

Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35*

J. Edward Miller

1529 Tawakoni Lane
Plano, TX 75075
jmiller@trinitybiblechurch.com

Abstract

Over 750 original umlaut sigla appear in the margins of Codex Vaticanus (New Testament), as well as hundreds of bars and textual gaps. Theories have surfaced regarding the intended purpose of these fourth-century notations, principally the false identification of a so-called 'bar-umlaut'. This article seeks to demonstrate (1) the absence of any significant relationship between Vaticanus's bar and umlaut, (2) the sectioning function of the *paragraphus* and gap, (3) the text-critical function of the umlaut appearing with or without the *paragraphus* (accompanied by several examples), and (4) the authenticity of 1 Cor. 14.34-35, defended against a false understanding of the umlaut's function.

A handful of articles have appeared recently pertaining to the text-critical symbols in the margins of the New Testament portion of Codex Vaticanus (B, 03) and their implications for 1 Cor. 14.34-35.¹ According to Philip B.

* I am indebted to Bruce M. Metzger, Daniel B. Wallace, W. Hall Harris and Philip B. Payne for their helpful feedback on this paper. Many thanks to Payne for his pioneering effort in the margins of Vaticanus.

1. Principally P.B. Payne, 'Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor. 14.34-5', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 240-62; C. Niccum, 'The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor. 14.34-5', *NTS* 43 (1997), pp. 242-55; and P.B. Payne and P. Canart, 'The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus', *NovT* 42 (2000), pp. 105-13. See also W. Willker's helpful website at <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/Vaticanus>. For related articles, see P.B. Payne, 'Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5', *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 152-58 and D.W. Odell-Scott, 'Editorial Dilemma: The Interpolation of 1 Cor 14.34-35 in the Western Manuscripts of D, G, and 88', *BTB* 30 (2000), pp. 68-74.

Payne, the scribe of Vaticanus designated an uncertain line of text with the conjunction of two extra-textual notations: the ‘bar’ (an underline extending one-letter width into the left-hand side of a column of text and stretching the same length out into the margin) and the ‘umlaut’ (two horizontal dots appearing in the margin). That is, when the scribe was aware of more than one possible reading in a line and was forced to choose one over the other, he inserted this ‘bar-umlaut’ siglum beside that line in the copy he was producing.² The numerous independent bar and umlaut sigla in the Vaticanus New Testament, however, suggest that the appearance of the two beside the same line of text may be coincidental. According to my findings,³ the bar and the umlaut have independent functions that are retained even when they accompany the same line of text.⁴ There has been no printed demonstration of the disjunction of these sigla, each of which appears hundreds of times in the Vaticanus New Testament.⁵ Likewise, there has been no thorough treatment of the function of the umlaut that, if performing a text-critical role in every case, identifies over 750⁶ New

2. The notation in the margin points to a *line* of text, not a *verse* of text. In Vaticanus, a line typically contains 15 to 19 characters, while each verse normally occupies 3 to 8 lines of text.

3. Three copies of the codex were examined for this study: a microfilm copy, a folio edition and the handsome 1999 color facsimile, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B*.

4. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, pp. 250-58, offers abundant evidence that the ‘bar-umlaut’ is a text-critical indicator in Vaticanus. But he only offers some evidence that the isolated umlaut carries the same function, maintaining that the ‘bar-umlaut’ and the isolated umlaut are separate sigla (p. 259 n. 71). In ‘The Originality’, Payne has apparently grown more confident in the text-critical function of the isolated umlaut, classifying it as a text-critical marker along with the ‘bar-umlaut’ and ‘separated bar-umlaut’ (p. 106 n. 8). This article argues against the existence of any so-called ‘bar-umlaut’ and ‘separated bar-umlaut’ sigla.

5. In 2001, Daniel B. Wallace and Joseph Fantin went to the Biblioteca Vaticana and examined the original manuscript on my behalf to confirm the authenticity of several umlauts that copies of the manuscript had rendered uncertain. Because of time restrictions with the codex, I asked them to examine only 12 instances in which a copy would not generate a definitive conclusion. According to their first-hand examination, each of the following passages revealed an umlaut: Mt. 7.21; 15.9; Mk 3.18; Lk. 5.7; 14.24; Acts 5.28; 9.38a; 1 Jn 5.7; Rom. 11.24; 2 Cor. 7.16; Heb. 9.18-19; 10.1 (these last two appear in the late-dated minuscule portion of the book of Hebrews).

6. Consensus has not been reached concerning the number of umlauts in Vaticanus’s New Testament. The uncertain authenticity of some of the notations is due to size, spatial relationship, bleeding, imprinting etc. To complicate matters, some lines

Testament variant readings known to exist in the early-fourth century.⁷ In this article, I will argue for the disjunction of the bar and umlaut sigla by demonstrating their mutually exclusive functions: the bar is a section marker and the umlaut is a text-critical indicator.

The Function of the Bar and Gap

While the umlaut siglum is peculiar to Vaticanus, the bar is not. In fact, ancient scribal punctuation customarily involved the use of such a bar, called a *paragraphus*. According to Turner, this *paragraphus* ‘takes the form of a simple horizontal stroke placed between the lines of writing’ and it is usually positioned ‘below the line to be marked’.⁸ Vaticanus’s bar

appear to have double umlauts (e.g. 1 Cor. 5.1; 1 Cor. 8.2; and 2 Cor. 7.16), and at least one line is accompanied by a strange three-dot construction (1 Jn 5.7). Nevertheless, Niccum, ‘The Voice’, p. 245, estimates the number of umlauts in the Gospels alone at nearly 400 (there are actually just over 250 in the Gospels). According to Willker’s examination of the 1999 facsimile of Vaticanus, there are 796 certain umlauts in the New Testament, and about 40 uncertain ones (for his master list of umlauts, see <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/Vaticanusumlaufs.txt>). According to my calculations, there are 778 lines tagged by umlaut sigla in the Vaticanus New Testament (140 in Acts alone), differing only slightly from Payne and Canart’s estimation of 765 (‘The Originality’, p. 106). This is equivalent to one umlaut per every 45 lines, or nearly one per column of text. So then, for 220 chapters of New Testament text (counting Heb. 9 as one chapter even though it is incomplete), there averages 3.5 umlauts per every chapter of extant text in the Vaticanus New Testament. Alas, an early UBS text!

