PROJECT MUSE®

Working with the Enemy: The Harmonizing Tradition and the New Utility of Judas Iscariot in Thirteenth-Century England

Britt Mize

Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures, Volume 36, Number 1, 2010, pp. 68-110 (Article)

Published by Penn State University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/mrc.0.0007>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/381197>

WORKING WITH THE ENEMY: THE
HARMONIZING TRADITION AND THE
NEW UTILITY OF JUDAS ISCARIOT IN
THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

Britt Mize
Texas A&M University

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw some diversification of both popular and official representations of Judas Iscariot in the Latin West. One new possibility that arose, as I will show, was the assimilation of Jesus' betrayer to one of the chief parochial priorities of the thirteenth-century church, the promotion of regular lay confession. The purpose of this essay is to define and illustrate the process by which Satan's man on the inside could become an ordinary Christian penitent worthy of a certain measure of human understanding: a contrite sinner who did exactly what he should have done, before failing at the last moment to claim God's mercy.

Section I below describes the development and ossification of the prevailing early medieval image of Judas as statically wicked. I argue that this came about largely through the theory and practice of gospel harmony, by which the more ambiguous synoptic versions of Judas, particularly the remorseful Matthean one, became flattened into a constant enemy of the true faith through commingling with details from the Gospel of John, which is unique in its intense hostility toward him. As a fundamental hermeneutic paradigm, "informal" harmony came to seem so natural, and was so strongly reinforced by its formalizations in orthodox traditions of interpretation, that very powerful counteracting influences would be required to make possible any reevaluation of Judas's significance for the contemporary Christian faith. Section II introduces the emergence in the twelfth century, and increasing prominence in the thirteenth, of intellectual and institutional tendencies that formed a new environment for scriptural

interpretation allowing, in Judas's case, some disruption of the older harmony-derived image and his integration into changing late medieval schemes of moral theology and sacramental praxis.

The later sections of this study examine the reanalysis of Judas in that environment for the purpose of practical teaching on the sacrament of Penance. In an especially informative convergence, the reconceptualized, penitential Judas proved capable of inhabiting even harmonizing biblical paraphrases, where reassertion of the Matthean remorse as a moral response to his earlier wrongdoing partially overcame the effect that the Johannine elements of gospel harmony had had on his character for a millennium. Sections III and IV will show this development by considering the treatments of Judas in two closely related Middle English narrative poems: the *South English Ministry and Passion* (ca. 1270 × 1285) and the derivative *Southern Passion*, into which the Passion section of the prior work was revised sometime before 1290.¹

Both texts are examples of what can simply but usefully be called “biblical literature.”² The intention of these and similar works is to reproduce scriptural subject matter with the ultimate goal of instructing the laity in biblical history and related matters of the faith, whether directly or through the mediation of clerical readers, teachers, and preachers for whom these texts could serve as source books. This pair of harmonizing gospel retellings affords both an early and an outstandingly clear picture of broader trends with respect to the interpretation of Judas; and in addition to what can be seen in either of them alone, their textual kinship permits close comparative analysis to reveal strategies of revision whereby a particular construction of his tropological meaning—the sense of his story's moral applicability to the lives of latter-day Christians—took firmer shape in the rewriting process. Judas's penitential tropology is isolated in the earlier *South English Ministry and Passion*, where it has a didactically opportunistic character and a textually localized presence. In the *Southern Passion*, it flourishes into a full-blown program of penitential instruction centered on the problem of despair.

I. THE WESTERN HARMONIZED TRADITION AND ITS EARLY MEDIEVAL JUDAS

For a medieval Christian with access to scripture, certain facts about Judas Iscariot seemed straightforward. Most centrally, Judas was a disciple of Jesus,

and he conspired with Temple officials to bring about his master's arrest in Jerusalem. These two propositions are attested by all of the canonical gospels; indeed, they constitute the whole of the core Judas narrative shared by those four earliest texts that mention him by name. Around this core a number of other details cluster, each found in one or two of the gospels and understood throughout the Middle Ages likewise to have the highest historical authority: from John, that Judas managed the purse for the band of disciples and embezzled from it;³ again from John, that it was he who objected to the use of precious ointment on Jesus' feet at Bethany, advocating that it be sold instead on the pretense of raising funds for the poor but really wishing to steal some of the proceeds;⁴ from Matthew, that he received money for his actions as an informant to Jesus' adversaries;⁵ from Matthew and Mark, that he identified Jesus to the arresting party with a kiss;⁶ from Luke and John, that his collusion with his master's enemies resulted from direct diabolical prompting;⁷ and from Matthew, that after Jesus' trial by Pilate, Judas regretted his betrayal, rejected the money he had in that version taken for it, declared Jesus' innocence, and hanged himself.⁸

These claims about Judas, each explicit in one or more texts in the scriptural canon, were all considered beyond direct question until modern times. To them were traditionally added other assertions that arose at an early date through the hermeneutic strategy of gospel harmony: the practice of weaving together material from all four gospels into an undifferentiated supergospel, a maximally inclusive account of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection, with any dissonance among the sources suppressed through selection or case-by-case rationalization. The impulse to create a plenary gospel narrative, on the assumption that such a compilation would reveal more fully the truth behind disparate texts, is as ancient as the gospels themselves. Indeed it drove the formation of at least Matthew, Luke, and John (if not also the first extant gospel, Mark), each of which demonstrably absorbed multiple written sources wholly or selectively in an attempt to produce *the* singular account of the gospel message,⁹ and none of whose authors imagined his or her work to be part of an eventual *tetrevangelium*. Even before the four-gospel canon completely stabilized, harmonizing practices were under way among those texts as well. In the mid-second century Justin Martyr had already produced or acquired a Greek harmony of at least extracts from the three synoptic gospels at his school in Rome,¹⁰ and probably in the early 170s, Tatian the Assyrian built on his former teacher Justin's text to produce a systematic harmony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John known as the *Diatessaron*.¹¹

About the turn of the fifth century, provoked by anti-Christian polemicists who brandished the multiplicity of gospels as evidence that the religion lacked a base in historical fact, Augustine of Hippo wrote *De consensu evangelistarum*.¹² Although *De consensu* too is a formal harmonizing project, the differences between Augustine's work and Tatian's are fundamental, and recognizing them will help define the importance of Augustine's approach for the tradition with which this study is concerned. Those differences proceed from disagreement on the underlying question of whether gospel harmony is something one *makes* or something one *discovers*: that is to say, whether it requires the work of an intervening editor or only of a sufficiently perceptive and skillful explicator. The former view, Tatian's, admits the existence of differences that matter among the four gospels, and the latter view, Augustine's, does not.¹³ In the second century Tatian labored to produce a correct cumulative narrative out of what he evidently regarded as the four most authoritative but still imperfect documentary records: his was a historiographical enterprise.¹⁴ By the end of the fourth century, the four gospels had long since become holy scripture, and Augustine's purposes are theological and apologetic.¹⁵ All indications are that Tatian puzzled over significant divergences of meaning among his sources in attempting to weave their fibers into a quasi-primary gospel text using not only their content but their very language,¹⁶ but Augustine insists in answer to critics of his faith that there are no such discrepancies.¹⁷ Tatian pieced together a continuous narrative from the texts of his gospel sources, which his cumulative account could at least potentially supersede in a continuation of the process by which the canonical gospels' own sources, other than Mark, had themselves been superseded;¹⁸ Augustine produces not a narrative but a commentary—a functionally secondary mode of work, always pendant to another text (in this case, texts) that it takes to be primary—and stresses the sacrosanct status of the gospels upon which he comments.

It would be hard to overestimate the crystallizing influence upon Western hermeneutics of Augustine's views on the relationship among the gospels, articulated in *De consensu evangelistarum* and manifested in practice throughout his exegetical and theological writings. Augustine's secondary formal harmony both derives from and in effect provides an intellectual justification for what we might call "informal" harmony: a seamless *conceptual* tissue of gospel facts that eliminates or severely devalues their identity as components of individual texts and therefore does not observe, or in less erudite forms even maintain cognizance of, the boundaries between

individual gospels. Informal harmony, such as that which took shape in Augustine's mind from his consciously and unconsciously cross-referential reading in scripture, guided also by his own education at the hands of Ambrose and others, finds formal expression and codification when it partially materializes in second-order textual types like tractates, homilies, and commentaries upon the gospels. Such secondary formal harmonies, including Augustine's *De consensu* itself, claim a modest enough ontology as satellites to primary scripture, but their concealed power in every age lies in their legitimating enactment of the principle that any deracinated gospel datum can be linked interpretively to any other, regardless of source, context, or intratextual function. As informal harmony continually takes on concrete form and is promulgated through commentary and teaching traditions, it determines what an initiated reader within the same tradition will already "know" in coming to any particular gospel passage and consequently will be apt to see there, thus contributing in turn to the next wave of informal harmony as it will be performed by private readers and communities of faith. As a dominant mainstream develops through one reading community's superior promotion of its favored interpretations, the iterative nature of the process causes the harmony itself to become both a constituent part and an enforcing mechanism of the next generation's orthodoxy.

Because every discrete element of the harmonized aggregate can be referred to some scriptural locus, from patristic times onward there has been a tendency in Christian exegesis and teaching to rely upon the amalgamation itself as if it possessed direct scriptural authority despite its chimerical and dehistoricizing nature: despite the fact, that is to say, that at any given moment many of its claims would have been alien to the authors of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Through cycles of informal harmony and its formalization in writings like Augustine's, by the early Middle Ages the intellectual project Tatian had attempted visibly in his narrative mosaic had been transmuted into a bedrock-level method of reading scripture capable, on a given occasion and for a given purpose, of effacing the gospels' unique textual identities and their distinctive treatments of their subject matter without compromising their fourfold authority under the names of the legendary Evangelists.

Characterizations of individual persons in the gospels were among the textual elements susceptible to unintentional but nevertheless drastic skewing through any form of harmony, whether primary and narrative or secondary and exegetical, and Judas is no exception. Of the specific early additions to Judas's story created by this interpretive methodology, perhaps

the most enduring has been the notion that greed motivated his betrayal of Jesus. This idea, with its indefinite relationship to the ascription of his actions to demonic possession in Luke and John, is supported by no gospel but derives from superimposing the promise (in Mark and Luke) or receipt (in Matthew and Acts) of money for the betrayal onto the portrait of Judas as a greedy thief, angry with Jesus for the waste of expensive ointment, that is found only in John—the one gospel in which, as it happens, remuneration for the treachery is never mentioned and therefore cannot be adduced as a motive for it.¹⁹

The harmonizing impulse extended beyond the four gospels, too, in Judas's case. An uneasy comparison of the Matthean account of Judas's rejection of the money and suicide with the divergent narrative in Acts, recounting his death by abdominal rupture on land he had bought with the money that version assumes he had retained, led commentators to develop scenarios that could be made to include both a hanging and a burst body. In traditions that remained in closer contact with the Greek New Testament, such explanations continued to be driven by the tension between the Matthew and Acts stories.²⁰ In the West, the accounts were made reconcilable, with great apparent authority, by Jerome's harmonizing insertion of a reference to hanging in his Vulgate translation of Acts.²¹ The connection of the hanging with the disembowelment was thereafter accepted as a scriptural fact in the Latin church,²² and this combined version of the two stories of Judas's death was usually taken at face value to indicate that his suicide was accompanied by a spontaneous evisceration signaling the wrath of God.²³

