

A REVIEW OF
J. J. KLOHA'S DISSERTATION:
"A TEXTUAL COMMENTARY ON
PAUL'S FIRST EPISTLE
TO THE CORINTHIANS"

reviewer: Mr. Gary S. Dykes
copyright © 2010

First published in PDF format at:
www.Biblical-data.org

In August of 2006 Jeffrey John Kloha (now Dr. Kloha) presented his dissertation to the University of Leeds for his PhD. The work was overseen by Prof. J. K. Elliott. It was produced in four parts with the pages being numbered consecutively, for a total of 1340 pages. It has just been recently made available on-line in PDF format.

One's first impression is that the work is extensive, and seemingly covers quite thoroughly the text of First Corinthians. The commentary portion precedes the portion which illustrates the various readings on a verse by verse basis. The work is nicely formatted and easy to use. Dr. Kloha has provided a fine textual commentary, and it is quite useful for analyzing this epistle. However like most works of this nature—in which the writer tries to be comprehensive—a number of errors exist. The work has not been properly proof-read, thus new errors and older citation errors are propagated.

Part of the problem is that Dr. Kloha did not double check many of his references. He presents data which may or may not be true. This is because he actually collated so few of the witnesses to his text. Most of his textual variations stem from the works of others. Consequently, without the actual manuscripts in-hand, he was unable to verify the readings. With an error-ridden apparatus his commentary loses some of its value especially when the commentary focuses upon some variant reading. The errors also distort his statistics and charts which he occasionally presents.

His presentation of the data is visually pleasing and well organized. He uses underlines to identify readings which he borrows

from Tischendorf and Von Soden. He puts into italics citations from the efforts of the Institute in Muenster (the Nestle editions, the *Text und Textert* series and *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*). He also references many other resources, including Old Latin and Vulgate materials. He indicates the sources for his collations:

- (1) collated from manuscripts - F, 876
- (2) collated from published photographs or facsimile editions:
P⁴⁶, codices 01, 02, 03, 012 and Old Latin 77.
- (3) collated from photographs: D, 5, 88, 614, 629, 915,
AMst(A), Old Latin 75
- (4) collated from microfilm: H, K, L, 088, 0289, 6, 256, 263,
424, 489, 1739, Old Latin 78

He also collated from published transcriptions, such as codices 04, 016, 0201, and 0270. One would expect accurate readings from the above MSS, however this is not the case [s.v. 1:2 below]. Certainly Dr. Kloha did not spend enough time on this project. Any haste will equate to an unreliable apparatus. He simply worked too quickly. Still the effort is certainly worthy of a PhD dissertation. There were instances in which I was able to use Kloha's apparatus to correct my own, which was accomplished by my double checking the actual MS for the reading in question. Kloha also states that he refers to Dr. Reuben Swanson's work. One would think that when he and Swanson disagreed that the disagreement would motivate him to offer a correction, often this simply went unnoticed.

Methodology proved to be a serious setback for young Dr. Kloha, or perhaps one might prefer to label it "one's philosophy". He maintains the popular view that the Byzantine text-type is secondary, and that it is a later emendation of earlier original texts. Of course it is

not expected that such a novice as Dr. Kloha, would go beyond popular theories and opinions. Perhaps in time he may develop a healthy view of textual criticism of the Greek New Testament. He discusses his thoughts on the Byzantine text-type on pages 708-710. He also discusses the Greek-Latin bilingual MSS 06, 010, and 012. One of his conclusions is:

As a result, the "Byzantine" witnesses are never an independent witness.
page 709

Such a naive comment is typical of those who do not do deep independent work, but rely on their peers for insight. Certainly there are readings which are original which are also only seen in Byzantine witnesses.

For example:

The particle τε at 1:2 provides a proper dichotomy (two places being implied), only the Byzantine manuscripts retain it. It was omitted in the latter Egyptian emendations including the original hand of Codex 02.

The most suitable reading (εβαπτισθη) at 1:15 is only seen in a few Byzantine minuscules.

Certainly Paul meant Greeks (ελλησι) and not simply Gentiles at 1:23. Greeks is only seen in the Byzantine manuscripts.

At 2:4 the reading περιθους ανθρωπινης σοφιας λογοις is the preferred reading, in my mind; which reading is only seen in the Byzantine manuscripts.

Since this is a dissertation, Dr. Kloha certainly did not want to shake up those who guided him, nor any faculties; earning a PhD is also seen as a career objective, necessary for career development and

income for his family. Thus it is not to be jeopardized (at least by most applicants). It is generally accepted that errors of omission occur more frequently than errors of addition. The latter Egyptian text-type often omits words and phrases, which the earlier Byzantine (or even the early Antiochian text) correctly retains.

