

mass or other service—the *beginning* in the European West of the ‘litany’, i.e. in the usual sense in which we employ the word for formulae like the litanies of the Greek liturgies, the litany of the Saints, Luther’s litany, the litany in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. But this remark brings me up straight, and face to face with the ‘prehistoric period’ (see p. 404 above), and the *kouwai εὐχαῖ* of Justin Martyr. The consideration of this subject must, however, be reserved for a later continuation of this Note.

EDMUND BISHOP.

‘TRANSFORMARE’ AND ‘TRANSFORMATIO’.

DR FELTOE, in his recent ‘Study of some Eucharistic Phrases in the West’ (*J. T. S.* xi 575–579), cites the following words from a blessing in the *Ordinatio Presbyteri* of the so-called *Missale Francorum*, ‘ut . . . [per obsequium plebis tuae] corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet’ (Mur. ii 668 and Migne *S. L.* lxxii 323 A); and, comparing them with the ‘ut . . . [in obsequium plebis tuae] panem et uinum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transforment’ of the present Roman pontifical, gives it as his opinion that—except for words in each which I therefore enclose with square brackets—the two passages are substantially identical, and that there is ‘no difficulty as to the meaning originally intended’, the meaning, that is to say, of ‘corpus et sanguinem transformare’. In other words, he equates the two phrases ‘corpus et sanguinem transformare’ and ‘panem et uinum in corpus et sanguinem transformare’. I think that Dr Feltoe is mistaken, because, inasmuch as the Person of our Divine Lord is the subject-matter of *transformatio* in the earlier passage, while bread and wine are the subject-matter of *transformatio* in the later, I suspect that the verb *transformare* had not the same grammatical sense and was not intended to connote the same theological idea in the one phrase as in the other. I also think that he is in error in his interpretation of the words ‘per obsequium plebis tuae’.

The document which contains the older and shorter of the two phrases, though known by the name of *Missale Francorum* is, as to its first half, a sacramentary and, as to its second, a missal; and there is good reason for believing (i) that, as now known to us, the former moiety is the resultant of numerous amplifications which, from time to time in the course of fully a hundred years, had accrued to a nucleus of Roman origins; (ii) that the literary history of this moiety resolves itself into three stages, the first Roman, the second Gallo-Roman, the third

Frankish ; and (iii) that the second of these is to be associated, as to place, with south-eastern Gaul, and, as to time, with the close of the fifth century ; the third being referable to Aquitaine and to editors to whom the Latin language was not a classic. And it is because I believe the blessing which contains the words ‘ut . . . per obsequium plebis tuae corpus et sanguinem Filii tui . . . transformet’ to have been composed, if not before or during the first of these, yet early in the second, that I am anxious to learn whether or not, to the intellectual apprehension of those who introduced it, *transformare* was synonymous with such words as *conuertere* and *mutare*.

St Paul (Rom. v 14) says of the first Adam, ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. Such comparatively modern translators as Tremellius and Junius render this by ‘qui est *typus* illius qui erat uenturus’, and Robert Etienne by ‘qui *typum* gerit illius futuri’ ; but St Jerome renders *τύπος* by a word less likely to occur to most of us than *typus*, and says ‘qui est *forma* futuri’. He also renders St Peter’s ἀντίτυπον βάπτισμα by ‘similis *formae baptismi*’ (1 Pet. iii 21), where the modern translators represent the radical of *ἀντίτυπον* by *figura* and *exemplar*—‘cuius *figurae* nunc respondens baptismus’, ‘cui rei nunc respondens *exemplar* baptismi’. Similarly : St Paul’s καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς (Phil. iii 17) is in Jerome’s phrase ‘sicut habetis *formam nostram*’, and his ώστε γενέσθαι ἡμᾶς τύπον (1 Thess. i 7) ‘ita ut facti estis *forma*’, whereas in each instance the modern translators prefer *exemplum* or *exemplare*.

And if we consult St Jerome’s subcontemporary Leo the Great, we find that he in his turn uses *forma*, and with the frequency of a commonplace, as the equivalent of *τύπος* in one or other of its two senses of precedent ideal and of exemplar to be copied. Thus, to cite but a few instances, he says in his twenty-fifth *Sermon*,¹ ‘De magna factum est potestate ut Dei Filius . . . nostram naturam quam condidit reformaret’, and, in his sixty-fourth,² ‘ut cuius erat conditor esset etiam reformator’ ; where *reformaret* and *reformator* connote restoration to a *τύπος* or ideal. Again, in the twenty-fifth,³ he says, ‘Qui [scil. Christus] ideo se uiam dixit esse ut conuersatio magistri sit *forma* discipulis’, ‘that the life and converse of the Master be *τύπος*, model, exemplar, to His disciples’ ; and in the third ‘he expounds a well-known passage in the Psalms thus, ‘Secundum ordinem Melchisedech in quo aeterni pontificis *forma* praecessit’. This last is singularly proper to my purpose ; for, as will be seen presently, if a Frankish document of perhaps the seventh or eighth century called the priesthood of Melchisedech a *praefiguratio* of our Lord’s, a presumably Gallo-Roman writer

¹ Migne S. L. liv 209 C.

