

THE FIRST LATIN CHRISTIAN POET¹.

ISIDORE of Seville, in the middle of the seventh century, writes that 'the first composer of hymns'—that is to say, in Latin—'was Hilary the Gaul, Bishop of Poitiers'.² That Hilary was a hymn-writer is known from more than one passage of Jerome, who was twenty or thirty years of age when Hilary died. In one passage he mentions that Hilary, 'whose Latin eloquence is like the river Rhône, but who was himself a Gaul, and born at Poitiers, describes the Gauls in one of his hymns as difficult to teach'.³ And in the account of Hilary which he gives in his Notices of Remarkable Men, he mentions a *Book of Hymns and of Mysteries* written by him⁴.

The *Book of Hymns and Mysteries* was lost, though a few poems have been ascribed to Hilary on varying degrees of authority. A letter, appended to the biography of Hilary, which was written by a distinguished man who succeeded him in the bishopric of Poitiers after an interval of two hundred years, mentions two hymns as sent along with it, a morning and an evening hymn, which the writer presents to his little daughter Abra, or Apra⁵. The general, though by no means unanimous, verdict of scholars has been that the letter to Abra is to be reckoned spurious. But even if it is genuine, it is not easy to ascertain on what grounds the Benedictine editor convinced himself that the hymn *Lucis largitor* was the morning hymn referred to, or on what grounds Mai connected the penitential verses *Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sidera* with the evening hymn. A hymn beginning *Hymnum dicat turba fratrum* is ascribed to Hilary in the ancient Irish *Liber Hymnorum*⁶, as well as by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims in the ninth century; but in the absence of further evidence little heed has been paid to that ascription. Mr. Glover, in his charming *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, knows only of 'some dull and rather halting hexameters on Genesis' as

¹ A paper read before a College Classical Society.

² *De Off. Eccl.* i 6.

³ *Praefat. in Galat. II* 'in hymnorum carmine Gallos indociles uocat'. The context, if not the words themselves, makes it clear that he does not mean, as some have supposed, that Hilary said that it was hard to teach the Gauls to sing hymns.

⁴ *De Vir. Inustr.* c 'et liber hymnorum et mysteriorum alius'. It is not clear whether Jerome intends to speak of these as one book or as two—'and another book of hymns and mysteries', or 'and a book of hymns and another of mysteries'. I incline to the former rendering.

⁵ So Mai prefers to write it (*Novae Bibl. Patrum* i p. 475).

⁶ Edited for the Henry Bradshaw Society by the present Dean of St Patrick's.

being attributed to Hilary of Poitiers : but, as he justly says, it is believed that they are not his work ¹.

In recent times, however, fresh light has been thrown upon the poetical activity of Hilary. Signor Gamurrini discovered in the beautiful library of the Confraternity of Santa Maria della Pieve at Arezzo a MS, written in Lombardic character, of about the eleventh century, which contained matter of extraordinary interest. A great part of it was occupied by a pious lady's account of her pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the fourth century². To the world of letters in general this was, no doubt, the most important part of the treasure trove. But the MS contains also a large portion of the long-lost treatise of Hilary upon the Mysteries, the last page of which, after a gap of some thirty-two pages, fortunately remains to tell us what it is—*Finit tractatus mysteriorum S. Hylarii episcopi*; and then follows the heading *Incipiunt Hymni eiusdem*. Gamurrini, who had already made known his discovery in a learned periodical in 1884, three years later published the whole contents of his MS in a quarto volume. Unfortunately, his skill in deciphering his MS was not equal to his merit in finding it; and in the part which concerns us at present, the facsimile page which he has given us enables us frequently to correct his published text of the first hymn. Sometimes he has made intentional corrections of the MS text which are not required. Truth compels us to add that the volume contains so many misprints as seriously to shake our confidence in Gamurrini's printed text. I subjoin an attempted revision of the text, and can only wish that I had been able to make it more perfect by a new examination of the MS³. Gamurrini's facsimile only carries us as far as I 31. Where, after that point, my critical notes say 'MS', it must be understood that Gamurrini's reading of the MS is meant.

FELIX PROPHETA DAVID PRIMVS ORGANI
IN CARNE CHRISTVM HYMNIS MVNDO NVNTIANS.

I

Ante saecula qui manes,
semperque nate, semper ut est Pater,—
namque te sine quomodo
dici, ni pater est, quod pater sit, potest?—

4

1. *ms.* manens

¹ *Life and Letters* p. 253 (Cambridge, 1901).

² Subsequent discoveries shew that the lady was a Spaniard called Etheria (Ferotin *Le véritable auteur de la Pèlerinage de Sainte Silvie* 1903).

³ A somewhat improved text was published, but without a fresh inspection of the MS, by the learned hymnologist, Drevés, in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* for 1888 (vol. xii), together with an interesting paper upon the hymns; but his punctuation of the poem makes it impossible to construe in parts.