7. Although complete confidence cannot be had that every umlaut dates from the original hand, Payne and Canart, ‘The Originality’, pp. 105-13, bring convincing evidence that many umlauts do. Like the text of Vaticanus, the umlauts were by and large reinforced centuries after the production of the manuscript by a retracer with an apparent interest in textual matters. And like the text, many of the umlauts were deliberately ignored or overlooked by the reinforcer for unknown reasons. Payne and Canart examined the manuscript first-hand and concluded that ‘eleven unreinforced umlauts unambiguously match the original apricot color of unreinforced text on the same page of the codex’ (p. 107). See also Willker, <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/Vaticanus/squeezed.html>, who points out a small sigma squeezed between an umlaut and the original text at the beginning of a line containing part of Eph. 6.20. Should the reinforcer have been responsible for adding this umlaut himself, he would have left plenty of space between the umlaut and original text for a letter of normal size. This demonstrates the likelihood that the umlaut was employed by the original hand, and not by a later reinforcer.

8. E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (ed. P.J. Parsons; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2nd edn, 1987), p. 8. See Turner for several

bears all the characteristics of this *paragraphus*. Milne and Skeat observe that ‘B normally accompanies a new paragraph with this sign’.⁹ Likewise, Hammond describes the bar as ‘a small line interposed at the beginning of a section’.¹⁰ By linking the bar with the umlaut, Payne is arguing for a unique usage of a standard scribal punctuation—a usage unattested in ancient manuscripts, biblical or otherwise. Furthermore, the bar appears apart from the umlaut in hundreds of places in the Vaticanus New Testament where it maintains its normal function as section divider. At first glance, then, the *paragraphus* would seem to retain its normal function even when marking a line accompanied by an umlaut.

The scribe’s practice of notation in the far-right column of the open codex supports the disjunction of the bar and umlaut. When marking this sixth column, the copyist predictably places the *paragraphus* in the left-hand margin, but nearly always places the umlaut in the right-hand margin—presumably to make it more visible for the reader. Were these sigla logically connected, we would expect them to appear together either to the left or right when marking the same line of text.¹¹ Since they do not, their functions should be explained independent of one another.

The New Testament portion of Vaticanus does not hold exclusive rights to the *paragraphus*.¹² Isolated bars employed as section breaks begin to appear toward the end of 1 Samuel. The first Old Testament bar marks the interface between a line containing the end of 1 Sam. 19.17 and another

examples from extrabiblical Greek manuscripts, especially of *paragraphus* used to mark sections.

9. H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), p. 88.

10. C.E. Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 6th edn, 1902), p. 44. See also E.M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 58.

11. Payne’s explanation (learned through correspondence) for this peculiarity is that ‘if the customary spatial relations of the bar-umlaut occurring in the left margin were duplicated in the far right margin, the bar would no longer be pointing into the text and would be too far removed from the text to function as effectively as a pointer into the text’.

12. Many thanks to Bruce M. Metzger who suggested that I examine the Old Testament for ‘items that may resemble the “bar-umlaut” of the New Testament’.

line beginning with 1 Sam. 19.18.¹³ This bar apparently signifies David's geographical move to Ramah and the protection of Samuel during his flight from Saul. The second bar surfacing in the Vaticanus Old Testament indicates a section division occurring in the middle of the line it accompanies. 1 Samuel 20, highlighted by this second bar, begins by recording another of David's geographical moves, this time from Samuel in Ramah to Jonathan. Both lines marked by *paraphi* are accompanied by modern-day verse divisions, and the second by a modern-day chapter division. Since no geographical movement on the part of David is recorded in the 53 lines in-between, it appears that the bars were inserted to delineate pericopes based on David's travels.

This pattern is continued in the New Testament, where the 39 bars appearing with umlauts also function as section dividers. Thirty-seven of these 39 'bar-umlauts' correspond with modern-day verse divisions, 13 with NA²⁷ paragraph breaks, and 3 with modern-day chapter divisions. In fact, only two bars fail to correspond with any of these.¹⁴ When both the bar and the umlaut accompany the same line of text, then, the bar appears to retain its individual function as a section marker with no logical connection to the umlaut.¹⁵

13. The appearance of the bar in select portions of the Vaticanus Old Testament supports the proposition by some that 1 Sam. 19.11 through Esdras, Hosea through Daniel, and the entire New Testament were written by the same hand. See Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, p. 88.

14. These two are at Mk 5.40 and Jas 4.4, which, along with Mt. 24.6-7 and Acts 13.16-17, demand closer scrutiny. The umlaut at Mk 5.40 corresponds to a new sentence in NA²⁷ and virtually every modern translation. Each marked line at Mt. 24.6-7 and Acts 13.16-17 exhibits a modern verse division, thereby validating some type of divider. Moreover, Mt. 24.7 contains the conjunction γάρ, which often introduces a new thought. Finally, both Acts 13.16-17 and Jas 4.4 include calls to attention followed by important information. Acts 13.16-17 reads, 'Men of Israel, and those who fear God, listen! [interruption in preparation for an important and lengthy sermon] The God of this people Israel chose our fathers...' Jas 4.4 reads, 'O adulterous people! [interruption by a textual gap] Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God?' Apparently, each of these calls to attention warranted a pause—signified by a bar—in the mind of the scribe. So then, while these four bars may not constitute paragraph divisions, *some sort* of division is certainly tenable.

15. While reading Vaticanus, I found myself relying on these bars for navigation through the unmarked text in search of verse and chapter beginnings.