² Ib. 358 D.

⁴ Ib. 145 A.

³ Ib. 212 B.

of the fifth or sixth had called Melchisedech's oblation a *praeformatio* of the Eucharist.

Nor is it only in respect of the underlying *forma* of *transformet* in the 'ut . . . corpus et sanguinem transformet' of the *Missale Francorum* that St Jerome, as contrasted with modern translators of the New Testament, would seem to be of service to us. I think that his rendering of St. Paul's *ταῦτα δὲ . . . μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἔμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλώ* (1 Cor. iv 6) gives a clue to the scope and force of the other factor, *trans*. Tremellius and Junius express the complex idea of figure in *σχῆμα* and of transferred appropriation in *μέρᾳ* by '*figura quadam transtuli*', and Robert Etienne, with like felicity, by '*per figuram transtuli*'. Eleven centuries before the earliest of these, and perhaps within living memory of the composer of the blessing cited by Dr Feltoe, St Jerome had, with simple boldness, said '*trans+figuraui*', 'Haec autem . . . *transfiguraui* in me et Apollo'.

Hence it would seem to follow that in the philosophical idiom of churchmen whose literary ideals resembled those of St Jerome and St Leo¹ no verb by which to denote the idea of setting forth by means of an attributive, substitutive, or translatory *tύπος* could have been at once more apt and more intelligible than *transformare*.

As to the words 'per obsequium plebis tuae'², I think that, unlike the very different 'in obsequium plebis tuae' of the present Roman pontifical, they are necessary to a true understanding of the phrase in which they occur; and that, if we can but ascertain the meaning they were intended to connote, they will help us to surmise the bearing of the whole 'ut per obsequium plebis tuae corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet'. Whom, then, are we to understand by *plebs*? Surely not the laity, as Dr Feltoe seems to hint; nor, indeed, all the assistants at any one celebration, whether they be lay or clerical; but, rather, the whole Christian *familia*, the whole state of Christ's Church, though of course with special reference to the 'congregation here present' on any given occasion, as in a *Collectio* of the Bobbio Missal (Mur. ii 931; Migne lxxii 554 D)³ which is so apposite to my meaning that I transcribe it in full: 'Deum ineffabilis potentiae, bonitatis immensae, fratres carissimi, deprecemur ut (i) sacerdotes [scil.

¹ In contrast to such, Faustus of Riez, a not much younger man than Leo, preaching to a community of monks employed the less recondite 'typum gerere'—'Unde et ille typum gerens diaboli Pharao premens populum Dei', &c., Migne S. L. lviii 878 D.

² In this paragraph I deal with a subject discussed by Mr Brightman in a communication to the JOURNAL of January 1911 (vol. xii p. 293). Let me therefore say that it, and indeed the whole of the present article, had been written some months previously. I leave it as it is.

³ In succeeding references I shall drop 'Mur. ii' and 'Migne lxxii'.

episcopos] (ii) clerum ac (iii) populum suum uisit et tueatur: illuminet (i, ii, iii) totam plebem suam, et illa qua redemit pietate sua miseratione conseruet.' Nor do I think that there can be any doubt as to *obsequium*. I cannot find that in the old sacramentaries this word ever signifies, as Dr Feltoe suggests, the co-operation of *assistentes* with *celebrans*, important as is the unquestionable fact that the eucharistic sacrifice is theirs as well as his. The word is not of frequent occurrence; but since on the Feast of St Peter's Chair the *Gothicum* (565: 257 D) gives us 'Suscite, Domine, inter angelicae uocis officium nostrae quoque seruitutis obsequium', thus equating *officium* and *obsequium*; since in their respective *Missae in Symboli Traditione* both the *Gothicum* and the *Gallicanum Vetus* (575 and 719: 263 D and 354 C, D) equate *familatio* and *obsequium* — 'nostrae seruitutis famulatio . . . in hoc seruitutis nostrae obsequio'—and since in the Bobbio Missal we read of the awe-stricken *obsequium* of the angelic choir (936: 557 C), I infer that the abstract *obsequium* should be rendered in English by some such general word as 'homage'. In the present instance, however, the governing *per* seems to indicate a very important fact which it behoves us by no means to overlook, the fact, namely, that the *obsequium* indicated is the instrumental means whereby the priest is to effect the 'transformatio corporis et sanguinis Christi', and therefore that it is to be understood in a concrete sense and as the equivalent of 'munera supplicantis familiae', 'munus oblatum', 'nostrae humilitatis oblatio', and other like well-known formulae for denoting the elements of bread and wine; as the equivalent, that is to say, of the 'oblatio seruitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae' of the Canon.¹ There would thus seem to be sufficient *prima facie*

¹ I cannot do better than cite the very words of the Canon and their context:—
'Hanc igitur oblationem seruitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae quae sumus Domine ut placatus accipias . . . Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus quae sumus benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui,' &c. The celebrant is directed to say these words 'tenens manus expansas super oblata'. I equate the 'oblatio seruitutis cunctae familiae tuae' of the Canon with the 'obsequium plebis tuae' of the *Missale Francorum*. The readers of the JOURNAL have no need to be reminded that in the early Church the elements to be consecrated by the officiant had been selected from the offerings in kind made by the 'congregation here present'. The tradition is even now perpetuated in a modified form day after day in the Ambrosian rite, as also in the Roman rite for the consecration of a bishop, which directs the newly consecrated prelate to make an offering of two loaves of bread and two small barrels full of wine.

