

<Text 7>

(*Cat*, 46)

<A Florilegium on the Apostles' Creed><sup>1</sup>

I BELIEVE IN GOD.<sup>2</sup> First of all, most dearly beloved, attend to what mode of expression this is at the head of the creed, and consider very carefully with what sort of beginning it commences.<sup>3</sup> In the first place, then, it has I BELIEVE. See that it does not order us to discuss, but to believe, the divine sentences, nor to seek their reason, but simply to exhibit faith.<sup>4</sup> For to have knowledge of the Son of God and accept the declaration of his divine generation, which the human mind by a rational investigation is not able fully to comprehend, nevertheless the fullness of faith embraces. For even if it is not permitted to me to know how God the Son is born from God the Father, nevertheless it is not permitted to me not to know that he is born: I

---

<sup>1</sup> The footnotes indicate the source from the previous footnote up to the present footnote, inclusive. (Sometimes the Text has added a word or two linking the sources.) Only in two places of any substantial length I have not identified the source. These two places are indicated in the footnotes.

<sup>2</sup> *Symb. Ap.* Although incomplete, Text 7 appears to be an exposition on the *Symb. Ap.*, according to the credal phrases given, through 'natus ex Maria uirgine'.

<sup>3</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 35/37).

<sup>4</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 37/40); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225B). The composer of Text 7 quotes from Ps.-Augustine, *Serm.* 242, seven times; the passages can also be found in Hrabanus, *Disc.* II, 56, except for the first one (on lines 1/3). In Hrabanus the passages are all contiguous or separated by only a few words, which would suggest that the composer of Text 7 depended on Hrabanus for the *Serm.* 242 material, except for the fact that lines 1/3 are not in Hrabanus. Perhaps our composer knew an intermediary text between Hrabanus and Ps.-Augustine.

am ignorant of the succession of the generation, but I acknowledge the source<sup>5</sup> of the generation. We were not present at the time when the Son of God was born from God the Father, but we were present at the time when the Son of God was spoken of by the Father. For God said: *From my womb before the Daystar I bore you* (Ps. 110, 3 [Vul. Ps. 109, 3]). And: *Today I have begotten you* (Ps. 2, 7; Heb. 5, 5). And: *Here is my beloved Son* (Mt. 3, 17; 17, 5). If good men should say this, we would think it wrong not to believe it: God has asserted it; the Son has proved it; the sun, fleeing, states it; the earth, shaking, attests it. If we do not believe God, who do we believe?<sup>6</sup> Here the Prophet says: *Unless you shall have believed, you will not understand* (Is. 7, 9). Therefore, so that an entrance to understanding is opened to you, rightly you first of all say that you believe. Whence also Paul the apostle writing to the Hebrews says: *The one approaching God ought first of all to believe that He exists and that for those believing in Him he becomes a remunerator* (Heb. 11, 6).<sup>7</sup> Then, the blessed apostle Peter responded to the Lord for all, one for many: *We have believed and we have come to know that you are the Christ, the Son of God* (Jn. 6, 69). He did not say first we have come to know, and we have believed, but *we have believed and we have come to know*. For we have believed in order that we might know. For if we wished first to know and then to believe, we would not be able to know or to believe.<sup>8</sup> But to believe God and to fear Him, like demons do, is not a great thing, if one does not also believe in Him; that is, if love of Him is not held in the heart.<sup>9</sup> Whence the Lord in the Gospel says: *This is the work of God, that*

---

<sup>5</sup> *auctoritas*, which can also be translated as decree, authority, etc. 'Source' seems to correspond best with 'sequence' (*seriem*).

<sup>6</sup> Cfr AMBR., *In Luc.* IV, 71 (p. 132-133, 881/893).

<sup>7</sup> Cfr RVFIN., *Symb.* 3 (p. 136, 20/22, 18/20).

<sup>8</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. Ioh.* 27, 9 (p. 274, 5/18).

<sup>9</sup> Cfr BEDA, *Epist. cath.* II, 19 (p. 198, 172/173).

*you believe in Him whom God sent* (Jn. 6, 29): that we believe in Him, not that we believe him. Moreover, not immediately does the one who believes Him believe in Him.<sup>10</sup> For it is one thing to believe Him, another to believe at Him, another to believe in him. To believe Him is to believe that what He says is true; to believe at Him is to believe that He is very God; to believe in Him is to love Him. Many even bad people can believe that what He says is true. For they believe it is true and they do not wish to regard his words, because they are sluggish to do them. Moreover, to believe that He is God, this likewise the demons are able to do. But to believe in God only they know who love God, who not only by name, but also by deeds and life, show that they belong to Christ, because without love it is the faith of a demon. Therefore, who does not wish to believe at Christ still does not imitate demons. But who now believes at Christ, but hates Christ, holds his confession of faith in the fear of punishment, not in love of the crown.<sup>11</sup> As the Apostle says: *For the one believing in Him, who justifies the impious, his faith is reckoned as righteousness* (Rm. 4, 5). What then is it to believe in him? For the one believing to love, for the one believing to treasure, for the one believing to go into him and be incorporated with his members. Faith itself is what God demands of us, and he does not find what he exacts, unless he himself shall have given what he finds. What is faith, unless what the Apostle defined, saying: *Neither circumcision is of any avail, nor foreskin, but faith, which operates through love* (Gal. 5, 6)? Let this be in you, so that you come to the knowledge of God.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> ALCVIN., *loh. euang.* IV, 17 (col. 844D); see also PS.-BEDA, *loh.* 7 (col. 727A); On Alcuin as a source for Ps.-Bede, see *CPPM* II A 2034. Alcuin drew on, but modified, Augustine, *In euang. loh.* 29, 6 (p. 287, 32/35).

<sup>11</sup> Cfr BEDA, *Epist. cath.* II, 19 (p. 198, 174/186).

<sup>12</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. loh.* 29, 6 (p. 287, 38/47).