A broader effect the early conflation of details from all four gospel accounts and Acts had on Judas was the determination of his character, or at least his inclinations, as unequivocally wicked. The uniquely emphatic vilification of him in John (where at his first appearance Jesus identifies him as a devil and where the authorial voice, in its running commentary on narrated events, accuses him of having been a habitual thief and a hypocrite long before the betrayal) escaped the bounds of the last-written canonical gospel to color every incident involving Judas in the plenary, harmonized account, irrespective of its original textual environment. All of the gospel writers thought Judas did a bad thing in turning Jesus over to the Temple officials,²⁴ but none except the author of John implies that he nursed any long-term enmity to Jesus, antagonism toward the principles of his ministry prior to the decision, or diabolical inducement, to betray him. In their silence, the writers of Mark and Matthew would seem to allow a natural supposition that some unknown or undisclosed process

might have taken Judas from full proto-apostolic participation in Jesus' closest, chosen circle to the nadir of disloyalty, and the author of Luke and Acts apparently imagines a sudden, catastrophic break, conceptualized as a demon possession. However, the early generalization of the vigorous Johannine hostility toward Judas discouraged seeing him, in whatever context, as anything potentially more complicated or ambiguous than a static adversary of Jesus. Most of the church fathers and their Western intellectual heirs in the subsequent centuries were disposed to think of him as having always been the bad seed, the snake in the grass, through his own unvarying moral inadequacy.²⁵

These were the standard patristic and early medieval patterns of belief concerning Judas, and all of the commonplaces about him that I have summarized thus far can be said to have firm roots in scripture if one grants the hermeneutic assumptions of the time, permitting details from all of the gospels to be freely commingled. On many other matters pertaining to Judas, however, the gospels have nothing to say, whether separately or in combination, and here commentators always had to keep quiet or resort to speculation. Some of the surmises they made were very confident and uniform, as on the fate of Judas's soul. Outside of the recently rediscovered *Gospel of Judas*, which was mentioned by early heresiologists but had no influence on emergent orthodoxy, the rogue disciple was always presumed in antiquity and the Middle Ages to be damned.²⁶ Of greater interest to this study is a further question prompted by that undoubted fate: namely, the exact reason for it. The reason that often went without saying, of course, is his betrayal of Jesus. Usually no need was felt to look past the great act of villainy by which Judas defined himself, to early Christian eyes, as an antagonist to the true faith. But we shall see an eventual variability in answers to this question, a variability that also corresponds, I suggest, to a shift of exegetical emphasis from historical concerns to moral (tropological) ones: from what happened, in Judas's case, to why his story should matter for the latter-day devout. That shift in interpretive priorities tended in some discursive environments to turn attention from Judas's betrayal to his death.

In his monumental project on suicide in the Middle Ages, Alexander Murray is inclined to see Judas's suicide as central to conceptions of him from an early date.²⁷ With due respect to a scholar to whose immense learning my own work is indebted, I believe this view of Judas is distorted by the lens through which it is captured: the topical nature of Murray's research leads him to overestimate suicide's importance to Judas's patristic and early

medieval character. Judas was a famous scriptural instance of suicide, true, and his suicide was occasionally discussed by commentators, but from those facts it does not follow that it was for many (or any) interpreters of his case what mattered most about him. Thinking about Judas throughout the early Middle Ages concentrates heavily on the betrayal, beside which the suicide is an ancillary concern at best. For a millennium and more, his act of treachery is the really significant thing about Judas in the Latin West, and all other details—even when, like his Johannine greed, they are brought forward for occasional purposes—are understood as building up to, stemming from, or otherwise taking on meaning chiefly in relation to it.

This pattern is set by the earliest writings on Judas. The four canonical gospels define his importance entirely by reference to the betrayal, introducing him in each case with an anticipation of it and thus establishing it as the narrative telos toward which he will move.²⁸ The Gospel of Matthew's unparalleled inclusion of his remorse and suicide is almost certainly designed to present his confession of false witness and his subsequent autoexecution as an authoritative testimony to the wickedness of his earlier actions, at once a proclamation of and a response to the extreme dishonor of the betrayal.²⁹ Under the influence of the account in Acts with which it became harmonized, as well as an increasing intellectual certainty in the first few Christian centuries that suicide was wrong in itself,³⁰ the Matthean suicide of Judas was soon reinterpreted as the quintessential bad end, befitting the persistent wickedness of a wicked man. But either way, Judas's death was seen as having significance primarily as a sequel to his betrayal, of which it constituted a further indictment.

The situation does not change appreciably when we turn to the patristic writers who most guided early medieval opinion. Augustine's and Jerome's ideas about Judas are overwhelmingly governed by the betrayal. Their comments on it hugely outnumber their remarks on his suicide; and this disproportion cannot be discounted on grounds that references to Judas's betrayal are really part of the more important story of Jesus whereas the suicide is tangential, for these authors' more passing mentions of Judas's character, too, are virtually always referential to that character as established by his act of treachery. However, on occasion Augustine and Jerome do each point specifically to his suicide. Even then, the usefulness of Judas as an example, for Augustine, rests directly on his presupposed moral status as a traitor: both in *Contra Gaudentium* and in his most famous anti-suicide argument, in book I of *De civitate Dei*, Augustine brings up Judas's case precisely because the well-known prior betrayal gives the example relevance

in service of his polemical purposes, though that relevance is of different kinds in these two texts.³¹ We should note that these references are part of independent arguments against suicide rather than analyses of Judas, and it is hardly surprising that he should be named as a case in point given his prior infamy for other reasons. In each case Augustine's reasoning about the problem of suicide has nothing intrinsically to do with Judas's precedent, nor does it grant him the kind of suasive prominence one might expect. In fact he might or might not even be mentioned in otherwise very similar contexts: Augustine does not refer to him at all in an earlier section of *Contra Gaudentium* where, apart from Judas's absence, the list of scriptural examples marshaled against suicide is identical to the one I cited from the same work a moment ago;³² and Judas never comes into the anti-suicide argument in chapter 13 of *De patientia*, which although much briefer is essentially parallel to the one in *De civitate Dei*.³³

Jerome's references to Judas's suicide show much the same thing. Like Augustine, he can mention Judas as a notorious example when he sees fit to address the topic of suicide, as in his exegesis of Amos 5:18–20.³⁴ In his commentary on Matthew he briefly discusses the suicide, as one would expect him to do in a verse-by-verse analysis of the book that recounts it.³⁵ One reference deserves special mention, because it would go on to become Jerome's most famous statement on Judas's suicide and would be widely cited in the later Middle Ages. It occurs in his homily on Psalm 108, where Jerome writes that Judas offended Christ more by his suicide than by the betrayal.³⁶ This statement is designed for rhetorical impact. In context, its purpose clearly is not to take exact measure of the severity of two great sins but, rather, to indicate a contrast between the effect of Judas's suicide and what Jerome is imagining Judas's intention to have been: namely, mitigation of the betrayal. Jerome means that far from improving his situation in the judgment of God, Judas made it worse by the means he chose of despising his guilt.

Nothing I have seen, in short, implies that Judas's extranarrative meaning attached in any very large measure to his suicide during the early Middle Ages. When writers thought about Judas, they were not mainly thinking of his suicide, and when they thought systematically about the topic of suicide, which as Murray observes was seldom,³⁷ it is not evident that they automatically thought of Judas. When the conjunction does occur outside of sequential commentary on Matthew (where it must), its environment is normally discourse on suicide, not on the character of Judas; only if the reverse were true would it suggest that analysis of Christ's betrayer gravitated toward his suicide. When he is brought into anti-suicide polemic, he is invoked because

he is already known to be bad due to the betrayal. The fundamental argument in these contexts is that suicide—a special form of homicide, according to both Augustine and Jerome, who object to it for that reason—is further confirmed to be wrong because it was the resort of the great wrongdoer Judas, not that Judas was bad because he committed suicide. I have thought it necessary to give some attention to this point because the scope of possibilities will later widen such that the suicide achieves some measure of independence from the betrayal in analyses of the significance of *Judas*, attracting comment more focused on that moment in his scriptural career and allowing it to acquire its own kinds of meaning, and that change cannot be discerned without a clear view of the prior state of affairs.

Neither Augustine nor Jerome ascribes Judas's presumed damnation to his suicide; what remained for them the real center of gravity in his story, the betrayal, prevented such fine considerations. But the position they took on suicide in general did help to solidify understanding of Judas's mode of death as a second egregious sin. There is no doubt that for both of them, as a violation of the divine prohibition of murder, even under different circumstances Judas's suicide would still have assured his damnation, just as they both assert to be the case for (almost) all other suicides.³⁸ So clear to them is the wrongness of the suicide, as an act of homicide, that it overpowers the scriptural reference to Judas's remorse. For Augustine, the suicide is diagnostic: it means that Judas's sadness over his sin must have been of altogether the wrong kind.³⁹ While Jerome does not suggest like Augustine that Judas's remorse itself was qualitatively immoral, in his analysis the moral error of the act it produced made the nature of the impulse behind it simply irrelevant.⁴⁰ Under either of these interpretations, regardless of Judas's intentions in killing himself, doing so can only have compounded his culpability since it meant that he committed a second major sin while dying with his earlier, character-defining one still unremitted and unexpiated. This creation of a basis for separate moral evaluation of Judas's suicide, although such an evaluation is never fully actualized by Augustine or Jerome, is a cornerstone for later developments.

II. NEW TRENDS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

This, then, was the dominant version of Judas inherited by medieval writers: constantly wicked, with his wickedness tightly bound to the act that originally defined him, his betrayal of Jesus. It must be said plainly that

this image of him never lost currency. Throughout the later Middle Ages and beyond, the figure of Judas would remain available for easy citation by Christian writers as an iconic prototype of treachery or deception. However, two interrelated trends, one broadly cultural and the other more specifically institutional, helped to diversify concepts of Judas from about the twelfth century, such that under new pressures and in new contexts, other attitudes about him could emerge, and with them, different kinds of didactic and ideological usefulness.

Both trends are well known, but their interaction with the Judas traditions most closely tethered to the Bible has not previously been studied. The first is the growing emphasis on the interior, subjective life of the individual that typifies the artistic, intellectual, and religious culture of the later medieval Christian West. Although some descriptions have exaggerated the discontinuity with the preceding era, it is clear that the twelfth century saw the ascendancy of aesthetic, philosophical, and spiritual orientations that placed increasing value on private concerns and interior experience.⁴¹ The cultural forces that propelled new literary forms like the romance, the escalation of affective modes of piety, and the tendency to relocate moral priority from the deed to the heart took their effect, through these and other avenues, on understandings of Judas as well. He came to be regarded at times as no mere antagonistic functionary, fitting a necessary slot in the story of Jesus, but as a *person*—even if a very sinful one—potentially with a story of his own.⁴² The growing possibility of imaginative interest in his psychology, motivations, and experience of events is realized in the appearance and rapid circulation of several versions of a Latin legendary biography of Judas, starting late in the twelfth century, as well as in a peculiar Middle English ballad about him from the thirteenth.⁴³ The same attraction to consideration of Judas's subjective experience can also be observed in the less freely creative treatments of him found in biblical paraphrases: as we shall see, these portrayals, too, move with the personalizing and interiorizing current in religious thought and practice that is an important part of the broader cultural trend.⁴⁴

The second half of the twelfth century also saw an institutional reconfiguration of pastoral duties, including the frequent administration of lay sacramental confession, begin to take hold regionally, particularly in Paris;⁴⁵ this movement can hardly fail to have influenced the ideals of the future Pope Innocent III while he was a student there, and later, during his pontificate, those same priorities were disseminated throughout the West by the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.⁴⁶ In directing periodic lay

observance of the sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance, the council's twenty-first canon, *Omnis utriusque sexus*, created the necessity of promoting both clerical and lay competence for these two groups' regular interaction through confession.⁴⁷ Building upon important twelfth- and early thirteenth-century precedents, Lateran IV's implied model of pastoral care, with its instructional demands on (and for) the clergy, fueled the production over the next three centuries of a massive body of Latin and vernacular literature on Penance, which was intended in some cases to guide the lay devout in moral self-examination but more often to aid preachers in preparing the laity for confession and confessors in leading their spiritual wards through it.⁴⁸ Akin to the developments in clerical practice associated with Lateran IV, the Bible's presumed utility as a tool for practical moral instruction continued to take on new prominence alongside its continuing functions as a conduit of historical and theological truth, as it had begun to do in the twelfth century.⁴⁹ This utility resided in its narrative portions no less than in its more plainly preceptive, hortatory, or directive ones. Moral or tropological interpretation had of course had a place in formal exegesis since patristic times,⁵⁰ but the methods and apparent agendas of some of the commentaries and vernacular biblical paraphrases of this era suggest a searching reevaluation of the possibilities of tropology.

