

# THE ORIGINALITY OF TEXT-CRITICAL SYMBOLS IN CODEX VATICANUS

by

PHILIP B. PAYNE

Edmonds WA

and

PAUL CANART

Vatican City

## 1. *The Discovery*

The discovery that the ink of text-critical symbols in Codex Vaticanus<sup>1</sup> matches the original ink of the codex breaks new ground for textual criticism. A scribe in the Middle Ages,<sup>2</sup> apparently concerned with fading, traced over the original ink of every letter or word of Vaticanus unless it appeared to be incorrect.<sup>3</sup> Thus, unreinforced letters and

---

<sup>1</sup> Vatican City: Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Vat. Gr. 1209, identified in critical editions as B.

<sup>2</sup> Critical consensus dates this between the ninth and eleventh century, cf. T.C. Skeat, "The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century," *JTS* 35 (1984) 461; James Hardy Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, Vol. III of *The Beginning of Christianity. Part I The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. by F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: MacMillan, 1926) xl; Frederick G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: MacMillan, 1926) 80; William Henry Paine Hatch, *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1939) plate XIV.

<sup>3</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964) 47; C.E. Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902) 49; Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, xli; Paul Canart and Carlo M. Martini, *The Holy Bible: The Vatican Greek Codex 1209 (Codex B) Facsimile Reproduction by order of his Holiness Paul VI. The New Testament. Introduction* (Vatican City: Vatican, 1965) 8. Examples include 1257C line (hereafter *l*) 36 from Matt. 17:8, 1267A *l* 34 from Matt. 23:26, 1271A *l* 31 from Matt. 25:42, 1286B *l* 30 from Mark 6:39, 1375C *l* 19-20 from John 17:15-16, 1409A *l* 23-24 from Acts 18:7, 1409B *l* 31 from Acts 18:17, 1424A *l* 27 from Acts 28:1, 1474A *l* 41 from 1 Cor. 14:39, and 1515B *l* 42 from Heb. 5:12. A corrector substituted a word for the unreinforced word in 1248C *l* 12 from Matt. 11:19, 1253B *l* 15 from Matt. 13:52, 1253C *l* 31 from Matt. 14:5, 1256B *l* 30 from Matt. 16:4, 1257A *l* 21-22 from Matt. 16:20, 1265A *l* 19 from Matt. 22:10, and 1330B *l* 37 from Luke 13:7.

symbols reveal the original ink of the codex. The most obvious examples of the original ink are the few places its scribe inadvertently duplicated a word,<sup>4</sup> phrase<sup>5</sup> or clause.<sup>6</sup> In these cases the reinforcer traced over only one of the duplicates, so the other reveals the original ink. In addition, he did not trace over letters that caused misspellings in his day. For example, he did not trace over the epsilon in **ΚΡΕΙΝΩ\*** in order to conform to the common spelling **ΚΡΙΝΩ** in John 12:47-48 (1370A lines, hereafter *l*, 33, 34, 39 and 41). Similarly, he frequently did not trace over the final **Ν** of verbs followed immediately by a consonant. For example, only the final **Ν** in **est in** reveals the faded original ink of the codex in 1 Cor. 7:9 (1466B *l* 24) and 1 Cor. 15:44 (1475C *l* 13 and 14). Surprisingly, the NA<sup>27</sup> does not note several significant variants in the original unreinforced text of Vaticanus.<sup>7</sup>

Throughout the margins of the Vaticanus NT are approximately 765 pairs of dots resembling a dieresis or umlaut. Examination of various categories of these “umlauts”<sup>8</sup> reveals a prevailing pattern. Almost all umlauts occur next to lines of text which differ significantly from some other NT manuscripts. The frequency of textual variants in these lines is far greater than in lines that have no umlaut.<sup>9</sup> This strongly

---

\* The UncialIII and SymbolGreekII font used to print this work are available from Linguist’s Software, Inc., PO Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020-0580 USA, tel (425) 775-1130, fax (425) 771-5911.

<sup>4</sup> 1258A *l* 26 from Matt. 17:15, 1266A *l* 23 from Matt. 22:43, 1291A *l* 32 from Mark 9:25, 1325C *l* 33 from Luke 11:9, 1363B *l* 30 from John 9:2, and 1413C *l* 7 from Acts 21:4.

<sup>5</sup> 1262C *l* 28-29 from Matt. 21:4, 1305B *l* 13-14 from Luke 1:37, and 1488B *l* 5-6 from Gal. 1:11.