The dogmatic significance of this offering in kind cannot be better illustrated than by the following *Secretae* from the *Leonianum* (XVIII. xiii, xvii) and the *Gregorianum* (*missae* for Third Monday in Lent and for Midnight at Christmas):—
 i. 'O. s. d., qui offerenda tuo nomini tribuis, et oblata deuotio nostraræ seruitutis

ground for rendering 'ut per obsequium plebis tuae corpus et sanguinem Filii tui transformet' by 'that by means of Thy people's oblation of bread and wine he may symbolize the Body and Blood of Thy Son', where for the moment I render *transformet* by 'symbolize', but in the hope of being able to elaborate a somewhat more explicit definition.

There is nothing in the other items of the *Missale Francorum* that tells either for or against this rendering of the passage; but the so-called Reichenau Missal yields valuable evidence, for it contains (Neale and Forbes, p. 11) a prayer thus worded: 'Descendat, Domine, plenitudo maiestatis, diuinitatis, pietatis, uirtutis, benedictionis et gloriae tuae super hunc panem et super hunc calicem; et fiat nobis legitima eucharistia in transformatione corporis et sanguinis Domini, ut quicunque et quotiescumque ex hoc pane et hoc calice libauerimus,' &c., where, as by the interpretation I just now gave to *obsequium*, bread and wine are categorically stated to be the instrumental means by which is effected the *transformatio* of the Body and Blood of our Lord. Again, the *Richenouense* (*ib.* p. 17) seems to give us *forma* in the sense of *τύπος* when, telling us that God took compassion on fallen man, it describes Him as 'formae suae imaginis miserator', *forma* here standing to *imago* in the relation of an unseen *τύπος* to its visible *εἶδος*. The *Gallicanum Vetus* also is of service in this respect; for (740: 368 D) in its *Benedictio Fontis*, a constituent which we may therefore assume to be one of its earliest, we find the phrase 'formare creareque iussisti', where *formare* seems to notify the abstract design of the Divine artificer and *creare* the concrete exhibition of that design in the creative act.

Turning to the *Missale Gothicum* we get fresh help. The only known edition of this document cannot, it is true, be much older than the eighth century, for it commemorates the martyrdom of St Leger, who suffered in the last quarter of the seventh; but we must not there-

adscribis, quaesumus clementiam tuam ut quod praestas unde sit meritum proficer nobis largiaris ad premium. per.' 2. 'Altaribus tuis, Domine, munera nostrae seruitutis inferimus, quae placatus accipiens, et acceptum tibi nostrum quaesumus famulatum et sacramentum nostrae redēptionis efficias. per.' 3. 'Munus quod tibi, Domine, nostrae seruitutis offerimus, tu salutare nobis perfice sacramentum. per.' 4. 'Accepta tibi sit, Domine, quaesumus, hodiernae festivitatis oblatio, ut, tua gratia largiente, per haec sacrosancta commercia in illius inueniamur forma in quo tecum est nostra substantia: qui tecum.' The 'per haec sacrosancta commercia' of this last illustrates and, I think, justifies my interpretation of 'per obsequium plebis tuae'; while the first and second citations prove that in the Roman Church of the fifth century it was no mere theological 'fiction' but an explicitly taught dogma that the Church's oblation of the elements was part of a divinely instituted transaction between her and the Creator. Without bread and wine there could be no eucharist; but these were bread and wine which had first been offered by her in obedience to God's command.

fore assume that it does not embody a nucleus, or ultimate original, of greater antiquity. The distinction is carefully borne in mind by Tommasi, who, after mentioning the Mass in honour of St Leger, goes back in thought to a remoter period than St Leger's martyrdom when he says 'descriptum tamen censeo ex uetustioribus exemplaribus', and then to another and yet earlier time when he adds 'Si de libri auctore inquiratur, nihil plane compertum: uerum, si locus coniecturae daretur, diuinaretur aliquis qui eius conditorem diceret esse Musaeum presbyterum Massiliae . . . mortuum . . . circa annum 460?' This guess of Tommasi's must not be made the basis of an argument, for it has not, so far as I am aware, been verified; but, should it ever prove to have been happily inspired, scholars will be able to say with some confidence that the nucleus of the *Missale Gothicum* was in close touch, as regards both date and provenance, with that edition of the *Missale Francorum* to which is referable the phrase 'ut corpus et sanguinem Filii tui transformet'. Meanwhile, and as at present known to us, the *Gothicum* supports my interpretation of the phrase; for (i) it attests the meaning of *forma* on which my interpretation is based; (ii) it gives us *praeformare* in the sense of *praefigurare* and (iii) it gives us a *transformatio*, which, like that of the *Missale Francorum* and the *Missale Richenouense*, has the Body and Blood of Christ, not bread and wine, for its subject-matter. And it is especially valuable from the fact that (iv) whereas it more than once asserts a change of which bread and wine are the subject-matter, that change, whatever be the precise philosophical definition of it, is notified by such words as *mutare*, *uertere*, *conuertere*, and even, it may be, by *transferre*, but never by *transformare*. I also think that (v) it contains a passage which gives us a morally certain clue to the precise scope of the factor *trans* in *transformet*.

