THE

ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XIV.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER LXXIX.

JULY, 1890

CONTENTS

BOSTON

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS — SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $4.

THE

ANDOVER REVIEW:

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XIV.—JULY, 1890.—No. LXXIX.

THE NATURAL GROUNDS OF BELIEF IN A PERSONAL IMMORTALITY.[1]

IN this statement of my subject I would emphasize two words: First, *Natural.* There may be *other* grounds of belief in immortality. I am here concerned only with those derived from the study of *nature* external and internal. Again, *Personal.* By personality I of course mean not *bodily* but *spiritual* personality — that is, self-consciousness, free will, and rational thought. So much was necessary lest you carry in your mind a false impression of my real subject. My mode of treating it, I fear, may seem to you a little abstruse. But what could I do? The seriousness of the subject is so extreme that it will not submit itself to the mere forms of rhetoric. It would seem almost an impertinence to attempt to *popularize* in the ordinary sense of that word. Nevertheless, I believe that with your earnest attention I *can* make it perfectly intelligible.

Contrary to my frequent practice I have written out what I shall say. I have done so because I dared not trust myself to extemporaneous delivery in a subject on which every word ought to be weighed.

Many of the thoughts here embodied may be found scattered about in my published writings, but in other connections, and expressed in different words. I have gathered them here in con-

[1] This article was prepared as an address to the University branch of the Young Men's Christian Association in March, 1889. On account of sickness it was not delivered. By request it was delivered to a popular audience at the Methodist Church in Berkeley, Cal., in March last.

weather these Six-Principle believers sat in the unheated, freezing church, with a patient godliness that seemed to deserve a better fate than that of extinction.

But selfish and passive goodness is not all that is necessary. This dying church teaches in its career and in its fast-approaching end the unswerving truth, that the life and success and advancement of the Christian Church is not in faith alone, but in deeds. May this short account of its quiet and fading existence help to extend the lesson.

Alice Morse Earle.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE "TE DEUM."

THERE are three distinct stages in the development of the early Latin hymnody, — the Hebraic, the classic, and the popular. The first belongs to that age when the Psalm-Book was still the chief manual of the church's praises, and the influence of classic culture was felt but slightly. The second is that inaugurated by Hilary and Ambrose, in which the quantitative metres, borrowed by the classic Latin poets from their Greek predecessors, were introduced with more or less consistency into the church's songs of praise. The third is that of a return to the accented and rhymed verse which constituted the primitive and really popular poetry of the Latin tongue, and which still survived among the peasants, the artificers, and the soldiers, after it had been banished from literary use. The name of Pope Damasus is inseparably associated with this revival of the genuine and native poetry of the Latin tongue. In addition to these, there were some attempts to adopt into the Latin hymns the alliterative forms of Celtic and Teutonic verse, but they were not carried out with any thoroughness.

The remains of the second and third eras or states of hymnodic development are ample and valuable, and they constitute the body of the hymns of the early Latin Church. But those of the first stage are not so. We have many Latin hymns, but very few Latin psalms. Partly this may be due to the fact that the productive force in this field was but weak; more probably it was due to the formless and free character of these compositions. As we see from the Apostle's reference to the matter (1 Cor. xiv. 26), the freedom of individual action in composing for the praises of

the church was as great as in the case of its prayers. They might be made up under the inspiration of the moment, as is still done by the freedmen of the South, the composer bearing the burden in singing, and the people joining in the refrain. Unpremeditated and formless compositions of this kind seldom would be thought worthy of preservation; and if any came down to us they would be those whose extraordinary excellence had impressed them on the memories of the hearers. So even in the Greek Church there are but half a dozen of these Christian psalms still in existence, and in Latin hymnody just half as many, of which one is certainly a translation from the Greek, and a second partly so. The three are the "Gloria in excelsis Deo," the "Te Deum laudamus," and the "Salvum fac populum tuum," which we find appended to the "Te Deum laudamus," but which I shall endeavor to show is an independent hymn.

