

"Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus and 1Cor 14:34-5"

NTS 41 (1995) 240-262

Philip B. Payne

[first part p. 240-250, discussing in detail 1 Cor 14.34-5 is omitted.]

Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus probably the most important manuscript of the NT clearly distinguishes 1 Cor 14.34-5 as a separate paragraph, as does P46, Origen, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Claromontanus (Dp), 33 and every other ancient Greek ms. of this passage I have been able to find. Thus, these two verses were consistently represented in the mss. as a separate paragraph and not grouped with 14.33b.

As shown in the photograph on page 262, in Vaticanus between 14.33 and 34 there is a horizontal line extending one character width into the text and protruding a similar amount into the left margin. Two dots like an umlaut are placed in the margin slightly above and to the left of this line. There are 27 'bar-umlaut' sigla in the Vaticanus NT, Some of these bar-umlauts appear not to have been traced over and to display the original ink of the codex. Thus, I conclude that this symbol goes back to **the original writing of the codex. (E.g. either the bar or the umlaut or both in Mark 2.16-17; 14.70-1; Luke 22.58; John 12.7 (1368B); Acts 2.47-3.1; 4.35-6; 6.10; Rom 16.5; Col 3.20.)**

To my knowledge, no one has yet drawn attention to the bar-umlauts in Vaticanus, let alone analyzed them. Tischendorf identified textual variants occurring on every one of the 27 bar-umlaut lines. The NA26 editors describe a text-critical problem in 23 of the 27 bar-umlaut lines. In 10 of these 23, the position of the text-critical problem is evident by **an unusual gap in the text. Eleven if, the variant Tischendorf noted at the gap in Mark 3.5-6 is included. The others are: Matt 13.50-1; 18,10,12; Mark 3.5-6; 5.40; 14.70-1; Luke 1.28-9; John 7.39-40; Acts 2.47-3.1; 14,13-14; 1 Cor 10.24-5; and Phil 2.24.** Five more examples are listed in the following discussion of 'separated bar-umlauts'.

These gaps provide evidence that the original scribe of Vaticanus included these bar-umlauts and was aware of the precise position of these text-critical variants. Another example of this scribe's interest in textual variants is at **Mark 16.8**, where one and a third columns (**1303B-C**) of the parchment are left blank precisely where the longer ending of Mark occurs in other manuscripts. No other book division takes nearly this much space in the entire codex. Where the variant occurs within a single line of text in Vaticanus, the bar-umlaut is always next to that line, and the line is partially underlined by the bar. Where there is a question regarding a block of text which may be an interpolation, as the text following the end of John 7.52 (7.53 - 8.11, which Vaticanus omits and marks with a separated bar-umlaut) and the text following 1 Cor 14.33, the umlaut is next to the line immediately preceding

the text in question, and the bar marks the interface between the established text and the text in question.

In 1 Cor 14.34 the bar separates v. 33 from v. 34, where it would naturally be put to indicate awareness of a textual problem regarding vv. 34-5. Since the NA26 lists no textual problem in the final line of v. 33 and since the possibility that vv. 34-5 is an interpolation constitutes a major textual problem, I regard this bar-umlaut as an indicator of awareness of a textual problem with vv. 34-5 on the part of the original scribe of Vaticanus.

This high incidence of textual problems in the Vaticanus lines, preceded by this bar-umlaut symbol contrasts sharply with the comparative infrequency of textual variations in other lines. The following table gives data about all twenty-seven of these lines having a bar-umlaut. Reading from left to right are: the page and column number in Vaticanus which contains each bar-umlaut (e.g. 1237B), the verse where the bar-umlaut occurs, a 1 or a 0 indicating whether or not the NA26 notes a variant occurs in the bar-umlaut line, and a siglum indicating the kind of variant the NA26 notes for that line (four of these lines have no sigla since the NA26 lists no variant on those, lines; nine have two or three NA26 variants). Following this information are twenty columns representing the twenty lines of text in Vaticanus immediately following the line marked with a bar-umlaut. For each line, a 1 indicates the presence of a textual variation noted in the NA26, and a 0 indicates the absence of a textual variation noted for that line in the NA26.

