

BETWEEN AUGUSTINIAN SIGN AND CAROLINGIAN REALITY:  
THE PRESENCE OF AMBROSE AND AUGUSTINE  
IN THE EUCHARISTIC DEBATE BETWEEN PASCHASIUS  
RADBERTUS AND RATRAMNUS OF CORBIE

WILLEMEN OTTEN

*Utrecht University*

I *Controversy*

From a historical perspective, it seems fair to say that the heyday for eucharistic controversy was the era of the Reformation. In this period, more than in any other before or after it seems, there was an intense longing to define exactly what happens at the eucharist, i.e., at the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the wine as the age-old sacrament that became increasingly crucial in shaping the identity of the Christian communities. Given the nature of the Reformation movement itself, which involved an impassioned debate on ecclesiology — what is the right direction for the Christian church to take — overlaid with a heavily polemical exterior, it should not come as a surprise that this definition was carved out in terms of absolutes: transubstantiation was absolutely wrong in the eyes of the various protestant parties, although among themselves they could certainly accept various shades of this so-called ‘right’, while not to hold this position was absolutely wrong according to the Catholic party. As the Council of Trent put it in no uncertain terms: let him be anathema.<sup>1</sup>

What may come as a surprise is that the Reformation period proved also to be the heyday of the eucharistic controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie. In fact, it seemed two controversies were actually played out at the same time with the Carolingian authors starring in different roles. The first was between Radbertus and Ratramnus. In it Radbertus was cast as the representative of the papal mass, as a result of which he became quickly condemned by the protestants, while he was embraced by the Catholic party. The second controversy centered

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, ed. and transl. by H.J. Schroeder O.P. (London, 1941) s.v. Sessio Decima Tertia. De Eucharistia. Canones de Sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento, 355-57.

on the position of Ratramnus himself: was his position that of a proto-protestant or was he reliably Catholic? In this latter debate — which has important connections with the present paper — the protestants came to emphasize the figurative interpretation of the eucharist in Ratramnus, which put him in line with their largely commemorative reading of this sacrament, while the Catholics were at pains to show that Ratramnus was nevertheless a faithful son of the church, that is: their Roman Catholic church.<sup>2</sup>

The Reformation took place in a world in which the fight for intellectual control over western Christendom — at least from a retrospective point of view — may well have reached its peak. Why then did the Reformers go back to the Carolingian phase of this debate? What attracted them? Was it a quest to find hidden roots in the medieval tradition? This does not appear likely. If they had wanted to develop a true taste for the medieval incarnation of the eucharistic debate, it would have been far better to turn to the late eleventh century, when Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours were the two opponents. There one finds all the tricks of the medieval repertory. As this debate shows, maligning one's opponent was by no means new; neither was the cursing of schismatics. There were confessions, recanting of earlier positions, official condemnations and appeals to the papal see.<sup>3</sup> Yet it was not to this phase that the Reformers went back, but to the preceding one. Stripped of the dialectical fireworks of a Berengar, Ratramnus' treatise not only showed a remarkable simplicity, its figurative reading of the eucharist going seemingly against the doctrine of transubstantiation, but by virtue of its use of earlier patristic material it also seemed to be closer to the position of the Church Fathers. As such he — and by extension his opponent

---

<sup>2</sup> See on this, ch. III (Notice bibliographique) of J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink (ed.), *Ratramnus. De corpore et sanguine domini. Texte original et notice bibliographique. Edition renouvelée* (Amsterdam, 1974) 71-137. This chapter gives an account of the tortuous reception history of Ratramnus' treatise. When it was printed in 1531, it was first seen by pope Sixtus VI as a forgery made by the protestant Oecolampadius. This feat seems to have endeared this little treatise to the Reformers even more, with all parties except the Lutherans making use of it from time to time, mainly because it seemed to reject the doctrine of transubstantiation. Some reformers also seemed interested because it could serve a role in the reconciliation talks between the different religious parties. The Benedictine scholar Jean Mabillon changed its reception in Catholic circles by accepting its orthodoxy in 1689.

<sup>3</sup> For an account of the controversy between Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc of Bec, see G. Macy, *The Theology of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period. A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c. 1080-c.1220* (Oxford, 1984) 35-43 and M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978) 63-97.

Radbertus as well — was naturally of relevance to the Reformers, who tended to see their own position in strong continuity with the Fathers. Hence, a popular English translation of this ‘book of Barthram’ from 1549 was accompanied by testimonial evidence culled from the Church Fathers.<sup>4</sup>

Before delving into the specifics of Radbertus’ and Ratramnus’ position as it relates to patristic authority, it should be said that the notion of a controversy dividing these two Carolingian authors had originated long before the period of the Reformation. It dates back to the tenth century, when the monastic author Heriger of Lobbes linked the respective Carolingian positions with those of Ambrose and Augustine among others,<sup>5</sup> and it appears to have been firmly established by the time of Lanfranc and Berengar. At that time, however, the debate received a fiery impulse which made it forever impossible to reconcile the two Carolingian views. Already in Heriger’s days, it seems John the Scot Eriugena was credited with the authorship of Ratramnus’ treatise, even though we fail to know how this identification came about.<sup>6</sup> Given Berengar’s besieged position, however, claiming the support of Eriugena for his side, as he emphatically did, was like adding fuel to the fire. Hence an escalation of the controversy was hard to avoid, culminating in Berengar’s well-known condemnation.

While the Reformers inherited the idea of a eucharistic controversy from the Middle Ages, they clearly shaped its subsequent modification. To borrow a twelfth-century metaphor, to them Radbertus and Ratramnus seemed to be fighting out their debate ‘as dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants’, i.e., the Church Fathers. The effect of this view on modern scholarship has been not just to contrast Radbertus and Ratramnus as such, but to tie in this contrast with their divergent reception of the Fathers. Standard accounts of this reformed view can be found in the volume *Early Medieval Theology*, edited by George McCracken in 1957,<sup>7</sup> a textbook used widely, or in the well-known handbook by Jaroslav Pelikan,

<sup>4</sup> See Bakhuizen, ‘Notice bibliographique’, 108.