When you hear GOD, understand, as much as a human mind can, the nature or substance of this one, without beginning, without end, simple, without any mixture, invisible, incorporeal and ineffable, incalculable, in which there is nothing added, nothing created. For this one is without originator, who is the originator of all.<sup>13</sup> God is, to be sure, a holy Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, in all things inseparable, in substance one divinity, and in the substances of the persons a distinguished Trinity;<sup>14</sup> in which nothing in the nature of the divinity must be believed to be less, to be more, to be before, to be after. Nothing serving, nothing subject, nothing circumscribable, nothing temporal, nothing weak, nothing increasing, nothing pertaining to sex or appearance, nothing corporeal is right to think. But God is everlasting without beginning, entirely everywhere without place, ordering all the mutable things of creation without His own mutation, equally discerning the past, present, and future; to whom nothing is past, nothing still in store, but all is present. To whom nothing that is good is displeasing; nothing that is evil is pleasing. By whom nothing is created evil by nature; who is good without quality, great without quantity.<sup>15</sup>

When you think about God, what this one is, let perish from your mind every human figure, let be expelled from your thoughts whatever is limited by a corporeal boundary, even with whatever great size it is spread out. Disperse from your mind any such figment, lest in your mind you fabricate idols. In that Trinity do not think of a human form, the outlines of human limbs, the shape of human flesh, the visible senses, the stature and movements of a body, the function of a tongue, except as these pertain to *the form of a servant* (Phil. 2, 7), which the only-begotten Son of

---

<sup>13</sup> Cfr RvFIN., *Symb.* 4 (p. 137-138, 9/16).

<sup>14</sup> The edition of Ps.-Isidore has subsistencies for substances (although see its apparatus criticus). The word for 'distinguished' is 'inconiuncta', a technical ecclesiastical term according to Diaz y Diaz (see his note 2, p. 85 of edition cited below).

<sup>15</sup> Cfr Ps.-ISID., *Ord. creat.* 1, 2 (p. 84-86, 8/21).

God received from the virgin Mary when the *Word became flesh and dwelt among us* (Jn. 1, 14). Think, if you can, of the beauty of wisdom. Consider the beauty of justice. Is it a shape? Is it a size? Is it a color? It has none of these, and yet it exists. For if it did not exist, it would not be loved or deservedly praised; nor, when it is loved and praised, would it be kept in mind and deeds. Now, to be sure, people become wise. From where would they become wise, unless there was wisdom? Moreover, o mortal, if you are not able to see your wisdom with the eyes of your flesh, nor think about it with that imagination by which corporeal things are thought, do you dare to impose the form of a human body on the wisdom of God?<sup>16</sup>

FATHER. Notice, that when the name of Father is joined with God in the confession, it shows that he did not first begin to be God, and afterwards Father. But without any beginning he is always both God and Father. Therefore, because the Father always has been, he has always had a Son of whom he is the Father.<sup>17</sup> He is called Father because he has a Son.<sup>18</sup>

How does it say “one God,” when the Father is God and the Son is God and the Holy Spirit is God? The three are one and the one three, that is, three persons, but one power and one majesty and one deity. How there can be three in one is easily understood. When in corporeal creatures, although they may be far from comparison with God, three are seen to be contained in one, how much more is this possible in the Creator, who created all things? To take an example, the sun has three in itself and is one: first, what the sun is in its nature; second, its light; third, its

---

<sup>16</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. loh.* 40, 4 (p. 351-352, 28/33, 11/17, 33/42).

<sup>17</sup> PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 41/45); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225B).

<sup>18</sup> PS.-ISID., *Lib. de num.* 20 (col. 1302B, 29/30); see also PS.-ALCVIN., *Diu. off.* 41 (col. 1271D, 45/46).

heat. Thus, although by a distant comparison, the sun accords with the Father, its light accords with the Son, and its heat accords with the Holy Spirit.<sup>19</sup>

Another analogy from incorporeal things can be given, that is, from the soul, which is understood to be made in the image and likeness of God. The soul itself, then, is an incorporeal substance, rational, in which is its intellect and its life. What the soul is in substance may be understood, if it is permitted to be said, in the Trinity as the person of the Father; what, moreover, in the soul is its power and knowledge, this in the Trinity may be understood as the Son, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God (cfr I Cor. 1, 24). And what in the soul is the property of giving life, this in the Trinity may be understood as the Holy Spirit, through whom the work of giving life is declared to be accomplished in many places, as in the Gospel: “It is the Spirit who gives life” (Jn. 6, 64). But these persons, which we have said are three, are in no way found individually one after the other, although our mind can perceive these three as distinct. But they are by nature so one, that when one of these comes to mind, at the same time the three always occur. And so, through these analogies, some idea of the truth of so great a thing is opened to us,<sup>20</sup> so that wherever you find one of these three persons, you recognize that the Trinity is there. Because when you name the Father, you know that he has a Son, and when you name the Son, you know that he has a Father. And the Father and the Son are not able to exist without their Spirit, because the Holy Spirit proceeds from both.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Cfr *Apert. symb.* (p. 182, 26/34).

<sup>20</sup> Cfr CASSIOD., *In Psalm. Ps. 50, 14* (p. 464, 468/487 –CC SL 97) perhaps according to THEODVLF., *Spir. sanct.* (col. 275A-B, 7/30)

<sup>21</sup> Cfr *Apert. symb.* (p. 183, 5/8).

There is one omnipotent God, a holy Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, which no creature, no intelligence, grasps. The Father, omnipotent God, takes his origin from no one and is himself the origin of divinity; from whom the Son, omnipotent God, is begotten without time. He is not, for sure, created, because he is God, to whom, in his divinity, everything of the Father's is common, except that he is the Son: in eternity, in will, in power, in wisdom. Thus also to the Father everything of the Son's is common, except that he is the Father. The Holy Spirit is omnipotent God; not begotten, because it is not the Son; nor unbegotten, because it is not the Father; nor created, because it is not a creature; but it has proceeded from the Father and the Son, to whom everything of the Father's and of the Son's is common, except that it is the Holy Spirit. For who the Father is, this one is not the Son or the Holy Spirit in person; nor who the Son is, this one is the Father or the Holy Spirit; nor who the Holy Spirit is, this one is the Father or the Son. But in essence, what the Father is, this one thing also the Son is and the Holy Spirit is; and what the Son is, this the Father is and the Holy Spirit is; and what the Holy Spirit is, this the Father is and the Son is. But there is not a three-fold number of gods in that Trinity: for, saving the separation of the persons, everything of the divinity is common.<sup>22</sup>

It itself is everlasting equality, not from some beginning and following thereafter, but without beginning and without end. For the generation of God does not have a beginning in time, because through the begotten one the times were made.<sup>23</sup> How, indeed, God the Father shall have begotten the Son I do not wish you to discuss and enter more inquisitively into a mystery of such depth, lest perchance when you examine very obstinately the splendor of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Cfr PS.-ISID., *Ord. creat.* 1, 3-4 (p. 86, 24/41).