Conditioned by these factors in the cultural and institutional environments of biblical interpretation, Judas's suicide episode, with new stress placed on the interior remorse underlying it according to the Gospel of Matthew, acquired the potential to become an additional or alternative point of focus for the meaning of his story. Traditional thought about Judas had been predominantly of a historical kind, concerned with the role he carried out in the master narrative of salvation history. When he was asserted to have meaning beyond his direct function in the gospel story, he had been associated through allegorical constructions with a paradigm of wicked opposition to Christ and Christianity.⁵¹ Seeing Judas as part of such huge edifices, however, was not conducive to much analysis of his suicide, which unlike the betrayal took place in a private place mentally and physically—off the main stage, as it were—and had no real part in the sweep of history: whether salvation history as understood by Christians or the intellectual and social history of their relationship to Jews and Judaism. But in the late medieval atmosphere of increased attention to the interior life, it was natural that Judas's actions should be reexamined to draw inferences about the psychology lying behind them and that heightened interest should be taken in that psychology. In the corresponding ecclesiastical

atmosphere promoting instruction to the laity both in the basic facts of scripture and in moral theology, it was equally natural to look with new alertness for points of contact between those two areas by excavating biblical stories for their import to the individual, latter-day moral life. The more heavily tropological orientation to scriptural narrative made it easy to suppose that there must be practical lessons to be had from Judas's example too; and as it happened, a reanalysis of his case had begun to form in the twelfth century that gained traction in the thirteenth and made such lessons much easier to locate there than they previously had been. The remainder of this essay will examine in detail one way the figure of Judas Iscariot came to be an instrument of moral utility in the late medieval church.

III. THE PENITENTIAL JUDAS OF THE SOUTH ENGLISH MINISTRY AND PASSION

The *South English Ministry and Passion* (hereafter *Ministry and Passion*), which survives entire in one manuscript and fragmentarily in another,⁵² brings together two late medieval innovations in the representation of Judas that can also be found manifested independently in some other texts close to it in time and genre. The first is a strong identification of Judas with the sin of despair, such that it forms an important part of his story's interpretable meaning and even occludes the act of suicide understood to result from it, as in the Middle English *Northern Passion* (ca. 1300). Like the Old French *Passion* of about 1200 on which it is based, the *Northern Passion* concludes its treatment of Judas with a statement that despair (not the suicide per se, and certainly not the betrayal) was his undoing: "Hys whanhope hys sowle schente;/With owten ende to peyne he wente" (ll. 865–66).⁵³

Behind this understanding of Judas's death stand tendencies discernible in twelfth-century remarks on it that have not yet resolved into the fuller interpretation we will see in our thirteenth-century English texts but which do privilege his interior state over his outward actions. For instance, in *Scito te ipsum* Peter Abelard classifies Judas's repentance as the wrong of two kinds, an approach superficially similar to the interpretation of Judas's remorse as the wrong species of sorrow found in Augustine and Cassian;⁵⁴ but instead of 2 Corinthians 7:10, the usual touchstone for earlier commentators, Abelard takes his scriptural cue from Wisdom 5:2–3 and thus works from the idea of "the repentance of the damned," as he puts

it, rather than the Pauline “sorrow of the world” that “worketh death.” His reasoning accordingly links Judas’s psychology directly to the eternal fate of his soul: Abelard’s analysis goes straight to Judas’s interiority and his conjectured motive for repenting, so the resultant act of suicide, which is never so much as mentioned, has no part in determining the significance of his case. Similarly, when Peter Lombard rewrites a discussion by Augustine of the sin against the Holy Spirit, he uses Augustine’s words almost verbatim, including his citation of Judas as an example, yet brings about a shift in focus through selection, rearrangement, and recontextualization.⁵⁵ Augustine’s analysis of the unforgivable sin as strife against grace and brotherly love places more emphasis on the sinfulness of the failure to reconcile with the community of faith, and Peter Lombard’s places more on the sinfulness of the psychology that leads to such a failure.

The other innovation is the incorporation of Judas’s story into a framework of exemplary logic, as in *Cursor Mundi*, another Middle English biblical paraphrase written close to 1300.⁵⁶ Judas is a negative example, of course, one from which latter-day Christians are admonished to deviate, but in order for even negative exemplarity to work it must begin from some point of possible identification such that readers can recognize the case’s relevance to their own circumstances and range of potential behaviors. *Cursor Mundi* does not associate the moral lesson to be drawn from Judas with despair, making it unusual for a work of its time and genre;⁵⁷ but the use of an exemplary mode signals didactic intent, and the use of scriptural instances as exempla is one form of tropological exegesis. The writer of the *Ministry and Passion*, commenting on Judas’s suicide, epitomizes in a single line this text’s combination of both of these trends—concentration on his interior despair and an attraction to the instructional paradigm of exemplarity—by remarking that “good ensample he 3af vs azens wanhope to be euerychon” (l. 2381).

Judas is bad through and through in the *Ministry and Passion*, his Johannine corruption being given pride of place and then intensified in the usual ways through harmonizing interpretation and a modest degree of embellishment. It is he who objects to the anointing of Jesus’ feet at Bethany; he is the disciples’ treasurer and a thief; he habitually pilfers a tenth of what is given to Jesus; and he reckons the price for which he will sell his master as the amount he would have embezzled from a sale of the ointment (ll. 1917–33). So far this is the familiar harmonized Judas, and the author sums up his character in no uncertain terms: “fals schrewe he was al his lyue, þer may noþing it hele” (l. 1922). When he

resolves to turn Jesus over to the categorically wicked Jews, the *Ministry and Passion* deftly manages the scriptural detail of Satan's provocation, the ethical implications of which other writers of the period sometimes found awkward or avoided altogether,⁵⁸ by making the devil's involvement complement a predisposition in Judas, an openness to such influence, that preserves his moral responsibility. The writer ironically juxtaposes Jesus' nightly retirement from Jerusalem to his lodging in Bethany with the devil's accustomed but not constant habitation in the "inn" of Judas's heart:

Euery day fro Palme Sone eue til it were Schere Prusday
 Oure lord wente a nyzt to Bethanye & with Symon leprous lay.
 To þe temple he wente azen, anon as it was daylyzt,
 To schewe hym azen þe hyze feste, & to his in wente a nyzt.
 þe deuele þat hadde to oure lord enuyze wente into Iudas;
 His in was redy þere euer—a fals schrewe euere he was.
 He eggid hym þat he schulde þe Iewis oure lord take.
 (ll. 2037–43; emphasis added)

Until the onset of his remorse, the *Ministry and Passion* represents Judas uniformly as an autonomous agent unfortified by moral virtue, and thus susceptible to diabolical urging, who does a terrible thing for monetary gain.

Of course, in drawing together elements of all the gospels, the *Ministry and Passion* does include Judas's Matthean change of heart. When he sees that Jesus is condemned to die, "gret sorwe to hym he nom" (l. 2363), and after identifying himself as a false witness to the unsympathetic Temple officials and rejecting the money, "he wente hym ouzt anon/With dolfull herte into þe zerd & hyng hym on a tre" (ll. 2370–71). These statements foreground Judas's emotion, but the passage as a whole does not emphasize it heavily. The *Ministry and Passion's* handling of this scene assumes that a reader's knowledge of Judas's interiority is important; but it will serve primarily to pave the way to subsequent comments on Judas's penitential status. While his "gret sorwe" and "dolfull herte" are to be noted as relevant information, there is no hint here that they are intended to have much emotional force.

A very pronounced move into the exemplary mode dissects the tableau of Judas's death into two different elements, explicitly identified as yielding one lesson for Jews and another for Christians. First, his hanged and

ruptured body is a warning to Jews. By it they may understand vengeance, the writer says, if they care to take notice:

3if þe Iewis wolde vnderstonde, þer þei myzt wreche se:
 For þo þat he hanged was, and in þe deþis stounde,
 His wombe brak into þe mydde & his gottys fel down to
 grounde. (ll. 2372–74)

The Jews in the *Ministry and Passion* have been flatly evil throughout, but up to this point they have mostly functioned “hermeneutically”—primarily as a textual construct originating within Christian theology to fulfill structural roles in that system of thought—more than as reflections of contemporary Christians’ encounters with actual Jews.⁵⁹ But against that abstracted, theorizing backdrop this passage stands out in contrast: Jews are now not the imagined literary antagonists of Jesus in antiquity but a current presence, the target of a statement about their continuing refusal to accept the truth of the Christian faith that is meant to have topical significance in the here and now.

A remark fashioned as if to be overheard and heeded by contemporary Jews is not the historical absurdity in an English text of this date that it would become a little later. Jewish communities still existed in England at the time of the *Ministry and Passion*’s composition, and in fact this prod toward conversion through a threat of God’s vengeance engages directly with its social moment. New stress could be and was laid on conversion in the years following 1275 and its *Statutum de Judeismo*, which barred the Jewish population from lending money at interest.⁶⁰ The prosperity of English Jewry as a whole had long been in decline,⁶¹ and with the *Statutum de Judeismo* Edward I made its collective economic recovery impossible, whether by design or inadvertently.⁶² Shortly after this removal of the special legal status that had once made Jews profitable, the king increased active encouragement to conversion: starting in 1280 he instituted sermons to that end, mandated that Jews attend them, and relaxed the laws that had previously required new converts to relinquish to the Crown all property gained through usury, now allowing a portion of such property to be retained personally by proselytes and the rest to fund the home for converts that had been established in London several decades earlier.⁶³ Conversion of Jews was one way out of the tangle of economic, political, historical, and religious factors their population embodied; the other was the expulsion eventually decided upon.

Even in the context of an accelerating mission to convert Jews, however, we must not assume that the *Ministry and Passion* writer's channeling of Judas's death into a comment warning them about their resistance to Christianity anticipates engagement with real Jews receptive to rebuke. This aggressive statement—even corporally threatening, in the graphic image of the hanged and disemboweled body to which it refers—is meant for Christian ears. Some English Jews did save themselves from a mass hanging in 1278 through “a timely realization of the verity of Christianity” (as Cecil Roth darkly puts it), and recollection of one or more such incidents may underlie this statement by the *Ministry and Passion* writer.⁶⁴ The immediate physical or legal threat of execution might persuade some, at least, to outward acts of conversion though not moral conviction; but a purely rhetorical dart like this one lacks even that strictly coercive power and would only repulse and offend if it became part of the arsenal of, say, a conversionist preacher.

Nothing about this remark in the *Ministry and Passion*, in other words, suggests a true interest in successful Christian disputation with Jews, even though it presumes an environment of ongoing contact and nominally recognizes conversion as an available solution. The writer is in fact fashioning a justification for contemporary Christian hostility, implying that Jewish suffering is and will be the deserved result of continued failure to read the body of Judas as a sign betokening God's wrath toward the enemies of Christ and his church.⁶⁵ The Augustinian, “hermeneutical” Jewish nation is inflected by this passage's superficially conversionist bent and animosity drawn from contemporary life, which intensify the impression of Jewish perversity in the face of plain evidence of Christianity's correctness. In order to make this polemical move the writer produces a claim of an exemplary kind, putting the lesson in terms of what Jews can and should “see” and “understand” by Judas's unhappy end. Rhetorical exemplarity, even if rhetorical only, still says something about the writer's sense of purpose and method.

