

The sixth hymn is the Lenten 'Iesu quadragenariae | dicator abstinentiae', of which Daniel himself to be sure says 'Sequiori aevo compositum esse tam certum est quam quod certissimum'. Kayser the conservative doubts if the forty days' fast was already, in Hilary's day, so fixed as the hymn takes for granted. And the rhyme is persistent. And the earliest authority is again Fabricius.

Last of the seven hymns given to Hilary by Daniel is the Whitsuntide 'Beata nobis gaudia | anni reduxit orbita'. The rhyme is again very marked, and Fabricius again is the earliest voucher for the Hilarian authorship. But the greatest objection is this. In Hilary's time, and for two centuries more, the Easter hymns were sung up to and including Whitsunday. So that he would not have thought of writing a hymn specially for this latter festival. As late as the Rule of Aurelian of Arles (†555) the Easter 'Hic est dies uerus Dei' of Ambrose¹ covered the whole of the fifty days. And Ambrose expressly says: 'Majores tradidere nobis, Pentecostes omnes quinquaginta dies ut Pascha celebrandos.'²

The last of the eight is 'the noble matin hymn in praise of Christ' 'Hymnum dicat turba fratrum, hymnum cantus personet'³. This really has some definite evidence for its Hilarian authorship. It is in so many words assigned to him by the so-called Antiphony of Bangor, by two ancient codices at St Gall, by two manuscript copies of the Irish *Liber Hymnorum*, and twice by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims⁴. Against this we have to set the fact that Bede, in his mention of the hymn, does not give the writer's name, which (say some) he would have given if it had been Hilary's. But the argument from silence is notoriously unsafe. Bede may have known the hymn to be his and yet not have stated the fact. And it may have been Hilary's without Bede knowing it. The Antiphony was written when Bede was yet a child⁵.

Daniel is inclined to identify the *Hymnum dicat* with the hymn to Christ as God sung before daybreak by the early Christians of Bithynia, and Kayser quotes his opinion with approval. However, it is but a guess, resting upon no direct evidence of any facts that can be

¹ Cf. Daniel i 49; Mone § 167; Thomasius p. 368; Werner 32; Biraghi 63; *Dreves Ambrosius* 136.

² In *Luc.* viii 25 (cf. *Apologia David* viii 42). Ambrose was perhaps not thinking about hymns in particular when he wrote these words, but, considered in the light of Aurelian's Rule mentioned above, they seem to me to indicate that only the Easter hymn was used.

³ J. D. Chambers in *Dict. of Hymnology*.

⁴ The Bangor Antiphony (now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan) was written about 680. St Gall cod. 567 in the eighth, cod. 577 in the ninth century. The two MSS of the Irish *Liber Hymnorum* (Dublin E. 4. 2 and Franciscan Library) in the eleventh century. Hincmar died 882.

⁵ Bede was born about 672.

brought forward other than 'the well-known connexion of the British and Irish Church with the Churches of Asia Minor'. And the hymn of which Pliny speaks was, of course, a Greek one. On the whole then, until stronger rebutting arguments have been brought forward than have been as yet adduced, we may be content to regard Hilary of Poitiers as the writer of the hymn. It is true that Muratori thought that it lacked the elegance that might have been expected in a hymn written by Hilary, and others have echoed his words. But what right have we to look for elegance in Hilary? The directness and simplicity of the hymn have persuaded some that it was not his. To such I should like to point out the contrast in regard to simplicity between one of Browning's elaborate poems, e. g. *Paracelsus*, and the *Pied Piper of Hamelin*. An obscure writer can be plain on occasion, when the obscurity does not arise from confusion of thought, which in Hilary it certainly did not.