<sup>5</sup> On the *Dicta domni abbatis Herigeri de corpore et sanguine Domini*, see J.-P. Bouhot, *Ratramne de Corbie. Histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales* (Paris, 1976) 129-135.

<sup>6</sup> See on this, J.-P. Bouhot, *Ratramne de Corbie*, 135 n. 50. Bouhot plausibly conjectures that Ratramnus’ anonymous treatise, which he had sent to Charles the Bald, may have become attributed to John the Scot Eriugena, because he was known as his court theologian. The name of John the Scot also features in the Reformation debates.

<sup>7</sup> See *The Library of Christian Classics*, volume IX (Philadelphia, 1957) 90-147. Ratramnus’ (shorter) treatise is fully translated here, while only a portion of Radbertus is represented. Where possible, translations in this article are taken from this volume.

*The Growth of Medieval Theology* (600-1300) from 1978.<sup>8</sup> Conflating the two accounts, we arrive at the following picture.

In the ninth century a monk of Corbie in northern France, Paschasius Radbertus, wrote a little book on the eucharist, which he called *De corpore et sanguine Domini*.<sup>9</sup> He holds the view that after the moment of consecration the bread and wine on the altar become identical with the body and blood of Jesus Christ, thus promoting a 'Capharnaite' view of the eucharist. An opposing view was held by Ratramnus, who launched 'an irenic attack' on said Radbertus in a work with the same title.<sup>10</sup> Ratramnus advocated a spiritual view in which the bread and the wine of the eucharist represent Christ's body and blood figuratively to serve in commemoration of him. They are not Christ's body and blood in truth, i.e., perceptible to the senses. The crucial terms for Ratramnus are *veritas*, which he applies to the natural world of the five senses, and *figura*, under which he subsumes all that is symbolic. Because of his use of the term *figura* and his spiritualizing interpretation, Ratramnus ought to be seen in the tradition of Augustine, whom he frequently quotes. It is precisely in his use of *veritas* and *figura* that Ratramnus seems opposed to Radbertus. For Radbertus sees *veritas* as that which faith teaches, while *figura* for him has the pejorative ring of outward appearance. Furthermore, while Radbertus mentions that he will quote the Church Fathers, he is less careful in doing so. His position generally accords with the sermons in Ambrose's *De mysteriis*, where a more miraculous interpretation of the sacrament as defying the order of nature is found.

## II *History and Memory*

If the idea of a disagreement about patristic viewpoints is not at the heart of this controversy — I shall argue below that it plays a central role only in Paschasius' letters to Fredugard — and if we cannot even speak of a true controversy, then in what does the difference of opinion between Radbertus and Ratramnus consist? Can we even be sure that there was one, given that neither mentions the other's name? To this purpose we will review the historical dossier more closely, following the detailed reconstruction made by Jean-Paul Bouhot.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*, volume III (Chicago, 1978) pp. 74-80.

<sup>9</sup> See Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, ed. B. Paulus O.S.B. (Turnhout, 1969) CCCM 16, 13-131.

<sup>10</sup> See the edition by Bakhuizen van den Brink in n. 2 above.

<sup>11</sup> In the next two paragraphs I follow Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 120-124.

Paschasius Radbertus, a monk at Corbie who became head of its monastic school, was apparently the first author to devote a book to the eucharist in the years 831-833. He was motivated by catechetical reasons, as he wrote at the request of his former student Warin, abbot of Corvey, to train the monks at this daughter monastery of Corbie in Saxony. Radbertus' work circulated without apparent controversy. This is not to put controversy past Paschasius, but his troubles were political and seem unrelated. When Charles the Bald came to Corbie for prayer early in 843, he found himself impressed by the sharpness of the monk Ratramnus. Having a keen interest in theological matters himself, in part because they could help him settle conflicts at the various councils that were held in his kingdom, Charles requested Ratramnus' view of the eucharist, especially 'whether the body and the blood of Christ, which the faithful at church receive in their mouth, are present there in mystery or in truth.'<sup>12</sup> Ratramnus replied with his own *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, of which only two copies were made: the original and a copy for the king, while Radbertus addressed the same matter in his spiritual conference on Matt. 26, 26, held on Maundy Thursday of the same year.

When Radbertus was elected abbot of Corbie in September 843, he may have become interested in sending a revised copy of his eucharistic treatise to king Charles, with whom he was not on excellent terms, and whom he may have hoped to placate through this gift. This second, revised edition of his treatise was expanded to include eucharistic miracles from the *Vitae Patrum*. Ratramnus, who had succeeded him as the school's master, taught in a different vein from Radbertus and students may have compared their classes. While Ratramnus cited the Fathers extensively, after which he discussed them, Radbertus used them freely, even without acknowledgement, which could lead one to believe he did not know them as well. When Radbertus stepped down as abbot in 849 and retired temporarily to St. Riquier, his students may not have thought him safe from the accusation that he was disloyal to the tradition. When his pupil Fredugard expressed such concerns, Radbertus wrote him two letters, the first of which was accompanied by a series of patristic quotations. Deriving from a florilegium which he had used before, they were meant to underscore his knowledge of the tradition.<sup>13</sup> Although problems regarding the

<sup>12</sup> See Ratramnus ch. 5, ed. Bakhuizen, p.44 lines 5-7: 'Quod in ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur corpus et sanguis christi, quaerit vestrae magnitudinis excellentia in misterio fiat, an in veritate.'

<sup>13</sup> Bouhot has made it clear that Fredugard approached Radbertus twice. The latter's first reply to Fredugard is printed by Paulus as a postscript on pp. 169-173. According to

interpretation of the eucharist damaged his contemporary Amalarius of Metz,<sup>14</sup> there are no indications that Radbertus was ever under suspicion.

