

**THE INSULAR ISCARIOT:
JUDAS IN MEDIEVAL BRITISH AND IRISH LITERARY TRADITIONS**

by

CHRISTOPHER LEYDON

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York
2010

© 2010

CHRISTOPHER LEYDON

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Professor William E. Coleman

Sept. 7, 2010

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Professor André Aciman

Sept. 7, 2010

Date

Executive Officer

Professor Catherine A. McKenna

Professor Clare L. Carroll

Professor E. Gordon Whatley

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

THE INSULAR ISCARIOT:

JUDAS IN MEDIEVAL BRITISH AND IRISH LITERARY TRADITIONS

by

Christopher Leydon

Advisor: Professor William E. Coleman

Because the betrayal is closely connected to the crucifixion and the resurrection, Judas Iscariot, perhaps the most infamous personage of the New Testament, occupies a privileged place in the Christian imagination. Judas figures prominently in patristic commentaries and exegetics, as well as in a number of extra-canonical texts and traditions from late Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and beyond. This project considers the matter of Judas in two apocryphal legends of the later Middle Ages, situating them between canonical and extra-canonical traditions, and focuses on their circulation in British and Irish manuscripts. This original research rests upon a philological foundation, correcting a number of errors in previous scholarship on these texts.

The first legend, *De ortu Judae*, is an Oedipodean biography of Judas that fills in gaps left by the evangelists and uses the 30 silver coins paid to Judas as the basis of an explanation for the betrayal of Jesus. Close comparison of Latin and Middle English texts

shows that Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* is the direct source of the *South English Legendary* version of the Judas legend, rather than the anonymous *Historia Apocrypha* as some scholars have suggested. A further conclusion, that the unknown SEL poet was creative and innovative, is supported by annotated translations into modern English prose of the *South English Legendary* chapters on Judas and Pilate.

In the second legend, *De gallo redivivo*, the miraculous resuscitation of a cooked cock proves to Judas the error of his ways, ultimately providing a motivation for his suicide, as well as making an explicit connection between the sins of Judas's betrayal and Peter's denials of Jesus. This apocryphon also links the 30 silver coins paid to Judas with the 30 silver hoops placed around the rood-tree by King David, centuries before its wood was made into Christ's cross. An examination of the Latin manuscript traditions demonstrates that, despite thematic similarities, *De ortu Judae* and *De gallo redivivo* hardly ever circulated together, and that, moreover, they were not integrated into a continuous narrative.

Analysis of Judas texts from the *Leabhar Breac* and several other late medieval Irish manuscripts yields a preliminary conclusion that while *De gallo redivivo* was attested in the Irish vernacular, *De ortu Judae* was not well represented in Ireland and may even have been unknown there. Another conclusion that may be drawn from the test case of Judas is that there was always a great deal of interaction between canonical scriptures and apocryphal writings, and, for that matter, between official interpretations and popular traditions.

Acknowledgments

It has been a special honor and a great pleasure to work with each of the members of my supervisory committee during the course of this undertaking. Foremost among these is my advisor, Prof. William Coleman, whose guidance and mentoring over a number of years has been invaluable. His advice on many matters has been unerring, although I was often slow to take it. I am especially grateful for the Prof. Coleman's availability and many practical contributions during this final summer. The participation of Prof. Gordon Whatley was also crucial to the success of this project. He was always generous in sharing his time and his wisdom on matters of a philological nature. I am particularly thankful for Prof. Whatley's help with the language of the *South English Legendary* and for his insightful, close readings of that text. I have learned a great deal from Prof. Catherine McKenna, who helped to shape the course of my graduate studies from the first semester, and I feel privileged that she was able to see this project through to the end. I was lucky to have Professor Clare Carroll, who has been extremely supportive of my work, as a reader. I also owe Prof. Carroll a great debt of gratitude for the mentoring role she played as Chair of the Comparative Literature Department at Queens College when I was a young graduate teaching fellow. I am extremely fortunate to have begun my teaching career in such a cordial, supportive, and intellectually stimulating environment.

I have benefited in important ways from participation in the following academic groups: Prof. Whatley's Old English and *Beowulf* classes, Prof. Catherine McKenna's

medieval Irish and Welsh classes, Prof. Michael Sargent's Latin study group, Prof. Glenn Burger's dissertation workshop. To these may be added the late Jo Ann McNamara and the Friends of the Saints, Sherry Reames and the members of the Hagiography Society, along with many past and present members of the Pearl Kibre Medieval Study and the Medieval Club of New York. A number of individual scholars have been particularly generous with their time and knowledge, including Kim Paffenroth, Pierluigi Piovanelli, Bob Miller, and Anne B. Thompson. Prof. Scott Westrem contributed to an early form of this dissertation and first gave me the idea to find in Christian religious texts something comparable to the Thebes of the classical tradition. Judith Hession and Bil Johnson helped, many years ago, to launch my career in literary studies.

My research was aided by many individuals and institutions, including Frances H. Willmoth at Jesus College (Cambridge), Raika Wokoeck at the British Library, Patricia Buckingham at the Bodleian Library (Oxford), J. Fernando Peña at the Grolier Club, Shannon McLachlan at Oxford University Press, the staff of the New York Public Library, and above all Beth Posner and the staff of the Interlibrary Loan office of the Mina Rees Library at The Graduate Center (CUNY).

For certain opportunities I am indebted to my colleagues on several campuses, including Nora Teikmanis at Queens College, Valerie Allen at John Jay College, and Rita Fleischer and Prof. Steven Kruger at The Graduate Center. I also wish to express my gratitude to Sharon Lerner and Matthew Schoengood, who have created an exceptionally cordial working environment in The Graduate Center's Office of Student Affairs, where I have been employed in recent years, as well as to various members of the disability services team, including Mehmet Kucukozer, Agnieszka Kajrukszto, Binnaz Saktanber,

Anton Masterovoy, Tracy Robey, Mark Rinaldi, and Fiona Lee.

I am grateful to several fellow students (past and present) at the Graduate Center for their camaraderie and for various acts of kindness, including Diane Auslander, Robin Hizme, Katharine Jager, Federico Luisetti, Ronald Nerio, Paul North, Patrick O'Reilly, Deborah Smith-Bernstein, Patricia Sokolski, and Linda Stein. I am particularly indebted to Cori Gabbard for her carefully reading of this dissertation, for the insightful feedback she provided, and for her friendship. A number of other individuals have contributed to this effort in diverse ways: Catherine Lunn, Catherine Bevilacqua, Akira Yatsuhashi, and above all Tracy Steffy, who has been a great friend to my entire family.

There are no words sufficient to acknowledge the role of my family in this venture. My mother, Aurora Leydon, not only exposed me to Poe and Kafka at a tender age, but also provided a role model for longterm commitment to higher education. My father, John P. Leydon, has passed on to me his intellectual curiosity and keen aesthetic sense, along with a sense of humor that lends a salutary perspective. I am grateful for the emotional and material support of both my parents during my graduate studies, without which I could not have succeeded. Effie MacLachlan, the light of my life, has contributed to the completion of this work in too many ways to enumerate here and continues to make my life on this planet bearable. Our daughters Cordelia, Matilda, and Cybele, who know the word 'dissertation' without being old enough to understand why it has so often been the cause of my absence, have provided ample motivation, and exercised a necessary check on the academic tendency toward abstraction.

Contents

Acknowledgments	vi
Abbreviations	xiii
1. Introduction: The Matter of Judas	1
The Problem of Judas.....	4
The Canonical Judas	5
Judas in the New Testament: Betrayal and Death	5
The Commentary Tradition: Judas in the Old Testament.....	12
Early Christian Apocrypha and the <i>Gospel of Judas</i>	18
Defining the Later Apocrypha	19
Genre.....	23
Overview of chapters	26
2. <i>De ortu Judae</i>: The Oedipodean Judas in the Latin tradition	28
The medieval apocryphal tradition <i>De ortu Judae</i> : overview and origins.....	29
<i>De ortu Judae</i> : Two Latin versions	41
The anonymous <i>Historia Apocrypha</i>	42
Jacobus of Voragine's <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	55
The <i>Historia Apocrypha</i> and the <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	57
Three chapters of Jacobus of Voragine's <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	67
The Latin tradition <i>De ortu Judae</i> : Conclusions.....	81

3. <i>De ortu Judae: The Oedipodean Judas in the South English Legendary</i>	83
The apocryphal tradition <i>De ortu Judae</i> in medieval vernaculars—overview	84
<i>De ortu Judae</i> in medieval Britain: vernacular and Anglo-Latin versions	85
The <i>South English Legendary</i> —overview and publication history	87
The <i>South English Legendary</i> and the <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	88
<i>Iudas</i> and <i>Pylatus</i> : the <i>Historia Apocrypha</i> legends in the SEL	91
SEL <i>Iudas</i> and <i>Pylatus</i> : Manuscript evidence	93
SEL manuscripts including <i>Iudas</i> and/or <i>Pylatus</i> (brief list)	94
Observations on the mss: sources, dating, and order of the collection	95
Critical approaches and literary analysis	103
Critical approaches to the <i>South English Legendary</i>	104
<i>Iudas: De ortu Judae</i> in the <i>South English Legendary</i>	107
<i>Pylatus</i> : The Pilate legend in the <i>South English Legendary</i>	133
Late apocrypha and the genre of abbreviated legendary	147
4. <i>De gallo redivivo: The tale of Judas and the cock in the Latin tradition</i> ...	150
Chapter overview and methodology	150
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> : Judas, his mother, and the cooked cock that crowed	154
The miracle of the resurrected rooster: <i>De gallo redivivo</i> and its analogues	157
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> : Textual history and critical reconstructions	163
Review of critical literature and discussion of major theoretical trends	164
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> and its analogues: preliminary conclusions	168

<i>De gallo redivivo</i> : The Latin manuscript tradition	168
Publication history	169
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> : Latin versions in extant manuscripts	172
Transmission of semi-stable compilation of apocryphal texts?	179
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> and <i>De ortu Judae</i> : A confluence of traditions?	182
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> and <i>De ortu Judae</i> : Conclusions	188
5. <i>De gallo redivivo</i> in the <i>Leabhar Breac</i> and the Irish context.....	190
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> in the <i>Leabhar Breac</i>	191
The Irish legend and the Latin sources compared	199
<i>De gallo redivivo</i> : Irish analogues	201
Judas Apocrypha attested in medieval Ireland.....	203
The suicide of Judas and Christ's Harrowing of Hell.....	204
The Voyage of St. Brendan and Judas's Sunday Rest	211
Evidence of Middle Irish texts derived from the <i>Legenda Aurea</i>	212
The matter of Judas in medieval Ireland: conclusions and future research	214
6. General Conclusions and Directions for Future Research	216
Appendix A: Manuscripts of the Latin <i>Historia Apocrypha</i> (detailed list)	224
Latin mss of uncertain connection to the HA and the LA:	226
Appendix B: SEL Manuscripts with <i>Iudas</i> and <i>Pylatus</i> (detailed list).....	228
Appendix C: The SEL <i>Iudas</i> translated into modern English (annotated)	231
Appendix D: The SEL <i>Pilatus</i> translated into modern English (annotated).....	246

Appendix E: Latin manuscripts of <i>De gallo redivivo</i> (22 mss total)	271
Appendix F: Transcription of representative Latin text.....	275
Appendix G: Translation of Latin text	278
Appendix H: The “lost” Ginsburg/Ricci manuscript, now BnF n.a. lat. 3072 ...	281
Works Cited.....	286

Abbreviations

Baum, “Mediaeval Legend”	Paull Franklin Baum. “The Mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot.” <i>PMLA</i> 13 (1916): 482-632.
Baum, “Judas Ballad”	---. “The English Ballad of Judas Iscariot.” <i>PMLA</i> 31.2 (1916): 181-89.
Baum, “Red Hair”	---. “Judas’s Red Hair.” <i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i> 21 (1922): 520-29.
Baum, “Sunday Rest”	---. “Judas’ Sunday Rest.” <i>Modern Language Review</i> 18 (1923): 168-82.
BHL	<i>Bibliographica hagiographica latina...</i>
c./cc.	century/centuries
cap./capp.	chapter/chapters
col./coll.	column/columns
CST	Cura sanitatis Tiberii
de Gaiffier, “Le Pendu”	Baudouin de Gaiffier. “Un theme hagiographique: Le pendu miraculeusement sauvé.” <i>Études Critiques d’hagiographie et d’iconologie</i> . Subsidia Hagiographica 43. Brussels: Soc. des Bollandistes, 1967. 194-226. O.p. <i>Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art</i> 13 (1943): 123-48.
de Gaiffier, “L’Historia”	---. “L’Historia apocrypha’ dans la <i>Légende dorée</i> .” <i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> 91 (1973): 263-72.
de Gaiffier, “Liberatus”	---. “Liberatus a suspendio.” <i>Études Critiques d’hagiographie et d’iconologie</i> . Subsidia Hagiographica 43. Brussels: Soc. des Bollandistes, 1967. 227-32. O.p. <i>Mélanges de linguistique et littérature romanes offerts à Mario Roques</i> . 1953. 2:93-97.
DIL	<i>Dictionary of the Irish Language</i> (web)
DMA	<i>Dictionary of the Middle Ages</i>
DRV	Bible, Douay-Rheims Version
Elliott, <i>ANT</i>	J. K. Elliott. <i>Apocryphal New Testament</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

- ESEL* *The Early South English Legendary*. Ed. Carl Horstmann. E.E.T.S. o.s. no. 87. London, 1887.
- f./ff. folium/folia
- Fleith, “Die Legenda” Barbara Fleith. “Die *Legenda Aurea* und ihre dominikanischen Bruderlegende: Aspekte der Quellenverhältnisse apokryphen Gedankenguts.” *Apocrypha* 7 (1996): 167-91.
- Fleith, “Patristic Sources” - - - . “Patristic Sources of the *Legenda Aurea*: A Research Report.” In: *Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Ed. Irena Backus. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997. 1:231-87.
- Fleith, *Studien* - - - . *Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der lateinischen Legenda aurea*. Subsidia Hagiographica 72. Bruxelles: Soc. des Bollandistes, 1991.
- Görlach, “Legenda Aurea” Manfred Görlach. “The *Legenda Aurea* and the Early History of the *South English Legendary*.” In: “*Legenda aurea*”: sept siècles de diffusion. Ed. Brenda Dunn-Lardeau. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1986. 301-13.
- Görlach, *Textual Tradition* - - - . *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*. Leeds: U of Leeds, 1974.
- Gounelle, “À propos” Rémi Gounelle, “À propos des volailles cuites qui ont chanté lors de la passion de Christ.” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 33 (2003): 19-63.
- Gounelle, “Sens et usage” - - - . “Sens et usage d’*apocryphus* dans la Légende Dorée.” *Apocrypha* 5 (1994): 189-210.
- HA the *Historia Apocrypha*, also known as the *Historia Apocrypha* of the *Legenda Aurea*
- ISOS Irish Scripts on Screen/ Meamram Páipéar Ríomhaire. Web.
- Iudas* the *South English Legendary* legend of Judas Iscariot
- Izydorczyk, *Census* Zbigniew Izydorczyk. *Manuscripts of the ‘Evangelium Nicodemi’: A Census*. Subsidia Mediaevalia 2. Toronto: Pontifical Institute, 1993.
- James, *Jesus Catalogue* M. R. James. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Jesus College*. Cambridge, 1895.
- James, *Magdalene Catalogue* - - - . *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in*

- the College Library of Magdalene College.*
Cambridge, 1909.
- James, *NTA* - - - . *The New Testament Apocrypha*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1924. Repr. Berkeley: Apocrophile P, 2004.
- James, *St John's Catalogue* - - - . *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the College Library of St John's College*. Cambridge, 1913.
- Knape, "Die Historia" Joachim Knape. "Die 'Historia apocrypha' der 'Legenda aurea'." *Zur Deutung von Geschichte in Antike und Mittelalter*. Bamberger Hochschulschriften 11. Ed. Joachim Knape and Karl Strobel. Bamberg, 1985. 113-72.
- Knape, "Pilatus" - - - . "Pilatus. Lateinische und deutsche Texte." In: *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Bd. 7. Ed. Wolfgang Stammer. Heidelberg, 1989. Coll. 669-682.
- Knape, "Topographie" - - - . "Topographie des Heils und räumlicher Weltordo im 12./13. Jahrhundert (Pilatus-Vita und Ebstorfer Weltkarte)." In: *Reisen und Welterfahrung in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Vorträge des XI. Anglo-deutschen Colloquiums in Liverpool 1989*. Ed. D. Huschenbett and J. Margetts. Würzburg, 1991. 141-161.
- LA Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*
- LA *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Maggioni (see below)
- Lehmann, "Judas Ischarioth" Paul Lehmann, "Judas Ischarioth in der lateinischen Legendenüberlieferung des Mittelalters," *Erforschung des Mittelalters; ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1959) 2: 229-85; o. p. *Studi medievali* N.S. 2 (1929): 289-346.
- Maggioni *Iacopo da Varazze. Legenda aurea: Edizione critica*. 2nd ed. Ed. Giovanni Paolo Maggioni. 2 vols. Millennio Medievale 6. Testi 3. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998.
- MCO "Mirabili coepit oriri..."
- MED *The Middle English Dictionary*
- MEN see Izydorczyk, *Census*
- ms/mss manuscript/manuscripts

NIV	Bible, New International Version
NQH	“Narrat quedam historia...”
NT	New Testament
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> (web)
OT	Old Testament
<i>Pylatus</i>	<i>South English Legendary</i> Pilate legend
PJT	“Postquam Judas tradidit...”
PL	Migne, <i>Patrologia latina</i>
PPA	The Penitence of Adam (Post peccatum Adae...)
q./qq.	quatrain/quatrains
RTL	Rood-tree Legend
S.C.	H. Coxe et al., <i>Summary Catalogue</i> of the Bodeleian Library, Oxford
SEL	the <i>South English Legendary</i> in any of its several forms
<i>SEL</i>	<i>The South English Legendary</i> , ed. Charlotte D’Evelyn and Anna J. Mill. 3 vols. (EETS 235-236, 244). London: Oxford UP, 1956-59.
Thompson, <i>Everyday Saints</i>	Anne B. Thompson. <i>Everyday Saints and the Art of Narrative in the South English Legendary</i> . Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
Thompson, “Narrative Art”	- - - . “Narrative Art in the <i>South English Legendary</i> .” <i>JEGP</i> 90.1 (1991): 20-30.
Vulgate	Bible, Latin Vulgate Version
Wells, “Relation”	Minnie E. Wells. “The <i>South English Legendary</i> in its Relation to the <i>Legenda Aurea</i> .” <i>PMLA</i> 51.2 (1936): 337-60.

1. Introduction: The Matter of Judas

Judas Iscariot introduces a disruptive influence into any text in which he appears, whether it be in the canonical gospels and apocryphal accretions of the early Christian era, or the legendary collections and harmonizing literary-historical narratives of the Middle Ages; such is equally true of texts from Coptic Egypt to Scandinavia, from Byzantium to Ireland. Uncertainty surrounds Judas, beginning with the New Testament accounts that are incomplete (as is the case with his obscurely motivated betrayal of Jesus) and even conflicting (as in regard to the manner of his death). The seeming contradiction presented by a prospective traitor who finds a place among the Twelve Disciples (followers of an all-knowing, incarnate God), yet who commits one evil act of betrayal that allows for the entire divinely beneficent salvation plan to succeed is an issue that has challenged every author who has taken up the matter of Judas since the Evangelists, as is the ultimate futility of the remorse that Judas shows prior to his unredeemed suicide. Indeed, beginning with the Gospels, nearly all texts that include Judas treat his story with ambivalence, invention, and rationalization. The Christian canon and the traditional interpretations that grow out of it present Judas as an exemplar of such sins as betrayal, greed, and despair, and make him a convenient focus for anxieties about sin and repentance, justice and punishment, kinship and incest, and the troubled relationship between Christianity and Judaism.

This dissertation addresses a group of non-canonical texts and traditions that will, for the sake of convenience, be referred to as the “matter of Judas.” The legendary

biographies of Judas serve to supplement the very spare canonical versions of his story through extra-biblical elaborations that primarily address the pivotal sequence of events beginning with Judas conspiring to betray Jesus and ending with his own death. The sustained interest in Judas through the history of Christian thought is understandable, for he plays a key role in the crucifixion of Jesus—and hence his resurrection—events of unparalleled importance to Christianity that effect the (potential) salvation of sinful humankind. As such, the texts and traditions that involve Judas afford a variety of insights into the literature and culture of the Middle Ages.

In part, the medieval matter of Judas represents a continuation of the numerous apocryphal traditions that arose during and shortly after the period of New Testament canon-formation in the early centuries of the Christian era. Yet the medieval Judas is mainly a figure of more recent apocryphal traditions, narratives that supplement the canonical Gospel accounts of the crucial moments in the life of Judas—conspiracy, betrayal, and suicide—often in order to assign a rational motivation for one or more of these events. Judas is treated with an ambivalent mix of condemnation and sympathy, or else as an illustration of certain doctrinal truths. Inventive biographical details are attributed to Judas and the members of his family that mirror, parallel, or invert events in the life of Jesus and the Holy Family. These texts also refer to Christian-Jewish relations past or present, most often with hostility toward Jews, of whom Judas becomes emblematic.

The matter of Judas is connected with a number of different Christian legends. Because of his involvement in the betrayal of Jesus, Judas figures prominently in Passion narratives, both canonical and apocryphal. The latter are, at least in the context of the

Middle Ages, largely a response to the terse and occasionally contradictory Gospel accounts of the Passion, products of the Christian imagination grappling with the enormity of the betrayal of Jesus and its paradoxically beneficial outcome in the divine salvation plan. As an arch-sinner, Judas is also linked to the emerging Christian beliefs about heaven, hell, and (later) purgatory. Inasmuch as earthly historical events may be viewed as reflections of the cosmic order, Judas is also tied to narrative traditions such as the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, which interprets the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersal of the Jews in 70 CE in terms of divine vengeance. Moreover, because of his acceptance and later rejection of the blood-money—30 silver *denarii*—Judas is also connected to another type of apocryphal legend—the originary narratives relating to the material relics of the crucifixion, including the wood of the cross.

As the betrayer of Jesus, whose treachery is premised upon a close personal connection, Judas Iscariot is unlike other New Testament villains such as Simon Magus, the two Herods,¹ or even Pontius Pilate. As such Judas occupies a singularly negative position in the New Testament texts and many apocryphal traditions. Yet Judas is also a figure of suffering in many apocryphal texts and, although his treachery is universally condemned, he is frequently afforded such a degree of sympathy that he becomes central to the narratives in which he appears. In these respects, Judas often has more in common with the martyrs of Christian hagiography than he does with the pagan tyrants who oppress them and his status approaches that of an anti-hero. Because he expresses

¹ The first, Herod the Great, was responsible for the Massacre of the Holy Innocents; the second, Herod Antipas, was tetrarch of Galilee at the time of the Crucifixion. There were actually four rulers named Herod, along with a number of sons of Herod the Great who shared the name.

regret after the betrayal yet remains unredeemed at his death, Judas is not so much an anti-saint—that is, a figure who inverts or reverses the usual modes of sanctity—as he is an imperfect saint, whose sanctity is unfinished or incomplete. Even as the medieval legends of Judas ultimately confirm his role as biblical malefactor, these narratives follow certain long-established conventions of sacred biography.

The Problem of Judas

This dissertation considers several different narratives about Judas Iscariot and examines two particular medieval traditions about him in detail. Several different concerns are addressed in the many stories involving Judas—both canonical and apocryphal—but it is only slightly reductive to say that all such narratives arise in response to betrayal, the central act of Judas's biography that is, for a believing Christian, essentially incomprehensible: this is the problem of Judas. Many questions about Judas arise from the gaps in and the inconsistencies among the canonical narratives. For instance, the Gospels are not in agreement about whether Judas was indeed wicked by nature, or merely predestined to betray Jesus without being utterly corrupt. None of the evangelists says how and why Jesus chose Judas to be his disciple, or whether he was selected especially to fill the role of betrayer, or how culpable Judas is for a crime that produced a much greater good (i.e., *felix culpa*). Similarly, doubts may be raised as to whether Judas is fully responsible for what happens, particularly if Jesus allowed Satan to enter into him (John 13:27). In the case of possession, one wonders to what extent Judas is then to blame for his actions, and whether to understand Satan as a real personage, or instead as a metaphor for any adversary of God (as in Matthew 16:23, when Jesus refers to Peter as Satan).

The Canonical Judas

In order to provide a context in which to discuss the matter of Judas and its place in medieval apocrypha and the literature, it will first be useful to outline the canonical understanding of Judas in the Western Church. The outline of orthodox (i.e., Catholic) Christian thought begins with the Gospels and follows a line through the Church Fathers such as Jerome and Augustine to their medieval successors such as Peter Comester and Jacobus of Voragine. The canonical view of Judas emphasizes two particular aspects of the Judas problem: the betrayal of Jesus and the death (i.e., suicide) of Judas. By the Middle Ages, these two sins are given clear motivations and the story of Judas becomes an illustration of greed, imperfect penitence, and despair. This orthodox interpretation of Judas has a dialectical relationship with the non-canonical traditions that are the main topic of this dissertation.

Judas in the New Testament: Betrayal and Death

To properly situate the matter of Judas it is necessary to give some attention to the canonical texts of the New Testament and to the contemporary scholarship that attempts to understand their origins.² Of particular interest are recent commentaries that take into account the theological, Christological, soteriological, and narrative differences between the various strata of the Gospels: the Pauline Epistles; the lost sayings gospel known as Q; the synoptic gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke-Acts; and the semi-gnostic gospel of John. The Epistles of Paul, which are thought to be the earliest texts in the canonical

² The following sections draw on a number of sources, including: Crossan, Ehrman, Greenberg, Helms, Klassen, Maccoby, Paffenroth, Pagels and King, Robinson, and Saari.

New Testament (c. 50), mention Jesus being “handed over,” but without naming any particular betrayer. The Greek word used is *paradodomi*, which primarily means “to give or hand over to another” and which usually does not carry the sense of “betray.”³ Yet the Pauline understanding of Jesus’ death and resurrection, in line with the soteriology of pagan myths involving sacrifice and rebirth, required a betrayal, and consequently a betrayer who was supplied or perhaps appointed from among the 12 disciples of Jesus. At this stage, “narrative begot character, and character begot new narrative” (Axton 179).⁴ Judas is first identified as the one who hands Jesus over in the Gospel of Mark (c. 60). By the time Matthew and Luke wrote (c. 80-100), there were two accounts of Judas that included his death, both of which included the purchase of a field with the blood money. The competing stories—in one suicide by hanging (in Matthew 27:5) and in the other falling headlong and bursting asunder (in Acts 1:18)—constitute what Alexander Murray calls a “split tradition” (339 ff.). Either death may be construed as punishment (or a curse), whether self-inflicted or divinely imposed.

To fill in the gaps in their narratives, the evangelists looked to verses in the Old Testament that were considered prophetic anticipations of the Messiah.⁵ Such methods of producing narrative from prophecy, sometimes described as Midrashic or as “theological

³ Greenberg 132-34, Klassen 51 ff., Crossan 75 ff.

⁴ Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge, 1979), 91. Quoted in Richard Axton, “Interpretations of Judas in Middle English Literature” in: *Religion in the Poetry and Drama of the late Middle Ages in England*, ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge: Brewer, 1990), 179-97.

⁵ For example, in Micah 5:2 is the prophetic verse “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel” (NIV). In order for this to be fulfilled, Jesus of Nazareth (in Galilee) must somehow be born in Bethlehem (in Judea). In Matthew (2:1-6) is a fairly bare account that cites and satisfies the prophecy, but in Luke (2:1-20) is the basis of the best-known Nativity story.

fiction” (Helms, *Who Wrote the Gospels* 42), may have led Matthew and Luke to give different accounts of Judas’s death, despite a number of shared elements. A formalist, on the other hand, reads the betrayal as an archetypal myth that requires both a sacrificial Christ and a Betrayer who acts as “both Helper and Opponent of his Master,” as Frank Kermode describes it. When taken to the extreme, this sort of analysis leads to conclusion, as Kermode suggests, that “there was originally no Judas at all” (94, q. in Axton 179).⁶

Although most recent biblical scholarship is reluctant to classify Judas as a totally fictional character, a rough consensus has formed around a persuasive account of how the character of Judas Iscariot developed through the books of the Greek New Testament. In his book *Gospel Fictions*, Randel Helms describes the process thus:

There was of course a particular intellectual framework, a justifying worldview, behind such fictive creation in the Gospels, one that allowed the evangelists and the oral and literary traditions behind them to create stories with full confidence they were telling the “truth”; first-century Christians believed that the career of Jesus, even down to minor details, was predicted in their sacred writings. By a remarkable creative fiat of interpretation, the Jewish scriptures (especially in Greek translation) became a book that had never existed before, the Old Testament, a book no longer about Israel but about Israel’s hope, the Messiah, Jesus. (18)

While this is clearly a polemic aimed at undoing centuries of dogma and traditional exegesis, Helms argues persuasively that the historical accuracy of the New Testament is never in question because the predictive and interpretive apparatus of the Bible is entirely self-contained. Helms calls this system “self-reflexive” (19), and quotes the authority of Northrop Frye:

⁶ This view, or a very similar one, is also held by Randel Helms and Hyam Maccoby.

How do we know that the Gospel story is true? Because it confirms the prophecies of the Old Testament. But how do we know that the Old Testament prophecies are true? Because they are confirmed by the gospel story. Evidence, so called, is bounced back and forth, each reflecting the other but neither the world outside. (Frye 78; quoted in Helms 19)

Aaron M. Saari, subscribing to a view shared by many contemporary biblical scholars, believes that the evangelists often worked in a Midrashic manner, by inventing narrative to resolve doctrinal issues. Saari “argue[s] that Judas was a creation of the Markan community meant to undercut the authority of the twelve” (144), in the same way that “the Passion Narratives [...] were composed from Hebrew prophecy” (145). Conflicting versions of specific events (such as the death of Judas) arose because the Gospel writers were often neither using the same texts, nor working for the same purpose. Hence, “Matthew and Luke were forced to use the Markan Judas tradition but changed Judas’ role to fit their community’s respective christologies and soteriologies” (146).⁷

Once the betrayal has been established, and a betrayer chosen and assigned a punishment, a motivation must next be supplied to complete the betrayal and sacrifice scenario; such back formations are not infrequently found in the canonical Gospels. Generally speaking, solutions to the problem of Judas fall into one or more of these categories, sometimes overlapping, with varying levels of culpability attached: (1) Destiny—Judas has been chosen to accomplish the betrayal necessary for Christ’s sacrifice, and cannot escape the wicked deed—which leaves open the question of whether he might have been forgiven for committing it; (2) Satan—Judas is inspired by the Devil to betray Jesus, and, elsewhere, to kill himself; (3) Irredeemability—Judas is evil by

⁷ Much of this is not new to Saari, and similar statements may be found in Helms, Klassen, Paffenroth, Maccoby, and Robinson, as well as works of other scholars upon whom they draw.

nature, and simply follows his inclination; (4) Greed—Judas is a paid informant, and his role as treasurer implies an interest in money that seems wrong for Christ's disciples, as well as the possibility he was skimming; and (5) any number of more far-fetched explanations have surfaced during the last two millennia, which lie beyond the scope of this study. In any case, these are the explanations most frequently given in early Christian writing, including the canonical Gospels, in the few places where they mention Judas. The lack of clear agreement among the sacred scriptures provides opportunities for both the orthodox exegete and the creator of apocryphal legends.

John, for instance, seems to waver between the idea that greed motivates Judas, and the option that satanic influence is at work, the latter seemingly aided by Jesus. At one point, John asserts that Judas is a thief who steals from the moneybag that he keeps for Jesus and the disciples (John 12:3-8). Later, however, he tells us that Satan entered into Judas, and in his version Jesus seems to be directly responsible for it (John 13:26-27; but cf. 13:2). In the case where two such explanations (or possibly three) are offered, the logic is suspect and the rhetoric less persuasive than if one good reason were clearly articulated.

Contemporary biblical scholarship is, however, of limited use to the study of western Christendom in the Middle Ages. For one thing, the Bible, and particularly the New Testament, is dealt with in its original Greek text, rather than in the Latin of the Vulgate, of the Roman church. Current discussions of Judas, for instance, inevitably refer to the contradictory accounts of his death. The first, suicide by hanging, is found in Matthew 27:3-5:

[T]unc videns Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset poenitentia ductus rettulit triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus

dicens peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum at illi dixerunt quid ad nos tu videris et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit. (Vulgate)

Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients, Saying: I have sinned in betraying innocent blood. But they said: What is that to us? look thou to it. And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed: and went and hanged himself with an halter. (DRV)⁸

In Acts 1.18-20, however, Judas perishes in a very different way. The original *koinē* Greek text has “*prēnēs genomenos elakēsen mesos kai exechuthe panta ta splanchna autou*” (“he fell headlong, his body burst open and all his intestines spilled out,” [NIV]), with no indication that Judas was hanged or in any way strangled. The Vulgate, by contrast, introduces the detail that Judas *has been hanged* prior to, or perhaps in the process of, suffering a very gruesome death:

[E]t hic quidem possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis et *suspensus* crepuit medius et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius. (Vulgate, emphasis added)

And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and *being hanged*, burst asunder in the midst: and all his bowels gushed out. (DRV, emphasis added)

To read the Vulgate, then, there is no contradiction, since Jerome has harmonized the account in Acts with that of Matthew, essentially reconciling the irreconcilable. Jerome has borrowed the word *suspendit* from his own translation of Matthew, changed its form to *suspensus*, and added this word to his translation of Acts to make it clear that both versions refer to the same events.

Hence one of the major focal points for contemporary discussions about the

⁸ Despite its archaisms, the Douay-Rheims translation (DRV) is most convenient because it renders the Vulgate text most faithfully into English.

biblical Judas is simply not applicable to the context of the Western Church in the Middle Ages. Alexander Murray's rather pithy explanation of Jerome's silent harmonizing of Acts 1:8 is worth quoting at length:

Among scholars who have debated the traditions of Judas' death it may have been noticed that none *was* medieval, and for a good reason, namely that medieval European scholars were unaware there was anything to debate about. They were indebted for this comfortable serenity, as for much else, to St Jerome. In turning the Hebrew and Greek Bible into the Vulgate in the late fourth century, Jerome had resolved the clash between Judas' two deaths by making *both* of them read as hanging. Jerome deftly chose one Latin word, *suspensus*, to replace the two problematic Greek ones in Acts, *prēnēs genomenos* ['falling headlong']... *Suspensus* literally means 'hanged', not always and necessarily, to judge from other contexts, 'self-hanged'; but usually, and it is close enough to the word *suspendiosus*, which definitely did mean 'self-hanged', to make Jerome's word at the very least ambiguous and in effect, in its cultural context, indistinguishable from the meaning of Matthew's *apangchesthai* ['to strangle oneself']... Since the original Greek of Acts was not available to medieval commentators [in western Europe] until at earliest the late thirteenth century, they were saved from the puzzle that plagued earlier and later scholars, and were saved without realizing what a danger they had escaped. Jerome had done them a favour, in this sense deliberate, that Jerome thought suicide extremely wicked, hence a fitting end for Judas, and 'interpreted' his Greek texts accordingly. Such 'harmonization' of sacred texts, even in the absence of translation out of Greek, was in fact not at all uncommon in these early Christian centuries (to the bafflement of textual scholars) and the bit of pious sleight of hand, if there can be such a thing, was far from untypical of the Jeromean *chef d'oeuvre*. (338-9)⁹

Murray goes on to say that medieval scholars (i.e., in western Europe) may well have not concerned themselves with the contradiction, even if the Latin text had reflected it, and cites the example of the Greek Church, which had the original Gospel texts all along, and always interpreted the death of Judas as suicide (339). There were, of course, more

⁹ Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages, Volume 2: The Curse on Self-Murder* (New York: Oxford UP, 2000).

elaborate accounts, including harmonizing traditions. In one such version, recorded by Theophylactus, Judas survives an attempt to hang himself when the tree limb bends or breaks beneath his weight, but later becomes dropsical and finally perishes after a rupture caused by falling head-first, as in Acts (Paffenroth 120). In order to understand the significance of Judas's death, however, the church fathers looked not only at the Gospels, but also to the Psalms.

The Commentary Tradition: Judas in the Old Testament

The imprecatory psalms, particularly Psalms 68 and 108, were viewed by Christian exegetes as prophetic, and were frequently applied to Judas because of his role in the betrayal. This practice was authorized by the evangelist Luke, who combined verses from these two psalms into a single quotation in Peter's speech about the death of Judas (Acts 1: 20).¹⁰ Jerome's short commentary on Psalm 108, in his *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, is limited to three of the thirty verses, yet his reading of them helps to frame the interpretive history of this text:

“And let the devil stand at his right [hand]” [Ps. 108.6]. For ‘devil’ in Hebrew is written ‘Satan’, which I interpret as ‘the adversary’. ‘Devil’ is in fact Greek, which we can interpret as ‘false accuser’. “And let his prayer be turned into sin” [Ps. 108.7]. When indeed [Judas] had repented of the betrayal, he hanged himself with a halter. “And let them know how that this is thy Hand, and that thou, Lord, hast done it” [108.27]. Let Pilate, Herod, and the Jews understand that [it was] not by their power, but by thy will that I suffered, nor did I unwillingly drink the cup, which, when I knew that it had to be drunk, I swallowed willingly: not mine, but thine; that is, I had not put on [the things] of man, but rather doing the will

¹⁰ “[S]criptum est enim in libro Psalmorum fiat commoratio eius deserta et non sit qui inhabitet in ea et episcopatum eius accipiat alius” (Vulgate); “For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric [i.e., office of overseer] let another take” (DRV).

of God.¹¹

Jerome does not name Judas in this passage, but presumably the association between this psalm and the betrayal of Jesus (again based on Acts 1) is already so strong as to make such an explicit reference unnecessary, as is the association between Judas and the devil (Luke 22:3, John 6:71, 13:27). Verse 7, concerning a prayer that is turned into sin, presents an interpretive challenge, which Jerome does not entirely manage to explicate (but compare Augustine’s solution below). By jumping ahead to verse 27, the reference to the work of God’s hand, Jerome is able to link the individual parties responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus—Judas, Pilate, Herod, and (collectively) the Jews—to the devil, whom he names first. The image of God’s hand and the allusion to Jesus in the garden of Gethsemani (Mark 13:42 ff.; Matt. 26:36 ff., Luke 22:41) serve to belittle the betrayers and restore the agency for the Christ’s sacrifice to God (Father and Son). The message is clear: although they may not know it, Satan and his minions are playing their assigned roles in the drama of salvation that God is directing.

Augustine’s opinions about Judas are exceedingly important for later Christian traditions, and his interpretation of Judas’s death exerted a formative influence upon the

¹¹ “*Et diabolus stet a dextris eius. Pro diabolo, in hebraeo ‘satan’ scriptum est, quod interpreter aduersarius. Diabolus uero graecum est: quem nos interpretari possimus criminatorem. Et oratio eius fiat in peccatum. Cum enim prodicionis paeniteret, laqueo se suspendit. Et cognoscant quia manus tua iste, et tu Domine fecisti ea. Intellegant Pilatus, Herodes, atque Iudaei, quod non eorum potestate, sed tua uoluntate sum passus, nec inuitus bibi calicem, quem cum scirem esse potandum, sponte hausit: non meam, sed tuam, id est, non hominis quem indueram, se Dei faciens uoluntatem*” (*S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*, pars I, CCSL vol. 72, 231-32). The scriptural quotations in my translation follow the DRV except where the wording differs from the Vulgate. The imagery of drinking from the cup and the words “not mine but thine” (*non meam, sed tuam*) are an allusion to Jesus’ agony in the garden of Gethsemani (Matt. 26:39; John 5:39, 6:38). With the metaphor of “putting on [clothing]” (*induere*), Jerome is alluding to the “new man” (*novem hominem*) who is donned in Collosians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24.

way that later generations understood the betrayer, as well as the way that the Church viewed suicide.¹² In a handful of passages, Augustine uses a combination of logic and rhetoric to link Judas's betrayal of Jesus with the failure of most Jews to acknowledge him as Messiah, and does so in a more thorough way than Jerome. In *City of God*, Augustine links the name and reputation of Judas with the sin of suicide, following Matthew's account of his death:

We rightly abominate the act of Judas, and the judgment of truth is that when he hanged himself he did not atone for the guilt of his detestable betrayal but rather increased it, since he despaired of God's mercy and in a fit of self-destructive remorse left himself no chance of a saving repentance. How much less right has anyone to indulge in self-slaughter when he can find in himself no fault to justify such a punishment! For when Judas killed himself; he killed a criminal, and yet he ended his life guilty not only of Christ's death, but also of his own; one crime led to another. (Saari 15)¹³

Augustine isolates despair—the failure to believe in (or pray for) God's mercy—as the reason that the remorseful Judas was unable to be fully repentant, and consequently the cause of his suicide. Behind the legalistic language and the formal argument is a meditation on the nature of penitence and forgiveness.

In his commentary on Psalm 108, verse 7, Augustine quite clearly presents Judas

¹² On this aspect of Augustine's writings, see: Murray 101 ff. and Aaron Saari, *The Many Deaths of Judas Iscariot: A Meditation on Suicide* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 15-17.

¹³ Saari quotes from: Augustine of Hippo, *Concerning the City of God, Against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), Book 1, Chapter 17. The Latin text: "Nam si Iudae factum merito detestamur eumque ueritas iudicat, cum se laqueo suspendit, sceleratae illius traditionis auxisse potius quam expiasset commissum, quoniam Dei misericordiam desperando exitiabiliter paenitens nullum sibi salubris paenitentiae locum reliquit: quanto magis a sua nece se abstinere debet, qui tali supplicio quod in se puniat non habet! Iudas enim cum se occidit, sceleratum hominem occidit, et tamen non solum Christi, uerum etiam suae mortis reus finiuit hanc uitam, qua licet propter suum scelus alio suo scelere occisus est" (Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. Emanuel Hoffman [Vienna, 1899], 1:31-32).

as an exemplum of despair, again using casuistical reasoning to interpret a rather difficult text, and picking up where Jerome left off:

“When his sentence is given upon him, let him be condemned” (Ps. 108:7). For he refused to be one of those to whom it should be said, “enter into the joy of thy Lord” (Matt. 25:21, 23); and preferred to be such an one of whom it is said, “cast him into outer darkness” (Matt. 8:12, 22:13, 25:30). “And let his prayer be turned into sin” (Ps. 108:7). For prayer is not righteous except through Christ, Whom he sold in his atrocious sin: but prayer which is not made through Christ, not only cannot blot out sin, but is itself turned into sin. But it may be inquired, on what occasion Judas could have so prayed, that his prayer was turned into sin. I suppose that before he betrayed the Lord, while he was thinking of betraying Him; for he could no longer pray through Christ. For after he betrayed Him, and repented of it, if he prayed through Christ, he would ask for pardon; if he asked for pardon, he would have hope; if he had hope, he would hope for mercy; if he hoped for mercy, he would not have hung himself in despair: therefore after he had said, “when sentence is given upon him, let him be condemned;” that he might not be supposed to have been able to liberate himself by prayer from the condemnation which hung over him; that prayer which he had learned together with his fellow disciples (Parker, 214-215, with punctuation and citations added)¹⁴

Here Augustine’s rhetorical training is put to good use, and his argument is at its most engaging, if not, perhaps, at its most subtle. Explicating the particularly difficult seventh verse in which prayer—a seemingly unconditionally good thing—is turned into sin, Augustine introduces the connected concepts of sin, mercy, hope, and despair. Thus the

¹⁴ “Cum iudicatur, exeat condemnatus. Noluit enim talis esse cui diceretur, Intra in gaudium domini tui; sed talis de quo dicitur, Projicite illum in tenebras exteriors (Matth. xxv, 21, 30). Et oration ejus fiat in peccatum. Quoniam non est justa oratio, nisi per Christum, quem vendidit immanitate peccati: oratio autem quae non fit per Christum, non solum non potest delere peccatum, sed etiam ipsa fit in peccatum. Quando autem Judas ita orare potuerit, ut oratio ejus fieret in peccatum, quaeri potest. Credo antequam Dominum traderet, et de illo tradendo jam cogitaret: non enim jam poterat orare per Christum. Nam posteaquam illum tradidit, eumque poenituit, si per Christum oraret, indulgentiam rogaret; si indulgentiam rogaret, spem haberet; si spem haberet, misericordiam speraret; si misericordiam speraret, non sibi desperation collum ligaret”(*Commentarium in Psalmos*, PL 191, col. 990A-B). Another of Augustine’s commentaries on the same psalm (*Ennaratio in Psalmam*, PL 37) makes a connection between the imprecation of the psalm and Judas (and by extension, all the Jews), using Peter’s quotation in Acts. Also cf. Augustine’s *Sermo* 352.

damnation of Judas can be traced back (through a prophetic text) to his failure to pray through Christ, which amounts, in Augustine's view, to forgetting the Lord's Prayer (revisiting the theme of poor discipleship).

Another Latin commentary, now known as the *Breviarium in Psalmos* of Pseudo-Jerome (*PL* 26 [1884] coll. 871-1382), is important to the medieval interpretation of Judas, partly via its influence upon the *Historica Scholastica* of Peter Comestor. The exact origin of this work, which seems to have drawn as least as much from Augustine as from the genuine works of Jerome, is not known. The oldest extant manuscripts date to the ninth century, but it may have evolved over a long period; in its present form, the *Breviarium* "shows certain Irish characteristics."¹⁵ The Pseudo-Hieronymian commentary on Psalm 108 (*PL* 26, coll. 1224C-1233A) deals with some of the same themes of betrayal, justice, and punishment as Augustine's commentary cited above, including mention of both Judas and the Jews. The sin of suicide is addressed in a paragraph on verse seven:

"When he is judged, let him go out condemned" (Ps. 108.7): Let him come not into judgment, but into condemnation. Where [there] is judgment, therefore, there is condemnation; but where there is condemnation, the sentence is already apparent. "And let his prayer be turned to sin" (Ps. 108.7): The penitence of Judas made a worse sin. In what manner did his penitence make a worse sin? He went out, and died by being hanged. And he who had been the betrayer of the Lord, thereby became his own slayer. For the mercy of the Lord I say this: how much more did he offend the Lord by this thing, in that he hanged himself, than when he betrayed the Lord? It was fitting that his prayer be in penitence and that it be turned into sin. You see the heretic praying, you see the Jew, you see the Manichean: although they fast, although they pray, their prayer is

¹⁵ Martin McNamara, *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000): 49.

nevertheless turned into sin.¹⁶

Peter Comestor cites Jerome “upon Psalm 108” as his source for the interpretation of Judas’s suicide, but he is obviously referring to the passage in the Pseudo-Hieronymian *Breviarium* quoted above.

As it happened, Satan, who had possessed Judas, withdrew from him after he had done what he wanted. Judas was therefore able to suffer remorse, which he did. As a result of [Judas’s] remorse, Satan could enter into him again, in order to make him set his hand upon himself. Jerome says (in his Commentary on Psalm 108) that Judas offended God more when he hanged himself than in the fact that he betrayed him.¹⁷

This assertion that suicide was a greater sin than betrayal is significant, though here it is combined with an etiology involving Satan, rather than despair. The Augustinian understanding of despair—that it leads to greater sins or gives the devil an opportunity of tempting one to greater sins—has a powerful influence over later Christian thought.

Peter’s description of the mechanics of Judas being possessed and repossessed by Satan in order that he should give in to despair may be at the root of the suicide accounts given in medieval drama. Doubtless the *Historia Scholastica* also helped to establish Judas as

¹⁶ “‘Cum iudicatur, exeat condemnatus.’ Non veniat in iudicium, sed in condemnationem. Ubi enim iudicium est, ibi condemnatio; ubi autem condemnatio, jam manifesta est sententia. ‘Et oratio ejus fiat in peccatum.’ Poenitentia Judae pejus peccatum factum est. Quomodo pejus peccatum factum est poenitentia Judae? Ivit, et suspendio periit. Et qui proditor Domini factus est, hic et interemptor sui exstitit. Pro clementia Domini hoc dico: quia magis ex hoc offendit Dominum, quia se suspendit, quam quod Dominum prodidit. Oportebat orationem ipsius esse in poenitentiam, et versa est in peccatum. Vides haereticum orantem, vides Judaeum, vides Manichaeum: licet jejurent, licet orent, tamen oratio ipsorum vertitur in peccatum” (col. 1226C-D).

¹⁷ “Forte Satanus, qui possederat Judas, postquam fecit, quod voluit, recessit ab eo ideo potuit Judas dolere, quod fecerat, ut ex dolore iterum intraret in eum Satanus, ut faceret eum injicere sibi manum. Dicit Hieronymus super cviii psal. quia magis offendit Judas Deum, quando se suspendit, quam in hoc quod eum prodidit” (*PL* vol. 198, cols. 1624-25).

“the stock example in medieval homiletics of the sin of wanhope” (Brown 96 n. 1410).¹⁸

Parallel to this Patristic and later Scholastic understanding of Judas are numerous apocryphal texts and independent non-canonical traditions that address the question of Judas in very different ways.

Early Christian Apocrypha and the *Gospel of Judas*

Apocryphal texts may differ from canonical Gospels in the matter of narrative, but it is the differences that have doctrinal implications which caused them to be labeled as heretical by such proto-orthodox authorities such as Irenaeus and Athanasius. A number of the early Christian apocryphal texts—including some written to support the proto-orthodox side—grew out of disputes among different groups of the followers of Jesus during the first few generations after his death.

One such early apocryphal text is the long-lost *Gospel of Judas*, preserved in badly-damaged papyrus manuscript that recently came to light in Egypt and has subsequently been conserved, edited, translated, and analyzed by scholars. Books on this non-canonical gospel have been published by scholars in the field of biblical studies, experts on apocrypha, and particularly specialists in Gnosticism.¹⁹ Despite the fact that

¹⁸ For examples of *wanhop* in Middle English literature, see: *The Speculum of Gy de Warwyke* (ed. G. L. Morrill, E.E.T.S. e.s. 75 [London, 1898]), lines 129-32; and Chaucer’s *Parson’s Tale* (*The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. L. D. Benson [Boston: Houghton, 1987]), lines 693-95; and *Lent* from *The South English Legendary* (ed. C. D’Evelyn and A. Mill), lines 87, 107 (pp. 1:131-32). For an example from French drama see Paffenroth 122-23 and Jeffrey Kahn, *Judas Iscariot: A Vehicle of Medieval Didacticism*, Ph.D. diss., University of Utah, 1976, 165-68.

¹⁹ See especially: *The Gospel of Judas from Codex Tchacos*, ed. Rodolphe Kasser, Marvin Meyer, and Gregor Wurst (Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2006); James M. Robinson, *The Secrets of Judas: The Story of the Misunderstood Disciple and His Lost Gospel* (San Francisco: Harper, 2006); Elaine Pagels and Karen L. King, *Reading Judas: The Gospel of Judas and the Shaping of Christianity* (New York: Viking/Penguin, 2007); and Marvin Meyer, *Judas: The*

Gospel of Judas was not known in the Middle Ages (except perhaps by reputation as a heretical text), it provides a convenient example of an early apocryphal text, complete with a theological agenda quite distinct from that of the canonical Gospels. The surviving fourth-century Coptic manuscript is probably the last representative of a Greek original of the second century (Pagels and King 126).

The *Gospel of Judas* not only portrays Judas as the most enlightened of Jesus' disciples (as against the Twelve), but perhaps more importantly presents Jesus as a teacher of Gnostic doctrine. As Pagels and King suggest, the author of the Gospel of Judas was responding to a bitter disagreement among the various communities of early Christians. At a time of persecution when some prominent leaders of the Church called for martyrdom, the unknown Gnostic evangelist set out an opposing interpretation of what Jesus would have expected from his followers. The text also delivers, from the mouth of Jesus, several lessons on the Gnostic cosmology that would seem quite alien to most Christians of today. With respect to these narrative elements and doctrinal matters, the *Gospel of Judas* differs sharply from the New Testament. But in other ways it functions the same as the canonical Gospels do: by elevating one of the disciples, as Matthew does with Peter and John does with "the beloved disciple," and by undermining the authority of the Twelve, as Mark and Luke do (Pagels and King 33 ff.).

Defining the Later Apocrypha

Contemporary biblical scholarship has demonstrated that different treatments of the character of Judas may be discerned in the New Testament, and that conflicting

stories about his life and death in the canonical Gospels are artifacts of the particular agendas belonging to each of the evangelists and the communities by whom their writings were intended to be used. The patristic tradition dealt with these variances among the sacred scriptures in quite another way, generally by attempting to harmonize the accounts, yielding results that complement and sometimes even resemble apocryphal texts. By the Middle Ages, however, the motivations of the canonical evangelists, the authors of the early apocryphal gospels, and the church fathers themselves have all been obscured; those who transmit the texts and traditions in question (the matter of Judas specifically and the late apocrypha in general) have concerns of their own, shaped by current cultural conditions, as well as by centuries of Christian tradition and the concomitant accretion of doctrinal and narrative artifacts.

While the agenda of the proto-orthodox camp in the early, formative centuries of the Christian Church, both of canon and creed, must be the necessary starting point for any historical approach to biblical apocrypha, the conditions surrounding the production and transmission of texts many centuries later, however, quite naturally involve different concerns, and consequently any analysis of them requires a separate set of critical tools. Although European Christendom was by no means free from heresies during the Middle Ages, the overwhelming majority of medieval apocryphal texts present no challenge to the doctrines of the Roman Church. Instead, this literature grows out of the desire of the faithful (whether clergy or laity) to supplement the narrative of the canonical sacred books. Richard Axton explains the process this way:

Apocryphal stories of Judas [...] show how curiously medieval people speculated about the motives of 'him who did betray the best'. These narrative speculations seem to have been prompted by gaps or puzzles in the Gospel accounts of the Betrayal, and they continue the process of

rationalization of the ‘history’ which the evangelists themselves wrestled with. (179)

This urge to fill in the gaps is seen in some apocryphal traditions preserved from Late Antiquity, as well as many more that appeared for the first time in manuscripts from the second millennium of the Christian era.

The case of apocryphal literature in medieval Ireland is especially interesting, because so many texts were preserved there—in Latin, initially, but later also in vernacular versions—that were lost elsewhere in western Christendom, though extant in languages such as Greek, Slavonic, Ethiopic, Arabic, or Syriac (Dumville 299). The *Gospel of Nicodemus*, for instance, into which an important Judas tradition eventually found its way, is relatively early in origin and orthodox in character, but it was not included among the 27 books of the New Testament.²⁰ Through the doctrine of Christ’s Descent into or Harrowing of Hell, however, it has nevertheless left its mark upon orthodox Christian belief, and was so widely transmitted (in both Latin and vernacular languages) that it is thought to have enjoyed a deuterocanonical status through much of the Middle Ages.²¹ David N. Dumville notes that references to the Christ’s descent into Hell are found “in the first canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633,” and also “in the Creed of the seventh-century Bangor Antiphony,” prior to the eighth century, when it was incorporated into the “universally accepted Apostles’ Creed” (Dumville

²⁰ The dating is disputed, but the oldest parts seem to go back at least to the 6th c. and be as old as 2nd c. See: G. C. O’Ceallaigh, “Dating the commentaries of Nicodemus,” *Harvard Theological Review* 56 (1963), 21-58.

²¹ Dumville 301. Nowadays the Catholic Church uses the term deuterocanonical, to describe those books once commonly referred to as the Apocrypha, and printed in most Catholic Bibles.

301).²² According to J. N. D. Kelly, this Descent motif was known to Rufinus (in the late 4th century), and mentioned in Creeds as early as 359. The *descendit Christi ad inferna* ('descent of Christ to the damned' later *ad inferos* 'into the lower regions,' i.e., hell) is mentioned by Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, and was justified on the grounds of biblical passages such as I Peter 3:19 and 4:6, Matthew 12:39 ff., Romans 10:7, Colossians 1:18, and Acts 2:27-3 (Kelly 378-79).

The legends about Judas in Christian texts of late antiquity and the Middle Ages consist of a number of elements or motifs, which, occurring singly or in combination, represent a wide spectrum of possible Judasologies, including a few that imply rather heterodox Christologies. Yet in the medieval context, these traditions may in most cases be assumed to have arisen or been transmitted for orthodox rather than heretical purposes.

To quote Martin McNamara at some length:

With the formation of the Canon the situation changed as far as many of the apocryphal writings were concerned. They were no longer contenders for canonicity and in many instances their use meant no danger to the faith. In some of the more objectionable of these works a certain redactional activity was practiced to remove the more offensive portions and thus make them more acceptable to orthodox readers. [...] In a number of apocryphal works there is nothing particularly heterodox; at least there is nothing specifically so in the form in which these have now reached us.²³

There are also assertions made by quite important and influential authorities (Priscillian, Jacobus of Voragine) to the effect that the literal truth of a story is less important than the

²² Dumville, David N. "Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation." *PRIA* (C) 73 (1973): 299-338. For Dumville's discussion of the Harrowing of Hell and the suicide of Judas, see 301-303. For the possibility of the Priscillianist milieu as a source of apocryphal texts for medieval Ireland, see 321-29.

²³ *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975), 4.

moral message it imparts. Priscillian (a problematic authority, since he was generally considered to be a heretic) valorizes a capable reader whom he deems qualified to decide what moral teaching to draw from the apocrypha.²⁴ Athanasius, as a more orthodox writer, sets off the canon and then covers his tracks, effectively erasing the reader and placing the power into the hands of those who guard the canon—the clerical hierarchy of the church. Much later, when heresy concerning scripture itself is less of a danger, orthodox retelling of apocrypha takes on another meaning.

Genre

In treating this material, the problem of genre also needs to be considered. Although hagiography may be broadly interpreted as writing on nearly any sacred subject, in practice the field is predominantly occupied with the lives and deaths of saints, as well as relics and other aspects of their cults. Sinners are an object of hagiographical study only inasmuch as they fill the role of antagonists, such as pagan tyrants who bring about martyrdom, or when such sinners experience conversion and themselves become saints. Personages such as Judas, Pilate, Herod, and Nero have no comfortable status and are not typically granted entries in the *BHL*, *BHG*, or the *AASS*.²⁵ Yet the narratives in question (biblical legends, apocryphal traditions, late apocrypha) sometimes acquire the status of legend, at least in the sense of being included into one of the great legendaries,

²⁴ See: Andrew S. Jacobs “The Disorder of Books: Priscillian’s Canonical Defense of Apocrypha,” *Harvard Theological Review* 93.2 (2000): 135-59.

²⁵ Admittedly, Pilate is considered to be a saint in some Eastern churches, and he has at least one entry in the *BHL* (4222d).

as when the Oedipodean Judas vita was incorporated into the *Legenda Aurea*.²⁶

Apocrypha, and in particular New Testament apocrypha, is usually divided into the same generic categories as the books of the canonical New Testament: gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses. The narratives in question, however, do not always adhere to these sorts of books. To be sure, legends such as that of Judas and the resurrected cock are found in combination with parts of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, though in this case it is generally considered to be a late interpolation into a relatively early apocryphal book. According to the traditional definition, the content of New Testament apocrypha refers primarily to the period just before, during, or shortly after the life and ministry of Jesus, with the outer limit being the age of the apostles and the early church (Gounelle, “Sens et usage” 201).

In the introduction to her monograph on medieval French versions of the Rood Wood legend, Angelique M.L. Prangma-Hajenius discusses the critical use of the term *légende biblique* (‘biblical legend’), which some scholars seem to favor, perhaps because it strikes a balance between the apocryphal (biblical) and the hagiographical (legend) aspects of these texts.²⁷ In certain cases, such as the Middle English *Cursor Mundi* and its Old French source, this category makes a great deal of sense because the text in question is primarily a world-history based upon a Bible harmony (such as the *Historia Scholastica*), plus a mix of secular and apocryphal sources. The legends of the cross, and

²⁶ In hagiography, a legend (from Latin *legenda*, ‘having to be read’) may consist of a reading, perhaps meant for use in a coenobitic community. A *legendary* denotes a collection of legends, in this case, a combination of saints’ lives and material relating to the movable feasts of the liturgical calendar (that is, a combination of *sanctorale* and *temporale*).

²⁷ Angelique M. L. Prangma-Hajenius, *La Légende de la Bois de la Croix dans la littérature française médiévale* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1995), 8-11.

particularly the originary legends thereof, also addle such categories. Indeed, the cross itself belongs only to Christian belief, though the legend of its origin take place during the time frame of the Old Testament and seems to be based in part upon Jewish apocrypha. By association with the feasts that surround the finding of the cross and the cult of its relics, these legends are sometimes included in collections such as the *Legenda Aurea*.

If the apocryphal texts of the Middle Ages ought to be distinguished from their early Christian counterparts, so too must apocrypha be distinguished from hagiographic literature. The dividing line between hagiography and apocrypha has been the subject of recent debate—one might even go so far as to say controversy—within the scholarship concerning Christian literature in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. More traditional scholars, such as Wilhelm Schneemelcher, “[prefer] to classify the later texts as hagiographic literature,” while other more progressive scholars, including Éric Junod and Jean-Claude Picard, argue “that there is no temporal limit for the rise of apocryphal texts,” (Piovanelli 32).²⁸ Considered as a group of texts, the late apocrypha share certain characteristics: they provide information that addresses questions arising from but unanswered by the canonical scriptures; they tend to recycle characters, language, or situations from elsewhere in Gospels; they borrow episodes and motifs from folklore and pagan myths; and they are often linked to larger narratives, incorporated into legendaries,

²⁸ As for the date of composition, one recent trend in scholarship is to downplay this aspect of a text to the point of including such recent works as Nicholas Kazantzakis’s novel *The Last Temptation of Christ*, Andrew Lloyd Webber’s musical *Jesus Christ Superstar*, and Mel Gibson’s film *The Passion of the Christ* under the rubric of apocryphal texts. Though the possibilities raised by proponents of a broad definition for apocrypha are of interest, such extreme judgments lie beyond the scope of this dissertation. See also: Gounelle, “Sens et usage.”

or included in encyclopedic works.

Overview of chapters

This dissertation considers two apocryphal traditions about Judas and explores a selection of the texts in which they are found, with a particular focus upon Britain and Ireland from the late thirteenth to the early fifteenth century. The individual texts and traditions considered here will be examined in their own right, as will the relationships between Latin and vernacular texts, and between the two apocryphal traditions, to the extent that there are any.

The second and third chapters deal with the apocryphal tradition *De ortu Judas*, which relates the origins and life of Judas prior to his becoming a disciple of Jesus, and is remarkable for its borrowing of several motifs from the myth of Oedipus. Chapter 2 considers the Latin versions of this tradition found in the *Historia Apocrypha* and the *Legenda Aurea*, in both of which the legend of Judas is associated with that of Pilate. A chief concern of this chapter is the process by which the orthodox author-compiler Jacobus of Voragine incorporated subject matter that he calls ‘admittedly apocryphal’ into the *Legenda Aurea*. Chapter 3 examines the Middle English verse legends of Judas and Pilate found in several manuscripts of the *South English Legendary*.²⁹ This chapter brings together recent scholarship on the Latin and the Middle English versions of *De ortu Judas* and shows that the *Legenda Aurea* (but not the *Historia Apocrypha*) was a direct source for the Judas and Pilate legends in the *South English Legendary*. The positioning of these two malefactors in the collection is also discussed, along with some

²⁹ See above note 26.

of the innovative ways that the Middle English author used and departed from the source material. Given the difficulty of the early Middle English of the *South English Legendary*, annotated translations of the Judas and Pilate *vitae* from the *South English Legendary* are provided in appendices.

The fourth and fifth chapters are concerned with the tradition *De gallo redivivo*, in which the resuscitation of a partially cooked rooster bears witness to the coming resurrection of Jesus and leads Judas to commit suicide. This apocryphon is most often associated with the legends of the wood of the cross before Jesus (*Origo crucis*), which trace the rood-lumber back through biblical history to David, Moses, or Seth. Chapter 4 considers the three Latin versions of *De gallo redivivo* and surveys the largely undocumented manuscript tradition of this apocryphon. Chapter 5 examines a Middle Irish version of *De gallo redivivo* found in the *Leabhar Breac*, and conducts a preliminary overview of the matter of Judas in late medieval Ireland. These chapters demonstrate that the story of Judas and the cock is not (as has been claimed by various scholars for nearly a century) dependent upon the Oedipodean life of Judas, nor did the two circulate together in very many manuscripts. These conclusions, if correct, have implications not only for the matter of Judas in England and Ireland, but also for current scholarly discourse concerning the development of the apocryphon of the resuscitated rooster.

2. *De ortu Judae: The Oedipodean Judas in the Latin tradition*

This chapter and the next one deal with an apocryphal tradition concerning the conception, birth, and youth of Judas usually known as *De ortu Judae*, and less often as *De ortu et origine Judae*; because of the several motifs shared with the myth of Oedipus, it may also be referred to it as the *Oedipodean Judas legend*.¹ This chapter considers the tradition *De ortu Judae*—along with the closely linked legends of Pontius Pilate, Veronica, and the destruction of Jerusalem—in two Latin prose versions: first, the anonymous *Historia Apocrypha* (HA), written in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; and second, Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (LA), a late thirteenth century compilation of saints' lives and other religious narratives. Since the HA has long been identified as the primary source for the LA version of these legends, the discussion will focus on the very different ways that the two works treat the same apocryphal material, with particular attention to the thorough reworking and repositioning of the HA source material that Jacobus chose to incorporate into the LA. Some consideration will be

¹ The adjective *Oedipodean*, though somewhat more awkward than *oedipal*, is free from associations with Freud. There is at present no universally agreed title by which this legend is known. The current standard Latin edition of the *Legenda Aurea* uses the title *De ortu Iudae* in its apparatus (Maggioni 277), while M. R. James, in his description of St. John's College, Cambridge Ms. 214, reports the title *De ortu Jude scarioht* (*St. John's Catalogue* 243), and von Heinemann's Wolfenbüttel catalogue gives the more exhaustive *De ortu et origine Jude proditoris* (Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 488). Elsewhere, as in the Bodleian Library *Quarto Catalogue* entry for MS. Laud 633, the legend is given a much less descriptive title, such as *De Juda traditore* (Coxe col. 457), which is also sometimes used as a title for the legend of Judas and the *gallus redivivus*, covered in Chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation.

given to the manuscript circulation of these two Latin texts, and they also figure in Chapter 3, which will examine their connections to the *South English Legendary*.

The medieval apocryphal tradition *De ortu Judae*: overview and origins

This legend, like several of those that make up the matter of Judas, is largely concerned with the early part of Judas's life, prior to his becoming one of the Twelve, and hence it has little overlap with the canonical gospel narratives. In the Oedipodean legend, Judas is the son of Ruben and Cyborea, who live in Jerusalem at the time of Herod and Pilate. A prophetic dream on the night of his conception leads his parents to abandon their infant son at sea in a small chest or basket. Judas survives, landing upon the island of Scarioth, where he is rescued by the queen and adopted into the royal family. After an envious rivalry leads Judas to murder his foster-brother, he flees to Jerusalem, soon becoming the protégé of Pontius Pilate. At Pilate's behest, Judas steals apples from an orchard that belongs to Ruben; an altercation ensues and Judas unwittingly commits patricide. Pilate gives to Judas the property and the widow of Ruben, which latter makes him the spouse in an incestuous marriage to his mother. Once the truth of his identity is revealed, Cyborea refers Judas to Jesus, from whom he seeks repentance for these grievous sins. At this point the legend links up with the canonical narrative again, as the discipleship of Judas goes awry because of his greed and ends in betrayal, further regret (though not true penitence), followed by suicide and damnation.

During the later Middle Ages, this legend was widely known from Jacobus of Voragine's version in the *Legenda Aurea*, in which it comprises much of chapter 45, on St. Matthias. There are, however, several earlier Latin versions and numerous later vernacular versions. Paull Franklin Baum, whose 1916 study on this subject is still the

most exhaustive, believed that this back-story was added to the life of the arch-traitor around the late eleventh century (though the earliest extant versions are late twelfth century), and that it was probably first recorded in Latin (Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 629).² Although he was unable to provide a single definitive account of the origin and meaning of this particular tradition about Judas, Baum presents several plausible explanations, each of which is routinely repeated in subsequent scholarship and each of which presumes that the motifs of abandonment, parricide, and incestuous marriage are borrowed—whether directly or indirectly—from the myth of Oedipus.³

The Oedipus story was not, however, known to medieval fabulators through the plays of Sophocles, nowadays considered the *locus classicus*. Yet by way of the *Thebaid* of Statius, Latin abridgements thereof, and vernacular versions such as the *Roman de Thébès*, some form of the myth of Oedipus was available in western Europe throughout the Middle Ages (Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 610-12).⁴ The Latin poem known as the *Lament* or *Planctus of Oedipus* provides further evidence that the Oedipus myth had

² Paull F. Baum, "The Mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot" (*PMLA* 31 [1916]: 481-632), hereafter referenced as "Baum" or "Baum, 'Mediaeval Legend'" as required by the context. Researchers in the nineteenth century (L. Constans, E. de Ménil, A. Graf, etc.) remarked upon Judas and other legends that appeared to be retellings of pagan myth in Christian guise, well before the more systematic attention from Rand and his student Baum in the early twentieth century. One conspicuous and relatively early treatment in the field of hagiography is that of Delahaye's *Legends of the Saints*, who indeed mentions both the Judas legend and saints' lives that are its analogues (119-69).

³ Richard Axton ("Interpretations of Judas in Middle English Literature") has also identified biblical motifs in the legend, notably "the exposure of the child by water" (184), which resembles the story of Moses (Exodus 2:3).

⁴ See the edition of Statius in the Loeb Classics (Bailey). An Old French version of the story of Oedipus is related in the more than 500 line prologue of the twelfth-century *Roman de Thébès* in a form that does not appear in Statius (Baum 612). See the edition by de Lage and the English translation by Coley.

some currency during the central part of the Middle Ages (Baum 611; Paffenroth 75).⁵

By a similar process of borrowing and recontextualization, elements of the Oedipodean biography of Judas were subsequently recycled by later hagiographers for the stories of such penitents saints as Julian the Hospitaller, Pope Gregory, Andrew of Crete, and Albanus (Albans)—each of whom is eventually redeemed.⁶ Gregory, who is the product of one incestuous union (between brother and sister) and grows up to unwittingly enter another (with his mother), spends years doing penance by living under a stone, on the strength of which he is eventually elected Pope. Albanus, also born to incestuous parents (father and daughter), also unwittingly marries his mother and repents with a similar

⁵ Paffenroth argues that this poem shows how the Judas legend may have influenced the medieval reception of the Oedipus myth (75-6). The *Planctus* was published several times in the 19th century, and again more recently in 1970 (Clogan) and 1980 (Hahn). Somewhat dated, but still worth consulting is Baum's main source for information on the Oedipus myth in the Middle Ages (Constans 95-130).

⁶ These sinner-saints are discussed at some length by Baum (483-4), Paffenroth (73-5), Edmunds (19-46, 61-67, 79-88), and more recently by Fritz Peter Knapp, in the article "*legenda aut non legenda* Erzählstrukturen und Legitimationsstrategien in 'falschen' Legenden des Mittelalters: Judas—Gregorius—Albanus" (*Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* 53.2 [2003]:133-54); and Jutta Emming, "Judas als Held. Formen des Erzählens in der mittelalterlichen Judaslegende" (*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 120.3 [2001]: 394-412). E. Dorn (in *Der Sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters*) divides the saints by their sins, so that Julian is classified with the parricides and Gregory with the incestuous; Dorn deals with Judas in a separate section on anti-saints (anti-heiligen). For the Legend of St. Julian, see cap. 30 of the *Legenda Aurea* (Maggioni 210-214, Ryan 126-30), as well as the extensive bibliography on the Old French versions (especially Baudouin de Gaiffier, "La légende de Saint-Julien l'Hospitalier," *Analecta Bollandiana*, 63 [1945], 145-219; 94 [1976], 5-17.), and the even more extensive bibliography on Flaubert's *Légende de saint Julien le Hôpitalier*, published in *Trois Contes* (1876), and frequently translated into English, e.g., Benjamin J. Bart and Robert F. Cook, *The Legendary Sources of Flaubert's Saint Julian* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1977). In regard to the Old French *Grégoire*, Baum (483-4 n. 2) refers his readers to the works of Emile Littré (*Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1863 vol. 2, § viii) and Arturo Graf (*Miti, leggende e superstizioni del medio evo*, 2 vols., Turin, 1892-93, 1:273-310). The Old French version later became the basis of one in Middle High German by Hartmann von Aue, *Gregorius oder Der gute Sünder*. My summaries draw heavily upon those of John Boswell, who also provides extensive bibliographic references and a detailed discussion the abandonment and incest motifs in the legends of Judas, Gregorius, and Albanus (Boswell 364-77). To this list of sinner-saints might also be added St. Ursius (see Baum 489 n. 6).

fervor after identities are revealed. Albanus later kills both of his parents when they renew their illicit relations, then repents again, and is ultimately martyred. The sanctity of Albanus is witnessed by the power to cure leprosy, a miracle attributed to the river into which his body was thrown by his murderers. Julian the Hospitator, forewarned that he will kill his parents, unintentionally commits a double parricide (though not incest) then becomes in turn hermit, hostler, and saint. The arch-sinners Gregory, Albanus, and Julian, having violated the most fundamental taboos of human society, are nevertheless able, through penance, to achieve sanctity. Although these sins do not rise to the level of deicide, the final transgression of Judas, his early career according to the Oedipodean vita is no worse by comparison. The message that no sin is too grave to be forgiven is more apparent in the legend of Gregory, which may indicate that it arose as a response to that of Judas.