The exemplary technique is sustained as the author then turns to the second parcel of meaning in Judas's death, the further example of his despair and the lesson it holds, this time for Christians:

Wrecchid Iudas, qwy askid þou not of mercy to affonge?
 Qwy þou3ttyst þou not on his grace or þou þiself þe honge?
 Iudas wrappid oure lord more with þe wanhope þat he hadde
 þan þo he sold hym to þe dep & þe lewis to hym ladde.
 Good ensample he zaf vs azens wanhope to be euerychon;

For non oþer þing he was dampned but for þat wanhope on,
 + For he schrof hym al alowd to þe Iewis of his wowȝ,
 & þat mysgete siluer he zeld aȝen, & sory was anowȝ.
 Þese þre þinges were anowȝ a mannys synne to amende,
 But for Iudas hadde wanhope a deuele wey he wende.
 (ll. 2377–86)

This analysis is constructed upon the standard three-phase model of sacramental Penance—contrition, confession, and satisfaction—explained ubiquitously in the moral literature of the day. But the particular way this penitential schema is drawn into relation to Judas's death is striking. Despair was often seen as an obstruction that prevented a sinner from ever properly setting forth on the penitential path (a development of the Augustine/Cassian two-sorrows model). However, the *Ministry and Passion* here depicts Judas as having not only begun but actually *fulfilled* the requirements of sacramental Penance before losing its salvific benefit through despair. The author checks off each prescribed stage of the process, noting that Judas was acceptably contrite, confessed his sin orally, and even made satisfaction, and affirms that “þese þre þinges were anowȝ a mannys synne to amende.” However, Judas then undermined what should have been his reconciliation to God with his despair of mercy, finally being damned, we are told straightforwardly, “for non oþer þing ... but for þat wanhope on.” The moral lesson is that the successful delivery of God's forgiveness can be disrupted at any point, even after all the correct penitential components have been put in place.

Lines 2379–80 in the above quotation, claiming that Judas “wraþþid oure lord” more with his despair than with the betrayal, appropriate a remark by Jerome that I mentioned in section I. It occurs in reference to Psalm 108:7, where Jerome writes,

*Et oratio eius fiat in peccatum. Paenitentia Iudae peius peccatum factum est. Quomodo peius peccatum factum est paenitentia Iudae? Iuit, et suspendio periit; et qui proditor Domini factus est, hic et interemptor sui extitit. Pro clementia Domini hoc dico, quod magis ex hoc offendit Dominum, quia se suspendit, quam quod Dominum prodidit. Oportebat orationem ipsius esse in paenitentiam, et uersa est in peccatum.*⁶⁶

[“May his prayer be turned to sin.” The penance of Judas became worse than the sin. How did the penance of Judas become worse than the

sin? He went out and died by hanging; and the one who became the Lord's betrayer also became, in this, his own murderer. Concerning the mercy of the Lord I say this: that he offended the Lord more in this, because he hanged himself, than in that he betrayed the Lord. His prayer needed to be turned into penance, but it was turned into sin.]

Note first that Jerome is referring throughout to Judas's act of suicide—to which, let us recall, Jerome objects because it is a species of homicide—and never to his state of mind. Furthermore, the statement picked up in the *Ministry and Passion* is, in its original context, a rhetorical coup de grâce underscoring the folly of trying to remedy one sin by means of a second sin. Jerome does not say that suicide (let alone despair) is a worse sin than the betrayal of Jesus. He says that in Judas's case it turned out to be a greater affront to God's mercy: it was a travesty of the Christian's opportunity to claim forgiveness, an attempted "penance" that not only failed to expiate the first sin but actually made things worse.

In the later Middle Ages, however, this comment was frequently handled as we see in the *Ministry and Passion*, with two adjustments having been made to it. The first is the decontextualization whereby it can be reinterpreted as a sober comparison of the severity of two offenses. It appears thus, for instance, in Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* (1169–73).⁶⁷ However, Comestor still recognizes Jerome's remark as pertaining to Judas's outward actions, whereas later writers, in their second adjustment, usually further refract Jerome's meaning by redirecting the comment's reference from Judas's act of suicide to his presumed spiritual despair. The simulacrum of Jerome's statement that we see in the *Ministry and Passion* is an early vernacular example of what would become a commonplace claim, far removed from Jerome's intention but often (though not in this text) still ascribed explicitly to his authority.⁶⁸

There could scarcely be a plainer demonstration of the escalating perception of despair as an imminent danger for all Christians than this late medieval retooling of Jerome's words, usually found in close association with practical instruction on Penance. In this passage of the *Ministry and Passion*, where the redaction of Jerome's comment forms part of an exemplum against despair that embeds within it a point-by-point outline of Penance, it is clear that *desperatio*, opposite number to the theological virtue of *spes* (hope), is being understood primarily in ecclesiological terms, as a threat to a practical expression of that hope that is built into the sacramental program of the church. The message of Judas in the

Ministry and Passion seems to be that a stumble into doubt can negate even an emotionally and formally correct execution of Penance: that is, one that appears outwardly—and perhaps even to the legitimately contrite penitent—to have been successful. Through this presentation of the relationship between despair and sacramental Penance, Judas Iscariot, betrayer of Christ, ends his life as a recognizable, earnest Christian penitent, fulfilling all the conditions for the remission of his sin before being caught in the snare of failing theological hope.

IV. FROM THE *MINISTRY AND PASSION* TO THE *SOUTHERN PASSION*: PUTTING THE PENITENTIAL JUDAS TO WORK

A large portion of the *Ministry and Passion* was detached and revised to make part of a new work, the *Southern Passion*, soon after the original poem's composition: certainly before the expulsion of Jews from England in 1290, leaving an interval of perhaps five or ten years—maybe even less and in no possible scenario much more—between the realizations of the two texts in the forms they now have.⁶⁹ Whereas the *Ministry and Passion* had originally been a freestanding work, the *Southern Passion* appears to have been designed for inclusion in the *South English Legendary* and to share authorship with several of that compilation's temporale components.⁷⁰ In connection with the *Legendary* it circulated more widely than the *Ministry and Passion* and now survives whole or in part in twelve manuscripts, with short extracts also appearing in another.⁷¹

The *Southern Passion's* treatment of Judas differs little from that in the *Ministry and Passion* when the passages about him are isolated from their larger contexts in the two poems and viewed in comparison. For instance, the lines of the *Ministry and Passion* portraying him as an almost-successful penitent, discussed in the previous section, remain substantially unchanged in the *Southern Passion*. But other developments in the later work reframe Judas's story in a way that suggests some distinctness between the two writers' sense of their own purposes and of the relationship between the ancient case of Judas and the lives of their readers. Through rewriting, addition, and deletion, the overall character of the *Southern Passion* is altered from that of the *Ministry and Passion*, and correspondingly, so is the place within it of the penitent Judas and his negative exemplarity. In the earlier text both the exemplary method and the didactic concern with despair are textually localized; neither seems out of place, but neither

represents a consistent priority, either. The *Ministry and Passion* writer's interest in the tropological function seems to have been largely satisfied by extensive paraphrasing of Jesus' own teachings as found in the gospels, seldom elaborated upon or probed for more precise contemporary application. Tropological conclusions drawn from events in the biblical narrative are likewise rare and, when they occur, brief and simple.⁷² On the topic of despair, the only exception in that text to an otherwise sharp focus on Judas is a remark on Peter (*Ministry and Passion* [MP], ll. 2749–54, to be considered alongside its *Southern Passion* [SP] analogue below). By contrast, along both of these two lines—teaching by means of an exemplary procedure and teaching about despair—the *Southern Passion* builds strength, and it is in the figure of Judas that these two agendas, one methodological and one topical, converge.

The *Southern Passion* everywhere reflects its author's very pronounced scrutiny of scriptural incidents for applications to contemporary devout life. Again and again one can discern in this work an impulse to make connections between the events of Jesus' ministry and death and what late thirteenth-century men and women do, or might do, such that information from the gospels constitutes a push toward morally and ecclesiastically desirable behaviors. In the first 130 lines alone, we encounter explanations of three different latter-day practices as deriving seamlessly from scriptural events: the pope's almsgiving on the eve of Palm Sunday to commemorate Mary's anointing of Jesus' feet (ll. 11–16), the use of stones and clappers instead of bells at "tenebres" because stones burst at the time of the Crucifixion (ll. 83–90), and the recommended custom of visiting the local church immediately upon entering a new town because the Temple was the first place Jesus went after his entry into Jerusalem (ll. 127–30). All of these are new in the *Southern Passion*.⁷³ Besides linking scripture to the present for etiology and counsel, the *Southern Passion* occasionally does so to criticize clerical abuses: in addition to reproducing from the *Ministry and Passion* a complaint that priests do not follow Jesus' example of regarding a small gift from the poor as greater than a large gift from the rich (SP, ll. 175–78; cf. MP, ll. 1601–4), the later text includes a new treatment of the parable of the wedding feast said to show that although bishops ordain many priests, few of them are worthy and many will be cast into hell (SP, ll. 333–44). The seven hundred-plus lines between Judas's objection to the anointing at Bethany—the episode that opens the *Southern Passion*, as it happens—and his eventual initiation of the conspiracy consist mostly of quotations of Jesus' words, which here much more often than in the

He ne lowede him nouȝt to deore : as þis chapmen wollep echon
 þing þat is deoreworþ : ak he axede ham anon
 “What wollep ȝe ffor him ȝiue” : as who seiþ “beode ȝe
 And as goed chep ich wolle him ȝiue : as ȝe wollep bydde me.”
 (SP, ll. 779–84)

Here, too, Judas is seen as a merchant, but now he is *contrasted* with real ones, who try to squeeze as much money as possible out of their customers.

In the earlier text the ease with which the two parties reach a satisfactory agreement had made buyer and seller look equally bad, and the attribution of greed to Judas, the motivation for the whole transaction, remained consistent with his opportunistic perceptiveness of his interlocutors' desire. But in these corresponding lines of the *Southern Passion*, Judas's traditional greed is taken right out of the picture when the adapter reverses his role in the negotiation, stressing that Judas asked them what they would consider a fair price rather than aiming at a particular sum himself. In the *Southern Passion* reviser's unusual interpretation of this scene's scriptural source, Judas is made to appear fair-minded in his negotiation in order to make real, thirteenth-century English merchants look worse.⁷⁵ This is a rather incautious ad hoc move—after all, it comes close to sounding like praise of Judas at the very moment when he is inaugurating the betrayal—and the passage just quoted is followed immediately by what reads like a nervously adamant reversal of it:

Now luþer þrift vp-on his heued : Amen seggeþ alle,
 ffor luþer chapman he was : and al-so him is byffalle.
 (SP, ll. 785–86)

The writer, as if recognizing in the nick of time where the comparison is leading, tries to drown out the reverberation of his previous words with a demand for collective condemnation of Judas: “but anyway, curses upon him for selling Jesus—everybody say ‘Amen!’” The sudden shift itself makes evident the poet's readiness to use Judas's actions as an occasion for moralizing commentary on contemporary society.