Table of textual variants in Vaticanus lines with a 'bar-umlaut':

1237B	Matt 3.9f.	1390A	Acts 6.10
1253B	Matt 13.50f.	1401B	Acts 13.16f.
1259A	Matt 18.10, 12	1403A	Acts 14.13f.
1262C	Matt 21.3	1403B	Acts 14.18
1268A	Matt 24.6f.	1428C	Jas 4.4
1280C	Mark 3.5f.	1442C	2 John 8f.
1284C	Mark 5.40	1460B	Rom 16.5
1301B	Mark 14.70f.	1470A	1 Cor 10.24f.
1305A	Luke 1.28f.	1474A	1 Cor 14.33 end:
1342C	Luke 21.19	1500C	Phil 2.24
1345B	Luke 22.58	1504B	Col 2.15f.
1361A	John 7.39f.	1506B	Col 3.18f.
1365A	John 9.41f.	1505B	Col 3.20
1385B	Acts 2.47f.		

The results are striking. Beginning on the left, the totals at the bottom show the number of lines containing an NA26 textual variant in the bar-umlaut lines (23), then in the first line following each bar-umlaut (10), then in the second line following each bar-umlaut (11), and proceeding across to the twentieth line following each bar-umlaut (7). Although 23 out of 27 lines having a bar-umlaut contain a textual variant in the NA26, on average only about one third of the 20 lines in the following context contain a textual Variant in the NA26. None of the following sets of lines contain anywhere near as many textual variants noted in the NA26, the next being 14. The average in this sample is 9.5 NA26 variants in a total

of 27 lines. The correlation between lines with bar-umlauts and recognized textual variants is statistically significant, showing that Vaticanus bar-umlauts signify awareness of textual variants.

An examination of the nature of these variants indicates that there are 17 variants in 15 of these verses where Vaticanus has *omitted* a word or words that appear in other manuscripts. These variants are indicated by the siglum in the table above. There are seven instances indicated by the siglum where other manuscripts have different words from those in Vaticanus. There are six instances indicated by the siglum where other manuscripts have a single different word from Vaticanus. There is one instance indicated by the siglum where other manuscripts have omitted words that occur in Vaticanus. There is one instance indicated by the siglum where other manuscripts have omitted a single word that occurs in Vaticanus. Within the 23 bar-umlaut lines which have a textual variant listed in the NA26, 17 contain textual omissions either by, Vaticanus (15) or by other manuscripts (2), and 12 contain changes in the form of words or substitute words where Vaticanus differs from other manuscripts. The bar-umlaut occurs predominantly in instances of word omissions and secondarily in instances of word variations. None of the bar-umlauts (or the reversed bar-umlauts described below) occur where the NA26 cites merely a difference in word order. Thus, the bar-umlauts occur where textual differences are most striking, namely omissions of text.

Since there is a pattern of use of the bar-umlaut before lines of text which contain textual variations in unusually high concentrations, since ten instances have an unusual gap at precisely the point where the textual variant occurs, and since there is a pattern that gives predominance to variations which would be most obvious to a scribe, it appears safe to conclude that the writer of the Vaticanus NT intended the bar-umlauts as text-critical sigla indicating variant readings in other manuscripts. Since omissions of text are the most obvious textual variations, they are the ones most frequently noted. Furthermore, textual variants at the beginning of sections of text would be more apparent than variants buried in long sentences. So it is not surprising that approximately a third of these occur in lines that include the beginning of an NA26 paragraph. Two of these lines begin at the beginning of an NA paragraph, Luke 21.19 and Acts 14.18. Eight others of these lines contain the beginning of an NA paragraph in the middle of the line: Matt 13.50-1; Matt 18.10, 12; John 7.39-40; 9.41-10.1; Acts 2.47-3.1; Phil 2.24; Col 2.15-16; and 2 John 8-9. Matt 18.10, 12 and 2 John 8-9, however, are not the beginning of a paragraph in the UBS 3rd ed. corr.

