

Gottschalk of Orbais
and the Controversy over his Teaching on Twofold Predestination

by Victor Genke

Tous les passés n'ont pas eu d'avenir.

Maurice Godelier

Gottschalk's life is an important episode of social and political history of Germany, France, Italy and the Balkans. He was the first to use the expression *gens teudisca*[\[1\]](#), which is equivalent to *Deutsche Volk*. Moreover, he is among the major witnesses for the formation of the independent Croatian state in Dalmatia. However, his place in the history of ideas is even more eminent. Between the Council of Orange (529) and the 16th century (a whole millennium!) very few people dared to apply so strictly and consistently the kind of theology St Augustine developed in the last decades of his life[\[2\]](#).

In the aftermath of the Reformation it was J. Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh, who wrote the first significant account of Gottschalk's life and teaching[\[3\]](#). This noble task was later continued by G. Mauguin[\[4\]](#), a French Jansenist, who in his turn tried to show Gottschalk's orthodoxy, which caused a rather hostile reaction of L. Cellot[\[5\]](#), a Jesuite, who, on the contrary, endeavored to reaffirm the rebellious Saxon's condemnation. This point of view was supported by P. Roeber[\[6\]](#) in Germany. The predestination controversy in the Carolingian era was also treated by J. Sirmond[\[7\]](#) (a Jesuite as well) and by J. Basnage[\[8\]](#) (a Reformed theologian).

If the 18th century was less fascinated with Gottschalk (however, the works by J. J. Hottinger[\[9\]](#), H. Noris[\[10\]](#), D. Bernino[\[11\]](#) and others deserve to be mentioned), in the 19th and the first few decades of the 20th century the interest to this eminent theologian grew more intense, while Latin gradually ceased to be the

language in which one had to write about him. Indeed, the current state of research on Gottschalk would be hardly imaginable without the works by F. Wiggers[12], J. Weiszäcker[13], H. Schrörs[14], A. Freystedt[15], L. Traube[16], N. Fickermann[17], B. Lavaud[18], F. J. Gaudard[19], Dom M. Cappuyns[20] and many others who wrote on various aspects of the controversy before 1931, when Dom G. Morin discovered a rich collection of Gottschalk's theological texts in the library of Bern[21] (before that time only his poetry and his two confessions were known as extant). Soon other discoveries followed, including Gottschalk's grammatical treatises. The largest part of these materials was published in 1945[22], yet other texts by the rebellious Benedictine appeared until 1958[23]. Thus, researches published after World War II are the most important, since the body of available writings by the medieval partisan of double predestination grew considerably. Quite surprisingly, these works are not so many as one would expect. Among others, O. Herding[24], F. J. E. Raby[25], B. Bischoff[26], M. L. Weber[27] commented on Gottschalk's poetical works; J. Jolivet[28] and G. H. Tavard[29] explored his trinitarian teaching; K. Vielhaber[30] gave a very important general overview of his biography and doctrine; D. Ganz[31] and P. R. McKeon[32] showed the importance of the political side of the controversy; for J. Devisse[33] Gottschalk was a significant episode in the life of Hincmar, whose excellent biography he authored. Very important is also a book by B. Boller[34] that recently appeared in France.

This brief overview[35] leads to a sad conclusion: very little has been written on Gottschalk's teaching, especially that on predestination. In this respect, great discoveries of the 1930s resulted in almost no considerable progress. It is obvious that the basic reason has been nearly a complete absence of modern translations of the theological treatises by the great Carolingian thinker[36], quite overshadowed by other important figures of the age. Indeed, if in 1996 Croatia printed a postage-stamp commemorating the 1150th anniversary of Gottschalk's coming to the court of the prince Trpimir, no considerable collection of translated texts on the 9th century predestination controversy has been published until now. Truly, "all the pasts have not had a future"[37]. The present book tries to change the situation to the better. There is hope that once these texts are available in English translation, it will result in a revival of research on Gottschalk, whose role in the history of ideas is still to be fully appreciated.

Saxony to Fulda

One of the earliest records of Gottschalk in history reads as follows: *Gottescalcus, filius Berni comitis Saxonis*[\[38\]](#). Thus Hatto[\[39\]](#) in a letter to Otgar[\[40\]](#), written in 829, states that the young, freedom-loving monk was a son of a Saxon count named Bernus[\[41\]](#). Gottschalk's date of birth is uncertain. However, in connection with the inheritance that had been offered to the abbey along with the child, Rabanus Maurus[\[42\]](#) wrote to Hatto the same year: "It is, as you know, a possession of the monastery and the church of Fulda, a dominical property belonging to it, that has rightfully come to the lord Emperor through succession to his father as consistent with the law of inheritance"[\[43\]](#). The point is that Louis I the Pious had inherited it from Charlemagne; which means that Gottschalk must have entered Fulda in the latter's lifetime, thus before 28 January 814. Now the age of an *oblate*, i. e. a child dedicated by his parents to become a monk, was defined as at least 10[\[44\]](#) (this would mean that Gottschalk was not to be born later than January 804). However, it was not a rule without exception: there were cases, when children entered a monastery as early as at the age of 5[\[45\]](#). Moreover, there are reasons to believe that Gottschalk was sent to Fulda[\[46\]](#) even before 810[\[47\]](#).

The annexation of Saxony was a long and painful process of deportations, slaughters and forced conversions. It is not long before Gottschalk's birth that counties began to be organized in the area: so his father was perhaps among the first counts appointed[\[48\]](#). But he did not only swear fidelity on a formal level, as most of others did. Passing over Gottschalk and his legacy to a monastery, he acted according to Frankish customs that were not in accord with those of his fatherland.

Summarizing the essence of the elementary course of an oblate, Rabanus wrote: "There are certain that from their cradle have been studying sacred literature and have long been fed by the nourishment of the holy Church, until, educated enough, they are promoted to the lofty state of the holy orders"[\[49\]](#). Founded in 744 by Sturm, a disciple of Boniface, Fulda was an important center of learning and education, especially since 803, when Rabanus became the director of its school. There Gottschalk must have been studying Latin, the Fathers and the Bible, as well as the elements of classical literature. Perhaps he did well, because after a while they sent him to Reichenau[\[50\]](#), a monastery no less renowned for its training.

In this school, located on an island in the Untersee[\[51\]](#), the Saxon oblate met his first life-long friend,

Walafrid Strabo[52]. Younger than Gottschalk, perhaps with impaired eyesight[53] and born of humble parents, Walafrid used to call his fellow student Fulgentius[54], as well as, eventually, his “father and brother”[55]. Of Reichenau tutors, “my teacher Wettin”[56] is the only one that Gottschalk would ever mention in his extant works[57]; so we may suppose, in view of his own later mystic experience, that the great visionary was a major influence in his early years. However, a few other names are to be mentioned in this connection. Abbot Haito[58], who traveled to Constantinople in 811, did much for the classical training of the monks. The librarian Reginbert made the local library one of the most important of the age. Also Grimald, future royal chancellor and, later, abbot of St. Gallen (841–872), studied and taught at Reichenau at that time[59].

However, the life of the young oblates at the school was not cloudless. Walafrid would recall in a poem dedicated to his friend: “In how much injury our youth has passed!”[60]. To be sure, the interpretations of *Ut quid jubes*[61], Gottschalk’s famous poem, are multiple[62]; but if one of the most convincing[63] is correct, it was composed at the period and expresses the Saxon’s deep home-sickness during his at least two year stay in the island monastery. Whatever the case, Gottschalk, together with Walafrid, finally came back to Fulda[64], where they might meet deacon Lupus, future abbot of Ferrières[65].

Some time before 829 Gottschalk was forced to take the monastic vows. L. Traube wrote: “We do not know whether he was tonsured forthwith or, as Heiric, some years after the oblation”[66]. Now Hatto, in a letter to Otgar, remarked that Rabanus “compelled Gottschalk to accept monastic life *in pueritia*”[67]. Regardless of how we translate *pueritia*[68], it is clear that this had happened quite long before 829 when the letter was written. In the register of monks from Fulda[69], the name Gotescalc is not on the list composed about 820/821[70] under abbot Eigil (817–822), but is to be found in a section containing the names of the monks inscribed “under posterior abbots”[71]. Thus Gottschalk is likely to take the vows soon after 822, when Rabanus was appointed abbot by Louis I the Pious[72], and before they sent the young man to Reichenau. At any event, some time after his return to Fulda, the Saxon “dunned abbot Rabanus, asserting that he had been both tonsured against his will and forcedly made over to monastic life by the same”[73].

It was no easy step. With Rabanus, who had been given the name Maurus by his teacher Alcuin after St.

Benedict's dearest disciple, Fulda became a center of missionary work throughout Germany. Strict disciplinarian, Rabanus saw his main task as upholding order at any price in a time when disintegration grew one of the most characteristic features of society. He had an immense authority among the ecclesiastics of the age. Nevertheless, Hatto, future abbot of Fulda, supported the rebellious monk. It is unclear whether Gottschalk had been keeping in touch with his relatives in Saxony earlier[74], but at this point they came to his rescue, too. In June 829, in Mainz, a synod was convened, where the case had to be determined. Hatto, in a letter to Otgar, described its outcome as follows: "By their judgment he was restored in the fatherly freedom; but so that, should it be acceptable to the abbot, this controversy in which they both[75] as well as his[76] relatives are involved may end with an oath"[77]. The condition was that Gottschalk and his Saxon supporters should swear that, once Gottschalk set free, they would never demand to give back his inheritance donated to the monastery by Bernus.

The refractory Benedictine left the monastery[78], but the compromise did not satisfy either of the parties. In August of the same year a new synod was convened, at Rabanus' request, this time at Worms. However, before it took place, the abbot of Fulda composed a treatise entitled *De oblatione puerorum*[79], a document most revealing as for details of the controversy.

First of all, he strongly intimated that the whole affair was for him primarily that of *faith*[80]. Having described the upbringing of the oblates, he says in the very next sentence[81]: "But, ungrateful for such a favor, they have opinions that are contrary to the faith of the orthodox fathers, and daily attack the Mother of all faithful by the weapons of their iniquity"[82]. Such are the ways of the "heretics" and "schismatics"[83]. They act with their hearts "blinded through earthly cupidity"[84]. These "misguided defenders of genuine freedom"[85] ventured to "set the worldly and temporal law before the divine and eternal law"[86]. What exactly irritated the abbot so much? "They say that those who become monks become slaves"[87]. Actually, the whole treatise is conceived to militate against this statement, or, more correctly, against its implications: monks do become slaves, but God's slaves, which brings no dishonor: on the contrary, "holy fathers deemed it a great honor to be called slaves of God"[88]. First, quoting the examples of Abraham and Jephthah, Rabanus insists that it is good from the part of the parents to sacrifice their children to God; second, that it is good from the part of the children to renounce the world and to serve God. Those who say otherwise "do not understand that

they wage war against the Lord”[89]. They actually “have opinions that are contrary to the Catholic faith and, the end of the world being near, introduce new sects into the Church”[90].

The technical side of the question is described like this: the abbot’s opponents asserted that the oblation of children “must be confirmed by suitable witnesses”[91]. In Gottschalk’s case, such witnesses could be only Saxons: “They say that the law of their race does not allow that a man of a different race should be called to witness to make void the law of their freedom”[92]. Rabanus’ answer is very straightforward. How do they dare to despise a nation that is superior to them? Everybody knows that Francs came to Christ earlier, and, moreover, they conquered the Saxons and turned them away from idolatry[93].

Towards the end of the treatise, the abbot of Fulda expressed himself absolutely clear with respect to the rebellious monk, calling him “this our adversary”[94]. The die was cast.

Fulda to Orbais

Here begins one of the most enigmatic periods of Gottschalk’s life. We do not know what happened at the synod of Worms, presided by Louis the Pious. First of all, was the rebellious Benedictine compelled to remain a monk against his will? Most researchers have been inclined to think so. Indeed, this would explain much of Gottschalk’s later biography. Having returned to the monastery under compulsion, he never stopped to struggle against those who oppressed him. Thus, a possibility to change the monastery (Fulda to Orbais) would be a kind of concession made to the monk in view of his conflict with the abbot.

However, after 829 Gottschalk never gave any sign of being discontent with his monastic status. If Rabanus had gained the upper hand at Worms, and exposed Gottschalk as a deviant, he would perhaps use this argument in the polemics that followed. But this never happened. It is possible that all this points to the fact that the refractory monk came back to the monastery of his own accord[95]. It could be added that the young man’s rebellion might have been inspired by his relatives in Saxony, who were irritated by the political gesture made a few years earlier by his father. As it seems, for them the whole affair was basically that of Gottschalk’s

legacy, not his monkhood[96].

Anyway, at some later point our Benedictine was canonically affiliated[97] with the monastery of Orbais[98], near Château-Thierry, in the diocese of Soissons. However, it is admitted that before installing at Orbais Gottschalk visited the monastery of Corbie[99] in Picardy, near Amiens: indeed, it is known that the restless Saxon was acquainted with at least two monks from that cloister: Gislemar and Ratramnus[100].

Now some time before 835[101] (year of his deposition) Ebbo, archbishop of Reims, commissioned Peter[102], then abbot of Hautvillers[103] (Ebbo's country residence, where he established the famous scriptorium), to produce a magnificent manuscript largely known as Ebbo Gospels[104]. Written with golden ink on vellum, it contained, along with the texts of the four Gospels and prologues by Jerome, a dedicatory poem addressed to Ebbo[105]. Already N. Fickermann[106] pointed to the fact that its author was Gottschalk. This statement was later brilliantly corroborated in a careful philological analysis of the poem by K. Vielhaber[107], and recently reaffirmed by B. Boller[108].

Thus, before Orbais, Gottschalk undoubtedly visited also Hautvillers. This explains well why in 849, at the synod of Quierzy, the abbots of the three monasteries were present: Bavo of Orbais, Paschasius Radbertus of Corbie and Haldvinus of Hautvillers[109].

In a poetical letter to Ratramnus, written by Gottschalk during his incarceration after the synod of Quierzy (849), the Saxon says that he spent a year at a school of a teacher of versification[110], which must have taken place after he had stayed at Corbie[111]. Moreover, in a letter to Ebbo[112], Gottschalk mentions a period of time when he lived in his house[113], and when the archbishop, his benefactor, gave him a possibility to study[114]. It is most likely that in both passages Gottschalk writes about one and the same period. His teacher might be Dunchad, Irish poet and erudite, who lived at Reims around the same time[115]. It is also very important that Hincmar would later write to the monks and laity of his diocese that they knew Gottschalk very well before he went to Italy[116], which remark would be unaccountable if the Saxon did not stay for rather long periods of time in Reims and its neighborhood[117]. No less important is Gottschalk's own witness concerning his dispute with a certain *Faustus manichaeus* about the latter's teaching that supposed the existence of the "blood of the Holy Spirit"[118], which took place in Reims at the same period. Gottschalk might

also have visited Châlons, as it may follow from his letter [\[119\]](#) to Lupus, bishop of that city [\[120\]](#).

As for Gislemar [\[121\]](#), another Gottschalk's Corbie acquaintance, it was L. Traube who identified him as a co-worker of Anskar in his missionary activities in Scandinavia. Proceeding, as it seems, from L. Traube's remark that Gislemar left the monastery to evangelize Denmark at Harald's request in 830 [\[122\]](#), K. Vielhaber suggested that if Gottschalk had met Gislemar before the latter's departure, he should have come to Corbie as early as in 830 [\[123\]](#). But in fact it is already in 826 that Harald Klakk, an exiled Danish king, appealed to Louis the Pious for support. The same year the Dane was baptized in Mainz and came back to his homeland together with Frankish military forces and missionaries, among whom were Anskar, Autbert and Gislemar. However, in 827 Harald was exiled again and Anskar had to leave Denmark. Of Gislemar's role in this episode we know only that which Rimbert [\[124\]](#), Anskar's biographer, wrote [\[125\]](#): Wala [\[126\]](#) arranged that "the most devoted father Gislemar, a man approved by faith and good works, as well as by his fervent zeal for God, should stay with Harald," [\[127\]](#) when Anskar had to come back to the court of Louis. In 829 the Apostle of the North was already going to Sweden to establish a mission there [\[128\]](#), this time with Witmar [\[129\]](#) as a co-worker. It is not known whether Gislemar accompanied him in 829–831; it is also unclear when the monk from Corbie finally left Denmark to return to the monastery [\[130\]](#).

Even though the whole story does not help us to determine the exact date of Gottschalk's coming to Corbie, it does help to clarify some other relevant circumstances. Indeed, missionary work in Scandinavia was among the most important as well as most characteristic features of the new policy begun by Louis the Pious [\[131\]](#), whose ideal of the empire was profoundly Christian. The era of great conquests by fire and sword ended with Charlemagne; his only surviving son's task was to keep the unity (*Ordinatio imperii*, 817) as well as to preach the Gospel to heathen nations.

