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Prolegomena

The 27th Nestle-Aland hand edition of the New Testament is without doubt an extraordinary achievement, as are its many predecessors. As has sometimes been remarked, however, it does have certain flaws, and it is the purpose of the present article to identify and attempt to rectify one of these flaws. It is unfair, however, to single out Nestle-Aland, as the problem under discussion here is shared with other NT hand editions, such as the UBS and SBL texts. The issue to be addressed in this article is that of the presentation of the titles of the four gospels in the main text of the Novum Testamentum Graece as well as in its apparatus criticus. See also the Additional Note on NA28.

The Nestle-Aland Titles

The problems with the presentation of titles in Nestle-Aland boil down to six, sometimes overlapping, elements.

First, information provided about gospel titles in NA27 is confined to the opening titles. Modern readers of course expect that a title will be provided at the beginning of a work, but this was not necessarily true in antiquity. Ancient book titles often appeared at the end of a text. Having discussed the placement of titles in rolls, Schubart notes in re early codices: ‘Wie dort [sc. in the roll], steht auch hier [sc. in the codex] der Hauptitel am Ende des Textes …’. The situation is actually more complicated than Schubart suggests, but, all the same, end-titles are very significant, and at least just as common, probably even more common than opening titles. In her study of rolls and codices of

---

2 W. Schubart, Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern, Berlin/Leipzig 1921, 139.
3 See C. Wendel, Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des Vorderen Orients, Halle 1949, 27, discusses a passage in Dio Chrysostom about authors writing their names both at the beginning and at the end of a work (Or. 53,9–10) and another in Augustine who reports that he did not see the title of Jerome’s work at the beginning of the codex ut adsolet (Ep. 40,2 [CSEL 34,71]). This passage of course attests to both what Augustine was familiar with, but also the opposite.
epic poetry, Schironi poses the question: ‘Why are end-titles far more common than beginning-titles?’ In NA27 copious information is provided about subscript titles and colophons to the Pauline letters with Hebrews, but there is no information in the apparatus about any of the subscriptions to the gospels (or other NT books). More understandable is the lack of reference to other titles, such as running headers, which have been little studied. There are in fact a number of locations in which titles may appear: (i) on a flyleaf, i.e. on a page of its own; (ii) an opening title above or at the beginning of the text of the particular gospel; (iii) in a list of the contents of a codex, or in the title of a kephalaia or capitula list, or in the title of an argumentum; (iv) as a running title, at the top of a page (or across an opening) more or less consistently through a manuscript of a gospel; (v) as a subscriptio at the end of a gospel: this too might be subdivided into the end-title tout simple, and those titles which appear in longer colophons (see e.g. on Codex Bezae below). This clarification of terminology is important, in particular because (ii), (iii) and (iv) are sometimes lumped together under the heading of superscriptiones or inscriptiones (superscriptions/ Überschriften), even though their position in the manuscript often dictates a different form of the title: where a manuscript has an introductory title in the longer form (e.g. ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον), for example, the running header may still appear in the shorter form (e.g. κατα μαθθαιον), as in Codex Bezae. Henceforth, the word “title” will be used indiscriminately to refer to any of the above, whereas if a particular location is in view, this will be specified.

A second, and related question is that of how the inscriptiones in NA27 are reconstructed or identified. Leaving aside mistakes about particular readings in manuscripts, there is one instance of a problematic method, namely where evidence for an opening title is derived from a subscript title: in NA27’s “Variae Lectiones Minores” (Appendix 2), it is noted that the reading ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην is assigned to “(A)” in parenthesis because the inscriptio has been reconstructed or transferred “e subscriptione”. This practice of reconstructing the opening title with a post-script title may not be legitimate (because the form of a title can vary according to its placement), nor is this practice carried out consistently.

5 Some reference is made in the appendix to NA27, as we will see below.
7 See e.g. the use of inscriptio for both opening and running titles in C. Tischendorf, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, Leipzig 1843, 11*.
Thirdly, another matter which relates to the appendix of the *variae lectiones minores* is a small inconsistency in how different hands are treated in the NA²⁷ apparatus. One can compare here the presentation of the *inscriptio* of John’s gospel. The evidence from Washingtoniensis is given as ‘Ws’ and that of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus as ‘(§ B)’. The parenthesis calls for consultation of Appendix 2, which indicates writing ‘secunda manu’. Most readers will take all this to mean that the W evidence is solid, but that of § and B less secure: they are after all placed in brackets and indicated as coming from a second hand. In fact the opposite is the case, although one cannot really find this out from Nestle-Aland alone. As we shall see, the “second hand” in § is part of the original scriptorium, and the same is probably true of B, whereas Ws postdates the original writing of Washingtonianus perhaps by three or four centuries. The present article will attempt to remedy such complex matters by presenting the data about the hands in as rational a manner as possible without compromising clarity.

Fourthly, each *inscriptio* is printed in the form ‘ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ’ etc. This placement of half-parentheses around the title may have the effect of leading unwary students, many of whom have no knowledge of textual criticism, to doubt the textual security of the title *in toto*, whereas in fact all that is in question is whether this shorter title should be prefaced by ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ. This is not a point at which the editors can be at all blamed, but there is a simpler – and less potentially misleading – way of presenting the data, which we shall explore below.

Fifthly, the versional evidence is presented rather erratically. Sometimes modern editions are cited rather than particular manuscripts, and moreover individual manuscripts are cited which are of little text-critical importance. Sometimes when particular versions are cited, the manuscript base – or the rationale for it – is unclear, though again this is by no means a problem specific to Nestle-Aland. The titles in the versions are little studied, as can be seen also from the broader literature such as the recent work of Hengel and Petersen, which make little refererence to the titles in non-Greek manuscripts.

Finally, we will see below that there is reason to wonder whether Nestle-Aland and the other hand editions are justified in printing the titles in their shorter (κατὰ κτλ.) rather than their longer (ευαγγελιον κατὰ κτλ.) forms.

---


10 Hengel makes some reference to the Latin tradition; see the discussion of the Latin evidence below.
Aim

The present article aims to rectify these difficulties as much as possible, in two distinct stages.

First, the various titles of the gospels in the earliest manuscripts will be set out systematically (§ 1: Greek; § 2: Latin; § 3: Syriac; § 4: Coptic). This has not to my knowledge yet been done, and so it is hoped that a convenient reference point will encourage greater attention to the gospel titles. All gospel manuscripts very likely to predate 500 CE which have titles are included. The focus here is on continuous gospel manuscripts, and so excluded are gospel titles on amulets and other miscellaneous texts, as well as patristic citations, canon lists and stichometries, which would be tasks in themselves. The reason for the cut-off point of 500 CE is partly pragmatic and partly rational: pragmatic, because extending the terminus by a further century would multiply the number of manuscripts beyond what would be possible to discuss in an article; rational because the subject of debate, viz. what is printed in

---

11 The manuscript evidence for the titles has generally been considered in brief compass by others. S. Petersen, Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons, ZNW 97 (2006) 250–274, touches upon the titles in Greek manuscripts (253–255) in the course of a larger discussion of their origin. The most extensive discussions of the origin of the titles are those of M. Hengel, of which the largest is now his Die Evangelienüberschriften, in: idem, Kleine Schriften. V. Jesus und die Evangelien (WUNT 211), Tübingen 2007, 526–567, an expanded and updated version of a publication of the same name from 1984. The most extensive description is Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 10–22, which is focused on the Greek and Latin evidence; although in need of correction and supplementation, Parker’s study is invaluable on the Latin evidence where so few facsimiles are available. D.C. Aune, The Meaning of Εὐαγγέλιον in the Inscriptiones of the Canonical Gospels, in: E. Mason (ed.), A Teacher for All Generations, in: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam, Leiden 2012, 857–882, is helpful on the wider question in its own title, but is inaccurate and incomplete on the manuscripts (e.g. on A C D W).

12 See B.M. Metzger, The Early Versions of the New Testament, Oxford 1977, for the fact that no manuscripts survive for this period from the other versions. The closest is the Gothic version, whose oldest witness the Codex Argenteus might date to the fifth century, but this is far from certain. See R. Gryson, La version gotique des Évangiles: Essai de réévaluation’, RTL 21 (1990) 3–31 (6 and n. 7.20–21), giving a date ‘à la fin du Vᵉ s. ou au début du VIᵉ s’ (21).


14 Hengel, Evangelienüberschriften (see n. 11), and Petersen, Evangelienüberschriften (see n. 11), have surveyed the patristic evidence.
Nestle-Aland, is based almost exclusively on the manuscripts from this earlier period.\textsuperscript{15}

Following this (in § 5), the titles as they appear in these manuscripts will be analysed for (a) the purpose of reconstructing what might be the Ausgangstext or initial text of the superscript and subscript titles, and therefore (b) how they might best be presented in a hand edition like that of Nestle-Aland. This will involve the assessment of all the evidence for the titles. The main argument of this article is that the evidence for the inscriptiones containing the longer form of the titles has been underestimated, and that the longer forms should also be reproduced in hand editions in subscriptiones.

\textit{Presentation}

Each sub-section heading in this article will present for each manuscript the gospel contents in the order in the manuscript, the number of columns per page (which is relevant to where titles are located), and the date (e.g.: Π 66 – Jn – 1 col. – late ii–early iii); discussion of the texts of the gospel titles in every place where these appear is accompanied, where relevant, with treatment of the question of when the titles were included relative to the copying of the main body of the text. Text in scriptio continua is printed here in §§ 1–4 continuously, with line divisions also marked, though in the later analysis (§ 5) word divisions will be introduced, line divisions will be removed, and abbreviated forms restored. Within each section, manuscripts are treated in chronological order (as far as this is known).

1. The Greek Manuscript Evidence

1.1. Π 66 – Jn – 1 col. – late ii–early iii\textsuperscript{16}

For the sake of argument here, we will take Π 66 as the earliest manuscript witness to a title, though the fly-leaf associated with the Π 4 fragments is just as strong a contender, as is perhaps Π 75. The only title of any kind which survives is the introductory title to John’s gospel, indented at the very top of the surviving text: ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην.\textsuperscript{17} It is probably written in the

\textsuperscript{15} One might also note the analogy of Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 17–20, who discusses similar evidence up to 500 CE.


\textsuperscript{17} It is possible that there is an apostrophe between the two gamma in ευαγγελιον. There does not seem to be a diaeresis on the iota in John’s name (though cf. ιωανης in 1.6).
same hand as the main body of the text, though was perhaps added later as it might not be part of the natural layout of the page.\textsuperscript{18}

1.2 Paris, Suppl. gr. 1120 i 3/ ? \(\text{P}^4\) Fragment E – Mt. – (1 col.) – late ii–early iii\textsuperscript{19}

This manuscript is a flyleaf simply containing the title \(\varepsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\iota\nu\nu\) | \(\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\alpha\theta\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\). The reason for the unusual designation of the manuscript here is that while the fragment has sometimes been included as a part of \(\text{P}^4\) (fragments of Luke), it is not usually so.\textsuperscript{20} (For convenience, I will refer to it below as \(\text{P}^4\).) The reason it is neglected is perhaps because the fragment is taken not to contain continuous text of the NT, although scholars (including Kurt Aland) invariably state that it was a fly-leaf or title page prefaces the text of Matthew’s gospel: as such it was clearly intended as part of a continuous NT text. (It is too big to be an amulet, for example.) It is a significant fragment in that it is the earliest manuscript title of Matthew’s gospel, and yet has never been mentioned as a witness to the title in the standard hand-editions of the NT.