From this account it appears the idea of a controversy broadens out into the notion of a budding scholarly culture. This culture was directed from monastic centers, for as a result of various Carolingian reforms, including the adaptation of the Rule by Benedict of Aniane (751-821), the Benedictine monasteries had turned into citadels of learning in what was otherwise still largely a cultural wasteland. Apparently capable of nourishing a healthy diversity of opinion, scholars would not shy away from tackling prime theological matters, with the involvement of the crown serving as an added incentive. In this climate Radbertus, as the head of Corbie's school who went on to become its abbot, and Ratramnus, who succeeded him in his earlier post, may well have had a basic knowledge of each other's approach. What seems certain is that both were driven by a deep attachment to the eucharist. It was the sacrament most dear to monastic brethren, as it tied those who consumed it intimately close to Christ whose followers they, as monks, were in exemplary fashion. As the brethren were called to be of one mind and one spirit, the eucharist, much more than baptism, was the sacrament that underscored that unity. At the same time it was the sacrament at the heart of the mass, which may explain why it gained more importance after the liturgical reforms for which the Carolingian period has become well-known and which played a major role in its conversion efforts. This may be one of the motives that drove Charles the Bald to ask his question.<sup>15</sup> Why Radbertus started writing his treatise, we may never know, but once he did, it is not difficult to see that other treatments or at least a follow-up discussion would ensue.

In light of this historical reconstruction, it seems clear that where Radbertus and Ratramnus reveal divergent opinions, this is not primarily about the interpretation of the Fathers. While it was crucial for the Reformers to have the support of the Fathers on their side, this was

---

Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 122, it had Radbertus' dossier of patristic references appended to it in order to allay Fredugard's fears. Paulus has edited this dossier in its primitive form, see CCCM 16, 162-169. Radbertus' second reply discusses the two passages from Augustine which Fredugard may have known through Ratramnus, see CCCM 16, 145-153 and was accompanied further by the text of his spiritual conference on Matt. 26, 26. Cf. Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 117-124.

<sup>14</sup> Amalarius of Metz was attacked by Florus of Lyons for teaching a threefold interpretation of the eucharist (based on the three acts which the priest performed with the host), which he connected with a threefold interpretation of the body of Christ, see Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 85-7.

<sup>15</sup> See Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 84-5.

certainly not the driving motive behind Radbertus' eucharistic treatment and it is not univocally clear that it conditions Ratramnus' view. This is not to deny that the Fathers play an important role in their texts, more explicitly so in Ratramnus than in Radbertus. Instead of being decisive, however, their role is perhaps best described as that of an *aide-mémoire*, a memory aid, designed to prop up whatever the Carolingians held to be the right understanding of the eucharist. By this I mean that it mattered more to them to evoke this memory from time to time than that they were driven to copy it, let alone codify it. Memory seemed to serve as a kind of bridge to them. It allowed them to cross over to the land of their ancestors which, while no longer their own place of residence, remained nonetheless very familiar. This particular use of memory accounts for the fact that their remembrances often have fluid rather than fixed contours.<sup>16</sup>

To develop a comparative sense for this, we may turn briefly to the *Opus Caroli*, that other product of a vigorous theological discussion in which the court played a major role.<sup>17</sup> While the *Opus Caroli*, written by Theodulf of Orléans, was essentially an attack on Greek icon-worship, a good part of the discussion centered on the use of the Fathers, more specifically on which Fathers to use, as the Greeks had laid out their case by leaning heavily on patristic support. In criticizing the Greeks for their willingness to rely on these material icons, Theodulf of Orléans accuses them at one point of having a 'bad memory'. Thus he traces their need to rely on fixed objects back to an apparent inability to evoke the presence of these saints directly.<sup>18</sup> For Theodore, it suffices just to possess the saints' relics. One could say that the texts of the Fathers are much like these relics. Just as relics contain the real bodies, if only in fragments, so that one can dispense with false and lifeless icons, so the point in quoting the Fathers is not to preserve their legacy but to engage them in a live (ly)

<sup>16</sup> In addition to the memory of the Fathers as here described, the rhythmic pattern of life in a Benedictine context also influenced the use of memory. On this, see J. Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories. Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge, 1992) 117-137.

<sup>17</sup> Formerly known as the *Libri Carolini*, this work has recently been published in a new edition. See *Opus Caroli Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*, ed. A. Freeman (Hannover, 1998) MGH Concilia Tomus II Supplementum I.

<sup>18</sup> For Theodulf's use of the Fathers in the *Opus Caroli*, see W. Otten, 'The Texture of Tradition: The Reception of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology,' in: I. Backus, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (Leiden, 1997) 3-50, especially 9-24. On the use of memory in the *Opus Caroli*, see 23-24. A similar observation is made in E.J. Kilmartin S.J., *The Eucharist in the West. History and Theology*, ed. by R.J. Daly S.J. (Collegeville, 1998) 81.

conversation on whatever the issue at hand. After all, relics were treasured not because they could add lustre to the reputation of a local church — although that was a welcome side-effect — but because their presence could persuade the saint to perform real miracles and cures.

From this it follows that the Fathers could serve as an important resource to help the Carolingians focus their arguments, but they neither selected the topic nor set the terms for the kind of conversation that was to take place. That was done by these authors themselves, from Theodulf's criticism of Greek icon-worship as a problem relevant to Charlemagne's aspirations as a Christian leader, to Radbertus' view of the eucharist as a problem relevant to his monastic *Sitz im Leben*. In the course of his study he seems to have made a dossier with patristic references. What makes the case of the eucharist especially complicated with regard to the remembrance of the Fathers, however, is the fact that the content of this debate involves memory also. It is the memory of Christ's life and death which is channelled through and preserved in the eucharistic elements of bread and wine.

### III *Figures and Things*

As a liturgical celebration the eucharist has as its chief object the remembrance of Christ's passion and resurrection. Yet the kind of memory that is involved in the eucharistic celebration sets it apart from other commemorative acts. While all of Christianity is about trying to keep the memory of Christ alive, in the sacrament of the eucharist this memory is present in a more concentrated form, as it is concretized in the elements of bread and wine. In the sacrament of the eucharist, therefore, we have memory made concrete, as the symbol becomes a thing.