It is indeed in contrast to these saints that Judas may be seen most clearly as a case of failed repentance and hence not merely as an arch-sinner, but as a particular type of anti-saint. Even Baum, who believed that the main purpose of the Oedipodean Judas legend was “a pious intention of blackening the name of Judas,” admits as a secondary motivation “a wish to show that no matter how great the sin, true repentance brings full pardon” (483). Although he is overly dismissive of the literary capabilities and even the objectives of the authors of these late apocrypha, Baum makes the important observation that:

These two intentions vary in prominence in the different versions, but the latter, which would seem to be ancillary, gained weight and emphasis probably through the influence of such legends as those of Gregory,

Albanus, and Julian. (Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 183)⁷

In this respect the legend *De ortu Judae* is—despite the objection that it seems to support a pagan view of fate—largely in keeping with one traditional Christian interpretation of the canonical betrayal narrative that derives from the early Latin Church Fathers.

According to Augustine, Jerome, and their followers, the attempt to return the blood money (Matt. 27:3-5) shows that Judas has at least recognized his error, yet because manifesting regret constitutes only the first step in a process of penitence, that of Judas remains incomplete. This imperfect repentance, followed by his suicide, demonstrates that Judas has died in the sin despair.⁸ The message is clear enough: even the most heinous of sins may be forgiven, as long as the sinner is willing to abide in penitence, and able to avoid giving in to despair. What separates the penitent saints from the failed disciple is belief in the efficacy of penance and faith in the possibility of divine forgiveness; lacking any such faith in God's mercy, Judas condemns himself.

The Oedipodean Judas legend receives periodic attention from scholars in several different fields, including folklorists, literary historians, researchers on hagiography and—not surprisingly—psychological and psycho-analytical theorists. One of the latter, Norman Reider, in a 1960 article, explores several possible accounts for the origin and meaning of this legend. Following Baum (483), Reider contends that elements adapted from the Oedipus myth are intended to further “blacken” the name of Judas. Reider also

⁷ Though Baum asserts that the legends of the sinner-saints “came into vogue at about the same time” (183), Knapp has since shown that Judas is the oldest among these legends, and probably influenced the others (Knapp, "legenda aut non legenda" 137).

⁸ In the Old French drama, a personification of Despair performs this function (Paffenroth 122-23). On Augustine, Jerome, and Pseudo-Jerome, see above, ch. 1, p.12 ff.

takes an interest in how “such differences of adaptation as would occur in making a Greek hero with a pagan background into an antihero with a Christian background” (Reider 520). Reider also introduces the important theme of Jewish-Christian relations, pointing out that the legend was contemporary with “the Crusades and mass anti-Semitism” in Europe (521).⁹ Rejecting the suggestion that the source of the Oedipodean material could have been in Statius, Reider supposes that “some monk in the eleventh century saw the combination of Oedipus and Judas in Origen’s *Contra Celsum* and made the equation that Judas equals Oedipus” (520; paraphrasing Baum 616).¹⁰

This hypothesis has received occasional support in the critical literature, notably by Richard Axton who, in his exploration of Middle English Judas legends, argues that the tradition *De ortu Judae* has “a learned source, perhaps in Book 2 of Origen’s *Contra Celsum*, where the Greek and Christian stories are discussed as parallel examples of prophecy which does not preempt [free will]” (Axton 183). The paradox inherent in divinely decreed acts of evil, alongside the presumption of human autonomy (ignorant or otherwise) lies at the center of both tales. Moreover, Axton remarks that a version of Origen’s text “was current in the Latin MSS of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, so

⁹ While the Crusades almost certainly post-date the origin of the legend, Bernard of Clairvaux’s rhetoric may have had an influence, if not upon the *Historia Apocrypha*, at least upon the *Legenda Aurea* (see below and Knape 129-31). Anti-Semitism is clearly evident in the LA treatment of Christ’s betrayers (but see Reames 262 note 9, for examples of Jacobus being less anti-semitic than his sources).

¹⁰ “The sum total which we derive from the passage in Origen is this. In making his point against Celsus, Origen, knowing two literatures, draws on them both, and in the same sentence mentions Oedipus and Judas. Some monk, in the eleventh century, let us say, perusing Origen’s *Contra Celsum* (in a Latin translation, of course) was struck by the combination; and what was in the original only a literary allusion fructified after many generation in the mind of a Western reader—that is, suggested the equation: Judas=Oedipus” (Baum 616).

that a medieval scholar, struck by the similarities, could have invented from them the early life of Judas” (183 n. 10).¹¹

Kim Paffenroth, who considers Origen in his discussion of free will and the culpability of Judas, gives the following quotation from *Contra Celsum* (supplying his own translation of the Greek):

We do not maintain that the one who has foreknowledge takes away the possibility of an event happening or not happening... This holds good for all foreknowledge about matters controlled by free will, whether we are dealing with the divine scriptures or with Greek stories... To make this point clear, I will quote from the Scripture the prophecies about Judas or the foreknowledge of our Savior that he would betray him; and from the Greek stories I will quote the oracle to Laius, allowing for the moment that it is true, since its historicity does not affect the argument. (Paffenroth 71, ellipses in original)

As Paffenroth explains, Origen is alluding to Psalm 108, one of the imprecatory psalms traditionally interpreted as predicting of the betrayal of Jesus by Judas. This reading is authorized by Peter’s quotation from it in Acts 1:20, and has a long history in Christian theology.¹²

Contemporary biblical scholars tend to read such parts of the New Testament as midrashic compositions, where the narrative is supplied in order to fulfill a certain scriptural prophecy.¹³ It is worth repeating here that in contrast to the account of Matthew (27.3-5), Luke’s version of Judas’s death (Acts 1:18) is not a suicide in the Greek text,

¹¹ Axton’s attention to the availability of this text is quite pertinent, but according to Baum’s dating, the 11th c. is the pertinent period to consider in this case.

¹² See above, ch. 1, p.11 ff. Axton notes that Origen’s interpretation “contrasts strikingly with the later emphasis of the latin fathers of Judas’ sin of despair” (183 n.10)

¹³ For this widely held account, see, for instance: Helms 114-116, Saari 94, 112; Crossan 1-38; and for a slightly different view, Maccoby, 46-49.

but rather a direct instance of divine punishment. Jerome's interpolation of the word *suspensus* ("having been hanged," Acts 1:18) into the text of the Vulgate effectively harmonizes the two accounts for the Latin tradition. With reference to Augustine (and possibly Jerome), Axton notes that, "Origen's Greek view here contrasts strikingly with the later emphasis of the Latin fathers on Judas' sin of despair" (183 n. 10). This remark is particularly insightful, because biblical scholars who study the Greek text of the Bible often reach conclusions that differ from those of medieval scholars who concentrate on the Latin text and commentaries. By the same token, a full treatment of this matter would require examination of the "Latin translation" of Origen to which Baum alludes (616), in order to determine whether the wording is more or less suggestive of an Oedipodean Judas.

On the basis of the original Greek text, however, Baum characterizes Origen's combination of pagan and biblical elements as "a mere juxtaposition" rather than a true "comparison," and summarizes the argument from *Contra Celsum* thus:

Celsus, says Origen, thinks that the fulfillment of a prophecy is the result of the prophecy; but we will not agree that the prophet by foretelling a thing causes it to happen; rather, the thing would take place even if it had not been predicted. In applying this doctrine Origen takes first an illustration from Scripture, showing that Judas did not betray our Lord because it was prophesied that he would; and then an illustration from Greek literature, showing that the calamities did not befall Laius because of the oracle, but because he did not refrain from begetting a son, (the oracle being merely a warning). The two illustrations are slightly contrasted by [*men*] and [*de*]. (Baum 616)

Whether or not this passage actually represents the genesis of the Oedipodean Judas legend, neither Origen's rhetorical use of the Oedipus myth, nor Baum's attempt at explication thereof is very convincing. In the Sophoclean version, at least, prophecy motivates both the abandonment of Oedipus and his flight from Corinth to Thebes, events

that lead directly to parricide and incest. Hence, as Oedipus himself asserts (*Oedipus Tyrannus* 1329), Apollo is at least partially culpable for the consequences of dream and oracle, rather than being merely prescient, in exactly the way that Celsus argues.

Considering the medieval analogues, Baum argues that “beneath the surface, whether the writers themselves were conscious of it or not, there may have been, as some think, an uncomprehended notion of the ineluctabile fatum” (483).

Another, and perhaps an even more compelling explanation of how the Oedipodean elements became attached to the character of Judas Iscariot, is that presented in the 1929 study of Latin Judas legends by Paul Lehmann.¹⁴ He contends that a sentence in Jerome’s commentary on Amos could have been misconstrued to imply that Judas is guilty of an incestuous relationship with his father’s wife, understood as his own mother rather than his step-mother. Such a reading, however spurious, might nevertheless be repeated with all the weight of patristic authority behind it (Lehmann 247). It is unclear whether Jerome may have been influenced by Origen’s text, though he almost certainly had another purpose in mind:

In hell who shall confess to thee? [Psalm 6.6] This is the sorrow of the world that leads to the death that—though the apostle [Paul] did not wish it—a certain [Corinthian] man who had fornicated with his father’s wife suffered, and which wretched Judas suffered, who being completely overcome with sorrow, coupled betrayal with murder, and a murder moreover worse than all other murders, by which he expected a remedy, and in death by hanging, the end of all his misfortunes, but there he met

¹⁴ Paul J. G. Lehmann, “Judas Ischarioth in der lateinischen Legendenüberlieferung des Mittelalters” (*Studi medievali* n.s. 2 [1929]: 289-346); all citations from the 1959 reprint (*Erforschung des Mittelalters: ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1959-1962, 2: 229-85).

with with the lion and the bear and the serpent.¹⁵

Here Jerome is explicating Amos 5.19: “As if a man should flee from the face of a lion, and a bear should meet him: or enter into the house, and lean with his hand upon the wall, and a serpent should bite him” (DRV).¹⁶ This passage is a biblical version of ‘out of the frying pan, into the fire,’ and the example of Judas, whose despairing suicide compounded his wrongs rather than simply concluding them, fits the theme quite well.

Less clear, however, is Jerome’s reason for alluding to Paul’s epistle admonishing the Corinthians: “It is absolutely heard, that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as the like is not among the heathens; that one should have his father’s wife” (I Cor. 5:1, DRV).¹⁷ Jerome mentions the unnamed incestuous adulterer of Corinth alongside Judas in the context of his discussion of damnation, but does not clearly establish any further connection between the two sinners, beyond the common end of perishing after a great transgression. Hence a careless reader might, as Lehmann suggests, conceivably attribute both sets of transgressions to Judas, since his name is the only one mentioned in the passage. In addition to making Judas the subject of “cum patris

¹⁵ “*In inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi?* [Ps. 6.5] Ista est saeculi tristitia, quae ducit ad mortem, qua apostolus [I Cor. 5:1] non uult perire eum qui cum patris uxore fuerat fornicatus, qua et Iudas periit infelix, qui abundantiori absorptus tristitia proditori homicidium copulauit et homicidium omnibus peius homicidiis, ut ubi putabat remedium, et mortem suspendii finem malorum, ibi leonem et ursum et colubrum reperiret” (*Commentariorum in Amos Prophetam Libri III*, ed. M. Adriaen, *Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri opera, Pars I, Opera exegetica, 6, Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 76 [Turnholt: Brepols, 1969], 1:292). Lehmann (“Judas Ischarioth” 310) quotes this passage from the edition of Migne (*PL* 25.1103). Lambert lists 17 mss from 7th-9th centuries, and many later medieval mss, that contain Jerome’s commentaries on the minor prophets .

¹⁶ “[Q]uomodo si fugiat vir a facie leonis et occurrat ei ursus et ingrediatur domum et innitatur manu sua super parietem et mordeat eum coluber” (Vulgate).

¹⁷ “[O]mnino auditur inter vos fornicatio et talis fornicatio qualis nec inter gentes ita ut uxorem patris aliquis habeat” (Vulgate).

uxore fuerat fornicatus,” Lehmann’s hypothetical reader would also have understood his partner in fornication to be his own mother, rather than merely his father’s wife, that is, his stepmother. If we allow for such misconstruing of the text—perhaps an already corrupted text—Jerome’s commentary may be the ultimate source of the Oedipodean history ascribed to Judas.

In this discussion of worldly sorrow, Jerome also is referencing a passage from Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which begins by mentioning his earlier letter (i.e., I Cor.):

For although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent; and if I did repent, seeing that the same epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorrowful. Now I am glad: not because you were made sorrowful; but because you were made sorrowful unto penance. For you were made sorrowful according to God, that you might suffer damage by us in nothing. For the sorrow that is according to God worketh penance, steadfast unto salvation; but the sorrow of the world worketh death. (II Cor. 7:8-10, DRV)¹⁸

This differentiation between “the sorrow of the world” and “the sorrow that is according to God” is central to Jerome’s interpretation of Judas’s remorse (Matt. 27:3-5), which is not merely imperfect, but apparently also arises from the wrong sort of regret. Using the Pauline categories, Jerome classifies the remorse of Judas as this-worldly sorrow (*saeculi tristitia*) that cannot lead to penance and salvation, but only to death and perdition.

Interestingly, as the apocryphal tradition *De ortu Judae* develops through the Middle Ages, the emphasis shifts away from this concern with sin, remorse, and despair, and

¹⁸ “[Q]uoniam et si contristavi vos in epistula non me paenitet et si paeniteret videns quod epistula illa et si ad horam vos contristavit nunc gaudeo non quia contristati estis sed quia contristati estis ad paenitentiam contristati enim estis secundum Deum ut in nullo detrimentum patiamini ex nobis quae enim secundum Deum tristitia est paenitentiam in salutem stabilem operatur saeculi autem tristitia mortem operator” (Vulgate).

toward the question of divine foreknowledge.

Like the Oedipus myth upon which it seems to be modeled, *De ortu Judae* is a meditation upon divine justice, one that considers the interplay of the opposite moral poles of free will and divine foreknowledge (which replaces fate, in the Christian context). Because of the extensive borrowing from the Oedipus myth, the Judas-vita follows the arc of a folkloric hero—perhaps even a tragic hero—yet there are also some striking similarities to the Christ story. This parallel aspect is marked in Cyborea's prophetic dream on the night Judas is conceived, which functions as a sort of sinister annunciation to the future deicide's mother.¹⁹ Even incest and certain other oedipal motifs (parricide, self-inflicted punishment) in the Judas legend may serve in part as a parallel to the relationships among Jesus, Mary, and God the Father.

Although Lehmann's hypothesis concerning Jerome shares a basic rationale with the attribution to Origen mentioned above, it is all the more elegant for having no explicit dependence upon the Oedipus myth during the first stage of legend formation. This account also has the advantage of attributing the genesis of the legend to an error, rather than the type of inventiveness that is even now occasionally maligned as monastic mendacity. Whether this legend grew from a kernel in Origen, Jerome, or Statius, by the early fourteenth century it could be found in almost every European vernacular (Baum 481). And whether it was read as a tale about fate and free will, or as a lesson on grace and penitence, or merely as a story calumniating Judas, *De ortu Judae* was most certainly read, copied, and translated. This tradition also found its way into the two Latin texts

¹⁹ Interestingly, in the earliest version of this tradition (Baum's Type A), the dream was assigned to Judas's father (Baum 490).

under consideration in this chapter: Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* and its source for the oedipodian Judas legend, the anonymous *Historia Apocrypha*.

De ortu Judae: Two Latin versions

The remainder of this chapter will consider in detail two important Latin prose versions of the Judas and Pilate legends: the anonymous late eleventh century Latin prose *Historia Apocrypha* (HA); and the four chapters of Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (LA) that draw upon it.²⁰ As is made clear later in the chapter, the LA text shows varying degrees of revision, reworking, recombination, and recontextualization of HA source material. The various changes in emphasis, language, mode, style, and even genre make these texts an interesting example of the processes of transformation undergone by the late apocrypha in general and in particular by the matter of Judas (as well as that of Pilate). The two texts also adopt different attitudes toward the extra-canonical (that is, apocryphal) material, yet the overall theological stance of both is clearly orthodox. As I argue in the later sections of this chapter, the LA seems to express the most anxiety about the retelling of apocrypha, possibly because Jacobus of Voragine, as a learned

²⁰ The citations for the HA refer to the line numbers in the edition of Joachim Knape ("Die 'Historia apocrypha' der 'Legenda aurea'," *Zur Deutung von Geschichte in Antike und Mittelalter*, Bamberger Hochschulschriften 11, Ed. Joachim Knape and Karl Strobel, Bamberg, 1985, 113-72). The citations for the *Legenda Aurea* are from the edition of Giovanni Paolo Maggioni (*Iacopo da Varazze. Legenda aurea: Edizione critica*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Millennio Medievale 6. Testi 3. Florence, SISMEL/Galluzzo, 1998). Maggioni's numbers differ slightly from those of the older editions of J. G. Theodore Graesse (*Jacobi a Voragine. Legenda aurea: Vulgo historia lombardica dicta*, 3rd ed., Bratislava, 1890; repr. Osnabrück, Otto Zeller, 1965.), and the century or so of scholarship based upon it, including the English translation by William Granger Ryan (*Jacobus de Voragine. The Golden Legend*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Princeton, Princeton UP, 1993). HA material in the LA is found in the following chapters: St. Matthias (including *De ortu Judae*), cap. 45 in both editions; the Passion of the Lord (including *De ortu Pilati* and the Veronica story), cap. 51 in Maggioni and 53 in Graesse; St. James the Less (including the Destruction of Jerusalem), cap. 63 in Maggioni and 67 in Graesse; St. Peter (including the Nero anecdotes), cap. 84 in Maggioni and 89 in Graesse. A complete account follows below, p.57 ff.

Dominican, was inclined to invoke the critical standards of his milieu and possibly because he was much closer to the summit of the Church hierarchy, both in rank and in geography, than the unknown compiler of the HA.

The anonymous *Historia Apocrypha*

At some point, possibly during the mid or late eleventh century (c. 1050, according to Dobschütz 278*), but certainly by the early twelfth century (Knappe 141), the tradition *De ortu Judae* was incorporated as the ending of a longer narrative that included four other distinct sections: a legendary life of Pontius Pilate; the related legend of Veronica, her image of Christ, and the healing of Tiberius; several anecdotes from the life of Nero; and the Destruction of Jerusalem, which is connected with the Pilate and Veronica stories through the characters of Vespasian and Titus. Since this narrative became the basis of several sections of the *Legenda Aurea* (LA), where Jacobus cites his source as “a certain admittedly apocryphal history,” it has been known to scholars as the “*Historia Apocrypha* of the *Legenda Aurea*,” or, less formally, the *Historia Apocrypha* (HA).²¹ Other names have occasionally been used for the HA, including: “[Judas] Type R” (Baum); “Latenische Pilatusprosa” (Dobschütz); “[Pilatus] Prosa C” (Werner); and

²¹ Jacobus brackets HA-derived material with disclaimers before “Legitur enim in quadam historia licet apocrypha” and after “Hucusque in predicta hystoria apocrypha legitur.” Such wording occurs several times in the LA, notably: 45.14, 45.51; 51.185, 51.256; 63.93, 63.143; and 84.212. Rémi Gounelle has written about Jacobus’s relatively infrequent and apparently quite intentional use of the term ‘apocryphal’ in just eight chapters of the LA (“Sens et usage d’*apocryphus* dans la *Légende dorée*,” *Apocrypha* 5 [1995]: 189-210). There has been some debate as to whether the wording is original to the LA, or found in an intermediary source between the HA and the LA (de Gaiffier, “L’*Historia apocrypha*” 268-69). See below, p.6161 ff .

“the Long Legend of Pilate” (Murray).²²

The *Historia Apocrypha* has been published several times in part or whole, most recently by Joachim Knape (in 1985) and Doris Werner (in 1972), though neither version claims to be a complete critical edition.²³ Knape combines his work on the Latin text with an edition and study of the Middle High German translation of the HA, while Werner’s book collects and classifies several Pilate legends. Knape (115-7) and Baudouin de Gaiffier (1973, 266-70) have published detailed reviews of the extensive literature concerning the HA and LA.²⁴ De Gaiffier’s article is particularly interesting as his history of the scholarship reveals several points at which scholars neglected to consult work previously done, and in particular a disconnect between those studying Judas traditions and those interested primarily in Pilate:

Depuis longtemps on s’intéresse à l’*Historia apocrypha* utilisée par notre compilateur [i.e., Jacobus], mais, par la malice de je ne sais quel mauvais genie, les auteurs qui s’en sont occupés au xx^e siècle n’ont pas toujours été au courant des travaux antérieurs ou bien n’ont pas remarqué tous les endroits où la Légende dorée s’inspirant de l’*Historia*. (de Gaiffier, “L’*Historia apocrypha*” 266)

The publication of this very article has largely mitigated the problem, and de Gaiffier’s work has since been augmented by Knape (and to some extent by Werner, of whose book

²² The title *De ortu Pylati* may also refer to the entire HA, or an HA text lacking Judas (*BHL* 4222d).

²³ Knape’s edition includes a complete text of HA edited from a Munich ms (M₁) supplemented (where the ms copy breaks off) by the Graz ms (Gr) (Knape, “Die *Historia apocrypha*” 146-65). Doris Werner (in *Pylatus: Untersuchungen zur metrischen latinischen Pilatuslegende und kritische Textausgabe*, Ratigen, Henn, 1972) includes an incomplete text (without Judas) of the HA (‘*De ortu Pylati*’, 261-73) edited from a different Munich ms (M₂), along with variants from another Munich ms (M₁) and the Trier ms (T).

²⁴ Baudouin de Gaiffier, “L’*Historia apocrypha* dans la Légende dorée,” (*Analecta Bollandiana* 91 [1973]: 263-72); hereafter referenced as “de Gaiffier, ‘L’*historia apocrypha*” when required by the context.

de Gaiffier seems to have been unaware). More recently, the publication (in 1998) of Maggioni's edition of the LA has addressed oft-repeated complaints regarding the shortcomings of Graesse's nineteenth century edition (e.g., de Gaiffier 272; Reames 68).

By all indications, the HA was the work of one hand, whom Knape calls "Kompilator, Bearbeiter und ergänzender Dichter in ein Person" ("Compiler, arranger, and supplementing writer in one person" 18), and who wrote from several sources late in the eleventh or early in the twelfth century.²⁵ The distribution and content of the extant manuscripts seem to suggest an origin in the German-speaking part of Europe and may eventually be linked to the imperial milieu, perhaps even to the court of a particular emperor.²⁶ In his analysis of the motifs and thematic unity of the HA, Knape observes that this history is understood as part of the cosmic struggle between the good and evil ("Civitas dei gegen Civitas diaboli," 132). The central role played in salvation history by the Roman Empire (and its ostensible descendant the Holy Roman Empire) may in part explain the preoccupation of this text with the emperors of the early Christian era, and the seemingly ahistorical move to turn several of them—Vespasian, Titus, and even Tiberius—into proto-Christians. The pro-imperial bent of the HA, however, seems

²⁵ The main building blocks of the HA seem to be such texts such as the the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* (ca. 6th or 8th c.), the *Vindicta Salvatoris* (ca. 7th c.), and of course the later tradition *De ortu Judae* (Knape, "Pilatus" coll. 670-74). Knape lists many other sources, direct or otherwise, including Eusebius, Orosius, Boethius, Paul the Deacon, and Seutonius ("Die Historia" 118-24).

²⁶ I have not been able to determine the origins of all the HA manuscripts, but it seems safe to assert a Continental source for this text. For instance O (Oxford Laud Misc 633), the one HA manuscript that is now held by an insular library, is clearly of German provenance, having originated in Brunshweig. Another way to trace would be to discuss the translation history of HA, which includes Old French, Icelandic, Middle High German, as well as at least one Latin reworking in northern Italy (the LA), plus the Vatican manuscript discussed below (originally from Worms and/or Trier), which may be a link between HA and LA.

unshaken even by the wicked deeds of Nero, which include the emperor's ersatz pregnancy and delivery of a frog, forcing the suicide of Seneca, and his playing music while Rome burned (HA 205-250). To the extent that HA represents a variant upon the Christian approach to history received from Augustine and Orosius, its ideological expression contrasts sharply with that of the LA.²⁷

Manuscripts of the *Historia Apocrypha* (brief list)

The most complete list of HA manuscripts published to date is that of Knappe (*Die Historia*, 117; *Pilatus*, 675), upon which the list below (including sigla) is largely based, with additions from Steinmeyer, Werner, Baum, Schönbach, Izydorczyk, and various library catalogues. A more detailed list appears in Appendix A.²⁸

- A** Admont, Austria, Benediktinerstiftsbibliothek, Cod. 174; 13th c.
- B₁** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 10147-48; 12th c.
- B₂** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 531-39 (V.d.G. I:131); 15th c.
- D** Darmstadt, Germany, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Cod. 825; 13th c.
- G** Göteborg, Sweden, Universitetsbibliotek, Ms. lat. 21; 13th c.
- Gr** Graz, Austria, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 1314 (37/45-4^o); 14th c.

²⁷ See the more detailed comparison below, p. 58 ff.

²⁸ At least five of these manuscripts (**D**, **Lz**, **O₁**, **R₂**, and **W₂**) are variants or separate recensions; another five (**B₁**, **Lz**, **M₁**, **P₆**, and **T**) do not preserve a Judas text (Knappe, "Die Historia apocrypha" 125). To this list may be added several mss containing texts that are connected with the HA, but which cannot, at this time, be confirmed as recensions of it: Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 7993-96 (V. d. G. III:1922), 15th c. (**B₃**) and Ms. 1079-84 (V.d.G. V:3141), 13th c. (**B₄**); Cambridge, UK, Gonville and Caius College Ms. 225, 13th c. (**C₁**), Corpus Christi College Ms. 66A, 14th c. (**C₂**), and St. John's College Ms. 214, 12th/13th c. (**C₃**); Reims, France, Ms. 1275 (J. 743), 13th c.; (**O₂**) Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 90 (S.C. 1887), late 13th c. (**R₃**); and Città del Vaticano, Bibliotheca Apostolica, Pal. Lat. 619; 12th/13th c. (**V**).

- L** Lüneburg, Germany, Ratsbücherei, Cod. theol. 2° 83; 15th c.
- Li** Lille, France, Bibliothèque de l'Université, Ms. 138; dated 1481.
- Lz** Linz, Austria, Oberösterreich Landesbibliothek, Ms. 488 (olim 123); 12th c.
- M₁** München, Germany, Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23390; 12th/13th c.
- M₂** München, Germany, Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, Clm 21259; 13th c.
- O₁** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud. Misc. 633 (S. C. 1250); 12th c.
- P₁** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 16079; 13th c.
- P₂** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Arsenal 387; 13th c.
- P₃** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 4413; 13th/14th c.
- P₄** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 11867; 13th c.
- P₅** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 4895 A; 13th c.
- P₆** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 693 (939); 12th/13th c.
- Pr** Praha, Czech Republic, Knihovna Národního, Ms. 2119 (XII.B.14); 15th c.
- R₁** Reims, France, Bibliothèque Municipale, cod. Misc. K. 784/794.
- R₂** Reims, France, Bibliothèque Municipale, cod. Misc. K. 764/790.
- T** Trier, Germany, Bistumarchiv, Abt. 95, Nr. 29; 12th/13th c.
- W₁** Wein, Austria, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. lat. 372; 13th c.
- W₂** Wien, Austria, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. lat. 1180; 14th c.

This list is not meant to be exhaustive, as it seems highly likely that other texts of the HA are yet to be discovered, or at least that some have yet to be identified as such.

The *Historia Apocrypha*: A Pilate text?

Although the *Historia Apocrypha* has also been studied by scholars interested in both malefactors, this text is much more concerned and identified with Pilate than it is

with Judas. The nearly 400 lines in Knape's printed edition could be divided this way: roughly half of the text comprises the interwoven narrative of Pilate's vita and Veronica's image of Christ, including the miraculous curing of Tiberius (1-200); the section concerning imperial histories of Nero, Vespasian, and Titus, including the conflict between Rome and Judea, occupies about a third (201-335) and the Judas-vita the remaining sixth part (336-97). Indeed, several of the known Latin manuscripts of the HA do not contain the *De ortu Judae* section at all, nor does the single Middle High German translation printed by Knape. The possibility that the Judas section was an afterthought or later addition to the rest of the HA has been refuted on the grounds of the thematic and stylistic consistency of the whole work by Steinmeyer (124-27), Knape ("Die Historia apocrypha" 156), and others. Thus we may tentatively conclude that the omission of Judas from several of the manuscripts (B₁, LZ, M₁, P₆, and T, as well as B₃ and B₄) represents the loss at some stage of transmission, of what was an original and integral part of the whole brought together by author-compiler of the *Historia Apocrypha*, whether by accidental omission, loss of manuscript pages, or intentional excision.

As Knape points out, the various episodes of the HA are connected through groupings of similar characters; here I paraphrase some of his findings. The group of villains is largest, consisting primarily of participants in the betrayal and killing of Jesus, and the oppression of the early Church: Pilate; Judas; Herod, if marginally; the Jews, especially those of Jerusalem; and Nero, as persecutor of Christians and killer of the

apostle Peter (126).²⁹ Among these, however, Knape distinguishes three chief malfactors whose biographies form the center of the narrative: Pilate, Nero, and Judas. These three arch-sinners stand in opposition to the three ‘good’ emperors, who become instruments of the divine will: Tiberius, Vespasian, and Titus. In addition, three different types of wise characters appear: the Christian Veronica, the pagan Seneca, and the Jew Josephus. Thus the author of the HA uses these exemplary figures to demonstrate the development and workings of evil, as well as its punishment and the subsequent triumph of God (126).³⁰ These sinners and their punishments constitute, as Knape notes, a thematic grouping of vices repeated in the HA, namely: anger, arrogance, curiosity, envy, malice, ingratitude, disloyalty, and greed (127).³¹

As further evidence of the unity of this text, Knape suggests that another “central thematic idea” in the HA is the recurring representation of “homicide and suicide as malicide” (“Ein thematischer Kerngedanke: Homizide und Suizid als Malizid,” 129 ff.). Of the several suicides—Pilate, Seneca, Nero, the Jews (through resisting Rome), and of course Judas—only Seneca, whose hand is forced by Nero, is represented in a positive

²⁹ “Zu Ende erzählt wird die Geschichte der wichtigsten Beteiligten, Mitschuldigen und Initiatoren am Tode Jesu Christi: Pilatus, Judas, am Rande Herodes, die Juden (vor allem die aus Jerusalem) sowie der erste grosse Christenverfolger und Apostelmörder Nero. Man kann darum von einer *Historia archipeccatorum* sprechen” (Knape, “Die *Historia apocrypha*” 126).

³⁰ “Den drei Hauptbösewichten Pilatus, Nero und Judas, deren Biographien das Zentrum der Erzählung bilden, stehen im wesentlichen die drei ‘guten’ Kaiser Tiberius, Vespasianus und Titus als Werkzeuge Gottes gegenüber. Hinzu kommen drei fromme oder weise Menschen: die frühe Christin Veronica, der gute, fast christliche Heide Seneca und der gute Jude Josephus (*vir prudens* 262). Am Beispiel dieser Figuren demonstriert der Autor das Werden und Wirken des Bösen, aber auch die strafende, letztlich stets erfolgreiche Gerechtigkeit sowie lenkende und fügende Wirksamkeit Gottes” (126).

³¹ Knape uses these German terms for the vices (*die Laster*), here a list of eight: *Zorn, Hochmut, Neugier, Neid, Bosheit, Undank, Treulosigkeit, and Habgier* (127).

way.³² In the twelfth century, and possibly contemporary with the composition of the HA (Knape “Die Historia apocrypha” 127), Bernard of Clairvaux coined the term *malicide* in his crusading rhetoric, asserting that a knight who kills an infidel for Christ, “in killing a wrongdoer, [...] commits an act not of homicide but, I dare say, of ‘malicide’.”³³ This line of reasoning is made even more explicit in the LA treatment of these arch-sinners, as will be made clear below (p.67 ff.).

Along with the emphasis upon negative characters and behaviors, there is also a repetition of healing miracles that connect divine power with secular rulers (as Knape observes, 127), and ultimately with divine justice. The pattern is most apparent in the healing of the emperor Tiberius through Veronica’s image of Christ, which leads him to seek vengeance against the deicide Pilate. This episode is bracketed by the healing of the future emperor Vespasian, based upon a mere report of Jesus, which leads him to undertake the destruction of the entire Jewish nation. This war is continued by his son (and imperial heir) Titus, who is himself healed by Josephus, a ‘good’ Jew. In the cases of Tiberius and Vespasian, the miracles involve travel, and represent the spread of Christianity through the Mediterranean world.

The relationship between sacred power and secular authority is a major concern of the HA (and also the LA), and an important theme in the grand narrative of Christian

³² For a fuller discussion of suicide in this context, see Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages* (full citation, 1998, esp. vol. 2) and Fritz Peter Knapp, *Der Selbstmord in der abendländischen Epik des Hochmittelalters* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1979).

³³ “Sane cum occidit malefactorem, non homicida, sed, ut ita dixerim, malicida.” From Bernard’s *De laude novae militiae*, propaganda for the knights of the recently founded Order of Templars, written ca. 1130, quoted in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 4: c. 1024-c. 1198*, ed. David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 1:180 and n. 88.

history. The canonical books of the New Testament, as well as some of the early apocrypha, reflect the concern of the early Church to represent Roman authority as relatively sympathetic to Christianity. Hence in the canonical Gospels, the character of Pilate is designed as a foil for Jesus, who is hostile and uncooperative in his dealings with the state. The effort to minimize Pilate's responsibility for the crucifixion was made at the expense of the Jews, who are shown to have forced the governor of Judea to condemn Jesus, more or less against his will. In later apocrypha such as the HA, composed early in the second millennium of Christianity, however, Pilate could be made into a villain in order to feature Tiberius in an actively proto-Christian role.³⁴

The *Historia Apocrypha* seems to have been influenced by the widespread medieval (and earlier) Christian project of reconciling early Church history with the

³⁴ See, for instance, the account of Arturo Graf, "I primi cristiani, solleciti di raccogliere quante più prove e testimonianze potevano in favore dell'insidiata e combattuta lor fede, giudicarono molto benignamente il giudice pusillanimo; affermarono ch'egli aveva fatto quant'era in poter suo per istrappar Gesù all'ingiusto supplizio; mostrarono una lettera da lui scritta all'imperatore, nella quale era ampiamente riconosciuta l'innocenza del Nazareno ed esecrata la malvagità de' nemici suoi; giunsero a dire persino ch'egli era morto martire della fede. Mutati i tempi, e assicurato il trionfo della Chiesa, mutarono anche i giudizi. La sospetta testimonianza, divenuta inutile ormai, fu lasciata volentieri in disparte, e sotto l'influsso di un altro pensiero, in virtù di un postulato della coscienza che voleva colpiti da formidabile e condegno castigo quanti, in un modo o in un altro, avevano avuto parte nella condanna e nella morte del Redentore, cominciò un lavoro delle fantasie in tutto diverse da quel di prima, e la leggenda si trasformò, e starei per dire si capovolse. Ecco Pilato diventare un pessimo scelerato, degno d'andarne alla pari co' rei giudici del Tempio e con lo stesso Giuda. Si narra allora come l'imperatore lo chiamasse al suo cospetto per chiedergli conto della morte del Giusto; come rigorosamente il punisse; come il punito si togliesse da se stesso la vita, e il maledetto suo corpo fosse tramutato di luogo in luogo, cagione sempre alla terra che l'accoglieva di turbamenti e di calamità. Si ricercano le origini di lui, il paese ove nacque, i primi suoi fatti, e tutta una storia s'immagina, la quale cel mostra malvagio sino dalla puerizia, e spiega il gran misfatto finale. La sua leggenda si lega ad altre leggende celebri, a quella della Veronica, a quella della vendetta del Salvatore, fa corpo con esse, riceve da esse nuovo vigore e notorietà nuova. Egli finisce con Giuda, e con alcun altro massimo scelerato, fra le mascelle formidabili di un Satanasso trifronte, nel più profondo e tenebroso abisso d'Inferno" (Graf, *Miti, leggende e superstizione del medio evo*, 144). Graf does not specify when the turning point was for Christian views of Pilate, but it must have come after the conversion of Constantine.

secular political narratives of imperial Rome and the sacred chronicle of Judea. The retroactive Christianizing of the early Roman Emperors is a process that had begun by the sixth century, when the first version of the legend of Veronica and Tiberius was recorded (6th c., see Dobschütz 276*), but is by no means limited to the group of emperors presented in the HA. The conversion of Trajan by Pope Gregory first appears in the anonymous Whitby Life of Gregory the Great in the early eighth century and John the Deacon's Vita of St. Gregory in the late ninth century (Whatley, "The Uses of Hagiography" 27 ff.). The prototype of all these may be the healing and conversion of Constantine by St. Sylvester (see LA cap. 12 'The Life of St Sylvester', *Vita/Acta Sylvestri* in Mombritius, etc.). In this legend, the emperor's leprosy—a result either of persecuting Christians or of contact with dragon's blood—is cured by Pope Sylvester, leading Constantine to become a Christian.

In an even earlier legend (probably 4th c.), associated with the *Inventio Crucis* tradition, the emperor Constantine is converted by dream-vision. According to Eusebius, Philip the Arab (born Syria, reigned 244-49) was the first Christian emperor of Rome, but it is more likely that he was merely tolerant of Christianity. The push to make the Roman Emperors prior to Constantine (who ruled 307-37) into Christians or at least proto-Christians seems to predate Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Empire he established. As such the HA may be seen as (originally at least) a process of rewriting secular history to conform more closely to the salvation narrative associated with the New Testament. This project of universal history was carried out by early Christian authorities such as Augustine, Eusebius, and Orosius, and continued by medieval writers such as Otto von Freising, Vincent of Beauvais, and even Dante. This includes a more important role for

saintly and especially clerical figures, particularly those seen to exert influence over secular rulers. In the HA, the emperors Tiberius, Vespasian, and Titus are given some degree of Christian coloring. Tiberius is healed by Veronica's image of Jesus, which he honors along with its bearer (HA 170-75); Vespasian is healed by his faith in Jesus, of whom he has only heard tell from Pilate's messenger, and swears to avenge the death of Jesus; Titus is healed of paralysis by the ingenuity of Josephus, but like his father Vespasian, he participates in the siege of Jerusalem, which is construed as avenging the crucifixion of Jesus.

The events that follow Pilate's death bear an odd relationship to the tropes of sacred biography, but in a different way from the Judas-vita. Whereas after death the holy man or woman's body often becomes an instrument for miracles of healing or protection, Pilate's corpse becomes instead a focus of demonic activity, which is responsible for foul weather, floods, and plagues. For this reason it is thrice removed and relocated from its resting places: the Tiber, in Rome; the Rhone, in Vienne; a first grave, near Lausanne; and finally a pit surrounded by seven mountains, high in the Swiss Alps. This series of disposals and dispositions of Pilate's body to different locations approaches farce, as the citizens of three successive cities remove the corpse from their territories. Admittedly these incidents are not given the type of detailed treatment usually found in hagiographic accounts of *inventiones*, *translationes*, or even squabbles over which monastic community will receive the deceased saint's remains. The broad brushstrokes of such hagiographic tropes are easily enough discerned both in Pilate's manner of death and

disposal thereafter, as has been noted by Knappe and Scheidgen.³⁵

The HA as a whole has three main geographical poles, which exist at different degrees of remoteness from the likely central European locus of its origin. The most remote of these is the sacred pole of the Holy Land, which includes Jerusalem, Judea, and Galilee, as well as the (fictive) isle of Scarioth. The HA is set in the first Christian century, but the Holy Land it depicts carries inevitable resonance with contemporary (late eleventh or early twelfth century) events, especially the Crusades.³⁶ Much of the action takes place nearer to the locus of enunciation, including several key events of the Pilate and Veronica legends. The nearest range, which could be considered local or regional, includes parts of Germany, Switzerland, and France connected with Pilate's origins or disposition after death: Mainz, Bamberg, Berliech (aka Forsheim), Rome, Lausanne, and Vienne (and see Scheidgen 110-116)³⁷. These cities, all bishoprics or archbishoprics, are

³⁵ Joachim Knappe, "Topographie des Heils und räumlicher Weltordo im 12./13. Jahrhundert (Pilatus-Vita und Ebstorfer Weltkarte)" (in: *Reisen und Welterfahrung in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Vorträge des XI. Anglo-deutschen Colloquiums in Liverpool 1989*, ed. D. Huschenbett and J. Margetts [Würzburg, 1991], 141-161); and Andreas Scheidgen, *Die Gestalt des Pontius Pilatus in Legende, Bibelauslegung und Geschichtsdichtung vom Mittelalter bis in die frühe Neuzeit: Literaturegeschichte einer umstrittenen Figur* (Mikrokosmos 68 [Frankfurt, Peter Lang, 2002]).

³⁶ Usually dated 1095-1291, the Crusades may have begun in earnest after the HA was written, but certainly form part of the background of the LA (ca. 1260). Bernard of Clairvaux was closely associated with the Second Crusade (1145-49).

³⁷ "Konträr zur Geographie der Heilstranslation entfaltet sich eine Topographie des Unheils, die sich mit den Pilatusstätten Mainz, Bamberg, Vienne und Lausanne verbindet. Dem Städtepaar Mainz und Bamberg und dem sich Geburt und Kindheit des Verdammten abspielen, entsprechen die beiden Stationen Vienne und Lausanne auf dem von dämonischen Erscheinung begleiteten Weg seiner Leiche. [...] Die vier genannten Städte sind ferner allsamt kirchliche Metropolen. Mainz, das den Primat über die deutsche Kirche beanspruchte, und Bamberg, gegründet durch Kaiser Heinrich II, nach eingekommenem Selbstverständnis zweites Rom und Abbild des himmlischen Jerusalem, gehörten zu den wichtigsten Bischofssitzen des Reiches; sie waren ferner herausragende

closely associated with the Holy Roman Empire: Vienne and Lausanne within the Kingdom of Burgundy in the romance language (Francophone) area, Mainz and Bamberg in the German-speaking part of the Empire, and Rome as the ancient capital of the Empire and the current center of the Western Church. Galicia does not fit clearly into either of the second or third group.³⁸

Judas in the *Historia Apocrypha*

Following Knappe, we may read the HA as a text that collects the biographies of a handful of arch-sinners, a series that begins with the birth of Pilate and ends with the death of Judas. Yet even if we approach the HA as primarily a Pilate text, the Judas-vita provides nearly as important a supplement to that legend as the stories of Veronica and Vespasian, and is probably more integral than the Nero section. Although the Judas-vita has little overtly political content and it lacks the geographical expanse of the legends that precede it in the HA, Cyborea's prophetic dream on the night he is conceived forms a thematic connection between Judas and the Destruction of Jerusalem legend. Pilate's actions make fulfillment of the dream oracle possible, both because his craving for apples leads Judas to commit parricide and because his decision to marry Judas to Ruben's widow leads Judas to commit incest. Judas is, moreover, linked to the Pilate-vita by motifs common to both secular folklore and hagiographic romance. The young Pilate's bent toward murder, his surname derived from an island, and his ultimate suicide make

sakrale Repräsentationsstätten des Kaisertums. Vienne und Lausanne fallen zwar in den romanischen Sprachraum, liegen aber im Gebiet des alten Königsreichs Burgund (Arelat), das ebenfalls mit dem römischen Imperium verbunden war." (Scheidgen 115)

³⁸ For the LA, Lyon must be added to the list of cities on the authority Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* (LA 51.260; Maggioni 353).

striking parallels to the apocryphal life of Judas, which concludes the HA in most extant manuscripts.³⁹ Above all, the widespread late medieval textual tradition of presenting the apocryphal lives of Judas and Pilate together seems to have begun with the HA.

Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*

The *Legenda Aurea* (LA), sometimes known in English as the *Golden Legend*, was compiled by Jacobus of Voragine, a Dominican who later became the archbishop of Genoa. The 177 chapters, mostly the legends of the saints (the *sanctorale*), are arranged according to their place in the Church calendar, along with entries on the movable feasts interspersed in their approximate positions (the *temporale*). The LA has long been recognized as a manual originally compiled for use by Dominican preachers (Gounelle, *Sens*, 192). Barbara Fleith suggests that in addition to being “used for the preparation of sermons” and read aloud in Chapter Houses and Refectories, the Latin LA would also have been used “in the school environment,” where it grew in importance once it was translated into the various vernacular languages of Europe, as did the use by lay clerics and the laity proper (Fleith, *Patristic Sources*, 234). Contrasting it to another major work of Jacobus, the *Sermones*, Sherry Reames concludes that the LA “was compiled to meet the special needs of preachers who faced audiences far less well-educated, and more intractable, than those assumed by Jacobus’s model sermons” (113).

The collection is generally dated to 1260-70, though Fleith sets the date of its completion as early as 1260. More than 1000 surviving manuscripts, including about 70 from the late 13th century, attest to the immediate and enduring popularity enjoyed by the

³⁹ A quarter of extant HA texts lack the Judas legend (see above p.45 ff. and Appendix A below).

LA during the later Middle Ages. The earliest extant dated manuscript is 1281; an even earlier manuscript, dated 1273, was destroyed during the Second World War (Fleith, *Patristic Sources*, 232). In assembling the LA, Jacobus drew on numerous and varied sources, whether directly or indirectly—as many as 250, according to Benz (Fleith, *Patristic Sources*, 235-37). Among the most important sources are the collections of three other Dominicans who were nearly contemporary with Jacobus: the *Abbreviatio in Gestis et Miraculis Sanctorum* of Johannes de Maliaco (Jean de Mailly), ca. 1225-30 (original version) and 1243 (expanded version); the *Epilogus in Gesta Sanctorum* of Bartholomeus Tridentinus (Bartholomew of Trent), ca. 1245; and the encyclopedic *Speculum Historiale* of Vincentius Bellovacensis (Vincent of Beauvais), ca. 1250 (Fleith, “Die Legenda Aurea” 167-73). The ways that the Jacobus used and adapted these and other sources have been studied by several scholars whose conclusions are not always in agreement. With regard to evaluating the editorial method Jacobus employed, Reames notes that “the crux of the problem is the impossibility of being sure that it was Jacobus himself, and not some intermediate source, who initiated any given departure from the original version of a legend” (69). The lack of critical editions of these major sources, noted by de Gaiffier (“L’Historia” 272) and Reames (68), has been somewhat resolved in recent years.⁴⁰ Fleith points out that, despite his reputation as an abbreviator, comparison with the other compilations reveals that Jacobus was also an amplifier and that, in addition to exercising a critical faculty (Gounelle, “Sens et usage” 203-10), he had a penchant for the

⁴⁰ Scholars now have the benefit of, for instance, Maggioni’s edition of the *Legenda Aurea*, and Paoli’s edition of the *Epilogus* (*Bartholomeo da Trento, Liber epilogorum in gesta sanctorum*, ed. Emore Paoli [Tavarnuzze, Firenze, SISMEL/Galluzzo, 2001]).

spectacular, even the apocryphal (Fleith, “Die Legenda Aurea” 191).

The Historia Apocrypha and the Legenda Aurea

Though the connections between the LA and other Judas and Pilate texts were noted as early as the mid-nineteenth century, it was not until 1918, when Steinmeyer published an article on a particular text he called the “Historia apocrypha der Legenda aurea,” that the connection was clearly established between this source and the four chapters of the LA (de Gaiffier, “L’historia apocrypha” 269; Knape, “Die Historia apocrypha” 115). More recent work has begun to examine the passage of the two Latin texts into vernacular traditions, including Old French (Burgio), Middle High German (Knape), and Icelandic (Wolf), and these researchers have increasingly managed to disentangle the HA and LA as sources. As mentioned above, the most detailed reviews of the extensive literature concerning the relationship between these two texts are those of de Gaiffier (“L’Historia”) and Knape (“Die Historia” and “Pilatus”).

Perhaps the most significant change between the HA and the LA is the change of genre, from a single document collecting a handful of apocryphal traditions to sections of a full-fledged hagiographic legendary. The alterations that Jacobus has made to the HA material—if indeed they are his, and not those of an intermediate redactor—are, in large part, a consequence of the new setting. According to Reames, Jean de Mailly’s *Abbreuiato* and Bartholomew of Trent’s *Epilogus* were “Jacobus’s major forerunners and apparent models in the new genre of the abridged legendary” (86). Even when viewed in the context of these works, the LA, with its mix of saints’ legends, biblical and church history, seems an odd setting for apocryphal texts on the archsinners. The particular authorial agenda of Jacobus—above all, his tendency to give the impression of a distant

and vengeful God (Reames 122, 139)—provides the rationale for his inclusion of the HA material, and also for some of the ways in which it has been reshaped.

Jacobus's scheme: *Historia Apocrypha* material in the *Legenda Aurea*

In the *Legenda Aurea*, the tale of Judas dominates the first half of the *sanctorale* chapter that is ostensibly on St. Matthias (cap. 45, lines 14-51, out of 115 total), who was chosen to replace him as the twelfth disciple (Acts 1). The Pilate-vita, by contrast, comprises the last third of the lengthy *temporale* chapter on Christ's Passion (LA 51.185-262), preceded by a canonical Passion narrative, several lengthy and detailed lists of the various indignities that Christ suffered at the hands of the Jews and the Romans, and quotations from Peter Comester's *Historia Scholastica*.⁴¹ Jacobus provides a careful rationale for his treatment of Judas, Pilate, and the Jews, whom he identifies as the third party responsible for the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ:

Et quia Christum in mortem tradiderunt Iudas per auaritam, Iudei per inuidiam, Pylatus per timorem, ideo uidendum esset de pena a deo his inflictam merito huius peccati; sed de pena et origine Iude inuenies in legenda sancti Mathie, de pena et excidio Iudeorum in legenda sancti Iacobi minoris, de pena autem et origine Pylati in quondam hystoria licet apocrypha sic legitur. (LA 51.183-5)

Now because Christ was betrayed and brought to his death by Judas due to greed, by the Jews due to envy, and by Pilate due to fear, we might consider the punishments that God inflicted on them for this sin. But you will find an account of Judas's origin and punishments in the legend of Saint Matthias [LA cap. 45], and the story of the Jews' punishment and downfall in the legend of Saint James the Less [LA cap. 63]. What follows [in this chapter on Christ's Passion, LA cap. 51] is what we read in a history, admittedly apocryphal, concerning the origin and punishment of Pilate. (Ryan 211)

⁴¹ All Latin citations are from Maggioni's edition of the *Legenda Aurea* (see above, p. 41, n. 20).

Jacobus first sets forth this distinct grouping of three betrayers and assigns a specific sinful motivation to each. The parties held responsible here are not surprising, and a similar grouping is presented by another great Dominican of the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas:

Judas is blamed for betraying Christ to the Jews, for in *John* we read, “one of you is the devil” (John 6:71). Now he said this of Judas who was to betray him. The Jews who handed Christ over to Pilate are likewise censured, “Your own people and the chief priests have delivered you to me” (John 18:35). Pilate however, “handed him over to be crucified” (John 19:16). Paul notes, however, that “there is nothing in common between justice and iniquity” (II Corinthians 6:14). It seems therefore that God the Father did not deliver Christ over to his passion. (*Summa Theologica* 3a. 47, 3 [Blackfriars ed., 54: 63], format slightly altered)⁴²

Nor are the motives for betrayal entirely original to the LA, but the combination of ideas may well have originated with Jacobus.⁴³ The fact that a similar grouping is mentioned by a contemporary of Jacobus suggests that there may be another source behind both, possibly another Dominican.

As he establishes three sets of sins and arch-sinners, Jacobus provides cross references for readers who might wish to read the legends of the betrayers not covered in the present chapter; with this notice he also identifies three of the four chapters of the LA

⁴² “Praeterea, Judas vituperatur ex eo quod tradidit Christum Judaeis, secundum illud *Jo.*, *Unus ex vobis diabolus est: quod dicebatur propter Judam, qui eum erat traditurus. Similiter etiam vituperuntur Judaei qui eum tradiderunt Pilato, secundum quod ipse dicit Jo., Gens tua et pontifices tui tradiderunt te mihi. Pilatus etiam tradidit ipsum ut crucifigertetur ut dicitur habetur Jo.* Non est autem *participatio justitiae cum iniquitate* ut dicitur II *Cor.* Ergo videtur quod Deus Pater non tradiderit Christum passioni” (*Summa Theologica* 3a.47, 3; 54:62). Note that in the English translation above, renders different forms of the single verb *trado* with the expressions ‘betray’, ‘hand over’, and ‘deliver’.

⁴³ Maggioni’s edition does not give any source for the combination, but Augustine, for instance, discusses the combination of Judas and the Jews in his commentary on Psalm 108 (*Ennaratio in Psalmam*, PL coll. 1224C-1233A).

that draw upon the *Historia Apocrypha*. Jacobus neglects, however, to mention certain anecdotes about Nero that appear in the chapter on St. Peter also derive from this same source. The reasons for associating Judas with Matthias and the Jews with James the Less are given in those chapters; the association of Pilate with Christ's passion is clear enough to require no further explanation. Moreover, the actual punishments promise to follow a sort of *contrapasso*, the full comprehension of which seems to require, at least in the case of Judas and Pilate, an account of the betrayer's origin, perhaps by way of forming an etiology for their involvement in deicide and consequent downfall.

A bracket is formed by the words that introduce the HA material, "Legitur enim in quadam hystoria licet apocrypha" ("we read in a certain admittedly apocryphal history"), together with the remark that follows after it "Hucusque in predicta hystoria apocrypha legitur; que utrum recitanda sit, lectoris arbitrio relinquatur, licet sit potius relinquenda quam asserenda" ("This much, however, is to be read in aforesaid apocryphal history, and whether it should be retold is left to the reader's judgment, though probably it is better left aside than repeated," Ryan 168, slightly altered). Of course, such a disclaimer is really the best sort of advertising possible, with all the allure of the forbidden fruit.⁴⁴ As discussed above, Knappe has identified the disastrous downfalls suffered by each of the arch-sinners as one unifying theme of the HA. Both texts combine the divine history of salvation with the secular political narratives of imperial Rome. In general, it seems that the HA has a more political (i.e., imperial) bias, while the LA tends

⁴⁴ Boswell points out that Jacobus's disclaimers, and especially the warning that the apocryphal legends are "better 'forgotten than repeated,'" are given "somewhat disingenuously" (367 n. 10). For more on the ways that Jacobus uses and characterizes apocryphal sources, see the articles by Gounelle ("Sens et usage") and Fleith ("Die Legenda Aurea").

to favor ecclesiastical power. Reames attributes Jacobus's heavy pro-clerical bias in part to the context of the thirteenth century, with "an ecclesiastical hierarchy that had begun to lose its moral authority and was trying to compensate by using its powers to intimidate and coerce," as well as to the nature of the still young Dominican Order, with its reform agenda, strict discipline, and mission "to promulgate the faith and to defend it against its enemies" (118). Jacobus may have also been moved by a sense of loyalty to the Church elite to which he belonged, and his proximity to the center of ecclesiastical power.

Possible intermediate text(s) between *Historia Apocrypha* and *Legenda Aurea*

The way that Jacobus uses this source material, including his description of the three traitors and their sinful motivations, seems to be completely original. Various scholars have suggested that there may have been a stage of transmission between the *Legenda Aurea* and the text now known as the *Historia Apocrypha*; the object of this search seems to be (for most) locating a source for the "quadam" and "hucusque" disclaimers that bracket HA-derived material in the LA.⁴⁵ The history of this research has been treated by de Gaiffier, who notes one possible intermediary text proposed by Rand and Baum in the second decade of the twentieth century ("L'histoire apocrypha" 268-71; Gounelle, "Sens et usage" 203). Rand reports (and Baum repeats) several interesting details he found in a twelfth- or thirteenth-century manuscript that pre-dates the LA: Città del Vaticano, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. Lat. 619 (Baum's Lv; Rand's V). Rand makes a convincing case:

⁴⁵ Minnie Wells refers to this wording as "a caveat" and "the 'Hucusque' passage" (*Relation* 356, 357; cf. Baum, "Mediaeval Judas" 498).

“Hystoria de Iuda proditore” inc. “Mathias apostolus in locum Iude substitutus est. Sed primo ortum et originem ipsius Iude proditoris breviter videamus. Legitur enim in quadam hystoria quod fuit quidam vir in Ierusalem nomine Ruben, qui alio nomine dictus est Symon, de tribu Iuda, qui habuit uxorem quae Cyborea nuncupata est.” (Rand 305, but cf. Baum 496-97, and catalogue description⁴⁶)

“History of Judas the Betrayer,” beginning, “The apostle Matthias was substituted in the place of Judas. But first we will briefly look at the origin and origin of the traitor Judas. It is read in a certain history that there was a man in Jerusalem named Ruben, who others say was called by the name Simon, of the tribe of Judah, who had a wife called Cyborea.” (compare to Ryan 167)

As Rand notes (305), these lines are, except for the position of the word *proditoris*, and the missing phrases *licet apocrypha* and *uel secundum Ieronimum de tribu Ysachar*, practically identical to LA 45.13 (Maggioni p.277). Such additions as these two are, in fact, just what could be expected of Jacobus: a disclaimer—his own, I conclude for the time being—marking off material he cannot fully endorse (see Gounelle, “Sens et usage,” 203 ff.); and a somewhat tedious scholarly gloss introducing a detail from a reliable source. Rand continues:

These are almost the words of Jacopo [of Voragine], except that the latter cautiously adds *licet apocrypha* after *hystoria*, and makes Ruben of the tribe of Dan.⁴⁷ The text of the Vatican manuscript agrees thereafter with that of Jacopo word for word, saving a few scribal vagaries, until the strictly Biblical part begins. Just there Jacopo adds: “Hucusque in praedicta historia apocrypha legitur quae utrum recitanda sit lectoris arbitrio relinquatur, licet sit potius reliquanda quam asserenda” [LA 45.51-

⁴⁶ Catalogue: “f. 18 — ‘De Pylato’; inc. ‘Fuit quidam rex nomine tytus qui quondam puellam nomine pyla’ etc. f. 19v. — ‘De destruction Iherusalem’; inc. ‘Refert iosephus quod propter mortem iacobi iusti factum est excidium iherusalem’, narratio imperfecta, f. 21v.” (Stevenson and de Rossi 1:223).

⁴⁷ Manuscripts of the LA show variation between *Iuda* and *Dan*; the learned gloss that according to Jerome, Ruben belonged to the tribe of Issachar, is also omitted from some LA manuscripts (LA 45.14; Maggioni p. 278). See Appendix C, note 6 on lines 4-5 of the SEL *Iudas*.

52].⁴⁸ These words are not in V, which has, however, all of the remainder, including the moralizations at the end. Since the script of V is clearly before the date of Jacopo (1230-1298), we have here the source which he incorporated, almost without change, in his *Golden Legend*. It is precisely the text the existence of which Gaston Paris had prophetically surmised and the date of which he had assigned to the twelfth century” (Rand 305).

Manuscript V seems to have originated in Germany, specifically the southern Rhineland, and it apparently spent time in both Worms and Trier, the former after 1254.⁴⁹ The Judas legend may have had some local appeal in Trier, because of his association (in Acts 1) with St. Matthias, whose relics were found at the Benedictine Abbey there in 1127, having supposedly been brought (or sent) there by the authority of the dowager empress Helena in the early fourth century, though the tradition probably arose at a much later date. The Judas-vita comes before the Pilate legend and the Destruction of Jerusalem in ms V (as in Li); this reverses the usual order of HA, but not the order in which the legends appear in LA. Moreover, the section about Josephus and the Destruction of Jerusalem in V is specifically connected to the martyring of St. Jacob the Less, who is not named at all in HA; the only James mentioned in the HA is James the Apostle, in reference to his pilgrimage and the region of Galicia (HA 73-75). It remains to be seen where the “imperfect narrative” breaks off relative to the extant versions of the HA. If this manuscript is an intermediary between HA and LA, perhaps it will also prove to be the source for the episode of Tiberius, Pilate, and the *tunica inconsultilis* (Christ’s

⁴⁸“So far, however, what we have set down comes from the aforesaid apocryphal history, and whether it should be retold is left to the reader’s judgment, though probably it is better left aside than repeated” (Ryan 168)

⁴⁹ The catalogue offers the following information regarding the dating and provenance of V: “Epigramma de moenibus civitatus Wormaciensis conditis a. 1254; inc. ‘Mille quarter cum bis centum decies quoque quinos’ f. 77v. / Distichon de civitate trevirensi; inc. ‘Ante romam treueris fuit annis mille ducentis’” f. 77 v. (Stevenson and de Rossi 1:224).

seamless tunic), another relic supposedly sent to Trier by St. Helena.⁵⁰

Another possible intermediary between HA and LA is C₃ (Baum's Lc):

Cambridge, St. John's College 214, which had its origin at Wigmore Priory, Herefordshire. The bulk of the manuscript is Isidore's *Etymologiae* and *Sententiae* in a late twelfth-century hand, but the apocryphal lives of Pilate and Judas are added on the final leaves in a thirteenth-century hand. Although the opposite has been argued by Baum and others, these two legends are nearly identical to and most likely based upon the LA:

De ortu poncii pilati [f.] 158b [inc.] Fuit quidam rex nomine Cyrus... [exp] -diabolice macinaciones ebullire uidentur [cf. LA 51.186/255].

De ortu Judae scarioht [f.] 159 [inc.] Legitur in quadam historia licet apocrypha.... [exp.] -Cum demonibus sociaretur [cf. LA 45.14/62].⁵¹

Based on the likely date range of 1260-1280 given by James (Baum 497 n. 15), both Wells and Gaiffier present strong arguments against the assertion that this manuscript represents the text from which Jacobus copied the 'quadam' and 'hucusque' disclaimers. Knape also classifies this manuscript among those of Vita Pilati (B), his name for the LA and LA-derived form of the legend (Knape *Pilatus* col. 675).⁵² Indeed, C₃ is much weaker candidate for such a missing link than is V, especially if we accept an early date for the

⁵⁰ According to Friedrich Lauchert, the earliest account of Helena sending relics to Trier is from an eighth century text ("Holy Coat," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 7 [New York, Appleton, 1910], web). See below, ch. 2, p.78 ff., and Erich Aretz, et al. eds., *Der Heilige Rock zu Trier: Studien zur Geschichte und Verehrung der Tunika Christi* (Trier, 1995).

⁵¹ M. R. James, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* with updates (o. p. Cambridge UP, 1913), web.

⁵² Knape lists an additional three 15th century manuscripts with individual Pilate legends taken from LA cap. 51: Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 828; Munchen, clm 15329; and Praha, Czech Republic, Státní Knihovna, cod. I.C.14 (Truláf 105) (Knape, "Pilatus" col. 675). Knape does not mention which of these, if any, also include the Judas legend; I have been able to verify only that the Prague Ms. does.

LA (Fleith proposes 1260, *Patristic Sources* 232). Yet the fact that C₃, a text from western England, contains a text almost certainly drawn from the LA, possibly before 1280, does provide a valuable witness to the distribution of the LA in the insular context. (This matter will be revisited in the next chapter, in connection with the sources of the *South English Legendary*.)

In Baum's classification of versions of the Oedipodean Judas legends, a system still regularly referred to by scholars nearly a century later, Type R corresponds to the *Historia Apocrypha*, though Baum did not refer the text by this name, and Type L to the *Legenda Aurea*. Of the two dozen HA manuscripts listed above, eight are mentioned by Baum, who determined that of the eleven Type R (= HA) manuscripts known to him, these seven: "Rm, Ro, Ra, Rb, Rn, Rq, Rl, [= M₂, P₅, P₂, O, P₃, P₄, and Li] offer practically the same text" (492). Four other Type R manuscripts listed by Baum are worth considering as well, especially in light of more recent scholarship.

One of these, namely Baum's **Rj**, is Knape's variant **W₂** in the list above.⁵³ The second is a "[m]anuscript copy lent [to Baum] by Professor [Ernst] von Dobschütz," which he describes as an "[a]bbreviated redaction" containing some unique "variant readings" (489). As obscure as Baum's description is, this copy be accounted for elsewhere in Knape's list, since von Dobschütz, who dated the "Lateinische Pilatusprosa" (=HA) to c. 1050, was aware of at least nine of the HA mss listed above (B₁, Gr, Lz; M₁, M₂, P₁, P₄, P₅, W₁, and W₂; Dobschutz 302*). De Gaiffier notes pointedly that Baum has overlooked some of Döbschutz's findings, despite having been in correspondence with

⁵³ Baum does not identify Ro [O] as a variant text, because he only considers the Judas material and the variation occurs in the Veronica section (Knape, "Die Historia" 117; Werner 20).

him (de Gaiffier, “L’Historia apocrypha” 269).

The remaining two manuscripts that Baum classified as Type R, **Rg** and **Rc** (= **C₁** and **C₂**), are worth consideration, in part because of their English provenance, which may be of interest to the Middle English vernacular context as well as the Latin traditions. Both seem to have originated at the Benedictine monastery of Bury St. Edmunds, **C₁** in the 13th century, and **C₂** in the 14th. According to Baum the Judas-vita in **C₁** is a “Crude summary of the legend based on some MS. of Type R [HA], with Cymbrea for Cyborea, and a strange disregard of syntax throughout,” which “ends imperfectly at the point where Pilate is overcome with desire for Reuben’s fruit” (Baum, *Mediaeval* 486). On the other hand, **C₂** is a “[b]eautifully executed manuscript; copied from Rg [**C₁**], but contains the whole [Judas] vita” (487). The provenance and dating of these two manuscripts support the hypothesis that **C₂** is a copy of **C₁**, and the quotations from the text supplied by James in his catalogue descriptions confirm that the source had more in common with the HA (Type R) than LA. Though the exact wording is different, the Pilate life begins in a manner similar to the HA, which specifically associates Tyrus with the region of Mainz (“Cum rex tyrus nacione maguntinus”); the Judas life also follows the HA in mentioning Pilate and Herod in the first line (“Fuit in diebus regis herodis poncio pilato preside uir in iudea nomine ruben...”; “In the days of king Herod, when Pontius Pilate ruled, there was a man in Judea by the name Ruben...”) and Judea rather than Jerusalem (cf. LA 45.14). The information of these few lines, which could not have derived from the LA alone, seems to provide evidence that some form of the HA, or perhaps an epitome of it, had reached the east of England prior to 1300. (The matter is taken up again below, ch. 3, p.95 ff.)

The relationship between the *Legenda Aurea* and the *Historia Apocrypha* is much better understood today than it was in 1974, when de Gaiffier published his summary of the research up to that time. Knape's substantial contributions, supplemented by the work of Scheidgen, stand as an invitation to further research on the HA. A full critical edition of the HA is a desideratum, though a more thorough search for other manuscripts and recensions would probably be required beforehand.⁵⁴ This chapter has begun a new study of the relationships among the HA, LA, and Judas/Pilate texts in the Vatican and the three Cambridge manuscripts (V, C₁, C₂, and C₃) in the light of research published since that of Rand and Baum. Completion of such a project would, however, require a more thorough examination of these texts than is possible from reading secondary literature and catalogue descriptions.

Three chapters of Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*

Regardless of the extent to which Jacobus perceived some type of structural unity in the *Historia Apocrypha*, he had a clear purpose in mind as he divided it up and incorporated sections of it into his own work. As HA source material was adjusted to fit into the structure of the *Legenda Aurea*, the recontextualizing changes the emphasis in the project of reconciling the divine history of salvation with the secular political narratives of imperial Rome. As with the other authors—from Augustine of Hippo to Dante Alighieri—who promulgate this grand tradition stretching from late antiquity, through the Middle Ages and beyond, Jacobus re-encodes the historical information to

⁵⁴ Knape is careful to state that his list includes the manuscripts known to him, hinting that it is not necessarily exhaustive (“Die Hystoria apocrypha” 117). In fact, his list overlooks A, B₂, and P₆, but in a second article adds R₁ and R₂ (Knape, “Pilatus” col. 673).

match his own set of ideological concerns, which are a response to the overall situation of the Church in the mid-thirteenth century. Reames provides several examples to support her assertion that the principle preoccupations of Jacobus in the process of compiling the LA include safeguarding the prerogatives of the clergy against secular rulers, and the power of saints to secure such rights through miracles (125-27).

Although the healings of Vespasian and Tiberius in the HA do not fit Reames's model exactly, since no actual clergy is directly involved in these miracles, both emperors take actions that serve the interests of the early Church: Tiberius attempts to bring Pilate to justice for his role in condemning Jesus to death, and Vespasian, along with his son Titus, takes vengeance upon the Jews by besieging and destroying Jerusalem. The sympathy shown by these secular powers toward the concerns of the nascent Church would probably have appealed to Jacobus, possibly as much as their use as the instruments of divine punishment. In the scheme Jacobus has created, the loose grouping of sinners in the HA, which included Herod and Nero, has been reduced to the three betrayers of Jesus, each led by a particular sinful motivations—greed, envy, and fear—to ultimate self-destruction. These three narratives give the uniform impression of wickedness beyond the possibility of redemption, upon which divine punishment is unflinchingly visited. Judas, Pilate, and the Jews remain unredeemed and unrepentant, ineligible for salvation offered by Christ.

With the *Historia Apocrypha* (or perhaps some intermediary text) as his source, Jacobus is able to integrate the Judas and Pilate lives into the whole of the *Legenda Aurea* only after a certain amount of intervention. In the pertinent chapters of the LA, Jacobus takes a number of steps to contain the potentially destabilizing influence of the

archsinner and the apocryphal nature of his subject matter. First, Jacobus delivers the critical assessment (however ambiguous) of the material he deems to be apocryphal from a source that he calls “admittedly apocryphal” (quoted above at length, on p.58). Second, by inserting the “quondam” disclaimer at the beginning, and the “hucusque” passage at the end of each apocryphal episode, Jacobus carefully marks off this suspect content so that the rest of his work will not be called into question. Third, he surrounds these brackets with more orthodox material, both narrative and interpretative, often cited from reliable sources. Fourth, Jacobus introduces and cross-references his grouping of three betrayers—Judas, Pilate, and the Jews—and is thus able to circumscribe them within chapters that narrate the workings of divine justice that lead to the downfall of each. Finally, he makes major and minor changes—additions, deletions, abbreviation, and amplification in each legend—in order to bring the HA material in line with his own ideology.

De sancto Mathia: Judas in Legenda Aurea cap. 45

The major transformation Jacobus of Voragine performs upon the narrative *De ortu Judae* from the *Historia Apocrypha* is the manner in which he places it within the structure of the *Legenda Aurea*. The legend is, to a certain extent, bracketed within the life of St. Matthias, where it is introduced abruptly after the etymological discursus with which Jacobus begins most chapters:

Mathias apostolus in locum Iude proditoris substitutus est, sed primo ortum et originem Iude breuiter uideamus. Legitur enim in quondam hystoria licet apocrypha quod...” (LA 45.13-14)

Matthias the apostle was given the place of [the traitor] Judas; but first let us briefly see something of Judas’s birth and origins. We read in a certain admittedly apocryphal history that... (Ryan 167, emended)

The rationale given is minimal, but we may infer that the origin of Judas serves in some way to explain his later betrayal of Jesus, which in turn makes the election of Matthias (described in Acts 1.23 ff) both possible and necessary. This association is already present in Acts, where Peter's long speech on the death of Judas is followed by the casting of lots to choose his replacement. Conspicuously absent from this chapter is any of the thematic justification that Jacobus uses later to link Judas, Pilate, and the Jews as the three betrayers of Christ whose origins and punishments are explicitly connected to the Passion story.

The brackets are closed around the HA-derived material when, toward the end of the Judas section of the Matthias chapter, Jacobus signals the reader that he is about to switch from an untrustworthy text to sources requiring no such demarcation:

Hucusque in predicti hystoria apocrypha legitur; que utrum recitanda sit, lectoris arbitrio relinquatur, licet sit potius relinquenda quam asserenda. (LA 45.51-52)

So far, however, what we have set down comes from the aforesaid apocryphal history, and whether it should be retold is left to the reader's judgment, though probably it is better left aside than repeated. (Ryan 168)

Aside from these two notices to warn his reader that the material is apocryphal, Jacobus introduces certain information from other sources to supplement the HA account of Judas's discipleship and death, but this falls outside the bracket created by the two editorial disclaimers. In this section (LA 45.53-62) Jacobus presents a brief narrative combining Gospel harmony and critical interpretation, without referring to any specific

authorities.⁵⁵

Within the brackets, the text of LA cap. 45 differs in relatively minor ways from the HA version of *De ortu Judae*, and for the most part it resembles a paraphrase.⁵⁶ There are, however, examples of both abbreviation and amplification in the opening sentences.