<sup>6</sup> 1273B *l* 22-23 from Matt. 26:57, 1370C *l* 33-35 from John 13:14, 1375C *l* 29-30 from John 17:18, 1448B *l* 16-20 from Rom. 4:4-5, 1454A *l* 30 from Rom. 9:18, and 1479B *l* 33-36 from 2 Cor. 3:15-16.

<sup>7</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> indicates the twenty-seventh edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Notable are the presence in Vaticanus of ἐπεὶ instead of ὅτι in Matt. 14:5 (1253C *l* 31), the second occurrence of μου in Matt. 17:15 (1258A *l* 26), the omission of ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἀλλ’ ἵνα τηρήσης αὐτούς from John 17:15 (1375C *l* 19-20), the omission of the definite article before ἀληθεία in John 17:17 (1375C *l* 23), and the original passive reading ἐνεφανίσθησαν in Acts 25:15 (1420A *l* 34). All of these original Vaticanus readings, however, are cited by Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus* (5 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995-98) 1.134, 1.165, 4.233-234, 5.439.

<sup>8</sup> Bar-umlauts, separated bar-umlauts, and the umlauts in 1 Corinthians are analyzed in Philip B. Payne, “Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus and 1 Cor 14.34-5,” *NTS* 41 (1995) 251-262, and the present article analyzes umlauts that display the original ink of Vaticanus. Payne, “Fuldensis,” 255, weighs the evidence that the bar in the first two categories may simply be a paragraph mark.

<sup>9</sup> Payne, “Fuldensis,” 252-255, which appears to be the first analysis of the umlaut sigla in Vaticanus. Cf. E. Tisserant’s statement in *The Vatican Greek Codex 1209*, 5, “the exploration of this exceptional volume remains still to be carried out.” Similarly, Canart

supports the conclusion that umlauts in the margins of Vaticanus mark textual variants.

Payne identified various factors which indicate that umlauts go back to the original hand of the manuscript.<sup>10</sup> Conclusive proof, however, awaited expert analysis of the manuscript to see if there are instances where the ink of an umlaut matches the original ink of the codex. The best proof possible that umlauts date to the original writing of Vaticanus would be the presence of unreinforced umlauts in ink that matches unreinforced text on the same page of the codex. Such cases are best suited to avoid variations between batches of ink and the variable degree of fading on different pages of the codex. Canart, professor of paleography at the Vatican whose analysis of Codex Vaticanus has spanned over four decades, and Payne examined the ink of unreinforced umlauts and compared them to the original ink of the manuscript in order to determine definitively whether the ink matches.

Direct examination of Vaticanus, first with the naked eye, then with a magnifying glass, and finally with an internally lighted, 7X magnifying lens<sup>11</sup> confirmed that eleven unreinforced umlauts unambiguously match the original apricot color of unreinforced text on the same page of the codex. In many instances the unreinforced umlaut is within a few centimeters of unreinforced text (e.g. 1356B *l* 23-24, 1370A *l* 32-33, 1459C *l* 39-41, 1466A *l* 25). In one case the unreinforced umlaut is less than one centimeter from unreinforced text (1475B *l* 10-11). The bright lighting of the 7X loupe displayed with great clarity the apricot color of these eleven unreinforced umlauts and the matching color of unreinforced text on the same page. These eleven examples are listed in the following table identifying their page, column (A, B, or C), line, and verse reference, followed by locations on that page with unreinforced text. If, as occurs frequently, only a single letter of a word is unreinforced, that letter is noted. Nine<sup>12</sup> of these eleven umlauts mark a location where text is omitted, inserted or replaced in other manuscripts. All of these variants are easily recognizable and affect the meaning of the text as cited in the following table's footnotes.

---

and Martini wrote in *The Vatican Greek Codex 1209*, 8, "A definitive appraisal of the corrections and annotations made to the codex during the course of time is still to be undertaken." This is echoed by Skeat, "Fifteenth Century," 456.

<sup>10</sup> Payne, "Fuldensis," 251-260.

<sup>11</sup> Loupe model: Peak light scale Lupe 7X.

<sup>12</sup> The NA<sup>27</sup> lists all of these except the variants in 1466A (see footnote 20) and 1356B *l* 24 from John 5:25, which is listed in the NA<sup>25</sup> and most other editions of the NT with an extensive apparatus, including Swanson, Merk, Nestle<sup>16</sup>, Tischendorf, and Griesbach.

