

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 33—JULY, 1895.

I. PRIMEVAL MAN.

DURING recent years the science of anthropology has made notable progress. Some workers in this field have been careful and conservative; others, perhaps, have been hasty and heedless. In certain quarters far-reaching conclusions are confidently announced, and but little regard is paid to what the sacred Scriptures have to say about some of its topics.

Great diversity of opinion has also been expressed in regard to some of the great questions with which anthropology is concerned. In reference to the length of time man has been upon the earth, as to whether there were races of men prior to the time of Adam, in regard to the relation of man to some brute species, and concerning man's actual primitive state, opinions differ widely. Some of these opinions, as set forth in recent books and periodicals, are evidently inimical to certain plain statements of Scripture. Hence, the theologian has important interests at stake on this field.

Of these questions, perhaps that of man's primeval condition is of greatest moment at the present day to the theologian in the light of modern science, and the purpose of this article is to discuss some of the problems raised by the inquiry concerning man's primitive status and endowments. In itself this inquiry is of absorbing interest; but its importance is greatly enhanced when we consider the fact that the conclusions to which we may be led by this inquiry will largely determine our opinions regarding the other questions just named. For if it be made out that man was at first a rude, untutored savage, it will be easy to establish his

II. RATRAMN'S PART IN THE FIRST CONTROVERSY RESPECTING TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

THE name of Ratramn or Bertram is now seldom mentioned, and his treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* is read by few in the present day. There was a time when English-speaking Protestants, and their enemies too, were more familiar with the author and his famous little book. It was, we believe, first published in an English translation in the year 1549, under the title of *The Book of Bertram the Priest*. It had already been printed in the original Latin in Cologne in 1532 under Protestant auspices. About the year 1545 it fell into the hands of Dr. Nicholas Ridley. This was an epoch-making event. The effect of its perusal on the illustrious bishop and martyr is thus stated by his biographer, Dr. Gloucester Ridley: "Few books have drawn after them such salutary consequences as this has done. It first opened Ridley's eyes, and determined him more accurately to search the Scriptures on this article [of the Lord's Supper], and the doctrine of the primitive fathers." His investigations brought him to the conclusion that transubstantiation was not the doctrine of the ancient church, and not fully developed and made an article of faith till after the ninth century, the age of Bertram. Ridley, a few months before he was burned at the stake, in his "*Protestatio*," delivered in Oxford on the 20th of April, 1555, before the commissioners of Queen Mary appointed to examine him, makes particular mention of his indebtedness to Bertram for his knowledge of the truth in opposition to prevailing error on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. After speaking of Bertram as a man learned and orthodox, who had for seven hundred years been always esteemed Catholic, Ridley expresses his astonishment that any one who feared God could with a good conscience contradict what Bertram had written on the Eucharist. "This man," said Ridley, "first pulled my ear, and was the first to compel me to turn from the common error of the Roman Church to the more

diligent examination of Scripture and ancient ecclesiastical writers in this matter. This I speak in the sight of God, who knows that I do not lie in the things which I affirm."

Ridley, then, may be said to have been led to reject transubstantiation by the reading of Bertram's book; and it was to Ridley that Cranmer acknowledged himself indebted for enlightenment in regard to this gross error. As is well known, the influence of Cranmer and Ridley was paramount in the formation of the Articles of the Church of England; and it is not too much to say that it is largely to the impression made on their minds by Bertram's book that we are to trace the strong testimony borne against transubstantiation in the twenty-eighth of these articles. A book that has so powerfully affected the Protestant creed of England, and of the nations that owe their origin to English colonization, ought to awaken in us a lively curiosity to ascertain its real character, and is certainly deserving of our earnest study.

Of the life of Bertram or Ratramn little is known. He was a monk of the Benedictine monastery of Old Corbie in Picardy in France. He was also a priest, while his great antagonist, Paschasius Radbert, though abbot of Corbie, remained all his life only a Levite or deacon. The statement that Ratramn became abbot of Orbay has been shown to be an error. The time of the appearance of his celebrated book, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, has been a matter of controversy. Boileau¹ contends that it could not have been written before 875, on the ground that in ancient manuscripts the treatise bears the inscription "*Ad Carolum Magnum imperatorem*," and Charles the Bold did not attain the title of emperor till 875, dying by poison two years afterwards. But this argument is not conclusive. It is perfectly allowable to suppose that transcribers, accustomed to speak of the dead Charles as emperor, may, in accordance with a common practice, by a prolepsis have described Ratramn's book as dedicated to the *Emperor* Charles, though at the time of dedication Charles may not have borne the imperial crown. About the date of the publication of this remarkable work we must be content with these particulars: It was in the year 844 that Paschasius Radbert be-

¹ Cf. Dissertation in Migne's *Patrologia*, Vol. CXXI., Col. 174.

came abbot of Old Corbie. In 851 he resigned this office. It was while abbot that he sent the second and improved edition of his book, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, to Charles the Bold. This sending of the treatise to the king could not have been earlier than 844. It may have taken place later than this year. It was by command of King Charles, and probably shortly after his receipt of the work of Paschasius, that Ratramn set forth the views which he held on the Eucharist. We are not warranted in fixing on the year 844 as the exact date of the issue of his reply, as some have done; but it is likely that Ratramn's treatise appeared some time near this date. It is of small compass, and might have been prepared for the king on short notice.

A difficulty meets us in the variety of names borne by him whom Protestants of old invariably called Bertram, and who bears this name in the writings of Sigbert of Gemblours and Trithemius. Scholars are now agreed that Ratramn is the proper designation of the renowned opponent of transubstantiation in the ninth century, and the name Bertram is hardly ever used by modern authors.