Of the "Gloria in excelsis" we have the Greek original in the Apostolical Constitutions and in the Alexandrian manuscript of the New Testament. As for the Latin version, we only know that it must have been made before the rise of the Macedonian heresy with regard to the godhead of the Holy Spirit, as both the original and the translation have been interpolated with regard to that heresy, but in different places. It therefore was translated most probably before A. D. 381, when Macedonius and his following were condemned by the Second Ecumenical Synod. This is the lower limit of date, but it may have been composed more than two centuries earlier. Bunsen is positive that it is the very hymn Pliny found the Christians of Bithynia singing in the opening years of the second century, and that in alternative strophes after the Hebrew fashion (*carmen Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*). As he says, "there is no trace in it of any metre; and indeed it would be quite inexplicable if we found in it any but the primitive Hebrew element. . . . It is easily reducible to the antiphonic system of Hebrew poetry."

The composite hymn we call the "Te Deum laudamus" cannot — as it stands — be older than the beginning of the fifth century or younger than the first quarter of the sixth. If it be all of a piece, — that is, if the "Salvum fac populum" be inseparable from the earlier part of the psalm, — these are the two limits of its date. As it uses in its last verses the Vulgate version of the Latin Scriptures, finished by Jerome in A. D. 404, it cannot be much older than A. D. 450, when that version, in spite of the hostile influence of Augustine of Hippo, would be established

in liturgic use. And as it is mentioned in the Monastic Rules of Cæsarius of Arles, and of Benedict of Nursia, it cannot be of later date than A. D. 525–530.

This is what makes it especially well worth inquiring whether we have before us two psalms of different date, or only one psalm, in what we call the "Te Deum." All attempts to establish a higher antiquity for the whole composition have broken down. The most careful comparison of all the early manuscript copies shows the influence of the Vulgate in each and all, as regards those concluding verses. If they are part of the original psalm, then it is not the work of Ambrose or of Hilary, or of any still earlier poet of the era before Ambrose and Hilary substituted classic for Hebraic forms in the praise songs of the church. It is of the fifth century, and by some unknown poet, who may be the Abundus, or the Sisebutus, or the Nicetas, to each of whom it is ascribed vaguely by early but uncritical writers.

The psalm, however, bears so evidently the stamp of a greater antiquity than this, that some have tried to overcome the difficulty by assuming that it is a comparatively late translation of a very early Greek psalm. But here, also, there is a want of evidence, and also a strong presumption to the contrary. No Greek original has ever been found for any but three of the concluding verses (24, 25, 26). And is it likely that if the Greek Church ever had possessed so great a psalm as this, it would have allowed it to lapse into oblivion? If it already existed in Greek, why did the compiler of the Apostolical Constitutions ignore it, while inserting others of far less value? It is true that the Byzantine Church was so much enamored of its elaborate and long-drawn "troparia" and "canons," as to neglect the earlier Greek hymnody almost entirely. But we are not dependent on the Byzantines in this matter, and in all the ample literature of the Greek Church — liturgic, historical, and dogmatic — there has not been found a trace of an allusion to our psalm. It would be no compliment to the Greek Church to deprive the Latin of the credit and honor of having given the "Te Deum" to the Christian world.

On the other hand, if we draw a line of division between the twenty-first and the twenty-second verses of the psalm, we shall find no difficulty in giving to each of the psalms, into which we thus divide the whole, its proper place and honor. As it is necessary for my purpose that my readers should have the original text before them, I insert it here in its authentic form: —