Bis nobis genite Deus, Christe, dum innato nasceris a Deo, uel dum corporeum et Deum mundo te genuit uirgo puerpera,	8
Credens te populus rogat, hymnorum resonans mitis ut audias uoces quas tibi concinit aetas omnigena, sancte, gregis tui.	12
Dum te fida rogat, sibi clemens ut maneat, plebs tui nominis, in te innascibilem Deum orat, quod maneat alter in altero.	16
Extra quam capere potest mens humana, manet Filius in Patre ; rursum, quem penes sit Pater, dignus, qui genitus est Filius in Deum.	20
Felix, qui potuit fide res tantas penitus credulus assequi, ut incorporeo ex Deo perfectus fuerit progenitus Dei.	24
Grande loquimur et Deum uerum, ut genitor, quicquid inest sibi aeternae decus gloriae, totum in unigenam ediderit Deum.	28
Hinc unus merito bonus ipsum, quod Deus est, extra inuidiam sui gigni uellet in alterum, transformans se, ut est, uiuam in imaginem.	32
Istis uera patet Dei uirtus : cum dederit omnia, non tamen ipsis, quae dederit, caret, cuncta, quae sua sunt, cum dederit, habens.	36
Kara progenies Dei, cognatum cui sit omne decus Patris, nil natae eguit dari, sed natum simul est quicquid erat Dei.	40
Lumen fulsit a lumine, Deusque uerus substitit ex Deo	

uero, non aliud habens ortus unigena quam innascibilis Pater.	44
Mirum Dei hoc opus est, aeternus ut incorruptibilis Deus, ortu qui careat,—quia sit sempiterna uirtus, quod est Deus,—	48
Non natis quibus est in bonis ex sese placidus gigneret in Deum ; ac sic unigena in Deo hoc ipsud ortu, quod genitum est, caret.	52
O felix duum unitas, alter qui cum sit mixtus in altero, unum sic faciunt duo, sit in duobus cum quod est in altero.	56
Patri sed genitus paret, omnemque ad nutum attonitus manet, et scire non est arduum, quid uelit, sese qui penes est, Pater.	60
Quanta est genitus in bona ; nam constitutus in cunctorum exordio, condens qui primum saecula aeternum in motum tempora protulit,	64
Rebus anterior Deus cunctis,—nam per eum omnia facta sunt, esset cum nihilum modo,— mundum corporeo condidit in statu.	68
Sed nos littera non sinit, per quam te genitum concinimus Deum, gesta, quae tua sunt, loqui carmenque natum, iam qui eras Deus,	72
Te cunctis Dominum modis caelorum regem et caelestis gloriae, ut cuncta per te condita * * * * *	

II

* * * * *

Fefellit saeuam Verbum factum et caro ; Deique tota uiui in corpus irruis.	12
---	----

51. *ms.* in unigena62. *ms.* exordia

Gaudens pendentem cernis ligno cum crucis,
tibi que membra fixa clavis vindicas.

Hanc sumis ante pompam tanti proelii
sputus, flagella, ictus, cassa harundinis. 16

Ibat triumpho morte sumpto a mortua
Deus inferno uinci regno nesciens.

Kandens frigescit stagnum; pallida est iugis
rigensque nescit Flegethon se feruere. 20

Lux orta uastae noctis splendet; inferum
tremet, et alti custos saeuus Tartari.

Mors, te peremptam sentis lege cum tua,
Deum cum cernis subdedisse te tibi. 24

Non est caducum corpus istud, quod tenes,
nullumque in illo. ius habet corruptio.

Omnis te uincit carnis nostrae infirmitas;
natura carnis est connata cum Deo. 28

Per hanc in altos scandam laeta cum meo
caelos resurgens glorioso corpore.

Quantis fidelis spebus Christum credidi,
in se qui natus me per carnem suscipit. 32

Renata sum—o uitae laetae exordia—
nouisque uiuo christiana legibus.

Sanctis perenne munus praestat hoc Dei,
conformi secum uiuant post haec corpore. 36

Terror recedat sortis tandem, mors, tuae;
sinu me laetam patriarcha suscipit.

Viua locata post haec in caelestibus,
Dei sedere carnem certa a dexteris. 40

Xriste, reuersus caelos uictor in tuos,
memento carnis, in qua natus es, meae.

Ymnos perennes angelorum cum choris
in hoc resurgens laeta psallam corpore. 44

Zelauit olim me in morte Satanas;
regnantem cernat tecum totis saeculis.

13. *ms.* gaudes . . . carnis 17. *ms.* mortem sumpta mortuo 22. *ms.* tremet
32. *ms.* suscepit 34. *ms.* nouis quae 36. *ms.* corpora 37. sortis
ms. mortis

III

Adae cernuata gloria et caduci corporis, in caelesti rursus Adam concinamus proelia, per quae primum Satanus est Adam uictus in nouo.	3
Hostis fallax saeculorum et dirae mortis artifex, iam consiliis toto in orbe uiperinis consitis, nihil ad salutem praestare spei humanae existimat.	6
Gaudet aris, gaudet templis, gaudet sanie uictimae, gaudet falsis, gaudet stupris, gaudet belli sanguine, gaudet caeli conditorem ignorari gentibus.	9
Inter tanta dum exultat nostrae cladis funera, Deo audit in excelsis nuntiari gloriam, et in terra pacem hominum uoluntatis optimae.	12
Terret coetus angelorum laetus ista praedicans, terret Christum terris natum nuntians pastoribus, magnum populis hinc futurum desperatis gaudium.	15
Errat partes in diuersas tantis rebus anxius; quaerit audax et quis hic sit tali dignus nuntio, nihil ultra quam commune est terris ortum contuens.	18
Cernit tamen, his quod Iohannes in desertis praedicet, aquis mersans in Iordanis, cunctis paenitentiam, quam sequatur confessorum criminum remissio.	21
Inter turbas, quae frequenter mergebantur, accipit uocem e caelo praedicantem, 'meus est hic filius; hunc audite; hic dilectus, in quo mihi complacet.'	24
Cernit hominem, cernit corpus, quod Adae perlex erat; nihil ultra uox honoris afferebat desuper; scit terrenam subiacere mortis legi originem.	27
Ad temptandum multas artes priscae fraudis commouet; quaerit audax tempus quid sit . . .	