But how could this change of name have arisen? The following explanation commends itself to our judgment. Every reader of ecclesiastical Latin is aware that *Beatus* is a common epithet prefixed to the names of saints and illustrious sons of the church. Hence Ratramn could be spoken of as *Beatus Ratramnus*, abbreviated into B. or Be. Ratramnus. It would be easy for a transcriber to contract this into Bertramnus, whence Bertram. Certain it is that there is no author of note in the catalogue of writers of the ninth century who bears the name of Bertram, while Ratramnus appears in the most ancient manuscripts as the author of the work *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, which was afterwards attributed to Bertram. Hincmar,¹ Archbishop of Rheims, who was his cotemporary, spells his name Ratramnus, and this we take to be his true name. A much weightier and more interesting question than the last relates to the genuineness of the work ascribed to him, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. It was, as we have stated, first printed in Cologne by a Protestant in 1532. A

¹ *De Prædestinatione*, Cap. 5.

German translation of it, with a preface by a reformed divine, Leo Judae, was published in the same year at Zürich. It soon produced a profound impression. Roman Catholics at once admitted that its testimony was against them. Protestants on the strength of it maintained that transubstantiation could not have been a fundamental article of faith in the ninth century, as there is no evidence that Ratramn was ever accused of heresy. On the contrary, he was accounted the ablest defender in his age of the Latin church against the attacks of the Greeks. The Greek and Oriental bishops had charged the Roman church with falsely teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, with not keeping the proper fasts, with fasting on the Sabbath, with forbidding presbyters to perform the rite of confirmation, and confining its administration to bishops, with imposing celibacy on the clergy and making them shave their beards, and with other departures from what was judged orthodox practice. Pope Nicholas I. appealed to Hinemar of Rheims and to the other archbishops and bishops of the Frank Kingdom to repel these charges. This task was undertaken by Ratramn. Others attempted it too, but Ratramn's work, *Contra Graecorum Opposita*, was regarded as the most successful vindication of the Latin church, and it gained for its author universal applause in the West. That such a man should have written a book against transubstantiation, without being called to account for it, was a most effective argument against the boast of Roman Catholics as to the uniformity of the faith of the church in all ages respecting the Eucharist. The first and readiest way of parrying the attack that suggested itself was to pronounce the work that had been published under the name of Bertram or Ratramn a daring forgery of Protestants. Some controversialists went so far as to name the alleged forger. The Dominican, Sixtus of Sienna, in a work published in 1566, declared the book ascribed to Bertram *pernici- osum Oecolampadii volumen*. Other Roman Catholic writers repeated the same charge of fabrication against Oecolampadius, the eminent Reformer of Basel, who had died in 1531. The highest authority in the Roman church stamped the work with the brand of heresy. The censors appointed by the Council of

Trent placed in the year 1559 on the index of prohibited books *Bertrami liber qui inscribitur de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. The judgment of the Tridentine censors was immediately published by Pope Pius IV. Pope Clement VIII. renewed the prohibition. The heretical character of the book ascribed to Bertram was affirmed also by the leading polemical writers of the church of Rome, among them being Cardinal Bellarmin.

But we have now to give a striking illustration of the Protean nature of Roman controversialists. It was soon seen that the accusation brought against Protestants of having impudently attempted to palm off a forgery on the world could not be maintained. The absurdity of the charge became manifest, and it had to be abandoned. So approved a Catholic divine as Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, had quoted from a manuscript of Bertram's book in a treatise which he wrote in 1526, without any suspicion that it was heretical. Old manuscripts, too, of Ratramn's book were found in places that could not be suspected. It was vain to attempt to resist such stubborn facts. The divines of Douay were the first Roman Catholics to acknowledge the genuineness of the published treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, bearing the name of Bertram or Ratramn. They admitted that they had little esteem for the work. But they thought that the best course was to allow the genuineness of the book, and to correct and interpret it so as to bring it into harmony with the doctrine of the church, as had been done with the writings of other ancient Catholic authors in which errors had been discovered. The great Benedictine scholar, Mabillon, settled beyond doubt the genuineness of the work and the purity of its text. He discovered one old manuscript of the book which must have been written about the latter part of the ninth century, and another manuscript only a century later, both of which bore the name of Ratramn. Other manuscripts of a more recent date helped to establish incontrovertibly the genuineness of the treatise and the correctness of its text, points which had once been stoutly opposed. But Mabillon and the French Benedictines saw that it would be ill for the church if a genuine work of Ratramn, the renowned monk of Corbie, should be acknowledged to favor the Calvinistic doc-

trine of the Eucharist. It was a necessity for them, therefore, to try to make out that Ratramn's book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* had been generally misinterpreted, and was really conformable to the Tridentine dogma of transubstantiation. Though it had been officially condemned by the Council of Trent, and though one and another pope had concurred in the condemnation, and though for a considerable time Roman Catholic controversialists were unanimous in judging it heretical, nevertheless, to the astonishment of the world, learned Roman Catholic scholars became zealous in seeking to prove the obnoxious treatise to contain sound doctrine on the Eucharist! The most elaborate attempt of this nature was made by James Boileau, a doctor of the Sorbonne. But it is a significant circumstance that the Archbishop of Paris, De Harlay, prohibited the publication of the French version of Ratramn's book which Boileau had prepared.

The attempt of De Marca, Archbishop of Toulouse, and of Hardouin, the Jesuit, to prove that Joannes Scotus Erigena was the real author of the book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, ascribed to Ratramn, has not found much favor. It is discredited by the authority of manuscripts. Internal evidence, too, is against it. The style of the book is very different from that which characterizes Erigena, while it is entirely in harmony with that of the undisputed works of Ratramn. At the same time it is altogether probable that the book on the Eucharist, condemned at the Synod of Vercelli in 1050 as a heretical work of Erigena, was really the book of Ratramn. Laufs¹ by a variety of considerations very ingeniously applied, has, in our opinion, made good this contention. But his argument that Erigena did not compose a separate treatise (now lost) on the Lord's Supper is not equally convincing. That Erigena was decidedly opposed to transubstantiation and the corporal presence of Christ in any manner in the Sacrament is, however, placed beyond doubt by his statements in a writing of his lately recovered, and by the testimony of authors living near his own age.²

The occasion of the composition of Ratramn's treatise, *De*

¹ Laufs in *Studien u. Kritiken*, Vol. I., Heft 4.

