

expressed, and many were doubtless were holding this view by the time but he crystalized it and put it in this definite form. This is the first clear presentation of the idea of transubstantiation, now the Roman Catholics would never admit that Paschus Radbertus originated and I don't say that he originated it but that he crystalized it and this view had developed among people. They pay comparitible little attention to him, they claim that this was believed ~~to~~ right from the beginning. They say that he defended the doctrine from those who were attacking him, but the historical evidence is that the attack was made against his book, he wrote the book and the other people began to attack. The other people said that this is not the scriptural teaching and not what the scripture teaches ~~and not~~ and a number of men wrote very strongly against it and one of them was another monk, named Ratramnus, and this man is said to have written his book to at the request of the king, being Charles the Bald, the successor or one of the successors of Charlemagne, and Ratramnus answered this question and in his answer of his question he went into the evidence and claimed that actually it is a spiritual relationship and these are symbols of the body and blood of Christ, it is not a physical relationship. And he took the position which we take as Protestants today and he says that the ~~real~~ sacrifice of the mass was not an actual even though unbloody repetition but only a commemorated celebration of Christ's sacrifice. And there were those at this time as you would suppose who strongly opposed transubstantiation and there were quite a number who held this view. ~~They were not~~ Dynamical and spiritual and not a visible and present of the body of Christ in the sacrifice and now the general mass of the people seemed to have adopted this view of Radbertus which seemed to fit in with the general attitude of wanting everything to be just as magical and wonderful and remarkable and tremendous and it fit in with that idea, and it did, the others disappeared. But in the 8th century when we had the first clear presentation of transubstantiation, it is by no means universally held, it is strongly opposed by others who are recognized as good Christian men and men of standing and recognized as good writers and good students, so it is not considered in 9th century as mark of orthodoxy to believe in transubstantiation, it comes to be two centuries later, but it is not at this time. Now I think this is as important as they think we have had in the whole year, as far