Another example of the *Southern Passion*'s tropology involving Judas comes in the scene of the Last Supper. In the underlying *Ministry and Passion*, Jesus had first blessed and distributed the bread of the proto-Eucharist as in Matthew, Mark, and Luke and then a little later identified Judas as the betrayer by giving him a sop, as only in John 13:26 (MP, ll. 2105–6). The combination of Judas's accusation from the Gospel of John with the communion scene

drawn from the synoptic gospels (the blessing and breaking of bread is not recounted in John at all) had motivated a careful but nonscriptural distinction in the *Ministry and Passion* between what Judas and the other disciples received. That writer had rationalized the conjunction of the Johannine and synoptic narrative material by having Judas refuse both the bread and the wine that all the other disciples willingly took prior to accepting the morsel he is given, and this sequence of events and its construction of Judas's volition had been made rather emphatic by repetition (*MP*, ll. 2084, 2090, 2107–8). In the *Southern Passion*, the reviser changes the narrative by combining the synoptic and Johannine elements in the opposite order, having Jesus first dismay the disciples with the news that one of them will betray him and then identify the traitor by giving Judas a sop of bread from his own plate (*SP*, ll. 810–38); only after this does he bless and distribute the bread and wine of communion (*SP*, ll. 839–54). The event is then related to the latter-day Mass,⁷⁶ and Judas is stated by the *Southern Passion* writer to have been excluded by his receipt of the other morsel instead:

Wiþ strengþe of þis wordes ek : þat god seiþ in his bok
 þat he blessedde þe bred : and to his disciples tok
 In þe obley and in þe wyn : his owe fflesch and blode
 At þe Masse is as purliche : as he hit shadde on þe rode.
 Alle his disciples bote Iudas : he tok his fflesch so,
 Ak to him he tok a mossel : þat was yn his disch ydo.
 (ll. 855–60)

Although the two English works harmonize the narrative a little differently, both do so in ways designed to keep what Jesus gives Judas distinct from what he gives the faithful disciples in establishing the sacrament of the Eucharist.

With their choices here both writers respond to the question of whether Judas had partaken of the true body and blood, a perplexity that had received much discussion by twelfth-century theologians.⁷⁷ Both English texts stress that Judas received a wholly separate piece of bread that had not been designated the body of Christ. However, only the later *Southern Passion* includes the detail from John that the devil entered Judas with the morsel that he accepted, and it does so, in the lines that immediately follow those just quoted, as part of a newly provided tropological interpretation:

Men þat nolleþ beo yshriue : and hare sunnes fforsake,
 As hit were oure lordes : fflesch holy bred hi wolleþ take,

An Ester day hi beoþ yliche : Iudas þat so com
 Wiþ oþere to godes bord : and his fflesch nouzt nom;
 Ak wiþ þe Mossel þat he tok : þe deuel in him wende.
 So mowe hi drede þat so doþ : bote hi hare lif amende.
 (SP, ll. 861–66)

This warning, that anyone who attempts to share in communion without having first fulfilled the requirements of Penance should dread a mishap similar to Judas's, takes for granted the standard teaching that no one mired in sin must presume to approach as a communicant and thereby desecrate the body of Christ.⁷⁸ But the scenario it outlines is more specific than that. These lines do not describe an unshriven person partaking of the transubstantiated Host; they describe an unshriven person partaking of blessed simple bread *instead* of the Host but “as if it were” the true body of Christ: this is what allows the comparison with Judas, who “com/Wiþ oþere to godes bord : and his fflesch *nouzt* nom” (SP, ll. 863–64; emphasis added).⁷⁹

This detail shows the writer resolutely bringing Judas's case to bear on contemporary praxis. Several twelfth- and early thirteenth-century theologians had addressed the problem of what a celebrant should do about would-be communicants who were known by the celebrant to be in mortal sin. The practice apparently had arisen of attempting to protect such individuals from compounding their sin through inappropriate receipt of the consecrated Host by substituting unconsecrated bread in its place: some priests were secretly passing out both transubstantiated and untransubstantiated wafers to different persons. This circumvention was usually disallowed by theologians on the grounds that a person who intended to receive the body and blood while in a state of mortal sin was still sinning by accepting what he or she assumed to be the transubstantiated elements, regardless of what was in fact provided by the celebrant, and so could not be protected by benevolent sacerdotal trickery.⁸⁰ That could be the situation the *Southern Passion* writer contemplates in these lines, but on the whole their emphasis on the would-be communicant's agency and apparent calculation (“wanting” to receive holy bread “as if it were” the Lord's flesh; “those who do so” should fear for themselves a fate like Judas's) seems inconsistent with a priest's silent, paternalistic intervention to offer a substitute without his parishioner's knowledge.⁸¹

More likely, the allusion here is to an ingenious reversed application of the same reasoning that had been held, on accepted theological grounds

distinguishing the physical medium of the sacrament from its moral effects, to rule out that kind of protective priestly substitution. This passage seems to refer, that is, to a substitution made by a cooperative celebrant at the wish of an unconfessed parishioner, who opts to receive only blessed bread in an attempt to exploit the concept of spiritual participation in the Eucharist and claim its benefits while avoiding a sacrilege against the physical body of Christ. If (as the theologians warned) the mere intention of receiving the physical substance of the Eucharist could effectively make it as if one had done so, with morally dire consequences for the unprepared, then might not the intention to partake only spiritually of the communion, combined with a careful avoidance of abuse of Christ's body in the consecrated Host, likewise have efficacy? To the *Southern Passion* writer it is absolutely clear, and must be made so to his readers, that the sinner who receives something materially different from what the morally fit communicants are given yet receives it "as if it were" the consecrated Host conveying the real presence—by choice, just the same as if unknowingly—receives it sinfully. The emphasis in lines 855–58 on the words of institution and on the real presence of Christ, put in the sacrificial terms that had come to prevail in discourse on the Eucharist (hence the assertion that the Host is identical to the body that was crucified), show that the writer is locating and bringing out for readers all the main points of contact with current eucharistic theology and practice that the story offers. Likewise, within the harmonized narrative of the Last Supper the scrupulous distinction maintained between the bread Judas received and that which the other disciples ate safeguards the principle of sacramental objectivity, and it is this distinction that creates the opportunity for the tropological comment about those who desire the spiritual benefits of communion without undertaking Penance first.

But in moving from Judas's case to those of contemporary communicants the *Southern Passion* poet allows a certain slippage in the scenario. Judas is excluded from the Last Supper by Jesus,⁸² whereas the latter-day culprits seem to be manipulators of the sacrament who, optimistic that they can exploit a theological loophole opened by intentionalist ethics, choose to exclude themselves from receiving the same substance. This is a difference that one would expect should matter in considering the implications of the story.⁸³ That the parallel between the events of Jesus' Passover meal and the sacramental operation of the Eucharist takes the exact form it does in this passage, despite straining the analogy between the biblical and the modern case, registers the strength of the reviser's desire to find points of contact between what Judas did and what his story means for contemporary Christians in terms of very specific practices that are familiar to him and on his mind.

Moreover, that desire is framed in terms that ground the text's didactic agenda directly in the decrees of Lateran IV: notice that the writer assumes precisely an annual lay communion, at Easter, and a drive for confessional activity leading up to it. It is this cycle of observance that motivates the stern warning. Such efforts to graft incidents from Judas's life and traits of his character to ecclesiological concerns both reflect the ways he is being thought about by the writer and, we must suppose, have some influence on the way he is being understood by readers of this text, including any who are themselves in a position to teach others. The *Southern Passion's* tropological program of application is often inseparable from church practice, and while the specificity of Judas's role in the moral lesson about abusing communion is interesting, there is nothing unexpected in itself about the author's use of the episode to guide individual behavior with respect to that sacrament. What is noteworthy is the seemingly automatic link—of both the Eucharist and Judas's failing with respect to it—with lay sacramental Penance, indicative of the featured role of that observance in devout life that was becoming well established by the late thirteenth century and is often evident in this text.

Indeed, from the scene of the Last Supper forward, the *Southern Passion* continually promotes Penance, and one way this preoccupation manifests itself is in an insistent emphasis on spiritual despair as a dangerous threat to a sinner's reconciliation to God. A more general kind of *wanhope* (the usual word for despair in early Middle English) is brought into the field of view during the Last Supper scene, when Jesus tells his disciples that he will leave them but that the Holy Spirit will descend soon afterward. The writer explains that this is done so that they will not lose hope during Jesus' absence from them (*SP*, ll. 1071–74), a comment that pairs thematically with the post-Resurrection scene on the road to Emmaus (*SP*, ll. 2017–73), where Jesus appears to two despondent disciples who mourn his loss and say in lines 2042–44 that their hope has been shattered. The more specifically antipenitential manifestation of despair, spiritual *desperatio* as a disruptor of the *spes* enacted ecclesiologically through the sacrament of Penance, first becomes explicit at the moment of Jesus' arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane, and significantly, it is introduced through the character of Judas—long before the condemnation of Jesus at trial and Judas's consequent Matthean remorse.

The writer of the underlying *Ministry and Passion* had included in the garden scene Judas's verbal greeting to Jesus as well as the kiss and a reply to him by Jesus (*MP*, ll. 2175–82), adopting the dialogue format that

their Gethsemane encounter takes only in Matthew.⁸⁴ The revision in the *Southern Passion* begins with Judas's greeting to Jesus and Jesus' answer, as in the earlier text, but adds an interpretation of Jesus' words that gives the incident a moral aspect establishing the association of Judas with despair:

Anon so Iudas him ysey : by-ffore he gan gon,
 "Mayster," he sede, "hayl þou beo" : and custe him anon.
 "ffreond," quap oure lord þo : "to wham artou ycome?
 þou takest an Mannes sone : myd cos to beo ynome."
 Se 3ut oure lord wuste wel : Iudas lufþer dede
 And 3ut he clupede him ffreond : þer was a Mylde dede.
 He 3af him fforbusne ynow : as 3e mowe yseo,
 ffor to come to fforziuenesse : and in no wanhope to beo.
 (SP, ll. 1131–38)

By addressing Judas as "friend" in his reply, the writer claims, Jesus was intimating to his betrayer, far in advance of Judas's own remorse, that he was still not beyond the pale of reconciliation. This explication in effect puts on display the range of possibilities for Judas, projecting his potentiality for both despair and legitimate penitence. In doing so, and with its second-person address to readers or hearers that gestures to the moment as an object of their practical consideration ("as 3e mowe yseo"), these lines lay the foundation for an emphasis on penitential concerns in the whole Passion–Resurrection sequence of the *Southern Passion*. Also in keeping with the character of this passage, those penitential concerns will concentrate particularly on despair, treated as a perennial, recognizable problem with the ability to counteract sacramental Penance.

The risk of despair in fact develops into a central motif of the *Southern Passion's* account of Jesus' Resurrection. In one indicative passage, Mary Magdalene, traditionally prominent as an exemplary penitential figure, becomes a particular example against despair. As the first person to whom the risen Christ appeared, what had been most important about her for the writer of the earlier *Ministry and Passion* was that she was a woman:

Þis schewyng was on Ester Day, & þe ferste tyme also
 þat oure lord hym schewid after he was in þe sepulcre do.
 Ferst he schewid hym to a woman þat hadde synful be;
 To alle women wurschepe he dede þerwith, as we moun se.
 (MP, ll. 2723–26)

That author thought it mattered that Mary had been a *sinful* woman because this fact indicated honor done by Jesus to all women rather than limiting it to those recognized as exceptionally virtuous. But her character, and the meaning of the incident as extrapolated from it to “alle women,” there remained organized under the primary conceptual rubric “woman,” of which she was one sort (a sinful one).

The *Southern Passion* begins its treatment of the post-Resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene thus:

þis was lo : þe ffurste tyme : þat Ihesu þe swete kyng
 Shewede him to eorþlich man : after his vprysyng.
 As an Ester day he him schewede : ffurst to a womman
 As to Marie Magdaleyne : raþer þan to eny oþer man,
 And gret honour he cudde : to womman in þis cas,
 And to alle synffolle : ffor 3eo so synffol was,
 We ne dorre beo in no wanhope : þat synffolle beoþ
 Whanne Ihesus wole to vs wende : as we here y-seoþ.
 (SP, ll. 1899–1906)

Next follows a remarkable defense of women far too long to reproduce here, a 138-line explosion of profeminist apologetics touched off by the spark of *Ministry and Passion*, line 2226 (quoted above).⁸⁵ This all represents a radical adaptation of the source material on Mary Magdalene, and it makes two major changes in her case’s conception and utility. The first change that must be recognized is a shift in rhetorical mode, which can be described as a move from exemplification to exemplarity. The second is a reconfiguration of the earlier *Ministry and Passion*’s notion of Mary as a woman who happens also to have been sinful into a pair of facts about her, both now presented as first-order categories that she embodies: she was a great sinner, and she was a woman. Both changes are informative as to the *Southern Passion*’s agenda and methods.