<sup>23</sup> AVG., *In euang. loh.* 40, 6 (p. 354, 16/18) perhaps according to ALCVIN., *loh. euang.* IV, 21 (col. 867A); PS.-BEDA, *loh.* 8 (col. 747C).

unapproachable light (cfr I Tim. 6, 16), you lose the little bit that is allowed to mortals by divine gift.<sup>24</sup>

Whence the Prophet says: *Who will tell his generation?* (Is. 53, 8). And the Lord in the Gospel says: *No one knows the Son, except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father, except the Son and to whom the Son wishes to reveal him* (Mt. 11, 27).<sup>25</sup>

Therefore, how God is the Father of his only Son our Lord Jesus Christ must not be discussed. For neither is it right for a servant to dispute about the birth of his lord. The Father has witnessed from heaven: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear him* (Mt. 17, 5). The Father calls this one his very Son and says to hear him. The Son says: *Who sees me, sees also the Father* (Jn. 14, 9). And: *I and the Father are one* (Jn. 10, 30). And: *I went out from God and came into the world* (Jn. 16, 27-28). Who is there, who between these voices of the Father and the Son inserts himself in the middle like a debater<sup>26</sup> and divides the deity, separates the love, ruptures the substance, cuts the Spirit, denies to be true what Truth says? Therefore, the Father is true God, just as he is the Father of Truth, not creating the Son outside of himself, but by that which he himself is, generating the Son; that is, as a wise man generates wisdom, as a just man generates justice, as an everlasting one generates an everlasting one, as an immortal one generates an immortal one, as an invisible one generates an invisible one, as a light generates brightness, as a mind generates a word.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Cfr R<sub>V</sub>FIN., *Symb.* 4 (p. 138, 23/26).

<sup>25</sup> Source not identified.

<sup>26</sup> *Discursor*, literally, one who runs to and fro.

<sup>27</sup> Cfr R<sub>V</sub>FIN., *Symb.* 4 (p. 139, 54/69).

ALMIGHTY, CREATOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH. He is almighty, for whom nothing is impossible, who made heaven, the earth, the sea, humankind and all animals, reptiles,<sup>28</sup> every creature great and small, things above, things below, things spiritual and corporeal, that is, visible and invisible, whatever substance is capable of weight, number, and measure,<sup>29</sup> not by some act of labor, but by the command alone of his Word. Therefore, let it not enter our thought how this or that was able to be made, who are ordered to confess that God is almighty.<sup>30</sup> For the Father is almighty, the Son is almighty, the Holy Spirit is almighty; and nevertheless there are not three almighties, but one God and one almighty.<sup>31</sup> He himself both made all things and arranged them in their ranks.<sup>32</sup> Who made the angel in heaven, the same made the worm on earth.<sup>33</sup>

Evil and lying or malice were not created by God, but were invented by the devil and evil men.<sup>34</sup> Why do we suffer many evils from creation, which God made? Because we offend God. Regarding your punishment, accuse your sin, not the judge.<sup>35</sup>

AND IN JESUS CHRIST HIS SON. Notice that just as one must believe in the Father, so one must also believe in the Son.<sup>36</sup> The Father cannot be believed without the Son because, although the propriety of the persons is distinct in these, that is, that the Father is one person, the Son another, nevertheless their majesty is one and indiscriminate. Therefore, just as the Father has

---

<sup>28</sup> PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 46/48); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225B-C).

<sup>29</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. loh.* 1, 13 (p. 8, 35/40).

<sup>30</sup> PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 48/52); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225C).

<sup>31</sup> Cfr *Symb. Athan.* (p. 4-5, sent. 13-16).

<sup>32</sup> AVG., *In euang. loh.* 1, 15 (p. 9, 3).

<sup>33</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. loh.* 1, 13 (p. 7, 18/19).

<sup>34</sup> Cfr *De symb.* (p. 180, 5/6). Although Gennadius is probably the original source, Gennadius does not come as close to Text 7 as *De symb.*; see Gennadius, *Dogm.* 26 (p. 95, 1/2).

<sup>35</sup> AVG., *In euang. loh.* 1, 15 (p. 9, 3/5, 6/7).

<sup>36</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 54/56); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225C).

always been all-powerful, thus the Son is always all-powerful.<sup>37</sup> And because he is equal to the Father in divinity and majesty, we recognize that we owe the giving of honor and service to him as much as to the Father.<sup>38</sup>

Jesus is called Messiah in Hebrew, Sother and Christus in Greek, and Savior or Salvation and Anointed in Latin. But this name Jesus is a proper name, because he was called Jesus by the angel Gabriel before he was conceived, and by the angel it was said why his name should be called Jesus, that is, Savior, because: *He will save his people from their sins* (Mt. 1, 21).<sup>39</sup> Moreover, Christ is called Anointed on account of the anointing with which prophets and priests and kings were anointed in the Old Testament. But this one is anointed by the Holy Spirit, concerning whom the Prophet says: *God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness before your fellows* (Ps. 45, 7 [Vulg. Ps. 44, 8]; Heb. 1, 9). Therefore, ought we to believe in humans, when it is said: *Cursed is the man who puts his hope in a man?* (Jer. 17, 5). It is not permitted to us to believe in a pure man, but because the Lord Jesus Christ is both man and God, it is permitted to us to believe in him, especially when that humanity equated itself to the divinity. From which now it follows:

OUR ONLY LORD. 'Only,' because there are many adopted sons. Whence in the Gospel it says: *As many as believed in him he gave to them power to become sons of God* (Jn. 1, 12). And in the Gospel of Luke we read from it: *Who was of Adam, who was of God* (Lk. 3, 38). And in the Gospel of John the Lord, on the cross, speaking about the disciple, says: *Woman, behold your son* (Jn. 19, 26); and to the disciple: *Behold your mother* (Jn. 19, 27). Therefore, God has many adopted

---

<sup>37</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 241 (col. 2190, 61/65).

