

A TEXT WITHOUT 1 CORINTHIANS 14.34-35? NOT ACCORDING TO
THE MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

Jennifer Shack

Concordia University College of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Introduction

The words of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 read: ‘The women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church’ (ESV). To the modern reader, the implications of these words may be distasteful. These verses are used by many to support a case against women’s ordination and/or the inclusion of women in any sort of leadership or ministry within the church. In contrast, they are also often said to be either an interpolation or addressed to a specific social situation and thus not applicable to anything the church does today.

The controversial nature of these verses makes them a particularly interesting case study. This article will demonstrate, using evidence primarily from three New Testament manuscripts, that the idea that 1 Cor. 14.34-35 is an interpolation cannot be supported from the external evidence.

The Great Methodological Debate: Internal versus External Evidence

This article will primarily argue against Philip B. Payne, who asserts that evidence exists for a manuscript that does not contain these verses. One of the reasons why I find different results than Payne is that I use a different methodology. This section will briefly demonstrate why a documentary approach is more accurate in determining the preferred reading than those methods that favour internal evidence.

Internal evidence deals with the text itself: how each set of words can be interpreted, how they gave rise to other sets of words and which set of words most likely came first. It asks questions about the intrinsic probability of a reading. Conversely, external evidence has to do with the manuscript apart from the meaning of the words it contains. It deals with the age of the manuscript, the skill of the scribe and the markings on manuscripts in addition to the main text that inform the reader about the scribal activity and intention. It deals with provenance and the interrelationship between manuscripts, including text-types and families. It also deals with the fact of a particular reading's existence, though not the meaning of that extant reading.¹

Currently, various forms of 'eclecticism' are used to decide on variants, that is, a balance of some sort between internal and external evidence. According to Fee, 'reasoned eclecticism' is that method 'where the age, weight, and diversity of witnesses to a variant play a significant role in textual decisions'.² This includes both internal and external evidence, though this method starts with and gives preference to the internal evidence.³

On the other hand, 'thoroughgoing eclecticism'⁴ is that method 'in which intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities ideally are the sole criteria, irrespective of the date and nature of the external evidence which supports a given reading'.⁵ External evidence is largely ignored. This method supposes that all variants came into the text before 200 CE and that no manuscript can be considered better than another. Fee, arguing against such a method, states, 'It is as if the original text were

1. It is this last point that is crucial to the interpretation of 1 Cor. 14.34-35.

2. Gordon D. Fee, 'Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?', in Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 124-40 (124).

3. Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), p. 302. He notes the same for Aland's 'Local-genealogical method', which he sees as a sort of sub-set of reasoned eclecticism, though with a slightly different emphasis. Fee also makes this assertion when he says, 'Rational [reasoned] eclecticism starts with readings, noting first the various intrinsic and transcriptional possibilities, and where such questions are indecisive, then appeals to the relative value of the witnesses' (Fee, 'Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism?', p. 140).

4. Also known as 'rigorous' or 'consistent' eclecticism (Fee, 'Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism?', p. 124).

5. Fee, 'Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism?', pp. 124-25.

scattered during the second century as pieces of a puzzle, to reappear in the most random geographical or chronological fashion—even in a single MS from the medieval period, although all of that MS's hundreds of relatives do not have the reading'.⁶ Both reasoned and thoroughgoing eclecticism give too much weight to the internal evidence and, as is shown in this case study, this can produce distorted interpretations.

It is certain that both internal and external evidence must be taken into consideration; however, greater weight should be given to the external evidence. As is often quoted in discussion of this topic, Westcott and Hort state, '*Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings*'.⁷ The advantage of external evidence is that it gives concrete information that is not based on subjective criteria. This is not to say that the *interpretation* of such information is not subjective—it certainly is and this will be demonstrated below—but it is hard to argue against the very existence of a reading when it is written in a codex and it is hard to argue against the fact that a reading was early when it appears in an early codex and, further, it is hard to argue that a reading was random when it only appears in manuscripts confined to a certain area.

With all this in mind, what Comfort calls a 'documentary approach' seems the most logical.⁸ He notes, '[The documentary approach] looks to the external testimony first and then seeks to substantiate that testimony on internal grounds'.⁹ It will be demonstrated through the study of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 that putting external evidence first produces quite different results—more certain results—than when the internal evidence is given priority.

The Debate Surrounding 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Brief Overview

In order to appreciate the impact of this study, one must first understand the general climate of research around this text. It would take several pages to detail the various opinions and theories surrounding 1 Cor. 14.34-35; however, a basic understanding of the issues is useful

6. Fee, 'Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism?', p. 127.

7. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek: With Notes on Selected Readings* (1881; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), p. 31. Emphasis theirs.

8. Cf. Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, p. 302.

9. Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, p. 298.

in this discussion. What follows is a brief summary of the general questions being asked and the general solutions being proposed.

First, it is necessary to understand the general evidence pertaining to the text. All of the extant manuscripts containing this portion of 1 Corinthians also contain these two verses; neither the NA²⁸ nor the UBS⁴ lists a manuscript that is missing these words.¹⁰ Included in these manuscripts are P⁴⁶, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. A small group of manuscripts that include these verses places them after v. 40, rather than after v. 33. These include Claromontanus (D^p 06) and codices F010 and G012.¹¹ The manuscripts that include the verses after v. 40 are all of the Western text-type.¹² In addition to this variant of location, there are a few minor variants within the two verses that are not directly pertinent to the discussion in this article.

In terms of how the evidence is interpreted, the opinions can be divided between those who think Paul actually wrote the text and those who see it as an interpolation. If Paul did not write the text, then the means by which these words became part of the text must be determined along with an explanation as to why they appear in two different

10. See their respective textual apparatuses. All scholars will admit to this and indeed this is the very crux of the issue in many respects.

