
The Rebellious Monk Gottschalk of Orbais: Defining Heresy in a Medieval Debate on Predestination

Jenny Smith*
(University of Notre Dame, Indiana)

Abstract: *Frankish ecclesiastical leaders imprisoned a rebellious monk in ninth-century Francia named Gottschalk of Orbais for teaching what they considered to be the heretical doctrine of predestination, whereby God chose some individuals to be saved and others to be damned. An examination of Gottschalk's writings reveal that he frequently supported his arguments on predestination with references to texts written by patristic fathers of the fifth and sixth centuries. While most scholarship on Gottschalk has focused on his citation of Saint Augustine of Hippo as support for his predestination arguments, this approach largely ignores both his use of a wider variety of patristic authorities as well as one of his even more fundamental uses of patristic texts: defining heresy. This essay explores Gottschalk's use of fathers aside from Augustine in his effort to formulate a definition of heresy. It demonstrates how Gottschalk defined a heretic according to the criteria established by non-Augustinian patristic models while simultaneously arguing that he himself fit none of the criteria in question and thus did not deserve the heretical label with which he had been branded. Thus, it is argued that Gottschalk used a variety of patristic fathers who both defined heresy and supported predestination in attempt to demonstrate that an orthodox definition of heresy and defense of predestination were not incompatible.*

Keywords: *Gottschalk, heresy, predestination, Frankish Church, Augustine, patristics*

INTRODUCTION

The 840s and 850s in medieval Francia witnessed a prolonged and vehement controversy over the nature of divine predestination and grace. Frankish ecclesiastical leaders sought to punish the rebellious monk Gottschalk of Orbais who argued that God

* I would like to thank my two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, as well as my thesis advisor, Sebastian Bartos, for his supervision of this project.

had chosen some individuals for eternal life and others for eternal damnation, a position that he argued was entirely orthodox according to western Catholic tradition. His theological opponents disagreed, however, bestowing on him the dreaded, though ambiguous, title of ‘heretic.’ To this charge he responded by reversing the accusation, thus labeling his opponents as the true heretics. As becomes evident, the Carolingian concept of heresy lacked definition, instead remaining a fluid and often ambiguous term used by theological opponents to accuse one another of departure from western Catholic orthodoxy. As recent scholarship by Matthew Gillis noted, the label of heretic, while often reserved for foreigners who departed from orthodoxy, remained particularly notable when applied instead to native Carolingians within the Frankish Empire.¹ Christine Ames similarly asserted the peculiarity of accusations of heresy, rather than more general ecclesiastical efforts to reform an errant individual’s beliefs, during the Carolingian focus on religious harmony, unity, and orthodoxy amidst the turbulent dynastic conflicts and political fragmentation of the ninth century.² However, in many ways it was the Carolingian effort to produce unity in the midst of disorder that led to its notable effort to guard orthodoxy and punish those outside its realm, identified as heretics. Not least among the figures to whom this label of heresy was applied remained Gottschalk, who subsequently attempted to reverse the dreaded label, in an extensive debate over the nature of grace, salvation, and free will.

In seeking to clarify the meaning of heresy and thus present his own ideas as entirely outside of its realm, Gottschalk spent a great deal of effort defining, labeling, and identifying heresy in his writings on the polemical topic of predestination. Acquaintance with his predestination writings further reveals that perhaps the chief model to which he looked to shape his views on heresy remained patristic authors who likewise defined heresy in their own writings. Extant scholarship has largely approached Gottschalk’s works by focusing on his frequent citation of Saint Augustine as a means to support his theory of predestination. However, there remains a substantive gap in understanding how Gottschalk appealed to patristic literature aside from Augustine to both provide a more comprehensive and explicit patristic stance on predestination as well as to define what composed those who departed from this understanding of orthodox doctrine and thus deserved the label of heretic. Analysis of Gottschalk’s choice of patristic models to define heresy within his predestinarian writings reveals that he used a diversity of patristic authors who supported predestination in their own writings including not only Saint Augustine but also Pope Gregory I, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Cassiodorus, Basil of Caesarea,

¹ Among those labeled heretical from outside the bounds of the Frankish Empire, Spanish Adoptionists as well as Byzantine Iconoclasts served as notable examples during the ninth century. For an analysis of the contrasting label of heresy among foreigners and natives in the Carolingian world, see Matthew B. Gillis, “Gottschalk of Orbais: A Study of Power and Spirituality in a Ninth-Century Life” (PhD Diss., University of Virginia, 2009), 21-22.

² Christine C. Ames, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2015), 127.

Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom, among others. This essay thus seeks to explore Gottschalk's citation of patristic fathers aside from Augustine in formulating his definition of heresy. It argues that Gottschalk eloquently manipulated the predestination arguments of a wide variety of non-Augustinian patristic fathers who both defined heresy and supported predestination in his attempt to demonstrate that an orthodox definition of heresy and defense of predestination were not incompatible. Although these additional patristic authors were often just as ambiguous as Augustine on the topic of the predestination of the damned, Gottschalk deftly positioned their arguments in such a way as to portray them as supportive of his own view of predestination.

Analysis of Gottschalk's stance on the topic of predestination reveals the complexity inherent in identifying conceptions of orthodox predestination versus heretical predestination in ninth-century Francia. Although Saint Augustine's assertion that God had bestowed the gift of eternal life on certain individuals based upon his divine prerogative generally remained within the realm of acceptably orthodox thought, the idea that God had actively chosen not to extend this gift to others ventured into the realm of heresy. Therefore, Gottschalk's argument that God had not only chosen to save some individuals but also to damn others stood as testament to his ecclesiastical opponents that he had assuredly departed from an orthodox understanding of predestination and instead adopted a heretical viewpoint that could be supported by neither biblical nor patristic citations, according to his detractors.³ In response to the accusation that there existed a dichotomy between an orthodox understanding of predestination and his own heretical view, Gottschalk assumed the task of framing his view of predestination as orthodox according to ecclesiastical tradition by eloquently manipulating specific patristic texts, however ambiguous on the topic of predestination, to portray them as supportive of his view of predestination of both the righteous and the wicked.

This technique, however, was not unique to Gottschalk, as many other participants in the debate, such as Hincmar, Rabanus, Prudentius, and others, frequently attempted to define heresy on preconceived terms that exonerated their own beliefs. Furthermore, this technique was also not unique to the predestination debate in the ninth century, but also remained a facet of other Carolingian theological debates such as the iconoclast, adoptionist, and Eucharistic controversies, the details of which extend beyond the realm of this paper. In each of these debates, however, Carolingian participants sought to define heresy on their own terms and in ways that eloquently represented patristic and

³ Hincmar, *Letter to the Monks and Simple Folk of his Diocese (Epistola ad reclusos et simplices suae dioceseos)*, in *Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais (Oeuvres)*, edited by Cyril Lambot (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1945), 8-10; trans. in Genke and Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy: Texts Translated from the Latin* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010), 169-172.

ecclesiastical tradition to their own advantage. Thus, Gottschalk's use of this technique represents a wider Carolingian pattern of textual manipulation and self-representation.⁴

Born into a noble Saxon family, Gottschalk of Orbais came of age in a monastery at Fulda in Saxony after being dedicated as a child oblate.⁵ Years later, Gottschalk finally obtained permission to be released from his vows, only to find himself in the monastery of Corbie in northern Francia, where he studied texts written by the patristic fathers Augustine, Gregory, and Isidore, which in part explains his later familiarity with their works.⁶ According to Matthew Gillis, it was at Corbie where he "developed a reputation as a *magister* for his teachings on predestination."⁷ After visiting Hautvillers, which later became his location of imprisonment, he relocated to a monastery in Orbais.⁸ He then left Francia around 836 to journey to Italy where he began to spread "teachings quite contrary to our salvation, especially on the subject of predestination."⁹ In a letter to Noting, the bishop of Verona, written in 840, Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Reims, lamented the spread of "the heresy that some people are wickedly defending concerning the predestination of God."¹⁰ After his stint in Italy, Gottschalk traveled to the Balkans, where he served as a missionary and spent time in Dalmatia.¹¹

Ecclesiastical leaders soon summoned Gottschalk to Mainz after his return to Francia around 848 where he appeared before a synod presided over by Louis the German to determine his punishment for theological error. Here Gottschalk professed a confession of faith before the bishops in which he openly avowed his belief in predestination.¹² After witnessing Gottschalk's refusal to change his beliefs, Rabanus sent him to Orbais to be under the jurisdiction of Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, who then ordered Gottschalk to appear at the Synod of Quierzy the following year where he condemned Gottschalk for his "incurable obstinacy" in teaching the doctrine of predestination. Hincmar further

⁴ For more on this Carolingian pattern of defining heresy within other ninth-century debates, see Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, 128-130. For a thorough discussion of the theological contours of these theological debates within a wider Carolingian context, see Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

⁵ Hatto of Fulda, *Letter to Otgar (Epistola ad Otgarium)* (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Epist. 5:529) trans. Victor Genke and Francis X. Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy: Texts Translated from the Latin* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010), 11, 15-16.