The HA reads:

Fuit in diebus Herodis regis Pylato preside uir in Iudea ex tribu Iuda Ruben nomine, qui noctis intempesta legalibus vxoris sue Cyboree alligabatur nexibus. Cyborea, cum membra sompno fuit et quiete, sompnum uidit; quo expergefata pectore sollicito retrahens suspiria velud presagiis futurorum malorum plena flebiliter ingemuit. (HA 336-37)

In the days of King Herod, when Pilate ruled, there was a man named Ruben from the tribe of Judah [living] in Judea, who, in the dead of one night, embraced his wife Cyborea in legal intercourse. With her limbs warmed by sleep and resting, Cyborea had a dream, awaking from which, with her breast shaking from (holding back) sighs, she groaned most piteously at length, as if foreseeing some future evils.

While relating the same basic narrative, the LA text differs in style and emphasis, as well as some of the particular details given:

[F]uit quidam uir in Iherusalem nomine Ruben, qui alio nomine dictus Symon, de tribu Iuda,⁵⁷ uel secundum Ieronimum de tribu Ysachar, qui habuit uxorem que Cyborea nuncupata est. Quandam igitur nocte cum sibi mutuo debitum extoluissent, Cyborea obdormiens sompnum uidit quod perterrita cum gemitibus et suspiriis uiro suo retulit... (LA 45.14-15)

[T]here was in Jerusalem a man, Ruben by name, who was also called Simon, of the tribe of [Judah] or, as Jerome has it, of the tribe of Issachar, and who had a wife named Cyborea. One night, after they had paid each

⁵⁵ Indeed Maggioni, the recent editor of the *Legenda Aurea*, cites no sources aside from Acts 1.18, though just after this section are references to such authorities as Vincent of Beauvais, Peter Comester, Jerome, and Bede (LA 45.53-62; Maggioni pp. 280-81).

⁵⁶ Baum says the following about the work of Jacobus: "Like the majority of revisers, he brought with him as many imperfections as he took away" ("Mediaeval Legend," 517).

⁵⁷ *Iuda* (LA 45.14): Graesse's edition and Ryan's translation give "Dan" here, a reading that Maggioni lists as a variant in manuscript **g** (Maggioni p. 278; see above, p. 62, n. 47).

other the marital debt, Cyborea fell asleep and had a dream that she related, terrified, sobbing and groaning, to her husband. (Ryan 167)

The substance is not much altered in LA, but changes both in lexis and syntax have been made by Jacobus—if indeed it is the work of Jacobus, rather than the unknown redactor of V, the intermediary source proposed by Rand. To begin with, the LA version replaces the HA’s temporal markers (Herod’s reign and Pilate’s governance) with a doubling of names (Ruben or Simon) and genealogies (the tribe of Judah /Dan or Issachar), along with naming an authority (Jerome). The description of Judas’s conception is also altered, changing the agency from Ruben’s rather one sided “embrace” of Cyborea to the more mutual, if also more formulaic, “payment of the marital debt.” Whether or not this reflects a particular pastoral interest in the institution of marriage, it does follow the general trend of the later versions of *De ortu Judae* to emphasize the viewpoint of Judas’s mother, with a correspondingly decreased emphasis on his father.

It could be—and has been—argued that these sorts of alterations tend to dampen the narrative force of the text as a whole, especially where the goal is apparently not merely to shorten and simplify (the two quotes above are practically the same length).⁵⁸ Jacobus, however, is writing as a Dominican—a member of the Order of Friars Preachers—and presumably producing a text for the benefit of his fellow preachers, who served a relatively unsophisticated laity (see above, p.55 ff.). While some of the criticism leveled at the style of the LA is certainly valid, it ought to be remembered that Jacobus

⁵⁸ See for instance, Anne B. Thompson’s assessment of the narrative style in one chapter of the LA: “Jacobus’s All Souls bristles with numbers and subdivisions throughout [...] Despite the multiplicity of illustrative *exempla* [...] the overall impression is emphatically nonnarrative and essentially unreadable” (*Everyday Saints* 126).

was not in the business of producing a literary text *per se*. There are, nevertheless, some moments of real storytelling in the LA as well (see below, p.77 ff.).

In addition to adding alternate accounts and appeals to authority, Jacobus trims away some of the more florid prose from the HA, as in the handling of Cyborea's pregnancy. The HA describes the passing of nine months thus:

Tempora fluxerunt, orbe nono cornua lunaria refulserunt. Instante itaque die partus generatur filius" (HA 352-53)

Time passed; for the ninth time the horns of the moon gleamed back on the world. And so presently the son begotten on that day was born.

The author of the HA seems to be thinking of a line from Ovid here, "orbe resurgebant lunaria cornua nono" (*Metamorphoses* 2.453, quoted in Steinmeyer, 164 n.12).

Presumably the author chose a line from the *Metamorphoses* to draw a parallel with the progress of a similarly ill-fated pregnancy, that of the nymph Callisto, which resulted from her having been raped by Jupiter, and caused her to be exiled by Diana. Jacobus, however, excises the literary allusion and simplifies the sentence to the briefest relation:

Procedente igitur tempore, cum filiam peperisset... (LA 45.19)

In due time a son was born... (Ryan 167).

Whereas in the source Judas is abandoned in a *cistella* ('little box, casket, chest' HA 156), Jacobus, possibly in an effort to evoke the abandonment of Moses (Exodus 2.1-3), has substituted a *fiscella* ('little basket,' 45.20; as in the Vulgate: *fiscellam*, Ex. 2:3).

These two changes show, on the one hand, the stripping away of a classical allusion, and on the other hand, the insertion of a biblical allusion.

In most cases, the editorial work that Jacobus (or the V redactor) performs upon the HA material is of the sort shown in the previous passages, and the multiplication of such examples would serve little purpose here. The most important exception is the

augmented ending *Jacobus* supplies for the Judas legend. In the HA, at least in those of the extant manuscripts that still contain the Judas vita, the ending is quite truncated.⁵⁹

After the parricide and incestuous marriage have taken place and been discovered, an abrupt ending concludes *De ortu Judae* as it meets up with the Gospel récit:

Penitencia ergo ductus,⁶⁰ Cyborea cogente et suadente, saluatoris nostri domini Ihesu Christi, per quem fit remissio peccatorum, ut suorum mereatur veniam peccatorum, fit discipulus; habebat autem tunc ut semper loculos, vbi sibi reseruabat futura pauperibus in elimosinas distribuenda. Exhinc a domino magis diligebatur ceteris, dum consilium cum Iudeis iniit eisque eum triginta vendidit argenteis. Videns autem, quia innocentem condempnauerat, proiecto in templo sanguinis precio laqueo se suspendit et medius crepuit.⁶¹ (HA 390-97)

Being led to repent himself, therefore, by the persuasion and convincing of Cyborea, he became a disciple of Our Savior the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom is remission of sins, in order to obtain pardon for his sins. He held then and always the receptacle in which they kept the alms that were to be distributed to the poor. After this the Lord loved Judas more than the others, until he conspired with the Jews, and sold Him to them for thirty pieces of silver. Seeing that he had condemned an innocent man, after throwing the blood money [down] in the Temple, he hung himself with a noose and split down the middle.

⁵⁹ See the list above, p. 45 ff., and Appendix A below; the Judas-vita is missing from several of the known HA manuscripts. These manuscripts—B₁, Lz, M₁, P₆, and T—are, along with O, among the oldest, dated to the 12th or early 13th century. In the case of M₁ and P₆, however, the narrative breaks off well before the place where the Judas life would start, and the loss is due to damage to the manuscript.

⁶⁰ Compare with Matthew 27:3: “tunc videns Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset paenitentia ductus rettulit triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus” (Vulgate); “Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients” (DRV).

⁶¹ Compare with Matthew 27:5 “et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit” (Vulgate); “And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed: and went and hanged himself with an halter” (DRV). The ending seems to follow the account given by Luke in Acts 1:18: “et hic quidem possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis et suspensus crepuit medius et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius” (Vulgate); “And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and being hanged, burst asunder in the midst: and all his bowels gushed out” (DRV). Jerome’s harmony or conflation of Matthew into Acts in the Vulgate, is discussed above, ch. 1, p. 9 ff.

This abridged account of the discipleship and death of Judas, derived from Matthew 27:3-6, seems to have satisfied the purpose of Jacobus, which is to link the downfall of Judas to the sin of greed, which (in the LA scheme) motivates his betrayal of Jesus.

Such an interpretation has its origins in the canonical New Testament (John 12.6), as well as a distinguished lineage in the Church Fathers. Jacobus expands upon the ending, adding more details about the betrayal of Christ, his motivations, and the significance of the 30 denarii, which are related to the perfume that could have been sold for 300 denarii (John 12.5, but compare Mark 14.5, where Judas is not specified). The immediate source for the calculations seems to be the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor (Evangelica cap. cxlviii), which pre-dates the LA by about a century, and was a source often cited by Jacobus.⁶² Peter's account connects the 30 denarii to the 300 denarii at which the ointment was valued, saying the 30 was equivalent to 300 "usuales," and hence was Judas's compensation for the loss of the 300 for the ointment. Peter does not, however, describe this percentage as a tithe. Aside from providing a clearer motive for Judas to betray Jesus, and an explanation for the 30 denarii, the intention here may be to present Judas committing the type of sin that might tempt the clerical reader of the LA.

De passione Domini: Pilate in Legenda Aurea cap. 51

The matter of Pilate in LA chapter on the Passion of the Lord may be summarized as follows (chapter and line numbers refer to the Maggioni text): Jacobus's list of the three betrayers of Christ; cross-references to chapters on Matthias (cap. 45) and James the Less (cap. 63); a disclaimer regarding the apocryphal source of Pilate vita (183-85, see

⁶² 1542 ed., fol. 241r.

quotation above p.60 ff.); the conception, birth, naming, and youth of Pilate; the murder of Pilate's foster brother (186-92); Pilate's sojourn as a hostage in Rome; murder of the son of the King of France (193-97); Pilate's appointment to the office of *Iudex* over the island of Pontos; origin of the name Pontius Pilate (198-204); friendship between Pilate and Herod (205); double-cross and subsequent enmity between Pilate and Herod (206-7); an alternate account of the enmity between Pilate and Herod, from Petrus Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* (208-11); Pilate's undelivered message to Tiberius; the emperor's illness; rumor of a healer in Jerusalem (i.e., Jesus); the mission of Volsianus to Jerusalem (212-15); Pilate's reception of Volsianus; meeting of Volsianus and Veronica (216-18); Veronica's story of her image of Christ (219-24); Veronica's journey to Rome with Volsianus; healing of Tiberius (225-32); Pilate's arrest and recall to Rome (233-34); Pilate's audience with Tiberius; protection of Pilate by the seamless tunic of Jesus (235-41); discovery and removal of the tunic by Tiberius; sentencing of Pilate to death (242-45); Pilate's suicide in prison (246-48); repeated disposals of Pilate's body: Tiber at Rome (249-50); Rhone at Vienne (251-53); outside Lausanne (254); a pit in the Alps (255); "hucusque" source disclaimer re: *Historia Apocrypha*; (256); various patristics on Pilate (257-63).

As with the Judas legend, Jacobus has made numerous changes, including the abbreviated opening. The HA version of Pilate's conception, by contrast, begins with a description of Tyrus, the future father of Judas, as a learned astrologer-king, whose calculations indicate that a very favorable time for him to sire a child occurs when he is separated from his wife, the queen (HA 1-13). The settings are specified: Tyrus is king in Mainz ("Regibus olim liberalibus eruditus in artibus accidit regem nomine Tyrum,

Mogonciensem nacione,” HA 1-2) and begets Pilate on a hunting trip near Bamberg (“in partibus Babenbergensium,” HA 3), which is about 250 km. from Bamberg as the crow flies or nearly 400 km. downriver (along the present course of the Main). The LA version gives no specific geographic setting for Tyrus, his kingdom, or his liaison with Pyla, which is made to seem random, part of a negative portrayal of Pilate’s parents. Jacobus has excised the astrological background of the liaison between Tyrus and Pyla. Compared to the original (and quite specific) setting of these events in HA, the LA version seems closer to romance or folktale than history (apocryphal or otherwise).

Again, such examples could be multiplied. The most significant addition in the LA is the entire episode of the Seamless Tunic (Robe) of the Lord, which is absent from any published version of the HA. When word reaches the emperor (by way of St. Veronica) of Pilate’s role in the condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus, Pilate is arrested, taken to Rome, and brought before Tiberius. As in the HA, the Roman Emperor, after being healed by Veronica’s image of Christ, is quite sympathetic toward the nascent Christian Church. In the LA, however, the dynamic between semi-Christian Tiberius and Christ-killing Pilate reverses and perhaps even parodies the usual *passio* drama of pagan tyrant and Christian martyr. This conflict takes a comedic turn when the pagan Pilate repeatedly appears before the emperor in the seamless tunic of Christ, which confounds Tiberius and thwarts his resolve to punish Pilate. This incident seems to refer—in an admittedly ironic or perhaps even a sardonic way—to the sort of protection from bodily harm and public humiliation that God offers to his martyrs before they are condemned and executed, usually by being beheaded. This scene also reverses the mockery of Christ, when Jesus is dressed in purple and crowned with thorns, with Pilate officiating. Finally,

at the advice of a Christian informant, Pilate is stripped of the tunic and condemned by the emperor, only to take his own life before the sentence can be carried out. This extra-biblical Pilate, who in the Gospel acts as an unwilling pagan oppressor of Jesus, experiences a change of roles that turns him into an anti-martyr.

The origin of this episode and Jacobus's immediate source are uncertain, though it seems very unlikely that Jacobus invented it from whole cloth. The story of Tiberius, Pilate, and the Seamless Tunic of Christ is included, in much the same form, in the *Mors Pilati* (the 'Death of Pilate'), which Döbschutz thought was derived from LA (302*), as does Knappe (*Pilatus* col. 676); Werner, however, lists it before the HA and LA (17-19). The earliest extant manuscript of *Mors Pilati* is from the fourteenth century (Milan, Ambr. L. 58) and postdates the LA, despite being used as the basis of Tischendorf's published text (Knappe *Pilatus* coll. 676).⁶³ The matter requires further comparison of the various extant HA texts, as well as comparison with the Vatican manuscript (CPL 619). An episode that makes a fool of Tiberius, an emperor otherwise treated favorably in the HA, would perhaps be out of place in that text. Jacobus, however, has little interest in positive portrayal of emperors and was free to incorporate this interpolation. Jacobus has also separated the sections concerning Pilate and Veronica from those dealing with Vespasian, Titus, and Josephus; the latter are related (in LA cap. 63) along with the Destruction of Jerusalem.

⁶³ See: *Evangelia Apocrypha*, ed. Constantin Tischendorff, 2nd ed. (Lipsig, Hermann Mendelssohn, 1876), lxxx ff., 456-58; James, *NTA*, 157-58 (and 66); and Elliott, *ANT*, 216-17.

De sancto Iacobi apostolo: the Jews in Legenda Aurea cap. 63

Jacobus starts the chapter on St. James the Apostle with the usual etymology and then explains that James the Apostle is also called James of Alpheus, James the Less, James the Just, and James the brother of the Jesus.⁶⁴ Although it is not clear from the Gospels alone that these titles all refer to the same person, Jacobus of Voragine does his best to account for each, citing a variety of authorities (LA 63.9-33). The key role played by this James is as the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and (nominal) head of the early Church after the death of Jesus. James is martyred after thirty years in this office, and for the events that lead up to his stoning, Jacobus follows Eusebius of Caesaria (LA 63.50-74; Maggioni 449). On the authority of Josephus, we learn that the destruction of Jerusalem is a divine punishment upon the Jews for the deaths of Jesus and James; for this Jacobus probably used the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais as an intermediary text (LA 63.75-92; Maggioni 451-52). Here Jacobus turns to his apocryphal source: the remainder of this chapter (LA 63.93-118; 120-40; 141-55; 176-89) is nearly all drawn from the *Historia Apocrypha* and most of it is indicated with the usual disclaimers (LA 63.93, 156).

Contemporary readers may well object to lumping an entire people together to form the third member of a trinity, yet we would do well to consider the monolithic aspect of 'The Jews' evident in the treatment of them as a group both unrepentant and

⁶⁴ To distinguish him from James the Greater, son of Zebedee, Jacobus follows a rather tortuous line of interpretation that makes this James the cousin of Jesus, who was known as his brother because of their striking resemblance. So strong was this resemblance, Jacobus tells us, that Judas was employed by the Jews because he was needed to tell them apart (LA 63.13-14).

unconvertible that Jacobus presents in his account of the destruction of Jerusalem.⁶⁵

Despite the abundant virtue of a man such as Josephus, in the end the value of the Jewish people is so degraded and worthless that one piece of silver buys thirty of them.⁶⁶ In my continuing work on medieval accounts of Judas, it has become clear that he stands nearly as often for the Jewish people in general as he does for his own individual and treacherous person. Inasmuch as Judas is a foil for Jesus in the Gospel story, he also makes a convenient screen upon which to project the Jewishness that is increasingly displaced from Jesus, or, to use a different metaphor, Judas becomes a sort of scapegoat.⁶⁷

Although Jacobus attributes the destruction of Jerusalem to the role of ‘The Jews’ in the deaths of Jesus and his brother James, the section on Judas begins with his mother’s dream that she would “bear a son so wicked that he would bear ruin upon [their] whole people” (Ryan 167). Thus despite whatever mercy the Lord shows to the people of Judea by granting them forty years to repent after the crucifixion, it seems clear from the

⁶⁵ Sherry Reames argues that Jacobus of Voragine’s treatment is less anti-Semitic than his sources for the *Vindicta Salvatoris*, presumably the HA. (*The Legenda aurea: A Reexamination of Its Paradoxical History*, Madison, U of Wisconsin P, 1985) “Even the chapter on James the Lesser, which recounts the siege and destruction of Jerusalem in grisly detail, shows noticeable restraint for a medieval narrative of its kind. ... Jacobus’s account goes on to emphasize the proofs of God’s desire to save the Jews, rather than see them punished for rejecting Christ. ... The message that Jews are human beings capable of redemption is reinforced elsewhere in the *Legenda* by Jacobus’s tendency to retell stories in which they are converted, rather than condemned, by miracles...” (262 note 9; examples follow).

⁶⁶ “Tandem secundo anno imperii Vespasiani Titus Iherusalem cepit et captam subuerit templumque funditus destruxit et, sicut Iudei Christum .xxx denariis emerant, sic et ipse uno denario triginta Iudeos uendidit.” (LA 63.176); “Finally, in the second year of Vespasian’s reign, Titus took Jerusalem, reduced the city to ruins, and leveled the Temple; and as the Jews had bought Jesus for thirty pieces of silver, Titus had Jews sold at the rate of thirty for one silver coin” Ryan (276); cf. “Iudeos quoque ciuitatis, qui Ihesum triginta comparauerant argenteis, e conuerso triginta vendidit pro vno denario” (HA 317-18).

⁶⁷ See Hyam Maccoby, *Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil* (New York: Free P, 1992), 6, 41 ff., 58.

Judas legend that their ruin has been, if not fated, at least foreknown by God. Neither the attempt that his parents make to avert such a destiny by abandoning Judas as an infant, nor the good influence that discipleship should have upon him serves to change the lot of Judas. Given that Pilate and Judas are evil from before birth until death by suicide, there seems to be little doubt that the third member of the trinity—the Jews, the stiff-necked chosen people of the Old Testament—will turn out to be just as inherently and stubbornly evil. In any case it hardly matters whether they are considered as knowing conspirators in a plot to commit deicide or rather imagined as the blind Synagoga, trying vainly to uphold her superseded law after the advent of a new dispensation—either way the authors and compilers of the Middle Ages had a long tradition of *Adversos Judeos* rhetoric to draw upon.

The Latin tradition *De ortu Judae*: Conclusions

Because of the wide circulation enjoyed by the *Legenda Aurea* in the later Middle Ages, “Type L” became the dominant form of the legend *De ortu Judae*, yet the somewhat fuller treatment of “Type R,” as found in the *Historia Apocrypha*, circulated alongside it as an important alternate version. Both Latin texts were used as the source for various European vernacular texts; in some cases apparently both were consulted for the same translation. Moreover, they may be found, whether standing alone as excerpts or abbreviated forms, in numerous Latin miscellanies and encyclopedic works.⁶⁸ One lasting

⁶⁸ For some relatively recent work on vernacular texts, see: Joachim Knape on the Middle High German prose version (“Die Historia Apocrypha” 138-64); Eugenio Burgio on the Old French traditions; Kirsten Wolf on the Icelandic *Gyðinga saga*; and Richard Axton on the Middle English traditions about Judas. (The *South English Legendary* will be discussed at length in Chapter 3, and some Middle Irish versions will be touched on in Chapter 5.) Latin texts of the Judas and Pilate lives, usually based on the LA version, survive in many manuscripts from the

legacy of the HA may be the enduring association between the Judas and Pilate legends, which passed thence into the LA. Thanks in part to Jacobus's cross-reference, Judas and Pilate continued to be paired in the many subsequent medieval Latin and vernacular versions, in which they are also occasionally associated with the destruction of Jerusalem. Though Jacobus (and arguably the compiler of the HA) framed the tradition *De ortu Judae* in terms of divine justice and retribution, the widespread popularity of this tradition may have little to do with the problem of free will, the proper forms of repentance, or the further castigation of Christ's treacherous disciple. The actual appeal of Oedipodean Judas legend, alongside its double the apocryphal Pilate-vita, was probably the fabulous and sensational elements that the story offered: abandonment of infants, intentional or unwitting parricide, and inadvertent incest are the sorts of *aventure* found in secular and hagiographic romance of the period, as well as being enduring motifs of folktales. Association with the central narrative of Christendom lent a sort of legitimacy to this tale, admittedly apocryphal or otherwise.

thirteenth century onward. To date no attempt has been made to list or categorize all of these, but they may be found in almost any major manuscript catalogue; for examples, see index under Judas and Pilate in Zbigniew Izydorczyk, *Manuscripts of the 'Evangelium Nicodemi': A Census*, *Subsidia Mediaevalia* 21 (Toronto, Pontifical Institute, 1993).

3. *De ortu Judae: The Oedipodean Judas in the South English Legendary*

This chapter considers a vernacular version of the tradition *De ortu Judae* found in the *South English Legendary* (hereafter SEL).¹ With attention to sources, dating, placement in collection, and the translator's reworking of the narrative, the SEL version of the Oedipodean Judas legend (hereafter *Iudas*) will be examined in detail, along with its closely related legend of Pontius Pilate (hereafter *Pylatus*). Of primary interest are the particular alterations of content and style that distinguish the Middle English text from its Latin source, and the implications that such a close comparison has for the matter of Judas, the SEL, the late apocrypha, and the genre of abbreviated legendary, particularly in vernacular languages. Also discussed is the transmission in medieval Britain of two Latin prose works, the *Legenda Aurea* (LA) and the *Historia Apocrypha* (HA). While some elements of this study have been addressed by previous publications, to date there has not been a systematic combination of all these approaches, together with the data collected in Chapter Two of this dissertation. Drawing on recent scholarship concerning the Latin and Middle English legendaries, this chapter demonstrates that the LA was the direct source of the SEL legends of Judas and Pilate, while at the same time showing how the SEL poet has introduced significant innovations to both legends. This research approaches the problem of the two arch-sinners among the saints by considering the ways in which the SEL poet makes use of his sources in rendering the legends of Judas and Pilate into Middle English verse, with particular attention to the departures from the main

¹ The edition most cited (hereafter as *SEL*) is: Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, *The South English Legendary*, 3 vols. [EETS o.s. no. 235-236, 244] (London: Oxford UP, 1956-59).

source, the LA. Because these departures are so varied and numerous, I will focus on just a few of them, hoping to contribute to an understanding of the overall project of the SEL, and especially how certain preoccupations of the poet—possibly the “outspoken” A(1) redactor of the collection—shape the mode of communication.² Also included here (in Appendices C and D at the end of this dissertation) are completely new annotated Modern English translations of the SEL *Iudas* and *Pylatus*.

The apocryphal tradition *De ortu Judae* in medieval vernaculars—overview

The vernacular versions of the Oedipodean Judas legend have been listed in detail by Baum (“Mediaeval Legend of Judas” 526-85), who found that the Latin legend had been translated into numerous European languages between the end of the thirteenth century and the start of the fifteenth. Baum’s work on the non-Latin tradition has been supplemented by several scholars, including, most recently: Joachim Knappe on the Middle High German prose version (“Die Historia apocrypha” 138-64); Eugenio Burgio on the Old French traditions (“Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle vite antiofrancesi di Giuda e di Pilato”); Kirsten Wolf on the Scandinavian and Icelandic traditions (“The Judas Legend in Scandinavia;” *Gyðinga saga*); Richard Axton on the Middle English versions (“Interpretations of *Judas* in Middle English literature”), and Lowell Edmunds on various analogues and post-medieval oral traditions (*Oedipus, The Ancient Legend and Its Later Analogues; Oedipus: A Folklore Casebook*).³

² See O. S. Pickering “The outspoken South English Legendary poet,” in *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and Their Transmission: Essays In Honour of A. I. Doyle*. Ed. A. J. Minnis (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994), 21-37. See discussion below, p. 104 ff.

³ Full citations for these texts may be found in the bibliography.

***De ortu Judae* in medieval Britain: vernacular and Anglo-Latin versions**

The *South English Legendary* is the earliest of several Middle English texts that preserve some form of the tradition *De ortu Judae*. The Oedipodean Judas legend, in a form probably derived from the LA, also appears in insular texts such as Mirk's *Festial*, the *Scottish Legendary*, the *Gilte Legende*, Caxton's *Golden Legend*, the metrical *Titus and Vespasian*, and the poem *Suspendio Judae* found at the end of the Townley dramas (Baum 331; Axton 183).⁴ A Middle Welsh *Ystoria Judas* ("History of Judas") has been dated to late 13th or early 14th century (Baum 549); this version circulates with the *Hanes Pontius Pilatus* ("History of Pontius Pilate") and has been published by Williams.⁵ Also of interest to the study of these apocryphal legends in medieval Britain is the Latin *Polychronicon* of Ranulf Higden (probably in the early 1340s), which was translated into Middle English by John Trevisa (1387), and printed by Caxton (1482). The versions of the Judas and Pilate lives in this text (Rolls Ser. vol. 41) follow the LA versions quite closely, including the familiar disclaimer that Jacobus uses to introduce his Judas-vita:

⁴ This curious fragment of Middle English verse in at the end the manuscript of the Towneley plays may be a 16th century addition. See: A. C. Cawley and Martin Stevens, eds. *The Towneley Cycle: a Facsimile of Huntington MS HM 1* (Leeds: U of Leeds, School of English, 1976), f.131v-132r.; Margaret A. Pappano, "Judas in York: Masters and Servants in the Late Medieval Cycle Drama," *Exemplaria* 14.2 (2002): 317-50; and "Suspensio Iude" ('The Hanging of Judas'), *Towneley Plays* 32 (E.E.T.S. e. s. no. 71), 393-96.

⁵ *Selections from the Hengwrt Mss. Preserved in the Peniarth Library*. Williams, Robert, ed. and trans. London: Thomas Richards, 1892. See also : J. E. Caerwyn Williams. "The Middle Welsh Text *Ystoria Judas*." *Celtic Linguistics: Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages: festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins*. Ed. Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe, and Jenny Rowland. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. 68. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990. 363-371.

“De quo Juda in historia quadam, licet apocrypha, sic legitur” (4:352-4).⁶

All of the vernacular texts listed above postdate the SEL, the earlier forms of which existed by the last decades of the thirteenth century, and probably already included Judas and Pilate (see below, p. 88 ff.). Several Latin texts of *De ortu Judae* and *De ortu et origine Pontii Pylati* are also preserved in British manuscripts starting in the late thirteenth century, and seem to be derived from the LA. These include Cambridge, St. John’s College Ms. 214 (C₃), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 90 (O₂), and London, British Library Ms. Royal 6 E. VI-VII (the encyclopedia *Omne Bonum* of James le Palmer, ca. 1330-50).⁷ Exactly when and in what form the LA reached England is not fully understood. Görlach gives a list of a dozen early (late 13th c.) LA mss in England, not all of which were written there: two with the complete collection, five with a significant number of selections, and five more with one or more individual selections (Görlach, *Textual Tradition* 22-23).⁸ On the strength of this sampling, he concludes that “selections, rather than complete [LA] collections, must have been frequent when the texts were first copied in 13th C England” (23) but notes that “the crucial question of when the book was first introduced into England cannot be answered with any certainty”

⁶ *Polychronicon* first finished 1327, then revised and extended to 1352 by Higden and/or other authors, John of Trevisa’s translation (dated 1387), and printed in three editions (1482-1527), by Caxton (*DMA*, 6:224). See: *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, ed. Churchill Babington and Joseph R. Lumby, 9 vols. Rolls ser. 41 (London, 1865-86).

⁷ See above, ch. 2, p. 45, n. 28 and ff.

⁸ The works of Manfred Görlach, especially *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary* (Leeds: University of Leeds, 1974) are discussed throughout this chapter, particularly in p. 82 ff.

(24).⁹

The *South English Legendary*—overview and publication history

The *South English Legendary* (SEL), is a compilation of hagiographic texts in Middle English rhyming heptameter couplets. The collection originated in the Southwest Midlands during the last part of the thirteenth century, written by poet or poets unknown, and is believed to have undergone several subsequent revisions. Like the *Legenda Aurea*, the SEL combines a *sanctorale*, in which the lives of saints are arranged according to their place in the calendar, with a *temporale* the movable feasts and a few texts on biblical history, interspersed in their approximate calendar positions. At one stage of the collection, the *sanctorale* and *temporale* seem to have been in different volumes; no two manuscripts are quite alike in the number or the order of items (*SEL* 3:3). The legends of Judas and Pilate, if they belong at all, belong to the *temporale*, and are often associated with one of the passion narratives.¹⁰

In his 1862 book *Early English Poems and Lives of Saints (with those of the Wicked Birds Pilate and Judas)*, F. J. Furnivall published several SEL legends edited from MS Harley 2277, including *Judas* and *Pylatus* (107-118). Later in the nineteenth century, Carl Horstmann published an edition of an early form of the SEL from Ms. Laud 108, which lacks the Judas and Pilate legends, as does the edition (*The Early South English Legendary*, EETS 87, [London, 1887], hereafter *ESEL*). Although it is not a complete critical edition, the mid-twentieth-century edition of Charlotte D'Evelyn and

⁹ This work has since been supplemented by the systematic study of Barbara Fleith, *Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der lateinischen Legenda aurea* (Bruxelles, Soc. Bollandistes, 1991).

¹⁰ For a good overview of the SEL, see the appendix of Anne B. Thompson's *Everyday Saints and the Art of Narrative in the South English Legendary* (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2003), 189-97.

Anna J. Mills (*SEL*), which is based on the Cambridge Corpus Christi College MS (with variants from Harley and two other mss), remains the standard and is my source for Judas and Pilate. Manfred Görlach's research from the 1970s (*The Textual Tradition of the SEL*) is the most thorough account of the manuscripts and sources of the *SEL*. It seems unlikely, at this point, that anyone will undertake a complete *Quellenforschung* for the whole collection, though various scholars continue publishing such research on particular legends. In recent decades, some of the most important contributions have been made by Manfred Görlach, Klaus P. Jankofsky, Oliver S. Pickering, Anne B. Thompson, and Thomas R. Liszka. The work of these scholars will be discussed below, and in the sections that follow.

The South English Legendary and the Legenda Aurea

One key aspect of this chapter is an investigation of the transformation of a Latin prose source into Middle English vernacular verse.¹¹ The *Legenda Aurea*, an abbreviated legendary compiled by the northern Italian Dominican Jacobus of Voragine, is now accepted as a source for much of the *SEL*. The exact degree of influence that the *LA* exerted upon the *SEL*, however, has been a matter of some debate. In his study of this matter, Görlach juxtaposes the views of Horstmann, who asserted (in the 1880s) that the two collections were completely independent of one another, and Wells, who argued (in the 1930s and -40s) that the *SEL* was completely dependent upon the *LA* (*Textual*

¹¹ Görlach admits that “the *SEL* author may have used French collections as supplementary sources” (Görlach, *Textual Tradition* 30), and Thompson asserts that, the *SEL* poet “was perfectly aware of French as a language” (Thompson, *Everyday Saints* 53). Aside from the Bible, however, no such sources seem to have been employed for the Judas and Pilate legends, almost certainly not the *Historia Apocrypha* or any known French translations thereof.

Tradition 26). Ultimately Görlach rejects both of these extremes, and stakes out a middle ground over which all subsequent scholarly debate has taken place; by comparison to the earlier polemics, however, this debate approaches a scholarly consensus.

Based in part upon his analysis of the oldest extant manuscript, Görlach found that in the earlier (“Z”) version of the collection, LA “influence appears to be almost or completely absent in the January to May legends,” but that the “July to Christmas portion shows close affiliation with” the LA.¹² In the later (“A” revision) version of the collection he finds “a stronger [LA] influence in the January to May portion” (*Textual Tradition*, 27). Two possibilities are suggested by Görlach, both of which are sufficiently complex that they must be quoted at length:

[1.] The “Z” author started translating an unknown pre-[LA] legendary and encountered the [LA] only when he had half finished his work. He then decided to continue with a text which he then combined from his legendary and the [LA], either selecting complete legends from one of the two collections, or combining features according to his own preference. It is possible that this [LA] copy contained a selection of legends only, so that the intermittent [LA] influence [...] would be explained. [...] The winter part was brought into agreement with the [LA] only later, in the course of the “A” redaction.

[2] The alternative explanation would be a complete early SEL, mainly, but not exclusively, based on a liturgical collection (a Worcester *legenda*). These texts were later revised after the [LA] had become available (“Z2”). (Görlach, *Textual Tradition*, 27-28)

Either way, Görlach concludes, the LA “became available at some point in the early history of an *existing* SEL collection (28). Certainly such an expansive resource as the

¹² The standard form of the SEL collection is arranged according to the secular calendar year, beginning on January 1 with New Year’s Day and the Circumcision of Jesus. The LA, by comparison, follows the ecclesiastical year of the Latin church, which begins on the first Sunday of Advent. Because, like other “movable feasts,” the start of the liturgical year falls on a particular day of the week, the calendar date occurs between November 26 and December 2.

LA (or even the hypothetical Anglo-Latin liturgical collection) would be an invaluable resource to a *légendière* who might otherwise require an entire library of sources to produce a work such as the SEL.

Oliver Pickering, building upon the work of Görlach, gives a slightly less technical account of how the collection may have developed in the four stages, expressing some uncertainty about whether to place the advent of the LA in the second or third stage:

1. A rudimentary collection of short saints' lives, probably dependent on liturgical Latin models, and now hardly recoverable.
2. Expansion into a cycle of longer lives clearly arranged in the order of the calendar year. This stage is additionally characterized by having a preceding group of short poems on the church's principal feasts and fasts; by having associated with it a number of *temporale* narratives centered around the life of Christ and Mary; and—either at this stage or the next—in showing, selectively, the strong influence of Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*.
3. A further expansion of both saints' lives and *temporale* poems by a notably creative and interventionist writer, whom I have recently called the 'outspoken' *South English Legendary* poet [and whom Pickering now further identifies as Robert of Gloucester].
4. A restructuring, tidying up and toning down of the SEL as it was left by this writer into a form which became the 'standard' version of the collection, by the EETS edition of the 1950s. (Pickering "Teaching or Preaching?" 2, quoted [with an editorial addition] in Thompson, *Everyday Saints*, 195-96.)¹³

Here Pickering's stages 1 and 2 would roughly correspond with Görlach's "Z" text, which he dates to 1260-75, and stages 3 and 4 with his "A" revision, dated to ca. 1270-85 (*Textual Tradition* 28, 38). As the reconstructions become even more complex and

¹³ O. S. Pickering, "The *South English Legendary*: teaching or preaching?" *Poetica* 45 (1996): 1-14.

detailed, further divisions are made to reflect intermediary stages of redaction: “Z(1)” and “Z(2); the “outspoken ‘A(1)’ redactor” and the “toning down ‘A(2)’ redactor.”

Judas and Pilatus: the Historia Apocrypha legends in the SEL

As the two individuals most directly responsible for the death of Jesus Christ, Judas Iscariot and Pontius Pilate do not fit comfortably within a collection such as the *South English Legendary*, which, though at some points in its history included a separate section for biblical history and movable feasts (*temporale*), is a collection largely composed of saints’ lives (*sanctorale*).¹⁴ Thompson notes that “many of the narratives do not fit the hagiographic model at all” (11), and, as D’Evelyn and Mill point out, the collection covers a variety of genres (*SEL* 3:25). Despite this diversity among the legends, the poets, scribes, and redactors responsible for producing the various forms of the SEL must have sensed the tension between the good majority and the evil pair. Of the dozen SEL manuscripts that preserve the Judas and Pilate legends, half place them at or after the end of the collection (see Appendix B for full list). Moreover, whether by intentional exclusion or by accidental loss in transmission, more than half of the major SEL manuscripts omit Judas and Pilate entirely.

In the conclusion to the introduction of their edition, D’Evelyn and Mill say that, “The stories of Pilate and Judas, among the most interesting of the legends, are early, if perhaps unintentional, studies of criminal tendencies abetted by environment and circumstances” (EETS 244 p. 25). The theme of criminality that is exploited so

¹⁴ Pickering has also written that the terms *sanctorale* and *temporale* are “undeniably” useful, but also, in the case of the SEL “nevertheless inappropriate and misleading” (“The *Temporale* Narratives of the *South English Legendary*,” *Anglia* 91 [1973]: 425-55; at 426). To judge by the previous quotation, the utility of these terms continues to outweigh their lack of precision.

thoroughly by the SEL poet is already present in the source, but it is given new emphasis in both legends. The overall purpose of the SEL *Iudas* is the depiction of the arch-betrayer as a scoundrel (*schrewe*) who is wicked (*luper*) to the point of being inherently irredeemable; in *Pylatus* the emphasis is not only upon Pilate's depravity (*shreuehede*), but also upon his cunning (*quoyntyse*). In both cases justice is ultimately served up in the form of suicide, as Judas and Pilate each suffer a self-imposed death sentence.

Although the LA versions of the Judas and Pilate legends are by no means lacking in condemnation, there is also a certain degree of sympathy left for these two betrayers of Jesus, even despite Jacobus's overall message of divine retribution. In part, these are artifacts of the histories (genealogies) of these apocryphal lives, which came to the LA and thence to the SEL with inscribed biases that did not entirely suit those collections. The HA, from which Jacobus drew his accounts of Judas and Pilate, is part of the large body of apocryphal texts associated with Pilate. In the later Pilate apocrypha, the guilt of the Roman official is considerable, by contrast to the Gospels and early apocrypha, which sought to absolve him, and by extension imperial authority altogether. In the HA, however, the emperors Tiberius, Vespasian, and Titus are portrayed as at least sympathetic toward the early Church, if not themselves Christian.

The *Historia Apocrypha* (HA), a Latin text of the 11th or 12th century that transmits the legends *De ortu Judae* and *De ortu Poncii Pilati*, as well as the Veronica legend, some anecdotes on Nero, and the destruction of Jerusalem, has been discussed in some detail in the previous chapter (see above, ch. 2, p. 42 ff.). Despite a great number of differences between the Latin prose and Middle English verse texts, the HA versions of the Judas and Pilate legends are still recognizable as the ultimate source of the SEL *Iudas*

and *Pylatus*. Further comparison, however, shows that the immediate source of these legends is the *Legenda Aurea* (specifically LA capp. 45 and 51), for which the HA seems to have been the direct source. The LA has long been acknowledged as an important source of for the SEL, but the exact extent of its influence and the sources of individual legends has been a subject of some debate (see below, p.99 ff.).

SEL *Iudas* and *Pylatus*: Manuscript evidence

The SEL is extant in 26 complete manuscripts, 19 fragments, and 18 miscellanies that contain single items from the SEL (Görlach, *Textual Tradition* vii-xi).¹⁵ The Middle English legends of *Iudas* and *Pylatus* survive in 13 manuscripts, that is, in roughly half of the complete collections, plus one of the fragments. In six of these manuscripts (D, K, N, O, P, and T),¹⁶ *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow directly after the *Southern Passion*, and thus seem to belong to the remainder of a *temporale* section. In the remaining six, Judas and Pilate seem to belong neither to the *temporale* nor to the *sanctorale*: in three manuscripts (C, H, and R) they are placed at the end of the year, and in three others (V, W, and Ba) they are included in an appendix not contiguous with the rest of the SEL selections. In addition, one manuscript contains only *Pylatus* (I), and another appends a Latin Judas text (M). The lack of uniformity in the placement of these legends within the various manuscripts that preserve them bears witness to the disruptive effect they had in a collection that was, by the time the extant manuscripts were created, dominated by a

¹⁵ For Z, the 26th complete manuscript of the SEL, see O. S. Pickering and M. Görlach, "A Newly-Discovered Manuscript of the *South English Legendary*," *Anglia* 100 (1982): 109-23.

¹⁶ Görlach's sigla for the various manuscripts, which have become standard throughout scholarly discussions of the SEL, are used throughout this chapter.

sanctorale.

SEL manuscripts including *Judas* and/or *Pylatus* (brief list)

- C** Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 145 (*olim* R.4), *ca.* 1310-20; 1400; 1450.
- D** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 463 (S.C. 1596), early 15th c.
- H** London, British Library, Harley 2277, *ca.* 1300.
- I** Cambridge, St. John's College B.6 (James 28), paper, *ca.* 1400.
- K** Cambridge, King's College 13 pt. II, mid-14th c.
- N** London, British Library, Egerton 2891, *ca.* 1300-25.
- O** Oxford, Trinity College 57, *ca.* 1380-1400.
- P** Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 2344, *ca.* 1350-75.
- R** Cambridge, Trinity College 605 (*olim* R. 3. 25), *ca.* 1400.
- T** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 17 (9837), *ca.* 1400, with later additions.
- V** Oxford, Bodleian Library, English Poetry a.1 (the Vernon MS), *ca.* 1390.
- W** Winchester, Winchester College 33A, *ca.* 1450; paper.
- Ba** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Additional C. 220 (MS 29430), late 14th c. or *ca.* 1400.

Manuscripts are parchment unless marked as paper. See Appendix B for a more detailed listing. The sigla are Görlach's, though his order, which reflects certain relationships among manuscripts, is H-ODPKNT-R-VWBa-I-C*; total, Judas: 12, Pilate: 13.¹⁷

¹⁷ Two additional manuscripts are of special interest here: **M** (London, British Library, Egerton 2810 [*olim* Phillips 8253], ff. 179v-80r) which contains a unique Latin Judas legend (Liszka "Dragon" 51); and **Qx** (London, British Library, Additional 22283 [the Simeon MS], end of the 14th c.) which is a miscellany, similar to Vernon MS, currently containing only a single SEL item, Michael III, separated from the rest of the SEL text (now lost). The Judas and Pilate legends are also missing, but may have been placed in an appendix, as in **V**.

Observations on the mss: sources, dating, and order of the collection

In the literature on the SEL, questions of sources, dating, and placement in the collection of *Iudas* and *Pylatus*, have been addressed by Baum, Wells, Görlach, and Litzka. Regarding the source, there are two main opinions: (1) that they are based directly upon chapters 45 and 51 of the LA (*St. Matthias* and the *Lord's Passion*); and (2) that they are based upon another, independently circulating Latin text, including both Judas and Pilate legends, possibly also the source used by Jacobus for the pertinent chapters of the LA.¹⁸ The first position, as the analysis below will demonstrate, is undoubtedly correct, though the second, probably because of Görlach's endorsement, retains some currency among SEL scholars. At this point it is most convenient, however, to deal with the placement of these legends in the collection and the related issue of dating, before returning to the matter of sources.

Baum had access to both Furnivall's 1862 edition of the Judas and Pilate legends from H (Harley 2277), and Horstmann's 1887 edition of L (Laud 108), which did not include *Iudas* or *Pylatus* (Baum 526-31). Following Horstmann's assertion that the LA and the SEL arose independently of one another (albeit simultaneously), Baum concluded that

The legend of Judas did not belong (as has been said) to the first English collection [of the SEL]. When it was added later, but still probably in the thirteenth century, it was naturally placed at the end, not merely as an appendage, but also because Judas Iscariot was decidedly outside the pale of honored saints. Afterward it was seen that, like the story of the destruction of Jerusalem, the legend of Judas would have a kind of dramatic value if placed immediately after the Passion of Christ,—just as the French made it a part of the 'vengeance' of our Lord. (Baum

¹⁸ On Baum, Rand, and the Vatican manuscript, see ch. 2, p. 64 ff.

“Mediaeval Legend” 528)¹⁹

Here Baum alludes to the irregularity in position of *Iudas and Pylatus* in the SEL, presumably because of the difficulty presented by introducing sinners into the *sanctorale*. While Baum’s account of the history and placement of the two legends is plausible, he nevertheless relies too heavily on the witness of L, which despite its early date, is not particularly representative of the best manuscript tradition, but rather, as Baum admits “represents an incomplete form of the collection” (526).²⁰

Görlach, on the other hand, favors an opposite if equally plausible explanation regarding the placement of the Judas and Pilate legends in the SEL:

Affiliation with [the *Long Life of Christ*] and the fact that Judas and Pilate occur appended to collections of saints’ Lives elsewhere in the 13 C suggest that both ‘legends’ belong to the early collection. They were, however, most probably arranged with the *temporale* volumes (cf. MS I) and their present distribution still largely agrees with that of [the *Long Life of Christ* and the *Southern Passion*] –although some scribes moved them back to the end of the collection or independently omitted the ‘*luper briddes*’” (*Textual Tradition* 299 n. 385)

In most matters involving the evolution of the collection, the opinion of Görlach, a specialist on the SEL, carries more weight than Baum’s. Although his *Textual Tradition of the SEL* may not be the last word on any one legend, it certainly remains the most complete overview of the collection.

¹⁹ Drawing upon Horstmann’s work, Baum knew of the following SEL manuscripts: A, E, G, L (all lacking *Iudas*); C, D, H, K, O, R, T (these including *Iudas*); V (which he did not seem to know contained *Iudas* in an appendix); and Q (which he correctly guessed may have once contained *Iudas*: this is found in Ba, since originally Q, Qa, and Ba formed a single manuscript) (“Mediaeval Legend,” 526-27)).

²⁰ Baum dates L to ca. 1285-95 (“Mediaeval Legend,” 526), and Görlach to slightly later, ca. 1300 (*Textual Tradition* 89). Thompson has described L as “a confused layering of previous redactions” that includes elements of both “Z” and “A” versions (*Everyday Saints* 195; cf. *Textual Tradition* 7, 88).

Thomas Liszka begins his analysis of *Iudas* and *Pylatus* from the point where previous research leaves off, with the benefit of Görlach's work on the entire collection, as well as Pickering's work on the *temporale* and the "A(1)" redaction:

The lives appear to have been parts of the *SEL* collection in an early, and perhaps the earliest, stage. Fourteen manuscripts preserve Judas or Pilate texts. Thirteen of them are major manuscripts, including [H] the second oldest surviving manuscript. And two manuscripts have Judas or Pilate as part of a *temporale* section, reminiscent of the one which preceded the *sanctorale* in the original *SEL* collection. (Liska, "Dragon," 50-1)

While not entirely in agreement with the previous research that he is building upon, Liszka fits the two legends into the larger narrative of the progressive development of the *SEL*. According to Liszka, the Judas and Pilate legends were likely either "original texts or early accretions" (51). He has identified three successive positions of these legends in the collection, and reconstructed a probable succession, which may be summarized thus:

- 1) originally, in the "Z" redaction, *Iudas* and *Pylatus* were part of a distinct *temporale* section that included movable feasts and other texts related to biblical history;
- 2) later, most likely early in the creation of the "A" redaction, when the *temporale* was partly discarded and partly integrated into the *sanctorale*, the Judas and Pilate legends were placed after the *Southern Passion* as the final texts of the Easter cycle; and
- 3) at some point, probably subsequent to the second stage, "a redactor moved the two to the end of the collection" (Liszka, "Dragon," 52-3).

The placement of the legends to the end of the collection or in some cases into an appendix in the "A(2)" redaction was motivated by the perception that "the Judas and Pilate texts seem out of place" (53) in the *sanctorale*, for although they resemble the

saints' legends in form (i.e., *vita*), the subjects of these two lives are archsinners who have no annual commemoration in the church calendar. For similar reasons, a fourth and final position might be added to Litzka's list: that of absence, when *Iudas* and *Pylatus* were either lost from the end of the collection, or "were intentionally omitted from some manuscripts" (51).

Litzka further argues that the *Banna Sanctorum*, a text he believes to have been written by the "A(1)" redactor, was originally "intended as a transitional piece linking the *temporale* and *sanctorale*, before it came to function as a prologue when the *temporale* was discarded in the "A(2)" stage" (54). In an earlier article, Litzka contrasts the "A(1)" redactor (to Litzka, "an artist" and to Pickering, an "innovator") with the "A(2)" redactor (to Litzka, the "amalgamator" and to Pickering, "tidying up and toning down").²¹

According to Litzka, the placement of Judas and Pilate at the end of the SEL is consistent with the organizing principles discernable in the *Banna Sanctorum*, and that this move provides "further evidence of the work of the 'A(1)' redactor to unify the collection" (54). Litzka considers the two figures of evil as captive enemies following the end of the triumphal parade of saints mentioned in the *Banna Sanctorum*, which functions as a prologue to the A-version of the SEL—an appealing, if perhaps somewhat forced, solution. Interestingly, while Litzka is clearly concerned about the dating, or at least the chronology of the various forms of the SEL, he avoids the question of sources, at least for Judas and Pilate.

Görlach too notes that, "[t]he position of [*Iudas*] and [*Pylatus*] in the SEL

²¹ "The First 'A' Redaction of the 'South English Legendary': Information from the 'Prologue'," *Modern Philology* 82.4 (1985): 407-13; 407.

collection is extremely uncertain especially as there is no evidence of a major revision or indeed of any manuscript groupings,” and that “[*Judas* lines] 115-36 show some agreement with texts of the Passion, especially with [the *Long Life of Christ*]” (89).²² In his review of this debate regarding the sources as it stood in 1974, Görlach states (299 n. 386) that he is in agreement with the earlier opinion of Baum, who proposed and identified a “Type R/L” version of *Judas*, which circulated with Pilate, but was not based on the LA. (On the manuscripts Baum found belonging to this independent tradition, see ch. 2, p.61 ff.) Görlach explains in the same note:

A pre-[*Legenda Aurea*] source [for *Judas* and Pilate in the SEL] was first suggested by P. F. Baum, ... who was convinced that [*Judas*] ‘was based not on some early copy of the *Legenda Aurea*, but on an independent manuscript which contained the life of *Judas*...and the life of Pilate side by side’ (p. 351). His early dating of MS St. John’s Coll[ege] Camb[ridge] 214 is controversial (p.492 ff.), but his hypothesis is confirmed by P. Lehmann who showed that type R was widely known before the [LA] (“*Judas*”). M. E. Wells’s attempted refutation of Baum (“*Relation*”, pp. 356-8) is therefore not convincing, especially as she herself is so obviously misled by the idea that the [*Legenda Aurea*] was the main source of the SEL” (299 n. 386).

The assertion that Lehmann’s article confirms Baum’s hypothesis is at best debatable, as

²² “B. D. Brown, *Southern Passion*, p. 93 (Notes) pointed out that the [*Southern Passion*] 27-34 ‘are closely paralleled by’ [*Judas*] 115-16, 119-20, 132-6, but she did not try to explain this agreement. She failed to notice that the agreements with the *Long Life* [of Christ] are even closer, including [*Long Life of Christ*] 772a = [*Judas*] 118b and the couplet 781-2 = [*Judas*] 131-2. Although final judgement must be postponed until the genesis of the *temporale* portions is better known, it seems that [*Judas*] and [the *Long Life of Christ*] belong to a layer earlier than [the *Southern Passion*], and that this connection of [*Long Life of Christ* and *Judas*] reflect their being composed for a separate *temporale* portion” (*Textual Tradition* 299 n. 387). It is worth noting that half of the manuscripts that preserve the *Southern Passion* (A, B, L, T, Z, and the late variant Uz) do not include separate *Judas* or Pilate legends. The *Judas* of these manuscripts is more strictly a figure of *wanhope* (‘despair’) as Brown observes (96), and of calculating embezzlement (*teopinge*). The idea that *Judas* offended more deeply by despairing of God’s mercy and the account of *Judas*’s ten percent theft come from Peter Comester’s *Historia Scholastica* (see ch. 2, p. 74 ff.). Pickering’s valuable research on the SEL *temporale* does not seem to have settled this question, though it may have laid the groundwork for a solution.

the distribution of extant manuscripts of the HA (“Type R”) suggests that it was “widely known” in Continental Europe rather than in England (see above, ch. 2, p.42 ff. and Appendix A). In addition to placing too much stock in Baum, Görlach is also overly dismissive of the argument presented by Wells, who makes a persuasive source study of *Iudas*, alongside some admittedly less credible claims about the whole collection, based in part upon the assumption of a very early date of 1255 for the completion of the LA (339, 357).²³

Wells (“Relation” 355-8) cites several parallel passages of the Judas legend from the *Historia Apocrypha*, which she refers to as “Type R” (Baum, “Mediaeval Legend,” 493-4), Graesse’s edition of the LA (3rd ed., Vratislavia, 1890), and Furnivall’s edition of the SEL *Iudas* and *Pylatus*, which is based upon H (Harley 2277). Wells gives five examples, quoting the Latin and Middle English texts for each. Below are summaries of the contents of her quotations, with an attempt to make explicit the connections that Wells has, for the most part, left for her (erudite) reader to make. In keeping with the rest of this dissertation, the citations refer to the more recent editions: the *HA* of Knappe, the *LA* of Maggioni, and the *SEL* of D’Evelyn and Mill.

Wells’s first example concerns the geographical, historical, and genealogical information given about Judas in the first part of the legend. The parents of Judas are named Ruben and Cyborea in all three versions (with various spellings, including Tyborie in the SEL), but are said to have lived in Jerusalem in the LA and the SEL only,

²³ Görlach faults Wells for circular reasoning and Jankofsky for a less than exhaustive review of possible Latin sources beyond the LA (*Textual Tradition* 26, 229-30 n.88, 299 n.386). Thompson, however, notes that “Görlach appears not to have considered the possibility that the SEL author was familiar with Petrus Comestor’s *Historia Scholastica*” (*Everyday Saints*, 79 n. 31).

and situated in the time of Herod and Pilate in the HA alone. The HA also mentions that Ruben belonged to the tribe of Judah,²⁴ to which the LA adds that Ruben was also called Simon (cf. John 6: 72 13:2, 26) and that according to Jerome he was of the tribe of Issachar, while the SEL gives no extended genealogy at all. Here the LA overlaps with the HA on some points, and with the SEL on others; only the parents' names are included in all three versions (HA 336-7; LA 45.14; SEL *Iudas* 4-5; Wells 357).

The second point of comparison given by Wells concerns the dilemma that Judas's parents face, following the prophetic dream and his birth, of whether to kill or nurture the newborn son. In the HA, this situation is confronted by Ruben alone (third person singular verbs), whereas in LA both parents wonder together what to do with him (third person plural verbs), and in the SEL, Tiborie first consults with her relatives and then (shifting from third person singular to plural) an ambiguous *Hii* ('they,' indicating either the parents or the extended family) decide upon the method of abandonment. In this instance, the LA seems very much the middle term, innovating upon the HA version, but being altered again by the SEL poet to emphasize the suffering of Judas's mother (HA 353-5; LA 45.19-20; SEL *Iudas* 19-22; Wells 357).

In her third example, Wells considers two distinct misrepresentations made by the queen of Scarioth after she discovers the foundling Judas. In the HA, the queen rescues the infant and has the birth of an offspring immediately announced in the realm. At the same point in the LA and the SEL, the queen rescues Judas and has him cared for in secret while she announces not the child's birth, but rather her supposed pregnancy. The

²⁴ The LA repeats the tribal affiliation, though some mss have Dan instead of Judah (LA 45.14).

agreement between the LA and the SEL on this point is quite close, and the distinction from the HA is very clear (HA 365-6; LA 45.25; SEL *Iudas* 35; Wells 358).

For a fourth proof, Wells uses the reaction to the bad behavior of young Judas in his adoptive family. In the LA and the SEL, the queen beats Judas when he misbehaves, though he does not desist from this behavior. In the HA, however, there is no description of Judas being disciplined, nor any mention of his lack of remorse. Once again, there is close agreement between the LA and the SEL (HA 369-70; LA 45.30; SEL *Iudas* 54-5; Wells 358).

As a fifth and final example, Wells notes that in the HA “no connection is made between the anger of Judas over the wasting of the ointment and his betrayal of Jesus for thirty pence” (Wells 358). In the LA this matter is treated in detail, with the 300 denarii connected to the 30 denarii by two different calculations, which Jacobus borrowed from the *Historia Scholastica*.²⁵ The SEL follows one of these calculations, namely, that 30 d. was the tenth (or tithe) of the 300 d. (HA *lacking*; LA 45.56-7; SEL *Iudas* 127-36).

Wells overstates her case a bit, as in the fifth example, when she states that the SEL version “appears to be a direct paraphrase,” of the LA (358). Nevertheless, a point-by-point comparison of the passages demonstrates persuasively that the SEL version was in each case closer to the Latin of the LA than to that of the HA. Wells uses these comparisons as part of her overall argument that the LA is the only major source and

²⁵ This calculation did not come to Jacobus from the HA, the LA’s source for the *De ortu Judae* tradition. Peter Comestor (Hist. Sch. 1542 ed., fol. 241r, Evangelica cap. cxlviii), connects the 30 denarii to the 300 denarii for the ointment, saying the 30 was equivalent to 300 “usuales,” and was Judas’s compensation for the loss of the 300 for the ointment, but does not comment that it’s a tithe. “Illi triginta denarii valebant trecentos usuales, et ita volebat Judas recompensare unguenti perditionem” (p. 214vb, 1543 ed., Google Books). See above, ch. 2, p. 75.

inspiration for the SEL as a whole, an argument that is not quite as out of step with critical trends now as it was when she published the article. And indeed the dating that Wells supposes may err on the early side for the LA (c. 1255-58), though her dates for the beginning of the SEL (c. 1275-85) are the generally accepted ones (Wells 340).²⁶ It seems, however, that Görlach's (partially justified) rejection of the ultimate conclusions may have led to a premature dismissal of the proofs Wells provides for her source attribution of Judas and (though without offering evidence) Pilate.²⁷

That the SEL *Iudas* and *Pylatus* do not derive directly from the HA is clear from a comparison of even a few key points, as Wells shows. These legends have such numerous points of agreement with the LA, however, that it seems improbable that it was not their direct source. In general, the chronologies of the most recent and reliable scholarship suggest that some form of the LA reached England by the early 1270s, probably through Dominican channels. Further research into questions of sources, dating, and positioning in the collection of *Iudas* and *Pylatus* may draw on data from outside of the SEL. As a starting point, the Anglo-Latin texts of the Judas and Pilate legends circulating during the late 13th century, some of which are listed in the previous chapter, should be compared more closely to the LA and the HA.

Critical approaches and literary analysis

The following sections, which constitute the bulk of this chapter, include original analysis of the legends *Iudas* and *Pylatus* in which matters of form, style, and content are

²⁶ Thompson, for instance, suggests that the LA was complete by 1263-67, and Görlach believes that it had reached England by the 1270s (*Everyday Saints* 191; *Textual Tradition* 28).

²⁷ For *Pylatus*, the episode of the holy tunic provides the clearest example of narrative found in the LA, but not present in any extant text of the HA (see below, p.146 ff.).

discussed along with comparisons to the Latin sources. This literary analysis is prefaced by a brief discussion of the approaches taken by scholars whose works on the *South English Legendary* as a whole have informed this research.

Critical approaches to the *South English Legendary*

Anne B. Thompson's work on the SEL, especially her book *Everyday Saints*, makes an extremely important contribution to the understanding of the collection as a work of literature, and offers particular insights regarding the use of sources by the poet-translator that have helped shape the textual analysis below. As to the overall purpose of the SEL, Thompson refers to historical contexts and theological (pastoral) considerations that may have motivated its compilation:

as a deliberate response to the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 promoting regular auricular confession and Easter communion, the poetry of popular instruction took the form of an outpouring of manuals of confession, books of vices and virtues, saints lives and so on, following hard on the heels of the enforcement of this decree in England by the Council of Oxford in 1222. (26)²⁸

A vernacular collection such as the SEL would be nearly as accessible to the laity as to the clergy, and might have been used in several different ways. Thompson also points out that one of the stated goals of the collection (which is not consistently practiced) is to supplement without repeating the exact content of the Gospels (62-63).

Moreover, Thompson believes that the SEL should be treated as a work of literary art, and one of the chief rhetorical purposes behind her book is "to persuade the reader of the importance of understanding that the SEL is the creation of a poet (or poets) with an

²⁸ Cf. Görlach, *Textual Tradition*, 22.

active interest in the art of storytelling as an end in itself” (15). According to Thompson, the author (or redactor) of these legends connects with his audience using an accomplished approach to storytelling, including an appeal to the lived experience of ordinary men and women. In this context, she discusses the “influence of everyday life” upon the text:

That the SEL’s strong sense of rootedness in time and place is in tension with what has been claimed by hagiographers through the ages as a central component of the genre’s meaning, its tendency to privilege timelessness and eternity at the expense of the present moment, is surely true....This emphasis on otherworldly-ness at the expense of thisworldliness has formed a significant strand of Christian teaching that stretches all the way back to Saint Augustin.... [T]he SEL’s active willingness, as I see it, to negotiate the *double* claims of immanence and transcendence gives it unique interest and value. The SEL seeks to affirm the existence of the eternal within, as well as outside, the boundaries of earthly life. (*Everyday Saints*, 16-7, 18)

Sidestepping the debate over the connection between the *sanctorale* and *temporale* sections, Thompson has described the unifying principle of the SEL in terms that bring to mind the *Thousand and One Nights* (a text that has no direct connection to the SEL):

The underlying principle of the SEL is indeed additive: one story gives way to another, and then to yet another, and authors approach each with anticipation and delight, not tiring of the multiple possibilities inherent in the creation of yet another fictional world. The stories do not get better although some *are* better than others; it is enough that each one takes its place within—and submits to the influence of—the idea of a collection, whereby narrative itself is the unifying thread that knits up the whole. (*Everyday Saints* 124)

Thompson is particularly interested in what she calls “the creative aspects of the text, for example its interest in narrative, and in humor and colloquial language as components of narrative” (11).

Thompson also points out that in the SEL, “not only is the number of nonmartyrs nearly equal to that of martyrs, but many of the narratives do not fit the hagiographic

model at all” (11). Alongside this mixture of genres, “the SEL poet’s success as a storyteller stems at least in part from his willingness to make use of secular as well as religious narrative models in his own work” (19). There are also specifically insular elements, both in the inclusion of several British and Irish saints, and beyond that, as Thompson remarks, “An interest in history is revealed through the inclusion of a number of English saints’ lives whose style is closer to chronicle than hagiography” (12).

Scholarly opinion upon the matter of narrative voice and style (and translation) in the SEL has shifted quite a bit since D’Evelyn and Mill wrote “To the interest of this subject matter, the passing comments of the narrator add their flavor. Whether such comment is original with the author or transferred from his source is still an open question” (*SEL* 3:25). While the question remains far from being closed, it is now certain that in many cases, the comments are original to the SEL, and that in many cases one particular redactor—the “outspoken” poet of the A(1) version (Pickering)—has indeed added “flavor,” as well as shifting emphasis and even (as in *Iudas* and *Pylatus*) altering the main message (theme) of the legend. Thompson, for instance, using the example of *All Souls*, analyzes the SEL poet’s method of transforming the LA source material:

In a typical move, the SEL unpacks the variously subordinated elements of one of Jacobus’s compound sentences, and lays them out along a timeline....The SEL also attributes more and more varied emotions to the characters.... Events are imagined as actions unfolding in time, rather than as reports after the fact. (*Everyday Saints* 133)

Although Thompson’s discussions of the SEL are insightful and persuasive, her polemic promoting the literary merits of the English poem is occasionally made at the expense of the *Legenda Aurea* and its author (e.g., *Everyday Saints* 23-28).

Jankofsky, who is particularly interested in the ways that the SEL reflects the cultural values of England in the latter part of the Middle Ages, has identified a pattern in

the treatment of sources:

scholars agree that this collection of *sanctorale* (lives of the saints) and *temporale* materials (events of the church year) is basically a work of translation and adaptation. Its major principles of organizing sources have been identified as [1] a simplification of theological-dogmatic and hagiographic problems; [2] an explanatory, interpretive and didactic expansion of subject matter; [3] a process of concretization through the creation of enlivening dialogues and scenes where the sources have plain third-person narrative, that is, dramatization; and [4] a process of acculturation, the adaptation of essentially Latin sources to an English audience, thereby creating a distinctive flavor and mood, *Englishing*. (Jankofsky, “National Characteristics,” 82-3; numbering added)²⁹

Because Jankofsky is giving an account of the SEL in general terms and summarizing the findings of a number of critics (“scholars agree”), his list may serve as a useful reference point in the analysis of a particular legend from the collection.

Judas: De ortu Judae in the South English Legendary

What follows is a short summary of the SEL Judas legend (hereafter styled *Judas*), followed by a detailed analysis that includes a point-by-point comparison with its source, *Legenda Aurea* cap. 45 (*De sancto Mathia*). Quotations and line numbers are from the published texts of D’Evelyn and Mill’s *SEL* (2:692-7) and Maggioni’s *LA* (277-284). For a complete, heavily annotated translation, please see Appendix C of this dissertation, which presents a version of the legend rendered into modern English prose. A description of the Latin tradition *De ortu Judae* may be found above (ch. 2, p. 29 ff.).

²⁹ “National Characteristics in the Portrayal of English Saints in the *South English Legendary*,” in: *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell. (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991), 81-39. Jankofsky gives a very similar list elsewhere: “*Legenda Aurea* Materials in *The South English Legendary: Translation, Transformation, Acculturation*,” in: *Legenda Aurea: Sept Siècles de diffusion* (Montréal: Bellarmin, 1986), 317-329, at 320. On the English saints of the “E” collection, see Görlach, *Textual Tradition*, 17.

Apart from a few lines at the beginning and end of the legend, the narrative of *Iudas* may be divided into four major sections, three of which are based upon the *Historia Apocrypha* (via the LA), modeled upon the myth of Oedipus, while the fourth is a Gospel harmonization derived (via the LA) from the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor (interpolating upon John 12:6).³⁰ The first section takes place in Jerusalem and describes the parents of Judas (Ruben and Tyborie), the prophetic dream on the night of his conception, his birth, and subsequent abandonment at sea (4-25). The second section, which is set on the island of Scariot, relates the rescue of infant Judas, his adoption into the royal family, his rivalry with his adoptive brother, his discovery of his origin as a foundling, his murder of the brother, and his consequent flight to Jerusalem (26-59). The third section, again at Jerusalem, covers Judas's friendship with Pilate, his theft of apples and altercation at Ruben's orchard which culminates in patricide and leads to the incestuous marriage to Tyborie, the discovery of his true identity and the revelation of his sins, and his resolution to do penance (60-108). In the fourth and final section Judas becomes a disciple of Jesus, then an apostle, and finally his bursar; Judas steals one tenth part of everything donated, he speaks against the anointment of Jesus by Mary Magdalene, thus motivated he betrays Jesus for 30 pence, then he commits suicide by hanging himself from a tree (109-44). A three-line introduction (1-3) and a two line closing prayer (145-46) bracket the narrative. The SEL poet follows the source fairly closely in the Judas legend, but makes the expected mix of short interpolations, alterations in minor details, narrative style, and emphasis, and also significantly reworks

³⁰ See above, p.102 n. 25.

much of the third section.

In the first line of *Iudas*, the poet identifies Judas as the betrayer of Jesus, immediately and firmly establishing his negative character, which will remain the key theme throughout the legend. (The first line is echoed, in a passive voice version, at the end of the poem in line 145.) The next two lines form a somewhat ambiguous disclaimer that reflects, albeit indirectly, the limited account of Judas given in the Gospels:

Ivdas was a luper brid · þat Ihesus solde to rode
 Som wat me may of hym telle · ac lute of eny gode
 Vor me ne schal no3t war of wyte · bote wo so wole lye (Iudas 1-3)

Judas was a wicked fellow who sold Jesus to the cross. We may tell something about him, but little of any value. For no one can know about him at all, except for whoever is willing to lie.

Hence, the legend begins with a definite assertion about the wickedness of Judas followed by a statement of uncertainty regarding his biography. The poet seems to be making a complex rhetorical maneuver by first designating the legend as lies, and then repeating it. Because no source is mentioned at this point (though ‘the book’ is referenced later in the legend), the reader is not even certain whether the SEL poet is repeating previously established lies about Judas, or creating new ones. As will become clear below, the poet’s process is a mixture of both, resulting in a particular type of fiction. The very fact that the source has been identified as unreliable from the start may signal the reader that the SEL poet is taking an even freer hand than usual.

These first three lines of *Iudas* replace a brief transition in the source, in which the Judas material is represented as background to the election of Matthias, the saint whose

legend hosts the Judas material in the LA.³¹ The statement of uncertainty (*Iudas* 2-3), however, represents the SEL poet's approximate rendering of the editorial disclaimer with which Jacobus sets off the legend *De ortu Judae* within the Judas section of the Matthias chapter:

Legitur enim in quadam hystoria licet apocrypha quod... (LA 45.14)

We read in a certain admittedly apocryphal history that... (Ryan 167)

The two remarks do not completely correspond, however, and the three-line introduction to *Iudas* seems to more closely follow the spirit of Jacobus's lengthier closing disclaimer, which Baum and Wells call "the 'Hucusque' passage ("Mediaeval Judas" 498; "Relation" 357), rather than that of the shorter opening one:

...Hucusque in predicta hystoria apocrypha legitur; que utrum recitanda sit, lectoris arbitrio relinquatur, licet sit potius relinquenda quam asserenda. (LA 45.51-52).

...This much, however, is to be read in the aforementioned apocryphal history, and whether it should be retold is left to the reader's judgment, though probably it is better left aside than repeated. (Ryan 168, slightly altered)

These lines and similar remarks in other chapters of the LA have been the topic of much scholarly discussion, and his caution regarding the apocryphal material may be understood as either sincere (Baum, Gounelle) or disingenuous (Boswell, Fleith).³² Though the language of the SEL is both more colloquial and less guarded than that of the LA, the inclusion of apparent untruths in the SEL should perhaps be read in light of the poet's

³¹ "Mathias apostolus in locum Iude proditoris substitutus est, sed primo ortum et originem ipsius Iude breuiter uideamus" (LA 45.13); "Matthias the apostle was [substituted in] the place of Judas [the betrayer]; but first let us briefly see something of Judas's birth and origins" (Ryan 167).

³² See above, ch. 2, p. 60 and n. 44.

stated intention to supplement rather than repeat what is written in the Gospels (Thompson 62-63).³³

In short, the first line of the legend neatly summarizes the canonical biography of Judas; the second and third lines serve to introduce the material that Jacobus has identified as having an apocryphal source, though the SEL poet characterizes it more bluntly, as lies. As will become clear below, these lies are nevertheless imbued with certainties, the most notable of which is the irredeemably evil nature of Judas. Perhaps because (as Anne Thompson has suggested) this author is concerned with the appeal of a good story, he seems somewhat less determined to be scrupulous than his source, whose elaborate framework for marking off and containing apocryphal material has been discussed above (ch. 2, p. 58 ff.). The Judas legend evidently satisfies this criterion, since the SEL poet apparently considers the non-canonical legend worth repeating as a supplement to the Gospel truth that depends upon and reinforces established beliefs about the betrayer of Jesus, along with the concomitant interpretive traditions.

In keeping with these traditional Christian views, the vilification of Judas begins in the first line of the legend, where he is described as a *luper brid* ('a wicked fellow,' 1) and continues in the sixth, where he is called a *schrewe* ('a scoundrel,' 6). On a lexical level, these two words go a long way toward accomplishing the disparagement of Judas.

³³ Based in an authorial comment in the *temporale* legend of Rogationtide (lines 52-54), Thompson explains that: "the SEL's legends of biblical saints stand in a somewhat tangential relationship to the accounts in the Bible: the overall intention seems to have been to avoid unnecessary repetition, to supplement knowledge of the disciples, for instance, with materials not found in the Vulgate, or to provide an expanded legend for a figure such as Mary Magdalen, whose significance to the Gospel is clear, but the facts of whose life as found there are disappointingly meager" (*Everyday Saints* 62-63, but see also 63 n. 6).

