

Debate on the Philosophies of Biblical Textual Criticism

Participants

Dr. James Warwick Montgomery

Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha

Saturday, October 15, 2016

at

**Chapel of Our Lord
Concordia University Chicago
River Forest, Illinois**

Lutheran Concerns Association

Balance-Concord, Inc. • Brothers of John the Steadfast • Association of Confessing Evangelical
Lutheran Congregations • Minnesota North Confessional Lutherans • Texas Confessional Lutherans

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Participants	3
Sponsoring Organizations.....	3
About this Transcript	3
Presentation by Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha	4
Presentation by Dr. John Warwick Montgomery.....	13
Response by Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha.....	21
Response by Dr. John Warwick Montgomery	26
Questions and Answers	29

Introduction

On Saturday, October 15, 2016, a debate was held about the philosophies of Biblical textual criticism. The debate took place at Chapel of Our Lord/Werner Auditorium, Concordia University Chicago, in River Forest, Illinois.

In recent years, several different philosophies of textual criticism have been offered to deal with the problem of textual variants in the biblical materials. This debate focused on the impact of one's choice of textual theory on the classic Lutheran conviction that the Holy Scriptures, as originally given, are the inerrant Word of God. This subject is of critical importance not just for theologians and Christian scholars, but also for pastors, teachers and every Bible-reading layman.

After a welcome by Mr. Walter Dissen, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Lutheran Concerns Association, the session began at 9:30 a.m., with a prayer by Rev. Roger Gallup, pastor at Bethlehem Lutheran Church, River Grove, IL, and a member of the Board of Regents at Concordia University Chicago. Mr. Dissen then thanked Concordia University Chicago for hosting the debate. Representatives from Concordia University and the Southern Illinois District brought greetings. This was followed by greetings from representatives from some of the sponsoring organizations.

The moderator, Attorney Mark O. Stern welcomed everyone. Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha and Dr. John Warwick Montgomery each gave 40-minute presentations.

After a short break each of the participants gave a 15-minute response. This was followed with a 45-minute question and answer period where the moderator read written questions from the audience. The session ended about 1:00pm, with Mr. Dissen thanking the participants and the audience. Rev. Gallup gave a closing prayer.

Participants

- **Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha**, Provost and Professor of Exegetical Theology at Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis. Dr. Kloha's biography is at <http://www.csl.edu/faculty/exegetical/kloha>
- **Dr. James Warwick Montgomery**, Distinguished Research Professor of Philosophy at Concordia University Wisconsin. Dr. Montgomery's biography is at <http://jwm.christendom.co.uk/>
- **Attorney Mark O. Stern**, Moderator and Vice Chairman of the Board Regents and Chairman, Finance Committee, Concordia University Chicago.

Sponsoring Organizations

The Lutheran Concerns Association (<http://lutheranclarion.org>) sponsored the event. Co-sponsoring organizations were:

- Balance-Concord, Inc.
- Brothers of John the Steadfast (www.steadfastlutherans.org)
- Association of Confessing Evangelical Lutheran Congregations (www.acelc.net)
- Minnesota North Confessional Lutherans
- Texas Confessional Lutherans

About this Transcript

This transcript was produced by Brothers of John the Steadfast. It is an "intelligent transcription" of the debate. It is verbatim except where speech tics have been removed or sentence fragments edited for clarity and ease of reading. Where specific words were inaudible or unclear or when there were hiccups in the recording, the debate participants were consulted. Dr. Kloha declined to review the transcript. He requests that interested individuals refer to his full paper, prepared for the event and made available online and at the event. Dr. Montgomery did review the transcript and corrected transcription errors affecting his presentation. When the speaker referenced a visual element it is noted in square brackets [].

Presentation by Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha

Good morning. The peace of Christ be with you. Thank you. By way of introduction, I'll just say that I grew up in Rogers Park at Bethesda Lutheran Church, about four miles from Wrigley Field. So the most important event happening today to me is probably happening at Clark and Addison at 7 o'clock tonight. It's been a long time coming. Okay, thank you.

I do want to thank you for coming today, thank you organizers for the invitation. Thank Dr. Montgomery for his sustained attention to my work over the last several years. It's helped to sharpen some of my thinking. Certainly, we disagree on a few points, but I do want to thank him first for his work, especially in the 1970s.

My first real introduction to the issues of the 1970s was reading his *Crisis in Lutheran Theology*, as an undergraduate at Concordia, Ann Arbor. Not an assigned text, but I just found it in the library and read it. And that actually spurred me on to this topic. If we believe in inerrancy, how do you know which words are inerrant. So in many ways he's somewhat responsible for this mess.

Having said that, about three years ago, actually almost exactly, I delivered a paper in Oberursel, Germany, to a few colleagues of seminary faculty of our partner churches worldwide, and intended to be for a small group of colleagues. Maybe you heard about that paper? So here we are today and thank you.

I'll just begin. St. Augustine summarizes the work of textual criticism as quote, the correction of the copies, so that the uncorrected ones should give way to the corrected. It is a discipline that seeks to resolve the differences among the manuscripts. All of which derived from the original authors act of writing or publishing. It studies manuscripts as objective historical artifacts and is fundamental to any serious work with a text from antiquity. Because, of course, a manuscript is produced by hand... [and if my clicker works—here we go.] ...produced by hand. Quite literally *manu* is Latin for “by the hand” in the relative case and *scripta*, excuse me, “having been written,” so “having been written by hand.”

And any hand-produced item, such as a manuscript, is subject to the skill and indeed whims of the copyist of the subsequent users of the manuscripts. Hence, Augustine's concern to correct the copies already in the late 4th century. His presumption and the presumption of every reader of scripture, until the invention of the printing press, is that the manuscripts that he uses for teaching and preaching and theologies, as you all know with Augustine, will contain mistakes, copyist mistakes, readers corrections, and that these mistakes require corrections. So textual criticism is a study of the manuscripts to determine how well any given manuscript carries forward the text of [indiscernible] exemplar, the manuscript from which it is copied, all the way back as far as the original copy.

And I'll just go briefly here. I don't think this is an issue of contention. We must emphasize here that textual criticism does not consider the prehistory of any writing or book. Textual criticism does not ask questions that source criticism or form criticism asks such as whether Luke and Matthew used independently a hypothetical “Q source,” which doesn't exist by the way. Textual criticism must be distinguished from what became labeled in the LCMS as historical criticism. And this is where, at least in my experience in teaching this over the last 15 years, seems to arise. Textual criticism works exclusively with manuscripts and other evidence like church fathers and translations that trace back to the original act of writing or copying.

Historical criticism works with the pre-manuscript editorial efforts by the author. So, we're dealing with manuscripts and this is what happens to a 6th century manuscript of the Pauline epistles, *Codex Sangallensis*, and Latin manuscript. And obviously handwriting, various a little corrections noted here and there. But what has struck me in working with manuscripts is that every one of these is an individual artifact, every one of them is produced by an individual, who

sat down and produced laboriously this text. And sometimes...I've used the image before...sometimes they left little traces, they got a little bored, left a little picture of themselves or maybe the guys sitting across the desk from them; these are produced by people. Every manuscript is the product of human judgment and experience. Beautiful objects. The church handing down generation after generation to us a faithful text.

Now, textual criticism, at least as classically practiced. Then I'll explain exceptions below, particularly the work of Bart Ehrman, has no interest in the pre-production process. As I said, we are simply interested in the manuscripts and how accurately and faithfully they preserve the original copy. So, what I would urge us all to do is to actually look at manuscripts or if you don't have access to the manuscripts to look at the apparatus of the text, which gives us a summary of the manuscripts. Today, if you had time to read my dissertation; anybody read it, 719 pages? Thank you. You've already covered this material, but for the rest of you I'll give a summary of just one text 1 Corinthians 14.

And this, I'm just going to go off the slide, it's not really my notes. So, first, the earliest evidence for 1 Corinthians 14:34–35, very familiar passage, “the wives must remain silent in the churches,” very contentious passage in our context. The earliest evidence for this passage is contained in P-46, a manuscript of the early 3rd century, or so, around 200 AD or slightly around there. And you can see that the text has 14:34–35 in exactly the right place. As “just as also the law says” and then it continues on here “or from you has gone out the word of God” so verse 36, so exactly the place where it's found in your Nestle-Aland text and in your English translations.

Second earliest piece of evidence is a very familiar manuscript, *Codex Sinaiticus*, of the 4th century. And again, the words appear exactly where they're supposed to appear. You see [indiscernible] “following all the churches of the saints” in verse 33 and then *Aleph* and, [indiscernible] or “from you has the word of God gone out,” exactly where it should be according to our standard editions. *Codex Vaticanus* likewise another famous manuscript B, in your apparatus, also 4th century. Here is where things start to get a little more interesting, because *Vaticanus* has the same text where you see again, “all the churches of the saints” or “from you has the word of God gone out.”

Notice these little marks, you see this bar and then a couple of dots, some scholars over the last 15 years have argued that these indicate a knowledge of a textual variation and indeed that these indicate that this text should be omitted. That's a pretty interesting argument, one which I had to trace through in about 10 pages of my dissertation, if you had a chance to read it, where I argue that in fact these bars are simply paragraphist marks. Just like you saw in *Codex Sinaiticus*, the paragraph is beginning, *Vaticanus* does not do that, it simply puts the bar there, exactly in line with *Codex Sinaiticus* consistently and also *Alexandrinus* by the way.

The dots in fact might represent textual variants, but they are added in the Renaissance period and in fact probably after the invention of the printing press. So again, you just got to look at the manuscripts and this is what it looks like, closer. But here's where it gets interesting with the *Codex Claromontanus*, a fifth century bilingual manuscripts of Paul's letters: Greek on one side, Latin on the other side, and it's hard to see because the ink bled through the thin vellum there. But now you will see the words in a different spot, you see [indiscernible], but it comes after “let all things be [indiscernible],” verse 40.

And [indiscernible] I make known to you the reading words of chapter 15 verse 1. Why are verses 34-35 after verse 40 of chapter 14 rather than after verse 33 becomes a question. You can see it a little more closely. [Indiscernible] incidentally has the same text. A related manuscripts, a sister manuscript later in the manuscript tradition, *Codex Boernarianus* of the probably early 9th century, likewise, has the words in the same place to give you a close up again, give us [indis-

cernible] the wives, your wives, it adds [indiscernible] there, that stood along there, and then you see [indiscernible], chapter 15. So these also include the words after verse 40.

So my manuscripts do this as well; I don't have time to go into this in detail, but you see the same words as I teach in the churches of the saints. There is "women in the churches must remain silent," and then he rewrites the words at the bottom. Now, one scholar has taken great pains to argue that somehow and this is bizarre, by writing the words twice he means to indicate that they're not there at all. I don't know how you do that, what he fails to notice is that you see this HDHS at the bottom the scribe does this in about six other places, it simply means [indiscernible], here something is absent, supply this. It's simply a text critical footnote. You just got to look at the manuscript and I don't know why it's so hard.

Another Greek manuscript that has evidence of the shift, you see down here, "the wives in the churches" is a 13th century minuscule manuscript; it should be up here [indiscernible] and [indiscernible] and the scribe didn't realize it until after he copied it, so he put a little double slash flag on the play, double slash in the margin and the text here. So he realized it afterward and moved the text. So there is your external evidence, that's what the manuscripts read. To be clear every single manuscripts has these words. The question is, do they occur after 33 or after verse 40.

Now that hasn't stopped some textual critics. Gordon Fee, who is a well-known textual critic, wrote a significant commentary on first Corinthians in 1989. And because he's a textual critic he made his argument sound sort of text critical. I won't read you his details here, but he said essentially that this kind of displacement of large chunks of text never occur in the manuscripts, that they cannot be scribal errors because there's too much text involved. And therefore he says, no adequate reason can be found for such a displacement were these words originally in the text after verse 33. So he argues that a later editor or copyist wrote these words in the margin and [indiscernible] some manuscripts stuck the words after verse 33, some after verse 40, but they are not original to Paul's writings.

Now, we have no text critical evidence for this, you notice a shift from sort of a text critical move to a source critical move, right? Nevertheless, Gordon Fee and his work and his commentary have been followed routinely by scholars who, for various reasons, have issues with Paul's teaching on women in the church. They also disregard the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral epistles and other such matters. Now we are getting into historical critical questions. So in my dissertation, here's the gauntlet laid down. Leading textual critics/scholars say these words are not part of Paul's text and I can prove it because this never happens elsewhere. So if you're going to critique his work, what's the first thing you do? Does it occur elsewhere?

So I read through the manuscripts that have the verses after verse 40 in the entire Pauline *Corpus Claromontanum* and *Boernarianum*. It took me about a week to read all of the Pauline epistles straight through and guess what? I found five other places where they do exactly the same thing: Romans 16:3, 16:21, 16:24, 1 Corinthians 16:19, Galatians 4:17, 1 Corinthians 14:34–35. If you tabulate this, here is what it looks like with the witnesses, all the manuscripts have these displacements. You see some consistency in reflecting this editorial move. Why they did it, I frankly don't know.

I could posit some hypothesis just for why they did it, but the fact is they did it. And the argument that this never happens elsewhere requires that these words were not original, can be shown to be false. So, here's what it looks like particularly 1 Corinthians 14:41. I gave a presentation on exactly this, in fact, using these slides before the Society of Biblical Literature some years back and presented the evidence. That presentation has been cited in several publications. My dissertation, which has not yet published, has been cited in several publications as a helpful argument to deal with the argumentation of Gordon Fee.

I want to point out that I have used in this argument a combination of internal evidence and external evidence. See that? What do the manuscripts actually say, what are the habits of the manuscripts, what are the characteristics of the manuscripts themselves, are they reliable manuscripts? It's both external evidence and I'll talk more about that later on.