⁶ David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Singaringen: Thorbecke, 1990), 66.

⁷ Gillis, "A Study of Power," 2.

⁸ Genke, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 19.

⁹ *Annales Bertiniani, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum (SRG)* 5, (Hanover, 1883); trans. Janet L. Nelson, ed. and trans., *The Annals of St Bertin: Ninth-Century Histories* Volume 1 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 67.

¹⁰ Rabanus Maurus, *Letter to Noting (MGH, Epist. 5:428)* trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 165.

¹¹ *Annales Bertiniani*, trans. Nelson, *Annals*, 67.

¹² Gottschalk, *Confession of Faith (Chartula suae professionis ad Rabanum episcopum)*, in *Oeuvres*, 38; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 68.

ordered that Gottschalk be imprisoned at Hautvillers, where he spent the rest of his days until his death in 868.¹³ At the time of his death, he remained an excommunicant.¹⁴

GOTTSCHALK IN HISTORIOGRAPHICAL MEMORY

Dom Germain Morin's 1931 discovery of a significant number of Gottschalk's works in the Bongars library in Bern, at which time he published his article, "Gottschalk retrouve" in *Revue Benedictine*, radically altered twentieth-century historiography on Gottschalk.¹⁵ Although a large portion of current scholarship on the rebellious monk occurred after Morin's discovery, there exist pre-twentieth-century contributions deserving of mention, notably G.F. Wiggers's "Schicksale de augustinische Anthropologie, Funfte Abtheilung: Der Munch Gottschalk", in which he rejected any tendencies to view Gottschalk as an early church reformer, preferring instead to view him as one trying to defend what he considered the correct interpretation of Augustine in order to preserve the purity of patristic theology, rather than seeking to rebel against the Catholic Church.¹⁶

In the twentieth century, the multitude of angles and approaches to understanding the multifaceted nature of Gottschalk's life have led to a diverse array of historiography on Gottschalk. Among notable post-1931 contributions, there exist analyses of Gottschalk's poetry by historians such as Norbert Fickerman, Helen Waddell, J.E. Raby, Bernhard Bischoff, Jean Jolivet, Gillian R. Evans, Peter Godman, Otto Herding, Marie-Luise Weber, and H. Grabert.¹⁷ Historians such as Maieul Cappuyns, E. Aegerter, Eleanor

¹³ Rabanus Maurus, *Letter to Hincmar on the Council of Mainz (Epistola VIII Synodalis, ad Hincmar archiepiscopum Rhemensem de Gothescalco)*, Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 6; and Hincmar, *Synod of Quierzy (Ecclesiastica sententia in pertinacissimum Gotescalcum)* trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 167-169.

¹⁴ Matthew B. Gillis, "Noble and Saxon: the meaning of Gottschalk of Orbais' ethnicity at the Synod of Mainz, 829," in *Ego Trouble: Authors and their Identity in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Richard Corradini, et. al. (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010), 197.

¹⁵ Dom G. Morin, "Gottschalk retrouve," *Revue benedictine* 43 (1931): 303-312.

¹⁶ G.F. Wiggers, "Schicksale de augustinische Anthropologie, Funfte Abtheilung: Der Munch Gottschalk," *Nieder Zeitschrifte fur die historische Theologie* (1859): 471-591.

¹⁷ Norbert Fickerman, "Wiederekannte Dichtungen Gottschalks," *Revue Benedictine* 44 (1932): 314-321; Helen Waddell, *The Wandering Scholars of the Middle Ages* (London, Constable, 1932), 63; Frederic J.E. Raby, *A History of Latin-Christian Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953); Bernhard Bischoff, "Gottschalk Lied fur den reichenauer Freund," *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewahlte Aufsätze zur Schrifkunde und Literaturgeschichte* 2 (1967): 26-34; Jean Jolivet, *Godescalc d'Orbais et la Trinite: La Methode de la theologie a l'epoque carolingienne* (Paris, 1958); Gillian R. Evans, "The Grammar of Predestination in the Ninth Century," *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982): 134-145; Peter Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1985); Otto Herding, "Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda" in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider gewidmet zu ihrem, 60, Geburtstag* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1948); Marie-Luise Weber, *Die Gedichte des Gottschalk von Orbais*,

Duckett, M.L.W. Laistner, Martina Stratmann, and John Marenbon analyzed the predestination conflict, noting in particular the influence of Gottschalk's theological allies and opponents in forming Carolingian views on heresy and orthodoxy.¹⁸ Historian Jean Devisse published an extensive analysis of Gottschalk's perhaps most prominent ecclesiastical enemy, Archbishop Hincmar while Jean Jolivet and George Tavard analyzed Gottschalk's opposition to Hincmar in the Trinitarian debate of the ninth century.¹⁹ In 1966, German historian Siegfried Epperlein argued that Gottschalk was representative of Saxon dissent against the Frankish church. Epperlein contended that his resistance to the feudalization policy employed by the Frankish church during the ninth century sparked a mass following that opposed the church's attempts to implement its feudal policy.²⁰

Regarding Gottschalk's use of patristic texts in his predestination arguments, recent historiography has made notable contributions in documenting the reception of patristic texts in the Carolingian period. Historians such as John Contreni noted the degree to which collecting an adequate number of Augustine's works was a scholarly achievement in the early medieval period as a result of the fragmented nature of most Carolingian libraries.²¹ Celia Chazelle drew attention to what she termed Carolingian "pastiche of patristic texts", noting especially the frequent use of Pope Gregory I.²² Scholars such as Christof Rolker and Cyril Edwards have traced the circulation of patristic texts near Reims, France, paying particular note to the developing practice of translation of their writings into the vernacular.²³ David Ganz pointed to the originality of Carolingian

Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 27 (Frankfurt: Lang, 1992); and H. Grabert, *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* 8 (1937), 611.

¹⁸ Maieul Cappuyns, "Jean Scot Erigene," in *Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensee* (Louvain: Abbaye du Mont Cesar, 1933); E. Aegerter, "Gottschalk et la probleme de la predestination au IXe siècle," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 116 (1937): 187-233; Eleanor Duckett, *Alcuin: Friend of Charlemagne, His World and His Work* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1951), 311; Eleanor Duckett, *Carolingian Portraits: A Study in the Ninth Century* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962); M.L.W. Laistner, *Thoughts and Letters of Western Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957), 257; Martina Stratmann, *Hincmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kichenprovinz* (Sigmaringen, 1991); and John Marenbon, "Carolingian Thought," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 182.

¹⁹ Jean Devisse, *Hincmar et la loi* (Dakar, 1962); Jean Devisse, *Hincmar: archeveque de Reims 845-882* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975-1976); Jean Jolivet, *Godesalc d'Orbais et la Trinite: La Methode de la theologie a l'epoque carolingienne*. (Paris, 1958); and George H. Tavard, *Trina Deitas: The Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1996).

²⁰ Siegfried Epperlein, "Sachsen im fruhen Mittelalter," in *Jahrbuch fur Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Berlin 1966), 206.

²¹ John Contreni, "Carolingian Era, Early," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999), 125.

²² Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, 122.