1 Te Deum laudamus ;
Te Dominum confitemur.
2 Te æternem Patrem omnis terra veneratur.
3 Tibi omnes Angeli,
Tibi cœli et universæ Potestates,
4 Tibi Cherubim et Seraphim incessabili voce proclamant :
5 Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth,
6 Pleni sunt cœli et terra majestatis tuæ gloriæ.
7 Te gloriosus Apostolorum chorus,
8 Te Prophetarum laudabilis numerus,
9 Te Martyrum candidatus laudat exercitus.
10 Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur Ecclesia,
11 Patrem immensæ majestatis,
12 Venerandum tuum verum et unicum Filium,
13 Sanctum quoque Paraclitum Spiritum.
14 Tu rex gloriæ, Christe,
15 Tu Patris sempiternus es Filius.
16 Tu ad liberandum mundum suscepisti hominem ;
Non horruisti Virginis uterum.
17 Tu, devicto mortis aculeo,
Aperuisti credentibus regna cœlorum.
18 Tu ad dexteram Dei sedes in gloria Patris.
19 Judex crederis esse venturus.
20 Te ergo quæsumus, tuis famulis subveni,
Quos pretioso sanguine redemptisti.
21 Æterna fac cum sanctis tuis gloria munerari.

22 (1) Salvum fac populum tuum, Domine,
Et benedic hereditati tuæ. (Psalm xxviii. 9.)
23 (2) Et rege eos,
Et extolle illos usque in æternum. (Ibidem.)
24 (3) Per singulos dies benedicimus Te,
25 (4) Et laudamus nomen Tuum
In sæculum et in sæculum sæculi. (Psalm cxv. 2.)
26 (5) Dignare, Domine, die isto
Sine peccato nos custodire.
27 (6) Miserere nostri, Domine,
Miserere nostri.
28 (7) Fiat misericordia tua, Domine, super nos,
Quemadmodum speravimus in Te. (Psalm xxxiii. 22.)
29 (8) In Te, Domine, speravi ;
Non confundar in æternum. (Psalm xxxi. 1.)

It will be observed that I have separated the "Salvum fac populum" from the rest. I now proceed to give the reasons for this.

1. The difference in tone and in content calls for the separation. Long before my attention was directed to this question, I became conscious of a break at verse 22 whenever I heard the psalm chanted. I am not learned in music, but I venture the

assertion that there is a substantial recognition of this break in the best musical settings. The "Te Deum" proper has a unity of impression, which is missed when the "Salvum fac" is added to it. It has a triumphant tone of exultation, which disappears after verse 21. It has an objectivity and a concreteness, which is lacking in this appendix. As A. W. Schlegel says of the best early hymns, it is epic and narrative in character, while the "Salvum fac" is lyric, pleading, and pathetic. The "Te Deum" fixes our thoughts on the sufficiency of God in Christ; the "Salvum fac" turns from this highest level of Christian praise to dwell on the weakness and the needfulness of man. The "Te Deum" is intensely and historically Christian; the "Salvum fac" for the most part is taken from the Old Testament, and, except perhaps in verse 26 (5), it never rises above that level.

2. There is one peculiarity of the "Te Deum" which runs through verse after verse, but which entirely disappears in the "Salvum fac." It is the beginning lines with a pronoun of the second person singular. Of the twenty-six lines in the arrangement given, five begin with "Tu"; three with "Tibi"; six with "Te." Of the fourteen lines of the "Salvum fac" not one has this kind of a beginning, the nearest approach to it being the "In Te" of verse 29 (8), although in several places it would have involved neither an alteration of the sense nor a weakening of the expression to have adopted the peculiarity of the "Te Deum." And this was a more striking peculiarity in a Latin composition of any kind than it would be in a psalm in any modern language, because the Latin was so much accustomed to suppress the nominative cases of personal pronouns, as rendered needless by the inflexional terminations of the verb. To a Cicero or a Catullus, the "Te Deum" would have sounded barbarous. The "Salvum fac" does not offend classic taste in this way, even where a similarity might have been expected.

3. The Bible of the author of the "Te Deum" was the early Itala version, made from the Greek in both the Old and the New Testaments. The Bible of the author of the "Salvum fac" was the Vulgate translation made from the Hebrew and Greek originals of the Scriptures by Jerome in A. D. 362–404.