It will be seen at once that the Arezzo MS does not give us any one hymn of Hilary in full. It contains large fragments of three hymns. Between the first and second fragments, twelve pages of the MS have been lost. It is impossible to tell how much has been lost after the third fragment. How large the collection originally was, we cannot say. The missing pages may, or they may not, have contained the hymns

1. *ms.* Adae cernis gloriam9. *ms.* ignorare24. hic *ms.* hinc28. *ms.* fraudes

Ad caeli clara, Lucis largitor, and Hymnum dicat. It would not even be quite certain, without investigation of the contents, whether the heading *Incipiunt hymni eiusdem* was intended to apply to all our three fragments, or whether the hymns of Hilary ended somewhere in the lost pages and a new heading began. These questions can only be answered after careful investigation of the second and third of the fragments.

That the first, at any rate, of the three hymns discovered by Gamurrini is a genuine work of Hilary can hardly, I think, be doubted¹. Its close connexion with the *Tractatus Mysteriorum* is exactly in keeping with the way in which Jerome speaks of the *Book of Hymns and of Mysteries*. The theology of the hymn is precisely the theology of Hilary's great work on the Trinity. The style, in its involutions and obscurities, is as much like that of Hilary's treatises as could be expected in comparing verse with prose. There are constructions, phrases, and favourite words which point strongly, when taken in conjunction, to the Bishop of Poitiers. I will call attention to a few of them.

Among constructions may be mentioned the use of *quod* with the subjunctive in *oratio obliqua*, instead of the accusative and infinitive. Thus vv. 3, 4 we have *quomodo dici . . . quod pater sit potest*, 'how can it be said that He is Father?' The same construction occurs in iii 19 *cernit . . . quod Iohannes . . . praedicet*, 'he sees that John is preaching.' Hilary not infrequently uses this construction: e.g. *de Trin.* i 20 *noli negare quod steterit*; . . . *noli nescire quod . . . Deus natus sit*; iv 42 *audit Israel, quod sibi Deus unus sit*; v 16 *memento quod . . . sis professus*; v 33 *ignoras quod . . . uiderit*; vi 21 *credo . . . quod, quae tua sunt, eius sint, et quae eius sunt, tua sint*. The useful particle *quod*, on its way to become the *che* and *que* of the Romance languages, is of course common in fourth-century Latin; but it is not, I think, so common in other authors with the subjunctive: they usually put the verb in the indicative².

A remarkable phrase occurs in v. 20. There we read *qui genitus est filius in Deum*, 'the Son who is born God' (or 'God by birth'); in 28, *in unigenam ediderit Deum*, 'that the Sire should have reproduced undiminished in an only begotten God whatever splendour of eternal glory there is in Himself'; in 31 *gigni uellet in alterum*, 'should wish His very Godhead to pass by generation into another'; in 50 *gigneret in Deum*, 'that the eternal and incorruptible God should without

¹ The most careful examination known to me which rejects the Hilarian authorship is that of Mr. E. W. Watson in the Introduction to his translation of Hilary in the *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*.

² Jerome perhaps uses the subjunctive more frequently than the indicative; see the instances in Goelzer's *Latinité de S. Jérôme* p. 375 foll. The instances in Regnier's *Latinité des Sermons de S. Augustin* p. 112 foll. are about half and half.

effort beget out of Himself His unoriginate elements of bliss into one who is God'. The phrase is a very bold and striking one. Gamurrini, who seems to have felt no difficulty over the three earlier cases, thought to simplify the fourth by omitting the *in*. But this was quite unnecessary. The expression is highly Hilarian. In *de Trin.* iv 35 we read, *idcirco Deus eius est, quia ex eo natus in Deum est*, 'God is Christ's God, because to Him He owes His birth as God'; in v 35 the Arians say that Christ is *non ex Deo natus in Deum, sed per creationem susceptus in filium*; in v 37 Hilary writes *neque abest a se, quod uiuus genuit in uiuum*; in vi 11 *quod per natiuitatis ueritatem ex Deo in Deum extitit*; in vi 13 *natiuitas . . . Dei, quae ex Deo in Deum extitit*; in vi 13 *id laborans ut de non extantibus nasceretur, id est, non a Deo Patre in Deum Filium uera et perfecta natiuitate natus esset*; in vii 11 *quae cum in Deum filium cum substantia uerae natiuitatis extiterint, Deo tamen, ut sua propria, quamuis ex eo in Deum sint nata, non desunt*. Instances might be multiplied from Hilary, but I do not remember the use of this turn of expression in any other author.

Such phrases as vv. 30 *ipsum quod Deus est*, 48 *quod est Deus*, to express what constitutes Godhead, have a very Hilarian sound. I quote rather at random from *de Trin.* iii 3 *omne quod Deus est . . . natiuitati eius impertiens*; iv 8 *conantur . . . filio auferre quod Deus est*; x 19 *habens in se et totum uerumque quod homo est, et totum uerumque quod Deus est*; xi 4 *cui non sit ex natiuitate quod Deus est*.

Again, the Greek-like phrase v. 49 *quibus est in bonis*¹ may be paralleled by such passages in Hilary as *de Trin.* xi 4, where, after recounting the attributes of Godhead, Hilary complains that according to the Arians our Lord is *extra hanc beatitudinem, manens ipse et mortalis et infirmus et malus, . . . dum in his Pater solus est*; ix 31 *Deum in his ostendit intellegendum esse quae sua sunt, in uirtute, in aeternitate* cet.; *ibid.* *unigenitus igitur in his se docens substituisse quae Patris sunt*; *ibid.* 61 *quod in his quibus ipse est, ei qui ex se est Pater totus sit*.