## TABLE OF UNREINFORCED “UMLAUTS” MATCHING UNREINFORCED TEXT

*l* = line(s)            \* = other umlaut(s) on this page match the ink of reinforced text

<i>umlaut location</i>	<i>in verse</i>	<i>the location and description of unreinforced text in close proximity</i>
1339C <i>l</i> 42 <sup>13</sup>	Luke 19:37	1339C <i>l</i> 9, 16 <b>N</b> , 1339B <i>l</i> 11 <b>N</b> , 1339A <i>l</i> 41 <b>H</b> *
1339C <i>l</i> 42 <sup>14</sup>	Luke 19:37	1339C <i>l</i> 9, 16 <b>N</b> , 1339B <i>l</i> 11 <b>N</b> , 1339A <i>l</i> 41 <b>H</b> *
1355B <i>l</i> 40 <sup>15</sup>	John 5:2	1355B <i>l</i> 1, 4, 24 <b>N</b> and 1355C <i>l</i> 20 <b>C</b> and <i>l</i> 26, 33, 37 <b>T</b> *
1356B <i>l</i> 24 <sup>16</sup>	John 5:25	1356B <i>l</i> 5, 23 <b>N</b> and <i>l</i> 6 <b>E</b> (dropped from <b>ΤΕΙΜΩCΙ</b> in John 5:23)
1370A <i>l</i> 32 <sup>17</sup>	John 12:47	1370A <i>l</i> 33, 34, 39, 41 <b>E</b> ; 1370C <i>l</i> 33-35 <b>ΕΙ</b> . . . <b>ΔΙΔΑCΚΑΛΟC</b> <sup>18</sup>
1459C <i>l</i> 41 <sup>19</sup>	Rom. 15:23	1459C <i>l</i> 25, 36, 39 <b>E</b> , 1459C <i>l</i> 33 <b>N</b> (twice) *
1466A <i>l</i> 25 <sup>20</sup>	1 Cor. 6:20	1466A <i>l</i> 25 <b>E</b> , 1466B <i>l</i> 21, 24, 26 <b>N</b> *
1466B <i>l</i> 6 <sup>21</sup>	1 Cor. 7:5	1466A <i>l</i> 25 <b>E</b> , 1466B <i>l</i> 11, 21, 24, 26 <b>N</b> *
1468B <i>l</i> 3	1 Cor. 9:6-7	1468B <i>l</i> 15 <b>K</b> , <i>l</i> 15, 16 chevrons in margin, 1468C <i>l</i> 7, 12 <b>N</b> *
1475B <i>l</i> 11	1 Cor. 15:34	1475B <i>l</i> 10, 24, C <i>l</i> 7 <b>E</b> , 1475B <i>l</i> 13, 27, C <i>l</i> 13, 14 <b>N</b> *
1499C <i>l</i> 42 <sup>22</sup>	Phil. 1:28	1499C <i>l</i> 28 <b>N</b> , <i>l</i> 32 <b>E</b> , 1499B <i>l</i> 15 <b>N</b> , <i>l</i> 6, 28, 30, 35 <b>E</b> *

These eleven unreinforced umlauts that match the original ink of the Vaticanus NT establish that at least these umlauts date to the time of the original writing of the codex. They are not limited to a specific

<sup>13</sup> This umlaut is on the interior margin of 1339C. 063 it sy<sup>c</sup> omit τῶν μαθητῶν.

<sup>14</sup> This umlaut is on the exterior margin of 1339C. 063 it sy<sup>c</sup> omit τῶν μαθητῶν.

<sup>15</sup> **ss**\*.2 **A D L Θ f**<sup>1</sup> 33. 565. 597 a (b) aur e ff<sup>2</sup> vg<sup>cl</sup> *l pc* have words replaced.

<sup>16</sup> **K S Π Ω** 28 42 91 242s 399s al<sup>10</sup> syr<sup>pmg,hmg</sup> et<sup>hr</sup> Chr in textu (in comm. variant codd.) substitute τοῦ ἀνθρώπου for τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. footnote 12.

<sup>17</sup> Variant expressions replace καὶ μὴ φυλάξῃ in **℘**<sup>66c</sup> **D W Θ** 070. 0250. 579. 1241. *pc* **℞** e q it vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> The duplicated unreinforced text in 1370C *l* 33-35 is from John 13:14a.