This makes its interpretation considerably complex, for the elements are quite literally things one cannot easily get around. This becomes clear when we compare the eucharist to baptism. Baptism deals with the frontier between the secular and the sacred, and as such it entails a *rite de passage* for all those undergoing it. Speaking in terms derived from salvation history rather than anthropology, one could say that baptism provides the entry into the *eschaton*, the time of the Kingdom of Christ. Seen from this glorious perspective, all events preceding it amount to little more than a life lived in shadows. Yet since light and shadow feed off of each other, the *eschaton* and the *saeculum* can never become too rigidly separated, as there is an undeniable reciprocity between proleptic anticipation and delayed gratification. One just needs to read Perpetua's



literary account of her last days to see how baptism transformed her: her visions foreshadow her heavenly powers and her present suffering takes on victorious meaning, staged in terms of athletic triumph. And while Tertullian, her close contemporary, comments on how little use baptism has as an actual washing, given the small amount of water it requires, he strongly emphasizes its spiritual powers. As the presence of the spirit enters the water, it creates life by removing death. It is as if the see-through quality of water makes its effect transparent so as to allow the interpreter to have his eschatological interpretation shine through even as the laws of the *saeculum* remain operative.<sup>19</sup>

In the era of the Fathers the eucharist was seldom cause for explicit reflection, but this changed after the cultural renaissance under Charlemagne. He deliberately sought to style his Frankish kingdom as a Christian culture ruled by a davidic king, who sealed his universal triumph by becoming emperor. Christianity was no longer about fighting a pagan world whose shadows and myths, while being an obstacle, served also as a useful launching-board for a proper definition of its truths.<sup>20</sup> These would now have to be analyzed on their own merits. This may well be one of the reasons why the eucharist came to the fore as a topic of intellectual discussion. As the church had long adopted the practice of infant baptism, one can understand why the eucharist became the new locus for a critical discussion of the church's spiritual make-up.<sup>21</sup>

But the elements of bread and wine lack the see-through quality of water to make their effect transparent. It appears as if the solidity of the eucharistic elements, which are consumed and digested even, thereby undermined their referential role. In my view it is this very solidity of the elements which, when taken into different directions by Radbertus and Ratramnus, fractured more than their interpretation of this sacrament alone. It also had a centrifugal impact on their remembrance of the Fathers. While Theodulf had woven the testimony of the Fathers into a consistent, albeit mostly western tradition, and Eriugena would soon arrive at his own idiosyncratic ranking of Eastern and Western authorities in his *Periphyseon*, Radbertus and Ratramnus seemed unable to round up univocal support from the Fathers. Going much deeper than a mere

<sup>19</sup> See P. Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200 – c. 1150* (Cambridge, 1993) 52-63 (on Tertullian's *De baptismo*) and 73-86 (Perpetua).

<sup>20</sup> While I do not wish to deny that paganism was a powerful force in the Merovingian and Carolingian periods, it seems that in terms of constructing Christianity's theological self-identity it was less important than the paganism fought in earlier periods, as it no longer offered a viable intellectual alternative.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Cramer, *Baptism and Change*, pp. 179-220 (ch. 5: The diminishing of baptism).

preference for either Ambrose or Augustine, the problem with the eucharistic debate may well be that no one involved in it — from the Carolingians to the Reformers — has ever been able to tease out convincingly the Fathers' position on this.

#### IV *Reference and self-reference*

To explain this fracturing impact of the eucharist, which appears to break up the unified support of the Fathers as well, it is important to take a closer look at how it affects the use of memory.

It is evident that the sacraments have a referential function, as they hark back to crucial episodes from Christ's life. While the earliest Christians may well have had access to a memory that was fresh, this had long given way to the collective memory of the Bible, with the Old and the New Testament becoming unified through a joint Christological reading. Various referential trajectories could thus be constructed, as Old Testament stories were made to flow seamlessly into contemporary liturgy. Christ's baptism, as performed by John the Baptist, was seen foreshadowed in the Spirit hovering over the waters at creation or in the Israelites' passing through the Red Sea, which became a lasting figure for the baptism performed on neophyte Christians. A similar chain of associations connects the eating of the manna in the desert and the drinking from the rock to the eucharist, which both Radbertus and Ratramnus use.<sup>22</sup> Yet in the case of the eucharist these references do not dovetail so neatly as falling dominoes, the one leading naturally to the other. A brief comparison with baptism may illustrate why.

Whereas Christ's baptism is a biblical episode that foreshadows our baptism in a logical sequence of original and copy, the Lord's supper is a biblical episode whose words, most powerfully the words of institution, do not simply foreshadow the eucharist as a sacrament. First and foremost, they serve as an internal reference foreshadowing another scriptural episode: that of Christ's death and resurrection. The proper receiving of the eucharist is ultimately contingent upon a proper understanding of both, it seems, though more so of the latter than of the former. While this makes the train of literary references noticeably more oblique, a further complication is added when we realize that the entire train ultimately contracts to a single point: the event of Christ's sacrifice itself as

---

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Radbertus, ch. 5 *passim* and Ratramnus, chs. 20-23 *passim*. In both cases, the OT references are mediated through a discussion of NT eucharistic texts, such as 1 Cor. 10 and John 6.

underlying both gospel accounts. While it is ultimately the shared memory of this event which constitutes the bond between the Christian believers, to the Carolingians the solidity of the eucharistic elements seemed to bring this memory alive as powerfully as any gospel references, just as relics seemed to speak as eloquently as the lives of the saints. This made the eucharist a uniquely difficult sacrament to interpret. In Augustinian terms, one might say that the eucharist presents an indistinguishable overlap of *signs* (verbal and non-verbal: the words of institution and the elements of bread and wine) and *things* (after being consecrated, bread and wine truly *are* Christ's body and blood).

Both Radbertus and Ratramnus seem to be aware of the difficulty involved, as they both call the eucharist a *mysterium*.<sup>23</sup> Ratramnus goes on to explain this mystery in terms of a figure, thereby following Augustine's interpretation in *De doctrina christiana* III.16.55, where the latter interprets Jesus' words in John 6:53 ("unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you do not have life within you") as a *figurata locutio*, referring to Christ's passion and not to the eucharist. As analyzed in a famous article by Erich Auerbach,<sup>24</sup> *figura* has an intrinsic connotation of historicity. When the passing through the Red Sea is related to the submergence in the baptismal pool of the neophyte Christians, for example, the Old Testament episode illuminates the contemporary liturgical event, while the contemporary event puts the past historic episode in a new light. Thus there is a reciprocity on the linear level. This is also true when the Holy Spirit descends on the waters of the pool, for this image can be traced to the dove descending on the shoulder of Christ in the gospel and before that to the Spirit at creation. Yet a similar linear chain does not connect us so neatly to the mystery of the eucharist.<sup>25</sup> Whereas we are baptized like Christ, we cannot relive Christ's death and resurrection. Ratramnus expresses this by contrasting *figura* to *veritas*. For him, it is crucial that the distance between Christ's own sacrifice and what happens on the altar be stressed, so as to protect the mystery from becoming a mystery cult.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Radbertus, ch.2 'Quod hoc mysterium Christi nullus fidelium debeat ignorare' and Ratramnus, ch. 11.

