

**Le manuscrit B de la Bible**  
(*Vaticanus graecus* 1209)

Introduction au fac-similé  
Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001)  
Contributions supplémentaires

édité par  
Patrick ANDRIST



Éditions du Zèbre  
Lausanne 2009

CIP:

Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires / édité par Patrick Andrist – Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009. – 310 p., 8 pl. hors-texte; 24 cm. – (Histoire du texte biblique, ISSN 1420-5033;7)

ISBN 2-940351-05-8

© Éditions du Zèbre 2009.

Imprimé en France sur les presses de l'imprimerie Realgraphic, Belfort.

Composition et réalisation : Ateliers des Éditions du Zèbre.

Couverture : *Codex Vaticanus graecus 1209*, détail de la page 1512 : apostrophe d'un lecteur contre une variante biblique (cf. dans ce volume, p. 131), © BAV, Città del Vaticano.

Police grecque : *Graeca* dessinée par P. B. Payne ; © Payne Loving Trust.

Diffusion : Éditions du Zèbre, CH-1408 Prahins

tél. & fax : (41 24) 433 17 21 ; [www.zebre.ch](http://www.zebre.ch)

ISBN 2-940351-05-8

Tous droits de traduction, d'adaptation et de reproduction

(intégrales ou partielles) par tous procédés réservés pour tous pays.

Publié avec les soutiens généreux

du Fonds national suisse de la recherche scientifique,

de la Fondation Boninchi,

et de la Faculté autonome de théologie protestante de l'Université de Genève.

## Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of *Codex Vaticanus*: Do They Mark the Location of Textual Variants?

by  
Philip B. PAYNE  
(Edmonds WA)  
and  
Paul CANART  
(Vatican)

### A. The Initial Discovery and the Question of Distigmai and Distigmai by a Bar

Philip B. Payne first identified a correlation between known textual variants and lines of *Codex Vaticanus* marked by two horizontally-aligned dots (distigmai<sup>1</sup>) in the margin at mid-character height in “Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and I Cor. 14,34-5”, *NTS* 41 (1995), p. 240-262. These distigmai resemble the identification by Jewish scribes of doubtful

---

<sup>1</sup> Payne formerly called them “umlauts” because of their shape, but their function is unrelated to umlauts, so Payne invited a group of leading NT textual critics and codicologists (D. Parker, H. Houghton, T. Wasserman, M. Holmes, T. A. E. Brown, P. Canart, P. Andrist and classicist A. Kelly) to choose a name. They concluded that distigme (plural: distigmai) is the ideal name to identify them since “di” is the standard Greek prefix meaning two and “stigma” (“stigmai” plural) is the standard Greek word used both in antiquity and in subsequent text-critical studies to identify text-critical dots in the margin of manuscripts. Stigma (feminine, its final -e pronounced ei since it represents the Greek eta) and stigmai were used as text-critical signs in the Homeric tradition, in manuscripts, in the *scholia vetera* and the *scholia recentiora*, by Origen, and also in modern treatments of Homeric textual criticism. For example, W. Dindorf (*Scholia*, p. xlvi) notes *Codex Harleianus* 5693 includes a text critical sign list written in a sixteenth century hand citing two horizontally-aligned dots named “duo stigmai” (δύο στυγμαί) and the explanation: “The antisigma and the duo stigmai [are used] in this order when the same thought is written twice. The antisigma is put on the former, and the duo [Friedrich Gotthilf Osann added this third instance of “duo”] stigmai on the latter.” A. Kelly (*A Referential*, p. 400-401) identifies “critical signs in the margins of MS A (antisigma to 535-7, and stigmai to 538-40)...

passages of Scripture with “dots or strokes”<sup>2</sup>. As well as identifying the use of distigmai to identify the location of textual variants in *Vaticanus*<sup>3</sup>, that article includes a detailed analysis of twenty-seven unambiguous cases of distigmai occurring next to horizontal bars. All but four of these twenty-seven, over 85% of them, occur by lines where the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum* (hereafter NA) notes variant readings in other manuscripts.

That article identifies evidence supporting a distinction between a distigme and a distigme + bar<sup>4</sup>, but it does not conclude that a distigme + bar is necessarily a distinct symbol from a distigme. It acknowledges that bars, known as paragraphoi, commonly identify paragraph or section divisions. There are enough distigmai and bars in the margins of *Vaticanus* that statistical probability makes it likely that in many instances a bar identifying a paragraph or section division will occur immediately following a distigme. Page 255 of that article, however, notes that only eight of twenty-seven distigme + bar occurrences are at UBS<sup>4</sup> paragraph divisions, only eleven are at NA<sup>27</sup> paragraph divisions, some seem to be odd locations for a paragraph division, notably those in Matth. 24,6-7 and Act. 13,16-17, and the one in Iac. 4,4 if it is a paragraphos, puts the vocative “Adulterous people” in a separate paragraph from the rest of the direct address, “Adulterous people, don’t you know that...?” This seems to be an impossible location for a paragraph division. Consequently, one should not assume that all bars in *Vaticanus* are paragraphoi. Furthermore, conjoining symbols that independently have separate meanings is common: colons, exclamation marks, and question marks are periods with added significance, and semi-colons are commas with added significance.

The key to establishing whether the scribe of *Vaticanus* sometimes used the distigme + bar as a distinct symbol is the identification of a distinction between the function of a distigme and a distigme + bar. A possible distinction may be suggested by the striking nature of many of the textual variants

---

Aristarkhos considered 535-7 a doublet to 538-40 and preferred the latter... almost every editor considers that something should be excised or bracketed.” Distigmai is ideal as a technical term marking the location of variants, since it specifically means “two dots” and has no other meaning that might distract from this usage. In keeping with historical usage of words related to these new name designations, distigme and distigmai should not normally be italicized, capitalized, or put in quotes, and the final “e” of distigme should not be given either a macron or a circumflex accent.

<sup>2</sup> F. KENYON, *Manuscripts*, p. 75-76. Cf. P. B. PAYNE, “Fuldensis”, p. 258 and n. 65-68.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the many specific examples of distigmai without a bar as text-critical symbols, *ibidem*, p. 258-259.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 255.

occurring in lines marked by a distigme + bar. The original scribe may have added a bar to some distigmai in order to highlight them as interpolations or particularly significant variants. If this was the scribe's intention, it explains the use of a distigme and a bar at the location of some of the passages most widely regarded as interpolations, including Ioh. 7,53 – 8,11, "for the Son of Man has come to seek and to save the lost" after Matth. 18,10, "blessed are you among women" after Luc. 1,28, "many are called but few are chosen" after Luc. 14,24, "in the church. In those days" after Act. 2,47, and I Cor. 14,34-35. It also explains why bars just below the distigmai that mark some of the most important textual variants extend noticeably farther into the margin and hence closer to the adjacent distigme than typical paragraphoi, presumably to associate them with the adjacent distigme. Each of the passages above where the bar extends toward a distigme<sup>5</sup> extends approximately 3 mm into the margin. Virtually<sup>6</sup> all such long bars that extend toward adjacent distigmai occur by widely recognized interpolations. In contrast, on average the seventy-five other bars in 1 Corinthians extend 2.0 mm into the margin beyond the left edge of the character it underlines, and only one other extends 3.0 mm into the margin (1475 B 29)<sup>7</sup>. It also explains why lines with distigme + bar contain the highest percentage of NA variants of any group of distigmai yet analyzed<sup>8</sup>. Furthermore, in ten of the distigme + bar lines in *Vaticanus*, the original scribe left an open space in the text at the exact location of a known text-critical problem<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> The distigme at the end of Ioh. 7,52 is in its right margin, but the bar is in its left margin, so this distigme does not attract the bar farther left.

<sup>6</sup> Possible exceptions are Marc. 5,40, but other manuscripts insert "but Jesus," in the middle of this *Vaticanus* line, and Rom. 16,5, but other manuscripts replace "Asia" with "Achaia," in this *Vaticanus* line. P. B. Payne ("Fuldensis", p. 253) lists the 27 instances of a distigme next to a bar.

<sup>7</sup> Excluding the bar at 1470 B 2, since its color ink does not match the surrounding text, its shape is irregular, and, unlike every other bar in 1 Corinthians, it does not underscore the first letter in the line.

<sup>8</sup> This is because these are exactly the kinds of variants the NA always includes. Cf. the evidence cited in P. B. PAYNE, "The Text-Critical", p. 107-112.

<sup>9</sup> Eleven, if the variant Tischendorf noted at the gap in Marc. 3,5-6 is included, and twelve if the variant in the long gap at the end of Luc. 14,24 is included. The others are Matth. 13,50-1; 18,10-12; Marc. 5,40; 14,70-1; Luc. 1,28-9; Ioh. 7,39-40; Act. 2,47-3,1; 14,13-4; I Cor. 10,24-5; and Phil. 2,24. Most of these occur at the end or beginning of a sentence, so they could simply indicate a sentence break, but in three cases without a bar (1253 B 39 in Matth. 13,55; 1446 A 22 in Rom. 1,29; and 1480 A 36 in II Cor. 4,14) the gap occurs in the middle of a sentence. This is evidence that the original scribe may have noted variants during the copying of the manuscript, and not just after the codex was bound. One apparent use of a gap to indicate the location of a variant follows Marc. 16,8,

External support for a distinction between distigmai and at least some distigmai + bars includes the use of horizontal lines or lines plus dots in other Greek literature (*e. g.* Zenodotus) to indicate spurious passages or textual variants. The LSJ dictionary gives examples of ὀβελός as a “horizontal line, — (representation of an arrow acc. to Isid. *Etym.* 1.21.3), used as a critical mark to point out that a passage was spurious, ... [including one that has] one point below and one above, ÷, ὀ. περιστυγμένος, in texts of Plato, denoted τὰς εἰκαίους ἀθετήσεις [passage suspect without reason], D.L. 3.66”<sup>10</sup>. Origen’s Hexapla uses the obelos (÷) for Septuagint sections absent from the Hebrew text<sup>11</sup>. Especially where a bar protrudes significantly farther than usual into the margin toward an immediately preceding distigme in a passage with manuscript evidence for an interpolation, all of which occur in Matth. 18,10, Luc. 1,28 and 14,24, Act. 2,47 (with an apricot ink distigme) and I Cor. 14,33, the hypothesis that best explains all the data is that this is a distigme-obelos signaling an interpolation.

