

FULDENSIS, SIGLA FOR VARIANTS IN VATICANUS, AND 1 COR 14.34–5

PHILIP B. PAYNE
(PO Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020-0580, USA)

This article identifies two previously unnoticed items of textual evidence that support the view that 1 Cor 14.34–5 (‘Let women keep silence in the churches...’) was an interpolation. I conclude that Bishop Victor ordered the rewriting of 1 Cor 14.34–40 in the margin of Codex Fuldensis (see photograph on page 261) with vv. 34–5 omitted and that there is a text-critical siglum that indicates the scribe’s awareness of a textual variant at the beginning of 1 Cor 14.34 in Codex Vaticanus (see photograph on page 262). This text-critical evidence, plus the evidence from the non-Western Greek ms. 88* and Vulgate ms. Reginensis with vv. 34–5 transposed after v. 40, makes an already strong case for interpolation even stronger. The text-critical sigla in Vaticanus open a new window onto the early history of the NT text. While tangential to the main argument of this article, this may well be its most important contribution.

Every Western witness has 1 Cor 14.34–5 after v. 40 (D E F G a b itar,d,e,f,g Ambrosiaster Sedulius-Scotus).¹ Comparison of Western witnesses with the Greek text used by Hippolytus (†234) establishes the existence of the Western text by then. Most text critics date the beginnings of the Western text in the first half of the second century AD.²

1 Cor 14.34–5 also follows v. 40 in the following non-Western texts: the 8th cent. AD Vulgate manuscript Reginensis and the Greek 12th cent AD miniscule

¹ Although the UBS Greek NT cites it^{dem s z}, B. Metzger in *The Early Versions of the NT* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 295 lists these as ‘no longer generally regarded as Old Latin’, cf. 306 which notes that z is Old Latin only in Heb 10–13, 1 Pet 2.9–4.15; 1 John 1.1–3.15.

² E.g. Carlo M. Martini, ‘La tradition textuelle des Actes des Apôtres et les tendances de l’Église ancienne’, *Les Actes des Apôtres: traditions, rédaction, théologie*, (ed. J. Kremer; Louvain: University, 1979) 34; J. H. Ropes, *The Text of Acts (The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles 3)*; ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake. London: Macmillan, 1926) ccxxiii–ccxxiv; R. P. C. Hanson, ‘The Provenance of the Interpolator in the “Western” Text of Acts and of Acts Itself’, *NTS* 12 (1965–6) 211–20; R. I. Pervo, ‘Social and Religious Aspects of the “Western” Text’, *The Living Text, Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders* (ed. D. E. Groh and R. Jewett; New York: University Press of America, 1985) 229–41, 240.

88*. A. C. Wire writes that ‘a review of the 88 text of 1 Corinthians shows that it seldom parallels “Western” readings except where they also appear in the eighth-to-ninth-century manuscript Ψ and go on to become the majority reading.’³ Since the majority reading does not put 34–5 after v. 40, we must conclude that 88* is another non-Western ms. supporting this variant position. Another Vulgate text, Fuldensis (AD 546) could be interpreted as also belonging to this category, but, as I argue below, it seems more likely that this witness gives evidence of an original text without vv. 34–5.

Codex Fuldensis is the earliest dated ms. of the NT and the only early NT ms. that, so far as we know, was personally edited by one of the eminent scholars of the early church. Daniell notes that ‘the whole MS. was carefully revised and corrected by Victor, in whose hand are three notes, one at the end of the Acts, and two at the end of the Apocalypse, respectively recording that he had finished reading the MS. on 2 May, AD 546, and a second time on 12 April, AD 547. In the same hand are occasional glosses.’⁴ As a result of Victor’s oversight and corrections, Metzger judges its text to be ‘very good.’⁵ Nestle calls it ‘one of the oldest and most valuable manuscripts of the Vulgate.’⁶

Victor was a remarkable scholar, the author of several commentaries on the OT and NT that combine original work with citations from various works of the fathers including four works of Origen that would otherwise be unknown. A testimony to his acute text-critical perception is the omission in Fuldensis of ‘the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit’ interpolation at 1 John 5.7–8 even though a preface purporting to be St. Jerome’s is included which accuses the Latin translators of omitting this *testimonium*.⁷ His astute judgments, combined with his keen interest in ancient mss., and his privileged access as a bishop to ancient mss. give the revisions he oversaw in the production of Fuldensis a unique value.

The textual evidence that Fuldensis provides for the omission of 1 Cor 14.34–5 has been overlooked due to an error by Metzger (an error often repeated by others) stating: ‘in Codex Fuldensis they [vv. 34–5] were inserted by Victor of Capua in the margin after v. 33, without, however, removing them from their place

³ A. C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul’s Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 151.

⁴ F. H. Blackburne Daniell, ‘Victor, Bishop of Capua’, in W. Smith and H. Wace, eds., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* (4 vols.; London: John Murray, 1877–87) 1.1126.

⁵ B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the NT: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964) 77.