<sup>38</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2192, 56/58); see also HRABAN., *Disc.* II, 56 (col. 1225C).

<sup>39</sup> Cfr ISID., *Orig.* VII, II, 6-8.

sons, but one natural son, that is, Christ. Mary also had two sons, Christ naturally and John by adoption.

He is called LORD on account of his divinity and OUR on account of the human nature, which he received, just as he is called the Lord of David according to his divine nature, and sometimes David's son, according to his human nature, because he was born from David's lineage.<sup>40</sup>

Again, we confess our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, fully God and fully man, of a rational soul and body, before the ages indeed born from the Father according to his deity, but in the end of days that same one truly, on account of us and on account of our salvation,<sup>41</sup> born from the virgin Mary according to his humanity. He is consubstantial to the Father according to his divinity, and consubstantial to us according to his humanity; for a union of the two natures took place: on account of which, we confess one Christ, one Son. According to this understanding of an unconfused union we confess that the holy virgin is the mother of God; on account of which, God the Word was incarnated and became human. From his very conception he united to himself a temple, which he received from her.<sup>42</sup> Concerning which union the Lord himself in the Gospel says: *Then what if you were to see the Son of man ascending to where he was before?* (Jn. 6, 63) For the Son of man is Christ, from the virgin Mary. Therefore, this one began to be the Son of man on earth, when he assumed flesh from the earth. Whence prophetically it was said: *Truth has risen from the earth* (Ps. 85, 11 [Vulg. Ps. 84, 12]). What, therefore, did he want for himself that he says: *When you see the Son of man ascending where he was before?* For there

---

<sup>40</sup> Source not identified.

<sup>41</sup> Cfr *Symb. N.*; *Symb. N.-C.*

<sup>42</sup> From 'we confess our Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God' = CYRILL., *Epist. ad Ioh.* 5 (p. 335, 22/31).

would be no question, if he had said: if you should see the Son of God ascending where he was before. But when he said *Son of man ascending where he was before*, was the Son of man in heaven before he began to be on earth? Here, indeed, he said where he was before, as if then when he spoke these words he was not there. Moreover, in another place he says: *No one has ascended into heaven except who descended from heaven, the Son of God, who is in heaven* (Jn. 3, 13). To what does this pertain, unless that we understand Christ to be one person, God and man, not two, lest our faith is not a Trinity, but a quaternity? Therefore, Christ is one: Word, soul, and flesh, one Christ; always the Son of God, in time the Son of man, nevertheless Christ is one according to the oneness of his person. He was in heaven when he spoke on earth. Thus, the Son of man was in heaven just as the Son of God was on earth: Son of God on earth in the assumed flesh, Son of man in heaven in the oneness of his person.<sup>43</sup>

WHO WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT. Not that he must be believed to be the son of the Holy Spirit just as also of Mary, but that, conceived by the power and work of the Holy Spirit, he was born from the virgin.<sup>44</sup> And so it is said 'conceived by the Holy Spirit,' because the Holy Spirit made him to be born from the virgin, seeing as this marvelous work was done entirely by a gift of God, and the Holy Spirit properly is called 'gift of God.'<sup>45</sup> Was the flesh of the one conceived not of the nature of the one conceiving, in order that the conception of the virgin would be a divine work? But not so must that generation be understood, uniquely marvelous and marvelously unique, so that through the newness of the creation the proper character of a birth was removed. For the Holy Spirit provided the virgin's fecundity; however, the truth of a body was taken from a

---

<sup>43</sup> Cfr AVG., *In euang. loh.* 27, 4 (p. 271, 4/30).

<sup>44</sup> Cfr PS.-ISID., *Ord. creat.* 1, 5 (p. 88, 47/49).

<sup>45</sup> Cfr ALCVIN., *Fid.* III, 3 (col. 39D-40A).

body and, *Wisdom building itself a home* (cfr Prov. 9,1; 24, 3), *the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us* (Jn. 1, 14); that is, in that flesh which he assumed from a human and which the spirit of rational life animated.<sup>46</sup> For in order to occasion the coming of the divine majesty it was necessary that divine aid assisted human weakness.<sup>47</sup> She who merited to procreate God would not have been able to conceive from elsewhere than from a gift of God.<sup>48</sup>

BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY. Here the mystery of the assumed body is described, that whom the Father bore before the ages according to divinity, in the last days the virgin Mary, with the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, conceived. Then holy Mary, just as she conceived as a virgin, so gave birth as a virgin, so remained a virgin after the birthing. And that is why the angel of the Lord, Gabriel, said about this mother: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you;*<sup>49</sup> *and what is born from you will be called holy, the Son of God* (Lk. 1, 35).

For it is one thing for humans who have been born to receive the grace of adoption, another from the very conception to have brought forth the one God through divine power. Nor is it possible to equate the glory of the only-begotten possessed by nature to others who have received it by grace. *The Mediator, indeed, of God and humans, is the man Christ Jesus* (I Tim. 2, 5). He is not one <person> in humanity, another in divinity. He was not conceived and brought forth purely as a man, so that afterward through merit he received that he would be God. But, when the angel announced and the Holy Spirit came, thereupon the Word was in the womb, thereupon the

---

<sup>46</sup> LEO M., *Epist. 28* (p. 26, 22 - p. 27, 2).

<sup>47</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm. 241* (col. 2191, 7/9).

<sup>48</sup> cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm. 242* (col. 2192, 63/65); see also HRABAN., *Disc. II, 56* (col. 1225D).

<sup>49</sup> Cfr PS.-AVG., *Serm. 241* (col. 2191, 1/7, 9/10).