A couple of years after I finished my dissertation, a buddy of mine sent me an email that they had recently discovered fragments of 1 Corinthians 14 and 15 and that I'd be interested in it obviously because of my dissertation. It took me awhile to cajole him to send me the images somewhat illegally, but because now you have a 4th century fragment and it's just a small piece of 1 Corinthians 14:15. Does it contain the words in the right place? Well, in fact it does. You see "in the churches" there's [14:] 33, 34, I'm sorry verse 33, [indiscernible] verse 34 [indiscernible], verse 34. So the words occur exactly where they should. There's a couple of other readings, flip it over in chapter 15, that line up exactly with *Codex Alexandrinus*.

So this text is simply another piece of evidence that confirms that one line of the text had it after verse 33, where it should be, and the other manuscripts have it after verse 40 due to this tendentious shift. Now I guarantee you had this manuscript not had these words, you would have heard about it. Or had these words been after verse 40, you would have heard about it because it would have confirmed Gordon Fee's thesis. But in fact it matches exactly what we would have expected.

I present all this and I'm sorry for the length of the presentation, but I want to emphasize that you actually have to work with the manuscripts. That's all we have. P46, *Sinaiticus*, *Vaticanus*. There is no [indiscernible] text sitting out there somewhere that we can use to tell which one is right. All you have are the manuscripts and you have to decide which of them is right. That's simply what textual criticism does.

I'm going to skim over much of the next section here, the early church working with the manuscripts. I will refer you to the paper I delivered in January of 2015 on this topic. I do want to close though with what I think is an excellent summary of the early church attitude to the text, which again comes from St. Augustine. And it's a letter to Jerome, a lot of interesting correspondence between those two. Jerome knew Greek and Augustine didn't, but anyway Augustine says here what I think is a very good summary of the early church, but also a good way for us to approach the text. He says: "I have learned to yield respect and honor only to the books of scripture. Of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error"; notice that assumption.

"And if in these writings, I am perplexed by anything, which appears to me opposed to the truth, I do not hesitate to suppose that either the manuscript is faulty," and you have to correct it as he said earlier, "or the translator has not caught the meaning of what was said or I myself have failed to understand it." Notice the humility that Augustine shows here. The apostolic authors have to be correct. And there's three more likely, or less likely to more likely, problems with my reading. Either the copyist got it wrong, the translator, or most likely of all, I'm the problem.

So Augustine shows this unblushing confidence in the authority of the scriptures. Yet at the same time a deep humility with respect to his own abilities; the text must be right. If it seems not to be right, it is the fault of the manuscript and then you correct it. If the fault is not with the copyist then the fault may well lie with the translator. Of course Augustine is working in Latin. And if the fault is neither with the manuscript nor the translator then the fault must lie in his own lack of insight and understanding. The text is always right. I mean this is Luther right? If you come across the passage you don't understand, you say a prayer of thanks to God, and you go on. The early fathers worked with this understanding. The manuscripts, even when there is variation can be considered true, indeed they have the authority of inspired writings, even if I can't reconcile it.

Now as to a bit of a theological framework, and I'll just say here what has struck me again is we, my perspective anyway, in our tradition, in our conservative Lutheran tradition, we have not really developed a theological framework around the problem of the text. And so, I have for many years turned to Martin Chemnitz as a resource for this. And I want to walk through this fairly carefully.

Chemnitz as you likely know, is a key contributor to the Formula of Concord; and he provides one of the most comprehensive and helpful discussions of the theological and historical issues of biblical authority. His *Examination of the Council of Trent* was written in the context of debate concerning exactly which texts are authoritative and how is that determined, the very question that confronts us today as we wrestle with questions of the integrity of biblical texts and changing editions, which are provided to us, like the *Nestle-Aland 28th Edition*.

Chemnitz' context is the debate with Rome, the Council of Trent, and their claim that a single text, that is the *Vulgate* translation, including the apocrypha of the Old Testament and the antilegomena of the New Testament, was authoritative, all the same, the Latin *Vulgate* translation. Chemnitz, however in his argument, does not simply declare that some texts were inspired and some were not. He realizes that this is, in fact, the very issue.

How do you know? How do you determine that? Chemnitz confesses the inspiration of Scripture clearly from its divine source, its "divine impulse and inspiration" using II Timothy 3 and II Peter 1 as his basis. He also, and this is an interesting move, consistently links this inspiration with many miracles and divine testimonies, special testimonies and that the Spirit confirmed they're written doctrine with miracles. This is simply New Testament language.

The apostles regularly confirm the genuineness of their apostolic preaching, especially in the context of doubt or rejection of that apostolic preaching with reference to the Spirit working powers along with the word. Look at my first footnote 14, passage after passage, where they're preaching and the signs are put side by side. You see this next paragraph Peter's sermon and Acts 2, and at the bottom of page 5, the ultimate sign and wonder, of course, is the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ.

This is the consistent theme of the apostolic preaching in the book of Acts, and the announcement and proclamation of that resurrection is regularly made by the "eyewitnesses," see again footnote 15 for numerous references. Jesus Himself sends out the disciples as witnesses, and in fact His last words in the Gospel of Luke are the summary of the Gospel proclamation and the sending of the disciples as "witnesses of these things." This eyewitness testimony is so critical to the Gospel proclamation that the Apostle Paul himself grounds the veracity of his message in the eyewitness testimony, which has been in his words "handed down." And I'm not going to go in detail through I Corinthians 15 here, but it's a familiar passage especially verse 14. "But if Christ is not raised, empty therefore also is our preaching, and empty is your faith."

Paul's preaching is without content, without any basis, without truth, without power, if Christ had not been raised. And, because the Corinthians' faith was based solely on Paul's preaching of the Gospel message, centered in the resurrection of Christ, although of course not exclusively, see the footnote, so also would the Corinthians' faith be without any basis.

Paul grounds the authority of his preaching solely and completely on the preaching about Christ and Christ's resurrection. He does not claim that his message is "inspired," and on the basis of that inspiration therefore the resurrection must be fact; rather the resurrection of Jesus has occurred, Paul preaches it, in fact he himself can testify to it, as well as 500 of the brothers, many of whom are still alive to this day in the mid-fifties when Paul writes I Corinthians.

So this theme of witness and testifying to God's work is the same language that Chemnitz uses in describing the relationship between the inspired word and the church in the question of the canon of the New Testament. And I've talked about this in other places. So I'm going to kind of skip through Chemnitz here a little bit, but to highlight a few things here, Chemnitz on

page 7, the quote there, he connects Jesus' teaching with the apostolic teaching. It's in the middle of the page where I think is more critical to walk through. Chemnitz provides a helpful way to understand the role of the church to continue the work of teaching those things that had been entrusted to it by Jesus, while also recognizing that this work of the church took place historically in space and time.

And this historic testimony of the church, especially of "the primitive church," to use Chemnitz' words, confirms also that the canonical and that's for Chemnitz inspired, canonical New Testament writings are indeed inspired. And he lays out a very careful, precise, and I think helpful argument. Again, he starts with the assumption that they are divinely inspired, II Timothy 3 and II Peter 1. But those divinely inspired writing were laid before, delivered, and commended to the church with public attestation in order in that she might, by exercising the greatest care and foresight, preserve them uncorrupted, get this phrase, transmit them as from hand to hand *per manus*, manuscript, and commend them to posterity, which is us. Indeed because he is speaking of the early church in its role as testifying, witness language, to the inspiration of these writings by the Spirit, he is able to speak of the church as "judge."

The primitive church at the time of the apostles was able to testify with certainty which writings were divinely inspired. See, it's a subsequent acknowledgment. For she knew the authors whom God had commended to the church by, there's those special testimonies, she knew also which were the writings which had been composed by them; and from the thing which she had received by oral tradition from the apostles, she could judge, *poterat iudicare* that the things which had been written were the same teaching which the apostles had delivered with the living voice. I mean he's simply channeling [indiscernible] here frankly.

The early church then passed down these writings: This witness of the primitive church concerning the divinely inspired writings was later transmitted to posterity by perpetual succession from hand to hand, there is that phrase *per manus* again and diligently preserved in reliable histories of antiquity in order that the subsequent church might be the custodian of the witness of the primitive church concerning the Scriptures.

Now, the modern church cannot make the writing authoritative, it can only acknowledge what the early church confirms, based on what it saw and heard from the apostles. So this is this paragraph on page 8 which is actually critical, as to Chemnitz's argument into our issues today.

There is therefore a very great difference between the witness of the primitive church which was at the time of the apostles. Second, the witness of the church which followed immediately after the time of the apostles, and which received the witness of the first church, and here he means Tertullian and Eusebius and all these guys he quotes in the next few pages. And last, the *testimonia* (witness) of the present church concerning the scripture. For if the church, both that which is now and that which was before, can show the witness *testimonia* of those who received and knew the witness of the first church concerning the genuine writings, we believe her as we do a witness (*testi*) to decide anything concerning the sacred writings for which she cannot produce reliable documents (*documenta*) from the testimony of the primitive church.

So whoever wants to now make these books canonical must be able to prove (*probare*) that they were certainly, without any doubt, written by prophets; and it is impossible to prove this. Or it is necessary to establish that it does not affect the divinely inspired Scripture whether it has divine testimonies of certainty, authority, and truth, or whether it has only human testimonies. Let the reader consider whither a dictatorial canonization of these books will finally lead. He's speaking here of course of the *antilegomena*, I'm sorry, the Old Testament Apocrypha, but the point is a critical one.

Now page 9. Critically, Chemnitz does *not* tie the authority of the canonical writings to the work of the Spirit in the present day. The authority was established by the Spirit in the writing of the apostles and prophets, in the presence of the, I'm sorry, the presence of the Spirit was

confirmed by “signs” at the time of the Apostles, and the primitive church received and acknowledged that inspiration and authority. The only thing that the present-day church can do is evaluate (judge) the testimony of the earliest church. It cannot *make* any book authoritative, it can only confirm. Or, as Chemnitz does with respect to Rome, reject the later church’s attempt to improperly make a writing authoritative.

Now, this makes Chemnitz’ approach very cautious and I know some people are uncomfortable with this, that he maintained this *homologoumena, antilegomena* distinction, but let me quote Pieper on this. I think it’s a helpful quote, I’m sorry that’s Preus. Let me skip down, that’s coming up later, let me skip down to the manuscripts.

I’m going to skim over for the sake of time what he does with the *Vulgate* translation and going back to the *fontus* and examining the sources (middle of page 10). He says “the Council of Trent will accept the errors of the translator, the mistakes of the copyists, the additions and mutilations of men as the Word of God, and we shall not be free to believe the pure fountain-heads (*puris fontibus*) themselves more than muddy and impure books. And the examination of the sources,” the *inspiciens fontibus* is simply the work of textual criticism.”

Now I’ll just note Chemnitz did not have the access to the variant readings. They weren’t known yet in the middle of the 16th century, it’s not until the early 18th century that the Lutheran dogmaticians had to start dealing with textual variants because they just were not known. But to summarize, Robert Preus in his *Theology of Post-Reformation, Theology or Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, notes, “...in any controversy, [page 11] appeal must be made to the *apographal*, that is, the manuscript copies, Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Underlying the debate concerning the authenticity of Scripture was the antithesis between Roman and Lutheran theology regarding the authority of Scripture and the authority of the church. The Lutheran position was very simple: just as the church cannot create the canon, it cannot decree a particular version of Scripture to be authentic. Authenticity, like canonicity, is due to God’s act of inspiration. The foundation of Scripture’s authority is God, not the churches.”

And I again summarize and find Chemnitz’s approach helpful even if it makes people a little bit uncomfortable, that he only wants to focus on that which is clearly attested. And Pieper recognizes this discomfort that some people might have with only being clear and firm with what we can be clear and firm about. [So page 12] Luther and the early dogmaticians did not maintain this distinction from hastiness or levity toward the Word of God, but on the contrary, because they were very conscientious with regard to the Word of God. Luther’s opinions on the *antilegomena* are not a “blot” on our Church, but rather they bear witness to how careful our Church once was in determining the standard and norm of our faith and life. How careful our Church once was in determining the standard and norm of our faith and life. We can only say what we are permitted to say based on the best evidence.

[Now I have 10 minutes? Okay.] Textual and literary judgments, bottom of page 12. The differences among the manuscripts have become great, either through the negligence of some copyists or through the perverse audacity of others; they either neglect to check over what they have transcribed, or in the process of checking, they make additions or deletions as they please. It’s not the ravings of a modern day skeptic, it’s Origen in about the year 245. Already in the third century he is dividing up the kinds of errors into what we now today call transcriptional errors or intentional errors. They make mistakes copying, or they intentionally change to suit their preferences. It’s already going on in the early church, and Origen and numerous other Church Fathers deal with textual variation on a pretty regular basis. I talk about this in other places. I don’t go into it here.

So how do textual scholars deal with this today? How do they resolve the differences among the manuscripts? And I will just say upfront here, I know this is a very esoteric topic. I provided some resources online earlier this week. I have written many times on this topic. [I have

presented at] pastors' conferences, including here last week in Chicago on exactly this topic. I would be happy to talk with you more about how textual criticism works.

But basically scholars, for about 130 years now really have used two types of evidence, external evidence and internal evidence. External evidence has to do with that which essentially you don't need to know Greek. So it's things like the date and character of the witness. How old is the manuscript and what is its "character," which we'll get back to. How widespread is the geographical distribution, was it copied in Rome and in Alexandria or only in one area.

The genealogical relationships, how do they relate to one another in a family sort of way? And this is kind of an interesting point here, witnesses are to be weighed and not counted. Now, if you think these through, every one of these is still a judgment. Somebody has to determine the character of the witnesses. Somebody has to determine where the manuscripts were written because none of them say that until you get to the Medieval period. Somebody has to determine the genealogical relationships among the manuscripts. Somebody has to weigh the manuscripts and tell how important they are. That's all subjective evaluation of the external non-Greek data.

Internal evidence, just like Origen said transcriptional probabilities, that is, the habits of the scribes, they lose text, they clarify things. And intrinsic probabilities, that is, what the author was more likely to have written. Both of those, of course, are subjective principles. Now this is not a new thing, page 14 and 15; I hope you had a chance to read this.