The adjective *luper(e)* ('evil, wicked') is used thirteen times to describe Judas or his actions and once more to describe Hell.³⁴ Most of the occurrences of this word are the SEL poet's addition of a modifier where the Latin has none, though "such a *luper vode*" ('such a wicked offspring;' *Iudas* 12) for "filium flagitiosum" ('such a wicked son;' LA 45.16) is a notable exception. Forms of the noun *schrewe* ('scoundrel, evildoer, malefactor, miscreant, villain, wretch') are used ten times to describe Judas and/or Pilate; half of these designations correspond to no particular word in the source but represent interpolations (lines 6, 65, 67, 94, and 120).³⁵ The poet also uses *schrewe(n)* as a substitute for proper names (for Judas and Pilate, 69; for Judas, 95), or to stand in for the unexpressed subject of the Latin verb (in lines 80, 82, and 89, corresponding to LA 45.43-44). Both of these key words occur in clusters around the SEL poet's interpolations, which are often non-narrative reflections upon particularly important events in the biography of Judas, such as the circumstances of his association with Pilate (62-69), his murder of Ruben (80-89), his marriage with Cyborea (93-96), and the circumstances of his association with Jesus (120-122).

By contrast to the unequivocally negative presentation Judas receives in the legend, the SEL poet endeavors to cast Ruben and Tyborie in a favorable light, consistently emphasizing their goodness.³⁶ This pattern is also set in early in the legend: "þey 3are sone a schrewe were hii were of gode lyue" ("Although their son may have

³⁴ *Luper(e)* appears in lines: 1; 12, 16, 22, 24; 32, 38, 48, 58; 79; 121, 136, 143; and 146.

³⁵ *Schrewe(n)* appears in lines: 6; 65, 67, 69, 80, 82, 89, 94, 95; and 120.

³⁶ Baum's summary of *Iudas*, which begins with the statement "Thiborie was a shrew," is clearly, if inexplicably, mistaken on this point ("Mediaeval Legend," 529 ff.).

been a scoundrel, they lived good lives,” *Iudas* 6). The legend inherited by the SEL-poet has several anti-Semitic features, including a certain emphasis upon the fact that the villain Judas and his family are Jewish, and that he represents a curse upon all Jews. This identification is established with the parents of Judas, whose names both encode their Jewishness: Ruben, one of the brothers of Joseph and ancestor of one of the twelve tribes, and Tyborie, a variant of Cyborea, the name found in the Latin tradition, ultimately derived from the biblical name Zipporah, “the wife of Moses, who was likewise set adrift” (Wolf, “The Judas Legend in Scandinavia,” 466).³⁷ The SEL poet retains Jerusalem as the abode of Judas’s parents (*Iudas* 5) but has omitted some of the other information that marks the family as Jews, including the detail that Ruben belongs to tribe of Judah (Dan in some manuscripts of the LA), or, according to Jerome, of Issachar (LA 45.14).

The Jewishness of the parents attains heightened significance on the night Judas is conceived, when Tyborie tells Ruben of her prophetic dream. Where, in the Latin source (LA 45.15-16), Jacobus has Cyborea tells Ruben about her dream with direct speech,³⁸ the SEL poet uses indirect discourse:

Hire mette 3eo hadde ibore a child þat al the wordle was loþ
 & al þe wordle him acorsed & were wyþ him wroþ
 & þat acorsed he scholde euere beo the wule þe wordle stode
 & þat al is kun me cors[i] wolde vor such a luþer vode. (*Iudas* 9-12)

³⁷ Wolf further notes that Zipporah (or Sephora) is first mentioned in Exodus 2: 21. See also Baum, “Mediaeval Legend,” 627 (and n. 94) and Rand 312 n. 3.

³⁸ “Cyborea obdormiens sompnium uidit quod perterrita cum gemitibus et suspiriis uiro suo retulit dicens: ‘Videbatur mihi quod filium flagitiosum parerem qui totius gentis nostre perditionis causa existeret’” (LA 45.15-16); “Cyborea fell asleep and had a dream that she related, terrified, sobbing and groaning, to her husband. She said: ‘I dreamed that I was going to bear a son so wicked that he would bring ruin upon our whole people’” (Ryan 167).

She dreamed that she had borne a child who was hateful to the whole world, and whom the whole world cursed, and at whom the whole world was angry, and that he would be accursed for as long as the world existed, and that all of his people would be cursed on account of such an evil offspring.

As in the Latin tradition, Tyborie's *mette* is a close parallel to the prophetic dream of Laius in the Oedipus legend, though it lacks a specific prediction of parricide or incest.³⁹ Here, however, the content of the dream has been altered to include the more expansive context of the entire world ('al þe wordle,' 9, 10), rather than the limited scope of what Freud calls the "family romance." Also following the Latin versions, this scene inverts the Annunciation to the Virgin Mary, but it features at least one additional biblical resonance. Although the Jews are alluded to rather than named specifically as the ultimate bearers of this curse, the prophecy essentially reverses God's promise to Abraham, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice" (Gen. 22:18, DRV).⁴⁰ Although the SEL poet does not adopt the LA scheme of Christ's three betrayers—Judas, Pilate, and the Jews—nevertheless, the inevitability of doom upon the Jewish people is clearly established in both.⁴¹

The prophecy takes the form of an intimate domestic scene that occurs "[a]s þis

³⁹ This is a feature of Type R/L of the legend *De ortu Judae* (Baum 489-90).

⁴⁰ "[E]t benedicentur in semine tuo omnes gentes terrae quia oboedisti voci meae" (Vulgate); cf. Genesis 12:3, 18:18, 26:4; Psalms 72:17; Isaiah 61:9; and Malachai 3:12. In Galatians 3:8, Paul incorporates this idea into his argument that the members of the gentile Church should not observe Jewish ceremonial law. Compare the translation of *gentes* here as 'nations' to *gentis* (LA 45.16) and *kun* (*Iudas* 12), both of which may be rendered as either 'race' or 'people.'

⁴¹ The responsibility for the doom and destruction is another story, told in the LA-derived SEL *temporale* poem *The Harrowing of Hell and the Destruction of Jerusalem* (HHDJ), a legend preserved in only one late manuscript (I) that contains *Pylatus* but not *Iudas*: Cambridge, St John's College MS B.6 (James 28), which Pickering dates "to the second quarter of the fifteenth century" (Marx 116).

Ruben bi is wyf a ny3t iley3e hadde” (‘one night, after this Ruben had lain with his wife,’ 7). Perhaps in an attempt at humble, direct style, the SEL version avoids using the LA’s trope of paying marital debt to describe the conjugal encounter that results in the conception of Judas. Similar treatment is given to Ruben’s dismissal of Tyborie’s dream, which he attributes to “the mase” (‘delirium’ 14), rather than to an oracular spirit (‘spiritu...pythonico,’ LA 45.17). Once the child begotten that night is born, however, the whole family shares the appalling choice of whether to murder the infant outright or to raise an evil offspring themselves:

bis wyf rikenede þe time & supþe heo gan ywyte
 & heo veledede þat heo was mid chylde & þulke time by3te
 Sori heo was & sore adrad hire freondes 3eo tolde vore
 Hii nuste wat hem was to done þo þat chyld was ibore
 Loþ hem was to morþry 3are flechs & 3are blod
 & loþ a bern to norysy so luþer & so vngod (17-22)

This woman calculated the time, and later she came to know and feel that she was [pregnant] with a child that had been begotten at that time. She was sad and grievously afraid; her relatives, whom she told beforehand, did not know what they ought to do when the child was born. They were loath to murder their own flesh and blood, and [equally] loath to nurture such a wicked and evil child.

Here the SEL poet, in keeping with his concern for the lived experiences of ordinary people, and in particular relationships such as those between husband and wife, structures the scene so it is quite sympathetic to Tyborie.⁴² The addition of the relatives whom Tyborie has taken into her confidence (‘hire freondes,’ 19), through their inability to offer

⁴² Lines 17-20, for example, emphasize the mother’s viewpoint in a way that the source does not: “Procedente igitur tempore, cum filium peperisset, parentes plurimum timuerunt et quid de eo facerent cogitare ceperunt” (LA 45.19); “in due time the son was born, and the parents, filled with fear, began to wonder what to do with him” (Ryan 167). Aspects of my reading of the SEL poet are informed by the work of Anne Thompson, as found in *Everyday Saints*, and “Narrative Art.”

helpful advice, serves primarily to underscore the difficulty of the mother's situation. The effectiveness of the narrative depends in part upon generating reader sympathy for parents of Judas, and especially Judas's mother, prior to the abandonment, as a preparation for what happens in the third section of the legend (i.e., parricide and incest).

Along with the sympathetic treatment given to Judas's parents, and particularly to his mother, this episode is also notable for one of the smallest, but perhaps not the least significant of these changes: the abandonment of Judas in a barrel ('barell,' *Iudas* 23) rather than in a basket ('fiscella,' LA 45.20).⁴³ The *fiscella* ('little basket,' LA 45.20) itself represents an innovation on the part of Jacobus of Voragine, who has replaced the *cistella* ('little box' or 'little chest,' HA 356) of his source. The intention of this maneuver in the LA version is presumably to reinforce the similarity between Judas being abandoned at sea and Moses being set adrift on the Nile (in *Exodus* 2.1-3). Assuming that exposure at sea is a bit more dangerous than on a river, the further alteration in the SEL may show a certain verisimilitude, since a barrel is more seaworthy than a basket.⁴⁴ As the description of the abandonment is made more vivid here, the

⁴³ The abandonment of the infant Judas in a barrel may be a distant echo of a tradition that relates to the end of his life. Alexander Murray documents the medieval European tradition of placing the bodies of suicides in barrels which were then dumped into a river. Though not attested before the early fourteenth century, this practice may be reflected in the Pilate legend, which is several centuries older. The geographic range of this practice seems to be limited to the German-language areas of Europe, and the SEL poet is unlikely to have been familiar with it (*Suicide in the Middle Ages* 2:37-41).

⁴⁴ The *Scottish Legendary*, by contrast, follows the LA closely, but makes the biblical association even more explicit, with the infant abandoned in a *cowyne* ('basket,' 49; also *cofyne*, 64 and *cophyne*, 206), "as quylum wes with moyses done" ('as once was done with Moses,' *Sc. Leg. Matthias* 56). Apparently this feature of the legend is rather unstable, as comparison with yet another Middle English version based upon the LA shows: in *Titus and Vespasian*, the infant is set adrift in a *bote* ('boat,' line 4531).

narrator's sympathy shifts briefly to the infant, who has done nothing to deserve such treatment (so far): "Þe se him harlede vp & doun as a lute clot" ('The sea hurled him up and down like a little lump,' *Iudas* 125).⁴⁵

This first section of the legend, then, covers the background, birth, and abandonment of Judas. In the Oedipus myth and several of the analogues to the Judas legend, this first exile—the abandonment of the infant by his parents—serves as the separation required to obscure the child's identity in order to prepare for the prophecy to be unwittingly fulfilled. In *Iudas*, however, the parricide and incest are not explicitly predicted in the dream, despite the similarity of the outcome. The poet also uses this first section as an exposition for the legend, introducing the major themes of the irremediable wickedness of Judas, along with the position of his parents, good people who happen to have an evil child, and who must deal with the dilemma produced by the prophecy.

The next section of the legend covers the youth of Judas, in which the poet further develops the theme of Judas's evil nature, which is now manifest in his actual wicked behavior. The second section of the legend (lines 26-59) begins when the barrel washes ashore on eponymous island of Scariot, and the infant is rescued by the previously childless queen of that land. The narrative arc is directed toward the end of Judas's sojourn on Scariot, when his wickedness is finally made manifest in violence both hot- and cold-blooded. The climax comes with his first murder, which—following the Oedipodean outlines of the legend—motivates the flight from the island that constitutes the return of Judas to his birthplace.

⁴⁵ For a list of hagiographical analogues that include abandonment motifs see Boswell, *Kindness of Strangers* 364-77, and above ch. 2, p. 31, n. 6.

Along the way to that end, however, the SEL poet makes a number of interesting alterations and interpolations, designed in part to heighten the contrast between the evil Judas and the good people who surround him—in this case his royal foster family. In the LA, for instance, the specific fact of royal infertility is never stated explicitly, though it may be inferred from the queen’s joyful speech upon discovering an outwardly beautiful infant: “Oh, if only I might be relieved by the consolations of such a child, so that I would not be deprived of a successor for my kingdom” (LA 45.24).⁴⁶ In order to further cement the narrative sympathy extended to the unsuspecting couple, the SEL poet expands upon their situation:

Pe kyng & þe quene of þe lond togadere were longe
Ak hii ne mi3te chyld for no þing bitwene heom auonge (*Judas* 29-30)

The king and queen of that land had been together for a long time, but they were utterly unable to conceive a child with one another.

Then, perhaps because this subject has been covered by the previous interpolation, the SEL poet alters the queen’s speech to fairly bland indirect discourse: “Glad heo was and hopede on him habbe an eyr” (‘She was delighted and hoped that in him she might have an heir’ *Judas* 35). Note that despite Jankofsky’s assertion (“National Characteristics,” 82-3; quoted on page 106 ff.), the substitution of indirect discourse where the source has direct seems to be about as common as the opposite, at least in this legend.

As Thompson has noted, this couplet (*Judas* 29-30) is used nearly verbatim in the SEL legend of Mary Magdalene, from the “story-within-a-story” (“Narrative Art” 22)

⁴⁶ “Inueniensque ibi puerum elegantis forme suspirans ait: ‘O si solatiis tante subleuarer subolis ne regni mei successore priuarer!’” (LA 45.23-24). In the HA, the queen does mention her infertility (363-365).

concerning the king and queen of *Marcile* ('Marseilles', 66):

So þat þe king com of þe lond and þe queen also
 A day to hore maumes þare hore sacrefise to do
 3if hi wolde hom sende eni child for togadere hi were longe
 And no child nemi3te between hom auonge

 In gret care bileuede atom as hi hadde er ido longe
 For hi no child ne no eir betwene hom nemighte auonge (79-80; 85-86)

And then one day the king of that land came, and also the queen, to make a sacrifice to their idols, hoping they would send them some child, for they had been together for a long time, but they had not been able to conceive a child with one another. [...] They remained at home in great sorrow, as they had previously done for a long time, for they were unable to conceive a child or an heir with one another.⁴⁷

The infertility suffered by the royal couple is implicit in each legend's Latin source, but the fact that they have been together for a long time is an interpolation in both SEL legends.⁴⁸ The circumstances may, however, be inferred from the queen's joyful speech upon discovering the infant (quoted above, p. 118 and n. 46). Her mention, in the LA, of an heir (or the lack thereof) serves as a reminder that the state of infertility is much graver when the childless couple happens to be king and queen.

Thompson's discussion of this legend investigates "the redactor's overall concern for thematic and structural coherence, and in particular his consistently affective focus on the royal couple, that is, on the mutuality of their relationship and their feelings for one another" ("Narrative Art," 22). The intimate scenes of married life, of the sort found in the legend of Mary Magdalen, but also several times in *Iudas* (Cyborea and Ruben, the

⁴⁷ See Thompson, *Everyday Saints*, 93 and "Narrative Art," 22 ff.

⁴⁸ Assuming that the early (if not earliest) position of *Iudas* is at the end of the Easter Cycle in the spring, it seems likely that the lines in Mary Magdalene (July 22) are borrowed, rather than the other way around.

king and queen of Scariot, Tyborie and Judas), provide Thompson with examples that demonstrate her interpretation of the SEL poet's narrative techniques:

The episode illustrates the narrator's habit of selecting certain kinds of detail so as to heighten the emotional resonance of important scenes. These details...are not of the kind so dearly loved by medieval audiences. That is, the narrator does not pile up color words, or lists of material objects, or sensuous terms to give texture to those objects. Instead, these details belong to a category of the essentially "useless." Most of the time they do not add visual richness or complexity, nor do they advance the plot significantly. But they do give a sense of what it means to be thinking and feeling in a particular place at a particular time, and they create a bond between the audience and the characters in the narrative owing to the universality of such thoughts and feelings. Affection for the ordinariness and indeed the importance of daily life comes across with particular force and immediacy in the most surprising ways, as a result of a single phrase, sometimes even a word or two. (Thompson, "Narrative Art," 25)

While Thompson's approach to this episode in the legend of Mary Magdalene is quite useful for a general understanding of the SEL, it is also extremely instructive when applied to the reading of *Iudas*. Although it might seem that the legend of Judas is no place for the exercise of the poet's special sensitivity to the thoughts and emotions of individual characters in specific circumstances, in fact, successful vilification of Judas requires that the audience extend its sympathy to the good characters who surround the archsinner. In the Mary Magdalene legend, the king and queen of Marseilles take part in a series of miracles that gain power from the sympathy generated by their prior misfortunes. In the case of the queen of Scariot, and to a lesser extent the king, the poet endeavors to immediately establish their good character, as the narrative moves quickly forward to the misfortunes visited upon them by Judas.

The discovery of the infant Judas seems at first to be a godsend to the queen and

king of Scariot (“Þe kyng & al þat lond also þer of were glade,” 36).⁴⁹ As with the adoption of the foundling Oedipus by the childless Polybus and Merope of Corinth, however, the eventual outcome proves to be just the opposite. The SEL poet foreshadows the ills that Judas will bring upon the royal family of Scarioth with a four-line interpolation:

Sone þe time 3eo nom vorþ þat þe child scholde beo ibore
 Me schewede vorþ þat luþere bern glad was þe kyng þer vore
 Ðo he hyt ysey vair & hende he lette hyt nempne Iudas
 Hyt nys no3t al god þat is vayr ysene þer hyt was (*Iudas* 37-40)

When she announced the time when the child was supposed to have been born, that wicked child was displayed, and the king was delighted. When [the king] saw that [the child] was fair and pleasing, he had him named Judas. It just goes to show that what is fair is not therefore good.

There is at least a hint of blame for the deception carried out by the queen, which is exaggerated somewhat by the political theatrics of (publicly?) presenting the heir to the king, who, approving of the child, names him Judas. Most striking, however, is the poet’s contrast of Judas’s inward evil (“þat luþere bern, 38”) with his external beauty (“vair & hende,” 39); such harsh words describe the infant even before the sententia is delivered (“Hyt nys no3t al god þat is vayr,” 40). The poet’s interpolations, such as the reminders that the infant is “luþer” (*Iudas* 32, 38, 48) and the sententia contrasting external beauty with internal evil (40), increase the dramatic irony of the episode and serve to heighten the tension with a sense of foreboding. After this reminder of the evil that lies dormant in the young Judas, the narrative returns to following the source, relating that the young Judas is

⁴⁹ The source has: “Principes pro suscepta subole uehementer exultant et ingenti gaudio plebs letatur” (LA 45.26); ‘The king was overjoyed at having a son, and the whole nation shared his joy’ (Ryan 167).

reared in a manner befitting the royal family (“Þat child was ido in gode warde as kynges sone scolde,” 41).⁵⁰

Not long after the baby Judas is presented as heir to the throne of Scariot, the queen conceives and then gives birth to the king’s son. Given the difficulties that the birth of this legitimate heir poses for the parents, it is significant that the poet here interpolates God’s will: “Sone hyt vel þer after as oure Louerd hyt wolde / Þat þe quene myd chyldre was of hire louerd bi3ute” (‘Soon after, it happened—as our Lord willed—that the queen was with child, one begotten by her husband.,’ *Iudas* 42-43). This statement of God’s will could be read as a divine punishment, picking up the idea that the queen has been dishonest in representing Judas as her own son, but the narrator gives no indication that she has done anything to deserve such a scourge as Judas.

Another significant interpolation that follows, in which the poet established the good nature of the legitimate son, while providing a possible motivation for the bad behavior of Judas:

Glad was boþe kyng & quene þo hii hit vnder3ute
 So þat heo hadde a knaue chyld þat vayr & gentyll was
 Þe quene vp him hire heorte dude & þe lasse vp Iudas
 Þis chyldren wo[x]e swipe wel Iudas bigan sone
 To do luþer & qued oueral as his ri3te was to done
 Children þat he com to he wolde smyte & hete
 & breke 3are heued & do 3am harm & þat god lete (*Iudas* 44-50)

Both the king and the queen were delighted when they learned of [her pregnancy]. And so she had a male child that was fair and noble. The queen then set her heart upon him, and less so upon Judas. These children grew up extremely well. Judas quickly began to do wicked and evil things all the time, just as was his nature to do. He would strike and beat other

⁵⁰ Translating: “Ipsum igitur secundum magnificentiam regiam educari fecit” (‘The child, of course, was brought up in royal style,’ LA 45.27).

children he encountered, and break their heads and do them harm, and forsake the good.⁵¹

The poet stops short of suggesting that Judas lashes out at other children because of his envy for his foster-brother, instead remarking that such misdeeds are proper to Judas, whose wickedness has already been thoroughly established. Nevertheless, the violence of Judas, which seems at first to have been directed at random, is soon turned upon his rival, and the conflict between the foster-brothers is described in very concrete terms:

To þe kynges sone he hadde envie vor he was iloued more
 Of þe kyng þan he were hit ofþou3te hym sore
 þer vore he al tobet þat chyld wanne he mi3te it one iwyte
 Ak þe quene him bet sore a3en wanne 3eo it mi3te vnder3ite
 Ak þervore nolde he neuere bileue vor neuere ichasted [he] nas (*Judas*
 51-55)

Judas envied the king's [legitimate] son, because he was loved more by the king than he himself was. This obsessed him grievously. Consequently he beat up that child whenever he came upon him alone. But the queen beat Judas badly in turn when she found out, yet he would never desist, for he was never chastened.

The cruelty that Judas shows toward his foster brother serves to once more highlight Judas's inherent wickedness and also gives the SEL poet a chance to expand upon the irredeemability of his subject, especially with regard to his repeated punishment and lack of remorse, which foreshadows the way he will perish at the end of the legend. Again the poet provides a psychological explanation in terms of family dynamics but attributes the persisting wickedness to the fact that Judas—as irredeemably evil—does not benefit from chastising or punishment.

The murder that follows this revelation introduces yet another aspect of Judas's

⁵¹ Another possible reading of the final half-line may serve as a rather ambiguous reminder of God's involvement in these matters: "and God allowed that [to occur]" (50b).

evil nature, his ability to await an opportunity to carry out a wicked act: “After þulke time þis luper þyng þat chyld hatede ynou3 / He awaytede his time wel & priueliche hyt slou3” (*Judas* 57-58); “after which time this wicked person hated the boy even more. He carefully bided his time and killed him in secret.” This trait, along with the youthful record of murdering brothers, is an important connection between the Judas legend and that of Pilate, who seems to be the master of cold-blooded villainy.⁵² The malicious murder of his foster brother also provides Judas with the necessary motivation to flee the isle of Scariot, and return to Jerusalem in order to fulfill his destiny with regard to his parents (parricide and incest) as well as his role as the betrayer of Christ.

The third section and longest section of the legend (lines 60-108) completes the apocryphal part of the Judas-vita, building to the horrific Oedipodean climax in which Judas learns his true identity and realizes the terrible sins he has unknowingly committed. In this section, Judas is repeatedly described with the epithet *schrewe*—eight times in all (lines 65, 67, 69, 80, 82, 89, 94, and 95). Now back in Jerusalem, Judas meets Pontius Pilate, becomes one of his henchman and eventually his right-hand man. The wicked influence of Pilate also helps to further establish Judas’s credentials as a scoundrel, as well as to prepare Judas for his role among the apostles in the last part of the legend. With a move that helps thematic unity between the two legends of the two archsinners, the poet describes Judas and Pilate as birds of a feather:

Pe o schrewe wyþ þe oþer mayster was as ri3t is
 Vor ech þyng louep hys ilyk so seyþ þe bok ywis
 Vor þey in al a contreye bote tweye schrewen nere
 3ut hii wolde felawes beo 3if hii togadere were (65-68)

⁵² This theme occurs three times in the SEL Pilate legend (*Pylatus* 17-18, 35-36, and 75).

It is right that the one scoundrel was master of the other, for each thing loves its like, as indeed the book says, for, even if there were but two scoundrels in an entire country, nevertheless if they met they would become friends.

The proverbial expression “Vor ech þyng louep hys ilyk” (‘for each thing loves its like,’ 66), renders the Latin “quoniam res similes sunt habiles [amabiles]” (‘since like things are suitable [loveable] to one another’ LA 45.34, with a manuscript variant shown in square brackets). The poet gives this assessment on the authority of his source (“þe bok,” 66), but follows it with an interpolation on the peculiar way that the truism applies to *schrewes*.

At the prompting of Pilate, who has a sudden hankering for apples, Judas raids Ruben’s orchard, and in the process he murders its owner, thus unwittingly accomplishing the first part of the Oedipodean prophecy. Pilate later knowingly rewards the murderer (Judas) with the property of the dead man (Ruben) and then unknowingly forces the widow (Tyborie) to marry her own son (71-99). Hence Pilate instigates the second part of the Oedipodean prophecy, just as he has the first. Since the scene in Ruben’s orchard has been significantly reworked by the SEL poet, it is worth comparing at length with its source. The LA version highlights the childishness of Pilate’s craving, which he is eventually able to satisfy by the arbitrary use of his authority, in the person of his trusted henchman Judas:

One day Pilate was looking out from his palace at a nearby orchard and was seized with such a desire for some of the fruit that he almost fainted. The orchard belonged to Ruben, Judas’s father, but Judas did not recognize his father nor did Ruben know his son, because Ruben thought that his child had perished in the sea, and Judas had no idea who his father

was or where he came from. Pilate called for Judas and told him: “I crave that fruit so much that if I don’t get some of it, I’ll die!” Thus prompted, Judas jumped over into the orchard and speedily picked some apples. (Ryan 168)⁵³

Between the moment when Pilate first desires the apples and his summoning of Judas, Jacobus inserts a crucial piece of information about the owner of the orchard and his son, whom fate is about to reunite, along with a somewhat heavy-handed reminder about why they will not immediately recognize one another.

The SEL poet, carrying over the pairing of these two scoundrels from the preceding lines, moves the scene away from Pilate’s palace, and places Judas there from the start, as they are together seeking diversion by an orchard:

So þat þis tweye schrewen þe louerd & þe styward
 A day eode al one pleye vnder a uayr orchard
 Swipe vayr applen Pilatus sey þer inne
 Clymme he bad euere Iudas somme þer of to wynne
 Iudas brak þe 3ard anon & sone was in ibro3t
 His owe fader orchard hit was ak he nuste hyt no3t (*Judas* 69-74)

So it happened that these two scoundrels, the lord and the steward, went to amuse themselves one day near a lovely orchard, in which Pilate saw some quite lovely apples. “Climb,” he repeatedly urged Judas, “and get some of them.” Then Judas broke the fence, and soon he was inside. It was his own father’s orchard, though he did not know it at all.

The use of the expression *al one pleye* (‘just for fun,’ 70) may be meant to indicate Pilate’s childishness, so too the way that Pilate’s speech is qualified by the words *he bad euere* (‘he kept asking,’ 72). The most interesting change, however, and one that serves to

⁵³ “Quadam igitur die Pylatus de palatio suo in quoddam pomerium aspiciens, illotum pomorum tanto desiderio captus est ut pene deficere uideretur. Erat autem illud pomerium Ruben, patris Iude, sed nec Iudas parrern nec Ruben filium agnoscebat, quia et Ruben ipsum in marinis fluctibus perisse putabat et Iudas quis pater aut que patria sua fuerit penitus ignorabat.; Pylatus itaque accersito Iuda ait: ‘Tanto illorum fructuum captus sum desiderio quod, si hi is frustrates fuero, spiritum exhalabo.’ Concitus igitur Iudas in pomerium insiliit et uelocius mala carpit” (LA 45.36-40).

improve the narrative, is the choice to hold back the orchard owner's identity until Judas has already broken in. The SEL poet also limits the back-story to one line, without being exhaustive about why father and son are not expecting one another, which may presume a more competent reader, but also makes for better storytelling.⁵⁴

On the other hand, Jacobus is quite elegant in his description of the fatal altercation between Judas and Ruben, which moves quickly to the violent climax of the scene:

At that moment Ruben came along and found Judas picking his apples, thereupon a violent argument started, words led to insults, and insults to blows and injuries on both sides. Finally Judas struck Ruben at the back of the neck with a stone and killed him. He then delivered the apples to Pilate and told him what had happened. (Ryan 168)⁵⁵

The brutality of this murder reminds us that Judas has killed before, and gives concrete illustration of his wickedness that recalls a number of archetypal murders.

Presumably seeing this encounter as both a pivotal moment in the legend and also as an opportunity to create more interesting narrative, the SEL poet greatly expands this scene, adding dialogue and graphic description:

Com þe godeman þat was is fader & e3ste wat he were
& bi whas leue he brak is 3ard & what he dude þere
Iudas sede ichulle her beo maugrey þine teþ bivore
& of þis applen habbe & bere þey [þu] hyt haddest iswore
Þis godeman was anuyd of þis luþere answeare
þe schrewe him missede a3en he ne mi3te hit no3t vorbere

⁵⁴ Although he does not say much about the literary merits of the SEL, Baum does have a far more sympathetic view of the narrative skills of Jacobus, whom he finds superior to the author of the HA version ("Mediaeval Legend," 517).

⁵⁵ "Interea Ruben uenit et Iudam mala sua carpentem inuenit. Fortiter igitur ambo contendunt et iurgia superaddunt, post iurgia surgunt ad uerbera et rnutuis se iniuriis affecerunt. Tandem Iudas Ruben in ea parte qua ceruix collo connectitur lapide percussit pariter et occidit. Poma igitur sustulit et Pylato quid acciderit enarrauit" (LA 45.41-44).

So þat hii nome eyþer bi þe top & made stronge wounde
 þe schrewe was strenggore þan is fader & brou3te him sone to grounde
 So þat he smot him mid a ston bihinde in þe pate
 þat al þe scolle toda3ste þe brayn veol out þer ate (*Judas* 75-84)

The good man who was his father came and asked who he was, and by whose leave he had broken his fence, and what he was doing there. Judas said, "I mean to be here, in spite of your front teeth and I will take some of these apples even if you swear to the contrary." This good man was vexed by this wicked answer. The scoundrel slandered him again; he could no longer put up with it. They grabbed one another by the head and inflicted severe wounds. The scoundrel was stronger than his father and quickly brought him to the ground. Then he struck him with a stone at the back of the neck, so that his skull was entirely split apart and his brains were dashed out.

The attention to detail here serves to heighten the horror of the Oedipodean encounter, particularly the reference to Ruben's brains spilling out. The poet then stops to reflect, in a short interpolation, upon the unhappy fate of Ruben, and how his murder by his own son has proven the truth of Tyborie's dream:

So þat he slou his owe fader & þo me mi3te ywyte
 þat his moder mette of him soþ þ[o] he was bi3yte
 But were is fader betere to habbe ibro3t hym of dawe
 As sone as he was ibore þen he hadde him aslawe
 Of þe applen þe schrewe nom & of þe peren also
 & bar Pilatus & tolde hym vore al þat he hadde ido (*Judas* 85-90)

Thus [Judas] slew his own father, and so it might be known that his mother had dreamed the truth about him at the time of his conception. Nevertheless it would have been better for his father to have taken his life as soon as Judas was born, than to be killed by him. The scoundrel took some apples and some pears too, and carried them off to Pilate, and straightaway told him all that he had done.

The SEL poet's addition of pears is interesting, and seems to be a humorous interpolation by the SEL poet, or possibly one intended to provide the verisimilitude of detail. This may also be a sly allusion to a well known episode in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine (2.4.9), and if so would be primarily for the amusement of fellow clerks. Such an allusion would be quite complex and rather learned, and because although the thefts are

comparably wanton, neither Judas nor Pilate is redeemed in the manner of Augustine. This makes for further irony, especially when coupled with the entire Edenic temptation motif represented by Pilate's request that Judas bring him apples. In Augustine's story, the pears are stolen for the (perverse) sake of the theft itself, and are barely even edible; in the SEL, we are not told whether the fruit is eaten or not, only that it is delivered to Pilate. In any case, the presence of pears calls further attention to the apples, and perhaps looks forward to the end of *Pylatus*.

In this third part of the legend, after briefly being sympathetic to Judas, the poet returns to the theme of the good parents contrasted to the wicked offspring. Ruben, as he becomes the unwitting victim of parricide, is called *godeman* ('good man,' 75, 79, and 91) parallel to Judas being described as a *schrewe* ('scoundrel,' 80, 82, and 89). Similarly Tyborie, mother and now also spouse of Judas, is a *godewyf* ('good woman' or, perhaps somewhat ironically, 'good wife,' 95 and 105), while Judas is again a *schrewe* (94 and 95). The two taboo violations (parricide and incest), accompanied by the poet's repeated description of Judas as a *schrewe*, would seem to drive audience sympathy for Judas to a new low—and possibly the nadir of the entire legend, since it is followed by the recognition scene and the decision to seek forgiveness through Jesus.

In the fourth and final part of the legend, after the incestuous marriage is discovered, Judas's mother/wife Tyborie urges him to repent, and he joins Jesus as disciple and bursar (100-16). Judas once again shows his true colors by stealing from the alms bag, and after the anointing of Jesus by Mary, Judas complains about the waste of the perfume worth 300 pence; he then betrays Jesus for 30 pence, which equals the one-

tenth part that he habitually stole (117-35).⁵⁶ In the Latin source, the final section of the Judas legend presents a brief narrative combining Gospel harmony and critical interpretation, without referring to any specific authorities (LA 45.53-62).⁵⁷

Judas hangs himself in a tree, but his bowels burst to keep his soul from exiting via the mouth that has kissed Jesus (136-40). In keeping with the theme of irredeemability, the attempt to return the blood money has been elided, along with any sign of regret on the part of Judas, and replaced by further calumniaion:

Hym sywede ek lufere þeoues vor he louede baret & stryf
 He was strong þeof & manuellare & also endede hys lyf
 & suche men scolleþ anhonged beo & þo noman hyt nolde do
 Hym sulf he heong vppon a treo vor such deþ he scholde to (137-140)

Wicked thieves followed him as well, for he loved trouble and strife. He was a ruthless thief and manslayer, and as such he ended his life. And such men ought to be hanged, and when no one else would do it he hanged himself upon a tree, for he was destined to have such a death.

These lines are another interpolation by the SEL poet, made up of elements already

⁵⁶ As Brown (93) and Görlach (*Textual Tradition* 89, 299 n. 387) have noted, *Iudas* lines 115-136 are similar in wording to analogous sections of two SEL temporale poems, the *Southern Passion* (SP lines 27-34) and the *Long Life of Christ* (LLC lines 772-785). Görlach makes the well-founded assertion that this section of *Iudas* is closer to LLC than to SP (299 n. 387). The correspondences may be summarized as follows: *Iudas* 115-16: SP 27-28: LLC 773-74; 118b: LLC 772a; 119-20 SP 29-30: LLC 775-76; 131-32: LLC 781-82; 133-34: (SP 31-32): 783-84; 135-36: SP 33-34: LLC 786-85; and additional similarities in the lines 128-29: SP 23-24: LLC 778-79.

⁵⁷ Indeed Maggioni, the recent editor of the *Legenda Aurea*, cites no sources aside from Acts 1.18, though just after this section are references to such authorities as Vincent of Beauvais, Peter Comester, Jerome, and Bede (LA 45.53-62; Maggioni pp. 280-81). According to Baum, however, “the crowning achievement of the redactor [of the LA version] was the introduction of the moralizing on Judas’s death. This, splendidly medieval in spirit, he perhaps borrowed, or rather developed, from a passage of Candidus (ca. 822) in his *De passione Domine*, 13 28): ‘*Et abiens, inquit, laqueo se suspendit. Non enim dignus erat ut vel caelum tangeret moriens, vel terram sed inter utraque periit, qui utrorumque Dominum ad mortem tradidit*’ (“Mediaeval Legend,” 517-18). Or he is perhaps more likely to have adapted it from a similar passage in the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor (*Hist. Act. Apost.* cap. 9, 1543 ed., p. 229).

introduced—theft, homicide, and associating with evildoers—, but such a blatant statement about the inevitability of the punishment that awaits Judas is a new twist, and one that is comparable with the scheme of divine justice worked out by Jacobus of Voragine in the *Legenda Aurea*.

The poet ends with a short prayer for protection from the place where Judas is now, since if anyone is in hell, we may be reasonably certain it is he: “Nou suete Louerd þat þoru Iudas isold were to þe treo / Shulde ous fram þe lufere stude þat we weneþ he inne beo” (“Now, sweet Lord, who was sold by Judas to the tree [i.e., the cross], shield us from the wicked place where we reckon him to be” *Iudas* 145-46). The damnation of Judas is not in question here, though a savvy reader might turn to the St. Brendan legend for a detailed description of the punishments endured by Judas (*SEL* 1:197-200, lines 515-604). The closing prayer seems to be a regular feature of the *SEL*, and the use of the first person plural at the end of the legend (*ous* and *we* in line 146) indicates that the poet might be keeping in mind a setting in which the text is read aloud. There is also an echo of the first line of the legend, effectively enveloping the apocryphal biography of Judas with the statement that he sold Jesus/Our Lord to the cross/tree, but making the Lord the subject of a passive-voice construction.

In *Iudas*, the *SEL* poet has seized several opportunities to shift the emphasis of, comment on, and even intervene in the narrative. These interpolations, both reflective and narrative, are generally offered to reinforce a few specific themes the translator found in the Latin legend; such latent patterns are essentially the building blocks of *Iudas*, but the arrangement of these blocks and the prominence given to certain blocks are the work of a master craftsman. The essence of the legend is the evil inherent in Judas: irredeemable,

unrepentant, and above all destructive. Whether he intends it or not, this *luper brid* brings evil upon almost every life he touches (the one exception being the already corrupt Pilate), and ultimately upon himself. In the SEL, the plight of both parental couples is made more concrete, particularly the suffering of Judas's mother Tyborie, and his foster-mother, the Queen of Scarioth. The two benefactors of Judas are presented as opposites, each of whom recognizes his true nature: Pilate entrusts Judas with his property because he is also a *schrewe*, and birds of a feather flock together (“Vor ech þyng loueþ hys ilyk,” *Iudas* 66), whereas Jesus does so first to test him (“To vondi his mod,” 113) and then in order that he carry out his predetermined role in the drama of salvation (“Wel wuste oure Louerd what he was & alle hys luperre dede / Ak napeles he moste voluulle þat þe prophetes of him sede,” 121-22). Finally, after betraying Jesus over the loss of an opportunity for theft, an unrepentant and decidedly unredeemed Judas ends his life as a criminal (“He was strong þeof & manuellare & also endede hys lyf” 138) and a man born to hang (“Hym sulf he heong vppon a treo vor such deþ he scholde to,” 140). The ending of *Iudas*, in keeping with its beginning, positions the more outlandish elements of the legend to serve the canonical understanding Christ's betrayer.

Along with some traces of the LA's apparatus for containing the apocryphal, *Iudas* also retains the outlines of *De ortu Judae* in the form that was part of the HA (Baum's "Type R"). Certain structural elements show through the work of two redactors—Jacobus of Voragine and the SEL poet—each of whom had an agenda distinct from that of the HA, as well as from one another. As a collection, the genre of abbreviated legendary, whether Latin or vernacular, presents a very different setting for the legend than does the more or less continuous narrative of the *Historia Apocrypha*. Yet

Judas does bear the imprint of what is fundamentally a Pilate text, in which Judas is a relatively minor character. The *Judas vita* is included in the HA (when it is included) because of the motifs it shares with the legend *De ortu et origine Pilatii*, and also because Pilate plays a key role in the story of Judas—it is at Pilate’s prompting that Judas commits the theft that leads him to kill his father, and again because of Pilate’s involvement that Judas marries his mother. With the two Oedipodean sins committed, it remains only for them to be revealed, and for Judas to seek out Jesus, whom he ultimately betrays. The two legends are also carefully bound together in the SEL, though in some different ways than in the Latin versions, and consequently *Pylatus* is the next item to consider.

Pylatus: The Pilate legend in the South English Legendary

In the SEL, the Pilate legend (hereafter styled *Pylatus*) runs to 262 lines, considerably longer than the 146-line Judas legend. This ratio is more or less in keeping with the Latin source material, as the Pilate section of the LA (51.183-262) is considerably longer than the Judas section (45.13-62). Ultimately the length of both LA and SEL versions reflect the fact that the Pilate material occupies over half of the HA, while Judas takes up merely one-fifth. This Middle English version includes the basic features of the legend already familiar from the Latin sources (see ch. 2, p. 75 ff.), with variations as noted below. For convenience, the legend may be divided into the following eleven episodes: Pilate’s illegitimate conception and birth (1-8); his childhood and the murder of his half-brother (9-18); his youth as a hostage in Rome and murder of a fellow hostage (19-36); his appointment as judge on the wicked island of Pontos (37-63); his subsequent alliance and falling out with Herod (64-96); an interpolation on the friendship

between Pilate and Judas (97-102); an account of the Veronica legend, concluding with Pilate's recall to Rome (103-56); an interpolation describing Pilates's earlier message to the emperor (157-68); Pilate's meeting with the emperor, including the 'holi curtel' (*tunica inconsultilis*), and ending with his imprisonment (169-212); his wasting away in prison and an interpolated version of his preemptive suicide (213-38); and the foul effects of his corrupting corpse upon the several places where it is disposed of (239-262).

The Judas legend in the SEL (*Iudas*), examined in the previous section of this chapter, is a loose but fairly faithful 'vulgarization' (or perhaps 'Englising')⁵⁸ based on the Judas-vita found in the Matthias chapter of the *Legenda Aurea*. In *Iudas*, the innovations and departures made by the SEL poet are numerous, but relatively limited in scope, showing alterations of style and emphasis, excision of scholarly glosses, short interpolations, additions of sententia, but with most of the significant changes limited to the third section of the legend. The Pilate legend represents an even more substantial reorganization of the source material, which is drawn from four different LA chapters, and presented with alterations both major and minor. As such, it may be *Pilatus*, rather than *Iudas*, that gives the clearer idea of how the SEL poet reshaped the apocryphal material culled from the LA. Far from showing discomfort with this material, in *Pylatus* the SEL poet expresses no suspicion about its veracity, and seems to delight in retouching some episodes and even inventing others from whole cloth.

The SEL places a greater emphasis on Pilate's cold-bloodedness, as shown in the careful planning and timing of violent and treacherous acts: the murder of his half-

⁵⁸ See K. Jankofsky, "National Characteristics," 82-3; quoted above p.106 ff.

brother, the legitimate son of king Tyrus and his queen (17-18); the murder of the son of the French king's son, a fellow hostage at Rome (35-36); his successful domination of the unruly people of Pontos (51-56); his betrayal of Herod by bribing the emperor to hold his territory directly (73-80); and ultimately his suicide (233-38). The depiction of Pilate here as a calculating and dissimulating opportunist goes well beyond the somewhat callous self-interest implied by his characteristic gesture of hand-washing (Matt. 27:24). As in *Iudas*, Pilate's negative character traits are emphasized at a lexical level by the use of the words *luper(e)* ('wicked' 1, 89, 150, 245) and *schrewe(n)* ('scoundrel' 34, 35, 58, 75, 100), as well as another group of key words: *quoynte* (adj., 'cunning' 58), *queyntore* ('more cunning' 48) and *quoyntise(s)* (noun, 'ingenuity; cunning' 54, 59, 65). In addition, there are a number of expressions describing how Pilate bides his time until an opportunity arises for him to carry out his wicked plan: "Pylatus awaytede his point" (17); "De schrewe awaytede wel is time" (35); and "a schrewe wole abide his time" (75). The similarity of these character observations, serves to establish a lexical associations between the betrayal of Herod and the two youthful murders. In this episode, Pilate stands accused of subverting the feudal order, and of plotting to do so in secret over a long period of time—both of which are viewed as extremely wicked. The key word that the SEL poet uses to describe Pilate is the noun *schrewe* ('scoundrel'), notably deployed in two *sententia*: "Vor a schrewe wole abide his time to cupe is felonye" ('For a shrew will bide his time before he reveals his villainy', 75); and "Vor twei schrewen wolleþ beo freond þei noman elles nere" ('For two shrews will be friends even though no one else would be [friends with either one]', 100). A similar idea expressed about these two scoundrels in the SEL *Iudas* (66-68). These observations in turn point to a wider theme of

irredeemability that recurs throughout the Judas and Pilate legends, which amounts to ‘once a shrew, always a shrew’ (17, 35, 75; cf. Judas 58). Such language also serves to draw an analogy between the two betrayers, whose legends are almost invariably linked in the SEL manuscripts (see above, p.94 ff., and below, Appendix B).

To further elaborate the presentation of Pilate as a ruthless scoundrel, the SEL poet makes subtle shifts of emphasis throughout and also does some significant reworking of the source material to fit the specific narrative and thematic requirements. The emperor’s deliberation over how to handle the murderous hostage Pilate is one example. The scene in the Latin source describes a collective decision:

Sed cum Romani quid de eo faciendum esset inquirerent, dixerunt: “Hic si superuixerit, qui fratrem necauit, obsidem iugulauit, rei publice plurimum utilis erit et colla ferocium hostium ferox ipse domabit.” Dixerunt ergo: “Cum reus mortis habeatur, in Pontos insulam gentibus illis que nullum paciuntur iudicem iudex preficiatur, si forte eius nequitia ipsorum contumacia edometur. Si non, quod meruit patiatur.” (LA 51.198-202)

Now the Romans, wondering what to do with him, said: “If this fellow, who slew his brother and strangled a hostage, is allowed to live, he can be mighty useful to the Republic; and, being a brute himself, he will know how to handle our brutish enemies.” They therefore decided: “He must be judged worthy of death, but let him be posted as a judge to the island of Pontus, where the people never tolerate a judge. If his wickedness can tame their perversity, all the better; if not, let him get what he deserves.” (Ryan 211)

The key ideas in this passage are (to follow Ryan’s choices of English words)

“wickedness” (*nequitia*), “perversity” (*contumacia*), and “brutishness” (*ferocitas*); the villainy of Pilate is opposed to the obstinance and inflexibility of the islanders, with fierceness verging on savageness on both sides.

In the SEL, the speech is slightly more detailed than that of ‘the Romans’ in LA, and is delivered by a single shrewd counselor, who urges that Pilate be spared and sent to govern the isle of Pounce (= Latin Pontos):

Sire, sire, queþ þys oþere þou hast mony a fo,
 & such a man 3ef he beleueþ forþ greot god mai þe do,
 & 3ef lawe of londe nele þat þou lete him go so
 Wel þou wost þat in þe yle of Pounce schrewen beoþ inowe
 Per ne com neuere no Iustise þat hii sone ne slowe
 Per vore, þou my3t him sende þuder to beo Iustise of þulke yle
 & bote he beo queyntore þan eny oþer he ne scapeþ no3t a gile
 & 3ef he þat lond chastep wel & bryngeþ al vnder vote
 He worþ mon wyþoute per 3ef he dury mote

“Sire, sire,” said this other, “you have many a foe, and if such a man remains [alive], he might do you great good, [even] if the law of the land does not will it, [that] you should let him go thus. You know well that there are many scoundrels in the isle of Pontos; no Justice ever comes there whom they do not soon slay. Therefore, you might send him there, to be Justice of that island, and unless he is craftier than any other, he will not escape a deceit. And if he disciplines that land well, and brings it entirely to heel, he will be considered without peer—if he is able to endure. (42-50)

This speech departs from the simple wickedness of the source, and builds upon the theme of trickery and ruthlessness already established by the actions of Pilate himself, using words such as *queyntore* (‘more cunning’) to echo and reinforce the poet’s previous descriptions of Pilate, thereby linking his murders to his betrayals. The Latin description *ferox* (here used as substantive ‘brute,’ but adjectivally meaning everything from wild to headstrong) is rendered by *schrewe*, a word that implies treachery rather than pure violence.

Once Pilate has secured from the emperor direct authority over Judea and Jerusalem and effectively cut Herod out of the loop in the LA (51.2), Jacobus gives an alternative cause for the quarrel between Herod and Pilate, drawn from the *Historia Scholastica* (*In Evangel. 94* [PL 198 col. 1045 sqq.]). In this version, which thanks to Peter Comestor has the air of orthodoxy about it, the hostility arises from events related to a false Messiah:

The *Scholastic History* tells us that there was another reason for their

hostility. There was an individual who claimed to be the son of God and beguiled a great many people in Galilee. He led his followers to Gazirim, where he said he was going to ascend to heaven. Pilate came upon them and killed them all, because he feared that the people of Judea might likewise be misled. This caused enmity between him and Herod, because Galilee was in Herod's jurisdiction. Both of these reasons may well be true. (Ryan 211-2)⁵⁹

The ultimate source of this story is probably the first century historian Flavius Josephus (himself a character in the HA), via a medieval Latin redaction. As usual, however, the Middle English redactor prefers to create a compelling narrative rather than being faithful to the more meticulous glosses of Jacobus (Thompson, Jankofsky). Hence while excising Jacobus's learned interpolation the SEL substitutes several lines describing Judas as Pilate's protégé and steward:

De whole Pilatus in is lond louerd & sire was,
 Iudas, þat oure Louerd solde, to him com bicas.
 His styward he hym made anon; gode freondes heo were,
 Vor twei schrewen wolleþ beo freond þei noman elles nere.
 Iudas was þere hys stiward vorte he his fader slou3
 & vorte he weddede is owe moder, wyþ groot strengþe & wou3.

While Pilate was lord and sire in his land, Judas (who sold Our Lord) happened to come to him. [Pilate] soon made [Judas] his steward. They were good friends, for two scoundrels will be friends even though no one else would be [friends with either one]. Judas was his steward before he slew his father and before he married his own mother, with great strength and woe [respectively]. (97-102)

These details are drawn and abbreviated from the LA version of the Judas legend (45.33-46), possibly by way of the SEL *Iudas* (lines 61-94). Thus the substitution may have

⁵⁹ “Alia causa inimicitie assignatur in hystoriis scholasticis. Quidam enim se filium dei faciens multos de Galileis seduxerat, quos cum in Garizim duxisset ubi dixerat se ascensurum in celum, superueniens Pylatus ipsum cum omnibus occidit tirnens ne similiter Iudeos seduceret. Ob hoc facti sunt inimici quia Herodes presidebat Galileis. Et utraque causa potuic esse uera” (LA 51.208-11).

served a twofold purpose: first, to elide a scholarly gloss that detracts from the forward movement of the narrative; and second, to form a closer connection between the legends of Judas and Pilate, lives of archsinners that are otherwise unique in the SEL.

By contrast, in the Veronica episode of *Pylatus*, the source material is replaced by popular tradition and supplemented by contemporary cult information. Where, in the LA (51.219-24), the miraculous image is imprinted upon a linen cloth (“linteum,” 51.222) that Veronica has already prepared to bear a painted portrait of Jesus, the SEL-poet, apparently under the influence of a different version of the legend, substitutes a kerchief (“keuerchef,” 127) that Veronica just happens to be carrying, with which she wipes the face of Jesus. The poet has also added an important detail—possibly gleaned from pilgrimage accounts—that the image is in St. Peter’s at Rome, and is frequently seen there (146).⁶⁰ In fact, during the course of the thirteenth century, the *sudarium* (‘sweat-cloth’) of Veronica had become one of the most important relics in Rome, which, “in response to the clamorous demand of pilgrims...was displayed at regular intervals” in a reliquary designed especially for use in processions (Sumption 222). Although it is hard to say which version of the Veronica story would have been current in England during the last decades of the thirteenth century, by the late fourteenth century, evidence of the Roman relic’s popularity is attested in Langland and Chaucer, and by the fifteenth century, “[t]he ‘vernacle’ was worn by every returning pilgrim” (249-50). The version of the legend attached to the *sudarium*, understood as Veronica’s kerchief, may well have

⁶⁰ There is a similar insertion into one of the French versions of the Pilate legend (edited by Burgio, 3.171-72), but this Old French translation from the LA is somewhat later than the SEL, and thus could not have been the source, we may conclude that this information was available elsewhere.

accompanied these pilgrimage mementos back to England, and was eventually canonized as the sixth Station of the Cross. This use of oral tradition is not unparalleled in the SEL, and Thompson suggests an oral source for elements of the All Souls legend (*Everyday Saints* 127).

Other changes in the Veronica section include: instead of the messenger Albanus being sent to Galacia, as in LA cap. 63 (*James the Less*), the unnamed messenger sent to Rome by Pilate is shipwrecked in Galilee (*Galile*, 162). The chronological order of source material on Pilate and the Destruction of Jerusalem (re-combining elements from two different chapters of LA) is also rearranged (157-68). Beginning with the meeting between Pilate and Caesar, however, the SEL poet takes more liberty with the source, to the point where the final episodes constitute a new version of the legend. This sequence of episodes includes the redirected journey of Pilate's messenger Albanus (157-64), Pilate's meetings with the emperor (169-212), his subsequent imprisonment and suicide (213-38), and the various places where his corpse is deposited (239-62). The many alterations are not easily assigned a single motivation.

These final hundred lines or so of the legend have been more thoroughly reworked than the rest. The episode of Christ's Seamless Tunic ("Oure Louerdes curtel.../Pat vnsowe[d] was of þred," 169-70) has been given a major reworking and expansion by the SEL poet. This includes the insertion of characteristically comic flourishes such as the general speculation that the emperor has become unsteady ("...alle þat hurde þis cas / Wondrede much of þe emperour þat he vnstable was," 183-84). The dialogue between Pilate and the Emperor is greatly expanded, and much of it (lines 189-212 in particular) seems to be entirely original to SEL.

Yet all of the changes to this episode are not merely expansions. In the LA, the tunic is finally stripped off of Pilate after Tiberius is prompted to do so by “a sign from God, or perhaps a hint from some Christian” (Ryan 213; “*diuino nutu uel forte alicuius christiani suasi ipsum illa tunica expoliari fecit,*” LA 51.242). When Pilate himself takes off the tunic in the SEL, however, it is both according to God’s will (“*as oure Louerd hyt wolde,*” 185) and by chance (“*bi cas,*” 186). Interestingly, this episode is itself based on an interpolation by Jacobus of Voragine (source unidentified), added to the HA Pilate legend (see ch. 2, p.77 ff.). Presumably the SEL poet recognized an opportunity for bringing out the comedic aspect of the encounter between Pilate and the emperor that was already present in the LA.

On the other extreme, the gruesome description of Pilate languishing in prison has been added by the SEL poet (*Pylatus* 213-18), whereas in the LA, Tiberius has Pilate imprisoned only until he is able to “consult with a counsel of wise men about what should be done with the criminal” (Ryan 213).⁶¹ The graphic details of Pilate’s physical deterioration may be intended to evoke pity prior to his conversation with the jailor. By now one has nearly forgotten the murderous young Pilate’s scheming, if not his role in decide—instead Pilate seems a defeated remnant of his former self. The poet’s move is perhaps an ironic one, as the sympathy for Pilate evoked by this description vanishes a few lines later when he is up to his old tricks, and once again acting the part of a *schrewe*.

In an interpolation that has no equivalent in the Latin sources, Pilate appeals to his former noble station in order to trick the guard into allowing him fresh air and sunlight,

⁶¹ “*Tunc imperator ipsum in carcere recipi iussit donec sapientum consilio deliberaret quid de eo fieri oporteret*” (LA 51.244).

then into giving him first an apple, and then a knife on the pretext of peeling the apple, which Pilate uses to kill himself (218-36). Here the poet has Pilate use—and perhaps overuse—words and phrases of French origin, evoking both a courtly register and the speech of contemporary Norman aristocracy. Pilate appeals to the jailor’s *gentrise* (‘gentility’ 221, 236) and even his *cortesy* (231). In the cultural milieu in which the SEL originated (the largely Anglophone southwest midlands), such snippets of French would be readily understood, but were likely to be associated with an unpopular Francophone ruling class. Thompson has noted the negative connotation repeatedly carried by the French tongue in the SEL: “the text makes adept use of tag phrases such as ‘beau sire,’ most often deployed to characterize the speech of wicked highborn rulers” (*Everyday Saints* 53).⁶² Along with using the coded language of the Anglo-Norman nobility, Pilate also makes a play for guard’s pity (and hence that of the reader/listener) as a noble man who has fallen from a great height, and who makes his last requests. Yet again he overdoes it, and ultimately the repeated reminders that he was a *kny3t* (‘knight,’ 222, 239, 234), a *hey3 man* (‘noble man’ 234), and once *hey Iustice* (‘high Justice’ 222, 235), however well they may fool the jailor, elicit just the opposite sentiment from the reader (at least in a modern one).

Jankofsky has remarked on the SEL’s interpolation in this passage, which includes both character development and the invention of dialogue:

⁶² Thompson describes the poet’s bias, whether anti-Norman or generally anti-aristocratic, thus: “The SEL may stop short of preaching democratic reform, but its construction of a world where the ‘heyemen’ are regularly taken to task for their acts of oppression, and where the poor and humble occasionally get to turn things around, may nevertheless have evoked for its audience the sense of a narrative world of more generous proportions than any they had previously encountered” (*Everyday Saints* 57).

Of more cultural-historical interest is the explanation of how Pilate gains access to a knife with which to commit suicide....The *Legenda aurea*, using apocryphal materials, reports only: ‘Data est igitur in Pylatum sententia, ut morte turpissima damneretur. Audiens hoc Pylatus cultello proprio se necavit et tali morte vitam finivit.’ ...The SEL on the other hand, creates a miniscene insofar as Pilate asks to be allowed to see the light of day one more time. Once out of his prison cell, he laments the loss of his power and former glory and the deterioration of his physical self. Then, true to courtly etiquette, Pilate asks the jailor for a paring knife to peel the apple he had asked for (Jankofsky, “LA in SEL” 323)

While the interactions between Pilate and his jailor seem to be a pure invention of the SEL poet, details of Pilate’s suicide episode are not, however, invented *ex nihilo*. The method of suicide—using a knife intended for peeling an apple—seems to have been borrowed by the poet from a story told about Herod. Jacobus recounts this same Herod story in LA cap. 10 (The Holy Innocents), and it therefore seems the likeliest source for the SEL version:

It was Herod’s custom to eat an apple, which he peeled himself, after every meal. One day, while peeling his apple, he was seized with a violent coughing spell and turned the knife against his own breast, looking around to see that no one could prevent him from killing himself; but a nephew of his grasped his hand and stopped him” (Ryan 59).⁶³

Although the situation of Herod’s suicide attempt is not exactly analogous to that of Pilate, the details of knife and apple are easily recognizable. According to Alexander Murray, who traces the development of this tradition in the second volume of *Suicide in the Middle Ages* (343-56), by the later Middle Ages, a competing version of this story had arisen in which Herod succeeds in killing himself with the paring knife. Murray finds

⁶³ “Habebat autem in consuetudine ut post omnem cibum pomum per se purgaret et comederet; cumque gladium in manu teneret tussique uiolenta distenderetur, circumspiciens ne se aliquis impediret se ipsum percussurus dexteram sustulit, sed consobrinus eius sustinendo dexteram impediuit” (LA 10.78-79).

this tradition particularly well established in English and French texts and illuminations (350-53). The SEL poet may have had access to one or more form of the story of Herod's suicide (or attempted suicide): the LA alone, or a more detailed version, perhaps even an oral tradition of some sort.⁶⁴ Alternatively, the SEL poet may have borrowed this particular suicide account in part to touch upon the apple motif that was associated with Pilate in *Iudas*. If so, this is further evidence that the author of these legends may have seen the two legends of malefactors as a pair, and made some effort at unifying them.

Finally, the SEL poet reworks the series of disposals of Pilate's malignant remains, which are the relics of local traditions on the Continent or perhaps of a political rivalry of the tenth century (Murray 343). In the LA, the body is disposed of in this series of manners and places: (1) thrown into the Tiber at Rome; (2) thrown into the Rhone at Vienne; (3) deposited outside Lausanne; and (4) placed in a pit (or well) high in the Alps. The sequence in the SEL is different, and with none of the traces of local traditions from the Continent. Pilate's corpse is deposited (1) outside the town (presumably Rome); (2) in the Tiber; (3) in a distant lake; and finally comes to rest after being lodged (4) in the middle of a rock that has opened supernaturally to receive it. The split stone is untraceable, if not completely unique, and does not seem to be tied to any particular place.⁶⁵

As the foregoing makes clear, the final hundred-odd lines of the Pilate legend,

⁶⁴ Alexander Murray points out that there are "spilt traditions" concerning the deaths of Judas, Pilate, and Herod: suicide in one account and a different (if not necessarily natural) cause in the other (335-56). In the case of Pilate, at least for western Europe in the Middle Ages, the suicide story became the historical fact, and the other tradition was forgotten (343).

⁶⁵ *Titus and Vespasian*, another Middle English verse narrative that transmits a similar (HA-LA type) apocryphal lives of Judas and Pilate, also includes an account (4467-86) of Pilate's body ending up within a split stone (Herbert 202). This 14th century text may have drawn on the SEL, or related traditions.

which begins with the end of the Veronica story, represent an extensive reworking of source material by the SEL poet. The poet's inventiveness seems more extreme in *Pylatus*, even by comparison to *Iudas*, which has several minor interpolations. The evidence seems to support the view that Thompson advocates, and may eventually contribute to the dossier of the 'outspoken poet' discussed by Pickering and Litzka.⁶⁶ The question arises as to whether there might be a fuller version somewhere, logically in French or Latin, which might have been an alternative or additional source for the SEL; no such text is known, nor is one likely to be found.⁶⁷

A few of these points above do, however, bring the SEL Pilate more in line with the version of the Latin *Historia Apocrypha*, which was the source Jacobus used for Judas and Pilate material in the LA. Other evidence has already shown conclusively that the LA is the source, and in the absence of any definite evidence that the HA was available in the southwest of England in the late thirteenth century, such coincidences are best ascribed to the SEL poet's desire to create a stronger narrative.⁶⁸ In his treatment of the Pilate legend, Jacobus seems to have been chiefly interested in fitting apocryphal material into his scheme of how the betrayers of Christ are punished, playing upon the usual hagiographic tropes to shape the legend of Pilate's downfall and death into a

⁶⁶ Anne Thompson, when presented with a summary of these innovations, found them to be in keeping with her expectations of the SEL poet (personal communication).

⁶⁷ Eugenio Burgio's three articles ("Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle vitae antiofrancesi di Giuda e di Pilato, I-III") present a thorough analysis of the extant Old French versions of the Pilate legend, including a point-by-point comparison to the Latin sources thereof (LA, HA, or both). None of these "oitanic" texts seems to have any direct connection with the SEL.

⁶⁸ But see above, ch. 2, p. 66 ff., on mss C₁ and C₂.

parodic martyrdom account.⁶⁹

The SEL poet maintains the basic structure inherited from his *Legenda Aurea* source, but makes some important alterations. In the story of Pilate's final imprisonment and death, the SEL places much greater emphasis on the experience of Pilate between the point at which he is stripped of the seamless tunic of Christ to face the wrath of Tiberius, and the final disposition of his corpse. Compared to the Latin source, Pilate's imprisonment is given a much more detailed treatment in the SEL and is clearly long and explicitly punitive. In the SEL, Pilate is jailed for such a long enough period and in such harsh conditions (absence of sunlight, etc.) that he begins to waste away bodily. The description of this physical deterioration serves to set up Pilate's final exchange with his jailer, which is the SEL's most striking departure from its source. By the time that Pilate makes his last requests, the reader has nearly forgotten the murderous young Pilate's scheming, as well as his role in deicide—instead Pilate seems a defeated shell of his former self.

On the one hand, this substitution of Pilate for Herod (one or another of them, not clearly distinguished) is typical of the later apocrypha and biblical literature of this type. For instance in the earliest versions of the *de ortu Judae* legend it is Herod rather than Pilate who takes on the young Judas as his protégé (Baum's "Type A"). But on the other hand, this incident allows the SEL poet to return to the theme of Pilate's scheming treachery, even as it has been nearly forgotten in the narration of his devastated humanity. In *Pylatus* he has the last laugh, not only robbing Tiberius of his execution, but also

⁶⁹ See Knappe and Scheidgen.

punishing the jailer who has shown him kindness. Thus Pilate shows himself to be the same scoundrel (*schrewe*) in his last act as he was in his youth. Alexander Murray (*Suicide in the Middle Ages*) has shown the habitual connection of Judas, Pilate, and Herod in what he calls the “occasional theology” (287 ff., 342) of the Middle Ages. Despite the lack of reliable historical evidence, these three antagonistic figures from the story of Jesus, drawn from early Christian and late antique historical sources, underwent a process of literary development and came to be considered as exempla for the sin of suicide.⁷⁰

Late apocrypha and the genre of abbreviated legendary

To a certain extent, the foregoing analysis of the SEL legends of Judas and Pilate complicates one contention of this dissertation: namely, that these legends have an inherently destabilizing effect upon the authors and texts that include them. As far as the SEL poet is concerned, however, these legends were as good as any others, and did not require the sorts of disclaimers and careful containment used in the Latin source. In contrast to the LA version, upon which it is apparently based, the Middle English author has a relatively easygoing attitude toward the apocryphal material, and seems if anything

⁷⁰ Murray contends that it was “the curse that came first, and the altered tradition to suit it” (339); that is, the suicide comes after the curse, as a natural function of divine justice against an infamous individual—although in a more concrete sense, the sentence is carried out by pious authors. In the case of Judas, suicide—specifically by hanging—is one of two legends about his death that were recorded by the Evangelists (Murray calls this a “split tradition,” 339 ff.). Matthew’s account of his suicide (Matt. 27:5), and Luke’s account of his “falling headlong” to his gruesome death (Acts 1:18) are both easily understood as accursed deaths assigned to Judas after he had been identified as the betrayer of Christ—a role not mentioned in the earliest Christian documents, the Pauline Epistles. The invented betrayal logically antedates the invented deaths, all of these following a nearly universal pattern of savior myth (Maccoby and others), and borrowing language and details from Old Testament passages that the Gospel authors considered to be prophetic of Christ. (See above, ch. 1, p. 9 ff. and ch. 2, note 13 on p. 34.)

to delight in the subject matter, which has provided an occasion for narrative invention and embellishment. Some traces of the LA scheme exist in the SEL, including the expression of doubt at the beginning of the Judas legend (*Iudas* 2-3) and the assertion, toward the end of the Pilate legend, that unpleasant deaths befell of all those who betrayed Jesus (*Pylatus* 217-18). Evidence of a new plan for connecting the two legends may be discerned in the repetition of certain words (*schrewe, luper*), the treatment of certain shared motifs (a wicked man awaiting an opportunity to perform a wicked act), and an allusion, in the Pilate-vita (where no such allusion exists in the source) to the fact that Judas has become his steward (*Pylatus* 97-102). Yet a look at the manuscript tradition of the SEL shows that these gestures are not enough to knit the two legends together, nor to secure them a stable position in the collection. The author of the SEL, however capable as a poet and storyteller, had a much less clear (or less clearly expressed) scheme, especially in comparison to the rigid idea of divine justice that enabled Jacobus of Voragine to erect a structure to contain the arch-traitor and his Roman counterpart. Such a comparison of the Middle English vernacular collection with the highly organized Latin legendary may not be entirely fair, but, considering that Judas and Pilate tended to disappear from the manuscripts of the SEL, neither is it wholly unwarranted.

Also in the *Legenda Aurea*, much more than in the *South English Legendary*, various elements retained from the *Historia Apocrypha*—Imperial Roman history, Church history, Judean history, and the stories of Pilate and Judas—form a narrative connection between providential salvation history, which leads toward the Christianization of the Roman Empire, and divine justice, which leads to the punishment

of not only Judas, but all the Jews. By way of the thirty silver *denarii* he is paid for betraying Jesus, a similar connection is established between Judas, the apocryphal legends of the wood of the cross, and history both sacred and secular. The following chapters will consider how, with Jesus (and Judas) at the center, the Rood Legends stretch back to Seth and Adam, and forward to Constantine and Helena, two other figures who contributed much to the history of Christianity the Roman Empire.⁷¹

⁷¹ It would be difficult to overstate the importance of Constantine's conversion to Christianity in the history of the Church, which experienced, under his reign, the end of persecutions and mass martyrdom, the formation of a standard doctrine and canon, and a move from the margins to the center of life in the Roman Empire. (See, for instance, Pagels and King xxi-xxii)

4. *De gallo redivivo*: The tale of Judas and the cock in the Latin tradition

This chapter and the next examine a story about Judas and his mother in which a cooked cock returns to life and crows aloud to presage the resurrection of Jesus—just after Judas has made a blasphemous oath affirming the impossibility thereof. The legend *De gallo redivivo*, the tale of Judas and the resurrected rooster, is an apocryphal tradition found in at least 22 extant Latin manuscripts of the twelfth through fifteenth centuries, as well as in several vernacular versions.¹ This apocryphon is of interest both in itself and also in connection with the tradition *De ortu Judae*, which has been discussed in the previous chapters. Considerable attention will be given to the manuscript circulation of the Latin texts in Chapter 4, and this project carries over to Chapter 5, which will examine the Middle Irish version of *De gallo redivivo* found in the *Leabhar Breac* in light of its probable Latin sources. Hence these two chapters form a pair similar to that of Chapters 2 and 3, with Chapter 4 considering the Latin tradition and its analogues, and Chapter 5 concentrating upon on a particular vernacular text and its sources.

Chapter overview and methodology

This chapter builds upon scholarship dealing with medieval biblical legends and

¹ Although Latin rubric “de gallo” is used as a rubric for this episode in the *Leabhar Breac*, no standard title for this text exists in either the medieval manuscripts or the modern scholarship. The descriptive title *De gallo redivivo* is my own designation, intended to refer to all of the various Latin texts and vernacular derivatives of the Judas tale in the place of terms such as ‘le coq cuit qui chant’ and ‘the roasted (or scalded) cock’. For a list of manuscripts, see Appendix E.

apocrypha found in Latin and in several vernacular languages. Of particular importance to the study of the diffusion of this tradition is the work of Zbigniew Izydorczyk on the Latin manuscripts of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (also known by the Latin title *Evangelium Nicodemii*, and henceforth abbreviated EN) and its various satellite texts, of which *De gallo redivivo* is one.² Also useful in the study of textual transmission is the work of Esther Quinn and Bob Miller on the various legends concerning the wood of the Cross.³ The history and significance of the apocryphon *De gallo redivivo* and its analogues have been examined in recent articles by Rémi Gounelle, Pierluigi Piovanelli, and Ilona Nagy.⁴ With the benefit of this research, some of it quite recent, it is possible to give a clearer account of the relationship between this Judas legend and the texts with which it is most

² Zbigniew S. Izydorczyk, *Manuscripts of the Evangelium Nicodemi: A Census* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1993) and “The Unfamiliar *Evangelium Nichodemi*,” *Manuscripta* 33.3 (1989), 169-91; also, Izydorczyk, ed., *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus: Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe* (Tempe, AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997).

³ Esther C. Quinn and Micheline Dufau, *The Penitence of Adam. A Study of the Andrius MS*, (Romance Monographs, Inc.: University, Mississippi 1980); also, Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1962); Andrew Robert Miller, *German and Dutch Versions of the Legend of the Wood of the Cross Before Christ: A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue* (2 vols., D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1992); Bob Miller, “Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen der Kreuzholzlegende ‘Post peccatum Adae’,” in *Metamorphosen der Bibel: Beiträge zur Tagung “Wirkungsgeschichte der Bibel im deutschsprachigen Mittelalter” vom 4. bis 6. September 2000 in der Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars Trier (Taschenbuch)*, ed. Ralf Plate and Andrea Rapp (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004): 289-342.

⁴ Rémi Gounelle, “À propos des volailles cuites qui ont chanté lors de la passion du Christ,” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 33 (2003): 19-63; Pierluigi Piovanelli, “Exploring the Ethiopic Book of the Cock: An Apocryphal Passion Gospel from Late Antiquity,” *Harvard Theological Review* 96:4 (2003): 427-454; “Pre- and Post-Canonical Passion Stories,” *Apocrypha* 14 (2003): 99-128; “The Book of the Cock and the Rediscovery of Ancient Jewish Christian Traditions in Fifth Century Palestine,” in: *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*, ed. I. Henderson and G. S. Oegema (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006): 318-332.; Ilona Nagy, “The Roasted Cock Crows: Apocryphal Writings (Acts of Peter, the Ethiopic Book of the Cock, Coptic Fragments, the Gospel of Nicodemus) and Folklore Texts” *Folklore (Tartu)* 36 (2007): 7-40; and in a slightly longer form “Neuentdeckte Apokryphen und die Folklore. Der gebratene Hahn kräht,” *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica* 52.2 (2007): 287-327.

frequently associated in the Latin manuscripts, particularly the Cross Legends and *Gospel of Nicodemus*.