Word, with its essence remaining unchanged, which is coeternal to the Word with the Father and the Holy Spirit, took flesh in the virginal womb, where the impassible one was able to suffer, and the immortal one to die, that is, he bore the passion of the cross in the flesh, not in divinity, and the eternal one, existing before the ages, was able to be temporal at the end of the ages; so that, through this ineffable mystery, by the holy conception and the inviolable birth, according to the truth of each nature, that same virgin would be both his handmaid and his mother. And although he himself is one thing from the Father, another thing from the virgin, nevertheless he is not one <person> from the Father and another <person> from the virgin, but the same one is eternal from the Father and temporal from the mother; the same one who made is the very one who is made; the same one who is *fairest among the sons of men* (Ps. 45, 2 [Vulg. Ps. 44, 3]) in his divinity,<sup>50</sup> this same one is he concerning whom it was said: *We saw him, and he had no form or comeliness or beauty* (Is. 53, 2) in his humanity. The same one who is from the Father before the ages, without a mother, this same one in the end of the ages is from a mother without a father, remaining one from both and in both natures, nor confused by the joining of the natures, nor doubled by the distinction of the natures.<sup>51</sup>

Many heretics have not understood how the divinity of Christ should be commended. And therefore some think the Lord Jesus Christ is either a different substance from the Father, or that there is only Christ, so that he is the Father, he is the Son, he is the Holy Spirit. Others think he is only a man, not God made man; or that he is God in such a way that he is mutable in his divinity, or God in such a way that he is not also human. Thus they have been shipwrecked from the faith and

---

<sup>50</sup> The ms, by error, has 'humanity'. The source, Gregory, has 'divinity'.

<sup>51</sup> Cfr GREG. M., *Moral.* XVIII, LII, 85 (p. 948-949, 41/70 –uol. 143A) perhaps according to BEAT., *Adu. Elip.* I, 56 (p. 41-42, 1559/1587).

cast forth from the harbor of the church.<sup>52</sup> The Lord Jesus Christ indeed was here according to the flesh; now he is here according to his divinity. And he was with the Father, and he had not receded from the Father. Therefore, in that he is said to have been sent and to have come to us, his incarnation is commended, because the Father was not incarnated. For there are some heretics called Sabellianists, who are also called Patripassionists, who say the Father himself suffered. Do not you think this, Catholic. For if you were a Patripassionist, you would be insane. Therefore, understand that the sending of the Son <is called the incarnation of the Son>. Do not believe that the Father was incarnated, but <also> do not believe that the Father receded when the Son became incarnate.

---

<sup>52</sup> Cfr *AVG., In euang. loh.* 36, 6 (p. 327, 4/7; p. 328, 16/23).

### Commentary on Text 7

To comment on “God,” the third word in the Apostles’ Creed, the composer of Text 7 includes a long extract from Augustine’s Commentary on John, Tract 40, 4. The composer selected the sentences carefully, because they are not in the order they are in in Augustine. One might think there was nothing controversial about Augustine’s teaching that when we think of God in God’s divinity, we must not imagine a human form. Augustine states this in very strong words, which our composer quotes, concluding with Augustine’s thrust, “And do you dare to impose the form of a human body on the wisdom of God?” Augustine’s words take on a controversial flavor, however, in light of the image controversy in the eighth century. One of the points made by the iconoclasts was that, since Christ’s humanity and divinity were inseparable in his one person, a painting of Christ, which can only depict his humanity, separates him (Nestorianism) or turns his divinity into an idol (a material divinity). The Carolingian court misunderstood the second council of Nicea’s distinction between venerating and worshiping images, and Theodulf wrote the *Libri Carolini* against that Council’s decision to restore the veneration of images. As F. X. Noble has recently shown (*Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, Philadelphia, 2009), from the 760s dossiers had been written east and west amassing Scriptural and patristic sentences pro or con the use of images. One might think Augustine’s Tract on John, 40,4 was used in the *Libri Carolini*, but it was not (see A. Freeman, ed., *Opus Caroli Regis contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*, (MGH, Conc. 2, Supplementum I), Hannover, 1998, index). Why did our composer choose to include this long excerpt? None of our other 43 Texts use this excerpt from Augustine, although they use other excerpts from Augustine’s Tracts on John (see the index fontium). It is tempting to propose that the author of

Text 7 had the image controversy on his mind when he compiled the florilegium. Does the ms context, or date and place of its ms, lend any support?

**Montpellier, Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire, Section Médecine 141**, s. VIII-IX (Le Clerc, *Catalogue général des départements*, 1, p. 338); s. IX<sup>1/2</sup>, Flavigny or vicinity (Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement*, p. 5, note 6); s. IX<sup>in.</sup>, Flavigny, and s. IX<sup>ca. 3/4</sup>, Flavigny(?) (Bischoff, *Katalog*, 2, p. 201, n. 2835). 135 f.; f. 1-80, 95-135 = ca. 300 x ca. 165 mm., two col., 33 lines; f. 81-94 = 300 x 150 mm., 47 lines; Merovingian script. F. 41-79 = palimpsest (the acts of a Roman council have been written over older writing [only slightly older, seemingly], in four col., consisting, at least in part, of grammar and school material [fragments of Priscian, Pompeius Festus]) (Add. Descrip. = Keefe, handnotes; Le Clerc, p. 337-338.)

Perhaps meant to serve as an exemplar for preserving and copying selected works.

f. 1r-3v = exposition on the Lord's Prayer, inc.: "Dominus et saluator noster ihesus christus discipulis suis petentibus – (expl.:) inquiring dicat amen super tua benedictione";  
f. 3v-25v = n. **169 (= Text 24)**, **46 (= Text 7)**, **116**, **38**;  
f. 25v-32v = Alcuin, *De animae ratione ad Eulaliam; Inuocatio ad sanctam Trinitatem*; poem, inc.: "Qui mare, qui terram";  
f. 32v = n. **73** (incompl.);  
f. 33r-80r = *Concilii Romani I acta seu disputationes Syluestri papae I cum Iudaeis in dicto concilio, habitae coram Constantino Imperatore anno 315, libri duo*, beginning lacking;  
f. 81r-135v = Jerome, *Commentarii in epp. Pauli* (CPL, 591), inc.: "Prefatio ieronimi in epistola pauli apostoli ad ephesios. si quicumque est – (expl.:) et consolatus es me".