11. This information is taken from the critical apparatus of UBS⁴.

12. This is reiterated by many scholars, including: Lee A. Johnson, 'In Search of the Voice of Women in the Churches: Revisiting the Command to Silence Women in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35', in Elizabeth A. McCabe (ed.), *Women in the Biblical World: A Survey of Old and New Testament Perspectives* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009), pp. 135-54 (140); Craig S. Keener, 'Learning in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 14:34-35', in Ronald W. Pierce *et al.* (eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementary without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), pp. 161-71 (162); and E. Earle Ellis, 'The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor. 14:35-5)', in Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 213-20 (213). Two exceptions are noted: MS 88 (discussed below) and 0915. Cf. Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), p. 231; and Curt Niccum, 'The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14:34-35', *NTS* 43 (1997), pp. 242-55 (251). Codex Reginensis also contains this reading, along with Codex Fuldensis, but they are Latin manuscripts (Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 247). Interestingly, according to Niccum, 'Far from being the reading of the entire Western tradition, the transposition is the product of a local text [within the Western tradition]' (Niccum, 'Voice of the Manuscripts', p. 252).

locations. Solutions include variations on the idea that the text became an early marginal gloss. It was then interpolated into the text in two logical places near where the marginal gloss appeared in the exemplar by a scribe thinking it belonged in the text and had been previously missed.¹³

If Paul did write the text, then questions arise concerning how to deal with its difficulties: Why do the words interrupt the flow of the argument? And how did they end up in two places? Some accept that the verses were originally placed after v. 33 and for an unknown reason were moved to a second location by a scribe attempting to smooth out a difficult reading.¹⁴ Another creative and possible solution is offered by Ellis:

When the author received the draft from the amanuensis, he would add a closing greeting and make any desired additions or corrections. In 1 Corinthians, Paul employed an amanuensis (1 Cor. 16.21) and he, or the amanuensis at his instruction, could have added 1 Cor. 14.34-35 in the margin of the MS before sending it on its way to Corinth.¹⁵

This is as plausible an explanation as any and accounts for the disjointed nature of the text in the same manner as those who suggest Paul never wrote it. Ellis then suggests that subsequent copyists added the text into the two places where we now have it.¹⁶

If the text is authentic, then a second set of questions emerges surrounding its interpretation. There are three general streams of understanding:

(1) Paul required silence of all women in all assemblies in the church.

(2) Paul required women to be silent in some qualified sense.

(3) These verses cite a false prophecy by a self-proclaimed Corinthian prophet.¹⁷

13. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 699.

14. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 499.

15. Ellis, 'Silenced Wives', p. 219.

16. Ellis, 'Silenced Wives', pp. 219-20.

17. Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 219. Cf. Johnson, 'Voice of Women', p. 141, who has essentially the same list.

A detailed explanation of each of these points is not needed for this study. The general information presented gives enough background to understand the state of the discussion.

Currently the debate is at an impasse, with external evidence supporting authenticity and internal evidence supporting interpolation. Any interpretation that allows Paul's words to stay relevant only to the first century is popular, and in my opinion, scholars are searching for that missing link to tip the scales in favour of interpolation that would allow us to forever excise these verses from 1 Corinthians. It is Philip Payne's search for—and purported discovery of—evidence for a manuscript that does not contain 1 Cor. 14.34-35 that will occupy the remainder of this study.

As will be demonstrated below, Payne's findings do not adequately support the idea that a manuscript without 1 Cor. 14.34-35 ever existed. While many of his observations about the manuscripts' features are sound, his interpretation of those observations cannot be supported. He puts forward a series of complex arguments, yet I contend that a simpler solution is available: the text of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 was part of the original text of the letter.

A Text without 1 Corinthians 14.34-35? A Second Look at the Manuscript Evidence

Payne claims that he can now support 1 Cor. 14.34-35 as an interpolation based on external manuscript evidence. He appeals to the fact that several manuscripts show the verses as a distinct paragraph and also points to three manuscripts in particular as evidence of a text that did not contain 1 Cor. 14.34-35 at all. While his assertion that the two verses always appear as separate paragraphs in the early manuscripts is interesting, its actual impact on the debate is minimal.¹⁸ Of much

18. Payne makes this assertion in Payne, *Man and Woman*, pp. 223-24, and Philip B. Payne, 'Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 240-62 (250-51). Noting that these verses always appear as a separate paragraph in a sense paves the way for the idea that they were inserted and do not belong due to their nature as separate from the rest of the context. On the contrary, at most all it does is demonstrate that there is some discontinuity between the verses and their context. This is already known and accepted by all who study the verses. Additionally, short paragraphs are common in ancient manuscripts and the separate nature of these verses may mean nothing at all of significance.

greater significance are Payne's assertions about evidence from Vaticanus, Fuldensis and MS 88 supporting a text that does not contain 1 Cor. 14.35-35. Each of these manuscripts will be examined and Payne's theories tested against the available plates. It will be shown that, in each case, Payne's argument is not the most obvious choice for interpreting the available evidence.

*'Bar-Umlauts' or Distigme*¹⁹ *in Vaticanus*

Codex Vaticanus is a fourth-century manuscript containing large portions of the New Testament, including 1 Cor. 14.34-35. The manuscript shows a horizontal line extending over the first letter of v. 34 and into the margin. Along with this line there are two dots in the margin directly aligned with the *κλησία* of the word *ἐκκλησία*, which is found at the beginning of the line above that which begins v. 34. (See Figure 1.) Payne asserts that it is this combination of markings—the bar-umlaut/distigme—that is the key to understanding how the scribe of Vaticanus viewed 1 Cor. 14.34-35.²⁰

According to Payne's analysis of how these marginal markings appear together in the rest of the text of Vaticanus, they always mark a variant.²¹ He says,

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 second 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.²²

19. Payne begins by calling this feature a 'bar-umlaut' in his 1995 article on the subject, but later changes his terminology to 'distigme' in his 2009 book. Cf. Payne, 'Fuldensis', pp. 251-52; Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 232.