Like the bars, the manuscript's 'gaps' also serve as section dividers.¹⁶ A textual gap is a space roughly equivalent to two letters if in the middle of a line of text, or potentially longer if at the end of a line. Twenty-seven of the 39 Vaticanus lines that are accompanied by both bars and umlauts contain such textual gaps. Of these 27 gaps, 25 establish the exact positions of what would later become verse divisions, 9 match NA²⁷ paragraph breaks, and 2 correspond to chapter divisions. In fact, only two gaps fail to correspond with any of these (see n. 14 for their treatment). Other gaps present mid-line in hundreds of places in the Vaticanus New Testament (with or apart from the bar and umlaut notations) appear likewise to be section dividers of some sort. Of Ephesians' 23 paragraphs in NA²⁷, all but two (at 3.8 and 5.21) are noted in Vaticanus by either a bar (e.g. 2.1), a gap (e.g. 6.23), or both (e.g. 1.15). In Philippians, Colossians and 2 Thessalonians, both a bar and a mid-line gap accompany every chapter division.¹⁷

It seems the Vaticanus scribe first incorporated gaps into his text that may or may not have existed in his source manuscript(s). Next, to provide the reader with better accessibility to section divisions—since this manuscript predates formal chapter and verse divisions by several centuries—the scribe positioned *paraphi* next to lines containing divisions, while extending them one-letter width into the margins for reader expedience. Where the bar and gap occur together, the *paraphus* draws the reader's eyes to the line and the gap pinpoints the exact spot in the line where the shift in content occurs.¹⁸

The bar and gap exhibit such broad usage by the scribe in marking off sections that categories can be established. Four discernable categories of section markings appear in Vaticanus: *Division for Content*, *Division for Announcement*, *Division of Discourse* and *Division of Greeting*.¹⁹ The

16. See F. Bleek, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (ed. J.F. Bleek; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2nd edn, 1883), p. 2.314, who observes that a small space appears at the end of 'several sentences and paragraphs'. These gaps appear both in the middle and at the end of hundreds of lines in the Vaticanus New Testament.

17. While this evidence is admittedly anachronistic, the correspondence of *paraphi* and gaps to modern verse, chapter and paragraph divisions seems more than coincidental.

18. A significant number of bars and gaps appear in the same lines. Still, many bars accompany lines without gaps, and many gaps appear in lines with no bars.

19. These categories are based on the *paraphus* and textual gaps that appear to be arranged around the manuscript's complex numerical system of division. See B.M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 1992), p. 22, who finds in Vaticanus 'the

most obvious use of the bar and gap is *Division for Content*, which normally accompanies modern-day chapter and paragraph breaks as seen above. The scribe simply inserted a bar, a gap, or both into the text to signify a shift in content. The *Division for Announcement* is the category of Acts 13.16-17 and Jas 4.4, both of which were already given full treatment (see n. 14). A third category, labeled *Division of Discourse*, pertains especially to discourse narratives in the Gospels. For example, in the accounts of the Rich Young Ruler recorded in Mt. 19.16-24 and Mk 10.17-25, bars and gaps provide navigation through the unmarked dialogue by informing the reader of the cessation of direct discourse. The famous discussion between Jesus and Nicodemus in Jn 3 further substantiates a *Division of Discourse*. Here, every instance of direct discourse cessation is marked by a bar, and Codex Alexandrinus exhibits a large marginal letter corresponding to each Vaticanus bar in this Jn 3 dialogue.²⁰ The final category, *Division of Greeting*, is genre specific to epistolary literature. In nine New Testament epistles, either a bar, a gap or both separate the Apostle's greeting from the body of his letter.²¹

Payne appears to have misdiagnosed the obvious and consistent function of the *paragraphus*, which, whether appearing with or without an umlaut, is to identify section changes.²² It does not function text-critically and has

oldest system of capitulation which is known to us'. H.K. McArthur, 'The Earliest Divisions of the Gospels', in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica* III (part II) (TU, 88; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964), pp. 266-72, calls these numbered divisions 'reference aids', and concludes that these 'were created as aids for reference purposes'. See also H.B. Swete, *Commentary on Mark* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977), p. li. The precise relationship between Vaticanus's numbered divisions and its bars and gaps has yet to be determined.

20. See Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, for examples of linear *paragraphi* dating from 325–275 BCE that were employed to mark the beginning and end of quotations. The *paragraphus* was also used in an early third-century BCE anonymous tragedy to mark a change of speaker (p. 92).

21. Both a bar and mid-line gap appear after Rom. 1.7 and 1 Cor. 1.3; a bar and end-line gap appear after 2 Cor. 1.2, Gal. 1.5, Eph. 1.2, 2 Thess. 1.2 and Jas 1.1; an end-line gap appears after Phil. 1.2; and a bar appears after 1 Pet. 1.2.

22. Payne and Canart, 'The Originality', p. 106, allude to 'Fuldensis', p. 255, claiming that in it Payne 'weighs the evidence that the bar in the ["bar-umlaut" and "separated bar-umlaut"] categories may simply be a paragraph mark'. However, while Payne did entertain the possibility that the bar *apart from the umlaut* is a paragraph mark, the force of his article denies this function of the bar when it *accompanies an umlaut* ('Fuldensis', p. 255). Based on the above evidence, the bar and umlaut appear to always serve mutually exclusive purposes.

no significant relationship with the umlaut. Rather, the bar and umlaut have individual functions that are retained even when they accompany the same line of text. The umlaut's function must be determined independent of the *paragraphus*.

The Function of the Umlaut

The umlaut appears to retain its unique text-critical function whether accompanied by a bar or not. To demonstrate that the umlaut sigla appearing on nearly every page of the Vaticanus New Testament are early indicators of known variants, I will employ four tests. First, Old Testament lines accompanied by umlauts will be scrutinized for possible variations. Next, an analysis of statistical probability will be presented pertaining to significant variants surviving in lines accompanied by umlauts (whether adjacent to bars or not). Third, an examination will be conducted of numerous parallel passages signified by umlauts. Finally, Vaticanus will be approached with knowledge of early variants in search of umlaut counterparts.