1. In a *missa dominicalis* (652 : 314 C) of pure fiction, and presumably early date, we find 'Qui [scil. Christus] formam sacrificii perennis instituens hostiam se tibi primum obtulit et primus docuit offerri', where it is evident that *forma* is to be equated, as by Jerome and Leo the Great, with *τύπος* in the sense of archetype, model, or exemplar.

2. In the *Post Nomina* of a Mass in honour of SS Ferreolus and Ferrucio (618 : 293 B) we find 'Oremus dominicam miserationem ut . . . sacrificium hoc nostrum, sicut in praeformationem [*lege fortassis praeformatione*] Melchisedec, in uirtute sanctificet'; where the *praeformatio* of the Melchisedechean type is contrasted with the *uirtus* of the Christian antitype, and where *praeformatio* connotes the same idea as St Leo's 'forma praecedens' when he says 'Melchisedech in quo aeterni pontificis forma praecessit'; where, therefore, the underlying *forma*, so far from having anything whatever to do with

'substance' or 'accidents', as used in the vocabulary of the scholastics, has an entirely different meaning from that of either term and is to be understood, as in the preceding instance, as the equivalent of *τύπος*; so that *praeformare* would mean 'to set forth, or symbolize, by means of a prophetic or anticipatory type or emblem'.

3. On the Feast of the Circumcision (534: 237B) we have, in the *Post Secreta*, 'Suppliciter oramus uti hoc sacrificium [scil. oblationem] suscipere et benedicere et sanctificare digneris ut fiat nobis eucharistia legitima . . . in transformationem corporis et sanguinis' &c., and in the *Post Mysterium* for that of St Peter's Chair (565: 257D), 'Sacrosancta munera . . . offerimus obsecrantes ut immiscere [lege immittere] digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum super haec solemnia ut fiat nobis legitima eucharistia . . . in transformatione corporis et sanguinis' &c.; where, in the first of these passages, both idiom and construction advise us to render 'in transformationem' &c. by 'so as to symbolize' &c., and, in the second, to render 'in transformatione' &c. by 'thereby symbolizing' &c.

4. I find that *mutare* and *conuertere* denote in the *Gothicum* either a conversion of one thing into another, or else a change of purpose; as on the Feast of the Epiphany (542: 242B and C) and in the last *missa dominicalis* (656: 317A),—'ut in sanguinem suum oblationum nostrarum uina conuertat', 'ut oblationes et uota conuertere dignetur in sacrificium diuinum', 'panem mutatum in carne, poculum uersum in sanguine': nay, on the Feast of the Assumption, *transferre* is used in a like sense and in a passage (548: 246C) cited by Dr Feltoe, 'translata fruge in corpore, calice in cruento'. But, so far from seeing in these passages anything that may fitly be compared with its use of *transformare*, I see a diametrical contrast. Whatever be the precise theological definition of the change designated by these words, bread and wine are the subject-matter of that change; and I never find them used to denote the concomitant, but distinct idea, an idea, however, which is absolutely necessary to a right apprehension of the eucharist as a sacrament; the idea, that is to say, that representative symbols cognizable by sense are the divinely ordained pledge of unseen realities. This the *Gothicum* denotes by *transformare* and *transformatio*. I hope I have made my meaning clear. The *Missale Gothicum* uses *mutare*, *conuertere*, *transferre* (i) in the sense of 'to change, convert or transmute', and (ii) with bread and wine, but (iii) not the Body and Blood of the Redeemer for their subject-matter. On the other hand, it uses *transformare* in the sense of 'to represent by means of an appropriated or attributive symbol', and (ii) with the Body and Blood of Christ for its subject-matter, (iii) not bread and wine.

5. The elements offered by Melchisedech were a prophetic or

anticipatory type of like elements, the bread and the wine which were to be blest at the first Eucharist: they were thus a *forma praecedens* of these as, in the words of St Leo, Melchisedech himself was a *forma praecedens* of Christ. When, therefore, the author of the *Post Nomina* in the Gothicum Mass for SS Ferréol and Ferrucion styled them a *praeformatio* of the first Eucharist he employed a phrase which is in strict accordance with the philosophical terminology of St Leo. On the hypothesis, then, that a writer of the same literary school as St Leo or the author of the *Post Nomina* should have desired to express the dual idea that it is the function of the Church of Christ 'until His coming again' to employ bread and wine as symbols (i) not of other bread and wine but of verities unlike themselves, and to employ them (ii) neither as retrospective nor as prospective symbols, but representatively, there can be no doubt, if analogy may guide us, that the word whereby to express this dual idea of an (i) attributive and (ii) representative symbolization would have been the word *transformatio*, the very word employed, and employed with eucharistic reference, in the *Missale Francorum* and in two Masses of the *Missale Gothicum*.