² Cf. Christlieb in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* Vol. XIII., p. 790. 2 *Auf.*

Corpore et Sanguine Domini, is stated in its introduction. The author, addressing the King Charles the Bold, tells him that he wrote by his command. Ratramn evidently enjoyed the monarch's confidence. In the controversy on predestination, which Gottschalk excited, the king consulted Ratramn; and it was in obedience to the wish of the monarch that he composed his treatise on predestination, a work which we venture to think might in our own time be read with profit. It contains a few misinterpretations of Scripture, and some needless repetitions, and is largely made up of quotations from Augustin and other fathers. But it is a clearer and more scriptural and consistent work than Ratramn's smaller book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*. It admirably answers the common objections against Augustinianism, and we would call the special attention of our readers to it as an excellent and very readable and judicious disquisition on the profound question of which it treats. But we must confine ourselves now to the book which sets forth Ratramn's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It was composed, as stated in the preface, in response to the wish of King Charles to know what Ratramn thought "regarding the mystery of the body and blood of Christ." The king's interest in this question is accounted for by a book *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, which had been presented to him by its author, Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbie, the monastery in which Ratramn was a monk. Ratramn does not mention the name of Paschasius; but that it was in opposition to him that Ratramn composed his treatise is testified by Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., who died in 1003.¹ Paschasius taught transubstantiation in the work which Ratramn undertook to controvert. And yet Paschasius makes statements which it would be hard to reconcile with this dogma. Dwelling on these inconsistencies with which he is chargeable, some old

¹ The long uncertain author of a writing on the Eucharist, which the Jesuit Cellot, in *Append. Ad. Hist.*, Gotteschalki, first brought to light (formerly spoken of as *the Anonymous of Cellot*), is now known to be Gerbert. A manuscript of the treatise bearing Gerbert's name was discovered by the Benedictine Bernard Pez. The style and method of the writing strongly indicate Gerbert as its author, and this point is now admitted by scholars. Gerbert expressly declares that Ratramn, as well as Rabanus Maurus, refuted Paschasius.

Protestant writers, and even Ebrard in the present day, deny that he taught the monstrous doctrine of which so many Protestant authors have accused him of being the inventor. But we are satisfied from an examination of his treatise, that the common opinion regarding his teaching is right; and the ridiculous stories which he relates of Christ's flesh and blood having sundry times appeared visible in the Sacrament should remove all doubt on this question.¹ Certain it is that what Paschasius taught concerning the Eucharist called forth strong protest from the most influential men of the age. But nothing was then done to settle the controversy by the intervention of church authority. It was not till two centuries later that freedom of opinion on this question was prohibited by a synod of the Latin church. Paschasius often refers to dissentients from his teaching. Among contemporary authors who openly controverted his views the best known are the famous Rabanus Maurus, Joannes Scotus Erigena, and Ratramn. To the doctrine on the Lord's Supper, set forth by the last-mentioned in opposition to Paschasius, we now direct attention. His treatise, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, with a historical preface, notes and dissertation vindicating its genuineness and orthodoxy, by James Boileau, doctor of the Sorbonne, is contained in volume CXXI. of Migne's *Patrologia*. The treatise itself is divided into one hundred and two short sections. In our references to it we quote according to this edition and its numeration of sections. After four sections, which may be called introductory, Ratramn states that the king had proposed the question, "Whether that which is received in the church by the mouth of the faithful is made the body and blood of Christ in a mystery or in truth?" "In a mystery" obviously means sacramentally in opposition to truth (*veritas*), or reality. Ratramn then expands and divides the foregoing question thus: (1), "Whether it (what is received by the mouth of the faithful) contains something secret which is open only to the eyes of

¹ Dr. Schaff's statement (*Church History*, III., p. 493, note 1), that "the technical term *transubstantiatio* was introduced by Paschasius Radbertus toward the middle of the ninth century," is incorrect. The word does not occur in his writings, though he set forth the doctrine that was afterwards thus designated.

faith, or whether, without the vail of any mystery, the sight of the body sees that outwardly which the sight of the mind sees inwardly, so that all which is done is clear in the light of manifestation; and (2), Whether it is the very body which was born of Mary, and suffered, died, and was buried, and which, rising again and ascending into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father?" The first half of the treatise is devoted to the discussion of the first question, and the latter half to the consideration of the second. In discussing the first question, Ratramn begins by explaining what he understands by a figure (*figura*), and what by the truth (*veritas*). He gives these illustrations of the use of a figure: A figure is employed when we call the Word bread, as in the Lord's Prayer in asking for daily bread. Like Augustin and others, Ratramn conceived the bread asked for in the Lord's Prayer to be the Personal Word, the Son of God, the Bread of Life. So, again, when Christ says, I am the living bread that came down from heaven (John vi. 41), or when he calls himself the vine, and the disciples the branches. (John xv. 1.) These are, according to Ratramn, examples of the use of a figure. They say one thing and signify another (*aliud dicunt et aliud innunt*, Section vii.). The truth, as distinguished from a figure, is exemplified when we say, "Christ was born of the virgin, suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried." Here there is plain truth without a figure. But in the former examples it is not so; "for substantially neither is bread Christ nor is a vine Christ, nor are branches apostles." (*Nam substantialiter nec panis Christus, nec vitis Christus, nec palmites apostoli*, Section viii.) He next applies the distinction thus made and illustrated between figure and truth to the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist. He describes the senses as not discovering, after consecration of the elements into the body and blood of the Lord, anything but bread and wine. Hence he concludes: "It is plain that that bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ figuratively." (*Claret quia panis ille vinumque figurate Christi corpus et sanguis existit*, Section x.) We call attention here to this point, that the illustrations employed by Ratramn show that he understood Christ's declaration in instituting the Supper, "This is my

body," as of a like figurative character with his saying, "I am the vine." But "substantially the vine is not Christ." How, then, could he have understood the bread to be "substantially" Christ's body?