(*a*) In verse 4 of the "Te Deum" we have the Trisagion or Seraphic hymn, from Isaiah vi. 3. As in all the Greek and Oriental liturgies, the Cherubim are associated with the Seraphim in the introduction to it. As in all the ancient liturgies, *cœli* (the heavens) are associated with *terra* (the earth) in the second

line. Of the expansion of "Thy glory" into "the majesty of Thy glory" I shall speak farther on.

Unfortunately no manuscript of the Itala version of Isaiah is known to be in existence. But it is noteworthy that the Septuagint (from which it was made) retains instead of translating the Hebrew word "*Sabaoth*" while Jerome translates it by "*exercituum.*" So the "Te Deum" has "*Sabaoth,*" as the Itala almost certainly had.

(*b*) In verse 17 of the "Te Deum" the expression "*mortis aculeo*" is an obvious reference to the expression in 1 Cor. xv. 55, rendered in the English version "the sting of death." Jerome renders the phrase by "*stimulus mortis,*" while the Itala had "*mortis aculeus*" just as our psalm has.

(*c*) The "*æterna . . . gloria munerari*" of verse 21 seems to me to contain an allusion to Romans vi. 23. But if so, then the author of our psalm had before him the Itala and not the Vulgate version of that text, for the former brings out the idea reproduced in this verse, while the latter obscures it: —

Itala: *Stipendia enim delinquentiæ mors*, donativum *autem Dei vita æterna in Christo Jesu domino nostro.*

Vulgate: *Stipendia enim peccati mors*, gratia *autem Dei vita æterna in Christo Jesu domino nostro.*

Jerome's rendering of χάρισμα is the more literal, but the Itala catches the military allusion, — the contrast between the soldier's hard-earned pay and the unearned donatives by which his general seeks his regard and confidence. And this corresponds to the representation of eternal life as a gift in our psalm, — an idea which is obliterated in the ordinary text and the current English version by the corruption of "*munerari*" into "*numerari.*"

(*d*) There are other allusions to passages of Scripture in the "Te Deum": but they offer nothing decisive as to our argument. They contain nothing peculiar to the Itala version. But there is nothing peculiar to the Vulgate in any of the twenty-one verses we have designated as constituting the original and genuine "Te Deum."

On the other hand, the eight verses of the "Salvum fac" contain no less than four distinct quotations from the Vulgate version of the Psalms, and it is the presence of these which has stood in the way of assigning a very early date to the whole psalm.

4. While there is but one recension (with a few various readings) of the "Te Deum," there are five recensions of the "Salvum fac," which differ markedly from each other: —

(1) In the Vatican Library there is an old Roman psalter, which gives but four verses out of the eight, and those in a different order: 24, 25, 22, 23. This is followed by a verse from the apocryphal additions to Daniel (iii. 26).

(2) The famous Psalter of Queen Christina of Sweden, probably compiled in Italy in the seventh century, also now in the Vatican Library, has only verse 26, with the same verse from the apocryphal Daniel.

(3) A third Vatican manuscript gives us verses 22, 23, the verse from the apocryphal Daniel, 26, 27.

(4) The famous Bangor Antiphonary, which gives the hymns used by the Irish Church in the seventh century, gives verses 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, and omits verses 26, 27, and 29.

These differences seem to arise from different handlings of a Greek psalm, which is found in the Alexandrian Manuscript of the New Testament. For the sake of exact comparison I give it in the Latin: —

(24) 1. Per singulos dies benedicam Tibi,
(25) 2. Et laudabo nomen Tuum in sæculum
Et in sæculum sæculi. (Psalm cxv. 2.)
(26) 3. Dignare, Domine, die isto
Sine peccato nos custodire.
4. Benedictus es, Domine,
Deus patrum nostrûm;
Et laudabile et gloriosum nomen Tuum,
In sæcula. Amen. (Dan. iii. 26.)