In his concluding remarks he states that his goal has been realized in ascertaining why the manuscripts were altered in the earliest period of transmission, up to the fourth century (page 714). Any student will immediately recognize that the period up to the fourth century is filled with witnesses from Egypt, other than the Syriac and Gothic. Thus he fills in the gaps NOT seen in the Byzantine witnesses, with the prevailing popular speculations. All of which are biased because he supposes that the early Byzantine text, is not early. His view is totally upside down, had he recognized that the Byzantine text-type is indeed the earliest, then he could explain the alterations seen in the Egyptian and western witnesses. But such is current scholarship, and in the current milieu, he creates no cause for concern.

Below are a few examples of some of his errors:

(each verse reference is, of course in First Corinthians)

1:2 (page 724) he cites MS 326 as reading $\eta\rho\omega\nu \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ which it does not read. However MS 876 does read this, which MS he often neglects to cite.

1:4 (page 726) again he provides a false reading of MS 326, which contains $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.

1:6 (page 728) we note that some MSS are displayed in the format which indicated that they were newly collated by Kloha (i.e. not underlined nor in italics), such as MS 33. What is his source for this reading? Or is this a typo?

1:7 (page 729) as an example; we recall the citation of MS 33, above. Yet in this verse it is missing, not cited. This example displays the inconsistency seen in this effort, many manuscripts are cited haphazardly. Unlike Swanson, we cannot get a true picture of each cited witness, as the eclectic mode of citation gives only a partial view of that manuscript's readings.

1:8 (page 730) He cites P⁴⁶ and 03 as containing the phrase εν τη ημερα....Χριστου, part of which which they do not. Then on page 731 he correctly shows that they omit Ιησου.

1:10 (page 733) he adds confusion by incorrectly citing codex 012* as reading τη αυτη for an εν τω αυτη. Whereas 012 actually reads εν τω αυτη correctly, but displays τη αυτη for εν τη αυτη.

1:11 (page 735) he claims that the Vulgate reads: *inter vos sunt*, whereas it actually reads: *sunt inter vos*.

1:12 (page 735) Earlier in verses 1 and 2 he consistently cited MS 1834 from Tischendorf, but does not cite it as reading ο εκαστος for οτι εκαστος here. He also does not cite the Latin codex 61 (Armagh) which for λεγω δε τουτο reads *hoc autem dico*.

1:14 (page 737) He neglects to note that the Sahidic and Bohairic both omit τω θεω. Again illustrating the haphazard citation, sometimes he does, at other times he fails to cite. Unpredictable. Again he has occasionally cited the Old Latin MS 61 (Armagh), but does not cite it in verse 14 wherein it reads *baptizaverim*.

1:17 (page 739) He cites MS 927 as reading ο Χριστος (from Von Soden), 927 does not have the article.

1:18 (page 741) He cites MS 326 as reading υρν (from Tischendorf), it actually reads ηρν.

1:18 (page 741) In verse 17, above, he incorrectly cites MS 927, here in verse 18 he neglects to show that 927 omits γαρ.

I have shown a small sampling of errors, simply by moving through the first several pages of his work (the first 18 verses of chapter one). I cite about 12 errors. Certainly I did not show all of the errors in these 18 verses.

One distracting problem is his persistent citation of the various Old Latin synonyms. These synonyms have little value except that they can be useful in classifying the Old Latin witnesses into various families, but most do not impact the Greek variants! But even herein he displays his inconsistency as Latin MS 61 at verse 13, (page 736) is not shown or overlooked by him. Nor does he treat the other versions as he does the Latin; he very rarely shows any Syriac synonyms or Sahidic synonyms.

One more representative error, at 15:53 (his page 1276) he cites codex 016, as reading την αθανασιαν: actually 016 does not contain this passage. It is underlined so he reproduced Tischendorf's error. Tischendorf's I is actually codex 088. Kloha claims to have used Sander's work on codex 016, but here he failed to check with Sander's work.

Some of his comments are indicative of his lack of depth. For example on page 49, he states:

No commentator ventures an opinion as to whether or not Paul is capable of this or has done this elsewhere, but we have seen that it does occur elsewhere in I Corinthians...

He is discussing whether or not Paul coins new words. Many commentators have suggested that Paul has indeed coined numerous new words! For example, in *The Cambridge Greek Testament: Corinthians I*, a commentary by John Parry, at 7:35 refers to ευπαρεδρον as a

word "coined" by Paul. Or what of C. K. Barrett's, *A Commentary of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1968, page 65, in which he declares that Paul coined *πειθοις*? Indeed Paul did coin at least a few new words, numerous words never before seen prior to Paul's epistles!

Dr. Kloha put forth a lot of effort in this dissertation, but the task seems to have overwhelmed him. He did not take the time to double check many of his references, by doing so he would have avoided numerous errors. Never-the-less within its vastness of citations are accurate witnesses. As I stated above, I often use Kloha's work to test my own. When a discrepancy is observed, I will double check my work. This is great for me, and has improved my own work. In some cases Kloha's work serves to improve mine. For his effort I, in part, am grateful. Thank you Dr. Kloha!

Yet for important textual analyses, Kloha's work is not satisfactory; perhaps in the future some souls may correct the work and produce a fine and accurate tool. Until then the present work should be used with caution and the citations verified elsewhere.