In Section xxxv. Ratramn adduces the following illustrations from Augustin's epistle to Boniface: We say at the approach of the Passover, to-day, or to-morrow, or the day after, is the Lord's passion, though the Lord suffered many years ago, and that only once. So on the Lord's day we say, To-day the Lord rose from the dead, though many years have passed since his resurrection took place. No one is so senseless as to charge us with falsehood when we thus speak, because we call these days according to their resemblance to those on which these things were transacted. So, on account of the resemblance between the sacraments and the things of which they are the sacraments, the sacraments receive the names of the things themselves. "As, therefore, in a certain sort the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ," etc. (*Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est*, Section xxxv.) Ratramn thus remarks on the foregoing words of Augustin: "We see that Augustin says that the sacraments are one thing, and the things of which they are sacraments are another thing. Now, the body in which Christ suffered, and the blood which flowed from his side are things. But the mysteries of these things, he says, are the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which are celebrated in memory of the Lord's passion (*quæ celebrantur ob memoriam Dominicæ passionis*), not only yearly at every festival of the Passover, but also every day in the year." (Section xxxvi.) In the next following section (xxxvii.) Ratramn goes on to say: "And while the body of the Lord in which he once suffered is one, and the blood which was shed for the salvation of the world is one, yet the sacraments have received the names of these very things, so that they are called the body and blood of Christ, while they are thus called on account of their similitude to the things which they signify." (*Attamen sacramenta ipsarum rerum vocabula sumpserunt, ut*

dicantur corpus et sanguis Christi, cum propter similitudinem rerum quas innuunt, sic appellantur.)

According to Augustin, sacraments are signs relating to divine things. (*Signa, cum ad res divinas pertinent, sacramenta appellantur*, Aug. Ep. 138.) As quoted by Ratramn, Augustin expressly says that the sacraments, or sacred signs, have received the names of the things signified by them. Hence, Ratramn calls the eucharistic signs the body and blood of the Lord; and that these eucharistic elements, while so-called, still remained bread and wine as to their substance is what he always assumes, and even explicitly affirms. In Section liv. he employs these words: "For, according to the substance of the creatures, what they were before consecration, this they continue afterwards." (*Nam secundum creaturarum substantiam quod fuerunt ante consecrationem, hoc et postea consistunt.*¹) Ratramn knows nothing of accidents or qualities existing without a substance; and he never ventures to question the testimony of our senses to which he often appeals. He does admit a change to be effected by the consecration of the elements; and the nature of this change we shall afterwards consider; but it does not involve either transubstantiation or consubstantiation.

The truth is that Ratramn held and taught distinctly that there could be the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of his blood without partaking of the Eucharist. According to him, believers under the Old Testament were made partakers of the body and blood of the Lord. This doctrine he professes to find in the words of the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. x. 1-4. In the manna and in water from the rock our fathers had the same spiritual meat and

¹ Ratramn speaks of the *species* of bread and wine being seen after consecration of the elements. Much has been made of this by Roman Catholic writers. But by *species* Ratramn does not mean *mere appearance*; for immediately after affirming in the place above quoted that as to their *substance* the elements remain after consecration what they were before it, he adds, *Panis et vinum prius existere, in qua etiam specie jam consecrata permanere videntur*. His applying the term *species* to the consecrated elements gives no countenance to the notion that only the appearance of bread and wine remains. *Species* denotes kind, sort of things, as well as appearance. In later Latin, *species* denotes fruits of the earth, *fruges*. (Ducange, S. V.) The elements can be called *species* before consecration, as, e. g., by Ambrose De Initiandis, Cap. 9. (*Ante benedictionem verborum celestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur.*)

the same spiritual drink given to them which we have furnished to us in the bread and wine of the supper. Here is what he says (Section xxiii.): "It is one and the same Christ, who made the people in the desert, who had been baptized in the cloud and in the sea, to eat his flesh and to drink his blood, and now in the church feeds his believing people with the bread of his body, and makes them drink the stream of his blood." That our fathers in the wilderness ate Christ's body and drank his blood is a conclusion which he draws from the apostle's saying that they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink. (*Per escam spiritualem potumque invisibilem ejus corpus manducabant et ejus sanguinem bibebant.*) Nay, he goes on to say that, "He who now in the church by his omnipotent power spiritually converts the bread and wine into the flesh of his body and the stream of his own blood, then also invisibly caused the manna given from heaven to be his body, and the water poured from the rock to be his own blood." (Section xxv.) Ratramn has much more to the like effect. He repeatedly and emphatically affirms that Christ changed the manna and the water from the rock into his own flesh and blood. But he gives us to understand that the change was of a spiritual character. It could not be other than spiritual. He who believed that under the Old Testament the body and blood of the Lord Jesus were as really partaken of as they are now under the Christian dispensation, could not possibly have supposed that the body born of the Virgin and crucified is actually present in a corporal manner in the Eucharist. It is idle for Boileau to say that such statements fully demonstrate that nothing seemed impossible to our author in the mystery of transubstantiation. To make Ratramn assert a real transubstantiation of manna into the historical body of Christ is to father on him an absurdity too wild for any rational being to have seriously entertained.

It is worthy of note that the Magdeburg Centuriators and the early Lutheran theologians spoke slightly of Ratramn's treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*. They saw that the doctrine of the corporal presence of the body of Christ *in, with, and under* the bread of communion could not be reconciled with the

plain teaching of Ratramn. They had not the same powerful motive which the Romanists had for wresting the words of the great orthodox doctor of the ninth century to prove his agreement with the creed of their church. They, therefore, did not claim Ratramn as on their side. It was the Reformed, or Calvinistic, Church that took pains to publish and to circulate Ratramn's book, and that confidently appealed to it as a witness in their favor.