The edition of Westcott and Hort from 1880, 1881 lays this out in a very clear manner. It's very helpful and it's an approach which I actually follow. They're very clear on how you get to "external evidence," right. On the very next page, bottom of page 14, "KNOWLEDGE OF DOCUMENTS SHALL PRECEDE FINAL JUDGMENT OF READINGS." But how do you know how good the documents are. On the very next page, Hort makes clear that "knowledge of documents" is simply the accumulated study of intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities in hundreds of places of variation and "provisional judgments" which later are revised based on this accumulation of decisions.

And so they say, by cautious advance from the known to the unknown, we are enabled to deal with a great mass of those remaining variations, open variations, so to speak, the confidence being materially increased when, as usually happens, and still a true statement, the document thus found to have the better text is also the older.

Now there are two sorts of schools of thought in textual criticism today: reasoned eclecticism and thoroughgoing eclecticism. Most scholars use reasoned eclecticism. But the quotes here, I'll just point out, there's frankly not much distinction between reasoned eclecticism and thoroughgoing eclecticism in the difficult, hard to reach decisions. So the quote in the middle of page 15 from Mike Holmes. "The most that can be obtained by a purely documentary approach," he's quoting Hort here, "is the discovery of what is relatively original: whether the readings thus relatively original were also the readings of the autograph is another question, which can never be answered in the affirmative with absolute decision except where the autograph itself is extant. Of all the various kinds of evidence," Hort goes on to argue, "only intrinsic probability, internal evidence, is concerned with absolute originality; other types are concerned only or predominately with relative originality. Thus, no matter what documentary discoveries or advances in understanding may be made, we cannot [indiscernible] the need to employ the intrinsic and transcriptional criteria that comprise a key part of reasoned eclecticism."

He recognizes that this means there [are] subjective decisions. Next quote. "Reasoned eclecticism is not a passing interim method; it is, in the present circumstances, the only way forward. Hopes for some sort of genealogical or documentary method that will somehow bring clarity out of confusion are illusory. "There is," as Zuntz observes, "there is no hard and fast rule, no iron-clad rule, no divining rod to save the critic from the strain of labour and thought."

Thoroughgoing, by contrast, eclecticism, Keith Elliott. Thoroughgoing eclecticism is the method that allows internal considerations for a reading's originality to be given priority over documentary considerations. The thoroughgoing eclectic critic feels able to select freely from the available fund of variants and choose the one that best fits the internal criteria. The critic is thus skeptical about the high claims made for the reliability of some manuscripts or about arguments favoring a particular group of manuscripts. For such a critic, no manuscript or group of manuscripts contains the monopoly of original readings.

I'm running out of time. I'll just point out that at the end of the day in the hard decisions, there is frankly no difference between how a thoroughgoing eclectic operates and a reasoned eclectic operates. Every edition, since Tischendorf, in the 1860s, Westcott and Hort in the 1880s has followed exactly this approach. I am not going to have time to go through issues in present day text criticism on page 17 and 18. You can track through the footnotes. We can talk about those if you like. I do want to point out on page 20 briefly, if you wouldn't mind. Not all textual critics are doing text criticism. Bart Ehrman, in particular, has used the data of textual criticism to make a completely different move. It's actually a deconstructionist move hermeneutically and is evident; he says it flat out in his *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, page 29.

He says, "This takes me now to a different theoretical understanding of the significance of textual variation in the New Testament manuscripts, an understanding that derives less from traditional categories of originals and corruptions than from," get this now, "modern literary theories that call these categories into question. Because scribes occasionally changed their texts in 'meaningful ways,'" get this now, "it is possible to conceptualize their activities as a kind of hermeneutical process. Reproducing a text is in some ways analogous to interpreting it. That's simply deconstruction; it's not text criticism anymore. So he has made a move from textual criticism into modern literary theory and I disagree. All right.

My way forward, I will do in my response. Thank you for your patience.

Mark O. Stern Thank you Dr. Kloha, and Dr. Montgomery you will have 42 minutes also. As someone who works by the hour, I understand time sometimes gets away from us a little bit. I will give you a five minute warning.

Presentation by Dr. John Warwick Montgomery

Okay, very good. Well, it's a great pleasure to be here and I appreciate the kind words of Dr. Kloha. I am amazed that he was influenced by my book, *The Crisis in Lutheran Theology*, but that's all to the good. It can't possibly hurt anything.

I am going to be sticking quite closely to my manuscript. There are some sections that will be omitted and I'll try to indicate when you should turn the page if you are following along. This is fairly detailed material and that's due to the nature of textual criticism. It was very helpful that Dr. Kloha gave you a survey of how the process generally works. The sum total of that seemed to be more or less that all of it is subjective whether you use external considerations or internal considerations. To this, I will only say, before I begin reading, that though all may be subjective, some things are more subjective than others, and therefore, we may need to worry a little bit about this whole area and I am going to help you worry.

[Would you go to the second page.] I am going to be dealing with textual theory and in particular thoroughgoing eclecticism to which Dr. Kloha commits himself with his doctoral dissertation and in other published writings. And then I am going to show what effect that has had on the way in which Dr. Kloha treats Biblical material and following that, we're going to look at the implications of this for the doctrine of inerrancy. In Dr. Kloha's paper, there are only two and a half pages at the very end of the paper that speaks specifically on this inerrancy issue. And in my view that really is the primary concern of all this. We are not interested in textual criticism *per se* and certainly we're not practicing textual criticism *per se*. All of us hopefully, are practicing a view of Scripture, which holds to its entire reliability. On page two, there is a quotation from a philosopher, a philosopher Gordon Clark of Butler University a generation ago.

Gordon Clark wrote a book entitled *Logical Criticisms of Textual Criticism*, and he did this because the textual critics said he isn't a textual critic and so he has no business speaking about this. I have run into this problem. Dr. Kloha has said on several occasions that I just don't understand him. And my doctorate (three of them) are not in textual criticism. So, I think that Gordon Clark perhaps has something to say on this occasion. Says Gordon Clark: "Although the present writer is not a textual critic, he will be bold enough to make some small claim to acquaintance with logic. If someone argues, 'All insects are quadrupeds, and all quadrupeds are edible, therefore, all edibles are insects,' the writer can with some degree of assurance declare the syllogism invalid, even though he may not know whether or not a bumblebee is an insect. Similarly, if the textual critic asserts that manuscript B has the correct reading for Luke 5:33 and that therefore B has the correct reading for Jude 22. We must suggest a course in logic for the critic. Even though we might think that B was discovered in 1624 and represents the Byzantine text—which, of course is utterly bizarre, but the point of this is that these issues do not require necessarily a technical knowledge of the details of the lower criticism. [Go on to the next page if you will.]

There are several theories of textual criticism in the biblical field, as we just heard. These differ particularly in the value they place on internal literary criteria for determining the choice of readings. We're going to focus on the theory espoused by Dr. Kloha following his doctoral mentor, J. Keith Elliott, one of the chief advocates of the approach termed thoroughgoing eclecticism, which doesn't differ greatly from reasonable eclecticism as has been pointed out. Here is Professor Elliott's statement of that philosophy in contrast with the classic approaches. Look at that very closely. "The majority of textual critics grudgingly apply principles of intrinsic probability to text critical problems only when their preferred external evidence is unhelpful or ambiguous. Thoroughgoing eclecticism by contrast, operates the other way around, that is to say, the initial questions asked, when the variants need to be resolved is: which reading is in accord with our author's style or language or theology?"

Now, what does that mean? It means that a thoroughgoing eclectic will choose among variants, so that the variant that he is going to employ fits in his view better the theological nature of the particular biblical book as he sees it, or the style, the language, the vocabulary, that sort of thing. This, of course, is based upon the assumption that there is going to be consistency in that respect throughout. And we'll see very shortly that that is a real issue. A follower of Professor Elliott, Charles Landon, in his text critical study [and we can go to slide two now and you can follow that very quickly by slide three].

A follower of Professor Elliott, Charles Landon, in his textual critical study of the Epistle of Jude is one of the very few attempts to apply thoroughgoing eclecticism to an entire New Testament book, says in his definition of the eclectic method that "...the method relies 'mainly on internal evidence to choose the best reading, whenever the manuscripts divide, [and] places minimal reliance on external evidence."

In practice this means that the thoroughgoing eclectic uses external textual evidence. How could you possibly avoid it? The factors that most influences conclusions are the internal literary character and context of the work for which he is trying to establish the best reading of a given passage. The following factors then loom very very large in that kind of analysis. A variant's conformity to the author's style, vocabulary, and use of rhetoric. A variant's conformity to the author's theology or ideology.

Well, thoroughgoing eclectics try to deflect the charge of literary subjectivism, but here's a recent evaluation of the methodology. This is from Porter and Pitt's *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism*. "While thoroughgoing eclectics insist on the objectivity of their criteria, issues of style, language, use, theology and other internal considerations are rarely as formally based as they propose or as clear cut as they need to be. A wholesale diminishing of external evidence ends up placing the entirety of the decision upon the shoulders of the critic, without due consideration of the objective controls provided by external considerations. This represents the primary reason, why most textual critics have rejected thoroughgoing eclecticism." Yes.

The use of stylistic considerations [we're skipping down] for the determination of text authorship and origins has quite rightly been rejected in other academic fields. Thus in the computer investigation of text, this is from Greenstein's *A Historian's Guide to Computers*. "A collection of newspaper articles and an autobiographical account, all by the same author, may differ considerably in their measurable style." Clearly then, stylistic analyses are fallible and cannot provide positive identification of the text authorship or literary heritage."

If you're a student and the style of your term papers and your love letters is exactly the same, the result is either you're not going to get a degree or you will never marry, or both. The fact is that we are not limited to a particular style as we write. And if a choice of a variant reading is made on the basis that this needs to fit the rest of the New Testament book, let us say, we're making an assumption that is highly dangerous and we'll see just how dangerous in a little bit. [We can move to the next slide.]

Now there are parallels here with the "higher criticism." The lower criticism, textual criticism does not attempt to work with sources that allegedly preceded the biblical text but higher criticism relies on the subjective internal literary considerations of the existing manuscripts to determine whether or not they were done by single authors or whether they are the product of all sorts of pre-textual changes. And the non-acceptance of such an approach, outside the narrow confines of a generally liberal theological community, should be observed. It's especially noteworthy, that thoroughgoing eclecticism has never been accepted or employed in the textual criticism of Shakespeare. There one relies objectively on a best text, the *First Folio* usually. As one writer has put it "*All modern Shakespeare critics are historical/documentary critics.*"

They're not doing this internal operation, or if they are doing it, it is subordinated to the value of the text as established independently. There is also a serious logical problem inherent in the philosophy of thoroughgoing eclecticism. If in the final analysis one determines a reading by what best fits the internal content of the work as a whole, how did one discover the proper readings constituting the work as a whole?

You need to have a solid text in order to judge what variant reading best fits it. So one can hardly claim that literary fit is the fundamental factor for deciding which given variant is to be chosen. This is of course why the standard critical editions of the Greek New Testament, *Nestle-Aland 28th Edition* and earlier, have generally used *Codex Sinaiticus*, *Codex Vaticanus* and the earliest major papyri as their starting point.

And it's worth pointing out that, at the present time, there is a newer approach to all of this, which is carried out in a method at the University of Münster in Germany and has produced a much more objective kind of results for the Catholic Epistles in Jude in this 28th edition of the *Nestle-Aland* text. We'll talk about that a little bit later.

All right, so much for the boring subject of thoroughgoing eclecticism and the textual theories in general. Let's come down to seeing how Dr. Kloha has used this approach in his published material.

Dr. Kloha's doctoral dissertation provides innumerable illustrations of the consequences of his acceptance of thoroughgoing eclecticism. [The next slide please.] Here are but two instances that point out very clearly the incompatibility of this approach with the classic approach to biblical inerrancy.

In his treatment of I Corinthians 7:33 and 34, Dr. Kloha rejects the archetypal reading reflected in our modern translations based on the foundational manuscripts P15 B and P, on the grounds that "the influence of the parallelism of the context, the difficulty of several syntactical features and the development of terminology and practice in the early church, led to several simultaneous alterations that cannot be attributed to accidental corruption."

And even more serious at the end of his thesis, Dr. Kloha speaks of the context of individual witnesses. He asserts that these contexts "cannot be known only in the case of a handful of witnesses. For example, F G and even there only imperfectly. Nevertheless, the theological ethical and even linguistic developments that were taking place during the first few centuries of the transmission of the *Corpus Paulinum*, the body of Pauline writings, must be understood. For example, only after a highly developed Trinitarian theology took hold could the addition of [I Corinthians] 8:6 have been made."

Okay, and there he relies on Bart Ehrman's notion of Orthodox Corruption, the idea that the texts were corrupted to a certain extent by churchmen who were attempting to make the Bible more orthodox than the texts were originally.

Now, if Dr. Kloha is right and you can engage in that kind of analysis, no pastor can preach I Corinthians 8:6, and by the way that says "for us there is one God, the Father from whom all things came and for whom we live and there is but one Lord Jesus Christ through all things came and through whom we live."

But the main illustration of the difficulty here comes in an article which Dr. Kloha published in the *Festschrift*, the commemorative volume for his mentor J. Keith Elliott, the leading spokesman for thoroughgoing eclecticism. There, he argues that it would be preferable to take Elizabeth as the author of the *Magnificat*, rather than Mary.

Now, he admits that all of the modern texts, the critical texts of the New Testament go with Mary and that the entire weight of the early Greek manuscripts favor Mary. The only places that you can find any support for an Elizabeth reading of the *Magnificat* are non-Vulgate Latin readings, Irenaeus, but unfortunately Irenaeus is a divided authority and also goes with Mary in

another location, and same situation with Origen. And then of course, there is a little known hardly impressive late third, early fourth century, Latin preacher who uses Elizabeth; this is one Nicetas of Remesiana. The fact that these authorities are earlier than the authoritative Greek text, *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Vaticanus*, is hardly a strong argument for the Elizabeth attribution since they are non-Greek versions, translations and they contradict the Greek text. Now, Dr. Kloha admits this.