Now be it noted that the notion of a Greek original for the "Te Deum" has nothing to go upon except this Greek original of a part of the "Salvum fac." And that this is a later appendix to our psalm is indicated by difference of structure and of content, by the use of a later version of the Latin Bible, by its variety of recensions, and by its relations to a Greek hymn, of which it is a partial translation.

If we detach the "Salvum fac" from the "Te Deum," what are we able to say of the home and date of the great Latin psalm, which thus emerges out of the confusions produced by their association? On neither point is there anything like certainty, but we are justified in assigning it to an earlier date than the great Christological controversies, which began early in the fourth century; and also earlier than the introduction of classic metres into the praises of the church, which probably was begun by Hilary of Poitiers shortly before A. D. 360. The Christology of our psalm, although sound and Scriptural, is not of the developed type which

the church reached through those controversies; and the phrase "*suscepisti hominem*," although thought orthodox enough in the age of Augustine, was tabooed after the condemnation of Nestorius at Rome in A. D. 430.

These are the certainties. The probability, I think, is that the "Te Deum" originated in the province of Africa, where Minucius Felix and Tertullian made the beginning of a Christian Latin literature in the second century, when the literature of the Church of Italy and of Southern Gaul was still Greek. Our psalm probably belongs, not to theirs but the next generation, and to what has been called, from the martyr bishop of Carthage, "the Cyprianic Age." He presided over that see in A. D. 248–258, at a time when the separatist tendencies, which afterward took final shape in Donatism, were already manifesting themselves in the schism of Novatian. Against those tendencies he wrote his chief work, "De Unitate Ecclesiæ." Is it not possible that we have an allusion to them in the tenth verse: "*Te per orbem terrarum sancta confitetur Ecclesia*"? It was to the Donatists that Augustine afterwards used that retort, which had so decisive an influence on the mind of John Henry Newman: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" And may not the twentieth verse, "*Te ergo quæsumus, tuis famulis subveni, quos pretioso sanguine redemptisti*," be, in the first instance, the cry of a church under the cross of heathen persecution?

But there is closer evidence than this of a connection with that province and the age of Cyprian. Among his genuine treatises there is one, "De Mortalitate," in which he exhorts his flock against the fear of death at the hands of the church's enemies. Among the considerations he uses to this end is the hope of a joyful reception in heaven from those who dwell there: "There the great company of our dear ones — parents, brothers, children — awaits us, and the abundant throng of those who in their own security are none the less concerned for our salvation. . . . There the glorious choir of the Apostles, there the exulting company of the Prophets, there of the Martyrs a multitude beyond number and crowned for the victory of their contest and passion, there the triumphant Virgins," etc. To appreciate the degree of the resemblance of Cyprian's expressions to verses 7–9 of the "Te Deum," it is necessary to see the Latin of his words: —

> "Illic Apostolorum gloriosus chorus;
> Illic Prophetarum exsultantium numerus;
> Illic Martyrum innumerabilis populus,

Ob certaminis et passionis victoriam coronatus ;
Triumphantes illis Virgines," etc.

Surely the coincidences both of the expressions and of the order in which they occur are much too close to be the result of mere coincidence of thought, even as guided by the language of the Book of the Revelation, to which the "Te Deum" refers. Did the martyr-bishop write with the words of our psalm in his mind, or did the author of the psalm find its suggestion in the treatise "De Mortalitate"? The probabilities are in favor of the former supposition, (1) because the expressions of the psalm are briefer, more concrete, and more poetical than those of Cyprian; (2) because these three verses of the psalm are part of a series equally lofty, which are represented by nothing in the bishop's text. Our Psalmist has not copied; he has seen the vision with his own mental eye. What to Cyprian, for instance, was only a "populus" or throng, takes to him the character of an "exercitus" — a great army with its ordered ranks. It is made visible to us as well as conceivable by the felicitous adjective "candidatus," so poorly rendered in the current English version. He, not Cyprian, is the poet, the original. Cyprian writes with the Scripture and our psalm both running through his mind, and he takes from both.