When the interpolation begins in the middle of a line, as in Matth. 18,10, Luc. 1,28, and Act. 2,47, that line takes the obelos. When the interpolation begins the line immediately after the obelos, as in Luc. 14,24, Ioh. 7,52, and I Cor. 14,33 the obelos effectively marks the interface between the original text and the interpolation. This obelos positioning corresponds exactly to the positioning of paragraphoi, which also date to the original composition of *Vaticanus*. If a paragraph division occurs anywhere in the middle of a line of text, that line takes the paragraphos, but where the first word of a paragraph begins a new line, the preceding line takes the paragraphos, so that it effectively marks the interface between the paragraphs.

To provide a statistical basis for judging whether distigmai mark the location of textual variants, Payne’s *NTS* article examines the twenty lines following each of these twenty-seven distigme + bar lines<sup>12</sup>. This selection preserves randomness by preventing arbitrary selection of lines. It also gives a large control group and one that is as comparable as possible. Immediate proximity to the lines with distigmai minimizes differences associated with different parts of the NT. On average, only about 35% of these 540 lines contain text where the NA lists a variant. Separating this control group into

---

where one and a third columns (1303 B-C), by far the longest gap in the codex, are left blank, precisely where longer endings of Mark occur in other manuscripts, see below, *pl.* 7.

<sup>10</sup> H. G. R. LIDDELL–R. SCOTT–H. S. JONES, *A Greek-English*, p. 1196.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. E. WÜRTHWEIN, *The Text*, p. 56; C. E. COX, *Hexaplaric*, p. 2; for an example, see below, *pl.* 4b.

<sup>12</sup> P. B. PAYNE, “Fuldensis”, p. 251-255.

twenty subgroups, the first consisting of the first line following the distigme, the second consisting of the second line following the distigme, etc., does not produce even one subgroup having nearly as high a frequency of NA variants as the lines with distigmai<sup>13</sup>.

Paul Canart invited Payne to the Vatican to see if any of the distigmai with faded ink Payne had observed in the 1965 color facsimile of *Codex Vaticanus* did in fact match the original ink of the codex. Together they examined these distigmai on the original leaves of *Codex Vaticanus* and discovered eleven unambiguous cases where the ink of distigmai matches the apricot color ink of the original manuscript. That research was published in *Novum Testamentum* 42 (2000), p. 105-113, “The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in *Codex Vaticanus*”. That article also details evidence for the originality of distigmai in dark chocolate brown ink and outlines the significance of the discovery<sup>14</sup>.

## B. The Discovery of Forty More Distigmai in the Original Ink of the Codex

The recently released, high-resolution, color facsimile of *Codex Vaticanus*<sup>15</sup> replicates the apricot color ink of the original hand of the manuscript to a degree never before achieved in print. Examination of this new facsimile permitted Payne to identify many new instances of apricot color distigmai.

Canart then directly examined these and other distigmai in the original *Vaticanus* leaves, first with the naked eye, then with a magnifying glass, and finally with different types of loupes. He confirmed that forty additional distigmai, some of which he discovered in the process, unambiguously match the original apricot color of unreinforced text on the same page of the codex. Two of these are less than 3 mm from text in the original ink (1349 B 19) or an original ink diplo “>” mark of an OT quotation (1309 A 23). Many others are within a few centimeters of text in the same apricot color ink:

<sup>13</sup> The percentage of lines containing NA variants in these twenty subgroups varies from 18.5% at the lowest to 52% at the highest. Cf. *ibidem*, p. 252-254.

<sup>14</sup> P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, “The Originality”, p. 109-111 on reinforced distigmai and p. 111-113 on the significance of the discovery.

<sup>15</sup> *Codex Vaticanus*.

- 2 between 3mm and 1 cm: 1332 C 20, 1349 B 19, 1475 B 11
- 6 between 1 cm and 2 cm: 1243 B 21, 1285 C 14, 1339 A 42, 1351 A 6, 1356 B 24, 1409 B 25<sup>16</sup> (see below, *pl.* 8ab)
- 13 between 2 cm and 3 cm: 1243 B 21, 1279 B 1 (3x), 1285 C 14, 1296 A 14, 1332 B 10, 1342 C 41, 1345 B 11, 1346 B 40, 1356 B 24, 1382 C 39 (2x), 1396 B 26, 1401 C 41, 1459 B 32 (>)
- 17 between 3 cm and 4 cm: 1243 B 21, 1277 C 19, 1279 C 41, 1285 C 14, 1336 A 22, 1339 A 42, 1345 B 11 (2x), 1346 B 40 (4x), 1351 A 6 (3x), 1356 B 24, 1357 C 1, 1370 A 32, 1457 B 24, 1466 B 6, 1471 A 38 (2x), 1473 A 6, 1501 A 32

All fifty-one<sup>17</sup> distigmai that match the original ink of *Vaticanus* are listed in the following table identifying their page, column (A, B or C), line, the type of variant found in other manuscripts, verse reference, and some locations on that page with unreinforced text displaying the original ink of the codex. If, as occurs frequently, only a single letter of a word is unreinforced, that letter is noted. These variants are easily recognizable and affect the text as cited in the following table's footnotes. Unless another critical edition is cited in the footnote, all variants are listed in the Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> edition *Novum Testamentum*.

*Table 10: Table of Unreinforced Distigmai Matching Unreinforced Text*

\* = Other distigmai on this page match the ink of reinforced text.

◊ omitted word ◻ omitted words † replaced word † replaced words † inserted word(s)

<i>distigme locus</i>	<i>in verse</i>	<i>variant</i>	<i>the location and identification of nearby unreinforced text</i>
1 : 1243 B 21 <sup>18</sup>	Matth. 8,1-2	† <sup>19</sup> ◊ <sup>20</sup>	1243 B 8, 34 N, 28 E, 1243 C 20, 27 N*
2 : 1261 A 21	Matth. 19,23	† <sup>21</sup>	1261 A 17, 24 N*
3 : 1264 C 29 <sup>22</sup>	Matth. 22,4	◻ <sup>23</sup>	1264 C 31 E, 1264 B 36 N*
4 : 1276 C 31	Matth. 28,8		1276 C 12, 13, 17 N (especially 12 and 13)*

<sup>16</sup> Canart classifies this as “probable” but not certain to match the original ink.

<sup>17</sup> Including the eleven original ink distigmai identified in the table in P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, “The Originality”, p. 108. Those eleven are numbers 21, 22, 30, 31, 34, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, and 50 in the table below.

<sup>18</sup> This distigme is on the right side of col. B.

<sup>19</sup> C KL W 33 579 1241 ℞ replace a word. R. J. SWANSON, *Matthew*, p. 60, adds S U Γ Π 2 1071. — Explanations of the manuscript abbreviations are given below, p. 263-265.

<sup>20</sup> 1424 omits a word. *Ibidem*, p. 60, adds 788.

<sup>21</sup> 565 puts πλούσιος after εἰσελεύσεται; cf. *ibidem*, p. 187.

<sup>22</sup> This distigme is farther left than usual.

<sup>23</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> omits words.



5 : 1277 C 19	Marc. 1,5	○ <sup>24</sup> τ <sup>25</sup>	1277 C 19 E, 30 N, 1277 B 15 (11) Θ *
6 : 1279 B 1	Marc. 2,1	ι <sup>26</sup>	1279 B 1 Υ, 2 N, 1279 A 6 N *
7 : 1279 C 41	Marc. 2,16-17	Γ <sup>27</sup>	1279 C 34 E, 1279 B 40 T *
8 : 1285 C 14	Marc. 6,21	τ <sup>28</sup>	1285 C 16 N, 17, 19 E *
9 : 1287 C 29	Marc. 7,17	ι <sup>29</sup>	1287 C 24 N *
10 : 1288 B 26	Marc. 7,33	○ <sup>30</sup>	1288 B 25 N, 17 E, 15 N E, 1288 C 15, 16 N *
11 : 1296 A 14	Marc. 12,14	ι <sup>31</sup>	1296 A 14, 25 N, 1296 B 30-32 OT quotes >, 37 N *
12 : 1300 A 37	Marc. 14,39	○ <sup>32</sup>	1300 A 30 E *
13 : 1300 A 39	Marc. 14,39-40	□ <sup>33</sup> ι <sup>34</sup>	1300 A 30 E *
14 : 1308 B 27	Luc. 2,43	ι <sup>35</sup>	1308 B 32 Υ N *
15 : 1309 A 23 <sup>36</sup>	Luc. 3,5	Γ <sup>37</sup>	1309 A 14-26 OT quotation marks >, 1309 B 18 N
16 : 1332 B 10	Luc. 14,14	Γ <sup>38</sup>	1332 A 5, 1332 B 5 EI, 19 N
17 : 1332 B 15	Luc. 14,15	Γ <sup>39</sup> Γ <sup>40</sup>	1332 B 5 EI, 19, 20 N
18 : 1332 C 20	Luc. 14,24	τ <sup>41</sup>	1332 C 23 N, 1332 B 19, 20 N
19 : 1336 A 22	Luc. 17,7	Γ <sup>42</sup>	1336 A 16 E, 13 N, 1336 B 14, 18 N *

<sup>24</sup> Θ 69 *pc* omit πάντες; cf. NA<sup>25</sup>; cf. R. J. SWANSON, *Mark*, p. 8.

<sup>25</sup> A G<sup>sup</sup> H K M P U W Θ Π f<sup>1</sup> 2 700 1424 ℞ place καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο after Ἱεροσολυμείται and 69 places ἐβαπτίζοντο after Ἱεροσολυμείται; cf. *ibidem*, p. 8.

<sup>26</sup> A C 0130 f<sup>1.13</sup> ℞ replace words.

<sup>27</sup> ℞<sup>88</sup> A f<sup>1</sup> 33 ℞ c q sy sa<sup>ms</sup> / s / L Δ f<sup>13</sup> (579) *pc* vg co / C / G 565 700 1241 1424 *pc* replace this word with five different phrases, and Θ replaces it with a different word.

<sup>28</sup> ℞<sup>45</sup> inserts ἐν after Ἡρώδης.

<sup>29</sup> A W Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> ℞ sa<sup>ms</sup> replace these words with a different phrase.

<sup>30</sup> s L W 892 c i omit a word.

<sup>31</sup> A f<sup>1.13</sup> (28) ℞ it change the word order. D Θ 565 k sy<sup>s-p</sup> replace a word with one or more different words.