²³ Christof Rolker, "The Collection in Seventy-four Titles: A Monastic Canon Law Collection from Eleventh-century France," in *Readers, Texts, and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages: Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl*, ed. M. Brett and Kathleen G. Cushing (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2009), 64; and Cyril Edwards, "German Vernacular Literature: A Survey," in

theological contributions despite the period's heavy reliance on patristic texts."²⁴ Willemien Otten similarly argued that ninth- and tenth-century scholars appropriated patristic writings while simultaneously making their own original arguments, leading to large-scale intellectual and theological developments despite the fact that Carolingians lacked access to an exhaustive canon of patristic work.²⁵ However, the majority of these analyses have focused exclusively on his citation of Saint Augustine. Some scholars have approached the topic of Gottschalk's use of Augustinian texts from a geographical standpoint, arguing that the reception of Augustinian works remained greater in southern Francia than in its northern regions.²⁶

More recently, in the twenty-first century, scholars such as Bernard Boller examined Gottschalk's missionary work in the Balkans prior to his imprisonment.²⁷ Also notable is Celia Chazelle's work *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, in which she focused largely on the effect of Gottschalk's predestination theology on the liturgical and Eucharistic debates of the ninth century.²⁸ Most recently, Brian Matz's essay, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination", has explored the influence of patristic legacy within the ninth-century debate, though with nearly exclusive focus on the legacy of Augustine.²⁹ Other scholars have briefly touched upon Gottschalk's use of other patristic fathers aside from Augustine such as Eleanor Duckett, Philip Schaff, Guido Stucco, Ildar Garipzanov, William Anderson, and Justo González who have made brief mentions of Gottschalk's use of a diversity of patristic authors.³⁰

Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 144.

²⁴ Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*, 93.

²⁵ Willemeine Otten, "The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology" in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Dorata Backus (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 5.

²⁶ Benoit Lavaud, "Precursor de Calvin ou temoin de l'augustinisme? Le cas de Godescalc," *Revue thomiste* 15 (1932): 71-101; Mark Byron, *Ezra Pound's Eriugena* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), 72.

²⁷ Boller Bernard, *Gottschalk d'Orbais, De Fulda a Hautvillers: Une dissidence* (Paris, Ste Ecrivains, 2005), 21.

²⁸ Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, 214.

²⁹ Brian Matz, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination," in Alexander Wang, Brian Matz, and Augustine Cassiday, *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 235-270.

³⁰ Guido Stucco, *God's Eternal Gift: A History of the Catholic Doctrine of Predestination from Augustine to the Renaissance* (Bloomington: Xlibris Corporation, 2009), 221-223; Eleanor Duckett, *Carolingian Portraits*, 154; Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church: Medieval Christianity, 590-1073*, Vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960), 120; Ildar H. Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority in the Carolingian World (c. 751-877)* (Leiden, Brill, 2008), 309; William P. Anderson, ed., *A Journey through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 141; and Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought, Volume Two: From Augustine to the Eve of the Reformation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2010), 115.

However, a comprehensive work on Gottschalk's use of these fathers has yet to be completed. Even less attention has been devoted to understanding how he used these authors to create a definition of heresy, though several historians have touched upon his opponents' application of the term "heretic" in ordering his punishment. Recently, Michael Thomsett argued that Gottschalk's condemnation at the hands of the Frankish Church occurred as a result of a series of personal feuds with prominent ecclesiastical leaders rather than "true belief that he was a heretic."³¹ While analysis of Gottschalk's life reveals that he indeed engaged in bitter personal arguments against many of his theological opponents, the conclusion that his writings on predestination bore little effect on his imprisonment ignores his voluminous writings dedicated to defining heresy according to church tradition, works that bear witness to the centrality of the notion of heresy to Gottschalk's attempts to defend himself. Regarding Gottschalk's formulation of his concept of heresy, Matthew Gillis made a notable contribution by pointing to the means by which Gottschalk and his opponents frequently used the term "heretic" against one another, thus demonstrating the fluid nature with which the term was often employed.³² Furthermore, in his exploration of Gottschalk's exercise of power throughout the theological controversy, Gillis noted the shift in scholarship that has moved toward an embrace of the originality of ninth-century theologians that is synonymous with their frequent use of biblical and patristic sources.³³

While scholars have thus demonstrated both the pivotal role played by patristic texts in Gottschalk's formulation of his doctrine of predestination as well as the complexity of circumstances under which he gained the label "heretic", there remains a gap in analyzing how Gottschalk used patristic texts to create a definition of heresy, one that both demonstrated his own understanding of orthodoxy and attempted to justify his arguments about predestination as falling within its scope. Although Gillis's recent work thoroughly demonstrated how Gottschalk relied on Augustine's thought to frame himself as non-heretical and contrastingly orthodox, this paper seeks to expand this claim to reveal that Gottschalk appealed to non-Augustinian sources to legitimize both his theory of predestination as well as reverse the accusation of heresy upon his opponents.

AUGUSTINIAN AMBIGUITY AND GOTTSCHALK'S APPEAL TO NON- AUGUSTINIAN SOURCES

Before analyzing the specific patristic authors that Gottschalk used to legitimize his theory of predestination and reverse the accusation of heresy upon his opponents, it is first necessary to analyze why Gottschalk needed to appeal to sources beyond Saint

³¹ Michael Thomsett, *Heresy in the Roman Catholic Church: A History* (Jefferson: McFarland, 2011), 70.

³² Gillis, "Study of Power," 70.

³³ *Ibid.*, 15.

Augustine. However prolific, Augustine left his readers with a rather vague consensus on the issue of predestination. While it remains undoubted that Augustine wholeheartedly espoused the doctrine that God appointed some to eternal life by his own prior choice, Augustine's stance on God's treatment of the remainder of the unchosen portion of humanity was somewhat vague. For example, in his seminal work, *On the Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine defined predestination as "preparation for grace", [*praedestinatio est gratiae praeparatio*], thus implying that it related exclusively to those who have been chosen for eternal life.³⁴

However, in other writings, Augustine espoused what is commonly known as "double" predestination, the idea that God predestined not only the elect to salvation but also the reprobate to damnation such as in another of his works, *On Man's Perfection in Righteousness*, where he made reference to "that class of men which is prepared for destruction", [*eo genere hominum, quod praedestinatum est ad interitum*] or in his *Enchiridion* in which he acknowledged the predestination of the wicked to punishment [*praedestinavit ad poenam*],³⁵ It should also be noted that Augustine himself evolved over the course of his life regarding his stance on predestination, moving from a somewhat moderate position on the nature of free will and human agency to a more rigid defense of the primacy of divine grace in initiating salvation in his later years. Although Augustine affirmed the role of predestination from the time of his conversion until his death, his most radical writings on the topic appeared toward the latter portion of his life.

Augustine's equivocation on this matter, whether deliberate, inadvertent, or representative of his own evolving stance, served as one of the central foundations upon which Gottschalk's enemies composed their arguments. They attacked Gottschalk's interpretation of Augustine as decisively heretical, a charge that he swiftly reversed by appealing to sources beyond Augustine to demonstrate that a wide body of patristic literature both supported his theory of predestination as well as defined heresy. According to Gottschalk, his enemies served as prime examples of this definition.

GREGORY THE GREAT

One of the foremost patristic authors relied upon by Gottschalk to define heresy was Pope Gregory the Great, an adamant defender of predestination whose works *Morals on*

³⁴ Augustine, *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum* (*On the Predestination of the Saints*), chapter 10, 19 PL 44: 975, trans. in John A. Mourant and William J. Collings, (eds.) *Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1992), 241.

