Blessed is the man who has competent associates.

The edition of this book would not have been possible without the findings of Dr. R. van den Broek. He discovered that a deviating Latin Diatessaron must have been one of the sources of Ludolph of Saxony's *Vita Jesu Christi* and that this text had much in common with the ninth-century *Heliand* and other Western vernacular Harmonies. From this I concluded that this same text must also be one of the sources of the Old High German version in the Codex Sangallensis. But even when I made my own contribution towards a solution of this problem I have been leaning heavily upon him.

My other associate, Drs. J. van Amersfoort, has established the long lists with variants printed at the end of the text. This was an enormous work which required both patience and precision.

This book had already been finished and made almost completely ready for the press when my attention was drawn to a very important article of J. Rathofer.

In this study the author establishes without any possible doubt that the Sangallensis is based upon the Codex Fuldensis, thus confirming some of the positions taken in this book.

More alarming is that according to Rathofer the text editions both of Ranke and of Sievers are not completely trustworthy. This may serve as a timely warning and makes a *caveat* necessary: it may be that in my innocence I have sometimes drawn conclusions from imaginary variants which are not to be found in the manuscripts.

Rathofer has had the excellent idea to consult the Evangeliaria present at Fulda in the first half of the ninth century, when the Old High German version was made there. He found that a number of deviations from the Fuldensis attested in the Latin and/or Old High German text of the Sangallensis are also found in these Gospel texts.

We must expect the publication of the complete material before

---

we can say whether these facts are in favour of or against the hypothesis developed in this book.

Up till now only eight out of some sixty variants have turned out to have a parallel in these Fulda Gospels. In some cases this might prove that either the Latin Diatessaron or an Evangeliarium was the source of the deviant reading. The variant “ego et pater tuus” (Luke 2, 48), until now attested exclusively in the Diatessaron tradition and in one copy from Fulda, might be interpreted as showing that a Latin Diatessaron besides the Fuldensis was present in the monastery at that time. But that would be a rash conclusion until more conclusive evidence can be offered.

On the other hand, it can be maintained that the hypothesis of a Latin Diatessaron as second source of the Old High German version remains necessary, unless all variants discussed in this book have been discovered in the Evangelia of Fulda. At the moment the bulk of my material does not seem to have parallels in these texts.

The problem is complicated by the fact that another copy of the bilingual Diatessaron does exist, namely the Manuscript Junius 13 of the Bodleian Library in Oxford.

Recently Peter Ganz, in a brilliant and penetrating paper, has argued that in some cases this text has preserved the original wording better than the Sangallensis.² Mr. Rathofer has contradicted these views. It might be, however, that this debate can be solved only if the Heliand and the tradition it represents is used as a touchstone.

So the Junius manuscript offers the very remarkable variant: “qui destruit templum dei” (Matth. 27, 40). The same addition is to be found in the Vetus Latina, two Latin Diatessarons from Munich, the Venetian, Tuscan and Dutch Diatessarons, and the Pepsian Harmony. More important, this is the reading of Ludolph of Saxony (IV, 106: “templum dei”); and it is clearly presupposed by the Heliand (5575: “that hōha hūs ḫencuninges”).

This then could mean that the Junius manuscript has better preserved the original wording of the version, influenced as the latter was by a Latin Diatessaron. Then the Sangallensis would not be the original version but a copy of it.

However, it is extremely difficult to express a considered opinion on this matter at the present moment, because an adequate edition of

the Junius manuscript is not available. Moreover, the origin and history of the bilingual Diatessaron of which Junius’ manuscript is a copy, are very obscure indeed.\(^3\)

It once was in the Netherlands, because it belonged to Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538-1614), the first professor of Greek at Leiden University. How then did it come that this text is not to be found among the Codices Vulcaniani still preserved in the university library of that same city?

At a certain moment, perhaps between 1656 and 1660, the well-known Latinist at the service of Queen Christina of Sweden, Nicolaas Heinsius (1620-1681), had this same Diatessaron at his disposal. He allowed Franciscus Junius Jr (1589/90-1677), the founding father of Germanic studies, to consult this manuscript. Why was Heinsius, who despised everything not classical, interested in this Gospel translation? Where did he get it? And how is it possible that this priceless manuscript has disappeared since then without leaving any trace?

Heinsius was a friend of Isaac Vossius (1618-1689). V. is known to have valued all sorts of manuscripts, including a Gospel version. In the beginning of June 1654, Queen Christina allowed him to visit her library for one hour only and to take with him whatever he liked. He later said that he had only taken “nescio quas quisquillas”, among which was the *Codex Argenteus* with the Gothic Gospel.\(^4\) This he lent for a time to Junius, who published it for the first time and thus laid the foundations of Germanic studies. Junius died in the house of Isaac Vossius at Oxford in 1677.

This reminds us of the fact that there was still another valuable manuscript which has disappeared, though only for a certain period. This is the Utrecht Psalterium, written about 850 at Hautvillers near Reims, with its beautiful illustrations. In the seventeenth century this belonged to the Cotton collection. In 1630 it was lent to Lord Arundel and I know of no evidence that it was ever given back.\(^5\)

From 1621 till 1640 Franciscus Junius was custos (librarian) of Lord Arundel and we may with confidence suppose that he was the last on record to have had the Psalter in his hands, before it

---

\(^3\) See Ganz, *o.c.*, 28-38.


disappeared and turned up at Utrecht in 1716. Nothing can be affirmed with any certainty. But some have supposed that Isaac Vossius had a hand in this deal.⁶

If we want to study the history of the Codex Junius and its prototype, we enter into an obscure world, where manuscripts are exchanged or disappear, and where everybody knew everybody. All this requires a special investigation and perhaps another publication.

I do not see, however, how the result of these studies could undermine the main thesis of this book, namely that the Codex Sangallensis has been influenced by the Codex Ludgerianus.

Th. C. de Kruijff and F. van der Rhee have read the manuscript and given valuable advice, for which I am grateful.

We have hardly ever indicated the numbers of chapters and pages of the various Diatessarons, because the passages can easily be found by aid of the indices to the editions mentioned in our list of literature. For the Heliand we quite often used the English translation of Mariana Scott.

Peter Staples has read and corrected my faulty English.