Folios 1-80 and 95-135 are dated to the beginning of the ninth century, and perhaps from Flavigny or its area. This puts us in a time and place that might have had a strong reaction to court activity surrounding the image controversy. We see the predominance of Alcuin works in the first 32 folios. (*Cat* n. 116, 38, and 73 are all works by him on the Trinity). Flavigny was one of Alcuin's monasteries; Alcuin is also associated with the *Libri Carolini*. Perhaps the most that can be said is that a collection volume was put together in or around Flavigny for studying and preserving matters of faith, among which is a florilegium (Text 7) that has included some strong opinions on the image controversy. It might have been someone, like Theodulf, who was incensed that images should be adored and found theological grounds in support.

There is some other evidence in Text 7 that its author was sensitive to current doctrinal debates, this time regarding Spanish Adoptionism. It goes as follows.

There is one fairly long section in Text 7 for which I have not identified any source. It could be original with our composer. After paraphrasing Isidore on the meaning of the name Jesus (and adding a quotation not in Isidore), Text 7 continues: “Therefore, ought we to believe in humans, when it is said: *Cursed is the man who puts his hope in a man?* (Jer. 17, 5). It is not permitted to us to believe in a pure man, but because the Lord Jesus Christ is both man and God, it is permitted to us to believe in him, especially when that humanity equated itself to the divinity.” Here Text 7 makes it clear that Jesus is not just a pure man, and that is why we can believe in him. This begins to sound like the Carolingian anti-Adoptionist writers, who objected to the Spanish Adoptionists’ claim that Jesus could be called adopted in as much as one is speaking of his humanity, which, if it is a true humanity, means he can only be, like the rest of humans, an adopted son of God. The anti-Adoptionists said no, Christ can in no way be an adopted son of God because he is not a pure man, but man and God: his one divine person united inseparably with humanity, but since it is the person that is adopted or natural, his one person is always his divine person, the natural Son of God.

Text 7 pushes the point. It continues: “Whence now it follows: OUR ONLY LORD. ‘Only,’ because there are many adopted sons. Whence in the Gospel it says: *As many as believed in him he gave to them power to become sons of God* (Jn. 1, 12). And in the Gospel of Luke we read from it: *Who was of Adam, who was of God* (Lk. 3, 38). And in the Gospel of John, the Lord, on the cross, speaking about the disciple, says: *Woman, behold your son* (Jn. 19, 26); and to the disciple: *Behold*

*your mother* (Jn. 19, 27). Therefore, God has many adopted sons, but one natural son, that is, Christ. Mary also had two sons, Christ naturally and John by adoption.

It seems that the composer of Text 7 was making a special effort to address the difference between adopted and natural sons. He uses the word “unicum” in the Apostles’ Creed to do this. Elsewhere among our Texts, *unicum* is explained as follows:

Text 14 (*Cat*, 86, ll. 33-45): AND IN JESUS CHRIST HIS ONLY SON OUR LORD. Although the divine nature is commended principally in the Father, it is sufficient for Jesus Christ next to be called ‘his only son our Lord,’ since by the very designation itself of ‘only Son,’ the full, natural communion of the Father and the Son is signified. For Jesus Christ could be fittingly believed to be of another omnipotence, lordship, immortality, and invisibility, if he was not called the ‘only’ Son of God the Father. He is called ‘only’ because he alone is true Son; he alone is true Son, because he alone is born from the nature of the Father. Thus the truth of that nativity from the Father demonstrates the natural fullness in the Son, in whom the fullness of the paternal nature remains from his natural generation.” **(ET IN IESVM CHRISTVM FILIVM EIVS VNICVM DOMINVM NOSTRVM.** Cum in Patre principaliter sit commendata diuina natura, sufficit Filium eius unicum Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum deinde nominari, quandoquidem ipso unici Filii uocabulo, plena inuenitur Patris et Filii naturalis significata communio. Alterius autem omnipotentiae, dominationis, immortalitatis, atque inuisibilitatis, Iesus Christus digne crederetur, si non Dei Patris unicus Filius diceretur. Vnicus autem dicitur, quia solus uerus est Filius; solus est autem uerus Filius, quia de natura Patris solus est natus. Veritas itaque natiuitatis illius, naturalem plenitudinem de

Patre demonstrat in Filio, in quo ex naturali generatione paternae naturae permanet plenitudo.)(It is an excerpt from Fulgentius.)

Thus, here in Text 14 ‘unicum’ is explained as a crucial word, what guarantees Christ’s true and full divinity. “Only” is linked to “natural,” or “true,” but it is not explicitly compared to “adopted.”

Text 10: “Augustine. OUR ONLY LORD.<sup>53</sup> Indeed, from the substance itself of the Father he alone was born, existing as this which the Father is, God from God, light from light”. Like Text 14, “unicum” means “he alone”.

Text 30 (*Cat*, 234, ll. 84-93): Under “OUR ONLY LORD”: “...And ‘only’, because he receives no comparison with other creatures, nor likeness, because he himself is the highest Creator of all things”. (“**VNICVM DOMINVM NOSTRVM**... et unicum, quia nec comparationem recepit cum reliquis creaturis, nec similitudinem, quia omnium rerum summus ipse creator est.”

Thus, in Text 30, “unicum” means “unique”: he cannot be compared or likened to any other creature (“other” acknowledges that even as a creature, that is, in his incarnated form, he is unique).

Text 8: OUR ONLY LORD.<sup>54</sup> Do not separate the Son from the excellence of God the Father. For these things which we said above about the Father were not said so that they would be alien to the Son, who said: *I and the Father are one* (Jn. 10, 30)... nevertheless there are not three gods

---

<sup>53</sup> *Symb. Ap.* has: *Filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum*. Here in Text 10, unicum is associated with “our Lord” and not with “his Son,” giving a different meaning.

<sup>54</sup> *Symb. Ap.*

or three almighties, but one God and one almighty.<sup>55</sup> And thus we believe our Lord <is> one (unicum).

In Text 8, “unicum” means “one.”

Text 32: “Augustine. OUR ONLY LORD.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, from the substance itself of the Father he alone was born, existing as this which the Father is, God from God, light from light.” Here “only” means “unique” and “one.”