³⁵ Augustine, *De Perfectione Iustitiae Hominis* (*On Man's Perfection in Righteousness*) 13.31 PL 44: 308, trans. in Philip Schaff, (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Volume V, St. Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings* (New York: Cosimo, Inc., 2007), 170; and Augustine, *Enchiridion* [*Enchiridion ad Laurentium*], ed. Car. Herm. Burder (Lipsiae: Sumtibus et Typis Caroli Tauchnitii, 1838), 238; trans. in Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ed. Thomas Hibbs (Washington D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 1996), 116.

the Book of Job, Homilies on the Gospels, and Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel all referenced the themes of a fixed and providential order, predestination, and the final judgment, in especial regard for the judgment that God had predestined for the wicked.³⁶ Gregory therefore held great authority in the eyes of one his most avid readers, Gottschalk. In his *Longer Confession*, in which Gottschalk avowed his rigid stance on the predestination of both the righteous and wicked, Gottschalk referenced Gregory's work, *Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel*. Gottschalk explained that he harbored a deep fear of denying the truth, a fear that prompted him to ensure that his own theological stance did not depart from orthodoxy. However, Gottschalk then admitted that fidelity to orthodoxy did not always guarantee popular approval. He even noted that at times, it could create a scandal among those who voiced disagreement, arguably a reference to his current imprisonment at the hands of Frankish ecclesiastical leaders. He then quoted Gregory's argument in his *Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel*, "it is better that scandal is allowed to rise than that truth is abandoned."³⁷ Gottschalk thus justified his contumacious position by looking to Pope Gregory as evidence that sometimes orthodoxy and popular opinion were not always synonymous.

Gottschalk sought to demonstrate that Gregory both understood the nature of heresy and viewed predestination as outside of its scope. Gottschalk then argued that he would "rather die a thousand times" than espouse a heretical doctrine.³⁸ Before citing Gregory yet again in his treatise entitled *Longer Confession*, Gottschalk also quoted a verse of Scripture from Proverbs 22:8, "Do not transgress the ancient boundaries that your fathers have set" in attempt to argue that he did not seek to present a new argument, but rather one that had been deemed orthodox by patristic Fathers of the church. He then incorporated Gregory's own commentary on the verse, taken from his *Moral Commentary on Job*. Gottschalk quoted Gregory's assertion:

The heretics undoubtedly do this, who live outside the bosom of the holy church. They change the boundaries because they go beyond the decisions of the fathers by transgressing, because they also ravage and lay waste the flocks, and because they

³⁶ Gregory, *Morals on the Book of Job (Moralia in Iob)*, in Mark Adriaen, ed., *Corpus Christianorum Scriptorum Latinorum* CCSL 143, 143A, and 143B, Gregorius Magnus, *Moralia in Iob*, trans. Gregory, *Morals on the Book of Job* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844); Gregory, *Homilies on the Gospels (Homiliae in Evangelia)* (PL 76:1075-1312C), trans. David Hurst, *Forty Gospel Homilies* (Collegeville: Cistercian Publications, 1990), 36; Gregory, *Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel (Homiliae in Hiezechielem)* (CCSL 142), trans. Theodosia Gray, *The Homilies of Saint Gregory the Great on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (Etna; Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1990), 30.

³⁷ Gregory the Great, *Homilies on the Prophet Ezekiel* 1.7, 5 (CCSL 142); and Gottschalk, *Longer Confession (Confessio prolixior)*, Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 68; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88.

³⁸ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession [Confessio prolixior]*; in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 69; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88.

also draw the unlearned to themselves by perverse arguments and feed them with destructive teachings in order to kill them.³⁹

By offering Gregory's definition of a heretic, Gottschalk attempted to demonstrate that he understood the danger posed by the threat of heresy. This is especially significant given that Gottschalk penned this *Longer Confession* after Hincmar wrote a letter to the laity within his jurisdiction entitled *Letter to the Monks and Simple* [*Ad reclusos et simplices suae dioeceseos*] in which he warned the laity of the danger of straying from orthodoxy if they believed the errors propagated by Gottschalk regarding predestination.⁴⁰

Gottschalk thus sought to counter Hincmar's warning by insisting that he likewise understood the danger of following heretics, but that his own teachings did not fall under this category. Continuing on his theme of protecting the laity from dangerous and heterodox doctrinal errors, Gottschalk also quoted Gregory's judgment on heretics who knowingly deceived listeners.⁴¹ By likewise condemning such action, Gottschalk sought to align himself with Gregory in attempt to distance himself from what he perceived as the misplaced heretical label given to him by his accusers. In addition, by relying on Gregory's label of a heretic as those who live "outside the bosom of the holy church", Gottschalk sought to portray himself as distinctively within the acceptance of the church, despite the fact that he wrote his *Longer Confession* while imprisoned at Hautvillers. While therefore clearly not accepted within the Frankish Church at the time of his writing, Gottschalk sought to make the larger argument that he remained within the bounds of orthodoxy according to the broader concept of the church universal, of which the current Frankish Church that rejected his teachings served as an erring member.

Gottschalk pointed to another of Gregory's assertions in which he argued that heretics rely on falsity to promote their message. Gottschalk quoted Gregory's assertion that heretics, "require the shadows of falsity in order to establish a ray of light."⁴² Gottschalk argued that while heretics twisted the truth to assert their point, he instead supported his teachings on predestination with both Scripture and citation of patristic fathers deemed orthodox by the western Catholic Church, such as Gregory. In further explanation of the truthfulness of his teaching, Gottschalk referenced Gregory's assertion that there existed two distinct types of heretics. One type remained ignorant of the truth and thus taught others out of their ignorance. The other, however, knew the truth inwardly yet purposely

³⁹ Gregory, *Morals*, 16.44, 6 (CCSL 143), trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88.

⁴⁰ Hincmar, *Letter to the Monks and Simple Folk of his Diocese* [*Epistola ad reclusos et simplices suae dioeceseos*], in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 8-10, trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 169-172.

⁴¹ Gregory, *Morals*, 11.26, 37 (CCSL 143), trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88.

⁴² *Ibid.*

taught unorthodox doctrines and spoke falsity in order to deceive listeners.⁴³ Both types were inherently sinful, argued Gottschalk, who somewhat surprisingly made no distinction of the guilt of one kind of heretic relative to the other. Both departed from orthodoxy, whether advertently or out of ignorance, he insisted. In addition to promoting falsity among listeners and fellow men, Gottschalk argued that heretics committed the likewise grave offense of using falsity against God himself. Argued Gregory, “Heretics offer God a deceit since they construct things which in no way please him for whom they speak, and they offend him when they try as if to defend him” thus asserting that heretics’ use of falsity did not go unnoticed by God himself.⁴⁴ Gottschalk then quoted Gregory’s further assertion that in return for their falsity, heretics become an enemy of God because they perverted the truth that they purported to teach.⁴⁵

Gottschalk thus used these statements by Gregory to argue that he understood the error committed by heretics who either ignorantly or purposefully spread falsehood. In making this argument, he sought to prove his own legitimacy by demonstrating that he neither spread his teaching of predestination out of ignorance, because he deeply understood the set of beliefs that he taught, nor out of malicious intent, because he realized the potential offense such action posed against not only human listeners but also against God himself. Gottschalk approvingly quoted Gregory who argued that divine punishment awaited heretics for their untruthfulness. By defining a heretic as one who operated on the basis of falsity, Gottschalk sought to portray himself as decisively truthful by relying on patristic fathers such as Gregory. While Gottschalk’s defense of his own orthodox is unsurprising, it remains a notable example of his skillful and eloquent manipulation of patristic texts beyond Augustine to legitimize his own arguments.

Continuing on his theme of falsity as the chief operative characteristic of heretics, Gottschalk incorporated additional references to Pope Gregory in his treatise, *On Predestination*. In his *Longer Confession*, Gottschalk even ventured to pray for the church universal, with an implicit acknowledgement of the Frankish Church in which he was involved, for protection against heresy.⁴⁶ By writing this prayer, Gottschalk sought to present his own agenda as aligned with those of his ecclesiastical enemies by attempting to demonstrate that, like them, he desired to rid the church of the threat of heresy. He therefore wanted his opponents to view his teachings on predestination as an attempt to infuse correct doctrine into the church, not to pervert it with errant teachings. In making

⁴³ Gregory, *Moralia*, 11.28-39, 39-40 (CCSL 143); referenced by Gottschalk, *Longer Confession* [*Confessio prolixior*], Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 70; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88-89.