The change from an exemplifying treatment to an exemplary one can easily be seen in this text’s development of the *Ministry and Passion*’s remark about Mary Magdalene as a woman. The earlier writer had wanted his readers to derive a lesson of a propositional kind from the fact that the resurrected Christ first appeared to Mary: namely, that Jesus honored women, including those with a dire history of sin. The single statement would seem to invite inferences concerning latter-day men’s attitudes about and behavior toward women, and implicitly to challenge the antifeminist stance typical of much clerical literature, but it comes and goes quickly; its implications are left as they lie

and may be passed over, unnoticed or ignored, by a reader of the *Ministry and Passion* not disposed to take them up.⁸⁶ The writer of that text, most intent on teaching about the events in the gospel story, may comment on their meaning in a general way but evinces no impulse to convert the point of fact about Mary Magdalene into a definite *moral* lesson. In the *Southern Passion*, however, her case does not illustrate a truth about Jesus so much as present a model of masculine relations toward and judgments about women with much more pointed relevance to contemporary Christians at the individual level.

The later writer is palpably riled up over those who judge women unfairly, and in his energetic rebuke—less an entrenchment against anti-feminism than an aggressive profeminist flanking action—he produces a wholly cogent, considered series of arguments. Despite his not having originated the claim that Jesus honored the whole female sex by appearing first to Mary Magdalene, the *Southern Passion* reviser has thought seriously about it and is at some pains to wield it effectively against misogyny popular as well as learned.⁸⁷ The poet's tropological bent leads him to assume an imitative paradigm of virtue: knowledge of Jesus' actions ought to directly guide behavior, so male readers should follow the example of the honor shown by him toward Mary Magdalene in their own, present-day dealings with and opinions about women. That this moral lesson cuts against the grain of much discourse about women in the medieval church accounts for the addition's length, which probably marks the writer's perception of the strength of justification needed for the position he adopts.

In thematizing the harmful stereotypes of women that too many men cherish and perpetuate, then, the *Southern Passion* gives Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene an exemplary dimension as regards gender relations directly. However, in presenting sustained argumentation against those stereotypes, the anti-antifeminist apology also gives the lie to a particular mode of gender differentiation in conventional moralizing discourse. The *Southern Passion* states that when Jesus appeared to Mary even before any of his apostles, he showed that the sinful, categorically, should not fall into despair. The separation of her gender from her history as a sinner, distinguishing her sex from her more fundamentally human fallibility, transforms her into a universal model of virtue rather than a strictly feminine one. That is to say, by bifurcating one modified head term (sinful woman) into two head terms (sinner and woman), the writer of the *Southern Passion* generates a corresponding bifurcation of the lessons to be observed in the example and makes Mary's case applicable to all Christian sinners, male and female alike. While the new passage in defense of women gives every sign of awareness that readers are going to need some convincing,

the far briefer comment on despair has a recognized place within church teaching. The concept is familiar and uncontested, and even if the discovery of an exemplum against despair in the post-Resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene is more novel, the writer expects it to ring true.

The *Southern Passion's* increase of emphasis on sinfulness in this passage—making it a primary term of Mary Magdalene's character that should be addressed on its own, rather than as an attribute subordinate to and partially governed by her gender—and the corresponding new derivation of a practical moral on despair from her case both reflect the priorities of the revision. The same foregrounding of the antipenitential threat of despair can be seen likewise in the *Southern Passion's* treatment of Peter, the development of whose case enriches the analysis of Judas's despair and, especially, of its meaning for the contemporary faithful. The possibility of a contrastive juxtaposition of Peter and Judas was traditional.⁸⁸ The contrast builds its meaning on what starts out as a similarity, in that both disciples in some sense betray Jesus: Judas by turning him over to the Temple authorities, and Peter by his triple denial of his master following the arrest in Gethsemane. Both the *Ministry and Passion* and the *Southern Passion* do recount the denials of Peter and his remorse when he recognizes what he has done, but the later *Southern Passion* greatly develops the significance derived from it to contribute to that text's consistent expansion of penitential instruction.

Already in the *Ministry and Passion* the figure of Peter was used to teach a lesson against despair: scripture does not reveal where Jesus came to Peter or what he told him, the earlier writer says, but it does indicate that such an encounter happened and that

þat was þe ferste tyme þat oure lord to Seynt Peter come
After he hadde hym forsake & so gret sorwe to hym + nom.
3it he cam ȝaper to hym, þow3 he hadde hym forsake,
þan to ony oþer of his disciplis—ensample we mow take
þat we haue no wanhope of oure synnys, qwatso betyde,
For as redy he is to forȝeue as ony man is hym to bydde.
(MP, ll. 2749–54)

In the earlier text this is the only reference to despair in connection with Peter and, indeed, the only reference to it at all outside of the explanation that despair ruined Judas's fulfillment of the penitential paradigm. The passage of the *Southern Passion* corresponding to this one (SP, ll. 2011–16) remains virtually unaltered itself, but it is now preceded by a new piece of commentary on Peter (SP, ll. 1830–48) that makes the statements just

the confidence that late thirteenth-century laymen and -women should have in the church's penitential framework and the institutional as well as divine mercy that it transmits to them. Only then do we learn, in the later passage (SP, ll. 2011–16), that the resurrected Christ appeared to Peter alone before he appeared to any of the other disciples. This, again, the *Southern Passion* writer indicates, was intended as a reassurance to Peter so that he would not despair. Whereas in the *Ministry and Passion* Peter's denials and their aftermath had elicited a comment in passing on despair as one important problem, the later writer creates a pattern implying a way of imagining Peter's story that highlights its pertinence to readers' own circumstances and does so in terms of its relation to Penance.

The point is not that the authors of the *Ministry and Passion* and the *Southern Passion* diverge significantly in their *interpretation* of Peter's case, or of Judas's. These works differ little in moral theology or in their writers' sense of the possibilities of scriptural exegesis in principle; in these two areas both texts are clear reflections of their moment in the history and practice of the Western church. Where the two poets differ is in the degree of their resolve to foreground despair and to commit wholly to a tropological or exemplary method of exegetical narration. That resolve is powerful in the writer of the *Southern Passion*, and the totality of that text's concentration on despair over a span of several hundred lines, from the Last Supper through the early post-Resurrection appearances, forms the context within which we must understand Judas's function there. Despair as a disruptor of Penance is such an important theme in this large section of the *Southern Passion* that Judas cannot help but be absorbed into that greater structure of meaning. His part in it is enhanced by the reviser's addition of a despair-centered analysis of his verbal exchange with Jesus in Gethsemane, a scene that combines with the episode of his death to assert a penitential meaning for his character that is strong and sustained. These passages join him contrastively to Peter, whose own theoretical relationship, as a penitent, to the danger of despair is likewise amplified by a new addition to the *Southern Passion*; and the reviser similarly sharpens the meaning of Mary Magdalene, conventionally a figure illustrating repentance, toward the narrower concept of despair as a threat to sacramental reconciliation to God. These new elements of the *Southern Passion* together give the work as a whole a more focused penitential dimension, one emphasizing the dangers of *desperatio* and the means of avoiding it, and assigning Judas an integral place within that picture.

In reading sequence, this thematic block begins with Judas's dialogue with Jesus at the moment of Jesus' arrest, which is explicated as being a

caution issued to Judas against despair. Next come Peter's famous denials of his lord, followed immediately by his remorse: here is a sin-and-repentance paradigm established through a protagonistic character, a chief apostle whom audiences understand to be the first earthly head of the church in which they continue to participate. Peter's remorse is left unresolved, however, while attention turns to Judas, who himself becomes remorseful. Judas now demonstrates a miscarriage of the sin-and-repentance paradigm in his despair and suicide, a turn of events that is explained quite carefully in terms of moral theology and penitential practice, as we have seen. The two disciples' transgressions and their responses to them combine into a diptych of penitential exempla drawn from scripture. Judas's has ended badly. But then comes the post-Resurrection appearance of the angel to the three Marys instructing them to bear the news of the Resurrection to Peter especially, with a rationalization of his mention by name in the scriptural account as intended to contravene his potential despair. This is followed closely by the self-revelation of Christ to Mary Magdalene and its new explication and finally by the conciliatory appearance of the forgiving Christ to Peter himself. All of these scenes are constructed as lessons against despair, dually directed: to the biblical characters at the historical level and, at the tropological, to thirteenth-century Christians. The *Southern Passion* builds a spiritual drama upon a scriptural-historical one to thematize Penance again and again. In it, Judas plays one of the starring roles, and the most directly cautionary one, illustrating failure. His death has become an essential element of an organized textual program designed to urge late thirteenth-century Christians to regular confession.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The old, wicked Judas, simple betrayer of Jesus and enemy to Christian interests, never went away. Certainly one encounters many portrayals of him on that model in late medieval literature. An option always remained open to writers to end consideration of Judas at Jesus' arrest, as the gospels other than Matthew do, and to let the kiss of betrayal stand as our final glimpse of him. But when his death is addressed, those treatments often take on a marked penitential aspect during the later Middle Ages. That this penitential version of Judas was able to colonize even harmonizing narratives like the *Ministry and Passion* and the *Southern Passion* is especially significant, because as we saw at the outset of this study, gospel

harmony as a paradigm for interpretation had historically pushed his character toward the Johannine extreme of pure antagonism and ruled out his Matthean remorse as a legitimate moral impulse. The ability of some thirteenth-century writers to begin to work in other directions even when engaging in original projects of gospel harmony bespeaks both the power of the urge at this time to locate widely applicable, practical moral lessons everywhere in scripture and the increasingly dominant place of Penance in the evolving sacramental landscape.

The development of the newer, penitential Judas is notable in reimagining him as something closer to a tragic figure—an adherent to the faith, flawed like everyone, who despite having sinned spectacularly, nearly gets it right before faltering at the last, critical instant—and this reorientation makes his case more readily exploitable as an exemplum. Few people need to be counseled against betraying someone unto death, but in a moment of intense remorse any believer might worry about the availability of God's mercy to the personally undeserving. A misguided but not altogether evil Judas, Judas as a failed penitent with whom the devout could partially identify or whom they could at least recognize as a sinful fellow Christian capable of responding morally to his own wrongdoing, became useful to the church in the wake of Lateran IV. In his story, moral theologians and popularizers of scripture found a biblical case that seemed tailor-made to call any ordinary sinner's attention not only to the importance of sacramental Penance but also to the specter of despair that might always hover near it.

NOTES

I gratefully acknowledge the support, during early work on this essay, of a 2007–8 Research Enhancement Award from the College of Liberal Arts at Texas A&M University and, as it approached completion, the generous consultation of Bryan Carella, Deana Klepper, James Morey, and the editors of the *Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures*.

1. O. S. Pickering, "The *Southern Passion* and the *Ministry and Passion*: The Work of a Middle English Reviser," *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 15 (1984): 33–56; O. S. Pickering, ed., *The South English Ministry and Passion*, Middle English Texts 16 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1984), 33–35, 46–47. I will cite the *South English Ministry and Passion* from Pickering's edition but sometimes alter editorial punctuation. A comment in lines 471–76 of the *Southern Passion* indicates that that work predates the 1290 expulsion of Jews, as Beatrice Daw Brown recognized in her edition of the poem (*The Southern Passion*, EETS o.s. 169 [London: Oxford University Press, 1927; reprint, Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1974], xi), from which I will cite it. Brown estimated the date of the *Southern Passion* to fall in the decade 1275–85 (*ibid.*, xii), but without benefit of Pickering's work showing it to be a revision of the *Ministry and Passion*, which (depending on the date of the *Ministry and Passion*) might push the *Southern Passion* to the end of her proposed date range or even a little beyond it.