⁶ E. Nestle, *Textual Criticism*, 122.

⁷ Daniell, ‘Victor’, 1126.

farther down.’⁸ In fact, vv. 34–5 do not follow v. 40, but follow v. 33. Nor is 14.34–5 in the margin at all, let alone in the margin after v. 33. The text that is in the margin, verses 36–40, is in the bottom margin, not after v. 33.

When I showed Professor Metzger a copy of the Fuldensis text (see photograph below) he readily acknowledged that he had never seen the actual text before and that his statement in the *Textual Commentary on the NT* is in error. Furthermore, after examining the handwriting in the bottom margin, Metzger agreed that it appears to be virtually identical to that of the original scribe. The distinctive features of the original hand of Fuldensis noted by Lowe also characterize the text of 1 Cor 14.36–40 in the margin, ‘the bow of the a is small and oval shaped; s is often distinctly top heavy.’⁹ Based on the style of handwriting Metzger agreed that probably Victor ordered the text to be written into the margin by the original scribe whom he had commissioned to write the codex.¹⁰

Ernst Ranke, the editor of the printed version of Codex Fuldensis, got the basic facts right, but his interpretation is doubtful: ‘The corrector added by error the text of the vv. 36–40.’¹¹ No scribe in his right mind would rewrite five verses of text in the margin right below the very same text simply ‘by error’. Metzger agreed that a scribe would have to have a good reason and proper authorization to rewrite that much text.¹² This is the largest single block of text in the margin anywhere in Fuldensis. The symbol *h̄* at the end of v. 33 shows where to begin reading the text in the bottom margin, just as it always does in its eight other occurrences in Fuldensis.¹³

The 1 Cor 14.36–40 gloss should properly be called replacement text, not merely an insertion, for three reasons:

1. It would not make sense that Victor intended to indicate that 14.36–40 should be read both before and after vv. 34–5.

2. No other ms. inserts 36–40 both after v. 33 and after v. 35.

3. The gloss replaces *ordine* in v. 40 with *ordinem*. This is almost certainly deliberate and is intended to replace the text above since it follows the nearly

⁸ B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek NT* (New York: UBS, 1971) 565.

⁹ E. A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores 8: Germany. Altenburg-Leipzig* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959) 8.49.

¹⁰ Based on discussions at the AAR-SBL Meeting in late November, 1991 in Kansas City and in late November, 1992 in San Francisco.

¹¹ E. Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis* (Marburg/Leipzig: N. G. Elwert, 1868) 485, translated from the Latin.

¹² In San Francisco in late November 1992.

¹³ Only in 1 Pet 3.14 is *h̄* in the text directing the reader *supra* to a gloss in the top margin.

universal pattern in these corrections to bring Fuldensis into conformity with the standard Vulgate text.¹⁴ Consequently, the gloss should be viewed as a replacement, not an insertion.

Having established that the gloss in question is a replacement, the question rises whether Victor intended it to replace vv. 34–40 or just 36–40. Six reasons make it more natural to read this gloss as a replacement of vv. 34–40 rather than only vv. 36–40.

1. One would expect a symbol for replacement text to be located by the text which it should replace. But on the view that the gloss replaces only vv. 36–40, the siglum for replacement text is not adjacent to the text that it is intended to replace. In the other places in Fuldensis where the sigla $h\bar{o}$ and $h\bar{s}$ may indicate replacement text, not inserted text, as in Rom 9.25 and 2 Tim 2.20,¹⁵ the sigla are adjacent to the text to be replaced.

2. According to the alternative view, this gloss has a complex function, not only replacing vv. 36–40 but also repositioning this replacement text prior to v. 34. The simpler interpretation is to be preferred, that this gloss replaces 34–40.

3. Immediately following the sign $h\bar{o}$ is the Roman numeral Lxiv. Immediately following the end of the text being replaced is the next Roman numeral in sequence, Lxv. Consequently, the block of text from v. 34–40 is identified as a single section. The sign $h\bar{o}$ shows that the marginal gloss must begin at the start of that section, and the end of the gloss coincides exactly with the end of that section. Thus, it is natural to regard the gloss as a replacement for that whole section, vv. 34–40.

4. Victor left no indication that he intended to change the section's ending marked by the Roman numeral Lxv. On the view that only 36–40 are replaced, however, this section now ends after v. 35, which is far separated from the Roman numeral that marks the end of this section, even though the old section marker is not deleted, nor is this new ending marked.

5. If replacement of vv. 36–40 and repositioning the replacement before v. 34 were in view, one would expect some indication in the text after the end of v. 35 showing where one should read next. Victor leaves no siglum or mark of any kind

¹⁴ Six of the other seven glosses marked by sigla $h\bar{o}$ and $h\bar{s}$ bring Fuldensis into conformity with the standard Vulgate reading as represented by the critical text of Weber: 1 Cor 7.35, 9.4; Col 1.2; 2 Thess 3.10; 2 Tim 2.20, and 1 Pet 3.14. R. Weber, ed., *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969).