<sup>24</sup> See his article 'Figura' from 1944, in: E. Auerbach, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (Minneapolis, 1984) 11-76. On p. 53 Auerbach gives the following definition: 'Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of which signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second encompasses or fulfills the first.'

<sup>25</sup> Auerbach picks up on this tension by calling the eucharist fittingly 'figure as well as symbol'. See E. Auerbach, 'Figura', 60.

It is clear that Ratramnus is guided to follow Augustine on this point. Yet it is important to realize that he makes this choice not out of sheer loyalty to Augustine as he was the most important Latin Father, but because Augustine proceeded here by analyzing Christ's *words* rather than evaluating his *deed(s)*. Ratramnus' approach to the eucharist is in the broadest sense a 'scriptural' one,<sup>26</sup> therefore, meaning that only Christ's words can fittingly describe it; his underlying fear that *signs* i.e., the elements of bread and wine isolated from their scriptural context, be mistaken for things i.e., Christ's sacrifice itself. Wishing to protect the latter as a unique historic event, he clings to the authoritative truth of Christ's own words, the presence of which here in DDC III.16.55 validates the authority of this Father as well. While the distinction between *signs* (incl. words) and *things* echoes indeed a general Augustinian insight, this is not to say that Ratramnus' eucharistic position is thereby overall a more Augustinian one. Given that for Augustine the difference between signs and things functions more as an exegetical than an ecclesiological principle, it is not necessarily representative for this Father's view of the eucharist. As has been argued by M. Cristiani, it is Radbertus rather than Ratramnus who may well be more true to Augustine's so-called 'ecclesial realism'.<sup>27</sup>

For Radbertus, on the other hand, seeing the eucharist as *mysterium* takes on an altogether different meaning, as he makes the effect of the elements of bread and wine on the community contingent upon the efficacy of Christ's deed, the sacrifice implied by and contained in his words. For him, just as for Ambrose whom he seems to follow here, the elements create new life. This is the new life of the Christian community, liberated from sin and restored to its paradisaical quality.<sup>28</sup> Clearly, this

---

<sup>26</sup> From chs. 7-8 it becomes clear that Ratramnus accredits more truth to 'scriptural' expressions (whether biblical or creedal), such as: *christus natus de virgine, passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus* with their *naturalibus significationibus verborum* than to symbolic ones, such as when Christ says: *Ego sum vitis vera, vos autem palmites*. Although the elements of bread and wine would seem to fall more in the latter than the former category, it appears bread and wine could only become sacraments because of Christ's effective sacrifice. It is the lingering echo of this sacrifice which Ratramnus seems to hear in Christ's words of institution.

<sup>27</sup> See M. Cristiani, 'La controversia eucaristica nella cultura del secolo IX,' *Studi medievali, serie terza, IX* (1968) 167-233, see esp. 174-185. I disagree with Bouhot [Ratramne, 157 n.27] that it is of little use to compare the Carolingians with the Church Fathers' entire doctrine, since they would probably not have known it. While this may to some extent be true, Cristiani's analysis convincingly points out how it is untenable to express blanket judgments by calling Radbertus Ambrosian and Ratramnus Augustinian in a general way.

<sup>28</sup> Radbertus draws repeated comparisons between paradise and the new life that is

new life defies the order of nature and is more miraculous than the first life, but this is only logical, for it is given to us by Christ himself, who is God but also man. Radbertus has many references to the incarnation,<sup>29</sup> as he follows Ambrose's *De mysteriis* here,<sup>30</sup> for just as Jesus once was born from a virgin through the power of the Spirit, so the church is conceived through the Spirit and is born daily from his body and blood, which have been given to us under the guise of bread and wine.<sup>31</sup>

What makes the eucharist a true *mysterium* for Radbertus, however, is the fact that it is *veritas* and *figura* at the same time. As he says in ch. 4:

It is truth, therefore, when the body and blood of Christ is created by the power of the spirit in his word out of the substance of bread and wine; but a figure when, through the agency of the priest at the altar, outwardly performing another thing, in memory of his sacred passion, the lamb is daily sacrificed as he was once for all. If we truthfully examine the matter, it is rightly called both the truth and a figure, so that it is a figure or character of truth because it is outwardly sensed. Truth, however, is anything rightly understood or believed inwardly concerning this mystery.<sup>32</sup>

Anchoring this doubleness of the eucharist in Christ's double nature, Radbertus sees a spiritual pedagogy at work for the community. For just as the figures or letters of a word are the first step on the way to spiritual understanding, so the man Jesus leads us to the divine Christ. This leads him to introduce the notion of *transitus*, the idea that by partaking of the eucharist — fittingly called a *viaticum* — one is taken from the realm of the visible to that of the invisible. The truth implied by this effective *transitus* for Radbertus is a truth which does more than just to defy the order of nature. Transcending the realm of the linear altogether, it

---

created for the church through the eucharist. See Radbertus, ch. 1, lines 143-153. He sees Christ in that respect as the *arbor ligni vitae*, who gives eternal life to those who eat from it, see ch. 7, 35-42: *Arbor quidem ligni uitae Christus nunc in ecclesia est cuius imago in paradiso arbor illa fuit*. In ch. 7 Radbertus gives three interpretations of what is meant in Scripture by *corpus Christi*, i.e., the church, the body born from the Virgin Mary and the tree of life. This is not at all related to Amalarius' threefold interpretation, see n. 14 above. For a reference to the tree of life, see also ch.9, 65-78.

<sup>29</sup> In fact, Radbertus calls the incarnation a sacrament as well, just as the presence of the Spirit in the Bible. See ch. 3, 24-38.

<sup>30</sup> See Radbertus ch. 1, 51-52 and esp. ch. 4, 86-90. The reference is to Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 9.53.