The little phrase *ut est* in v. 32 is a favourite phrase of Hilary's. Compare *de Trin.* ii 7 *Deumque ut est quantusque est non eloquetur*; 8 *est Pater ut est, et ut est esse credatur*; vi 12 *Deus, ut est Deus, quod est, permanet*.

When we come to special words, perhaps *unigena* and *innascibilis* are the two which most closely link the hymn to the prose writings of Hilary—especially when *unigena* is joined to *Deus*. The word *unigenitus* could not easily be got into the metre of the hymn, although Gamurrini, misreading his MS and misunderstanding his metre, has endeavoured to cram it in. *Unigena* does duty for it (vv. 28, 44, 51). I may say

¹ Cp. Srawley's *Greg. Nyss. Or. Cat.* pp. 9, 93.

in passing that Hilary does not appear to have actually read *unigenitus Deus* in the famous text of St John (i 18); when he formally quotes the text he gives it as *unigenitus filius*, unless the printed editions misrepresent him. But the phrase *Deus unigenitus* occurs in him more frequently than in any other author, or than its equivalent Greek either. It comes scores and scores of times in the *de Trinitate*. It comes in the *Mysteriorum Liber* on the same page of Gamurrini as our hymn itself. So does *innascibilis*, which represents the Greek ἀγέννητος. I have counted nineteen occurrences of the word, together with the still more unpromising substantive *innascibilitas*, in the fourth book of the *de Trinitate* alone.

Manere again, in the sense of ὑπάρχειν, which comes in the first line of the hymn, and which in 14, 18, 20 is almost a synonym of *esse*, is a thoroughly Hilarian word. In dealing with the famous text Phil. ii 6 he again and again interprets the word ὑπάρχων by *manere*. In *de Trin.* ix 14 we have *qui in forma Dei manebat, formam serui accepit*; and again *cumque accipere formam serui nisi per euacuationem suam non potuerit qui manebat in Dei forma*. In these and similar passages Hilary does not mean by *manebat* that the Son remained in the form of God while assuming the form of man. It is one of his peculiarities to suppose that the assumption of the form of the servant involved the abandonment of the form of God—though he understands the word ‘form’ in a different sense from most theologians. His *manebat* there refers to the essential existence of Christ before the Incarnation; ‘He who was (at the moment of the Incarnation) abiding in the form of God (abandoned that form and) took the form of a servant’. The use corresponds exactly with our *ante saecula qui manes*. So again in *de Trin.* xi 14 we read *manens igitur in forma serui, qui manebat in Dei forma*; *ibid. in forma Dei manens formam serui assumpsit*. Or, leaving the text from Philippians, we get *manere* = ὑπάρχειν in such sentences as these: *de Trin.* vi 12 *natura illa non . . . ex diuersis constat ut maneat*; 13 *non enim qui manebat Deus, sed ex manente Deo Deus natus est*; xii 25 *nemini . . . dubium est quin . . . natiuitas manentem doceat, non etiam non manentem*; *ibid. cum ex manente natus est, non est natus ex nihilo*; 36 *ne forte ante Mariam non manere existimaretur*¹.

The curious use of the word *penes* which twice over in this hymn denotes the mutual indwelling of the Persons of the Trinity (19, 60), occurs in Hilary’s *Comm.* in Matt. xxxi 3 *quod is ipse est penes quem erat antequam nasceretur*. I do not remember this use elsewhere.

The more this hymn is examined in detail² the more abundantly

¹ *Constitutus* (v. 62) is another representative of ὢν or ὑπάρχων.

² A few special points in the hymn may be illustrated thus: v. 20 *dignus*, cp.

clear it becomes that the attribution of it to Hilary of Poitiers is correct.

The results which this conclusion conveys to the classical and philological student are not without importance. We cannot but be interested to see how a bishop of one of the most cultured parts of Gaul in the fourth century went to work to commend his doctrine to the people. Hilary was himself a good scholar, both in Greek and in Latin. He had been, like other great Latin Fathers, a student of philosophy, and had found the study a bridge to Christianity. During his exile in the East, if not before, he became acquainted with the use of religious poetry among Greek-speaking Christians. He probably learned how the Arians employed verse as a medium for disseminating their heresy. He determined to make a similar attempt in Latin for the propagation of the Catholic faith. The little prologue to his book of hymns shews that he was conscious of the boldness of his attempt. 'Happy the prophet David, who was the first to announce to the world in hymns Christ in the flesh of service.' Hilary felt that he was putting himself, like a new David, at the head of a new line of hymn-writers, to proclaim the incarnate Christ to the western world.

The first thing which Hilary had to do—at any rate the first after selecting his special theme—was to select a metre. His first choice was a somewhat strange one. He took the asclepiadean metre of Horace's third ode:—

Sic te diua potens Cypri,
sic fratres Helenae, lucida sidera.

For purposes of convenience he grouped his lines in stanzas of four. Horace, in many cases, did the same, though Munro refused to say that he did so always. Hilary does not always mark the end of his quatrain by a break in the sense, as Ovid marks his couplets; but he marked the beginnings of them by following the letters of the alphabet. The Old Testament probably gave the first suggestion of this arrangement, where, besides Psalm cxix, a good many other Psalms and Lamentations are alphabetical¹. Not only the first of Hilary's hymns was composed on the alphabetical plan: the second of Gamurrini's fragments was composed on the same plan, and it is so far in favour of the Hilarian

de Trin. iv 10 'cum potius . . . gloriosus auctor sit, ex quo is qui tali gloria sit dignus extiterit'. v. 30 *extra inuidiam*: cp. *de Trin.* ix 61 'qui diligit, non inuidet, et qui pater est, non etiam non pater totus est'. Ibid. *uiuam in imaginem*: cp. *de Trin.* xi 5 'Deum uiuentis Dei uiuam imaginem'. v. 38 *cognatum*: cp. *de Trin.* ix 31 'naturalis igitur filio Dei et congenita omnis potestas est'.