¹⁵ It is unlikely that the three different sigla used to mark deletion of the letters 'er' in 2 Tim 2.20 (slash-through and over-comma) and the text in Rom 9.25 (overdots) all went back to Victor, so it is probable that at least one of these texts confirms the use of sigla $h\bar{o}$ and $h\bar{s}$ for replacement text, not just inserted text.

at the end of v. 35 to indicate that the reader should skip to the beginning of chapter 15 and continue reading there.

6. Interpreted as a replacement of vv. 34–40, the gloss is much easier for a reader to integrate with the text. Beginning where it does and going to the end of the chapter, it is most naturally read as replacing 14.34–40.

According to this reading of the gloss as replacement text, Victor has left the reader a simple trail to follow. The $h\bar{\alpha}$ symbol tells the reader to read the text at the bottom of the page. Then the reader can easily find the right place to continue because the words just read coincide with the last words in the chapter. The point to continue reading is clearly marked with a large Roman numeral in the margin indicating the beginning of chapter 15.

It would be much harder for the reader to follow the text if the replacement text were read as an insertion that did not replace all of the rest of this chapter. In that case the reader would have to go first to the bottom margin to read the text, then back to the original siglum, and then continue reading until recognizing text that was duplicated in the margin. Since there is no mark at the end of v. 35 indicating where to continue reading, the reader would have to compare the text in the bottom margin to find both where the overlap began and where it ended. This would make it difficult for the reader to follow the flow of the text and, all in all, seems like an unnatural way to read the text.

If Victor had wanted to indicate simply that the location of vv. 34–5 should be changed to follow v. 40, it would have been far more natural for him to add a gloss to indicate this.¹⁶ He could have used the same set of sigla that is now in the text, placing $h\bar{\alpha}$ at the end of v. 40 and putting only the two verses 34–5 in the margin instead of five verses. Or he might have used something like the double slash sign that in ms. 88 indicates a repositioning of 1 Cor 14.34–5. But Victor followed none of these simple options that would have facilitated a reading that still included vv. 34–5.

The following factor further indicates that Victor probably thought that 1 Cor 14.34–5 was an interpolation and not in the original text: scribes in that period simply did not take the liberty to rearrange the argument of Scripture in this

¹⁶ He might have used an arrow as is commonly done by a corrector of Codex Sinaiticus around his time, dated by Hunt at the end of the 5th cent. AD and by Kenyon at the beginning of the 7th, e.g. pages xviii, 108, 130, 131 (four times), 133, 134 in Kirsopp Lake. *Codex Sinaiticus petropolitanus. The NT, Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911).

manner. We do not have even a single parallel example of a scribe rearranging the sequence of an original text of any of the NT letters to make it more logical.¹⁷ Furthermore, even if Bishop Victor felt he had the authority to rearrange the sequence of the text, there is no adequate reason why the text would make more sense reinserted at the end of the chapter.

After seeing photocopies of the Fuldensis text, Professor Metzger agreed that the most natural explanation is that Victor ordered the rewriting of the text of 1 Cor 14.36–40 to replace all of vv. 34–40 in the text above and that this implies that Victor believed that 34–5 was an interpolation.¹⁸

It is perfectly natural that the original text of Fuldensis would reproduce the position of 1 Cor 14.34–5 in its traditional position since this is its position in all of the other Vulgate texts except one, the 8th cent. AD codex Reginensis (R). This makes it virtually certain that the text from which Fuldensis was copied also had 14.34–5 after v. 33. Consequently, there would have been no reason for Victor to correct this passage in Fuldensis based on the manuscript from which it was copied or from any other standard Vulgate text. Since Victor chose the Vulgate as the base text for his manuscript, we must presuppose that it would be his natural inclination to follow its text here as well. The Vulgate text of the epistles of Paul is quoted by Pelagius and his followers in the early fifth century,¹⁹ well over one hundred years before Fuldensis, so it would have been well-established by the time of Victor.

Consequently, we must assume that Victor had sufficient evidence to convince him that the Vulgate text was wrong at 1 Cor 14.34–5. Otherwise there would have been no point in his ordering the rewriting of the entirety of 14.36–40, the largest gloss in his entire manuscript and the only gloss written with care to make the lines perfectly parallel.

All of the other changes made by Victor to Fuldensis, such as the Diatessaron form of his gospels and the other changes in the bottom margin marked with the same sigla, are supported by manuscript evidence. It is safe, therefore, to assume that Victor had what he believed to be sufficient manuscript evidence for making this change as well.

¹⁷ The few instances in the gospels were obviously motivated by a desire to harmonize with Matthew, not to rearrange the logic. Cf. G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 700 and note 9.

¹⁸ At the AAR/SBL Annual Meetings in 1991 and 1992, when he read a draft of this study.

¹⁹ Aland, *The Text of the NT*, 188.