Witness to the northmen was started by no other than Ebbo who, appointed apostolic legate by Pope Paschal I in 821 with this special purpose, worked as a missionary in Denmark for one year in 823. The primary goal was obviously to secure the Danish frontier, but the mission proved unsuccessful. Monks involved in further effort were associated with Corbie and Corvey, its daughter monastery, since 822 the chief Saxon cloister. It was no accident: at the time Saxony was a dangerous, poorly christianized area; Wala, for instance,

introduced Anskar to Louis the Pious as a suitable candidature for missionary work in the pagan North because he had shown his aptitude teaching Saxon boys at Corvey^[132]: the latter manifestly represented a good sample of “heathen psychology”.

When Gottschalk traveled to Corbie he could not be ignorant of these developments. It is very likely that he was attracted by a certain ideology that stood behind the movement. Indeed, the whole undertaking was seen as a fulfillment of the eschatological Scriptures such as Is. 49:5–7 and Mt. 24:14 that play so great a role in the “Life of Anskar”. Scandinavia was the end of the known earth; when Christ is proclaimed there, the end of the world will come. Besides, the overall approach was deeply mystical: missionaries were guided by visions and miracles.

It is in this circle that Gottschalk was received warmly: J. T. Palmer’s reading of Rimbert’s hagiographical work led him to state that “Rimbert was notably sympathetic to Gottschalk’s ideas and there is a strong predestination theme in the *Vita Anskarii*. With his concern to illustrate mission in relation to prophecy and salvation, especially in the context of creating a new Christian society in the north, it was natural for Rimbert to include such themes in the *Vita*”^[133]. It is significant that Rabanus and Hincmar were notable for their “more sober, historical evaluation of the northmen”^[134] and the missionary work in Scandinavia.

Tragically, the year 829, when Gottschalk left Fulda, became the turning-point in the reign of Louis the Pious. Previously he had done virtually everything in his power to keep the unity of the empire. In 817 (soon after Louis’ imperial coronation in 816) it had been decreed that the succession would be as follows: his only heir had to be his eldest son, Lothair I, but the empire would include three dependent kingdoms, that of Aquitaine for Pippin, that of Bavaria for Louis, and that of Italy for Louis the Pious’ nephew, Bernard. However, in 818 Louis’ wife, Ermengard of Hesbaye, the daughter of count Ingramn, died. Four months later the emperor married Judith, the daughter of a mighty count Welf. In June 823 they had a son, future king Charles the Bald (it is notable that Walafrid Strabo became both Charles’ tutor and Judith’s private chaplain^[135]). This “biological and dynastic fact” (L. Theis) unchained a whole series of events that dominated Carolingian politics for the next few decades. Indeed, it is in 829 that Louis the Pious allotted to Charles the region of Alemannia, Rhaetia and part of Burgundy, which led to an open rebellion of his elder sons in 830^[136]. Pippin, with

Lothair's consent, was able to depose his father, and imprison his step-mother (accused of adulterous liaison with count Bernard) in the monastery of St. Radegund in Poitiers. However, by October of the same year Louis was reinstated and Judith purged herself of all charges by an oath.

It is in 833 that the real storm broke. Louis' sons managed to form a coalition against their father, and the emperor's own army deserted him on the Field of Lies. Judith was seized again and sent to Italy, while Charles was imprisoned in the monastery of Prüm. Lothair assumed control over the imperial office and many magnates as well as churchmen allied with him. Both Wala, the abbot of Corbie, and Ebbo of Reims joined the rebels.

Ebbo, born as a serf, had been observed by Charlemagne himself, who made him companion to his son Louis. When the latter governed Aquitania, Ebbo served him as a librarian, and in 814, when Louis came to power, Ebbo accompanied him to the royal palace, and two years later^[137] was raised to the episcopal see of Reims^[138]. In 833 he was among the leaders of the nobility who allied Lothair's rebellion. Moreover, it was Ebbo who took the responsibility of convicting the emperor of his "crimes" (partly fictitious) and in fall of the same year it was he who imposed penance on the emperor at the church of Notre-Dame at Compiègne, which was something unheard-of. Many ecclesiastical leaders, among others Rabanus, remained faithful to Louis, and acutely disapproved of Ebbo's proceedings. The requital came in due time: as early as in 834 Louis was restored, and the next year Ebbo was deposed at Thionville and incarcerated. In 840, after Louis' death, he was freed and restored at his see for a short time, but soon lost this position. He tried to regain it for the rest of his life, thus creating serious complications for his successor, Hincmar of Reims^[139]. Ebbo died in 851, sheltered by Louis the German, who had made him bishop of Hildesheim.

Now the question is to what extent these vicissitudes affected Gottschalk personally. Even a brief overview of his travels immediately after August 829 shows how improbable the idea of his remaining in the orders at that time is. Indeed, beside the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, every Benedictine monk took an oath of *stabilitas loci* ("stability of place"), which meant that he would by no means leave the monastery, with which he was affiliated, without a special dispensation^[140]. It is virtually impossible that a monk already denounced by his abbot as deviant, would be allowed to travel so much without any specific mission^[141]. It is

also very significant that in 849, at the synod of Quierzy, the sentence signed by the bishops contained the following phrase: "Because you ventured... to throw into confusion... both ecclesiastical and political[142] affairs"[143].

Even more important is Gottschalk's own witness in his letter to Ebbo. According to Dom C. Lambot's interpretation[144], not long before the letter was written the Saxon had been separated from his patron[145] and suffered all kinds of tribulations. It was painful for him to learn that some calumniators charged him with scheming against the archbishop of Reims. Gottschalk asked to receive him as soon as possible and hear out his own explanations as he had never done so. He had enemies who sought to destroy him by accusing him of "the crime against the name of the emperors"[146]. His only refuge was Ebbo's protection to which he appealed.

Gottschalk was of noble birth, but bereft of his inheritance. This might be the reason why Ebbo, his fellow countryman, advised him to enter a monastery so as to facilitate his further promotion in the Church. On the other hand, it might be the Saxon's own decision, as he could choose to distance himself from the archbishop, at whose house he lived, and whose actions might seem increasingly more questionable. Indeed, Gottschalk's best friend, with whom he obviously kept in touch, was patronized by Judith, and his own patron was plotting against her.

Even though the young monk might plan to stay at Orbais for a long time, this plan was less and less feasible, especially after Ebbo's deposition in 835, since his own and the former archbishop's enemies could gain their ends very soon, now that Louis the Pious was restored again. The only way out was seeking the patronage of a powerful magnate and flee from the monastery under his protection. The first goal might well be achieved by Gottschalk with his friend's help: the appearance of the monk from Orbais at the court of Eberhard, margrave of Frioul[147], is probably explained by Walafrid's mediation. Indeed, about 835/836 Eberhard married Gisela, Judith's daughter by Louis the Pious. The empress' chaplain had a good chance to arrange Gottschalk's benevolent reception by Judith's son-in-law in Frioul.

However, leaving calm Orbais on the Surrmelin river was no easy thing, because of the same *stabilitas loci*. Gottschalk knew well that Anskar's prolonged wanderings that contradicted the above-mentioned principle aroused too many questions[148]. As it seems, in connection with the Scandinavian mission, the problem was

resolved on the basis of permission to leave the monastery granted to monks by Pope Gregory the Great, in case they were active as missionaries^[149]. The same Pope also indicated that if monks were needed as priests for a long time, they had to be ordained and could break their ties with the monastery^[150]. This explains well why Gottschalk sought ordination before he left the cloister. To all appearances, this was done in all haste: Rigbold, the interim bishop of Reims (835–845), ordained the monk without the knowledge of Rothad, bishop of Soissons, to which diocese Orbais belonged^[151].

Thus, between 835/836 (Ebbo's deposition and Eberhard's marriage) and 840 (the first witness concerning Gottschalk in northern Italy) our Benedictine, presumably leading a group of monks^[152], went to the southeast of the empire, perhaps authorized by Bavo, his abbot, for missionary work. It is clear that the Saxon never planned to come back.

Orbais to Mainz

Eberhard of Frioul was a remarkable figure^[153]. Thanks to his marriage to Gisela, grand-daughter of Charlemagne, he acquired enormous political influence. Louis' sons (Eberhard's brothers-in-law) sought his friendship and advice. He played an important role in negotiations that preceded the treaty of Verdun (signed in 843), which had to bring to an end the strife between Lothair and his brothers. Moreover, the march of Frioul was a key territory in the defence of the empire. It is also known that Eberhard, whom Sedulius Scottus called a defender of the Church^[154], had a great library and corresponded with the leading theologians of the age^[155]. Protection of such a magnate allowed Gottschalk's rare gifts and abilities to reach their fullest flower. Indeed, it is in Italy that he first preached his doctrine on a large scale and became an eminent teacher of double predestination. Unfortunately, this almost ten years' period (from about 836 through 846) is the least known in Gottschalk's biography.

It has been often alleged that he left Orbais to accomplish a pilgrimage to Rome. The only source for this assertion remains a poem by Walafriid^[156] (written as an answer to a now lost letter of Gottschalk), where he alludes to his friend's visit to that city. They supposed as well that this poem had been written before

Gottschalk was ordained, which led to the idea of his two assumed visits to Italy: one before and one after ordination. However, as early as in 1886 L. Traube showed that the poem in question should be dated by December 848^[157]. Consequently, there are no substantial reasons to speak about two Gottschalk's visits to Italy. It is also likely that soon after Ebbo's deposition he did not travel to Rome, but directly to the court of Eberhard; he might go *ad limina apostolorum* any time during his prolonged stay in Frioul.

Two basic sources for the Italian period are letters addressed by Rabanus to Noting^[158] and Eberhard^[159]. The first one was written in May 840^[160]. In its first lines Rabanus says that, when he accompanied Louis the Pious in a military expedition and passed through Logana^[161], he had a conversation with Noting, during which they discussed "a heresy that some unjustly contend concerning the predestination of God"^[162]. As a result of this meeting Rabanus wrote to his interlocutor the present letter, having joined a treatise on predestination to it^[163]. The identity of Noting is indicated by Rudolph of Fulda: "[Rabanus] also wrote to Noting, bishop of Verona, concerning the foreknowledge and predestination of God, concerning grace and free will"^[164]. As in the case of his "On the Oblation of Children", Rabanus does not mention his former subordinate by name either in the letter or in the subjoined treatise, but there is no doubt that the uneasiness of Noting was occasioned by Gottschalk's preaching, whose activity in Italy and Noricum^[165] is attested in the Annals of St Bertin^[166].

It is possible that Rabanus would act more energetically against what he thought was a pernicious heresy, but very soon his own affairs preoccupied him more than anything else. Louis the Pious, with whom he invariably sided, died on 20 June 840, on his way back from a military expedition against his son Louis the German. Rabanus supported Lothair, who was before long defeated by Louis. The same year the abbot of Fulda fled from the monastery, and returned in 841, only to resign his abbacy in 842. It is in 845 that he was finally reconciled with his new king Louis^[167].

It was now time to deal with Gottschalk seriously. About 846^[168] Rabanus composed a lengthy missive to Eberhard. To all appearance, by that time the charismatic preacher from Saxony reached the climax of his popularity^[169]; his teaching spread not only in Italy, but also in the realm of Louis the German^[170]. Eberhard's protection, granted to such a man, deeply troubled Rabanus, who maintained friendly relations with

the margrave of Frioul. He wrote: "For the rest, according to what they say in these lands, it is well known that a certain sciolist named Gottschalk abides in your house, who propounds a dogma that the predestination of God so binds each person that even if one wants to be saved and struggles for that with the right faith and good works, so that he may come to eternal life through God's grace, labors in vain and to no purpose if he is not predestined to life, as if God, who is the Author of our salvation and not perdition, compelled a man to perish by His predestination. And already on this account he brought many to despair through this his sect, so that people say: 'What's the use if I labor for my salvation and life eternal? For if I do good and am not predestined to life, it is of no benefit; on the other hand, if I do evil, it will not hurt me, because the predestination of God brings me into the eternal life.' Such a giving up is an inducement to sin for many in these lands, and makes people disobedient to the preachers of the Gospel, for it already made them desperate concerning themselves. They say that this your teacher gathered many testimonies out of the works of the most blessed and learned father Augustine, by which he endeavors to maintain his sect, whereas the memorable father and the Catholic teacher, writing against Pelagians, who preached against the grace of God, was a defender of that grace, not a destroyer of the right faith" [171]. Further Rabanus sets forth his own understanding of the teaching on predestination. The letter is concluded by the following request:

"Consequently, I have written these things to you, dearest friend, to this end that you may recognize what an inducement to sin the opinion coming out from those lands will create in this people, and if any one dwelling with you teaches that which is contrary to the right faith, prevent him from it, so that he should hold back from [spreading] this sect, and tell him: 'See to it, brother, lest your liberty in preaching should become a cause of offence for weak people, and lest by your doctrine you should destroy the one for whom Christ has died, for his blood will be required at your hand (cf. Ez. 3:20)'. I do trust confidently that you, O venerable man, is a Christian, and that you do not want to be in communion with anything that is contrary to the Gospel of Christ, but rather with that which is pleasing to God and pertains to the salvation of souls" [172].

It is to note that in these two texts (*De predestinatione* to Noting and the letter to Eberhard) Rabanus fully expounded what he had to say concerning the issue. Later he would repeatedly point to these documents as to a complete statement of his position.

It is not known how Eberhard reacted to Rabanus' message. Since the Annals of St Bertin state that

Gottschalk was “shamefully ejected”^[173] from Italy, it has been assumed that he went to Dalmatia after the margrave of Frioul expelled him from his realm. However, there are reasons to believe that the idea is not correct.

The confidence, with which the Saxon went to Mainz, shows that he was altogether convinced that his ideas were correct and rather attacked than protected himself. To some extent blinded by the popularity and security he had enjoyed for more than ten years, he rushed to Austrasia (instead of escaping), sure of an easy victory he would gain over Rabanus. Moreover, Gottschalk’s trip to Dalmatia and Pannonia, of all places, did not resemble a flight, but rather a long planned operation in a strategic region, for which the margrave of Frioul was personally responsible^[174]. Since Rabanus asked Eberhard to prevent Gottschalk’s teaching from further spreading, letting a person denounced as a heretic by the most authoritative churchman of the age to evangelize^[175] the Slavs (in a mission very much parallel to that of Anskar) would be a rather strange reaction. Thus it is much more likely that Eberhard (whatever his own reaction might have been) received Rabanus’ letter and showed it to Gottschalk only upon the latter’s return from his Balkan mission^[176], and the Saxon immediately assumed the measures against what he thought was a calumny.

Pannonia passed under Frankish suzerainty about 795, when the Croatian chieftain Vojnomir accepted baptism. Charlemagne established control in the area between the Sava, Drava and Danube rivers. In 799 Franks invaded Dalmatia, and by 803^[177], after a lengthy war, suppressed Byzantine influence in the region^[178]. The area became a Carolingian march under the jurisdiction of the margrave of Frioul. Aquileia was the center of ecclesiastical authority. By 814 Pannonian Croats were led by Ljudevit, and Dalmatian Croats by Borna. That year both of them affirmed their loyalty to Louis the Pious.

Borna (ruled 810–821) was a remarkable leader. If he is identical to Πορίβος from the 30th chapter of *De administrando imperio* by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus^[179], it is during his rule that bishops, sent from Rome, baptized many Croats. In the *Annales regni Francorum* by Einhard, under the year 818, Borna is described as *dux Guduscanorum et Timocianorum*, that is the duke of the Gačani (the inhabitants of Gačka, which region corresponds to present-day Lika and Krbava) and the Timočani (who had lived in the lowlands of the Timok river). Borna always remained faithful to the Franks. When in 819 Ljudevit revolted^[180], it was

Borna who won the most important battles against him, though Franks sent their troops there in 820, 821 and 822, until Ljudevit finally fled to the Serbs and was murdered in 823. In his recent research B. Boller set forth an interesting supposition^[181]: he suggested that duke Borna was no other than Bernus, Gottschalk's father. Indeed, the etymology of the Dalmatian ruler's name seems to be Germanic. Moreover, B. Boller pointed to the fact that Charlemagne consciously resettled much of Saxon nobility. Besides, the assumption explains well Gottschalk's interest towards the region, where he might have relatives^[182]. This theory well deserves more ample treatment, but if correct, it constitutes a considerable contribution to our representation of the medieval Croatian history.

It is generally accepted that Gottschalk visited Dalmatia and Pannonia in 846–848. At the time Croatia was ruled by Trpimir (845–864), who came to power after Vladislav (duke of the Croats and Dalmatians 821–830) and Mislav (830–845)^[183] and founded his own dynasty.