<sup>31</sup> See Radbertus, ch. 3, 81-87.

<sup>32</sup> See Radbertus, ch. 4, 37-46: *Veritas ergo dum corpus Christi et sanguis uirtute Spiritus in uerbo ipsius ex panis uniusque substantia efficitur, figura uero dum sacerdos [sacerdote] quasi aliud exterius gerens [gerente] ob recordationem sacrae passionis ad aram quod semel gestum est, cotidie immolatur agnus. Sed si ueraciter inspicimus, iure simul ueritas et figura dicitur, ut sit figura uel character ueritatis quod exterius sentitur, ueritas uero quicquid de hoc mysterio interius recte intelligitur aut creditur*. See McCracken, p.102.

encompasses height and depth, as Christ himself went from the harrowing of hell to his seating at the right hand of the Father. Just so, through the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine, we partake of the sacrifice of his true body and blood to become fully ‘concorporated’ with him.<sup>33</sup>

#### V *Ambrose, Augustine and the Authority of the Fathers*

It is his own thinking about the sacrament of the eucharist that seems to have led Paschasius Radbertus to develop his position in *De corpore et sanguine Domini*. After that the discussion on the eucharist took so many different twists and turns, not only with the subsequent view of Ratramnus, but also with the debates in the eleventh century and the Reformation, that it has not been easy to return finally to where it all started. In Radbertus’ position the Fathers played an important role. But they were not the authorities to whom the Reformers wanted to pay such reverence, precisely because they were essentially foreign to them. They were still ‘home’ to Radbertus in a manner similar to the ‘home’ that was provided by the biblical texts, the walls of this home coinciding roughly with the confines of his monastery. Thus he could quote freely, without much regard for context or for the precise setting of their arguments, for he lacked the awareness that his references, or lack thereof, might be misconstrued. This makes his use of the Fathers the mirror image of the Reformation also on another point. Whereas having the Fathers on your side could make or break an issue during the Reformation, here the question was ultimately peripheral, for one started out with the confidence of having the Fathers on one’s side. Still, the question remains whether there is a difference between Radbertus and Ratramnus on the point of their preference for Ambrose or Augustine. As we return to this point, we shall also revisit the possibility of a conflict between them.

We have already dealt with the case of Ratramnus. He favoured Augustine’s figurative interpretation not just because it was Augustine, but most of all because Augustine based his interpretation on Christ’s own words. The reason I want to come back to this now is to develop a better sense of Ratramnus’ approach, as he proceeded through a careful concatenation of ‘scriptural’ references. We find this reflected even at the very beginning of his treatise, where he states in ch. 4:

---

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. Radbertus ch. 2, 38-43 and ch. 9, 172-176 (through grace Christ is incorpored in us and we in him).

Subject, therefore, to your majesty's command, yet relying on the permission of Him about whom we shall speak, I shall try, with whatever words I can command, to reveal my belief about this topic, not leaning upon my own ability but following in the footsteps of the holy fathers.<sup>34</sup>

Although it is tempting to contrast *ingenium* and the *vestigia sanctorum patrum* here, our earlier analysis leads to a rather different conclusion. For was it not Ratramnus' own *ingenium* which persuaded him to trace the *vestigia sanctorum patrum* in the first place? More importantly, by following the precepts of Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* III.16.55, he proved 'ingeniously' able to revert the authoritative words of this and other Fathers back to the ultimate source of all authority, i.e., the *verba Christi*. In the end, it is these words that are central to him, as they alone embody the authority of Christ himself. Given this state of affairs, it becomes all the more understandable why Berengar of Tours with his interest in grammar as well as the Reformers with their *ad fontes*, though both for very different reasons, would try to find support here for their own positions.

In following his procedure as outlined, Ratramnus was able to rearrange the train of eucharistic references — by nature an oblique one, as their sequence was fractured by the mystery of Christ's actual death and resurrection — in such a way as to bring out the inner logic of a linear chain.<sup>35</sup> The added benefit was that his references were verifiable, perhaps too much so, as they have led numerous generations to believe that in Ratramnus' treatise we find Augustine's unadulterated presence rather than Ratramnus' view of him. Thus it is easily forgotten that Ratramnus could find support in Ambrose also, as when he quoted from *De mysteriis* 9.53-54, a typical Paschasian passage it seems, yet one where Ambrose cites Christ's words of institution. In ch. 56-7 Ratramnus comments on Ambrose after quoting him first:

The same author adds: 'It is the true flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried. It is truly, therefore, the sacrament of his flesh. The Lord Jesus himself proclaims it: 'This is my body.'" [57] How carefully, how intelligently was the distinction

<sup>34</sup> Ratramnus ch. 4, ed. Bakhuizen p. 43 line 29 – p. 44 line 3: 'Subditus igitur vestrae magnitudinis iussioni, confisus autem ipsius de quo locuturi sumus suffragio, quibus potuero verbis quid ex hoc sentiam aperire temptabo. Non proprio fretus *ingenio*, sed *sanctorum vestigia patrum* prosequendo.' Transl. McCracken, 119.

<sup>35</sup> Unlike Radbertus, Ratramnus shows repeated concern for the proper historical sequence of events in Scripture, to which he needs to comply in order to keep up his linear chain of references. See e.g. ch. 5, with its repeated: *nondum...nondum...et iam*, where he addresses the problem how the manna in the desert could foreshadow the eucharist according to 1 Cor. 10, 4. His reply is typical: *Non istic ratio qua fieri potuerit disquirenda, sed fides quod factum sit adhibenda.*

made! About the flesh of Christ which was crucified, which was buried, that is, with respect to which Christ was both crucified and buried, he says, 'It is the true flesh of Christ.' But about that which is taken in the sacrament, he says, 'It is truly, therefore, the sacrament of his flesh,' distinguishing the sacrament of the flesh from the truth of the flesh, seeing that he would say that He was crucified and buried in the truth of the flesh which He had assumed from the Virgin, but he would say that the mystery which is now enacted in the church is a sacrament of His true flesh.<sup>36</sup>