<sup>32</sup> 788 omits καὶ and 69 reverses the word order of ἀπελθὼν πάλιν; cf. *ibidem*, p. 235.

<sup>33</sup> D it omit words.

<sup>34</sup> A C (N) W (Θ) f<sup>1.13</sup> ℞ (q) sy<sup>(p).h</sup> replace words.

<sup>35</sup> A C Ψ 0130 f<sup>13</sup> ℞ it sy<sup>p.h</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> replace words with a different phrase.

<sup>36</sup> This distigme is farther left than usual, presumably in order to keep it from overlapping the dipole mark (shaped like a greater-than sign) of the OT quotation. This indicates that at least this distigme was written after this dipole mark.

<sup>37</sup> s A C L W Θ Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33 ℞ it; Ir<sup>lat</sup> replace a word.

<sup>38</sup> s\* N f<sup>13</sup> 1 1424 2542 *pc* it replace a word.

<sup>39</sup> A D W Θ Ψ ℞ sy<sup>h</sup>; Cl replace a word.

<sup>40</sup> A\* W f<sup>13</sup> ℞ sy<sup>s.c</sup>; Cyr<sup>lem</sup> replace another word.

<sup>41</sup> Γ f<sup>13</sup> (579). 700 892<sup>mg</sup> *al* insert a clause.

<sup>42</sup> 579 replaces ποιμαίνοντα with ἡτοιμένωντα. 1071 replaces it with ποιμαίνονται; cf. R. J. SWANSON, *Luke*, p. 295.

20 : 1339 A 42	Luc. 19,17	Γ <sup>43</sup>	1339 A 41 H, 34 N*
21 : 1339 C 42	Luc. 19,37	□ <sup>44</sup>	1339 C 9, 16 N, 1339 B 11 N, 1339 A 41 H*
22 : 1339 C 42	Luc. 19,37	□ <sup>45</sup>	1339 C 9, 16 N, 1339 B 11 N, 1339 A 41 H*
23 : 1342 C 41	Luc. 21,25	Γ <sup>46</sup>	1342 C 41 Σ, 35 N, 30 H*
24 : 1345 B 11	Luc. 22,58	Γ <sup>47</sup>	1345 B 17 E, 4, 18 N
25 : 1346 B 40	Luc. 23,23-24	Τ <sup>48</sup>	1346 A 36, 40 E, 1346 B 40 E, 41 EN
26 : 1349 B 19 <sup>49</sup>	Luc. 24,47	Γ <sup>50</sup>	1349 B 19 ΞΑΜΕΝΟΙΑΠΟΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΑ, 23 E
27 : 1350 B 18 <sup>51</sup>	Ioh. 1,27-28	Τ <sup>52</sup>	1350 A 19 N
28 : 1351 A 6 <sup>53</sup>	Ioh. 1,42	Γ <sup>54</sup>	1351 A 6 ΑΟΥ, 1, 5 N, 10 E*
29 : 1352 A 40	Ioh. 2,24	□ <sup>55</sup>	1352 A 19 E, 20 ΟΙ, 24 N, 1352 B 5 E, 1352 C 28 N*
30 : 1355 B 40	Ioh. 5,2	Γ <sup>56</sup>	1355 B 1, 4, 24 N, 1355 C 20 Σ, 26, 33, 37 T*
31 : 1356 B 24	Ioh. 5,25	Γ <sup>57</sup>	1356 A 24 N, 1356 B 5, 23, 29 N, 6 E (dropped from ΤΕΙΜΩΣΙ in Ioh. 5,23)

<sup>43</sup> Ⲛ A L W Θ Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> Ⲙ replace a word.

<sup>44</sup> This distigme is on the interior margin of 1339 C. 063 it sy<sup>c</sup> omit τῶν μαθητῶν.

<sup>45</sup> This distigme is on the exterior margin of 1339 C. 063 it sy<sup>c</sup> omit τῶν μαθητῶν.

<sup>46</sup> D (W) Ⲙ replace a word.

<sup>47</sup> Ⲣ<sup>69vid</sup> D sy<sup>s</sup> / A W Θ Ψ f<sup>1</sup> Ⲙ replace words with a different word or phrase.

<sup>48</sup> A D W Θ Ψ 0250 f<sup>1.13</sup> Ⲙ (c f) sy bo<sup>ms</sup> / 1424 insert a phrase.

<sup>49</sup> The distigme at 1348 B 19 appears to be a mirror impression caused by the ink from the distigme at the corresponding position on 1349 B 19. This explains why the distigme at 1348 B 19 displays the original ink of the codex, why it is so faint, why it is on the right side of col. B, not on its left side as is typical, and why it is slightly below the baseline instead of the usual mid-letter height.

<sup>50</sup> -νου is replaced by -νου in Ⲣ<sup>75</sup> A C<sup>3</sup> W f<sup>1.13</sup> Ⲙ sy<sup>h</sup>, -νω in D Δ<sup>c</sup> pc lat, -νους in Θ Ψ 565 pc.

<sup>51</sup> This distigme is on the right side of col. B.

<sup>52</sup> E F G H N 2\* (pc) insert a clause. Ⲣ<sup>66</sup> Ⲛ insert words. Cf. R. J. SWANSON, *John*, p. 11.

<sup>53</sup> This distigme is on the right side of col. A.

<sup>54</sup> A B<sup>2</sup> Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> Ⲙ c q vg<sup>cl</sup> sy bo<sup>ms</sup>; Epiph replaces a name. Θ 1241 pc vg replace it with another name.

<sup>55</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> omits this phrase.

<sup>56</sup> Ⲛ<sup>\*.2</sup> A D L Θ f<sup>1.33</sup> 565 597 a (b) aur e ff<sup>2</sup> vg<sup>cl</sup> l pc replace words.

<sup>57</sup> K S Π Ω 28 al substitute ἀνθρώπου for θεοῦ. This is listed in E. NESTLE – K. ALAND, *Novum Testamentum*<sup>25</sup>, p. 244, and most other editions of the NT with an extensive apparatus, including R. J. SWANSON, *John*, p. 60, A. MERK, *Novum Testamentum*, p. 324, who adds 280 482s 399s syih<sup>m</sup> (throughout this article the manuscript notation conventions of the work cited are used and are not converted to NA conventions); E. NESTLE, *Novum Testamentum*<sup>16</sup>, p. 244; C. TISCHENDORF, *Novum Testamentum*, t. I, p. 790, who adds al<sup>10</sup> syr<sup>p</sup> m<sup>g</sup> et<sup>hr</sup>; and J. J. GRIESBACH, *Novum Testamentum*<sup>3</sup>, t. I, p. 525, who adds 42. 91 al.3 Chrys. in textu (in comm. variant codd.).

32 : 1357 C 1	Ioh. 6,11	ϵ <sup>58</sup> τ <sup>59</sup>	1357 C 1 N
33 : 1368 C 15	Ioh. 12,7		1368 C 22 O, 24 N, 1368 B 7 N, 21 E, 23 N
34 : 1370 A 32	Ioh. 12,47	ϵ <sup>60</sup>	1370 A 33-4, 39, 41 E, 1370 C 33-35 EI ... ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ <sup>61</sup>
35 : 1380 A 26 <sup>62</sup>	Ioh. 20,14	τ <sup>63</sup>	1380 A 30 N, 1380 B 31 EO *
or			
35 : 1381 C 26 <sup>64</sup>	Ioh. 21,22		1381 B 9 N, 1381 A 18 N *
36 : 1382 C 39	Act. 1,14	τ <sup>65</sup>	1382 C 24 N, 40 N, 1382 B 36 M *
37 : 1383 A 4	Act. 1,15	ϵ <sup>66</sup> ϵ <sup>67</sup>	1383 A 14 E, 1383 B 7 Θ *
38 : 1396 B 26	Act. 10,4	ϵ <sup>68</sup>	1396 B 26, 27 N, 1396 A 35, 39 N *
39 : 1401 C 41	Act. 13,33	ϵ <sup>69</sup>	1401 C 38 N, 30 E, 1401 B 28-32 >, 26, 28, 42 N *
40 : 1419 B 36	Act. 25,2	ο <sup>70</sup> ϵ <sup>71</sup>	1419 A 30 E, 1419 C 37, 19, 9 N *
41 : 1457 B 24	Rom. 12,17	τ <sup>72</sup>	1457 B 20 E, 32-34 >, 5 E, 1457 C 11 M, 12, 18 N *
42 : 1459 B 32	Rom. 15,13	ϵ <sup>73</sup>	1459 B 11, 16, 19, 26 >, 1459 C 33 N N, 25, 36 E *

<sup>58</sup> ⲛD it sy<sup>c.(p)</sup> / Ⲕ<sup>28.66.75</sup> NΓ 69 579 1071 *pc* / 28 replace a phrase with two different phrases.

<sup>59</sup> ⲛ<sup>2</sup> D Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> Ⲙ b e j (sy<sup>s</sup>) ac<sup>2</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup> insert a phrase. 1424 *pc* insert αὐτοῦ.

<sup>60</sup> Variant expressions replace καὶ μὴ φυλάξῃ in Ⲕ<sup>66c</sup> D W Θ 070 0250 579 1241 *pc* Ⲙ e q it vg<sup>ms</sup> sy<sup>hmg</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> The duplicated unreinforced text in 1370 C 33-35 is from Ioh. 13,14a.

<sup>62</sup> This distigme, especially its first dot, is higher than usual. Perhaps the second dot was lowered to make it clear which line it indicates. This distigme may simply be a mirror impression caused by the not-quite-dry ink of the similarly-lopsided distigme on the facing page at 1381 C line 26.

<sup>63</sup> Λ and C. L. LLOYD, *HKAINHΔIAΘHKH* insert ó; cf. R. J. SWANSON, *John*, p. 275.

<sup>64</sup> This distigme, especially its second dot, is higher than usual. This distigme may simply be a mirror impression caused by the not-quite-dry ink of the similarly-lopsided distigme on the facing page at 1380A line 26.

<sup>65</sup> C<sup>3</sup> 33 1739\* Ⲙ insert καὶ τῆ δεήσει.

<sup>66</sup> C 056 1611 replace τε with δέ, D<sup>c</sup> with δέ ó, and D\* with γὰρ ó; cf. R. J. SWANSON, *Acts*, p. 9.

