APPENDIX I

A CATALOGUE OF MANUSCRIPTS OF DIATESSARONIC WITNESSES AND RELATED WORKS

No manner of arrangement of the material presented in this appendix is capable of satisfying the conflicting demands of chronology, degree of proximity to the Diatessaron, type of witness, etc. The catalogue is, therefore, arranged along certain more or less arbitrary lines.

A) Items are divided between Eastern Witnesses (presented first), and Western Witnesses.

B) These two geographic divisions are subdivided into individual languages, ordered alphabetically (Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, etc.).

C) Within each language group, witnesses have been separated into three categories:

1) "manuscripts," being witnesses which are manuscripts (or fragments) of actual gospel harmonies and which are thought to be descended from the Diatessaron, albeit, several revisions and/or translations removed;

2) "quotations," being sources which here and there, either by name or by virtue of the variants in the quotations, appear to cite the Diatessaron;

3) "influenced," being witnesses whose gospel citations appear to have been influenced by the Diatessaron.

The division between these last two categories is somewhat subjective. In general, those witnesses which have been investigated more thoroughly, and whose agreements with the Diatessaronic tradition are more extensive and better documented have been placed in the "quotations" category, while lesser-investigated witnesses, whose alleged Diatessaronic references are less obvious, less frequent, and more oblique have been relegated to the latter. As an example, Ephrem's Commentary is listed under "Quotations," while the "Arabic Version of the Gospels" is placed under "Influenced." In making these decisions, scholars' claims have been taken at face value, and no attempt
has been made to verify whether or not an individual witness or manuscript does or does not contain Diatessaronic readings. Inclusion in this list should therefore not be taken as "proof" that a particular source is indeed a Diatessaronic witness; rather, the catalogue should be regarded as a list of sources claimed by one or another scholar at one or another time as Diatessaronic; therefore, it may serve as a starting point for future research.

D) Within each category, individual witnesses are listed in alphabetical order (for example, under "Syriac, Quotations," the first entry is for "Aba," the second is for "Aphrahat," etc.).

1) Where the information was available and seemed relevant, individual manuscripts have been listed in proximate chronological order, from oldest to youngest, with the proviso that the most significant manuscripts have been placed first regardless of age (in the Middle Dutch category, for example, the Liège Harmony is given pride of place).

2) "Nicknames" or specific designations (e.g., "Kossmann's Fragments," the "Dura Fragment") are indicated immediately below the manuscript's present location, inventory number, and date.

3) Thereunder, a selection of literature relevant to that specific manuscript or witness is listed, first giving the catalogue listing (where available), then editions (if available), studies and, in some cases, references (indicating where that specific item is referenced in the literature), descriptions (indicating where the manuscript is described, albeit not in a formal catalogue entry), and remarks (noting specific features pertinent to that witness or manuscript).

None of these aids should be regarded as exhaustive. For example, under "editions" only those pertinent to current research are given; under "studies" only the most significant studies are indicated.

In general, this catalogue should be regarded as a tool for research, not a comprehensive listing of every proposed Diatessaronic witness. In particular, marginal Patristic sources—especially in the Eastern languages—have been excluded.
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