<sup>19</sup> **℘**<sup>46</sup> **ss** **A D (F) G Ψ** 33. 1739. 1881 **℞** have πολλῶν instead of ἱκανῶν.

<sup>20</sup> Souter notes that in Methodius ἄρα γε precedes δοξάσατε. Constantine Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th ed. maior; 3 vols.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869-94) 3.488, notes that Meth<sup>epiph</sup> 579 inserts ἄραγε before δοξάσατε and that Ps.-Ath 2,4 omits the text which occurs in this line of Vaticanus.

<sup>21</sup> **ss**<sup>2</sup> **K L** 88. 326. 436. 614. 1241. 1984. 1985. 2127. 2492. 2495 *Byz Lect* **℞** sy<sup>p-h</sup> got Dion Ephraem Chr<sup>txt</sup> Thret insert τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ (“fasting and”) before “prayer.” 330. 451 and John-Damascus add καὶ νηστείᾳ after “prayer.”

<sup>22</sup> **D**<sup>2</sup> **P Ψ** 075. 104. 1505. *pc* **℞** (MVict Aug) insert μέν.

section but are scattered throughout the manuscript. Since there is scholarly consensus that a single scribe wrote almost all of the NT of Vaticanus<sup>23</sup> and since the ink of these umlauts matches that of the original text, it is a reasonable inference that the original scribe penned at least these eleven umlauts.

## 2. *Evidence for the Originality of Umlauts with Ink Matching Reinforced Text*

The ink of most of the umlauts in the Vaticanus NT matches the chocolate-brown ink of the reinforced text, which scholars date between the ninth and the eleventh centuries.<sup>24</sup> It follows that these chocolate-brown umlauts should not be assigned to a date later than the eleventh century.<sup>25</sup> What was the origin of the chocolate-brown umlauts? It is implausible if Codex Vaticanus had only eleven original umlauts that

---

<sup>23</sup> E.g. Canart and Martini's statement in *The Vatican Greek Codex 1209*, 8, "It is most probable that the entire NT (or most of it) was produced by a single scribe." Cf. Caspar René Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1907) 345.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. above, note 2.

<sup>25</sup> Thus, neither they nor the eleven demonstrably original umlauts are compatible with the conjecture of Curt Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5," *NTS* 43 (1997) 245, that "these 'umlauts' postdate the fourteenth century, probably belonging to the sixteenth." It is not likely in any event that a fifteenth or sixteenth century scribe would mark as textual variants so many Vaticanus readings that were standard at that time. Nor does Niccum's conjecture explain the umlauts which occur where no known manuscript has a variant. Such occurrences are natural, however, if the original scribe was noting variants in the fourth century. It is also doubtful that someone like Sepulveda, with the scholarly care and observant eye necessary to document textual variants, would not only mark up this very ancient manuscript but would continue to note textual variants even after the change from uncial to the obviously different and later minuscule text. Skeat, "Fifteen Century," 454-465, is surely correct that the minuscule text appended to Vaticanus replaced damaged uncial text. On the first page of the minuscule text there is an umlaut by its first column (1519 A / 12 from Heb. 9:18-19), two much smaller, non-horizontal, raised dots of undetermined purpose by its second column (1519 B / 12 from Heb. 10:1) and also a symbol like a square root sign at the beginning of Hebrews chapter 10 (1519 B / 8). Both the umlaut and chapter symbol occur systematically in the preceding uncial text of Vaticanus but only here in the minuscule text. The simplest explanation for this is that, in order to preserve them, a scribe copied both of these symbols from the damaged uncial page into a corresponding position in the first minuscule page which replaced it. Niccum, "The Voice," 245, objects that if a scribe had copied these symbols from a torn leaf, he also would have copied other original markings such as horizontal bar paragraph markers. Niccum assumes that such bars were on whatever then remained of the damaged uncial page. This is a precarious assumption since there is only one such bar in the previous complete uncial page. Furthermore, the text where the umlaut occurs was the standard reading throughout this period and so would probably not have been marked as a variant reading at that time.