Ellis cites Metzger as stating that Fuldensis ‘contains hundreds of OL readings’ and concludes, ‘In all likelihood the scribe who wrote it (or a predecessor) had both readings of I Cor 14.34–5 before him and decided to include (or retain) a deuterograph rather than to sacrifice either textual tradition.’²⁰ Ellis based his proposal on two errors. First, he, like so many others, repeated the error of Metzger that Fuldensis ‘places 14.34–5 not only after 14.40 but also in the margin after 14.33.’²¹ Second, he apparently did not notice that Metzger’s comment about the Old Latin readings in Fuldensis was in the context of the Old Latin translation of the Diatessaron which formed the basis for the gospel portion of Fuldensis only, and so is irrelevant for understanding its text of 1 Corinthians.²²

Fee’s excellent commentary on 1 Corinthians convincingly argues that the only adequate explanation for the entire Western tradition having 14.34–5 at the end of the chapter is that these verses were not in the original text, but were an interpolation.²³ Many other scholars agree. In light of Bishop Victor’s exceptional interest in, and access to, early manuscripts, he would be as likely as any early Christian scholar to find and appreciate textual evidence for interpolation.

Another strong argument for interpolation is that 1 Cor 14.34–5 appropriates words and phrases from the context but uses them in ways that are alien to its context. Ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις picks up on the use of the word ἐκκλησία in 14.4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, and especially ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις at the end of v. 33. This introduces an awkward redundancy if 33b is joined with 34.²⁴ The form of the command for silence, σιγάτωσαν, is a third person, present active imperative like the same verb in 14.28 and 30. The others, however, command silence in a limited context for the purpose of enhancing worship and learning. Only here is unqualified silence demanded, and only here is it demanded of a specific social group. In 1 Corinthians Paul consistently champions the cause of the downtrodden. Horrell notes that ‘the only place in 1 Corinthians where the

²⁰ E. E. Ellis, ‘The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor. 14.34–5)’, 213–20 in *NT Textual Criticism, Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon, 1981) 219.

²¹ E. E. Ellis, ‘The Silenced Wives of Corinth’, 219.

²² Cf. B. M. Metzger, *Early Versions of the NT*, 21, cf. 26–7.

²³ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 699–710, addresses both transcriptional and intrinsic probability.

²⁴ The end of verse 33 assumes a natural ellipsis, ‘As [we teach/is taught] in all the churches’, which is made explicit in Fuldensis’ addition of *doceo*. The second occurrence of this word in v. 35, ἐν ἐκκλησίαις, is identical in form to the occurrences of this phrase in 14.19 and 28.

subordination of a social group is demanded is 14.34–35'.²⁵ Λαλεῖν occurs twenty times in chapter 14. In 14.5 and 39 it has this identical infinitive form. However, although there are many uses of the word, all of the others identify the nature or content of the speech, such as speaking in tongues or in prophecy.²⁶ Only here is a prohibition of speech without any qualification, and it is directed at a socially weak group within the church. Καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει picks up the reference to the law in 14.21 (cf. the identical forms of these words in 9.8). Nowhere else, however, in Paul's letters does he appeal to a precept of ὁ νόμος to establish an ethical requirement for Christian behaviour or Christian worship.²⁷ Μαθεῖν is picked up from 14.31, 'you can all prophesy in turn so that everyone may learn'. which affirms everyone can prophesy and learn *in church*, but 34–5 instead tells women if they want to learn they should ask questions *only at home*. Although house (οἶκῳ) has a superficial resemblance to upbuilding (οἰκοδομή) in 14.3, 5, 12, 26, in context it cuts women off from their participation in the upbuilding. Αἰσχρὸν γυναικί follows this exact form of these words from 1 Cor 11.6, but in Chapter 11 it is used as part of an argument setting the demeanor within which women are free to pray and prophesy, whereas in 14.35 it is used to prohibit women from speaking in the congregation. Thus, the extensive borrowing of terminology²⁸ from the context of 1 Cor 14 is done in ways foreign to that context. Interpolation best explains this.

The interpolation thesis may explain why no citation of 1 Cor 14.34–5 is made by any of the Apostolic Fathers or by Justin Martyr († AD 165), Athenagoras († c. 177), even though he cites both 14.32 and 14.37, Irenaeus († AD 202), *The Shepherd of Hermas* (ii AD), Tatian († post AD 172), Clement of Alexandria († pre AD 215), even though he cites 1 Cor 14.6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 20, Caius († AD 217), or Hippolytus († 235). Clement of Alexandria does not cite 1 Cor 14.34–5 even though he discusses the behaviour of women in church in *pæd.* 3.11, where he

²⁵ D. Horrell argued this at the Cambridge NT Seminar on 2 Feb. 1993.

²⁶ Cf. speaking in tongues in 14.2, 4, 5 (twice), 6, 13, 18, 23, 27, 39; speaking mysteries 2; speaks for their strengthening, 3; speak revelation, knowledge, or prophecy, 6; what (the content that) you are speaking, 9; speaking into the air, 9; the one speaking, 11 (twice); speak with my mind, 19; I will speak through strange tongues and the lips of foreigners, 21; speak to himself and to God, 28; let two or three prophets speak, 29.