Text 37: “ONLY.<sup>57</sup> He is called ‘only’ because ineffably, *before the foundation of the world* (Jn. 17, 24), he was begotten by the Father. Also he is called ‘only’ because he did not have brothers before or after himself. Question: Are we not also sons of God? Response: We are. Question: How? Response: Through adoption, that is, the grace of baptism. If we do the works of God, we *are called children of God, and we are* (Jn. 3, 1).” Here “only” means “alone,” “uniquely.” Like Text 14, it also means “natural,” “true” as opposed to “adopted.”

Text 42: “The Son of God is called ‘only’. For he is only and alone who was born thus; nor is that one able to have any comparison, who is the maker of all things. This Jesus Christ is therefore the only Son of God, Light from Light, who is our Lord. Although the rest may be called sons, nevertheless they are called this by the grace of adoption, not by their true nature. But this one alone is only, just as the Apostle says: *And one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom all things* (1

---

<sup>55</sup> From “therefore in the right faith”: cfr *Symb. Athan.* (p. 4-5, sent. 13-16).

<sup>56</sup> *Symb. Ap.* has: *Filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum.* Here in Text 10, unicum is associated with “our Lord” and not with “his Son”, giving a different meaning.

<sup>57</sup> *Symb. Ap.*

Cor. 8, 6).<sup>58</sup> Here we see again that “only” means not only “alone” in the sense of “uniquely,” but “true” in the sense of not adopted.

It seems, then, that the composer of Text 7 has tailored the ideas of Texts 14, 10, 30, 8, 37, and 42 to counter Adoptionism. The logic of Text 7 is: Scripture says God has many sons; the Creed says God has only one Son. For both Scripture and the Creed to be correct, Jesus must possess a different, unique, kind of sonship, and, indeed, the answer is that even in our shared humanity, Jesus is the only true, natural Son of God, whereas we are sons of God by adoption.

Text 30 is supportive of this connecting “unicum” in the Apostles’ Creed with Adoptionism. Right before Text 30 glosses the specific word “ONLY,” it has a first interpretation of the whole creedal phrase “OUR ONLY LORD.” It says: “There is one Lord Jesus Christ both before the incarnation and after the incarnation. For he is nothing else than true God and true man, remaining equally in the two substances of God and humanity.” Then Text 30 actually quotes Cyril writing against Nestorius: “Christ, who is also the Son, is one, although out of both, not with the diversity of the natures done away with by their conjunction, but because together the natures made for us one God, even Christ and the Son, that is, divinity and humanity, through that secret and ineffable union for oneness.<sup>59</sup> Since the Carolingian anti-Adoptionists considered Spanish Adoptionism a form of Nestorianism, the composer of Text 30 used the opportunity of the word “unicum” in the Creed to combat Spanish Adoptionism.

---

<sup>58</sup> From “The Son of God is called only”: *Symb.* 7 (p. 144, 43/54)

<sup>59</sup> From “Christ who is also”: *CYRILL., Epist. alt. ad Nest.* (p. 129, 17/20); these words of Cyril are found in many canon law collections; see the list of codices used by SCHWARTZ, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, II/4, p. 2.

Also, just prior to its explanation of “OUR ONLY LORD”, Text 7, expounding on the word “JESUS,” says: “It is not permitted to us to believe in a pure man, but because the Lord Jesus Christ is both man and God, it is permitted to us to believe in him.” The expression “pure man” (*purus homo*) is used frequently by the anti-Adoptionist writers. See, for example, Paulinus of Aquileia, *Contra Felicem Vrgellitanum episcopum libri tres*, in a number of places, and Alcuin, *Contra Felicem Vrgellitanum episcopum libri septem*, for example, in Bk. 1: “quia non solummodo purus homo natus est, sicut nos, sed etiam Deus homo” (*PL*, 101, 140A).

In conclusion, while it is not certain that Text 7 reflects the influence of the Spanish Adoptionist controversy on its composer, it is necessary to explain why he does not simply quote another patristic source to explain ‘OUR ONLY LORD’ in the creed.

There is another connection with the Adoptionist controversy in the explanation given under “OUR ONLY LORD”. Text 7 says, “He is consubstantial to the Father according to his divinity, and consubstantial to us according to his humanity; for a union of the two natures took place: on account of which, we confess one Christ, one Son. According to this understanding of an unconfused union we confess that the holy virgin is the mother of God (*Dei genetricem*).” The title “*Dei genetricem*” sticks out because of its equivalence to *Theotokos*, the epithet famously associated with Nestorius because he refused to allow it to Mary, whom he considered not to be the mother of God, that is, the mother of Christ’s divinity, but only of Christ’s humanity. The term came up in the Adoptionist controversy: Paulinus of Aquileia in his *Contra Felicem Vrgellitanum episcopum libri III*, I, 15, accusing Felix of denying that the only-begotten Son of God was born from the virginal whom and is God-man, said: “then by what pact does the one catholic church, spread through the whole world, not cease to confess with a free and public voice, that the blessed Virgin

Mary is Theotocon, that is, Mother of God (*Theotocon, hoc est Dei genitricem*), a name sweet and venerable to me. If, therefore, a true mother from her womb begot God so-called (*nuncupativum*) and not true God, as that insane man foams with his most false mouth, that is, that same one who was begotten before the daystar from the Paternal womb, that is, from the essence of the Father without beginning, remaining this which he always was, how will the blessed Virgin with the most true mouth of all catholics be confessed the true Mother of God (*uera Dei genitrix*)? Let the heretics say it is necessary for her to be Mother so-called (*nuncupativam genitricem*), if she will be thought by these to be the mother of a so-called child, but the catholic and apostolic faith has confessed, confesses, and will confess with eternal perpetuity, that he is true God who was born true man, and she is true Mother of God (*Dei genitricem*) who begot him, God and man; not two, but one true and proper Son of God; not two, but one and true God, Jesus Christ our Lord." (Quo ergo pacto catholica Ecclesia una in toto orbe terrarum diffusa, beatam Virginem Mariam, dulce mihi et venerabile nomen, Theotocon, hoc est Dei genitricem libera publicaue voce confiteri non cessat? Si igitur nuncupativum et non verum Deum, ut insani capitis vir iste fauce despumat falsissima, ex utero vera mater genuit, illum videlicet eumdemque, qui ante luciferum ex paterno utero, hoc est, ex Patris essentia sine initio genitus, permanens id semper quod erat: quomodo vera Dei genitrix beata Virgo omnium catholicorum verissimo confitebitur ore? Fateantur necesse est haeretici eam nuncupativam genitricem, si nuncupativae ab eis putabitur genitrix **[Col.0367B]** prolis. Catholica vero atque apostolica fides verum Deum, verumque qui, natus est, hominem, veramque, quae genuit, Dei genitricem, Deum et hominem, non duos, sed unum verum propriumque Dei Filium: nec duos, sed unum verumque Deum

Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum et confessa est, et confitetur, et aeterna confitebitur perpetuitate. *PL*, 99, 367A-367B).

