

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. I.

MARCH, 1921.

No. 3.

New Thought.

PROF. TH. GRAEBNER, St. Louis, Mo.

"We are not of the earth, earthy, but gods from heaven, for we have always been in heaven and can never get out of heaven. . . . My democracy is the democracy of divinity, for I recognize each human being as a fellow-god. . . . And, my beloved gods and goddesses, we were all there before the earth and before matter, for we are the creators and the originators and operators of this mental universe."

This is New Thought speaking through one of its prophets in *The Nautilus* of December, 1917. (pp. 23—25.) New Thought does many things. It cures a baby of constipation when you say to it, for three days, "You are no longer constipated — you are a perfect being." (p. 37.) It overcomes appendicitis without recourse to the knife. (p. 38.) By speaking "helpful little phrases" before falling into slumber at night, one devotee has become successful in business. (p. 47.) New Thought is just the thing to help one become a successful poultry-raiser (p. 49), and by "investing in an annual subscription to this unparalleled monthly" (*The Nautilus*), the mind is renewed along the line of St. Paul's counsel to "be transformed by the renewing of mind." (p. 52.) But, above all, it assures its believers of their essential identity with the God-head; not union, but identity. "We are not of the earth, earthy, but gods from heaven." Ralph Waldo Trine, one of its high priests, writes: "Man is god incarnate."

At present there are, if their statistics can be relied upon, about five million gods and goddesses in the world. Of these the greater number are said to live in what has been called the "pay-streak of our civilization," — the band of population stretching along the forty-first degree of latitude. From New York City the cult reports 700,000 adherents, from Pittsburgh 350,000, from

The Authenticity of Matt. 6, 13b and of 1 John 5, 7.

REV. P. E. KRETZMANN, PH. D., St. Louis, Mo.

We Lutherans are no exponents of higher criticism, especially not in the form in which it has been practised by certain liberal and radical theologians during the last one hundred and fifty years, both here and abroad. To approach the Bible in a subjective attitude, to presume upon an explanation of its eternal verities with preconceived notions, that is to us blasphemy, pure and simple. But this does not mean that we are, by principle, averse to a sane criticism of the transmitted text. The sciences of Isagogics and Hermeneutics are not relegated by us into a dim background, but are taught and utilized by us as the basis for sound exegetical work. So much being understood, the chances are that the present discussion may prove of some value.

So far as the doxology of the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6, 13 b, is concerned, its authenticity and canonicity has been called into question since the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot (1513 to 1517). Erasmus, and afterward Beza, agreed with the editors of this momentous work. Since their time the question has been debated, occasionally with great vigor, by Bible students and commentators. The Catholic writers, almost to a man, reject the passage, since it does not occur in the Vulgate, and therefore is missing also in Wyclif's translation of 1380, in the German translation by Van Ess, and in the Rheims Version of 1582. Luther did not include the doxology in his early explanations of 1518 and 1519 (St. Louis Ed., 7, 712—821), although he included a short exposition in his commentary on Matt. 5—7 of 1532 (7, 510). The words are found in the Textus Receptus, but have since been rejected by the majority of Protestant scholars, including all those most prominent in the field of textual criticism, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, Nestle, Souter, and others, one notable exception being Scrivener, who defended the genuineness of the passage with much vigor (*A Supplement to the Authorized English Version of the New Testament*, 1845). There is also a recent able summary in favor of its authenticity (*Hom. Mag.*, 1919, 567 f.).

The facts which speak against the genuineness of the passage are the following. It is not found in the most ancient and most reliable uncial manuscripts, in the Sinaiticus (4th century), the Vaticanus (4th century), the Cantabrigiensis, or Codex Bezae (5th or 6th century), and the Dublinensis rescriptus (6th century), nor is it contained in at least five cursives, namely, Nos. 1, 17, 118,

130, and 209 (all of a much later date). The Latin fathers, Tertullian (who calls the sixth and seventh petitions the *clausula* of the prayer), Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, have no notes upon it. The Alexandrine codices did not contain the doxology, for it is missing in Origen and in the Coptic Version, at least in that of the northern dialect. It is found neither in the Arabian nor the Persian versions, and Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus Confessor, and Caesarius make no mention of it. Moreover, it is strange that Euthymius Zigabenus, the great Byzantine theologian, in the fragments of his *Panoplia*, accuses the Bogomiles of rejecting the *epiphonema* of the Lord's Prayer, as added by the fathers: *to para ton theion phosteron kai tes ekklesias kathegeton prostethen akroteleution epiphonema — to hoti sou estin he basileia kai he doxa tou patros kai tou hyiou kai tou hagiou pneumatos — oude akousai anechontai.*

The weight of evidence against the genuineness of the doxology becomes still heavier if we consider that none of the earlier texts exhibit the formula as the Textus Receptus has it, or as it was found in the later cursives. The *Didache* (1st or 2d century) simply has: *hoti sou estin he dynamis kai he doxa eis tous aionas* (Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I, 320). *The Apostolic Constitutions* (Book VII, chapter 24) has: *hoti sou estin he basileia eis tous aionas, amen.* In the Sahidic or Thebaic Egyptian Version the formula has: *he dynamis kai to kratos.* In two cursives of the 12th century, namely, Nos. 157 (Rome) and 225 (Vienna), there is an addition after *doxa tou patros kai tou hyiou kai hagiou pneumatos.*

The objection is made that the doxology is found in the Syriac Versions, especially in the Peshitta of the second century. This is true; and it is a fact, also, that Chrysostom (*In Matthaicum*, Homilia XX, Ed. Frankofurti ad Moenum, Col., 246) has the verse: *hoti sou estin he basileia kai he dynamis kai he doxa eis tous aionas, amen.* These two, however, are the only real witnesses which can be brought in defense of the passage, for the other Syriac versions, the Philoxeniana and the Hierosolymitana, as well as the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Gregorian versions were not in existence before the fourth century.