¹ This way of treating verses was not foreign, however, to the genius of Latin poetry. Cicero tells us (*De Diuin.* ii 54) that some of the poems of Ennius were acrostichal in character.

authorship of *Ad caeli clara* that it likewise is alphabetical. The device was no doubt an aid to memory. It approved itself to later hymn-writers within the patristic period, who wrote not for scholars but for the people; and Augustine's swinging *Hymnus Abecedarius* on the one hand, and Sedulius's fine poem beginning *A solis ortus cardine* on the other, shewed what could be done in that way.

Hilary chose an elaborate Horatian metre for his first hymn, but he dealt with it in a way that would have made Horace—or Quintilian—'stare and gasp', though Priscian or Servius would have regarded it with greater equanimity. According to the Horatian scheme, the odd lines prefix a spondee, the even lines a spondee and a choriambus, to the two final dactyls. Hilary, knowing that metres were made for men, and not men for metres, felt free to alter this scheme where it suited his purpose. Not only did he freely put a trochee—or less often an iambus—for a spondee at the beginning of any line—he begins straight away with *Ante saecula*—but he freely puts a spondee or quasi-spondee, or even an iambus in place of the first three syllables of the choriambus of the even lines—and more frequently as the poem goes on:—

2 semperque nate, | semper ut est Pater
 6 Christe, dum innato | nasceris a Deo
 38 cognatum cui sit | omne decus Patris
 42 Deusque uerus | substitit ex Deo
 48 sit sempiterna | uirtus quod est Deus
 52 hoc ipsud ortu | quod genitum est caret
 54 alter qui cum sit | mixtus in altero
 56 sit in duobus | cum quod est in altero
 58 omnemque ad nutum | attonitus manet
 60 quid uelit sese | qui penes est Pater
 64 aeternum in motum | tempora protulit
 72 carmenque natum | iam qui eras Deus
 74 caelorum regem et | caelestis gloriae.

These rhythms occur thirteen times out of the thirty-seven possible opportunities. But Hilary takes an even wider view of the capacities of his metre. In at least one formidable-looking line, he resolves the initial spondee into a dactyl—that is, a dactyl of a kind:—

62 nām cōnstītūtūs īn cūnc|tōrūm ēxōrdīō.

The same seems to be the only possible account of a line still more formidable, unless the copyists have done it an injustice: I mean the line—

44 ōrtūs (genitive) ūnigēnā qu(am) īn|nāscībīllīs Pātēr.

In other words, he treats the first half of the long asclepiad line as the first half of a variable pentameter, or of an alcaic, or of a sapphic, just as it suits him.

But the liberties which Hilary took with his metre were of a far more striking kind than a mere alteration of the feet which compose it. The feet themselves, spondee, trochee, iambus, even dactyl, are not feet—or only accidentally so—which Horace would have recognized as such. To all intents and purposes they are accentual, and not quantitative feet. A most interesting paper by the great Munro¹ takes a Latin metrical inscription at Cirta as the text for an essay on the substitution of accent for quantity in the making of Latin verse. In that inscription the substitution is complete, as it is also in the verses of Commodian. As Munro shews, the worthy banker, whose tomb it adorns, had never learned prosody, and read his Virgil by accent and by nothing else. I wish that Munro could have threaded for us the intricacies of the metrical laws by which Hilary was governed. They were not quite so simple as those of the banker of Cirta. Hilary is not wholly un-influenced by quantity. Probably, if he had chosen, he could have written as good quantitative verses as his contemporary and fellow countryman, Ausonius. There is indeed one false quantity in his first hymn, which no ingenuity can explain away: it is in the sadly *scanzonic* line 57 *Patri sed genitus paret*. But there is no other shortening of a naturally long syllable which can be quite set side by side with this². Accent, at any rate, has nothing to do with this shortening, for the accent in any case would be upon the first syllable of *paret*. The line itself may be taken as an example to shew that Hilary was not guided by accent alone. To Praecilius of Cirta *Patri sed genitus paret* would have been two dactyls and a spondee (or trochee); to Hilary it is a spondee (or trochee) and two dactyls. Quantity with him still counts

¹ 'On a metrical Latin Inscription at Cirta,' in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* vol. x part II (Cambridge, 1861).

² Unless it be (63) 'condens qui primum saecula'. It will be observed that if this line be read accentually it would nearly agree with 'bis nobis genite Deus', or *uel dum corporeum et Deum*, or *et scire non est arduum*, or indeed with almost all the short lines of the poem. It would seem from such lines as if Hilary read his *navis quae tibi creditum* as a dimeter iambic. Even *quanta est genitus in bona* might be reconciled with that scheme, by leaving the *a* unelided, and (as is frequent in conversational Latin) ignoring the *i* in *genitus*. But there are at any rate nine lines which would not lend themselves to that scansion. *Dura te fida rogat sibi* would resist it as obstinately as *sic te diua potens Cypri*. Metrically, perhaps, the most difficult line in the piece is the last but one,

Caelorum regem et caelestis gloriae.

The accent of *caelestis* makes it, of course, as unlike a dactyl as the quantity. I cannot but think that there is some error of transcription.

for something. But it counts for very little. He had not the horror of the *profanum uulgus*, which Munro shews to have induced Horace to make accent and quantity so often clash. His great desire was to popularize his thoughts. Accentual verses were what the people liked, and made, and sang. So long as the people in general had an ear for quantity, they made and sang verses in which accent and quantity went together; but when the decay of quantity took place, accent had things all its own way.