In the latter half of his treatise Ratramn formally discusses the second question which he had proposed to consider: whether the very body which was born of Mary, and suffered, and died, and was buried, and which is seated at the right hand of the Father, is that which is daily, through the mystery of the sacraments, received in the church by the mouth of the faithful? (Section 1.) This was what Paschasius Radbert had maintained. Ratramn meets the question openly, argues against it, shows that it cannot possibly be true, and rejects it utterly, and so declares plainly his disbelief in the doctrine afterwards called transubstantiation. In treating this question, he first of all makes some quotations from Saint Ambrose. One might suppose that Ambrose is the last of the Latin fathers to whom Ratramn would have appealed. He is, with reason, held to be the one who did most to further the development in the church of a belief in the conversion of the elements of bread and wine into the real body and blood of the Lord, though he did not fully evolve this doctrine. Perhaps it was because Ratramn regarded the teaching of Ambrose as seemingly most unfavorable to his own view of the supper that he undertook to show that Ambrose and he were not in antagonism on the second question proposed. But it is not our business to set forth the doctrine of Ambrose, but that of Ratramn, on the Lord's supper; and for this purpose it is sufficient to attend to his comment on a passage which he had adduced from Ambrose: "How carefully, how judiciously, is the distinction made! Of the flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried, that is, according to which Christ was both crucified and buried, he [Ambrose] says: 'It is the true flesh of Christ.' But of that which is received in the sacrament he says: 'It is truly the sacrament of

that flesh,'—distinguishing the sacrament of the flesh from the truth of the flesh." (Section lvii.) He makes Ambrose teach that there is a great difference between the sacramental body and blood of Christ and the body in which Christ suffered and the blood which he shed from his side when hanging on the cross. (Section lxix.)

Ratramn next gives a quotation from Jerome, and draws this teaching from the quotation, that "the spiritual flesh which is received by the mouth of the faithful, and the spiritual blood which is daily presented to believers to drink, differ from the flesh which was crucified, and from the blood which was shed by the soldier's lance, as the authority of this man [Jerome] testifies; therefore they are not the same." (Section lxxi.) Then follows an argument in which the different and opposite properties of the body of Christ in the communion, and of the body which was born of the Virgin, and died, and rose again, are dwelt upon; and after contrasting them Ratramn declares the supposition of their identity to be inconceivable. (Sections lxxii., lxxvi., lxxvii.) Next, Ratramn makes his appeal to St. Augustin, and after adducing several of his statements he says of him: "By the authority of this doctor discussing the words of the Lord concerning the sacrament of his body and blood, we are manifestly taught that those words of the Lord are to be understood spiritually, and not carnally." (Section lxxxii.) And in the next paragraph (lxxxiii.) Ratramn thus sums up the teaching of Augustin on this subject: "We see, therefore, that that meat of the body of the Lord, and that drink of his blood, are truly his body and truly his blood in a certain respect (*secundum quid*), namely in this, that they are spirit and life." Boileau could not leave this last sentence without an attempt to turn away the mind of the reader from its true significance. So he has this curious comment on it: "That is, not in that carnal manner in which the food and drink we ordinarily use are taken." This note, as every one can perceive, is altogether irrelevant as an explanation of what Ratramn had said. But it has a relevancy if we have regard to the aim of Boileau to shield from observation Ratramn's antagonism to what is now adjudged orthodoxy in the Roman Church.

We have already mentioned that Ratramn's treatise, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, was put on the index of prohibited books by the censors appointed by the Council of Trent. In the Netherlands under the dominion of Spain, the Roman Catholic censors extended to it more toleration. In the *Belgian Index Expurgatorius*, issued by the command and authority of Philip II., the publication of the work was allowed with the omission of certain passages which were considered too heterodox to be suffered to fall under the eyes of the public. We will give one of these omitted parts which embraces almost five sections or paragraphs (lxxiii.—lxxvii.) of the authentic text. Our readers will not find it difficult to divine the reason of its suppression. In fact, the perusal of it alone is sufficient to determine the question of Ratramn's attitude towards the Tridentine standard of orthodoxy:

"It ought to be considered that in the bread [of the Eucharist] not only the body of Christ, but also the body of the people believing in him, is represented (*figuretur*), and hence it is made of many grains of corn, because the body of believing people is increased in the multitude of the faithful by the word of Christ."

"Wherefore, as in a mystery that bread is accepted as the body of Christ, so also in a mystery the members of the people believing in Christ are signified; and as that bread is not corporeally, but spiritually, called the body of believers, so also it is necessary that the body of Christ be understood not corporeally but spiritually."

"So, also, in the wine which is called the blood of Christ, water is ordered to be mingled, nor is one without the other permitted to be offered, because neither can the people exist without Christ, nor Christ without the people, as neither the head can exist without the body, nor the body without the head. Accordingly, water in that sacrament represents the people. Therefore, if that wine, which is consecrated by the function of the ministers, is corporeally converted into the blood of Christ, the water, too, which is equally mingled, must necessarily be corporeally converted into the blood of the believing people. For where there is one consecration there is, consequently, one operation, and where there is an equal reason there follows a mystery that is equal also. But

we see that in the water nothing is changed as respects the body (*secundum corpus*), consequently, then, in the wine also nothing is corporeally shown to us. Whatever is signified in the water concerning the body of the people is taken spiritually; it is, therefore, necessary that whatever is signified in the wine concerning the blood of Christ be taken spiritually."

"Moreover, things which differ among themselves are not the same. The body of Christ which died and rose again, and being made immortal, dieth no more, death will not further have dominion over it (Rom. vi. 9), it is eternal, it is not now capable of suffering. But this which is solemnized in the church is temporal, not eternal; it is corruptible, not uncorrupted; it is in the way, not in the country. They differ, therefore, from one another. Whence they are not the same. How is it called Christ's true body and true blood?"

"For if it is the body of Christ, and it is said truly that it is the body of Christ, it is in verity the body of Christ; and the body of Christ is incorruptible, and is incapable of suffering, and hence eternal; then this body of Christ which is celebrated in the church must be incorruptible and eternal. But it cannot be denied that it is corrupted, because, having been broken into parts, it is distributed to be received, and having been ground by the teeth it is passed into the body."