1.3 \(\text{P}^75\) – Lk-Jn – 1 col. – early iii\textsuperscript{21}

This papyrus fragment provides two titles, because folio 44\(r\) has the end of Luke and the beginning of John. The subscription to Luke’s gospel begins on the line following the end of the main body: \(\varepsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\iota\nu\nu\) | \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\) | \(\lambda\omicron\upsilon\kappa\alpha\nu\), after which there are 2–3 blank lines followed by the introductory title \(\varepsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\iota\nu\nu\) | \(\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\omega\alpha\nu\tau\nu\). There is no reason to suppose that these titles were not written by the original hand after finishing Luke and before commencing John: ‘Le titre final de Luc et le titre initial de Jean, séparés par un vide de quelques lignes sur la même page, sont de la main du copiste du reste du texte’.\textsuperscript{22} A number of the pages are sufficiently well preserved at the top to make it tolerably clear that there are no running headers.

\textsuperscript{18} Martin, Papyrus Bodmer II (see n. 16), 21.
\textsuperscript{19} For further information, including plate and transcription, see S.J. Gathercole, The Earliest Manuscript Title of Matthew’s Gospel (BnF Suppl. gr. 1120 ii 3 / ? \(\text{P}^4\)), NT 54 (2012) 209–235. I examined the manuscript at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (7.ii.2012), and am very grateful to Christian Förstel, the curator of Greek manuscripts, for his kind assistance.
\textsuperscript{20} K. Aland labels the fragment as part of \(\text{P}^4\) in two places: Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II, NTS 12 (1965/66) 193–210, here 193–194, and Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes, Berlin 1967, 108; see also C. Astruc / M.-L. Concasty (eds.), Catalogue des manuscrits grecs. Troisième partie: Le supplément grec III, Paris 1960, 241 (§ 1120); Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 11, calls it “\(\text{P}^4\) (Fragment C)”.
\textsuperscript{22} Martin/Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIV (see n. 21), 14.

1.4 Π sixty-two – Mt. – 2 rows (bilingual) – early (?) iv

Π sixty-two has suffered neglect similar to that of Π thirty-four. The codex consists of Mt 11,25–30 and Dan 3,50–55 in Greek and (Akhmimic) Coptic, with an initial title page as follows:

[π]γαλα[γ]αξι]ον
[πα]λαμαλιος

[ευαγγελιον
[καταμαθθαιον?] twenty-four

The difficulties here are twofold. In the first place, despite the fact that the text is presented above as Coptic followed by Greek, it is not certain that this is the correct order. The scribe’s Greek and Coptic hands are the same. The other evidence goes in both directions: one might much more readily expect the nominative form μαθαυς after κατα in Coptic than in Greek; against this, however, is the fact that the order of the text of Mt 11,25–30 is Greek first and then Coptic, which would lead one to expect that the Greek title came first as well. The form of μαθαυς probably outweighs this latter consideration, however, and so Amundsen’s order – as presented above – is probably correct. If this is right, a further complication with the Greek title is the fact that the second ευαγγελιον is very poorly preserved and the second “according to Matthew” not at all: it does seem very unlikely, however, that the attribution was not present in the original text. Although it is the title of an excerpted text, it would be unreasonable to leave it out of a discussion of the earliest titles.

---

23 The information here is derived from L. Amundsen, Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection, SO 24 (1945) 121–147. Amundsen remarks on a date in the ‘earlier part’ of the fourth century on p. 129.

24 Amundsen, Christian Papyri (see n. 23), 121, prints:

[π]γαλα[γ]αξι]ον
[πα]λαμαλιος

[ευαγγελιον
[καταμαθθαιον?] twenty-four

25 Amundsen, Christian Papyri (see n. 23), 128.
1.5. Codex Sinaiticus (01 ℅) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 4 cols – iv

Codex Sinaiticus is often said to be the “oldest bible”, though this distinction may belong to Codex Vaticanus. Because a quire is missing, Matthew’s gospel begins with no introduction. There is no special superscript title, but there is a header centralised on the page: καταμαθθαιον. Because of its position, this title looks more like a running header than an opening title (compared with the other opening titles in the gospels). After καταμαθθαιον on each of the first three pages, it then appears on each opening, with some occasional variation. There is no subscript title for Matthew, which is unusual for Sinaiticus. At the beginning of Mark, κατα μαρκον is written specifically at the top of the first column, where Mark begins (rather than across the whole page, so clearly not a running header). There follow two openings with κατα μαρκον across each, after which the pattern is to place the running title on alternate openings. At the end, Mark has a subscript title over three lines, written ευαγ'γε | λιον | καταμαρκον. At the top of the next column is καταλουκαν above the beginning of the third gospel. The same pattern of running headers appears here.

---

26 I am very grateful for the assistance of Dr. Gunn Haaland, Keeper of the papyrus collection in the University of Oslo Library and Director of the Oslo Papyri Electronic System (OPES) project.


29 For a more detailed summary, see Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 21.
as in Mark, with the title κατά λουκαν on alternate openings. The subscript title is ευαγγελιον | καταλουκαν, with the round letters (ε and ο) written extremely small. The same pattern as in Luke appears again in John: initial title κατα ιωαννην, thereafter the header κατα ιωαννην across alternate openings. At the end comes the subscript title ευαγγελιον | κατα | ιωαννην, with minute ε and ο. Nestle-Aland is right that the superscript titles derive from a second hand rather than from Scribe A, but this (and the fact that in the apparatus the ο is thus placed in parentheses) is potentially misleading to the unwary since the superscriptions were added by Scribe D who was part of the original scriptorium team\(^\text{30}\), and indeed ‘probably in charge’.\(^\text{31}\) The subscript titles for Luke and probably John were written by the original hand (Scribe A)\(^\text{32}\), whereas Scribe D wrote Mark’s and possibly (so Tischendorf) John’s.\(^\text{33}\)

1.6. Codex Vaticanus (03 B) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 3 cols. – iv\(^\text{34}\)

Codex Vaticanus is probably the most consistent of all the great uncial manuscripts in its presentation of titles. The codex is written by two scribes: Hand A copied Gen. 46.28 – 1 Reigns 19.11 and Psalms to Tobit, and Hand B copied 1 Reigns 19.11 – 2 Esdras, Hosea – Daniel and the New Testament.\(^\text{35}\) Milne and Skeat are clear that the subscript titles in the gospels are the work of the original scribe, Hand B.\(^\text{36}\) The opening titles are a more complicated matter, and they are marked in NA\(^\text{27}\) as belonging to a second hand. As in the case of Codex Sinaiticus above, however, this may give a wrong impression, for it seems very likely that the opening titles are part of the original project, deriving from the work of the scriptorium which produced the codex. The complexity derives in part from the lack of research into the scribes of Codex Vaticanus (at least by


\(^{31}\) Parker, Codex Sinaiticus (see n. 28), 65. As is frequently noted, D corrects the work of, for example, A, but is not himself corrected.

\(^{32}\) Parker, Codex Sinaiticus (see n. 28), 73.

\(^{33}\) Lake, Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus (see n. 30), xx (where the argument is also made for a single scribe as the source of the superscriptions); T.C. Skeat, The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine, JThS 50 (1999) 583–625, here 603. The subscriptio to Mark and the opening title to Luke are written by Scribe D (and therefore are still part of the original production) on a cancel leaf (Jongkind, Scribal Habits [see n. 27], 45–46).


\(^{36}\) Milne/Skeat, Appendix I: Scribes of the Codex Vaticanus (see n. 35), 88.
comparison with the extensive work done on \( \aleph \), and in part from an objective difficulty: most of the text of Vaticanus (including the titles) was reinked in the tenth or eleventh century making the original text underneath harder to read.\(^37\)

Nevertheless, there is a factor which strongly suggests that the superscript titles are part of the original production.\(^38\) Milne and Skeat had remarked that ‘in the lines framing the subscriptions [Hand] A never uses the tailed bar \( \bowtie \).’\(^39\)

(In fact, this sometimes more closely resembles a \( \tau \).) One can add to their observation a point about the superscript titles, namely a distinctive feature which conversely Hand A uses in the lines framing the superscriptions but which Hand B does not. In the earlier books of the Old Testament, copied by Hand A, the opening titles are frequently framed (as Milne and Skeat say of the subscriptions) with lines, and especially in the longer named books, this involves three pairs of lines, roughly as follows:

- - -
\[\varepsilon \xi o\delta o\varsigma\]
- - -

Frequently, however, in these books up to 1 Reigns, a wavy line or tilde shape is employed in the middle:

- ~ -
\[\alpha \rho i \theta \mu o\]
- ~ -

Notably, this practice disappears during Hand B’s first section (1 Reigns – 2 Esdras), but then reappears in Hand A’s next chunk (e.g. in the opening titles of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and *Wisdom of Solomon*). On both of these points (in re the tailed bar/\( \tau \), and the wavy line) it is not necessary to assume that the superscriptions are the works of Hands A and B, though this may well be the case. The alternative, however, is that the addition of the opening titles was carried out by others in co-ordination with the work of the two copyists. Even on this latter model, then, the natural conclusion is that the opening titles were executed in the scriptorium when the codex was produced.\(^40\)

Coming to the wording of the titles, slightly indented (almost centralised) in the first column of the first New Testament page (p. 1235) is the superscript

\(^{37}\) For this date, see D.C. Parker, Art. Codex Vaticanus, ABD I, 1074–1075, here 1074.
\(^{38}\) Mai refers to the later corrections of the spelling of Matthew’s name as ‘2. manu’ / ‘2. m.’, which may indicate that he thought the inscriptio and subscriptio to have belonged to the first hand. A. Mai (ed.), Novum Testamentum Graecum ex antiquissimo Codice Vaticano, New York 1859, 1.64.
\(^{39}\) Milne/Skeat, ‘Appendix I: Scribes of the Codex Vaticanus’ (see n. 35), 87.
\(^{40}\) Cf. on Genesis and Revelation, it is noted in T.C. Skeat, The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifth Century, JThS 35 (1984) 454–465, here 458: ‘The scribe was clearly instructed to leave some lines blank at the beginnings of Genesis and the Apocalypse for the insertion of titles, which he certainly did not execute himself’.

Thereafter, the same form of the title spans each opening (as with all the running headers, the words are centralised in the central column). Matthew finishes in the middle of the second column of page 1277 (the 43rd NT page), after which the scribe writes, centralised: καταμαθθαιον. Mark thus begins in the third column of that page, and the scribe writes there, centralised in the third column, καταμαρκον. Thereafter καταμαρκον spans each opening as a running title, and the scribe adds the subscription καταμαρκον. The same applies to Luke (καταλουκαν at the beginning, then across openings, and then καταλουκαν at the end on a single line) and John (καταϊωανην at the beginning, then across openings, and then καταϊωανην at the end).