<sup>67</sup> E replaces ὀνομάτων with ἀνδρῶν, and 618\* replaces it with ὀνμάτων; cf. *ibidem*, p. 9.

<sup>68</sup> 1828\* replaces τί ἐστὶν with τίς εἶ; cf. *ibidem*, p. 165.

<sup>69</sup> E Ⲙ / 1175 / D gig; (Or) / Ⲕ<sup>45vid</sup> t replace this phrase with four different phrases.

<sup>70</sup> Ⲕ<sup>74</sup> omits a word.

<sup>71</sup> H P 049 189 326 *pm* replace a phrase.

<sup>72</sup> A<sup>1</sup> / F G 629 lat insert two different phrases.

<sup>73</sup> ⲛ replaces δυνάμει πνεύματος with δυνάμι πνς; cf. R. J. SWANSON, *Romans*, p. 236 (prepublication galley proof shown to Payne). All manuscripts investigated by Swanson except B Ⲕ<sup>46</sup> 69 substitute the abbreviation πνς for πνεύματος; cf. *ibidem*, p. 236.

43 : 1459 C 41	Rom. 15,23	Γ <sup>74</sup>	1459 C 25, 36, 39 E, 33 NN *
44 : 1466 A 25	I Cor. 6,20	Τ <sup>75</sup>	1466 A 25 E, 1466 B 21, 24, 26 N *
45 : 1466 B 6	I Cor. 7,5	Τ <sup>76</sup>	1466 A 25 E, 1466 B 11, 21, 24, 26 N *
46 : 1468 B 3	I Cor. 9,6-7		1468 B 15 K, 15, 16 marginal diples, 1468 C 7, 12 N *
47 : 1471 A 38	I Cor. 11,28	Γ <sup>77</sup>	1471 A 31, 39, 40, 42 E, 1471 B 33, 35, 37, 39 N *
48 : 1473 A 6	I Cor. 14,3		1473 B 18, 19, 29 N, 1472 C 7 E *
49 : 1475 B 11	I Cor. 15,34		1475 B 10, 24 E, 13, 27 N, 1475 C 7 E, 13, 14 N *
50 : 1499 C 42	Phil. 1,28	Τ <sup>78</sup>	1499 C 28 N, 32 E, 1499 B 15 N, 6, 28, 30, 35 E *
51 : 1501 A 32 <sup>79</sup>	Phil. 3,5	Γ <sup>80</sup>	1501 A 36 E, 1501 B 26 M, 42 NE *

The NA lists a variant in thirty-six<sup>81</sup> of the fifty-one lines listed in the chart above, namely in over 70% of the lines with distigmai matching the original apricot color ink of *Vaticanus*. This contrasts sharply with the relative infrequency, 35%, of the 540 control lines without distigmai. Thus, approximately twice as many lines with apricot color ink distigmai contain NA variants than do lines without distigmai.

<sup>74</sup> P<sup>46</sup> S A D (F) G Ψ 33 1739 1881 M have πολλῶν instead of ἱκανῶν.

<sup>75</sup> C. Tischendorf (*Novum Testamentum*, t. 3, p. 488) notes that Meth<sup>Epiph 579</sup> inserts ἄραγε before δοξάσατε (as does A. SOUTER, *Novum Testamentum*) and that Ps. Ath 2,4 omits the text that occurs in this line of *Vaticanus*.

<sup>76</sup> S<sup>2</sup> K L 88 326 436 614 1241 1984 1985 2127 2492 2495 *Byz Lect* M sy<sup>h</sup> got Dion Ephraem Chr<sup>xt</sup> Thret insert τῆ νηστεία καὶ (“fasting and”) before “prayer”. 330 451 and Iohannes Damascenus add καὶ νηστεία after “prayer”.

<sup>77</sup> P<sup>46</sup> has the spelling ἐσθειέτω instead of ἐσθειέτω; cf. P. W. COMFORT – D. P. BARRETT, *The Text*, p. 270.

<sup>78</sup> D<sup>2</sup> P Ψ 075 104 1505 pc M (MVict Aug) insert μέν.

<sup>79</sup> This distigme may simply be a mirror impression caused by the not-quite-dry ink of the distigme at 1500 C 32, but 1501 A 32 is probably the original distigme since it is in a typical distigme position whereas 1500 C 32 is not and since two other distigmai in the same facing column, 1500 C 10 and 24, are in typical distigme positions.

<sup>80</sup> P<sup>46</sup> has the genitive περιτομῆς instead of the dative περιτομῆ, P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett (*ibidem*, p. 324), C. Tischendorf (*Novum Testamentum*, t. 3, p. 717) and J. B. Lightfoot (*Saint Paul's*, p. 146) note that some texts, e.g. Eus<sup>Ps359</sup>, have the nominative περιτομή.

<sup>81</sup> 1243 B 21, 1264 C 29, 1277 C 19 (NA<sup>25</sup>), 1279 B 1, 1279 C 41, 1285 C 14, 1287 C 29, 1288 B 26, 1296 A 14, 1300 A 39, 1308 B 27, 1309 A 23, 1332 B 10, 1332 B 15, 1332 C 20, 1339 A 42, 1339 C 42, 1339 C 42, 1342 C 41, 1345 B 11, 1346 B 40, 1349 B 19, 1350 B 18, 1351 A 6, 1352 A 40, 1355 B 40, 1356 B 24 (NA<sup>25</sup>), 1357 C 1, 1370 A 32, 1382 C 39, 1401 C 41, 1419 B 36, 1457 B 24, 1459 C 41, 1466 B 6, and 1499 C 42.

The fact that these fifty-one distigmai match the apricot color of the original ink of *Codex Vaticanus* shows that they were penned as part of the original production of the codex. The presence of these original-ink-color distigmai scattered throughout *Codex Vaticanus* demonstrates that the scribe who penned these distigmai had the goal of systematically going through the codex to make these notations. It would be only natural for someone with a goal of systematically noting the location of textual variants in another manuscript to compare texts from beginning to end, especially since, at that time, NT texts had no verse divisions.

### C. Statistical Evidence that Distigmai Mark the Location of Textual Variants

To what level of statistical probability has it been established that distigmai mark the location of textual variants? The appropriate statistical test to determine the significance of the relationship between distigmai and textual variants is the chi-square test. The chi-square test reveals the statistical probability that the null hypothesis may be rejected. In this case the null hypothesis is that occurrences of distigmai and occurrences of textual variants are independent. If, for instance, the chi-square is 6.625, the odds are one in a hundred that the null hypothesis is correct. If the chi-square is 10.828, the odds are one in a thousand that the null hypothesis is correct. The chi-square value resulting from comparing how many of the twenty-seven distigma-plus-bar lines contain NA variants to how many of the following twenty lines contain NA variants is  $\chi^2 = 25.081$ , a chi-square value so high that it goes off standard chi-square charts<sup>82</sup>. This chi-square value shows that the odds are less than one in 10,000 that the occurrences of distigmai and of textual variants are independent. This chi-square value permits rejection of the null hypothesis, that occurrences of distigmai and textual variants are independent, with a very high level of confidence. Correspondingly, this chi-square value gives extraordinarily high confirmation that there is a co-occurring relationship between distigmai and textual variants.

Applying the chi-square statistical test to the fifty-one distigmai that match the original apricot color ink of *Vaticanus* also allows rejection of the null hypothesis that the occurrences of distigmai and of textual variants are independent. Again, it does so at an extraordinarily high level of probability,

---

<sup>82</sup> Cf. the Chi-square Distribution table in E. HATCH – A. LAZARETON, *The Research*, p. 603.  $p < 0.001$   $d.f. = 1$ ;  $d.f.$  stands for “degrees of freedom”. This calculation includes Yate’s correction for continuity.

$p < 0.001$  [ $\chi^2 = 24.431$ ,  $d.f. = 1$ ]<sup>83</sup>. This chi-square value again shows that the odds are less than one in 10,000 that the occurrences of distigmai and of textual variants are independent. The odds against getting such results by chance in back-to-back tests are astronomically high unless distigmai mark textual variants. Thus, both tests strongly support the conclusion that distigmai are markers of textual variants. The fact that the fifty-one distigmai in this second group all match the color of the original ink of the manuscript strongly supports the conclusion that distigmai marking the location of textual variants date to the original production of *Codex Vaticanus*.

#### D. Mirror-Image Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of *Vaticanus*

The presence of at least five mirror-image distigmai in the original ink of the codex at corresponding points on facing pages<sup>84</sup> indicates that before the ink of these distigmai was thoroughly dry, their pages were pressed together, causing the mirror-image distigmai. If these distigmai had been penned before the remaining text on these pages had been written, the original distigmai surely would have dried thoroughly before these pages were pressed together. Therefore, these mirror images imply that the insertion of the distigmai was a separate stage in the writing of *Codex Vaticanus* undertaken, at least in part, after completion of its text. The distigmai in the original ink of the codex at 1345 B 11 left a slight mirror impression on the facing page from the previous quire. This could only happen after the Codex B quires were bound, at least provisionally, to each other. A separate distigmai writing stage explains why distigmai left so many mirror impressions, including this one across quires, whereas the *Vaticanus* NT text did not<sup>85</sup>. Perhaps the

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *ibidem*, p. 603. Only one of the two mirror-image distigmai at 1380 A 26 and 1381 C 26 originally marked a textual variant and so only one is included in this chi-square statistical test.

<sup>84</sup> 1345 B 11 leaves a slight impression on the right side of 1344 B between lines 10 and 11. 1346 B 40 appears to leave an impression on the left side of 1347 C 41. 1349 B 19 leaves an impression on the right side of 1348 B 19. 1380 A 26 mirrors 1381 C 26, but it is not clear which caused the mirror impression. 1457 B 24 leaves an impression on the right side of 1456 B 24. 1501 A 32 leaves an impression on the right side of 1500 C 32. 1409 B 25 (see below, *pl.* 8ab) leaves an impression on the right side of 1408 B 25, but is not included in our statistics since Canart identified it as “probable” but not certain to match the original ink. It is possible that a seventh (or eighth) does this as well: 1276 A 18 may be a mirror impression of 1277 C 19, a mirror impression that was later reinforced, or 1277 C 19 may be a mirror impression of 1276 A 18.