It is not an original idea of Ratramn (we find it in the early fathers), that the body of believers, or the church, as well as Christ's own body, is represented in the eucharistic bread. Whatever we may think of this notion, it is manifest that Ratramn runs the parallel between the body of believers and the body of Christ, both of which he sees in the sacramental bread, in such a way that neither can be thought of as substantially there. If every communicant in the celebration of the Eucharist swallows the real body of Christ, then, according to Ratramn, he must be held to swallow at the same time the body of believers, the whole church of God! To such an absurdity he reduces the doctrine of the real presence of the Lord's body in the sacrament. And when he makes the water, which in the ancient church was usually mingled with the sacramental wine, to represent the people of Christ and

reasons: If the wine of consecration is corporeally converted into the blood of Christ, then the water mixed with it must be corporeally converted into the blood of the believing people; for where there is one consecration, there is consequently one operation—is it possible, we ask, in the face of such statements, to entertain a doubt that the real sentiments of Ratramn were utterly opposed to the dogma of transubstantiation? His argument, in brief, is this, that as the water used in the communion cannot be believed to be literally changed into the blood of the people of God, so the wine of the communion cannot be believed to be literally changed into the very blood of the Redeemer. Ratramn reasons *ex concessis*. His premises were universally granted in his age, and he demonstrates from them the preposterousness of supposing a material transmutation of the sacramental elements.

The Belgian censors, who corrected Ratramn's treatise by the expurgation of the foregoing and other obnoxious passages, did not profess to have any manuscript authority for this procedure. The portions omitted are just as well authenticated as any other parts of the text. But their testimony to Ratramn's fundamental disagreement with the modern Roman Catholic Church was too clear and pronounced to be mistaken by any one, and it was deemed politic to suppress the evidence that rank Calvinism was taught in the ninth century by one of the most honored doctors of the church, without any charge of heresy being preferred against him.¹

We forbear to adduce further evidence to prove that the early reformed divines were fully justified in claiming with all confidence Ratramn as a witness that their rejection of transubstantiation was no novelty. There are, we admit, some statements in his book, which, if isolated and considered by themselves, might be held to favor the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist. But in the same way Calvin² might be quoted as maintaining what is commonly known as the doctrine of the *real presence*.

¹ Cf. Daillé On the Right Use of the Fathers. Chap. IV.

² Cf. *Instit. Lib.* IV., Cap. XVII., 19. *Quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialem que corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris Cœnæ symbolis fidelibus exhibetur facere potest, libenter accipio.* A study of the context prevents our misunderstanding these words.

Ratramn in his book, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, quotes only Latin authors. These are Augustin, Isidor of Seville, Ambrose, Jerome, and Fulgentius. He might have referred to a distinguished expositor of Scripture of his own monastery of Corbie, Christian Druthmar, who, in the early part of the ninth century, wrote a commentary on Matthew, in which he gave the symbolical interpretation to the words of Christ, "This is my body." And while neither Ambrose nor Jerome were admitted by Ratramn to confound the signs with the things signified, he could find in Augustin, Isidor, and Fulgentius (who was called *alter Augustinus*) positive statements of a doctrine clearly contrary to transubstantiation. There can be no reasonable dispute that Augustin, under whose mighty influence Ratramn's theological views were formed, interpreted our Lord's words in instituting the supper, not in a grossly literal, but in a spiritual and figurative, sense. Calvin could truthfully say of Augustin on this question that he was wholly on his side. (*Sine controversia totum esse nostrum.*) The wonder is, that in the Latin church, with her reverential regard for the authority of Augustin, the doctrine of transubstantiation should have finally prevailed. If Augustin's observations on the Eucharist were published anonymously, Roman Catholics ignorant of the source whence they were taken would certainly pronounce them Calvinistic and heretical.¹ Ratramn, in opposing Paschasius, wrote with the boldness of a man who was persuaded that he did not stand alone, but had the support of Augustin and of the best teachers of the church in all ages, and that it was Paschasius, and not he, who was the innovator.

¹ A striking illustration of the truth of this remark is given by Schröck. (*Kirchengeschichte*, XXIII., p. 506.) Fulbert, the famous bishop of Chartres, in the beginning of the eleventh century, quotes the comment of Augustin on Christ's words. (John vi. 53.) In this comment Augustin observes that here a crime seems to be commanded. It is, therefore, a figure which commands us to communicate of the passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably lay up in our memory that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us. The editor of Fulbert, who was Charles de Villiers, a Parisian doctor of theology, did not perceive that this passage proceeded from so orthodox a teacher as Augustin. So after the words, "It is, therefore, a figure" (*figura ergo est*), he actually added, "A heretic will say this" (*dicet haereticus*)! When he discovered his mistake, he put his interpolated remark, "A heretic will say this," among typographical errors, and added that the whole passage contains a mystical interpretation.

We have now to inquire into the nature of the change in the elements, which, according to Ratramn, is effected by their consecration. He allows that the elements remain the same in substance after consecration as they were before it. (Section liv.) The historical body of Christ is not in the bread, but in heaven. (Section xxx.) Yet the sacramental symbols are held by him to have undergone objectively a change through the ministry of the priest, so that they are more than they were before. He compares the change effected in the eucharistic elements with that which he supposes to take place in the water of baptism. He maintains that the baptismal water after consecration possesses a power of sanctification (*sanctificationis virtutem*), otherwise it could not wash away the stain of vices; and also a force of life (*vigorem vite*), otherwise it could not give life to the spiritually dead. We do not stop here to refute Ratramn's erroneous doctrine concerning baptism. He assumes it as currently believed in his day, and he employs it for the purpose of showing the nature of the change wrought in the eucharistic symbols by the consecration of the priest. The bodily sense sees in the baptismal water a fluid element subject to corruption, with the power of washing only the body. But through the consecration of the priest there is added to it the power of the Holy Ghost (*accessit sancti Spiritus per sacerdotis consecrationem virtus*), and thus it is made efficacious to wash not only bodies, but also souls, and to remove spiritual uncleanness by a spiritual power. (Section xvii.) There is in one and the same element of water that which is cognizable by the bodily sense, and, therefore, mutable and corruptible; and there is that which faith alone sees, and which, therefore, cannot be corrupted or destroyed. That which washes superficially is the element, but that which cleanses inwardly is a vital power, a power of sanctification, a power of immortality. (Section xviii.) "So, also," he adds, "the body and blood of Christ, considered superficially, is a creature subject to change and corruption. If, however, you consider the power of the mystery, it is a life imparting immortality to those who partake of it." (Section xix.) So the sea and the cloud in which our fathers were baptized (1 Cor. x.) contained invisibly the sanctification of the