a later scribe would have identified their purpose, let alone expanded their use. It is also implausible that a scribe half a millennium later would simply by chance have used the same symbol that the original scribe had used to mark the location of textual variants, especially since it never became conventional after the writing of Vaticanus in the fourth century for scribes to use umlauts for this purpose. Thus, it is far less likely that the reinforcer in the Middle Ages originated these umlauts than that he simply traced over them while reinforcing the rest of the text. It is reasonable to expect that the chocolate-brown umlauts the reinforcer traced, like the text itself and the apricot umlauts that were not reinforced, also date to the original writing of the codex. A small protrusion of the original ink of Vaticanus along the edge of a reinforced umlaut is an ideal confirmation of originality. Canart discovered that the first dot of the umlaut by the final line of 1 Cor. 14:33 has a small protrusion toward the left which reveals a color more nearly the apricot of the original text than the chocolate brown of the reinforcement. This strongly supports the presence of an umlaut at this point in the original text. It also reinforces the expectation that the chocolate-brown umlauts in Codex Vaticanus result from the reinforcement of umlauts that date to its original writing. This expectation would be overcome only if in specific cases sufficient evidence pointed to a later date.

Why didn't the scribe reinforce the eleven umlauts which match the original ink of the codex? It is natural that the scribe who reinforced the manuscript's ink would inadvertently overlook some of the marginal notations outside the normal flow of text. The likelihood of inadvertent omission is, of course, greatest in the case of small notations like these umlauts. Three categories of umlauts were particularly susceptible to inadvertent omission. First, the most faded umlauts (e.g. 1459C / 41, 1466A / 25, 1475B / 11, 1499C / 42) were particularly likely to escape notice. Second, overlooked umlauts at the very end of the sixth column of the open codex were immediately lost from sight when a page was turned. In contrast, the reinforcer might notice and trace over earlier overlooked umlauts at any time until completing all six columns of the open codex. This explains why four out of these eleven apricot umlauts occur at the very end of the sixth column.<sup>26</sup> Third, the reinforcer was more likely to overlook umlauts in sections

---

<sup>26</sup> 1339C with umlauts both before and after line 42, 1459C / 41 and 1499C / 42. Unlike the usual position of umlauts on the exterior side of the farthest right column of the open codex, the umlaut on the interior side of the far right column 1339C is

of the codex with comparatively little fading (e.g. 1355B *l* 40, 1356B *l* 24, 1370A *l* 32, 1466B *l* 6, 1468B *l* 3) since these umlauts do not have the same need for reinforcement and presumably were even less faded in the Middle Ages. Together, these three categories account for nine of these eleven umlauts and confirm the expectation that their lack of reinforcement was inadvertent.

### 3. *The Significance of the Discovery*

Since most lines of Vaticanus contain only 15-18 letters of text, an umlaut in the margin was a sufficiently specific notation to permit anyone with access to a manuscript containing that variant to identify it. Manuscripts containing the variants noted by umlauts were probably in the library of the scriptorium where the codex was written, so both the original scribe and others subsequently using the codex there could identify them. Extant textual variants make it possible in many cases to identify the variant that the scribe probably intended to note.<sup>27</sup> These umlauts demonstrate both that the scribe was aware of these variant readings and that he or she<sup>28</sup> regarded them as sufficiently important to note. Notation of textual variants should not be surprising since this practice was well established even in Sumerian and Akkadian texts.<sup>29</sup> Origen's Hexapla and Bishop Victor of Capua's Codex Fuldensis also employ symbols which combine dots with other pen strokes to note textual variants.<sup>30</sup>

There is a remarkable convergence between the text of Vaticanus and the surviving text of the Bodmer papyri, especially  $\wp$ <sup>75</sup>, "copied about the end of the second or the beginning of the third century."<sup>31</sup>

---

in a sufficiently unconventional location that it was particularly susceptible to being overlooked.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Payne, "Fuldensis," 251-260.

<sup>28</sup> Eusebius in *H.E.* 6.23.2 records the employment of "girls trained in penmanship" in Origen's scriptorium at Caesarea.

<sup>29</sup> J. Krecher, "Glossen," *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (ed. Erich Ebeling *et al.*; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971) 3.435-436; cf. Payne, "Fuldensis," 258.

<sup>30</sup> Ernestus Ranke, ed., *Codex Fuldensis* (Marburg/Leipzig: N.G. Elwert, 1868) 465 and 573, which contains a photocopy of a Fuldensis page with many such symbols.