Just as he derived the distance between literal and figural interpretation from Augustine, so he derives that between a sacrament and its truth from Ambrose. Rather than the line between Ambrose and Augustine, therefore, it is the line between on the one hand *figura*, *sacramentum* or similar terms such as *imago*, and on the other hand the *veritas rei* of Christ's sacrifice which Ratramnus appears hesitant to cross. It is no surprise, therefore, that for him the eucharist consists primarily in commemoration. This allows him to approach the fracturing solidity of the elements in the most prudent and revering way, namely with the spiritual quality of faith. He fittingly ends his treatise with a quote from John 6:63: *Spiritus est qui vivificat, nam caro nihil prodest*.<sup>37</sup>

Radbertus, on the other hand, is not quite such a man of letters as Ratramnus. Nor is he primarily concerned about a chain of 'scriptural' references. This is immediately obvious from his loose handling of patristic authorities. Although he says that he will quote many, he only gives a few references, thereby underscoring how his view is not dependent on the Fathers. Instead it is rooted in a much deeper incarnational theology, by which it was the purpose or mission of the Word all along to become flesh. The difference between Word and (Word made) Flesh is that of promise *versus* fulfillment, and in Radbertus' diagnosis it is precisely on the point of fulfillment that the eucharist fractures the chain of linear references implied by *figura*. They become literally absorbed in Christ, not unlike the way in which the elements of bread and wine are consumed by the believers. On the point of fulfillment, the manna and

<sup>36</sup> Ratramnus chs. 56-57, ed. Bakhuizen p. 57 lines 6-16: 'Subiungit idem auctor: 'Vera utique caro christi quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est, verae ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. Ipse clamat dominus iesus *hoc est corpus meum*[Mt. 26:26].' LVII. Quam diligenter, quam prudenter facta distinctio. De carne christi quae crucifixa est, quae sepulta est id est secundum quam christus et crucifixus est, et sepultus, ait, 'vera' itaque 'caro christi.' At de illa quae sumitur in sacramento dicit: 'Verae ergo carnis illius sacramentum est,' distinguens sacramentum carnis, a veritate carnis, quatinus in veritate carnis, quam sumpserat de virgine diceret eum et crucifixum et sepultum. Quod vero nunc agitur in ecclesia misterium, verae illius carnis in qua crucifixus est diceret esse sacramentum.' Transl. McCracken, 134.

<sup>37</sup> See Ratramnus ch. 101, ed. Bakhuizen p. 69 line 8: 'It is the Spirit which quickens, for the flesh is of no avail.' The final chapter, 102, is a dedication to king Charles.



the water from which the Israelites drank in the desert are qualitatively not identical with the eucharistic elements for Radbertus, even though they foreshadow them, for 'the flesh of Christ has been made eucharist out of the resurrection, which was at an earlier time through the lamb (cf. Exodus-story) or through that same heavenly food (cf. manna in the desert) prefigured to believers.'<sup>38</sup>

To Radbertus it is clear that the spiritual pedagogy which his treatise sets forth, the *transitus* or fulfillment of the *Pascha*, is based on Christ's movement from his incarnation through his passion to his resurrection. As a proper response the believers undergo a kind of countermovement, yet instead of going from the eucharist as the celebration of (his death and) resurrection back to his incarnation they go on to become 'concorporated' with Christ. This movement or *transitus* is as real to Radbertus as Christ's own movement, for it is ultimately based on it. He explores this spiritual pedagogy in the remainder of ch. 4. Having quoted Hebr. 1, 3 'Since he is the splendor of glory and the figure of his substance (*figura substantiae*), bearing all things by the word of his power, making purification of sins,' he explains the rise from letter to spirit in the following way:

Yet the characters of the letters are not falsity, nor are they anything but letters. Neither can the man Christ be called false or anything but God, with the result, of course, that the figure may rightly be called the character of the divinity's substance. Because he advances us small children through himself to things spiritual, which must be understood inwardly and by our senses, he shows himself in visible form while we receive what is in it. But because he, after the flesh had to penetrate the heavens, so that, through faith, those reborn in him might with greater boldness seek, he has left us this sacrament, a visible figure and character of flesh and blood, so that through them our soul and our flesh are richly nourished for grasping things invisible and spiritual by faith. This which is outwardly sensed is, however, the figure or character, but that which is intrinsically perceived is wholly truth and no shadow, and for this reason nothing else henceforth than truth and the sacrament of his flesh is apparent.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> See Radbertus, ch. 5, 24-26: Et facta est eucharistia ex resurrectione caro Christi quae prius per agnum uel per eandem e caelis escam figurabatur credentibus adfutura. Transl. adapted from McCracken, 104.

<sup>39</sup> See Radbertus ch. 4, 67-81: 'Verumtamen neque caracteres litterarum falsitas neque aliud quam litterae neque Christus homo falsitas dici potest neque aliud quam Deus, licet figura uel character substantiae diuinitatis iure dicatur, quia nostram infantiam per se ad spiritalia interius intelligenda prouehit et sensibus nostris, ut ea quae in illo sunt capiamus, uisibilem se ostendit. Sed quia illum secundum carnem caelos oportuit penetrare, ut per fidem illuc in illo renati confidentius appeterent, reliquid nobis hoc sacramentum uisibilem [uisibile in] figuram et characterem carnis et sanguinis, ut per haec mens nostra et caro nostra ad inuisibilia et spiritalia capeenda per fidem uberius nutriatur. Est autem figura uel character hoc quod exterius sentitur, sed totum ueritas et nulla adumbratio quod intrinsecus percipitur ac per hoc nihil aliud hinc inde quam ueritas et sacramentum ipsius carnis aperitur.' Transl. McCracken, 102-103.