*Old Testament Umlauts*²³

There are 14 lines accompanied by unambiguous umlauts in the Old Testament portion of Vaticanus.²⁴ Eleven of the 14 marked lines contain known variation.²⁵

Joshua 4.7. The marked line begins with οὔτοι ὑμῖν, which is transposed in Codex Alexandrinus.

Joshua 15.28. The MT includes the name Biziothiah after Beersheba in this verse. An umlaut signifies this variation beside the appropriate line in Vaticanus.

23. The paucity of Old Testament umlauts begs the question: With so many thousands of potential lines containing variation, why did the scribe employ this text-critical feature so sparingly? The answer likely pertains to the number of source manuscripts at his disposal, the scribe's limited familiarity with variation lines in other Old Testament manuscripts, or some combination of these possibilities.

24. Willker has identified 17 Old Testament umlauts, along with 76 triplets (a three-dot construction in the form of a triangle). I have confirmed 14 of Willker's 17 umlauts, eliminating those at Josh. 4.19, 2 Sam. 24.13 and Ezra 4.24 due to size and improper spatial relations.

25. 2 Kgs 3.4-5, Ezra 7.16 and 1 Esd. 2.22 contain lines accompanied by umlauts, but no known variations seem to exist for the marked lines.

Judges 7.25. In the marked line, Vaticanus places the murder of Zeeb at $\lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\phi\zeta\eta\theta$ whereas Alexandrinus reads $\lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\phi\zeta\eta\beta$.

Judges 8.18. While Vaticanus and Alexandrinus are virtually identical throughout 8.18a (only a one-letter discrepancy), they diverge significantly following $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\nu$. The umlaut beside the appropriate Vaticanus line denotes knowledge of some variation.

Judges 16.17. The umlaut is probably indicating the presence or absence of the article following the first $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta$ in different witnesses.

1 Samuel 4.15. The variation highlighted by the umlaut in this line pertains to the age of Eli. While the Vaticanus scribe records Eli's age as 90, he was aware of other witnesses that claimed he was 98.

2 Samuel 20.10. This umlaut apparently signifies knowledge of spelling variations of the name 'Bochiri'.

2 Kings 3.3-4. The line signified by the umlaut includes the last word of v. 3, which is singular in Vaticanus but plural in some traditions.

1 Chronicles 24.28. The marked Vaticanus line includes Ithamar as a son of Mahli in addition to Eleazar. Many witnesses record Eleazar's name only. The umlaut alerts the reader to this variation.

1 Chronicles 26.30. The original Vaticanus text reads $\lambda\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\upsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ in the line marked by an umlaut, but a later hand has corrected the spelling to $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$.

Nehemiah 3.30. The name in this Vaticanus line is spelled Ανωμ , but some witnesses read Ανουμ .

The 14 unambiguous Old Testament umlauts provide an ideal test case for the function of the umlaut in Vaticanus. Eleven of the 14 lines (79%) yield clear instances of variation among textual traditions. These examples strengthen the plausibility that the scribe of Vaticanus employed the umlaut siglum for text-critical purposes.

*Statistical Probability*²⁶

This test examines the 88 umlauts in the Gospel of Matthew²⁷ as a control

26. Payne used the NA²⁶ apparatus to test the probability of the 'bar-umlaut'. Granted, von Soden's textual apparatus would have been more comprehensive, but Payne deliberately chose to use NA²⁶ because it overlooks smaller variants in favor of more significant ones. I have chosen to use the NA²⁷ apparatus as my base for this test rather than a more comprehensive one so that the results can be compared with those of Payne.

27. Willker has counted 91 umlauts in Matthew.

group.²⁸ Fifty-two Matthean umlauts (59.1%) correspond to variants listed in NA²⁷. By comparison, the average number of variant-carrying unmarked lines (derived from the 20 lines following each umlaut line) is 23.95 out of 88, or 27.2%. This means that in Matthew's Gospel the lines marked by umlauts have a 59.1% chance of containing variants listed in NA²⁷, while lines not marked (represented by the 20 lines following each umlaut line) have only a 27.2% chance of corresponding to significant variants. Thus lines in Matthew not accompanied by umlauts are less than half as likely as lines marked by umlauts to contain variants listed in NA²⁷.²⁹

*Parallel Passages*³⁰

Occasionally the Vaticanus scribe identifies a line of text that shows signs of harmonization attempts (usually in the Synoptic Gospels). Other passages parallel one another in their particular wording, and so lend themselves to identical textual alterations by scribes familiar with the text. The test of parallel passages in the New Testament is perhaps the most controlled method for (1) proving that the independent umlaut is, indeed, a scribal indicator of known textual variation, and (2) establishing that the extant variant in a line of text is, in fact, the *same one* indicated by the

28. The Gospel of Matthew was selected at random for this test.

29. This test was administered by Payne to the 39 'bar-umlaut' lines in Vaticanus ('Fuldensis', pp. 252-54). While Payne's results show a greater likelihood of 'bar-umlaut' lines displaying NA²⁶ variants (33/39, or 84.6%), it must be pointed out that the average of the 20 lines following each grouped 'bar-umlaut' line (no data were provided for the 'separated bar-umlauts') was likewise higher than mine (9.55/27, or 35.4%). The highest frequency of variant-carrying unmarked lines from Payne's study was 14/27 (or 51.9%), while in my study the highest number was 31/88 (or 35.2%). Payne's percentage ratio of variant-carrying marked lines to variant-carrying unmarked lines was 84.6 to 35.4 (2.39 to 1); mine is 59.1 to 27.2 (2.17 to 1). This suggests that the sample examined by Payne contained a higher percentage of significant variants both in marked and unmarked lines. Furthermore, it seems the higher incidence of variants in so-called 'bar-umlaut' lines is likely the result of more variants appearing (on average) at the beginning of paragraphs. Payne was not cataloguing variants indicated by the 'bar-umlaut', but those of the umlaut alone; these umlauts coincidentally appear contiguous to section divisions (the *paragraphus*) in these instances.