Unus hómo mille mille mille decollauimus;
tantum uini hábet nemo quantum fudit sanguinis.

So sang the boys of Rome to salute a victorious emperor at the end of the third century. Hilary took the side of the people.

Let me say again that Hilary was an explorer and a pioneer. 'He was the first who ever burst' into the untried region of Latin Christian hymnody. Other writers who followed him seem to have felt that in submitting to the demands of accent he had made a mistake. The genuine hymns of Ambrose, the poems of Prudentius, of Sedulius, and of Venantius, are far more classical and quantitative in their construction than those of Hilary. It is impossible to say whether their greater success in the way of use in church is in any degree owing to this cause, or whether it is all to be traced to their higher poetical genius and more touching devotional power. But Hilary, at any rate, had no experience of others to direct him. He had to make the venture for himself; and if some of the great fathers of Christian poetry shrank from following him in this particular respect, there were others, of scarcely less merit, who flung the scholastic traditions of quantity altogether away, and wrote hymns like *Ad cenam Agni prouidi*, and *Urbs beata Ierusalem*, and *Sancti uenite, Christi corpus sumite*, without regard to anything but accent.

I will not, however, pursue further the somewhat intricate question of the relation of accent to quantity, but will call attention to one or two other features in Hilary's first hymn which illustrate the state of the Latin language in the latter half of the fourth century.

Observe the freedom with which Hilary uses or refuses elision. Munro's Numidian banker seems to have known nothing of elision. There are cases in Hilary's poem where we may take our choice whether to elide or not. In *Christe, dum innato*, or *Totum in unigenam*, the first foot may be a dactyl or a trochee, as we may be pleased to read it. But in the lines—

7 uel dum corporeum et Deum
23 ut incorporeo ex Deo

elision is necessary: in the lines—

26 uerum, ut genitor, quicquid inest sibi

32 transformans se, ut est

45 mirum Dei hoc opus est,

elision is impossible. Classical students will remember how easily a juxtaposition like *se ut est* or *iam qui eras* (where the *se* and *qui* are shortened by position), could be paralleled out of Plautus or Terence.

It is perhaps more interesting to observe that Hilary uses, when he likes, the elision of the final *s* with a following *est*—or rather perhaps I should say, how he uses the shortened *est*, which is so familiar in the older Latin poetry. That is obviously the scansion of—

20 dignus, qui genitu(s e)st filius in Deum

and of—

30 ipsum, quod Deu(s e)st, extra inuidiam sui

and of—

49 non natis quibu(s e)st in bonis.

It seems to me that a similar account—that is, of an enclitic and abbreviated *est*—is the best that can be given of the line—

56 sit in duobus cum quod (e)st in altero.

I need hardly say that the treating of *quodst* as a short syllable is not at all beyond what the Latin playwrights would have thought permissible.

The only other thing that I need notice in the first hymn is the curious, the violent use which the poet makes of hyperbaton. It sometimes seems as if he paid no regard to the order in which the words should stand, like an English schoolboy making Latin verses for the first time. In the third stanza, *resonans* belongs either to *populus* in the line before, or to *aetas* two lines below. I think it goes best with the latter. In the *O* stanza is a still more complicated arrangement. The *qui* which is the subject of *faciunt* is intruded into the first *cum* clause. This would not be so bad by itself, but a second *cum* clause follows, in which the *cum* appears at the very end of the sentence, except for the phrase which forms the subject of the verb. Written in straightforward prose, it would be *cum quod est in altero in duobus sit*. That Hilary liked this position for the *cum* is shewn by his writing a little below *esset cum nihilum modo*, when, for all that can be seen, *cum esset* would have suited his prosody quite as well. So, for that matter, would *cum in duobus sit*. But perhaps the most difficult transposition of all is in the last unfinished sentence which closes the fragment. Hilary seems to mean that the point of the alphabet which he has reached (*littera*) will not admit of his treating of the wonders

of creation, in which the Son of God had His share, nor of His Incarnation. If *carmenque natum* is what Hilary wrote, *carmen* is coupled to *littera*, and we have to supply *non sinit loqui* before *natum*, which agrees with the *te* of the following stanza. But this is very harsh, and I rather suspect that *carmenque natum* is a mistake for *carnemque natam*, or something of that sort.

Whether Hilary wrote any more hymns in these elaborate metres we cannot tell; but few readers, I think, will be inclined to doubt that he was more successful with the iambic and trochaic metres of the other two fragments which Gamurrini has given us, if indeed he was the author of them.

I must admit that there has been some question, even among those who accept Hilary's authorship of *Ante saecula qui manes*, as to whether these other two poems are to be ascribed to him. The speaker in the second fragment is a feminine speaker:—

29 per hanc in altos scandam laeta cum meo
caelos resurgens glorioso corpore;

and again—

33 renata sum—o uitae laetae exordia—
nouisque uiuo christiana legibus.

(Compare vv. 38, 39, 40, 44.) Gamurrini therefore supposes it to be the poem of some lady neophyte, which Hilary has incorporated into his collection. He thinks that he has discovered the lady. She was a certain Florentia, whom, according to Venantius, Hilary met and baptized in his exile, and who followed him to Poitiers on his return. This is of course possible; but on the other hand, as Duchesne has pointed out¹, there is no reason why Hilary should not have composed the poem for the use of Florentia or of some other lady. If there is any historical foundation for the statement that he composed a morning and an evening hymn for his daughter Abra, nothing could be more natural than that these verses should have been written for a Christian woman's use. We might even suppose that they were written for Abra herself. Dreves, indeed, thinks that as she appears to have been baptized at the same time as her father, it is unlikely that he would have written such a poem at such a moment. It need not, however, have been written at the time of their baptism. The language would be appropriate for a baptized Christian at any period after baptism—especially at Eastertide, to which the hymn evidently belongs. I would, however, venture the suggestion that the ten lost lines at the beginning may have contained words that gave

¹ *Bulletin Critique*, 1887, No. 13.

another reason for the feminine. For instance, the speaker may conceivably be the Christian soul.