On review, therefore, of the evidence thus far adduced, it would seem that in the philosophical vocabulary of St Leo and of the Gallo-Roman theologians of, at least, the latter half of the fifth century the sense of *transformatio* was not change, conversion, transmutation, and the like; but attributive representation, as of abstract by concrete, of unseen by visible, and, in the case of the Eucharist, of an intrinsic spiritual grace by an extrinsic material symbol; and therefore that the Roman pontifical, in replacing 'ut . . . corpus et sanguinem Filii tui . . . transformet' by 'ut panem et uinum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui . . . transformet', so far from doing a thing 'not detrimental to the proper meaning', the meaning, that is to say, of 'the original form of the phrase', extinguished it and replaced it by another.

In good truth, it would seem as if the same sort of fate had befallen *forma* as has befallen many other words; the sense slipping from that of *τύπος* = an abstract ideal, to that of *τύπος* = a concrete exemplar; thence to that of semblance, until, no specific meaning given to it, a compound word like *transformatio*, so far from being used, even by theologians, to denote a translative or attributive symbolization, was regarded as a mere synonym for *conuersio* or *mutatio*.¹

¹ It would be interesting to know (1) when and (2) where this remarkable substitution first found its way into a pontifical, and (3) when it was first adopted at Rome. Dr Marco Magistretti, in his *Pontificale in usum Ecclesiae Mediolanensis*, tells us that it is to be found in a Maintz pontifical of the ninth or tenth century preserved at Milan. To both theologians and historians it is a long cry from south-eastern Gaul at the close of the fifth century to Maintz at the close of the ninth.

And, indeed, in the case of Gallican missals or pontificals the change not improbably began at a comparatively early date. We can scarcely suppose that a Burgundian, a Frank, or a Visigoth would be likely to form an accurate conception of an abstract idea and, having formed it, to embody it with precision in a language that was not his own. Nay; we may fairly doubt whether in the latter half of the sixth century, in the seventh, or in the eighth, men who, though of Gallo-Roman descent, no longer thought in Latin would be likely to respect and perpetuate a metaphysical formula such as I believe *transformatio* to have been. My meaning may be illustrated from the *Gothicum* itself which (563: 255 D) styles the conversion of St Paul a *mutatio* and extols his 'flagrantia praecepta'; which, in a panegyric of St Saturninus of Toulouse (556: 251 D), instead of inviting us 'insignem martyrem debito honore excolere', bids us 'conclamantissimum testem suspicere'; which, improving on some such phrase as 'expleuit episcopatum', tells us that he 'cathedram consummauit', and which with cruel erudition calls angels 'nuncii' (578: 265 D) in the first constituent of its Maundy Thursday *missa*. This very constituent is specially apposite to my present argument, inasmuch as the writer of it would seem to have gone to the trouble of analysing the word *transformatio*; for he informs us that those who 'offer immaculate hosts on sacred altars' on the anniversary of the *Coena Domini* 'celebrate the *effigies* in sacrificio spiritali *transfusa*' of the 'dominica immolatio'. What definite idea, if any, this 'effigies transfusa' was to formulate the context does not enable us to say; but the formula itself would certainly seem to have been suggested by an analysis of *transformatio*.

If from the *Missale Gothicum* we turn to the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, we perceive that here, possibly as a consequence of change from one place to another, possibly from lapse of time, possibly from impaired literary tradition, and not improbably from more than one of these causes, *forma* is not the sole term used as the equivalent of *tūtos*, but that the word has a rival in *figura*. I have already observed that in presumably one of the earlier items of the *Gallicanum Vetus*, its *Benedictio fontis* (740: 368 D), we find the phrase 'formare creareque', where, in at least the order of human thought, *formare* would seem to denote that design of the Divine Artificer which we conceive to have preceded the act notified by *creare*; *formare* thus being the precursor of *creare*, and bearing to it the relation of type to antitype: but, on the other hand, we encounter on Good Friday (727: 360 B), as if in a parenthesis or inserted gloss, the phrase 'quodammodo figuralis tangentes hostiae caput', and on the following day (730: 362 B) 'agnus figuratus diu'. In like manner: its *Expositio Symboli*, presumably a very ancient composition but possibly an imported item, gives us