Might the bar portion of the bar-umlauts have indicated a paragraph or a section division rather than a textual variation? Hammond refers to 'a small line interposed at the beginning of a section' as by the original hand of Vaticanus. These small lines when they occur without an umlaut in general do reflect paragraph divisions. Usually the division occurs in the middle of the underlined line, but where the first word of a paragraph begins a line, the bar underlines the left end of the preceding line so that the bar logically separates the two paragraphs.

Only ten of these 27 bar-umlaut lines, however, overlap the beginning of paragraphs in the NA26 and only eight of them with the UBS3corr paragraphs. The

eight are: Matt 13.50-1; Luke 21.19; John 7.39-40; 9.41-10.1; Acts 2.47-3.1; 14.18; Phil 2.24; Col 2.15-16, Matt 18.10, 12 and 2 John 8-9 have paragraph breaks in this line in NA26 but not in UBS3. Eight of these ten NA26 paragraph breaks occur in the middle of them containing the 'bar-umlaut' and two of them, Luke 21.19 and Acts 14.18 at the end of that line.

While many of the remaining lines could be regarded as overlapping a paragraph break, others are odd and one seems an impossible place for a paragraph or section division. This would require, for instance, in Jas 4.4 that 'Adulterous people' would have to be in a prior paragraph from the rest of the line, 'Adulterous people, don't you know that... Cf, also these odd places for paragraph divisions: Matt 24.6-7; Acts 13.16-17.

But is it likely that the writer of Vaticanus had access sufficiently to other NT manuscripts to enable recognition of these textual variants? Of the 23 bar-umlaut lines, 18 have readings which differ from the Syriac tradition. Scholars have noted substantial similarities between the Vaticanus text and the Syriac tradition. Thus, it would be reasonable to conjecture that the writer of the Vaticanus NT had access to a manuscript representing many of these variants in the Syriac tradition. Even access on the part of the writer of Vaticanus to just a few manuscripts could account for knowledge of at least one of the variants noted by the NA26 in each of these lines.

Besides the twenty-seven bar-umlaut occurrences examined, there are twelve verses in Vaticanus in which the bar is separated from the umlaut. (There is a possibility that line **1359A** from John 6.52 might be included, but that would depend on two very faint, horizontally-uneven smudge marks that are closer to the text than other umlauts. This line (1359A) does include a word omitted by many early texts.) The bar is on the left of the column, but the umlaut portion of the bar-umlaut is on the right of the line. In every case but one (where another symbol occupies that position: In Matt 9.13-14 (**1425B**) either or both of two factors appear to have caused this. First, another symbol, NS, already occupies that location. If the umlaut were put on the left as it usually is in column B, it would have overlapped this other symbol. Second, the text that is omitted is on the right side of the line, which makes the umlaut on the right of the line particularly appropriate.) the umlaut appears to the right of column C, the farthest right of the six columns of the open codex. The reason for this is almost certainly: because the umlaut is easier to see when it is on the far right border of the page than if it is tucked in between the fifth and sixth columns.

The location in Vaticanus by page and column and the verse reference of each of these twelve separated bar-umlauts is given in the chart below along with a sigla showing the nature of the variant(s) that occurs in that line.

<i>page/column</i>	<i>verse(s)</i>
1237C	Matt 3.15 - 16
1243C	Matt 8.13
1245B	Matt 9.13 - 14
1267C	Matt 24.1
1279C	Mark 2.16 - 17
1361C	John 7.52 - 8.11
1371C	John 13.38 - 14.1
1887C	Acts 4.35 - 6
1395C	Acts 9.30 - 1
1429C	Jas 5.12 - 13
1447C	Rom 3.8 - 9
1469C	1 Cor 10.17 - 18

In eight cases this separated bar-umlaut occurs on a line where Vaticanus omits text that occurs in other manuscripts. Five of these eight have a significant gap in the text at precisely the point of the variant. In three of these, other manuscripts insert additional text at this point: Matt 3.15-16; 9.13-14 and Mark 2.16-17. In the last two, Acts 4.35-6 and 9.30-1, other manuscripts substitute a different word here. The ink is faded in four of these eight separated bar-umlauts indicating their originality. Each of these four are by lines where the NA26 lists variants. (Matt 3.15-16, Luke 19.37; Acts 4.35-6; Rom 3.8-9. Similarly, all seven of the contiguous 'bar-umlauts' that were faded are by lines where the NA lists variants: Mark 14.70-1; Luke 22.58, Acts 2.47-3.1;6.10; Rom 16.5; Col 3.20; and 1 Cor 14.33.