There is one bit of evidence which might seem to point us to Spain rather than Africa for the author of the "Te Deum." In its sixth verse the Biblical phrase "Thy glory" is expanded into "the majesty of Thy glory," as in the version of the Trisagion found in the Mozarabic Liturgy of the early Spanish Church. This is not found in any other of the ancient liturgies, although the Egyptian group have it "Thy holy glory," and the Syrian of St. James expands it into "Thy glory, honor, and majesty." The rest follow the text of the Hebrew and the Septuagint, so far as we have them. But we have no text of the Liturgy of the church in Africa, and no complete text of the old Gallican Liturgy. The Vandals of Africa destroyed the former; the vandals of Rome made away with the latter. So the Mozarabic Liturgy may have got its version of the Trisagion from the African Liturgy, either directly or through the Gallican Liturgy, for anything we know.

H. A. Daniel thinks the "Te Deum" originated in Gaul, probably because the first authentic mention of it is in the "Regula ad Monachos" of Cæsarius, who was bishop of Arles in A. D. 501–542, and who may have written that rule before his becoming bishop. He suggests that it was the work either of the Hilary who in 429–449 was bishop of the same see, or of some monk of

that notable monastery of Lerins, where Cæsarius received his training without absorbing its Semipelagianism. But we hear nothing of Hilary of Arles being a poet, and both suggestions would probably never have been made if Daniel had been aware that the "Te Deum" proper is older than the Vulgate.

Yet another problem is that of the unity of the "Te Deum" proper. Are all these twenty-one verses one psalm, the work of the same author, written on the same occasion? Professor Hort, of Cambridge, whom I consulted with reference to the Itala version of Isaiah, tells me that for thirty years past he has been convinced that verses 1 to 13 constitute a hymn to the Trinity, and verses 14 to 21 a hymn to Christ. A somewhat similar opinion has been defended by Rev. E. P. Gray, of the Protestant Episcopal Church; but he, unlike Professor Hort, fails to separate the "Salvum fac" from the "Te Deum." He takes the verses 14 to 28 as constituting the second hymn.

The reasons given for making a division between verses 13 and 14 are: (1.) The structure of verses 1 to 13 in triplets, while that of verses 14 to 21 is in couplets, — the former (it is said) with reference to the three persons of the Trinity, and the latter with similar reference to the two natures in Christ. There is some appearance of such a purpose, but it may just as well have been introduced into two parts of the same psalm with this symbolical intent, as into two independent psalms. (2.) The absence of vocative cases of nouns and pronouns in the first part, and also of verbs in the second person, even where we should have expected to find them, as contrasted with the presence of both in the second part. (3.) The use of the term "*æternus*" as applied to one person of the Trinity in part first, while the term "*sempiternus*" is employed in the same connection in the second. This argument is much weakened by the use of the phrase "*æterna . . . gloria*" in the second, as eternal life and glory were called such from their relation to the life and glory of God.

The second consideration seems to have the most weight in favor of recognizing a farther subdivision of the psalm than that for which I have been contending. But all three amount to much less than the reasons for sundering the "Salvum fac" from the "Te Deum." That should be made for the sake of the psalm itself. Not only is the composite hymn too long for ordinary use, but it is deprived of that unity of effect which characterizes every great poem, by the shift from one line of thought and feeling to another at the end of verse 21. It is almost as though we were to try to patch out Doddridge's

"Hark the glad sound! the Saviour comes,"

from Watts's

"Look how we grovel here below."

Its organic character is obliterated by an appendix fastened to it in an external fashion, and also its character as "the triumphal hymn," so that it leaves the Christian congregation in a state of uncertainty whether New Testament exultation in the great facts of redemption, or Old Testament pleading for a grace dimly realized in hope and sorely needed in experience, were the more rightful attitude of Christian praise. Taken by itself, the "Te Deum" assumes more distinctly its place as the first and grandest psalm of Western Christendom, whose use connects our worship with that of the Martyr Age of the church.

Robert Ellis Thompson.

University of Pennsylvania.