what I venture to call the classical use of *forma* in the sentence 'Quicquid . . . praeformatum est in patriarchis . . . quicquid praedicatum est in prophetis' &c.; and yet in its one surviving, but acephalous, Mass for Maundy Thursday (723: 357 B) it styles the Melchisedechean offering¹ not, as does the *Gothicum*, a *praeformatio* but a *praefiguratio*. It may, indeed, be urged, as a way of accounting for this divergence, that *praefiguratio* was chosen in order to avoid tautology, for *transformare* occurs in the next sentence. Be it so. But here is the word; and its very presence proves that to the author—or, if not the author, the editor—of the constituent *praeformatio* was not the sole word, nor even, it may be, the most readily occurring word, by which to notify what St Leo would have styled a *forma praecedens*. Nor is this all. The contextual *transformare* which I just now mentioned has not the Body and Blood of our Redeemer for its subject-matter, as on its one and only occurrence in the *Missale Francorum* (668: 323 A), as on its one and only occurrence in the *Richenouense* (Neale and Forbes, p. 11), and as on its two and only occurrences in the *Gothicum* (534 and 565: 237 B and 257 D); but, on the contrary, the elements of bread and wine. This change of subject-matter connotes for *transformare* as used in the *Gallicanum Vetus* a distinctly different sense from that of 'to represent by an attributive symbol'; but, even so, I cannot persuade myself that we are to see in it a logical precursor, an adumbration, an anticipation of the Tridentine definition of the mode of the Real Presence; still less, in Dr Feltoe's words 'the nearest approximation to the doctrine of Transubstantiation at present to be found expressed in the chief Roman service books'.

I cite the passage in full; observing only that, although Dr Feltoe does not, like Mabillon, turn *in sacramento* into *in sacramentum* he treats as unnecessary to the general sense the clause 'quae Melchisedech . . . obtulerat', words which Mabillon encloses within brackets. I remove Mabillon's brackets and neglect his *in sacramentum*, thus giving the passage as we find it in Muratori¹:

¹ The *Qui pridie* clause of the Canon which immediately follows this *Hanc igitur* represents our Lord as standing at the sacrificial act of eucharistic oblation:—'Qui pridie quam pro omnium salute pateretur hodierna die *sans* in medio discipulorum suorum accepit panem.' This would seem to be better than the view seemingly implied, if not categorically expressed, by St Thomas Aquinas in the immortal

'In supremae nocte coenae *
Recumbens cum fratribus', &c.

It certainly emphasizes the idea which pervades all these Gallican commemorations of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, that our Lord made an oblation of the elements before He said to the disciples 'Accipite et manducate', &c.

² Muratori's text, however, gives us 'quo Melchisedech' for 'quae Melchisedech'. But this must be a printer's blunder.

'Hanc igitur oblationem quam tibi offerimus ob diem ieunii coenae dominicae in qua Dominus noster Jesus Christus Filius tuus in nouo testamento sacrificandi ritum instituit dum panem ac uinum quae Melchisedech in praefiguratione futuri mysterii sacerdos obtulerat in sacramento sui corporis et sanguinis transformauit quae sumus Domine ut placatus accipias dies nostros.'

Treating the clause 'quae Melchisedech in praefiguratione futuri mysterii sacerdos obtulerat', not as a needless parenthesis, but as an intrinsic part of the whole *Hanc igitur*; assuming that *trans+formare* when used, as here is the case, of *formae* or *τύπω* denotes with philosophical accuracy the conversion of one sort of type into another, but declining, *pace* Mabillon, to regard *in sacramento* as a corrupt substitute for *in sacramentum*—a procedure which, after all, would give us anything but transubstantiation—we have a meaning which is convincingly luminous, simple and consistent:—'We therefore pray Thee, O Lord, that Thou wouldest be pleased to accept this oblation which we offer to Thee on the fast of the Supper of the Lord, the day wherein our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son instituted the rite of sacrifice under the new covenant; for then it was that in the sacrament of His Body and Blood He gave a new symbolism to bread and wine which Melchisedech had as priest offered in prophetic figure of the mystery that was to be.'

Thus, though the *transformare* in this passage of the *Gallicanum Vetus* differs from the *transformare* of the *Missale Francorum*, the *Reichenau Missal* and the *Missale Gothicum* in having bread and wine, not the Body and Blood of our Lord, for its subject-matter, the two significations, though distinct, are akin and collateral, since in this document, as in those, the reference is to symbols, not to substances; the *Gallican Vetus* no more predicated in its employment of *transformare* a conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Redeemer than do the other books predicate a conversion of these into bread and wine.

But, as has already been intimated, the very fact that the *transformare* of the *Gallicanum Vetus* thus differs from that of the *Missale Francorum*, the *Richenouense* and the *Gothicum*, and the further fact that in it *figura* appears as a rival to *forma*, may fairly lead us to suspect that the philosophical sense of *forma* known to St Jerome and St Leo was not always and everywhere preserved in its integrity. Indeed, when we turn to the Bobbio Missal we find reason to believe that there were parts of Western Christendom to whose vocabulary it was not indigenous.

Carefully excepting the Mass in honour of St Martin, we find on perusal of the Bobbio book, that, if the document is not of another age than the *Missale Francorum*, the *Gothicum*, and even the *Gallicanum*

Vetus, it represents another school of philosophical terminology than does any of these; for neither are derivatives of the abstract *forma* nor the abstract *forma* itself to be found in it. The Mass in honour of St Martin does indeed use *forma* in the sense of 'norm' or 'pattern'—'sic egit suscepti pontificatus officium ut per formam probabilis uitae obseruantium exegerit disciplinae' (892 : 529 C); but here, as often happens, 'exceptio probat regulam'; for the Preface in which this 'forma probabilis uitae' occurs is a constituent of the *Gothicum Missa sancti Martini Episcopi*, and this must certainly be deemed the earlier of the two Masses, since in prayers peculiar to itself it commemorates (644, 645 : 309 C, D) the 'patris nostri Martini episcopi hodie depositio' and styles the feast a *celeberrimus dies*, and must therefore be attributed to St Martin's own spiritual children at Ligugé.