This reexamination of the Latin texts and vernacular versions also affords an opportunity to scholarly accounts of the origin and spread of the motif of “le coq cuit qui chante.” In particular, this research suggests the need to modify Gounelle’s conclusion that the tradition *De gallo redivivo* was from its inception closely linked to the Oedipodean Judas vita (*De ortu Judae*), and contributes to a revised understanding of how the two are connected in the medieval Anglo-Irish milieu. A survey of the Latin manuscript tradition suggests that the story of Judas and the rooster circulated, independent of the Oedipodean Judas vita, among the loose collections of texts associated with a growing interest in relics of the cross and the cult of Joseph of Arimathea in Anglo-Norman Britain (Nagy 32 n.1).⁵ As part of a group of apocrypha organized around the cross legends, *De gallo redivivo* entered the vernacular languages in part or in full, as shown by such texts as the Old French Andrius compilation and *La Bible anonyme*, the Middle English *CursorMundi*, the Middle Irish *Leabhar Breac*, and others, such as the German, Dutch, and Czech texts identified by Bob Miller and Martin Bažil, and the Old English version proposed by Napier.⁶ Several of these traditions also entered the

⁵ Miller makes the same suggestion, and lists several Latin manuscripts that preserve the shortened versions of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* which begin with Chapter 11, the section on Joseph of Arimathea (“MS Douce 79 and MS Bodley 556: An Anglo-Norman Manuscript and a Latin Source of the Old French ‘Andrius Compilation’ (Andrius Manuscript or Penitence of Adam),” [forthcoming] 8-9, note 35).

⁶ Miller *Thesis*, “Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen;” and unpublished research (shared via private communication); Jiří Polívka, *Drobné příspěvky literárně-historické* (Nákledem Spisovatelovým, Prague, 1891), 64-115; Arthur S. Napier, *History of the Holy Rood-tree: a twelfth century version of the Cross-legend*. EETS 103 (London: Trübner, 1894).

vernacular drama (notably the *Passion de Semur*), but such texts are beyond the scope of the present study.⁷

Inasmuch as considering such a text in isolation is nearly impossible, this chapter will employ two methods of inquiry. The story of Judas and the cock must be understood both in the context of those compilations of biblical legends and apocryphal texts in which it circulated and also as a component in the matter of Judas. An examination of the specific settings in which the text was produced, copied, and transmitted is one objective of my study. This requires not only analysis of the form that the apocryphon takes in a particular recension or translation, but also attention to the other texts with which it is grouped in manuscripts, and, to the extent it is possible, examination of the cultural context in which such texts are preserved at all: that is, the social, historical, and religious factors that influenced the creation and transmission of the apocryphon. The present study emphasizes the interpretation of specific texts, rejecting the attempt to find a single meaning for an entire apocryphal tradition.⁸

As a complement to these investigations, it will be useful to resort periodically to a wider view of the matter of Judas and medieval apocrypha in an effort to see where a particular piece fits into the whole. This apocryphon overlaps the canonical gospels during the latter part of Judas Iscariot's career as one of the Twelve, and, as with much of the matter of Judas, it involves the end of the Gospel narrative: the Conspiracy, the Last

⁷ See: Emile Roy, *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle* (Dijon and Paris, 1904), 124; and Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 542.

⁸ Nagy suggests that the variations in "literary representations" and "oral folk traditions" may "in fortunate cases [occur] in forms representing the characteristics of several peoples and cultures" (7-8).

Supper, the Betrayal, Arrest, Trial, and Passion of Jesus, and the Suicide of Judas. As is typical of the late apocrypha, this Latin tradition is best understood as an attempt on the part of orthodox Christian authors or copyists to better understand these events—chiefly by assigning additional narrative details and a greater degree of character motivation.⁹

De gallo redivivo: Judas, his mother, and the cooked cock that crowed

The following is a detailed summary of Latin text of *De gallo redivivo*, based upon the shortest recension found in the extant Latin manuscripts, but including the discussion of some variants in the two longer versions.¹⁰ In fact, as will be shown below, this recension of the text is an abridgement, and poorly represented in the manuscript tradition. A transcription and a translation of the text from Cambridge, Jesus College Q. B. 25 (James 41) are included as Appendices F and G to this dissertation.

After the betrayal and arrest of Jesus, Judas visits his mother at her home, shows her the thirty silver coins, and tells her how he has earned them. Judas's mother responds with tears and insults, asking why he has betrayed a good and holy man, regretting her own life and the wicked birth of her son; she then tells Judas that the imprecations of the psalmist have been written about him, including: “may his children be orphans and his wife be a widow” (Ps. 108.9).¹¹ The mother identifies Jesus as the only begotten son of

⁹ At least one analogue of this tradition may have had a heterodox theological agenda: see the discussion of Pierluigi Piovanelli's article below (159 ff.). For a general discussion of New Testament apocrypha in the Middle Ages, see above ch. 1, p 19 ff. and Nagy 15.

¹⁰ This short version begins “Postquam Judas tradidit...” and will be reference hereafter as PJT. See below for details on the other recensions of *De gallo redivivo* (p. 172 ff. and Appendix E).

¹¹ The connection between Judas and this imprecatory psalm goes back at least as far as the Evangelist Luke, who has Peter quote Ps. 108:8 and Ps. 68:25 in his account of the death of Judas (Acts 1:20). The line of interpretation is furthered in the commentaries upon this psalm by

God, and predicts his resurrection, along with the harm that will come to their people. Enraged by his mother's reaction, Judas makes an oath in response, swearing that Jesus is no more likely to arise from the dead than is the boiled cock to rise from the cooking pot before them. No sooner has Judas uttered this oath than the cock rises alive from the pot and flies to the roof of the house to crow as if it were proclaiming the resurrection of Christ. According to the purported Greek source, this is the same cock that later crows thrice at Peter's denials of Jesus. Judas, meanwhile, forced by the miracle to admit the gravity of his error, goes from the house to the where Jesus is condemned to death; he then throws down the money in the Temple and finally hangs himself, perishing between heaven and earth.¹²

While this pericope is linked at several points with the Gospel narrative (the betrayal, the payment and return of the blood-money, and the suicide of Judas), it is not a mere Gospel harmony, but rather a complete apocryphal episode, and apparently one of relatively late origin.¹³ As a supplement to the canonical Gospels, this apocryphon shows Judas passing rapidly from triumph at his cleverness, to outward (if imperfect)

Augustine, Jerome, and Pseudo-Jerome, and the latter is repeated and further disseminated by Peter Comestor in his *Historia Scholastica*. For a longer discussion see ch. 1, p. 11 ff.

¹² Jacobus of Voragine uses similar language to describe the suicide of Judas, but he also provides an explanation as to the significance of the statement: "In aere etiam interiit ut qui angelos in celo et homines in terra offenderat ab angelorum et hominum regione separaretur et in aere cum demonibus sociaretur" (LA 45.62); "Moreover, Judas perished in the air, so that the one who had offended the angels in heaven and men on earth was kept out of the regions belonging to angels and to men, and was left in the air in the company of demons." (Ryan 169). Like Jacobus, our author has probably taken this idea from Petrus Comestor: "Congruum enim erat, ut separaretur ab angelorum et hominum regione, qui offensus fuerat utrisque. Et ita modus, et locus poenae congruit culpae" (*Historia Scholastica*, Hist. Acta. Apost. 9; p. 229 in 1542 ed. [Google Books]). Ultimately this image is drawn from 2 Kings 18:9, describing the death of Absalom, who also: "suspenso inter caelum et terram" (Vulgate); "hung between the heaven and the earth" (DRV).

¹³ Some defining characteristics of medieval (late) apocrypha are discussed above, ch. 1, p.19 ff.

repentance, then finally to despair and suicide. In this sense, the apocryphon *De gallo redivivo* utilizes the dialogue between Judas and his mother to externalize a process that a reader of the Gospels might otherwise conclude to be one of internal deliberation.

Moreover, an anecdote that features, as its climax, the miraculous revival of a “semi-coctus gallus” makes for rather good reading as well. The position of Judas’ mother, while clearly sympathetic in this tale, is not entirely unproblematic. She is apparently privy to some knowledge about the divine salvation plan and the coming resurrection of Jesus in a way that no one else is—including the disciples. The failure of the Twelve to understand the true nature and mission of Jesus is a theme developed in the Gospel of Mark (and is also discernable in Luke), and in this context the identification of Judas as one of the Twelve is an instance of guilt by association. In Matthew’s version, however, Judas is used here as a contrast to Peter, a character who fails but who ultimately redeems himself.¹⁴ These features of the sacred texts are the legacy of the conflict between the Jerusalem Church of the original disciples and Paul’s gentile Church, which also helped to shape the matter of Judas.

Here also arises the thematic element of divine vengeance upon the Jewish people for their failure to recognize Jesus as Messiah and Christ, as well as their attempts to suppress the early Church. This insight on the part of Judas’ mother, which Judas himself challenges in his blasphemous speech, is not explained at all in the apocryphon,

¹⁴ Peter is not redeemed at all in Mark, the earliest of the canonical Gospels, which was especially unsympathetic to the Jerusalem Church (i.e., the original Jewish-Christian disciples). Matthew, however, recuperates Peter (Mt 16:17-19) and Luke (e.g., Acts 1:15) follows his lead. This topic has been treated by many scholars, along with the closely related representation (most clear in Mark’s Gospel) of the Twelve as ignorant of the true nature and message of Jesus. See, for instance, Pagels and King 33-36 and Saari 82-86.

despite being confirmed by the miracle. Moreover, the rooster forms a connection between the denials of St. Peter and the betrayal of Judas, making neat contrast in terms of sin and repentance—major thematic elements that run throughout the matter of Judas.¹⁵ Because the betrayal is unredeemed (if not entirely unrepented) at the time of his death, yet remains a (theoretically) forgivable offense, the final despair and suicide of Judas seem to complete the betrayal.¹⁶

The miracle of the resurrected rooster: *De gallo redivivo* and its analogues

Although this Judas legend has not attracted as much critical attention as *De ortu Judae*, the bibliography on the miracle of the cock is still significant. While Paull Franklin Baum, who made several important contributions to the matter of Judas, did not include a separate work devoted to this this legend, he does make mention of it in his 1918 article.¹⁷ Baum's misreading of one text may have inadvertently established a false impression about the entire tradition *De gallo redivivo*. Paul J. G. Lehmann, in his 1929 article on Latin Judas legends, also mentions this tradition only briefly, and he publishes one version.¹⁸ A number of scholars have examined the many related traditions in which Judas does not feature as a character. Several attempts to collect these were made in the

¹⁵ Klassen notes that Peter and Judas are the two disciples about whom the most is written in the New Testament (1). Saari sees this representation of Peter as ideal Jesus-follower and Judas as negative exemplar strongest in Luke-Acts (102 ff.).

¹⁶ The idea that the worst sin of Judas was despairing of God's grace and forgiveness, and that he offended God more by his suicide than by the betrayal has a long history, including Augustine, Jerome, Pseudo-Jerome, and popularized in the latter Middle Ages by Peter Comestor. See above, ch. 1, p. 12 ff.

¹⁷ Baum, "Mediaeval Legend," 514-15, 542, 550; for Baum's other contributions to scholarship on Judas ("Judas Ballad," "Sunday Rest," and "Red Hair"), see the bibliography.

¹⁸ Lehmann, "Judas Iscarioth," 345-46. Also discussed above, ch. 2 p. 37 ff.

nineteenth century, notably by the folklorists Child and Gaidoz.¹⁹ In the twentieth century, the topic continued to attract intermittent attention of scholars such as Kretzenbacher and the Bollandist Gaiffier.²⁰ More recently, important studies have been published by Gounelle, an expert on biblical apocrypha, and Nagy, a folklorist.²¹

For the present study, four representative analogues will be discussed, two Eastern and two Western. Although none of these narratives involves Judas directly, each is particularly relevant to the topic of the origin and transmission of the tradition *De gallo redivivo*, as well as being instructive as examples of different types of apocryphal traditions.

Of the several eastern analogues of this miracle, with and without Judas, that have been treated by experts in apocrypha, two are cogent to the present study.²² The

¹⁹ Francis J. Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 5 vols. (New York: Dover, 1965; o.p. 1882-98).

²⁰ Leopold Kretzenbacher, "Der Hahn auf dem Kirchturm. Sinnzeichen, Biblexegese und Legende," *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 9 (1958): 194–206, "Pilgerfahrt nach Maria Luschari," *Süddeutsches Archiv* 3 (1960): 87–100, "'Verkauft un dreissig Silberlinge.' Apokryphen und Legenden um den Judasverrat," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 57 (1961): 1-57, "Zeugnis der stummen Kreature. Zur Ikonographie eines Mirakels des Nikolaus von Tolentino," *Festschrift für Matthias Zender, Studien zu Volkskultur, Sprache und Landesgeschichte I*, ed. Edith Einnen und Günter Wiegelmann (Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1972): 435-446; Baudoin de Gaiffier, "Un theme hagiographique: Le pendu miraculeusement sauvé," *Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*. Subsidia Hagiographica 43. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1967. 194-226. O.p. *Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art* 13 (1943): 123-48. Gaiffier, "Liberatus a suspendio." *Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*. Subsidia Hagiographica 43. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1967. 227-32. O.p. *Mélanges de linguistique et littérature romanes offerts à Mario Roques*. 1953. 2:93-97.

²¹ Cited above, p. 151, n. 4.

²² For Eastern analogues see: James Keith Elliot, *Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993): 163, 672; Pierluigi Piovanelli, "Exploring the Ethiopic Book of the Cock, An Apocryphal Passion Gospel from Late Antiquity," *Harvard Theological Review* 96 (2003): 427-454; and Enzo Lucchesi, "La 'Vorlage' arabe du *Livre du coq* éthiopien," *Orientalia* 74 (2005): 91-92.

fragmentary Coptic *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle* is a non-canonical gospel that associates the resurrected cock with a meal shared by Jesus and his disciples prior to his arrest, which seems to be the Last Supper. Matthias, who has prepared the meal, tells Jesus that as he slaughtered the rooster, the Jews threatened: “The blood of your master shall be shed like that of this cock” (James, *NTA*, 150; Elliott, *ANT*, 672). The presence of Matthias in this story is especially intriguing, for he is chosen (in Acts 2) to replace the traitor Judas as the twelfth apostle. This premature substitution (if it is one) of Matthias seems to imply the suppression of Judas—a particularly suggestive detail in a text that makes such a broad claim regarding Jewish collective guilt for the death of Jesus. Clearly this tradition arose in a time and place where Judaism was not only poorly understood—as evidenced by the passover meal of chicken—but also reviled in a way that could only have arisen in the environment of the early Gentile Church.

On the other hand, the *Book of the Cock* (*Mashafa dorho*) is an Ethiopic (Ge’ez) passion narrative that contains perhaps the most elaborate (and amusing) version of the miracle of the resurrected cock. The *Book of the Cock*, not as readily classified as apocrypha, has been in continuous use for centuries in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church as part of the liturgy for the Thursday before Easter, and survives in some 30 manuscripts (Piovanelli, “Exploring,” 433-35). In the title episode, Jesus revives the cooked rooster so he can spy on Judas, who has left to betray his master. The miracle takes place during Passover in the home of Simon the Pharisee, whose wife Akrosennā has prepared the meal. Although the earliest manuscripts are 17th century, Pierluigi Piovanelli has recently proposed a fourth-century origin for the text, which is likely to have been translated into Ethiopic from a lost Arabic original (427-28). Basing his conclusion on several textual

parallels, Piovanelli further suggests that the authors of the Ethiopic *Book of the Cock*, the Coptic *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, and the Greek *Gospel of Nicodemus* may have “independently made use of the same ancient collection of passion narratives” (441).

The uses to which these two narratives are put, however, highlight the differences in their origins and rhetorical purposes. Piovanelli notes the extremely unfavorable depiction of pre-conversion Saul in the Ethiopic *Book of the Cock*, an anti-Pauline subtext that suggests an origin in the fifth or sixth century, possibly in a Jewish-Christian milieu in or near to Jerusalem (449-51). Moreover, Piovanelli finds a connection between the cock, which speaks in the Ethopic version, and “the Ziz (Ps 50:11) or *tarnegôl barâ*, the great ‘wild rooster’ of the Jewish legendary traditions” (442). Hence the significance of the miracle, in the original cultural context of this version, is quite complex: “Not only does the bird symbolize Peter’s betrayal and Jesus’ resurrection; it also represents the messianic status of Christ” (443).²³ The sharp contrast between the anti-Pauline *Book of the Cock* and the anti-Judaic *Book of the Resurrection* shows how a single motif can be incorporated into narratives that take opposite sides in a sectarian rivalry.

In the medieval European context, the early English ballad “St. Stephen and Herod” gives an alternate account of Stephen’s martyrdom, which occurs here just after

²³ Henry J. Stauffenberg cites the Gospel passages that establish “the testificatory role of the cock” and points out that Job 38:36 and “pertenint exegetical commentary” upon it is “[o]f even greater consequence for the development of such legends” (*The Southern Version of Cursor Mundi*, vol. 3 [Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1985], 149).

the Nativity, shortly before the Massacre of the Innocents.²⁴ Stephen, a servant of Herod, upon seeing the same star as the magi, forsakes his master. Herod is skeptical about the birth Stephen has proclaimed, but his cooked capon comes back to life in order to confirm the news.²⁵ Herod then orders Stephen to be stoned to death, as indeed he is, under different circumstances and at least thirty years later, according to Luke (Acts 7:56-59). Thomas D. Hill has suggested that this narrative, which directly contradicts the version of events recorded in the New Testament, represents an attempt on the part of the “popular religious culture” of the Middle Ages to account for certain aspects of the protomartyr’s commemoration in the Church calendar.²⁶ The mere fact of Stephen’s feast day falling on December 26th may have implied some connection with the Nativity, of the sort that is made by the ballad. Also, since the Massacre of the Innocents (ordered by Herod) takes place during the infancy of Jesus, their deaths collectively make them candidates for the title of first Christian martyr. By moving the martyrdom of Stephen to a date both before the Massacre of the Innocents and proximate to the Nativity, the “ballad clearly displays the tendency of medieval popular religion to reshape ‘historical’ narrative to conform to the conventions and expectations of traditional or ‘folk’ narrative (Hill 240). This text also demonstrates, particularly by contrast with the eastern analogues

²⁴ The feast of the Holy Innocents is celebrated on December 26. In Acts 6-7, the proto-martyr St. Stephen is a deacon of the early church who is stoned to death by the Jews.

²⁵ See Child (no. 22): 1:233-42; 2:501; 3:502-3; 4:452-52; and 5:212. In addition to the Middle English ballad, Child lists several Scandinavian poems and songs involve Stephen, who is recast as Herod’s stable-boy, perhaps under the influence of some pre-Christian legacy. A second early English ballad published by Child, “The Carnal and the Crane,” also sets the miracle at the time of Jesus’ birth, rather than prior to his resurrection.

²⁶ Thomas D. Hill, “The ballad of St Stephen and Herod’: biblical history and medieval popular religious culture,” *Medium Aevum*, 70.2 (2001): 240-50.

discussed above, the range of concerns addressed by the later apocrypha, as opposed to the aims of traditions that can be traced to the earlier centuries of the Church.

Another western analogue that does not involve Judas but that goes back at least as far as the fourteenth century is a miracle set at the Spanish town of Santo Domingo de la Calzada located along the pilgrimage route to Santiago de Compostela.²⁷ Through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, an innocent young pilgrim who has been falsely accused and unjustly hanged for theft is preserved alive in his gibbet. After the local lord is informed of the miracle, he expresses his incredulity with an oath, which is contradicted by the revival of the cock (and the hen, too, in this version), as a second miracle confirming the first.²⁸ The descendants of the resuscitated fowl remain as an attraction for modern pilgrims, and a confirmation of the oral and written traditions about these birds. In one sense, this cock-and-hen story functions in the same way as collections of miracles associated with a saint's shrine and relics: a very local concern with economic as well as religious implications.

Finally, as Piovanelli's research suggests, interpretations of this apocryphon and

²⁷ *BHL* 4099b. See: Baudoin de Gaiffier, "Un theme hagiographique: Le pendu miraculeusement sauvé," *Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*, Subsidia Hagiographica 43 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1967), 194-226, o.p. *Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art* 13 (1943): 123-48 and "Liberatus a suspendio," *Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*, Subsidia Hagiographica 43 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1967), 227-32, o.p. *Mélanges de linguistique et littérature romanes offerts á Mario Roques* (1953), 2:93-97; and L. Kretzenbacher, "Der Hahn auf dem Kirchturm. Sinnzeichen, Bibelexegese und legende," *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für volkskunde* 9 (1958): 194-206 and "Pilgerfahrt nach Maria Luschari," *Südostdeutsches Archiv* 3 (1960): 87-100.

²⁸ At the risk of multiplying analogies, similar tales are found in such apparently unrelated texts as the Arabic collection known as the *Thousand and One Nights* and the Old French romance of *Ogier of Denmark*. See: Pires de Lima, Fernando de Castro, *A Lenda do Senhor do Galo de Barcelos e O Milagro do Enforcado*, (Lisbon: Fundação Nacional para a Alegria no Trabalho, Gabinete de Etnología, 1965); Patricia Quaipe, *Bibliography of the miracle of the cock and the hen* (unpublished, 1998); Henry Thomas, *Monstruo y Milagro* (Oxford, 1946).

its analogues may be informed by investigation of the folkloric connections and religious symbolism of the rooster or cock—this holds as true for European texts as it does for Middle Eastern. Although she mentions the tradition *De gallo redivivo* only in passing, Lorraine Baird-Lange's article on the Middle English lyric "I hav a gentil cok," nevertheless contributes to several possible lines of interpretation. In the context of early Christianity, the cock frequently figures as a reminder or revealer of sin and may also represent the priest, and God or Christ himself (the earliest examples given are from the fourth and fifth centuries).²⁹ Baird-Lange introduces the Latin terminology for the *gallus deus* or *gallus Christi* and *gallus praedicator* (1-2), suggesting that the divine aspect may actually go back to a pagan precursor, the sunbird.

***De gallo redivivo*: Textual history and critical reconstructions**

The following section will consider more closely the history of and critical literature upon the apocryphon of the cock. Although reconstructing the hypothetical origin and transmission of this narrative is an interesting and potentially productive exercise, it is beyond the scope of the present study. The focus here will remain upon the Latin traditions and the vernacular texts derived therefrom. As such, certain general points may be raised and left unresolved in favor of a more detailed discussion of particular texts.

²⁹ Lorraine Y. Baird-Lange, "Symbolic Ambivalence in 'I haue a gentil cok'," *Fifteenth Century Studies* 11 (1985): 1-5. In the poem Baird-Lange discusses, there is an additional level of signification, which artfully exploits the multiple meanings of the Middle English words *cok*, *gret*, *kynde*, and *comyn* (4-5). Gounelle also finds early examples of the cock symbolizing Christ and John the Baptist ("À propos," 58-60).

Review of critical literature and discussion of major theoretical trends

Though there is no critical consensus regarding the exact origin of this narrative, the earliest attested version of the tale of Judas and the resuscitated rooster seems to be a Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, which was published by Tischendorff in 1876.³⁰ Despite the relatively late date of the two extant manuscripts of the 14th century (Nagy 10), this text has been the starting point for most studies of this motif—a situation that may reflect the bias of biblical scholars. In this version, however, the two main roles are reversed from the Latin tradition, and it is the wife of Judas who makes the blasphemous oath. More recently, Rémi Gounelle and Iona Nagy, each seeking to trace the evolution and dispersion of this miracle, have argued that this recension of the EN is not the earliest version.

Rémi Gounelle, whose research plays a central role in current scholarship (particularly this dissertation), considers texts and traditions in several languages, some concerning Judas, others connected to a particular saint, and he draws upon the work of many scholars, including Baum and Lehmann. According to Gounelle, the likely origin is in a particular anecdote in which the miraculous resuscitation of a cooked rooster disproves a blasphemous oath. This *récit* was used by Peter Damien in the eleventh century and was subsequently adapted to the context of the pre-existent Judas legend (“À propos,” 45-46, 49-50, 61-63). This anecdote, in which two speakers quarrel, seemed to fit well into the dynamic established between Judas and his mother in *De ortu Judae*. For Gounelle, the chief significance of the story of Judas and the cock (at least in its Anglo-

³⁰ Constantin Tischendorff, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsig, Hermann Mendelssohn, 1876): liv-lxxvii, 210-432; M. R. James, *NTA* 94-146, and Elliott, *ANT* 164-204.

Irish expression) is the way that it seems to dovetail with the Oedipodean Judas vita.³¹

Approaching the matter as folklore, Iliona Nagy agrees that the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* was not the original source, but concludes that the miracle of the cock is ultimately derived from food-related miracles in the apocryphal Acts of Peter, which include the resuscitation of fish. Nagy argues that “late manuscripts of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* are not the sources but only the records of a tradition popular all over Europe, and the Christian Orient, which spread in writing and supposedly in orality as well” (31). Further, she points out that the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* “has never been translated into any other languages, therefore it is hardly possible that the narrative with the cock miracle, which became connected to Judas, got folklorized from the [two extant] Greek manuscripts, kept in Paris and Venice” (20). Although she overlooks the possibility that these two extant manuscripts may represent a lost tradition that was more widespread, Nagy’s analysis serves as a reminder of the ease with which a particular motif may pass from a text into oral tradition, and then back into another text, with alteration at each stage of transmission.

According to the complex but persuasive account presented by Gounelle, the legend of Judas and the miracle of the cock developed as follows: (1) a passage from Ambrose of Milan asking that the cock who crowed at Peter’s denials of Christ denounce the errors of those who speak blasphemy is probably at the root of (2) an *exemplum* that circulated thoroughly through western Europe from the 11th century, and which was as such easily transferred to fit diverse contexts (e.g., by Peter Damien); next, in the 12th

³¹ For the use of the adjective Oedipodean (as opposed to oedipal), see ch. 2 note 1 on p. 2828.

century or at latest the first half of the 13th, this *exemplum* was used to create (3) a continuation (sequel) to the story of Judas as unwitting parricide and incestuous spouse, which narrates the betrayal of Jesus in a very brief manner; then this tradition, which circulated among the Histories of the Cross, passes thence into the Greek world, and is exploited in (4) the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*; from the beginning of the 13th century, the story of a cooked cock resuscitating is also associated with (5) the massacre of the innocents (e.g., the ballad of St. Stephen), and (6) thanks to the famous fowl of Santo Domingo de la Calzada, it is found in accounts of the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella from the 14th century, whence it passes into the various legendary cycles of (7) St. Dominic and (8) the Blessed Virgin Mary, as well as several late medieval or early modern traditions of shaky provenance and obscure date from (9) Poland, at the latest from the 17th century, (10) the Congo, prior to 1682, (11) Hungary, prior to 1746, (12) Romania, and (13) Ireland (Gounelle 62-63).

The third item on the list, as will be shown below, must be reconsidered in light of the Latin manuscript tradition, which suggests that the miracle of the cock was first associated with Judas Iscariot in the context of the cross legends, and is found alongside the Oedipodean Judas legend only rarely and in later texts. This need not, however, seriously disrupt the lines of transmission sketched out above, aside from rejecting the supposition that the *De gallo redivivus* passed into the cross legends by way of *De ortu Judae*, which is not found among them.³² According to Gounelle's reconstruction, the

³² As to the provenance of the final item of Gounelle's list, the modern Irish legends seem likely to be continuations of late medieval ones, some of which have surely passed from written or oral

origin of the legend was likely in the West, from where it was transmitted eastward to Byzantium, and then south to Egypt. This series seems most plausible, and within this scheme insular, versions would arise from one or more of the Latin versions than from the Byzantine recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*:

[A]u xiie s. ou dans le première moitié du xiiie s. [l'histoire de la volaille qui chante] a été utilisé pour créer une suite à l'histoire de Judas l'incestueux et le parricide, qui narrait en des termes fort concis la manière dont Jésus été livré; cette tradition, qui a circulé dans des Histoires de la Croix, est passée dans le monde grec et a été exploitée dans la recension grecque byzantine de l'Évangile de Nicodème" ("À propos," 62; and cf. longer discussion 50-53).³³

The versions of greatest interest to this chapter are categorized by Gounelle as part of a western tradition arising "prior to 1243 and largely Anglo-Irish," ("Une tradition antérieure à 1243 et majoritairement anglo-irlandaise;" 37), in which, he suggests, the story of Judas and the cock was intended to supplement the seemingly truncated ending of the Oedipodean legend *De ortu Judae*. As will be shown in Chapter 5, however, these conclusions rest in part upon a misunderstanding of the Irish text; evidence from the Latin manuscript tradition given below shows certain other weak points in the argument. By contrast, my own reading of the episode (following Quinn, at least in part) emphasizes the meaning of this apocryphon in the context in which it most often appears, with the ordinary legends concerning the wood of the Cross and the other relics of the

tradition. Gounelle's information about Irish texts is drawn primarily from Baum ("Medieval Judas"), McNamara (*Apocrypha in the Irish Church*), and Seymour ("The Cock and Pot").

³³ "[I]n the 12th century or during the first half of the 13th century, [the story of the fowl that crows] was used to create a sequel to the story of the incestuous and parricidal Judas, which narrates the betrayal of Jesus in a very brief manner; this tradition, which circulated with the *Cross Legends*, passed into the Greek world and was exploited in the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*." On this point Gounelle and Nagy are in at least partial agreement.

crucifixion, and in particular the thirty silver coins.

***De gallo redivivo* and its analogues: preliminary conclusions**

While the most recent and careful critics (Gounelle, Piovanelli, Nagy) are not in complete agreement about the exact origin, dating, or meaning of the apocryphon of Judas and the cock, there is enough common ground to form the basis of a working scholarly consensus on at least a few points. (Twenty-first-century scholars seem to agree, for instance, that the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* is an analogue, rather than a source, of the Latin tradition *De gallo redivivo*.) It should be noted, however, that some of the detailed information about the Latin versions (Izydorczyk, Miller and Bažil), as sketched out in the next section, was either not available to or partially overlooked by those scholars. The ultimate aim of this chapter is not to trace the origins of this entire apocryphal tradition, but rather to account for their transmission within the *narrow* scope of Ireland, Britain, and perhaps France (which Miller describes as the Anglo-Norman area of influence) between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. Within these geographic and chronological parameters, however, it may be possible both to isolate the narrative *De gallo redivivo* from other Judas legends circulating more or less simultaneously, and to associate it with a definite, if not quite stable, group of apocrypha of which it formed a part.

***De gallo redivivo*: The Latin manuscript tradition**

The apocryphon of Judas and the cock is frequently associated in manuscripts with the legends concerning the wood of the Cross prior to the crucifixion, known generally as

Origo crucis, and specifically the *Rood Tree Legend* (RTL) and the *Penitence of Adam* (PPA), which displaced RTL after 1300.³⁴ A second text that circulates with *De gallo redivivo* is the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (Acts of Pilate/Harrowing of Hell) (EN). This Latin version is not to be confused with the Byzantine redaction of the Greek *Gospel of Nicodemus*, which includes a version of the story of Judas and the cock discussed above (p. 164). In several cases, including the Andrius compilation, an acephalous version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (beginning at 11.3) is preceded by *De gallo redivivo*. In this context, the acephalus EN is best understood as another text related to the history of the cross, the cult of Joseph of Arimathea, the Holy Grail, and the matter of Britain. A few other texts associated in manuscripts, which Izydorczyk refers to as satellites of EN, include: the *Vita Adae et Evae* (VAE); the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* (CST), a text on the Veronica legend; *Nero/De Imperioribus* (ed. Miller, forthcoming article); the *Vindicta Salvatoris/Destructionem Hierusalem* (VS/DH); and other texts associated with Pilate, such as the *Epistola Pilati* (EP) and HA/LA legends of Judas and Pilate.

Publication history

To date the Latin texts of this apocryphal tale have mostly remained unpublished. Several have been listed in manuscript catalogues, by various titles, and notably in Izydorczyk's manuscript census of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. The modern bibliography on the tradition *De gallo redivivo* begins with the 1881 article by E. M. Thompson that included a text of the longer version of the legend of Judas and the cock. The Ginsburg

³⁴ The *Penitence of Adam*, also known by Meyer's title *Legende*, is referred to by its incipit *Post peccatum Adae*, abbreviated PPA. Miller finds that "The circulation of RTL appears to have given way entirely to that of PPA during the course of the 13th century" (unpublished research).

(later Ricci) manuscript that Thompson used for his text (see Izydorczyk, #436; p. 209), despite being considered lost for some decades, is currently located in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris (MS nouv. acq. lat. 3072).³⁵ Closer attention to the contents and origins of this manuscript would provide a better understanding of the Continental circulation of the legend of Judas and the cock.

In 1882, Wilhelm Meyer published an important study of the *origo crucis* tradition in the form he called the *Legende*.³⁶ Arthur Napier's work on the *Rood Tree Legend* (RTL) in Anglo-Saxon England came as an interesting supplement to Meyer's findings.³⁷ (See Miller, Darling, and Fallon.) In the appendix to his book, Napier published the Latin Judas legend edited from the three manuscripts he knew: Oxford, Jesus College 4 (sigla J); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 88 (sigla D); and Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 2. 8 (sigla C). Napier was aware of the several vernacular versions (Andrius-type collections), and believed that the Judas legend was an original part of RTL (pages). During the same period, Montague Rhodes James signaled the existence of four manuscripts in three catalogues of College library holdings at Cambridge University: Jesus (Q. B. 25 and Q. D. 4), Magdalene (F 4 15) and St. John's (E 24).³⁸ In the Jesus

³⁵ E. M. Thompson, "Apocryphal Legends," *Journal of British Archaeological Association* 37 (1881): 239-53. I refer to this as the Ginsburg-Ricci manuscript, after the two owners who preceded its acquisition by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, where it is designated Ms. n. a. lat. 3072 (see Appendix H below).

³⁶ Wilhelm Meyer, "Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christus," *Abhandlungen der philosophische-philologischen Classe der königliche bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 16 (1882): 101-66.

³⁷ Arthur S. Napier, *History of the Holy Rood-tree: a twelfth century version of the Cross-legend*. EETS 103 (London: Trübner, 1894). Fallon has recently made a critical addition of MCO based on all ten extant manuscripts (*Cross as Tree*, 231-62).

³⁸ *Jesus Catalogue* 60-63, 70-76; *Magdalene Catalogue* 40-43; *St John's Catalogue* 159-62.

College Catalogue, James included a transcription of the Judas episode from Jesus College Q. D. 4, in many ways the oddest text of its type.

The 1929 article by Lehmann on Latin Judas legends (already discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation) also included a published version of the story of Judas and the cock from the *Omne Bonum* of James le Palmer, a mid-fourteenth-century encyclopedia.³⁹ The entry on “Iudas proditor” contains, among other material, the *De ortu Judae* text probably taken directly from the *Legenda Aurea*.⁴⁰ In a short but important 1940 article, N. R. Ker touches on the story of Judas and the cock, and signals its presence in two additional manuscripts not noted by Napier: Oxford, Bodleian 556 and London, British Library, Harley 4725.⁴¹

One curious and frustrating aspect of this published material is the unfortunate fact that—as seems to happen not infrequently in the study of Judas—scholars working in this field have often seemed unaware of one another’s work.⁴² A notable exception is the ongoing research of Bob Miller.⁴³ Building upon the work of Izydorzcyk and Quinn, Miller’s project of cataloguing the cross legends includes collecting texts of the Judas

³⁹ Paul Lehmann, “Judas Ischarioth in der lateinischen Legendenüberlieferung des Mittelalters,” *Erforschung des Mittelalters; ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1959) 2: 229-85; o. p. *Studi medievali* N.S. 2 (1929): 289-346.

⁴⁰ Although Sandler has discussed probable sources for this entry, including a compilation of canon law texts, an edition including a transcription of the text and an account of its sources remains a desideratum (Sandler, *Omne Bonum*, 1:29, 45, 150 n. 98; 2:225).

⁴¹ Neil R. Ker, “An Eleventh-Century Old English Legend of the Cross Before Christ,” *Medium Aevum* 9 (1940): 84-85. (I owe this reference to Bob Miller.) Ker mistakenly cites this manuscript as Harley 4726.

⁴² For instance Gounelle, whose article is otherwise authoritative, knew of Lehmann and Baum, but was apparently unaware of both Napier and Thompson. De Gaiffier made a similar remark in his article about research on the HA (see above ch. 2, p.43).

⁴³ Miller, *German and Dutch Versions* (145) and “Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen” (294 n. 10).

story, first mentioned in his 1992 Oxford D. Phil. Thesis, which he now numbers at 20.⁴⁴

The recent dissertation by Nicole Fallon is an important addition to the now quite substantial bibliography on the *origo crucis* legends.⁴⁵

***De gallo redivivo*: Latin versions in extant manuscripts**

The research cited above has made it possible to assemble a listing of 22 extant Latin manuscripts containing the text *De gallo redivivo*, which are listed in notes below, and again with more detail in Appendix E. These texts are discussed according to the major variants in the Latin tradition. The manuscripts will be presented in three groups, along with the description of these different recensions. Hereafter, the three recensions will be referred to by the following titles taken from their *incipits*, and by the abbreviations derived therefrom: *Mirabiliter cepit oriri...* (MCO), the most common version; *Narrat quadam historia...* (NQH), the longer, homiletic version; and *Postquam Judas tradidit...* (PJT), the abridged version. For convenience of reference, I have also assigned sigla to the manuscripts, which are listed alphabetically in Appendix E.

“*Mirabiliter cepit oriri...*” (MCO)

There are 14 manuscripts of this recension, which is the most common and probably the oldest.⁴⁶ MCO begins “[M]irabiliter cepit oriri arbor sancta de tribus uirgulis

⁴⁴ Because Miller’s primary interest is in the cross legends, his total number of Latin manuscripts of *De gallo redivivo* includes only MCO and NQH; adding the two mss of PJT makes the present total 22.

⁴⁵ Nicole Fallon, *The Cross as Tree: The Wood-of-the-Cross Legends in Middle English and Latin Text in Medieval England* (Ph. D. diss., U of Toronto, 2009).

⁴⁶ Manuscripts of MCO: Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale, 2772-89 (Van den Gheyn II:1381), ff. 59-69v, 13th c. (BR); Cambridge, Magdalene College, F.4.15 (James 15), ff. 86-91, 13th to 14th c.

composita: prima erat cipressina, atque alia cedrina, et pini speciem habebat tercia...” and ends “...Sique inter celum et terram periit, quia magistrum suum tradidit, immo unigenitum dei filium et saluatorem omnium credentium” (Napier 68-70). The orthography and wording vary slightly from manuscript to manuscript: “Mirabiliter coepit oriri...” or “Mirabiliter igitur coepit oriri...” “Mirabiliter etenim cepit oriri...” “Mirabiliter oriri cepit...;” in Izydorczyk’s census, this text is entitled *De arbore crucis*.

With three of the manuscripts that preserve it dated to the 12th or 13th century, MCO seems to be the earliest form of the legend *De gallo redivivo* found in the Latin manuscripts, and as the most widespread version, it seems also to be the one that found its way into the vernacular translations. The beginning of the text clearly indicates that a transition has been made from an *Origo crucis* narrative to the Judas legend (originally the RTA but later also PPA). The basic form seems to be 30-odd sentences, beginning with a discussion of the three twigs of different types (cypress, cedar, and pine) that grew to form the Rood Tree, which are interpreted as standing for the three persons of the Trinity (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). The twigs remain unchanged (neither growing, nor loosing their leaves) from the time of Moses until David plants them in his garden, where

(**CM**); Cambridge, St. John’s College, E. 24 (James 127), ff. 103-105, 14th c. (**CS**); Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 2 .8 (now with Dd.III.16), f. 6, 14th c. (**CU**); Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 2. IV, ff. 133-139, 12th c. (**HC**); London, British Library, Harley 4725, ff. 206r-v, 14th c. (**LB**₁); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 556 (S. C. 2340), ff. 13-20, 13th c. (**OB**₁), Douce 88 (S. C. 21662), ff. 32v-34, 13th/early 14th c. (**OB**₂), and Rawlinson D 1236 (S. C. 13968), ff. 49-51, 13th c. (**OB**₃); Oxford, Jesus College 4, ff. 96-97, late 12th c. (**OJ**); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1722, ff. 101v-102v (?), 12th-13th c. (**PN**₁), lat. 3338, ff. 162vb-163rb, late 13th-14th c. (**PN**₂), and lat. 6755, 47r-56r, 15th c. (**PN**₃); and Winchester, Cathedral Library 7, f. 97r, 12th-13th c. (**WC**). A late, extended recension of this text (MCO+) ending with a brief and apparently unique version of the *De ortu Judae* legend, is preserved in a single (fifteenth) manuscript: Cambridge, Jesus College, Q. D. 4 (James 46), ff. 134v-136r, 15th c. (**CJ**₂). For a more detailed list, see Appendix E.

they grow for thirty years, seeming to form a single tree, and each year David puts a silver hoop around the trunk. Because the tree is both fragrant and more beautiful than all the cedars of Lebanon, Solomon, when he succeeds David, intends to use it in the construction of his Temple. The tree proves impossible to use in the construction, but it is kept in the Temple, where circles of silver are hung aloft. At this point, with the words “Tunc infelix Judas...” (Napier) or “et quos infelix Judas...” (James), begins the story of Judas, his mother, and the cock, as summarized above (p. 154 ff.).

“*Narrat quadam historia...*” (NQH)

NQH, the longest form of the legend, exists in four known manuscripts.⁴⁷ The text begins, “Narrat quedam ystoria grecorum quia Moyses, famulus Domini...” and ends “...Quod nobis patrare dignetur Iesus Christus, Dominus noster, cui est, cum patre et Spiritu Sancto, honor et Gloria, virtus et magnificentia, per omni secula seculorum. Amen.” (Thompson, “Apocryphal Legends” 241-43).⁴⁸ NQH is constructed as a monastic

⁴⁷ České Budějovice, Jihočeská vědecká knihovna 1 VB 28 (olim Hohenfurt 28), 15th c. (CV₁), and 1 VB 58 (olim Hohenfurt 58), 15th c. (CV₂); Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek 495, ff. 9v-10v, 15th c. (KS); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, n. a. lat. 3072 (olim Ginsburg-Ricci), ff. 33-37, 13th or 14th c. (PN₄); and Schägl, Stiftsbibliothek, 156 (Cpl 145), ff. 388r-389v, 15th c. (1473) (SS).

⁴⁸ The relationship (if any) between the text of *De gallo redivivo* beginning “Narrat quadam hystoria grecorum” (NQH), and the phrase “In quadam vero hystoria Grecorum licet apocrypha” (‘in a certain, indeed admittedly apocrypha, history of the Greeks,’ LA 64.8), with which Jacobus of Voragine uses in *De inventione sancte Crucis*. Given the number of apocryphal narratives attributed to Greek sources, this may be a mere coincidence of wording. Maggioni gives Gervais of Tilbury as the source for this part of the legend, which admittedly seems like PPA material, involving the *Origo crucis* legend. See Fleith (“Die Legenda Aurea” 178-80 and “Patristic Sources” 236, 261), and Gounelle (“Sense et usage,” 197, 201-203), who speculates that the “apocryphal history of the Greeks” (LA 64.8) might represent a manuscript of the *Historia Apocrypha* (as in LA capp. 45, 51, 63, 84) interpolated to include *origo crucis* material such as the Seth legend. While this is an appealing argument, it does not explain why only this one alone would be identified as Greek. (But all three versions of *De gallo redivivo* do mention a Greek text as the source of the identification of the cock of Judas and that of Peter.)

homily, addressed at the closing to “fratres karissimi” (‘dearest brothers’). NQH includes more material than MCO at the beginning (four sentences concerning the legend of Moses and the rods/rood tree) and ending (six sentences more than MCO, framing the foregoing in terms of God’s greatness, plus a longer closing prayer), as well as a number of differences of wording in the overlapping section.

Since no extant manuscript of NQH contains texts of either the Rood Tree Legend (RTL) or the Penitence of Adam (PPA), the additional introductory material may have functioned as a much abbreviated substitute for the *Origo crucis* legend rather than as a connection with a previous text, as in MCO. The extra material at the end includes yet another psalm quotation (“Omnia quecumque voluit Dominus fecit in celo et in terra, in mari et in abyssis” [Ps. 134:6]), which seems to be addressed at the way Judas dies between heaven and earth (possibly from LA cap. 45 or *Historia Scholastica, In Actus Apost.*, cap. 9), the significance of which is unexplained in MCO.

Of the five manuscripts that have been identified as NQH, at least four of them are relatively late (14th-15th century), and of Austrian or Bohemian origin, comprising what Bob Miller calls the “upper Danube” group of texts. The fifth, PN₄, the former Ginburg/Ricci manuscript, now in Paris, was assigned a northern Italian origin by late nineteenth and early twentieth century antiquarians, but Miller has recently called this into question as well, suggesting that a northern or central European provenance is more likely.⁴⁹ Moreover, the dating is uncertain, since Thompson suggested 14th century (“Apocryphal Legends,” 239), as did the Sotheby catalogue of the Ginsburg sale (52),

⁴⁹ Personal communication (see also Appendix H, p. 291, n. 11).

while Porcher gives 13th c. (“Nouvelles acquisitions,” 239), despite including in his description of the manuscript’s contents at least one text that clearly dates to the 14th c.⁵⁰

In the event that the earlier date is correct, the manuscript might be a ‘missing link’ of the sort that Miller has suggested, whether its provenance is Italian or not.⁵¹

“*Postquam Judas tradidit...*” (PJT)

The abbreviated form of *De gallo redivivo* is found in just two manuscripts, both of 14th c. English provenance, and in both cases this narrative functions as a supplement to other apocryphal information collected on Judas.⁵² PJT begins with the Judas story, corresponding to a point near the middle of MCO: “Postquam Judas tradidit Jhesum Judeis, venit ipse Judas ad matrem suam et retulit ei per ordinem, qualiter et quomodo pro XXX denariis argenteis tradidit Jesum.” Like MCO, PJT ends with a reflection upon the “...sicque inter celum et terram periit, quia magistrum suum, Dei unigenitum, salvatorem omnium credencium, tradidit” (Lehmann 345-46; but cf. the transcription in Appendix F). The *Omne Bonum* (LB₂) is an encyclopedic work arranged alphabetically in which *De ortu Judae* and *De gallo redivivo* are included in the entry on Judas, along with material from a canon law compilation (see below, p. 185, n. 69). In CJ₁, the entire episode is an afterthought, added in a later hand, and bears no obvious relationship to the surrounding texts. Perhaps CJ₁, written in a fifteenth-century hand, was copied from an earlier

⁵⁰ “Littera Roberti regis ad Neapolitanos, 30 mart. 1327;” Jean Porcher, “Nouvelles acquisitions latines et françaises du Département des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale pendant les années 1941-1945,” *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes* 106.2 (1946): 225-281, at 238.

⁵¹ See Appendix H for a fuller account of this hypothesis.

⁵² Cambridge, Jesus College, Q. B. 25 (James 41), f. 109r-v, 15th c. addition to older ms. (CJ₁); and London, British Library, Royal 6 E VII (*Omne Bonum*, vol. 2), f. 340v, ca. 1330-50 (LB₂).

manuscript that had served as the source for the mid-fourteenth-century LB₂, or was even copied from LB₂ itself. It is also conceivable that the two identical abridgements of MCO were created independently, but this possibility seems quite remote. With only two witnesses, it is difficult to decide with much certainty.

Whereas in NQH, and to some extent MCO, an attempt is made to summarize or make a connection to the context of the *Origo crucis* legend, in PJT all material related to the history of the cross has been omitted. Nor does PJT seem to be connected in any way with the context of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, or associated with it in either manuscript. This decontextualizing (or, if you prefer, these two recontextualizations) of the apocryphon changes the significance of certain items: for instance, the 30 pieces of silver, identified in other versions as made from the silver hoops placed around the trunk of the rood-tree by David, return to the status of a mere Biblical detail, rather than relating directly to the history of the wood of the cross.⁵³ In this new context, the story of Judas, his mother, and the cock does give an impression of confluence with the Oedipodean legend, with which it is closely associated in both manuscripts.

***De gallo redivivo*: three versions compared**

A section of one speech will illustrate some of the differences among the three recensions of the Latin *De gallo redivivo*. In MCO, during the conversation between Judas and his mother that leads up to the miracle, the mother of Judas quotes Psalm 108.9 as part of her rebuke:

⁵³ In some manuscripts, which include VS or DH, the 30 silver denarii are recalled in an inverted ratio: the price for which the Jews were sold into slavery was 30 for one *denarius*.

“...Nunc ergo absque dubitatione omnes maledicciones implebuntur in te <que> per prophetam ita sunt scripte ‘ffiant filii eius orphani et uxor eius uidua,’ et cetera que secuntur in illo psalmo...” (James, CJ₂)

“...So now without doubt every curse is fulfilled in you that was written by the prophet: ‘May his children be orphans and his wife a widow,’ and the rest that follows in that psalm...”

The wording of the Vulgate differs in a few particulars, but again the imprecation is clear:

“[S]int filii eius pupilli et uxor eius vidua” (Ps. 108.8-9, Vulgate)

“May his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow” (DRV)

Except for the omission of the *et cetera* phrase at the end, the wording of PJT is only slightly different from MCO, and the substance is the same:

“...Nunc absque dubio omnes maledicciones in te implebuntur que per prophetam scripte sunt: ‘filij eius fiant orphani et uxor eius vidua’...” (CJ₁);

“...Now without a doubt, every curse is fulfilled in you, as was written by the prophet: ‘May his children be orphans and his wife a widow’...”

The redactor who wrote NQH substituted different verses to form the quotation, including the verse prior to that quoted in MCO, and one from a different psalm:

“...Nunc ergo, fili amarissime, absque ulla dubitatione omnes ille maledicciones implebuntur in te, que propheta David—ita scriptum est, ‘Fiat habitatio eius deserta, et ne sit qui inhabitatet in ea. Fiant dies eius pauci, et episcopatum eius accipiet alter’ et cetera que secuntur...” (Thompson, “Apocryphal Legends” 243 [PN₄])

“...So now, most bitter son, without any doubt every one of those curses is fulfilled in you, as was written by the prophet: ‘Let his habitation be deserted, and let there be none who might dwell in it. Let his days be short, and let another man take his office [of overseer],’ and all that follows...”

The end of the quotation is from Psalm 108,⁵⁴ while the beginning of the quotation comes from Psalm 68,⁵⁵ another imprecatory psalm associated with Judas, but both come here by way of Acts 1:20, where the two verses are already combined:

scriptum est enim in libro Psalmorum fiat commoratio eius deserta et non sit qui inhabitet in ea et episcopatum eius accipiat alius' (Vulgate)

For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric let another take. (DRV)

This choice may have been influenced by the homiletic nature of the NQH redaction, or simply to make an improvement upon the text.⁵⁶ In any case, this brief comparison suggests that PJT is a straightforward abbreviation of MCO, both in overall length of the text, and also in the wording of each sentence. By contrast, NQH is not merely an expansion upon MCO in terms of the introductory and concluding sentences, but a thorough reworking, and probably one with specific cenobitic audience in mind.

Transmission of semi-stable compilation of apocryphal texts?

Though it may be impossible to accurately reconstruct an original compilation, Miller, Quinn, and Gounelle each hint at the circulation of something approaching a

⁵⁴ Ps. 108:8: "fiant dies eius parvi episcopatum eius accipiat alter." (Ps. 108.8-9, Vulgate); "May his days be few: and his bishopric let another take." (DRV).

⁵⁵ Ps. 68:26: "fiat commoratio eorum deserta in tabernaculis eorum non sit qui habitet" (Vulgate); "Let their habitation be made desolate: and let there be none to dwell in their tabernacles" (DRV).

⁵⁶ There seems to be no immediate connection to the version of 'the election of Matthias' that follows 'Peter's sermon' in the *Historia Scholastica*: "Tunc enim dici debuit in quarto libro Psalmorum: Fiat habitatio eorum deserta, et non sit qui habitet in ea (Psal. CVIII), de suis scilicet, et episcopatum ejus accipiat alter, id est alius, quia de multis discipulis lxxij electus est Matthias, eique substitutus est. Vel ideo dictum est, quia Matthias fuit longe alter ab eo, quia vir sanctus, Judas vero nequam, vel alter duorum, quorum sortes missae sunt" (*Historia libri actorum apostolorum*, cap. 10).

regular group of biblical legends and apocryphal traditions in western Europe during the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries. Nevertheless, the manuscript evidence that Miller draws upon points in the direction of something that could be termed “a relatively stable compilation.”⁵⁷ The manuscripts mentioned above for MCO and NQH (but probably not PJT), plus those listed by Miller (145) (294 and n. 10) and the *Census* of Izydorczyk, give ample evidence for such transmission. A number of manuscripts could also be mentioned that contain texts associated with MCO (or NQH) and its vernacular counterparts, yet lack any version of *De gallo redivivo* (as Napier noticed).⁵⁸

Of the manuscripts so far identified, from the point of view of particular combinations of texts, as will be discussed below, there are some interesting findings, most of which need to be discussed after the exposition of the Andrius type compilation and vernacular texts such as the *Leabhar Breac*. Four mss (CM, LB₁, PN₃, and PN₁) combine the MCO text with the shortened version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (EN 11.3-27), which begins with the story of Joseph of Arimathea. A fifth ms (PN₄) also shares the Andrius type combination of MCO with a fragmentary EN, but has not been sufficiently described to determine whether it is the same acephalous version found in the other mss. Finally, a sixth ms (P₂) contains MCO and two separate EN texts, 1-27 and 12.1-27.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Bob Miller, “MS Douce 79 and MS Bodley 556: An Anglo-Norman Manuscript and a Latin Source of the Old French ‘Andrius Compilation’ (Andrius Manuscript or Penitence of Adam),” forthcoming.

⁵⁸ These would include: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax 17 (S.C. 3987), late 12th c., ff. 54 and 59-64; and London, British Library, Harley 3185, early 14th c., ff. 47r-68v. (I am grateful to Bob Miller and Martin Bazil, who have shared their unpublished research on these manuscripts).

⁵⁹ The Middle Irish *Leabhar Breac* also contains two translations of the EN, one complete and one incomplete (which Hughes designates LB1 and LB2).

This particular pattern suggests that the Gospel of Nicodemus, in the form preserved with MCO, forms a part of a complex of cross legends, of which the PPA and RTL are the beginning, rather than a complete and freestanding apocryphal gospel.

In her discussion of an Old French version of *De gallo redivivo* found in the Andrius manuscript, Esther Quinn seeks to understand the tale of the cock as part of the three-part compilation that includes: (1) the *Penitence of Adam* (PPA); (2) the *Rood-Tree Legend* (RTL); and (3) the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (EN). According to Quinn, the “Judas episode, which through the thirty pieces of silver serves as a link to the rood-tree legend, is also a kind of anecdotal prefiguration of the third main part, which deals with the resurrection” (*Penitence of Adam* 17). The miracle central to this apocryphon also contributes to that transition, as the dead, plucked, and partially-cooked fowl is brought back to life, fully feathered, capable of both flight and song, and becomes a portent of the approaching resurrection of Jesus. The *Gospel of Nicodemus* (in a somewhat acephalous form that begins with the third sentence [verse] of chapter 11) follows immediately after the death of Judas in the Andrius compilation, as well as in a number of the Latin manuscripts and some vernacular versions.⁶⁰ Bob Miller, in a forthcoming article, identifies a handful of manuscripts, both Latin and French (or Anglo-Norman) that combine these texts.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Not all of the Latin and vernacular manuscripts that combine the *De gallo redivivo* narrative with the *Gospel of Nicodemus* also contain the *Origo crucis* (RTL or the later form PPA). The *Leabhar Breac*, however, does feature the pattern *Origo crucis-De gallo redivivo-Evangelium Nicodemi*, followed by other cross legends (see below ch. 5, p. 199 ff.)

⁶¹ See above, n. 57.

***De gallo redivivo* and *De ortu Judae*: A confluence of traditions?**

At this point, having set forth the basics of the Latin textual tradition of *De gallo redivivo*, it is possible to address at least some of the arguments put forth by Gounelle in his article on *le coq cuit qui chante*. In his reconstruction of the origin of the miracle of the cock, Gounelle gives a persuasive account of how an exemplum admonishing against the sin of blasphemy (first attested in Peter Damien, ca. 1067)⁶² could have been turned into an anecdotal narrative, which would thus become available for recasting in almost any setting. The next step in Gounelle's argument relies on the likelihood that the tale of Judas, his wife (and/or mother), and the cock arose somewhat later than the Oedipodean biography, an assumption that seems to be in keeping with current scholarly consensus.⁶³ Given such a chronology, the cock-legend could have been added to the end of the Judas saga in part to complete the rather truncated form that it sometimes takes.

Gounelle dates this tradition to (at latest) 1243, because traces of it are found in the *Bible des Sept États du Monde* of Geoffroi de Paris, a text for which a definite date (*non post quem*) has been established (37).⁶⁴ Aside from the *Passion de Semur* (a French drama of the 15th century) and a couple of Polish examples, Gounelle is only aware of insular (Anglo-Irish) texts, including: the *Cursor Mundi* (dated to the 1300s); Jesus College Ms. Q.D. 4 (CJ₂; 15th century); the *Leabhar Breac* (1411); the poem *Crist Rocrochadh* (late 14th century); and gravesite crucifixes depicting a cock emerging from

⁶² Pierre Damien, *Disputatio super quaestione qua quaeritur si Deus omnipotens est...* (Gounelle, "À propos" p. 46 note 96). Also Migne, *PL* 145.

⁶³ Admittedly not a unanimous consensus—compare Lucchesi and Piovanelli.

⁶⁴ This date is established for manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale fr. 1526 (Gounelle 37).

a cauldron found in Ireland from the end of the 15th to the start of the 19th centuries. From the association between the miracle of the cock and *Inventio crucis* legends in both the *Leabhar Breac* and CJ₂, Gounelle infers wide diffusion and entertains the possibility other witnesses could turn up in that setting (38; quoted below p. 188), concluding that the cultural context of the medieval Christian west provided an environment in which this narrative could arise (37-38). Since the legend of an Oedipodean Judas dates to the 11th century at the latest, it is earlier than the legend of Judas and the cock which arose before 1243, and the confluence of the two almost certainly occurs in the first half of the 12th century (50-53).

Yet by drawing upon sources unknown to Gounelle it is possible to push this dating back at least a half century. As early as 1894, Napier mentioned “the Jesus [College Oxford] MS. of the *Judas story*, written before 1200” (xli).⁶⁵ Izydorczyk, however, dates this manuscript (OJ) to the eleventh and twelfth century, significantly earlier than Gounelle’s mid-thirteenth century date (125-26). More recently, the research of Miller has identified an additional manuscript dated to the twelfth century (HC), plus two more dated to the twelfth or thirteenth (PN₁ and WC), for a total of four manuscripts prior to 1243. With MCO thus first attested no later than 1200, and possibly a century or more earlier, the interval between the purported origins of *De gallo redivivo* and those of *De ortu Judae* is very much reduced.

Acceptance of Gounelle’s conclusions regarding an Anglo-Irish tradition that

⁶⁵ Napier thought that the Judas story (*De gallo redivivo*) was part of the early (perhaps 11th century) form of the *Origo crucis* legend which he called “X,” the common source of his Rood-Tree Legend (RTL) and Meyer’s *Legende* (PPA) (xiii-xiv; xlv-xlv). See also Darling (25).

combines these two Judas apocrypha seems to rest upon three basic points: (1) shared thematic elements, particularly in the character of Judas's mother; (2) evidence of Latin manuscripts in which the two legends circulate together; and (3) a particular reading of the Judas/*De gallo redivivo* story in the *Leabhar Breac* and other Irish witnesses.⁶⁶ The first point is certainly appealing, as it proceeds from the general idea that the two legends somehow belong together; as this is a rather subjective criterion, it is hardest to reject. Yet according to the scenario suggested by Gounelle, in which an anecdote from Peter Damien is reworked as a dialogue between Judas and his mother, the creation of *De gallo redivivo* does not depend explicitly upon a close rapport with the Oedipodean Judas vita. The second point is discussed at some length below in light of research on the Latin manuscripts. The third point, though somewhat doubtful, receives careful consideration in Chapter 5. The final answer may be specific to a particular manuscript or group of texts, rather than any single reading that unites the entire Latin tradition. The three Anglo-Latin manuscripts discussed below provide the clearest, if limited, evidence to support the theory of confluence.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Gounelle offers a compelling suggestion as to how such a joint tradition might have come to be, and his presentation differs somewhat from my digest of it above: (1) The Latin legend of Judas and the cock and Judas and his mother circulate jointly; (2) The Latin legend of Judas and the cock is a discourse between two characters—as is the exemplum of Peter Damien—thus the exemplum furnished an appropriate dialogue to complete a scene between the pious mother of Judas and her evil son; (3) The choice of animals for the récit is purely a function of the exemplum from which it borrows; links to Peter's denial, etc. are just intended to mitigate the incongruity, as in the meal of chicken at a Passover meal ("À propos," 51-52). Further attention to the evidence, particularly that of the manuscripts, indicates that the actual situation was probably somewhat different

⁶⁷ A fourth manuscript (Cambridge, Trinity College O.9.38) preserves LA-type Judas and Pilate legends with PPA, but does not include *De gallo redivivo* (see A. G. Rigg, *A Glastonbury Miscellany of the Fifteenth Century* [London; Oxford UP, 1968] 95-99).

***Omne Bonum* (LB₂)**

In the *Omne Bonum* (LB₂),⁶⁸ a thirteenth-century encyclopedia, the apocryphon of the cock appears after the *Legenda Aurea* version of the Judas saga, yet while both legends are attested in chronological order, Gounelle himself concedes that the treatment of Judas's mother is less favorable, which would seem to indicate that the cock episode has not been fully integrated.⁶⁹

Cambridge, University Library Ff.2.8 (with Dd. 3.16 and Oo.7.48) (CU)

Although CU is not mentioned by Gounelle,⁷⁰ it is another 14th c. Latin manuscript of English origin that preserves *De gallo redivivo* together with *De ortu Judae* (in the section of the ms. that was, prior to the three parts being rejoined, Oo.7.48). This manuscript, however, is not an encyclopedia, but rather a miscellany, in which the two Judas legends are separated by dozens of folia. As in several other Latin compilations of cross legends, MCO comes between the *Penitance of Adam* (PPA) and the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (EN); after another 20 ff. comes a group that includes texts on Judas, Pilate, and the destruction of Jerusalem, all presumably derived from the *Legenda Aurea* (capp. 45, 51, and 63). Ker (334-37) has traced the origin of this manuscript to the

⁶⁸ LB₂ = London, British Library, Royal 6 E VII (the second volume of the encyclopedic *Omne Bonum* of James le Palmer), fol. 340v [PJT] (14th century). Lehmann published the Latin text of the Judas episode from LB₂ (345-46); a French translation is given by Gounelle (36). The *Omne Bonum* as a whole remains unpublished, but see Lucy F. Sandler, *Omne Bonum: A Fourteenth – Century Encyclopedia of Universal Knowledge*, 2 vols. (London: Harvey Miller Pub, 1996).

⁶⁹ Upon brief inspection of microfilm images from this section of the *Omne Bonum*, however, it seems that the entry on Judas consists of three parts: the first is homiletic—taken from a canon law anthology, according to Sandler (2:225); the second is copied from cap. 45 of the *Legenda Aurea*; and the third is PJT. Also, see above, p. 176 ff.

⁷⁰ It is, however, listed by Napier and Izydorczyk (see below, Appendix E).

Benedictine monastery of Bury St. Edmunds, where two other manuscripts containing *De ortu Judae* also seem to have originated: C₁ (13th c.) and C₂ (14th c.), the latter a copy of the first.⁷¹ The coincidence in this collection seems to be that two sets of apocryphal legends are preserved in one miscellany, and hence no confluence of the two Judas traditions in the Anglo-Latin context may be inferred from this manuscript.

Jesus College Q.D.4 (CJ₂)

In the 15th c. manuscript CJ₂, a radically condensed form of the Oedipodean life of Judas is appended to the story of the resuscitated rooster. The order of the texts, which does not follow a normal biographical chronology, would seem to weaken the case for a well-integrated combination of the two legends circulating together (Gounelle 52 n.123). Rather than *De gallo redivivo* completing the *De ortu Judae* narrative, as Gounelle suggests is the case, the Oedipodean Judas legend is used as a supplement to the tale of Judas, his mother, and the resurrected cock. The seemingly unique ending of this MCO text refers to (an unfamiliar version of) the *de ortu Judae* tradition:

Hoc autem signo infelix Iudas territus abiit ad locum ubi passus est Christus: uidensque illum esse dampnatum proiecit in templo argenteos unde prius fuerunt abstracti fuerunt a Iudeis et abiens laqueo se suspendit. Sicut pater suus antequam ipsum procreauit diuinavit. Erat enim pater eius astrologus qui eadem nocte in qua genitus fuerat Iudas respexit planetas et uidit et ita intimavit uxori sue quod si quis eadem hora noctis generaret filium quod ille filius patrem proprium occideret et dominum suum detraheret et se ultimo laqueo suspenderet. Quod factum est sicut prophetauit. Nam statim pater predicti infelicis Iude accessit ad uxorem suam nec se potuit abstinere et filium iniquitatis procreauit. Qui patrem proprium submersit dominum suum fefellit laqueo se suspendit et sic patet eius origo et eius ffinis. (fol. 136r; James, *Jesus Catalogue*, 75-76)

⁷¹ Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College Ms. 225, 13th c. (C₁), and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Ms. 66A, 14th c. (C₂) are discussed above in ch. 2, p. 66 ff., and below in Appendix A.

At this sign, miserable Judas, terrified, went off to the place where Christ suffered, and seeing him condemned [to death] threw the silver pieces down in the Temple, where he had received them from the Jews. And going from there, hung himself with a noose. Even thus had his father foretold before he begot him. His father was indeed an astrologer, who, on the night upon which Judas was begotten, gazed at the planets and saw (and hinted as much to his wife) that whoever would beget a son at that hour of the night, that this son would kill his own father, and would betray his lord, and finally hang himself with a noose. This was done, just as it had been prophesied. For the father of the aforementioned miserable Judas at once went in unto his wife; he was unable to restrain himself, and he begot a wicked son. And he, having drowned his own father, and having deceived his lord, hanged himself with a noose, and thus suffered his origin and his death [*ffinis=finis vitae*].

This particular epitome of the tradition *De ortu Judae* seems to represent a different or perhaps an earlier version than the one discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Baum calls it “A peculiar and doubtless wilful perversion of the legend” (“Mediaeval Legend,” 514), which he classifies as miscellaneous, but to which he does not assign a siglum. It remains for further research on the extant Latin copies of MCO to determine whether any other texts share the oddities of CJ₂.

Through the textual history of both Judas legends—*De ortu Judae* and *De gallo redivivo*—there is a marked tendency to emphasize the role of his mother, who becomes an increasingly sympathetic character. This tendency to depict Judas’s mother as a sort of romance heroine—perhaps by attraction to the abandonment and incest motifs—has been remarked upon by a number of critics, and forms part of Gounelle’s argument for understanding *De gallo redivivo* as a legend that completes *De ortu Judae*. While the two legends undeniably intersect in some manuscripts, the particular type of the Oedipodean legend presented here cannot be considered part of the by then dominant strain, which begins with a prophetic dream by Cyborea on the night that she conceives Judas. In the earliest attested versions of the legend, Baum’s Type A (“Mediaeval Legend,” 489-92),

the prophecy is delivered to (and spoken by) the father of Judas rather than his mother. These earlier versions, in which Ruben receives the prophecy, are more in line with the Oedipus myth, and emphasize the parricide as much as the incest.⁷² Although the general contours of *De ortu Judae* are discernible in the CJ₂/MCO+ text, there is no explicit mention of incestuous relations between Judas and his mother. At this point it is difficult to determine whether this omission is due to intentional redaction (as Baum suggests), or a confused, possibly oral transmission of the legend, or derives from some independent version of the tradition that is not attested elsewhere. In any case, this preliminary examination of the text (which has been available for more than a century in the catalogue description published by James) reveals that there is not much here to support Gounelle's contention of two jointly circulating apocryphal Judas traditions.

***De gallo redivivo* and *De ortu Judae*: Conclusions**

As the foregoing analysis demonstrates, Gounelle's assertion of a "confluence of traditions" ("À propos," 50-53) must be rejected, at least as far as the Anglo-Latin witnesses are concerned. Nevertheless, his hypothetical history of *De gallo redivivo* and its analogues is otherwise largely persuasive and suffers little from this alteration. As a careful scholar, however, Gounelle does qualify his analysis of the data available to him when he prepared this article, conceding that more witnesses of this tradition might be found in manuscripts that transmitted the *Origo crucis* legends:

Le récit conservé dans le ms. Cambridge, Jesus College, 46 Q. D. 4 figure

⁷² The astrologer father may be a conflation from another legend, perhaps that of Pilate or Alexander, though the way he is murdered (drowning) does not conform to either. There is another interesting reversal in this brief epitome of the legend, because Judas's father is to blame for his lack of restraint in begetting a child despite receiving the prophecy beforehand.

après l'*Histoire de la Croix*; celui du *Leabhar Breac* apparaît au début d'une série de légendes sur la découverte de la Vraie Croix. Cette coincidence donne une idée des moyens par lesquels cette tradition a pu se diffuser. Il est tout à fait possible que d'autres témoins puissants en être découverts dans les multiples manuscrits transmettant des histoires du bois de la Croix. (Gounelle, "À propos," 38).⁷³

In fact, as is shown above, several such manuscripts have been identified, that are indeed associated not only with the *Origo crucis* legends (RTL or PPA), but also with the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Some, but by no means all, of these manuscripts predate the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century witnesses upon which Gounelle's interpretation seem to rest.

Essentially, this research suggests that the Latin apocryphal tradition *De gallo redivivo* arose in the milieu of the cross legends, especially those concerning the origin of the wood-of-the-cross. There, too, this apocryphon first circulated, and was only later joined, in several independent texts, to *De ortu Judae*. The association of a similar story with the Byzantine Greek recension of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* almost certainly postdates the Latin tradition, and the association of *De gallo redivivo* with a shortened version of the Latin *Gospel of Nicodemus* is a function of the unifying cross narrative.

⁷³ "The narrative preserved in [CJ₂] after the *History of the Cross*; that of the *Leabhar Breac* appears at the beginning of a series of legends upon the discovery of the *True Cross*. This coincidence gives an idea of the means by which this tradition may have been diffused. It is quite possible that other potent witnesses to it are yet to be discovered in the many manuscripts transmitting stories about the wood of the Cross."

5. *De gallo redivivo in the Leabhar Breac and the Irish context*

This chapter extends and in some ways completes the discussion, begun in the previous chapter, concerning the tale of Judas and the cock as it relates to certain other apocryphal texts circulating during the latter part of the Middle Ages (12th-15th centuries). The focus of this research is a Middle Irish prose version of the legend of Judas and the resuscitated rooster, found in the early 15th century compilation *Leabhar Breac* (hereafter *LB*).¹ In this respect it is analogous to Chapter 3, which examined a vernacular version of *De ortu Judae*, but the present chapter is somewhat more modest in scope. This rather specific investigation leads naturally to several other avenues of research, for which only the preliminary results are presented here. These topics include an overview of Irish analogues to the miracle of the cock, a few of which are connected with the resurrection of Jesus, but most of which do not involve Judas. In order to better understand the figure of Judas in Ireland during the latter part of the Middle Ages, this chapter introduces some supplementary evidence from a few other Middle Irish texts, including the poems *Críst ro crochadh* ('Christ was Crucified') and "The Harrowing of Hell" from the book of Fermoy, as well as two more prose selections from the *Leabhar Breac* (a *Passion* based on the Gospel of Matthew and a *Homily on Penitence*). Through an examination of this cluster of apocryphal traditions preserved in the Irish vernacular, it has also been possible

¹ Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 P 16 (Catalogue no. 1230), *An Leabhar Breac* ("The Speckled Book"), also known as The Book of the MacEgans and *Lebhar Mór Dúna Doighre*, early 15th c. (1408-11). Described in: Kathlen Mulchrone and Elizabeth Fitzpatrick, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*, fasc. 27 (Dublin: RIA, 1943), 3379–3404. See also: Máire Herbert, "Medieval Collections of Ecclesiastical and Devotional Materials," in: *Treasures of the Royal Irish Academy*, ed. Bernadette Cunningham and Siobhán Fitzpatrick (Dublin: RAI, 2009), 32-35.

to assert (at least tentatively) that the matter of Judas in medieval Ireland is of a rather different character than previously supposed and that it does not seem to include any trace of the Oedipodean Judas vita. The chapter ends with a proposed direction of further research concerning the influence of the *Legenda Aurea* (and its vernacular descendants) upon religious writing in Ireland during the later Middle Ages and presents some initial findings thereupon.