In conclusion, while it is not certain that Text 7 reflects the influence of the Spanish Adoptionist controversy on its composer, it is necessary to explain why he does not simply quote another patristic source to explain 'OUR ONLY LORD' in the creed, but composes his own (or uses some contemporary source) to explain it; why he uses "purus homo," and why he uses "Dei Genetricem."

Another thing that may have caught the reader's attention is the frequency with which the incarnation is referred to as the "end times" or "last days":

Line 285: **NATVS EX MARIA VIRGINE.** Sacramentum hic suscepti corporis demonstratur, ut quem ante saecula Pater genuit secundum diuinitatem, in nouissimis diebus Maria uirgo, Spiritu Sancto inspirante, concepit.

Lines 237-240: "...ante saecula quidem ex Patre natum secundum deitatem, in fine uero dierum eundem uerum propter nos et propter nostram salutem de Maria uirgine secundum humanitatem."

Lines 310-311: "...aeternus ante saecula temporalis possit esse in fine saeculorum"

Lines 320-322: "Ipse de Patre ante saeculum sine matre, ipse in fine saeculorum de matre sine patre,

These passages are from Pope Leo I, Cyril of Alexandria, and Pope Gregory I, and there is nothing new in the patristic sources about calling the arrival of Christ the last days, or the end of days, or the end of the ages.

But these references do raise the fascinating question of how the Carolingians viewed the time in which they lived in relation to the Eschaton or the second coming. Isidore in his *Origins*, VI. xxxviii. 5 lays out the six ages of the world: “the first age is from Adam up to Noah; the second from Noah to Abraham; the third from Abraham up to David; the fourth from David up to the transmigration of Judah to Babylonia; the fifth from the transmigration up to the coming of the Savior in the flesh; the sixth, which is happening now, up to when this world is finished.”

This is, of course, biblical time, so it is intriguing about how the Bible was their historical framework. Look at the illustrations in the Utrecht Psalter. My Text 7, for example, says: “Moreover, Christ is called Anointed on account of the anointing with which prophets and priests and kings were anointed in the Old Testament,” not ‘in Old Testament times’ but ‘in the Old Testament,’ as if the Bible is an historical period, not a text. Probably our mind in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is still thinking of the Bible as the basis of our sense of history (BC, AD, or even CE).

If the Old Testament tells the true historical past, then there is a direct continuity between the OT and the NT. The age we live in now is the 6<sup>th</sup>, not the 1<sup>st</sup>. There is no BC/AD division, only a division between the 5<sup>th</sup> age and the 6<sup>th</sup> age. This sense of continuity presumes the ordered sequence of the Pentateuch and the historical books of the OT books that we are familiar with today. This order of Books (the Hebrew Scriptures) was in place before Christian times and were what the first Christians (who were Jews) and Jesus himself knew. Simeon takes the long-awaited child in his arms (Lk. 2, 28-32) and announces not the end of the OT, but the end of waiting.

So, there is this continuity. At the same time, Jesus, the God-man, himself offers a new division: “...aeternus ante saecula temporalis possit esse in fine saeculorum” (“Eternal before the ages, He would be temporal at the end of the ages”). What a paradox! The new division is: what is eternal, and what will come to an end: the “forever and ever” and the end times or last days.

Here we have the entire framework for Christian ethics. All action must be weighed against “Quid est, in luce aeternitatis?” But in fact this eternity and temporality is not a division in the sense of a separation, because Jesus did not stop being eternal when he became temporal. What is new is a concretization of the Eschaton now, in history, in the person of Jesus Christ. He is the

Eschaton. We enter the Eschaton when we enter into his life in baptism. When we step out of the font we are a “new creation,” not just because we are as clean from sin as the newly created Adam, but also because we are now in Him who said, “Behold, I make all things new...I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end” (Rev. 21, 5-6). As Paul put it to the Corinthians: “Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation” (2 Cor. 5, 17). Baptism allows the neophyte to be part of a story that begins with Genesis and goes to Revelation. He or she has heard the story as catechumens (which means “hearers”). Now, as neophytes, they become the story. The early church fathers taught this sense of biblical identity in their baptismal, mass, and creed commentaries: the ceremonies or words are interpreted at an historical, tropological and anagogical level.

For example, Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechetical lectures: the acts themselves are the antitype of scripture. Why did Cyril take this exegetical approach? He knew, here in Jerusalem, that it would work. The acts he spoke to were deeply familiar with the biblical past as real history. They were in constant touch with the sites mentioned in the OT and NT. 2) It was good pastoral practice: sharing a common history creates a sense of community: the church is a real group of people.)

Were the Carolingians *unusually* interested in chronology? Does Text 7's repeated references to the “end times” reflect some particular concern? T. Noble in *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* talks about the Carolingian concern to create a sense of cohesion as a single people. The Franks were the “new Israel,” “the chosen people of God” (p. 234). For whatever political as well as religious reasons, Noble says that tradition, order, and worship were extremely important to Charlemagne's desire to create a well-ordered realm (p. 236). In the context of Theodulf's efforts to establish the western tradition over the eastern in the *Libri Carolini*, Noble says: “The Carolingians were acutely aware of history and of tradition, especially Jewish and Roman. Their aim was to join that history” (p. 236).

What might this (and the image controversy) have to do with Text 7's consciousness of living in the "end times"? Just this, that people connected with the court were thinking hard about time.

It is also possible that the paradox of Christ being both eternal in nature and temporal in nature starting with the incarnation, or the beginning of the "end times," is stated against the Adoptionists, who would seem to subject Jesus to the same limits as all other true humans.