Apart, then, from this one constituent of this one Mass, I find that the Bobbio book recognizes neither the abstract *forma* nor its derivatives. Thus, although the normal *missa* with which it begins comprises the Roman Canon, and is indeed rubricated *Missa Romensis Cottidiana* (777 and 776 : 453 B and 451 A), the prooemium to the Lord's Prayer differs conspicuously from the Roman; for, instead of 'Praeceptis salutaribus moniti et diuina institutione formati audemus dicere', it is worded 'Diuino magisterio edocti et diuina institutione audemus dicere' (779 : 455 B), a construction which dispenses with *formati* as if this were an unfamiliar idiom. We saw just now that in the *Gallicanum Vetus* the word *formare* bears to *creare* the relation that an artist's abstract ideal bears to his concrete handiwork, but in Bobbio the nearest approach to this is the relation of *figurare* to *facere*,—'Cur non credis eum in utero virginis hominem figurasse quem credis hominem fecisse de terra?' (831 : 489 C): and when we do find *forma* we perceive that it denotes not the abstract or unseen ideal, but the concrete or visible copy; for, whereas the *Gothicum* has 'formae tuae imago', Bobbio expresses the same idea by the precisely converse 'imaginis tuae forma',—'Tu . . . Deus . . . imaginis ac similitudinis tuae formam in nobis magis magisque restaura' (791 : 463 A). Again, Bobbio does not, after the idiom of the *Gothicum* (619 : 293 B), describe the patriarch Joseph as one who *praeformauit* the Redeemer or even, like the *Gallicanum Vetus* (723 : 357 B), as one who *praefigurauit* Him, but (824 : 484 B) as His *typum portans*. Nay, it styles the paschal lamb of the Mosaic institution not only a *figura* but an *imago* of the Lamb of God (959 : 572 C), an idiom which I should imagine to have been impossible to the compilers of the other sacramentaries,—'Domine Deus . . . qui populo tuo . . . praecipere dignatus es . . . agnum immaculatum imaginari, quem in figura . . . Domini nostri . . . immolaret', &c.

In short, whereas in the *Gothicum* an Old Testament type is a *praeformatio* and in the *Gallicanum Vetus* either a *praeformatio* or a *praefiguratio*, Bobbio, knowing nothing of either *prae* or *forma*, employs the words *figura* and *imago*: whereas in the idiom of St Jerome, of St Leo, of the *Richenouense* and of the *Gothicum*, *forma* denotes sometimes the abstract as contrasted with the concrete and sometimes a type as contrasted with an antitype, there is no trace of either idiom in the Bobbio book: whereas in the *Gothicum* and the *Gallicanum Vetus* *forma* is used as of a model for imitation, the one constituent in the Bobbio book which thus exhibits it is an imported Preface. It cannot, therefore, surprise us to find that the Bobbio compilers, so far from using *transformatio*, like the *Missale Francorum*, for the symbolizing of the abstract by the concrete and the representing of the unseen by a visible, or, like the *Gallicanum Vetus*, for the substitution of a new antitype in place of an old, make no use whatever of it. I doubt if it can have had a place in their vocabulary.

For the only remaining instance of *transformatio* in this group of Sacramentaries we must return to the *Gothicum* (637: 305 A). The item in which that instance occurs is the Mass in honour of St Leger, who suffered in the year 678; it is therefore presumably, though not certainly, of later date than the other proper *missae*. But even here, notwithstanding the extreme unlikelihood that at the end of the seventh century and in a district more Gothic than Roman, as Languedoc then was, a term of such delicacy as St Leo's metaphysical *forma* should have retained its proper clearness of philosophical definition, *transformatio* cannot reasonably be regarded as of the same category with 'mutare panem in carnem' and 'conuertere poculum in sanguinem', for the constituent in which it occurs contains nothing that obliges, or even invites, us to infer that it connotes, as Muratori would have us believe, a '*substantialis mutatio et conuersio*' of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Redeemer. That the writer assumed some sort of change we need not doubt, but he does not categorically assert it; nor was it congruous that he should make implicit reference to it; for he is evidently contemplating the consecrated elements, not as visible figures of a present, if unseen, reality, but as, what they no less certainly are, the fulfilment of a past type and the pledge of a future blessing.— 'Haec facimus, Domine, passionem tuam commorans [*lege* "commemorantes"]. Haec facimus Pater [*lege fortassis* "per te"] Iesu Christe, qui nobis de lege ueteri nouam tradidisti. Concede nobis . . . ut descendat hic benedictio tua super hunc panem et calicem in transformatione Spiritus tui Sancti, ut haec benedicendo benedicas, sanctificando sanctificases; ut quicunque ex ultraque benedictione sumpserimus aeternitatis praemium et uitam consequi mereamur aeternam. Per.'