In Gottschalk's extant writings there are several passages where he alludes to his Balkan mission. The most important of them is that which we find in his "Answers to Various Questions", in the section entitled "Whether Sibyls and other Foretellers of the Heathens ever Deserved to Merit or Have the Holy Spirit"^[184]. Having pointed to the fact that birds of prey can predict the outcome of a battle, he goes on to say: "Likewise, also horses are cheerful in the battle array on that side which, when God gives it, must be victorious. This I myself have certainly proved by experience through Gottschalk, my little son, with respect to our horse. For when Trpimir, king^[185] of the Slavs, was going against the people of the Greeks and their governor, and our villa was in the very neighborhood of the future war, I told him to go and take care about everything that would be necessary for the king and his army, which he, by all means, had to do. However, I have terribly conjured him by the Lord God that he should neither take the arms nor go with the army, but, following them astride with full attention, consider which attitude this our horse would have or take. Indeed, I most certainly knew for a long time that victory would come and be on the side of people, whose horses would tread cheerfully and show their cheerfulness with their triumphant attitude"^[186].

L. Katić interpreted this passage as follows^[187]. *Villa nostra*, which Gottschalk mentions, must be one of Trpimir's known residences: that of Klis, Podstrana or Bijači (all of them were located near Split). The phrase

gens Graecorum designates Byzantine power in general, not the actual population of the coastal city-states. *Patricius eorum* must be the imperial governor^[188], a representative of the civil and military power of Byzantium, who had his residence in Zadar. The one with whom Trpimir was at war might be a certain Bryenius, whose name is found on a seal^[189] that may be dated by the period either about 840 or after 842^[190]. The military conflict probably took place near Split and was about the frontier between the Croatian and Byzantine lands. The context of “Answers to Various Questions” shows that Trpimir gained the upper hand.

Another passage shows that Gottschalk was well acquainted with the usual manner of speech in the coastal cities. In his “On Predestination” he writes: “Likewise Dalmatians, that is people who are as well Latin people however subject to the power of the Greeks, designate the king and the emperor by an expression which is common throughout the whole of Dalmatia, which is a most spacious region, [they designate] I say, the king as ‘kingdom’ and the emperor as ‘power’. For they say: ‘We have been by the kingdom’, and: ‘We have been standing before the power’, and: ‘Thus the kingdom has told us’, and: ‘Thus the power has said’”^[191]. It is possible that linguistic abilities of the Benedictine helped him to become a mediator and an interpreter between Trpimir and the Byzantine army^[192].

Gottschalk also visited Bulgaria, as is evident from his remark in “On the Body and Blood of the Lord”^[193]: “...For once a certain noble and powerful heathen in the land of Bulgarians humbly begged me to [give him to] drink in the love of that God who makes His blood out of wine”^[194].

L. Katić wrote that Gottschalk might originate the idea to build a monastery in Rižinice, that was realized by Trpimir about 850^[195]. B. Boller even conjectured that Gottschalk might himself build a church in Croatia. Indeed, in a funerary chapel at Nin, on the lintel of the chapel door, one may read the following inscription: **GODE.SAV.IVP.PANO [...]** IS.TO DOMO.CŌ^[196]. The first part of the inscription has long been interpreted as containing the name Godeslav (or Godečaj, Godežav), whereas B. Boller suggested to read it as follows: **GODES[CALC] AV[CTORE] IVPPANO [...]** ISTO DOMO CŌ[STRVXIT], that is: “Gottschalk, under the authority of a župan^[197], has constructed this edifice”.

Another interesting supposition of L. Katić^[198] deserves special attention. He wrote that a certain

Martin, mentioned by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus in the 31st chapter of his *De administrando imperio* is no other than Gottschalk. The actual text of Porphyrogenitus reads as follows: “After a long time, in the days of the king Trpimir, king Krešimir’s father, a certain man, one of those who are very pious, named Martin, came from Francia, from the region between Croatia and Venice, clothed with worldly shape, who, as Croats themselves say, has performed many miracles. Such a pious man was weak and his legs were cut off^[199] so that four people took him up and carried him wherever he wanted”^[200]. It is evident that the only feature that Gottschalk has in common with Martin is that they both came from the lands between Croatia and Venice, that is from Frioul. First of all, Porphyrogenitus’ text speaks about king Trpimir II (928 – c. 935), father of Krešimir I (c. 935 – c. 945), and not prince Trpimir I, whose guest Gottschalk was. Furthermore, even though B. Boller suggested that the report of Martin’s mutilation is explained by the punishment Gottschalk endured at Quierzy^[201], it does not account for the fact that Martin was unable to walk while in Croatia, should he really have been our Benedictine. Finally, it is rather difficult to explain why Gottschalk’s name would be changed to Martin^[202]. The interpretation of I. Tkalčić, who identified Martin mentioned by Porphyrogenitus as St Martin of Podused^[203], seems to be more plausible.

Upon the completion of his mission, Gottschalk came back to Frioul, but left it as soon as he learnt what Rabanus wrote to Eberhard concerning himself and his teaching^[204]. The same year he came to Fulda, where he was received by Hatto, who had supported him in 829, and since 842 was the abbot of the monastery which the Saxon had entered as an oblate child. The great circle of Gottschalk’s wanderings was now closed. The catastrophe was imminent.

Mainz, Quierzy, Hautvillers

Gottschalk’s behavior at this point is mysterious. Even though he might have some illusions when he was leaving Frioul, back in Fulda he could not ignore that Rabanus, the archbishop of Mainz since 847 and still the most respected theologian of the age, acquired enormous political influence. Gottschalk’s own status was incommensurable with that of his former abbot. Besides, the general context was that of social unrest^[205],

and any pronouncement against the authorities had very little chances to be treated tolerantly. If the Saxon had had the upper hand in Worms in 829, was he encouraged by this fact to appeal to a king against Rabanus once again? Was he too naive? Was he too arrogant? Nothing or almost nothing helps us to solve this riddle.

Whatever the case, on the 1st of October 848[206] the synod or rather the diet (*placitum generale*)[207], presided by Louis the German, was open in presence of many bishops and abbots of the East Frankish Kingdom, including Einhard, bishop of Seligenstadt, Charlemagne's famous biographer. What happened next is very chilly stated in the Annals of St Bertin[208] as well as those of Xanten[209]: Gottschalk, together with some of his followers, appeared before the assembly and presented two writings that he authored, namely a treatise[210] where he answered to Rabanus' accusations[211], and a confession of faith (*chartula suae professionis*)[212]. Since the Saxon and his companions refused to acknowledge their views as heretical, they were publicly flogged. Gottschalk had to swear that he would never come again into the kingdom of Louis the German and was sent to Hincmar of Reims, his metropolitan, accompanied by a letter[213], in which Rabanus explained the case as he saw it. As one might expect, the archbishop of Mainz, who was then 72 years old[214], did not change his own views in the least.

Flodoard, in his *Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, mentions a letter that Hincmar wrote to Rothad of Soissons concerning Gottschalk's reception[215], which means that the Saxon was first sent to Orbais, where he awaited what was to follow, while the archbishop of Reims twice wrote to Rabanus asking for instructions[216]. Since Rothad grew notably sympathetic with the condemned Benedictine's ideas[217], the latter probably had a good chance to prepare himself for what he might expect would be a more serious investigation of his case.

However, Hincmar, as it seems, only aspired to finish off with it. A small synod that had to take place in February or March 849[218] at the royal *villa* of Quierzy (Carisiacum) presented a chance to do so. It was not convened to examine Gottschalk's teaching, but by the order of the king and to deal with the king's affairs[219]. The canons of this synod where fifteen bishops were present[220] are lost. What actually happened there is reported in the Annals of St Bertin[221]. Gottschalk presented to the assembly presided by Charles the Bald a collection of scriptural and patristic quotations, which had to prove the orthodoxy of his doctrine[222], but it was found heretical. Gottschalk was again publicly flogged and compelled to throw into the fire "the books that

contained his teachings”, which apparently was the same scriptural and patristic florilegium[223]. Found guilty of disobedience to his monastic status because of his wanderings, the Saxon was also deposed from priesthood, since he had been uncanonically ordained by the interim bishop Rigbold, without letting know Rothad of Soissons, to whose diocese Orbais belonged. Not only that Gottschalk’s being a former protégé of Ebbo could not endear him to the new archbishop of Reims, he probably also fell a victim of Hincmar’s longstanding struggle against the institution of interim bishops, whose permissions were altogether unclear[224]. However, Hincmar’s trust in the bishop of Soissons, even though the latter was not interim, was not in the least more ample[225]. Gottschalk was not let back to Orbais to be confined there, but they sent him to the abbey of Hautvillers, which lay in the archdiocese of Reims. The text of the sentence reducing the deposed priest to perpetual silence, translated by Francis X. Gumerlock, can be found in the present book.

The synod and its proceedings arouse several questions. First of all, was Hincmar so dreadful as depicted in Florus’[226] dramatic account[227] in *De tribus epistolis*, containing the words *pene emoriens* (“almost dying”) and *inauditum crudelitatis exemplum* (“an example of unprecedented cruelty”) so often quoted in modern literature on Gottschalk? As J. Devisse rightly notes[228], this work was written at least six years later and was based on the descriptions of bishops whose remorse was quite belated. One may add that the nature of *De tribus epistolis* as a covert personal attack against the archbishop of Reims does not permit to take it literally. Much credit given to Florus’ emotional description aroused suspicion concerning the cold account in the Annals of St Bertin, edited by Prudentius of Troyes[229]. Was it not later falsified by Hincmar? There are no substantial grounds to believe so. On the other hand, even though Hincmar indeed applied chapter 27 of the Rule of St Benedict regarding the treatment of obdurate monks, and followed the example of Rabanus, given at Mainz, softer measures foreseen by the same Rule had hardly been exhausted.

Other charges against Hincmar included his unwillingness to let Gottschalk’s case be treated by Rothad, to whose diocese the monk from Orbais formally belonged, as well as to convene a large council to investigate it. In fact it was Rabanus who infringed upon canon law: the monk was to be judged first by a provincial synod in his own province, that of Reims, which, as J. Devisse indicated[230], is commanded in the canons preserved in the so-called *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana*[231]. As for general councils, they had not been convened since 794 to treat the issues of dogmatic theology. The archbishop of Mainz, a very poor Augustinian, did not realize

the extent of the problem; the archbishop of Reims blindly acted upon the instructions of Rabanus, in whom he confided without reserve; the kings merely let the prelates to accomplish their duties. Who else in 848–849 would be able to grasp the essence and scope of Gottschalk's teaching?

In contrast to very many discussions concerning why Rabanus or Hincmar did or did not do this or that, another important problem has little been investigated, namely why Gottschalk, backed up by only a few of his followers who were common people, assumed that a simple monk might that plainly present himself before kings and archbishops and let them know that all their ideas about God and the Church were nonsense, and that they were in fact heretics unless ready to agree with him at once. There is no doubt that Gottschalk was a great theologian, but his manner to confront the whole world with his doctrine might only receive an adequate explanation through a few witnesses concerning his behavior in Hautvillers.

Hincmar reports: "He also wrote, addressing himself to God and telling Him, that He had commanded him not to pray about me, and that first the Son had entered him, then the Father, and afterwards the Holy Spirit who, entering him, scorched his beard around the mouth. And, since he refused to receive clothes from the vestiary of the brothers who were in communion with me, and did not purchase them for money (since he had no money), he preferred to walk as Adam walked before he sinned. However, soon, when cold began to seize him, he took pains about procuring himself both a fur coat and a fire-place"[\[232\]](#). Farther on he continues: "Indeed, a few years ago he wrote to one of his friends that in three and a half years I, as Antichrist who usurped the power, would at once die, and he himself would become the bishop of Reims, and seven years later would perish being poisoned, and thus should reach the glory of a martyr... He did not see the accomplishment of the prophecy inspired by his spirit"[\[233\]](#). This was written after the council of Soissons that took place in 853, to which *De una et non trina Deitate* elsewhere alludes. (In connection with Quierzy Hincmar wrote that Gottschalk behaved *like* one possessed by a demon, *ut arreptitius*[\[234\]](#)). Little has changed by about 866, when Hincmar came to the same sad conclusion in a letter to Egilo[\[235\]](#): "Lastly, I would be able to write much about this Gottschalk to you, how destructive he is, and how much harmful would be for others if released from this custody, for assuredly he says and does such things by which he is certainly recognized as either one possessed by demon or mad; and you know that madness does not usually occur without a demon"[\[236\]](#). Attempts to explain all this by senile dementia or prison psychosis[\[237\]](#) do not seem

convincing at all. Gottschalk wrote almost all the time that he spent at Hautvillers and his treatises do not resemble in the least those of a feeble-minded person. Becoming psychotic in the very mild conditions, in which he was kept in Hautvillers, would be unlikely: “Whatever food or drink the brothers have, they serve him with it daily without any negligence; he is offered sufficient clothes if he wants to accept them; he is given enough wood to make a fire. In the lodge where he lives he has a fireplace and a toilet”^[238]. And, quite characteristically, Hincmar adds: “He is not refused to take baths, but since he entered this lodge he has not only been unwilling to wash his body, but even his hands and face. In fact, those with whom he used to keep company witness that he has been most filthy formerly and thus far remains in his filthiness as much as he can”^[239].

Strangely enough, despite the “perpetual silence”, Gottschalk managed to send his treatises and letters to many influential people, arousing public interest to his case. Only within the year 849 three of his writings fell into Hincmar’s hands^[240]: “Tome to Gislemar”^[241], “Reply to Rabanus Maurus” (which had been presented at the diet of Mainz^[242]), and “Shorter Confession”^[243]. These (except, perhaps, the “Tome”, though the date of its composition is unclear) had been written earlier^[244]. Even more surprising is that the archbishop of Reims wrote in reply^[245], establishing a written dialogue with Gottschalk, who, in his turn, sent him his “Longer Confession”^[246], a copy of which was probably delivered to Amolo^[247]: “Afterwards through one of the faithful Church members we received one of your writings, where you openly set forth in a lengthy discussion how you understand the testimonies of the Scriptures and holy Fathers and what you think and teach”. The bishop of Lyons continues: “Now we have also other quite long treatises of yours that you seem to have written or published for the bishops or [even] against the bishops who had been present at the council which condemned you”^[248]. We know^[249] as well, that Gottschalk wrote to certain Matcaud^[250], Lupus^[251] and Jonas^[252]. He also wrote to the bishop of Ferrières concerning the beatific vision and got quite a cold answer from him^[253], in contrast to Ratramnus, who sent him a letter full of sympathy (in which he criticized Hincmar’s *Ad reclusos et simplices*^[254]) as well as two poems^[255]. In his poetic letter to Ratramnus^[256] Gottschalk asserts that he wrote not only to the eminent West Frankish theologians, but also to those who lived in barbarian kingdoms^[257]. During this period the most of the material published by C. Lambot must have been produced. However, any reliable chronology would hardly be possible^[258].

Rabanus was shocked when he learnt that Gottschalk had such a freedom to communicate with the outer world[259]. However, on account of some mysterious reason, Hincmar never cut short the Saxon's activity in authoring and sending out letters and treatises. This, nonetheless, did not help much the condemned monk.

Subsequent Polemics

As it seems, exchange of texts with Gottschalk engendered doubts in Hincmar's heart. Indeed, it is rather strange that the archbishop of Reims should consult Prudentius of Troyes, a bishop belonging to the jurisdiction of the archdiocese of Sens, whether he had to admit the condemned monk to the Sacrament, if he was absolutely sure that the Saxon was nothing more than an unrepentant heretic[260].

Gottschalk's active correspondence must have given rise to rumors about his case, at least in the outskirts of Reims. That is why in autumn 849 Hincmar published a lengthy pastoral letter to the cloistered and simple of his diocese[261], where he warned them against the dangerous false prophet. Even though in this work Hincmar did everything to convince his perplexed parishioners that Gottschalk was the devil himself, nevertheless, together with his suffragan of Laon, Pardulus, he resolved to learn the opinion of several noted theologians concerning the issue of predestination—which shows that doubts did not disappear. According to Florus[262], Pardulus, in a letter to the church of Lyons, mentioned five authorities addressed, including Amalarius of Metz[263]. However, the first to be consulted was again Prudentius, and his answer[264] must have confirmed Hincmar's worst fears. The bishop of Troyes, even though his tone was not at all controversial, affirmed a perfectly Augustinian teaching that clearly contradicted Hincmar's own ideas.

No less perplexed than his congregation was supposed to be with respect to Gottschalk's doctrine, the archbishop of Reims turns to the authority whose judgment had always been unquestionable for him: Rabanus. Having written a letter to the archbishop of Mainz[265] (February or March 850), he joined to it a dossier that contained the sentence of Quierzy, *Ad reclusos et simplices*, the letter of Prudentius, the Longer Confession (*nugae Gotescalci*, in the words of Rabanus[266]), as well as Ratramnus' letter to Gottschalk, criticizing *Ad reclusos* (since the letter of Lupus of Ferrières[267], who had also been consulted, was not added, it must have

come later — and afflict Hincmar no less than Prudentius' reply). How uneasy about Gottschalk Hincmar was at the time is seen in the fact that he again asked advice, this time from Rabanus, concerning administering the Lord's Supper to his prisoner.