<sup>85</sup> Of course, if the text was written before its leaves were sewn into quires, its leaves could not have produced mirror images on their facing pages, since they would not yet have a facing page fixed in place.

scribe was so absorbed in comparing manuscripts and noting points of difference that issues of drying ink or using blotter paper were occasionally forgotten. When one is in the process of comparing manuscripts, one feels compelled to continue the comparison until a logical breaking point in the sense of the text is reached. Since such breaking points rarely coincide with the end of a page, it would be natural for the scribe to want to turn the page immediately in order to continue the comparison.

In numerous cases where a distigme caused a mirror impression, other distigmai follow on the same page or its facing page that did not leave a mirror impression<sup>86</sup>. Manuscript comparison proceeds sequentially, so in the process of noting differences between two manuscripts it would not make sense that the ink of earlier-penned distigmai would be damp but that later-penned distigmai would be so dry they left no mirror impression. Consequently, the distigmai must not have all been penned in a single continuous progression through the manuscript. The only plausible explanation is that the distigmai that caused mirror impressions were written at a different time than the following distigmai that did not cause mirror impressions. The latter distigmai most likely were penned either in an earlier or in a later comparison of *Vaticanus* to a different manuscript. This thesis, that the scribe who added the distigmai compared *Vaticanus* to multiple manuscripts one after the other, explains three otherwise mysterious features regarding distigmai. First, it solves the mystery of why earlier distigmai on a page left a mirror impression but later ones did not. Second, it helps explain how there could be such a diversity of manuscript traditions represented in the known variants that occur in lines with distigmai. Based on the variety of manuscripts with variants listed in the footnotes of the table above for the 51 lines with apricot color distigmai, it is virtually inconceivable that one manuscript could have accounted for all the significant textual variants at the locations marked by the fifty-one original-ink distigmai, let alone all the other distigmai whose ink was apparently reinforced in the Middle Ages. Third, it helps explain why some portions of *Vaticanus* have far more distigmai

---

<sup>86</sup> The apricot color distigme at 1346 B 40 appears to have caused a mirror impression, but a distigme follows it at 1347 B 8 that did not leave a mirror impression. The apricot color distigme at 1457 B 24 caused a mirror impression, but on the same page four other distigmai follow it that did not leave a mirror impression: 1457 B 36 and 1457 C 4, 11 and 25. The apricot color distigme at 1501 A 32 caused a mirror impression, but 1501 B 42 did not. If the apricot color distigme at 1380 A 26 is the original that caused its mirror image at 1381 C 26, this is a fourth example since it is followed by distigmai at 1380 B 7 and 1381 B 28 that did not leave a mirror impression. A possible fifth example is 1409 B 25, which Canart classifies as “probable” but not certain to match the original ink. The distigme at 1409 B 25 caused a mirror impression but the distigmai at 1409 C 8, 10 did not.

than others. For example, the four pages from 1457-1460 in Romans have 30 distigmai, but the pages from 1374-1377<sup>87</sup> in John do not have a single unambiguous distigme. The simplest explanation for this variety in distigme frequency is that some of the manuscripts whose variants are noted by distigmai contained only parts of the NT text. This would be typical of early papyrus manuscripts. All this evidence makes a strong case that the *Vaticanus* distigmai identify the location of variants in multiple manuscripts.

Apparently distigmai were penned by a scribe who compared the text of *Vaticanus* to the text of other NT manuscripts one by one. Presumably most of these were manuscripts in the scriptorium that produced *Vaticanus*. The great scriptorium in Alexandria or the one in Caesarea, both of which have been proposed as the provenance of this manuscript<sup>88</sup>, would have been outstanding repositories of ancient NT manuscripts. The extraordinary quality of the letterforms of the original hand of *Codex Vaticanus* certainly supports its origin from a professional scribe at a major scriptorium. T. A. Brown wrote that “the original *Vaticanus* hand is the most beautiful and well-balanced uncial script I have ever seen in a Biblical manuscript, having an excellence in form approaching that of monumental inscriptions”<sup>89</sup>. In light of the many surviving manuscripts representing variant readings in the lines marked by the fifty-one original-ink-color distigmai, the scribe who penned these distigmai probably compared *Vaticanus* to several manuscripts at least. In light of the evidence that the scribe who penned these distigmai had the goal of systematically comparing *Vaticanus* to other manuscripts, it would be perfectly natural for that scribe to include in this comparison the most ancient manuscripts available. The time-consuming nature of such comparisons and the calligraphic beauty of the character forms in the original ink is evidence that the preparation of the codex was not rushed to meet a

<sup>87</sup> The two dots by 1377 C 38 (the only possible distigme on p. 1377) bleed into one another, are closer to each other than is typical of distigmai, and occur on the left side of the far right column of the open codex, which is also not typical. Of approximately 156 distigmai on the far right column of the open codex only seven are on the left side of that column, and this is the only one of those where the two dots are not cleanly separated. Thus, it is unclear whether it should be categorized as a distigme.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. S. Pisano (“The Text”, p. 40, = “The Vaticanus”, above, p. 96) states “it was most likely produced in Alexandria”. This viewpoint is supported in the current volume by P.-M. Bogaert (cf. above, p. 47-51, 135-144). T. C. SKEAT, “The Codex Sinaiticus”, p. 598-604 concludes, “*Vaticanus* therefore, like Sinaiticus, was written in Caesarea”. This viewpoint is supported in the current volume by J. Keith Elliott (cf. above, p. 119-133).

<sup>89</sup> In an e-mail to Philip B. Payne dated May 29, 2003. The original letter forms have been carefully reproduced as a computer font by Alan Loder and Philip B. Payne, *New Testament Manuscripts Font Collection: Codex Vaticanus*. Edmonds, WA: Linguist’s Software, 2003.



pressing deadline, whether for Constantine or anyone else. Although its scribe may have collated Codex B with manuscripts not in the scriptorium collection, manuscripts already there would have been the most accessible. Consequently, the addition of these distigmai may have made *Codex Vaticanus*, in effect, a catalogue of the locations of textual variants in its scriptorium. One could only identify with certainty the variants whose locations distigmai mark by comparing *Codex Vaticanus* to those other manuscripts. These distigmai therefore suggest that their scribe expected that Codex B would remain in the scriptorium with the manuscripts whose variants' locations it notes. Consequently, the distigmai constitute significant evidence that its scribes did not create *Codex Vaticanus* in order to ship it away to Constantine.

### E. Steps in the Original Production of *Codex Vaticanus*

Mirror-image distigmai in ink matching the original ink color of *Vaticanus* imply that a scribe penned the distigmai after the binding of the codex, at least provisionally. Another clue to the sequence of the original writing of *Vaticanus* is that the distigme matching the original ink of the codex at 1309 A 23 lies to the left of a dipole (shaped like a greater-than sign) identifying an OT quotation. This distigme's unusually far left position suggests that the dipole marks of OT quotations on this page were written prior to it. Dipoles were always written on the left side of each column of the codex (e.g. 1249 C, 1251 C, 1337 C, 1391 C) since they point like arrowheads toward the line to their right containing the quotation. Distigmai, however, are non-directional. They were usually placed on the left side of each column except the sixth column of the open codex, in which case they were usually written in the far right margin, where they are more noticeable. This difference may support the view that the addition of the distigmai and dipoles were separate steps in the production of the manuscript. Since the ink color of the distigmai investigated in this article and also the ink color of most<sup>90</sup> of the dipoles match the original ink of the text, the original writing of all three (text, dipoles, distigmai) should be considered part of the original production of *Codex Vaticanus*.

---

<sup>90</sup> Most of these were not reinforced, but some, e.g. the dipoles before 1352 A 8-9 and possibly 1361 A 31-34, appear to have been reinforced.

## F. Evidence for the Originality of Distigmai in Ink Matching Reinforced Text

Various factors support regarding the non-reinforcement of the fifty-one apricot color distigmai as inadvertent. These fifty-one distigmai that match the original ink of the codex are not limited to a specific section but are scattered throughout the *Vaticanus* NT. The vast majority of them are either so faded<sup>91</sup> that they would be far more likely than most distigmai to be overlooked by the reinforcer of the manuscript or else are sufficiently dark<sup>92</sup> that they would not stand out as needing reinforcement. In addition, there are five cases where this is the only distigme on its page<sup>93</sup> and so could have been easily overlooked. Furthermore, distigmai at the very end of the sixth column of the open codex were immediately lost from sight as soon as a scribe turned the page. In contrast, the reinforcer might notice and trace over earlier overlooked distigmai at any time until completing the collation of all six columns of the open codex. This explains why so many (six<sup>94</sup>) of the fifty-one unreinforced distigmai occur at the very end of the sixth column even though these last two lines constitute only 1/126<sup>th</sup> of the typical number of lines visible when the codex is open. Together, these four categories account for all but six<sup>95</sup> of these fifty-one distigmai and support the expectation that their lack of reinforcement was inadvertent. One striking indication of inadvertent non-reinforcement is the distigme at 1409 B 25 (Act. 18,16), where the left dot appears to be reinforced but the right dot is not reinforced and still displays what Canart classifies as “probable” to be the original ink of the codex (see below, *pl.* 8ab). In addition, Canart discerned traces of the original ink of the codex protruding from the distigme at 1469 A 3

<sup>91</sup> 1243 B 21, 1264 C 29, 1277 C 19, 1279 B 1, 1279 C 41 (which is also at the end of the far right column of the open codex), 1345 B 11, 1350 B 18 (which is also on the right side of its column) 1380 A 26, 1381 C 26, 1457 B 24, 1466 A25, 1499 C 42, 1501 A 32, cf. P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, “The Originality”, p. 110.

<sup>92</sup> 1261 A 21, 1276 C 31, 1285 C 14, 1287 C 29, 1288 B 26, 1300 A 37, 1300 A 39, 1308 B 27, 1309 A 23, 1332 B 10, 1332 B 15, 1332 C 20, 1339 A 42, 1346 B 40, 1349 B 19, 1351 A 6, 1355 B 40, 1356 B 24, 1357 C 1, 1370 A 32, 1383 A 4, 1401 C 41, 1419 B 36, 1459 B 32, 1459 C 41, 1466 B 6, 1468 B 3, 1471 A 38, 1473 A 6, 1475 B 11, cf. *ibidem*, p. 110-111. Presumably these were even less faded in the Middle Ages.