<sup>31</sup> Metzger, *TCGNT*<sup>2</sup>, 5\*, who also concludes that the Alexandrian text type represented by Vaticanus "goes back to an archetype that must be dated early in the second century." Calvin L. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," *JBL* 81 (1962) 375, concludes, "The evidence of our investigation distinctly indicates that the texttype [*sic*] represented by P75-Codex Vaticanus was in existence by A.D. 200." Kenneth Willis Clark, "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt,"

In light of this convergence, it is reasonable to conclude that the original scribe of Vaticanus copied a manuscript closely related to the Bodmer papyri. Thus, the scribe must have copied either a very old manuscript or one that was based on a very old manuscript. Umlauts marking the location of textual variants throughout the manuscript prove that the scribe had access to more than one manuscript. Presumably, then, the scribe chose to copy one particular manuscript because it appeared to be old or because of its reputation as preserving an ancient or more original form of the text. This helps explain the remarkable similarity of its text to that of the Bodmer papyri. It also fits the scholarly consensus that Vaticanus is a remarkably good guide to the original form of the text.

These umlauts offer new light on a host of textual questions such as the following two examples. First, the chocolate-brown umlaut at the end of John 7:52 is at the point where the account of the woman taken in adultery traditionally occurs. Thus, although Vaticanus does not include this account, this umlaut, presuming it was traced over an original one, provides the earliest evidence for the presence of this account here in the text of John, even earlier than Jerome's reference to its occurrence in many Greek codices.<sup>32</sup> Second, the umlaut by the line that contains the end of 1 Cor. 14:33 probably indicates awareness of the textual problem regarding verses 34-35 ("Let women keep silent in the churches. They are not permitted to speak. . .").<sup>33</sup> The text in question here, like that following John 7:52 begins immediately after the line adjacent to the umlaut.<sup>34</sup> The status of these verses is

---

*NovT* 5 (1962) 24, states "there is a notable affinity between the third-century P 75 and the fourth-century Codex Vaticanus . . . it is this text of P 75 that bears most closely upon the textual character of Codex Vaticanus in the fourth century." Cf. C.M. Martini, *Il problema della recensioalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV (AB 26)* (Roma: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1966).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *adv. Pelag.* ii. 17, "in multis graecis et latinis codicibus inuenitur de adultera," etc. and the evidence cited by J.H. Bernard, *Gospel According to St. John* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1928) 2.715-717, and U. Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin* (BZNW 28; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963) 117-144. For reference to this account in the East long before Vaticanus, cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (i-xii)* (Anchor; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) 335-336.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. above, p. 110 on evidence for the originality of this umlaut. For more on the textual history of this passage, cf. Payne, "Fuldensis," 240-262; Philip B. Payne, "Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5," *NTS* 44 (1998) 152-158; and the comprehensive analysis in Philip B. Payne, *Man & Woman, One in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, forthcoming).

<sup>34</sup> On the pattern of umlauts next to the line immediately preceding long interpolations, cf. Payne, "Fuldensis," 259. The unique three horizontal dots of undetermined origin in the margin by 1 John 5:7 also abut the line preceding an interpolation (the

unquestionably the major textual issue here, and the NA<sup>27</sup> lists no other variants at the end of 14:33 than the Western text transposition and Straatman's conjecture that the text originally did not include 14:34-35. If this umlaut had indicated awareness of the Western reading that puts 14:34-35 after 14:40, there should also have been an umlaut after 14:40, but there is not one there. Thus, the umlaut at the end of v. 33 is far less likely to represent the Western dislocation than a text that omitted 1 Cor. 14:34-35.

The discovery that eleven umlauts unambiguously match the original ink of Codex Vaticanus has four significant implications for textual criticism. 1. It demonstrates that its scribe was aware of textual variants and believed them to be sufficiently important to note. 2. It supports the view that its scribe desired to preserve the most original form of the text possible. 3. The third implication follows from the evidence for the originality of the Vaticanus umlauts in general and from two correlations between umlauts and documented textual variants. First, in the vast majority of lines where Vaticanus has umlauts, other manuscripts preserve significant variants. Second, the frequency of significant variants in these lines is far higher than in lines without umlauts. These two correlations provide a statistical basis for the first time for concluding that the majority of variants that were available to the scribe of Vaticanus have survived in other manuscripts. 4. These umlauts are windows that give insights into the history of the text before Vaticanus even for passages for which no early papyri have survived. Demonstration of the originality of these umlauts enhances respect for the scribe of Vaticanus and breaks new ground for NT textual criticism.

---

*Comma Johanneum*, which is not in Vaticanus). Here, however, unlike 1 Cor. 14:34-35 and John 7:53-8:11, the interpolation would not begin the next line since the last three letters of  $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\delta\acute{\nu}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  wrap onto that line.