarian symbolic altar arrangement of three altars under the one high altar. He also promoted the symbolism of seven, and he rededicated a prior chapel to the Mother of God. Yet, the people’s involvement was not essential in planning the architecture and liturgy, as it was at St. Riquier. Rabe sees St. Riquier as unique in its efforts to involve the lay, whereas Benedict of Aniane’s reforms under Louis the Pious greatly reduced the amount of interaction between the laity and the monasteries (p. 143-144).

The importance of all this is whether Angilbert thought his project would transform society: that, following Augustine, if people could think of God in terms of Trinity, they would love God and want to be like God (Rabe, p. xvii).

Another point about Text 3: Every place that Scripture is quoted, it is introduced in the present tense (The Son says:, Isaiah says:, John says:, Hear Christ teaching:, the Savior says to his disciples:, Jesus says about the woman:, Scripture says:). Perhaps the compiler of the florilegium was only keeping with what his source does, but it is consistent, and it has an effect on the hearer. I should imagine that modern

textual-critical readers would be very happy: using the present case refers the reader to the text, not to the historical time. For example, to say: “Jesus said to his disciples” tells an historical event: we don’t think of the place in Scripture where this is written, but the seashore where it took place. But to say: Jesus says to his disciples assumes a phrase such as “in the gospel of Matthew”: we think first of the Bible, the report of the story, not the historical event. Now, I do not think the Carolingian compiler of Text 3 was necessarily worried about distinguishing the past from the present verb for textual-critical reasons. Another thing the present case does is to make the Bible the living word, still speaking to its readers and hearers in the Carolingian countryside.