⁴⁴ Gregory, *Morals*, 11.28-39, 39-40 (CCSL 143), trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 88.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession* [*Confessio prolixior*]; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 73; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

this prayer, Gottschalk sought to present his teachings as aligned with, rather than opposed to, his opponents' endeavor to reject heresy and pursue orthodoxy.⁴⁷

FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE

Following this prayer, Gottschalk then referenced another notable patristic author, Fulgentius of Ruspe, a North African bishop and defender of predestination whose works *The Truth about Predestination and Grace* as well as letters to contemporaries named Monimus and Euippius espoused the doctrine of predestination to both salvation and damnation, perhaps more explicitly than any other patristic author.⁴⁸ As Francis Gumerlock noted, Fulgentius argued for the persistence of the literary term *synecdoche*, in which the word “all” in biblical verses supporting divine will for all persons to inherit eternal life dealt only with a pre-determined selection of individuals, rather than “all” in its fullest sense of all individuals.⁴⁹

Embracing this interpretation, Gottschalk therefore used Fulgentius as a model for both his defense of predestination as well as his definition of heresy. For example, in his *Longer Confession*, after writing a prayer in which he defended his theory of predestination, Gottschalk stated that he chose to “openly defend the catholic faith here clearly expressed concerning predestination.”⁵⁰ He then quoted Fulgentius' response to those he perceived as having departed from the faith by stating that he chose to “flee from [them] like the plague and reject [them] as a heretic.”⁵¹ However, he then asserted that he did not undergo this process of disassociation lightly. Rather, it was with sorrow that he applied the term “heretic” to an individual who had strayed from orthodoxy, Gottschalk

⁴⁷ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 73; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

⁴⁸ Fulgentius, *The Truth about Predestination and Grace (De Veritate Praedestinationis et Gratiae Dei)* (CCSL 91A.48-548); trans. Rob Roy McGregor and Donald Fairbal, *Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace, Fathers of the Church*, vol. 126 (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013, 144); Fulgentius, *To Monimus (Ad Monimum)* (CCSL 91:1-64) in Anonymous, *The Life of the Blessed Bishop Fulgentius*, trans. Robert B. Eno, *Fulgentius: Selected Works, The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 95 (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 198-204; and Fulgentius, *To Eugippius (Ad Eugippium)* (CCSL 91A); trans. Francis X. Gumerlock, *Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Saving Will of God: the development of a sixth-century African bishop's interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:4 during the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009), 149-152.

⁴⁹ Francis Gumerlock, “The Difficulty of 1 Tim. 2:4 for Augustine and Others,” in Wang, et al., *Grace for Grace*, 156.

⁵⁰ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*, [*Confessio prolixior*]; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 73; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

⁵¹ Fulgentius of Ruspe, *On the Faith for Peter (De fide ad Petrum)*, CCSL 91, trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

claimed.⁵² This sorrow stemmed from both his aforementioned disdain for the corruption produced in the church by means of heresy as well as his lamentation that certain individuals believed and taught teachings contrary to orthodoxy. In expressing his concern and sorrow over the dangers posed by heresy, Gottschalk thus attempted to portray his goals as aligned with the ecclesiastical leaders of the Frankish Church.

Gottschalk then ventured further in his quotation of Fulgentius by addressing the punishment fit for heretics. For example, in his *Longer Confession*, he cited Fulgentius' response to perceived heretics by stating that he denounced those who strayed from orthodoxy as "a heretic and an enemy of the Christian faith and as one who, because of this, should be anathematized by all catholics."⁵³ By including the phrase "all catholics," Gottschalk thus implicitly included himself as a fellow orthodox catholic who shared the collective responsibility of shunning heretics. He then expanded on this topic of avoidance and shunning of heretics by arguing that both actions were the logical means of dealing with heretics who, after repeated warnings to renounce their errant teachings, remained insistent upon their stubborn heterodox beliefs. This type of individual, Gottschalk warned, "should now be avoided by me."⁵⁴ In making this statement, Gottschalk attempted to portray himself as fully supportive of the practice of shunning heretics by including himself among those who planned to avoid teachers of heretical doctrines.

In another of his works, Gottschalk again referenced Fulgentius' *On the Faith for Peter* in regard to defining the nature of a heretic. In one section of this treatise, Gottschalk first quoted Fulgentius' defense of predestination in which he referred to "vessels of mercy" that "have been predestined by God before the foundation of the world." Immediately after including this quote, Gottschalk then referenced Fulgentius again, this time referring to his warning on the importance of shunning those who departed from orthodox beliefs.⁵⁵ By including this reference on shunning heretics immediately after one in which Fulgentius defended the same theory of predestination as did Gottschalk, Gottschalk sought to demonstrate that not only were his teachings about predestination orthodox, but that those who did not agree were themselves the true heretics, as supported by citation of Fulgentius.

⁵² Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*, trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

⁵³ Fulgentius, *On the Faith for Peter*, [*De fide ad Petrum*] (CCSL 91).

⁵⁴ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*, [*Confessio prolixior*]; in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 74; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 92.

⁵⁵ Fulgentius of Ruspe, *On the Faith for Peter*, [*De fide ad Petrum*], (CCSL 91); trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 125.

CASSIODORUS

In addition to Gregory and Fulgentius, Gottschalk also formed his definition of heresy by referencing Cassiodorus, a sixth-century former monk and later Roman statesman. Though Cassiodorus failed to make an explicit distinction between the predestination of the chosen and the damned, Gottschalk manipulated his writings to frame him as supportive of the same view of predestination as that advocated by Gottschalk. For example, in his *Explanation of the Psalms*, Cassiodorus referred to persecution of the church as necessary “so that the number of the predestined may be swiftly obtained.” In another part of the treatise, Cassiodorus referred to the judging of the nations “which is known to have been predestined before time began as well as frequent references to “those who are predestined.”⁵⁶ In his *Longer Confession*, Gottschalk referenced Cassiodorus, whom he praised for having “very beautifully defined what a heretic is.”⁵⁷ He then cited Cassiodorus’ *Explanation of the Psalms*, in which he defined a heretic as “someone who, carried off by ignorance or contempt of the divine law, either a stubborn inventor or new error, or an adherent of someone else’s, wants to oppose catholic truth rather than to be subject to it.”⁵⁸ Gottschalk thus relied on Cassiodorus’ argument that a heretic sought to remove himself from under the Catholic Church to insist that he himself sought not to oppose the teachings of the church but rather to restore the doctrine of predestination espoused by the Catholic Church’s patristic fathers. By using Cassiodorus as an example of a patristic father who both defined heresy as well as supported predestination, Gottschalk sought to demonstrate that his theory of predestination was clearly distinct from the notion of heresy.

EASTERN PATRISTIC FATHERS

Although Gottschalk primarily referenced western patristic fathers, such as those discussed above, he also relied upon eastern fathers as well. For example, he referenced the fourth-century Greek bishop, Basil of Caesarea, who, although upholding the legitimacy of man’s moral responsibility in exercising free will, still retained a high view

⁵⁶ “cito praedestinatorum numerus impleatur. . . quod tamen praedestinatum ante saecula esse cognoscitur. . . illis tamen parcedum esse non dubium est qui praedestinati sunt. . . numerus praedestinatorum.” Cassiodorus, *Explanation of the Psalms (Expositio psalmorum)* (CCSL 97), trans. Patrick Gerard Walsh, ed., *Cassiodorus: Psalms 51-100*, vol. 2 (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991), 393, 183, 55, 175, 415, 383, 127, 68, 188.

⁵⁷ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*, [*Confessio prolixior*]; in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 70; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 89.

⁵⁸ Cassiodorus, *Explanation of the Psalms*, [*Expositio psalmorum*], (CCSL 97); trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 89.

of divine sovereignty over man's salvation, as exemplified in his *Hexaameron*.⁵⁹ Gottschalk approvingly referenced Basil's argument that true orthodox Christians chose not to depart from orthodoxy out of fear of corrupting the truth to argue that heretics, in contrast, completely harbored no such fear.⁶⁰ Gottschalk thus attempted to argue that if he were a heretic, as his opponents labeled him, he would display little regard for the teachings of Scripture and ecclesiastical authority. However, his avid study of both biblical passages as well as patristic texts on the subject of predestination revealed that he in fact demonstrated a deep concern for orthodoxy, he asserted. In his *Longer Confession*, Gottschalk expressed his concern over the means by which his ecclesiastical opponents "suspect that those are heretics who by your grace necessarily believe and confess this truth of the catholic faith concerning the predestination of the reprobate against those who resist and speak against it and that those who assert the opposite are Catholics." Such opponents, Gottschalk argued, served as distinct points of contrast to the orthodox Christians described by Basil.