Holy Spirit. (*Invisibiliter sancti Spiritus sanctificationem continebant.*) In them inwardly a spiritual power shone which did not appear to the eyes of the flesh, but to the eyes of the mind. (Section xxi.) So with the manna and the water that flowed from the rock. There was in these corporeal substances the spiritual power of the Word. (*Inerat corporeis illis substantiis spiritualis Verbi potestas.*) (Section xxii.) The bread and the wine are called the body and blood of Christ because they are received not as what they are outwardly seen to be, but what they are inwardly made by the working of the divine Spirit. (Section lxiii.) The Word of God, who is the living Bread invisibly existing in that sacrament, invisibly feeds the minds of believers, vivifying them by the partaking of himself. (*Verbum autem Dei, qui est panis invisibiliter in illo existens sacramento, invisibiliter participatione sui fidelium mentes vivificando pascit.*) (Section xliv.) Under the cover of corporeal things a divine power secretly works the salvation which comes through these sacraments. Secret powers belong to the sacraments. (Section xlvi.) An inward divine power is represented as “existing” or “contained” in the elements. It is called also an invisible substance (*invisibilis substantia*), the power of the divine Word, by which they feed and sanctify the minds of the faithful. (Sections xlvi.—xliv.) So (section lxiv.) the bread or the manna is held to be the body of Christ, because there is in it the spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the divine Word, which not only feeds but also cleanses the soul. (*Patenter ostendit secundum quod habeatur corpus Christi, videlicet secundum id quod sit in eo Spiritus Christi, id est divini potentia Verbi, quae non solum animam pascit, verum etiam purgat.*)¹

¹ “In attempting to explain,” says the Roman Catholic historian Alzog, “the constituents of the sacrament, Ratramn appears at times to admit that the substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ by the words of consecration; but he also appears to maintain that the divine Word or logos takes the place of the body of Christ in the sacrament, and nourishes the soul; and even goes the length of asserting that the Israelites received the body in the manna.” (Alzog’s *Universal Church History*, Vol. II., p. 435.) The above statement as that of a Roman Catholic historian is interesting. But he ought to have conceded that Ratramn, with all explicitness, denies that the body of Christ in the sacrament is the body which was born of Mary, and died, and was buried, and rose again, and is now at the right hand of the Father.

The references to Ratramn which we have given show that Ratramn made the bread and wine of the Lord's supper the body and blood of Christ for believers only. He teaches that they possess a secret, inherent, sanctifying and saving power for believers. An objective virtue or power resides in them. At one time he says that the Spirit of God is in them; at another, that Christ the Word, the logos, is in them. In opposition to the doctrine of the Reformed Church which teaches that "the sacraments become effectual means of salvation not from any virtue in them," Ratramn insists that there is a virtue in them. Steitz¹ remarks truly that consistency ought to have led Ratramn to place the operative power of the Spirit and of the Word in the soul of the believer, and not in the consecrated elements. But we must not misrepresent his views to uphold his consistency, or to make him more in agreement with the truth, as it is taught in the Reformed Church, than he is. But though he does make a saving power to be resident in the bread, still that which is divine and heavenly in it, that is, the body of Christ, can neither be seen nor received, nor eaten, save by the believer. (*Ast interius longe aliud multo pretiosius multo que excellentius intimatur, quia celeste, quia divinum, id est Christi corpus, ostenditur, quod non sensibus carnis, sed animi fidelis contuitu vel aspicitur, vel accipitur, vel comeditur.*) (Section ix.)

We regret Ratramn's confusion of thought. It involved him in serious error. Readers of Calvin know how earnestly he opposes those who attributed to the sacraments a secret saving power by which they justify and confer grace on those who do not place the obstacle of mortal sin in the way. This opinion Calvin characterizes as deadly, pestilential, diabolical; and the more so because it has so long prevailed in the church to her great detriment.²

Neander, in introducing his history of the controversy respecting the Lord's supper in this age, observes that that which is divine, and which in the observance of this ordinance fills the religious consciousness, was transferred to the external sign; and

¹ Herzog's *Real Encyc.* XII., p. 539. 2 *Auf.*

² *Instit. Lib.*, IV., Cap. XIV., 14.

this was regarded as the bearer of a divine power communicated through the consecration which the priest uttered over it. From this error Ratramn was not free. Pity it is that he did not clearly grasp and set forth the truth so well expressed by Hooker that "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament (*i. e.*, in the elements), but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament." It ought, however, to be remembered, as extenuating Ratramn's error, that though he admits an objective, saving virtue to be immanent in the sacrament, he at the same time contends that faith is necessary to receive this virtue, and to partake of Christ's body and blood with their benefits. He makes unbelievers receive only the bare signs. He did not regard the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice offered for the sins of the living and of the dead. He represents it as celebrated in memory of the Lord's passion. (*Ob memoriam Dominicæ passionis.*) (Section xxxvi.) He does indeed call it a sacrifice; but he takes care to let us know that sacraments receive the names of the things which they represent. "Thus we can say that the Lord is sacrificed when the sacraments of his passion are celebrated, since he once was sacrificed in himself for the salvation of the world." (*Sic etiam dicamus Dominum immolari quando passionis ejus sacramenta celebrantur, cum semel pro salute mundi sit immolatus in semetipso, sicut Apostolus ait.*) (Section xxxviii.) He quotes the following words from Fulgentius: "In this sacrifice there is thanksgiving, and the commemoration of the flesh of Christ which he offered for us, and of the blood which he shed for us." (Section xc.) This sacrifice, he tells us in the next paragraph, is "a *figure* of things past." In what Ratramn has written in regard to *this* question he is most satisfactory. He makes no acknowledgment of a repeated offering of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice by the priest. It is only believing partakers who receive any profit from the sacrament. The idea of non-communicants being benefited by its solitary celebration by a priest was altogether foreign to his mind. His doctrine is in every point diametrically opposite to the third canon on the sacrifice of the mass promulgated by the Council of Trent.¹ It is impossible to read his treatise and believe that communion in one kind was practiced in

¹ This canon runs: *Si quis dixerit, Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis, et*

his day, or that the host was elevated for the people to adore it. These practices are natural consequences of transubstantiation, and their absence is a clear indication that that dogma had not yet established itself in the consciousness of the church.