<sup>93</sup> 1296 A 14, 1345 B 11 (which is also faded), 1350 B 18 (which is also in an unusual position on the right side of the column and so would be less likely to be noticed), 1356 B 24, and 1370 A 32.

<sup>94</sup> 1279 C 41, 1339 C 42 (two), 1401 C 41, 1459 C 41, 1499 C 42.

<sup>95</sup> 1336 A 22, 1342 C 41, 1352 A 40, 1368 C 15, 1382 C 39, 1396 B 26.

(I Cor. 9,22), which is also clearly visible in the new facsimile, and from the distigme at 1501 B 42 (Phil. 3,16-17)<sup>96</sup>. The NA<sup>27</sup> notes early variants in all three of these distigme locations. If these three are included with the original, apricot-color distigmai, they provide even weightier statistical evidence that distigmai mark the location of textual variants. More importantly, they prove that distigmai (at least these) were traced over just like the text of *Vaticanus*. These observations support the view that distigmai matching the dark chocolate-color ink used to reinforce the entire manuscript in the Middle Ages were probably reinforced along with the rest of the manuscript.

While *Codex Vaticanus* was in the scriptorium where it was written, manuscripts there to which it was compared could be easily checked to confirm the purpose of the distigmai. As soon as it was separated from those manuscripts, however, the likelihood that the purpose of the *Vaticanus* distigmai would have been recognized drops sharply<sup>97</sup>. Consequently, the more time elapsed from the writing of *Codex Vaticanus*, the less likely it is that new distigmai would have been added, especially since no other NT Greek manuscript has been identified that uses distigmai to mark textual variants<sup>98</sup>. Thus, unless there is evidence to the contrary, the presumption is

---

<sup>96</sup> However, in a recent rechecking of all the distigmai, Canart was unable to confirm his earlier observation that, by the final line of I Cor. 14,33, the small protrusion toward the left of its first dot is more nearly the apricot of the original text than the dark chocolate brown of the reinforcement, cf. P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, “The Originality”, p. 110.

<sup>97</sup> There is, however, evidence that the reinforcer associated distigmai with spelling corrections. There is a reinforced distigme before five lines where the reinforcer corrected spelling over an unreinforced letter: 1361 C 1, 1468 A 26, 1479 A 12, 1481 C 21, 1501 B 42. It seems likely that the reinforcer in a sixth such instance regarded his change of H into EI in 1262 A 2 also as a spelling correction. The best evidences of the reinforcing scribe’s association of distigmai with spelling corrections are two instances where corrected spelling is marked in the margin by a symbol that is similar to a distigme but is shaped and positioned differently. In both cases the marks are positioned lower than typical distigmai and are not two dots but rather two short slanted strokes somewhat like grave accents: 1409 A 23-24 (pointed out by P. Andrist) and 1423 A 14. The first of these distinctive marks is half way between two lines, unlike any original distigme, since “Titius” begins on line 23 and wraps onto line 24. “Titius” is unreinforced, which effectively changes the spelling to “Justice” alone. These distinctive features indicate that the reinforcing scribe did not trace over original distigmai in these two instances but created these two marks. Since these marks originally inserted by this scribe are recognizably different than distigmai, the expectation is that dark chocolate brown distigmai that match the shape and positioning of original distigmai are reinforcements of original distigmai.

<sup>98</sup> James Snapp notes a pair of dots in the margin (though not aligned with any line of the text) of page 174 of the Latin *Codex Sangallensis* 50 (A.D. 800’s) next to annotations, and a

that the dark chocolate color distigmai are reinforcements of original apricot color distigmai and also date to the original writing of *Codex Vaticanus*, or at least to the early period when it was in the scriptorium with manuscripts whose variants they note<sup>99</sup>.

The originality of reinforced distigmai is also supported by the absence of even one variant reading cited next to any distigme. This suggests that the scribe who penned them did not prefer the variant reading. It is understandable that the original scribe, familiar with the revered exemplars *Vaticanus* copied, might not attach variants, since they could distract from or challenge that text. If later scribes introduced these 700+ chocolate color distigmai, however, it is surprising that none of them ever decided that even one of these variant readings was sufficiently worthy to cite.

### G. Recommendation for Designation of Distigmai in Critical Editions

In light of this new evidence that text-critical distigmai date to the original writing of *Codex Vaticanus* it would be helpful for future critical editions of the NT to add B<sup>v</sup> as part of the textual evidence for variants differing from B that occur in lines with distigmai in *Codex Vaticanus*. Reuben Swanson in his *1 Corinthians*, *2 Corinthians* and subsequent volumes and Tommy Wasserman's *The Epistle of Jude* already include B<sup>v</sup> data. Since there is always the possibility that a distigme in *Vaticanus* might signal a variant other than the ones known today, critical editions should explain this in their description of B<sup>v</sup>. Mirror-impression distigmai, in contrast to the original distigmai that caused them, should not be included as textual evidence for any reading since they are merely the unintended transfer of ink from one page of the codex to its facing page. The addition of B<sup>v</sup> would be appropriate, for instance, to add as part of the textual evidence for the inclusion of Ioh. 7,53 – 8,11 after Ioh. 7,52 and also as part of the textual evidence, along with *Codex Fuldensis* and 88\*, for the omission of I Cor. 14,34-35<sup>100</sup>.

---

corresponding pair of dots above the text in Marc. 2,1 to which the annotation pertains, photo at <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0050/174/large> (controlled January 2009).

<sup>99</sup> T. C. SKEAT, "The Codex Sinaiticus", p. 604-609, 619 argues that *Vaticanus* was taken to Constantinople shortly after it and two or three other similar codices of the NT were completed. If he is correct, the purpose of the distigmai would probably have been unknown in its new location, and so the addition of new distigmai would not be expected; on this matter, see below, P. Andrist, p. 243-244.

<sup>100</sup> As is argued in P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, "The Originality", p. 112-113; P. B. PAYNE, "Fuldensis", p. 240-262; IDEM, "Ms. 88", p. 152-158; IDEM, *Woman*.

## H. Examples of the Importance of Distigmai for Textual Criticism

These distigmai offer new light on a host of textual questions such as the two examples just mentioned. The chocolate-brown distigme at the end of Ioh. 7,52 is at the point where the account of the woman taken in adultery traditionally occurs. Thus, although *Codex Vaticanus* does not include this account, this distigme, presuming it reinforced one in the original ink, provides the earliest evidence for the presence of this account here in John, even earlier than Jerome's reference to its occurrence in many Greek codices<sup>101</sup>. Metzger describes the evidence that this pericope is an interpolation as "overwhelming"<sup>102</sup> and the case is indeed strong. Since, however, there are only two extant papyri written prior to *Vaticanus* that omit this pericope<sup>103</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, the evidence provided by this distigme that a manuscript of John written prior to *Vaticanus* included this pericope here is important evidence for its antiquity.

The distigme by the line that contains the end of I Cor. 14,33 probably indicates awareness of the textual problem regarding verses 34-35 ("Let women keep silent in the churches. They are not permitted to speak...")<sup>104</sup>. The status of these verses is unquestionably the major textual issue here, and the NA<sup>27</sup> lists no other variants at the end of 14,33 than the Western text transposition and Straatman's conjecture that the text originally did not include 14,34-35. If this distigme had signified the Western reading that puts 14,34-35 after 14,40, there should also have been a distigme after 14,40 to identify the corresponding difference in that text as well, but there is no distigme there. Thus, the distigme at the end of verse 33 is far more likely to represent a text that omitted I Cor. 14,34-35 than the Western dislocation.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Hieronymus, *Dial. c. Pelag.* 2.17: "In Evangelio secundum Joannem in multis et graecis et latinis codicibus invenitur de adultera muliere, quae accusata est apud Dominum" (p. 76, ed. C. MORESCHINI) and the evidence cited by J. H. BERNARD, *Gospel*, vol. 2, p. 715-717. For reference to this account in the East long before *Vaticanus*, cf. R. É. BROWN, *The Gospel*, p. 335-336.

<sup>102</sup> E.g. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual*, 1971, p. 219-222; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 187-189.

<sup>103</sup> Based on the index of NT passages in papyri in P. W. COMFORT – D. P. BARRETT, *The Text*, p. 7.

<sup>104</sup> For more on the textual history of this passage cf. above, p. 216, n. 100, and on the pattern of distigmai next to the line immediately preceding long interpolations cf. P. B. PAYNE, "Fuldensis", p. 259 and above, p. 201-202. The only other variant that has been proposed, the addition of "is taught" at the end of v. 33, occurs only in Western text type manuscripts that also have v. 34-35 not after v. 33 but after v. 40. If the scribe of *Vaticanus* were noting a variant from any Western manuscript, by far the most obvious variant at this point is the omission of v. 34-35 after v. 33.

There are significant parallels between Ioh. 7,53 – 8,11 and I Cor. 14,34-35:

(1) In both cases the doubtful verses have been put into the text in varying locations.

(2) In both cases there is a high concentration of textual variations in the doubtful verses. A. C. Wire notes the “fact that I Cor. 14,34-35 show about twice as many word reversals and other small variants as other verses in the context”<sup>105</sup>. The NA<sup>27</sup> lists twelve sets of variant readings in I Cor. 14,34-35. C. Tischendorf notes five additional variants here in Codex Claromontanus<sup>106</sup>. Ms. 88 also has three variants not noted in the NA<sup>27</sup>. There are four textual variants noted nowhere else in the two unpublished manuscripts in the VanKampen Scriptorium that Payne confirmed by examining these manuscripts: VK0908 (Ms. 2892) substitutes ἐπιτεράπαι for ἐπιτρέπεται and ἔστι γυναιξὶν for ἔστιν γυναικὶ. VK0902 (Ms. 909) substitutes ἀλλ’ for ἀλλὰ and ἔστι γυναιξὶν ἐν ἐκκλησία λαλεῖν for ἔστιν γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίαι. Furthermore, every representative of Western text type as well as Ambrosiaster, Ms. 915 and the Vulgate Ms. R transpose I Cor. 14,34-35 to the end of the chapter.