30. The designation 'parallel passages' loosely describes similar wording found in any two or more places in the New Testament. These could be as simple as one word or as complex as word-for-word pericopes as found among the Synoptics. Scribes familiar with the New Testament text would be acquainted with variants emerging from two or more similar passages.

fourth-century copyist. What follows are examples of parallel lines containing variants tagged by umlauts.

*Matthew 13.55.*³¹ The textual variant in this line reflects confusion on the part of some witnesses over the name 'Joseph'. Though involving different witnesses, the precise confusion surfaces again in Acts 4.36. Both lines in Vaticanus containing ἰωσήφ are accompanied by umlauts.³²

Mark 7.32. Whereas the initial καί in this line of the manuscript is well preserved, it is curiously omitted from several witnesses (P⁴⁵ A L f^{1.13} 33 91 sy). The habit of the Vaticanus scribe to retain the καί when other witnesses drop it is seen also in Lk. 16.23, Acts 27.34, Jude 22, Rom. 11.33, 2 Cor. 3.3 and Eph. 3.21.³³ Each of these Vaticanus lines supplying this conjunction is marked by an umlaut indicating that, while the scribe preferred to retain the καί, he was aware of manuscripts that dropped it in each of these places.

Mark 8.29. In an attempt to harmonize Mark's account of Peter's confession with that recorded in Mt. 16.16, some early manuscripts expand the shorter declaration σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός by adding ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (8 L) or ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (W f¹³ sy^p). The scribe notes this attempted

31. One occasionally finds in Vaticanus apparent references to variants that are nowhere attested in fourth-century manuscripts or earlier, such as we have here at Mt. 13.55. This could be considered a weakness, suggesting that if these variants post-date Vaticanus, the scribe could not have been aware of them. However, the appearance of readings only in later texts does not preclude the possibility that those readings may be early; they may have existed beforehand in manuscripts that are no longer extant. See K. Aland, 'The Text of the Church', *TrinJ* 8 (1987), p. 141, who argues that even among MT manuscripts, it is 'undeniable that the older elements...persisted stubbornly'. See also M.W. Holmes, 'The "Majority Text Debate": New Form of an Old Issue', *Themelios* 8 (1983), p. 16, who acknowledges that early readings exist in Majority manuscripts. According to Holmes, 'Many Majority readings are ancient readings; this has been known, though inadequately recognized, at least since the discovery of P⁴⁵ and P⁴⁶'. He also writes that some readings 'once dominant have even disappeared'. Nevertheless, where two or more variants are known to exist in one marked line, the earliest discrepancy is most likely the one intended by the copyist.

32. Keep in mind that the umlaut siglum is not marking a *verse*, but a *line* of 15 to 19 characters, thus substantially narrowing the scope of potential variants intended by the copyist.

33. Vaticanus reflects a scribal predilection to smooth out a text with the retention and occasional addition of the conjunction καί. This was confirmed by a thorough collation of 1 Thessalonians, yielding two singular readings in Vaticanus where καί is added to the text: 1 Thess. 1.6 and 4.10.

harmonization by placing an umlaut next to the appropriate line in Mark's Gospel.

Mark 14.22. The shorter reading λάβετε is modified in many manuscripts (Γ 0116 f¹³ 28 1241 2427 91 ff² bo^{ms}) to reflect the longer reading λάβετε, φάγετε in Mt. 26.26. An umlaut accompanies the appropriate line in Mark.

Luke 10.1, 17. The marginal notations at Lk. 10.1 and 17 are particularly compelling. Witnesses are divided between ἑβδομήκοντα (P⁴⁵ s A C L W f^{1.13}) and ἑβδομήκοντα δύο (P⁷⁵ B D). Fortunately for this study, this variant appears in two places.³⁴ When one encounters an umlaut beside the Vaticanus line with the reading δύο in Lk. 10.1, and fails to encounter another until he reads—79 lines later—the second δύο at v. 17, he has convincing evidence that the scribe was employing the umlaut for text-critical purposes.³⁵

Luke 11.2. An umlaut appears next to the line containing the shorter invocation in the Lord's Prayer, Πάτερ. Many early manuscripts (A C D W among others) have apparently harmonized this verse with the parallel passage in Mt. 6.9, reading Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. An umlaut highlights the Vaticanus line from Lk. 11.2 containing Πάτερ.

John 1.42. Whereas the original hand of Vaticanus reads Ἰωάννου, a number of witnesses prefer the name Ἰωνα (A B² Ψ f^{1.13} 91 c q vg^{cl} sy bo^{ms}). Many of these same manuscripts likewise prefer Ἰωνα to Ἰωάννου later in Jn 21.15 (A Ψ f^{1.13} 91 bo^{ms}). Both Vaticanus lines supplying the name under scrutiny are accompanied by umlauts.

Acts 7.30. Both here and in 2 Thess. 1.8, Vaticanus records the construction φλογὶ πυρός. An early transposition occurs in both passages, which changes the expression to πυρὶ φλογός (P⁷⁴ A C E 1739 at Acts

34. All manuscripts examined have internal agreement concerning this reading (that is, the reading in v. 1 is repeated in v. 17) except M 28 33 Syr^c.

35. According to The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel According to Luke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), a few later manuscripts add μαθητάς after ἑβδομήκοντα instead of δύο at Lk. 10.1 (0211 7 60 267 1654 1685 1184) and at Lk. 10.17 (Λ 124 161 174 230 262 348 477 1187 1216 1443 1579). The late date of this reading, however, suggests that the much earlier variant δύο was the one that the scribe had in mind. Still, no variant reading existing in one umlaut line fails to appear in the parallel line in some manuscripts. This builds our confidence that the scribe was noting parallel variants in these two verses.

7.30; \aleph A 33 1739 1881 at 2 Thess. 1.8).³⁶ An umlaut marks each instance in Vaticanus.

Romans 1.18. A few witnesses (a vg^{cl} sa; Ambst) add τοῦ θεοῦ after τὴν ἀλήθειαν in an apparent harmonization with Rom. 1.25, which reads τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ in all known witnesses. Both lines are marked by umlauts in Vaticanus.