De gallo redivivo in the Leabhar Breac

Much like the three Latin versions of *De gallo redivivo* discussed in Chapter 4, this Middle Irish text combines the apocryphal motif of a cooked fowl returning to life as a witness to the resurrection of Jesus with the canonical incident of Peter's denials. As noted in the previous chapter (p.183 ff.), Paull Franklin Baum, and on his authority Rémi Gounelle, have asserted that the story of the resurrected rooster in the *Leabhar Breac* contains at least an implicit allusion to *De ortu Judae*. The following analysis should show, however, that the incest motif is not demonstrably present in this Irish text, but is rather a legacy of the problematic translation provided by Baum in his 1916 article, an interpretation that has held sway over subsequent generations of scholarship:

In the *Leabhar Breac* [...] we find implications of the [Oedipodean] Judas legend, although the story is not told explicitly. In a passage 'Of Judas and his mother' beginning on p. 222 of the facsimile edition we read that after Judas related to his mother how he had sold his Master she cried: "Woe to her that is in my wretched and contemptible existence, because that I have borne an incestuous and flagitious offspring such as thyself...." Then follows the story of Judas and the cock. "...So when incestuous sinful Judas saw the boiled cock rise out of the cauldron, thereby he recognized

that Christ would rise from the dead.” (Baum, “Mediaeval Legend” 550)²

While it is impossible to prove that the author of the Irish version was *not* alluding to the Oedipodean Judas legend, the connection made by Baum is hardly certain, and rests upon the translation of a single Middle Irish word.

In the first of the two passages quoted, the mother of Judas lashes out at her son:

“Maírg atá im bethaid tróig dereoilsi,” ol sí, “úair ro-*thuismes* **gein colach** corpthi *amal* tussa. 7 cid” ol sí, “marabadais don duine nóem 7 *fhíréon* dia thidnocul cen chin cen *fha* chaind?” (LB p. 222b; transcribed Darling 51)

“Alas for my wretched, lowly life,” she said, “since I bore such a **wicked offspring** as you. And why,” she said, “did you bring death upon a holy and just man by handing him over without crime [and] without cause?”

The imprecation *gein colach* is properly translated “wicked offspring” rather than “incestuous and flagitious offspring” (Baum 550).

Ó at-*chondairc immorro* **Íudas colach pecdach** in coilech berbtha do-érgi asin cori, do-rat-som aithne fair co néireochad Críst ó marbaib, ros-gab gráin 7 ecla he íarsin 7 do-chuaid ina rith co dú am boí Críst isin croich. 7 ó at-*chondairc-sium* Críst ar ná dámmnad 7 ar na crochad, do-*chuaid* ina rith co tempul Solman 7 do-*chuir* urchar don argut uada is *inmad* asa tucad dó hé ar tús ó na h-Íudadaib asin tempul 7 do-rat féin gasti íarsin ima brágait. (LB p. 223a; transcribed Darling 53)

When the **wicked, sinful Judas** saw the boiled cock rising up from the cauldron and it made him recognize that Christ would arise from the dead, he had horror and fear afterwards and ran to the place where Christ was on the cross. And, when he saw Christ was condemned and crucified, he ran to the temple of Solomon and threw the silver away into the place where the Jews had previously taken it from the temple, and he put a noose around his neck.

Here the description *Íudas co lach pecdach* is properly translated “wicked, sinful Judas”

² In a footnote Baum thanks Professor [Ernst] von Dobschütz for the reference, which was presumably by way of a personal communication (550 n. 46). Baum does not say whether the translation was his own or that of Dobschütz, but either way (as will be demonstrated below) it is at best an overly free rendering and, albeit unintentionally, misleading.

not “incestuous sinful Judas” (Baum 550). In each case the interpretation hinges upon an adjectival phrase and the Oedipodean subtext from the rendering of the word *colach*, of which the basic meaning in Old Irish is ‘wicked, criminal, lewd, sinful’ (*DIL* col. 322), but in Modern Irish is understood to mean “incestuous; sinful, wicked” and further “repugnant, loathsome” (Ó Dónnaill, *Foclóir* 276).³ The language of the *Leabhar Breac*, however, is Middle Irish, which would seem to leave some room for debate, as do the citations of *colach* and the root noun *col*, both in the *DIL* and the article by Loth (149-152). Indeed *col* may be the most usual Irish word for incest, and the early glosses seem to indicate that it was often used to describe a transgression or sin of that sort, but it is equally clear that there are other possible senses of the word.

In the Latin version, which is the probable source for this part of the *LB*, the mother describes Judas with the adjectives [*s*]celeratus and infelix—the latter is repeated later by the narrator. The Latin of MCO (*Mirabiliter cepit oriri...*) is likely to have been the prototype:

““Heu me miseram, que te celeratum genui filium! Quid tibi et iusto illi? Quare, infelix, sanctum et iustum tradere uoluisti?” (Napier 69)

“Alas, woe is me, who gave birth to you, wicked son! What is [wrong] with you and what [did you do to] that just man? Why, wretch, would you want to betray a holy and just man?”

Hoc autem signo territus, infelix Iudas abiit ad locum ubi passus est Christus, uidensque illum dampnatum, proiecit in templo argenteos, unde antea fuerint abstracti a Iudeis, et abiens, laqueo se suspendit. (Napier 70)

³ See: *Dictionary of the Irish Language* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1983; repr. 1990; web: eDIL); Niall Ó Dónnaill, *Foclóir Gaeilge-Bearla/Irish-English Dictionary* (Baile Átha Cliath: Oifig an tSoláthair, 1977); and J. Loth, “Irlandais *col*, *cuil*; gallois *cwl*,” *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 17 (1928): 147-152.

Terrified at this sign, wretched Judas went to the place where Christ suffered and, seeing that man condemned to death, threw the silver pieces into the Temple, whence he had earlier taken them from the Jews, and going from there, hanged himself with a noose.

While the root noun *scelerus* (like the Irish *col*) has the sense of pollution, the Latin word *sceleratus* can mean ‘impious’ and ‘accursed,’ or simply ‘wicked.’ The epithet *infelix* also has a number of meanings, ranging from ‘wretched’ to ‘wicked,’ as in the Latin text MCO.⁴ It seems that either of these Latin terms, therefore, may reasonably be rendered into Irish as *colach*.⁵

Although he was at least aware of the Latin version, Baum (or perhaps his informant) nevertheless translates the word *colach* as “incestuous” (550), giving the more modern and narrow definition, rather than the one Loth calls “le sens ordinaire” (149) of the word—though he does concede that the adjective *colach* often has the sense of “licencieux, qui péche par luxure” (150), that is one who commits a sin such as adultery.

The two modern editor-translators, neither of whom seems to be familiar with Baum’s work or any of the Latin versions of *De gallo redivivo*, agree with the more general reading, rather than the specific one suggested by Baum and repeated by Gounelle. William S. Smith’s translation, based upon the 1870s facsimile edition⁶ of the *Leabhar Breac*, uses an assortment of adjectives to render *colach*:

⁴ See above, p. 179. The French version, attributed to the monk Andrius, uses *malaventurous* to translate *infelix* (Quin, *The Penitence of Adam* 91). In cap. 25 of the *Navigatio sancti Brendani abbatis*, Judas identifies himself using the superlative form: “Ego sum infelicissimus Judas” (Selmer 66). One is tempted to think of Virgil’s *infelix Dido*, although the cultural context is a very different one.

⁵ I have not, as yet, been able to find precise examples to prove this assertion.

⁶ Joseph Ó Longáin (facsimile) and J.J. Gilbert (ed.), *Leabhar Breac, the Speckled Book, otherwise styled Leabhar Mór Dúna Doighre, the Great Book of Dun Doighre* (Dublin, 1876).

“A curse is upon my wretched, woeful life, since I bore such evil, corrupted offspring as you.” (14)

Now, when the guilty, depraved Judas saw the cock rising from the pot, he realized that Christ would rise from the dead. (17)

Gregory J. Darling, whose edition is based upon photostats and the manuscript itself, translates the same passages in an even more literal manner, with similar results:

“Woe it is about a wretched, mean life, for you took a wicked birth in the body.” (130)

“When, however, the criminal, sinful Judas saw the boiled cock that rose from that cauldron and it made him recognize that Christ would rise from the dead. (132)

Moreover, St. John D. Seymour, whose 1921 article was one of Gounelle’s major sources of information on the Irish analogues of the miracle, apparently fails to see the connection made by Baum.⁷ In this article, Seymour offers both translations and paraphrases of Irish texts, including the cock miracle from the *Leabhar Breac*. While he does remark parenthetically that “curious legends are told” about the mother of Judas “in apocryphal and medieval literature,” Seymour makes no assertion that such things are repeated in this text (“The Cock and Pot,” 149).

Hence the oft-repeated assertion of Baum (“Mediaeval Legend,” 550) that the prose version in the *Leabhar Breac* refers to the Oedipodean Judas vita must be rejected on the grounds of a faulty translation and insufficient attention to the probable source. No direct mention of or definite allusion to this story of Judas and his mother (*De ortu Judae*) is made here or elsewhere in the *Leabhar Breac*, and it remains to be discovered

⁷ St. John D. Seymour, “The Cock and Pot,” *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 51 (1921): 147-51.

whether that legend was known anywhere else in medieval Irish literature. In the light of these findings on the Irish version, along with those concerning the Latin tradition discussed in Chapter 4, Rémi Gounelle's account of the development of the miracle of the cock as it relates to Judas Iscariot and his mother must be revised. In particular, the tentative assertion that *De gallo redivivo* was adapted to this context in order to complete the Oedipodean biography of Judas should be dismissed.

The evidence offered by Gounelle to support his claim that the legends converge consists of four specific texts:

Dans le ms. Londres, British Library, Royal E. VII. 7 (sic), l'histoire sur Judas et le coq suite celle sur Judas et sa mère.... Dans le *Leabhar Breac* et la *Passion de Semur*, en particulier, l'incest est rappelé par la mère de Judas lorsqu'elle reproche à son fils d'avoir trahi Jésus pour l'argent; dans le ms. Cambridge, Jesus College, 46 Q. D. 4, le rappel de l'origine incestueuse de Judas suit le récit sur le coq. ("Á propos" 51; 52 n. 123)⁸

Of these examples, the Omne Bonum (LB₂) and Jesus College Ms. 46 (CJ₂) could hardly be said to represent a tradition, but seem instead to be independent compilations, as discussed above (ch. 4, pp.185 ff. and 186 ff.). If the miracle of the cock had been drawn from pre-existing sources and adapted in order to further supplement the Oedipodean Judas legend, then surely additional, earlier Latin manuscripts would attest to such a combined tradition and do so in a more thoroughly integrated way. Instead, it seems that the pre-existing narrative of Judas, his mother, and the miracle of the cock are only

⁸ "In London, British Library, Ms. Royal [6 E. VII], the story of Judas and the cock follows that of Judas and his mother....In the *Leabhar Breac* and the *Passion de Semur*, in particular, the incest is recalled by the mother of Judas when she reproaches her son for having betrayed Jesus for silver; in the ms. Cambridge, Jesus College, 46 Q.D.4, the reminder of Judas's incestuous origin follows the narrative of the cock." The incorrect shelfmark for vol. 2 of James le Palmer's *Omne Bonum*, which Gounelle cites from Lehmann (284), is corrected in this translation.

occasionally associated with the other legend concerning Judas and his mother.

The *Leabhar Breac* version has been dealt with above and dismissed as uncertain if not spurious. If the combination of these two legends about Judas had enjoyed any popularity, some definite traces ought to have also been left in the insular vernacular traditions. The *Passion de Semur* seems to be a genuine combination, though it is late (15th c.), but it is neither Anglo nor Irish.⁹ The poem *Críst rocrochadh* ('Christ was crucified'), preserved in the late 14th century *Book of Uí Maine*, seems to be the only other Middle Irish text that definitely connects Judas with the miracle of the cock.¹⁰ In this poem, along with the descriptions of the physical attributes of Jesus and his disciples, several quatrains toward the end recount the story of Judas, his sister, and the cock. This version, like some of the Eastern analogies and one early English ballad, features the sister of Judas as the kinswoman who acts as cook and interlocutor:

Iudás marntid nár maith ciall,
 'na inad tucad Madian,
 is é rochóid co siair toich
 ocus Críst isin cruaidh-chroich.

Rocuinnig foigde co fhír
 cosin siair iar mbrath ind Rígh,
 co raberbad cailech cain
 d'Iudás colach dia c[h]aithim. (qq. 18-19)

Judas, the traitor, who had not good sense, in his place Matthias was

⁹ M. É. Roy, *Le mystere de la Passion en France du XIVE au XVIe siecle* (Dijon and Paris, 1903-4), p. 124, w. 6116 ff. (quoted and cited by Baum, "Medieval Legend" 542).

¹⁰ One extant text: Dublin, Royal Irish Academy MS D ii 1 (catalogue no. 1225), ff. 73v-74r (132d-133a). An edited text was published along with an English translation by Thomás O Máille (*Ériu* 3 [1907]: 194-99). See also: Martin McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975), 84-87; and my article "Judas, his Sister, and the Miraculous Cock in the Middle Irish Poem *Críst ro crochadh*," in *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 28 (forthcoming, Fall 2010).

brought. It is he who went to his sister while Christ was on the cruel cross.

He asked a boon truly of his sister after having betrayed the King, that she should boil a fair cock for sinful Judas to consume it. (O Máille, 196-97)

The word *colach* is used to describe Judas as ‘sinful’ (19d), i.e., wicked rather than incestuous, and again it most likely represents the Latin *infelix*.¹¹ As with the other Irish witness, an incestuous relationship between Judas and his sister may only be inferred by a reader who is already familiar with the Oedipodean Judas legend. To convincingly identify *Críst rocrochadh* with *De ortu Judae* requires reading the word ‘sister’ (*siair*) with the rather remote sense of ‘kinswoman’ (i.e., mother).¹²

Críst rocrochadh is not unique in featuring the sister of Judas as an important character, even in the west. The Middle English poem *Judas*, a very early ballad (late 13th or early 14th c.,) has attracted a certain amount of critical attention because it presents a seemingly unique version of the conspiracy and betrayal. After Jesus sends Judas to town with 30 silver coins (*platen*) to buy the food for the Last Supper, he is waylaid by his sister, who convinces him to take a nap with his head in her lap. Judas awakens to find that he has been robbed, and, tearing out his hair until his scalp is bleeding, decides that the only way he can hide his mistake is to sell his master for the exact amount he has lost: he will not accept gold when it is offered, but only silver. The scene changes to the Last Supper and the poem ends abruptly after Peter’s assertion that he would never deny

¹¹ The second stanza quoted above (q. 19) features a play on words, only possible in Irish, between *colach* (‘sinful’), with a broad *l*, and *cailech* (‘cock’), with a slender *l*. Although the prose version of *De gallo redivivo* in the *Leabhar Breac* uses the same Irish words, there is no attempt at wordplay in that version.

¹² Such an argument might further claim that the poet used the monosyllabic *siair* (‘sister’) in a metrical position that would not as easily accommodate the bisyllabic *mathair* (‘mother’).

Jesus.¹³ This sister (*soster*) of Judas, whom Peter Dronke (67-69) suggests is actually his lover (*leman*), whether incestuous or otherwise, is clearly antagonistic. She slanders Jesus and steals from Judas, serving to hasten the betrayal, and is closer to the unsympathetic sister of the Greek version, rather than the sister of *Críst rocrochadh* who (like his mother in *De gallo redivivo*) points out the folly of the betrayal to Judas.

Thus there seems to be very little evidence indeed of an insular Latin tradition combining the two legends of Judas, and virtually none to demonstrate the existence of such a tradition in the Irish or English vernacular. As appealing as it may be in the abstract, the idea that the miracle of the cock helps to round out the story of Judas during his discipleship must be treated with scepticism: the “confluence of traditions” did not occur in the creation of *De gallo redivivo* as a sequel to *De ortu Judae*, but only in a few isolated instances, compiled after the fact.

The Irish legend and the Latin sources compared

Of the three Latin recensions of *De gallo redivivo* (discussed in Chapter 4, p. 172 ff.), the Middle Irish text most closely resembles MCO (*Mirabiliter cepit oriri...*), which is apparently the original form of the legend and remains the version best represented in

¹³ Richard Axton, “Interpretations of Judas in Middle English Literature,” in *Religion in the Poetry and Drama of the late Middle Ages in England*, ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge: Brewer, 1990) 179-97; Paull Franklin Baum, “The English Ballad of Judas Iscariot” *PMLA* 31.2 (1916): 181-89; Carleton Brown, ed., *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1932) #25; Francis J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, (1882-98. Repr. Dover, 1965) #23; Peter Dronke, *The Medieval Lyric*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Brewer, 1996) 67-69; Tori Mitsui, “How Was ‘Judas’ Sung?” *Ballads and Boundaries: Narrative Singing in an Intercultural Context: Proceedings of the 23rd International Ballad Conference of the Commission for Folk Poetry (Société Internationale d’Ethnologie et de Folklore)*, ed. James Porter (Los Angeles: U of California P, 1995) 241-50; Donald G. Schueler, “The Middle English Judas: An Interpretation.” *PMLA* 91 (1976): 840-45; and Mary-Ann Stouck, “A Reading of the Middle English Judas,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (1981): 1988-89.

extant manuscripts. Most of the vernacular texts of the *Leabhar Breac* were pre-Norman, having “been originally compiled in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries” (Herbert 33-34).¹⁴ From this dating would follow that a Latin text of *De gallo redivivo* was circulating in Ireland prior to 1200, and possibly long before that date. These dates are consistent with the survey of extant Latin manuscripts of MCO, the earliest of which is 12th c. and of English origin (see above ch. 4 p. 183, and Appendix E below). At this point it is not possible to say exactly where or when MCO originated, but it is attested earliest in an Anglo-Irish milieu.

There are, of course, numerous differences in approach and details that arose at some stage after the Irish text diverged from the Latin. The Irish version, for instance, omits a scriptural quotation that helps to establish the 30 pieces of silver as the price of the betrayal.¹⁵ On the other hand, the *LB* text gives a specific number of years between the building of the Temple and the crucifixion of Christ.¹⁶

¹⁴ Herbert (42 n. 3) cites Frederic Mac Donnacha, “Medieval Irish Homilies,” in: *Biblical Studies: the medieval Irish contribution*, ed. Martin McNamara (Dublin, 1976), 59-71. According to Darling (1-2), Hull has tentatively dated the language of the *LB* cross legends to the 12th c. and Wright has tentatively dated some of the *LB* homilies to the 11th c. In the Irish context, the term ‘pre-Norman’ refers to the period before 1167, as the first Normans reached Ireland a full century after their conquest of England.

¹⁵ “Et xxx^{ta} aureos [for *argenteos*] circulos in templo suspensos uesani acceperunt Iudei et dederunt infelici Iude pro tradicionem domini nostri ut esset ueraciter impletum quod dicitur per prophetam: Apprehenderunt mercedem xxx^{ta} argenteis quos appreciatus (sum) ab eis.” (James *Jesus Catalogue* 75; cf. Napier 69, Thompson 242); “And the senseless Jews took the 30 golden [for *silver*] rings [that had been] hung in the Temple and gave them over to wicked Judas for the handing over of our lord, so that what was said by the prophet might be truly fulfilled: ‘They took 30 pieces of silver as the payment which I was appraised by them’” (cf. Matt. 27:9 and Zach. 11:12). Another instance of golden rings instead of silver is found in a 15th c. Middle English prose version edited by Betty Hill (*Medium Aevum* 34 [1965] 203-222 at 219).

¹⁶ The cross legends section of the *LB* begins with a rather complicated calculation of the number of years from Adam to Jesus, which was intended to give a context to the story of the cross,

The Judas episode in the *Leabhar Breac* is set “after Judas had taken the 30 silver coins and after the Jews had taken Christ, and after his crucifixion.”¹⁷ This temporal reference is more specific than the Latin version, and one that occurs later in the chronology of the passion narrative, which in the Latin comes “after the wretched Judas took 30 silver coins in exchange for selling Our Lord Jesus Christ.”¹⁸ The *LB* version takes place not just after the betrayal, but also after the crucifixion, which is inconsistent with the claim that this same cock later crows at Peter’s denials of Jesus during the night after his arrest. Yet the text is very clear that its sources confirm (Greek and Hebrew) that this very rooster *later* crows thrice at Peter’s denials of Jesus. Interestingly, in the Byzantine Greek version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* that includes the story of Judas and the cock, the temporal reference is also different from the Latin texts, but not as drastically, as the scene of the poultry miracle takes place after Judas has returned the 30 pieces of silver, and, seemingly, after he has already begun to despair (Gounelle, “À propos” 38-39).

De gallo redivivo: Irish analogues

Among the food-related miracles that appear frequently in medieval Irish hagiography are several that involve restoring an animal to life after it is dead, cooked, or even eaten. In Dorothy Anne Bray’s *List of Motifs in the Lives of Early Irish Saints*,

including the legends of its origin and the legend of its discovery by dowager Empress Helena (Darling 191-94 n.2).

¹⁷ “Íar n-gabáil trá in XXX airgenti sin do Íudás, 7 íar n-gabáil Críst dona h-Íudaídib 7 iarna chrochad amal itcúas duib” (LB p222).

¹⁸ “Tunc infelix Judas accepit .xxx. argenteos pro uenditione domini nostri Iesu Christi...” (Napier 69).

under the subcategory of “Animal resurrected after cooking,” five saints are named: Brigit, Columba, Finnian, Mochua, and Monenna (118). A similar miracle is performed by St. Ailbe, who brings back to life “a kid slaughtered at Mamre for the entertainment of three angels” (Seymour, “Notes” 109).¹⁹ As is the case with other forms of thaumaturgy, such miracles demonstrate the power of God, though typically as manifested through a saint. Nagy sees the motif thus:

Reviving roast or boiled animals (fish, cow, calf, etc.), especially many kinds of bird (cock, hen, pigeon, peacock, partridge), appear frequently in legends in order to testify to the truth of a certain statement, or to its falsity. This narrative unit, in which the miracle is usually performed follows a provocative statement (Just as this roasted cock – hen, pigeon – will not revive, this or that thing will not happen), was called “the testimony of the dumb creature” by L. Kretzenbacher (Nagy 19)²⁰

This type of miracle is in no way unique to medieval Irish hagiography, however, as Nagy’s examples from early Christian apocrypha show.

The Irish text of *De gallo redivivo* in the *Leabhar Breac*, the poem *Crist Rocrochadh*, and the supplementary examples of tombstones, crucifixes, and church windows collected by Seymour and Lucas attest that the legend of Judas and the cock was fairly widespread in medieval and post-medieval Ireland.²¹ The Modern Irish song

¹⁹ I have not been able to find an example that is an exact match, i.e., a resuscitated cock.

²⁰ For an overview of animals that do speak, see: Christopher R. Matthews, “Articulate Animals: A Multivalent Motif in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles,” in: *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Harvard Divinity School Studies. Ed. Francois Bovon, Christopher R. Matthews, and Ann Graham Brock (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999), 205-32.

²¹ For analogues including representations of the cock arising from the cauldron in Irish visual art, see: St. John D. Seymour, “The Cock and the Pot,” *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 51 (1921): 147-151; A. T. Lucas, *Penal Crucifixes* (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1958), o.p. *County Louth Archaeological Journal* 13.2 (1954): 145-72; and Anne O’Connor, “‘Mac na hÓighe Slán:’ A Short Study of the ‘Cock and Pot’ in Irish Folk Tradition,” *Sinsear* 2 (1980): 34-42.

published by Hyde, along with those collected by Partridge and Shields, though they do not associate the miracle with Judas, nevertheless add to the accumulation of evidence that the tradition of the revived rooster had passed into oral tradition, and was thus available for reuse in a variety of contexts.²² On the strength of these witnesses, it would seem that the legend *De gallo redivivo* was probably the most important and well-known apocryphal tradition concerning Judas in the medieval Irish context, and certainly in the vernacular.

Judas Apocrypha attested in medieval Ireland

The Judas legends preserved in the Middle Irish vernacular present a figure that in some ways resembles his contemporary British and Continental counterparts yet remains quite distinct from them. In addition to the story of the resuscitated rooster, two other apocryphal traditions concerning the afterlife of Judas are particularly noteworthy. In one of these traditions, the suicide of Judas is motivated by his desire to meet Christ in Hell just prior to the Harrowing, and there to beg or trick his way into salvation. The other is an encounter between St. Brendan and the damned soul of Judas on an island buffeted by waves, where he enjoys a respite from the torments of Hell on Sundays and major feast days. Each of these traditions is concerned with the very end of the Judas story: his

²² Douglas Hyde, ed. and trans., *Abhráin diadha chúige Connacht/ The Religious Songs of Connacht* (London and Dublin, 1915), 2:152-57; 412 (“Adhlacadh Íosa”) and trans., *Legends of Saints and Sinners* (Dublin, 1915; repr. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973), 76-79 (“The Burial of Jesus”). According to Hyde, “[t]he story about the cock is common” (2:153); he also transcribes translates another analogue, a short poem in “Highland Gaelic” (2:412). See also: Angela Partridge and Hugh Shields, “Amhráin bheannaithe as co. na Gaillimhe agus as Tír Chonaill [Religious songs from co. Galway and from Donegal],” *Irish Folk Music Studies* 3 (1981), 18-44; M. R. James, “Notes on the Apocrypha” (*Journal of Theological Studies* 11 [1909-10]: 288-91), 290-91 and “Irish Apocrypha” (*Journal of Theological Studies* 20 [1918-19]: 9-15), 10. Gounelle and Nagy list examples (from outside of Ireland) of textual traditions that gave rise to oral traditions.

suicide, his death, and his afterlife. Each of the three seems to have been more popular in medieval Ireland than elsewhere in Europe, where it was less frequently attested. Thanks in large part to the immense popularity of Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* and its vernacular derivatives, the legend *De ortu Judae* was more widely known in the rest of Europe. As has been shown above, this legend was practically unknown in medieval Ireland—or if it was known, it remains seemingly unattested.

The suicide of Judas and Christ's Harrowing of Hell

There was another apocryphal tradition about Judas known in medieval Ireland, according to which his suicide was an attempt to gain salvation by arriving in Hell just prior to Christ, who delivers the souls trapped there. Being delayed by God, however, the soul of Judas instead ends up as the first one damned after the Harrowing. According to Seymour, this motif may be found “in various places in Irish literature” (Morey 407 n. 31); Dumville, who notes that the story is not only apocryphal, but heretical (303), provides some specific examples.²³ Of particular interest are two texts from the *Leabhar Breac* (a Passion and a Homily) in which Dumville finds evidence of apocryphal traditions:

It is clear that the Irish author or authors of these works credited Judas with a cunning fully commensurate with his rôle as the archvillain of Christian history. Judas's suicide is, for the purposes of these homilies, no act of penitential despair, but a calculated ploy intended to gain for himself eternal salvation. The means is the Harrowing of Hell; Judas

²³ St. John D. Seymour, “Notes on Apocrypha in Ireland,” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 37C (1927), 107-17; quoted in James H. Morey, “Adam and Judas in the Old English ‘Christ and Satan’,” *Studies in Philology* 87.4 (1990), 397-409. David N. Dumville, “Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation,” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73C (1973), 299-338; see especially 301-303.

hastens to kill himself so that his soul will enter Hell whence it will be released at Christ's coming. He is caught out, however; for God delays his soul, the harrowing takes place, Hell is emptied, and Judas has the dubious distinction of being the first soul to be committed to the care of the new régime in Hell. (Dumville 302) ²⁴

Each of the several concepts set forth here by Dumville requires separate attention, because each has its own particular place in the history of New Testament apocrypha. The first claim is that Judas's suicide is a premeditated strategy rather than an act of despair, which is premised upon Judas possessing some foreknowledge of Jesus' resurrection or, at the very least, of the Harrowing. The strategy of Judas also requires that Christ completely empty Hell, rather than saving only the righteous, as according to the unorthodox doctrine of universal salvation (apocatastasis), which Dumville sees as evidence of the survival of early Christian texts in medieval Ireland. Next is the idea that Judas's bid to gain salvation is somehow foiled by God, whose intervention insures that Judas becomes the first soul condemned there after the Harrowing. Dumville presents, in this summary, a complex group of interrelated individual ideas that vary from fairly orthodox to practically heretical.

Yet these beliefs are are not so closely associated as to be inseparable. For instance, the *Leabhar Breac* Passion text that Dumville cites does not specify whether Hell has been completely emptied and it presents a rather addled chronology:

So when Judas had flung down the money in the temple, he went away from them at once, and put a noose round his neck, so that he died of it, as befitted his deserts. It was not immediately on the decease of Jesus that Judas killed himself; but on the day of the Lord's resurrection in every place. Fitting it was for the enemy of the people of heaven and earth to die

²⁴ See Robert Atkinson, *The Passions and the Homilies from the Leabhar Breac* (Dublin, 1887), 131, 221 (texts) and 378, 459 (translations).

between heaven and earth. It was for this reason Judas hanged himself, in order that his soul might go swiftly to hell; for he thought it likely that his soul would be brought out of hell with the Captivity; but Jesus did not allow the soul of Judas to go to hell till he had brought out the Captivity from thence, so that the soul of Judas was the first soul on which hell closed after that. (Atkinson 378)²⁵

The author of this passion has changed the order of events from the usual account, which follows Matthew's Gospel. Postponing his suicide until Easter Sunday prevents Judas from being rescued from Hell by Jesus. Yet the homilist adds that Jesus acted in some way to delay the soul of Judas, presumably by delaying either Judas's death or the transit of his soul.

This tradition presents a sharp contrast with the Judas of *De gallo redivivo*, who shows signs of both greed and scheming, but who is also manifestly rash and ignorant, committing suicide out of remorse and despair. The suicidal Judas of the apocryphal tradition represented by the *Leabhar Breac* Passion, is, by contrast, a calculating arch-schemer, perhaps the most wicked of extra-canonical interpretations of the betrayer. Although his attempt to gain undeserved salvation by way of a cosmic trick fails, the attempt itself requires a far better understanding of Salvation History—as well as a greater cunning—than is possessed by Judas in many other apocrypha, or, for that matter, in the Gospels.

Dumville also cites it as evidence of an apocryphal tradition, in the *Homily on*

²⁵ “& o ro-laustar Iudás in airgent isin tempul dochoid uadib ind-sin, & do-rat gosti ima brágait fen, comba marb de; amal robo chubaid fria airilliud. Ni focetoir i l-ló etsechta Ísu ro-marb Iudás he fén, acht i l-ló na h-esergi coimdeta in cech dú. Cubaid tra nama múintire nime & talman do oigid iter nem & talam! Is aire imorro ro-crochustar Iudás he fen, fo-daig co roisseda a ainim co luath dochumm n-iffirn, ár ba dóig les-sium co m-bertha a animm a h-iffirn imalle frisín m-broit. Ni ro-leic imorro Ísu anmain Iudáis dochum n-iffirn, cein co tucad in broit a h-iffirn, & conid hi cet aním fora r-h-iadad iffern iarum aním Iúdáis” (Atkinson 131).

Penitence from the *Leabhar Breac* Judas is once again an exemplar of imperfect repentance and as such belongs to the orthodox exegetic tradition that runs from Augustine to Peter Comestor (discussed at length above, ch. 1, p. 12 ff.):

...unhappy Judas, after the betrayal of Christ, fell into despair, and put a noose round his neck, and in desperation hanged himself in his misdeeds, so that his soul was the first on which hell was shut after the Captivity had been rescued from it by Christ. (Atkinson 459 [translation])²⁶

Here is no mention of Judas scheming to gain salvation through suicide, nor is it entirely clear who, if anyone, was left in hell after the harrowing. Indeed, the belief that Christ emptied Hell of souls does not seem to be overtly endorsed by either of the texts from the *Leabhar Breac*, though both agree that Judas was the first one to enter afterwards. And although some texts of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* imply a complete Harrowing of Hell, the *Leabhar Breac* versions are not among these; instead it begins with the section on Joseph of Arimethea (*EN* ch. 11, para. 3).

Dumville also quotes a text contemporary with the *Leabhar Breac*, the third redaction (*ca.* 1400) of the *Leabhar Gabhála Érenn*, which asserts that “all the people of the five ages (that is, all those who lived before the time of Christ) were saved at the Harrowing” (302).²⁷ In addition to these late medieval texts, Dumville cites the case of an eighth century Irish missionary promulgating the doctrine of apocastasis as a means of reassuring potential converts that they need not be parted from their ancestors in the

²⁶ “Ocus do-rigne Iudas anfhechnach iar m-brath Ísu Crist fessin: dochoid i n-dérchóined, & do-rat fén gosti ima bragait, co ru-s-croch buden ina mignimaib, & co n-dechaid i n-dérchóiniud, conid hi a animm cet animm fora r-h-iadad iffern, iar tabairt na broti esti do Christ mac Dé.” (Atkinson 221 [text]).

²⁷ Dumville’s citation: “Ed. and tr. R. A. S Macalister, *Lebor Gábala Érenn, the Book of the Taking of Ireland*, i (Dublin and London 1938), p. 124f., #67.” The *Lebor Gábala Érenn* is dated to 11th century, but this third redaction is *ca.* 1400.

afterlife (302). Here again, the impression is that of continuity in Irish religious literature running through the course of the Middle Ages.

McNamara (72) lists another poem not mentioned by Dumville that also provides vernacular evidence from the late medieval period.²⁸ The doctrinal question is clearly expressed in two stanzas from a poem on the Harrowing of Hell found in another fifteenth-century Irish manuscript, the *Book of Fermoy*:²⁹

Atáit dáine ga rádh rind
d'feruibh lóghmura in léghinn,
nach tuc as acht drong do dligh
in cass donn dona dáinib

Dáine ele rind gá rádh,
ag nach fuil credemh comhlán
nach fuil mduine, geal ná gorm,
nochar ben uile a hiform.

There are some among distinguished men of learning who tell us that the brown curly-haired One brought forth no men but those who merited it.

Others, who have not perfect faith, tell us that there is no man white or black that He did not bring forth, one and all, out of Hell. (qq. 34-35; Bergin 182, 298)³⁰

Although the poet seems to have taken the side of the learned and orthodox opinion, the way the endorsement is qualified (“some among distinguished men of learning”) tends to undermine this point and the rhetorically powerful final position is given to the view that is dismissed on the surface level. Judas is mentioned elsewhere in the poem, and only in

²⁸ Martin McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin: Inst. for Adv. St., 1975).

²⁹ Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 E 29 (#1134), pp. 193-93; dated “mainly 15th century” (*Catalogue*, ISOS).

³⁰ Osborn Bergin, *Irish Bardic Poetry* (Ed. David Greene and Fergus Kelly, Dublin: DIAS, 1970), 178-82 (text); 296-98 (trans.); originally published as “The Harrowing of Hell from the Book of Fermoy” (*Ériu* 4 [1910]), 112-19.

connection with the betrayal.

The notion that the harrowing completely emptied hell is at least as old as the third century, when it was discussed by Origen in his commentary on Matthew 27: 3-7.

James H. Morey finds two remarkable aspects to this text, written by an otherwise orthodox author:

First, Origen expects Judas to participate in the apocatastasis, the universal salvation. No one is to be permanently damned. Second, Judas knows that Christ will be in hell, and he knows that he must precede Him there in order to have any chance for salvation. (407)

Morey suggests that Origen might have been known in Anglo-Saxon England by way of one of the two known Latin translations (406 n. 28) and he further notes that “Origen expresses similar sentiments in his *Contra Celsum*” (407 n. 30), a text that also existed in Latin translation (see ch. 2, p. 35).

A more fully realized version of this tradition is given by Theophylactus, the Orthodox bishop of Ochrida, in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew (*ca.* 1100):

Some say that Judas, being covetous, supposed that he could both make money by betraying Christ, and yet Christ not be killed, but escape from the Jews as he often did escape. But when he saw him now condemned and judged to die, he repented because the affair had turned out other than he supposed it would. And this was why he hanged himself, in order that he might get to hades before Jesus, and there implore him and obtain salvation. You must know, however, that he actually put his head into the noose, having hanged himself on a certain tree; but the tree bent down and he continued to live, because it was God’s will either to reserve him for repentance or for open disgrace and shame. For they say that he had the dropsy, so that he could hardly pass where a carriage could easily pass; and then he fell on his face and burst asunder, as Luke says in Acts. (Paffenroth 120)³¹

³¹ J. Rendel Harris, “Did Judas Really Commit Suicide?” (*American Journal of Theology* 4 [1900]), 494-95; quoted in Kim Paffenroth, *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple* (Louisville, KY, Knox P, 2001), 120. See also, Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages* (2:363).

Theophylactus uses the bending tree to explain how God delays the soul of Judas, and at the same time reconciles the two different accounts of his death.³² A misunderstanding of Christ's nature—the assumption that he cannot or will not be killed—leads Judas to betray Jesus, and accounts for his regret when things do not go as planned. However eccentric the interpretation of Theophylactus is, it does motivate the suicide of Judas without either saving him from damnation or resorting to an unorthodox complete Harrowing of Hell. This Judas, forlorn rather than scheming, wishes to “implore” his master to grant him forgiveness, rather than resorting to what Kim Paffenroth calls “mere legalistic trickery, and not real regret” (124). It may prove difficult, however, to link this Greek writer with a medieval Irish context, or even a Latin one.

The ninth-century Frankish abbot, Paschasius Radbertus (died *ca.* 860), who does not agree with Origen (Morey 408) nevertheless repeats, in his own commentary on Matthew, the suggestion “that Judas may have hanged himself in the false hope of being in the next world before Jesus, so that he could fall at Jesus’ feet and beg pardon the moment Jesus died” (Murray 360).³³ Such a Latin source of this era, or perhaps one of the Latin translations Origen, might well have been available as the basis of the related Irish traditions of the later Middle Ages.

³² In the Greek New Testament, Judas hangs himself according to one account (Matt. 27:5), but dies by “falling headlong,” (*prēnēs genomenos*) according to another (Acts 1.18). On Jerome’s harmonizing of these two accounts in the Latin Vulgate Bible, see above, ch. 1, p. 9 ff.

³³ Murray (360 n. 119) cites from Migne (*PL* vol. 120 col. 930A), but compare: *Pascasii Radberti Expositio in Matheo libri XII*, ed. B. Paulus, CCCM 56-56B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1984), 3: 1345. See also: Samuel Laeuchli, “Origen’s Interpretation of Judas Iscariot” *Church History* 22.4 (1953), 253-268; 259.

The Voyage of St. Brendan and Judas's Sunday Rest

While it does not have the ancient pedigree of the harrowing, the travels of the Irish saint are related in many versions, many languages, the earliest of which is Latin.³⁴ On his maritime quest for visions of heaven and hell, Brendan and his company of monks encounter the soul of Judas Iscariot, who is enjoying his weekly reprieve from demonic torments on an island where he still suffers quite a thrashing from the waves. Much to the chagrin of the demons, Brendan prays that the Sabbath repose of Judas be extended.³⁵ The Latin version of Brendan's voyage, which is thought to have originated in Ireland as early as the eight or ninth century,³⁶ gave rise to numerous redactions and translations, sometimes in combination with his *Vita* (Selmer xx), including a vernacular Irish version,³⁷ and found its way into collections such as the *South English Legendary*

³⁴ Some texts include: Carl Selmer, ed. *Navigatio sancti Brendani abbatis from Early Latin Manuscripts* (South Bend, IN: U of Notre Dame P, 1959); John J. O'Meara, trans. *The voyage of Saint Brendan* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1976); and W. R. J. Barron and Glyn S. Burgess, eds., *The voyage of St Brendan: Representative Versions of the Legend in English Translation* (Exeter: Exeter UP, 2002). See also: Baum, Paull Franklin. "Judas' Sunday Rest." *Modern Language Review* 18 (1923): 168-82 and St. John D. Seymour, "Notes on Irish Apocrypha," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 37C (1927): 107-117 at 114.

³⁵ In the fourteenth-century Anglo-Norman verse homily *De passione Judas*, for instance, the poet uses Judas as a trick to grab the attention of the audience (or reader), eliciting first revulsion, and later perhaps the identification that any sinner may make with the arch-sinner in order to better avoid the temptations that ensnared him.³⁵ Chief among these is the sin of despair—more specifically despairing of God's grace, mercy, and especially forgiveness—which medieval commentators often interpreted as a greater failing on the part of Judas than even the betrayal (see above ch. 1, p. 12 ff.). *De Passione Judas* exists in one manuscript: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud 471, ff. 114r-18v; 13th/14th cc., and in one edition: Nancy Iseley, "De Passione Judas, an Anglo-Norman Poem," *Studies in Romance Languages and Literature* 2 (Chapel Hill: UNC, 1941): 29-40.

³⁶ See: David N. Dumville, "Two Approaches to the Dating of *Nauigatio Sancti Brendani*," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser. 29 (1988): 87-102.

³⁷ Whitley Stokes, ed. and trans. *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore*, (Oxford, 1890), 99–116, 247–61; Charles Plummer, ed. and trans. *Bethada Náem nÉrenn: Lives of Irish Saints*. 2

(D'Evelyn and Mill, *SEL* 1:197-200, lines 515-604).

Evidence of Middle Irish texts derived from the *Legenda Aurea*

It seems that no systematic study has yet been made to determine the presence of the *Legenda Aurea* in Ireland, or its impact upon Irish vernacular religious writing. The evidence of extant LA manuscripts is scant and inconclusive. In the appendix to her study of LA manuscripts, Barbara Fleith lists two manuscripts that are presently in Ireland: Dublin, Trinity College, Ms. 313 (C. 4. 3) and Ms. 314 (F. 5. 7). The latter is a 15th century manuscript of English provenance, and the former is listed as 14th/15th century, with no provenance given.³⁸ Evidence from indirect sources, such as translations of or allusions to individual legends, require analysis on a case-by-case basis, and may only yield results after a great deal of research. For the moment, the following working bibliography on the subject will serve as a beginning.

There are at least two vernacular texts of the Pilate legend (2 versions, ed. Mac Niocaill), from the late 15th and early 16th centuries, seemingly derived from the LA, both of which thereby postdate LB considerably.³⁹ Another witness is the *Stair na Lombardach* ("The History of the Lombards") in the The Book of Lismore (RIA MS 23 P 2), dated before 1417, which is roughly contemporary with the *Leabhar Breac*. This

vols. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1922; repr. 1997), 1:44-102; 2:44-98, 337-38. The latter text features a lament of thirteen quatrains in which a remorseful Judas describes his torments to Brendan.

³⁸ See: Martin Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts* (1991); Abbott, *Catalogue* (1900); Grosjean, *Anal. Boll.* 46 (1928): 81-148.

³⁹ Gearóid Mac Niocaill, "Dhá leagan de scéal Phíoláit," *Celtica* 7 (1966) 205–213; edition of an Irish translation of a passage of "De passione Domini," from the *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus a Voragine, from Dublin, RIA, 475 olim 24 P 25 (*Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne*, first half of the 16th c.: cf. B.M. Cat., Eg. 137, art. 4, Eg. 161, art. 65) and Oxford, Rawlinson B. 513 (catalogue 39, late 15th c.), with an introduction in Irish.

text is “probably a fifteenth-century translation of a chapter (“De S. Pelagio papa”) from *Legenda Aurea*” (Breatnach, 280).⁴⁰ In fact the chapter on Pelagius, which includes the History of the Lombards, is the very last chapter of the LA, which may imply that the source (original) was a complete collection. The *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*, another fifteenth-century manuscript, contains lives of St. Eustathius and St. Mary of Egypt, both of which derive, according to Robin Flower, from the LA (*Catalogue*).⁴¹

Two more examples, though less certain, are also worth citing. The Life of St. George (*Betha Sain Seoirsí*) in the Book of Fermoy (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy Ms. 23 E 29, 15th c.) contains “a shortened form of the dragon story told in [the LA]” (*Catalogue* p.20). Near the end of the *Leabhar Breac* is found “a late and mutilated account of the passion of Christopher Dog-head” (Atkinson 40), for the writing of which text the scribe, according to Fraser, “evidently had before him a version of the life of Christopher as related in e.g. the Golden Legend” (Fraser 307 n. 2).⁴² This attribution is based on the LA-style etymology on the saint’s name. According to Fleith, however, the LA chapter on St. Christopher resembles that of the *Abbreviatio in gestis et miraculis sanctorum* of Jean de Mailly” (Fleith, “Die Legenda Aurea” 266). Because, however, Jacobus took many of his etymological introductions from the *Abbreviatio*, the legend of St. Christopher in the *Leabhar Breac* does not necessarily show the influence of the

⁴⁰ Caoimhín Breatnach, “Lismore, Book of,” in *Medieval Ireland: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Seán Duffy, Ailbe MacShamhráin, and James Moynes (New York, Routledge, 2005), 279-80.

⁴¹ Dublin, Royal Irish Academy Ms. 23 O 48 (b), ff. 41va-43rb. (ISOS, web catalogue.)

⁴² J. Fraser, trans. “The Passion of St. Christopher,” *Révue Celtique* 34 (1913): 307-25; repr. *Medieval Saints: A Reader*, ed. Mary-Ann Stouck (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview P, 1999), 561-67.

Legenda Aurea. Nevertheless, this handful of examples, as haphazard as it is, should suffice to establish the LA as one source of Middle Irish hagiography and apocrypha, albeit the relative importance of this source has yet to be determined.

The matter of Judas in medieval Ireland: conclusions and future research

While it seems clear from the foregoing that *De ortu Judae* could well have been known in Ireland at the start of the fifteenth century, the textual evidence to demonstrate a wide diffusion of this tradition is lacking. The Oedipodean legend of Judas would have surely been available from manuscripts of the *Legenda Aurea* that may have reached Ireland by way of the Dominicans or other orders, as the several texts known to have been translated from that Latin source into Irish during this period attest.⁴³ Yet the extant evidence, from the *Leabhar Breac* and elsewhere, suggests that *De gallo redivivo* was the best known apocryphal tradition about Judas in the Irish vernacular and that it was completely independent from *De ortu Judae*. As shown above, this evidence is not limited to Judas legends, nor is it even limited to medieval texts. The Middle Irish poem *Críst rocrochadh* and its several post-medieval analogues, plus the examples from visual culture, all support a widespread knowledge of the miracle of the resurrected rooster. The legend of Judas, his mother, and the cock stands—along with the Judas episode in the Voyage of St. Brendan and the interpretation of Judas's suicide as an attempt to unjustly gain salvation in the Harrowing of Hell—as one of three major Judas apocrypha known to have circulated in vernacular versions during the latter part of the Middle Ages. It remains for future research to take up the apocryphal traditions about Judas attested in

⁴³ The Franciscans, not the Dominicans, were the most prominent preaching order in late medieval Ireland.

Hiberno-Latin manuscripts, in order to provide a fuller account of the medieval Irish Iscariot.

6. General Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

In this dissertation, the figure of Judas Iscariot has served as a lens through which to view the religious and literary culture of Britain, Ireland, and to some extent also continental Europe in the latter part of the Middle Ages. Each of the major texts discussed in this research, whether Latin or vernacular, shows the influence of both the canonical and the apocryphal accounts of Judas; each text also is also informed by a variety of concerns, ranging from pastoral to performative, of an author who has adapted source material to suit a specific cultural context—that is, a particular group of people at a particular place and time.

Richard Axton concludes his survey of Judas in Middle English apocryphal texts by considering their original audience:

Their importance seems to me to lie primarily in the fact that they are, as Jacobus would say, ‘not authentic’, not accepted as orthodox, and consequently they show medieval minds at work at the edges of difficult issues which the Church Fathers had failed to explain to the satisfaction of ordinary people. (197)

There is indeed a vigor and an imaginative flavor to the matter of Judas that seems to indicate popular uses—whether intended primarily to instruct or to delight—for the apocryphal literature of the later Middle Ages. This aspect, probably more so than any other, accounts for the appeal of these texts (to the extent that there is any) to the contemporary reader: the evident creativity of the storytellers as they work inventively with a set of well known characters and events, forming new episodes and alternative explanations that add to the possibilities of the Christian mythos.

Traditions about Judas that may seem manifestly extra-canonical to a reader of today nevertheless belonged, in the late medieval context, to the province of quite

orthodox authors. While a contemporary reader may place both apocryphal texts and the canonical New Testament along a continuum of “gospel fictions” (to borrow from Helms), and to discuss the work of the evangelists as “prophecy historicized” (to borrow from Crossan), such a move would hardly have been possible for a medieval scholar. Instead, the collection and transmission of such texts was justified upon the grounds of their utility in communicating an orthodox doctrinal message rather than by any claim that they conveyed historical facts (Gounelle “Sens et usage” 205). Jacobus of Voragine, for instance, whose oft-cited disclaimer in chapter 51 of the *Legenda Aurea* purports to leave the repetition or omission of certain items up to the judgment of his reader, nevertheless records the untrustworthy material from the *Historia Apocrypha*, if only to reinforce a message of divine justice and retribution. Yet this rationale does nothing to alter the nature of these texts, which is admittedly fictional—to gloss Jacobus’s *licet apocrypha* with a modern term. One conclusion that may be drawn from the test case of Judas is that there was always a great deal of interaction between canonical scriptures and apocryphal writings, and, for that matter, between official interpretations and popular traditions.

Moreover, the influence is clearly flowing in both directions: even as the orthodox exegetes adopt a more open stance toward the apocrypha, the received understanding of Judas also helps to shape the apocryphal elaborations of his character. This insight is hardly a new one, but it is one that bears repeating and invites further elaboration. James Morey, for instance, points out some extra-canonical elements in his discussion of one very early church father:

Though Origen was concerned to establish the canonicity of the four Gospels, and though much of his career was devoted to suppressing

heresy, Campbell notes that “the suggestions of the harrowing of hell did not need to await apocryphal elaboration, for very early the most orthodox patristic exegetes elaborated the idea of the descent into hell.”¹ Thus Origen himself uses and perhaps even creates apocryphal material, as the [...] example from his Matthew commentary shows. (406)²

Indeed the urgent doctrinal matter of the harrowing seems to have presented the circumstances under which the *Gospel of Nicodemus* was adopted as practically deuterocanonical—an official apocryphon, as it were—because “this work, in its various recensions, represented the final, orthodox position with regard to that vital question: whose souls were released?” (Dumville 301).³

Because the betrayal is closely connected to the crucifixion and the resurrection, the matter of Judas occupies an equally important place in the Christian imagination, and asks just as vital a question: why did he do it? As was suggested in the introductory chapter of this dissertation, nearly all of the apocryphal traditions about Judas address the dual questions of his motivation to betray Jesus and then to kill himself. While some of these traditions are more focused upon the betrayal and others upon the suicide, not all may be easily interpreted as motivating either action. The intervening chapters have explored two important components of the matter of Judas, narratives that feature unlikely situations and events, but ultimately deliver fairly conservative (and by no means complete) solutions to the Judas problem.

These two apocryphal traditions about Judas, *De ortu Judae* and *De gallo*

¹ Morey quotes Jackson J. Campbell, “To Hell and Back: Latin tradition and Literary Use of ‘Descensus ad Inferos’ in Old English,” *Viator* 13 (1982): 107-85, at 116.

² Here (407) Morey quotes a passage in Latin that indicates Origen’s belief in the apocatastasis and even in the salvation of Judas. See above, ch. 5, p. 209.

³ See above ch. 1, p. 3 and n. 21

redivivo, share several thematic and narrative elements, along with some similarities that are external to the texts. Each of these traditions has a significant number of analogues in folklore and religious writing (whether hagiographical or apocryphal), which can, in some cases provide a clearer understanding of the context and significance of the version attached to Judas. By comparison with other narratives that share the same motifs, it is possible to position *De ortu Judae* in between the pagan and Christian analogues. On the one hand, the Oedipus myth, which deals with divine foreknowledge and human agency, is a good match for a betrayer who is still culpable, even if his act has been foreseen by God (or his Son) and even if it is necessary to the divine salvation plan. On the other hand, the legends of the penitent sinner-saints, whose biographies prove that no sin is too heinous to be forgiven, mesh well with the orthodox interpretation of Judas as a figure whose remorse became a second and greater sin as despair of God's mercy led him to perdition. Even more in line with traditional readings of Judas, *De gallo redivivo* begins with focus upon the thirty silver coins, referencing the motive of greed, and ends with a description of Judas's suicide, which would seem to be motivated by the intervening non-canonical action narrated in the apocryphon. A survey of the analogues indicates that the miraculous resuscitation of a cooked animal is frequently used to disprove a blasphemous oath such as the one Judas makes, and more generally to make manifest God's power, as all miracles do. The particular choice of a cock for this version allows for a connection to be made between Judas's betrayal and Peter's denials of Christ, examples of comparable sins that are followed by comparable remorse. Judas compares unfavorably to Peter, however, whose experience teaches a lesson, not unlike that of the later sinner-saints, of redemption through hope for mercy.

Each of these traditions found its way, at an early stage, into a larger textual configuration. *De ortu Judae* was first appended to the Pilate legends of the *Historia Apocrypha*, which circulated on the European continent and was translated into a few vernacular languages. The *Historia Apocrypha* was divided and incorporated into four chapters of an abbreviated legendary, the *Legenda Aurea*. As a section of the Matthias legend in that enormous collection, *De ortu Judae* circulated much more widely, reaching Britain and Ireland, and was both excerpted in Latin and translated into many vernacular versions. *De gallo redivivo*, of which no independent versions are known before the mid-fourteenth century, seems to have been integrated, at least two centuries earlier, into a compilation of apocryphal texts concerned with the origin and rediscovery of the cross. There the tale of Judas, his mother, and the miraculously revived cock formed a transition between the *origo crucis* legend and a version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* beginning with the story of Joseph of Arimathea, whose legend had particular appeal in Norman England because of his connection with the Matter of Britain. *De gallo redivivo* seems, however, to have achieved its greatest popularity in Ireland, where it became by the later Middle Ages perhaps the best known Judas apocryphon.

Eventually the two traditions, *De ortu Judae* and *De gallo redivivo*, found one another and were, in a few texts, joined together, though never as a single continuous and integrated narrative. Certain patterns may be easily discerned in these two legends: a female family member acts as both an interlocutor with and a foil for Judas, receiving sympathy and condemnation in an inverse proportion to him; the relationship between Judas and his kinswoman is marked by an impropriety, either a sin (such as blasphemy), or the violation of a taboo (such as incest); and, finally, a climactic domestic scene

transforms into a moment of cosmic significance in the Christian master-narrative of salvation history. *De gallo redivivo* and *De ortu Judae* both use the family life of Judas to fill in the gaps left in his story by the evangelists, and indeed, the several ways in which they coincide are the most compelling items in the dossier in support of linking the two traditions. These scenes (including those with Judas's father) also mirror and invert the relationships within the family of Jesus: his mother, his step-father, and his heavenly father (who is united, in Christian doctrine, with his only son).

The critical contribution of this dissertation might be aptly described by Bernard of Chartres's phrase 'standing on the shoulders of giants' –if the idea of picking off nits were added to it. Working nearly a century after Paull F. Baum harvested such a bumper crop of Judasiana, the latecomer to the field must be content with plowing around the edges. The present research on *De ortu Judae* has been sufficient to show that Baum was wrong to name the *Historia Apocrypha* (his Type R) as the source for *Iudas* (and *Pylatus*) in the *South English Legendary* and that Manfred Görlach was wrong to follow Baum while dismissing the work of Minnie E. Wells. For the most part, however, the chapter on the *South English Legendary* supports the current scholarly consensus regarding the way the author-translator used and adapted material from sources such as the *Legenda Aurea*, and is particularly in line with Anne B. Thompson's views about the poet's creative innovations and flair for storytelling.

By the same token, the present research on *De gallo redivivo* has demonstrated that Baum was mistaken in his assertion that the relationship between Judas and his mother in the *Leabhar Breac* is an incestuous (i.e., Oedipodean) one. This discovery, together with a new examination of the Latin manuscript tradition, has largely disproven

Rémi Gounelle's theory that *De gallo redivivo* was intended to complete *De ortu Judae*, and that this text was part of a 'confluence' of the two traditions, though his account of the history of *le coq cui qui chante* is based upon careful scholarship and remains otherwise plausible. A critical edition of the three Latin versions of *De gallo redivivo* (MCO, NQH, and PJT) would be a useful direction for future work in this area and might provide a basis for further research into the various vernacular versions. Study of the Latin textual tradition of this apocryphon would also be aided by establishing the date and provenance of the former Ginsburg-Ricci manuscript (Paris, BnF, NAL 3072).

It has also been possible to show that while *De gallo redivivo* was attested in the Irish vernacular along with several analogues, *De ortu Judae* was not well represented in Ireland and perhaps not known there at all. An overview of the matter of Judas in late-medieval Ireland—something along the lines of Axton's "Interpretations of Judas in Middle English Literature"—has yet to be undertaken, though Chapter 5 might serve as starting point for such a survey. Another very old apocryphal tradition linked to Judas, the unorthodox belief in Christ's complete emptying of hell, is of particular interest in the Old and Middle Irish context, and has been found by Morey in an Old English poem, inviting further examination of the cultural connections that cross the Irish Sea.⁴ A thorough account of the reception and influence of the *Legenda Aurea* in Ireland is another desideratum; such a research project could take advantage of recent scholarship on the *Legenda Aurea*, along with the many manuscript catalogues and images now available online, but is likely to require a number of years to complete.

⁴ See: James H. Morey, "Adam and Judas in the Old English 'Christ and Satan'," *Studies in Philology* 87.4 (1990): 397-409, especially 404-9.

Chapter 3 of this dissertation, together with Appendices B, C, and D, represents a large part of the work that would go into producing a critical edition of the legends of Judas and Pilate from the *South English Legendary*. For that project a base text, probably not either of the manuscripts used by Furnivall or D'Evelyn and Mill, would have to be chosen and edited, at which point the work already done here might be integrated into a critical apparatus, notes, glossary, and commentary. The *Historia Apocrypha*, which has been published several times in part or in full (though not in the last 25 years), is also in need of critical edition that takes into account the various recensions indicated by the scholars who have looked into its manuscript tradition. A full translation of that text into English might also prove quite useful to scholars. Finally, the Vatican manuscript (BAV cod. Pal. Lat. 619) should be reexamined in the light of recent scholarship to determine whether it is really a missing link between the *Historia Apocrypha* and the *Legenda Aurea*, as Baum suggested, and Rand before him.

The topic of the Insular Iscariot encompasses a number of independent traditions, two of which have been discussed here in some depth; it also involves texts that span a range of geographic, cultural, and linguistic areas, several of which have also been represented. In order to make sense of Judas in a medieval context it has been necessary to provide some grounding in the Gospels, as well as the exegetic traditions that followed after them. Judas also inhabits the context of apocrypha both early and late, which has called for another set of instruments, as have hagiographic genres such as the abbreviated legendary, where he may sometimes be found. On the whole, this dissertation has contributed several pieces toward the completion of the puzzle that is the matter of Judas Iscariot in the Middle Ages; the rest remains for future scholarship to fill in.

Appendix A: Manuscripts of the Latin *Historia Apocrypha* (detailed list)¹

- A** Admont, Austria, Benediktinerstiftsbibliothek, Cod. 174, f. 194-202; 13th c.
- B₁** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 10147-48; 12th c. [Knape's **B**; probably earliest extant ms, but lacks the Judas-vita.]
- B₂** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 531-39 (Van den Gheyn 1:131), f. 378^v-381; paper, 15th c. [Izydorczyk no. **37**]²
- D** Darmstadt, Germany, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Cod. 825; 13th c. [An abridged variant (Knape 117).]
- G** Göteborg, Sweden, Universitetsbibliotek, Ms. lat. 21; 13th c.
- Gr** Graz, Austria, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 1314 (37/45-4^o), f. 154-164; paper, late 14th c. [Schönbach's **M**; Steinmeyer's **B**, used for end of Knape's edition.]
- L** Lüneburg, Germany, Ratsbücherei, Cod. theol. 2^o 83, f. 64^{rb}-68^{rb}; paper, 15th c. [Judas-vita precedes Pilate and other sections of HA]
- Li** Lille, France, Bibliothèque de l'Université, Ms. 138, f. 18-20^v; paper, dated 1481. [Baum's **Rl**; Izydorczyk no. **139**.]³
- Lz** Linz, Austria, Oberösterreich Landesbibliothek, Ms. 488 (olim 123), f. 1^r; 12th c.

¹ Manuscripts are parchment unless noted as paper.

² Provenance: Benedictine Monastery of Great St. Martin, Cologne, "Ce manuscrit provient probablement de Saint-Martin de Cologne (1); car f. 1^r, on lit: *Liber monasterii Sancti Martini maioris ordinis Divi Benedicti qui compactus est per fratrem Petrum de Thegelen*" (Van den Gheyn 1:66).

³ *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, t. 26 (1897): 107-8.

- (with 15th c. additions). [Pilate/Veronica only, no Judas; Schönbach's **N**; Knape's **Vita Pilati (A)**, an epitome from the HA; Mone 529 ff.; Dobschütz p. 278*]
- M₁** München, Germany, Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, Clm 23390, f. 44; 12/13th c.
[Lacks Judas-vita (breaks off at f. 53^v); base text for most of Knape's edition;
Werner's **Mb**; Steinmeyer's **A**.]
- M₂** München, Germany, Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, Clm 21259, f. 227^v-231^v; 13th
c. [Rand's **M**; Baum's **Rm**; Werner's **Ma**.]
- O₁** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Ms. Laud. Misc. 633 (S.C. 1250), f. 97^v; 12th c.
[Baum's **Rb**; Werner's **Prosa C**, a variant distinguished from Prosa A (the HA
proper) by expansion of the Veronica narrative (Werner 20) and additional
dialogue (Knape, "Die Historia" 117).]⁴
- P₁** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 16079, f. 86a-88b; 13th c.
- P₂** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Arsenal 387, f. 66-70^v; 13th c. [Rand's **A**;
Baum's **Ra**.]
- P₃** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. fr. 4413, f. 4; 13th/14th c.
[Baum's **Rn**.]⁵
- P₄** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 11867, f. 177; 13th c. [Baum's **Rq**;
Izydorczyk no. **280**.]
- P₅** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 4895 A, f. 118^v; 13th c. [Baum's

⁴ Provenance: Braunschweig (Brunswick), lower Saxony, Germany (S.C. 1250) (G. 85) 2704 *Quarto Catalogue* ii (Laud), Misc. no. 633 (Chronicon Polidense, &c.).

⁵ According to Baum, this manuscript: "as is shown both by the unusually large number of glosses, and by its apparent collation of x' and x'' (and perhaps x'''), as well as by its completion of the Lucan quotation, would seem to represent an effort to provide a 'complete critical text based on all the known manuscripts'" ("Mediaeval Legend" 495-96).

Ro.]

- P₆** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 693 (939), f. 157-158; 12th-13th c.
[Izydorczyk no. **250**; No Judas-vita—text breaks off at end of ms. before Nero section.]⁶
- Pr** Praha, Czech Republic, Knihovna Národního, Ms. 2119 (XII.B.14); 15th c.
- R₁** Reims, France, Bibliothèque Municipale, cod. Misc. K. 784/794.
- R₂** Reims, France, Bibliothèque Municipale, cod. Misc. K. 764/790. [Variant (Knappe, *Pilatus* col. 673)]
- T** Trier, Germany, Bistumarchiv, Abt. 95, Nr. 29; 12th/13th c. [Lacks Judas; Werner's **T**; *BHL* 4222d.]
- W₁** Wien, Austria, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. lat. 372, f. 15; 13th c.
- W₂** Wien, Austria, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. lat. 1180, f. 194-196; 14th c. [Baum's **Rj**; Izydorczyk no. **396**; a considerably altered variant (Knappe 117); preserves additional details at several points, particularly the healing of Tiberius (Werner 18 n. 3)]
- Latin mss of uncertain connection to the HA and the LA:**
- B₃** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 7993-96 (Van den Gheyn 3:1922), f. 255-256^v; paper, 15th c.⁷ [Lacks Judas-vita (?).]
- B₄** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, Ms. 1079-84 (Van den Gheyn 5:3141), f. 115; 13th c. [Lacks Judas-vita; Izydorczyk no. **38**.]

⁶ Judas was part of the original text, entitled *Narratio de nativitate Jude et de morte ejusdem*.

⁷ Provenance: *Iste liber pertinet ecclesie de Rosendale* (Roosendaal, North Brabant, Netherlands).

- C₁** Cambridge, UK, Gonville and Caius College Ms. 225, ff. 173-176v; 13th c.⁸
[Baum's **Rg.**]
- C₂** Cambridge, UK, Corpus Christi College Ms. 66A, ff. 231-232b; 14th c.⁹ [Baum's **Rc.**]
- C₃** Cambridge, UK, St. John's College Ms. 214 (H. 11), ff. 158b-159; 12th-13th c.
[Baum's **Lc**; Knape's **Vita Pilati (B)**.]
- O₂** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodley 90 (S.C. 1887), ff. 105-9; 2nd half of 13th c. [Baum's **Lj**; "four excerpts apparently from the *Legenda Aurea*" (S.C. 2:99)]¹⁰
- R₃** Reims, France, Ms. 1275 (J. 743), f. 1-2; 13th c. [Rand's **R**; Baum's **Hr.**]¹¹
- V** Vaticano, Città del, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. Lat. 619, fol. 18-21v; 12th -13th c.¹² [Judas-vita precedes Pilate and other sections of HA; Baum's **Lv**; Rand's **V**.]

⁸ Provenance: Benedictine monastery of Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England.

⁹ Provenance: Bury St. Edmund's; copy of **C₁** (Baum, "Mediaeval Legend" 9).

¹⁰ According to the *Summary Catalogue*, this manuscript, written in French and Latin, is of English origin.

¹¹ According to Baum, the "humanist" (Type H) version of the Oedipodean Judas life follows a Pilate life that "has nothing in common with the usual Life of Pilate" (485). The *incipit* given in the catalogue, however, matches the HA Pilate exactly, and the *explicit* matches the ending of the Nero section of the HA, which suggests that this version may be missing the Destruction of Jerusalem (Henri Loriquet, ed., *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, v. 39 t. 2 pt. 1 [1904]: 398-437)

¹² Provenance: Worms and Trier, Rhineland, Germany (Stevenson and de Rossi 1:224). See also, ch. 2, p. 63, n. 49.

Appendix B: SEL Manuscripts with *Iudas* and *Pylatus* (detailed list)

- C** Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 145 (*olim* R.4), most of MS is *ca.* 1310-20, fols. 211-13 *ca.* 1400, fols. 214-18 *ca.* 1450. *Iudas* (ff. 214^a-215^a) and *Pylatus* (ff. 215^a-217^b) are placed after the end of the year in the newest section of the ms, C⁺ a.k.a. C¹ (fol. 214 ff.), and not listed in the Table of Contents (D'Evelyn and Mill, 3:30). This is the base text for the edition of D'Evelyn and Mill.
- D** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 463 (S.C. 1596), f. 35b (early 15th century). *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow *Southern Passion*. Closely related to O. [Brown's L.]
- H** London, British Library, Harley 2277, *ca.* 1300. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* are placed at the end of the year. Furnivall used this ms for his texts of *Iudas* and *Pylatus*; D'Evelyn and Mill used it for variants in their edition.
- I** Cambridge, St. John's College B.6 (James 28), paper, *ca.* 1400-1450. *Pylatus* (ff. 70-73); no *Iudas*. This late ms preserves a seemingly complete *temporale*, perhaps representing the "Z" form, including the *Old Testament History*, *Long Life of Christ* (ending with Longinus and Pilate), *Harrowing of Hell*, *Destruction of Jerusalem*, and *Movable Feasts* (Görlach 85; Horstmann xxiv; James *St John's Catalogue* plus online updates).
- K** Cambridge, King's College 13 pt. II, mid-14th century (James). A portion of the SEL including *temporale* legends. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow *Southern Passion*.
- M** London, British Library, Egerton 2810 (formerly Phillips 8253), 14th century, ff. 179v-80r. According to Liszka, the fragment **Bd**, Oxford, Bodleian Library,

English Poetry d.200 was originally part of the same manuscript. According to Liska, “in one of the imperfect manuscripts, parts of which survive as [M] and [Bd], a later scribe supplied a Latin text on the Judas legend, no doubt to correct a perceived omission” (51). “The text is not mentioned in descriptions of the manuscript of which I am aware. It begins ‘Iudas Icarior cui pater Ruben vocabatur’” (51 n. 4).

- N** London, British Library, Egerton 2891, *ca.* 1300-25. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow the *Southern Passion*. Possibly related to C. [Brown’s **E**.]
- O** Oxford, Trinity College 57, *ca.* 1380-1400 (Horstmann). *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow the *Southern Passion*. Closely related to D. [Brown’s **Ty**.]
- P** Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys 2344, *ca.* 1350-75. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow the *Southern Passion*. Used by Brown as base text for *Southern Passion*.
- R** Cambridge, Trinity College 605 (*olim* R. 3. 25), *ca.* 1400 with index from later, *ca.* 1400-25. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* are placed at the end of the year.
- T** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 17 (9837), *ca.* 1400 with some later additions including drawings. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* follow *Southern Passion*.
- V** Oxford, Bodleian Library, English Poetry a.1 (the Vernon MS/MS 3938-42), *ca.* 1390. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* in appendix, separated from main *SEL* text by hundreds of pages.¹

¹ With respect to this well-studied manuscript, it is tempting to include, at least hypothetically, its twin **Qx**: London, British Library, Additional 22283 (The Simeon MS), end of the 14th century. Miscellany, similar to Vernon MS, currently containing only a single *SEL* item, Michael III, separated from the rest of the *SEL* text (now lost). *Iudas* and *Pylatus* would presumably have been placed in an appendix, as in V.

- W** Winchester, Winchester College 33A, *ca.* 1450; paper. *Iudas* and *Pylatus* in appendix. The *Old Testament History*, *Iudas*, and *Pylatus* form an “introductory portion” (Görlach 105).
- Ba** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Additional C. 220 (MS 29430), late 14th century or *ca.* 1400. Currently an *SEL* fragment, **Ba** was formerly part of single volume with two other manuscripts **Q** (London, British Library, Additional 10301) and **Qa** (London, British Library, Additional 10626). *Iudas* and *Pylatus* are included (reversed from the usual order) in an appendix with “additional saints” and “temporale material” (Görlach 95).

The sigla are those of M. Görlach (*Textual Tradition of the SEL*), with those of Brown in square brackets where hers differ. Görlach’s ordering is HODPKNTRVWBaIC* (to show relation between various ms families), totalling 12 mss including *Iudas*, and 13 including *Pylatus*.

Appendix C: The SEL *Iudas* translated into modern English (annotated)

The following is a rendering into modern English prose of the Middle English *Iudas* from the *South English Legendary* (abbreviated SEL). My version is based on the text of Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill (EETS no. 236, pp. 692-97). The base text is C (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 145), most of which was written *ca.* 1310-20, though the appendix (C¹) that includes the Judas (fols. 214a-215a) and Pylatus has been dated *ca.* 1450. D'Evelyn and Mill give variants from H (London, British Library, MS Harley 2277), in which Judas and Pilate are placed at the end of the year, and which is dated *ca.* 1300 or slightly later. The main source for this legend is *De sancto Mathia*, cap. 45 in Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (hereafter LA); all citations are to the latter-day edition of Maggioni, by chapter and sentence number. Ryan's English translation of LA (based upon the Latin of Graesse, 3rd edition, 1850) is cited by page number, with occasional revisions shown in brackets. The source behind the LA version, the *Historia Apocrypha* (HA), is cited from the edition of Knappe, using his line numbers.

* * * * *

Judas was a wicked fellow who sold Jesus to the cross.¹ We may tell something²

¹ *Ivdas was a luper brid þat Ihesus solde to rode* (1): This introductory line is original to the SEL, and it establishes that Judas an indisputably evil (*luper*) character from the start. The corresponding chapter in LA, which is ostensibly about Matthias, introduces Judas as the one whom Matthias replaced (LA 45.1-13). ME *sellen* also has the sense of 'to betray (s.b.) for gain' (MED *sellen* 4) as in Mod. Eng. 'sell out' (OED *sell* 12e).

² *Som wat me may of hym telle* (2): more literally, perhaps, 'to some extent'.

about him, but little of any value. For no one can know about him at all, except for whoever is willing to lie.³ His father was called Ruben,⁴ and his mother was named Tyborie.⁵ This Ruben dwelt with his wife in Jerusalem.⁶ Although their son may have been a scoundrel,⁷ they lived good lives.⁸ (1-6)

³ *Vor me ne schal no3t war of wyte bote wo so wole lye* (3): This line is difficult to construe, and may admit of multiple readings, including: “For one cannot know anything about him, except for someone who likes to lie.” If it relates to the LA in any way, it may refer to the disclaimer Jacobus inserts at the start of the Judas section of his chapter on Matthias: “Legitur enim in quondam hystoria licet apocrypha...” (LA 45.14); “We read in a certain admittedly apocryphal history...” (Ryan 167). An even better match, however, is the repetition of the editorial disclaimer with which Jacobus brackets the section containing the apocryphal portion of the Judas story, and which probably influenced these lines: “Hucusque in predicta ystoria apocrypha legitur, que utrum recitanda sit, lectoris arbitrio relinquatur, licet sit pocius relinquenda quam asserenda” (LA 45.51-52); “So far, however, what we have set down comes from the aforesaid apocryphal history, and whether it should be retold is left to the reader’s judgment, though probably it is better left aside than repeated” (Ryan 168).