20. A plate of this manuscript is available in Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 262.

21. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 254. It is important to note that each of these markings appears separately and functions independently as well, but this will be discussed in greater detail below. Cf. J. Edward Miller, 'Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35', *JSNT* 26 (2003), pp. 217-36 (218). Payne also admits their independent functions.

22. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 252.

Payne's point, using the John *pericope adulterae* as a 'proof' example, is that where the scribe intends to convey an omission of a block of text in another manuscript, he places the 'bar' of his distigme under the line of text above what should be omitted, rather than beside it as happens in other instances.²³ Following this line of reasoning then, since the scribe places the bar in the 1 Corinthians text under the line *above* the beginning of v. 34, he intends the reader to understand that the next portion of text is deleted in some manuscripts.

There are several problems with this understanding. First, Payne's comparison with the *pericope adulterae* in Vaticanus's text of John is somewhat flawed because Vaticanus actually does omit the text from Jn 7.53–8.11. This means that when placing a 'bar' to supposedly indicate the textual variant, the scribe had no choice but to place it at the line 'before' the omitted text because the 'questionable' text did not exist in the manuscript for him to place it beside, as he apparently does for all other variants. Of course, he could have placed it near the subsequent line of text, Jn 8.12, but then there may have been confusion that the variant was meant to include something in 8.12 and following.²⁴ This situation is different than that of 1 Cor. 14.34-35.

Payne draws several other parallels between the *pericope adulterae* and 1 Cor. 14.34-35 in order to further support his case for an awareness of an omission of the 1 Corinthian verses by the Vaticanus scribe. They are: (1) In both, the doubtful verses occur at different locations in the text; (2) Manuscripts of both display a high concentration of textual variants; (3) Both contain word usage atypical of the book's author; (4) In both, the doubtful verses disrupt the narrative or topic of the passage; (5) In both, marginal symbols or notes indicate scribal awareness of a textual problem. In particular, Vaticanus has a distigme at the beginning of both passages.²⁵

23. It is significant that another large and important variant, the ending of Mark, which is not included in Vaticanus, is *not* marked by either bars or umlauts. (This observation was made by examining a printed copy of the Vatican facsimile of Vaticanus.)

24. Another example that Payne cites as supporting his hypothesis is Lk.14.24 (Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 233). Again, Vaticanus omits the text in Luke and so the placement of the bar adjacent to the preceding text is the only choice the scribe has if he intends to indicate the variant that includes the text. Also, if the umlaut and bar are functioning separately, this may be the most logical place to put the section/paragraph break.

25. Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 234. Cf. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 257.

While each of these may be technically true comparisons, the impact is not as great as Payne would have it.

In the case of the first point, 1 Cor. 14.34-35 occurs in two different places with a separation of only a few verses. The Johannine pericope is located variously after Jn 7.52, 7.36. 21.25 and Lk. 21.38.²⁶ It hardly seems justified to call these two texts ‘parallel’ in this manner when one appears in only two locations of close proximity while the other appears in at least four locations that differ from several verses to several chapters to an entirely different book.

In the case of the second point, that there is a high concentration of variants in both instances, Metzger notes eight units of variation in Jn 7.53–8.11 over twelve verses, including that which moves the text.²⁷ In the case of 1 Cor. 14.34-35, he notes only two units of variation in two verses, including the one that moves the text.²⁸ The NA²⁸ notes seven units of variation pertaining to 1 Cor. 14.34-35 including the movement of the text.²⁹ For the passage of Jn 7.53–8.12, the NA²⁸ lists thirty-nine units of variation.³⁰ On variants per verse, Metzger shows more for the 1 Corinthians passage and NA²⁸ more for the John passage. Admittedly, both passages have a large number of variants for their size, but this is no reason to draw more than this single parallel point between them.³¹

On the third point, that both passages use words that are not typical of their authors, Payne’s position is precarious. This statement is certainly true for the *pericope adulterae*,³² but whether the same can be

26. See critical apparatus of UBS⁴ for Jn 7.53–8.11. It is also worth noting that Jn 8.3-11 appears in two additional separate locations: after Jn 7.52 and Lk. 24.53. See UBS⁴ critical apparatus.

27. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd edn, 1999), pp. 187-90.

28. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, pp. 499-500.

29. See critical apparatus of NA²⁸ for 1 Cor. 14.34-35.

30. See critical apparatus of NA²⁸ for Jn 7.53–8.11.

31. Another thing to consider would be the actual sort of variant. According to the UBS⁴ critical apparatus, aside from the one that moves the text, the variants in 1 Cor. 14.34-35 are only minor.

32. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 188. Also, Kubo notes four *hapax legomena* in the *pericope adulterae*: ἀυτόφωρος (‘caught in the act’), καταγράφω (‘to write’), ἀναμάρτητος (‘without sin’), and κατακύπτω (‘to bend down’). Additionally, ten other words used in this pericope do not appear elsewhere in John’s Gospel. See Sakae Kubo, *A Reader’s Greek–English Lexicon of the New*

said for the passage in 1 Corinthians is debatable. Arguments have been made that words in 1 Cor. 14.34-35 are used in a way not in keeping with their usage in the rest of the book. Payne says, ‘These verses appropriate words and phrases from the context, but use them in ways that are alien to its context’.³³ He appeals to arguments made by Allison, who points out that there is ‘extensive, superficial verbal similarity between the two passages [1 Cor. 14.26-33a, 37-40 and 1 Cor. 14.33b-36], on the one hand, and thoroughgoing conceptual discontinuity between them on the other’.³⁴ The major flaw in this argument is that it takes into consideration only 1 Corinthians 14. Though there may be some truth in the claim that the words are used in different ways, this does not necessarily support interpolation. A more convincing argument would be one that demonstrated a lack of continuity with the whole book or corpus. Of course, it would be difficult to do this in the best of circumstances because the disputed passage is so short. That is hardly a solid base from which to get an accurate picture of atypical practice, especially on a topic that is rarely addressed so explicitly in the whole of the New Testament, let alone this book or chapter.³⁵ In short, the argument that 1 Cor. 14.34-35 has atypical vocabulary use cannot be firmly substantiated.

Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), p. 98. See below for a similar discussion concerning 1 Cor. 14.34-35.

33. Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 253.

34. Robert W. Allison, ‘Let Women Be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor 14:33b-36): What Did Paul Really Say, and What Did It Mean?’, *JSNT* 32 (1988), pp. 27-60 (37). Cf. Payne, *Man and Woman*, p. 256. Allison cites several examples of this supposed discontinuity. One of them is that the word *μανθάνειν* is used in the greater context of the passage in terms of encouraging all to learn in the service, while in vv. 33b-36 it is used to denote women learning at home (Allison, ‘Let Women Be Silent’, p. 37). The other distinctions are of a similar sort. This is not convincing enough to demonstrate evidence of interpolation. It should be noted that Allison considers the whole of 1 Cor. 14.33b-36 to be a unit; however, he states that there is no interpolation of vv. 34-35 (Allison, ‘Let Women Be Silent’, p. 30).

35. This becomes even muddier when 1 Timothy is also deemed to be deutero-Pauline as 1 Tim. 2.8-15 is arguably the only other passage that treats a similar topic so clearly. Add to this the fact that all the words in 1 Cor. 14.34-35 occur at least twice in 1 Corinthians, and only one word less than ten times in the New Testament (Kubo, *Reader's Lexicon*, p. 159), and the argument for atypical vocabulary becomes even more untenable.

The fourth argument for a parallel between the 1 Corinthians and John passages deals with the fact that both passages interrupt the flow of the argument. In the case of John, an entire independent pericope of twelve verses is inserted between two sections where Jesus is involved in discussions with the Pharisees. Though these two passages could go together, they could conceivably also be referring to different occasions and thus a break would have existed at that point even without the insertion of the *pericope adulterae*. In any case, the *pericope adulterae* clearly has no connection to either passage and is completely independent of them. It is easy to say, then, that in the case of John, the interpolation interrupts the flow of the argument. In 1 Corinthians, however, the passage's divorce from the context is less clear. Though an argument can be made that these verses are distinct from their surroundings, others claim that they are part of a unit that also includes vv. 33b and 36.³⁶ It is clear that while the John passage is by nature self-contained and independent of its surroundings, the 1 Corinthians passage is not. The clear link to its surroundings is also strengthened by the fact that even when it is in another place, it is so close to the original location³⁷ that it can still be loosely considered to be in the same context.

The fifth point, that the scribe was aware of a textual difficulty in both places, is somewhat irrelevant. There clearly is a textual problem in both places. But the fact that the scribe acknowledges such with his marginalia does not confirm the actual content of those difficulties.

By far the biggest dividing factor between the John and 1 Corinthians passages is the fact that the John passage is not extant in the oldest manuscripts, definitely including P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, with good reason to assume its absence from Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus.³⁸ Contrary to this, none of our extant manuscripts contain readings of 1 Corinthians 14 without vv. 34-35. There is no

36. For example, Allison, 'Let Women Be Silent', p. 30, and James B. Hurley, 'Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women: A Consideration of 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36', *WTJ* 35 (1973), pp. 190-220 (216-17).

37. There is no reason to believe that a scribe would move these verses from a location after v. 40 to one after v. 33 without some precedence.

38. Cf. the critical apparatus of John in UBS⁴. The text of A and C are damaged at that point; however, there does not appear to have been room for these verses in the text based on what remains. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 187.

explicit evidence of omission.³⁹ If there was explicit evidence of a text without 1 Cor. 14.34-35, that would change things considerably.

As an aside to the issue of what the distigme is indicating in Vaticanus, there is the distinct possibility that the ‘bar’ and ‘umlaut’ portions are actually functioning independently.⁴⁰ The horizontal line (the ‘bar’) is a *paragraphos*, marking sections. The ‘umlaut’ or double dot in the margin appears frequently, marking variants.⁴¹ In response to the idea that the bar/*paragraphos* may simply be independently marking paragraphs, Payne states, ‘These small lines when they occur without an umlaut in general do reflect paragraph divisions. Only ten of these twenty-seven bar-umlaut lines, however, overlap the beginning of paragraphs in the NA²⁶ and only eight of them with the UBS^{3corr.} paragraphs’.⁴² Payne goes on to say that some of the places could conceivably be paragraph boundaries, while others are surely not,

39. Payne himself admits that no known manuscript actually completely omits these verses. In response to Miller’s claim that there is no explicit manuscript evidence for omission, Payne writes, ‘This is factually correct if by “manuscript” one means documents containing this portion of 1 Cor. 14 and does not mean the different texts contained within the same document’ (Philip B. Payne, ‘The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Response to J. Edward Miller’, *JSNT* 27 [2004], pp. 105-12 [110]). What Payne refers to by ‘the different texts contained within the same document’ is the evidence of correcting hands and different readings demonstrated by textual criticism. Specific to the 1 Corinthians situation, Payne notes that ‘two manuscripts in particular include more than one reading of 1 Cor. 14.34-35. In both cases the reading that omits 1 Cor. 14.34-35 is the more important of the two readings for that manuscript’ (Payne, ‘Response’, p. 111). The two manuscripts to which he refers are MS 88 and Codex Fuldensis, which will be discussed below. It will be shown that, as in the case of Vaticanus, the supposed omission of these verses by these manuscripts is unlikely, and thus they cannot be used as concrete proof of omission of the verses. Since Payne’s evidence for omission is thus inadmissible, the ‘factual correctness’ of Miller’s statement stands: no known manuscript omits these verses outright.