²⁷ 1 Cor 14.21's citation from Isa 28.11,12 is not a citation of a precept, even if the somewhat-related content in Deut 28.49 is understood as also implied. Paul occasionally reinforces arguments by appeals to a precept of ὁ νόμος, but in each of the three passages where he does this he is either using the precept as a metaphorically-applied example, not as a new Christian law (1 Cor 9.8 and 14.21), or he uses it only as correlative support for what he establishes foundationally on Christ (Rom 7.7 and 13.8–10).

²⁸ Even 'let them ask', ἐπερωτάωσαν, comes from the root ἐρω in 1 Cor 14.16, 23.

states, ‘Woman and man are to go to church decently attired, with natural step, embracing silence... for this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled.’²⁹ In *strom.* 4.19 he affirms, ‘the sister of Moses... was the prophet’s associate in commanding the host, being superior to all the women among the Hebrews who were in repute for their wisdom... It is not then possible that man or woman can be conversant with anything whatever, without the advantage of education, and application, and training.’³⁰ Clement of Alexandria calls both men and women without distinction to silence in church, which may imply that 1 Cor 14.34–5 was not in his text of 1 Corinthians. The earliest extant citation of 1 Cor 14.34–5 appears to be by Tertullian (AD 160–240), whose knowledge of these verses produces remarks in sharp contrast to Clement’s: ‘For how credible would it seem, that he who has not permitted a woman even to learn with overboldness, should give a female the power of teaching and of baptizing! “Let them be silent,” he says, “and at home consult their own husbands.”’³¹

The crucial vocabulary of 14.34–5 reflects 1 Tim 2.12 and its surrounding verses (but restricts women’s activities in ways 1 Timothy does not). The only close parallel to ἐπιτρέπεται is ἐπιτρέπω in 1 Tim 2.12.³² The commanding of silence and prohibition of women’s speaking reflects the double call to women’s quietness and the prohibition of teaching³³ in 1 Tim 2.11–12. Similarly, the command that women be in submission reflects the call for women to ‘be in all submission’ in 1 Tim 2.11. The reference to the law reflects 1 Tim 2.13–14’s quotations from the accounts of creation and fall in Genesis. Μαθεῖν parallels the same verb in 1 Tim 2.11. Αἰσχρὸν γυναικί reflects the repeated concern in 1 Tim 2.9–15 for women to avoid shameful things (2.9, 12) but to do what is fitting for women (2.10) of propriety (2.15). Both are set in the context of rules for church worship.³⁴ The parallels are graphically laid out below:

²⁹ A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (9 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, reprinted 1989) 2.290.

³⁰ Roberts, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 2.431–2.

³¹ *Bap.* 15.17, cited from Roberts, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 3.677.

³² Only in these verses is it in the indicative mood or present tense. Its only other Pauline occurrence, 1 Cor 16.7, is a subjunctive aorist.

³³ Given Paul’s typical use of οὐδέ for hendiadys and the only well-established meaning for ἀυθεντέω at that time, 1 Tim 2:12 should probably be translated, ‘I am not permitting a woman to teach-and-dominate a man’, namely ‘to teach in a way that dominates a man’. See the author’s forthcoming *Man and Woman One in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan).

³⁴ Cf. 2.8 ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, referring to places of church worship. 1 Tim 3.5 and 15 use the word ἐκκλησία.

1 Cor 14.34

αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν,

1 Tim 2.12

γυναικί 2.8 ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ 2.12 εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω διδάσκειν

1 Cor 14.34

ἀλλὰ ὑποτασέσθωσαν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει. εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν,

1 Tim 2.11

ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ (2.13–14) 2.11 μανθανέτω

1 Cor 14.34

ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· αἰσχροὺν γὰρ ἐστὶν γυναικί λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.

1 Tim 2:10–15

2.15 τεκνογονίας³⁵ 2.12 ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω 2.10 ὃ πρέπει γυναξὶν 2.15 σωφροσύνης

Since Victor had the gospels written in diatessaron form on the basis of one ms., we know that one ms. could be enough to cause him to omit 14.34–5. Most likely he found such a ms. of 1 Corinthians that was copied from an individual copy of this letter that antedated the collection of Paul's letters into a corpus. Once Paul's letters were bound together into a single codex, those collections where available would have supplanted the use of individual letters as the exemplars for the succeeding generations of copies. This is demonstrated by the existence of families of texts, each text as a whole typically belonging to one family. The Western family of texts must have all originated from a single *Vorlage* in codex form that had 1 Cor 14.34–5 after v. 40. Only where a portion of Paul's letters was missing from a given collection would a scribe be likely to look for a separate exemplar to fill in the gap. A Western text used to fill in such a gap could explain the occurrences of vv. 34–5 after v. 40 in non-Western mss. 88* and Reginensis.