Romans 5.21. Vaticanus goes against every other manuscript here with a singular reading that transposes the name (Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Later, in Rom. 15.5, many important manuscripts (\aleph A C F P) read Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, while the Vaticanus copyist retains Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. Both Vaticanus lines are accompanied by umlauts.

Romans 15.4. Whereas the best manuscripts—along with the editors of NA²⁷—prefer προεγράφη at the beginning of v. 4 and ἐγράφη later in the verse, Vaticanus employs ἐγράφη in both instances. An umlaut appears next to each of these lines (with one unmarked line in-between).

1 Corinthians 3.5. The first Vaticanus line of v. 5 reads τί οὖν ἐστὶν Ἀπολλῶς; the second line, τί δὲ ἐστὶν Παῦλος. Both lines are marked by umlauts in Vaticanus. One of two textual variants is in view here. Either the scribe was conveying his awareness of τίς replacing both instances of τί in many witnesses (P^{46vid} \aleph^2 C D F G Ψ 1881 Θ sy), or he was indicating a reversal of the order of names in several manuscripts (D¹ Ψ Θ sy).

Colossians 1.27. Vaticanus's relative pronoun ὃ is replaced by ὅς in Col. 1.27 (\aleph C D H I Θ) and again in 3.14 (\aleph^* D* 81). Both Vaticanus lines are accompanied by umlauts.

These passages do not constitute an exhaustive list of germane parallels; much more work on parallel variants needs to be done. For instance, for three of the above passages, where the scribe signifies knowledge of attempts to harmonize with a parallel text, he supplies another umlaut next to the line with which it is sometimes harmonized. An umlaut appears at Mt. 26.26 (with which Mk 14.22 is sometimes harmonized), Mt. 6.9 (with which Lk. 11.2 is sometimes harmonized) and Rom. 1.25 (with which Rom. 1.18 is sometimes harmonized). Since no early manuscripts (apart from a few versional witnesses in the case of Mt. 26.26) show variants in the particular lines indicated by the umlaut,³⁷ the marginal notations are

36. This change is probably a harmonization with the LXX reading πυρὶ φλογός in Exod. 3.2.

37. Critical apparatuses consulted include Tischendorf, von Soden, Merk, Bover, Legg and NA²⁷.

probably marking commonly harmonized texts. In each of these instances, the scribe was likely highlighting both facets of the harmonization (the true text and the harmonized) while offering to subsequent copyists a caveat not to defile the text further. Nevertheless, these instances of parallel texts offer impressive evidence that the Vaticanus scribe employed the umlaut siglum to denote textually uncertain lines.

*Comparison against Known Variants*³⁸

For this test, the Vaticanus New Testament is approached with knowledge of numerous early textual variants, and umlauts are sought in the margins accompanying those lines of text. In the preceding test we began with known umlauts and sought corresponding variants; here we will begin with early, well-established variants and seek corresponding umlauts. Since these variants are selected more or less at random, this test does not alone provide irrefutable proof of the umlaut's text-critical function. Combined with the other tests, however, the correspondence of these early variants with umlauts adds further plausibility to my overall argument. Comparison against known variants has three obvious shortcomings. First, it is unreasonable to expect that the source manuscript(s) at the disposal of the Vaticanus scribe contained all textual variants existing at the time. There were certainly variants existing in his day that he was unaware of, though we may know of them today. Second, it is only natural for a copyist to overlook a number of variants in his source manuscript(s) that he would certainly have marked were they brought to his attention. Finally, the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, the end of Hebrews (9.14b-13.25)³⁹ and Revelation are missing from the manuscript.⁴⁰ Their early variants of interest, then, are not available for our examination. While this test encounters such shortcomings, it nevertheless proves successful in a number of passages.

Matthew 5.22. This textual variant was early enough to undergo

38. Thanks to Daniel B. Wallace for his suggestion of this test.

39. The codex places the General Epistles prior to the Pauline corpus.

40. Hammond, *Outlines*, p. 43, and J.H. Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), p. 39, both neglect to include Philemon in their lists of missing sections. G. Milligan, *The New Testament and its Transmission* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932) p. 32, neglects to include 1 Timothy through Philemon among the missing. Instead he writes that the Catholic Epistles have been lost. C.R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), p. 345, erroneously reports that Hebrews reads to 9.25.

scrutiny by Jerome.⁴¹ In some early witnesses the word εἰκῆ is inserted following Jesus' words ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ (S² D L W Θ 0233 f^{1.13} 33 9l it sy co; Ir^{lat} Or^{mss} Cyp Cyr). An umlaut accompanies the Vaticanus line where this word is inserted into other manuscripts.

Mark 1.2. This umlaut stands just to the right (since it is the far-right column of the codex) of the line containing an ancient and infamous textual problem. Vaticanus clearly reads τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ, while a number of witnesses omit the prophet's name and employ the plural τοῖς προφήταις (A W f¹³ 9l vg^{ms} sy^h (bo^{mss}); Ir^{lat}).

Luke 10.1, 17. This textual variant is early enough to have papyri disagreeing over its reading. According to P⁷⁵ (and B), ἑβδομήκοντα δύο were sent out. According to P⁴⁵, only ἑβδομήκοντα were sent out by Jesus.⁴² Both 10.1 and 10.17 in Vaticanus are accompanied by umlauts.

John 7.39. Once again the papyri disagree over an early reading. Either the text should read πνεῦμα (P⁷⁵ S) or πνεῦμα ἅγιον (P⁶⁶ B). An umlaut marks the Vaticanus line containing this early textual variant.

Acts 12.25. Metzger highlights this early textual problem as particularly difficult due to the 'violent conflict between external and internal evidence'.⁴³ The nearly impossible reading εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ occurs in S B 9l, while the internally preferred reading ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ is supported by P⁷⁴ A 33 1739. This line is marked by an umlaut in Vaticanus.