So why would he possibly favor the Elizabeth readings against the powerful weight of textual authority? Well the answer is because he accepts Elliott's thoroughgoing eclecticism and I'm sure that Elliott was just delighted with this article. In the introduction to the Elliott *Festschrift*, we are told that Elliott's career had seen him refocus his work from searching for the original text to what may reasonably be said to be the history to which the texts point. [Next slide please.] Dr. Kloha revealingly quotes Elliott at the beginning of his article in the following terms. Now this is very important. According to Elliott, approved by Dr. Kloha, the textual critic "feels able to select freely from among the available fund of variants and choose the one that best fits the internal criteria."

Now, if such an approach is accepted the result is what might well be termed, "the designer New Testament." Variants are chosen according to the literary criteria of the textual critic, the idea being to arrive at a text which has the literal quality, similarity, vocabularies, styles, structure, *et cetera* with which the critic is comfortable. This is, of course, to deny the historical claims of the book. The book is no longer supposed to be presenting what actually happened; what you have here is a literary work in which, whoever the writer was, he would have chosen readings which would fit better into the context that he assumes. Incidentally, the reason that Dr. Kloha thinks that internally Mary was not the author is that after all Mary isn't featured to any real extent in the Gospel of Luke; Jesus says who is my mother, who are my brothers and so forth and she doesn't do anything else like the *Magnificat* later on. The fact of the matter is she apparently would have lost her poetic abilities under those conditions.

Well, it doesn't seem to me that that's the way you make these decisions. What you should do, is go to the best text, for goodness sake, and even if the result isn't what you think would have looked better in the literary context, so much the worse for you. This is in one sense similar to the higher critical problem. Higher critics make decisions as to underlying authorship of biblical materials on exactly the same kind of stylistic reasoning. It's as if they are saying "If I had written the Bible, I wouldn't have written it that way." Okay? But of course God, like Sinatra, wanted to do it His way, and that's why God didn't choose either higher or lower critics as the authors of Scripture.

Yes, the central problem with thoroughgoing eclecticism and Dr. Kloha's employment of it lies in the unrestrained expression given to the textual critic. Now, even recognizing the results of this kind of approach, can't we say that considering the overwhelming similarities of textual readings and therefore the virtual identity of modern translations, based on commonly accepted Greek texts of the New Testament, almost never the product of thoroughgoing eclecticism, no harm is really done. [The next slide please.]

Sadly much harm is done. This is due to the fact that Dr. Kloha has drawn a logical but deadly conclusion from the fundamental principle of thoroughgoing eclecticism that all variant readings are in theory deserving of consideration. Since the number of existing texts, good, bad and indifferent is legion and since there is always the possibility of uncovering previously undiscovered ones, the text of the New Testament is indeed never settled. In his Oberursel lecture, the text is plastic. Now he has given up that language. There is no question about that, but there isn't any elimination of the point. For example, he says in the revision of that essay, "We now have a text of the New Testament that makes no claim to being fixed and stable for it is subject to continuous improvement and change."

Now, that being the case how can it be authoritative for the Pastor or Layman? When can one say with confidence “thus saith the Lord”? Dr. Kloha sees the historical church as the solution. It is the church that ultimately decides on the text to be accepted at any point in time and since the church is the body of Christ led by the Holy Spirit we need not be troubled by an ever-changing Bible.

In Dr. Kloha’s view, the attempt to get back to the original autograph of Scripture is a chimerical task. We cannot even be sure that the *Corpus Paulinum*, body of Pauline writing, gives us the *ipsissima verba* of the Apostle. Indeed, final theological authority cannot reside in a Bible produced by single acts of divine inspiration. Rather, that authority must lie in the church herself as she continually reevaluates the results of the labors of textual scholarship. [The next slide.]

The text like the canonicity question is never finally closed but remains an open and continuing task for the church. I quote Dr. Kloha, now he may well have changed his views in these respects but these are published writings and this is what he says. “How, then is it decided which reading is apostolic and has been received as such by the church. The church has been and continuous to be led by the Spirit into all truth as it hears ever again the Word. And the church has always taken the greatest care to ensure that what it teaches and preaches is indeed apostolic. That work continues in the light of new evidence and historical study. To speak of a single act of inspiration leaves us vulnerable. God works in history, the Spirit created the church.”

Now this is, to be sure, the Roman Catholic solution to textual problems and biblical authority but it is *not* the Lutheran answer. Had it been, Luther’s Reformation would never have occurred. [Next slide.] He could hardly have said at Worms, “My conscience is captive to the word of God,” and set biblical teachings against that of the Roman Church of his day. You cannot have it both ways, if Scripture is created by the church it can be hardly be used to criticize the church’s errors.

Moreover, of course, this kind of solution is pure *Schwärmerei*; the Holy Spirit, instead of working through the objective word to “re-prove the world of sin righteous and judgement...” [Next slide.] Instead of that, the Holy Spirit becomes a *deus ex machina* to justify the subjective literary judgements of the textual critic as to the proper content of the biblical text. In a very real sense when “the Church, led by the Spirit” justifies the text, it really justifies the literary perspective of the textual critic. Unless the text is justified by Christ’s promise to the apostolic band, that is, by its apostolic character, there will be no adequate case for its revelatory and inerrant nature. Without this, the Christian falls into the sectarian category of proclaiming as God’s word what cannot be shown to be such as with the *Bhagavad gita*, the *Book of Mormon*, *Science and Health* and so on.

And what happens to the Lutheran commitment to the *inerrancy* of Holy Writ? Inerrancy refers to issues of *truth*: whether the Bible is factually correct in all its assertions. Thorough-going eclectics, such as Dr. Kloha, treat the Scripture as a literary production, the text being chosen that presumably better fits the literary context. Then, inerrancy becomes impossible in principle. A literary production can be effective and moving but it cannot be true or false. Think of *Winnie the Pooh* for example. It’s moving but you wouldn’t use the categories of truth or falsity in connection with it.

To be sure, one can redefine inerrancy, to mean say, effective and moving, doing in every instance what God wants it to do. This is precisely how the Seminex professors handled the matter. They never outrightly denied the inerrancy of the Bible; they merely downplayed it at best and redefined it at worst. A sad example is Arthur Carl Piepkorn.

Hear Dr. Kloha on the inerrancy issue and ask yourself, how does this differ from simply jettisoning the doctrine and going with Seminex “gospel reductionism,” the position that the Bible is true in the sense that it presents the Gospel.

I'm quoting from Dr. Kloha. “If you want to rip Romans 15 and 16 out of my Bible, I can live with that. If you want Hebrews, James, Revelation torn out too, I can live with that, if you force me to look only at P46 or the bizarre majuscule manuscript W or one of the thousands of Byzantine minuscules and use them as my New Testament I can live with that. Give me only *Codex Boernarianus* one of the most poorly copied misspelled and error filled copies of Paul's letters, I can live with that. I could live with or without any of these because even these poorly copied, corrupted by people, edited, to use Luther's words, preach Christ. And if they preach Christ, they are of the Spirit. For preaching Christ is the Spirit's work and if they preach Christ they are apostolic, for the apostle can speak nothing other than what he has been sent to speak. So apostles, no matter who they are, even one who has been aborted yet lived like Paul, who persecuted the church, preached the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. I can live without a perfect Bible; I cannot live without God raising Jesus from the dead.”

And here I would like you to take a look at couple of footnotes if you will. [Next slide, please.] Take a look at footnote 34. No, I'm sorry, footnote 24, and then we'll look at 34. The logical slippage in the above argument should not be overlooked. Kloha: “If they preached Christ they are apostolic for the apostle can speak nothing other than what he has been sent to speak.” So apostles, no matter who they are, and so forth. But preaching Christ does not make the preacher an apostle or apostolic or everyone who has ever preached the Gospel would be an apostle. In reality, solely being an apostle makes one's utterances apostolic. And then footnote 34. Dr. Kloha relies on John chapters 15 through 17 to argue that Jesus' promise to “lead into all truth” was a promise made to the whole church through the centuries and thus that the church, by way of the Spirit, can presumably create a canon and validate on a continuing basis the scriptural text to be accepted as revelatory.

However, these utterances of our Lord were specific to the Apostolic company; [John] 14:26 makes that absolutely evident, “The Holy Spirit will bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have told you, whatever I said to you.” That can't possibly apply to anybody other than people who had sat under the actual ministry of Christ, namely the apostles. The personal references in these chapters are exclusively to apostles: Peter, Thomas, Philip, Judas and in [John] 15:27 “...you had been with me from the beginning...” Well, the whole church hasn't been with Jesus from the beginning, for goodness sake. That refers to the apostles; that's why a single act of inspiration is vital for determining the question of the canonicity of the book as being apostolic or arising in apostolic circles or whether it isn't. [Alright and the next slide.]

We mention Seminex in passing. The Seminex professors accepted as legitimate the higher criticism, higher critics received from the lower textual critics the best biblical texts and then endeavor to go higher or deeper by subjecting the biblical material to internal stylistic literary analysis. I'm finding what they believe to be errors, inconsistencies, vocabularies and stylistic differences *et cetera*, they arrive at the conclusions there must have been earlier sources, earlier authors and earlier editors. The fact that such earlier documents are nowhere to be found doesn't seem to bother them, for this approach, like that of thoroughgoing eclecticism, focuses not on the objective but on the subjective. In both cases one might say, perhaps unkindly but realistically, an objective God who objectively reveals is replaced by the critic whose subjective determinations provide whatever “revelation” there is. [Next slide.]

Is it really important whether biblical revelation is destabilized by higher criticism or by an unfortunate philosophy of lower criticism? The result is the same unless one gives the Holy Spirit a function Scripture does not, or unless one accepts the Roman Catholic belief that the Church visible is the justifier of Scripture, these views must be rejected. One simply cannot be permitted to hold such views as a confessional Lutheran.

And now some words of conclusion. And if you will move over to your page 13.

American seminary graduates, especially those from theological faculties of ingrown denominations, where the student has spent virtually his entire academic life in the institutions of that Church body, we won't mention any in particular such as The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. When they arrive in Europe and are blown out of water by a professorial atmosphere, all too often, you either become a disciple of your major professor or you return home with no doctorate and nothing to show for all the time and money expended. A sad example, Daniel Fuller, son of the radio evangelist Charles Fuller, who returned from his studies at the University of Basel in Switzerland having given up Biblical inerrancy and he became dean of his father's seminary and in a few years the seminary gave up its commitment to the inerrancy of scripture.

Those American theological students who do proudly return to the U.S. with a European Doctorate often receive teaching positions at conservative theological seminaries, colleges and Bible schools. The institutional administrators are so impressed with the newly crowned doctors that their beliefs are seldom questioned. As long as they continue to use the proper creedal and denominational lingo and they are hardly ever asked to define the terms. For a while, the professors continue to use the old language of biblical “infallibility” or “inerrancy,” but eventually those go by the board and the institutions move to a “moderate” or “quasi-liberal” theological stance. Classic example is Princeton Seminary and the Fuller Theological Seminary.

The word “professor” is etymologically,... [Next slide, please.] “...one who professes” something. A seminary professor, above all, should be professing something. The professor should be presenting, stressing and reinforcing his student's confidence in Holy Scripture. Not offering new and original viewpoints that do exactly the opposite. Our entire culture pressures the church and its clergy to give up confidence in God's inerrant word. Sadly our Lutheran seminaries offer little or no meaningful answers and little if any serious apologetic for the truth of the faith once delivered to the saints. This is scandalous in my view, and the declining church membership is often but a reflection of inadequate seminary instruction.

One of the major themes of Tolkien's *Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*... [Next slide.] ...is the ease with which we come to believe that if evil is decisively conquered on one occasion we shall have nothing to fear in the future. But in fact, middle earth and our earth are never free of the dangers of the old dragon's return. Only Christ coming will end that struggle.

In The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, many have believed that with the purification of the church and especially the St. Louis Seminary from the Seminex contamination, the church body became immune to scriptural and doctoral problems. Now all we need to worry about are the church growth movement and increased administrative centralism, we're told. I consider that nonsense.

If I were C.S. Lewis' demonic Uncle Screwtape, I would not bother with liberal denominations. They aren't saving people anyway. I would focus my efforts on destroying the few church bodies that still hold to the entire truth of God's Word (Scripture and Gospel). [Next slide.] They are the ones to corrupt and the best place to start is the faculties of theology and the best place in the seminaries to do devilish work is the exegetical department. Why? Because a corrupt view of Scripture will, as the night follows the day, inevitably result in the corruption of systematic and practical theology and thus impact what will be preached from the pulpit by the seminary graduates. And I would always push any viewpoint that stresses subjective decision making since at all cost the demonic strategy is to downplay the fundamental truth that God's word is always *extra nos*—it is as always outside of ourselves, exterior to us.

For Uncle Screwtape to succeed, all it takes is naïve seminary and church administrators, seminary's presidents, deans and department heads who value scholarship or academic reputation above doctrine. Church presidents who want peace at any price and value above doctrinal

truth, good ecumenical relations with sister denominations or with wider ecclesiastical life.
[The next slide.]

Thucydides said classically, “The secret of freedom is courage,” but in Church and seminary bureaucracies today courage is the virtue encountered the least. Why do theological seminaries and churches go liberal as virtually all have done? Answer: the pusillanimous attitude that refuses courageously to root out whatever is incompatible with the formal or material principles of any truly confessional theology. So, we have some concluding recommendations. [Have they come up yet? Oh good, alright.]

Our concluding recommendations: First, refuse to tolerate textual philosophies that employ internal stylistic criteria as the preferred standard for the choice of readings. Just as we have refused to tolerate higher critical theories that employ internal stylistic criteria to determine the origin and authorship of the biblical books.