As it seems, at the time the archbishop of Reims still ignored that a few months earlier the debate had attracted his king's attention. In December 849, back from his expedition to Toulouse, Charles the Bald spoke at Bourges to the abbot of Ferrières, asking him for instruction concerning the issues of "predestination, and the free will, and the redemption by the blood of Christ"[\[268\]](#). Lupus gave his vision of these issues first orally and later in a treatise entitled *De tribus quaestionibus*[\[269\]](#), where he expressed himself more amply than he did in the letter to Hincmar and Pardulus. As it seems, the archbishop of Reims and his suffragan of Laon reacted rather bitterly, since Lupus had to write to the king an explanatory letter[\[270\]](#) and publish a *Collectaneum* of patristic quotations supporting his point of view[\[271\]](#). Moreover, Charles decided to consult Ratramnus, whose friendly relationship with Gottschalk and critique of Hincmar's *Ad reclusos* must have been already known. However, in a treatise addressed to the king[\[272\]](#) the monk of Corbie repeatedly asked him to keep it private unless his doctrine should be approved and/or corrected by Charles[\[273\]](#). M. Cappuyns believes that it is only as late as in 855 that this work was handed over to Hincmar[\[274\]](#).

To be sure, the archbishop of Reims was impatient to hear from Mainz in response to the dossier that he had sent in February/March 850. Rabanus let him know that he received it right away (it happened before Easter, that is April 6), but wrote that he would examine the documents later[\[275\]](#). It is only in summer that the real answer came[\[276\]](#), but it sounded disappointing: Rabanus, now aged, simply acknowledged that he agreed with Hincmar, and that what Ratramnus and Prudentius wrote agreed with Gottschalk's teaching. He himself would not participate in the discussion any more. All he had to say was to be found in his letters to Noting and Eberhard. Now Hincmar had to accomplish what was actually begun by Rabanus without the latter's support, which was obviously a serious loss. As for the Sacrament, the archbishop of Mainz was inexorable: Gottschalk was an obdurate heretic and as such he could not be given communion.

Simultaneously, correspondence between Reims and Lyons developed. As it seems, it was Gottschalk himself who began it. As stated above, "through one of the faithful Church members" he sent to Amolo a

writing, in which he “set forth in a lengthy discussion” his understanding of “the testimonies of the Scriptures and holy Fathers” as well as his own position^[277]. There is almost no doubt that the Longer Confession is implied. However, when exactly it happened? At all events any correspondence with Amolo should have taken place before March 31, 852, date of his death. Should it be supposed that Gottschalk sent this confession both to Hincmar and to Amolo right after it was written, then its delivery to Lyons must immediately follow the time of its composition, which has to be placed between autumn 849 (*Ad reclusos*, which ignores it) and February/March 850, when Hincmar joined it to the dossier sent to Rabanus. Thus a reply from Lyons (addressed to Hincmar who was supposed to deliver it to Gottschalk^[278]) at all events arrived in 850, possibly as early as in summer of that year.

As it seems, upon the arrival of Rabanus’ second letter (written in reply to the dossier containing *Ad reclusos* and other documents), to which the archbishop of Mainz subjoined his writings concerning predestination (summer 850), Hincmar sent to Lyons another dossier^[279] that contained two letters (his own and Pardulus’) and Rabanus’ *De praedestinatione ad Notingum*^[280]. Fragments of Hincmar’s letter to Amolo^[281] are preserved in Florus’ *De tribus epistolis*^[282] and summarized by Flodoard^[283].

The fateful move was made by Pardulus of Laon: “However, since all these [opinions] differed much, we urged to write the Scot from the king’s palace, named John”^[284]. *De praedestinatione* by John Scot^[285] that appeared at the end of 850 or early in 851, nearly destroyed Hincmar’s cause. Indeed, Erigena’s noble mind, not unlike Gottschalk’s in its bold singularity, originated ideas that could not but scandalize the contemporaries. Enrolled on Hincmar’s side was now a theology that seemed to deny the reality of hell and even the reality of good and evil as such.

The interference of John Scot had two major consequences. First, Gottschalk ceased to be the focus of the controversy that grew much larger in scope: it would be a mistake to believe that being opponents of the Saxon’s opponents automatically meant becoming Gottschalk’s supporters. Second, Hincmar’s political rivals now had an opportunity (which they would never lose) to denigrate the archbishop of Reims^[286]. Making a beast out of Erigena and a martyr out of Gottschalk was now the surest way to undermine Hincmar’s authority, which was a goal of too many bishops around him.

The first to come into play was Wenilo, the archbishop of Sens and Hincmar's chief competitor in the race for power within the kingdom of Charles the Bald. He took nineteen statements, which John Scot himself had placed at the beginnings of sections into which his treatise was subdivided[287], and sent them to the bishop of Troyes, commissioning his suffragan to refute them. In autumn 851[288] Prudentius answered with his own *De praedestinatione*[289], where he accompanied each of Erigena's statements with "the sign that in Greek is called Theta, which some used to put before [the names of] those to be condemned to the capital sentences"[290]. Moreover, he sent the nineteen statements of Erigena (seemingly together with his own treatise), to Florus, a learned deacon in Lyons, with whom he seems to have been in correspondence earlier[291]. Under Remigius, the new archbishop, Florus authored two works, both in 852: *De tribus epistolis*[292] that treated on Hincmar's appeal to the see of Lyons, and *De praedestinatione*[293] against John Scot.

Even though official, these treatises were anonymous, which gave Hincmar a possibility to discard them as unauthentic, at least until 859. Now that Sens in the kingdom of Charles and Lyons in that of Lothair obviously united against him, the archbishop of Reims resolved to take a radical step and shove back his enemies through synodal decisions.

The first successful move was made in April 853. Clerics, ordained by Ebbo, Hincmar's predecessor, during his brief restoration in 840, and the most of whom subsequently left Reims, suddenly reappeared and requested a reconsideration of their status. This demarche was obviously aimed at the weakening of Hincmar's position: should the ordinations be acknowledged as legitimate, the archbishop's own elevation at the see of Reims would become highly questionable, whereas Ebbo's deposition in effect illegal. However, at a council of Soissons these ordinations were pronounced null.

Inspired by this manifest political success, Hincmar at once convened another council, this time at Quierzy, where he triumphed in the matter of predestination controversy as well. Four *capitula*, issued there[294], affirmed his own understanding of free will, predestination and atonement, and were signed by the bishops as well as by the king himself. If Hincmar is to be trusted at this point, Prudentius of Troyes subscribed to the document, too[295].

The council did not stand a good chance to be applauded in the south. Indeed, during next few years the church of Lyons produced two more treatises aimed against the four *capitula* of Quierzy: emotional *Sermo*[\[296\]](#) as well as *Libellus de tenenda immobiliter Scripturae veritate*[\[297\]](#), both by Florus. January 8, 855, at Valence, Lothair convened a council where the bishops of Lyons, Vienne and Arles were present. The six *capitula* concerning predestination enacted there[\[298\]](#) openly attacked those of Quierzy and Erigena's nineteen statements.

In August 855 Heribald of Auxerre, during their meeting at Bonneuil, delivered to Hincmar a copy of Florus' *Sermo*[\[299\]](#). Before September 29[\[300\]](#) of the same year (date of the emperor's death) Lothair, retired in the convent of Prüm, received the *capitula* of Valence through Ebbo of Grenoble[\[301\]](#), who had taken an active part in their composition, and commissioned him to deliver them to his brother Charles. The *capitula* were delivered to the latter at Verberie, together with other documents from Lyons, among which was probably *De tenenda* by Florus. It is only in July 856[\[302\]](#), at Neaufle (diocese of Rouen), that Charles handed over this dossier to Hincmar.

If M. Cappuyns believes that Hincmar's first *De praedestinatione*[\[303\]](#) was the reaction of the archbishop of Reims to these writings[\[304\]](#) (which probably included Ratramnus' *De praedestinatione*, since Flodoard mentions it in connection with Hincmar's work[\[305\]](#)), J. Devisse is sure that by the time it was already written[\[306\]](#). Whatever the case, the treatise was never published and its text is lost.

A new blow to the *capitula* of Quierzy was delivered at the ordination of Aeneas[\[307\]](#). Prudentius, who was ill, sent one of his priests in order that he should announce to the assembly a condition for consent: the bishop of Troyes composed four counter-*capitula* to those of Quierzy[\[308\]](#), which Aeneas had to sign if he was to become the successor to Ercanrad at the see of Paris[\[309\]](#).

Death of the emperor again disturbed a fragile balance achieved between Lois, Lothair and Charles at the second Meerssen conference in 851. Riots in Aquitaine and Brittany, Viking raids as well as Louis' invasion into Neustria distracted general attention from the debate. However, the need for reconciliation of the brother kings made a very large meeting inevitable. It indeed took place in 859.

At a preliminary conference held at Langres, bishops from the south edited the *capitula* of Valence in

order to eliminate that which offended the northern party led by Hincmar. Any reference to the *capitula* of Quierzy was removed. Since the archbishop of Reims was extremely displeased by the association of his name with the unfortunate nineteen statements, it was specified that their author was “a certain Scot”^[310]. The seventh *capitulum* of Valence, which implied that many bishops were inadequate to their positions (understood by Hincmar as a personal attack^[311]), disappeared to be replaced by harmless formulas that concerned only the bishops in the realm of Charles of Provence. Despite these conciliatory efforts the final decision was postponed, and the *decreta* prepared at Langres were again presented by Remigius of Lyons a few weeks later, at the council of Savonnières^[312], which was open June 14, 859, in presence of the three kings and representatives of twelve provinces. Since Hincmar and his party raised questions, now concerning contradictions between the *decreta* of Langres and those presented now, the decision was again postponed^[313].

When Charles the Bald received from Remigius his version of the *capitula*, he delivered them to the archbishop of Reims, who reacted with the second treatise *De praedestinatione*^[314], which turned to be the last one concerning the issue in that controversy. When a new representative meeting was scheduled, Hincmar wrote a synodal letter^[315], which treated on a lot of subjects like Trinity, angels, humans, incarnation, redemption, sacraments etc almost without any order. As for predestination, it said that God “wants all men to be saved” (which might well be understood in the restrictive sense) and equaled “all who are to be saved” with “all those predestined”^[316]. Such conciliatory formulas became the basis for the decisions^[317] of the council of Tusey^[318] that was opened October 22, 860 and put an end to the controversy.

Prudentius of Troyes died in April of the next year. Hincmar, who was to continue the Annals of St Bertin, left there a note full of venom concerning his predecessor: “Galindo, surnamed Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, of Spanish origin, a most erudite person, who during a few years had offered resistance to Gottschalk, but later, moved by bitterness against certain bishops who made a stand with him against the heretic, dies as a most violent defender of the same heresy, having composed since then a lot of things contradicting to each other and opposed to faith; thus, even though he was wearied by a lasting illness, he ceased to write only when he ceased to live”^[319].

Such acrimony was understandable: indeed, in the annals, under the year 859, the archbishop of Reims

discovered a short but vexing entry: “Nicholas, the Roman pontiff, faithfully confirms and catholically determines his position concerning grace and free will, as well as concerning the truth of the twofold predestination and the blood of Christ, which was shed for all believers”^[320]. Even though Hincmar “neither heard about this from anyone else nor read anywhere else”^[321], in 866 he begged Egilo of Sens, who made his way to Rome, to ask the Pope whether anything like that might have indeed taken place^[322], since the annals were already accessible to many^[323]. As long as we ignore what Egilo was able to find out, the basis of that statement of Prudentius remains a subject of much controversy until this day.

Whatever the case with regard to the annals, it is certain that Nicholas I was in effect interested in Gottschalk’s case: in 863 Hincmar had been ordered to appear together with his prisoner before two papal legates at the council of Metz. The archbishop of Reims did not appear there. In a letter to the pontiff^[324] he later had to explain that the summons had not reached him in due time. In the same letter he felt compelled to add: “Regarding the aforementioned Gottschalk, if your authority writes to me either that I should release him from custody in order that he should go to you, so that you may examine his doctrine, or that I should give him freedom to go to some person which you will designate by name... I will in no way object to your orders”^[325]. However, nothing like that ever happened.

Having several times refused to renounce his views, Gottschalk died in October 868 unreleased.

Gottschalk’s Teaching on Predestination

We do not possess a coherent account of the whole of Gottschalk’s teaching on predestination. Most of his writings dedicated to this theme are very fragmentary (besides, perhaps, the Longer Confession, which, however, is not enough for conclusive judgment), each presenting only some aspect of his doctrine, almost without any connection to other parts of the system. Accordingly, a temptation is strong to read into his works some meanings that he never intended, under the pretext of “reconstructing” the rebellious Saxon’s original teaching. Indeed, theological vocabulary of predestination has grown richer than in the 9th century, especially

since Reformation, and extreme caution is needed to avoid anachronisms. However, Gottschalk's thought revolves around a few *loci* or points of doctrine that may and should be detected and described. The author of the present lines has distinguished eight such points, to which all the rest is basically reducible. It is to note that the order, in which they are stated here, is almost purely casual: it does not reflect either the succession of reasoning or the hierarchy of importance. The idea that predestination is twofold is placed first simply because Gottschalk himself often began with that assertion. Of course, the nature and complexity of the logical operations implied in the word reducible might also result in a larger or less extended list: theoretically one can trace all of Gottschalk's ideas concerning predestination back to the statement that God is immutable or that He is omnipotent. Nevertheless, the degree of specification accepted here seemed to be the most adequate starting from the amount of attention given to such or such assertion by Gottschalk himself. Thus his teaching on predestination may be presented as follows.

1. *God predestined both the elect to eternal life and the reprobate to eternal death. Accordingly, predestination is one but twofold.*

"The omnipotent and immutable God has graciously foreknown and predestined the holy angels and elect humans to eternal life, and... He equally predestined the devil himself, the head of all the demons, with all of his apostate angels and also with all those reprobate humans unto merited eternal death"[\[326\]](#) (*Shorter Confession*).

"Just as He predestined all of the elect to life through the gratuity of the free grace of His kindness... so also He altogether predestined the reprobate to the punishment of eternal death"[\[327\]](#) (*Reply to Rabanus Maurus*).

"Just as immutable God before the foundation of the world immutably predestined to eternal life all His elect through His free grace, likewise the same immutable God Himself through His just judgment immutably and deservedly predestined to eternal death absolutely all the reprobate"[\[328\]](#) (*Confession of Faith at Mainz*).

"Saint Isidore also says this: *There is a twofold predestination, either of the elect to rest or of the reprobate to death.* For, he does not say that there are two predestinations, because there are not. But he says

'twofold,' that is, bipartite, because at one time you, Lord, spoke of how predestination is indeed one, but nevertheless twofold"[\[329\]](#) (*Longer Confession*).

"Predestination is called twofold, so that it should by no means be spoken about two predestinations, but [only] one, just as charity [is said] to be twofold and one"[\[330\]](#) (*Another Treatise on Predestination*).

"Predestination is understood as twofold; namely, in a general sense it is one because it was eternally set up forever and at the same time; neither of them is unjust but both just; and in a special sense it is twofold, because one is owed and the other is gratuitous"[\[331\]](#) (*Another Treatise on Predestination*).

It is to note that Gottschalk was often charged with teaching that God predestined the reprobate to sin. Since his opponents interpreted the word *evil* in the canons of Orange as "sin", it gave them a possibility to impute to the Saxon proclaiming ideas contrary to these canons. Gottschalk indeed said that God predestined some people to evil, but understood it differently: "Now what is briefly said in the *Canons of Orange* by holy Caesarius and confirmed by his fellow bishops in the city of Orange, that *whoever would say that God predestined people to evil, let him be anathema*, as the truth is obvious, must be understood [as said with regard to] the evil of sin, trespass and misdeed, not to the evil of torment, torture and punishment"[\[332\]](#) (*On Predestination*). There is difference between unjust and just evil things, for God is just: "On the death of sin that men have inflicted, inflict and will be inflicting on themselves, God has inflicted, inflicts and will be inflicting bodily death, that is the separation of the soul from the body, and the death of hell, evidently by reason of the one unjust and the twofold just. This is the difference between the unjust evil things that every unjust person has committed, commits [and] will be committing and the just evil things that God has paid back, pays back [and] will be paying back through adversities in the present and perpetual torments, as the Just One sees fit"[\[333\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

2. *Predestination of the reprobate to eternal death is on the basis of the foreknowledge of their evil merits.*

"He equally predestined the devil himself, the head of all the demons, with all of his apostate angels and also with all those reprobate humans unto merited eternal death, most certainly because of their own foreknown future evil merits"[\[334\]](#) (*Shorter Confession*).

“He [God] foreknew the angels who were going to be apostates and deserters. And also He equally indeed foresaw the people who were going to be perpetually reprobate, and would sin against God and abandon Him. But truly those that He foreknew were going to fall and going to persevere in evil through their own crime, shame, and vice, He justly predestined through a just judgment”[\[335\]](#) (*Answers to Various Questions*).