Both *figura* and *veritas* are terms that can be applied to the eucharist, as they both can be traced back to, for are ultimately held together by, the underlying reality of Christ's incarnation and resurrection. In an odd foreshadowing of the *extra-calvinisticum*, Radbertus' view of the eucharist does not even rule out a commemorative interpretation. Apparently, the truth of the sacrament is so powerful that it does not allow for the ties between memory and event ever to be severed. In contrast to Ratramnus, Radbertus does not seem worried that the sacrament will supplant the reality of Christ's sacrifice, thereby detracting from its salvific efficacy. Instead, it seems the fulfillment in the eucharist of what had long been prefigured in the law functions as a kind of solving of a puzzle: as the veils become removed, truth itself can finally be embraced. It is interesting that his terminology in this respect, which connects the veneration of the sacrament with the enjoyment of truth (*sola ueritate fruimur*), reveals a latent yet undeniable Augustinian influence, which is further enriched by his strong Trinitarian emphasis derived from Hilary of Poitiers.<sup>40</sup>

## VI Conclusion

In contrast to Bouhot, it does seem possible — and perhaps even likely — that Ratramnus argued against Radbertus when opposing *figura* and *veritas*, given that Radbertus emphatically wished to incorporate both. While we do not know whether Radbertus came to know his successor's interpretation, it appears that even if he did, he would not have been overly concerned. Given his view of the sacrament as simultaneously self-referential and all-encompassing, Radbertus has little interest in validating his position through a correct alignment of his 'scriptural' authorities. Although he clearly favors Ambrose, who saw the miracle of the incarnation as defying the order of nature,<sup>41</sup> and expands his second edition with miracles from the *Vitae Patrum*, which was known devotional reading in monastic circles, he appeared unshaken when Fredugardus' letters confronted him with the Augustine-passage from *De doctr. chr.* III.16 and its advice to see Christ's words in John 6:53 as an example of

<sup>40</sup> For the whole passage, see Radbertus ch. 5, 43-48: 'Nos uero longe patribus hanc gratiam repromissam iam suscepimus et susceptam ueneramus, uenerantes autem ex ipsa pascimur et potamur, non figuris quidem legalium enigmatibus adumbratam, sed his detectis et euacuatis *sola ueritate fruimur* et ueram carnem Christi et sanguinem in mysterio sumimus.' Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* I.4 makes clear that the only *res* (thing) to be enjoyed (*frui*) is God the Trinity. Cf. e.g. Radbertus ch. 9, 103-110 citing Hilary's *De trinitate* 8. 13-14. See also Cristiani, 'La controversia eucaristica', 185-86.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Ambrose, *De mysteriis* 9.52 with Radbertus, ch. 4, 86: Et ne mireris o homo neque requiras naturae ordinem.

*tropica* or *figurata locutio*. It seemed Fredugardus was afraid that his eating of the host could amount to the equivalent of a crime, i.e., the crime of devouring Christ.<sup>42</sup> This may echo Ratramnus' position, but not that of Radbertus.

While Bouhot has all but proven that Fredugard knew Ratramnus' treatise, since the only connection between the two Augustinian passages to which he wanted Radbertus' response is that they are both found there,<sup>43</sup> it does not follow from this that Fredugard's worry concerned his former teacher's patristic expertise. Is it not just as possible — and frankly, more likely — that Fredugard worried about the sacramental efficacy of the eucharist itself, as it is meant to accomplish salvation for those who partake of it? If so, then Fredugard merely proved to be a competent student who, after he made the subject-matter his own, came up with a question to which he wanted his former teacher's response. And insistent as he was, when the master's first response failed to address the most relevant Augustine quotation (*De doct. chr.* III. 16), he simply wrote him a follow-up letter.

For his part, it seems Radbertus remained unperturbed, displaying no fear that his interpretation of the eucharist as being the true body and blood of Christ could be undermined in any way by Augustine's interpretation of Christ's words in John 6:53 as *figurata locutio*. He simply countered this Augustine-quotation with another one, which we now know to be pseudonymous: 'Receive this in the bread which hung from the tree and receive this in the chalice which flowed from the side'<sup>44</sup> and went on to give references taken from other Fathers, ranging from Ambrose to Cyprian and to Eusebius of Emesa.<sup>45</sup> After that he concluded that: 'Augustine differs in nothing from the other holy Fathers who in most cases have come to hold that it is so as the Saviour said, and believe

<sup>42</sup> Fredugardus seems to have faced the following dilemma: If the host is not the truth but a figure, then how should we understand it. And if it is the truth, i.e. Christ's true body from the virgin, are we not guilty of a crime when eating it. For the text of this letter, see *Epistola ad Fredugardum*, CCCM 16, 145-173. For this passage, see *Epistola*, lines 49-57, esp. 55-57: 'Deinde addis: Et si credam ipsum esse quod assumpsit ex Maria uirgine, genetrice sua, e contrario etiam ipse egregius doctor hoc magnum facinus esse proclamat.'

<sup>43</sup> See Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 124-7.

<sup>44</sup> See *Epistola*, 147-149: 'Quos secutus subtilissimus disputator praefatus pater Agustinus, ut dixi: Hoc accipite, inquit, in pane quod pendit in ligno et hoc accipite in calice quod manauit in latere.'

<sup>45</sup> In reality Radbertus is referring here to Faustus of Riez' sermon *Magnitudo*, see Bouhot, *Ratramne*, 123 n.16.

that which the holy church of God believes.’<sup>46</sup> Underscoring this with references to an earlier quotation from Augustine’s letter 98 to Boniface, he lifts out the phrase: ‘Believing is nothing else than to have faith because of the sacrament of faith, because the response itself belongs also to the celebration of the sacrament.’<sup>47</sup> In the comment that then follows we may well have the best summary of Radbertus’ attitude to the Fathers by far. Perhaps it originated as an adverse reaction to Fredugard’s repeated questioning. Or perhaps Radbertus was slightly annoyed by Ratramnus’ upstart teaching style, forcing him to explain his sacramental views all over again. However that may be, in a tone of voice that barely suppresses the audible sigh of an experienced teacher, he ends the debate by simply telling his student:

And from this it can be inferred that not all who read the blessed Augustine have an immediate grasp of him.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> See *Epistola*, 181-184: ‘Nihil ergo dissentit in his omnibus, ut opinor, beatus Augustinus a reliquis sanctis Patribus qui in quam plurimis hoc ita esse, ut Saluator ait, senserunt et credunt quod credit sancta Dei ecclesia.’

<sup>47</sup> See *Epistola*, 200-202: Nihil est autem, inquit, aliud credere quam fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti.

<sup>48</sup> See *Epistola*, 202-03: Ex quo datur intellegi, quia non omnes continuo qui beatum Agustinum legunt, eum intellegunt.

Copyright of Dutch Review of Church History / Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis is the property of Brill Academic Publishers and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.