In these two poems, Hilary whom I assume for the moment to be the author, shews to far greater advantage than in the first. The subjects, no doubt, are easier to treat; but the verse also moves with greater freedom and force. The accent no longer struggles for mastery with quantity; its dominion is unchallenged. The only places where accent and ictus do not always agree are the first and last foot of the iambic. It gives variety to get sometimes a rhythm like *ibat triumpho, sputus flagella*, in the first foot, instead of having always one like *sefellit saeuam, Deique tota*; and in the last foot a rhythm like *et caro, cum crucis*, instead of a constant rhythm like *irruis* and *uindicas*. Even this closing inversion of accent, which comes thirteen times out of thirty-six in the iambic hymn, comes only twice out of twenty-eight in the trochaic, *uictus in nouo, quod Adae pellex erat*. The caesura, on which the verse turns, is always well managed: in the only place where it is not strictly observed,

renata sum—o uitae laetae exordia—

the break in the sense, to my ear at least, makes the observance unnecessary, and the effect is rhythmically good.

In the third poem Hilary may be regarded as having achieved a real success. The old Greek trochaic metre was well adapted to the Latin accentual system, and it had often been used in popular songs. But, unless I am mistaken, our poem is the first in which the trochaic lines are grouped in stanzas of three; and any one familiar with Latin hymns, patristic and mediaeval, rhymed and unrhymed, will know what the world owes to the inventor of this stirring form of verse. Hilary's mutilated *Paradise Regained*—for so I may call the third hymn—is metrically the direct parent of Prudentius's magnificent lines—

Corde natus ex parentis ante mundi exordium,
Alpha et O cognominatus, ipse fons et clausula
omnium quae sunt, fuerunt, quaeque post futura sunt,

and indirectly, through Venantius, of Thomas's great sequence—

Pange, lingua, gloriosi corporis mysterium
sanguinisque pretiosi, quem in mundi pretium
fructus uentris generosi rex effudit gentium.

If, as I believe is far from unlikely, the morning hymn *Lucis largitor optime* is really Hilary's, then Hilary has the almost greater glory of having invented the stanza of four equal iambic lines which Ambrose

made his own—the Christian remet *par excellence*—which has given us such poems as—

Veni, redemptor gentium,
ostende partum uirginis;
miretur omne saeculum;
talis decet partus Deum—

and a hundred other noble hymns.

I said that the *Pange, lingua* of Thomas Aquinas was descended from Hilary's trochaic poem through Venantius Fortunatus. That Thomas's *Pange, lingua, gloriosi corporis mysterium* was modelled after Venantius's *Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis* will be disputed by no one. But that Venantius in turn was influenced by Hilary, can hardly be doubted by any who will compare his *Pange lingua* with those which Gamurrini has recovered for us. It will be remembered that Venantius lived at Poitiers, of which city he became bishop. He it was who, while still a presbyter, wrote the life of Hilary to which I have already referred.

Not only is the metre of Venantius the same as that of the third of Hilary's poems. The thoughts are in great measure taken over from that hymn and from the foregoing one. The very beginning, which lifts the story of the Passion into a paean, is almost enough to shew it :—

Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis,
et super crucis tropaeum dic triumphum nobilem.

It is the very spirit, not only of the lines—

III 2 in caelesti rursum Adam concinamus proelia,
per quae primum Satanas est Adam uictus in nouo,

lines which so curiously anticipate the modern—

A second Adam to the fight
And to the rescue came—

but the same spirit rings through the iambic poem also :—

15 ante pompam tanti proelii—
17 ibat triumpho morte sumpto a mortua.

The thought that the craft of Satan was foiled by a higher and better craft—

multiformis proditoris ars ut artem falleret—

was a fairly common one in ancient days ; but it lay ready to Venantius's hand to combine Hilary's—

III 4 Hostis fallax saeculorum et dirae mortis artifex

and—

ad temptandum multas artes priscae fraudis commouet—

with his—

II 11 Fefellit saeuam Verbum factum et caro

and—

III 25 cernit hominem, cernit corpus, quod Adae pellex erat.

To reckon up the elements and instruments of the Passion must always have been a favourite exercise of the devout Christian; but when we read Venantius's—

Hic acetum, fel, harundo, sputa; clauis, lancea
mite corpus perforatur

with Gamurrini's discovery before us, we cannot but see its source in Hilary's—

II 16 sputus, flagella, ictus, cassa harundinis.

Perhaps I may add that Venantius's—

Vagit infans inter arta conditus praesepia,

which has no support in the Gospels, may very likely have been derived from Hilary's strange insistence upon the same point in his prose works: *de Trin.* ii 24 *per conceptionem, partum, uagitum, cunas*; 25 *ad cuius uocem archangeli tremunt, . . uagitu infantiae auditur*; 26 *cunae, uagitus, partus atque conceptio*; 27 *partum, uagitum, et cunas*; 27 *sic uagitus per angelorum . . gaudia honoratur*; *ib. infans uagit, laudantes angeli audiuntur*. It is indeed possible that one of Hilary's lost hymns may have insisted likewise on the wailing. It is not, so far as I am aware, a common feature of early teaching. Finally, Hilary's repeated reference to the 'law of death'—

II 23 Mors, te peremptam sentis lege cum tua—

III 27 scit terrenam subiacere mortis legi originem

is caught up with vigour in another poem of Venantius, from which various centos have been culled for church processions under the heading of *Salue festa dies*—

legibus inferni oppressis—
tristia cesserunt inferni uincula legis.