At this point an important observation has to be made. These two texts are the only instances when Gottschalk explicitly refers to the foreknown evil merits as to the *basis* of predestination to eternal death. However, the correct understanding of his assertions concerning evil merits depends on what Gottschalk says about the nature of foreknowledge itself:

“You have foreknown and predestined before the ages at the same time and together, without any interval of time. You also have foreknown and predestined all of, and each one of, your works”[\[336\]](#). And in the following: “That same blessed minister of yours, Augustine, tried to put forth in a true manner that the reprobate are condemned by foreknowledge, although here and there he allows that they are condemned to death by predestination, and that the one is true indeed because the other is true. For, sometimes foreknowledge is put for predestination, as he wisely and truly admits. He indeed does not reject this—May it never be!—but rather seems to agree with its truth”[\[337\]](#) (*Longer Confession*).

It is in this light that we should perceive what Gottschalk says in his *Reply to Rabanus Maurus*: “I say that He foreknew those who were going to have a very bad birth, and a worse death; and He predestined them to merited eternal torment and everlasting destruction”[\[338\]](#), since, at least at times, he does not differentiate predestination and foreknowledge. Indeed, he taught that in this case one word is simply used for the other, according to the rhetoric figure known as *metalepsis*: “The reprobate are condemned both by foreknowledge and by predestination, and they very plainly are predestined justly to destruction... Although, if it should happen that the testimony concerning this matter [is doubted] inwardly, it can be, and indeed should be, understood according to the generally accepted rules [of rhetoric] as *metalepsis*. And surely that which follows should be understood by that which has preceded”[\[339\]](#) (*Longer Confession*).

No less interesting is the formula found in the *Confession of Faith at Mainz*: “Immutable God Himself

through His just judgment immutably and deservedly predestined to eternal death absolutely all the reprobate who at the judgment day will be condemned because of their evil merits”[\[340\]](#), since there is no mention of foreknowledge there.

Finally, the following text is most revealing: “God, who cannot and is unable to err, be deceived or deceive, never had to, has to or will have to do any other thing except that He once, simultaneously and permanently has ordained to accomplish immutably His foreknown, predestined, foreordained, fixed, prepared and determined beforehand free benefit of His grace on the elect and the just judgment of His justice on the reprobate, always according to the counsel of His will, having mercy upon whomever He likes with great kindness, and hardening, abandoning and consequently condemning whomever He likes with no iniquity, but with highest impartiality, as it must be with a just judge, bestowing grace on the elect and rendering justice, judgment and torment to the reprobate”[\[341\]](#) (*On Predestination*). Even though Gottschalk does mention foreknowledge here, he clearly states that predestination is *always* “according to the counsel of His will” and that God condemns “whomever He likes” with no harm to divine justice[\[342\]](#). Identifying grace as God, Gottschalk exclaims: “Is not grace God and omnipotent, which freely liberates and saves whomever it wants?”[\[343\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

Does it mean that at a certain period of time Gottschalk simply chose formulas that might seem less offensive for his opponents? Or did his views actually hardened, and with time he in fact rejected the idea of *praevisa demerita*? Without reliable chronology of his works no conclusive decision can be made. But it is certain that the condemned Benedictine’s views on foreknowledge were not something fixed: they evolved, as also did the formulas, which conveyed them.

3. *God does not want to save all people.*

“All those whom God wills to be saved, without doubt are saved”[\[344\]](#) (*Reply to Rabanus Maurus*).

“As for all who are not saved, God does not will them to be saved”[\[345\]](#) (*Reply to Rabanus Maurus*).

“Can it really be that He by dying wanted to redeem those [reprobate], but did not want to save them, when indeed it is a more serious matter to redeem by dying, than it is to save by rising? Or that He wanted to save them, but they refused? Where then is that omnipotence of God?”[\[346\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“For indeed those who say that God, who generally and universally, equally and without distinction wants all men to be saved, saves the elect because they want to be saved and does not save the reprobate because they themselves do not want to, certainly deny God’s grace in the elect and unknowingly deny God’s omnipotence in the reprobate”[\[347\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

4. *Humankind is divided into two groups, the elect and the reprobate. The elect cannot be lost to God and become reprobate.*

“For there are two bodies: one Christ’s and the other Antichrist’s, and each one is established by the integrity or plenitude of its members”[\[348\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“The reprobate are not the city of God, but the city of devil”[\[349\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“There are two kinds of humans in the one human race”[\[350\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“Those who are redeemed by Christ’s death do not perish, but only the reprobate have perished through deathly outrages and crimes”[\[351\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“And so it is clear enough that nobody among those who have been redeemed by the blood of Your cross ever are lost to You”[\[352\]](#) (*Tome to Gislemar*).

“God forbid that I should ever wish even to dream or only to whisper that the ancient serpent might be able to seize and carry off with him into eternal perdition any of those for the sake of whose salvation such precious blood has been shed to God the Father by our Lord, His Son. Amen”[\[353\]](#) (*Tome to Gislemar*).

5. *It is only the elect that Christ redeemed.*

“Our omnipotent God, Author and Creator of every creature, is the gracious Repairer and worthy Restorer of all of the elect and them alone. And He perpetually willed to be the Savior, the Redeemer, and the Glorifier of none of the reprobate”[\[354\]](#) (*Reply to Rabanus Maurus*).

“The one who says that the Lord suffered generally for all, for the salvation and redemption of both the elect and the reprobate, contradicts God the Father Himself”[\[355\]](#) (*Tome to Gislemar*).

“He bought them [the reprobate] by the Sacrament of Baptism, but neither suffered the cross, nor

underwent death, nor shed His blood for them”[\[356\]](#) (*Tome to Gislemar*).

“We certainly both rightly believe, and hope, and duly trust that the body and blood of Christ were delivered and shed for the Church of Christ only”[\[357\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“[The Psalmist] declares that the reprobate are neither redeemed nor liberated by God through the blood of Christ’s cross”[\[358\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“For that God did not suffer for the baptized reprobate is altogether clear from the fact that the devil overcomes them and submits them to himself”[\[359\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“Christ redeemed only His holy Church and only the elect, that is solely His body and members through the blood of His cross, and certainly only for them He was crucified, and without doubt He suffered on the cross the most disgraceful, shameful and infamous death of that time for them only”[\[360\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“In short, the Lord suffered for the elect alone”[\[361\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

6. *Since the Fall humans can do only evil. It is only God’s grace that enables them to do good. The reprobate do not have that grace.*

“For, truly from free will he has been made a slave of sin and [afterward his freedom] is proved to exist exclusively for doing evil, [and] has been completely lost”[\[362\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“Anticipating the unwilling man, it [mercy] causes him to will good, and follows the willing one so that he can [continue to will good]”[\[363\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“It is present in the elect to will that which God has given to them, but they do not find [in themselves ability] to do good”[\[364\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

“It is clear without a scruple, is evident without ambiguity, is manifest without a cloud that just as the reprobate do not have [freedom] to do good, but [only] evil, so also they certainly do not have it to say the truth but [only] to lie”[\[365\]](#) (*Answers to Various Questions*).

7. *Baptism liberates only from past sins and therefore is of no avail for the salvation of the reprobate.*

“Redemption which is found in Baptism is common for the elect and the reprobate, for both are

completely redeemed from their past sins”[366] (*On Different Ways of Speaking About Redemption*).

“But that redemption, which is accomplished by the baptismal grace... which is common to the elect and the reprobate... washes away past sins, but does not redeem from future sins”[367] (*On Predestination*).

“At the same time let it be known and let it be said to you gladly that the kind of redemption, which is from past sins in Baptism, is common for the elect and the reprobate... After this redemption all the reprobate, the members of Antichrist... perish”[368] (*On Predestination*).

“The redemption of Baptism is similarly common, because [in it] both [elect and reprobate] are redeemed from [their] past original and personal sins”[369] (*Another Treatise on Predestination*).

“He evidently did not redeem on the cross any crime of any reprobate, though baptized, however small and insignificant it might be, that was perpetrated after the redemption of Baptism, but He certainly redeemed all the sins of all the elect”[370] (*Another Treatise on Predestination*).

8. *The Eucharist that is received by the reprobate is of no avail for their salvation.*

“The body and blood of Christ endure to salvation and avail for the remedy unto everlasting life only in those who are the body of Christ, not in the members of devil and the body of Antichrist”[371] (*On Predestination*).

“For truly, bread and wine, that is the body and blood of the Lord, are eaten and drunk by many unto their judgment, for they do not have the Holy Spirit with which the elect are filled”[372] (*On Predestination*).

“The reprobate world, that eats and drinks in an unworthy manner, eats and drinks judgment upon itself”[373] (*On the Body and Blood of the Lord*).

It is evident that Gottschalk’s teaching is largely based on that of Augustine. Thus the question naturally arises concerning the correlation of the two systems. It is obvious that the issue is far from being even superficially investigated. Even though such examination would require much more space than the present introduction allows, a few preliminary considerations still may be set forth here.

The first thing that arrests one's attention at the survey of Augustine's heritage is that his thought was like a river: the bishop of Hippo himself was never able to enter it twice. Almost each time he considered a certain problem he tended to modify his opinion, which is especially true with respect to his views on predestination and free will. It is the mutable human being that was his primary concern in this connection, and his reasoning always started with anthropology.

Nothing like that with Gottschalk. It is immutable God that fascinated his mind, very much in line with certain views of Plato, whom the rebellious Benedictine highly estimated and wrote that through this pagan God's wisdom spoke^[374]. It is the unalterable Creator that stands in the center of the Saxon's teaching; he indeed cared much less about fluid, variable creatures like human beings. It is undeniable that such a break with the previous anthropocentric tradition was outstanding; but it is no less undeniable that Gottschalk's theocentrism ran counter to pastoral theology. It is there that one should look for the reasons of the violent reaction of many contemporary Church leaders to his teaching. Amolo of Lyons, whose position towards the condemned monk was one of the most brotherly and compassionate, still wrote to him: "And the bishops, to whom you write, you exhort as if compassionately that they should preach to people that as they cannot escape the predetermined damnation, they should humiliate themselves and supplicate God that He may a little soften what is fixed for them or may alleviate the tortures. Tell me, I implore you, where in the holy Scriptures did you read that? Where in the holy and Catholic doctors of the Church did you find that? ...Or what else will you leave to those whom you likewise assert to be damned by an irrevocable sentence?"^[375]. The point was not so much in *what* actually Gottschalk taught, but *how* he did it (it concerned both the form in which he presented his ideas and the manner in which he himself behaved).

Comparison of the Saxon's writings with those of Prudentius, Ratramnus, Lupus and Florus shows to what extent our Benedictine disregarded or even disdained the very important reservations that made the ideas of others who disagreed with Hincmar and Rabanus much less scandalous if at all for bishops and abbots who stroke the keynote of Church policy at the time. It is very much understandable why Gottschalk's teaching produced on parishioners in recently Christianized areas the effect described by Rabanus: "What's the use if I labor for my salvation and life eternal? For if I do good and am not predestined to life, it is of no benefit; on the other hand, if I do evil, it will not hurt me, because the predestination of God brings me into the eternal

life”[376].

Any compromise was abhorrent to Gottschalk, whose behavior patterns sometimes bordered those of a sociopath. Only God and his own certitude in God-given truth mattered. Anything else did not, conventionalities of the human society and the visible Church included. It was the invisible that led him through his earthly pilgrimage. And such deep religious subjectivity in some respects draws him together with later Christian mystics like Bernard of Clairvaux or Richard of Saint-Victor.

What is indeed striking with respect to Gottschalk’s theology, is that simultaneously it is altogether rational. His epistemology has not been an object of deep investigation as yet; however, it may turn to be very fruitful. The Saxon’s confidence in reason is almost boundless. He uses “inevitably captious”[377] syllogisms throughout, giving Aristotle his due no less than Plato. Actually, formal logic is the basis of the whole of his system (as well as the basis of his unlimited assuredness in its verity).

Indeed, it is *logical* that God should not will all men to be saved: if He willed, He would not be omnipotent, since in fact all men are not saved; but He is omnipotent, ergo He does not will all men to be saved.

Here are a few more striking examples of Gottschalk’s way of reasoning: “Now if the baptized reprobate are redeemed through the blood of Christ’s cross, then they are also saved and freed through it. But surely those are not saved and freed through it, who, fitly enough, are prejudged, precondemned, and predestined to eternal death by Christ Himself and, so to say, they have been already justly thrown headlong into it. Therefore they are not redeemed through the blood of His cross”[378] (*On Predestination*).

“If Christ redeems by His blood the baptized reprobate, then He, without doubt, will deliver them up to stand before His Father’s face. However, He will not deliver them up to stand before His Father’s face. Therefore, He did not redeem them by His blood”[379] (*On Predestination*).

“However, I would like also to add prudently this, asking that most unable scoundrel: To which of the two worlds does he think the baptized reprobate belong according to the just judgment of God: to the reconciled and purified world or to the inimical, condemned, impure world? If he says that they belong to the reconciled, saved and purified world, you will tell him: Therefore they are reconciled, saved and purified

through the death of the Son of God and for that reason they will be saved from wrath through Him? If he, whether he likes it or not, sees and says that this is not true, and therefore will answer that they rather belong to the inimical, condemned, impure world, then you draw a conclusion and refute him, constraining him and saying cheerfully and with full assurance: Therefore, whether you like it or not, this time you finally have to believe, understand and confess that Christ, the Son of God, by no means redeemed through the blood of His cross the baptized reprobate, whom He does not have as reconciled, saved or purified”[\[380\]](#) (*On Predestination*).

Thus one may actually assert that Gottschalk’s use of logic, his rational approach to the issues he treats, makes him a forerunner of early scholastics together with Anselm of Canterbury and Berengar of Tours.

Truly, all the pasts have not had a future. But they surely will, since as a thinker as well as a historical figure Gottschalk is still full of surprises for an inquisitive researcher.

December 14, 2006

Nizhni Novgorod

[\[1\]](#) Lambot, p. 195.

[\[2\]](#) In particular, Thomas Bradwardine (c. 1290–1349), Gregory of Rimini (d. 1358) and John Wycliffe (c. 1330–1384) might be mentioned in this connection. However, they are separated from the Council of Tusey (860), which brought to an end the predestination controversy in the Carolingian era, by almost five hundred years.

[\[3\]](#) *Gotteschalci et Praedestinatianae controversiae ab eo motae Historia*. Dublin, 1631; Hannover, 1662.

[\[4\]](#) *Veterum Auctorum, qui IX saeculo de Praedestinatione et Gratia scripserunt, opera et Fragmenta plurima nunc primum in luce edita, etc.* 2 Vols. Paris, 1650.

[\[5\]](#) *Historia Gotteschalci praedestiniani et accurata controversiae per eum revocatae disputatio in libros V distincta*. Paris, 1655.

[\[6\]](#) *De erroribus Gottheschalci saec. IX damnatis*. Witebergae, 1646.

[\[7\]](#) *Historia Praedestiniana*, in: *Opera varia*. Vol. I. Paris, 1655.

[\[8\]](#) *Histoire de l’Eglise*. T. I. Rotterdam, 1699, chapters 8–9.

[\[9\]](#) *Diatribes historico-theologicae, qua praedestinianam et Godeschalci pseudohaereses commenta esse*

demonstratur. Tiguri, 1718.

[10] *Historiae Gothescalcae synopsis*, in: Opera. Verona, 1732. IV, p. 681 ff.

[11] *Historia di tutte l'heresie*. Venice, 1724.

[12] *Schicksale der augustinischen Anthropologie von der Verdammung des Semipelagianismus auf dem Synoden zu Orange und Valence 529 bis zur Reaction des Mönchs Gottschalk für den Augustinismus. Fünfte Abteilung: Der Mönch Gottschalk*, in: Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, 29 (1859). S. 471–594.

[13] *Das Dogma von der göttlichen Vorherbestimmung im neunten Jahrhundert*, in: Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, 4 (1859). S. 527–576.

[14] *Der Streit über die Prädestination im IX. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg, 1884.

[15] *Studien zu Gottschalks Leben und Lehre*. I–III, in: Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 18 (1897/1898), S. 1–22, 161–182, 529–545, and other articles.

[16] *Prooemium to Godescalci Carmina*, in: MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, II, pp. 707–722.

[17] *Wiedererkannte Dichtungen Gottschalks*, in: Revue Bénédictine, 44 (1932), S. 314–321.

[18] *Précurseur de Calvin ou témoin de l'augustinisme? Le cas de Godescalc*, in: Révue Thomiste, 15 (1932), pp. 71–101.

[19] *Gottschalk moine d'Orbais ou le commencement de la controverse sur la prédestination au IX^e siècle*. Saint-Quentin, 1887.

[20] *Jean Scot Erigène. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée*. Leuven, 1933.

[21] Dom G. Morin. *Gottschalk retrouvé*, in: Revue Bénédictine, 43 (1931), pp. 303–312.

[22] Dom C. Lambot, ed. *Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais*. Leuven, 1945.

[23] Dom C. Lambot, ed. *Lettre inédite de Godescalc d'Orbais*, Revue bénédictine 68, 1958.

[24] *Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda*. Tübingen, 1948.

[25] *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry*. Oxford, 1953.