The most striking of these separated bar-umlaut omissions in Vaticanus is the pericope of the woman taken in adultery, John 7.53-8.11, which is almost universally recognized as a later interpolation. A later hand, had partially reinforced the horizontal line and added a vertical stem to indicate a chapter division. Similar overwriting of a horizontal bar to indicate a chapter break has also been done on many other horizontal lines, e.g. in Vaticanus columns **1353C, 1403C, 1436C, 1451A, 1456C, 1459A.**

The photograph on page 262 shows that the bar separating John 7.52 from 8.12 has differing pigmentation from the vertical bar that was apparently added later as a section marker. There are significant parallels between the John 7.53 - 8.11 interpolation and 1 Cor 14.34-5:

- 1) In both cases the doubtful verses have been put into the text in varying locations.
- 2) In both cases there is a high concentration of textual variations in the doubtful verses. Wire notes the 'fact that 14.34 -35 show about twice as many word reversals and other small variants, as other verses in the context'.
- 3) In both cases the doubtful verses contain word usage atypical of the writer.
- 4) In both cases the doubtful verses interrupt the logical sequence of the passage.
- 5) In both cases marginal symbols or notes indicate scribal awareness of a textual problem.

In particular, Vaticanus has a bar-umlaut by both passages.

But, it may be asked, is it likely that the scribe who wrote the Vaticanus NT would use any sort of textual sigla? Hammond identifies 'the marks of quotation (»), a small line interposed at the beginning of a section, the apostrophus, and a punctuation as from the original scribe who wrote Vaticanus, not a later hand.

Furthermore, in light of the outstanding quality of the Vaticanus text from a text-critical point of view it is entirely conceivable that it could have used sigla to mark the most obvious points where textual variants were known. Caspar Rene Gregory wrote that Vaticanus represents 'good manuscripts of the second century. The word good is to be emphasized here. If the given view be correct, they represent not the current re-wrought, worked-over manuscripts of the second century, but such as retained in an eminent degree the text which had come to that century from the hands 'of the original writers. (*Gregory, Canon and Text of the NT*, 347, where he indicates that his evaluation is shared by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.)

The use of glosses to denote textual variants is well-established even in Sumerian and Akkadian; Origen's Hexapla used various sigla for text-critical purposes. He introduced additions to the Septuagint derived from the Hebrew text with an asterisk (X) and marked their end with a metobelos. He introduced with an obelos (+) sections of the Septuagint to be deleted because they did not exist in the Hebrew text, and he marked their end with a metobelos. Origen was aware of historical textual problems and interested in noting them. Brock notes that 'he quite frequently speaks of the current LXX text as being corrupt'. It may not be mere coincidence, then, that both Vaticanus and Bishop Victor also used bars and dots as sigla for textual variants.

An examination of the occurrences of umlauts in 1 Corinthians, where there is no bar confirms this pattern. Like bar-umlauts, these umlauts occur to the left side of the first five columns of text and to the right side of the far right column, in the far right margin. The only exception is 1 Cor 15.20 (**1474C**), which has no NA26 variant. Cf. below on 1 Cor 5.1.

There are forty-nine occurrences of umlaut sigla adjoining lines of text in 1 Corinthians. This figure does not include the 'bar umlauts' discussed above (1 Cor 10.17-18, 24 - 5; and 14.33) or dots whose shape is significantly different from the usual pattern (the large dots in 1 Cor 7.32 and the widely separated dots in 15.48-9) or that have a position that cannot be - clearly associated with a particular line (see 1 Cor 13.11 and 16.19).