Most likely, then, someone added 1 Cor 14.34–5 in the margin of an individual copy of 1 Corinthians prior to the creation of the first codex of Paul's letters or in the margin of that first codex. It may have been put in the margin with the intent that it be interpolated into the text since its addition counters the appropriation by women of 'you can all prophesy' in 14.31. The motivation for this interpolation is obvious given the popularity of social perspectives wanting to keep women in their place or a desire to counter the prominent position of

³⁵ Even the reference to 'husbands' and 'at home' reflects 'childbearing' in 1 Tim 2.15.

women in Christian circles affected by gnosticism. This is precisely how Tertullian used these verses against Marcion.³⁶ Its similarities with expressions in 1 Cor 14 and 1 Tim 2:12 make it sound Pauline and so would help its acceptance as part of the text.

Subsequent scribes copying this ms. would have inserted the marginal verses into the text³⁷ either after v. 33 or after v. 40, assuming incorrectly that vv. 34–5 had inadvertently been omitted and so was in the margin. It was, after all, typical for scribes to add text in the margin that had been omitted by mistake. One scribe must have inserted vv. 34–5 after v. 40 to create the exemplar (or *Vorlage* of the exemplar) for the collection(s) of Paul's letters from which the Western text family descended. Another scribe (or scribes) must have put vv. 34–5 after v. 33 to create the exemplar(s) (or *Vorlage* of the exemplars) for the collection(s) of Paul's letters from which all the non-Western text families descended.

Victor had such a reputation for a keen critical interest in the text of the NT that when a copy of the Diatessaron was found, it was brought to him. He recognized its value and preserved it through commissioning and editing this codex. He was one of the most likely of the early church scholars to have had access to, and to have recognized the importance of, evidence that vv. 34–5 should be omitted from the text of 1 Cor 14. He combined the gifts of curiosity, interest in manuscripts, financial resources, ecclesiastical clout, and sufficient confidence in his judgments to preserve a reading of 1 Cor 14 which apparently omits vv. 34–5. Because of Victor's stature and text-critical interests, his textual choice in the margin, omitting 1 Cor 14.34–5, is far more important for textual criticism than his scribe's first writing of the text above. Indeed, his manuscript is perhaps the most important witness elucidating the early history of this text.

FURTHER MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE OF INTERPOLATION: CODEX VATICANUS

Codex Vaticanus, probably the most important manuscript of the

³⁶ *Ad. Marcionem* 5.8.

³⁷ Just as Rom 3.13–18 was probably interpolated after Ps 14.2 first as a note in the margin but then included in the text of some editions of ℳ, several versions in other languages, and the Hebrew ms. De-Rossi, IV, 7 (cod. Kenn. 649); cf. C.A. and E. G. Briggs, *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (2 vols.; ICC; New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1906, 1909) 1.104; P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco, TX: Word, 1983) 146–7. Codex Bezae, the uncial Φ, the Old Latin and Curetonian Syriac versions, and a few copies of the Vulgate have a much longer interpolation after Matt 20.28.

NT,³⁸ clearly distinguishes 1 Cor 14.34–5 as a separate paragraph, as does \mathfrak{P}^{46} , Origen,³⁹ Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Claromontanus (D^P), 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.⁴⁰

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.⁴¹ Thus, I conclude that this symbol goes back to the original writing of the codex. To my knowledge, no one has yet drawn attention to the bar-umlauts in Vaticanus, let alone analyzed them.⁴²

Tischendorf identified textual variants occurring on every one of the 27 bar-umlaut lines.⁴³ The NA²⁶ editors⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ These gaps provide evidence that the

³⁸ Cf. Metzger, *The Text of the NT*, 47–8; Aland, *The Text of the NT*, 106 ‘by far the most significant of the uncials’. The only one of the early papyri containing 1 Corinthians 14.34–5 is \mathfrak{P}^{46} , written about 200 AD, and every readable letter in it agrees with Vaticanus. The Bodmer Papyri, especially \mathfrak{P}^{66} and \mathfrak{P}^{75} , both copied near or slightly after 200 AD, show substantial similarities with Vaticanus, implying origin from a common archetype that must not have been later than early in the second century, cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, xviii.

³⁹ Origen’s *1 Corinthians* 71 and 74 in Claude Jenkins, ‘Origen on 1 Corinthians’, *JTS* 10 (1909) 40, lines 6–8, and 41, lines 24–7.

⁴⁰ Even where the later minuscules do not have regular paragraph marks, each one I checked had a breaking mark at the beginning of v. 34 and at the end of v. 35, e.g. 876 (which has no pause mark in the middle of v. 33), 223, 1175, 1739, 1780 and 1881.

⁴¹ 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.

⁴² Cf. Cardinal E. Tisserant’s statement, ‘The exploration of this exceptional volume remains still to be carried out’ on p. 5 of the introduction to *Ta iera Biblia codex Vaticanus graecus 1209* (Vatican City: Vatican, 1965); similarly Canart and Martini wrote on p. 8, ‘A definitive appraisal of the corrections and annotations made to the codex during the course of time is still to be undertaken’; echoed by T. C. Skeat, ‘The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century’, *JTS* 35 (1984) 456.