1.7. Codex Bezae (05 D) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 1 col. – iv–v

Codex Bezae contains the gospels in the Western order. The bilingual text has facing Greek and Latin pages. It is perhaps the most chaotic of all the great uncial manuscriptsptions of titles, which are all the work of the original scribe, and appear in alternating red and black ink. Through no fault of its own, however, the codex’s beginning is missing, and so we have no opening title for Matthew, but we do have running headers, which are spelled or abbreviated in a variety of ways: καταμαθθαιον, κατμαθθαιον, καταμαθθεον, κατμαθθ, and καμαθθ, with some pages omitting headers altogether. Rather than having a separate subscript title at the end of Matthew, it has a colophon announcing the conclusion of Matthew and the beginning of John: ευαγγελιονκαταμαθθαιονετελεσθηαρχεταιευαγγελιονκαταϊωανην. There is a title at the top of John (καταϊωανην, or καταϊωανην), but in the same (shorter) form as the running titles, and it may well have been simply a routine page heading rather than a deliberate superscript title marking the beginning of the gospel. The variety of running headers becomes positively bewildering: καταιωαν, κατϊωανην, κατϊωαν, καταιωαν, and καταιωαν (as in Matthew, with some pages where a header is omitted). Again, at the end comes a colo-

---

41 On the strength of Parker's dating D to c. 400, I have placed D here before A and C. See Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 281.284. A probably predates C.
42 Information is derived from Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: Quattuor Evangelia et Actus apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine. Sumptibus Academiae phototypice representatus (Cambridge 1899), the CSNTM website, and an examination of the manuscript (9.ii.2012). I am extremely grateful to Dr Patrick Zutshi (Keeper of Manuscripts), Ms Jayne Ringrose (Deputy Keeper of Manuscripts) and Mr Frank Bowles (Superintendent, Manuscripts Reading Room) all of the University Library, Cambridge, for their permission and assistance.
43 See Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 22–23.
44 For a comprehensive list of D's headers, see Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 14–16.
45 See Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 11.
phon, with the same colour pattern as before: ευαγγελιον κατα | ιωανην (cf. ιωανην above) ετελεσθη | αρχεται ευαγγελιον | κατα λουκαν. The longer version of the title, ευαγγελιεν κατα λουκαν, appears again above the beginning of Luke’s text (centralised, i.e. in the same position as the running titles), and the running titles proper fluctuate unpredictably between κατα λουκ and κατα λουκαν. As before, at the end comes ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν | επεληρωθη\: (cf. ετελεσθη after John) αρχεται κατα μαρκον: the shorter title for Mark here may have appeared because the scribe did not have enough space to include ευαγγελιον in the two-line colophon; on the facing page he wrote euang secund luum explicit | incipit euang secund marcum – here again the pressures of space are evident in the abbreviation of euangelium. The full title comes at the top of Mark: ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον. The running header is usually either κατα μαρκον, or κατα μαρκ, but one also finds the fuller κατα μαρκον, and one real oddity – presumably influenced by the Latin side of the scribe’s brain – κατα μαρκον (fol. 296b)! No subscript title survives from the original copy, as the manuscript breaks off at Mark 16.15 (fol. 347b).46 Many of these inconsistencies on the Greek side are paralleled on the Latin side, as will be seen in § 2.2 below.

1.8. Codex Washingtonianus (032 W) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 1 col. – iv–v47

Codex Washingtonianus (sometimes Washingtonensis or Washingtoniensis), from the Freer biblical manuscripts, is a four-gospel codex. A date of 4th–5th century is given in the Liste, although this is sometimes contested.48 The first page of Matthew has an initial title, centralised in the header: [ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον] (cf. μαθθεος in Matt. 5:5; 14:31). The subscript title is the same except for a different spelling of Matthew’s name: ευαγγελιον κατα | μαθθεον.49 The evidence here is drawn from the CSNTM website (http://www.csntm.org/manuscript), checked against H.A. Sanders, Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection, Ann Arbor, MI 1912. Although not strictly relevant to the matter of the titles, it is perhaps worth noting that accompanying the picture of the evangelist Mark in W is + μαρκος written vertically alongside him; similarly the end of Luke’s name survives: certainly the alpha, and a trace of the sigma as well. According to C.R. Morey, The Painted Covers of the Manuscript, in: Sanders, Facsimile, vii–x, however, these are 7th–8th century.

46 The end is re-copied in a later hand, with ευαγγελιον καταμαρκον | ετελεσθη. See Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 45–49 for the argument for a ninth-century date.

47 The evidence here is drawn from the CSNTM website (http://www.csntm.org/manuscript), checked against H.A. Sanders, Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection, Ann Arbor, MI 1912. Although not strictly relevant to the matter of the titles, it is perhaps worth noting that accompanying the picture of the evangelist Mark in W is + μαρκος written vertically alongside him; similarly the end of Luke’s name survives: certainly the alpha, and a trace of the sigma as well. According to C.R. Morey, The Painted Covers of the Manuscript, in: Sanders, Facsimile, vii–x, however, these are 7th–8th century.


49 This is perhaps not so legible now as it was a century ago: H.A. Sanders, The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, London 1912, 145, printed [ευαγγελιον κατα μαθαιον, but [ευαγγελιον κατα μαθεοιον might be nearer what is now evident from the online photographs. Parker, omitting reference to ευαγγελιον, gives κατα μαθαιον (Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 12).
9.9, as also in Lk. 6.15 and Mk 3.18; in Matt. 10.3 it is ματθαίος). After Matthew comes John, at the beginning of which is a replacement quire for Jn 1,1 – 5,12a (pages 113–128 in the codex) copied by a different, perhaps eighth-century hand.50 Scribe W as he is usually called (as in the NA apparatus) is thus responsible for the initial title ευαγγελιον κατα Ἰωάννην at the beginning of John. (The other titles are all contemporaneous with the rest of the text.51) The subscript title appears in the short form, κατα Ἰωάννην. Luke has two similar longer titles, an initial title ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν, and a subscript extending over two lines, ευαγγελιον | κατα λουκαν. Mark’s gospel has ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον initially, and after W’s distinctive ending (and an άμην probably marking the end of the codex52), a subscript title, again over two lines, but this time divided ευαγγελιον κατα | μαρκον.53 There are no running headers in the codex. More than compensating for this, however, are the attractive birds in each coronis accompanying the subscript titles of Matthew, John and Luke.54

1.9. Codex Alexandrinus (02 A) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 2 cols. – v55

In Codex Alexandrinus, the titles are not necessarily all executed by the scribes as they go along, though they are part of the original production of the codex.56 Matthew’s Gospel is missing its first twenty-five leaves, but in what survives, there are running headers which carry not the title of the gospel, but the kepalaia or capitula. At the end of the gospel we do find a title, after a line-long pattern and elaborate drawing: ευαγγελιον | κατα μαρκον ευαγγελιουαι | περιοχαι (all in scriptio continua, in the same hand as the subscriptio to Matthew), introducing the list of capitula. Then there is a superscript at the very top (some way above where the columns of text begin) of the next page above the beginning of Mark’s gospel,

50 J.R. Royse, The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex, in: Hurtado (ed.), Freer Biblical Manuscripts (see n. 48), 185–226, here 186. Cf. the remark of Sanders that these leaves ‘seem to be earlier’ (Facsimile [see n. 47], v).
51 Sanders, Facsimile (see n. 47), v; L.W. Hurtado, Introduction, in: idem (ed.), Freer Biblical Manuscripts (see n. 48), 1–15, here 8. The birds (see above) are obvious evidence of a particular consistency in the colophons for the first three gospels in the codex.
52 Hurtado, Introduction (see n. 51), 9.
53 There is a further, much later colophon after the subscript title.
54 Noted in Hurtado, Introduction (see n. 51), 8.
55 The data here is taken from The Codex Alexandrinus. In Reduced Photographic Facsimile, London 1909.
56 See H.J.M. Milne / T.C. Skeat, Appendix II: Scribes of the Codex Alexandrinus, in: idem, Scribes and Correctors (see n. 35), 91–93. They clearly assume the contemporaneity of the colophons and the main text (they use them to distinguish between the hands), and there is no reason from the appearance of the script to assume that the opening titles of Mark and Luke are from a later period.
and stretching across the whole first column (the first column of the front of leaf 30):

\[\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaα \tauα \muαρκ\nu\]

Thereafter come running headers consisting of capitula again (e.g. \(\alphaρνησις \piετρου\) in col. 2 of the front of leaf 41), with sometimes more than one in the header because of the length of the columns. Finally, at the end of the gospel after a line of patterning there is a subscript title spread over five lines of diminishing length: \(\varepsilonυαγγελιον | \kappaατα | \muαρ | \kο | \nu\). Luke’s gospel begins (at the start of leaf 43) similarly, with a capitula list to which is appended \(\tauουκαταλου | \κανευαγγε | \λιουτακε | \φαλαισ\). At the top of the next leaf, stretching across almost the whole length of the page (spanning both columns, unlike the Mark title above) is widely spaced:

\[\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaατα \lambdaουκαν\]

Again at the end of the gospel, following a pattern filling a line and an elaborate drawing, the subtitle \(\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaατα\lambdaουκαν\) is written. With John we also have a capitula list (beginning at leaf 66), though a rather more modest one (only 18 capitula by comparison with 48 in Mark and 83 in Luke), and with no equivalent to \(\tauου \kατα \ldots \varepsilonυαγγελιον \alphaι \περιο\chiαι / \kεφαλαια\). The paratextual material is generally less extensive in John: there is no superscript title at the commencement of the gospel, and no running capitula either. A title does appear at the end of the gospel, where we find, in a box, \(\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaατα \ιωαννη\).

1.10. Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (04 C) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 1 col. – v

The most neglected of the great uncials is the palimpsest, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, whose gospel text survives underneath Greek text of Ephraem. Here, the superscript titles to Matthew and Luke are not mentioned by Nestle-Aland; Parker omits those of Luke and John. Once the text has been restored to its original order, the title \(\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaατα\muατ\θαιον\) (as in A, the tau-theta spelling) appears at the beginning. There is no list of capitula, and no running headers; since the extant text concludes at Matt. 28.14, the ending where there may have been a subscriptio is lost. The loss extends into the beginning of Mark as well, so there is no opening title. Again, as for all four gospels, there are no running headers, but there is a subscript title, centralised and in scriptio continua: \(\varepsilonυαγγελιον \kappaατα\muαρκ\kappaα\). Luke’s gospel begins with a capitula

---

57 Data from Tischendorf, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus (see n. 7). R.W. Lyon, A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, NTS 5 (1958/59) 260–272, here 264, provides very helpful details of some of the subscript titles. I examined the manuscript at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (7.ii.2012), and am very grateful to Christian Förstel, the curator of Greek manuscripts, for his kind assistance.

58 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 12: ‘C has only one heading extant’.
list, preceded by the heading: τουκαταλουκαν ευαγγελιου τακεφαλαια, followed by no fewer than eighty capitula. The beginning of Luke has the title ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν, and a subscriptio with the same wording, except in scriptio continua: ευαγγελιονκαταλουκαν. John’s gospel comes with a similar pattern, although there is no title connected to the capitula (which are in any case very incomplete, numbering only 15). The superscript title is ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην, and the subscript, when restored, is the same: ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην. This difference in form of the subscript title (going over two lines, unlike Mark’s and Luke’s) is one factor which leads Lyon to wonder whether a different scribe has copied John.\(^59\) As is clear from this remark, he sees the subscript titles as by the main scribe: I have seen no reason to dispute this having examined the manuscript, and the different subscript to John might be easily explicable as a flourish at the end of the four gospels.