40. See for example Payne’s example of the *pericope adulterae*. Here, the bar is on one side of the column while the umlaut is on the other side. (A plate of this can be seen at <http://www.bible-researcher.com/vaticanus1.html> and in Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, p. 262). This seems to support the idea that while these two markings may at times occur in the same place, they are not necessarily meant to be a single entity but are two independently functioning signs.

41. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, pp. 258-59, and Miller, ‘Observations’, pp. 231-32.

42. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, p. 255.

citing Jas 4.4 as an example.⁴³ The fact that the two major critical editions of the New Testament do not break the paragraphs at the same place as the scribe of Vaticanus is no reason to dismiss the possibility of these bars being paragraph markers. There are likely several other places in the manuscript where Vaticanus does not agree with the committees of the NA or UBS texts. In light of all this, it is very possible that the correspondence of the ‘bar’ and ‘umlaut’ here is only a coincidence.⁴⁴

In summary, Payne has brought to mind the fact that the scribe of Vaticanus was aware of textual problems at 1 Cor. 14.34-35 and marked them with a double-dot in the margin. It is likely that the bar is functioning as a *paragraphos* and that the marginal dots are functioning separately. This demonstrates that, at the time of the writing of Vaticanus in the fourth century, a variant concerning the text was known.⁴⁵ This is important in demonstrating that the variant happened relatively early in the textual tradition. Unfortunately what these

43. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, p. 255. Payne’s observation that the bar/*paragraphos* here is not marking a paragraph boundary is possibly accurate; if it assumed to be associated with the line of text below which it is found, then it occurs in the middle of a sentence, above the word ὅτι. However, if the *paragraphos* is read underneath the line of text found above its placement instead, then it occurs in the middle of the word μοιχαλίδες. This word would be a logical place to begin a new paragraph. Even if Jas 4:4 represents an ‘anomaly’ in use, it is still safe to assume that most of the time the ‘bar’ is marking a paragraph.

44. Miller, ‘Observations’, p. 218.

45. Niccum thinks these umlauts were all additions made somewhere in the fourteen to sixteenth centuries (Niccum, ‘Voice of the Manuscripts’, p. 245), though Payne and Canart present convincing evidence that shows it is likely that the original scribe of Vaticanus did use these umlauts in his text and at least some of them are original (Philip B. Payne and Paul Canart, ‘The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus’, *NovT* 42 [2000], pp. 105-13 [107-10]). Given that the text of Vaticanus was mostly traced over by a scribe sometime between the ninth and eleventh centuries (cf. Payne and Canart, ‘Text-Critical Symbols’, p. 106) it is probably impossible to say with certainty which of the traced-over umlauts were original and which may have been added later. It is interesting to note that while the later scribe traced over most of the text and marginalia, he did not trace over portions that he deemed ‘incorrect’. It is significant then, that this scribe *did* trace over 1 Cor. 14.34-35. (This observation was made through an examination of a printed copy of the Vatican facsimile of Vaticanus.) The scribe thought these verses belonged in the text and this speaks against interpolation.

marginalia cannot do is firmly establish that the variant to which the scribe was referring was an omission.

Fuldensis: Omission of Verses 34-35 or Repetition of Verses 36-40?

Codex Fuldensis is a sixth-century Latin manuscript of the New Testament. What makes it unique in respect to the study of these verses is that it contains 1 Cor. 14.34-35 following v. 40 in the main body of text and it has vv. 36-40 re-written in the lower margin of the page with a siglum indicating that the text be inserted after v. 33.⁴⁶ Significantly, the first edition of Metzger's textual commentary described this manuscript quite differently and Payne's examination clarified the manuscript's actual appearance.⁴⁷

With this new evidence to work with, Payne states, 'I conclude that Bishop Victor [the editor of Fuldensis] ordered the re-writing of 1 Cor. 14.34-40 in the margin of Codex Fuldensis...with vv. 34-35 omitted⁴⁸ 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'.⁴⁹ Based on this, Payne then concludes that Victor intended a correction that effectively erased 1 Cor. 14.34-35.⁵⁰

Certainly, this is one possible way to interpret the evidence. But it is not the most logical way. To help demonstrate how the text of Fuldensis is functioning, the text, with its insertion, is reconstructed below using the text of the ESV.⁵¹ The text given below starts in the middle of a page and continues part way down the next page. Note that the text breaks off at the bottom of the left page in the middle of the last word of v. 37 and continues on the top of the right page.⁵²

46. http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Codex_Fuldensis_296-297.jpg displays a plate of this portion of Codex Fuldensis. Alternatively, a plate is available in Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 261.

47. According to Payne, he pointed out the discrepancy to Metzger who admitted that he had never actually seen the manuscript (Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 242).

48. What the scribe has actually done is re-write vv. 36-40. Verses 34-35 are not 'omitted'—they were never written in the margin in the first place.

49. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 240.

50. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 241.

51. The text is reconstructed using the ESV text to make this more accessible to English speakers. The Latin *nomina sacra* in Fuldensis have been expanded.

52. On the manuscript, the beginning of v. 37 is marked by a space and a large letter in the first line of the right facing page. The Roman numerals in this

³³For God is not a God of confusion but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints, ***insertion mark**

LXIII ³⁴the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. ³⁵If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

³⁶Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached? ³⁷If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord.