Secondly, insist upon a serious commitment to biblical inerrancy, which necessarily means that scriptural material purporting to present historical facts, for example Luke's Gospel. You know it's fascinating that the beginning of Luke, Luke says “I followed all things closely from the beginning and this stuff is absolutely what happened.” And then in the same chapter later on, we have the *Magnificat*, which all of the good Greek manuscripts attribute to Mary. Now if you decide that she didn't do this because Elizabeth will work better in the total literary context of the book, the historicity of this stuff goes by the board. And what has happened is that a neat literary creation has appeared—one based solely upon the stylistic judgments of the critic.

Thirdly, continue to oppose all varieties of Gospel reductionism—all positions that maintain in one fashion or another that biblical revelation consists of nothing more than the expressions of the gospel, and that whatever else is there can be treated as the product of human fallibility. There must be unqualified repudiation of the viewpoint that says, “I don't care about the text as long as it preaches Christ.” If such a belief allows for the doctrine of the biblical inerrancy, then I don't understand language.

And fourthly, maintain and present to a dying world the objective factual evidential work of God, as exemplified by a totally trustworthy Bible and a historical Christ whose human life and divine ministry are precisely as described in the biblical records. Thank you.

Mark O. Stern: Thank you, Dr. Montgomery. We are right on-schedule. We are going to take a fifteen-minute break. After that we are going to have fifteen minutes from each speaker, followed by 45 minutes of questions and we should be finished by 1:00 PM. We'll see you in fifteen minutes.

Mark O. Stern: Hello. Okay, we're going to reconvene here. We'll have 15 minutes for Dr. Kloha, 15 minutes for Dr. Montgomery and then [45 minutes of] questions and answers. Please turn those in and include name and vocation. Thank you. Dr. Kloha?

Response by Dr. Jeffrey J. Kloha

Well, I thought we were here today to talk about the Bible. Apparently, we're here to talk about me. It should go without saying, and I was hoping to keep this fairly positive. I'll try to get back to the issue at hand later, but it should be fairly obvious that I pretty much disagree with everything he says and I'll explain why as I go through this. Let me give you my summary in three points.

First, my approach to the text is consistent with the practice of textual criticism in the early church down through the present day. As I mentioned before, every edition since Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort in the 19th century follows an eclectic method. Dr. Montgomery's complaints are not directed at me, they're directed at every edition of the Greek New Testament in the last 150 years. He doesn't make that clear.

Second, my theological framework is consistent with the classic dogmatists of the Lutheran tradition including especially Chemnitz and Pieper. I posted on Tuesday on the website www.concordiatheology.org, a paper that I delivered to the Lutheran Concerns Association two years ago where I laid out Pieper's approach to the text. I think that's an excellent one. He goes through "orthodox corruptions" in fact, and I agree with his assessment. I think you should read that and ask whether that's what Dr. Montgomery is actually describing.

Third, and this is my biggest concern, Dr. Montgomery has not provided a viable alternative to the way that the rest of the world does textual criticism. And I'll show you the two examples where he does tentatively highlight something as a way forward, but in fact they're both naïve and incorrect.

So let me start by showing a slide that I've used in my classes for the last 15 or so years. The motivation, and this is direct slide. "The Motivation for Textual Criticism for Lutherans," I'm not going to speak for others, "is the desire to be able to read with confidence and preach and teach authoritatively, certain that what one reads and teaches and preaches is indeed the Word of God, and not a human corruption. Our doctrines of Inspiration and Inerrancy," which by the way are simply the same thing, essentially, "require the challenging work of Textual Criticism."

Now in the last couple of years I added in parenthesis to the word require, "assume." We've "assumed" text criticism; we've "assumed" somebody else's text critical work without doing the work ourselves. That's why I got into this field as [an] undergraduate at classic Concordia, Ann Arbor with Dr. Hecker. It struck me that if we believe in an inerrant Bible, we ought to know which words are actually inerrant in this mass of 6,000 manuscripts. So we "assume" it, but we're assuming the work of others. And I simply think we need to be involved in this discipline.

So that's why I do text criticism. It's because I believe that every single word, every single word is of critical importance in the reading of the New Testament, that I use thoroughgoing eclecticism, not *exclusively* as I laid out earlier. And if you read my dissertation, you see numerous places where it's quite obvious I end up using external evidence. In fact in my viva, where I had my external examiners in Leeds, the guy from Cambridge asked me, or he said at the end, he said, "Kloha, you say you're a thoroughgoing eclectic, but in fact you're Hortian," which is, if you don't know means, Westcott and Hort in their 1880 edition. I took that as a compliment. That he read my work extremely well and that you can arrive at what are called external evidence *only* by doing all of the internal evidence.

So that's why I read about 60 manuscripts in Greek and Latin and Syriac of I Corinthians and looked at about 4,000 places where those manuscripts disagree. You don't start with the assumption that those 60 or 80 manuscripts are wrong. You look at all of them first and then you have a reason to talk.

Second, I'm fully aware of the limitations of thoroughgoing eclecticism. Dr. Montgomery is quite right to point out that nobody has produced a critical edition based solely on thoroughgoing eclectic principles. Personally, I don't think it's even possible and I did not do that in my dissertation. But you must understand how this works in context. There's numerous articles that I've written in this field dealing with this, some of which are actually exclusively dealing with external evidence, not internal evidence whatsoever. But textual criticism is such a specialized field, in fact, Dr. Montgomery refers to this book and I cited it numerous times; this came out in 2012, *Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*. It's about 30 essays in here on different aspects of the field of textual criticism. Only one essay in here is on thoroughgoing eclecticism. You cannot do text criticism just using one method.

There [are] all kinds of things that need to be taken into account. What I – the reason I prefer thoroughgoing eclecticism is because it forces you to wrestle with every word of the text. Other methods, especially when I was beginning my graduate school, was simply computer tabulations of how manuscripts agree, boring dissertations, tables, charts, who cares. That does me no good. It doesn't do the church any good for me to do computer study of manuscript relationships.

Thoroughgoing eclecticism requires word by word close study of every single word of the text. If you read my dissertation it reads like a commentary because that's simply what you're doing. You're doing a commentary on every single word and every single manuscript. It requires the closest study of the text, so I'm fully aware that you're not going to create a text using thoroughgoing eclecticism and the method only really applies in those questions where there is textual uncertainty. If you read my work, that's exactly what I do. Let's see, if you want to talk about the *Magnificat*, we can talk about that in the Q&A. I'll just say that Dr. Montgomery mischaracterizes my work. It's not based on what Luke thought about Mary. That is crazy; read the article.

Let's see; let's go to this, just to make this clear. Dr. Montgomery claims that I have said, although I've never spoken with him, that he doesn't understand me, and quotes others as reporting the same thing. There's actually a reason for this. If you turn to – let's see what page is it here. I'll just put the slide up. [In] his discussion he claims that in 7:34, I Corinthians 7:34,35, I come up with a reading, conclude that a reading, which is completely unsupported in the manuscript tradition, and therefore it's a fallacious methodology. He begins his quote here. “The influence of the parallelism,” I think it's on page 5 of his document and he argues that I reject the reading of P[apyrus]15 BP. Here's a picture of my dissertation. The archetypical reading of I Corinthians 7:33, 7:34 is *kai memeristai kai he'gune'he' agamos kai he' parthenos* P15 BP. It's right there in black and white. I don't know how you can misread that sentence. Simply a mistake.

Furthermore when you claim, I mean, I can go on, P15 as a core witness; that's P15 [on slide]. It's a fragment. There's so little text we hardly know what to do with it. In fact it supports the readings, you can see there's *no memeristai*, you see the gap with the *kai*. I walk through all the evidence of this in my dissertation but it's hardly a core witness. You got to understand the facts of the manuscripts before you can make sweeping judgments about the best ways to handle the material.

I'll point to a second error and this one just floors me. He says quote “It should be observed that if this view is accepted, no pastor should preach I Corinthians 8:6 as if it were the Word of God.” This has been repeated in various places for three years now. Here is my actual disser-

tation [on slide]. “The addition of the bicolon describing the work of the Holy Spirit can only be a secondary development. It is structurally based to the two previous bicola and no previous explanation for its submission can be given.” What I’m simply saying is that this addition to I Corinthians 8:6, which you find in every edition and every translation, some manuscripts add “and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things and we are in him.” I’m arguing that this is secondary which is what every edition and every translation ever produced agrees with. How he can argue that I throw out I Corinthians 8:6 is beyond me. It is simply in black and white. So though he talks about three passages that I discussed and two of them he completely misunderstands and misrepresents what I say. Yes, indeed he does not understand what I’m saying. It’s in black and white.

Now again, misattribution. This happens regularly as people have looked at my work over the last couple of years. “Dr. Kloha declares we now have a text of the New Testament that makes no claim to being fixed and stable for it is subject to continuous improvement and change.” Again, this is not my view. This is precisely what the editors of this edition (*Nestle-Aland 28th Edition*) claim. You read the actual text in context. Here is the full citation [on slide]. I’m referring to what the editors of the Nestle edition have claimed. It’s not my argument.

Now where he does offer a solution twice on page 16 where he tries to fix me, and also on page 3, footnote 4, he suggests that we should follow the coherence-based genealogical method which is the method used in the production of this edition. At least, for the Catholic Epistles to this point. So here’s his quotes, page 16 “...that he rethink the eclectic position [on slide],” again, which is the position of every edition since the mid-19th century, “and move in the direction of a more objective textual philosophy such as that of the coherence-based genealogical method.” And page 3 note 4, “The latest efforts to arrive at the *Ausgangstext*,” which I’m not sure if he knows what that means, but anyway, “on the basis of external manuscript evidence rather than internal, literary criteria, is the coherence-based genealogical evidence.” This is factually wrong.

[Here’s a] 2011 article by Hugh Houghton, about the coherence-based method [on slide]: “It is worth emphasizing that the decision at each point of variation remains the responsibility of the editor, based on traditional criteria and philological reasoning; the information stored in the system is simply a record of all previous choices.” It is still an eclectic method. I already pointed this out in my Oberursel essay. Here it is right here [on slide]. “The researcher decides, based on whatever methodology he or she chooses, what they think the original reading is in that place.” It’s already laid out black and white. I don’t know why he thinks it’s an objective method. It simply is *not*. Please read what it says. And by the way I’m not convinced that it is the best method forward, as I pointed out in my essay there.

I hesitate to do this and I only bring this up again because it’s going to sound like sour grapes here. But I received an e-mail yesterday from a colleague who works in the field who came across Dr. Montgomery’s essay, I’ll leave his name out, he pointed out two errors of his in reading his work and citing it in his paper. I’m not the only person whose work he misreads and misuses; doesn’t understand the field of textual criticism whatsoever.

Regarding orthodox corruptions [on slide], again, I encourage you to read Pieper on this. I’ll also point out that it’s not new. Early church fathers were making this observation very early on. And even Luther, in his commentary on I John, the Trinitarian edition, which is not found in any modern edition. Luther knew that this was a secondary edition. And here’s his argument. He says [on slide] “The Greek books do not have these words, but this verse seems to have been inserted by the Catholics because of the Arians, yet not aptly;” this is internal evidence now; “for wherever John speaks about the witnesses, he speaks about those on earth, not about those in heaven.” Luther is [using] exactly the method that every textual critic does, explain the rise of

the reading, here it's clearly a Trinitarian edition and Luther looks at it, at the internal evidence, the argument of the text to reach his conclusion.

His other proposed alternative to an eclectic approach, in addition to the coherence-based method, which he doesn't understand, is to pick one manuscripts and he suggests *Codex Sinaiticus*. You know you could pick it if you want it. Here's *Codex Sinaiticus* [on slide], if you're going to take the text, if you're going to take the corrections, what are you going to do with it? You have to understand that *Codex Sinaiticus* has a pretty good text of the Gospels, but it's inferior to *Codex Vaticanus*. In John chapter 1, 1 through 8:12, it in fact follows *Codex Bezae* rather than *Codex Vaticanus*. It's a block mixture of text and it's text of Revelation has been completely revised. It has a unique text, which takes out all the grammatical, you know, non-Greek things because Revelation has a very semitized style of Greek. So what's the problem? If you pick one manuscript, you still are stuck with a subjective problem of somebody choosing the readings for you. No manuscript is without error. Every manuscript needs to be corrected. That's simply the work of textual criticism.

Regarding Gospel reductionism, to claim that the Scriptures are authoritative, because of Jesus Christ, is not Gospel reductionism, it is simply what the New Testament teaches. I nowhere in my writings say that other doctrines are not important. If you've read my commentary work, my Concordia journal articles, my sermons, listen to my Bible study every Sunday morning on KFUE, it is quite clear that I do not advocate Gospel reductionism. Here's what the CTCR document in 1972 says about this [on slide] and I'm not sure how – well, I'll just read it. “Especially with reference to the Bible do Lutherans reject the idea that the Gospel serves as a core to which other teachings of the Bible are related as a mere set of deductions relative to that particular time and culture. Lutheran theology does not appeal to the Gospel in such a way as to relativize the rest of the Scriptures. Gospel is not the norm in the Scriptures in such a way as to make only the Gospel the norm of theology.” This is far from what I'm doing. “This is a ‘Gospel reductionism’ that Lutherans condemn as a repudiation of the authority of Scriptures.” Just read the apostle Paul.

Second and last, he does a little bit on what are my students going to get. Thursday in class we are reading Acts chapter 9. It's a Greek readings course, it is a Ph.D. course so we go pretty quick and we've got some difficult text. Here's the one variant on the page that actually matters in Acts chapter 9 [on slide]. It's when Saul sees the vision on the road to Damascus and Ananias sees in a vision [indiscernible] see there in verse 10, the Lord speaking to him and says to go to the house on Straight Street and verse 12, some manuscripts describe that Ananias had seen the man [indiscernible], in a vision. The brackets mean that the editors are not sure of the original reading. That's the only place on the page, [indiscernible] doesn't matter either, frankly. We spent about 30 seconds on this in the class. We noticed that it's an assimilation to the preceding text. If you want to look at the external evidence it is down here, it's actually pretty weak. The text prints [indiscernible] 1175, in fact [indiscernible] rather it seems, with internal evidence, but that's all we do in class. I'm not telling students to write a new Bible. Thoroughgoing eclecticism applies where there are controverted difficult passages and the effort is required to be as certain as we possibly can about the wording of the text, because we need to take every single word seriously.