2. James H. Morey, *Book and Verse: A Guide to Middle English Biblical Literature* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000); see 237–46 for description of these two works.

3. John 12:6. I cite the Vulgate Bible from *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. B. Fischer, I. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Thiele, rev. Robert Weber, 5th corr. ed., rev.

Roger Gryson (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007). Where Bible quotations are given, I supply English translations from the Douay-Rheims Bible. Translations from other works are my own except where otherwise attributed.

4. John 12:1–8. All four gospels contain some version of the anointing controversy (cf. Matt. 26:6–13, Mark 14:3–9, and a more distant analogue, Luke 7:36–50), but only in John is the objection attributed to Judas.

5. Matt. 26:14–16. Cf. Mark 14:10–11 and Luke 22:4–5, where he is promised money, but any later receipt of it goes unmentioned within those texts. The author of Luke later indicates in Acts 1:18 that Judas had received money and bought land with it.

6. Matt. 26:48–49; Mark 14:44–45. Cf. Luke 22:47–48, where Judas is said to move toward Jesus to kiss him, but Jesus' words seem to preempt a kiss.

7. Luke 22:3–4; John 13:2, 26–30. Earlier in John (7:71–72) Jesus has also referred to Judas as a devil.

8. Matt. 27:3–5. In Mark, Luke, and John, Judas is not mentioned again after Jesus' arrest in the garden (although the author of Luke does go on to give a divergent account of Judas's death in Acts 1:15–20, to be discussed below).

9. See Graham Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), for recent discussion of the transition of the concept "gospel" from the message behind any given text to the text itself, and esp. 86–87 for the more specific point here.

10. Helmut Koester, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 19–37, at 28–33; cf. Oskar Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 53–76, 179–87, esp. 66–67. The question of whether Justin used a complete harmony of Matthew, Mark, and Luke is not decided. Graham N. Stanton argues that Justin had harmonized only the material he extracted for his catechism ("Jesus Traditions and Gospels in Justin Martyr and Irenaeus," in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. De Jonge [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003], 353–70, at 364–65); cf. Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*, trans. John Bowden (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000), 20.

11. Several other harmonies are also known to have existed in the second century and are briefly discussed by William L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae: Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language* 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 29–33. Scholars long speculated about the relationship between Tatian's work and Justin's, but direct influence was finally demonstrated by William L. Petersen, "Textual Evidence of Tatian's Dependence Upon Justin's ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 512–34.

12. *De consensu evangelistarum libri quattuor*, ed. Franz Wehrich, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (hereafter CSEL) 43 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1904).

13. I do not imply that Augustine was the first to stress the principle of unity in interpreting scripture. On earlier forms of this idea, see Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Nor were Augustine's and Tatian's the only two positions possible. I juxtapose Augustine with Tatian because with regard to the life and ministry of Jesus, both were fully committed to locating the true historical narrative, a shared objective that makes the differing assumptions behind their harmonizing projects especially visible.

14. Tjitze Baarda, "'A Staff Only, Not a Stick': Disharmony of the Gospels and the Harmony of Tatian (Matthew 10:9f., Mark 6:8f., Luke 9:3 and 10:4)" (1989), reprint, in *Essays on the Diatessaron* (Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1994), 173–96; Tjitze Baarda, "ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian," in Petersen, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 133–54; Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 75–76.

15. Baarda ("ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ") suggests that part of Tatian's purpose was similarly polemical, based on a need to show the unity of the truth behind the four gospels in defense of Christianity, and this may be so, but the crucial distinction lies in the nature of the gospel texts in his opinion and in Augustine's. A concession to the gospels' limitations as historical sources, such as that implied by Tatian's method, would be unacceptable to Augustine.

16. E.g., Baarda, "'A Staff Only, Not a Stick'"; William L. Petersen, "Tatian's Diatessaron," in Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 403–30, at 426–27, 430; Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 26–27, 398–403.

17. *De consensu*, 1.7(10). Augustine conceives of the evangelists as writing deliberately complementary accounts and ends the first book of *De consensu* (1.35[54]) by arguing that their separate efforts are together reducible to singular authorship by Christ.

18. The *Diatessaron* is known to have been used in lieu of the four now-canonical gospels in many Syrian churches into the fifth century (Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 41–43), but it is uncertain whether Tatian himself meant for his harmony to supersede them. For good statements of differing opinions, see Baarda, “ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ–ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ”; and Nicholas Perrin, “Hermeneutical Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels and the Question of Textual Authority,” in Auwers and De Jonge, *The Biblical Canons*, 599–605.

19. In Mark, Matthew, and Luke, Judas has already decided to betray Jesus when he approaches the priests; it is why he goes to them. The offer of money comes after his decision has been made, even though he is opportunistic enough in Matthew to suggest that they should pay for his service as an informant.

20. A tradition arose, for example, that the tree from which Judas attempted to hang himself bent and that he later died in the manner recounted in Acts. See Kim Paffenroth, *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 120; Archer Taylor, “The Gallows of Judas Iscariot,” *Washington University Studies* 9 (1922): 135–56, esp. 140, 147, 149–50.

21. “Et hic quidem possedit agrum de mercede iniquitatis/et suspensus crepuit medius/et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius” [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] (Acts 1:18; emphasis added).

22. Alexander Murray (*The Curse on Self-Murder*, vol. 2 of *Suicide in the Middle Ages* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 338–39) points out that Jerome’s insertion rendered the discrepancy between Matthew and Acts invisible to most Latin writers and accounts for the scarcity of comment on the matter in the West.

23. But sometimes further rationalization was thought necessary: e.g., Peter Comestor’s speculation in his *Historia scholastica* (in *Patrologiae cursus completus ... series Latina*, comp. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols. [Paris: Migne, 1844–64], vol. 198, cols. 1053–722), col. 1625A.

24. Notwithstanding valiant attempts to argue otherwise, such as William Klassen, *Judas: Betrayer or Friend of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

25. This concept of Judas as statically wicked is particularly notable in Augustine. See, for instance, in *Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, ed. R. Willems, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* (hereafter CCSL) 36 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 50.9–12, which gives an unusually full explanation of this view; but many other passages in the same work reflect it, such as 5.18–19, 45.10, 46.7, 49.8, 51.12, 55.4, and especially 61.2. Considerations of space and focus make it impossible to do justice here to the nuances of Augustine’s thought or that of Jerome, about whom I will make a few further remarks below.

26. See Werner Foerster, ed., *Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts*, 2 vols., trans. R. McL. Wilson et al., ed. R. McL. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972–74), 1:41–43, for the comments of Iranaeus, Pseudo-Tertullian, and Epiphanius on the Gospel of Judas. More recently, Bart D. Ehrman (*The Lost Gospel of Judas Iscariot: A New Look at Betrayer and Betrayed* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006], 62–65) brings these heresiologists’ remarks into conjunction with his analysis of the Gospel of Judas itself, to which of course Foerster did not have access. Its text and translation are now available: Rodolphe Kasser, Marvin Meyer, Gregor Wurst, and François Gaudard, eds. and trans., *The Gospel of Judas, Together With the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes From Codex Tchacos: Critical Edition* (Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2007).

I leave aside here the possibilities implicit in Origen’s apocatastatic theology (see C. A. Patrides, “The Salvation of Satan,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 28 [1967]: 467–78, with discussion of Origen at 467–69), because as Samuel Laeuchli (“Origen’s Interpretation of Judas Iscariot,” *Church History* 22 [1953]: 259–68, at 260) points out, Origen never explicitly applies this idea of universal salvation to Judas. In the fourteenth century a Dominican preacher, Vincent Ferrer, allegedly claimed in a sermon that Judas was not damned, but all the information we have about the incident derives from testimony given against him at inquisitorial proceedings in 1391, and the facts are not certain; Murray (*The Curse on Self-Murder*, 360–64) discusses the Ferrer case.

27. Murray, *The Curse on Self-Murder*, 326–34.

28. Matt. 10:4; Mark 3:19; Luke 6:16; John 6:71–72.

29. Caroline F. Whelan, “Suicide in the Ancient World: A Re-examination of Matt 27:3–10,” *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 49 (1993): 505–22; L. Nortjé, “Matthew’s Motive for the

Composition of the Story of Judas's Suicide in Matthew 27:3–10," *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994): 41–51; Ehrman, *The Lost Gospel of Judas Iscariot*, 28–29; David Daube, "Judas," *California Law Review* 82, no. 1 (1994): 95–108; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, ed. Helmut Koester (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 471–73.

30. The defining statement on suicide for many centuries to follow was Augustine's discussion in *De civitate Dei* (2 vols., ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL 47–48 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1955], 1.16–27). Murray analyzes Augustine's treatment of suicide (*The Curse on Self-Murder*, 101–21) as he tracks the development of increasingly homogeneous anti-suicide opinion in the theoretical discourses of religion, philosophy, and law in the classical and early postclassical world (86–188).

31. In *Contra Gaudentium*, 1.37(49), Judas is brought into the discussion in connection with treason (*Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum episcopum libri duo*, in *Sancti Augustini scripta contra Donatistas*, 3 vols., ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 51–53 [Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1908–10], 3:199–274); in *De civitate Dei*, 1.17, it is because he had previously committed a great crime and was therefore guilty (an a fortiori argument against suicide: if even one as guilty as Judas should not kill himself, neither should anyone else).

32. *Contra Gaudentium*, 1.27(30).

33. *De patientia*, in *De fide et symbolo, De fide et operibus, ... De cura pro mortuis gerenda, De patientia*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 41 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1900), 661–91, at 673–75.

34. *Der Amos-Kommentar des Eusebius Hieronymus: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, ed. and trans. Bettina Höhmann (Münster: Schöningh, 2002), 416.

35. *Commentarium in Matheum libri IV*, ed. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, CCSL 77 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), bk. 4, ll. 1481–501.

36. *Opera homiletica*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 78 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), 212, ll. 100–107.

37. Murray, *The Curse on Self-Murder*, 194–97.

38. Augustine (in his long discussion of suicide in *De civitate Dei*) and Jerome (*In Jonam propheta*, in *Commentarii in prophetas minores*, 2 vols., ed. D. Vallarsi and M. Adriaen, CCSL 76–76A [Turnhout: Brepols, 1969–70], 1:377–419, commenting on Jonah 1:12 at 390–91, ll. 373–79) both allow the possibility of a rare exception when chastity is on the line. Murray (*The Curse on Self-Murder*, 104–17) insightfully discusses Augustine's reasoning on this subject in the context of the larger debates in which he was engaged.

39. Calling upon a paradigm of two species of sorrow drawn from a distinction made by Paul in a wholly different context, Augustine describes Judas as "exitiabiliter paenitens" [regretting in a way leading to death], recalling Paul's "saeculi ... tristitia" [sorrow of the world] that "mortem operatur" [worketh death], and he follows Paul in setting this attitude in a relationship of mutual exclusion with a beneficial feeling of regret (*salubris paenitentia*), Paul's "secundum Deum tristitia" [sorrow according to God] that "paenitentiam ... operatur" [worketh penance]: see *De civitate Dei*, 1.17, ll. 12–14; and 2 Cor. 7:10. Augustine's understanding of Judas's sorrow in *De civitate Dei* is identical to that of his contemporary John Cassian, who makes the dependence of this analysis on 2 Cor. 7:10 explicit in *De institutis coenobiorum*, 9.9–11 (in *De institutis coenobiorum, De incarnatione contra Nestorium*, ed. Michael Petschenig and Gottfried Kreuz, editio altera, CSEL 17 [Vienna: Österreichischen Wissenschaften, 2004]).