Variety of opinion in regard to the nature of the Lord's supper was tolerated in the age of Ratramn. Ratramn himself recognized as Christian brethren those who held the views which he antagonized (Section ii.), while at the same time he affirms that they were divided by a not unimportant schism (*non parvo schismate dividuntur*) who uttered discordant sentiments regarding the mystery of Christ's body and blood. So, too, Paschasius Radbert, whom Ratramn opposed, frequently admits that doubt and contradiction were encountered by him in his teaching on the Eucharist. The writings of Paschasius abundantly testify that a denial of transubstantiation was not judged sufficient to exclude a man from the fellowship of the church. More freedom of opinion was allowed on this question in that age than on the question of predestination, as is shown by the persecution of Gottschalk. It was not till two hundred years later (and we are to remember that the tenth century, one of unparalleled darkness and disorder, intervened) that Berengar was condemned as a heretic for advocating views on the Lord's supper similar to those set forth by Ratramn. Berengar, in his epistle to Ascelin, accused Paschasius of having invented the notion that the substance of the bread does not remain in the sacrament. (*Solus sibi confingit sacramento Domini corporis decedere panis omnino substantiam.*) Protestants, not without reason, charge Paschasius with having first formulated the doctrine of transubstantiation, though this name is not given to it by him. As Steitz expresses it,¹ there had been playing with the notion of transubstantiation up to the time of Paschasius.² He was *in earnest* with it, hence the epoch-making significance of this theologian. Even Bellarmin declares that he "was the first author who wrote seriously and copiously concerning the truth of

gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, penis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit.

¹ Article "Transubstantiation," Herzog's *Real Encyclopædia*, XV., p. 811.

² For proofs that Paschasius was an innovator, see Claude *On the Eucharist*, Book VI., chapter ix.

the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist." But contradiction of his extravagance was still permitted, and we have the evidence that he was boldly opposed by teachers of the greatest eminence then living, such as Rabanus Maurus, Joannes Scotus Erigena, and Ratramn. Even a century and a half afterwards, Pope Sylvester II. only ventures to make a modest apology for what he calls the "simplicity" of Paschasius.

The celebrated Jansenist Nicole, in his treatise on the *Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church touching the Eucharist*, makes this argument, which, though fully refuted by Claude, is still repeated: In the eleventh century the church declared against Berengar, and against his Calvinistic doctrine of the supper. The church doctrine of that century must have been also the church doctrine of preceding centuries. It is impossible that the church could have varied in so essential a dogma. Such variation would have occasioned disputes and disturbances which could not have passed away, leaving no trace of their occurrence. Such is the scope of Nicole's boasted argument. He craftily ignores the disputes that took place in the ninth century, when the treatise of Paschasius appeared advocating the view that the body of Christ in the sacrament is identical with the body which was born of the Virgin, and was crucified, and rose, and ascended into heaven. How daring, too, is the assumption that there is no trace of any variation in the doctrine prevailing in the church on the Lord's supper! Was not infant communion once the established usage in the Latin, as well as in the Greek, church? Was it not believed and taught that no infant could inherit eternal life without having partaken of the Eucharist? In the Greek church infant communion still prevails. In the Latin church the practice has been abolished, and the Council of Trent has pronounced against it. The doctrine of the Latin church has varied on this point, by the consent of all. Augustin could teach that infants who had not received the communion as well as baptism were liable to eternal punishment.¹ It cannot be contended that this is an unimportant question. It involves both doctrine and ritual. It is wonderful that, with such an admitted fact, Roman Catholic controversialists will still persist in declaring that the doctrine of

¹ *Nullus qui se meminit Catholicæ fidei Christianum negat aut dubitat parvulos*

the church on the Lord's supper has been uniform and unvarying. Unprejudiced inquirers find in ancient Christian literature two opposite tendencies manifested in speaking of this sacrament, some of the fathers favoring what is called the metabolic, the realistic, the grossly literal, view of Christ's words in instituting the Eucharist; others declaring for the symbolic, the figurative, the spiritual, view of them. Up to the time of Paschasius the conflict between the two diverging conceptions had not reached an acute stage. The age that succeeded was the best fitted for the triumphant establishment of the greatest absurdity that has ever been promulgated as a Christian doctrine. Any one who studies the memorials of the tenth century will not be so much astonished that what Berengar called the senselessness of the multitude (*vecordia vulgi*) should have embraced so unreasonable and unscriptural a delusion as transubstantiation. "This doctrine," Tillotson says truly, "hath been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this hath been in the Church of Rome the great *burning article*; and, absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it than, perhaps, for all the other articles of their religion."

At a time when, in a large and influential branch of the Protestant Church, which pays an extravagant reverence to everything that has been received by tradition from the fathers, there is displayed a strong reactionary spirit in favor of the revival of the doctrine of transubstantiation, it is useful to study its history; and we cannot but value highly the treatise of Ratramn, *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, as an irrefragable witness that the doctrine is an innovation in the faith of the Church Catholic.

DUNLOP MOORE.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

non accepta gratia regenerationis in Christo sine cibo carnis ejus et sanguinis potu non habere in se vitam, ac per hoc pænæ sempiternæ obnoxios. (Epist. 106.)

Döllinger and his friends thus refer to this subject (*Janus*, p. 51): "Innocent I. and Gelasius I., the former writing to the Council of Milevi, the latter in his epistle to the bishops of Picenum, declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive the communion that those who died without it go straight to hell." (*S. Aug. Opp.* II., 640; *Concil. Coll.* (Ed. Labbé), IV., 1178.) A thousand years later the Council of Trent anathematized the doctrine.