

which view we also like, of course. This conflicted with the older Pelagianism and even more seriously with the mediaeval church ideas that the church alone could grant salvation. If the work of salvation is by grace alone, it was reasoned, what is the good of all the works ascribed to by the church? The answer was obvious. To admit such teaching in a credible fashion would have destroyed the ecclesiastical hierarchy and reduced the doctrinal formulae to levels simple enough that the most common person could understand them. The outgrowth of such a theological system might well allow worshippers to feel independent of the parent institution and so could break the power of the church! Thus the church stood against an Augustinian interpretation of grace and salvation and did it in a mighty way.

What might have seemed a theological impasse in a case of this nature had been resolved in the Roman church through the reinterpretation of Augustine by Gregory I. In effect he had made the great father's teaching palatable to the church at large while emphasizing his ecclesiology and reducing his soteriology and anthropology to something like doggerel. With Gregory's adaptations, Augustinian theology had room for penance, meritorious works of supererogation, and cooperation with grace...and all of these things required the oversight of the organization.

Thus the teaching of Gottschalk was a defiance, among other things, of the commonly understood teaching of Augustine! In some ways it was a direct challenge to papal competency. His overthrow was needed for the power of the church and he eventually went mad...as a result of the continuous persecution, torture, deprivation forced upon him...but, so far as I know, could not be budged from his position. And the argument is still with us although Rome tried to end it at the Council of Trent,. There it pronounced the doctrine of justification by faith alone to be one of the great heresies and anyone who would dare to teach it was placed under the ban of the church.

FILIOQUE

This problem had its roots in an addition to the Apostle's Creed in the matter of the progression of the Holy Spirit. The argument is whether the Spirit comes from "the Father and the Son" or just the "Father". The clause "filioque" (and the son) was generally accepted in the west after 809