[in the bottom margin of the page]*

³⁶Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached? ³⁷If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord. ³⁸If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized. ³⁹So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues. ⁴⁰But all things should be done decently and in order.

[next page]³⁸If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized. ³⁹So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues. ⁴⁰But all things should be done decently and in order.

LXV^{15.1} Now I would remind you,

³³ *Non enim est dissensionis Deus, sed pacis: sicut in omnibus ecclesiis sanctorum doceo.* ***insertion mark**

LXIII ³⁴ *Mulieres in ecclesiis taceant, non enim permittitur eis loqui, sed subditas esse, sicut et lex dicit.* ³⁵ *Si quid autem volunt discere, domi viros suos interrogent. Turpe est enim mulieri loqui in ecclesia.*

³⁶ *An a vobis verbum Dei processit? aut in vos solos pervenit?* ³⁷ *Si quis videtur propheta esse, aut spiritalis, cognoscat quæ scribo vobis, quia Domini sunt man-*

[in the bottom margin of the page]*

³⁶ *An a vobis verbum Dei processit? aut in vos solos pervenit?* ³⁷ *Si quis videtur propheta esse, aut spiritalis, cognoscat quæ scribo vobis, quia Domini sunt mandata.*

³⁸ *Si quis autem ignorat, ignorabitur.*

³⁹ *Itaque fratres æmulamini prophetare: et loqui linguis nolite prohibere.* ⁴⁰ *Omnia autem honeste, et secundum ordinem fiant.*

[next page]*data.* ³⁸ *Si quis autem ignorat, ignorabitur.* ³⁹ *Itaque fratres æmulamini prophetare: et loqui linguis nolite prohibere.* ⁴⁰ *Omnia autem honeste, et secundum ordine fiant.*

LXV ^{15.1} *Notum autem facio vobis,*

In effect, the text of 1 Cor. 14.36-40 has been inserted before vv. 34-35 with the siglum notation and the text in the bottom margin. The question is: is this a simple insertion, effectively placing 1 Cor. 14.34-35 both in its normal location (the original text of Fuldensis) *and after* vv. 36-40 (the inserted reading of Fuldensis)? Or, is this really an omission, where the scribe intends that the reader completely replace

reconstruction represent the section markers in Fuldensis. Cf. the plate in Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 261.

the entire section (from section marker LXIII to LXV) with the text from the bottom of the page? The first option leaves vv. 34-35 as part of the text in two locations. The second option erases vv. 34-35 entirely.

Payne favours the omission of the text 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 universal pattern in these corrections to bring Fuldensis into conformity with the standard Vulgate text.⁵³

I agree with Payne that it would not make sense for Victor to intend reading vv. 36-40 in two locations. However, it makes perfect sense for the conscientious bishop to intend to show that these verses could be read in *either* of the two places. Either the reader reads vv. 33-40 as written in the original text, *or* they read it with the insertion (making the order of the verses 33, 36-40, 34-35), omitting the duplication of vv. 36-40 the second time. If this is understood—that Victor intended the reading to be in either place, but not both—then Payne’s second point is irrelevant because this manuscript is not actually suggesting a double-reading.⁵⁴

As for the third point, the change in wording, this also does not seem significant. This change ‘corrects’ a difficult reading. *Ordinem* is in the accusative case, which functions much more easily with the preceding *secundum* than the ablative *ordine*. The actual intention of the text is not changed; a grammatical correction simply improves its flow.⁵⁵ Victor may have sought to ‘correct’ a perceived mistake while at the same time pointing out a second possible location of the text. Given

53. Payne, ‘Fuldensis’, pp. 242-43.

54. Incidentally, just because no other manuscript includes vv. 34-35 twice, this does not rule out the possibility that Fuldensis does. It could be a singular reading. Having said that, there is no reason to think that that is what is intended here.

55. Special thanks to Andrew J. Danielson (a PhD student at UCLA) and to Michael Hertwig-Jaksch (instructor in classics at Concordia University College of Alberta), who assisted me in understanding the implications of the Latin variant.

how meticulous Victor appeared to be,⁵⁶ it is no surprise that he would have this grammatical change copied in with the variant of location.

Payne also makes six arguments specifically in favour of viewing the marginal text as replacing the whole of section LXIII. First, Payne notes that, since the replacement symbol is located after v. 33, that is where the text should be 'replaced'.⁵⁷ If it were to replace only vv. 36-40, the mark would have been later. Thus vv. 34-35 are erased. However, if Victor intended both readings to be in view, he had to put the mark where he did. If he wanted to replace vv. 36-40, it is probable that the mark would be moved. This may support the idea that this is indicative of an insertion.

Secondly, Payne notes that it is simpler to see this mark as indicating a replacement of vv. 34-40.⁵⁸ This reads as a logical conclusion to his first point. Contrary to this, seeing the siglum as a mark indicating replacement is actually quite complicated, given that there are no other explicit markings to indicate such a reading.

Thirdly, Payne notes that since the original wording has vv. 34-40 as a whole section (section LXIII) and the insertion point is at the beginning of that section, then the gloss is meant to replace the whole section, not just a portion of it.⁵⁹ It is true that vv. 34-40 constitute a whole section in the original reading, but there is no indication whatsoever as to whether this marginal text is meant to actually replace the entire section or just be inserted at its beginning.

Related to point three is Payne's fourth point: Victor did not indicate a change to the section's end, which, if the replacement only includes vv. 36-40, would now have to be after v. 35. Payne's argument can be illustrated with the following reconstruction:⁶⁰

56. Cf. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 250.

57. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 243.

58. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 243.

59. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 243.

60. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 243.

insertion mark [³⁶**Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached?...**
³⁹**So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues.** ⁴⁰**But all things should be done decently and in order.]**

LXIII ³⁴the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. ³⁵If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

~~³⁶Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached?...he is not recognized.³⁹So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues.⁴⁰But all things should be done decently and in order.~~

LXV^{15.1} Now I would remind you, brothers...

The text from the margin is mentally 'inserted' at the beginning of section LXIII. (Here partially represented.) These same verses thus must be 'deleted' from later in the section. (See below.)

If vv. 34-35 are not omitted then the new 'end of the section' falls here at the end of v. 35

The text of the 'original' vv. 36-40 is mentally deleted, but is still physically taking up space on the page, creating a large gap between the end of section LXIII (now v. 35) and the beginning of LXV (15.1).

The distance between the end of v. 35 and the beginning of 15.1 is too great for the LXV notation to indicate the new section. The scribe should have written a new section marker after v. 35. Since he did not write a new section marker, this indicates that the insertion is meant to be a replacement of the whole section. This view eliminates the difficult proximity to the section marker because vv. 34-35 is no longer part of the text when the whole section is replaced.

This raises more questions than it answers. The lack of proximity of the end of v. 35 to the section marker LXV seems to be Payne's main objection as to why vv. 34-35 must be omitted here. In short, v. 35 ends too far back in the text for the LXV section marker to apply to it. Lack of proximity to the section's end does not negate the intention of the original section markers (besides the fact that the scribe seems to be marking section beginnings rather than endings, something which makes this whole argument moot). Further, if Victor only intended to show that either reading could be read, then his moving the section marker would wreak havoc with the section ending for the first reading.

An insertion where Victor desired to show the same sections with verses in different locations is simpler.

Payne's fifth point is that Victor would have left some indication in the text of where to read next (as in, which verses to omit) if he only intended an insertion.⁶¹ On the contrary, if he intended to let both readings stand he would not need to do that and indeed could not do that without doing damage to the flow of the other reading.

Payne's final point concerning why a complete omission and re-reading of section LXVIII is envisioned by Victor is that it is easier to read (for the reader) if the replacement is seen as taking up the whole section.⁶² Nevertheless, what may be easier for the reader is not necessarily what Victor would do. The complication of the need for reading directions is nearly eliminated with the understanding that Victor intended both readings to stand as alternatives to each other and he relied on his reader's good sense to understand this.

It is worth considering what Victor might have done if he did intend to erase vv. 34-35. He had many options at his disposal in order to do this. It seems as though it would have been far easier for him to have the scribe rub out the verses, stroke through the verses, place deletion dots over the letters or any manner of other things focused on the actual text of vv. 34-35. Any of these would have made the deletion explicit. However, Victor does none of them. The question in this manuscript is not actually the placement of vv. 34-35, but of vv. 36-40. That is the duplicated text and thus where the focus should be.

In summary, Payne has not presented a convincing case for an omission of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 but has provided a valuable correction to our view of Fuldensis. Previously it read in Metzger's *Textual Commentary* that Fuldensis's insertion consisted of vv. 34-35 rather than vv. 36-40. This is an important and significant contribution from his research, illustrating the importance of actually studying manuscripts or their photographs when dealing with textual issues.

MS 88: A Last Chance for Omission?

MS 88 is a twelfth-century minuscule housed in the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III in Naples, Italy.⁶³ This scribe copies the

61. Payne, 'Fuldensis', pp. 243-44.

62. Payne, 'Fuldensis', p. 244.

63. Philip B. Payne, 'Ms 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14:34-35', *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 152-58 (152).

verses of 1 Corinthians 14 in this order: 33, 36-40, 34, 35 and makes a note using double slashes that vv. 34-35 should be placed after v. 33 (see Figure 2).⁶⁴ According to Payne, it is most likely that the verses appeared in this order because the exemplar that the scribe was using also had the verses in that order.⁶⁵ This is likely. The only other manuscripts that we have in which the verses appear in this order are manuscripts of the Western text-type.⁶⁶ In response to whether the exemplar of MS 88 could have been of the Western text-type, Payne says, ‘Ms. 88, however, is not a Western text and does not exhibit the usual pattern of readings of a Western text. Therefore, it cannot have been copied from a Western text.’⁶⁷ This is probably true, yet does it necessarily follow that the exemplar of MS 88 did not have the verses in the same order as the Western text?

In examining this phenomenon, Payne suggests two possible reasons why the verses appear in MS 88 as they do: ‘1) that ms. 88 was copied from a non-Western manuscript with vv. 34-5 after v. 40 or 2) that ms. 88 was copied from a non-Western manuscript without vv. 34-5’.⁶⁸ He also goes on to observe that, either way, the scribe did not copy his exemplar verbatim. If the exemplar had vv. 34-35 after v. 40, then the scribe disagreed by creating the insertion point moving the text to where it is usually found. If the exemplar did not have vv. 34-35 at all, the scribe disagreed by adding the verses to his text.⁶⁹ Payne explicitly states, ‘*Either of these two possible antecedent manuscripts could explain each of the distinctive features of ms. 88 listed at the beginning of this short study*’.⁷⁰ Despite this assertion, Payne favours the latter option.

Payne argues that, since there is no other non-Western Greek manuscript that has vv. 34-35 after v. 40, it is unlikely that this is the first one.⁷¹ He then further states, ‘There is, however, substantial

64. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 153. A plate of this manuscript is available in Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 158.

65. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 153.

66. See discussion above, n. 13. But see also below, discussion of MS 915.

67. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 154.

68. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 154.

69. Cf. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 154.

70. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 154. Emphasis mine.