2. The Evidence of Latin Manuscripts

As Tertullian implies, translations of parts of the Bible were made into Latin already in the second century (Adv. Marc. 2.9). The present form of the Old Latin text, however, ‘cannot be traced back beyond the time of Cyprian of Carthage’.\(^60\) Of the Old Latin Gospel manuscripts recently surveyed by Burton, fourteen can be dated to the fifth century or earlier, of which ten give evidence relevant here.\(^61\) In addition are two early Vulgate manuscripts from the fifth century. Some problems have attended use of Latin titles, such as insufficient care in representing them (see e.g. scholars’ corrections of each other sub 2.1 and 2.3 below), the varieties of OL manuscripts employed in printed editions of the New Testament\(^62\), and mention of the OL tradition en bloc, rather than with sensitivity to the various different texts.\(^63\)

---

59 Lyon, Re-examination (see n. 57), 264.
61 Burton, Old Latin Gospels (see n. 60), 14–28. Various different dates appear in earlier editions, but those supplied in Burton represent the current communis opinio.
62 See Elliott, Old Latin Manuscripts (see n. 9), 225–248.
63 M. Hengel, Studies in the Gospel of Mark, London 1985, 66, notes: ‘The long form is also supported by the Old Latin translation’, with a footnote to Jülicher. Cf. Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 11 (‘in fact very little information is provided’ in Jülicher).
2.1. Codex Vercellensis (a = Beuron 3) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 2 cols. – iv

The first two pages of Vercellensis, which do not in any case have an inscripcion, do not date back to the fourth century. John and Luke have no titles at the beginning. A colophon survives between Luke and Mark, occupying the whole of the column to the left of the beginning of Mark (523a): euang secun | lucanum | exp [i]nc | secundum | marcum. The colophon at the end of Mark (which is again in a later hand) simply follows directly on from the main text: explicit euangelium secundum marcum. The colophons have alternating red and black lines. As far as running headers are concerned, Buchanan had remarked that: ‘In a the whole title of the three words is on each page’. Gasquet corrects this observation: ‘In no case is « the whole title of three words » written « on each page », as Mr. Buchanan has been led to suppose’. He adds in a footnote: ‘The mistake has arisen no doubt from an examination of the last 9th century page at the end of St. Mark’s Gospel where Sec. is found over one column and Marcum over the other’. Gasquet states positively: ‘At the top of the pages in minute uncials are written the titles of the Gospel: on the left hand page is secundum, secund. or sometimes sec. only; on the right Mattheum : Ioannen : Lucanum etc.’ Parker has sec and secu but not secundum (though this last does appear once in the electronic edition), with mattheum and mattheum, iohannen and iohannem, Lucanum and marcum.

2.2. Codex Bezae (d = B5) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 1 col. – iv–v

The Greek side of Codex Bezae has already been treated above (§ 1.7), and the placements and forms of the titles are very similar in the Latin half. The beginning of Matthew does not survive, and running headers to Matthew appear in the form sec matthaem/ mattheum with various abbreviations of the

---

64 Sources: A. Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis, 2 Vol. (CBLa 3), Rome 1914, including plates; P. McGurk, Latin Gospel Books from AD 400 – AD 800, Amsterdam 1961, 92; Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), and www.iohannes.org.
65 Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis I (see n. 64), 1, note ‘a’, confirmed by McGurk.
66 McGurk, Latin Gospel Books (see n. 64), 92.
67 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 13.
69 Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis I (see n. 64), xii.
70 Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis I (see n. 64), xii, n. 1.
71 Or iohannen, or iohannem, as the www.iohannes.org edition attests, and Gasquet’s own plate confirms.
72 Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis I (see n. 64), xii.
73 According to www.iohannes.org, at p. 182.
74 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 22.
75 For the text, see the facsimile, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (see n. 42), and for discussion, Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6).
evangelist’s name: matthae, matth, matt, and at one point, reflecting the same kind of bilingual interference which we saw above, μαthé (fol. 99). A colophon concludes the gospel: euangelium sec | mattheum explicit | incipit euangelium | sec iohannen in red and black. Thereafter, the first Latin pages of John are missing, and running headers are consistently sec iohan, with again an interesting Graecising exception: sec Ἰωάννης (fol. 125). The next colophon reads: euangelium secund · | iohanen explicit | incipit euangelium | sec lucan. Luke provides evidence also for additional superscript titles in the Latin which have not survived for Matthew and John, with euang sec lucan appearing above the beginning of Luke. Running headers come in the shorter form: sec lucam or sec lucan, and occasionally sec luc; Parker also rightly notes a rogue instance of sec lueam (fol. 243). At the end comes a colophon euang· secund· lucan explicit | incipit euangelium secund marcum. A further title comes at the top of Mark’s gospel proper (euang secundum marcum, with running titles thereafter in the forms sec marcum or less commonly sec marc). As noted above, the end of Mark is not extant in the original hand.77

2.3. Codex Bobsiensis (k = B1) – Mk-Mt – 1 col. – v

The order Mark-Matthew (Mk 8,8–11.14–16; 8,19 – 16,9; Mt 1,1 – 3,10; 4,2 – 14,17; 15,20–36) suggests a Gospel codex John-Luke-Mark-Matthew. Running headers euang· (or euangel· or euangelu·) cata· marc· and euang· (or euangel·) cata· matthe·79 appear across each opening, with Matthew’s name sometimes appearing by mistake above Mark’s text.80 Between the two Gospels appears a colophon, lines alternating between red and black:81 euangelium· cata· marcum· exp· incip· cata mattheum· feliciciter.82

76 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 15.
77 The (perhaps) ninth-century hand has: euangelium sec marcu | explicit.
79 The forms math· and matth· and mattheum can also be found (cf. Parker, Codex Bezae [see n. 6], 22).
80 The editors note that, in the text of Mark’s Gospel, ‘Folia 32,33 habent cata . MATTH bis lapsu’ (Wordsworth et al., Portions of the Gospels [see n. 78], 19). Turner, Re-collation (see n. 78), 89, correcting Wordsworth, adds the further instance cata matth above the text of Mark’s Gospel on fol. 1, and to this can be added fol. 26. Mark’s name appears above the text of Matthew on fol. 44.
81 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 13.
82 Sic. Before the colophon there is an enigmatic word, praedicationis, at the end of Mark (see Plate).
Here we see the first Latin instance of a fairly common pattern, in which the initial title appears in the short form, and the subscript title in the longer.

2.4. Codex Palatinus (e =B2) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 2 cols. – v

This famous manuscript, written in silver on purple vellum, is missing the beginning of Matthew and the end of Mark. The following colophons appear between the Gospels:

*secundum mattheum | explicit incipit | secundum iohannem *

*euanangelium | cata iohannem | explicit incipit | cata lucan *

There is nothing between Luke and Mark. Tischendorf remarks as follows on running headers: ‘In the upper margin the author of the Gospel is consistently noted, such that it contains what one has on the left-hand leaf, *secundum*, and on the right hand leaf, *mattheum* or *iohannem* or *lucan* or *marcum*’.

2.5. Codex Veronensis (b =B4) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 2 cols. – v

This Gospel codex, also written in silver on purple vellum, has silver and gold colophons in a form otherwise similar to those of other OL codices. The beginning of Matthew’s Gospel and the end of Mark’s Gospel do not survive, but the following are written in the relevant places:

*euan · sec · | mat · expl · | incip · sec · | iohannen · *

*euanangelium | sec · iohan · | explicit in do̅ |

*sec · luca̅ · exp · | inc · sec · marcu̅ ·*

83 The most helpful information for the present purposes appears in C. Tischendorf, Evangelium Palatinum ineditum, Leipzig 1847; H. Vogels, Evangelium Palatinum: Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelienübersetzung, Münster 1926, 1, comments that there are two columns, but provides no information about titles. See also the errata in www.iohannes.org, which in addition gives not only the Johannine information but also the incipit to Luke.

84 Tischendorf, Evangelium Palatinum ineditum (see n. 83), xii: ‘Nulla est evangeliorum subscriptio nisi simplicissima illa, quam in editione exhibuimus: explicit hoc, incipit illud.’

85 Tischendorf, Evangelium Palatinum ineditum (see n. 83), xii: ‘in superiore margine passim notatur auctor evangelii, ita ut, quod ad sinistram folium habeas, „secundum”, quod ad dextram „mattheum” sive „iohannem” sive „lucan” sive „marcum” contineat.’ This is confirmed by Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 22.

86 Information from Buchanan, Four Gospels from the Codex Veronensis (see n. 68), with Plates. The information on John has been checked against the edition at www.iohannes.org.

87 Thus Buchanan; McGurk, Latin Gospel Books (see n. 64), 93, says this colophon is ‘almost undecipherable’.
On the running headers, Buchanan comments: ‘The headlines of the Gospels are in small uncials written with severe simplicity … in b sec without euangeliun is on one page and the name of the Gospel on the opposite page’. These names are written as matthaeum, iohannen, lucan and marcun.

2.6. Codex Corbeiensis (ff2 =B8) – Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk – 2 cols. – v

The beginning is lost, with the text starting at Matt. 11.16. Buchanan’s edition helpfully sets out the text on the page in the same format as the manuscript, and also supplies some facsimiles. The codex has running headers across the openings throughout, with, for the first three Gospels, euangelium sec on the left hand page, and then matteum, iohannem and lucanum on the right hand pages. For Mark, finally, the left hand pages have euangelium and the right hand pages have sec marcun. Colophons accompany the ends/beginnings of each Gospel, as well as the capitula of Luke and Mark, and the argumentum of Luke:

euangel | secundu” | matheu” | exp · inc | euangeli” | secundu” | iohannem
euangeliu” | sec iohanne” | expl< inc< | euangeliun | secundum | lucanum | amen |
capitula euangeli | lucum

capitula euan | geli | lucan< epl< | inc eiusdem< | argumentum<
expl · ar< | gu<men | <tum< | incipit | euangeliun | secundum | marcum
expl eu< | gelium sec | lucanum | incp<capitula | euangeli< | secundum | marcum

capitula | euangeli | secundum | marcum | explicit | incipit< euan< | secundum | marcum
explicit | euangeliun | secundum | marcum
explicit | euangelium | secundum | marcum

This great array of titles is notable for the form used in the opening and ending of the capitula of Luke: capitula euangeli | lucani and capitula euan | geli | lucan<. In the former case at least, it is evident that, very unusually, the genetivus auctoris is used of the Gospel writer.

2.7. Codex Vindobonensis (i = B17) – Lk-Mk – 1 col. – v

There are no opening or closing titles, as neither the beginnings nor the ends of either Gospel survive. Belsheim notes the running titles secundum lucanum
and *secundum marcum* across openings, which are partly confirmed by the plate included with his edition.

2.8. Fragmenta Curiensia (a² = B16) – Lk – 2 cols. – v

This fragment consists merely of two leaves of Luke (11,11–29 and 13,16–34). According to the Ranke edition and as is evident from the photograph supplied with it, the header *secund> lucan·* runs across openings.

2.9. Sangallensis 1394 (n = B16) – Mt-Jn-Mk – 2 cols. – v

The striking similarities in script and format have led scholars to conclude that this manuscript is very probably from the same scriptorium as the Chur fragments (a², 2.8 above). All three gospels have running titles in the forms *secund· mattheum*, *secund· iohannen*, and *secund· marcum* spread across openings. A subscriptio at the end of Matthew also survives: *secund· mattheu· euangelium*.

2.10. Codex Claromontanus (h = B12) – Mt – 2 cols. – v

The beginning of Matthew’s gospel is missing, but there is a colophon: ‘S. Matthew ends on the first column of fol. 66 a. At the end of the column is written *euangeliu· secundum | mattheum | exp*. Headers (e.g. *secund· mattheum*) can be found across openings.

---

92 The information here is derived from E. Ranke, Ein kleiner Italafund, ThStKr 45 (1872) 505–520; idem, Curiensia Evangelii Lucani Fragmenta Latina … (Marburg 1872), reprinted as idem, Fragmenta antiquissimae evangelii Lucani versionis Latinae: E membranis Curiensibus, Vienna 1873. Of the books, the former, at least in the Cambridge University Library edition, includes a plate of a half-page (the right hand column), whereas the later edition had a full opening, where the complete running title can be seen. Cf. Wordsworth et al., Portions of the Gospels (see n. 78), xxxiv–xxxvii.