[26] *Gottschalks Lied für den reichenauer Freund*, in: *Mittelalterliche Studien: ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, II (1967), pp. 26–34.

[27] *Die Gedichte des Gottschalk von Orbais* (Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 27). Frankfurt, 1992.

[28] *Godescalc d'Orbais et la trinité: la méthode de la théologie à l'époque carolingienne*. Paris, 1958.

[29] *Trina Deitas: The Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk*. Wisconsin, 1996.

[30] *Gottschalk der Sachse*. Bonn, 1956.

[31] *The Debate on Predestination*, in: Gibson M., Nelson J., eds. *Charles the Bald; Court and Kingdom*. Oxford, 1981. pp. 353–373.

[32] *The Carolingian Councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and their Background*, in: Revue Bénédictine, 84 (1974), pp. 75–110.

[33] *Hincmar: archevêque de Reims 845–882*. Genève, 1975–1976.

[34] *Gottschalk d'Orbais. De Fulda à Hautvillers: une dissidence*. Paris, 2004.

[35] Which is in no way complete; for a detailed general picture see the bibliography.

[36] It is to note, however, that R. Hanko did accomplish a few translations (those of *Confessio brevior* and *Confessio prolixior*) that were published in the Protestant Reformed Theological Journal, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1978. To his regret, the author of these lines was unable to discover any references to this important work in later

literature on Gottschalk.

[37] Cf. the epigraph.

[38] MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 530.

[39] Abbot of Fulda 842–856.

[40] Archbishop of Mainz 826–847.

[41] In contemporary literature spellings vary; it may also read Bern, Berno or Bernon.

[42] C. 780–856, abbot of Fulda 822–842, archbishop of Mainz 848–856.

[43] *Sunt, ut nostis, possessiones Fuldensis monasterii et ecclesiae ad eam pertinentes proprietates dominicalis, quae domino imperatori ex paterna successione hereditario iure provenit.* L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 709. In the present Introduction translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.

[44] H. Leclerq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris, 1936, Col. 1861.

[45] As Haito, abbot of Reichenau 806–823.

[46] An abbey in Hesse, modern central Germany.

[47] More on this in the section on the Dalmatian period.

[48] Cf. B. Boller, *Gottschalk d'Orbais. De Fulda à Hautvillers: une dissidence*, Paris, 2004, p. 21, n. 31.

[49] *Sunt ergo quidam qui a cunabulis suis sacras litteras didicerunt, et sanctae Ecclesiae nutrimento tandiu aliti sunt, quousque satis educati in sublime sacrorum ordinum proveherentur.* Rabanus Maurus, *De oblatione puerorum*. PL 107, 419 B–C.

[50] Founded in 724 by missionary bishop Pirmin (abbot 724–727), the monastery was located on the highway to Italy and frequented by pilgrims. In Latin Reichenau was called *Augia Dives*. Its vernacular name until the 10th century was Sintlas-Au.

[51] Western arm of Lake Constance (Bodensee).

[52] C. 808–849, abbot of Reichenau 838, 842–849.

[53] J. A. Fabricius, *Notitia historica in Walafridum Strabum*, PL 113, 9 A. Strabo means “squint-eyed”.

[54] *Gotescalcho monaco, qui et Fulgentius*, PL 114, 1115 D; MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, II, p. 262. L. Traube subtly remarks: “I believe that Gottschalk was called so after Fulgentius Planciadus, a translator of Virgil, not after the bishop of Ruspe, a disciple of Augustine; it is much more probable that both [Gottschalk and Walafrid] eagerly read Virgil at the period, than meditated upon the doctrine of predestination” (*op. cit.*, p. 708, n. 2).

[55] *Pater fraterque*. PL 114, 1116 D.

[56] *Magister meus Vuctinus*. Lambot, p. 170. Thus Gottschalk was transferred to Reichenau before 824, when the death of Wettin occurred. Before leaving this life, Wettin saw hell, purgatory and paradise. Haito set forth the vision in prose; afterwards Walafrid, then about 18 years old, put it into verse (famous *Visio Wettini*) at Grimald's request.

[57] K. Vielhaber, *Gottschalk der Sachse*, Bonn, 1956, p. 14, n. 26) notes that G. Mauguin, who mentions that Gottschalk studied under Tatto, had some source of his own.

[58] Also spelled Heito or Hatto, 762/763–836, head of monastic school under Waldo (abbot 786–806), abbot of Reichenau and bishop of Basle 806–823.

[59] Under abbots Haito (806–823) and Erlebald (823–838).

[60] *In pauperie passa est quam nostra iuventus*. PL 114, 116 C.

[61] MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, III, pp. 731–732.

- [62] To mention a few: G. L. Perugi, *Gottschalc*, Rome, 1911, p. 56; H. v. Schubert, *Die Geschichte des deutschen Glaubens*, Leipzig, 1925, p. 55; O. Herding, *Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda*, in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider gewidmet zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, 1948, pp. 53–54. See also F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry*, Oxford, 1927, p. 191.
- [63] K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, pp. 85–87.
- [64] Presumably about 827.
- [65] In a letter to Eginhard Lupus mentions (PL 119, 433 B) that he was sent to Fulda by Aldric (archbishop of Sens 829–836, before Wenilo). L. Traube assumed that this happened when Aldric was still the abbot of Ferrières (after Adalbert), so before 829 (*op. cit.*, p. 708, n. 3).
- [66] *Confestimne attonsus sit an, ut Heiricus, aliquot annis post oblationem, ignoramus. Op. cit.*, p. 707, n. 2. At any event, if it was Rabanus who forced Gottschalk to become a monk, he was not able to do this immediately after Gottschalk entered the monastery (if it happened about 814): J. Mabillon indicates (*B. Rabani Mauri Elogium historicum*, PL, 107, 17 A–B) that in 814–817 Rabanus left Fulda on account of disagreement with Ratgar and, presumably, visited the Holy Land. Rabanus alludes to this trip in his commentary on Joshua (PL 108, 1000 A).
- [67] *Godeschalcum in pueritia coegit (Rabanus) monasticam vitam suscipere*. MGH, Epistulae, V, p. 529.
- [68] Be it “childhood”, “boyhood” or “youth”, the term is rather vague as a designation of age.
- [69] P. Piper, ed. *Libri confraternitatum Sancti Galli, Augiensis, Fabariensis*, Berlin, 1884, p. 202.
- [70] K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 14, n. 25.
- [71] *Sub sequentibus abbatibus*, P. Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
- [72] Besides, if Gottschalk blamed Rabanus for having forced him into monkhood, it is natural to suppose that when it had happened the latter had been already in charge of the monastery and thus responsible for the decision.
- [73] *Interpellavit Rabanum abbatem... asserens se et invitum fuisse attonsum et violenter ab eo monasticę vitę mancipatum*. MGH, Epistulae, V, p. 530.
- [74] As it is suggested by F. J. Gaudard, *Gottschalk, moine d'Orbais ou le commencement de la controverse sur la prédestination au IX^e siècle*, Saint-Quentin, 1887, p. 19.
- [75] Rabanus and Gottschalk.
- [76] Gottschalk's.
- [77] *Eorum iudicio paternae restitutus est libertati: ea tamen ratione, ut, si abbati ita placeret, controversiæ eorum finis inter eos istius ac propinquorum suorum esset iuramentum*. MGH, Epistulae, V, p. 530.
- [78] Cf. L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 709.
- [79] PL 107, 419–440.
- [80] Even though in his correspondence he considers the problem of Gottschalk's legacy as an important factor in it, see above.
- [81] Rabanus gives no names, but there is no doubt at all that he means Gottschalk and those supporting him.
- [82] *Sed ingrati tanto munere, contraria orthodoxorum Patrum fidei sentiunt, ac matrem universorum fidelium telis iniquitatis suae quotidie impugnant*. 419 C.
- [83] 420 C.
- [84] *Obcaecato corde per cupiditatem terrenam*. 429 C.
- [85] *Importuni defensores genuinae libertatis*. 425 A.
- [86] *Legem mundanam et temporalem legi divinae atque aeternae... praeponunt*. 425 B.

- [87] *Dicentes eos servos fieri qui monachi fiunt.* 431 C.
- [88] *Hoc pro magno honore sancti patres habuere, quod servi Dei nuncuparentur.* 420 B.
- [89] *Non intellegunt se sontra Dominum pugnare.* 431 C.
- [90] *Contraria fidei catholicae sentiunt, atque sectas novas, appropinquante fine mundi, in Ecclesiam introducunt.* 429 C.
- [91] *Testibus idoneis confirmari debere.* 431 A.
- [92] *Hoc enim, aiunt, legem gentis suae pati non posse, ut alterius gentis homo in testimonium citetur ad infringendam legem libertatis suae.* 431 B.
- [93] 432 A.
- [94] *Iste adversarius noster.* 438 C.
- [95] For more details see K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 16–17.
- [96] It is highly improbable that the legacy was given back. It is important to note that being “free” but without the inheritance was a rather shaky social status; on the contrary, monastic life offered a possibility of a stable career.
- [97] PL 125, 84 A. Cf. Dom C. Lambot, *Lettre inédite de Godescalc d’Orbais*, *Revue bénédictine* 68, 1958, p. 49.
- [98] Founded in 677 by Reol (Regulus), bishop of Reims 669–695.
- [99] Founded in 657 by Bathilde, widow of Clovis II.
- [100] He also might know personally Paschasius Radbertus (who was a monk at Corbie under Adalhard and Wala, and himself elected abbot of Corbie about 843) whose understanding of the Eucharist Gottschalk would later criticize in his treatise *On the Lord’s Body and Blood*, Lambot, pp. 324–335 (see also pp. 335–337).
- [101] Or even before 833, cf. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
- [102] Abbot 820–841.
- [103] A monastery founded about 662 by Bercharius (636–696), its first abbot.
- [104] The manuscript is preserved in the *Médiathèque municipale* of Épernay. Another work of art produced at Hautvillers scriptorium around the same time is the Utrecht Psalter, preserved in the *Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit*.
- [105] MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, I, p. 623–624. For a facsimile reproduction see B. Boller, *op. cit.*, pp. 226–231.
- [106] MGH, *Poetae Latini Medii Aevi*, VI, p. 88.
- [107] *Op. cit.*, pp. 88–89.
- [108] *Op. cit.*, pp. 65–70.
- [109] These three are the only abbots that Hincmar mentions by name, PL 125, 85 C. The abbot of Hautvillers might be invited because Hincmar planned beforehand the role of that monastery as Gottschalk’s prison. However K. Vielhaber believes that this idea came to Hincmar’s mind during the synod itself (*op. cit.*, p. 90). Cf. also Lambot, p. 379.
- [110] *Carmen ad Rathramnum*, MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, II, p. 735.
- [111] Since Rathramnus was supposed to ignore this episode of his life.
- [112] Written before 835.
- [113] As a *vernaculus* or *cliens* (C. Lambot, ed. *Lettre inédite de Godescalc d’Orbais*, p. 42, 44).
- [114] *Dedistis operam ut lumen scientiae addiscerem verenter*, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[115] As suggested by Traube, *op. cit.*, pp. 710–711.

[116] Hincmar, *Ad reclusos et simplices*, W. Gundlach, ed. *Zwei Schriften Hinkmars von Reims, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 10 [1889], p. 261: *Gotescalcus... antequam ex ista parrochia contra leges ecclesiasticas excommunicatus pergeret... auribus et aspectibus vestris commendans... venena pessima auditibus simul et cordibus vestris infudit.*

[117] Thus definitively outside Orbais which he ought not to leave, should he be a monk there at the period.

[118] Lambot, pp. 298–301.

[119] MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, II, pp. 723–724.

[120] Very little is known about Lupus of Châlons, beside the fact that he was present at the synod of Quierzy in 853 (PL 125, 85 B).

[121] To whom Gottschalk, in the words of Hincmar, sent a *thomus*, where he set forth his teaching (*Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Gundlach, p. 261).

[122] L.Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 710.

[123] K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 17, n. 38.

[124] This Rimbert also authored a letter to Ratramnus addressing the question about *cynocephali*, dog-headed men, where he wondered whether they were in need of Christian witness. Cf. Ratramnus' answer in MGH *Epistulae*, VI, pp. 155–157.

[125] Between 869 and 876.

[126] A cousin of Charlemagne, abbot of Corbie 826–831; abbot of Bobbio in Italy since 834.

[127] *Porro cum Herioldo esse disposuit Patrem devotissimum Gislemarum, fide et operibus bonis probatum, atque in zelo Dei ferventissimum.* Rembertus Hamburgensis, *Vita S. Ansharii*, PL 118, 971 B.

[128] He returned in 831 to become the abbot of Corvey and bishop of newly established diocese of Hamburg (both in Saxony).

[129] Later on a prior at Corvey.

[130] For further details see K. Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des Norwegischen Stammes zum Christentume*, Vol. 1, München, 1855, pp. 19–22.

[131] Its other important trend was the establishment of the Benedictine rule in all of the Frankish monasteries under the leadership of Benedict of Aniane (for a detailed account of this reform see R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987*, London and New York, 1983, pp. 108–124).

[132] PL 118, 967 B.

[133] J. T. Palmer. *Rimbert's Vita Ansharii and Scandinavian Mission in the Ninth Century*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 55, No 2, 2004, p. 243.

[134] *Ibid.*, p. 244.

[135] R. McKitterick, *op. cit.*, p. 166. Cf. also Walafrid's two poems to Judith in PL 114, 1095 C–1096 D, and the one about her and her son Charles in PL 114, 1093 D–1094 C.

[136] That same year another significant event took place, perhaps even more important for Gottschalk's biography: in 829 the synod of Paris was convened, where the necessity of good works for salvation was emphasized as an inalienable part of the orthodox doctrine.

[137] In 816.

[138] Frankish aristocracy was deeply displeased by this nomination, because of Ebbo's obscure origin, as well as by the elevation of Agobard, who was a Visigoth, to the archiepiscopal see of Lyons.

[139] In the 850s this struggle against Hincmar was continued by the bishop of Grenoble, Ebbo's nephew and

namesake, cf. P. R. McKeon. *The Carolingian Councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and their Background*, in: *Revue Bénédictine*, 84 (1974), pp. 100–101.

[140] *The Rule of Benedict*, ed. and trans. J. McCann. London, 1972, 1, 61, pp. 14–15, 138.

[141] Besides, it is difficult to conceive any such mission entrusted to Gottschalk at this time, in view of the two synods where he had shown quite a disobedient attitude towards his abbot.

[142] It also may be translated as “public” or “civil affairs,” which at all events presupposes Gottschalk’s rather deep involvement (at least at some point) in social and political life of his day.

[143] *Quia et ecclesiastica et civilia negotia... conturbare... praesumpsisti*. Quoted by L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 713.

[144] *Lettre inédite*, p. 45.

[145] It is probable that at the time of its writing Gottschalk was already a monk at Orbais, since he speaks about the accusations of the *saeculi homines* (“secular people”) and describes himself as enjoying *fratrum consortium* (“fellowship of the brethren”), Dom C. Lambot, *Lettre inédite*, p. 44. Thus he entered the monastery before 835, the year of Ebbo’s deposition and imprisonment.

[146] *Contra imperatorum nomen... crimen*, *Lettre inédite*, p. 44. The phrase is mysterious. What might be the nature of this supposed crime and whether it was connected to Ebbo’s own conspiracy against Louis the Pious is unclear. Whatever the case, this passage gives further attestation of Gottschalk’s involvement in politics.

[147] Died in 867.

[148] Rimbert would have to explain on what grounds monks could ignore the vows of stability for years in case they were involved in missionary work.

[149] G. Butler. *Benedictine monachism*, London, 1924, p. 327.

[150] J. T. Palmer, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

[151] Hincmar in PL 125, 85 C: *Gothescalus... honore presbyterali, quem per Rigboldum Rhemorum chorepiscopum, cum esset Suessionicae parochiae monachus, inscio civitatis suae episcopo, usurpaverat potius quam acceperat...*

[152] Cf. L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 711, n. 2.

[153] Cf. G. H. Tavard, *Trina Deitas: The Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk*. Milwaukee, WI, 1996, p. 31.

[154] *Tutor ecclesiae*, MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, III, p. 202.

[155] Among whom, beside Rabanus, was Lupus of Ferrières.

[156] MGH, *Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, II, pp. 362–364.

[157] *Op. cit.*, p. 712.

[158] MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 428–429; PL 112, 1530 C–1531 A. See the English translation by Francis X. Gumerlock in the present book.

[159] MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 481–487.

[160] As suggested by E. Dümmler, MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 332, n. 2.

[161] Probably modern Lahngau, cf. K. J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles d’après les documents originaux*. Trad. corr. et augm. par H. Leclerq. IV, 1. Paris, 1911, p. 142, n. 2.

[162] *De heresi, quam quidam de predestinatione Dei inique contendunt*. MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 428.

[163] PL 112, 1531–1553.

[164] *Ad Notingum quoque episcopum Veronensem de praescientia ac praedestinatione Dei, de gratia et libero arbitrio scripsit*. Quoted by E. Dümmler: MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 428, n. 2.