In addition to Basil of Caesarea, Gottschalk also referenced the fourth-century Archbishop of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus. Similarly to Basil, Gregory also upheld a view that emphasized both divine sovereignty and man's response in salvation, arguing, "it is necessary both that we should be our own masters and also that our salvation should be of God" while qualifying this statement with the assertion that "since to will is also from God, he has attributed the whole to God with reason."⁶¹ Like his commentary on Basil, Gottschalk similarly asserted that heretics demonstrated little regard for Gregory's statement that "[i]t is a mark of fortitude to persevere in truth, although someone is beaten down in relation to things that are nothing."⁶² Gottschalk clarified Gregory's statement by adding, "But falsehood and deceit are certainly nothing" before explaining that true proponents of orthodoxy chose to "avoid, shun, and abhor"

⁵⁹ Basil of Caesarea, *Hexaameron*. For Greek text, see Stanislas Giet, ed., *Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron*, in *Sources chrétiennes*, SC (Paris: Les Ed. Du Cerf, 1950); trans. into Latin by Eusthasius, 400, in E.A. Mendieta and S.Y. Rudberg, *Ancienne version latine des neuf homélie sur l'Hexaameron de Basile de Cesaree* (Berlin, 1958); trans. into English in Philip Schaff, ed., *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series*, vol. 8 (Oak Arbor: Logos Research Systems, 1997), 110.

⁶⁰ Basil of Caesarea cited in Theodoret of Cyrus, *Ecclesiastical History [Historia ecclesiastica]*; For the Greek text, see Theodoret of Cyrus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. and trans. J. Bouffartigue, L. Parmentier, G.C. Hansen, P. Carnivet and A. Martin, Théodoret de Cyr, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, SC 501, 530; trans. into Latin by Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, 510, in *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum CSEL 71)* trans. into English in Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 89.

⁶¹ "Quod enim salvamur, id et a nobis, et a Deo esse oportet. . . quoniam velle quoque ipsum a Deo est, optimo jure totum Deo assignavit" Gregory of Nazianzus, "Oratio 37" ed. Claudio Moreschini, *Sources Chrétiennes*, SC (Paris: Les Ed. Du Cerf, 1950), 318 (1985); trans. into Latin by Rufinus, in (*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, CPG 3010), trans. into English in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series*, vol. 7 (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1894), 342.

⁶² The source of this quotation has not been located.

heretics, particularly the falsity that accompanied their teachings.⁶³ In reflecting on this statement of Gregory of Nazianzus regarding the proper response to falsity, Gottschalk sought to distinguish the response of heretics from that of orthodox Christians, placing himself in the latter category. In addition to Basil and Gregory, Gottschalk also cited John Chrysostom, a fourth-century patristic theologian and Archbishop of Constantinople who advocated a position that acknowledged divine sovereignty as the source of human salvation.

Upon reflection of divine choice of some for eternal life, Chrysostom reminded readers, “He Himself has put the faith within us.”⁶⁴ Thus, Gottschalk’s use of Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom reveals that Gottschalk relied not only on western patristic fathers but eastern ones as well, even using the term “blessed Basil” to demonstrate his admiration of the eastern father. In this case, Gottschalk’s intent was not primarily to venerate eastern orthodoxy but rather to make the broader claim that his assertions about predestination were not capricious ideas but rather were well grounded in patristic authority, both western and eastern.

PATRISTIC HERETICS

Beyond merely referencing numerous patristic models on which he formulated his definition of heresy, Gottschalk also explicitly named certain individuals from the patristic era whom he viewed as heretics. For example, Gottschalk identified Pelagius, the fourth-century proponent of a viewpoint that denied original sin and emphasized free will to the exclusion of divine sovereignty in matters of salvation. In a treatise written as a reply to one of his Carolingian theological enemies, Rabanus Maurus, the Archbishop of Mainz, Gottschalk praised Augustine for his refutation of the theories of Pelagius, a statement on which his Carolingian opponents, including Rabanus, would have likewise agreed.⁶⁵ In another example, Gottschalk named the fifth-century Pelagian bishop, Julian of Eclanum as one example of a heretic. In 417, Pope Zosimus issued his *Epistola*

⁶³ Gottschalk, *Longer Confession* [*Confessio proluxior*]; in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 71; trans. in Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 89-90.

⁶⁴ “*Id est, ipse nobis fidem indidit, ipse principium dedit*” John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (*In Epistola ad Hebraeos*), Homily 28. For Greek text, see *Continens homilias in epistolam ad Hebraeos, et indices*, in Frederick Field, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum per homilias facta* (Oxford: printed by J. Wright: Veneunt at the shop of J.H. Parker; London: J. Rivington, 1845); trans. into Latin by Mutianus Scholasticus, 550, in *Clavis Patrum Graeca*, CPG 4440; trans. into English in *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, Vol. 39 (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1877), 324.

⁶⁵ Gottschalk, *Reply to Rabanus Maurus* (*Responsum ad Rabanum Maurum*); Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 37-41; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 66.

Tractoria against Pelagians. After Julian refused to affirm the *Epistola Tractoria* issued by Zosimus, he was deposed as bishop and made the object of a number of writings by Augustine, including *A Treatise against Two Letters of the Pelagians*.⁶⁶ Gottschalk referenced Julian as an example of a heretic in his treatise entitled *On Predestination*, citing Julian's misunderstanding of original sin.⁶⁷

Interestingly, when choosing specific individuals to use as examples of heretics, Gottschalk chose those who were unanimously condemned as heretics by all Frankish ecclesiastical leaders. Although Gottschalk charged his opponents with holding what some term as *Semipelagianism*, a modified view on original sin and free will, there remained a distinction between the *Semipelagian* views of Gottschalk's opponents and the more extreme notions of *Pelagianism* that had been deemed heretical in the fifth century.⁶⁸ Although Carolingian ecclesiastical leaders rejected the radical *Augustinianism* proposed by Gottschalk, they likewise rejected a radical Pelagian viewpoint that denied fundamental catholic doctrines such as original sin.⁶⁹ They thus shared agreement with Gottschalk in condemning figures such as Pelagius and Julian. By choosing common enemies, Gottschalk sought to create a mutual understanding in attempt to demonstrate that he too condemned the same heretics as did they. By identifying those already deemed heretics by prior ecclesiastical sentences, Gottschalk also attempted to shift accusation away from himself and identify examples of the proper recipients of the label of heretic, those who denied catholic orthodoxy.

In his *Longer Confession*, Gottschalk discussed another specific example of a heretic whom Fulgentius had opposed in his writings, Faustus of Riez, described by Gottschalk as a monk at Lérins before becoming a bishop in southern Gaul. Although deceased by the time Fulgentius wrote against his works, Faustus espoused a view of predestination similar to that of Gottschalk's opponents who placed a great deal of emphasis on man's free will in salvation. As Matthew Pereira noted, his work, *De gratia*, represented the southern Gallican tradition in which the relationship between divine grace and human agency was characterized by symbiosis and cooperation between man and God.⁷⁰ Gottschalk introduced Fulgentius' conflict with Faustus by stating that Fulgentius had

⁶⁶ Augustine, *A Treatise against Two Letters of the Pelagians (Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum)* (CSEL 60), trans. Philip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Series, Volume 5, St. Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings* (New York: Cosimo, 2007), 374-416.

⁶⁷ Gottschalk, *On Predestination, [De Praedestinatione]*, Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 180-258; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 115.

⁶⁸ Council of Ephesus, *Excursus on Pelagianism*, Canon 4, in Henry Pace, ed. and trans., *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series*, vol. 14, (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1900), 229-230.

⁶⁹ Hincmar, *Letter to the Monks and Simple Folk of his Diocese [Epistola ad reclusos et simplices suae dioceseos]*, in Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 8, trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 170.