71. Payne, ‘Evidence’, p. 155. Contrary to this, Niccum cites the thirteenth-century manuscript 915, representative of the Byzantine text-type, as being another

evidence for the existence of a text that omitted 1 Cor 14.34-5'.⁷² Payne's 'substantial evidence' appeals to conclusions based on internal evidence and transcriptional probability *and* his own previous conclusions concerning Fuldensis.⁷³ None of these arguments are convincing. All that the internal evidence shows indisputably is that vv. 34-35 represent a difficult reading, which in most other cases would deem it an authentic reading. For some reason, in this case, this criterion seems to be completely ignored. As for transcriptional probability, it does not hold much weight on its own. Further, it has already been demonstrated above why Fuldensis does not in fact support an omission of the text.

Payne does pull out some new evidence, saying,

Clement of Alexandria († pre AD 215) cites 1 Cor 14.6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 20 yet calls both men and women without distinction to silence in church, indicating that 1 Cor 14.34-5 was not in his text of 1 Corinthians. Further evidence of a text of 1 Corinthians 14 without vv. 34-5 is that none of the Apostolic Fathers or the next generation of church fathers gives any indication of awareness of 1 Cor 14.34-5.⁷⁴

This argument from silence is not convincing. There is nothing that necessitates that any of these writers mention these verses. There are likely other verses not mentioned in our extant material; should those verses also be considered interpolations? Further, contrary to Payne's statement, the UBS⁴ lists Origen, who lived in the late second and early third century, as one who includes vv. 34-35 after v. 33.⁷⁵

In summary, Payne's evidence for an omission of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 in MS 88 is not convincing either. He argues that internal evidence dictates that these verses are interpolation, and maintains that, by looking at ambiguous external evidence, it is evident—because these verses were interpolated—that these scribes were giving evidence of the interpolation. He concludes, therefore, that the external evidence also supports that the verses were interpolations.

Evidence supporting the interpolation cannot be based on previous conjecture of the interpolation. For a strong argument, both internal

non-Western manuscript with vv. 34-35 following v. 40 (Niccum, 'Voice of the Manuscripts', p. 251).

72. Payne, 'Evidence', p. 155.

73. Payne, 'Evidence', p. 155.

74. Payne, 'Evidence', pp. 155-56.

75. Origen's reference to the text is found in his *Fr. 1 Cor.* 71.1-3 and 74.1-4.

and external evidence must support the interpolation independently. Payne has not demonstrated this. I remain unconvinced of external evidence supporting an interpolation of 1 Cor. 14.34-35.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the case for a manuscript without 1 Cor. 14.34-35 based on external evidence is unconvincing. It has been shown that the *paraphoi* and marginal ‘umlauts’ in Vaticanus do not point to the scribe showing a variant of omission, but most likely simply demonstrate knowledge of a variant. Further, it has been shown that the scribe of Fuldensis likely inserted the text of 1 Cor. 14.36-40 in the bottom margin of the page in order to indicate his awareness of two alternate readings: one with vv. 36-40 *before* vv. 34-35 and one with it after. There is not sufficient evidence to show that the scribe clearly intended the notation to indicate an erasure of vv. 34-35. Finally, MS 88 also demonstrates a scribe who wishes to move or correct a reading, rather than omit it.

So where does all this leave 1 Cor. 14.34-35? It leaves it in the text. If it cannot be viewed as an interpolation, what does that mean? It means that we continue to wrestle with the evidence and we continue to do the best we can to accurately understand the text of 1 Corinthians with Paul’s words in 14.34-35 intact.

Figure 1: Sketch of 1 Cor. 14.34-35 from Codex Vaticanus

-- ΚΛΗΣΙΑΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ
 ΑΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΕΣ ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ
 ΚΛΗΣΙΑΙΣ ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΠΙΤΡΕΠΕΤ ΑΙ
 ΤΑΙΣ ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΑΛΛΑ ΥΠΕ-
 ΤΑΙΣ ΕΣΩΣΑΝ ΚΑΘΩΣ
 ΚΑΙ Ο ΝΟΜΟΣ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΛΕ-
 ΤΙΜΑ ΘΕΙΝ ΘΕΛΟΥΣΙΝ ΕΝ
 ΟΙΚΩ ΤΟΥ ΣΙΔΙΟΥΣΑΝ
 ΔΡΑΣΕΤΕΡΩ ΤΑΤΩΣΑΝ
 ΑΙΣ ΧΡΟΝ ΓΑΡ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΙ
 ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΕΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ
 Η ΑΦΎΜΩΝ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΩ

Figure 2: Sketch of 1 Cor. 14.33b-35 (including vv. 36-40) in MS88

double slash over
vv. 33, 36
↓

κλησιας του θεου η αψυχη οχο
 ροσ του θεου η εφραθι γου εις υμασ μου
 κατακτησεν· οτι παδοκει προφη
 τει και ητις κος· ετις ημασ διε
 τσα εγραφο υμεν· οτι κωσεισιν
 εν ταροι· ει δε ησ υμεν· αφοσειτω·
 οσσι αδελφοι· ηλυται το προ
 φητα εις υμασ· λαληρησασαι ο
 λω κω ληθε· παντασι χιμονοσ
 ε καταταξιν ημνσ θωσιν· αημν κωκ
 εφτασ ε κκλησιασι ση γατωσ·
 ον αρσσι τρι πηλαιαυτασ ηλησιν
 αλλα υπο παντωσ ασει κωσασε
 ον ομλησεισιν· οιδετην ομασειν
 ηε δεσιν· εν σι κωσσι· αδωσ ανδρ
 επερωτατωσ· αιοχρον ηρεσιν
 ημνσ εις ενε κκλησιασι λαλειτωσ

← double slash in this
line between vv. 40, 34

These sketches were made from photographs where the lettering was not always clear. They were produced primarily to illustrate the marginalia and other scribal markings pertinent to this discussion and are not intended to be used as substitutes for actual plates in the detailed study of these manuscripts.