⁴³ C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th ed.; 3 vols.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–94).

⁴⁴ NA²⁶ indicates the twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

⁴⁵ 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;

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 scribe⁴⁶ 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 lists a variant in the bar-umlaut line, and a siglum indicating the kind of variant the NA²⁶ notes for that line in (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.

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'.

⁴⁶ It is generally regarded that the NT of Vaticanus was written by a single scribe. Canart and Martini, *Ta iera Biblia*, 8 state, 'It is most probable that the entire NT (or most of it) was produced by a single scribe.' Cf. C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907) 345. Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, xxxviii, writes that a separate scribe wrote Ps 77.72–Matt 9.5.

Table of Textual Variants in Vaticanus lines with a 'bar-umlaut'

| Vat. line | verse bar-umlaut line+sigla | | the subsequent twenty lines in Vaticanus (1 = NA ²⁶ has text variant, 0 = none) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------|---|----|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|
| 1237B | Matt 3.9f | 1 ^τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1253B | Matt 13.50f | 1 ^τ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1259A | Matt 18.10,12 | 1 ^τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1262C | Matt 21.3 | 1 ^Γ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1268A | Matt 24.6f | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1280C | Mark 3.5f | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1284C | Mark 5.40 | 1 ^{τΓ} | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1301B | Mark 14.70f | 1 ^{τ□} | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1305A | Luke 1.28f | 1 ^{ττ} | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1342C | Luke 21.19 | 1 ^Γ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1345B | Luke 22.58 | 1 ^{Γο} | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1361A | John 7.39f | 1 ^{τΓ} | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1365A | John 9.41f | 1 ^{ττΓ} | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1385B | Acts 2.47f | 1 ^{τΓ} | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1390A | Acts 6.10 | 1 ^{τΓ} | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1401B | Acts 13.16f | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1403A | Acts 14.13f | 1 ^Γ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1403B | Acts 14.18 | 1 ^τ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1460B | Rom 16.5 | 1 ^{τΓ} | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1470A | 1 Cor 10.24f | 1 ^τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1474A | 1 Cor 14.33 _{end} | 1 ^τ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1500C | Phil 2.24 | 1 ^τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1504B | Col 2.15f | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1505B | Col 3.18f | 1 ^τ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1505B | Col 3.20 | 1 ^Γ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 1428C | Jas 4.4 | 1 ^τ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 1442C | 2 John 8f | 1 ^Γ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| TOTALS | | 23 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 5 | 7 |

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.⁴⁷ 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 \top in the table above.⁴⁸ There are seven instances indicated by the siglum \prime where other manuscripts have different words from those in Vaticanus. There are six instances indicated by the siglum \uparrow where other manuscripts have a single different word from Vaticanus. There is one instance indicated by the siglum \square where other manuscripts have omitted words that occur in Vaticanus. There is one instance indicated by the siglum \circ 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

⁴⁷ This is probably higher than the overall average in Vaticanus since the lines farther away from the 'bar-umlaut' tended to have fewer variants noted in the NA²⁶ and since the continuation of several of these passages contained no textual variations noted in the NA²⁶ for over ten lines (e.g. Luke 1.34–5; Acts 14.22–5; and Rom 16.10–14 for over twenty lines).

⁴⁸ Note that the text of Vaticanus, not the NA²⁶, is the text to which other texts are being compared in the use of this and the following sigla.

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.⁴⁹

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.⁵⁰ These small lines when they occur without an umlaut in general do reflect paragraph divisions.⁵¹ Only ten of these 27 bar-umlaut lines, however, overlap the beginning of paragraphs in the NA²⁶ and only eight of them with the UBS³ corr. paragraphs.⁵² 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...’⁵³

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.⁵⁴ Scholars have noted substantial similarities between the Vaticanus text and the Syriac tradition.⁵⁵ 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

⁴⁹ Two of these lines begin at the beginning of an NA²⁶ paragraph, Luke 21.19 and Acts 14.18. Eight others of these lines contain the beginning of an NA²⁶ 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.

⁵⁰ Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism*, 48.

⁵¹ 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.

⁵² 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 the line containing the ‘bar-umlaut’ and two of them, Luke 21.19 and Acts 14.18 at the end of that line.

⁵³ Cf. also these odd places for paragraph divisions: Matt 24.6–7; Acts 13.16–17.

⁵⁴ The whole Syriac tradition in Matt 13.50–1; 18.10,12; John 7.39–40; Acts 2.47–3.1; Rom 16.5; 1 Cor 10.24; Syriac^h in Matt 3.9–10; Luke 1.78–9 (twice); Jas 4.4; Syriac^{h**} in Mark 5.40; 14.70–1; Col 3.18; Syriac^s in Luke 22.58; Syriac^p in Mark 14.70–1; Luke 1.78–9 (twice); Acts 14.13–14; Phil 2.24; Col 3.18; Syriac^{hmg} in Acts 6.10; Acts 14.18.