The accumulation of these coincidences of thought and expression forms no inconsiderable argument for the genuineness of the hymns attributed to Hilary in Gamurrini's MS.

It may seem superfluous to go on illustrating the language of these hymns from the recognized works of Hilary; but I will give one example which may suffice for many. In that portion of his Commentary upon St Matthew where he discusses the Temptation of our

Lord (canon 3), Hilary, after giving a somewhat minute and detailed account of the state of the tempter's knowledge at the time, proceeds to say: *igitur istius temporis metu, in temptando eo quem hominem contuebatur, sumpsit temeritatem. Adam enim pellegerat, et in mortem fallendo traduxerat.* The whole passage exactly corresponds with our hymn. Its very words, *contuebatur, pellegerat*, recall our *contuens, pellex erat.* It and it alone gives the explanation of the enigmatical enquiry with which the fragment ends—*quaerit audax tempus quid sit.* The poet no doubt went on to say, as Hilary says in his Commentary, that Satan was alarmed at the fast of forty days (*istius temporis metu*)—a period which in other instances already had portended disaster for him; yet the very fasting, with its proof that our Lord was truly man, emboldened him to essay temptation (*sumpsit temeritatem*).

I will end with calling attention to a few particular words which are worthy of a moment's notice from classical students.

II 16 *Cassa harundinis.* The only other instance of the word *cassum* that I have been able to find is in Julius Solinus, p. 215 of Mommsen's edition. Solinus lived about the same time as Hilary, and wrote a kind of abridgement of Pliny's *Natural History*, mixed with passages from other authors. Speaking of the stone *lychnites*, he says that it *aut palarum cassa aut chartarum fila ad se rapit.* Pliny XXXVII vii 30, has simply *paleas et chartarum fila.* The dictionaries—Facciolati and Ducange—say that it means *fragmenta*; and I do not doubt that they are right, though I think it is doubtful whether the word is simply the neuter plural of the adjective *cassus*. Here then it will mean 'the splinters of the reed'; and, unlike Venantius's *harundo*, it refers, not to the reed on which the vinegar was offered, but to the sceptre with which 'the King of the Jews' was mocked. Its place is *ante pompam . . . proelii.* Hilary imagines its splintering as they struck Him with it on the head.

III 1. This line is evidently corrupt in the MS. It needs two additional syllables to complete it. It was in reading Solinus that the emendation which I have ventured to propose occurred to me. Solinus (p. 194, Mommsen) tells the story from Pliny, how Antiochus slew a chieftain of the Asiatic Gauls and triumphantly mounted his charger. The faithful animal *adeo spreuit lupatos, ut de industria cernuatus ruina pariter et se et equitem affligeret*¹. The verb *cernuare* is one of those good old Latin words which began to reappear in the second and third centuries after a period of obscurity. It is quoted from Varro. It is found again in Apuleius. Prudentius has it in his poem against Symmachus i 350:

post trabeas et eburnam aquilam sellamque curulem
cernuat ora senex.

¹ Pliny's words are (viii 64) *praecipitem in abrupta issa.*

The word was rare, and the copyists of Prudentius, like those of Hilary, as I imagine, were puzzled by it and offered substitutes for it. But it is not a bad word, and it would suit this passage well enough:—‘When the glory of Adam and of the perishable body had been thrown to the ground.’

III 25. The word *perlex*, or *pellex*, is unknown to the dictionaries. Dreves, in his reprint of these verses, emends *perlex erat* into *perlexerat*, which is very simple. Dreves had not thought of comparing with this poem the passage of Hilary's Commentary on St Matthew to which I have referred; the comparison makes his emendation more tempting. But Dreves curiously leaves *Adae* in the genitive, which of course is impossible with *pellexerat*. If *pellexerat* had been the right reading no scribe would have gone out of his way to change *Adam* into *Adae*. We must therefore find something to suit *Adae*. At first I thought of *pellax*, a word which in itself needs no recommendation. But the meaning of *pellax* is not quite what we want; and I have no doubt now that the MS is perfectly right, and that *perlex* is the word. *Allex* and *illex* are well-recognized Latin words connected with *allicio*, *illicio*. *Pellex* would be a parallel form connected with *pellicio*. I think, therefore, that we may add it to our dictionaries. I need hardly say that it has nothing to do with the word *paelex*, a concubine or rival wife, though that is sometimes barbarously spelt *pellex* in the printed books, to make it seem to be connected with *pellicio*.

A. J. MASON.

THE INTERPOLATIONS IN ST CYPRIAN'S *DE UNITATE ECCLESIAE.*

DOM JOHN CHAPMAN has earned the admiration and gratitude of all who are interested in the text of St Cyprian and in the history of its transmission. Since Dr von Hartel no one has contributed so much as he to our knowledge of a subject, the intricacy of which only those who have attempted to unravel it can appreciate. He has lately added to our debt by three articles in the *Revue Bénédictine* (nos. 3 and 4, 1902, and no. 1, 1903) in which, whether or no we regard him as somewhat hasty in his main conclusion, a substantial addition is made to our acquaintance with St Cyprian.

It is well known that in *De Unitate* § 4 a variation of the text, of no great theological importance, has been for upwards of three centuries