The explanation for the interpolation of the doxology in the later manuscripts, especially in the cursives, is probably the following. From the beginning, the influence of the Jewish liturgy upon that of the Apostolic Church, as Cabrol (*Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, Vol. I) and others have shown, was very strong, and

an examination of the synagog prayers, as they have been preserved through the centuries, shows a verbal agreement of the several clauses of the doxology. It seems, therefore, that the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer was added on the basis of the Jewish liturgy and 2 Tim. 4, 18. This was done at a very early date, probably before the end of the first century. Various formulas were in use, as the Oriental liturgies show, but the one found in the Peshitta and in Chrysostom was interpolated in some manuscripts and found general acceptance, especially in the Orient. Incidentally, we agree with Schaff, when he writes: "No one can doubt the eminent propriety of this solemn conclusion which we are accustomed to regard from infancy as an integral part of the prayer of prayers, and which we would now never think of sacrificing to critical considerations in our popular Bibles and public and private devotions" (Lange-Schaff, *Matthew*, 568). —

The decision as to the genuineness of 1 John 5, 7 is almost as difficult. Luther remarks on this verse: "It seems that this verse was inserted by the orthodox with reference to the Arians, which insertion, however, was not congruous, because he does not speak of the witnesses in heaven, but of the witnesses on earth, in either case" (9, 1507 f.). This was in 1527. In 1529 and 1530 Luther evidently had a later edition of the Erasmusian New Testament, for he explains verse 7 without comment as to its authenticity (9, 1636). In his *Church Postil* the words are omitted (12, 535). Among recent Lutheran writers in this country, opinions are divided (*Hom. Mag.*, 28 [1904], 104; Zorn, *Die drei Episteln Sankt Johannis*, 30).

The manuscript evidence is overwhelmingly opposed to the passage, since the latter is not found in any of the uncials, and in none of the cursives till the fourteenth or the fifteenth century, namely, in codex rescr. 173, in numbers 34 and 162, and 61 (Dublin), and 629. The words are also missing in practically all the ancient versions, and are not found in the Latin versions before the eighth century. Not one of the older Greek fathers quotes the verse, nor is it referred to by any of the older Latin fathers.

Some writers, it is true, have objected to this statement, naming Tertullian (d. 220 or 240), Cyprian (d. 258), and Phoebadius (bishop of Aginnum, near Bordeaux, d. after 392) as men who had used this passage in arguments. But a close examination of the passages in question does not bear this out. Tertullian writes: *Connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paraclete, tres efficit cohaerentes*

alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sunt, non unus, quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus [John 10, 30], (*Adversus Praxean*, cap. 25). Thus he expressly takes his proof-text from the Gospel of John, not from the Epistle. The words of Cyprian are: *Dicit Dominus: Ego et Pater unum sumus, et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est: ET HI TRES UNUM SUNT* (*De Unitate Ecclesiae*). But his reference is to verse 8, according to the later symbolical interpretation, which identified *pneuma*, *hydor*, and *haima* with the three persons of the Godhead. (Cp. the *Scholias* of Matthaëi and the explanation given by Facundus of Hermiane in the 6th century.) The passage from Phoebadius reads: *Unum tam Deus, QUIA TRES UNUM SUNT* (*Contra Arianos*, cap. 45; Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 20, 31—50), a reference which is not complete enough to permit definite conclusions.

There is only one reference which cannot be questioned, namely, that reported from the *Conventus generalis episcoporum catholicorum diversarum provinciarum Africae*, A. D. 484 (Mansi, 7, 1149). There we read, under the heading: *B. Eugenii episcopi carthaginensis fidei catholicae ratio: Et ut adhuc luce clarius unius divinitatis esse cum Patre et Filio Spiritum Sanctum doceamus, Joannis evangelista testimonio comprobatur; ait namque, Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant (perhibent) in coelo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt*. This testimony is so clear that it permits of but two explanations: either there was a manuscript in use in North Africa which contained the words or the interpolation on the basis of Cyprian's allegorical interpretation had been generally accepted.

With this one exception, it seems certain beyond a reasonable doubt that verse 7 is a later addition, being usually ascribed to the time of Priscillian (d. 385), and after him to Vigilius of Thapsus, about a century later. The verse was originally in Latin, the Greek translation being inserted in the *Complutensian Polyglot* after the transactions of the Lateran Council of 1215. Erasmus did not accept the verse in his editions of 1516 and 1518, but yielded to the pressure of the Church in 1522, because it was contained in the *Codex Britannicus* (No. 34). Robert Stephanus followed Erasmus in 1546—1569, Beza in 1565—1576, and so the words found their way into the *Textus Receptus*. In the German versions, that is, the Wittenberg Bibles, the verse does not appear between 1522 and 1545. As much as we love the passage, and as truly as we know that it contains divine truth, we cannot let our subjective attitude set aside incontrovertible objective facts.