(3) Several manuscripts besides the distigme in *Vaticanus* provide evidence for an original text without verses 34-35. These two verses are absent after verse 33 in Ms. 88<sup>107</sup> and also from this paragraph as Bishop Victor of Capua had it rewritten in the margin of Codex Fuldensis<sup>108</sup>. Apparently the text used by Clement of Alexandria ca. A.D. 190-202 omitted I Cor. 14,34-35 as evidenced by *Paed.* 3.11’s reference to “Woman and man are to go to church ... embracing silence... it is becoming for her to pray veiled”<sup>109</sup> and *Strom.* 4.19’s “man or woman can be conversant with anything whatever”<sup>110</sup>. Similarly, the *Acts of Paul* 41 reports that Paul told Thecla, “Go and teach the word of God!”, which seems incompatible with a text including I Cor. 14,34-35<sup>111</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> A. C. WIRE, *The Corinthian*, p. 150, cf. p. 284, n. 16. Cf. also B. M. METZGER, *A Textual*, 1971, p. 219-222; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 187-189.

<sup>106</sup> C. TISCHENDORF, *Codex Claromontanus*, p. 558.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. P. B. PAYNE, “Ms. 88”, p. 152-158.

<sup>108</sup> As argued by P. B. PAYNE, “Fuldensis”, p. 240-250.

<sup>109</sup> A. ROBERTS – J. DONALDSON (eds), *Fathers*, vol. 2, p. 290.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 431-432. This is argued in P. B. PAYNE, “Fuldensis”, p. 247-248 and IDEM, *Woman*.

<sup>111</sup> E. HENNECKE – W. SCHNEEMELCHER (eds), *New Testament*, vol. 2, p. 364. P. W. DUNN (“The Influence”, p. 452) argues that its author “seems quite determined to show that the practice of the Corinthians follows Paul’s teachings to the letter.”

(4) In both cases the doubtful verses contain word usage atypical of that book's author.

(5) In both cases the doubtful verses interrupt the logical sequence of the passage.

(6) In both cases marginal symbols or notes indicate scribal awareness of a textual problem. In particular, *Vaticanus* has a distigme by both passages. Other generally recognized glosses share most of these characteristics<sup>112</sup>.

These parallels highlight the standard criteria for identifying an interpolation and show that I Cor. 14,34-35 exemplifies these criteria. In fact, I Cor. 14,34-35 provides even more evidence<sup>113</sup> that it is an interpolation. In particular, its unqualified prohibition of women speaking in church appears to contradict the permission Paul gives to women shortly before in this same letter to pray and prophesy when their heads are "covered" (I Cor. 11,2-16). It is fascinating that even though *Vaticanus* does not include Ioh. 7,53 – 8,11, its distigme here provides the earliest evidence for its presence after Ioh. 7,52. Similarly, although *Vaticanus* does include I Cor. 14,34-35, its distigme here provides the earliest NT manuscript evidence that these verses were an interpolation.

### I. The Special Case of the Three Dots by I Ioh. 5,7

The only occurrence in the *Vaticanus* NT of three horizontal dots in a position somewhat similar to the usual distigme position is at 1441 B 37 (see below, *pl.* 8c)<sup>114</sup> just before the word "three" in the I Ioh. 5,7 phrase that precedes the "*comma Iohanneum*", the Trinitarian three heavenly witnesses interpolation<sup>115</sup>. The three dots instead of two might be explained either by the word "three", which they immediately precede, or, if the variant

<sup>112</sup> E.g. Marc. 16,9-20 shares characteristics 2, 3, 4, 5, cf. *ibidem*, 1971, p. 122-128; 1998<sup>2</sup> p. 102-107. Ioh. 5,3c-4 shares characteristics 2, 3, 5, cf. *ibidem*, p. 209; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 179. Act. 8,37 shares characteristics 2, 3, 5, cf. *ibidem*, 1971, p. 359-360; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 316. I Ioh. 5,7b-8 shares characteristics 2, 4, 5, *ibidem*, 1971, p. 716-718; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 647-649.

<sup>113</sup> P. B. PAYNE, *Man*, analyzes this evidence in detail.

<sup>114</sup> The left two dots in 1410 B 17 are much smaller than distigme dots, and the dot to its right appears to be a merging of two overlapping dots. 1420 B 13 has a smaller third dot farther removed than the two to its right. In 1429 A 17 the lower third dot is a mirror impression caused by the dot on the facing page. 1471 A 32 has a third dot above and to the left of a distigme. 1500 C 24 and 1506 A 25 appear to result from an attempt to correct misplaced tracing, resulting in two pairs of overlapping dots. 1506 A 28 has a small dipole mark to the left of a distigme.

<sup>115</sup> See S. PISANO, "The Vaticanus", above, p. 80, n. \*, and below, *pl.* 8c.

to which they refer regards the Trinity, the three dots could be intended to highlight this. There are, however, six peculiarities of these three dots that raise doubts that they are from the same hand that originally penned the other distigmai.

First, these three dots, especially the second and third dots, are much closer together than any of the other distigma dots in 1 John. All but one of the pairs of dots in the thirteen<sup>116</sup> undisputed distigmai in 1 John are at least 0.6 mm apart from each other. The second and third of these three dots are much less than 0.1 mm apart.

Second, these three dots come much closer to the nearest letter in the text than any of the distigmai in 1 John. All but one of the thirteen undisputed distigmai in 1 John are 2 mm or more<sup>117</sup> separated from the nearest letter in the text, but the three dots are only 1.3 mm from the nearest letter.

Third, the second and third of these dots are much larger than any of the dots in undisputed distigmai in I John.

Fourth, these three dots, especially the second two, are much darker than the surrounding text. Many of the letters in the surrounding text are faded to the point of being difficult to identify. The three dots, in contrast, especially the second two, are as dark and clear as if they had been penned with ample ink yesterday. This suggests that at least the second two of these dots were written *after* the reinforcing of the adjacent text in the Middle Ages.

Fifth, there are three dots, not the customary two.

Sixth, if the scribe intended the three dots to identify the later form of the *comma Iohanneum* or the addition "in earth" in its earlier form they should have been next to the following line in *Vaticanus*, not this line, and if the scribe intended to identify the three heavenly witnesses as documented in the fourth century they should have been three lines lower down. This final peculiarity is particularly problematic, especially for the oldest known

---

<sup>116</sup> 1437 C 19 1.0 mm, 1437 C 23 0.9 mm, 1438 A 33 0.8 mm, 1438 B 12 0.8 mm, 1438 B 36 0.8 mm, 1438 B 38 0.8 mm, 1439 A 17 0.7 mm, 1439 B 12 0.2 mm, 1440 A 8, 0.5 mm, 1440 C 31 1.0 mm, 1441 A 14 0.7 mm 1441 C 4 0.7 mm, 1441 C 6 0.8 mm. It is unclear whether there was originally a distigma at 1440 B 26. Two slight flecks of ink (?) might be the remains of a first dot, but if this was a distigma, the two dots are much closer together (0.3 mm) than usual and closer to the next letter (1.8 mm) than usual.

<sup>117</sup> 1437 C 19 2 mm, 1437 C 23 2 mm, 1438 A 33 2 mm, 1438 B 12 3 mm, 1438 B 36 2 mm, 1438 B 38 3 mm, 1439 A 17 2.5 mm, 1439 B 12 1.5 mm, 1440 A 8, 2.5 mm, 1440 C 31 2.5 mm, 1441 A 14 2.2 mm 1441 C 4 3 mm, 1441 C 6 4 mm.



form of this variant, since statistical analysis has shown a high degree of accuracy in the positioning of distigmai by lines where variants occur. This adds to the likelihood that someone penned these three dots who was not routinely marking the exact line where the variant occurs. A later date also would make it more likely that the *comma Iohanneum* would have been available to the scribe who penned these three dots.

It is possible, however, that this originally was a distigme, perhaps intended to identify the substitution of μαρτυροῦσιν for μαρτυροῦντες, a variant reading that is found in Ψ 255 1852<sup>118</sup>. Someone aware of the *comma Iohanneum* and noticing two dots in front of the word “three” may have later added the third dot and reinforced the other dots in order to highlight this passage. This would explain why there are three dots, why the dots are so close together, why they are so close to the following text, why the second two are so large and so dark in comparison to the surrounding text, and why they are not where the *comma Iohanneum* is.

Because of differences of opinion as to how far back in the Latin tradition the *comma Iohanneum* can be traced<sup>119</sup>, there will inevitably be disagreement on the degree of probability or improbability, or even the impossibility that it could have been known to the scribe of the *Codex Vaticanus* NT. B. M. Metzger writes, “The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as part of the actual text of the Epistle is in a fourth century Latin treatise entitled *Liber Apologeticus* (chap. 4), attributed either to the Spanish heretic Priscillian (died about 385) or to his follower Bishop Instantius... In the fifth century the gloss was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy as part of the text of the Epistle, and from the sixth century on it is found more and more frequently in manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate”<sup>120</sup>. Consequently, it is perhaps possible that the scribe who originally wrote the distigmai knew of the *comma Iohanneum* in Latin. It is more straightforward to identify the line where a variant occurs when both texts are in Greek. Since this variant probably existed at that time only in Latin, the scribe could be excused for being less accurate than usual in positioning these dots. Furthermore, the immediately following “three” might be regarded as an attracting force, which combined with the different language and the Trinitarian nature of the variant reading, could have over-

<sup>118</sup> Cf. A. MERK, *Novum Testamentum*, p. 782.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. W. THIELE, “Beobachtungen”, p. 61-73; A. PLUMMER, *The Epistles*, p. 163-172; A. E. BROOKE, *Johannine Epistles*, p. 160, “It is far more probable that both Priscillian and his opponents found the gloss in the text of their Bibles”.

<sup>120</sup> B. M. METZGER, *A Textual*, 1971, p. 717; 1998<sup>2</sup>, p. 648.

come the expected positioning of the distigme. This then makes it possible, though not likely, that the original scribe penned a typical two-dot distigme in this position in order to identify the *comma Iohanneum* variant. Influenced by the immediately following “three” and the Trinity, that scribe might even have added the third dot. The addition of the third dot explains both the closeness of the dots together and their closeness to the following text. On this view the larger darker dots, causing even greater closeness of the dots to each other and to the following text, are presumably the work of a later reinforcer wanting to draw greater attention to the Trinitarian variant reading. If further analysis of the ink were to supply evidence that under these large dots lie three smaller dots in the original ink of *Vaticanus*, this would establish their originality and would indicate that the scriptorium producing the codex had a Latin text with the *comma Iohanneum*. This in turn would support a provenance for *Codex Vaticanus* in North Africa<sup>121</sup> or Italy.