1 Thessalonians 1.1. A number of early manuscripts (including S A D I 33 vg^{mss} sy^{h**} bo) add ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ at the end of the verse. This early harmonization with 2 Thess. 1.2 is identified by an umlaut in Vaticanus.

1 Thessalonians 2.7. Were Paul and his companions claiming to have been ἡπίοι (S² A C² D² 33 1739 1881) or νήπιοι (P⁶⁵ S* B C* D* F G I) among the Thessalonians? This early textual discrepancy is accompanied by an umlaut in Vaticanus.

The evidence provided by the Old Testament umlauts, statistical probability, parallel passages and the comparison against known variants demonstrates that the hundreds of umlauts in the New Testament portion of Vaticanus were intended to signal the reader to textually uncertain lines.

41. B.M. Metzger, *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic* (NTTS, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), p. 192.

42. See Metzger, *Text of the New Testament*, pp. 243-45, for a helpful discussion of this problem.

43. Metzger, *Text of the New Testament*, p. 242.

Furthermore, there is no so-called ‘bar-umlaut’ siglum. Rather, instances where the bar and umlaut accompany the same line of text are best regarded as coincidental.

1 Corinthians 14.34-35 Revisited

These findings on the umlaut have strong implications for the authenticity of 1 Cor. 14.34-35. According to Payne, the weight of evidence now available favors the view that 1 Cor. 14.34-35 was not originally part of 1 Corinthians. Rather, it probably first appeared as a comment in the margin of an early manuscript. When this manuscript was subsequently copied, conscientious scribes inserted the passage into the body of the text (one after 14.33, another after 14.40), thinking it had been unintentionally omitted and placed in the margin by a previous scribe. Payne argues that the ‘bar-umlaut’ beside the Vaticanus line preceding this variant was placed there by the scribe to indicate knowledge of a manuscript omitting the passage. According to Payne, when the copyist wished to indicate an uncertain ‘block of text’, he did so by placing the siglum beside the line preceding the variant-carrying line.⁴⁴ However, evidence will be presented that the notation always accompanies the first uncertain line of text rather than the last certain line before a known variant, and that uncertain blocks of text are therefore *accompanied* by marginal notations rather than *preceded* by them. Another explanation will then be offered for the umlauts at 1 Cor. 14.33 and Jn 7.52 in Vaticanus.

The Vaticanus scribe consistently places the umlaut next to the line supplying the beginning of a questionable reading, whether long or short (and whether the text is included in or omitted from Vaticanus). To demonstrate this, two types of data are necessary: (1) uncertain text blocks and lengthy variants *included* in Vaticanus that have umlauts beside them, and (2) uncertain text blocks and lengthy variants *omitted* from Vaticanus that have umlauts beside the lines in which we would expect them to begin.

44. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, pp. 252 and 259. What Payne labels as a ‘block of text’ is unclear, yet through correspondence I have learned that by this designation he meant ‘a complete sentence or clause that could stand meaningfully on its own’ (such as 1 Cor. 14.34-35). Three classes of variants, then, are marked by the umlaut siglum: (1) those confined to one Vaticanus line, (2) stand alone ‘text blocks’ that occupy more than one line, and (3) ‘lengthy variants’ incapable of standing alone that take up more than one line.

When a text block or lengthy variant is included in Vaticanus but known to be omitted from other manuscripts, the consistent practice of the scribe is to place an umlaut beside the line that begins that variant. In Jn 12, an umlaut appears next to the line bearing the last eight characters of v. 7 and the first seven characters of v. 8. The variant indicated by the fourth-century scribe involves the entirety of v. 8 (absent from D and sy^s), which appears in Vaticanus and spills over into three subsequent lines. Yet the umlaut rests beside the line containing the beginning of this ‘text block’ and not the line preceding it. Likewise, Jn 16.14-15 accommodates an umlaut beside the line with the last twelve characters of v. 14 and the first five characters of v. 15, which is absent from some early manuscripts (such as P⁶⁶ and \aleph). In Rom. 11.6, an umlaut appears next to the line containing the final twelve characters of the verse according to several solid manuscripts (P⁴⁶ \aleph * A C D F 1739 1881 among others). Vaticanus, however, continues the verse with a lengthy variant (13 words), the first four characters of which appear at the end of the line marked by the umlaut. Finally, Jude 22-23 is absent from P⁷², and an umlaut signifying a known omission appears beside the Vaticanus line containing the last nine characters of v. 21 and the first nine characters of v. 22.⁴⁵ When we come to 1 Cor. 14.34-35, the umlaut in question does not accompany the line beginning with 1 Cor. 14.34, but the line containing the end of 1 Cor. 14.33. The consistent method of notation is that, when Vaticanus includes an uncertain text block or variant of length, an umlaut accompanies the line in which the variant begins, not the line preceding it.⁴⁶ It is unlikely that the scribe would abandon this habit only in the case of 1 Cor. 14.34-35.⁴⁷

45. In Jude 25, Vaticanus contains an umlaut beside a line that begins with a lengthy textual discrepancy with P⁷². This umlaut has not been included as an example because the preceding line is also accompanied by an umlaut, which might confuse my argument. This first umlaut, however, is probably signifying the omission of $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota$ from a few manuscripts (such as P⁷²).

46. While not all of these examples conform to the ‘text block’ definition (see n. 44), Jn 12.8, 16.15 and Jude 22-23 certainly do.