So here's my request.

First tell us why Chemnitz has no problem using language of “witness” and “judging” and “source” with respect to text and canon. Oh, one more thing, the slippery slope argument about textual criticism leads to historical criticism; please read my paper. I skimmed over that. It's at the end of the paper, please read it. Second, tell us which edition of the Greek New Testament and which English translation is “objectively inspired.” I mean which edition do you use? I'd like to know. And for the fun of it, look at John 1:18 and tell us which reading is objectively determined to be the original reading, *monogenês huios* or *monogenês theos*. I'd like to be

positive, please read the conclusion of my paper. I think there's actually a way forward which I lay out there at the end. But time does not permit. Thank you.

Response by Dr. John Warwick Montgomery

Yes. Just a couple of words in regard to the claim that I really don't know what I'm doing in this area, I expected this. If you go to the *Festschrift* in which Dr. Kloha did his revision of his Oberursel paper, you'll see that what I quoted concerning the fact that we have no certain text of the New Testament, everything is up for grabs—this sort of thing, you will see that that is his exact words, this hasn't been picked up from somebody else through some sort of sub-quotation. You will also note that maybe it's just the reverse. Maybe it's Dr. Kloha who doesn't understand me. I never said in my paper that lower criticism, textual criticism, in some way leads to higher criticism or that higher criticism leads to lower criticism. I didn't say that at all. What I said was that the common ground between the two is simply that the critic, either lower or higher, makes his determinations fundamentally on the basis of the literary nature of the material as he sees it. Okay? This is the common methodology for goodness sake. The higher critic determines that given biblical books are not the product of the alleged authors, but are an editorial combination of material as a result of reading those books and seeing stylistic vocabulary, ideological changes in the narrative. Right? Now, the lower critic is using exactly that same approach to make the decision as to a variant in instances where the lower critic is unable to arrive at any manuscript evidence, external manuscript evidence that he can trust. All right.

Dr. Kloha mentions this Swedish colleague of his who sent him a letter – an e-mail indicating that I had not understood him, understood that fellow properly and I corresponded with him. And the only point that was really significant in that was a typo error in my note 4. And if you go to my note 4, and I can find it. Yes. If you go to my note 4, you should make that correction, if you go three lines from the bottom, this is a “scribal error.” It's what textual critics regard as a scribal error. That should say “New Testament material for which we ‘have’ an apparatus, not for which we ‘do not yet have;’ for which we ‘have’ an apparatus.” And you may want to add in there “I John and Jude.”

The ECM, *Editio Critica Maior*, employs the coherence-based genealogical method. In the 28th edition of Nestle, that text is being followed for the Catholic Epistles and now that method has been extended to I John and Jude. And the fact of the matter is that, as I'm going to point out in just a minute, at a pre-stage you have a level of objectivity which you don't have in other methodologies and that's why this is of more than routine significance.

Let me quote, if I can find it here, yes; Klaus Wachtel, University of Münster Institute for New Testament Research, has said in his essay on *The Coherence Method in History*, “The pre-genealogical coherence is independent of any subjective element. It is based solely on the degree of agreement between witnesses.” Now, later on the coherence method does certainly use internal criteria and I have not said that there is something inherently the matter with ever using internal criteria. I have said that the trouble with the way Dr. Kloha goes about this stuff is that the internal always privileges the external and that's following religiously his mentor, Keith Elliott. It should be just the reverse, and the ECM is moving in the direction that privileges the external, before you do anything with the internal. And that's exactly the way this ought to work.

Now, as to Dr. Kloha's paper, in my opinion the problem is not what he says, it's what he leaves out—what he leaves out. He has glossed over that essential difference between thoroughgoing eclecticism and other approaches. And, as I say, I have never denied the use of internal criteria. Among the internal criteria there are certain considerations that don't pose much of a problem. For example, you choose the variant that is the shorter or shortest reading or the harder or hardest reading. And you would choose Koine Greek rather than Attic Greek in the case of a reading, and you would choose a reading normally that would go with Semetic forms of expression. These are criteria that are quite a bit different from the use of the theology or the ideology, or the style of, the literary style of the material.

In the case of Luther, consider that passage that deals with “the three who bear record on earth” and “the three who bear record in heaven.” The fact of the matter is that the reason that we don't include “the three who bear record in heaven” is the solid textual authority that leaves them out. That is not based upon some kind of internal reading.

Now Luther, of course, did have a strong tendency to judge certain Scripture books and passages according to his theological insight. You know he had great difficulty with the book of Revelation until it was pointed out to him there is that passage about “the whore that sitteth on the seven hills,” and the minute that Luther saw that, of course, that's the Pope, suddenly the book of Revelation meant a great deal more to him than it had ever meant previously. That was a failing of Luther's that he had a tendency to throw out the epistle of James because he was convinced that it was contrary to justification by grace through faith and not of works. But the Lutheran Church has recognized that is a failing of Luther's and has moved on beyond that. All right.

What are some of the other things that are omitted from the Kloha presentation? Well, for one thing he offers no repudiation of any of his previously published material. It's those previously published materials that constitute the source of the present discussion and difficulty. If he really no longer does hold, for example, that we have a text of the New Testament that makes no claim to being fixed and stable, *et cetera*, then why doesn't he tell us that and why doesn't he publish, in exactly the same context, whatever the repudiation is. It is not enough to publish obscure *Festschrift* articles after the kind of thing that that plastic text essay represents hit the web and has been read by everybody. If you want to buy that *Festschrift*, it only costs \$90. Nobody is going to do that!

Or, why is it that he hasn't repudiated the notion of continuous inspiration by way of the Holy Spirit through the history of the church? You know, as Lutherans, that we should be centering on a single act of inspiration that is based upon apostolic authorship.

Only two and a half pages at the end of his 24-page paper touch on inerrancy, and he never defines it. We don't know what he means by it. Does he mean that the Biblical text is factually correct in everything that it says? If he does then, of course, he holds that I and II Timothy were written by the apostle Paul because in the first verse of those two books that's exactly what it says.

And what about his favorite book, I Corinthians? From reading his dissertation, I'm really not sure if he thinks that this material can be taken back to the Apostle Paul or to his circle. He is very vague on the *Corpus Paulinum* as to whether we really can get back to anything that is genuinely apostolic.

And finally, he didn't mention to us what he does at the very end of his paper. There he says that any kind of apologetic defense, any kind of evidence is “self-referential” and “self-serving.” Now, one of the problems that The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod has had is its absence of providing evidence to a secular pluralistic non-Christian world. The assumption has been that if you simply have a church that is presenting orthodoxy, obviously people are going to come and they're going to hear the Word and they're going to be saved. Maybe this is why the denomination is losing members instead of gaining them. In any event, let me tell you what *is* self-serving and self-referential. It's simply claiming that the Bible is the Word of God because that's exactly what the cults and the sects and other religions do.

Let me give you two examples, okay? Some years ago I debated the Imam Shabir Ally at the Inns of Court School of Law in London. And Ally said, “The New Testament documents present a Christ that is not the real Christ. The authors corrupted the real picture of Jesus.” And I said, “well, excuse me, but why would you hold to a thing like that?” He said, “Because the New Testament picture of Jesus contradicts the Quran's picture of Jesus.” And I said, “But the Quran was written seven centuries later, not by people who had any contact with Jesus.” And he said,

“But, it is God's Word. It was written by Mohammad, the Prophet of Allah,” *et cetera*. He would not give any evidence for the Quran at all because he couldn't. He couldn't.

Second illustration. About the same time, my wife and I are minding our own business in our apartment in Strasbourg, France, and a knock comes at the door and there are these two people dressed in funereal black suits with short haircuts. And I said, “You're either CIA who finally caught up with me, or you are Mormon missionaries, which is it?” And they admitted that they were Mormon missionaries and I invited them in and I asked them why one would accept the *Book of Mormon*. And they said “The burning in the bosom.” You may not be aware of this, but Mormon bosoms burn at a higher centigrade than non-Mormon bosoms. All of it was inner experience, right? The subjective – the subjective, and do we, as Christians, really want to offer that kind of gospel presentation. THAT is what is self-referential and self-serving because it's based entirely on the inner beliefs of the individual.

If we, instead of going that route, recognize that we need to provide a strong positive argument for the text of the New Testament and for the value of the eyewitness accounts that are there, and what they say about Jesus and the miracles that He historically performed and the fulfilled prophecies that actually were the case, then we have something that is *Christ referential and Christ serving*. But if we remain, as Dr. Kloha does at the end of that paper, in the position of not being able to prove anything, we are simply reducing historic Christianity to some kind of cultic operation.

Now I do not have the responsibility to choose the best text. That is indeed, Dr. Kloha's responsibility and the responsibility of people in his field. But what I'm insisting on is that he start with the external evidence and privilege that, and only use the internal considerations where they're absolutely necessary. This is as in the law, in the law. The law doesn't allow extrinsic evidence to be brought in to interpret an integrated document like a will, unless it is absolutely essential to do this owing to the ambiguity or inability of the document to deal with itself. Okay?

I want that kind of an approach to be taken by Dr. Kloha and his colleagues and it seems to me that the Münster folk are moving in that direction and this is all to the good. Now if, as a result of all of this, you are saying, well, Dr. Kloha's got to be right though, there are all of those variants. Please everybody, take a look, if you can handle it, at a good Greek New Testament, *28th edition of Nestle-Aland*. And you will find that the significant variants are almost nil; really a small number of these, because if you do rely on solid external evidence then you get a text that yields, virtually all the familiar modern translation into modern languages. And in fact, you can go back to the old King James Bible, or Luther's translation into German, both based on Erasmus' *Textus Receptus*, and what it says won't be materially different from what you're reading today.

Thus, in fact we do have a solid text and the stuff that Dr. Kloha has been messing with is on the periphery, and you can have confidence in the text. And it seems to me that that kind of confidence in an era like ours is absolutely critical. If we don't operate in that way, we are going to leave people without a witness and we're supposed to be preaching the gospel to every creature, last I heard. Thank you.

Mark O. Stern: Thank you, Dr. Montgomery and Dr. Kloha.

Questions and Answers

Mark O. Stern: It is now time for our question-and-answer period, which we will try to wrap up by 1:00 p.m. I'm going to read off the written questions that we've received and you can continue to submit those in the back. The first question comes from Rev. Jack Cascione from Arizona, he says...

Dr. Montgomery: That's Cascione, Cascione, that's Italian.

Mark O. Stern: Okay...“Did the apostles know they were writing the inspired Word of God?” And I will start with Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Montgomery: I'm not sure that they did but that's not especially relevant. The relevant thing is that Jesus promised that the Holy Spirit would give them a special gift. This is the gift that has been called by a great French theologian “the gift of total recall.” “The Holy Spirit will bring you remembrance all things whatsoever I have told you.” And on the basis of that, the early church collected writings that could be related to those apostles; the stuff didn't have to be written by the apostle himself. The stuff could have been written in an apostolic circle, but where there could be apostolic validation of it. It was this key issue of apostolic authority that led to these materials becoming part of the Bible. That's the essential criterion on the basis of which the New Testament canon came to be completed.

It's interesting that there is the line in the Scripture that, “prophets of old often wrote not knowing what they were saying.” I suggest that may very well be the case for the apostles. The apostles may not have realized that even a short letter on a very specific subject would eventually enter into the totality of Scripture, but it is particularly interesting that in Peter, you have the passage in II Peter, you have the passage where Peter says people are misreading Paul as they do *the other Scriptures*. So that means that already during the lifetime of the apostles, Paul's writings were being classified as Scripture—*kai tas loipas graphas*—on the same level as the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Mark O. Stern: Dr. Kloha do you have any thoughts?

Dr. Kloha: I agree. Although I think you could say it a little more strongly. Paul says quite clearly: “If you seek proof of the Christ who is speaking in me,” or “by me,” [indiscernible], Paul clearly assumes that he's preaching [the] Word of God and that's on the basis on which he makes every admonition; he begins his letter, “Paul's *apostoles*.” So I don't know why the hesitation. But yes, I have no problem assuming that the apostles and their followers Mark and Luke knew that they were writing [the] Word of God.

Mark O. Stern: Thank you. Second question comes from Dr. Christian Kopff, who is a layman. He says, “would the speakers comment on the issue of ‘clarity of Scripture’ (*Deutlichkeit der Schrift, Perspicuitas Scripturae*). An NT text created by a new committee with a new methodology, that in the future online format can be changed so easily, seems to eliminate the possibility of a clear statement of what is to be believed authoritatively.” And I'll turn to Dr. Kloha to start with.

Dr. Kloha: Yes, I'd encourage you, again, a very helpful resource is Robert Preus' *Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, especially the last few chapters where he kind of summarizes the orthodox fathers, pages 3-11 through 3-13. He gives three points about clarity of Scripture. He says, “First, the Lutheran position did not imply that everything in Scripture, the thoughts and mysteries revealed therein was clear. The thoughts of God and mysteries contained in Scripture are often unclear to us in our understanding. Second, the Lutheran position does not pertain to every verse of scripture. In fact many passages dealing with the articles of faith and divine precepts are obscure. However, all that is needful for faith and life is clearly revealed in Scripture. Third, the clarity of

scripture is more than mere perspicuity in hearing in the words and sense of the passages for the most part and in the message as a whole, it is a dynamic property that illumines our understanding and leads us to Christ. And when He is found, we have everything necessary for salvation.” Not that hard.

Dr. Montgomery: Yes, an encouraging word along the lines of what I was saying in my rebuttal. There's the story of the pompous bishop who tripped over his cleaning woman just before Christmas and realize she existed, and he gave her a Christmas gift, a commentary on the Gospel of John—Bultmann's commentary in the Meyer series, I would imagine. And then he forgot all about it and tripped over her again just before Easter. And he remembered the gift and he said, “And was the commentary that I gave you helpful?” She replied, “Falth, it was terrible difficult, but the Gospel of John has helped me a lot to understand it.” The text of scripture is clearer than the commentaries in most instances. Don't stuff your library full of commentaries, read the bloomin' text.