93 Excellent electronic images are available at http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/1394; cf. Wordsworth et al., Portions of the Gospels (see n. 78), 57–65 (Mt), 66–67 (Jn), 68–72 (Mk), with Plate. See also the introductory remarks of White (pp. xxiii–xxxi and 56).

94 White, in Wordsworth et al., Portions of the Gospels (see n. 78), xxxvi–xxxvii, while arguing against the identification of the two (by Batiffol) as from the same manuscript.

95 Source: J. Belsheim, Evangelium secundum Matthaueum ante Hieronymus latine translation e codice olim Claromontano nunc Vaticano, Christiania 1892; F.C. Burkitt, On Codex Claromontanus (h), JThS 4 (1903) 587–588.

96 Burkitt, Claromontanus (see n. 95), 587–588, here 588.

97 Neither Belsheim nor Burkitt mentions any running headers, but Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 20 notes that they are extant. I have found only one image (http://www.flickr.com/photos/sannikov/6355294487/in/set-72157628029825621/), which confirms Parker and contains the text noted above.
2.11. Codex Sangallensis 1395 (S) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 2 cols. – v98

As the first of two Vulgate witnesses, we can survey the evidence of what C.H. Turner published as ‘The Oldest Manuscript of the Vulgate Gospels’. Two colophons survive: the one between Matthew and Mark survives complete, but that between Luke and John is partially incomplete at the end of each line because the outer margin is lost.

euangelium | sec· mattheu̱ | expl |
text incipit | sec· marcum

euange[lium] | secund[um] | lucan e[xpl]
text incipit | secundum | iohann em

Turner notes that the running headers appear, on those occasions where the pages are preserved sufficiently, in the form secund(um) + the name of the evangelist, viz. ‘matth(eum), marc(um), lucan99, iohan(nem)’100, on alternate openings.101

2.12. Autun, Bibl. mun. 21/ BnF 1628 Nouv. acq. lat. (N) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 2 cols. – v102

On the running titles, Royet writes: ‘Au sommet des pages on lit encore sur 22 feuillets ces titles: cata math., iuxta marcũ, secundũ lucã, iuxta iohann’, in smaller script.103 The subscriptiones to Matthew and Luke, which are the only other titles to survive, are written by contrast ‘en grandes capitales’.104 Unfortunately, they are damaged, and Royet’s edition indicates that there is text missing prior to the subscriptiones to Matthew’s and Luke’s Gospels:105

[...] | iuxta ma | t[.....]m
[...] | secundum luc[...]|

As a result, the subscriptiones are not very useful for text-critical purposes, and will not be used as evidence here.

99 Might lucan, on analogy with the others, be lucan(um)?
100 Turner, Oldest Manuscript (see n. 98), xxv.
101 Parker, Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 22.
103 Royet, Un manuscrit palimpseste (see n. 102), 520 for the wording, 521 on the script of the running titles.
104 Royet, Un manuscrit palimpseste (see n. 102), 521.
105 See Royet, Un manuscrit palimpseste (see n. 102), 551, (1923) 237.
2.13. Conclusion

Elements here are clearly distinctive to Latin manuscripts, such as the *feliciciter* in Bobbiensis.¹⁰⁶ Some features on the other hand are the product of slavish reproduction of the Greek, not only in the word *euangelium* but also in the use of *cata* by e, k and N, and in the use of Greek case endings.¹⁰⁷ This is not necessarily a mark of extreme reverence, but is characteristic of manuscripts with Latin translations of Greek works.¹⁰⁸ In general terms, two differences mark the Latin manuscripts in contrast to the Greek. First, “linking” colophons, with *incipit* and *explicit*, abound in the Latin texts, and secondly, there is great consistency in the inclusion of running titles, which only appear in Χ, Β and D in the Greek tradition (and are also absent in the great many early fragments not surveyed in the Greek section above).¹⁰⁹ The Latin manuscripts are, overall, quite similar in form to one another: there is no marked difference in form between the African (Bobbiensis and Palatinus) and the European codices (the other OL mss.), nor between the OL and the Vulgate manuscripts.¹¹⁰ There are some variations, however.

The greatest consistency appears in the running headers, which are almost always in the shorter form. Only k and ff² depart from the rule here. Least regular are the opening titles, where manuscripts without *euangelium* in the *incipits* outnumber those with by 4:2. There is a much more consistent pattern in the closing titles, where all manuscripts have a longer title, although b and e also have examples in the shorter form, without *euangelium*.

3. The Evidence of Syriac Manuscripts

Syriac translation of the Gospels probably comes soon after the Latin, around the beginning of the third century.¹¹¹ The Old Syriac Gospel manuscripts most probably date to before 500 CE, as do a few Peshitta Gospel manuscripts.¹¹²

---

¹⁰⁶ See the helpful remarks on this word in R.P. Oliver, The First Medicean MS of Tacitus and the Titulature of Ancient Books, TPAPA 82 (1951) 232–261, here 256, with further examples on 238 and 252. To these can be added ms. F of Apuleius’ *De Platone*.


¹⁰⁸ See K.-E. Henriksson, Griechische Büchertitel in der Römischen Literatur, Helsinki 1956, passim.

¹⁰⁹ Running headers are the norm for manuscripts of this period, as E.A. Lowe, Some Facts about our Oldest Latin Manuscripts, CQ 19 (1925) 197–208, here 206, remarks.

¹¹⁰ One often noted difference of another kind is that by contrast to the Vulgate, OL texts tend to have the “Western” (Mt-Jn-Lk-Mk) order. See e.g. Burton, Old Latin Gospels (see n. 60), 7.


¹¹² S.P. Brock, Bible in the Syriac Tradition, Piscataway, NJ 2006, 49, refers to ‘a few’ Peshitta mss. from the fifth century.
One can make a good case for three Peshitta manuscripts originating in the fifth century, although some scholars would include more in this chronological span.\textsuperscript{113}

3.1. Syrus Sinaiticus (Sin. Syr. 30) – Mt-Mk-Lk-Jn – 2 cols. – iv–v\textsuperscript{114}

The text of this famous palimpsest begins at Matt. 1.1, but there is no inscriptio. Running headers do appear, however, though not invariably, whether as a result of scribal inconsistency or deletion or fading. These appear across openings with one word on each page, in Matthew, \textit{ܕܡܬܝܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ} (‘Gospel of Matthew’). The end of Matthew and the beginning of Mark do not survive, but Mark’s text also has running headers in the same form and place: \textit{ܕܡܪܩܘܣܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ} (‘Gospel of Mark’), across openings. A colophon comes at the end, with the same title, \textit{ܕܡܪܩܘܣܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢܫܠܡ} (‘Here ends the Gospel of Mark’), and an inscriptio marking the beginning of Luke: \textit{ܕܠܘܩܐܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ} (‘Gospel of Luke’).\textsuperscript{115} Running headers (\textit{ܕܠܘܩܐܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ}) continue, followed by an explicit for Luke (\textit{ܕܠܘܩܐܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢܫܠܡ}) and an inscriptio to John (\textit{ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢܕܝܘܚܢܢ}).\textsuperscript{116} After running headers to John in this same wording, the codex ends not with a title of John, but with a colophon to the whole \textit{tetraevangelium}. There is thus consistency in the form of the title, where –\textit{x}, rather than a closer equivalent to \textit{κατά}, is employed.

3.2. Codex Curetonianus (BM Add. 14451) – Mt-Mk-Jn-Lk – 2 cols. – v\textsuperscript{117}

The Curetonian differs from the Sinaitic not least in the order of its Gospels. Fewer titles survive. The inscriptio to Matthew is preceded by the heading of

\textsuperscript{113} In the case of Cod. syr. Phillipps 1388, A. Allgeier, Cod. syr. Phillipps 1388 und seine ältesten Perikopenvermerke, OrChr 2/6 (1916) 147–152, prefers a late fifth-century date, whereas most recently A. Juckel, A Re-examination of Codex Phillipps 1388, Hugoye. Journal of Syriac studies 6 (2003) 3–36, cites with approval the 5th–6th century view of E. Sachau, Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 1. Abtheilung, Berlin 1899, 10–15 (no. 7), who gives the inscriptiones and colophons to the manuscript (10–11), which are very similar to other Peshitta manuscripts; the date is ‘gegen Ende des 5. oder zu Anfang des 6. christlichen Jahrhunderts’ (13).


\textsuperscript{115} Bensley et alii, Four Gospels (see n. 114), 131.

\textsuperscript{116} Bensley et alii, Four Gospels (see n. 114), 232.

\textsuperscript{117} Brock, Bible in the Syriac Tradition (see n. 112), 48; Williams, Syriac Versions (see n. 111). I examined the text in the British Library on 23.i.2012.
the tetraevangelium manuscript as a whole. One finds above the first page of Matthew: ܡܬܝ ܦܪܫܐ ̈ ܕܡ ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ 118, i.e. ‘The Separated Gospels’ preceding the simple ‘Matthew’. Since this manuscript is fragmentary, many of the openings and endings do not survive. In addition to the superscription to Matthew, only the ending of Mark and the beginning of John are extant: ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܫܠܡ ܕܡܪܩܘܣ ‘(Here ends the Gospel of Mark)’.119 Running headers appear sporadically throughout the manuscript, and inconsistently in form. When they do appear, they are usually written in red. Both long and short forms appear, with the latter slightly predominating. Thus the forms are: ܕܡܬܝ, ܕܝܘܚܢܢ and ܕܠܘܩܐ,120 with or without a prefixed ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ.

3.3. Paris Syr. 296 1° – Lk – 2 cols. – mid-late v121
This manuscript is perhaps the clearest example of a pre-500 Peshitta manuscript, because it is strongly suspected to have been copied by the same scribe which wrote another, dated manuscript (BM Add. 14425) from c. 463–464 CE. The first (and earliest) section consists only of Lk 6,49 – 21,37, so no inscriptio or subscriptio survives, but there are irregular running headers in the form ܕܠܘܩܐ ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ. These, seemingly in the same hand as the main text, are written in red on three pages only (9b, 23b, 33b), that is, on the right hand page of the relevant openings.

3.4 BM Add. 14459 – Mt-Mk – 1 col. – v122
This manuscript contains the text of Matthew and Mark in foll. 1–66, frequently thought to have been copied the fifth century, bound with a later text

---

118 This point is restored by Burkitt, as is half of the seyame above the mem in ܦܪܫܐ ̈ ܕܡ (the first dot is visible, and in the place of the second there is a hole in the manuscript). See F.C. Burkitt, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, 2 Vol., Cambridge 1904, I,2; II,33.
119 A later hand has added ܝܘܢܐܝܬ ܕܡܠܠ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܕܝܘܚܢܢ ܟܪܘܙܘܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܒܐܦܣܘܣ in the lower margin, a colophon in the style of those in the Peshitta.
120 None of Mark’s survive, as all that is extant is the last page with the colophon.
122 P.E. Pusey / G.H. Gwilliam, Tetraevangelium sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum versionem, Oxford 1901, x (5th cent.). I saw the manuscript in the British Library on 23.i.2012.
of Luke and John. The beginning of the codex is lost, the text beginning at Matt. 6.20. This manuscript is better known than the other Peshitta manuscripts considered here, having been studied by Gwilliam in an article which also discusses the titles. The beginning of Matthew is lost, but a colophon of the type common in Peshitta manuscripts comes at the end:

\[
\text{ своими } \text{ عبري } \text{ بلاد } \text{ نكحت } \text{ كرزا } \text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ شم }
\]

(‘Finished is the holy Gospel of Matthew the Apostle, which he preached and wrote in the Hebrew tongue, in the region of Palestine.’)