[165] A region north of Italy, comprising central Austria and parts of Bavaria.

[166] *Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. F. Grat et al. Paris, 1964, ann. 849, p. 57 (see the English translation in G. H. Tavard, *op. cit.*, p. 33). The same source indicates that Gottschalk propagated his ideas not only orally, but also through his writings. However, no extant treatise of the Benedictine can be attributed to that period with certainty.

[167] To succeed Otgar as archbishop of Mainz in 847.

[168] Thus H. Schrörs (*Hinkmar Erzbischof von Reims. Sein Leben und seine Schriften*. Freiburg, 1884, p. 100) and L. Traube (*op. cit.*, p. 712). A. Freystedt (*Studien zu Gottschalks Leben und Lehre*. I–III, in: *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 18 [1897/1898], pp. 179–180) believed the letter was written in 847. K. Vielhaber (*op. cit.*, p. 20) dated it by 845/846. E. Dümmler (p. 481) attributed it to 846–847.

[169] In his letter to Eberhard Rabanus uses at least three times the word *secta* (MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 481, 482, 487), which presupposes multiplicity of the followers.

[170] In Noricum (as the *Annals of St Bertin* witness, see above).

[171] *De cetero quoque, quia divulgatum in istis partibus constat quendam sciolum nomine Gotescalcum, apud vos manere, qui dogmatizet, quod predestinatio Dei omnem hominem ita constringat, ut etiam, si quis velit salvus fieri, et pro hoc fide recta atque bonis operibus certet, ut ad vitam aeternam per Dei gratiam veniat, frustra et incassum labore, si non est predestinatus ad vitam, quasi Deus predestinatione sua cogat hominem interire, qui auctor est salutis nostrae, non perditionis. Et iam hinc multos in desperationem suimet hæc secta perduxit, ita ut dicant: Quid mihi necesse est pro salute mea et vita aeterna laborare? quia si bonum fecere, et predestinatus ad vitam non sum, nihil mihi prodest; si autem malum egero, nihil mihi obest, quia predestinatio Dei me facit ad vitam aeternam pervenire. Hæc traditio multis in istis partibus scandalum est, et predicatoribus evangelii inobedientes facit, quia iam desperantes de semetipsis eos reddidit. Dicitur enim ipse doctor vester multa testimonia excerptisse de opusculis beatissimi et doctissimi patris Augustini, quibus nititur suam sectam affirmare, cum memoratus pater et doctor, contra Pelagianos scribens, qui gratiae Dei contrarii predicatoribus fuerunt, defensor eiusdem gratiae, non destructor rectae fidei fuerit.* MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 481–482.

[172] *Hæc ergo, amice karissime, ideo tibi scripsi, ut cognosceres, quale scandalum de illis partibus opinio veniens in hoc populo generarit, et si quis iuxta te manens impudenter docet quæ recte fidei sunt contraria, prohibeas eum, ut cesset ab hac secta, dicasque ei: Vide, frater, ne hac licentia tua in predicando offendiculum fiat infirmis, et tuo dogmate ne perdas eum, pro quo Christus mortuus est, quia sanguis eius requiretur de manu tua. Confido enim te, vir venerabile, bene esse christianum, nec aliquid te habere velle in tua communione quod evangelio Christi adversetur, sed agis hoc quod placeat Deo, et ad salutem pertinet animarum.* MGH, *Epistulae*, V, p. 487.

[173] *Turpiter ejectus. Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. F. Grat et al. Paris, 1964, ann. 849, p. 57.

[174] In 827 Baldrich, the then margrave of Frioul, was deprived of his office because of his failure to prevent undesirable activity of the Bulgars in Pannonia.

[175] Cf. *Liber de tribus epistolis: ... postquam eum dixit ultro sibi praedicatoris nomen assumpsisse, atque ad barbaras et paganas gentes velut evangelizaturum perrexisset...* (PL 121, 987 C).

[176] Cf. K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[177] At the time Dalmatian Croats were led by Višeslav, whose seat was in the city of Nin (Aenona).

[178] As a result, Byzantium kept the city-states Zadar (Diadora), Trogir (Tragurium) and Split (Aspalathos) as well as the islands of Krk, Rab and Osor, while Charlemagne controlled Istria and the inland Dalmatia (Treaty of Aachen of 812).

[179] Byzantine emperor 913–959.

[180] After Charlemagne's death Frankish influence in the area considerably decreased.

[181] *Op. cit.*, p. 43, n. 90.

[182] G. H. Tavad believes that Gottschalk's companion in his Balkan travels, his *filiolus* (see below), equally called Gottschalk, was his nephew (*op. cit.*, p. 31). However, it is also possible that he was his pupil and godson, whom the Saxon christened with his own name.

[183] It is not known whether any of them were Borná's descendants.

[184] Lambot, pp. 162–171.

[185] Even though Gottschalk designates Trpimir as *rex*, he was in fact a *knez*, that is a prince.

[186] *Sic nihilominus et equi sunt in acie laeti ex ea parte quam deo dante debet uictoria sequi. Quod prorsus ego ipse per Gottesscalcum filiolum meum de equo nostro probaui. Cum enim Tripemirus rex Sclauorum iret contra gentem Graecorum et patricium eorum et esset in ipso confinio futuri belli uilla nostra, dixi illi ut iret et quicquid regi et eius exercitui necessarium esset sicut omnino deberet impenderet. Adiuraui tamen terribiliter eum per dominum deum ut nec arma sumeret nec cum exercitu pergeret, sed tamen studiose post eos equitans attenderet quemnam gestum equus ille noster ageret atque gereret. Ex olim siquidem certissime sciebam illi parti hominum uenturam et futuram esse uictoriam quorum equi incederent laeti monstrarentque gestu triumphando laetitiam.* Lambot, p. 169.

[187] *Saksonac Gottschalk na dvoru kneza Trpimira*, in: Bogoslovska smotra, 20 (1932), pp. 415–423.

[188] According to a lengthy commentary to that word given by D. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, Vol. VI, Paris, 1938, pp. 214–218.

[189] Its inscription reads: Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῶ δούλῳ Βρυεν[ίῳ] β[ασιλικῷ] σπαθ[αρίῳ] σ[τ]ρ[α]τ[ε]γῶ Δαλματίας (“O Lord, help your servant Bryenius, the king's court dignitary, governor of Dalmatia”), quoted in L. Katić, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

[190] F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*. Zagreb, 1925, p. 327.

[191] *Item homines Dalmatini, perinde id est similiter homines Latini Graecorum nihilominus imperio subiecti, regem et imperatorem communi locutione per totam Dalmatiam longissimam reuera regionem regem inquam et imperatorem regnum et imperium vocant. Aiunt enim: Fuimus ad regnum, et: Stetimus ante imperium, et: Ita nobis dixit regnum, et: Ita nobis loquutum est imperium.* Lambot, p. 208.

[192] As L. Katić suggests, *op. cit.*, p. 415. To this also Gottschalk's strict neutrality may point, as he forbids his companion to take arms and go into battle (see above).

[193] Ironically enough, this treatise was for a long time attributed to Rabanus.

[194] *...Nam quondam in terra Vulgarorum quidam nobilis potensque paganus bibere me suppliciter petiuit in illius dei amore qui de uino sanguinem suum facit.* Lambot, p. 325.

[195] *Op. cit.*, 423.

[196] B. Boller, *op. cit.*, p. 44, n. 93, p. 247.

[197] Each Croatian clan occupied a certain territory, subdivided into *župe* (counties). Each of them was ruled by a *župan*. The ruler of several *župe* was a *knez* (prince).

[198] *Op. cit.*, pp. 430–432.

[199] The other possible translation is: “His legs were mutilated”.

[200] Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους πολλοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Τερπημέρη τοῦ ἄρχοντος, τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἄρχοντος Κρασημέρη, ἐλθὼν ἀπὸ Φραγγίας, τῆς μεταξὺ Χρωβατίας καὶ Βενετίας, ἀνὴρ τις τῶν πάνυ μὲν εὐλαβῶν, Μαρτίνος ὀνόματι, σχῆμα δὲ κοσμικὸν περιβεβλημένος, ὃν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ Χρωβάτοι θαύματα ἰκανὰ ποιῆσαι. ἀσθενῆς δὲ ὢν ὁ τοιοῦτος εὐλαβῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἠκρωτηριασμένος, ὥστε ὑπὸ τεσσάρων βασιτάζεσθαι καὶ περιφέρεσθαι, ὅπου δ' ἂν καὶ βούλεται.

[201] *Op. cit.*, p. 54, n. 119.

[202] L. Katić's idea that it happened because Martin was a typical Frankish name for Croats, while the name

Gottschalk sounded too strange for them (*op. cit.*, p. 432), does not seem convincing.

[203] On St Martin of Podused, see A. Z. Kiš. *Sveti Martin: Kult sveca i njegova tradicija u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb, 2004 (on Porphyrogenitus' text, p. 159).

[204] See above.

[205] In that connection anti-sacerdotalist preaching of the chiliast Thiota should be mentioned (cf. McKeon, *op. cit.*, p. 89), as well as the council of Paris (which condemned those teaching that Christians are at all events saved, even in case they persist in evil, and that the pagans are automatically punished) that took place around the same time (cf. Devisse, p. 121 and n. 26). In a simplistic perspective, like that of Rabanus, Gottschalk's teaching was something very similar.

[206] K. J. Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[207] *Annales Fuldenses*, ad ann. 848, ed. F. Kurze, Hannover, 1891, p. 37–38. G. F. Wiggers, *op. cit.*, p. 475, designates it *ein Reichstag*; B. Lavaud (Prédestination. IV. La controverse sur la prédestination au IX^e siècle, in: Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique. XII, 1935, Col. 2903) calls it *la diète de Mayence*; K. J. Hefele (*op. cit.*, p. 137) defines it as *moitié diète, moitié concile*.

[208] *Annales de Saint-Bertin* ad ann. 849, ed. F. Grat et al. Paris, 1964, p. 57.

[209] *Annales Xantenses* ad ann. 848, ed. B. Simson, Hannover, 1916, p. 16.

[210] Fragments preserved by Hincmar, PL 121, 365–368. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock is included into the present volume ("Reply to Rabanus Maurus").

[211] Probably those expressed in his letter to Noting.

[212] Preserved by Hincmar, PL 125, 89 D–90 A. Translation by Victor Genke is included into the present volume.

[213] PL 112, 1574–1576. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock is included into the present volume.

[214] J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 133, n. 84.

[215] *Rothado Suessionico, quem saepe ad synodum venire differentem vel negligentem vocabat, scribit... pro recipiendo et adducendo ad iudicium Gothescalco, quem domnus Rabanus ad dioecesim Remensem remiserat: qui profectus fuerat ex parochia Suessionica, scilicet Orbacensi monasterio* (PL 135, 204 D). The letter is now lost.

[216] Flodoard: *Diversis etiam tam episcopis quam archiepiscopis multimoda utillima dedit scripta... Hrabano Moguntiae praesuli, super ejusdem Gothescalci (quem idem pontifex a parochia sua ob haeresum semina, quae spargebat, repulsum, ad eumdem cum quibusdam complicibus suis direxerat) susceptione vel discussione; item de hac eadem re, et quid post susceptionem ipsius de eodem egerit, qualemve invenerit ipsius vesaniam, consilium ab eo rationabilius, quid sibi adversus eum agendum sit, expetens* (PL 135, 200 A–C). Cf. Devisse, p. 126, n. 56.

[217] As Hincmar would later write to Pope Nicholas (PL 126, 43 C–D). Fragment of that letter translated by Victor Genke is included into the present volume.

[218] The synod must have taken place a few weeks before the Easter (April 14), since in the letter, in which Hincmar informs Prudentius of Troyes concerning Gottschalk's condemnation, he also asks, *si in coena Domini vel in Pascha debeat illum admittere ad audiendum sacrum officium vel accipiendam communionem* (Flodoard, PL 135, 206 A).

[219] *Regio mandato pro negotiis regis*, as Hincmar says in his *Epistola ad Ecclesiam Lugdunensem*, lost but quoted by Florus in his *Liber de tribus epistolis*, PL 121, 1027 C.

[220] Beside Hincmar, there were his nine suffragans and his interim bishop, the archbishop of Sens, bishops of Langres and Rennes, as well as the interim bishop of Cambrai (*De praedestinatione*, PL 125, 85 A–B: *Indequae a synodali conventu in Carisiaco palatio iterum auditus ab episcopis, et caeteris quam plurimis viris*

ecclesiasticis atque religiosis, qui eidem synodo interfuerunt, videlicet Wenilone Sennensium archiepiscopo, Hincmaro Rhemorum episcopo, Folcoino Morinensium episcopo, Teuderico Camaracensium episcopo, Rothado Suessionicae civitatis episcopo, Ragenario Ambianensium episcopo, Immone Noviomagensium episcopo, Erpoino Silvanectensium episcopo, Lupo Catalaunensium episcopo, Yrminfrido Belvacensium episcopo, Pardulo Laudunensium episcopo, Teutboldo provinciae Lugdunensium et Lingonicae civitatis episcopo, Gernobrio Turonensium provinciae episcopo, Rigboldo Rhemorum chorepiscopo, Witao Camaracensium chorepiscopo). Elsewhere (*Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Gundlach, p. 308) the archbishop of Reims affirms that the sentence was pronounced by twelve bishops, which means that three persons abstained from subscribing it.

[221] *Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. F. Grat et al. Paris, 1964, ann. 849, p. 57.

[222] Disastrous experience in Mainz seems to compel him to think about the presentation of his ideas: if previously Gottschalk had produced only his own writings, this time he obviously took into account his adversaries' custom to rely on authorities, even though it did not help him much.

[223] Perhaps the section of Gottschalk's larger *On Predestination* entitled by the editors [*Testimonies of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles*] in the present book may be considered to be a copy or a later reconstruction of the scriptural part of this florilegium by Gottschalk himself.

[224] Cf. K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 22 and n. 56.

[225] In 863 he would depose Rothad for contesting his authority.

[226] Theologian and poet of Burgund or Spanish origin, d. c. 860.

[227] PL 121, 1030 B–C: *Quapropter illud prorsus omnes non solum dolent, sed etiam horrent: quia inaudito irreligiositatis, et crudelitatis exemplo, tandiu ille miserabilis flagris et caedibus trucidatus est, donec (sicut narraverunt nobis, qui praesentes aderant) accenso coram se igni libellum, in quo sententias Scripturarum sive sanctorum Patrum sibi collegerat, quas in concilio offerret, coactus est jam pene emoriens suis manibus in flammam projicere, atque incendio concremare: cum omnes retro haeretici verbis, et disputationibus victi, atque convicti sunt. Et sic pravitas, quae videbatur hominis, fuerit coercenda, ut nulla divinis rebus inferretur injuria. Maxime cum illi sensus, qui ipso continebantur libello, excepto uno qui extremus ponitur, non essent sui, sed ecclesiastici: nec ignibus damnandi, sed pia et pacifica fuerint inquisitione tractandi. Sed et illa ejusdem miserandi hominis tam longa, et inhumana in ergastulum per tot annos damnatio, aliqua ut credimus, compassionis benignitate, et consolatione fuerat temperanda, vel etiam removenda, ut frater pro quo Christus mortuus est, per charitatem, et spiritum mansuetudinis potius lucraretur, quam abundantiori tristitia absorberetur.*

[228] *Op. cit.*, p. 129.

[229] Prudentius was probably a Basque whose parents came to the Frankish side of the Pyrenees at the beginning of Louis the Pious' reign (cf. G. H. Tavard, *op. cit.*, p. 17); his original name was Galindo.

[230] *Op. cit.*, p. 127, n. 59.

[231] Book of canon law sent by Pope Hadrian I to Charlemagne at the latter's request in 774.

[232] *Scrripsit quoque ad Deum loquens, et dicens ei quod ipse illi praeceperit ut pro me non oraret, et quia primum Filius in eum intraverit, postea Pater, deinde Spiritus sanctus, qui in illum intrans ei circa os barbam adussit: et quia nollet vestimenta de vestiario fratrum communicantium mihi accipere, nisi pretio compararet qui pretium non habebat, sed sic vellet ire, sicut Adam ibat antequam peccaret. Mox autem ut frigus eum coepit constringere, cum vestimentis etiam pelliciam et focum studuit quaerere* (PL 125, 613 A–B).

[233] *Ante hos siquidem annos revelatum sibi quibusdam familiaribus suis scripsit, quod ego statim post tres semis annos suae revelationis, sicut Antichristus usurpans sibi potestatis potentiam mori, et ipse Rhemorum episcopus fieri, et post septennium veneno interfici, et sic gloriae martyrum adaequari deberet.... Prophetiam a spiritu suo inspiratam impleri non vidit* (PL 125, 613 B–C).

[234] PL 121, 1027 D. Other spellings of the term are *arreptivus* and *arrepticus*, cf. A Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin*. Oxford, 1949.

[235] This is the letter that preceded another one to the same addressee, translated for the present volume by Victor Genke.