Here bread and wine are the subject-matter of the *benedictio tua*; but, though the ultimate object of the Holy Spirit's action is clearly stated, we must conjecture as best as we can, for we are not told, what is the precise sense that we are to give to *transformatio*. I think, however, that this may be apprehended by a careful study of the *Post Secreta* as a whole. The style in which this is written is perhaps more pregnant than lucid; but the most obvious interpretation would seem to be the right one:—‘This, O Lord, we do in commemoration of Thy passion. This we do, O Jesus Christ, for Thy sake who out of the old law didst for us evolve and to us hand on the new. Grant to us that . . . Thy blessing may come down upon this bread and cup *in transformatione Spiritus tui Sancti*, that blessing Thou mayest bless [this bread], sanctifying sanctify [this cup], that so whosoever of us shall partake of each blest element [“ex utraque benedictione” being abstract for concrete] may be counted worthy to attain the reward of eternity and the life everlasting. Through.’ If this be the true general sense, then the most obvious way of dealing with ‘*in transformatione Spiritus tui Sancti*’ is either to collate it with, and explain it of, the *de lege veteri nouae traditio legis* of the first part of the paragraph or to interpret it by the ‘ut quicunque . . . aeternam’ of the sequel; unless, indeed, we adopt both methods; and the fact that by the meaning which I give to *transformatio* both are permissible, while each has the support of parallel places in *Gothicum* and *Gallicanum Vetus*, convinces me that that is the meaning intended:—‘This we do . . . for Thy sake who out of the old law didst for us evolve and to us hand on the new. Grant to us that . . . Thy blessing may come down upon this bread and cup in Thy Holy Spirit's replacement of type and promise by antitype and fulfilment, that blessing Thou mayest bless this bread, sanctifying sanctify this cup, that thus so many of us as shall partake of each blest element may be deemed worthy to attain the reward of eternity and everlasting life.’ The passages which bid us understand by the Holy Spirit's *transformatio* the replacement of type by antitype need not be cited again, for they are fresh in the memory of the reader. The following, from the *Gothicum* in its *Missa in Symboli Traditione* (577: 265 B), justifies us in further explaining it of the replacement of promise by fulfilment:—‘Sic nobis [Deus] cibum praebendum [*lege fortassis* “cibum praebuit sumendum”] uel poculum ut quicquid praefigurauit in mysteriis reddit in praemiis’; for if the mysteries are a *praefiguratio* or *praeformatio*—the words, as we have seen, are synonymous—the corresponding reward is, *ui terminorum*, a *transfiguratio* or *transformatio*.

There is a similar prayer in the third Sunday Mass (651: 313 D),—
 ‘Te, Pater omnipotens, deprecamur et supraposita altario tuo munera

laetus aspicias, atque haec omnia obumbres [*lege obumbret*] sancti Filii tui Spiritus, ut quod ex hac tua benedictione acceperimus aeternitatis gloria consequamur', where, though the Holy Spirit is mentioned in close connexion with the *munera supraposita altario*, no mention is made of the *res sacramenti*, and our thoughts are carried off from the 'he that eateth Me' to dwell on the 'he shall live by Me'. In like manner, but still more forcibly, the *Post Secreta* of the fifth Sunday Mass (654: 315 D) says 'Offerimus tibi . . . hunc panem sanctum et calicem salutarem, obsecrantes ut infundere digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum edentibus nobis uitam aeternam regnumque perpetuum conlatura potentibus'.

It is not in contravention of Dr Feltoe's main thesis that I submit these considerations to his judgement and to that of other theologians, but rather the contrary. I do not pretend to suggest, for I certainly do not think, that he is mistaken in suspecting that the tendency to use strong and definite words on the subject of the Real Presence is first seen in Gallican, as contrasted with Roman, sources; but that *transformatio* is not one of them; my contention being (i) that the tradition of its employment with a eucharistic reference is Roman, not Gallican; (ii) that when thus employed it has a distinctly different sense from that of *conuersio* and *mutatio*, and (iii) that it is to be regarded as a metaphysical formula connoting either the exhibition of unseen verities by attributive *τύποι* in analogy with St Jerome's *transfiguraui* for *μετεοχημάτισα*, or else the replacement of one *τύπος* or set of *τύποι* by another, the second factor of the word having always a sense strictly akin to that of *forma* in St Jerome's *forma futuri* for *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος* and of St Leo's *forma* when he styles the priesthood of Melchisedech a *forma praecedens* of the everlasting priesthood of our Lord and Saviour.

MARTIN RULE.

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES. II.

The original propositions, as they stand in *Articuli Lambethani*, read thus:—

(1) Deus ab aeterno praedestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

(2) Caussa efficiens Praedestinationis non est praevisione fidei aut perseverantiae aut bonorum operum aut ullius rei quae insit personis praedestinatis, sed sola et absoluta et simplex voluntas Dei.

(3) Praedestinatorum praefinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.