This is followed by:

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ كرزا }
\]

(‘The holy Gospel, the preaching of Mark’). At the end of Mark there is again a substantial colophon:

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ كرزا } \text{ كرزا }
\]

(‘Finished is the holy Gospel, the preaching of Mark the Evangelist, which he spoke in Latin, in the city of Rome’)

These colophons appended to Matthew and Mark are accompanied by blessings upon the Trinity. There are running headers in red, in the forms

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل }
\]

They appear very often in Matthew and less frequently in Mark, and always on the right hand page of the openings.

3.5. BM Add. 17117 – Mt-Mk – 2 cols – v

This little-studied manuscript is also of relevance, with titles all in red. It opens with the superscription,

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل }
\]

(‘The holy gospel, the preaching of Matthew’), and between Matthew and Mark is the colophon:

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل }
\]

followed by

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل }
\]

(‘Gospel of Mark’). The end of Mark does not survive. There are sometimes running headers, usually in the longer forms, and

\[
\text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل } \text{ قدشي } \text{ انجيل }
\]

---


124 Gwilliam, Account (see n. 123), 154–156 (description of ms.) and 157 (titles). For an image, see Kiraz, Comparative Edition I (see n. 114), 458 = Plate 5.

125 Not كرزا, which Gwilliam, Account (see n. 123), 157, prints.

126 Not كرزا, which Gwilliam, Account (see n. 123), 157, prints.

127 For the date, see Vööbus, Studies (see n. 121), 89 n. 54 and 98 n. 24 (‘about 500 A.D.’, and even, ‘written in the year 499–500’); Pusey/Gwilliam, Tetraevangelium sanctum (see n. 122), x (c. 500). I saw the manuscript in the British Library on 23.i.2012.

128 Pusey/Gwilliam, Tetraevangelium sanctum (see n. 122), 198, notes this title in the apparatus.
3.6. Conclusion

Syriac manuscripts in this early period lend support to the long title. Initially, in Syrus Sinaiticus and the Curetonian, the titles appear with –ܐ, but as Burkitt has argued, the Peshitta texts attempt more closely to replicate the κατά: the formula ‘the holy gospel, the preaching of…’ potentially makes the relationship between gospel and evangelist slightly less straightforward than does the simple –ܐ.129

4. The Evidence of Coptic manuscripts

Coptic translations of NT books were probably first made in the mid-late third century.130 The dates of our manuscript witnesses to these translations are a great puzzle, however. Coptic palaeography is a notoriously inexact science, although some important steps have been taken to establish that science on a sound footing.131 By comparison with the Syriac evidence, there are many fewer dated manuscripts from the early period to enable comparison.132 The dates of the manuscripts here, even if based on communis opinio, are by no means completely watertight.133 The criterion of dialect is more secure than palaeographical criteria for our period134, and so the most secure evidence is that of the minor dialects, because, with the exception of Fayyumic, they flourished only for a relatively short time in the early stages of Coptic (4th–5th centuries).135 Sahidic texts especially, on the other hand, cover a wide chronological sweep, and so their significance needs to be assessed more cautiously. Eight manuscripts generally considered pre-500 CE contain evidence of titles.

132 Gwilliam, A Syriac Biblical Manuscript (see n. 123), 155–156, notes the comparatively large number of dated Syriac manuscripts.
134 For some later manuscripts, we know rather more about their origins from archaeological evidence, and of course their colophons.
4.1. P. Osl. Inv. 1661a (Bilingual Greek-Akhmimic) – Mt – 2 rows – iv

This text was considered above in the discussion of Greek manuscripts. A title is found at the beginning of the manuscript, probably in the Coptic part (the top half) of the bilingual page: ἡ Ἰωάννης Ἡλίας ἤ τῷ Ἐρμή[ὴν] ἔρχεται ἐκ νησίων.

4.2. P. Bodmer III (Bohairic) – Jn – 1 col. – iv

This manuscript is our only Bohairic example. The text has the subscriptio ἡ Ἰωάννης Ἡλίας ἤ τῷ Ἐρμή[ὴν] ἔρχεται ἐκ νησίων.

4.3. Codex Schøyen (Middle-Egyptian) – Mt – 1 col. – iv

The plates in Schenke’s edition of this controversial text, despite having been produced by placing the manuscript on a photocopier, are finely produced and show that the first surviving page begins with Matt. 5.38. There are no running headers, but the last page has a title at the end of the Gospel: οἱ Ἰωάννης Ἡλίας ἤ τῷ Ἐρμή[ὴν] ἔρχεται ἐκ νησίων.

4.4. Codex Scheide (Middle-Egyptian) – Mt – 1 col. – iv–v

This manuscript has no inscriptio legible on the first page, but has a handsome colophon in red and black ink: οἱ Ἰωάννης Ἡλίας ἤ τῷ Ἐρμή[ὴν] ἔρχεται ἐκ νησίων.

136 See the photo printed above.
137 R. Kasser, ed. Papyrus Bodmer III. Évangile de Jean et Genèse I – IV, 2 en bohaïrique (CSCO.SC 25), Louvain 1958. Askeland, What Constitutes …? (see n. 133) has questioned this early date.
139 Schenke thought the text went back to a Greek Matthew independent of canonical Matthew.
140 As reported to me by James Leonard, during the viva voce examination of his dissertation on Codex Schojen.
141 H.-M. Schenke, Das Matthäusevangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide), Berlin 1981. For the date, see also Metzger, Early Versions (see n. 12), 117–118.
142 Schenke, Codex Scheide (see n. 141), Plate 3.
143 Schenke, Codex Scheide (see n. 141), Plate 14.
4.5. P. Bodmer XIX (Sahidic) – Mt – 2 cols. – iv–v

This codex preserves the second half of Matthew and the beginning of Romans. At the top of each page are page numbers rather than running headers, and there is no title at the beginning of Romans. There is a subscriptio at the end of the gospel, standing alone in the middle of the right-hand column: πεταγγελιον | πκαταθωσιον.

4.6. P. Palau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 181–183 (Sahidic) – Mk-Lk-Jn – 2 cols. – v

This is one instance where the general view is of a fifth-century date, although Askeland has raised significant concerns about such an early time-frame. Again there are page numbers rather than titles in the headers. The inscriptions at the beginnings of the Gospels are rather erratic: first, μαρκος, then πεταγγελιον | ηκατα λουκας, then nothing for John. The subscriptiones are more consistent, however:

πεταγγελιον | ηκαταμαρκος
πεταγγελιον | ηκαταλουκας
πεταγγελιον | η | κατα ιωαννης

---

144 R. Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XIX, Évangile de Matthieu XIV,28 – XXVIII,20, Épitre aux Romains I,1 – II,3 en sahidique, Cologny/Geneva, 1962. Again, Askeland has questioned this date (What Constitutes …? (see n. 133)).

145 For the date, see H. Quecke, Das Markusevangelium saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182, Barcelona 1972, 59; K.H. Kuhn’s review of Quecke, Markusevangelium (JThS 25 [1974] 164–165), remarks on the Akhmimic and ‘Sub-Akhmimic’ influence on the Sahidic language of the manuscript, regarding this as a reassuring sign of the manuscript’s early date, though the Achmimicisms are not necessarily exclusively such. Plates are published in Quecke’s edition of the inscriptio to Mark, and of the subscriptiones to Mark and Luke; otherwise I am dependent upon the transcriptions of Quecke and Schüssler (for the latter, see http://www.biblia-coptica.com/ebooks/bibcop05/biblia_coptica_05.html).


147 Quecke, Markusevangelium (see n. 145), Plate I.


149 According to the transcription in Schüssler’s electronic text (see n. 145); cf. H. Quecke, Das Johannesevangelium saïdisch. Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 183, Barcelona 1984, Plate I.

150 Quecke, Markusevangelium (see n. 145), Plate III.

151 Quecke, Lukasevangelium (see n. 148), Plate III.

152 According to the transcription in Schüssler’s electronic text (see n. 145); cf. Quecke, Johannesevangelium (see n. 149), 222.
4.7. Vienna K 2591 (Sahidic) – 2 cols. – Mt – v

‘Unter dem Text Zierabschluß, darunter Titel in Rahmen’, remarks Till elliptically in his catalogue entry for this manuscript. He had earlier printed the subscript title, which appears in the first column of the hair side in small letters: \( \text{ⲡϩⲉⲛⲧⲥ / υⲧⲥⲧⲉⲧ} \). The \( \text{ⲡϩⲉ} \) (‘The end…’) is interesting here, as such an explicit is paralleled widely across the versions.


Finally, one tantalising fragment cannot be completely excluded, even though its evidence is slim in the extreme. The top line of this fragment has \( \text{k[... which at first sight is most likely to be either (i) the beginning of a title (ⲡⲧⲏⲧⲧⲓⲧⲣⲧⲓⲧ] or (ii) a page number (’twenty-something’). Given that the page (6v) only covers Jn 15,25 – 16,4, however, it is unimaginable that a page number could be anything between 20–29 (it would be more like 120–129!), if the text was originally a continuous text beginning at John 1. It is, then, more likely to be a running header: \( \text{k[ⲧⲏⲧⲧⲓⲧⲣⲧⲓⲧ] \), although it could be something else altogether. There are no other running headers (nor any page numbers) visible in the fragments.

4.9. Conclusion

Some scribal practices are distinctive in the early Coptic tradition when compared with the other textual traditions which we have considered. A number of manuscripts, for example, have page numbers, rather than running titles, in the top margin. One notable conclusion from the Coptic evidence is that it supplies little support for the shorter title without \( \text{ⲡⲧⲏⲧⲧⲓⲧⲣⲧⲓⲧ} \). This may be explained in various ways: it could be that the longer titles were those encountered in the Vorlagen of the Coptic translators, or alternatively it could be that the longer

153 For the text, see W. Till, Kleine koptische Bibelfragmente, Bib. 20 (1939) 241–263, here 263 (§ 26); for other information, see idem, Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien: Katalog der koptischen Bibelbruchstücke. Die Pergamente, ZNW 39 (1940) 1–57, here 22.
154 Till, Papyrussammlung (see n. 153), 22.
155 No plate available; this is the text as printed in Till, Kleine koptische Bibelfragmente (see n. 153), 263.
156 I am very grateful to Dr Adam Hyatt (Papyrology Collection Manager, University of Michigan) for granting me permission to see the images of this manuscript, and to Dr Hans Förster (University of Vienna) for his helpful observations on the text. See description in Metzger, Early Versions (see n. 12), 111, and in the Michigan catalogue http://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-16134. The catalogue, and Kahle, date it to the fourth century (Bala‘izah I [see n. 133], 270).
version was a preferred convention among Coptic scribes.\textsuperscript{157} The clear exceptions are the inscriptio \textit{ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ} in P.Palau Rib. Inv.-Nr. 182, and \textit{Vienna K 2591}'s colophon \textit{ⲟⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ}. This last case is the only instance in the Coptic manuscripts from this period of an explicit, a feature much more common in the Latin and Syriac tradition. Overall, however, the Greek influence is extremely strong, as is evident from not only the use of \textit{ⲉⲩⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲓⲟⲛ}, but also in the consistent use of \textit{ⲕⲧⲁ}. 