47. Rom. 3.8-9 provides another example of a variant spilling over into the subsequent line, yet even Payne’s so-called ‘bar-umlaut’ in this passage is next to the line containing the beginning of the reading in question (the umlaut accompanies the Vaticanus line ending with the first six letters of the reading $\pi\rho\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha\ \omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$. Some witnesses (D* G (Ψ) 104 (1505) *pc* it sy^{p,h**} bo; Ambst) replace these words with $\pi\rho\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$). In several other instances (e.g. Mt. 5.44; Mk 8.26; Lk. 17.18; Acts 6.10; 17.5; 2 Cor. 9.10; Heb. 7.14; Jude 25), an umlaut accompanies a line beginning a lengthy text that other manuscripts merely modify (as opposed to adding to

According to Payne, when an uncertain block of text is omitted from Vaticanus, the scribe indicates this knowledge by positioning a siglum beside the line preceding the one in which we would expect the block to begin. His only example⁴⁸ is the ‘bar-umlaut’ at the end of Jn 7.52, which, according to Payne, signifies that the scribe was aware of a manuscript containing 7.53-8.11, the *Pericope de Adultera*. Eight passages (Mt. 27.35; Mk 6.11; Rom. 4.18; 12.17; 1 Cor. 10.28; Acts 8.37; 24.7; 1 Thess. 1.1)⁴⁹ raise suspicions about this theory.⁵⁰ A text block or lengthy variant appearing in another manuscript would begin in each of these lines marked by an umlaut in Vaticanus.⁵¹ These findings suggest that the umlaut at Jn 7.52 is unrelated to the *Pericope de Adultera* (absent from Vaticanus), because the notation marks the line preceding the one in which the *Pericope* would begin.

them or omitting them altogether). These variants, because they occupy more than one Vaticanus line, further substantiate the consistent practice of the scribe of placing the umlaut beside an uncertain line of text rather than beside the line preceding it.

48. I agree with Payne that the unique three-dot construction at 1 Jn 5.7 was probably intended to be an umlaut. However, even though the umlaut accompanies the line preceding the location of a famous textual problem, Payne is reluctant to conclude that the umlaut is identifying the *Comma Johanneum* (absent from Vaticanus).

49. A shorter omission marked by an umlaut appears at the end of Mk 14.70. Here, the reading και γαρ Γαλιλαιος ει is spread over two Vaticanus lines, dividing the word Γαλιλαιος. The umlaut (with a bar) stands next to the line containing the second half of this reading. A few manuscripts omit this phrase altogether (W 2427 pc), and it is this reading that Payne identifies as the variant that Vaticanus includes and others omit. However, if this were the variant known to the scribe, we would expect the umlaut to appear in the *preceding* line, the one with the beginning of the variant. Since the marginal notation appears in the second line, the known variant was probably the longer reading in other manuscripts, και γαρ Γαλιλαιος ει και η λαλια σου ομοιαζει (A Θ f¹³ (33) 9^h q sy^{p,h} bo^p). Notice that the line in which we would expect the omitted text to *begin* is accompanied by an umlaut, with a bar and gap corresponding to a modern-day verse division. Other instances in which an umlaut marks a line whose variant (absent from Vaticanus) would spill over into the next line(s) include Lk. 14.24 (an umlaut confirmed by Wallace and Fantin through hands-on examination of Vaticanus; see n. 5), Rom. 4.18, 12.17, 15.29, 1 Cor. 10.28, Phil. 3.16 and 2 Pet. 1.10.

50. Again, while not all of these examples conform to the ‘text block’ definition (see n. 44), Mk 6.11, 1 Cor. 10.28, Acts 8.37 and Acts 24.7 certainly do.

51. If these omitted passages had been included in the manuscript, the variant in Mt. 27.35 would occupy approximately six Vaticanus lines, Mk 6.11 five lines, Rom. 4.18 three lines, Rom. 12.17 two lines, 1 Cor. 10.28 two or three lines, Acts 8.37 eight or nine lines, Acts 24.7 ten lines, and 1 Thess. 1.1 three lines.

Since the copyist did not employ the umlauts with 1 Cor. 14.34-35 and the *Pericope* in mind, other variants must have been intended. In 1 Cor. 14.33, a variant exists in the Vaticanus line marked by the umlaut. Tischendorf's critical edition cites a number of manuscripts that add διδάσκω after των αγιων (F G 2 10 61 93 137 Syr^P among others).⁵² Since there remains enough space at the end of the line to begin another word, the marginal notation is provided next to this line.⁵³ Regarding Jn 7.52, many manuscripts replace εγειρεται with εγηγερται (E G H L M S^{TX} X Δ Syr^P among others) in the line accompanied by the notation.⁵⁴ This variant, rather than the *Pericope de Adultera*, seems to be the one intended by the scribe.

Conclusion

The conclusions reached in this article have important implications both for the discipline of textual criticism and for the authenticity of 1 Cor. 14.34-35. Evidence was provided that Vaticanus's umlaut functions text-critically with or without the bar/*paragraphus*, which maintains the obvious function of section divider. By signifying uncertain lines of text with marginal sigla, the Vaticanus scribe provides three categories of indispensable information. First, for the first time ever scholars have access to hundreds of specific text-critical decisions made by an early professional scribe. A careful study of these decisions may enable scholars to identify canons employed by Vaticanus's scribe during copying.⁵⁵ Second, hundreds of variants, emerging only in later manuscripts, can now be dated to the early-fourth century with some measure of confidence. Lastly, for those marked lines failing to yield extant variants, New Testament scholars must acknowledge the likelihood that some variants known to exist in the early-fourth century have been lost.⁵⁶

52. C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 8th edn, 1869), p. 546.

53. The burden of proof rests with anyone arguing for the inauthenticity of 1 Cor. 14.34-35. While a handful of witnesses place these verses after v. 40 (D F G 88* it^{d, g} Ambrosiaster Sedulius Scotus), no known manuscripts omit the passage altogether.

54. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, p. 826.

55. See J.C. O'Neill, 'The Rules Followed by the Editors of the Text Found in the Codex Vaticanus', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 219-28, for a discussion of these possibilities.

56. According to Niccum, 'The Voice', p. 244, 'Markings not corresponding to known variation units could provide bases for conjectural emendation'.

Finally, the Vaticanus scribe consistently positions the umlaut beside an uncertain line of text rather than the line preceding it. This eliminates 1 Cor. 14.34-35 as the variant indicated by the nearby umlaut, since the umlaut marks the line containing the final words of 1 Cor. 14.33 and not the following line which begins with 1 Cor. 14.34.