It is just possible that the author of the *Hymnum dicat* was not Hilary of Poitiers, nor yet Hilary of Arles, but a third, otherwise unknown, Hilary, who lived in Gaul in the fifth century and who wrote, in 204 hexameters, an account of the Creation, which he dedicated to Pope Leo¹. According to Peiper he also wrote the poem *de martyrio Macchabaeorum* and another *de evangelio*². But with the hymn both the St Gall MSS mentioned above and the Irish preface in the *Liber Hymnorum* expressly connect the Bishop of Poitiers.

There is also a series of verses³—a hymn in the strict sense of the word it is not—often identified with the evening hymn sent by Hilary to his daughter, an abecedarius of twenty-three stanzas and a doxology beginning 'Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sidera | leuare meos infelices oculos'. In spite of Mai and Dreves—and on such a point the weight of their opinion is great—I cannot think that the bishop would have sent to his little girl for her daily use a hymn of such length, and containing such a sentiment as this: '[ingluuies] extendit uentrem, temulentum reddidit, | miscuit risus'. And to me Kayser's criticism appears to be just: 'die darin ausgesprochenen Empfindungen sind übertrieben, die Gefühle unwahr'⁴.

¹ Pope from 440 to 461.

² *Corpus script. eccl. lat.* xxiii 270 ff. This is a fragment of 114 hexameters. It is worth noting that while the *Hymnum dicat*, in enumerating the gifts of the Magi, makes no mention of the *myrrh*—perhaps as not being especially suitable for a king—the poem omits the *gold*. Manitius (*Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie* 101 ff) treats Hilary of Poitiers as the writer of this fragment.

³ Mone i 387 ff, Du Méril *Poésies populaires latines antérieures au xii^{me} siècle* 182 ff. An Ottobon MS of the ninth century attributes the verses—which Mone with a Paris MS (ninth century) entitles *uersus confessionis de luctu paenitentiae*—to Hilary of Poitiers. Others give them to Paulinus of Aquileia; cf. Dümmler i 147.

⁴ *Op. cit.* i^o 69.

The opinion, therefore, at which I have arrived is that almost certainly Hilary did not write the first seven and the *Ad caeli clara*. But the *Hymnum dicat* he probably did write, or at least may have written.

A. S. WALPOLE.

AN ANCIENT OFFICE FOR HOLY SATURDAY.

IN spite of the great labours of liturgiologists in the past there still remain services and customs in old MSS which have not yet been published or described. The communication of a passage in a Vatican MS at the meeting of the Roman Conferences on Christian Archaeology in January last, and the subsequent discussion at the February meeting, seem too important to be lost without some permanent record of a liturgical point then treated for the first time.

The passage in question is found in Cod. Vatic.-Urb. Lat. 602, a troper usually, though without sufficient authority, assigned to Monte-cassino, with Beneventan script and musical notation of the twelfth century; a thirteenth-century writer has inserted on ff. 99-100^{vo} with neums:

S]i quis catechuminus est, procedat.

Si quis hereticus est, procedat.

Si quis iudeus est, procedat.

Si quis paganus est, procedat.

Si quis arrianus est, procedat.

Cuius cura non est, procedat.

I]sti sunt agni novelli qui annuntiaverunt alleluia, modo venerunt ad fontes.

Repleti sunt claritate, alleluia, alleluia.

In conspectu agni amicti stolis albis et pal[

[For convenience, the words *Isti sunt . . . palmis*, which are separated from the preceding by a slight break, will be referred to as Part II.]

The neums clearly shew that these insertions were not made merely to preserve a dead rite, but for actual use. But what rite is referred to? In the absence of other similar texts, the first and not unnatural interpretation was that the first part represented the ancient *missa infidelium* before the oblation, when the catechumens were dismissed by the formula 'Catecumini recedant. Si quis catechuminus est, recedat' (Mabillon *Mus. Ital.*; Lutet. Paris 1684 vol. ii p. 79), whilst the second referred to the words which the subdeacon pronounced on the Saturday *in albis* as he presented to the Pope the wax *Agnus Dei*.

This explanation of *Si quis* &c., seemed to be so at variance with the