5. \textit{The Titles in the Earliest Manuscripts and in \textit{NA}^\text{27}}

This final section proposes some revisions to the text and apparatus of \textit{NA}^\text{27} in the light of the manuscripts discussed above. When we come to assess what to print as the main text, an important question arises. Should the editor treat each gospel title on a case-by-case basis, or together? This question arises because, as we will see, the quantity of Greek manuscripts varies from gospel to gospel: Matthew and John each have two early papyri with titles, Luke has one and Mark has none. In the cases of Matthew and John, this evidence is a very important factor in shifting the balance from the shorter inscriptio to the longer, whereas Mark has no such advantage, and Luke little more. In subsections 5.1–4 below, we will treat the titles on a case by case basis, but then consider in §5.5 what the consequence would be if they were taken as a group, as one might prefer to do if it were thought that all the gospels received their current titles together.\textsuperscript{158} In either case, we are seeking the initial text or \textit{Ausgangstext}, that is, ‘the archetype of the tradition’, or ‘the starting-point for the rest of the textual tradition’, without specific regard to what the individual evangelists themselves wrote.\textsuperscript{159} For the sake of clarity, I only include in the apparatus below the evidence discussed above.

\textsuperscript{157} Cf. Parker’s comment about the Latin form of colophons in Codex Bezae (see n. 6), 11–13.

\textsuperscript{158} Taking them individually would be required on the hypothesis of Hengel, that the title was affixed from the beginning to Mark’s gospel and then was taken over by the other evangelists (Hengel, Evangelienüberschriften (see n. 11), 566–567; cf. idem, The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ, London 2000, 242). On the other hand, the view of Trobisch, Heckel and others of a single event in which all the gospels are given matching titles would require treating the titles en bloc from a text-critical point of view. See e.g. D. Trobisch, The First Edition of the New Testament, Oxford 2000, 38. Petersen, Evangelienüberschriften (see n. 11), 267–274, has a helpful taxonomy and discussion of the various views.

5.1. Matthew

Assembling the results specific to Matthew from the above survey, we find the following data:160

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P(^4) flyleaf</td>
<td>A subscriptio ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(^62) flyleaf</td>
<td>B subscriptio κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N inscriptio?</td>
<td>D colophon exp. ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B inscriptio</td>
<td>W subscriptio ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C inscriptio</td>
<td>it(^b) colophon exp. euangelium secundum matthaeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W inscriptio</td>
<td>it(^d) colophon exp. euangelium secundum mattheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it(^k) colophon inc. cata mattheum</td>
<td>it(^e) colophon exp. secundum mattheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syr(^c) inscriptio</td>
<td>it(^f2) colophon exp. euangelium secundum matheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syr(^p) inscriptio</td>
<td>it(^h) colophon exp. euangelium secundum matheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co(^sc) flyleaf</td>
<td>it(^n) subscriptio secundum matheum euangelium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vg(^5) colophon exp. euangelium secundum mattheum</td>
<td>syr(^p) colophon exp. euangelium secundum mattheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co(^m)(pl) subscriptio πευαγγελιον ηκατα ηαθεοιοc</td>
<td>co(^m)(pl) subscriptio πευαγγελιον ηκατα ηαθεοιοc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co(^s)(pl) subscriptio πευαγγελιον ηκατα ηαθεοιοc</td>
<td>co(^s)(pl) colophon exp. (π)κατα ηαθεοιοc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

160 Here and subsequently, the text provided for the “running header” is in each case an approximation of the predominant usage.
We can compare this with NA27:


The first point to note is that NA27 omits reference to the Ψ4 fragment, which may well be consistent with its principle of not making use of fragments which are not continuous NT text. As we have remarked earlier, however, it was clearly intended as part of a continuous text of Matthew (as K. Aland recognised). Ψ62 is also omitted, perhaps because the title is not followed by the beginning of the gospel but by an excerpt from Matthew 11, but it should be included (as indeed it is in NA27’s apparatus to Matt. 11). It is also an error to attribute the reading εὐαγγελιον κ. Ματθ. to D, which has no surviving inscriptio at all: the beginning of Matthew in Codex Bezae is not extant. C, on the other hand, is not mentioned in the apparatus, but does have the initial title εὐαγγελιον κατα ματθαιον. As far as the uncial manuscripts are concerned, the weight of early evidence is in favour of the shorter reading. There is, however, a danger of misinterpretation in the description of the titles of ℵ and B as secunda manu, because they are part of the production of the original manuscript. Against the evidence of ℵ and B, however, that of Ψ4 and Ψ62 should not be neglected.

An alternative presentation of the data might appear as follows:

Inscriptio

Inscriptio: Ψ B ik · txt Ψ Ψ62 vid (Μαθθ. C) W sycoac

When it comes to the subscript titles, Vaticanus, together with a single Old Latin and a single Coptic manuscript constitute the only evidence for the shorter version of the title:

Subscription

Subscription: Ψ B ic coap · txt A D W Itb.d.f2.h.n vg syco ac sa(pt)

Readers, especially but not exclusively those without knowledge of textual cri-

---

161 See § 3.2 above: the solitary י on appears immediately after a heading to the tetraevangelium as a whole, where it would be extremely cumbersome to repeat י on.
ticism, presented with the data in this way would gain a rather different – and, it is suggested, more accurate – picture of the evidence.

5.2. Mark
The following emerges from the Markan manuscript tradition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ν inscriptio</td>
<td>κατὰ μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α capitula list inc.</td>
<td>το κατὰ μαρκον ευαγγελιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α inscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β inscriptio</td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D colophon inc.</td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D inscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W inscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itα colophon inc.</td>
<td>secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itβ colophon inc.</td>
<td>secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itδ colophon inc.</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itδ inscriptio</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itε2 capitula list inc.</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itε2 capitula list exp.</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itε2 colophon inc.</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vgδ inscriptio</td>
<td>secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syτp inscriptio</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coαα inscriptio</td>
<td>μαρκος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν subscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α subscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B subscriptio</td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C subscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W subscriptio</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itαα colophon subs.</td>
<td>euangelioum secundum marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itκ colophon subs.</td>
<td>euangelioum cata marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syτα colophon subs.</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syτε colophon subs.</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syτρ subscriptio</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coαα subscriptio</td>
<td>πεμαγγελιουμ ηκατα μαρκος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be compared with NA²⁷:

\(\text{KATA ΜΑΡΚΟN}^\dagger\)

*Inscriptio:* ευαγγελιον κ. Μ. A D L W Θ f¹³ 1. 33. 2427 lat · το κ. Μ. αγ. ευαγγ. 209. 579 al (vgδ) · txt (Ν B) pc

*Variae lectiones minores:* ut txt, sed secunda manu Ν B
Here, especially given the absence of any papyri, and Mark’s *inscriptio* being lost from C, NA27 has reasonably enough followed the evidence of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, despite the counterevidence of A D W. The evidence of Codex Bezae is divided here, in fact, because there are two opening titles, that of the colophon in the short form (though NA27 misses this), and the free-standing title in the longer form. The versional evidence is similarly mixed, making a final decision a very close call. In the end, the short version is perhaps preferable, though (bearing mind the fourth factor in the introduction) it may be more “positive” to place a ῶ before the short form, rather than ′ … ′ around it, as follows:

*Inscriptio*

ᶶ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ

*Inscriptio*: ῶ εὐαγγελιον A (et in cap.) D W ιτδς syρ. Ἰωάννης ουν. tεxτ Β D ιτς β vgς

If a critical edition of the text were to print a *subscription*, however, it would be difficult to deny that the longer version was better attested. Of all the Greek and versional evidence, B is the only manuscript with a short subscript title.

*Subscription*

°ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ

*Subscription*: ° Β · tεxτ Β Α C W it sy co

5.3. Luke

For Luke we have slightly more evidence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Β</td>
<td>Π75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capitula list exp.</td>
<td>τὸ κατὰ λούκαν εὐαγγέλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capitula list inc.</td>
<td>τὸ κατὰ λούκαν εὐαγγέλιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colophon inc.</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptio</td>
<td>εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ λούκαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This can be set against what appears in Nestle-Aland:

\[
\text{\textit{Inscriptio}}: \text{\textit{εὐαγγελίων κ. Λ. (A) D L W Θ Ξ Ψ 33 \textit{\textit{late sa}}^{\text{ms}} \text{\textit{bo}}^{\text{nt}} \text{\textit{· το κ. Λ. αγ. ευαγγ. 209. 579 \textit{\textit{al} · αρχη του κ. Λ. αγιου ευαγγελιου 1241 pc · txt (\textit{\textit{κ}} B) pc \text{\textit{vgst bo}}^{\text{ms}}}}}
\]

\text{\textit{Variae lectiones minores: εὐαγγελίων κατα λουκαν, sed secunda manu A · ut txt, sed secunda manu \textit{κ}} B}

In addition to the texts of \textit{κ} and B, NA\textsuperscript{27} here cite in support of their shorter reading \textit{pauci codices}, along with the Stuttgart edition of the Vulgate and a Bohairic manuscript. The former, \textit{vgst}, is of course a modern edition, and interestingly it does not cite any witnesses to its reading: in fact, the earliest Vulgate witness (Sangallensis 1395) attests the long version in the \textit{subscriptio}. The \textit{boms} is Horner’s \textit{Θ}\textsuperscript{162}, to which one would not assign much value for the reconstruction of an Ausgangstext, as it was copied in 1272 CE.\textsuperscript{163} On the other hand, in support of the longer reading, the \textit{inscriptio} in C is omitted. It is also a pity that A is placed in brackets, as the wording is part of the original production of the codex, though the same applies to \textit{κ} and B.

The question of whether these considerations are sufficient to overturn the NA\textsuperscript{27} reading is a difficult one. Perhaps erring on the cautious side, one might print:

**Inscriptio**

*CATA ΛΟΥΚΑΝ*

*Inscriptio:* ἔυαγγελιον Α (et in cap.) C (et in cap.) D W itd.ff2 sy* co* · ttt B it*  

If one were to present a subscript, however, it would be almost impossible to print anything other than ἔυαγγελιον κατα λουκαν. The *capitula* list titles also confirm the currency of the longer title.

**Subscription**

*ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ*

*Subscription:* B it* · ttt A C D W itd.d.ff2 vg* sy* co*  

5.4. John

John’s gospel perhaps has fared best as far as evidence of initial titles is concerned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ψ66</td>
<td>Ν subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ75</td>
<td>A subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β</td>
<td>B subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D colophon exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itb</td>
<td>W subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itd</td>
<td>itb colophon exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ite</td>
<td>itd colophon exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itff2</td>
<td>ite colophon exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vg*</td>
<td>itff2 colophon exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy*</td>
<td>co* subscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy*</td>
<td>co* subscriptio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it appears more strange that NA27 (as well, of course, as the SBL Greek NT, for example) prints as follows:
The main text does look rather odd here, as it is so poorly supported by comparison with the longer title. As an alternative, one might prefer:

Inscriptio
°ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ

And similarly, a subscriptio would also probably have to be printed in the longer form:

Subscriptio
°ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ

5.5. An Alternative Approach: Treating the Inscriptiones en bloc

It might perplex some readers that the inscriptiones to Mark and Luke appear here in a form different from those in Matthew and John. This is in part a result of the happenstance of which witnesses have survived — a fact which affects the whole enterprise of textual criticism. Perhaps there is some distortion where Mark and Luke are concerned, however, as a result of there being fewer early papyri which have survived for them.