Three lines having umlauts are particularly noteworthy. The line in 1 Cor 10.28 - 9 has a blank space at precisely the point where other texts include the clause 'for the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof'. The line in 1 Cor 8.2, which has three NA26 textual variations, has two umlauts after it. The line in 1 Cor 5.1 which ends at precisely the point where many other manuscripts (including P46) add ONOMAZETAI has an umlaut following the line at that point as well as the umlaut preceding it. Thirty-two of these forty-nine umlaut lines in 1 Corinthians contain NA26 variants, approximately double the typical one-line-in-three where there is no umlaut. The ratio becomes even higher if the seven of these where the umlaut is most faint are excluded, since only one of these contains a variant. Then there would be 31 out of 42 containing variants. It is possible that the original Vaticanus scribe put in these umlauts based on variant readings he saw in a manuscript of 1

Cor but that the later scribe who reinforced the ink line by line, having no knowledge of variants in these lines, chose not to reinforce them. The paucity of textual variants in lines with faded umlauts in 1 Cor contrasts sharply with the uniform presence of NA variants with faded 'bar umlauts' whether reversed or not. This added to their distinctive written form, higher ratio of NA26 variants, and the low correlation of the bar umlauts with NA26 and UBS paragraph breaks, indicate that the 'bar umlaut' is a separate siglum from the 'umlaut'.

This pattern of umlauts occurring where there are textual variants is not limited to 1 Corinthians. One particularly interesting such case is Luke 11.2 where an umlaut is next to the line of the Lord's Prayer where Vaticanus reads 'Father' instead of 'Our Father in heaven'. Since these umlauts as well as bar-umlauts occur with lines that have an unusually high percentage of textual variants, this gives even greater weight to regarding the bar-umlauts as sigla indicating textual problems. If the bars in the bar-umlauts were intended merely as section breaks logically separate from umlauts, all sigla marking textual variations would have the same umlaut shape. This would explain why only the umlaut portion of the bar-umlaut was put on the right side of ,the sixth column. If 'bar-umlauts' were contiguous by chance, the umlaut by the last line of 1 Cor 14.33 would still be in an appropriate position to mark recognition of 1 Cor 14.34-5 as a textual problem, since the pattern we have seen for blocks of text which may be an interpolation (e.g. at the end of John 7.52) is for the umlaut to be put next to the line immediately preceding the text in question.

Conclusion:

My first conclusion regards text criticism. The Vaticanus bar-umlaut and/or umlaut text-critical sigla open a new window, giving us a glimpse of the textual variations that were known at the time these sigla were written. We cannot be certain that the textual problems we can identify at these points in the text are the same as the ones originally indicated by the bar-umlaut, but a reasonable degree of confidence is warranted given the obvious nature of most of the variants at these points and because of a gap in some of these lines which highlights the exact position of the textual problem. These, gaps and the faded bar-umlauts are evidence that they were by the original hand of Vaticanus. Of the total of 39 bar-umlauts (including the 12 separated bar-umlauts in the far right column), 33 are on lines where the NA26 already has noted textual variations. This means that even limiting our knowledge of the text to the variants listed in the NA26, we are aware of variants which occur in 85% of the lines that were noted in Vaticanus as having textual variations. These 39 bar-umlauts are a large enough sample that, based on our knowledge of variants in manuscripts that have survived, it seems reasonable to conclude that we must know a high percentage, not just of these 89 variants, but of the other comparable textual variants at the time Vaticanus was written. This brings us a quantum leap forward in the degree of confidence we can have concerning our knowledge of textual variants at that time. Further analysis of known variants

where these bar-umlauts and umlauts occur may shed light on the early history of the textual families which contain them.

My second conclusion is that the new textual and internal evidence herein analyzed strengthens an already strong case that, 1 Cor 14.34-5 is an interpolation. In particular, this evidence indicates that Bishop-Victor ordered the end of 1 Cor 14 to be rewritten - omitting vv. 34-5, that Clement of Alexandria's text of 1 Cor 14 seems not to have included vv. 34-5, and that there is a bar-umlaut text-critical siglum indicating awareness of a textual problem at the end of 1 Cor 14.33 in codex Vaticanus where the only textual problem noted in the NA26 concerns vv. 34-5. Furthermore, 1 Cor 14.34-5 appropriates many words and phrases from the context but uses them in ways that are alien to its context. Extensive verbal correspondence suggests that 1 Tim 2.12 affected the wording at this interpolation.