⁴ *Ruben* (or Reuben) is a name that encodes Jewishness, as does Judas (or Judah).

⁵ *Tyborie* (*Thiborie* in ms. H): Cyborea in LA, and ultimately deriving from the biblical (i.e., Hebrew or Jewish) name Zipporah, who was the wife of Moses (Exod. 2.21).

⁶ In the LA, Jacobus provides a much more detailed lineage of Judas: “...quod fuit quidam uir in Iherusalem nomine Ruben, qui alio nomine dictus est Symon [*ms variant*: Symeon], de tribu Iuda [*ms variant*: Dan], uel secundum Ieronimum de tribu Ysachar [*ms variant omits Jerome’s account*] qui habet uxorem que Cyborea nuncupata est” (LA 45.14); “...that there was in Jerusalem a man, Ruben by name, who was also called Simon, of the tribe of [Judah *or* Dan], or, as Jerome has it, of the tribe of Issachar, and who had a wife named Cyborea” (Ryan, 167). The LA version, in turn, is a learned expansion upon the relatively straightforward (if more secularly oriented) HA: “Fuit in diebus Herodis regis Pylato preside uir in Iudea ex tribu Iuda Ruben nomine,” (HA 336-7); “There was in the days of King Herod, when Pilate ruled, a man in Judea, from the tribe of Judah, named Ruben.” The SEL, by contrast, reduces the information found in the LA to just the names of Judas’s parents, and their home city. (See Wells “Relation,” 357.)

⁷ Translating Middle English *schrewe* (‘scoundrel’ in my version) is not a straightforward matter. The modern ‘shrew’ has drifted significantly in both connotation and denotation. D’Evelyn and Mill suggest ‘evil creature’, which captures the sense, but perhaps the tone might be closer to evildoer, malefactor, miscreant, villain, or even wretch. A secondary meaning is ‘devil’ (MED *shreue*), and in *Piers Plowman* (PP B Passus 1. 127) it means ‘Satan’. Here (line 6), as elsewhere in the legend, *schrewe* does not translate a particular Latin term, but represents an interpolation by the SEL poet.

⁸ *Pey 3are sone a schrewe were hii were of gode lyue* (6): The explicit contrast between the good parents and the evil offspring is an innovation the SEL version, and a theme that is repeated at crucial moments in the narrative. (See below, notes on lines 79 and 95.)

One night, after this Ruben had lain with his wife,⁹ she dreamed a vivid dream, which terrified his wife. (7-8)

She dreamed that she had given birth to a child that was hateful to the whole world, and whom the whole world cursed and was¹⁰ angry with, and [she dreamed] that he would be always be accursed for as long as the world existed, and [she dreamed] that people would curse all his kin on account of such a wicked offspring.¹¹ This woman was quite full of fear, and she told her husband right away. (9-13)¹²

“Hey,” he said, “this is delirium, and it will go away.”¹³ “I know well,” declared this good woman, “that if I am pregnant, it is an omen of a wicked and mean child.” This

⁹ *As þis Ruben bi is wyf a ny3t iley3e hadde* (7): The conjugal encounter is expressed much more directly in SEL than in LA, which uses the trope of a ‘marital debt’ being paid: “Quadam igitur nocte cum sibi mutuo debitum exoluissent...” (LA 45.15); “One night, after they had paid each other the marital debt” (Ryan 167). Compare the version in HA: “Ruben...qui noctis intempesta legalibus vxoris sue Cyboree alligabatur nexibus” (HA 336-7); “Ruben...who in the dead of night embraced his wife Cyborea in lawful intercourse.”

¹⁰ *& were wyþ him wroþ* (10): *were* is in the subjunctive mood, possibly because it refers to the non-factual elements of a dream.

¹¹ The SEL, LA, and HA versions are alike in omitting any specific prediction of parricide or incest at this point, and thus conform to what Baum calls ‘Type R/L’ of the Judas legend (Baum 496-501). (See below, note on line 86.)

¹² *hire louerd heo tolde anon* (13): The Latin version of Jacobus provides a direct speech by Cyborea: “Videbatur mihi quod filium flagitiosum parerem qui totius gentis nostre perditionis causa existeret” (LA 45.16); “I dreamed that I was going to bear a son so wicked that he would bring ruin upon our whole people” (Ryan 167). The *Historia Apocrypha* also gives a direct speech here, but emphasizes that the people singled out for condemnation are the Jews: “Cum carnali copula legi deseruirem maritali, prolem certo tempore pariendam, que tocius magno constabit iudaici dampno populi gentibus concepisse per sompnum vidi” (HA 342-44). In the SEL, Tyborie’s direct speech in LA (and HA) is transformed into an indirect narration (lines 9-13). The SEL poet also expands upon the source, by widening the context of Judas’s infamy to the whole world.

¹³ *þe mase* (14): ME *mase* or *maze* ‘delirium, daze, bewilderment, delusion’ (often used with *þe* [MED]) renders the “oracular spirit” of the Latin versions (“spiritu...pythonico,” LA 45.17; “spiri...phytonico,” HA 348), removing the pagan or daemonic element. The epithet of Delphic oracle would probably be understood in a medieval Latin text as demonic (Christian) rather than daemonic (Pagan), but probably not understood at all in the vernacular.

woman calculated the time, and later she came to know and feel that she was [pregnant] with a child that had been begotten at that time. (15-18)

She was sad and grievously afraid; her relatives, whom she told beforehand, did not know what they ought to do when the child was born.¹⁴ They were loath to murder their own flesh and blood, and [equally] loath to nurture such a wicked and evil child.¹⁵ (19-22)

So that at last they decided they would make a barrel, in which they placed this wicked child, and they cast it into the sea.¹⁶ The sea hurled him up and down like a little

¹⁴ In keeping with the SEL poet's generally more sympathetic portrayal of Tyborie, these lines (17-20) emphasize the mother's viewpoint in a way that the source does not: "Procedente igitur tempore, cum filium peperisset, parentes plurimum timuerunt et quid de eo facerent cogitare ceperunt" (LA 45.19); "in due time the son was born, and the parents, filled with fear, began to wonder what to do with him" (Ryan 167). Compare the more literary treatment in HA: "Tempora fluxerunt, orbe nono cornua lunaria refulserunt. Instante itaque die partus generator, filius." (HA 352-3); "Time passed, and nine times the horns of the moon shone bright. And so presently, the son begotten on that day was born." The source or at least the inspiration for this seems to be a line from Ovid: "orbe resurgebant lunaria cornua nono" ('nine times since then the crescent moon had grown full orb'd, [F. J. Miller, Loeb Classics edition] *Metamorphoses* 2.453, quoted in Steinmeyer, 164 n.12). In this episode, Diana, discovers the pregnancy of the nymph Callisto (unnamed), who has previously been ravished by Jupiter disguised as Diana.

¹⁵ The abandonment of the infant Judas is rendered more vividly in the SEL (21-26) than in the source, and again with a greater emphasis upon the viewpoint of Cyborea. Jacobus has: "Cumque filium abhorrent occidere nec uellent destructorem sui generis enutrire, ipsum in fiscella positum mari exponent, quem marini fluctus ad insulam que Scarioth dicitur propulerunt" (LA 45.20); "They abhorred the thought of killing him but were unwilling to nurture the destroyer of their people, so they put the infant in a basket, which they set afloat in the sea, and the waves carried it to an island called Scariot" (Ryan 167). In the HA the decision seems to belong entirely to Ruben, rather than both parents, a difference noted by Wells as evidence that the LA (rather than the HA) was the source for the SEL (Wells "Relation," 357): "Ruben uero multimodis et inplacabilibus inuoluitur curis. Nepharium ducit filium occidi et scelerosum tocius gentis destructorem enutiri" (HA 353-5) "Indeed Ruben was trapped in various types of inexorable troubles. He considers it abominable to kill a son, and criminal to rear the destroyer of an entire people."

¹⁶ So þat hii biseye 3am þat hii made a barel attelaste / Þer inne hi dude pis luper child & amydde þe se hyt caste (23-4): byseye (23), ME bisēn from OE biseon 'regard': a range of meanings including 'consider', 'provide' (as D'Evelyn and Mills gloss it), and 'decide'. Hence: 'They made up their minds to make a barrel.' Here the sturdier barel (23) substitutes for, rather

lump,¹⁷ and then it cast him onto land upon the island of Scariot.¹⁸ (23-26)

Thus he was always called ‘Judas Scarioth’ after that, because he was found by chance on the island of Scariot. The king and queen of that land had been together for a long time, but they were utterly unable to conceive a child with one another.¹⁹ One day, when the queen had gone to amuse herself along the shore²⁰ of the island of Scarioth, she found this wicked child. When she saw that it was a handsome and fair child she was delighted, and hoped that in him she might have an heir. (27-34)

She had him²¹ cared for²² in secret, and pretended to be [pregnant] with child. On

than translating the *fiscella* (‘little basket’ of LA 45.20). Perhaps in an effort to evoke the abandonment of Moses on the Nile (Exodus 2.1-3), Jacobus has himself already substituted this *fiscella* (‘little basket’) for the *cistella* (‘little box or chest,’ HA 356) of his source.

¹⁷ *þe se him harlede vp & down as a lute clot* (25): OED cites this passage, which emphasizes the perilous experience of the abandoned infant.

¹⁸ Ms H has *Cariot* here and throughout (Furnivall 108). The LA gives “Scarioth” (45.21)

¹⁹ *þe kyng & þe quene of þe londe to gadere were longe / Ak hii ne mi3te child for no þing between heom auonge* (29-30). A very similar couplet appears in the SEL legend of Mary Magdalene, in reference to the king and queen of the land of *Marcile* (‘Marsailles’, 66): “3if hi wolde hom sende eni child for togadere hi were longe / And no child nemi3te between hom auonge” (79-80; and cf. line 86). See above, ch. 3, p. 118 ff., and note 47. The fact that the royal couple has been childless for a long time is not specifically expressed in the source, and the couplet is an interpolation in both *Iudas* and *Mary Magdalene*. The circumstances may, however, be inferred from the queen’s speech: “O si solatiis tante subleuarer subolis ne regni mei successore priuarer!” (LA 45.24); “Oh, if only I might have such a child, how relieved I would be, because my kingdom would not be left without a successor” (Ryan 167). Compare the HA, which gives a nearly identical speech, followed by details Jacobus omits: “O si solatiis tante subleuarer prolis ne regni mei successore priuarer! Pedisseque igitur infantulum suggerunt, ut uulua sterili permanente heres habeatur” (HA 363-65); “Oh, if only I might be relieved by the consolations of such an offspring, so that I would not be deprived of a successor for my kingdom!” So the servant women immediately brought the infant, so that an heir might be had by one persisting in a barren womb.”

²⁰ *So þat þe quene eode a day & pleide bi þe stronde* (31): the verb *pleien* means, ‘to play; have fun, enjoy oneself, be merry; be joyful’ (MED; 1a). Compare line 70 below.

²¹ The infant Judas is referred to as *hyt* ‘it’ in this section (35, 39). Although this is perfectly good Middle English, since the antecedent *chylde* is neuter (cf. Mod. German *das Kind*), here *hyt* is translated as ‘he’.

account of this [news] the king, and all of the land as well, were delighted. (35-36)

When she announced the time when the child was supposed to have been born, they displayed that wicked child, and the king was delighted. When [the king] saw that [the child] was fair and pleasing, he had him named Judas. It just goes to show that what is fair is not therefore good.²³ The child was placed into good keeping, as a king's son ought to be. (37-41)

Soon after, it happened—as our Lord willed²⁴—that the queen was with child, one begotten by her husband. Both the king and the queen were delighted when they learned of this. And so she had a male child that was fair and noble. The queen then set her heart upon him, and less so upon Judas. (42-46)

These children grew up extremely well. Judas quickly began to do wicked and evil things all the time, just as was his nature to do.²⁵ He would strike and beat other children he encountered, and break their heads and do them harm, and forsake the good.²⁶ (47-50)

Judas envied the king's [legitimate] son, because he was loved more by the king

²² *Wytye* (35) 'cared for' from OE *(be)witian* 'guard, keep, protect'.

²³ *Hyt nys no3t al god þat is vayr ysene þer hyt was* (40): More literally, "Whence it may be seen that by no means is what is fair [necessarily also] good." This also sounds proverbial, and Whiting (*Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases from English Writings mainly before 1500*, Cambridge: Belknap, 1968) lists it, albeit as the only citation under the entry for "Not all that is good is fair" (G365). The sense seems to be just the opposite here, however, since Judas is fair but not good, rather than good but not fair; compare the modern proverb "not all that glitters is gold."

²⁴ The sense of *oure Louerd* (42) is here 'the Almighty', though elsewhere used for Jesus; not in LA.

²⁵ *as his ri3te was to done* (48): Reading *ri3t* with the sense of 'just, exactly' and *his* as 'his nature' (48).

²⁶ & *þat god lete* (50) also admits of the rather provocative reading 'and God allowed this'.

than he himself was. This obsessed him grievously. Consequently he beat up that child whenever he came upon him alone.²⁷ But the queen beat Judas badly in turn when she found out, yet he would never desist, for he was never chastened.²⁸ Eventually the queen upbraided him [with the fact] that he was a foundling, after which time this wicked thing hated the boy even more. [Judas] carefully bided his time and slew him in secret.²⁹ (51-58)

Then [Judas] did not dare remain any longer for fear of justice.³⁰ He slipped away to Jerusalem, so that no one [on Scarioth] knew what had become of him. Pilate³¹ was then the Justice³² of that land, and Judas immediately found a place in his service. [Pilate] liked Judas so well that he made him steward of all his property, and he ordered his men to do all that he asked them. It is right that the one scoundrel was master of the other,³³

²⁷ *per vore he al tobet þat child wanne he mi3te it one iwyte* (53): The SEL poet has added a psychological motivation for the bad behavior of Judas, where the LA has none. Yet such an explanation, though based in credible family dynamics, actually runs counter to the dominant idea that Judas is wicked by nature, as has been prophesied before his birth.

²⁸ *Ak þe quene him bet sore a3en wanne 3eo it mi3te vnder-3ite / Ak þervore nolde he neuere bileue vor neuere ichasted [he] nas* (54-5): This renders the Latin of Jacobus: “Regina autem hoc moleste ferens et Iudam ad se non pertinere sciens ipsum crebrius verberabat, sed nec sic a molestia pueri desistebat” (LA 45.30); “The queen resented this [behavior] and, knowing that Judas was not her son, often chastised him for his misdeeds, but Judas continued as bad as ever” (Ryan 167). Both versions indicate that despite being beaten, Judas is never sorry (or made to feel sorry), and hence he is never repentant. [Wells 358.]

²⁹ *stilleliche* (60): This is suggestive of Cain killing Abel (Genesis 4.8), but also of Moses killing the Egyptian in (Exodus 2.12).

³⁰ *Lest he hadde his dom* (59): more literally, perhaps, ‘lest he be judged’.

³¹ *Pylatus* (and *Pilatus*) in SEL and LA is, here rendered as ‘Pilate’.

³² *Iustise* (61): some sort of judge or magistrate, perhaps equivalent to the Roman title *Praetor*, or more likely meant to evoke the English *Justiciar*. The Latin versions simply state that Pilate was ‘ruling at that time’ (“tunc presidis,” LA 45.33; HA 373).

³³ *þe o schrewe wyþ þe oþer mayster was as ri3t is* (65): Or possibly: ‘The one, a scoundrel, with the other, a master [scoundrel], was natural’ (65).

for each thing loves its like, as indeed the Book says,³⁴ for, even if there were but two scoundrels in an entire country, nevertheless if they met they would become friends.³⁵

(59-68)

So it happened that these two scoundrels, the lord and the steward, went to amuse themselves one day near a lovely orchard,³⁶ in which Pilate saw some quite lovely apples. “Climb,” he repeatedly urged Judas, “and get some of them.” Then Judas broke the fence, and soon he was inside.³⁷ It was his own father’s orchard, though he did not know it at all.³⁸ The good man who was his father came and asked who he was, and by whose leave

³⁴ *Vor ech þyng louep hys ilyk so seyþ þe bok ywis* (66): While such references to “the Book” might be generally presumed refer to the Bible, here the SEL poet merely means his source, the LA. The Latin of Jacobus has two scribal variations at this point: “quoniam res similes sibi sunt habiles [amabiles]” (‘since like things are suitable [lovable] to each other LA 45.34); compare “quoniam res similes sunt habiles” (HA 374). The meaning differs in that *habilis* means ‘suitable, fit’, while *amabilis* means ‘lovable, amiable’ and is perhaps a better match to the SEL. The expression used in SEL is proverbial according to Furnivall (176). Whiting lists this as the earliest English citation of “Like to like” (L272). A closer modern equivalent might be ‘birds of a feather flock together’.

³⁵ To the above, the SEL adds the extreme conditions under which two scoundrels befriend one other. See SEL *Pylatus* 100 for another (interpolated) statement on friendship between scoundrels.

³⁶ *A day eode al one pleye under a uayr orchard* (70): more literally, perhaps, ‘one day they went by a fair orchard, just for fun’. Compare the use of the verb *pleien* above in line 31.

³⁷ Judas does not climb the fence at all, but breaks it down. In the LA version, Pilate does not specifically tell Judas to climb, but instead says that he will expire if he does not have the fruit he covets: “Pylatus itaque accersito Iuda ait: ‘Tanto illorum fructuum captus sum desiderio quod, si his frustrates fuero, spiritum exhalabo’” (LA 45.38); “Pilate called for Judas and told him: ‘I crave that fruit so much that if I don’t get some of it, I’ll die!’” (Ryan 168). Judas then hurriedly enters (by climbing rather than breaking into) the orchard to steal the apples: “Concitus igitur Iudas in pomerium Ruben insiliit et velocius mala carpit” (LA 45.40); “Thus prompted, Judas jumped over into the orchard and speedily picked some apples” (Ryan 168).

³⁸ The SEL poet shortens the more detailed explanation found in the source: “Erat autem illud pomerium Ruben, patris Iude, sed nec Iudas patrem nec Ruben filium agnoscebat, quia et Ruben ipsum in marinis fluctibus perisse putabat et Iudas quis pater aut que patria sua fuerit penitus ignorabat” (LA 45.37); “The orchard belonged to Ruben, Judas’s father, but Judas did not recognize his father, nor did Ruben know his son, because Ruben thought that his child had perished in the sea, and Judas had no idea who his father was or where he came from” (Ryan

he had broken his fence, and what he was doing there. (69-76)

Judas said, “I mean to be here, in spite of your front teeth³⁹ and I will take some of these apples even if you swear to the contrary.” (77-78)

This good man was vexed by this wicked answer.⁴⁰ The scoundrel slandered him again; he could no longer put up with it. They grabbed one another by the head⁴¹ and inflicted severe wounds. The scoundrel was stronger than his father and quickly brought him to the ground. Then he struck him with a stone at the back of the neck, so that his skull was entirely split apart and his brains were dashed out.⁴² Thus [Judas] slew his own father, and so it might be known that his mother had dreamed the truth about him at the time of his conception.⁴³ Nevertheless it would have been better for his father to have

168). None of this explanation is in the HA, but was added for the LA version. By way of contrast, the *Scottish Legendary* (lines 149-159) gives a very faithful (and consequently tedious) rendering of Jacobus’s interpolation (ed. Metcalfe 1:226).

³⁹ *Maugre þine tēþ bivore* (77): seems to have the force of an idiom, along the lines of ‘despite your eye’ or even ‘in your face’. Note the use of a similar expression in *Piers Plowman*: “Maugre his many tethe” (PP B Passus 18.81); “Ac maugre hus meny teth” (PP C Passus 21.84).

⁴⁰ *godeman*: here (79), as above (75), the goodness of Ruben is stressed; this is then contrasted with the wickedness of Judas (*þe schrewe*, 80; 82). See notes on line 6 above and line 95 below.

⁴¹ *bi þe top* (81); literally ‘top’, meaning, perhaps ‘head’ or, more remotely, ‘tuft’ (of hair).

⁴² *So þat he smot him mid a ston bihinde in þe pate / Þat al þe scolle toda3ste þe brayn veol out þer ate* (83-83): The Latin versions of the Judas legend do not describe the fatal injury in quite so much detail (or with quite as much relish) as the SEL: “Tandem Iudas Ruben uenit in ea parte qua ceruix collo connectitur lapide percussit partier et occidit” (LA 45.43); “Finally Judas struck Ruben at the back of the neck with a stone and killed him” (Ryan 168); “Ruben tandem lapide qua ceruix collo connectitur a Iuda percussus occubuit” (HA 382-83); “Finally Ruben, struck with a stone at the back of the neck by Judas, fell down dead.” The scene is reminiscent of several famous parricides, but the specific act of striking with a stone at the back of the neck bears a strong resemblance to the murder of Nectabus, an astrologer who claims to be, or (in some versions) actually is the father of Alexander. See, for instance, the ME *Kyng Alisaunder*, 719-20: “*His panne braak a3ein [a] ston; / Atwo crussht his nek-bone*” (Smithers 1:43).

⁴³ Although Tyborie’s dream (lines 9-12, and note) does not predict either parricide or incest, both may be seen as confirming the truth of its prophetic qualities. In some Latin versions of the legend (not LA or HA), the dream predictions more clearly match the outcomes. In Baum’s “type

taken his life as soon as Judas was born, than to be killed by him.⁴⁴ (79-88)

The scoundrel took some apples and some pears too, and carried them off to Pilate, and straightaway told him all that he had done.⁴⁵ Some days later, Pilate went to the good man's house and gave all his goods to Judas, and made him marry [the dead man's] wife. (89-92)

For since [Pilate] was lord and Justice, he could commit plenty of injustice.⁴⁶ Then the scoundrel married his own mother, and killed his father.⁴⁷ (93-94)

One night, as this good woman lay there beside her scoundrel husband, she began to sigh most grievously.⁴⁸ He asked her what was wrong.⁴⁹ "Surely sir," said this woman, "well ought I to sigh so: more woe and sorrow have come to no other woman [than me]. I will never ever be glad or happy, when I think about myself, for I never had but one son, and that one I had drowned. And then I have found my husband slain—I know not in what manner—and I am married to you against my will through the power of the Justice

A," for instance, a vision comes to the father of Judas, predicting that he would have a son who would kill him (Baum 490).

⁴⁴ *3ut were is fader betere to habbe ibro3t hym of dawē / As sone as he was ibore þen he hadde him aslawe* (87-8): The syntax of this couplet is a bit awkward, but the sense is more literally: 'Yet it would have been better for his father to have caused [Judas] to die as soon as he was born rather than [Judas's] having slain him.' No such remark is found in the Latin sources.

⁴⁵ *Of þe applen þe schrewe nom & of þe peren also* (89): The addition of pears is either a humorous interpolation by the SEL poet, or one intended to provide the verisimilitude of detail. It may also be a sly allusion to a well known episode in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine (2.4.9). (See above ch. 3, p. 128 ff.)

⁴⁶ *he mi3te do vnri3t ynou3* (93): This remark (a typical understatement) is added by the SEL poet.

⁴⁷ *þo weddede þe schrewe his owe moder & is fader slou3* (94): The poet obscures the order of these events: Judas first kills his father and then marries his mother.

⁴⁸ *As þis godewyf lay a ny3t bi hire schrewe louerd þere* (95): Again the good parent, this time the mother, is contrasted with her evil child. (See above, notes on lines 6 and 79.)

⁴⁹ *he e3ste why hyt were* (96): literally, 'he asked her why it might be,' that is, why she sighed so.

[Pilate]. (95-102)

When Judas heard this, he was quite upset. “Indeed,” he said, “I am your son, and I killed my father.”⁵⁰ Then the good woman was more upset than she had been before. “Son,” she said, “what must we do to be absolved of this, alas?”⁵¹ Judas had heard it said that Our Lord then walked upon the Earth, [and] that he had helped many people in sickness and in need. (103-8)

Because of his mother’s counsel of penance, Judas went to Our Lord. He was repentant and willing to change his life, so he followed Our Lord for a long time to learn of his ways. Our Lord made Judas his disciple to be a companion to the Apostles.⁵² Later the Lord made him his apostle,⁵³ [in order] to test his mind, and then bursar of His pence, to dispense all His goods.⁵⁴ (109-14)

For many men who were well intentioned gave their goods to Our Lord to support the Apostles; for they had no other resources whatsoever. (115-16)

But when Judas was [accepted] among them, and he realized his power over Our

⁵⁰ The SEL version follows the LA fairly closely. There is no particular sign or token (such as the scars of Oedipus, or the “silk and gold” of St. Gregory [Boswell 374]) that identifies Judas as the abandoned child.

⁵¹ *Sone 3eo sede wjat mowe we do after schryft alas* (104): ME *schryft* means ‘confession or penance,’ here translating the Latin “penitentia” (LA 45.50), “penitencia” (HA 390) ‘repentance, penitence’.

⁵² The term apostle (Greek *apostolos*, ‘one who is sent’) is at best a dubious designation prior to the Pentecost, yet Jacobus too uses the term: “Dominus autem suum eum fecit discipulum et de discipulo in suum elegit apostolum” (LA 45.53); “the Lord made Judas his disciple and then chose him to be an apostle” (Ryan 168).

⁵³ *To vondi his mod* (113): This is not in the LA, but may be implicit in the Gospels (e.g., John 6:70-71).

⁵⁴ *& suppe bourser [of] is panes to spene al his god* (114): *spene*, literally ‘to spend, to employ’ here seems to imply both custody and disposition. Thus the role assigned to Judas by Jesus closely parallels his earlier position as Pilate’s steward (see above, lines 64-65).

Lord's property which he kept, he stole it all to nothing.⁵⁵ He would steal one-tenth of each thing, unless he could take more.⁵⁶ [Judas] was a scoundrel all his life—it could not be helped.⁵⁷ Our Lord knew well what he was, and all his wicked deeds, but nevertheless He had to fulfill what the prophets had said about Him.⁵⁸ (117-22)

Saint Mary Magdalene came to Our Lord before His sweet passion, and took a great deal of ointment with her.⁵⁹ She washed His feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. She then anointed Our sweet Lord with this sweet oil. Judas was upset about⁶⁰ this oil, for it was valuable, and he said that it was a shame⁶¹ that it had not been

⁵⁵ *Of oure Louerdes god þat he wuste* (118), ME *wuste* < *witie* from OE *witian*, 'guard, keep, protect': the syntax here is quite loose and not easily rendered. (See above, line 35 and note.)

⁵⁶ *he stal hyt al to grounde / Bote he my3te more of ech þyng þe teoþingge he wolde stele* (118-9): Judas habitually stole ten percent, but would take more when he could get away with it; he is able to steal more by skimming over a long period than he might by stealing the entire bag outright. In Middle English, *þe teoþingge* admits of two distinct but not necessarily exclusive readings: 'the tenth part' or 'the tithing'. In the chapter on Lent, the SEL poet uses the same word in both ways (Lent being the tenth-part or the tithing of the year), along with the verbal form *teþegi*, 'to tithe' (SEL *De septuagesima* 5). In the case of *Iudas*, however, there may be an allusion to the sin of simony, or at least to the imperfect poverty among some of the clergy. In the context of the late thirteenth century, the friars (of which the SEL poet may have been one) might make such a criticism of the secular clergy; by the time of Chaucer, on the other hand, the friars are themselves accused of greed. Jacobus gives two options for arriving at 30 *denarii* (LA 45.56-57). The HA, being at this point very truncated, gives no such details here. For the canonical description of Judas as a thief, see John 12:6.

⁵⁷ *Me may hyt no leng hele* (120) possibly 'it could not be concealed for long' (an ironic understatement); or perhaps 'nobody could do anything about it' (emphasizing the fixed nature of Judas's character).

⁵⁸ *Wel wuste oure Louerd what he was & alle hys lufere dede / Ak napeles he moste voluulle þat þe prophetes of him sede* (121-2): SEL interpolation (ultimately based on John 6:70-71), where the LA does not address the question of what and when Jesus knew about Judas.

⁵⁹ *Seynte Marye Magdeleyn* (123): Calling her Saint in this context is a bit proleptic, but by no means extraordinary in the context of ME literature (hagiography and especially drama). Some of these lines are quite close to other passion narratives in the SEL (see above ch. 3, p. 130, n. 56).

⁶⁰ *Iudas ofþou3te þis oyle vor hyt muche worþ was* (127): *ofþou3te*, from *ofthink*, 'to grieve over, be sorry for, repent of' (OED, 2b).

⁶¹ *It was vuel ido* (128): literally, 'it was wrongly done'.

sold [instead]: it was worth three hundred pence, and with that [money] many poor men might have been fed by whomever sold it. (123-30)⁶²

Judas said that because, if the boxes been sold, he would have controlled [the proceeds] and kept the tenth part for himself. (131-32)⁶³

The tenth part of that was thirty pence. Judas was very upset that so many pence of his theft should be taken from him. On account of this he unjustly sold Our Lord for thirty pence, in order that he might recover the tenth part of those boxes [of ointment].⁶⁴ Wicked thieves followed him as well, for he loved trouble and strife. He was a ruthless

⁶² Ms C: *An hondred panes* (129) seems to be a mistake; MS H gives the correct reading of *Preo hondred*. This error, or divergence at any rate, is not surprising given that Jacobus muddies the waters by providing two methods of arriving at 30 pieces of silver (the SEL poet seems to favor the second method, which is rather more elegant): “Dolens uero tempore dominice passionis quod unguentum quod trecentos denarios ualebat non fuerat uenditum ut illos etiam denarios furaretur, abiit et dominum triginta denariis uendidit; quorum unusquisque ualebat decem denarios usuales et ita dampnum unguenti trecentorum denariorum recompensauit uel, ut quidam aiunt, omnium que Christo dabantur decimam partem furabatur et ideo pro decima parte quam in unguento amiserat, scilicet pro triginta denariis, dominum uendidit.” (LA 45.56-70); “At the time of the Lord’s passion he protested because the ointment that was worth three hundred pence had not been sold so that he could steal that money too. Then he went out and betrayed his Lord for thirty pieces of silver [*denariis*], each coin being worth ten pence [*denarios usuales*, i.e., copper pennies], and so he made up the three hundred pence lost over the ointment—or, as some say, he regularly stole one-tenth of all that was given to Christ, and therefore sold the Lord for the tenth part of the lost sale price of the ointment, i.e., three hundred pence” (Ryan 168, translating *denarii* as ‘pence’). (See also John 12:5.) As Wells notes, “in Type R [i.e., the HA] no connection is made between the anger of Judas over the wasting of the ointment and the betrayal of Jesus for thirty pence, although in the *Legenda Aurea* this is set forth in much detail” (“Relation,” 358).

⁶³ *pat [he] sede vor he wolde 3ef þe boxes hadde ibeo solde / Habbe ispend & to hym þe teoþyngge iholde* (131-2): Perhaps the intended distinction is: Judas was vexed not just because would have controlled all of the proceeds from the sale (mere cupidity), but also because he would have stolen one-tenth for himself (actual theft).

⁶⁴ Görlach notes the preceding lines, “115-36 show some agreement with texts of the Passion, especially with [the Long Life of Christ]” (*Textual Tradition* 217). It should be noted, however, that these legends appear together in only 2 extant manuscripts (T and the fragments Ba/Qa, which were once part of a single ms).

thief and manslayer, and as such he ended his life. (133-38)⁶⁵

And such men ought to be hanged, and when no one else would do it he hanged himself upon a tree, for he was destined to have such a death.⁶⁶ When he is supposed to have died, his belly burst open and his guts fell to the ground⁶⁷—as many men saw—and the evil spirit exited that way; it could not go out the mouth because he had once kissed Our Lord, and unjustly so. (139-44)⁶⁸

⁶⁵ *Hym sywede ek lupere þeoues vor he louede baret & stryf/ He was strong þeof & manquellare & also endede hys lyf* (137-8). There is no parallel statement in the LA about Judas associating with thieves, nor any reiteration of his own status as a thief and homicide. This remark seems intended to sum up the past sins of Judas, and lead logically to the next interpolation, which concerns his ignominious death.

⁶⁶ The SEL version elides the moment of repentance, in which Judas throws the blood money down in the Temple: “Quos tamen penitentia ductus retulit et abiens laqueo se suspendit...” (LA 45.58); “However, he was sorry for what he had done, threw back the money, and hanged himself with a halter...” (Ryan 168). The SEL poet has substituted a different account of the death of Judas thus changed the meaning of Judas’s suicide from an act of regret and despair, into something inevitable (139-40).

⁶⁷ *þo he scholde dey3e* (141): perhaps meaning, “The story goes that when he died...” a reading that may indicate the SEL poet’s dissatisfaction with the source. Here the LA (45.58) gives a harmonization of the two Gospel stories about the end of Judas (Matthew 27.5 and Acts 1.18), in which the hanging from a tree and the ‘bursting asunder’ become a single event: “Quos tamen penitentia ductus retulit et abiens laqueo se suspendit et suspensus crepuit medius et diffusa sunt uiscera eius” (LA 45.58); “However, he was sorry for what he had done, threw back the money, and hanged himself with a halter, and, as the gospel tells us, ‘burst asunder in the middle and all his bowels gushed out’ [Acts 1.18]” (Ryan 168). Jerome’s version of Acts in the Vulgate had already largely accomplished such a harmony (see above, ch. 1, p. 9 ff.). The fact the SEL poet should express more doubt about the (slightly ambiguous) Gospel truth than about the earlier story that Jacobus has clearly marked off as apocryphal and untrustworthy, serves to highlight the differences between the authors of the two legends.

⁶⁸ *þat monymon hyt ysey3e* (142): The witnesses who saw the death of Judas (and perhaps even glimpsed the spirit leaving through his belly) seem to be an invention of the SEL poet. The rest follows Jacobus closely: “In hoc delatum est ori ne per os effunderetur: non etiam dignum erat ut os tam uiliter inquinaretur quod tam gloriosum os, scilicet Christi, contingerat” (LA 45. 59-60); “Thus his mouth was spared defilement since nothing came out of through it, for it would have been incongruous that a mouth which had touched the glorious lips of Christ should be so foully soiled” (Ryan 168). The soul of Judas exiting through his belly was regularly depicted in visual art of the period. See, for example: Lee R. Sullivan, “The Hanging of Judas: Medieval Iconography and the German Peasants’ War,” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 15 (1999): 93-102. The

Now, sweet Lord, who was sold by Judas to the tree (i.e., the Cross),⁶⁹ shield us from the wicked place where we reckon him to be. (145-46)⁷⁰

SEL poet omits two other ways in which, according to Jacobus, Judas had a fitting death (LA 45.61-2).

⁶⁹ *Nou suete Louerd þat þoru Iudas isold were to þe treo* (145): this line echoes the first line of *Iudas*, with *luþer* repeated in the next line, creating an envelop pattern for the whole legend.

⁷⁰ *Schulde ous fram þe luþere stude þat we weneþ he inne beo* (146): presumably Hell, where most (but not all) traditions place the soul of Judas dwells. This closing prayer seems to be the SEL poet's own idea of an ending, not taken from LA. Compare the SEL *Pylatus* (262), which closes with a similar sentiment.

Appendix D: The SEL *Pilatus* translated into modern English (annotated)

As in Appendix C, the following translation is based on the edition of the *South English Legendary* (SEL) published by Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, EETS 235-36 (2.697-706). The base text for the edition is Cambridge Corpus Christi College, MS 145, a mid-fifteenth century Appendix, (siglum C¹) to a *ca.* 1310-20 Ms.; fols.215a-217b; variants are included from Harley, MS 2277 (siglum H), dated *ca.* 1300 or slightly later. Line numbers (1-262) follow that edition. The main source of the SEL *Pilatus* is Jacobus of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*, (abbreviated LA), cap. 51 *Passio domini* (though the SEL poet draws upon chapters 10, 45, and 63). Latin citations are for Maggioni's edition (by chapter and sentence number), and English translations are from Ryan (cited by page number, with occasional revisions shown in brackets). Though the bulk of the material comes from the last third of the chapter *De passione domini* (LA 51.185-262), the SEL poet also draws on LA chapters 10, 45, and 63. The LA version of the Pilate legend is, in turn, a significantly altered and greatly abbreviated redaction of the earlier Latin prose *Historia Apocrypha* (hereafter HA), which I cite from Knape's edition (by line number).

* * * * *

Pylatus was a wicked man¹, and came of wicked stock.² He was born of adultery³

¹ *Pylatus was a luper man* (1a): In the SEL, Pilate's evil, scheming nature is established from the very beginning of the legend, and frequently reinforced by the use of words such as *luper* ('evil' 1, 89, 150), *schrewe* ('scoundrel' 34, 35, 58, 75, 100), *quoynte* (adj., 'cunning' 58), *queyntore* ('more cunning' 48), and *quoyntise* (n., 'ingenuity; cunning' 54, 59, 65). In most cases, these

between a king and a wanton woman.⁴ Tyrus,⁵ the king, was a great man, and a man of great fame.⁶ He lay with a miller's daughter (her name was Pyle) and happened to beget the wicked child upon her, in disregard of the queen.⁷ The miller who was her father was

negative descriptions are added by the SEL poet. (See notes below, especially at lines 58-9; cf. notes on lines 17-18, and *Iudas* line 1.)

² & *com of lupere more* (1b): ME *more*, 'root, stock, lineage ancestry' from OE *more*, 'an edible root' (MED). But the language admits of wordplay here, so he may have come "from more wicked(ness)," or "from other wicked folk." This opening inverts the favorable description that might begin the legend of a saint: "*Seint Dunston was of Enguelonde, icome of goude more*" ('Saint Dunstan was of England, came of good stock,' ESEL *Dunstan* 1-2, quoted in Thompson, *Everyday Saints*, 118)

³ *in spousbruche was ibore* (2b): Although the adulterous origin of Pilate seems to be part of the negative characterization in this legend, compare the similar (but less negative) opening of the SEL *St. Bridget*: "*Sein Bride þat holi maide of Irlonde was / Biþute he[o] was in spousbruche in a wonder cas*" ('Saint Brigid, that holy maiden, was of Ireland; she was begotten of adultery, under unusual circumstances,' SEL *Bride* 1-2 EETS 235 pg 37).

⁴ As with *Iudas*, the first two lines are not based on the Latin source, but instead give an overview of Pilate's origins. In contrast to the SEL *Iudas* (2-3), here the poet also removed all trace of the famous disclaimer with which Jacobus sets off the material he has taken from the HA: "De pena autem et origine Pylati in quadam hystoria licet apocrypha sic legitur" (LA 51.185); "What follows is what we read in a history, admittedly apocryphal, concerning the origin and punishment of Pilate" (Ryan 211). There is also no trace of the opening of the HA, to which the SEL poet presumably had no access. Nor is there any indication that Pilate is one of the betrayers involved in the crucifixion of Jesus.

⁵ The name Tyrus is probably derived (by scribal drift) from Cyrus; Creiznach considered this a mark of the tale's "oriental origin" (Knape 118 n. 19). The miller's daughter, however, seems to have an occidental precursor in the Charlemagne legend (see the next note).

⁶ SEL, following LA, gives no specific geographic setting for Tyrus, his kingdom, or his liaison with Pyle. In HA, Tyrus is king in Mainz ("Regibus olim liberalibus eruditus in artibus accidit regem nomine Tyrum, Mogonciensem nacione," HA 1-2), and begets Pilate on a hunting trip near Bamberg ("in partibus Babenbergensium," HA 3). Compared to the original (and quite specific) setting of these events in HA, the LA and SEL seem closer to romance or folktale than history (apocryphal or otherwise). The Charlemagne legend includes a similar birth-story (Knape 118-9).

⁷ *bi cas*, 'by chance, as it happened' (5): These two words, while potentially meaningless, support, at the lexical level, the treatment Pilate's conception has in the SEL, which follows LA in its simplified and thoroughly negative portrayal of Pilate's parents. The HA version of Pilate's conception, by contrast, begins with a description of Tyrus as a learned astrologer-king, whose calculations indicate that a very favorable time for him to sire a child occurs when he is separated from his wife, the queen (HA 1-13). Pyle, the miller's daughter, described in the SEL as *fol*, 'foolish, wanton' (2), is chosen as the mother because of her proximity while Tyrus is far from his lawful wife (Mainz is about 250 km. from Bamberg as the crow flies, or nearly 400 km.

called Atus. Therefore after both their names—the daughter Pyle and the father Atus⁸—he invented [a new name for the child], and named him Pylatus.⁹ (1-8)

This child grew and thrived well, and when he was three years old the woman sent him to his father, because he was very powerful. The king loved him very much, and saw to it that he was properly educated. The queen had another child by him, the same age as Pilate.¹⁰ (9-12)

This legitimate child and Pilate were put together to be nurtured and properly educated.¹¹ As they grew up they fought often; there was no love between them. But the legitimate child always came out on top. Pilate awaited his advantage, and considered how to get back at him.¹² Secretly he made his move one day, and slew that child by means of trickery.¹³ (13-18)

downriver, at least along the present course of the Main); the circumstances of the liaison are not at all ‘by chance’. The LA version has already removed any astrological rationale Tyrus may have had for having carnal knowledge of Pyla (“carnaliter cognouit” 51.187), which the SEL condemns as adultery (“spousbruche” 2).

⁸ *Per vore þe dou3ter þat het Pyle & þe fader Atus* (7): That is, he is named after *his* mother Pyle and *her* father Atus (the child’s grandfather): tortuous syntax.

⁹ *Pilatus* (and *Pylatus*) (8): hereafter rendered as Pilate, following familiar modern usage.

¹⁰ The good-natured legitimate brother who becomes a rival and eventually the victim of murder is a motif that *Pylatus* shares with *Iudas*.

¹¹ *þat chylde þat was ri3t bi3ute* (13): literally, ‘that child who had been legitimately begotten’; this contrast is made in similar terms below: *Ak þat chylde ri3t bi3ute*, (16); and *his ry3te sone* (20). Compare the Latin, “Regis legitimus filius” (LA 51.192); “the king’s legitimate son” (Ryan 211).

¹² & *þou3te 3ulde hys wule* (17): literally, ‘and thought to repay his effort’ or ‘to compensate him’ (MED *while* [n.] 3a [c]); used here ironically, perhaps with the sense ‘giving him something for his trouble’.

¹³ The SEL poet expresses this idea—that a cold-blooded criminal patiently awaits an opportunity to act in secret—three times in *Pylatus*: before Pilate murders his half-brother (17-18); before Pilate murders the son of the king of France (35); and before Pilate betrays Herod (75). In the latter two, Pilate’s crafty patience is specifically associated with the epithet *schrewe*

When the king learned of this he was quite aggrieved. He did not know what to do with the scoundrel who had slain his legitimate son. He thought that if he should slay him, it would be a double sorrow; and (yet) he would not be happy to see him going anywhere. (19-22)

The emperor¹⁴ sent to him for tribute for his land; the king considered how he might best satisfy his embassy.¹⁵ He sent Pilate there as if he were a hostage, intending that the emperor would slay him when [Tyrus] failed to send tribute. He sent [Pilate], letting the emperor know that he had no other child but this one alive, and he would not lose his life, except if he should fail to send his tribute on the appointed day, [in which case let him] do whatever he wanted with [Pilate], as was proper with respect to hostages. (23-30)

The emperor loved Pilate, but he knew nothing of his depravity.¹⁶ The son of the king of France was brought there as hostage.¹⁷ Though they were companions, he was more beloved than Pilate, for the one was good and the other was a scoundrel who was

(‘scoundrel’). Another parallel example occurs just before Judas murders his half-brother (SEL *Iudas* 58). On the one hand, the wording of these passages reinforces the implicit message of irredeemability in this legend (and also *Iudas*): once a scoundrel, always a scoundrel; on the other hand, it also implies that the SEL poet (and perhaps his culture) valued open, spontaneous gestures, even impulsive action, and that the careful planning and timing that our culture values was often suspect.

¹⁴ *Pe emperour* (23): Tiberius in HA/LA; Claudius in other Pilate legends. (See note on *Pylatus* line 77.)

¹⁵ *apaye* (24): ‘repay’ or ‘satisfy’ (MED *apaien*), possibly with the sense: ‘return’ or ‘respond to’.

¹⁶ *shreuehede* (31), ‘wickedness, depravity, evildoing’ may also mean ‘an evil deed’ (MED).

¹⁷ *Pe kynkes sone of Fraunce* (32): a perfectly grammatical ME genitive construction. This character, originally named Paginus (HA 35), is unnamed in LA and SEL.

never good.¹⁸ (31-34)

The scoundrel patiently bided his time, for he was quite crafty: in private, with only the two of them (present), he slew his companion.¹⁹ The emperor caught him soon; he did not know what to do with him. He would have slain him, but his [counselor] did not grant him leave to do so, but said that he was promising—a very bold man, after all; through such a man much good might come to pass for all the country. (35-40)

“Shall we let,” said the emperor, “a manslayer go alive?” (41)

“Sire, sire,” said this other, “you have many a foe, and if such a man remains [alive], he might do you great good, and [even] if the law of the land does not will it, you should [still] let him go thus. You know well that there are many scoundrels in the isle of Pontos;²⁰ no Justice ever comes there whom they do not soon slay. Therefore, you might send him there, to be Justice of that island, and unless he is craftier than any other, he will not escape a deceit.²¹ And if he disciplines that land well, and brings it entirely to heel,²² he will be considered without peer—if he is able to endure.²³ (42-50)

¹⁸ *schrewe* (‘scoundrel’ 34, 35, etc.): as a noun this word means “rascal, rogue; a wicked person, an evildoer; also, an unruly or ill-disciplined child,” and as an adjective, “wicked, evil” (MED ‘shreue’).

¹⁹ *Bitwene hem sulue priuelyche hys felawe he slou3* (36): or perhaps: “When no one else was present, he secretly/quietly slew his companion” (reflecting the ms variation: *priuelyche* in C, *stilleliche* in H). See also the notes on lines 17-18 above and line 75 below.

²⁰ *pe yle of Pounce* (45): translates the Latin “Pontos insulam” (LA 51.201; HA 43). Like the island of Scariot(h) in the Judas legend, Pontos or Pounce is a fanciful etymological back-formation upon the name Pontius Pylatus, with no geographic basis.

²¹ *he ne scapeþ no3t a gile* (48): expressed more loosely, perhaps, “they’ll put one over on him for sure.”

²² *& bryngeþ a1 vnder vote* (49): more literally, “and bring all under foot.”

²³ In the LA, Jacobus attributes this speech to unspecified Romans: “Sed cum Romani quid de eo faciendum esset inquirerent, dixerunt: ‘Hic si superuixerit, qui fratrem necauit, obsidem iugulauit,

When Pilate was sent there, he clearly understood the ruse,²⁴ and he investigated the ways of the country, when he came into the island. He spoke pleasingly, and was mild, and was always quiet. With pleasing speeches and ingenuities, he got his way with them. They acted in complete accordance to his will, and considered him their Justice,²⁵ where previously none had ever been at all. (51-56)

When the emperor heard that he was able to discipline the wicked people, he maintained that nowhere was there so cunning a man as the scoundrel [Pilate]. His cunning was widely spoken of²⁶—by day and by night—how he had subdued the island of Pontos as no one ever could [before him]. Because he subdued and disciplined the island of Pontos so well, he is called Pontius Pilate in the Creed and in the Gospel.²⁷ (56-

reipublice plurimum utilis erit et colla ferocium hostium ferox ipse domabit.’ Dixerunt ergo: ‘Cum reus mortis habeatur, in Pontos insulam gentibus illis que nullum paciuntur iudicern iudex preficiatur, si forte eius nequitia ipsorum contumacia edomecur. Si non, quod meruit patiatur.’”(LA 51.198-202); “Now the Romans, wondering what to do with him, said: ‘If this fellow, who slew his brother and strangled a hostage, is allowed to live, he can be mighty useful to the Republic, and, being a brute himself, he will know how to handle our brutish enemies.’ They therefore decided: ‘He must be judged worthy of death but let him be posted as a judge to the island of Pontus, where the people have never tolerated a judge. If his wickedness can tame their perversity, all the better; if not, let him get what he deserves’.” (Ryan 211). Here the SEL poet builds upon the source text, shifting the emphasis of the speech by the clever (if unscrupulous councilor), and supplying a short interjection by the emperor.

²⁴ *wel he wuste þe gyle* (51): in other words, Pilate has recognized the trick being played on him by the emperor and his counselors, and hence he is on his guard (as is clear from what follows).

²⁵ *Iustise* (55): translating the Latin “iudex” (‘judge,’ LA 51.201), but possibly meant to evoke the English *Justiciar* (cf. *Iudas* line 61 and note thereupon).

²⁶ *He ne heold nowhar so quoynte man as he huld þe schrewe / Of his quoyntyse me spak wyde* (58-9): The collocation of *quoynte* (‘cunning’ adj.) or *quoyntyse* (‘cunning’ n.) with *schrewe* (‘scoundrel’) is used to emphasize the particular underhanded brand of wickedness practiced by Pilate. (See note on line 1.)

²⁷ *Pounce Pylat me clupeþ him in crede & in gospel* (62): Pontius Pilate, as indeed he is known in the Apostles’ Creed and in the Gospels, despite the fanciful derivation of Pontius given here and in the Latin sources. “Quia igitur tam dure gentis uictor extitit, a Pontos insula Pontius Pylatus nomen accepit.” (LA 51.204); “His victory won for him the title of Pilate of Pontus, or

62)

The king Herod,²⁸ who was then king of the land of Judea²⁹ and also of Jerusalem and Galilee, had frequently heard of Pilate, of his wit and his cunning³⁰: he would be overjoyed and proud to have such a Justice. [Herod] gave him noble gifts, and tried in every way [to see] if he would [come] out from his land and dwell in his [i.e., Herod's] service. Then Pilate came to him, and they made a plan that more than half of his kingdom was handed over to him as a gift³¹—to be ruler of Jerusalem and also of Judea; [Herod] kept the land of Galilee in his own control. (63-72)

Pontius Pilate” (Ryan 211). The wording of the HA is similar: “Quia uero tam dure gentis uictor extiterat, a Pontos insula, cuius uictor exstiterat, Poncius Pilatus nomen accepit.” (HA 49-51). See also: note on line 45 above.

²⁸ *þe kyng He[re]des* (63, 80, 84, 87, 89): D’Evelyn and Mill emend ms reading *Hederes* to *Heredes* (Latin *Herodes*, LA 51.205), the name having been altered by scribal metathesis. In keeping with his usual editorial practices, Jacobus leaves out additional information about the secular rulers given in the HA (the SEL follows the LA in this): “Herodes ergo minor, filius Archelai, magni Herodis filii, princeps diebus illis Iudee et Ierusalem” (HA 52-3); “the lesser Herod, the son of Archelaus, Herod the Great’s son, the ruler in those days over Judea and Jerusalem.” This ‘lesser Herod’ is better known nowadays as Herod Archelaus. (See also: Steinmeyer 166, and Murray 343-344.)

²⁹ *þat was þe kyng of the londe of Iude / & also of Ierusalem & of Galyle* (63-4): instead of *Iude*, ‘Judea’, ms H has *Ynde*, ‘India’, an error likely due to a scribal misreading of two minims (*u* for *n*) at some stage of transmission, as was not infrequent with minims. As ruler over Jerusalem, Galilee, and also India, this *Hederes* would have been a great king indeed! (Compare the geographical substitution of Galilee for Galicia below, line 162.)

³⁰ *Of Pilatus he hurde ilome of is wyt and is quoyntise* (65): *quoyntise* ‘guile, cunning; deceit, trickery’ (MED ‘queintise’ 1b), while elsewhere interpolated, in this case translates the Latin *versutia*, ‘cunning, craftiness’: “Herodes autem hominis illius industriam ut audiuit, euis uersutiis congaudens ipse uersutus eum ad se muneribus et internuntiis inuitauit” (LA 51.205); “Herod heard about this man’s way of doing things and, being a crafty schemer himself, was delighted with the other’s stratagems and sent envoys with gifts and an invitation to visit” (Ryan 211).

³¹ *he tok him to loke* (70): The LA has: “et super Iudeum et Iherusalem potestatem et vicem suam tradidit” (LA 51.205); “Then he made Pilate his deputy and gave him power over Judea and Jerusalem” (Ryan 211). In the SEL *tok* has the sense of ‘give, grant, hand over, entrust’ (rendering *tradidit*), while *loke* means ‘gift, present’ (MED ‘taken’ [v.] 31a [b-c]; ‘lok’ [n.(3)] 2a).

When Pilate had held sway there (far and near) for a long time, [and] when he saw [the extent of] his [own] power, he began to reveal what he was. For a scoundrel will bide his time before he reveals his villainy.³² He gathered treasure and lots of other goods in his possession, and went to the emperor Caesar who was ruler over the king.³³ Generously he brought him treasure and lots of other goods, and offered it to him with [the condition] that he must have dominion there [directly] from [Caesar] as he had done from Herod, as though it were [Pilate's] own kingdom. (73-80)

The emperor, who was the king's lord, quickly considered [the matter], and happily accepted the treasure that Pilate had brought him; and [Caesar] granted Pilate [the right] to hold as ruler all that land that he had previously held from Herod. That was a great treachery.³⁴ He went back to Jerusalem and also to Judea; when he came there he followed all of his lord [Caesar's] instructions.³⁵ After a while, Herod summoned him to give an account. [But] Pilate spoke at the behest of the emperor, and he could not have

³² *Vor a schrewe wole abide his time to cuþe is felonye* (75): For more about this recurrent theme, see note on lines 17-18 and 58-9 above. This repetition of wording from the previously narrated murders of the step-brother and the fellow hostage associates the betrayal of Herod with these much more violent crimes Pilate's youth, and may indicate how severely he is about to violate the feudal order. Consider, for instance, the ninth circle of Dante's *Inferno*, and the placement of Ganelon (*Inf.* 32.122).

³³ *Cesar þe emperour* (77): 'The emperor Caesar', who was indeed the ruler above King Herod, is referred to by two of his titles rather than a specific name in the SEL, despite the fact that the LA names Tiberius (in 51.206 and elsewhere) as well as referring to him by the title Caesar. (See note on line 23.)

³⁴ *þat was great trycherye* (84): The SEL poet has added this blunt assessment in such a way that at least some of the blame seems to adhere to the emperor, who is, by contrast, a fairly sympathetic character in the LA. This harsh condemnation may relate to the disruption of established feudal ties (see note on line 75 above).

³⁵ *Hys louerd he dude al his hasten* (86): or perhaps, "he carried out Caesar's orders completely" (MED 'hest[e]' 1a-b).

cared less [about Herod].³⁶ (81-88)

Then Herod saw the treachery and the wicked falsehood.³⁷ He considered himself betrayed by villainy, and he did not know what to make of it.³⁸ When he saw that he could not undo the emperor's action he cursed Pilate frequently for his wicked falsehood. And when he could not do anything but feel anger, and rightfully so, such a great animosity was between them that no man could describe it.³⁹ The animosity lasted until Our Lord was due to go to death, but because each of the two had sent [Him] to the other, they were reconciled at that point.⁴⁰ (89-96)

³⁶ *Pilatus spak þoru þe emperor & ne 3af no3t worþ a ville* (88): adversative asyndeton, where the sense seems to call for an *Ak* at the beginning of the line. The point here is that Pilate will no longer answer a summons from Herod, and can now be commanded to 'give an account' or even to 'speak' by only the emperor himself. Thus Herod's summons was 'not worth a [chervil] leaf' (MED *fille* [n.(2)]) to Pylate.

³⁷ *þe tricherye & þe luþere valshede* (89): Pilate's treatment of Herod is criticized implicitly here (as explicitly above) for both the breaking of feudal hierarchy, and for the devious way he goes about doing so. These terms are repeated in this section: *þat was great trycherye* (84); and *his luþere valshede* (92).

³⁸ *he nuste what to rede* (90): literally, 'he didn't know what to believe' or perhaps, 'what to think' (MED 'reden' [v. (1)] 7b).

³⁹ *bote wrapþe him bar wyþ ry3te / So gret wrapþe hem was bitwene þat no mon telle ne my3te* (93-4): The SEL lays a great deal of stress upon the *wrapþe* ('anger, rage, hostility, animosity', MED) that Herod feels after being betrayed by Pilate, which soon becomes mutual, and unspeakably intense. The Latin source, however, is far more neutral: "Huiusmodi causa facti sunt inimici Pylatus et Herodes..." (LA 51.207); "This gave rise to the enmity between [Pilate and Herod]..." (Ryan 211).

⁴⁰ *Ac vor 3are eyþer to oþer sende acor[d]ed hii were þo* (96): Here *3ara eyþer* mean 'each of them' (MED 'either' 2b[a]), which indicates a double exchange. The LA's focus is upon the first transaction: "...quoadusque tempore passionis domini eum sibi reconciliauit, eo quod dominum ad se misit." (LA 51.207); "...until the time of the Lord's passion, when Pilate, to conciliate Herod, sent [the Lord] to him" (Ryan 211). The verb *sende* (translating *misit*) lacks an explicit direct object (a word to translate *dominus*). Ms. C reads *acorsed* ('accursed, wicked, damnable,' MED), which D'Evelyn and Mill's emend to *acorded* ('came to an understanding, became reconciled') from H. Though both make sense, the latter version seems to follow the Latin source more closely. The whole matter is handled more clearly (and more to the advantage of Pilate) in the earlier Latin version: "Huiusmodi causa facti sunt Pilatus et Herodes inimici, quousque dominus Ihesus traditus est Pilato. Quem Pilatus ueste purpurea induit et misit Herodi uolens se

While Pilate was lord and sire in his land, Judas (who sold Our Lord) happened to come to him. [Pilate] soon made [Judas] his steward. They were good friends, for two scoundrels will be friends even though no one else would be [friends with either one].⁴¹ Judas was his steward before he slew his father and before he married his own mother, with great strength and woe [respectively]. (97-102)⁴²

seruare innocentem a sanguine huius. Herodes autem credens hec ad honorem et reuerenciam sui facta mutuo dilectionis honore remisit eum Pilato. Et reconciliati sunt Herodes et Pilatus in die illa. Pilatus uero satisfaciens peticioni Iudeorum Ihesum flagellis et alapis cesum, delusum, uinctum tradidit ad crucifigendum.” (HA 60-65); “This was how the enmity arose between Pilate and Herod, until the lord Jesus was handed over to Pilate. And Pilate dressed him in purple garments and Pilate, wanting to remain innocent of that blood, sent Him to Herod. Herod, believing it to be an honor and reverence to himself, in order to make the honor of love reciprocal, sent him back to Pilate. And Herod and Pilate were reconciled on that day. Then, Pilate really granted the requests of the Jews, with whips and blows, ceased, mocked, and bound, handed Jesus over to be crucified.” (See below, note on line 110.)

⁴¹ *Vor twei schrewen wollep beo freond þei noman ells nere* (100): This *sententia* on the nature of friendship between scoundrels echoes an analogous passage in the Judas legend: “Vor ech þyng louep hys ilyk so seyþ þe bok ywis / Vor þey in al a contreye bote tweye schrewen nere / 3ut hii wolde felawes beo 3if hii togadere were” (‘for each thing loves its like, as indeed the Book says, for, even if there were but two scoundrels in an entire country, nevertheless if they met they would become friends,’ *Judas* 66-68), and see note on these lines above, Appendix C.

⁴² In the corresponding section of the LA, Jacobus departs from the HA narrative by inserting an alternative cause for the quarrel between Herod and Pilate: “Alia causa inimicitie assignatur in hystoriis scholasticis. Quidam enim se filium dei faciens multos de Galileis seduxerat, quos cum in Garizim duxisset ubi dixerat se ascensurum in celum, superueniens Pylatus ipsum cum omnibus occidit tirnens ne similiter Iudeos seduceret. Ob hoc facti sunt inimici quia Herodes presidebat Galileis. Et utraque causa potuit esse uera. (LA 51.208-11); “The *Scholastic History* tells us that there was another reason for their hostility. There was an individual who claimed to be the son of God and beguiled a great many people in Galilee. He led his followers to Gazirim, where he said he was going to ascend to heaven. Pilate came upon them and killed them all, because he feared that the people of Judea might likewise be misled. This caused enmity between him and Herod, because Galilee was in Herod’s jurisdiction. Both of these reasons [could] be true” (Ryan 211-2). As Jacobus tells us, this gloss is drawn from the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comester (*In Euangel. 94* [PL 198 col. 1045 sqq.]). The SEL poet chooses to overlook the second explanation, which even Jacobus concedes does not preclude the first, and thus the Middle English version seems to unwittingly follows the HA. In place of this digression, however, the SEL inserts six lines about Pilate’s protégé and *styward* Judas, material borrowed and greatly abbreviated from the Judas legend (lines 61-94) and ultimately, LA cap. 45 (33-44). The substitution may have served a twofold purpose: first, to elide a scholarly gloss that detracts from

When God [i.e., Jesus] was apprehended and was due to be put to death, [it was] Pilate [who] condemned him thereto, according to the wishes of the Jews. For the Jews of Jerusalem took Him into their power, but they could not kill him, except by [Pilate's] sentence. For a long time after He was dead, [Pilate] frequently regretted [it]. Because of this he dared not appear before the emperor at Rome, but always sat tight at Jerusalem among the Jews. Yet he was dreadfully afraid that the emperor might finally slay him.⁴³

(103-110)

A long time afterward, it happened that the emperor lay grievously ill; in a severe and protracted malady so that he was worse off than anyone.⁴⁴ He ordered physicians to be gathered from afar, but none of them could heal him. Finally, one of his messengers came to Jerusalem; he made extensive inquiries there, seeking some good physician.⁴⁵ He

the forward movement of the narrative; and second, to form a closer connection between the legends of Judas and Pilate, lives of anti-saints that are otherwise unique in the SEL.

⁴³ The Latin source has: "Cum autem Pylatus dominum Iudeis crucifigendum tradidisset, timens tamen offensam Tyberii cesaris eo quod condempnasset sanguinem innocentem, quendam sibi familiarem pro sui excusatione ad cesarem destinavit" (LA 51.212); "When Pilate handed Jesus over to the Jews to be crucified, he was afraid that his condemnation of innocent blood might offend Tiberius Caesar, and dispatched one of his familiars to make a case for him to the emperor" (Ryan 212). The SEL differs both in its emphasis on Pilate's fear and inactivity, and in its omission (until lines 157-60) of any mention of the messenger (here named Volusianus) sent by Pilate to Rome. In the LA, the story of the messenger (there named Albanus, a name that also appears in some manuscripts of cap. 51 [Maggioni 350]) is continued in the legend of St. James the Less (LA 63.93-116). The SEL temporale poem *The Harrowing of Hell and Destruction of Jerusalem* contains similar material (see above, note on lines 161-2).

⁴⁴ *pat he nas noman ylyk* (112): more literally, 'that he had no one equal'; that is, with respect to the severity of his illness, no one could compare to the emperor.

⁴⁵ *Leches he let vecche wyde*, etc. (113-15): In the Latin source, a report prompts Tiberius to dispatch a single messenger to Jerusalem: "Interea cum Tyberius morbo graui teneretur, nuntiatu eidem quod Iherosolimis quidam medicus esset qui omnes morbos solo uerbo curaret, nesciens quod eum Iudei et Pylatus occidissent. Dixit itaque Volusiano sibi priuato: 'Vade citius trans partes marinas dicesque Pylato ut hunc medicum mihi mittat qui me pristinae sanitati restituat'" (LA 51.213-5); "Meanwhile, it was announced to Tiberius, who was seriously ill, that in Jerusalem there was a physician who cured all diseases by his word alone. Therefore the emperor,

went to a woman who was called Veronica, [hoping] that she might point one out to him.
(111-16)⁴⁶

“Alas,” said the woman, “if you had come here while the prophet was here, your will would have been done.” (117-18)

“Ah, where, where,” said the messenger, “has the prophet gone to?” (119)

“Surely,” said this Veronica, “the Jews took him [away]: they brought him to death on the cross, by Pilate’s sentence.⁴⁷ Therefore after that he did not ever dare come before you at Rome. While the prophet was here, I had very great joy in coming to Him and being near Him, if it might so happen and one might be near Him.⁴⁸ I asked Him a

not knowing that [the Jews and Pilate] had put this physician to death, said to one of his intimates, whose name was Volusian: ‘Cross the sea as fast as you can and tell Pilate to send this healer to me so that he may restore me to health’” (Ryan 212).

⁴⁶ *To a woman he com þat het Veronie þat 3eo scholde him som teche* (116): in ME, ‘teach’ has the sense, ‘to indicate, point out’ (MED ‘techen’ 12a). In the LA, Volusian meets Veronica after first speaking to Pilate: “Cum autem ille ad Pylatum uenisset et mandatum imperatoris exposuisset eidem, territus Pylatus XIV dierum inducias postulauit. Infra quod spatium dum Volusianus quandam matronam que fuerat familiaris Ihesu, nomine Veronica, ubinam Christus Ihesus inueniri posset interrogasset,” (LA 51.216-7); “Volusian came to Pilate and delivered the emperor’s command, but Pilate, terror-stricken, asked for a fortnight’s grace. During this time Volusian made the acquaintance of a woman named Veronica, who had been in Jesus’ company, and asked her where he might find [Jesus] Christ” (Ryan 212).

⁴⁷ *Certes quap þis Veronye þe Gywes him habbet inome / To deþe hii brou3te him in þe rode þoru Pilatus dome* (120-1): The conversation between Veronica and the imperial messenger (SEL 117 ff.) is significantly altered from the source: “[Veronica] ait: ‘Heu, dominus meus et deus meus erat, quem Pylatus per inuidiam traditum condempnauit et crucifigi precepit’” (LA 51.217-8); “She answered: ‘Alas, he was my Lord and my God, and Pilate, to whom he was handed over through envy, condemned him and commanded that he be crucified’” (Ryan 212). Here Jacobus repeats his assertion that the Jews betrayed Jesus because of their envy (cf. LA 51.183).

⁴⁸ *Þe whule þe prophete her was gret ioye ich hadde wyþ alle / Hym to kome & ney3 him beo 3if hit mi3te so bivalle / & me my3te ney3 him beo* (123-5): This is a run-on sentence, perhaps intended to convey the speaker’s excitement.

favor: that I might often see His likeness,⁴⁹ and He granted it to me right away. I handed over my kerchief to Him and He wound it about His face.⁵⁰ There everyone may well see His might and His grace, for His own likeness remained there, as was in His face. In each detail then He committed it to me; there was nothing missing. That likeness has remained with me, that I may be cheered by the sight that is so like Him when I may not see Him otherwise. If your Lord the emperor would see the likeness once, I know he would be healed immediately, and cleansed of his illness.” (120-34)

“Please ma’am!” said the messenger, “how may this image for any gold or silver at all be brought to the emperor?” (135-36)⁵¹

“That is nothing,” said this lady. “For all his gold indeed cannot buy the least corner that is on there. But I will travel with you to him, to cure the emperor if Our Lord will send him help through His likeness. (137-40)

She went forth with this messenger, and when she came to Rome they told all this

⁴⁹ *Pat ich my3te his fourme oft iseo* (126): Here (and in lines 129, 133) I use ‘likeness’ to translate *fourme* (‘outward appearance, likeness’ but also ‘semblance, image’ [MED]), which in turn renders Latin *imago* (‘imitation, copy’ also ‘image, likeness’).

⁵⁰ The SEL poet elides the detail that Veronica had been on her way to have his picture painted on the cloth when she met Jesus (LA 51. 221-223). Here the poet has apparently replaced the source material with a more popular version of the legend, perhaps drawn from oral tradition and supplemented by contemporary cult information. Where, in the LA (51.219-24), the miraculous image is imprinted upon a linen cloth (“linteum,” 5.222) that Veronica has already prepared to bear a painted portrait of Jesus, the SEL-poet, apparently under the influence of a different version of the legend, substitutes a kerchief (“keuerchef,” 127) that Veronica just happens to be carrying, with which she wipes the face of Jesus. The poet has also added an important detail—possibly gleaned from pilgrimage accounts—that the image is in St. Peter’s at Rome, and is frequently seen there (146). See Sumption 222.

⁵¹ *Dame merci quap þe messenger wher þulke ymage / Vor eny gold oþer seluer to þe emperour beo ibrou3t* (135-6): Here (and in lines 143,145) the poet uses *ymage* ‘painted likeness, effigy, figure’ rather than *fourme* (see note on line 129 above). “Cui ille: ‘Estne huiusmodi ymago auro uel argento comparabilis?’” (LA 225); “‘Can this image be bought for gold or silver,’ Volusian asked” (Ryan 212).

to the emperor, when they came to him. As soon as he saw the image⁵² he was immediately healed. He honored Veronica, and she was not permitted to leave him. He kept the image from then on, and it never left Rome. It is in St Peter's Church, as men frequently see.⁵³ (141-46)

Then he asked where Our Lord was, and what had become of him since. Veronica told how the Jews had put him to a harsh death, and how Pilate, the Justice, gave the sentence to do so. (147-49)

“Ah, wicked man,” said the emperor, “has he carried on this way? He consented to the Jews when he was not even of their faith. If I come across him, I will hang him or pull him apart.⁵⁴ Alas that he ordered the life of such a holy man to be ended. I know the Jews are quite wicked: they should be glad of it.”⁵⁵ At once he ordered that Pilate to be courteously sent for, so that he should come to him as was right for [a vassal] to do with

⁵² *Anon so he þe ymage isey he was hol anon* (143): The SEL poet shortens the episode a bit, leaving out the procession: “Cesar igitur pannis sericis viam sterni fecit et ymaginem sibi presentari precit” (LA 51.231); “Caesar therefore had the road carpeted with silk cloths” (Ryan 212).

⁵³ The emperor keeping Veronica at Rome after the healing is an innovation of the SEL poet. In the LA it remains unclear what happens to both Veronica and her contact relic. According to the HA, Veronica does not stay in Rome: “Tunc Ueronica benedicens Deum in donis suis et laudans Salvatorem in omnibus operibus suis; Ueronica honorifice remittitur” (‘Then Veronica, praising God for his gifts and praising the Savior for all his works, is sent back [home] with honor,’ HA 174-75).

⁵⁴ The emperor's question and the very graphic threat he subsequently directs at Pilate are supplied by the SEL poet. In the LA we learn of his fury only after Pilate has been arrested and brought to Rome.

⁵⁵ *Ichot þe Giwes beoþ wel luper hii wolde beo þer of vawe* (154): The emperor's sarcastic suggestion that the Jews might be joyful (MED *fain*, 1a) at the death of Jesus is original to the SEL. The LA does not feature the same degree of anti-Judaism of the SEL version in this episode, but see note on lines 120-21 above.

respect to his lord.⁵⁶ (150-56)

Now Pilate had sent a letter to his lord, [asking] that he pardon him of the anger that he bore against him, and [claiming] that he was guiltless of the death that was blamed upon him, and that the Jews slew Him entirely without his consent.⁵⁷ (157-60)

But a severe storm at sea drove his messenger to the land of Galilee,⁵⁸ and there he landed. But Vespasian,⁵⁹ who was the ruler of that land, took the messenger into

⁵⁶ Pilate has shown earlier that he is answerable only to the emperor (see above line 88 and note).

⁵⁷ This account of Pilate's messenger draws on a portion of the legend of James the Less (LA 63.93-164), which is derived from the HA (lines 67-107). The last hundred lines or so of the Pilate legend in SEL (starting around line 157) represent a thorough reworking of the source material by the SEL poet(s).

⁵⁸ *Ak a strong tempest in þe se is messenger gan dryue / Into [þ]e lond of Galile & þer he gan ariue* (161-2): In the earlier Latin version the messenger (called Adanus, Adranus, or Adrianus) ends up in Galicia, in the northwest of the Iberian Peninsula. Perhaps in order to avoid confusion with Galatia, which is located at the other end of the Mediterranean Sea in Asia Minor, the HA make it clear that the Galicia meant is the current region of the Pilgrimage of St. James: "Adanus sumpto legacionis itinere uentis sibi contrariis in Galiciam mittitur, ubi nunc ex omni nacione christianorum suffragia beati Iacobi apostolic petuntur" (HA 73-75); "Adanus, having undertaken to travel upon the embassy, due to contrary winds was sent into Galicia, where now Christians from every nation seek the favor of the blessed apostle James." Jacobus (or the intermediary source, if there is one), however rejects this unambiguous language, possibly because he has included the episode in the legend of St. James the Less (LA cap. 63), and did not wish to risk confusion by mentioning the St. James the Apostle, nor his shrine in Campostella, in that context. Thus in the LA, Pilate's messenger arrives in Anatolian Galatia, an inland region of Asia Minor: "Nuntius igitur Pylati a uentis contrariis in Galatiam pellitur et ad Vespasianum adducitur" (LA 63.96); "Pilate's envoy was driven ashore in Galatia by contrary winds and taken to Vespasian" (Ryan 273). The SEL poet seems to have followed the cross-reference to St. James the Less (51.183-4), and taken the rest of the story from that chapter (LA 63.93 ff.), though the possibility of an immediate source such as a gloss cannot be entirely excluded. Galilee, like Galatia, is an inland region, and much closer to the point of departure than Galicia. An independently translated version of this story appears in the *Harrowing of Hell and Destruction of Jerusalem*, another SEL-related Middle English poem based chiefly upon LA cap. 63 (Marx 123). The account in the HHDJ (lines 331-6, 375-424) is much more faithful to LA, including such details as the name of the messenger "Albon" ('Albanus.'385), and the destination "Galasy3e" (presumably Galatia, though Marx does not opine, 389).