Mark O. Stern: Okay. We have a question from Noah Hahn who is a layman. This is for Dr. Montgomery. “Dr. Montgomery, you criticized A.C. Piepkorn for his redefinition of inerrancy. Are you aware that Robert Preus' Board of Control interviewed Piepkorn extensively concluding that his position was ‘...in accord with the scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.’”

Dr. Montgomery: Yes, I'm aware of that and Robert Preus was one of my dearest friends. Just before he passed away my wife and I had him as our guests at our Athenaeum Club in London. I worked with Bob Preus on all sorts of things. Yes, I understand that. May I say; however, that Boards of Control are not infallible, only Holy Scripture is infallible. Boards of Control tend to place the best construction on what anybody says who is having some doctrinal difficulties and the result is that almost never has a Board of Control actually removed anybody from a teaching position in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, at least in the seminaries.

The fact is that it is vitally important to know what a person means when he uses the theological terminology like “inerrancy” or “inspiration.” These terms that can mean a vast number of different things. If you have ever read Piepkorn's essay that appeared in the old *Concordia Theological Monthly*, titled, “What Does Inerrancy Mean?,” you will not see any possible compatibility with the classic Lutheran position on inerrancy. I knew Piepkorn well too. Listen, he desperately wanted to be Missouri Synod. But his approach to Scripture was certainly that of the old United Lutheran Church, now the ELCA, not that of the classic Lutheran fathers.

Mark O. Stern: Dr. Kloha, do you have any response to that.

Dr. Kloha: No.

Mark O. Stern: Okay. The next question Dr. Kloha, is for you, and its referencing this quote [on slide]. This is coming from Eric Hiller who's a layman from Chicago. He says, “Dr. Kloha regarding the quote Dr. Montgomery provides on page 9 of his paper. Did you say this? Is it taken out of context and if it is not out of context can you explain the apparent view you hold that the Spirit will continue to reveal new truth or modify our interpretation versus what the church has believed for 2,000 years and that are specifically addressed in the book of Concord. I think someone else referred to this as continuous [indiscernible].”

Dr. Kloha: I really don't know where that view came from. If you read my dissertation or the eight or ten scholarly articles I published in text criticism. I never once say the Holy Spirit told me this is the right reading. It's not at all what I'm saying and not at all what I put into practice. That is complete fabrication; I have no idea where that came from.

Dr. Montgomery: That is absolutely false, that stuff comes directly from your material.

Dr. Kloha: Show me one passage where I claimed the Holy Spirit from your reading.

Dr. Montgomery: I've cited it. Read the footnotes. The footnotes will take you to the exact location. That's why we have footnotes.

Dr. Kloha: There is no reading where I ever claimed that, Sir. As to this quote, please read it, and I can't say everything in every essay; I get criticized for what I don't say. I'm not writing a comprehensive doctrine of Scripture or a comprehensive study of textual criticism or even more challenging, a comprehensive study dealing with both at the same time. Read this quote and what I, in fact do in that essay, is put it in the context of Chemnitz. And I made the mistake of assuming that our pastors had read Martin Chemnitz and I could just refer to it and they would know what I was talking about. Read what I put in this paper. Go read the 20 pages of Chemnitz. It has by far the best understanding of the theology. Preus has a very nice summary of Chemnitz. He said Chemnitz combines the best of exegetical theology and historical theology and he holds them both together. Please read Chemnitz on that and read this comment in light of that.

Mark O. Stern: Okay. Dr. Montgomery, you already had a little bit of a response.

Dr. Montgomery: That was my response.

Mark O. Stern: Good, thank you. Next, we have a question from Mary who is a student at Concordia Wisconsin, for Dr. Montgomery. "Dr. Montgomery, on page 7 of your paper it says if the Scripture is created by the church, it can hardly be used to criticize the church's errors. How would you understand church invisible or visible?"

Dr. Montgomery: Well, I am talking about the visible church. Dr. Kloha has made perfectly clear that for him the idea of "once-for-all inspiration—inspiration focused on the Holy Spirit's bringing to the remembrance of the apostles what Jesus said, and the New Testament resulting from it makes the church 'vulnerable.'" That's his expression, and in fact it does just the opposite. "Single-act" inspiration makes the authority and the inerrancy of the New Testament materials derive not from the church but specifically and directly from Jesus Christ Himself.

What we do here is we start with the New Testament documents as ordinary historical documents and we find that they're excellent and then we look at what the witnesses say in these documents about Jesus. And Jesus claims to be God—God incarnate—and He fulfills prophecy and He rises again from the dead. And having given this promise to the apostles; that means that the New Testament materials are going to be indeed revelatory and revelatory because of Jesus' gift of the Holy Spirit to those apostles.

And that is the basis for our maintaining that the Scriptures, the validity of the Scriptures, does not depend upon the church. The early church simply determined what the sources of these books were. The early church was only putting a stamp of approval on what had already been determined as a result of apostolic authorship. So this is very different from a situation where, let us say, there is some kind of continuous activity on the part of the church validating the text of the moment or validating the canon of the moment. The Roman Catholic Church has to deal with it that way. For the Roman Catholic Church these textual problems are trivial because, in the last analysis, the church is the continuation of the incarnation in time. And so, of course you do not need to worry about any textual problems. The church is going to be the locus of your theology anyway.

Mark O. Stern: And there was a follow-up for Dr. Kloha. "Is the distinction between the visible and the invisible church important to understand your view?" You made that distinction I guess.

Dr. Kloha: Well, I mean we have no access to the invisible church, it is only the spiritual. All we have access to is the visible church.

Dr. Montgomery: You're a member of it.

Dr. Kloha: Now let me just point out what you just summarized, Sir, is exactly what I wrote on pages four through the Chemnitz section 4 through 9 in my paper. It is exactly what I wrote. Exactly what I meant the entire time.

Dr. Montgomery: Maybe that's Chemnitz, but the fact of the matter is that you have published stuff that is inconsistent with that.

Dr. Kloha: Yeah, well we have already talked about your ability to read my work. So we'll leave it at that.

Dr. Montgomery: Ditto!

Mark O. Stern: Okay, this question comes to us from Dr. Charles...

Dr. Kloha: Never mind, that *ad hominem*; I don't engage in that.

Mark O. Stern: Dr. Charles Gieschen, a Professor of Exegetical Theology at Concordia Theological Seminary. For Dr. Kloha. "If you were teaching a Bible class or preaching in an LCMS congregation on the *Magnificat* who would you teach/preach as the speaker of the *Magnificat*? You do not use the adjective "plastic" in your revision of the paper you delivered in Oberursel. Is it problematic to describe the text of the NT as "plastic," within the church? If so why, if not, why?" So, Professor has got in a compound question.

Dr. Kloha: Yes, he has asked about three questions, Chuck. I think there's three.

Dr. Montgomery: Well, he is a seminary Professor. You should expect that.

Dr. Kloha: First, you could ask my Bible Study on Sunday morning at St. Paul Lutheran Church, Des Peres. In Advent last year we went through Luke 1 and 2 and didn't even mention the problem, for what it is worth. [I did not publish that...]

Dr. Montgomery: It is worth absolutely nothing. You have a commitment if you believe that that's the case to present it as the text.

Dr. Kloha: The argument that it's a closed question because the manuscripts have it. It is a question that has been repeated over and over again. It is a question; however, that has come up many times in the history of the church. I took a stab at writing through it, came to some conclusions. I think it is a pretty decent essay. If you don't like it, that's fine. But I see my role as contributing to the larger project of textual criticism and that my judgments by themselves are not decisive.

Second question about "plastic." I regret using that word, and I haven't used it since, except when people bring it up like today. I will point out though, this is not a new problem. We've had 28 editions of the Nestle-Aland text; 27 of them have been different; 26 and 27 were the same. Prior to that, we had Westcott and Hort and Tischendorf. In fact, you might be familiar with—last month the ESV Committee came out with the statement that they were going to change the text one more time for the third time since 2001, and then it was going to be fixed and stable forever. Did you guys see this on the internet? Well, three weeks later, they changed their mind and here's what they said, which I think is a fair way to say it. Let me read this. "Our goal at Crossway remains as strong as ever to serve future generations with a stable ESV text, but the means to that goal, we now see, is not to establish a permanent text but rather to allow for ongoing periodic updating of the text to reflect the realities of biblical scholarship, such as textual discoveries or changes in English over time. These kinds of updates will be minimal and infrequent but fidelity to scripture requires that we remain open in principle to such changes as the

Crossway Board of Directors and the ESV Translation Oversight Committee see fit in years ahead.” I think that’s a very clear and helpful summary of the issue.

Mark O. Stern: Thank you. Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Montgomery: Well, they noted that one of the reasons for this is a change in English usage and the like. Of course, they would not be able to arrive at a point where you would have a single modern-language expression of biblical truth. Consider all the different translations and paraphrases. We knew that anyway.

The very fact that the variants are set forth in the critical editions indicates to us that there are other possibilities, but in life you've got to go with the weight of evidential probability and if you do this, your text for all practical purposes, is solid.

This is what ought to be stressed and I find it absolutely disingenuous when you will not follow through on what you wrote in your own article. If you believed in that article that the better reading, the better text for the *Magnificat* was Elizabeth, you had no business in the world just ignoring the question in your current teaching. It may well be, Dr. Kloha, that you give papers in non-confessional contexts that really work very well in those contexts and then when you come to us we get this litany of orthodox Lutheran fathers, which is supposed to give the impression that the kind of work you've done is consistent with biblical inerrancy. It isn't. It isn't.

Mark O. Stern: Do you want to respond, Dr. Kloha?

Dr. Kloha: Yes, certainly. One has to have a little bit of credibility in order to speak to textual problems, in order to present my work on I Corinthians 14, which again is thrown out by the vast majority of New Testament scholars who don't like the traditional view on women in the church. I'm not going to be able to go in there and say simply, “It's inspired, you're done.” You actually have to have some credibility, know the data, be able to handle the data, and make a cogent argument based on the data. That's what my work is focused on. That's simply what I'm doing. I'm not going to quote inspiration or quote Chemnitz in an academic setting like the Society of Biblical Literature.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, this is a question from Adam Wagner, who's a layman, for Dr. Montgomery. “Dr. Montgomery's footnote 24 on page 11, says ‘preaching Christ does not make the preacher an apostle.’ Could you both explicate your understanding of the preaching office? Is the pastor's preaching and absolving presently inspired or a reminder of a singular historical inspiration?”

Dr. Montgomery: Okay, the pastor's preaching, if it accords with the apostolic witness and with the inerrant Scriptures is a proper employment of the ministerial office. But that does not make the preacher an apostle and it doesn't mean that when he declares something from the pulpit he is somehow apostolic in the sense of being another Paul or Peter. It doesn't mean that at all. Listen, you can go down to the inner city and you will find a storefront church and it'll say on it Apostle Jones' Tabernacle. Well, it may be Jones and it may be a tabernacle. But it ain't an apostle.

Mark O. Stern: [Dr. Kloha,] Anything further?

Dr. Kloha: [indiscernible] Christ for your sake. That's fine.

Mark O. Stern: This is for Dr. Kloha from Pastor Philip Hale. “If textual criticism does not consider the pre-history of a work, do you still hold to your opinion in the Oberursal piece that Scriptural books were produced like drafts of the Gettysburg Address? If this view is not rejected, how can it be proven since this is used to question inspiration. Which of those three or four drafts of Romans are inspired? Is this a textual matter?”

Dr. Kloha: No, that's not actually what I say at all. And that wasn't in the published version. Read it, get the paper.

Dr. Montgomery: Another person who misinterprets Kloha!

Dr. Kloha: Stop it, stop it, stop it please. The point being made is that when Paul writes a letter, and it's quite clear throughout his letters that he sends multiple copies to multiple churches. In Colossians, he says "Send this to Laodicea; have it read there also. I Corinthians is quite clear that he's got several people who are receiving copies of the letter. As soon as you make a copy, a hand produced object, there's a very strong likelihood, if not in fact, it's going to happen that those copies will be different.

So, that's what I'm referring to is the letter that Paul sends to Rome, and then the ones he sends to the other churches; are those all going to be identical? Which one ended up in our canon is an interesting question. But, that's how I was using the Gettysburg Address. Not that there were multiple drafts of Romans or something like this. The ending of Romans is, in fact, a pretty interesting question which can get pretty technical but we can talk about it if you like but we'd need to go through some Greek and spend some time looking at the manuscripts to do that. I don't know if you are aware of the textual question there. But I was not referring in that essay at all, to pre-canonical drafts or something like that. It's simply, what happens when the apostle Paul sends a letter to multiple congregations.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, now Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Montgomery: Yes, have you ever done anything with the various texts of the Magna Carta? There was a Magna Carta anniversary here, just a year ago.

Dr. Kloha: That's correct, yes.

Dr. Montgomery: There were multiple contemporary, official texts of the Magna Carta. The remarkable thing about them is that it's impossible to say that any one of them is the original. And the reason for this is that they all say exactly the same thing. Legally, it was so important to maintain a solid text, that when multiple copies were made, tremendous care was made that those texts all were the same. Now, if the apostle Paul recognized the significance of his apostleship, which he surely did, and prepared letters in several copies, don't you think that he would make sure that those copies were identical?

Dr. Kloha: That's a subjective question, isn't it? If any...

Dr. Montgomery: No, it's not a subjective question, it's a question. You may have to answer it subjectively, but the question is not subjective or objective. It's just a question. What I'm wondering is why anybody would assume, unless they're regarding this stuff as a purely human product, why you would suppose that some drunken scribe had produced dreadful copies of apostolic stuff to go all over the place and the apostles never bothered to check it. How will we handle the problem if such copies turn up? This is a non-question.

Dr. Kloha: It's simply a question. It's one that needs to be dealt with if you look at...it's just a fact. Every copy of Paul's letters that we have is from the thirteen letter collection. We have no single manuscript of just Romans or just Ephesians.