⁵⁵ E.g. Metzger, *Early Versions of the NT*, 39–41.

few manuscripts could account for knowledge of at least one of the variants noted by the NA²⁶ in each of these lines.⁵⁶

Besides the twenty-seven bar-umlaut occurrences examined, there are twelve⁵⁷ verses in Vaticanus in which the bar is separated from the umlaut. 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)⁵⁸ 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>Vaticanus page and column</i> | <i>verse(s)</i> | <i>the nature of the variant</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 1237C | Matt 3.15–16 | Ɱ |
| 1243C | Matt 8.13 | Ɱ |
| 1245B | Matt 9.13–14 | Ɱ |
| 1267C | Matt 24.1 | |
| 1279C | Mark 2.16–17 | Ɱ |
| 1361C | John 7.52–8.11 | Ɱ |
| 1371C | John 13.38–14.1 | Ɱ |
| 1387C | Acts 4.35–36 | Ɱ |
| 1395C | Acts 9.30–31 | Ɱ |
| 1429C | Jas 5.12–13 | |
| 1447C | Rom 3.8–9 | Ɱ Ɱ |
| 1469C | 1 Cor 10.17–18 | Ɱ |

In eight cases this separated bar-umlaut occurs on a line where Vaticanus omits (Ɱ) 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

⁵⁶ A more detailed analysis of which manuscript families most often contain these variants is forthcoming in the author's *Man and Woman One in Christ* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan).

⁵⁷ See the chart below. 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.

⁵⁸ In Matt 9.13–14 (1425B) either or both of two factors appear to have caused this. First, another symbol, Ɱ, 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.

Mark 2.16–17. In the last two, Acts 4.35–36 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.⁵⁹

The most striking of these separated bar-umlaut omissions in Vaticanus is the pericope of the woman taken in adultery, John 7.53–8.11,⁶⁰ which is almost universally recognized as a later interpolation.⁶¹ 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’.⁶²
- 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

⁵⁹ 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 NA²⁶ 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.

⁶⁰ A later hand has 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.

⁶¹ Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 219–22; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 333 notes that ‘those that do include it display a rather high frequency of textual variants... The diversity of placement confirms the inauthenticity of the verses.’ Surprisingly, the same principle when applied to 1 Cor 14.34–5 he says is not weighty in ‘Silent in the Churches’ in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1991) 142.

⁶² Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 150, cf. 284 n. 16. C. Tischendorf, *Codex Claremontanus sive epistulae Pauli omnes* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1852) 558 notes five variants here in that one codex. Three variants here in ms. 88 are not noted in NA²⁶.

a punctuation' as from the original scribe who wrote Vaticanus, not a later hand.⁶³ 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 René 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.'⁶⁴

The use of glosses to denote textual variants is well-established even in Sumerian and Akkadian.⁶⁵ Origen's Hexapla used various sigla for text-critical purposes. He introduced additions to the Septuagint derived from the Hebrew text with an asterisk (※) 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 (↵).⁶⁶ 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'.⁶⁷ It may not be mere coincidence, then, that both Vaticanus and Bishop Victor also used bars and dots as sigla for textual variants.⁶⁸

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.⁶⁹ There are forty-nine occurrences of umlaut sigla adjoining lines of text in 1 Corinthians.⁷⁰ Three lines having umlauts are particularly

⁶³ *Outlines of Textual Criticism*, 49.

⁶⁴ Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT*, 347, where he indicates that his evaluation is shared by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort.

⁶⁵ J. Krecher, 'Glossen', *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (ed. E. Ebeling *et. al.*; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971) 3.435–6.

⁶⁶ Cf. Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica* (London: SCM, 1979) 56; C. E. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (SBL LXX 21; Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1986) 2.

⁶⁷ S. P. Brock, 'Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament', *Studia Patristica* 10/1 (TU 107; Berlin: Akademie, 1970) 218; cf. B. M. Metzger, 'Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in NT Manuscripts', in *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (NTTS 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968) 88–103.

⁶⁸ Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis* 465, 573 (photocopy of a sample page).

⁶⁹ The only exception is 1 Cor 15.20 (1474C), which has no NA²⁶ variant. Cf. below on 1 Cor 5.1.

⁷⁰ 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

noteworthy. The line in 1 Cor 10.28–29 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 \mathfrak{P}^{46}) add $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ has an umlaut following the line at that point as well as the umlaut preceding it. Thirty-two of these forty-nine⁷¹ umlaut lines in 1 Corinthians contain NA²⁶ variants, approximately double the typical one-line-in-three where there is no 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.

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

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).

⁷¹ 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 NA²⁶ 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 UBS³ paragraph breaks, indicate that the ‘bar umlaut’ is a separate siglum from the ‘umlaut.’

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 thirty-nine 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 39 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 of this interpolation.