## J. The Significance of the Discovery

Examination of these fifty-one distigmai that match the original ink of *Codex Vaticanus* adds to compelling statistical evidence that distigmai identify the location of textual variants. Mirror-impressions of distigmai on facing pages demonstrate that distigmai were added after the binding of the codex, at least provisionally. Some mirror impressions of original-ink distigmai are followed on the same page by distigmai without mirror impressions. This indicates that the scribe of *Vaticanus* systematically compared it to other manuscripts one by one. Comparison to multiple manuscripts explains the diversity of manuscript traditions represented by the variants in these fifty-one lines having original-ink distigmai.

The discovery of these forty additional distigmai matching the original ink of *Codex Vaticanus* confirms the validity of the four key implications for textual criticism noted with the discovery of the first eleven apricot-color distigmai and builds on them. (1) It confirms that the scribe of *Codex Vaticanus* was aware of textual variants and believed them to be sufficiently important to note. (2) It supports the view that the scribe of *Vaticanus* desired to preserve the most original form of the text possible. (3) These distigmai provide windows into the history of the text before *Vaticanus* even for passages for which no early papyri have survived. Twenty of the fifty-one

---

<sup>121</sup> Cf. A. PLUMMER, A. *The Epistles*, p. 166, “The insertion appears to have originated in North Africa”. But contrast A. E. BROOKE, *Johannine Epistles*, p. 163, “The gloss was certainly known as part of the text of the Epistle in Africa in the fifth century. Its acceptance as part of the text cannot be proved in any country except Spain in the fourth century”.

original-ink-color distigmai are in passages that occur in no early papyri<sup>122</sup>. (4) Most important of all, the high proportion of known textual variants in lines with distigmai compared to lines without distigmai provides a statistical basis for concluding that the majority of the variants that were available to the scribe of *Vaticanus* have survived in extant manuscripts. The significance of this discovery is enhanced by the diversity of textual traditions represented in the surviving variants where original-ink distigmai occur. It is also enhanced by the demonstrable antiquity of the text(s) on which *Vaticanus* is based, as evidenced by its close correlation with  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ <sup>123</sup>. This discovery provides a new basis for confidence that the NT text has been reliably preserved from the ancient manuscripts available to the scribe of *Vaticanus* until today.

#### POST-SCRIPTUM

par  
Paul CANART  
(Vatican)

C'est très volontiers que, sur la proposition de Philip Payne, j'ai signé avec lui l'article de *Novum Testamentum* (P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, «The Originality»). Il aurait pu se contenter de signaler ma collaboration, d'ordre technique, et m'en remercier: c'est lui, en effet, qui a remarqué le premier la présence des distigmai et en a mis en relief la valeur de « critique textuelle ». Mais il a voulu m'associer plus étroitement à son travail et je lui en suis reconnaissant. Comme il n'avait pu participer au Colloque, j'y ai présenté, de manière favorable, sa découverte et l'interprétation qu'il en tire. Après quoi, comme il avait approfondi la recherche, toujours avec ma collaboration technique, et préparé un second article, je lui ai proposé de le publier dans le cadre des Actes, encore une fois sous nos deux noms, puisque notre collaboration s'était poursuivie et se poursuit encore, avec des interruptions dues à des circonstances d'ordre personnel, étrangères à la recherche elle-même. De 2001 à aujourd'hui, stimulé par la lecture des différentes contributions au Colloque, j'ai eu le temps de réfléchir aux considérations et interprétations

<sup>122</sup> Based on the index of NT passages in papyri in P. W. COMFORT – D. P. BARRETT, *The Text*, p. 5-10.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. S. PISANO, "The Text", p. 33-41, = "The Vaticanus", above, p. 85-97; P. B. PAYNE, "Fuldensis", p. 251, n. 38; P. B. PAYNE – P. CANART, "The Originality", p. 111-112.

d'ordre codicologique et historique que pourraient susciter les découvertes de Philip Payne. Cette pause de réflexion m'a inspiré quelques remarques, qui coïncident en partie avec celles que j'avais émises au Colloque en mon nom personnel. J'ai cru utile de les présenter ici, après les avoir soumises à Philip Payne. Elles n'ont d'autre prétention que d'encourager des réflexions et des discussions ultérieures.

Le lecteur de notre contribution aura fait le départ entre les faits (présence des distigmai ; phénomène des décharges d'encre « en miroir » ; corrélation très nette entre distigmai et variantes textuelles) et leur interprétation. Mais, selon Payne, tous les indices convergent vers l'explication suivante. Au moment de l'exécution du manuscrit et après que celui-ci eut reçu une reliure au moins provisoire, le copiste ou un de ses collègues du *scriptorium* a ajouté en plusieurs fois une série de distigmai ; celles-ci marquent des endroits du texte qui présentent des variantes ; le copiste a dû puiser ces données dans plusieurs manuscrits-modèles qu'il avait à sa disposition, ce qui montre qu'il travaillait dans un *scriptorium* important. Il est peu probable que ce travail de collation ait été prolongé ou repris dans la suite, par exemple par le copiste qui a retracé le texte. Certes, pour cette opération, le « retraceur » n'a pas procédé de manière mécanique, puisqu'il a évité de reproduire les dittographies du copiste original et introduit des changements d'ordre orthographique et textuel. Mais, s'agissant des distigmai, on peut se demander s'il a fait autre chose que les repasser, sans en comprendre la signification<sup>124</sup>, mais avec une fidélité matérielle assez poussée, sinon parfaite<sup>125</sup>.

L'explication qui vient d'être résumée laisse la porte ouverte à plusieurs réflexions. Une première serait celle-ci. Ceux qui ne croiraient pas à la valeur de « critique textuelle » des distigmai devraient proposer une autre explication à leur présence ; personnellement, je n'en vois pas. Ceci dit, tant

<sup>124</sup> Le cas du « triple point » relevé par Payne en marge de I Ioh. 5,7 et étudié par lui avec grande ingéniosité pourrait constituer une exception, si l'intervention était due au « retraceur » ; mais cela n'est pas certain. Sur cette opération de retraçage, cf. ci-dessus, p. 219-222.

<sup>125</sup> On ne peut s'empêcher de faire cette réflexion : que le « retraceur » du texte se soit soumis à un travail épuisant (surtout si l'opération se situe une époque où la majuscule biblique n'était plus pratiquée que sous une forme très dégradée) pour faciliter la lecture, il faut bien l'admettre. Mais pousser le scrupule jusqu'à repasser une quantité de distigmai sans en soupçonner au moins l'intérêt, n'est-ce pas incroyable ? Et P. Andrist me fait remarquer : « il existe des cas où les distigmai correspondent à du texte non repassé. Il semble difficile de croire qu'après un certain nombre de ces occurrences, le repasseur n'ait pas fait le rapport entre les deux choses et compris à quoi servaient les distigmai ». Bref, il faudrait soumettre à un examen plus approfondi les interventions du « retraceur ».

le phénomène lui-même que les explications qu'on en donne appellent encore un supplément d'enquête<sup>126</sup>: un examen attentif de toutes les distigmai et leur confrontation avec tous les lieux variants attestés par la tradition pourraient confirmer ou nuancer les statistiques et les conclusions de Payne.

Une autre réflexion est celle d'un codicologue s'efforçant de se représenter concrètement les étapes de la confection et de l'utilisation du codex B. A qui pouvait concrètement servir le travail de collation marqué par les distigmai ? En l'absence de tout « mode d'emploi », n'était-il pas réservé à l'auteur des distigmai ? Celui-ci avait-il en vue un travail de recension ou d'exégèse du texte, pour lequel les distigmai constituaient une sorte d'aide-mémoire ? Cela ne paraît guère s'accorder avec le caractère de copie de luxe que présente le codex B, et encore moins avec la thèse soutenue par T. Skeat, pour laquelle je conserve un faible. Bref, il ne me semble pas qu'on ait dit le dernier mot sur les circonstances dans lesquelles fut produit le codex B.

#### RÉSUMÉ

L'examen des 51 distigmai marginales du *Codex Vaticanus*, écrites à l'encre originale, confirme les preuves statistiques déterminantes, selon lesquelles les distigmai signalent des variantes textuelles. Selon le test statistique du chi carré, les chances que les distigmai et les variantes textuelles soient indépendantes les unes des autres sont inférieures à une pour 10'000. Les décharges d'encre que certaines distigmai ont laissées sur la page opposée montrent que les distigmai ont été ajoutées après la reliure du volume, ou du moins après la couture des cahiers concernés. Sur une même page, on trouve parfois des distigmai qui ont laissé des décharges d'encre et, plus bas, des distigmai qui n'en ont pas laissé. Cela indique que le scribe du *Vaticanus* a systématiquement comparé le texte avec d'autres manuscrits, l'un après l'autre. Cela permet aussi d'expliquer la diversité des traditions textuelles représentées par les variantes textuelles des lignes signalées par des distigmai en encre originale.

Il en résulte quatre conséquences cruciales pour la critique textuelle :  
 (1) C'est une confirmation que le copiste du *Codex Vaticanus* était conscient de l'existence de variantes textuelles et de l'importance de les noter.  
 (2) C'est un argument en faveur de l'idée que le copiste du *Vaticanus* désirait préserver la forme textuelle la plus proche possible de la forme originale.

<sup>126</sup> C'est bien ce que Payne et moi sommes en train de faire. Le retard pris n'est dû qu'à moi.

(3) Ces distigmai ouvrent une lucarne sur l'histoire du texte antérieur au *Vaticanus*, même pour les passages pour lesquels aucun ancien papyrus n'a survécu. Sur les 51 distigmai en encre originale, 20 se trouvent dans des passages pour lesquels aucun ancien papyrus n'a été conservé. (4) La grande proportion de variantes textuelles avérées dans des lignes marquées par des distigmai, comparée aux variantes des lignes sans distigmai, fournit une base statistique suffisante pour conclure que la majorité des variantes à disposition du copiste du *Vaticanus* a survécu dans les manuscrits conservés. L'importance de cette découverte est renforcée par la diversité des traditions textuelles des variantes signalées par des distigmai en encre originale, et par l'antiquité démontrée du/des texte(s) dont le *Vaticanus* dépend. Cette découverte renforce l'assurance que le texte du NT a été fidèlement préservé depuis les anciens manuscrits à disposition du copiste du *Vaticanus* jusqu'aujourd'hui. (Traduction P. A.)