Dr. Montgomery: Right, the ...

Dr. Kloha: Somebody put it together using the sequence by length: Romans is the longest, I Corinthians is the second longest and follows II Corinthians, Galatians. It's ordered like every codex collected essays or collected letters in the ancient world. So, how do we know which one ended up in the collection? These are very interesting questions. The question needs to be asked. I'm not saying that this creates some kind of gap or something. It's simply a question that needs to be addressed. Because our manuscripts all go back to that collection.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, we have a question from Synod Vice-President Dr. John Wohlrabe. He says, "Dr. Kloha seems to emphasize the preaching of Christ as the ground of authority, instead of the inspiration of Scripture. Dr. Montgomery seems to emphasize the inspiration of Scripture, II Timothy 3:16, II Peter 1:21. Paul also emphasizes his apostleship in several places. Lutherans are rarely 'either or' theologians and more often 'both and...'"

Dr. Montgomery: Is this a question?

Mark O. Stern: Well, there's an interrogatory at the end here.

Dr. Montgomery: Ah.

Mark O. Stern: "...Lutherans are rarely 'either or' theologians and more often 'both and.' What place do all these have...all three have in acknowledging the causative and normative authority of Scripture?"

Dr. Montgomery: What are the three? I got the two. Christ and inspiration of Scripture. What's the third?

Mark O. Stern: Paul's emphasis of his apostleship.

Dr. Montgomery: Oh, alright, sure. Sure. Both and. If it's three it can't be both. We won't worry much about that. Okay. The situation is how you relate these together. Do you, for example, start out with the assumption that the New Testament is indeed, the inerrant Word of God? Do you start there? What I'm doing is exactly the very opposite of that. What I'm doing is building the case for the inerrancy of Scripture from Christ himself and His promise of that special gift of the Holy Spirit to the original apostles. In my view, you've got to see that the material principle (the Gospel) and the formal principle (the Scriptures) are like a reversible reaction in chemistry. Right? If you mess with one of them, you're going to ruin the other, and vice versa. You need to maintain the full authority of scripture, of course, because if you don't have that full authority, how do you know the Gospel is true? And you've got to maintain the Gospel because if you don't maintain the Gospel, then you're not going to understand what this revelation is actually endeavoring to do. They both need to be employed.

As far as the epistemological side of it, the evidential side of it, you need to start with Christ's promises of the Holy Spirit. And if you say, but isn't that circular reasoning because you find those promises in these same documents? The answer is no, because you are at that stage working with these documents as ordinary historical documents and nothing more than that. And it's only after that analysis brings you to the conviction that Jesus is God Almighty and that He has inspired this stuff through the Holy Spirit; that the documents you began with as mere historical documents turn out to be the very word of God. Did I get all three in? Did I get Paul in there too?

Dr. Kloha: So they're not the Word of God until you studied for a while?

Dr. Montgomery: What?

Dr. Kloha: It's not the Word of God until you studied it for a while?

Dr. Montgomery: It's the Word of God. This is the question, if a tree falls in the forest and no one is there, was there any noise? Your question is equally silly. The fact is, it's the Word of God, period. That's what it is as a matter of fact. But in order to show that it is, in order to arrive at the fact, Christians do not handle things as do believers in the Quran. -If you won't offer evidence, you are a straight fideist. You are simply asserting religious truth without evidential support.

Dr. Kloha: Well, first I just refer you to page 22, 23 in my paper about all of this. Again both J.A.O Preus and Robert Preus have really good summaries of all this. I'm not going to read that. I think we agree on this. I'm not sure why there is a false dichotomy. I

guess...I'm an exegete. Keep that in mind. So, if it doesn't say it in the text, I'm not going to be real happy with it. And what I find the apostles doing regularly is referring to Jesus Christ and basing their teaching and preaching on Him. Again and again, and again and again. See my footnotes 14 and 15, where the apostle Paul regularly talks about what his preaching has done, how the Spirit has demonstrated the validity of his preaching's because he is preaching Christ. My approach I prefer. You're right, it's a circle. It's a circle. But the writings themselves focus on the apostolic preaching of Christ. And so, I guess, that's where I prefer to start that loop.

Dr. Montgomery: The apostles also, by the way, when they're dealing with pagans, focus on the evidence.

Dr. Kloha: When they're dealing with pagans they preach the gospel.

Dr. Montgomery: That's fine. So do I, but if you just leave it there, you do nothing more than what a Muslim does when he preaches the text of the Quran.

Dr. Kloha: Can I add onto this? Dr. Montgomery seems to claim that I think there's no place for [indiscernible] several times. Actually in the historical record, so yeah there is certainly ways to reconcile the date of the census if you want to call it that, again it is specific form of taxation with what we know about the dates for [indiscernible]. So I have no problem with what Luke says. Art Just's commentary walks through this, you can also read Ray Brown's *Birth of the Messiah*—walks through the options—[he] has a pretty good way through this. So I have no problem with what Luke says at all.

Dr. Montgomery: That's a good question because it deals with one of those controverted areas in which critics of the New Testament are formal in their conviction that this stuff is really not historical. Here we have genuine litmus tests to whether one does in fact hold to the entire truth of the text. An even better illustration of this, seems to me, are the assertions of authorship that you get at the beginning of most of the epistles in the New Testament. "Paul, an apostle" and so forth, "Peter an apostle and servant of Jesus Christ," etc. So it seems to me that anybody who maintains inerrancy is compelled to the Petrine authorship of the Petrine letters and if the person tries to rationalize this it's going to involve a redefinition of what's meant by inerrancy.

And this is really... In Peter's second letter not only does he claim that Peter, the apostle wrote it, but, he also goes on to say, "We were with Him, Christ, on the mountain, we were eyewitnesses of His Majesty,"—that's the transfiguration. It follows inexorably that if the apostle Peter did not write that letter, that's the end of Biblical inerrancy. So, my standard question to the person who claims that he holds to inerrancy is, "Who do you think wrote I and II Timothy? Who do you think wrote I and II Peter?" and if that person begins to equivocate then I think he has a problem.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, this is a question from Anna Hahn...

Dr. Kloha: I suggest you read Chemnitz on that, frankly. I'll leave it at that.

Mark O. Stern: ...a student at Concordia, Wisconsin has question for Dr. Montgomery, "If I understand correctly, you favor considering external textual criteria before internal criteria. How do you determine which external manuscript is the reliable one without using the subjective judgement of textual critic and how can the critic be objective?"

Dr. Montgomery: Well, any decision made by a human being on anything can be attributed to subjectivism because the person making the decision is the subject," right? He's the subject of the decision but that's not what we are talking about. We are talking about methodologies that prefer the importation of the opinions of the critic as to questions of ideology, theology, literary style, that sort of thing, over the decisions concerning the manuscripts. And what we are saying is, that was my point earlier, that in a sense, all

decisions are subjective but some are more subjective than others. What we've got to do is to reduce the area of personal philosophy, as it were, to the minimum when we are dealing with this kind of thing. This is no different really from exegesis. Some people say, "You can get anything out of the Bible." Sure, as long as you are allowed to bring anything to it and the proper way of handling exegesis is to recognize your assumptions and presuppositions and can them and shut up and listen to the text.

And the ideal way of doing textual criticism is to try to subordinate, to the greatest extent possible, your own opinions as to what "must" constitute a sound document, a document that has consistent style, that has an ideology that is the same all the way through, a vocabulary that is the same all the way through. Don't follow that because the writer doesn't have to pay any attention to what you would have wanted. That's why the external approach is so much more valuable than the internal approach and that's the thing that worries me the greatest. Of course Dr. Kloha has to use external sources, my heavens, all of his work with those manuscripts. He has to do this because otherwise he wouldn't have anything to work with it at all. But at the same time he professes the position of Keith Elliott, who privileges textual decisions based on theology and literary style. He makes this crystal clear; see the quotations that I have in my paper. And he places those in first position and this is a big mistake.

Dr. Kloha: Please read pages 13 and 18 of what I gave to you, it's very clear on all this. What thoroughgoing eclecticism does is not prejudge the value of a manuscript. However, as I said before, I looked at 60-80 manuscripts of I Corinthians. At the end of my dissertation there's about 40 pages describing the "value" of each manuscript. How effective is *Codex Vaticanus* in carrying forward the text? What kinds of mistakes does it do? I have about 60 pages on D, F and G in the Latin tradition, a very detailed analysis, how reliable is the Latin tradition? By the way, I don't think he understood what I was talking about there.

So the third—what I value of thoroughgoing eclecticism is I'm not beholden to somebody else's judgment; I have to do all the work myself. And then compare it to somebody else's judgment. That's all external evidence is, is the compilation of lots of individual judgments. That simply is what Westcott and Hort laid out in the 1880s, it's on page 14; this is how the discipline has worked from the beginning. It is just where you start in the circle, right. And my concern about an allegedly documentary approach is, A., you're not going to get the finish line. It's impossible using the documentary approach, as Hull points out. And second, you're letting somebody else make the decision for you.

Dr. Montgomery: The pre-genealogical people certainly don't hold to that.

Dr. Kloha: You completely misunderstand that, if you'd like me to read this Prof from Sweden's email, I'll read it but you completely misunderstand Coherence-based Genealogical Method.

Dr. Montgomery: Nonsense.

Dr. Kloha: No, you simply don't, please read up on it.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, one additional question from Phillip Fischaber, a seminarian at Concordia Theological Seminary, "Using thoroughgoing eclecticism can we arrive at the same degree of textual certainty as classicists do with their methodology in treating classical texts?" And I'll start with Dr. Kloha.

Dr. Kloha: Yeah. Well, it depends on which classical text. You often hear repeated in an apologetic context that we have 6,000 manuscripts and we only have, you know, nine of Caesar's *Gallic Wars*. Okay that's true to that extent, but there are some texts for which we have actually very early evidence, we have pre-BC textual evidence for Aristotle's

work, for *Iliad and Odyssey*, very good copies, actually, of these manuscripts. So don't kind of fall into this argument if we got so much stuff it's certain and the other stuff is all uncertain.

Having said that, there is a—much of the method is very similar, it's called the Lachmannian Method, it was developed by Karl Lachmann in the 1830s, it was adopted by both Tischendorf and (I'm sorry I'm thinking down in the dirt here). But the basic method of looking at the manuscripts, determining which one is the right one and if need be, and this is where classical scholar will differ from textual critics, if need be, [indiscernible] is the last step, in other words the manuscripts seem to all be corrupt and therefore we need to suggest an emendation. They do that, because in most cases, the manuscript tradition is late and all related to a single stream, in other words, it is very easy to produce a stemma of manuscripts. If you look at a classical text edition, critical edition in the original language, they always lay out in the preface, here's our stemma of manuscripts. And it's very simple.

[For] New Testament textual criticism that does not work. They tried doing that and Wescott-Hort tried doing that and pointed it out it didn't work. Streeter tried doing that in the 1920's; it didn't work. Metzger thought it still worked but now we know that he was wrong. So that's why we are in this kind of in flux in terms of methodology because the number of witnesses is both kind of bane and blessing. We have so many that it is pretty clear that the text is pretty darn reliable, and we are just talking details here at this point, but at the same time we can't do the kind of stemmatic study the classical texts do, that's a little too much in the weeds, sorry, but there are differences.

Dr. Montgomery: No, nothing.

Mark O. Stern: Nothing further. Okay, let's see Walter, are we good 'til one – I think we're about 45 minutes and pretty close to.

Mr. Walter C. Dissen: We have time for one more question.

Mark O. Stern: One more question. Okay, one more question.

Dr. Montgomery: A decisive question.

Mark O. Stern: And before we do this I want to thank everyone for coming. We at Concordia University appreciate having you. We appreciate all the groups that sponsored today and we do appreciate both Dr. Kloha and Dr. Montgomery coming here and addressing this important topic. It's great to have folks here in person because oftentimes things get lost on the internet.

And we have a final submission from Paul Raabe at Concordia Seminary, who asks, "What are Dr. Montgomery's answers to Dr. Kloha's three concluding questions?"

Dr. Montgomery: I already spoke to that at the beginning of my remarks in rebuttal. I spoke to that.

Dr. Kloha: Well. How does Chemnitz use [indiscernible]? I mean Chemnitz seems to have no problem with the Church, later Church judging. Just curious as to your answer.

Dr. Montgomery: Judging is one thing all right, establishing apostolic authorship is another. Now it's true that at the time of the Reformation, canonicity questions, and in a sense text questions, were again up for grabs because the reformers could hardly accept the Roman Catholics position that the church had indeed created the Scriptures. That's why Luther raised question of which books are indeed apostolic. That's why Luther was able to have to raise questions about James and Revelation and so forth.

But Chemnitz is not saying that the church is somehow in a position to do what the early church did. And the early church, for that matter, did not, through its authority, make

these books inspired or inerrant; they simply recognized this to be the case, because of their apostolic authorship. They were in a position to investigate the authorship and they surely did this. Otherwise, they would hardly have been quoting the stuff as inerrant Scripture. They were well aware that the only solid basis for inerrant Scripture is Christ's promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit to that specific apostolic band.

Dr. Kloha: That's frankly just what I'm saying. They were in the same situation where the text is up for grabs, as you say, with new methods, more manuscripts and this returning to the earliest witnesses is simply the work of textual criticism.

Dr. Montgomery: But the church has nothing...

Dr. Kloha: They are judging what the early church did.

Dr. Montgomery: The church—look, if you think that the church, in approving the conclusions that you reach as a textual critic, somehow provides a foundation to say what is revelational, you don't understand ecclesiology.

Dr. Kloha: Not at all what I'm saying.

Dr. Montgomery: Okay, good.

Mark O. Stern: Okay, on that note we now thank both speakers again. We will have concluding remarks from Lutheran Concerns and we will have a closing prayer by Pastor Gallup. We thank all those who joined us [here and those] who joined us by the internet live stream and again thank you for your time and thank you to both speakers.