If we were to treat the four gospels with their inscriptiones as a corpus together, different results would fall out. To take the Greek witnesses alone for simplicity’s sake, one finds:

inscriptiones in the longer form: Ψ14 Ψ62 Ψ66 Ψ75 Α (D 3/4) W
inscriptiones in the shorter form: Β (D 1/4)

On the basis of this, if one were treating the inscriptiones as a group for text-critical purposes, perhaps as a result of a particular view of the origins of the titles, this evidence would give a very strong steer to presenting the long form in each case. Historical factors in favour of such a harmonisation might include: (a) absence of consistent differences in the form of the title from one gospel to another in the manuscript tradition: the variations are from manuscript to manuscript rather than from gospel to gospel; and (b) the consistent appearance of κατὰ, very unusual as a designation of authorship, which might suggest that the gospels were (re-)titled en bloc as ευαγγελιον κατα Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. This is an alternative approach which might be considered; indeed, it is probably preferable.
5.6. The Titles according to the Manuscripts

If the inscriptiones to Mark and Luke were retained in the shorter form, this would not be a particular problem as long as a subscriptio in the longer form was printed. It is a common enough pattern in manuscripts that inscriptiones, especially when they follow subscriptiones, are often truncated. Schironi, for example, has collected a number of examples of manuscripts of Homer where a subscriptio or explicit is followed either by an abbreviated initial title or no title at all.164 ‘In some codices [sc. of epic poetry] the end-titles are combined with beginning-titles, and they are often written in a much reduced form: only the letter to indicate the book, without any genitive of the work.’165 For example, the Morgan Homer, a 3rd-4th century codex of the Iliad, marks the end of II.12 with the title and (twice) the book number (ιλιαδος μμ), but when introducing II.13 has no title but only (again twice) the book number (ν ν).166 To cite a Coptic example, in the Three Steles of Seth, one finds the second stele concluded with the words ‘the Second Stele of Seth’ (ϯⲙⲉϩⲥⲛⲡ υⲥⲧⲏⲗⲏ υⲥⲧⲏⲗⲏ) then followed by the briefer inscription, ‘the Third Stele’ (ϯⲙⲉϣⲟⲙⲧⲉ υⲥⲧⲏⲗⲏ υⲥⲧⲏⲗⲏ).167

This pattern is especially prominent in the Latin tradition, with colophons lending themselves especially to such truncation:

georgica | lib· i· explic incip | lib· ii·

georgicon lib· iii explicit | incipit lib· iii felicitier

in c· verrem iii· | incipit lib· iii felicitier168

apulei madaur|ensis de habitudine platonis | liber ii explicit | incipit liber iii felicitier

apulei madaurensis de habitudine platonis liber primus explicit . incipit liber secundus169

Against this background, it is worth noting that Codex Sinaiticus, the earliest Old Latin manuscript a along with k (and less consistently b and e), the earliest Vulgate manuscript S and the Sahidic P.Palau Rib. 182 all have at least some inscriptiones in shorter forms but consistently have subscriptiones in the longer form. (Interestingly, the converse never appears.) In sum, to print the inscriptiones to Mark and Luke in their shorter forms is permissible, but such inscriptiones only really make sense alongside the subscriptiones.

164 See Schironi, ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΝ (see n. 4), esp. §§ 12.16.28.43. See further Wendel, Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung (see n. 3), 26–27.
166 Schironi, ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΝ (see n. 4), 172–175.
167 NHC VII,5, 124,14–16.
168 The Virgil and Cicero examples come from Oliver, The First Medicean MS of Tacitus (see n. 106), 252.256 and 253 respectively.
169 The Apuleius cases come from P. Thomas (ed.), Apulei Platonici Madaurensis De Philosophia Libri, Leipzig 1921, 134.
5.7. The “Real Titles” according to the Manuscripts

An implication of this is that – at least for the scribes – the longer version appears to have been closer to a “real” title, and the shorter version an abbreviation, rather as scholarly footnotes today first cite a title in full and thereafter abbreviate it. This qualification “at least for the scribes” is an important one, however, since the concept of a real ancient title understood along the lines of modern book titles is certainly problematic, as Hoffmann has noted.170 We can perhaps nevertheless talk of what the title was for scribal purposes and consequently for the purposes of the users of the manuscripts. If one wanted to expand this narrow scope, one would have to adduce other evidence, such as Justin’s reference to the memoirs of the apostles ἄ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια (I Ap. 66.3), which suggests a conventional usage, albeit one perhaps unfamiliar to his imperial audience. One might also make the common-sense point that titles such as κατὰ μαθθαιον and κατὰ λουκαν would sound like gibberish at least to outsiders, rather as talking of “the Browning version” (which Browning? version of what?) or “the Authorised Version” (of what? authorised by whom?) would to those unfamiliar with these short-hands.171 On the other hand, ancient titles could often be very enigmatic: one thinks for example of Tertullian’s Scorpiace.172 For purposes of reference for those who knew of the Scorpiace, however, this was sufficient. For scribes and readers of the gospel manuscripts the functional titles were the longer titles, which could in certain circumstances be abbreviated.

6. Conclusion

These data and the accompanying discussion are offered in the hope of stimulating greater reflection on the presentation of gospel titles in hand editions of the NT, especially NA²⁷ because it is the most widely used. (It may well be that further work should be done of a similar kind on the other New Testament


171 For non-British readers, it may be helpful to note that the Authorised Version is a shorthand for the 1611 translation of the “King James Bible”, and the “Browning Version” is a famous translation (by Robert Browning) of Aeschylus’s Agamemnon.

172 See the discussion of the manuscript evidence and the Jerome testimonium in Henriksson, Griechische Büchertitel (see n. 108), 173–174.
More specifically, the proposed text and apparatus above is submitted as an alternative to conventional presentations. As stated above, the Nestle-Aland edition is a remarkable achievement, but it is also to the credit of the editors that they are constantly open to re-evaluating the text, as has been happening in the IGNTP and the preparations of both the *ECM* and the NA*28* (on which see the Additional Note). This article is a modest contribution concerned merely with a tiny fraction of the text, although the questions surrounding the titles and the attributions of the gospels are of course of wider significance for New Testament study.*

Table 1: Synopsis of Titles by Greek Manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Titles</th>
<th>Title in <em>capitula</em> list</th>
<th>Running header</th>
<th>End Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Π⁴</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον (flyleaf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρ⁶²</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον (flyleaf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρ⁶⁶</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα Ιωαννην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρ⁷²</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα Ιωαννην</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>κατα μαθθαιον</td>
<td>κατα μαθθαιον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατα λουκαν</td>
<td>κατα λουκαν</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατα Ιωαννην</td>
<td>κατα Ιωαννην</td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα Ιωαννην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I am very grateful to Drs Philip Burton, Hans Förster, Christian Askeland and J.F. Coakley for their helpful advice about individual sections of this article, and to Drs James Carleton Paget and Peter Williams for comments on the whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Titles</th>
<th>Title in capitula list</th>
<th>Running header</th>
<th>End Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον]</td>
<td>το κατα μαρκον ευαγγελιον</td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
<td>το κατα λουκαν ευαγγελιον</td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατα μαθθαιον</td>
<td></td>
<td>κατα μαθθαιον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
<td></td>
<td>κατα μαρκον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατα λουκαν</td>
<td></td>
<td>κατα λουκαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατα ιωανην</td>
<td></td>
<td>κατα ιωανην</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
<td>το κατα λουκαν ευαγγελιον</td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατ(α) μαθθαιον κτλ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατ(α) μαρκον ευαγγελιον κατ(α) μαρκον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν (his)</td>
<td>κατ(α) λουκαν κτλ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην</td>
<td>κατ(α) ιωανην κτλ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον κτλ.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαθθαιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα μαρκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ευαγγελιον κατα ιωανην}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κατα ιωανην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{} indicates later hand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Titles</th>
<th>Running Titles</th>
<th>End Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>sec(undum) marcum</td>
<td>sec(undum) mattheum etc. sec(undum) marcum sec(undum) lucanum sec(undum) iohannem etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>sec(undum) marcum sec(undum) iohannen</td>
<td>sec(undum) matthaerum sec(undum) marcum sec(undum) lucan sec(undum) iohannen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>euangelium secundum marcum (bis) euangelium sec(undum) lucan (bis) euangelium sec(undum) iohannenum</td>
<td>sec(undum) matthaerum etc. sec(undum) marcum etc. sec(undum) lucan etc. sec(undum) iohan(nen) etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>cata lucan secundum iohannem</td>
<td>secundum mattheum secundum marcum secundum lucan secundum iohannem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ff2</strong></td>
<td>euangelium secundum marcum (3x) euangelium secundum lucanum (bis) euangelium lucanum (bis) euangelium(i)m secundu(m) iohannem</td>
<td>euangelium sec(undum) mattheum euangelium sec(undum) marcum euangelium sec(undum) lucanum euangelium sec(undum) iohannem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h</strong></td>
<td>secund(um) mattheum</td>
<td>euangelium(m) secundum mattheum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i</strong></td>
<td>secundum marcum secundum lucanum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k</strong></td>
<td>cata mattheum</td>
<td>euangel(ium) cata matthe(um) euangel(ium) cata marc(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>secund(um) mattheum secund(um) marcum secund(um) iohannen</td>
<td>secund(um) mattheum secund(um) marcum secund(um) iohannen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Titles</td>
<td>Running Titles</td>
<td>End Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a^2$</td>
<td><em>secund(um) lucan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>sec(undum) marcum</em></td>
<td><em>evangelium sec(undum) mattheu(m)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>secund(um) iohann(em)</em></td>
<td><em>secund(um) iohann(em)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{} indicates later hand.

Table 3: Synopsis of Gospel Titles by Syriac Manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>Running titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SyrS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SyrC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paris Syr. 296 1°</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM Add. 14459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM Add. 17117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Synopsis of Gospel Titles by Coptic Manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Initial titles</th>
<th>Running titles</th>
<th>End titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Osl. Inv. 1661a (ac)</td>
<td>υχζ[γ]ρελ[γ]</td>
<td>[πκα.]τα ιαωλος (fly-leaf)</td>
<td>υγατηλείον κατα ιαωλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Bodmer III (bo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>υγατηλείον κατα ιαωλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Schøyen (mae)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πεγατελειον ικατα ιαωζος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheide (mae)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πεγατελειον ικατα ιαωζος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Bodmer XIX (sa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πεγατελειον ικατα ιαωζος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Palau Rib. 181–183 (sa)</td>
<td>ιαρκος πεγατελειον ικατα λογιας</td>
<td></td>
<td>πεγατελειον ικατα ιαρκος πεγατελειον ικατα λογιας πεγατελειον ικατα ιαωλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna K 2591 (sa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ι)κατα ιαωλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. Inv. 3992 (sa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ικατα ιαωλος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Note
At the proof stage, the NA28 was finally released, and so comment can be added here about how much of the discussion applies to this new edition. The text of the Gospel titles in NA28 is unchanged, and the apparatus criticus are very similar to those of NA27. The differences are as follows. (1) New witnesses are included, though all from the 9th to 13th centuries. (2) Abbreviations of Greek text are filled out. (3) The vague references to $al$ and $pc$ have been removed. (4) Significantly, brackets have been removed from references to $u$ and $B$, so that instead of the references to ‘(8 B)’ with accompanying notes in the appendix, NA28 now has the more transparent ‘–8* B*’ $txt 8$ B’. In sum, with the exception of the remarks pertaining to (4) here, all the rest of the article above still applies to NA28.