⁷⁰ Matthew Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius, and the Southern Gallic Tradition," in Wang, et. al., *Grace for Grace*, 184.

“argued in a very catholic manner and at great length” against Faustus.⁷¹ Gottschalk sought to not only provide a concrete example of a heretic who held erroneous beliefs about predestination, but also to demonstrate the manner in which Fulgentius countered such erroneous beliefs. Never one to mince words when criticizing theological opponents, Gottschalk praised Fulgentius’ attack on the ideas of Faustus by asserting, “This same doctor proved him wrong and marvelously crushed the lies of the devil . . . and eliminated the lethal poison of antichrist.”⁷² Gottschalk thus demonstrated that Fulgentius had displayed the same type of pastoral care over the church that Gottschalk had earlier discussed by eliminating the threat of doctrinal heterodoxy from within the church.

REVERSE ACCUSATION

In addition to attacking patristic examples of heretics, Gottschalk also made the even more daring accusation of heresy against those among his fellow Carolingians who opposed his teachings. In his *Longer Confession*, after praying for the ability to exhibit the “truest, sincerest, and kindest love against the barking of heretics,” Gottschalk preceded in the same sentence to also pray for the ability to “beat back their teeth and biting falsity . . . whether they like it or not.”⁷³ In the following sentences, Gottschalk then warned his enemies that if they became angry with him for his theological position and labeled him a heretic, he would not hesitate to return the insult. He justified his counter attack on his ecclesiastical opponents who charged him with heresy by identifying them as the true heretics, those who denied the predestination of the reprobate. Among his attacks on his opponents, he referred to them as liars, unbelievers, and stubborn resistors of the truth. In addition, after providing an extensive defense of his beliefs based upon patristic citations, he asserted that anyone who did not uphold the same theory of predestination as he did was undoubtedly “blind.”⁷⁴ In his treatise *On Predestination*, Gottschalk termed those who did not believe him as “enemies of the truth,” and thus heretics. In a role reversal, Gottschalk countered his opponents’ accusation of heresy by instead implying that only those who did not agree with his teachings were the true heretics, the “stubborn unbelievers” and “enemies of the truth.”⁷⁵ By framing his

⁷¹ Fulgentius, *Against Faustus (Contra Faustus)*, referenced in Fulgentius’ *Letters (Epistulae)*, 15.19 (CCSL 91A:456), but now lost.

⁷² Gottschalk, *Longer Confession*, [*Confessio prolixior*]; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 55-78; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 85.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁷⁴ Gottschalk, *On Predestination [De Praedestinatione]*; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 180-258; trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 109.

⁷⁵ Gregory, *Morals*, 11.26, 37, (CCSL 143) trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 133.

argument in this light, Gottschalk defined heretics as those who operated on the basis of falsity and rejected basic claims that fathers such as Gregory the Great had previously deemed orthodox.

Gottschalk also used the method of pointing to common enemies in attempt to accuse his Carolingian opponents of not believing specific doctrinal points. For example, in addition to Pelagius and Julius, Gottschalk also attacked the third-century patristic scholar, Origen, for his views on the power of free will in addition his more radical theories on the nature of the soul and Christological errors. Anathematized at the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, Origen remained an object of mutual loathing among Frankish ecclesiastical leaders.⁷⁶ Gottschalk referenced Origen in his argument that those who were not chosen for salvation, the reprobate, were not redeemed. Given that Gottschalk's ecclesiastical opponents did not agree with his argument that the reprobate had been predestined for judgment, Gottschalk instead approached the topic by arguing that failure to believe his assertion would inevitably lead to a belief in the same teachings of Origen. Gottschalk clearly stated what he perceived as the consequences of believing that Christ had died for some of the reprobate by arguing, "if this is true, then that is also true – God forbid! – which Origen asserts, namely, that through a cycle of the years the saints will fall from heaven and the unjust will go from hell to heaven and that they will have this alternation of beatitude and misery."⁷⁷ By making this argument, Gottschalk attempted to frame his enemies' beliefs as points on a slope leading toward heresy. Furthermore, by pointing to someone commonly identified as a heretic, Origen, Gottschalk sought to establish a common ground with which to warn his opponents that their theological beliefs drifted toward the very heretical notions that they accepted as anathema. In this extreme role reversal, Gottschalk turned the label of "heretic" away from himself and instead placed it upon his opponents.

CONCLUSION

By citing patristic fathers aside from Augustine who both supported predestination, whether explicitly or ambiguously, and wrote extensively about heresy, Gottschalk demonstrated that his theory of predestination was not a heretical doctrine, but rather was a continuation of what orthodox fathers of the church had argued in centuries past. In citing Pope Gregory, Gottschalk defined a heretic as one who posed a danger to the laity,

⁷⁶ *Excursus on the XV Anathemas against Origen (Canones XV Anathemate contra Originem sive Origenistas)* in *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*. Tome 4, Volume 1, eds. Eduard Schwartz and J. Straub (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971), 248-249, trans. Henry Robert Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church* (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1900), 318-320.

⁷⁷ Gottschalk, *On Predestination, [De Praedestinatione]*; Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 180-258 trans. Genke and Gumerlock, *A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, 116.

remained opposed to the Catholic Church, and relied on falsity. In citing Fulgentius, Gottschalk added to this definition that a heretic sought to contradict the Catholic faith and thus deserved to be shunned. Similarly, Gottschalk relied on Cassiodorus to argue that a heretic sought to remove himself from the church, an accusation which, along with the definitions given by Gregory and Fulgentius, Gottschalk adamantly described as being wholly unrepresentative of his own behavior. By using Basil's definition of a heretic as one who portrayed a flippant attitude toward biblical and patristic tradition, Gottschalk contrasted his admiration and avid study of biblical and patristic models with the carelessness with which heretics treated such subjects. In citing the definition given by Gregory of Nazianzus that presented a heretic as one who could be justifiably shunned, Gottschalk legitimized his practice of shunning or avoiding heretics in order to draw a clear distinction between himself and those he perceived as heretical. Finally, Gottschalk also referenced Chrysostom's definition that a heretic misled himself into error to argue that he well understood the dangers posed by heretics, not only to others but also to the inner mind of the heretic himself.

In addition to citing patristic fathers, Gottschalk also incorporated examples of patristic heretics in effort to portray his alignment with the church's conciliar decisions regarding heretical doctrines, identify mutual enemies to establish common ground with his opponents, and to warn his opponents that their rejection of his doctrine of predestination reflected a drift toward the same heterodox doctrines that they accepted as condemned. He thus skillfully returned the label of "heretic" upon his theological opponents as a means of accusing himself of any association with the dreaded label. By using patristic models to define a heretic as one who posed danger to the laity, relied on falsity, deserved to be shunned, sought to remove himself from the Catholic Church, displayed little regard for Scripture or church fathers, and misled himself away from the truth, Gottschalk argued that he fit none of the above criteria and thus did not deserve the heretical label with which he had been branded. Thus, by appealing to authorities beyond Saint Augustine, Gottschalk relied on a vast body of ecclesiastical tradition to refute the identification of "heretic" by demonstrating that an orthodox definition of heresy and defense of predestination were not incompatible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary

- Annales Bertiniani*, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* (SRG) 5, Hanover, 1883.
- Annals of St. Bertin*, Ninth-Century Histories, Vol. 1. Translated by Janet L. Nelson Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Augustine. *Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (CSEL) 60. Translated by Philip Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Series*, vol. 5. New York: Cosimo, 2007.
- Augustine. *De Perfectione Iustitiae Hominis*, 13.31 PL 44: 308.
- . *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum*, PL 44: 975.
- . *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*, ed. Car. Herm. Burder Lipsiae: Sumtibus et Typis Caroli Tauchnitii, 1838.
- . *Enchiridion*, ed. Thomas Hibbs. Washington D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 1996.
- Basil of Caesarea. « Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron. » In *Sources chrétiennes*, ed. Stanislas Giet. Paris: Les Ed. Du Cerf, 1950; trans. into Latin by Eusthadius, in E.A. Mendieta and S.Y. Rudberg, *Ancienne version latine des neuf homélie sur l'Hexaéméron de Basile de Césaire*. Berlin, 1958; trans. into English in Philip Schaff, ed., *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series*, vol. 8. Oak Arbor: Logos Research Systems, 1997.
- . Cited in Théodoret de Cyr, “Histoire ecclésiastique.” In *Sources chrétiennes*, edited and translated by J. Bouffartigue, L. Parmentier, G.C. Hansen, P. Carnivet and A. Martin. Paris: Les Ed. Du Cerf, 1950. Translated into Latin by Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, in *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, CSEL 71.
- Cassiodorus. *Expositio psalmodum*, CCSL 97. Translated by Patrick Gerard Walsh, ed., *Cassiodorus: Psalms 51-100*, vol. 2 Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1991.
- Chrysostom, John. “Continens homilias in epistolam ad Hebraeos, et indices.” In *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum per homilias facta*, edited by Frederick Field. London: J. Rivington, 1845. Trans. into Latin by Mutianus Scholasticus, in *Clavis Patrum Graeca*, CPG 4440. Trans. into English in *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, Vol. 39. Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1877.
- “Excursus on Pelagianism, Canon 4.” In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series*, vol. 14, edited and translated by Henry Pace. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1900.
- “Canones XV Anathemate contra Originem sive Origenistas.” In *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, tome 4, volume 1, edited by Eduard Schwartz and J. Straub. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971. Translated in Henry Robert Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church*. Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1900.
- Fulgentius. “Contra Faustus.” Referenced in *Fulgentius' Letters*, CCSL 91A:456, but now lost.
- . *De fide ad Petrum*, CCSL 91.
- . *De Veritate Praedestinationis et Gratiae Dei*. CCSL 91A.48-548. Translated by Rob Roy McGregor and Donald Fairbal, *Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace*, *Fathers of the Church*, vol. 126. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013.
- . *Ad Eugippium*, CCSL 91A. Translated by Francis X. Gumerlock, *Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Saving Will of God: the development of a sixth-century African bishop's interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:4 during the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009.
- . “Ad Monimum.” In Anonymous, *The Life of the Blessed Bishop Fulgentius*, CCSL 91:1-64. Translated by Robert B. Eno, *Fulgentius: Selected Works, The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 95. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Gregory the Great. *Homiliae in Evangelia*, PL 76:1075-1312C. Translated by David Hurst, *Forty Gospel Homilies*. Collegeville: Cistercian Publications, 1990.
- . *Homiliae in Hiezechielem*, CCSL 142. Translated by Theodosia Gray, *The Homilies of Saint Gregory the Great on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Etna; Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1990.

- . *Moralia in Iob*, CCSL 143, 143A, and 143. Translated in Gregory, *Morals on the Book of Job*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. “Oratio 37.” In *Sources chrétiennes*. Paris: Les Ed. Du Cerf, 1950. Trans. into Latin by Rufinius, in *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, CPG 3010. Trans. into English in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series*, vol. 7, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1894.
- Hatto of Fulda. *Epistola ad Otgarium*, MGH, Epist. 5:529. Translated by Victor Genke and Francis X. Gumerlock, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy: Texts Translated from the Latin*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010.
- Maurus, Rabanus. *Letter to Noting* (MGH, Epist. 5:428).
- Mourant, John A., and William J. Collings, eds. *Saint Augustine: Four Anti-Pelagian Writings*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1992.
- Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d’Orbais*, edited by Cyril Lambot. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense: 1945.

Secondary

- Aergerter, Emmanuel. “Gottschalk et la probleme de la predestination au IXe siècle.” *Revue de l’Histoire des Religions* 116 (1937): 187-233.
- Ames, Christine C. *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2015.
- Anderson, William P. *A Journey through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- Bernard, Boller. *Gottschalk d’Orbais, De Fulda a Hautvillers: Une dissidence*. Paris: Ste Ecrivains, 2005.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. “Gottschalk Lied fur den reichenauer Freund.” *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* 2 (1967): 26-34.
- Byron, Mark. *Ezra Pound’s Eriugena*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Cappuyns, Maieul. “Jean Scot Erigene,” In *Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensee*. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont Cesar, 1933.
- Chazelle, Celia. *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ’s Passion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Contreni, John. “Carolingian Era, Early.” In *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999.
- Devisse, Jean. *Hincmar: archeveque de Reims 845-882*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975-1976.
- . *Hincmar et la loi*. Dakar, 1962.
- Duckett, Eleanor. *Carolingian Portraits: A Study in the Ninth Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Edwards, Cyril. “German Vernacular Literature: A Survey.” In *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, edited by Rosamond McKitterick, 141-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Epperlein, Siegfried. “Sachsen im fruhen Mittelalter.” In *Jahrbuch fur Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Berlin 1966.
- Evans, Gillian R. “The Grammar of Predestination in the Ninth Century.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982): 134-145.
- Fickerman, Norbert. “Wiederekannte Dichtungen Gottschalks.” *Revue Benedictine* 44 (1932): 314-321.
- Garipzanov, Ildar H. *The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority in the Carolingian World (c. 751-877)*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ganz, David. *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*. Singmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990.
- Genke, Victor, and Francis X. Gumerlock. *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy: Texts Translated from the Latin*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2010.
- Gillis, Matthew B. “Gottschalk of Orbais: A Study of Power and Spirituality in a Ninth-Century Life.” PhD Diss., University of Virginia, 2009.
- . “Noble and Saxon: the meaning of Gottschalk of Orbais’ ethnicity at the Synod of Mainz, 829.” In *Ego Trouble: Authors and their Identity in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Richard Corradini,

- Gillis B. Matthew, Rosamond McKitterick, and Irene van Renswoude. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010.
- Godman, Peter. *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.
- González, Justo L. *A History of Christian Thought, Volume Two: From Augustine to the Eve of the Reformation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2010.
- Grabert, H. *Nationalsozialistische Monatsefte* 8 (1937).
- Gumerlock, Francis. "The Difficulty of 1 Tim. 2:4 for Augustine and Others" In *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, edited by Alexander Wang, Brian Matz, and Augustine Cassiday. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2014.
- Herding, Otto. "Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda." In *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider gewidmet zu ihrem, 60, Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1948.
- Jolivet, Jean. *Godescalc d'Orbais et la Trinite: La Methode de la theologie a l'epoque carolingienne*. Paris, 1958.
- Laistner, M. L. W. *Thoughts and Letters of Western Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Lavaud, Benoit. "Precursor de Calvin ou temoin de l'augustinisme? Le cas de Godescalc." *Revue Thomiste* 15 (1932): 71-101.
- Matz, Brian, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination." In *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, edited by Alexander Wang, Brian Matz, and Augustine Cassiday. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2014.
- McKitterick, Rosamond, ed. *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Morin, Dom G. "Gottschalk retrouve." *Revue benedictine* 43 (1931): 303-312.
- Otten, Willemein. "The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, edited by Irena Dorata Backus, 3-44. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Raby, Frederic J. E. *A History of Latin-Christian Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- Rolker, Christof. "The Collection in Seventy-four Titles: A Monastic Canon Law Collection from Eleventh-century France." In *Readers, Texts, and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages: Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl*, edited by M. Brett and Kathleen G. Cushing, 59-72. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.
- Tavard, George H. *Trina Deitas: The Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1996.
- Thomsett, Michael. *Heresy in the Roman Catholic Church: A History*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2011.
- Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church: Medieval Christianity, 590-1073*, vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.
- Stratmann, Martina. *Hinkmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kichenprovinz*. Sigmaringen, 1991.
- Stucco, Guido. *God's Eternal Gift: A History of the Catholic Doctrine of Predestination from Augustine to the Renaissance*. Bloomington: Xlibris Corporation, 2009.
- Waddell, Helen. *The Wandering Scholars of the Middle Ages*. London: Constable, 1932.
- Weber, Marie-Luise. *Die Gedichte des Gottschalk von Orbais, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* 27. Frankfurt: Lang, 1992.
- Wiggers, G. F. "Schicksale de augustinische Anthropologie, Funfte Abtheilung: Der Munch Gottschalk." In *Nieder Zeitschrifte fur die historische Theologie* (1859): 471-591.