[236] *Plura denique vobis de ipso Gothescalco scribere poteram, quam perniciosus sit, et multo magis noxius erit multis, si ab ipsa custodia fuerit absolutus: quia pro certo talia dicit et talia facit, in quibus evidenter cognoscitur aut daemonicus esse, aut maniacus: et scitis quoniam mania esse non solet absque daemone* (PL 126, 70 D).

[237] K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 27; D. E. Nineham. *Gottschalk of Orbais: Reactionary or Precursor to the Reformation?* In: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 40 (1989), p. 5.

[238] There is also no doubt that Gottschalk had access to the library of the abbey, cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 132, n. 82.

[239] *Quidquid fratres in cibo et potu habent, hoc ei quotidie sine ulla negligentia ministratur; vestimenta illi ad sufficientiam offeruntur, si vult ille accipere: ligna ad focum faciendum illi sufficienter dantur. In mansione in qua degit caminatum habet, et necessarium. Lavacra illi non denegantur: sed postquam in eamdem mansionem intravit, non solum corpus lavare noluit, verum nec manus, nec faciem. Antea enim, sicut illi testantur inter quos conversatus erat, turpissimus et adhuc quantum potest in sua turpitudine manet* (PL 126, 70 D). This interesting report about Gottschalk's being *turpissimus* even before Mainz, Quierzy and Hautvillers, as well as the sharp inconsistency between how he behaved and how he wrote, led us to draw a queer parallel, namely with the type of holiness, which was represented by *yurodivys* in medieval Russia. Indeed, a *yurodivy* was an eccentric figure outside the conventional society, whose madness might be either factual or feigned. They were sure of their divine inspiration and thus were able to say things that others would never dare to utter. Russian Orthodox Church numbers 36 *yurodivys* among its saints.

[240] *De quibus perversitatibus scilicet suis et scripta illius suscepi: unum quidem thomum a confratribus nostris oblatum, scripsit...; alterum autem quem contra Rabanum...; tertium quoque thomulum quantitate parvum, sed impietate maximum ab illo ipso mihi oblatum suscepi* (*Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Gundlach, p. 261–262).

[241] See the extant fragments translated by Victor Genke for the present book. There is almost no doubt that this is the same as *pitacium ad quemdam monachum* (PL 125, 369 C–D) and the writing addressed *ad quemdam complicem* (PL 125, 291 A).

[242] See above.

[243] Translated for the present book by Francis X. Gumerlock. *Thomulum quantitate parvum* mentioned by Hincmar was identified as the “Shorter Confession” by M. Cappuyns, *op. cit.*, p. 106, n. 1.

[244] B. Boller places the date of composition of the *Confessio brevis* as early as in the year 840 (*op. cit.*, p. 240), which date does not seem to be justified. K. Vielhaber places it between the synod of Quierzy and *Ad reclusos et simplices* (*op. cit.*, 23, n. 60).

[245] Flodoard, PL 135, 258 D, cf. L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 715 and n. 2. M. Cappuyns (*op. cit.*, p. 109, n. 3) and B. Lavaud (*op. cit.*, col. 2906) assert that the letter is lost; but cf. J. Devisse, p. 131, n. 79.

[246] The date of its composition must be placed between *Ad reclusos et simplices* and Hincmar's letter to Rabanus written in 850: M. Cappuyns, *op. cit.*, p. 107, n. 3; J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 132, n. 80; K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 23, n. 60. There Gottschalk requested to put him to ordeal so as to test the orthodoxy of his teaching.

[247] Cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 132 and 192, n. 25.

[248] *Deinde perlata est etiam ad nos studio ecclesiasticorum virorum quaedam scriptura tua, in qua apertissime, et prolixo sermone, atque ut tibi visum est etiam testimoniis Scripturarum, sive sanctorum Patrum, quid sentire sive doceres multipliciter exsecutus es. Nunc quoque accepimus et alia scripta tua non parva, quae ad episcopos, vel contra episcopos, qui in concilio damnationis tuae affuerunt, scripsisse vel protulisse videris* (PL 116, 86 C–D). This was written about 850–851, cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

[249] PL 125, 618 C.

- [250] K. J. Hefele (*op. cit.*, p. 140) seems to identify him as Marquard of Prüm.
- [251] L. Traube (*op. cit.*, p. 717, n. 3) believes that here Lupus of Ferrières is implied. However, it may be Lupus of Châlons (c. 835 – c. 857); cf. Gottschalk's letter to this bishop published by Traube in the same volume of MGH (*Poetae Latini Aevi Karolini*, III, p. 723–724).
- [252] Probably Jonas of Orleans, d. 843 or 844.
- [253] PL 119, 491–495.
- [254] It is the *chartula Ratramni monachi*, mentioned by Rabanus (MGH, Epistulae, V, p. 488). Cf.: *Ille Corbeiensis monachus in epistola sua vituperavit vos non recte sententiam Fulgentii exposuisse scribendum de vobis ad amicum suum* (PL 112, 1522 B).
- [255] Cf. L. Traube, *op. cit.*, p. 717.
- [256] PL 121, 367–372.
- [257] *Per barbara regna locatos*, PL 121, 370 B. Cf. K. Vielhaber, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
- [258] Cf. Lambot, p. xxiii.
- [259] *Miror enim prudentiam vestram quod istum noxium virum, hoc est Gotescalcum, qui in omnibus vituperabilis inventus est, quia nec monachi votum, nec sacri ordinis ritum, sed neque praedicandi officium legitime observavit, scribere aliquid permisistis, in quo officio magis nocere potuit quam viva voce loquendo* (PL 112, 1527 D).
- [260] In the same letter Hincmar also sought Prudentius' counsel concerning a passage in Ezekiel that he would use in *Ad reclusos et simplices* (ed. Gundlach, p. 297), as well as why he “deprived him of his presence” (*quare sibi praesentiam suam subtrahat*), Flodoard, PL 135, 200 C. It is obvious that at the period the opinion of the bishop of Troyes was very important for Hincmar.
- [261] *Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 258–309. See excerpts translated for the present book by Francis X. Gumerlock (“Letter to the Laity of his Diocese”).
- [262] *De tribus epistolis*, PL 121, 1052 A.
- [263] No wonder that Florus preferred to repeat only this name: it is as a result of his protests that Amalarius' teaching concerning the symbolism of the mass, expressed in his treatise *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, had been officially condemned by the council of Quierzy in 838 (cf. P.-J. Godet. *Florus*, in: *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique*, VI, Col. 54). Amalarius' answer to the request of Hincmar and Pardulus is lost. Among the other four authorities must have been Prudentius, Lupus and Rabanus.
- [264] PL 115, 971–1010. This letter, addressed to Hincmar and Pardulus, probably reached them late in 849.
- [265] M. Cappuyns (*op. cit.*, p. 108, n. 2) asserts that it is lost, but cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 142, n. 133.
- [266] MGH, Epistulae, V, p. 488.
- [267] MGH, Epistulae, VI, pp. 109–110; PL 119, 606–608. Lupus answered to Hincmar and Pardulus separately, but the letters seem to have been identical.
- [268] *De praedestinatione et libero arbitrio ac redemptione sanguinis Christi*. Lupus, *Epistola ad Carolum*, PL 119, 601 B.
- [269] PL 119, 621–648.
- [270] MGH, Epistulae, VI, pp. 109–110.
- [271] *Collectaneum de tribus quaestionibus*, PL 119, 647–666.
- [272] *De praedestinatione Dei*, PL 121, 13–80, prefatory letter in MGH, Epistulae, VI, pp. 151–153.
- [273] Most probably out of fear to do harm to Gottschalk.
- [274] Cf. M. Cappuyns, *op. cit.*, p. III, n. 1.

- [275] *Epistula ad Hincmarum 2*. MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 488–490.
- [276] *Epistula ad Hincmarum 4*. MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 490–499. PL 112, 1518–1530.
- [277] PL 116, 86 C–D.
- [278] It is not known whether he did it.
- [279] According to J. Devisse (*op. cit.*, p. 195), it happened in December 849/January 850, which seems to be too early, since by that time Rabanus' *Ad Notingum* is unlikely to have reached Hincmar and therefore he would be unable to send it to Lyons.
- [280] It follows from what is said in *De tribus epistolis*, PL 121, 985 B–987 A, as well as from Flodoard's remark in PL 135 200 B–C, cf. M. Cappuyns, *op. cit.*, p. 116, n. 2.
- [281] Translated for the present book by Victor Genke.
- [282] PL 121, 987 C–988 B, 1027 D–1028 A.
- [283] PL 135, 260 C.
- [284] *Sed quia haec inter se valde dissentiebant, Scotum illum qui est in palatio regis, Joannem nomine, scribere coegimus*. Pardulus' lost letter to the church of Lyons, quoted in Florus' *De tribus epistolis*, PL 121, 1052 A.
- [285] PL 122, 355–440, prefatory letter in MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 630–631.
- [286] Especially taking into consideration Lothair's tenacious hostility towards Hincmar. Cf. E. Lesne, *Hincmar et l'empereur Lothaire*, in: *Revue des questions historiques*, 34 (1905), p. 5–58.
- [287] Hincmar would constantly deny his association with these nineteen statements, either saying that they are counterfeit (PL 125, 51 A), either pretending to be ignorant of their content (PL 125, 296 A–B).
- [288] M. Cappuyns, *op. cit.*, p. 115, n. 1.
- [289] PL 115, 1009–1366, preface in MGH, *Epistulae*, V, pp. 632–633.
- [290] *...Illud nota quae graece dicitur theta, quam sententiis capitalibus damnandorum aliqui praescribere solebant* (PL 115, 1012 A–B). Concerning this sign see G. R. Watson. *Theta nigrum*. *Journal of Roman Studies*, 42 (1952), pp. 56–62.
- [291] Cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
- [292] PL 121, 985–1068.
- [293] PL 119, 101–250.
- [294] PL 125, 63–64.
- [295] PL 125, 182 C–D, 268 C–D.
- [296] PL 119, 95–102. Translated by Francis X. Gumerlock for the present book.
- [297] PL 121, 1083–1134.
- [298] Mansi, 15, 1–14.
- [299] PL 125, 55–56.
- [300] J. Devisse suggests that it happened in spring 855, possibly after Easter, *op. cit.*, p. 215, n. 115.
- [301] A nephew to Ebbo of Reims.
- [302] J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 215 and n. 117.
- [303] J. Devisse and D. Ganz call it Hincmar's second treatise on predestination (counting *Ad reclusos* as the first one, cf. J. Devisse, *op. cit.*, p. 123, n. 39).
- [304] *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

[305] *Item collegit atque composuit volumen ingens plures continens libros de praedestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio contra quosdam reprehensores suos atque Ratramnum monachum Corbeensem*. PL 135, 181 A.

[306] *Op. cit.*, p. 215.

[307] It took place between May 856 and February 857, P. R. McKeon, *op. cit.*, p. 92, n. 5.

[308] Prudentius, *Epistola tractoria ad Venilonem*, PL 115, 1365–1368.

[309] Since Aeneas in effect became the bishop of Paris, Prudentius' counter-*capitula* must have been signed.

[310] Canon 4 of Langres (Mansi XV, 538).

[311] PL 125, 385 A–C.

[312] Savonnières, *villa regia Saponariae* near Toul, arose as a military station dependent from the governor of Trier. Under Childeric (456–481) it became royal property. After the Treaty of Verdun (August 845) the palace of *Saponariae* passed into the ownership of the Emperor Lothair I, and later was inherited by his son, Lothair II. There are three places called Savonnières in Lorraine: Savonnières-devant-Bar, Savonnières-en-Perthois and Savonnières-en-Woëvre. Neither of them is the place where the council of 859 was held. Ancient royal *villa* was later called Savonnières or Savonnières-lès-Toul (near Foug, to the west of Toul, Meurthe-et-Moselle département). In 1870 a column was erected there in commemoration of that notable meeting of Frankish princes and prelates (K. J. Hefele, *op. cit.*, p. 217, n. 3). However, the village is now destroyed and not to be found on the map of modern France.

[313] PL 125, 66 B–C.

[314] PL 125, 55–474. J. Devisse and D. Ganz call it Hincmar's third treatise on predestination.

[315] *Epistola concilii Tusiensis ad rerum ecclesiasticarum pervasores et ad pauperum praedatores*, PL 126, 122–132.

[316] *Vult omnes homines salvos fieri... Omnes qui salvandi sunt, id est omnes praedestinati* (PL 126, 123 C, 126 B).

[317] Mansi, XV, 563–571.

[318] Tusey is not to be confused (as it often has been) with Douzy on the Chiers River, near Sedan (Ardennes). Ancient Gallo-Roman settlement, Douzy was one of the boroughs where Charlemagne stayed while visiting Ardennes. In 871 two synods were held there; this is also the place of meeting of Otto I with Louis IV d'Outremer in 947. In Medieval Latin Douzy was called *Duciacum* or *Duziacum*. However, the council of 860 was held at a different place called *Tusiacum*, which is now a small village Tusey near Vaucouleurs (Meuse), southwest of Toul. (Cf. also G. H. Tavard, *op. cit.*, p. 52, n. 28; and D. E. Nineham, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n. 39).

[319] *Galindo cognomento Prudentius, Tricassinae civitatis episcopus, natione Hispanus, adprime litteris eruditus, qui ante aliquot annos Gotescalco praedestinatiano restiterat, post felle commotus contra quosdam episcopos secum heretico resistentes, ipsius haeresis defensor acerrimus, indeque non modica inter se diversa et fidei adversa scriptitans moritur; sicque, licet diutino languore fatigaretur, ut vivendi ita et scribendi finem fecit* (PL 125, 1203 A).

[320] *Nicolaus pontifex romanus de gratia et libero arbitrio, de veritate geminae praedestinationis et sanguine Christi, ut pro credentibus omnibus fusus sit, fideliter confirmat et catholice decernit* (*Annales Bertiniani*, ad ann. 859, ed. G. Waitz, p. 52).

[321] *Quod per alium non audivimus, nec alibi legimus* (*Epistola IX ad Egilonem eumdem archiepiscopum*, PL 126, 70 B).

[322] The letter was written because a certain Guntbert, a monk from Hautvillers, escaped the monastery to bring Gottschalk's appeal to the Pope, PL 126, 68 D–69 A.

[323] PL 126, 70 C.

[324] PL 126, 25–46, see the excerpt translated for the present book by Victor Genke.

[325] PL 126, 45 C–D.

[326] Lambot, p. 52. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[327] Lambot, p. 38. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[328] Lambot, *ibid.*

[329] Lambot, p. 67. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[330] Lambot, p. 339.

[331] Lambot, p. 342.

[332] Lambot, p. 189.

[333] Lambot, p. 173.

[334] Lambot, p. 52. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[335] Lambot, p. 155. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[336] Lambot, p. 56. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[337] Lambot, p. 63. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[338] Lambot, pp. 37–38. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[339] Lambot, p. 64. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[340] Lambot, p. 38.

[341] Lambot, p. 202.

[342] At another place Gottschalk says: “For indeed God by no means wanted to save with eternal salvation those whom He, on that account, as the Scripture testifies, justly hardens because He wants to, not because He does not want to” (Lambot, p. 238), and: “He hardens with no iniquity involved” (Lambot, p. 237).

[343] Lambot, p. 185.

[344] Lambot, p. 40. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[345] Lambot, *ibid.* Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[346] Lambot, p. 229.

[347] Lambot, p. 239.

[348] Lambot, p. 203.

[349] Lambot, p. 206.

[350] Lambot, p. 213.

[351] Lambot, p. 225.

[352] Lambot, p. 44.

[353] Lambot, pp. 41–42.

[354] Lambot, p. 41. Translation by Francis X. Gumerlock.

[355] Lambot, p. 42.

[356] Lambot, p. 43.

[357] Lambot, p. 188.

[358] Lambot, p. 190.

[359] Lambot, p. 218.

- [\[360\]](#) Lambot, p. 243.
- [\[361\]](#) Lambot, p. 226.
- [\[362\]](#) Lambot, p. 241.
- [\[363\]](#) Lambot, p. 234.
- [\[364\]](#) Lambot, p. 240.
- [\[365\]](#) Lambot, p. 151.
- [\[366\]](#) Lambot, pp. 279–280.
- [\[367\]](#) Lambot, pp. 221–222.
- [\[368\]](#) Lambot, p. 226.
- [\[369\]](#) Lambot, pp. 342–343.
- [\[370\]](#) Lambot, p. 343.
- [\[371\]](#) Lambot, p. 189.
- [\[372\]](#) Lambot, p. 195.
- [\[373\]](#) Lambot, p. 330.
- [\[374\]](#) Lambot, p. 476.
- [\[375\]](#) PL 116, 92 A–B.
- [\[376\]](#) PL 112, 1554 B–C.
- [\[377\]](#) Lambot, p. 206.
- [\[378\]](#) Lambot, p. 182.
- [\[379\]](#) Lambot, p. 217.
- [\[380\]](#) Lambot, p. 230.