⁵⁹ *Ak Waspasion þat was þer mayster þe messenger vaste nom* (163): closely following the source: "Eo autem tempore Vespasianus monarchiam in Galatia a Tyberio cesare tenebat. Nuntius igitur Pylati a uentis contrariis in Galatiam pellitur et ad Vespasianum adducitur. Talis autem seruabatur ibi consuetudo, ut quicumque ibidem naufragium pateretur, rebus et seruitute principi

custody, so that the messenger never came near the emperor. (161-65)

When the emperor's messenger came to Pilate, and Pilate had learned his errand from him, he thought that his own messenger had gone to the emperor, and that he had pardoned him and sent after him without anger.⁶⁰ (166-68)

He put on Our Lord's tunic,⁶¹ which (as he was well aware⁶²) was not sewn with

subderetur. Quem Vespasianus quis esset aut unde ueniret seu quo tenderet requisivit." LA (63.95-8); "Pilate's envoy was driven ashore in Galatia by contrary winds and taken to Vespasian, who at that time held the governorship of Galatia from Tiberius. The prevailing custom in that country was that anyone who had been shipwrecked had to give his goods and his service to the ruler. So Vespasian asked Albanus who he was, where he came from, and where he was going" (Ryan 273). The spelling *Waspasion* may represent an attempt to preserve (or even improve upon) the Latin etymology given of Vespasian's name (*vespa* 'wasp' plus *nasus* 'nose'): "Vespasianus enim quoddam genus uermium naribus insicum ab infancia gerebat, unde et a uespis Vespasianus dicebatur" (LA 63.101); "In fact since childhood he had had some kind of worms in his nose, whence his name was Vespasian" (Ryan 273). The LA version is essentially that of HA, without the mention of divine nature of his affliction: "Vespasianus enim quoddam genus uermium forsitan ad manifestanda opera Dei in illo insitum naribus gerebat ab infancia. Vnde et a uespis dicebatur Uespasianus" (HA 86-8).

⁶⁰ These twelve lines (157-68) represent a significant rearrangement of the source material from the LA, and, interestingly, this departure from the ordering of Jacobus brings the SEL more in line with the HA. The SEL poet demonstrates a careful reading of the cross references in LA cap. 51 by importing into the Pilate narrative an episode that Jacobus relates only in cap. 63, James the Less, which also relates the Destruction of Jerusalem. Nevertheless it is a minimal version of the episode, just enough to explain why Pilate goes willingly to Rome—which he does not do in LA. In the full (HA/LA) version of the story, Vespasian is healed of his chronic malady through his faith, pledges to avenge the death of Jesus upon the Jews, and does so after an interval of 40 years.

⁶¹ *Oure Louerdes curtel he dude on* (169): The episode featuring Christ's Seamless Tunic or Robe (here called a *curtel* 'coat, robe' MED: the usual word for early translations of the Latin *tunica*) is reworked and expanded from LA 51.235-43, with the SEL poet imparting the comic touches noted below. This episode is not found in the extant manuscripts of the HA, however, though it does Latin text of the *Mors Pilati*, a text, according to Dobschütz and Knapp (but not Werner), is derived from the LA, rather than the other way around (Dobschütz 237). Jacobus inserts it in his narrative without citing another authority, possibly because he considered this tale to be similarly apocryphal, or perhaps because it was already interpolated into his manuscript of the HA. The manner in which the emperor is made to seem a fool may have appealed to Jacobus, whose work was partly shaped by the power struggles between Church and Empire in his own time (Reames 125-27). The SEL poet probably expanded upon the incident not for an overtly political reason, but because it made for an interesting narrative (see above ch. 3 p. 104 ff. on Thompson).

thread,⁶³ as it says in the Gospel.⁶⁴ With a very good demeanor he went to the emperor, and greeted him with very great honor when he came before him.⁶⁵ (169-72)

The emperor had never before been as angry with any man under the sun as he was with Pilate: for he had sworn his death. But because [Pilate] had Our Lord's tunic on him when he came before [the emperor], his heart was fully assuaged. He received him with great joy, and with him made all the joy that one might make with another—by virtue of the holy tunic—and all his men did likewise.⁶⁶ As soon as [Pilate] was out of his sight, [the emperor] swore his oath right away, that he would put him to a harsh death if he could overtake him. But [the emperor] made great joy when [Pilate] came to him. But always when [Pilate] was away from him, the emperor judged him with a harsh sentence. It went on this way for a long time, so that all who heard of this case truly wondered about the emperor, [thinking] that he was changeable.⁶⁷ (173-84)

⁶² *þat he wuste euere wel* (169): That Pilate knew the properties and power of Christ's tunic may be inferred from the LA, but it is not explicitly stated in the source: "Pylatus autem tunicam domini inconsutilem secum detulit quam indutam coram imperatore portauit" (LA 51.235); "Pilate, however, had taken with him the Lord's seamless tunic and [he] came before the emperor wearing it" (Ryan 212-3).

⁶³ *þat vnsowe[d] was of þred* (170): that is, it was seamless (translating Latin *inconsutilis*).

⁶⁴ *as hit seyþ in þe gospel* (170): This is the SEL poet's interpolation, based on John 19:23.

⁶⁵ The detail that Pilate apparently brought the Lord's seamless tunic from Jerusalem to wear before the emperor tends to undermine the previous indication that he is unaware that he will be facing imperial wrath. On the other hand, it could just be chalked up to Pilate's continuing cunning, albeit, in this case, more impromptu than scheming.

⁶⁶ The notion that the emperor's men were affected by the tunic is not explicit in the LA version.

⁶⁷ *alle þat hurde þis cas / Wondrede much of þe emperour þat he vnstable was* (183b-4): Here the word *unstable* probably does not mean 'insane' as it can in Mod. Eng., but rather has the senses: "vacillating, irresolute, easily swayed; inconstant, fickle" (MED *unstāble* 1a). Speculation about the emperor's instability is not explicit in LA, in which he too marvels at the situation, not just the others: "Mirantur omnes, mirabatur et ipse quod sic contra Pylatum dum abesset excandesceret et dum presens esset nihil ei aspere loqui posset" (LA 51.241); "All wondered, and

At last (as Our Lord would have it) Pilate took off his tunic by chance, as he never should have, and he came thus before the emperor, who immediately seized him and right away swore another oath that he would come to great misfortune.⁶⁸ (185-88)

“Say,” he said, “you wretched man, what have you done? Did you slay the holy prophet? You did so to great misfortune.”⁶⁹ (189-90)

“Truly sire,” said Pilate, “I never put him to death.” (191)

“Confess,”⁷⁰ said the emperor, “for you might as easily.” (192)⁷¹

“But the wicked Jews,” said Pilate, “brought him to death.” (193)⁷²

he himself wondered, that he could be so wrought up against Pilate absent and could not so much as speak to him harshly when he was present” (Ryan 213).

⁶⁸ *So attelaste Pilatus as oure Louerd hyt wolde / His curtel strupte of bi cas* (185-6a): There is an apparent contradiction here between causality attributed to God’s will (*as oure Louerd hyt wolde*) and to chance (*bi cas*), though the latter expression often conveys very little meaning in verse. (But compare above, note to line 5.) Such ambivalence may, however, derive from the Latin source, which mentions both divine intervention and human interference: “Tandem diuino nutu uel forte alicuius christiani suasi ipsum illa tunica expoliari fecit et contra eum pristinam ferocitatem animi mox resumpsit” (LA 51.242); “At length, a sign from God, or perhaps a hint from some Christian, he had the man stripped of that tunic, and instantly his previous rage was rekindled” (Ryan 213). As noted above, the tunic episode has no analogue in HA, at least in the extant versions, and seems to have been borrowed from the *Mors Pilati*, or a similar text (unless it was an interpolation in the SEL poet’s ms of the LA).

⁶⁹ This entire conversation between Pilate and the emperor (189-212) is an invention of the SEL poet, and seems to be one of the SEL poet’s longest additions. In the LA, Pilate is imprisoned to await sentencing (LA 51.244; see below notes on line 215-6).

⁷⁰ *Beo iknowe quap þe emperour* (192): more colloquially, perhaps, “come clean” (MED ‘iknouen’ 3b).

⁷¹ *vor þou mi3t as eþe* (192): With reference to the previous line (*dude him ... to deþe*, 191), the emperor makes an implicit threat that Pilate “might just as easily [be condemned to death],”.

⁷² *Bote þe luþere Gywes quap Pilatus to þe deþe him brou3te* (193): Although this conversation is interpolated by the SEL poet, the kernel of this remark may be from Jacobus: “Venit igitur Volusianus cum Veronica Romam dixitque Tyberio imperatori: ‘Ihesum a te diu desideratum Pylatus et Iudei iniuste morti tradiderunt et per inuidiam crucis patibulo affixerunt’” (LA 51.228-9); “So Volusian came to Rome with Veronica and told Tiberius: ‘The Jesus you have long desired to see was unjustly given over to death by Pilate and the Jews, and, by reason of their envy, nailed to the gibbet of the cross’” (Ryan 212). The assertion that the Jews (but not Pilate)

“Without you,” said the emperor, “they never would have thought of such a thing.” (194)

“Truly sire,” said Pilate, “I cannot deny this—that I condemned him to death⁷³—but indeed I had to, for the inquest upon him said that he destroyed our laws, and the law provided that all such should have their lives ended. And I, who was the Justice there by your command and your will, was obliged to give the sentence when the inquest said.” (195-200)

“When you understood,” said the emperor, “the falsehood of the Jews, why did you not speak against it, and interfere with the wicked deed?”⁷⁴ (201-2)

“God knows,” said Pilate, “—and Jerusalem also—that I was sincerely against it—[and] that he would not have been put to death, except that they were so firmly set against him that once the inquest passed judgment, one could not [act] under any law unless his life were ended.” (203-6)⁷⁵

“If you justly could not save him,” said the emperor then, “How did you dare to do such a great deed without my leave?” (207-8)

“Truly sire,” said Pilate, “one may not deny that I did wrong in that [respect]; I

betrayed Jesus out of envy (not mere wickedness) is also made earlier in the chapter, just before the beginning of the Pilate legend (LA 51.183).

⁷³ *Pat ich ne dempnede him to deþe* (196): Here I take the negative particle *ne* as pleonastic, perhaps following the negative verb *asake* (‘deny, gainsay’ 195).

⁷⁴ *Þe Gywene valshede* (201): The falsehood of the Jews in this line seems to go beyond the envy ascribed to them by Jacobus (see above, note to line 193).

⁷⁵ *Þat ich was þer a3en myd my my3te þat he nere to deþe ido / Ak hii were vp him so vaste þat me ne mi3te mid no lawe / Whanne þe queste passed bote he were ibrou3t of dawe* (204-6): Perhaps, more loosely, “Personally, I was against it; he would never have been put to death, but [the Jews] were so stubbornly set against him that once the judgment was given there was no way under the law to avoid his execution.”

am caught in guilt.” (209-10)

“One will do with you,” said the emperor, “as with [any] guilty man.”⁷⁶ Judgment shall be passed upon you as you took it upon yourself [to do].” (211-12)⁷⁷

[The emperor] had [Pilate] thrown immediately into a harsh prison, so dark that he could see neither foot nor hand, and he had him bound tightly. He lay so long in prison, in hunger and in pain, that his limbs shrank away and his body started to waste away entirely. (213-16)⁷⁸

He would rather have death than life, so completely did he shrink to nothing: so did all those who put Our Lord to death before their [own] deaths. (217-18)⁷⁹

⁷⁶ *& me schal bi þe quaþ þe emperor as bi gultyman do* (211): More loosely: “I’ll do by you (said the emperor) as I would by a common criminal,” or, even, in contemporary parlance: “you will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.” The emperor seems to be picking up on Pilate’s use of the impersonal, and mimicking it ironically.

⁷⁷ *Pou schelt passi þoru iugement vor þou toke on so* (212): that is, “as you took upon yourself to pass judgment upon Jesus.” Despite the emperor’s promise, no judgment comes in the SEL version. In the LA, news of the death sentence precipitates Pilate’s suicide, whereas here his suicide is motivated by the *lack* of any final judgment, and the prospect of continued deterioration in prison.

⁷⁸ *So longe he lay in prisoun in honger & in pyne / þat his lymes clongge away his body gan al vordwyne* (215-6): In LA, Tiberius puts Pilate in prison for a relatively short period: “Tunc imperator ipsum in carcere recipe iussit donec sapientum consilio deliberaret quid de eo fieri oporteret” (LA 51.244); “He had Pilate remanded to prison until he could consult with a counsel of wise men about what should be done with the criminal.” (Ryan 213). Hence, the detail of Pilate languishing in prison is another innovation of the SEL poet, which artfully sets up the pathetic scene with the jailor that follows (219-38). By this point one has nearly forgotten the murderous young Pilate’s scheming, as well as his role in deicide—instead Pilate seems (however temporarily) a defeated shell of his former self. Moreover, the pattern of interrogation by a pagan ruler followed by imprisonment (particularly with starvation) follows the general outline of a martyrdom account. At this point a reader familiar with hagiography should expect Pilate’s legend, like a saint’s *passio*, to end with an execution.

⁷⁹ *So hii dude alle byvore 3are dep þat oure Louerd to deþe brou3t* (218): This may reflect the particular way that the SEL poet has interpreted the scheme of divine vengeance put forth by Jacobus (LA 51.183-4). The terrible deaths of those who were responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus may be, however, have been gleaned from elsewhere.

One day as the jailor came into the prison, Pilate cried so sorrowfully that [the jailor] was seized with great sorrow. “Have pity on me sir,” he said, “for your own gentility.⁸⁰ You know well that I am a knight and formerly [was] a high Justice,⁸¹ and now I shrink away and see no sights with my eyes. For charity’s sake, let me see light once before I die.” (219-24)

The jailor had pity on him—for he had been such a [noble] man—and he led him out of the prison to see the world. When Pilatus came into the light (as the book has told us),⁸² and saw his body all wasted away, his heart fell quite cold. (225-28)

“Alas,” he said, “to endure this day—that I should ever come into the light! So blackened am I, who was formerly a noble knight! Sir jailor,⁸³ for the sake of your

⁸⁰ *vor byn owe gentrise* (221): Here the poet also has Pilate use—and perhaps overuse—words and phrases of French origin, evoking both the courtly register and the contemporary Norman aristocracy, as when Pilate appeals to the jailor’s *gentrise* (‘gentility’ 221, 236) and his *cortesy* (231). In the cultural milieu in which the SEL originated (Anglophone southwest midlands), such snippets of French would be readily understood, but were likely to be associated with an unpopular Francophone ruling class. Anne B. Thompson has noted the negative connotation repeatedly carried by the French tongue in the SEL: “the text makes adept use of tag phrases such as ‘beau sire,’ most often deployed to characterize the speech of wicked highborn rulers as it happens” (*Everyday Saints* 53).

⁸¹ *Such wrecche as ich nou am ich was wule hey Iustise* (235): Playing on the pity of the guard (and hence the audience) for a noble man who has fallen from a great height, Pilate makes his last requests. Yet he overdoes it, and ultimately the repeated reminders that he was a *kny3t* (222, 239, 234), a *hey3 man* (‘noble man’ 234), and once *hey Iustice* (‘high Justice’ 222, 235) elicit just the opposite sentiment, at least in a modern reader.

⁸² *as þe bok vs hap itold* (227): Curiously, and perhaps significantly, this appeal to authority is placed precisely where the poet has departed from his main source, LA cap. 51, but before the part of the narrative that draws on LA cap. 10. The possibility of another source for this conversation between Pilate and his jailor, however, seems quite remote given the likely source(s) of this suicide account.

⁸³ *Sire gayler* (231): ms H substitutes the proper name *Renald* for the common noun *gayler* ‘jailor’. Although this may have been a now-obscure allusion to a particular individual, the name could also have been chosen because it sounds Norman, or (ironically) for its similarity to the ubiquitous fox Renard.

courtesy, grant me one boon. Give me an apple for food, for I may do it soon. (229-32)⁸⁴

The jailor gave [Pilate] an apple, and he said, “it is not right for a high man or knight to eat an unpeeled apple. Such a wretch as I am now, [nevertheless] I was formerly a high Justice. Lend me a knife to peel this apple, for [the sake of] your gentility.” (233-36)⁸⁵

When the jailor gave him a knife, [Pilate] struck himself immediately, and stabbed deep into his body, and lay dead as a stone.⁸⁶ (237-38)

⁸⁴ *vor ich hyt may do sone* (232): perhaps with the force of ‘because I’m done for soon’. The antecedent of *hyt* is not at all clear here, unless it refers proleptically to Pilate’s suicide. Pilate’s request for an apple also alludes, however obliquely, to the orchard scene in the Judas legend (LA 45.36-44, and, in a somewhat expanded form, SEL *Iudas* 70-90). The poet repeatedly hints that Pilate is up to his old tricks.

⁸⁵ *Len me a knyf þis appol to parye* (236): While the interactions between Pilate and his jailor seem to be pure invention of the SEL poet, the particulars of Pilate’s suicide episode are not, however, invented *ex nihilo*. The method of suicide—by knife intended for peeling an apple—seems to have been lifted from a story told about Herod. LA cap. 10 (The Holy Innocents) is a likely source: “Habebat autem in consuetudine ut post omnem cibum pomum per se purgaret et comederet; cumque gladium in manu teneret tussique uiolenta distenderetur, circumspiciens ne se aliquis impediret se ipsum percussurus dexteram sustulit, sed consobrinus eius sustinendo dexteram impediuit.” (LA 10.78-9); “It was Herod’s custom to eat an apple, which he peeled himself, after every meal. One day, while peeling his apple, he was seized with a violent coughing spell and turned the knife [literally, ‘sword’] against his own breast, looking around to see that no one could prevent him from killing himself; but a nephew of his grasped his hand and stopped him” (Ryan 59). While the situation of Herod’s suicide attempt in the LA differs from that of Pilate in the SEL, the details of knife and apple are easily recognizable. According to Alexander Murray (339 ff.), by the later Middle Ages, a competing version of this story had arisen in which Herod succeeds in killing himself with the paring knife; this tradition was particularly well established in English and French texts and illuminations (see above ch. 3, p. 145 ff.). More than likely, the SEL poet had access to one or more form of the story of Herod’s (attempted) suicide: the LA alone, or a more detailed version, or a half-remembered impression of either. The inclusion, in the SEL, of an apple-peeling knife as the instrument of suicide, seems to be unique among versions of this Pilate legend.

⁸⁶ *Po þe gayler him tok a knyf him sulf he slou3 anon / & smot deope in to þe body & lay ded as a ston* (237-8): While some narrative elements are borrowed from the Herod legend, and other details seem to be invented, Pilate’s manner of death is basically in keeping with the source: “Data est igitur in Pylatum sententia ut morte turpissima dampnarentur. Audiens hoc Pylatus cultello proprio se necauit et tali morte uitam finuit” (LA 51.245-6); “Pilate was henceforth sentenced to a shameful death, but when he heard of this, he killed himself with his own knife and

When the news came to the emperor, he had the body taken and had it cast outside the town, abandoned among old walls.⁸⁷ No man went around there in any direction who was not [made] lame or [driven] mad or had some other mischance befall him. There was thunder and lightning and a great storm around there, so that men were out of their minds and so afraid that they did not dare to stir abroad. (238-44)⁸⁸

For this reason the emperor finally had the wicked corpse taken, carried to the

so ended his life” (Ryan 213). In the SEL version, Pilate never receives a final judgment (see note on line 212), and he does not have a knife of his own with which to commit suicide, but instead must trick the jailor into giving him one. Note too that in the LA, Pilate uses a *cultellus* or ‘small knife’ (51.246), while Herod uses a *gladius*, more properly a ‘sword’ (10.79). At the end of the chapter, Jacobus adds another account (on the authority of Peter Comester’s *Historia Scholastica In Act.* 53) according to which Pilate was exiled to Lyon and died there (LA 51.258-59). The *Historia Apocrypha* gives a more graphic description of Pilate stabbing himself in the throat, but features none of the details found in the SEL version: “Pilatus audiens se morte turpsissima dampnandum, cutello proprio faucibus suis immisso capitis et colli dissoluit iugulum” (HA 181-2); “Pilate, hearing himself condemned to a shameful death, severed throat from head from neck [the connection of head and neck] by plunging his own knife into his throat.” Thus, working from this minimal account of Pilate’s suicide in the LA, the SEL poet has created an entirely new episode that brings full circle the wicked life that has included a murderous youth, a treacherous political career, and a key role in deicide. Here, as in the SEL *Iudas*, the clear message is: ‘once a scoundrel, always a scoundrel’.

⁸⁷ *Po þe tþingge com to þe emperor þat bodi he lette take / & caste hyt wyþoute þe toun amang olde walle[s] vorsake* (239-40): This has no parallel in the Latin versions. In the LA, the emperor reacts first with a speech: “Cognita cesar morte Pylati dixit: ‘Vere mortuus est morte turpissima, cui manus propria non pepercit’ (LA 51.247-8); “When Caesar was informed of this, he said: ‘Truly he died a most shameful death, and his own hand did not spare him’” (Ryan 213). There is no trace here of the genuine pagan Roman view of suicide, which could even be considered an honorable act in such cases. The disposition of Pilate’s body in the SEL (*Pylatus* lines 239-60) differs significantly from the Latin versions. In the LA (51.249-55, following HA 185-200), the corpse of Pilate is: (1) thrown into the Tiber; (2) removed some 1000 km from Rome to be thrown into the Rhône at Vienne, a city thereafter named *Via Gehenna* ‘the road to hell’; (3) removed nearly 250 km up the Rhône and across Lake Geneva to be buried in the territory of Lausanne; and thence (4) removed from inhabited places entirely, and thrown into a pit (elsewhere a well) in an inaccessible alpine region between seven mountains. The reasons given for the relocations—body resurfacing and causing demonic activity, storms, diseases (but not ships sinking)—are similar in all versions.

⁸⁸ *Per was þonder & ly3tyngge & greot tempest per aboute / þat men were wytles & adrad þat hii ne dorste uour route* (243-4): for 243b, ms H has *þat hi neþerfte nowhar atroute*, ‘that they did not need to escape/take refuge anywhere’ (MED ‘thurven,’ ‘atrouten’).

waters of the Tiber, and thrown in.⁸⁹ Then such a great storm arose that many ships foundered, around there in a wide area and in every direction. (245-48)⁹⁰

The [people of the] country had grave concerns about it, and they took counsel among themselves. And they brought this corpse to a lake away from all men amidst hill and wilderness, and they threw it in there.⁹¹ Thunder struck there right away, and extensive lightning. That body rolled up and down, cast here and there by the weather

⁸⁹ *So þat þe emperour let take þe wrecche lycame ate laste / & bere hyt to þe watere of Tybre & þer inne hit caste* (245-6): In the LA, the Tiber is the first place Pilate's body is thrown: "Mole igitur ingenti alligatur et in Tyberim fluuium immergitur. Spiritus uero maligni et sordidi corpori maligno et sordido congaudentes et nunc in aquis nunc in aere raptantes mirabiles inundations in aquis mouebant et fulgura, tempestates, tonitrua et grandines in aere terribiliter generabant, ita ut cuncti timore horribili tenerentur." (LA 51.249-50); "The corpse was weighted with a huge stone and thrown into the [river] Tiber, but wicked, foul spirits made sport of the wicked, foul body, plunging it into the water and snatching it up into the air. This caused awesome floods in the water and lightning, tempests, and hailstorms in the air, and a widespread panic broke out among the people" (Ryan 213).

⁹⁰ *Þe schipes dreynte þer monyon þer aboute in eche side* (248): An addition of the SEL poet—as note above, there are no shipwrecks are mentioned in the Latin sources.

⁹¹ *Þat þe contreye hadde þer of doute & nome þham to rede / & into a water al fram men þis lycame gonne lede / Bitwene hulle & wyldernesse & þer inne hii hyt caste* (249-51): This is a rough parallel to the fourth and final placement of Pilate's body in the Latin source: "Qui cum nimis prefatis infestationibus grauarentur, ipsum a se remouerunt et in quodam puteo montibus circumsepto immerserunt, ubi adhuc relatione quorundam quedam dyabolice machinationes ebullire uidentur" (LA 51.255); "There the populace, harried to excess by the aforesaid upheavals, took the body away and sank it in a pit surrounded by mountains, where, according to some accounts, diabolical machinations still make themselves felt" (Ryan 213). The HA specifies that the location is called Septimus Mons, because of the seven mountains that surround it: "Puteus autem hic uicinus est monti, qui uocatur Septimus mons, vel quia montibus aliis circumseptus, vel septimus mons tanquam de septem montibus eminentioribus unus." ("This pit is in the vicinity of a mountain, which is called "Mount Septimus," either because it is surrounded [circumseptus] by other mountains, or "Mount Seventh" because it is one of seven [septem] high mountains,' HA 198-200). In the SEL, the action that takes place in the 'lake' or 'body of water' (water, 250) seems to require something larger than the puteus ('pit, well') mentioned in the LA, though some sort of liquid may be inferred from the verb immerserunt ('they sank'). Alternately, a substantial body of water may have been suggested by the placename Losanne ('Lausanne,' LA 51.254), a city situated on lake Geneva, or perhaps one of the independent traditions (transmitted perhaps through a gloss) that link Pilate to particular toponyms, such as the Italian Lago di Pilato (or Laghetti di Pilato) on Monte Vettore in the Sibillini Mountains.

and storm of the water, so that everyone was afraid. (249-54)

In the middle of the water was a rock, and when the corpse was nearby, the rock split in half (as all the people saw), and like an arrow shot from a bow, that body shot in there. The rock struck together as soon as the body was inside of it, and the wretched corpse lies there still to this day.⁹² There is much woe thereabouts, as many men still say. (255-60)⁹³

Thus Pilate ended his life, as he well deserved. May God shield each Christian from such a sorrowful fate. Amen ⁹⁴ (261-62).⁹⁵

⁹² *þe roch smot togadere anon þo þe bodi was wyþinne / And þe wrecche licame per lyþ 3ut to þysse day* (258-9): Another departure from the source; perhaps the SEL poet wished to impart a further sense of finality than what he read in the LA. Such alterations may indicate that the SEL poet is less inclined to take an interest in the continental geography (and etymology) represented in the LA/HA version, which seems to derive from divergent local traditions about Pilate. This might form a corollary to the poet's interest in British geography (e.g. in the legend of Kenelm). The particular mix of alterations and substitutions, however, are not completely explained by geographical considerations. I have located no sources for Pilate's final resting place in the middle of a stone, though there is an analogue in the 14th century metrical *Titus and Vespasian* that includes a rock that splits in half to receive Pilate's corpse (4467-86). It remains to be determined whether the two poems drew on similar unidentified sources (whether texts or oral traditions), but it seems more likely that SEL is the source for *Titus and Vespasian*.

⁹³ *Muche wo þer is of aboute as monimon 3ut ysay* (260): The continued demonic manifestations are consistent with the final resting place of Pilate in the Latin source (LA 51.255; see note above on *Pylatus* lines 249-51).

⁹⁴ *God schulde eche Cristineman fram so deoluol cas Amen* (262): The closing prayer of *Pylatus* is similar to the one at the end of *Iudas* (146) and is likewise original to the SEL version. In the LA, Jacobus closes the Pilate legend with a disclaimer about his source: "Hucusque in predicta hystoria apocrypha legitur. Que utrum recitanda sit lectoris iudicio relinquatur" (LA 51.256-7); "Thus far we have quoted the aforementioned apocryphal history: let the reader judge whether the story is worth the telling" (Ryan 213). Along with the remark at the beginning of the Pilate material (LA 51.185), these lines bracket off the narrative drawn from the HA. Jacobus then continues with an alternative conclusion to the life of Pilate, based on Peter Comester's *Historia Scholastica*, in which Pilate is exiled to Lyon for a different reason. (See above, note on lines 237-8.)

⁹⁵ Ms. H adds the following colophon: "hic finiuntur gesta. Maledictorum. Iude et Pilati" ('her are ended the deeds of the evildoers Judas and Pilate,' Furnivall 118; quoted by Baum "Mediaeval Legend" 529).

Appendix E: Latin manuscripts of *De gallo redivivo* (22 mss total)

Manuscripts are parchment unless marked otherwise (i.e., paper).¹

- BR** Bruxelles, Belgium, Bibliothèque Royale, 2772-89 (Van den Gheyn 2:1381), ff. 59-69v, 13th c.; MCO.²
- CJ₁** Cambridge, UK, Jesus College, Q. B. 25 (James 41), f. 109r-v, 15th c. addition to earlier ms.; from Durham, Benedictine Cathedral Priory of St Cuthbert; PJT.³
- CJ₂** Cambridge, UK, Jesus College, Q. D. 4 (James 46), ff. 134v-136r, 15th c.; MCO+, preceded by PPA.⁴
- CM** Cambridge, UK, Magdalene College, F.4.15 (James 15), ff. 86-91, 12th to 15th cc.; MCO, RTL excerpts. [Fallon's M] [MEN 049] from Stamford, Franciscan Convent.⁵
- CS** Cambridge, UK, St. John's College, E. 24 (James 127), ff. 103-105, 14th c.;

¹ Abbreviations: MCO (*Mirabiliter cepit oriri...*), 15 mss, including one with an anomalous ending (MCO+); NQH (*Narrat quadam historia...*), 5 mss; PJT (*Postquam Judas tradidit...*), 2 mss; MEN (Z. Izydorzyc, *Manuscripts of the Evangelium Nicodemi: a census* [Toronto, 1993]). The sigla used here consist of two letters, the first from the city, and the second from name of the library; in cases of multiple manuscripts housed in the same library, these are distinguished by a subscript arabic numeral.

² Van den Gheyn, 2:310-11.

³ Description: James, *Jesus Catalogue*, 60-63; provenance: Ker, 340.

⁴ Description: James, *Jesus Catalogue*, 70-76.

⁵ Description: James, *Magdalene Catalogue*, 40-43; provenance: Ker, 341.

- MCO. [MEN 053] 14th c., English possession if not necessarily origin.⁶
- CU** Cambridge, UK, University Library, Ff. 2 .8 (now bound with Dd.3.16 and Oo.7.48), f. 6, 14th c.; MCO, PPA, EN. [Napier's C] [MEN 057] From Bury St. Edmund's (T. de Chabham).
- CV₁** České Budějovice, Czech Republic, Jihočeská vědecká knihovna, 1 VB 28 (previously Hohenfurt 28), ff. 80v-84r; paper, 2nd ½ of 15th c. (1470); NQH. [MEN 063] Prague.⁷
- CV₂** České Budějovice, Czech Republic, Jihočeská vědecká knihovna, 1 VB 58 (previously Hohenfurt 58), ff. 29r-32r, paper, 15th c.; NQH. [MEN 064]⁸
- HC** Hereford, UK, Cathedral Library, P. 2. IV, ff. 133-139, mid-12th c.; MCO. [Fallon's D]⁹
- KS** Klosterneuburg, Austria, Stiftsbibliothek 495, ff. 9v-10v, 15th c.; NQH. [MEN 116]).¹⁰
- LB₁** London, UK, British Library, Harley 4725, f. 206r-v, 14th c.; MCO. [MEN 156] Followed by EN (11.3 to end, fragmentary in places).
- LB₂** London, UK, British Library, Royal 6 E VII, f. 340v, 14th c. (ca. 1330-50); PJT.Vol. 1 of the *Omne Bonum* of James le Palmer, ca. 1330-50 (MSS Royal 6 E. VI and VII). PJT, *De ortu Judae* from LA cap. 45, other texts that derive from a

⁶ James, *St. John's Catalogue* 159-62.

⁷ Jihočeská vědecká knihovna, the South Bohemian Research Library, formerly Statni vědecká knihovna, the State Research Library.

⁸ See previous note.

⁹ R.A.B. Mynors and R.M. Thompson, eds., *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library* (Cambridge, 1993).

¹⁰ Catalogue: Pfeiffer-Černik, 3: 276-79 (<http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/kln>).

canon law compilation.¹¹

- OB₁** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Bodley 556 (S. C. 2340), ff. 13-20, 13th c.; MCO, RTL. [Fallon's B] [MEN 228]¹²
- OB₂** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Douce 88 (S. C. 21662), ff. 32v-34, 13th or 1st ½ of 14th c.; MCO. [Napier's D].¹³
- OB₃** Oxford, UK, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson D 1236 (S. C. 13968), ff. 49-51, 13th c.; MCO, RTL. [MEN 238] Early note places in Dublin (St. Mary, Cistercians, 14th c.).¹⁴
- OJ** Oxford, UK, Jesus College 4, ff. 96-97, late 12th c.; MCO. [Napier's J] [MEN 241] English origin: Pershore, Worcestershire, Benedictine Abbey of St. Edburga.¹⁵
- PN₁** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 1722, ff. 101v-102v (?), 12th-13th cc. (ca. 1300); MCO. [MEN 253]¹⁶
- PN₂** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3338, ff. 162vb-163rb [27-30], late

¹¹ G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 4 vols (London: Oxford UP, 1921), 1: 157-59. Lehmann, an otherwise very reliable authority, incorrectly identifies the manuscript as "Royal E. VII.7" (345-46), an error which the also careful Gounelle reprints ("À propos" 51). See also L. F. Sandler, *Omne Bonum*, 1:45, 2:225.

¹² F. Madan et al., *Summary Catalogue*, 7 vols. (1895-1953), 2.1: 317.

¹³ F. Madan et al. *Summary Catalogue*, 4: 516-17.

¹⁴ William D. Macray, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ*, pt. 5, fasc. 4 (1898), coll. 371-72.

¹⁵ Provenance: Ker (387); H. Coxe, *Quarto Catalogue*, pt. 2.

¹⁶ "Notitia de sanctae crucis lingo et de morte Judae. *Incipit*: 'Mirabiliter cepit oriri...' cf. Oxford MS Jesu IV, 4 (sic)" (Phillippe Lauer, et al., eds. *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, 8 vols. [Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1939-97], 2: 142). Clearly the cataloguer was aware of the description of Jesus College, Oxford 4, probably by way of Napier or the *Quarto Catalogue*; the episode is indexed in the appropriate tome of the *tables* for vols. 1-2 of the catalogue.

- 13th-14th cc. (c.1300), from France; MCO, EN, etc. [Fallon's P] [MEN 259]¹⁷
- PN₃** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 6755 (olim Ashburnham Place, Barrois 284), 47r-56r, late 13th c. (ca. 1267); MCO, RTL. [Fallon's N] [MEN 227] (3 vols.), French origin.
- PN₄** Paris, France, Bibliothèque Nationale, n. a. lat. 3072 (former Ginsburg-Ricci MS), ff. 33-37, 14th c., NQH. [MEN 436] Includes partial EN, CST, EP.¹⁸
- SS** Schägl, Austria, Stiftsbibliothek, 156 (Cpl 145), ff. 388r-389v, paper, 2nd ½ of 15th c. (1473); NQH. [MEN 340]
- WC** Winchester, UK, Cathedral Library 7, f. 97r, 12th-13th cc., MCO EN, PPA. [MEN 401] written in England.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* 5:216-28.

¹⁸ See appendix H.

¹⁹ Ker and Piper, *Medieval MSS in British Libraries* IV, 1992, pp. 583-85, microfilm.

Appendix F: Transcription of representative Latin text (previously unpublished)

Cambridge, Jesus College, 41 Q. B. 25, f. 109a-b, 15th century addition to older MS.¹

Quomodus et processus qualiter Judas postquam tradidit Jesum venit ad matrem suam et qualiter consulit² eum et noluit ab.

Postquam Iudas tradidit Iesum Iudeis venit ipse Iudas ad matrem suam et retulit ei per ordinem qualiter et quomodo pro XXX argenteis tradidit Iesum. Quo audito in lacrimis confusa est ita dicens: “Heu me miseram que te sceleratum filium genui. Quare infelix sanctum et iustum³ tradidisti? Nunc absque dubio omnes maledicciones in te implebuntur que per prophetam scripte sunt: ‘filij eius fiant orphani et uxor eius vidua’.⁴ Non enim tradidisti filium hominis tantum sed unigenitum dei patris. Ecce a te ipsius sanguis exquiritur et tu⁵ mortis eius reus existi vere de illo propheta dicit: ‘Filius hominis vadit sicut scriptum est de illo, sed ve illi, per quem tradetur’.⁶ Nunc ergo fili doloris quid

¹ Description: James, *Jesus Catalogue*, 60-63.

² consulit] consuluit (?).

³ Compare Acts 3:14: “vos autem sanctum et iustum negastis et petistis virum homicidam donari vobis” (Vulgate); “But you denied the Holy One and the Just: and desired a murderer to be granted unto you” (DRV).

⁴ Psalm 108.9: “fiant filii eius orfani et uxor eius vidua” (Vulgate); “May his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow” (DRV); and cf. Acts 1:20: “scriptum est enim in libro Psalmorum fiat commoratio eius deserta et non sit qui inhabitet in ea et episcopatum eius accipiat alius” (Vulgate); “For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric let another take” (DRV).

⁵ tu] inserted above line.

facturus eris dum veritatis prophetam a mortuis resurrexisse cognoueris?”

Ad⁷ vocem igitur lacrimose matris in iracundiam prouocatus Iudas vidit supra focum feruentem ollam et in ea semicoctum gallum et clamavit ad⁸ matrem ita dicens: “Quomodo deuenisti in tantum errorem ut illum dicas a mortuis resurrecturum? Juro per maximum iuramentum et affirmo quod iste gallus deplumatus et in olla semicoctus poterit facilius de olla viuus exire quam ille resurgere crucifixus.” Hec cum infelix Iudas dixisset, semicoctus gallus viuus effectus est et protinus de feruenti olla exiliens apparuit pulcherimus pennis et plumis vestitus et supra tectum domus volavit ibi que diu cantans mansit quasi resurrectionem Christi pronuncians. Affirmavit igitur edicio grecorum hunc eundem extitisse gallum qui eadem nocte ter cantando Petrum arguit negantem, super quem dominus respexit continuo lacrimantem.⁹ Hoc autem signo infelix Iudas territus¹⁰ abiit ad locum vbi Christus passus est illum dampnatum videns in templo argenteos proiecit et abiens laqueo se suspendit¹¹ sicque inter celum et [terram]¹² perijt¹³ quia

⁶ Matthew 26:24: “Filius quidem hominis vadit sicut scriptum est de illo vae autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis traditur bonum erat ei si natus non fuisset homo ille” (Vulgate); “The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed: it were better for him, if that man had not been born” (DRV).

⁷ *Ad*: with capital A.

⁸ Page break.

⁹ Compare Luke 22:61-62: “et conversus Dominus respexit Petrum et recordatus est Petrus verbi Domini sicut dixit: quia priusquam gallus cantet ter me negabis et egressus foras Petrus flevit amare” (Vulgate); “And the Lord turning looked on Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, as he had said: Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter going out, wept bitterly.” (DRV).

¹⁰ territus] *terittus ms* (cf. Lehmann 285; LB₂)

¹¹ Compare Matthew 27:3-5: “tunc videns Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset paenitentia ductus rettulit triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus dicens peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum at illi dixerunt quid ad nos tu videris et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit” (Vulgate); “Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was

magistrum suum, dei vnigenitum salvatorem omnium credencium tradidit.

Explicit mirabilis finis Jude traditorus Iesum Christi.

condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients, Saying: I have sinned in betraying innocent blood. But they said: What is that to us? look thou to it. And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed: and went and hanged himself with an halter” (DRV).

¹² *terram*: Completely illegible, supplied from Thompson (P₄).

¹³ An echo, perhaps, of 2 Kings 18:9, a passage often connected with the death of Judas: “accidit autem ut occurreret Absalom servis David sedens mulo cumque ingressus fuisset mulus subter condensam quercum et magnam adhesit caput eius quercui et illo suspenso inter caelum et terram mulus cui sederat pertransivit” (Vulgate); “And it happened that Absalom met the servants of David, riding on a mule: and as the mule went under a thick and large oak, his head stuck in the oak: and while he hung between the heaven and the earth, the mule on which he rode passed on” (DRV).

Appendix G: Translation of Latin text

The manner and outcome as Judas, after he betrayed Christ, came to his mother, and how his mother deliberated¹ with him, and he was unwilling to heed her [advice].

After Judas betrayed Jesus to the Jews, this same Judas went to his mother and related to her in order how and in what manner he [had] betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver. And she, hearing this, was confounded in tears, speaking thus: “Alas, woe is me, who gave birth to you, wicked son! Why, miserable one, did you betray a holy and just man?² Now, without a doubt, every curse is fulfilled in you, as was written by the prophet: ‘May his children be orphans and his wife a widow’.³ For you have not merely betrayed the son of (a) man, but the only begotten (son) of God the Father. Lo! Because of you your blood is sought after, and you are guilty of death. Truly the prophet said of this one: ‘The Son of Man goes just as it is written about him, but woe unto him by whom

¹ Or possibly: *advised him*.

² Compare Acts 3:14: “vos autem sanctum et iustum negastis et petistis virum homicidam donari vobis” (Vulgate); “But you denied the Holy One and the Just: and desired a murderer to be granted unto you” (DRV).

³ Psalm 108 (109): 9: “fiant filii eius orfani et uxor eius vidua” (Vulgate); “May his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow” (DRV); and cf. Acts 1:20: “scriptum est enim in libro Psalmorum fiat commoratio eius deserta et non sit qui inhabitet in ea et episcopatum eius accipiat alius” (Vulgate); “For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric [i.e., office of overseer] let another take” (DRV).

he is betrayed.’⁴ Now, therefore, o son of sorrow, what are you going to do, since you know that the prophet of truth will rise from the dead?”

Now Judas, provoked into wrath by the tearful voice of this mother, saw upon the hearth a hot pot, and in it a partially cooked cock, (and) shouted at this mother, saying thus: “How have you come into such error, so that you would say that he will rise from the dead? I swear by the most solemn [lit. maximum] oaths and I affirm that this cock, plucked and partially cooked in the pot, can more easily get out alive than can he, having been crucified, rise up again!”

As soon as wretched Judas had said these words, the partially cooked cock was brought to life, and starting up at once from the cooking pot, appeared clothed in the most beautiful feathers and plumage, and it flew atop the roof of the house and remained there for a long while crowing as if announcing the resurrection of Christ.

The text of the Greeks⁵ affirms that this is the same cock who, by crowing thrice on the same night made manifest the denial of Peter, who, [when] the Lord turned to look upon him immediately wept.⁶ At this sign, wretched Judas, terrified, went to the place

⁴ Matthew 26.24: “Filius quidem hominis vadit sicut scriptum est de illo vae autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis traditur bonum erat ei si natus non fuisset homo ille” (Vulgate); “The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed: it were better for him, if that man had not been born” (DRV).

⁵ Compare this item, found in PJT and MCO, to “Narrat quedem ystoria Grecorum...” (NHQ). It seems to refer to an apocryphal text of Greek origin, perhaps of the type mentioned by Jacobus of Voragine as a source for his cross legend, “In quadam uero hystoria Grecorum licet apocrypha legitur quod...” (LA 64.8), and referred to by Gounelle (“Sens et usage,” 203).

⁶ Compare Luke 22:61-62: “et conversus Dominus respexit Petrum et recordatus est Petrus verbi , Domini sicut dixit quia priusquam gallus cantet ter me negabis et egressus foras Petrus flevit amare” (Vulgate); “And the Lord turning looked on Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, as he had said: Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And Peter going out, wept bitterly” (DRV).

where Christ was suffering and, seeing how he had been condemned to death, threw the silver pieces into the Temple and going from there, hanged himself with a noose.⁷ And thus he perished between heaven and earth,⁸ because he had betrayed his Master, the only-begotten (son) of God, Savior of all the faithful.

Here ends the remarkable story of the death⁹ of Judas the betrayer of Jesus Christ.

⁷ Compare Matthew 27:3-5: “tunc videns Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset paenitentia ductus rettulit triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus dicens peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum at illi dixerunt quid ad nos tu videris et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit” (Vulgate); “Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients, Saying: I have sinned in betraying innocent blood. But they said: What is that to us? look thou to it. And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed: and went and hanged himself with an halter” (DRV).

⁸ An echo, perhaps, of 2 Kings 18:9, a passage often connected with the death of Judas: “accidit autem ut occurreret Absalom servis David sedens mulo cumque ingressus fuisset mulus subter condensam quercum et magnam adhesit caput eius quercui et illo suspenso inter caelum et terram mulus cui sederat pertransivit” (Vulgate); “And it happened that Absalom met the servants of David, riding on a mule: and as the mule went under a thick and large oak, his head stuck in the oak: and while he hung between the heaven and the earth, the mule on which he rode passed on” (DRV). This language is further used and explained by Peter Comestor (*Hist. Act. Apost.* cap. 9, 1543 ed., p. 229) and Jacobus of Voragine (LA 45. 53-62). See above, ch. 3, p. 130, n. 57.

⁹ Here *finis* stands for *finis vitae*.

Appendix H: The “lost” Ginsburg/Ricci manuscript, now BnF n.a. lat. 3072

The first known modern owner of this manuscript (PN₄) was the biblical scholar Christian David Ginsburg (1831-1914), a Jewish convert born in Poland who spent most of his adult life in England. He published important editions of the Masorah and worked on the Revised Authorized translation of the Bible.¹

Thompson, who published two excerpts from the manuscript in his 1881 article, describes the manuscript as being²

in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Ginsburg of Virginia Walter [...] the MS. contains a collection of sermons for various occasions, with other miscellaneous tracts, written in Italy early in the fourteenth century. The portion of the volume which contains the apocryphal pieces is written in a different hand, and may have once formed part of another MS. of the same size. It is, in fact, only an imperfect fragment, beginning with the concluding passages of the Gospel of Nicodemus, the rest of which, along with at least one, if not more apocryphal pieces, has been lost. (239)

Apparently basing his description of the manuscript upon Thompson (though Bob Miller is listed as the informant in this case), Zbigniew Izydorczyk lists it among the “Manuscripts Recently Lost or Destroyed” in his census of *Gospel of Nicodemus* manuscripts: “no. 436 Virginia Walter, Great Britain, Rev. Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, MS.

¹ *The Encyclopedia Americana* (New York, 1919) 12:659-60. Web.

² Thompson, E. M. “Apocryphal Legends.” *Journal of British Archaeological Association* 37 (1881): 239-53.

Unidentified.”³ After the death of Dr. Ginsburg, however, it was sold at auction by Sotheby (London) in July 1915.⁴ The auction sale catalogue (day two) describes the manuscript thus:

Classical Writings, Manuscript on Vellum (Latin, 151 ll. 8½ by 6 in.), written in Italy, in different hands of the early part of the XIVth century, containing extracts from the Schoolmen, Legends from the Apocrypha, Sermons, etc. including: Libellus S. Thome de apparicionibus; Ex quodlibet magistri Johannis de Napoli; Notula de Rithmis optimal; De praedestinatione, extractum ed prima parte S. Thome de Aquino; Descent of Christ into Hell, part of the Gospel of Nicodemus (imperfect at beginning); Epistle of Pilate to Tiberius regarding Jesus Christ; Legend of the Tree from which the Holy Rood was made; Story of the Death of Judas; Legend of the Cura Sanitatis Tiberii Caesaris; Hymns to the Virgin Mary, with musical notes; Sermons for various occasions, etc. the volume originally contained other pieces and is imperfect at beginning; in original vellum covers, laced with thongs to leather pieces, on the upper cover are the words “Scutella pauperum,” evidently intended as a general title for the whole volume by one of its earlier owners. Saec XIV.⁵

The title “Scutella pauperum” (‘the poor men’s platter’) occurs in none of the other extant descriptions of this manuscript.⁶

From an annotated copy of the sale catalogue in the British Library (the Sotheby’s original set), we learn that Lot 488 was sold for 1 pound 12 shillings, and that the buyer was “Ricci”—none other than great Anglo-French bibliographer and bibliophile Seymour

³ Zbigniew Izydorczyk, *Manuscripts of the Evangelium Nicodemi: a census* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1993), 209.

⁴ The fact of the auction, though not the crucial details of it, was signaled by a search of the Schoenberg Manuscript Database at the University of Pennsylvania.

⁵ *Catalogue of the Extensive and Important Library of the late Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, LL. D. of Oakthorpe, Palmers Green, N., sold by Order of the Executors. Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge July 14th-16th, 1915* (London: Dryden Press, 1915), 51-52 [Lot 488, from day two of the auction].

⁶ *Scutella pauperum* may refer to the designation of a constellation with seven stars in a circle (Charles François Dupuis, *Origine de tous les cultes, ou, Religion universelle* [Paris: L. Rosier, 1836]: 9:359).

de Ricci (May 17, 1881-December 25, 1942).⁷ After Ricci's death in 1942, most of his books and manuscripts passed by bequest to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF).⁸ Thereafter the former Ginsburg manuscript was catalogued among the *nouvelles acquisitions latines*, and described under the following rubric: "3072. Miscellanea theologica — Sermones."⁹

Similar, if not identical, is Jean Porcher's description of a manuscript when it was listed among the "nouvelles acquisitions latines":

F. 1-2 v^o. Johannes de Neapoli, Quodlibet X, fragm. Cf. Glorieux, *Litt. quodl.*; II, 169. — F. 2 v^o-3 v^o. «Libellus Sci. Thomae de apparicionibus» [Gerardus de Abbatisvilla, Quodlibet IX, fragm.] (*ibid.*, I, 120). — F. 3 v^o-7 v^o. S. Thomas de Aquino, Tractatus de sortibus (éd. Mandonnet, *Opusc. omnia*, III, 144). — F. 7 v^o- 8. S. Thomas, Libellus utrum liceat uti iudicii astrorum (*ibid.*, 142). — F. 8-13 v^o. Johannes de Neapoli, Quodlibet X, fragm. — F. 13 v^o. Johannes de Neapoli, Quodlibet IV, fragm. — F. 14-17. Jacobus de Viterbio, Quodlibet I, fragm. Cf. Glorieux, *o. c.*, I, 215. — F. 17-17 v^o. «Notula de rithmis optima.» — F. 17 v^o -21. «Tabula kalandarii secundum Dyonisium.» — F. 21 v^o -32. S. Thoma de Aquino, Summa theologica, fragm. — F. 32. «Versus scripti in colu[m]pnis Brundusii.» — F. 32 v^o. «Nota quod quadruplex est homo»; «Versus in sepulcro Boamundi... apud Canosium a. d. M^oCVI^o.» — F. 33-37. «Compilatio ex evangeliis apocryphis, etc...», fragm. — F. 37 v^o. «De conjugio», fragm. — F. 38. «Nota de iri.» — F. 38 v^o -40 v^o. Hymnus not. ad b. Mariam. — F. 41-69. Jacobus de Voragine, Legenda aurea,

⁷ Personal correspondence from Raika Wokoek of the Rare Books Reference Service (March 25, 2008). The Rare Books Department of the British Library possesses a nearly complete set of Sotheby's archival annotated catalogues pre-1970. This collection has been microfilmed, and my examination of the reel in question (citation) confirms the information provided by Ms. Wokoek.

⁸ Porcher, Jean. "À la Bibliothèque Nationale: le legs Seymour de Ricci." *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 105 (1944): 229-33. Goldschmidt, E. P. "Seymour de Ricci: 1881-1942." *The Library* 4th ser. 24.1-2 (1943): 187-94. See also: <http://www.dictionarofarthistorians.org/riccis.htm> .

⁹ From 1871 to 1982, descriptions of new Latin and French acquisitions of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France were published every five years in the *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*. Jean Porcher "Nouvelles acquisitions latines et françaises du Département des mauscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale pendant les années 1941-1945," *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 106.2 (1946): 225-281 (<http://www.persee.fr>). Porcher gives an overview of the Ricci material (226-27) as well as a description of the former Ginsburg manuscript (238-39).

fragm. — F. 69 v^o. Littera Roberti regis ad Neapolitanos, 30 mart. 1327. — F. 70. «Notula de vocibus animalium.» — F. 70 v^o -137 v^o. Sermones anon. ; au f. 91 v^o, Innocentius III, Ad claustrales (*P. L.*, CCXVII, 671) ; au f. 128, Guiardus Laudunensis, De uno martyre. — F. 137 v^o -138. «Dei diffinitiones excerptae ex pluribus auctoribus.» — F. 138 v^o -150. Sermones anon., avec table; au f. 147, «Nota de missa».

XIII^e et XIX^e s. — (Phillipps.) — Parch. 151 ff. 225 X 145 mm.

— Rel. parch.

There is enough information here to make a positive identification of the Ginsburg Ms. with BnF n.a. lat. 3072: the number of pages in the volume are an exact match, the dimensions are an approximate match (inches and millimetres being not quite reconcilable), and the names of the authors John of Naples and Thomas Aquinas coincide, as do the titles of several texts.

While this description gives many details that are missing from those of Thompson and the Sotheby catalogue, the section that concerns us lacks some important information, including the omission of any mention of the Gospel of Nicodemus or its parts, the Cross legends, and *De gallo redivivo*: “F. 33-37. ‘Compilatio ex evangeliiis apocryphis, etc...’ fragm.” This description also lacks any indication of the geographic origins of the manuscript, and assigns it a puzzling date. A manuscript that contains a letter dated March 30, 1327 could hardly be 13th, rather than at least partly (early) 14th c., unless the letter was a late addition (no note to this effect—Hudry, BAMAT agree on 14th c.). Moreover, John of Naples, author of several Quodlibets, is thought to have died in 1336, which would also point to a date in the 14th c. The reference to Phillipps is also mysterious, and may be impossible to verify. Porcher’s other references to former Phillips Mss. include a number, as in the case of BnF n.a. lat. 3070 (Phillipps 3381) and

3074 (Phillipps 9644; Porcher 238-39).¹⁰

Bob Miller has called into question the attribution of Italian provenance to this manuscript on the grounds that the original attribution, published by Thompson, might not have been sufficiently authoritative.¹¹ It is not known, however, who was responsible for description in the Sotheby sale catalogue, or to what extent it represents the scant information provided by Thompson or by Ginsburg himself. Although the description provided in Porcher's article is by far the most detailed of the three, his treatment of the apocryphal material (fols. 33-37) is curiously lacking in detail. It seems unlikely that Porcher consulted or was even aware of the previously published descriptions of the manuscript. One also wonders whether Porcher consulted Ricci's own notes, assuming there would have been some. Much of the material contained in this manuscript seems to be of a scholastic nature and certain items point to strong connections with Italy (possibly even southern Italy), but Porcher gives no geographic origin or provenance. Perhaps a further comparison would allow at least some tentative conclusions regarding these matters, but to finally settle the questions raised by Miller, the manuscript must be examined by someone qualified to make a more reliable determination of provenance.

¹⁰ As of yet I have been unable to determine whether Ginsburg bought the Ms. from Phillipps.

¹¹ Regarding Thompson's identification of the then Ginsburg manuscript as Italian, Miller says: "I have seen several manuscripts described as Italian by nineteenth-century bookdealers which are more likely to derive from Northern Europe. In the absence of the manuscript and any other evidence than a statement made in an antiquarian magazine by a non-specialist, I see no reason to suppose that the complex of texts here treated ever reached Italy. The absence of a certain provenance for this manuscript is particularly regrettable as it belonged to the group otherwise only known from the Upper Danube area [...] it might have been a 'missing link' indicating the path by which the texts came from England or France to central Europe. If the manuscript did indeed originate in Northeastern Italy this could be seen as a simple extension of the Upper Danubian group into a neighbouring diocese" (Bob Miller, unpublished *Notes on the Latin manuscript source of the Andrius Compilation*, personal communication, December 23, 2008).

Works Cited

- Adriaen, M., ed. *Commentariorum in Amos Prophetam Libri III. Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri opera, Pars I, Opera exegetica, 6, Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 76. Turnholt: Brepols, 1969.
- Atkinson, Robert. *The Passions and the Homilies from Leabhar Breac: Text, Translation and Glossary*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1887.
- Axton, Richard. "Interpretations of Judas in Middle English Literature." *Religion in the Poetry and Drama of the late Middle Ages in England*. Ed. Piero Boitani and Anna Torti. Cambridge: Brewer, 1990. 179-97.
- Bailey, D.R. Shackleton. *Statius*. Harvard UP, n.d.
- Baum, Paul F. "The English Ballad of Judas Iscariot." *PMLA* 31.2 (1916): 181-89.
- . "The Mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot." *PMLA* 31.3 (1916): 481-632.
- . "Judas's Red Hair." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 21 (1922): 520-29.
- . "Judas' Sunday Rest." *Modern Language Review* 18 (1923): 168-82.
- Bergin, Osborn. "The Harrowing of Hell from the Book of Fermoy." *Ériu* 4 (1910): 112-19. Repr. *Irish Bardic Poetry*. Ed. David Greene and Fergus Kelly. Dublin: DIAS, 1970. 178-82 (text); 296-98 (trans.).
- Boswell, John. *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. New York: Vintage, 1990.

- Bray, Dorothy Anne. *A List of Motifs in the Lives of the Early Irish Saints*. Helsinki: Academia Scientarium Fennica, 1992.
- Breatnach, Caoimhín. "Lismore, Book of." In: *Medieval Ireland: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Seán Duffy, Ailbe MacShamhráin, and James Moynes. New York, Routledge, 2005. 279-80.
- Brown, Beatrice D. *The Southern Passion*. London: Oxford UP, 1927.
- Burgio, Eugenio. "Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle vitae antico-francesi di Giuda e di Pilato. I. Le redazioni in prosa della vita di Pilato." *Annali di Ca' Foscari: Rivista della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Venezia* 34.1-2 (1995): 97-137.
- . "Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle vitae antico-francesi di Giuda e di Pilato. II. I volgarizzamenti quattrocenteschi in prosa." *Annali di Ca' Foscari: Rivista della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Venezia* 35.1-2 (1996): 29-75.
- . "Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta delle vitae antico-francesi di Giuda e di Pilato. III. Le Histoires Apocrifes nella Bible Historiale." *Annali di Ca' Foscari: Rivista della Facoltà di Lingue e Letterature Straniere dell'Università di Venezia* 37.1-2 (1998): 153-213.
- Child, Francis J. *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 5 vols. New York: Dover, 1965; o.p. 1882-98.
- Clogan, Paul M. "The Planctus of Oedipus: text and comment." *Medievalia et Humanistica* n. s. 1 (1970): 233-39.
- Coley, John Smartt. *The Romance of Thebes: a translation of the Roman de Thèbes*.

- Vanderbuilt UP, 1965.
- Colker, Martin. *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts* 1991.
- Constans, Léopold. *La Légend d'OEdipe: étudié dans l'antiquité, au moyen âge, et dans les temps modernes*. Paris, 1881.
- Coxe, Henry O. *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars secunda codices Latinos et Miscellaneos Laudianos complectens*. Vol. 2. Oxford, 1885.
- Crossan, John D. *Who Killed Jesus? Exposing the roots of anti-Semitism in the gospel story of the death of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
- Darling, Gregory J. *The Cross Legends of the Leabhar Breac: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Comentary*. Ph.D. diss. City University of New York, 2003.
- de Gaiffier, Baudouin. "L' 'Historia apocrypha' dans la Légende dorée." *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973): 263-72.
- de Gaiffier, Baudouin. "Liberatus a suspendio." *Études Critiques d'hagiographie et d'iconologie*. *Subsidia Hagiographica* 43. Brussels: Soc. des Bollandistes, 1967. 227-32.
- Delehaye, Hyppolyte. *The Legends of the Saints*. Trans. Donald Attwater. New York: Fordham UP, 1962.
- D'Evelyn, Charlotte and Anna J. Mill. *The South English Legendary*. 3 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1956-59.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. *Christusbilder: Untersuchung zur christlichen Legende*. 2 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1899.

Dorn, Erhard. *Der sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967.

Dumville, David N. "Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish Church: A Preliminary Investigation." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73C (1973): 299-338.

—. "Two Approaches to the Dating of *Nauigatio Sancti Brendani*," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser. 29 (1988): 87-102.

Edmunds, Lowell. *Oedipus: The Ancient Legend and Its Later Analogue*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985.

Edmunds, Lowell and Alan Dundee, eds. *Oedipus: A Folklore Casebook*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1995; o.p. 1983.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Lost Christianities: The battle for scripture and the faiths we never knew*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003.

Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation based on M. R. James*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005; o.p. 1993.

Emming, Jutta. Judas als Held. Formen des Erzählens in der mittelalterlichen Judaslegende." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 120.3 (2001): 394-412.

Fallon, Nicole A. *The Cross as Tree: The Wood-of-the-Cross Legends in Middle English and Latin Texts in Medieval England*. Ph.D. diss. Toronto, 2009.

Fleith, Barbara. "Die Legenda Aurea und ihre dominikanischen Bruderlegende: Aspekte der Quellenverhältnisse apokryphen Gedankenguts." *Apocrypha* 7 (1996): 167-191.

—. "Patristic Sources of the Legenda Aurea: A research report." *The Reception of the*

- Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Ed. Irena Backus. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1997. 231-87.
- . *Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der lateinischen Legenda aurea*. Bruxelles,: Soc. Bollandistes, 1991.
- Fraser, J. "The Passion of St. Christopher." *Révue Celtique* 34 (1913): 307-25. Repr. *Medieval Saints: A Reader*. Ed. Mary-Ann Stouck. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview P, 1999. 561-67.
- Furnivall, Frederick J. *Early English Poems and Lives of the Saints (with those of the wicked birds Pilate and Judas)*. Berlin: 1862, Asher.
- Görlach, Manfred. "The Legenda Aurea and the Early History of the South English Legendary." *Legenda aurea: Sept siècles de diffusion*. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1986.
- . *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*. Leeds: University of Leeds, 1974.
- Gounelle, Rémi. "À propos des volailles cuites qui ont chanté lors de la passion du Christ." *Recherches Augustiniennes* 33 (2003): 19-63.
- . "Sens et usage d'apocryphus dans la Légende dorée." *Apocrypha* 5 (1994): 189-210.
- Graesse, J. G. Theodore. *Jacobi a Voragine. Legenda aurea: Vulgo historia lombardica dicta*. 3rd ed. Bratislava, 1890. Repr. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1965.
- Greenberg, Gary. *The Judas Brief: Who really killed Jesus?* New York: Continuum, 2007.
- Hahn, Thomas. "The Medieval Oedipus." *Comparative Literature* 32.3 (1980): 225-37.
- Helms, Randel. *Who Wrote the Gospels?* Altadena: Millennium P, 1997.
- . *Gospel Fictions*. Buffalo: Prometheus, 1988.

- Herbert, J[ohn]. A[lexander]., ed. *Titus and Vespasian or the Destruction of Jerusalem in Rhymed Couplets*. London: Roxburghe Club, 1905.
- Herbert, Máire. "Medieval Collections of Ecclesiastical and Devotional Materials." In: *Treasures of the Royal Irish Academy*. Ed. Bernadette Cunningham and Siobhán Fitzpatrick. Dublin: RAI, 2009 32-35.
- Hill, Thomas D. "'The ballad of St Stephen and Herod': biblical history and medieval popular religious culture." *Medium Aevum* 70.2 (2001): 240-50.
- Hyde, Douglas, ed. and trans. *Abhráin diadha chúige Connacht/ The Religious Songs of Connacht*. London and Dublin, 1915.
- , trans. *Legends of Saints and Sinners*. Dublin, 1915. Repr. New York: Barnes, 1973.
- Iseley, Nancy. "De Passione Judas, an Anglo-Norman Poem." *Studies in Romance Languages and Literature* 2. (Chapel Hill: UNC, 1941): 29-40.
- Izydorczyk, Zbigniew. *Manuscripts of the 'Evangelium Nicodemi': A Census*. Subsidia Mediaevalia 2. Toronto: Pontifical Institute, 1993.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. "The Disorder of Books: Priscillian's Canonical Defense of Apocrypha." *Harvard Theological Review* 93.2 (2000): 135-59.
- James, M. R. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the College Library of Magdalene College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1909.
- . *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the College Library of St John's College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1913.
- . *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Jesus College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1895.
- . "Irish Apocrypha." *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1918-19): 9-15.

- . *The New Testament Apocrypha*. Clarendon P: Oxford, 1924.
- . “Notes on the Apocrypha.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1909-10): 288-91.
- Jankofsky, Klaus. “National Characteristics in the Portrayal of English Saints in the *South English Legendary*.” In: *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*. Ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991. 81-39.
- Kasser, Rodolphe Kasser, Marvin Meyer, and Gregor Wurst, eds. *The Gospel of Judas from Codex Tchacos*. Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2006.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. New York: McKay, 1972.
- Ker, Neil R. “An Eleventh-Century Old English Legend of the Cross Before Christ.” *Medium Aevum* 9 (1940): 84-85.
- Klassen, William. *Judas: Betrayer or friend of Jesus?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Knape, Joachim. “Die ‘Historia apocrypha’ der ‘Legenda aurea’.” *Zur Deutung von Geschichte in Antike und Mittelalter*. Ed. Joachim Knape and Karl Strobel. Bamberg, 1985. 113-72.
- Knape, Joachim. “Pilatus. Lateinische und deutsche Texte.” *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Ed. Wolfgang Stammer. Vol. 7. 1989. coll. 669-82.
- Knapp, Fritz Peter. *Der Selbstmord in der abenländischen Epik des Hochmittelalters*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1979.
- . “legenda aut non legenda: Erzählstrukturen und Legitimationsstrategien in ‘falschen’ Legenden des Mittelalters: Judas—Gregorius—Albanus.” *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* 53.2 (2003): 133-154.
- Lehmann, Paul. “Judas Ischarioth in der lateinischen Legendenüberlieferung des

- Mittelalters.” Lehmann, Paul. *Erforschung des Mittelalters: Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*. Vol. 2. 1959. 5 vols. 229-85.
- Liszka, Thomas R. “The Dragon in the South English Legendary: Judas, Pilate, and the ‘A(1)’ Redaction.” *Modern Philology* 100 (2002): 50-59.
- Maccoby, Hyam. *Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid. “Dhá leagan de scéal Phíoláit.” *Celtica* 7 (1966): 205–213.
- Maggioni, Giovanni Paolo. *Iacopo da Varazze, Legenda aurea: Edizione critica*. 2nd. 2 vols. Florence: SISMEL/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998.
- Marx, C. W. *The Devil’s Parament and The Harrowing of Hell and Destruction of Jerusalem*. Heidelberg: UV C. Winter, 1993.
- Matthews, Christopher R. “Articulate Animals: A Multivalent Motif in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.” In: *The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. Harvard Divinity School Studies. Ed. Francois Bovon, Christopher R. Matthews, and Ann Graham Brock. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 205-32.
- McNamara, Martin. *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975.
- . *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic P, 2000.
- Meyer, Wilhelm. “Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christus.” *Abhandlungen der philosophische-philologischen Classe der königliche bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 16 (1882): 101–66.
- Miller, A[ndrew] R[obert]. *German and Dutch Versions of the Legend of the Wood of the Cross Before Christ: A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue*. D. Phil. thesis.

Oxford, 1992.

Miller, Bob. "Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen der Kreuzholzlegende 'Post peccatum Adae'." *Metamorphosen der Bibel: Beiträge zur Tagung "Wirkungsgeschichte der Bibel im deutschsprachigen Mittelalter" vom 4. bis 6. September 2000 in der Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars Trier (Taschenbuch)*. Ed. Ralf Plate and Andrea Rapp. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004. 289-342.

Morey, James H. "Adam and Judas in the Old English 'Christ and Satan'." *Studies in Philology* 87.4 (1990): 397-409.

Mulchrone, Kathlen and Elizabeth Fitzpatrick. *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*. Fasc. 27. Dublin: RIA, 1943. Web.

Murray, Alexander. *Suicide in the Middle Ages, Volume 2: The Curse on Self-Murder*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Nagy, Ilona. "The Roasted Cock Crows: Apocryphal Writings (Acts of Peter, the Ethiopic Book of the Cock, Coptic Fragments, the Gospel of Nicodemus) and Folklore Texts." *Folklore (Tartu)* 36 (2007): 7-40.

Napier, Arthur S. *The History of the Holy Rood-tree: a twelfth century version of the Cross-legend*. E.E.T.S. o.s. 103. London: Trübner, 1894.

O'Ceallaigh, G. C. "Dating the commentaries of Nicodemus." *Harvard Theological Review* 56 (1963), 21-58.

Paffenroth, Kim. *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Pagels, Elaine and Karen L. King. *Reading Judas: the Gospel of Judas and the shaping of Christianity*. New York: Penguin, 2007.

- Partridge, Angela and Hugh Shields. "Amhráin bheannaithe as co. na Gaillimhe agus as Tír Chonaill." *Irish Folk Music Studies* 3 (1981): 18-44.
- Pickering, Oliver S. "The outspoken South English Legendary poet." *Late-Medieval Religious Text and Their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle*. Ed. A. J. Minnis. Cambridge: Brewer, 1994. 21-37.
- . "The Temporale Narratives of the South English Legendary." *Anglia* 91 (1973): 425-55.
- Porcher, Jean. "Nouvelles acquisitions latines et françaises du Département des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale pendant les années 1941-1945." *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 106.2 (1946): 225-281.
- Prangmsma-Hajenius, Angelique M. L. *La Légende de la Bois de la Croix dans la littérature française médiévale*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1995.
- Quinn, Esther C. *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1962.
- Quinn, Esther C. and Micheline Dufau. *The Penitence of Adam. A Study of the Andrius MS*. University, Mississippi: Romance Monographs, Inc., 1980.
- Raynaud de Lage, Guy. *Le Roman de Thèbes*. Paris: Champion, 1971.
- Reames, Sherry L. *The Legenda aurea: a reexamination of its paradoxical history*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1985.
- Reider, Norman. "Medieval Oedipal Legends about Judas." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 29 (1960): 515-27.
- Robinson, James M. *The Secrets of Judas: The Story of the Misunderstood Disciple and His Lost Gospel*. San Francisco: Harper, 2006.
- Roy, Emile. *Le Mystère de la Passion en France du XIV^e au XVI^e siècle*. Dijon and

- Paris, 1904.
- Ryan, William Granger. *Jacobus de Voragine. The Golden Legend*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.
- Saari, Aaron M. H. *The Many Deaths of Judas Iscariot*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Sandler, Lucy F. *Omne Bonum: A fourteenth-century encyclopedia of universal knowledge*. 2 vols. London: Harvey Miller, 1996.
- Scheidgen, Andreas. *Die Gestalt Des Pontius Pilatus in Legende, Bielauslegung Und Geschichts*. Frankfurt: P. Lang, 2003.
- Selmer, Carl. *Navigatio sancti Brendani abbatis from Early Latin Manuscripts*. South Bend: U of Notre Dame P, 1959.
- Seymour, St. John D. "Notes on Apocrypha in Ireland." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 37C (1927): 107-17.
- . "The Cock and Pot." *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 51 (1921): 147-51.
- Smith, William S. *Six Columns of Leabar Breac (LBr 222 a et sqq.)*. M.A. thesis. Columbia University, 1931.
- Smithers, G. V. *Kyng Alisaunder*. 2 vols. London: Oxford UP, 1952-57.
- Steinmeyer, Ernst von. "Die Historia apocrypha der Legenda aurea." *Münchener Museum für Philologie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* 3 (1918): 155-66.
- Stevenson, Enrico and Giovanni B. de Rossi. *Codices Palatini Latini Bibliothecae Vaticanae descriptivi*. Rome, 1886.
- Sumption, Jonathan. *Pilgrimage: An Image of Mediaeval Religion*. London: Faber & Faber, 1975.

- Thompson, Anne B. *Everyday Saints and the Art of Narrative in the South English Legendary*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- . “Narrative Art in the South English Legendary.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90.1 (1991): 20-30.
- Tischendorff, Constantin, ed. *Evangelia Apocrypha*. 2nd ed. Lipsig: H. Mendelssohn, 1876.
- Wells, Minnie E. “The South English Legendary in its Relation to the Legenda Aurea.” *PMLA* 51.2 (1936): 337-360.
- Werner, Doris. *Pylatus: Untersuchungen zur metrischen latinischen Pilatuslegende und kritische Textausgabe*. Ratigen: Henn, 1972.
- Whatley, Gordon. “The Uses of Hagiography: The Legend of Pope Gregory and the Emperor Trajan in the Middle Ages.” *Viator* 15 (1984): 26-63.
- Williams, J. E. Caerwyn. “The Middle Welsh Text of Ystorya Judas.” *Celtic Linguistics/Ithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins*. Ed. Martin J. Ball, et al. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990. 363-71.
- Williams, Robert, ed. and trans. *Selections from the Hengwrt Mss. Preserved in the Peniarth Library*. London: Thomas Richards, 1892.
- Wolf, Kirsten. *Gyðinga saga*. Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar, 1995.
- . “The Judas Legend in Scandinavia.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 88 (1989): 463-76.