40. This is evident in Jerome's explication of Matthew 27:3–5, the verses that recount the remorse and suicide of Judas: *Commentarium in Matheum*, bk. 4, ll. 1481–501.

41. One need not subscribe to a tidy myth of the "discovery of the individual" to recognize a move toward interiorization in many cultural and discursive fields. Alongside Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200* (1972; reprint, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), see work by other scholars to sharpen, qualify, and recontextualize his analysis (including John F. Benton, "Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable with Carol D. Lanham [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982], 263–95; Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982], 82–109; Glenn W. Olsen, "St. Augustine and the Problem of the Medieval Discovery of the Individual," *Word and Spirit* 9 [1987]: 129–56; and Allen J. Frantzen, *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England* [New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983], esp. 198–208), as well as Morris's own partial reevaluation ("Individualism in Twelfth-Century Religion: Some Further Reflections," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 [1980]: 195–206). A classic statement of these twelfth-century trends is R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven: Yale University Press, [1952]), esp. 219–57.

42. For this reason the often-encountered notion that throughout the period Judas “served, for Christians, as a symbol of all Jews” will not hold water (quotation from Lester K. Little, “The Jews in Christian Europe” [1978], reprint, in *Essential Papers on Judaism and Christianity in Conflict: From Late Antiquity to the Reformation*, ed. Jeremy Cohen [New York: New York University Press, 1991], 276–97, at 289). The rising interest in Judas’s subjectivity, with the concomitant possibility of finding moral complexity in his character and actions, parts ways with the textual treatment of Jews during the same era, who seem to have been forced into ever narrower antagonistic and objectifying categories during the “twelfth-century renaissance”: the time when many historians detect a shift in mainstream Christian culture from predominantly theological anti-Judaism to increasingly irrational antisemitism. The entanglement of Judas with many strands of medieval Christian thought about and treatment of Jews, including the dissimilar range of possibilities for Christian literary treatments of them, needs careful study of its own. Hyam Maccoby, *Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil* (New York: Free Press, 1992), overgeneralizes, underdocuments, and cannot be relied upon. On developments in Christian attitudes to Jews in and around the twelfth century, see Anna Sapir Abulafia, *Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1995), as well as several of the essays in a collection of Sapir Abulafia’s previously published writings, *Christians and Jews in Dispute: Disputational Literature and the Rise of Anti-Judaism in the West (c. 1000–1150)*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998); Robert Chazan, *Medieval Stereotypes and Modern Antisemitism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Robert Chazan, *The Jews of Medieval Western Christendom, 1000–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); and Steven F. Kruger, *The Spectral Jew: Conversion and Embodiment in Medieval Europe*, *Medieval Cultures* 40 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), esp. chap. 2. All of these studies contrast utterly, in their sensitivity to historical nuance, with Robert Michael, *A History of Catholic Antisemitism: The Dark Side of the Church* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

43. Paull Franklin Baum (“The Mediaeval Legend of Judas Iscariot,” *PMLA* 31 [1916]: 481–632) edits two end-of-the-twelfth-century versions of the legend at pp. 490–91 and 493–94, and his study remains an indispensable survey of this tradition. Its most widely propagated version is embedded in chap. 45 of the thirteenth-century *Legenda aurea* (the account of St. Matthias): Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea, con le miniature dal codice Ambrosiano C 240 inf.*, 2 vols., ed. Giovanni Paolo Maggioni, trans. Francesco Stella et al., Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini 20 (Florence: SISMEL—Edizione del Galluzzo; and Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2007), 1:324–30. The Middle English ballad is no. 25 in Carleton Brown, ed., *English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), 38–39.

44. The more valuable studies of the subjectivizing and interiorizing tendencies in religious life during this period include Bynum, “Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?”; John W. Baldwin, “From the Ordeal to Confession: In Search of Lay Religion in Early Thirteenth-Century France,” in *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Biller and A. J. Minnis, *York Studies in Medieval Theology* 2 (York: York Medieval Press, 1998), 191–209; Giles Constable, “Twelfth-Century Spirituality and the Late Middle Ages,” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 5 (1971): 27–60; Giles Constable, “Liberty and Free Choice in Monastic Life and Thought” (1985), reprint, in *Monks, Hermits, and Crusaders in Medieval Europe* (London: Variorum Reprint, 1988), chap. 4; Giles Constable, “The Ideal of Inner Solitude in the Twelfth Century” (1987), corr. reprint (with addenda near the end of the discontinuously paginated volume), in *Culture and Spirituality in Medieval Europe* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996), chap. 11; and Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 257–95. Particularly useful in linking this interiorizing tendency to the developments in the theory and practice of sacramental confession that will be referenced below are Thomas N. Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 16–27; Frantzen, *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England*; Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols., *Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History* 41 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 2:583–608; and Joseph Goering, “The Internal Forum and the Literature of Penance and Confession,” *Traditio* 59 (2004): 175–227.

45. Alexander Murray, “Confession Before 1215,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 3 (1993): 51–82. Murray also argues that a less widely influential movement originating at Laon had some impact in England earlier in the twelfth century.

46. On the Paris schools and especially their contributions to the moral theology of Penance, see John W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter*

and *His Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), esp. 1:49–57; the introduction to Joseph Goering, ed., *William de Montibus* (c. 1140–1213): *The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, Studies and Texts 108 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1992), 28–42, 58–99; and Murray, “Confession Before 1215.” The spread of lay Penance following Lateran IV is discussed in Leonard E. Boyle, “The Inter-Conciliar Period 1179–1215 and the Beginnings of Pastoral Manuals,” in *Miscellanea Rolando Bandinelli Papa Alessandro III*, ed. Filippo Liotta (Siena: Accademia senese degli intronati, 1986), 43–56; Leonard E. Boyle, “*Summae confessorum*,” in *Les Genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales: Définition, critique, et exploitation*, Publications de l’Institut d’Études Médiévales, 2nd ser., 5 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1982), 227–37, at 230–33; Peter Biller, “Confession in the Middle Ages: Introduction,” in Biller and Minnis, *Handling Sin*, 3–33, esp. 8–13; and Baldwin, “From the Ordeal to Confession.”

47. I cite the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council from its *Constitutiones*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo et al., trans. Norman P. Tanner, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols., ed. Norman P. Tanner (London: Sheed and Ward; and Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 1:227–*271.

48. For further discussion of the backgrounds and consequences of Lateran IV’s pastoral and educational aspects, including the rapid spread of literature on Penance for clergy and laity alike, see (in addition to Tentler, Frantzen, Colish, and Goering as cited in n. 44 above) Marjorie Curry Woods and Rita Copeland, “Classroom and Confession,” in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature*, ed. David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 376–406; M. Michèle Mulchahey, “*First the Bow Is Bent in Study . . .*”: *Dominican Education Before 1350*, Studies and Texts 132 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1998), 527–52; Goering, *William de Montibus*, 58–99; Judith Shaw, “The Influence of Canonical and Episcopal Reform on Popular Books of Instruction,” in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan, Tennessee Studies in Literature 28 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 44–60; Leonard E. Boyle, “The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology,” in Heffernan, *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, 30–43; Leonard E. Boyle, “Notes on the Education of the *Fratres Communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century” (1978), reprint, in *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education, and Canon Law, 1200–1400* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981), chap. 6, 249–67; Boyle, “The Inter-Conciliar Period 1179–1215 and the Beginnings of Pastoral Manuals”; Boyle, “*Summae confessorum*”; and Siegfried Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), 68–96.

49. Cf. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd rev. ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952; reprint, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978), esp. 196–308; and Beryl Smalley, *The Gospels in the Schools, c. 1100–c. 1280* (London: Hambledon Press, 1985), 277–78. This trend is part of what Smalley describes as a conceptual shift of tropological interpretation from the “spiritual” to the “literal” sense of scripture, and it goes hand in hand with the new emphasis on the historical meaning of scripture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that is described also in G. Dinkova-Bruun’s recent survey of Latin biblical verse (“Biblical Versifications From Late Antiquity to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century: History or Allegory?” in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity: The Encounter Between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. Willemien Otten and Karla Pollmann, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae: Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language* 87 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 315–42).

50. See Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, for the early history of moral interpretation of scripture.

51. This is seen, infamously, in Augustine’s and Jerome’s allegorical identifications of Judas with the Jews in their interpretations of Psalm 108. This association had a pernicious influence, to be sure, providing one of several received justifications for Christian belief in the accursedness of the Jews. On the risks of overgeneralizing from it, however, see n. 42 above.

52. Pickering, *The South English Ministry and Passion*, 8–10; Morey, *Book and Verse*, 237. One additional brief extract from the poem is preserved in a separate manuscript, as both Pickering and Morey note.

53. The French and English works are both edited in Frances A. Foster, ed., *The Northern Passion*, 2 vols., EETS o.s. 145 and 147 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1913–16). Foster prints four versions of the English in parallel; I cite the composite text given in her first column (here, from MS I).

54. *Peter Abelard's Ethics*, ed. and trans. D. E. Luscombe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 78, ll. 2ff.

55. Augustine, *De sermone Domini in monte libros duos*, ed. Almut Mutzenbecher, CCSL 35 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), bk. 1, ll. 1791–832; Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. in 3, ed. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 4–5 (Grottaferrata, Italy: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1971–81), 2.43.1.6.

56. *Cursus Mundi (The Cursus o the World): A Northumbrian Poem of the XIVth Century in Four Versions*, 7 vols., ed. Richard Morris, EETS o.s. 57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 99, 101 (London: N. Trübner and Co., 1874–93).

57. I analyze *Cursus Mundi's* distinctive tropological use of Judas in another essay currently in preparation.

58. Trying to work out the relationship of demon possession to Judas's moral impulse of remorse, Peter Comestor speculates, "Forte Satanas, qui possederat Judam, postquam fecit, quod voluit, recessit ab eo, et ideo potuit Judas dolere, quod fecerat, ut ex dolore iterum intraret in eum Satanas, ut faceret eum injicere sibi manum" [Maybe Satan, who had possessed Judas, withdrew from him once he had done what he wanted, and for that reason Judas was able to lament what he had done—(yet lamented) such that through that sorrow, Satan entered into him again in order to make him violently lay hands on himself] (*Historica scholastica*, cols. 1624D–25A). The Old French *Passion* and the *Northern Passion* based on it go the other direction from Comestor, who had multiplied Satan's interventions, by entirely omitting the Lukan and Johannine involvement of the devil in Judas's betrayal.

59. See, e.g., lines 1409–28, explaining a parable drawn most directly from Luke 20:9–16 (cf. Mark 12:1–9 and Matt. 21:33–41) but taking a cue for its interpretation from Matthew 21:43. On the "hermeneutical Jew," see Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*. Cohen (*ibid.*, 5) is careful to note that the abstract intellectual origin of this concept of the Jews does not insulate real Jews from the effects it might have on Christians' behavior toward them.

60. Anglo-Norman text in *Statutes of the Realm*, 11 vols. (1810–28; microfilm reprint, 1978), 1:221, with translation; more recent English translation in Robin R. Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262–1290* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 291–93.

61. See Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 39–40, 70–75. Roth's (*ibid.*, 1–131) whole account of the Jews in pre-expulsion England remains valuable, and in general I follow it, although his analysis of the financial status of English Jewry in the thirteenth century is subject to qualification, e.g., by Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*. The question seems to come down to whether one focuses on the financial health of English Jewry as a whole or on the continuing financial viability of certain individuals within it. With his more atomistic emphasis on those who did remain active in finance, Mundill argues that "it is not easy to state firmly that the Edwardian Anglo-Jewry was a business community in decline" (*ibid.*, 208). Mundill stresses that lending practices changed but did not cease; Jews were forced by the *Statutum* to deal more often in commodities than before and to find creative ways to lend for profit, and the social profile of their clientele changed, with "a shift towards more Jewish lending to those of lower social status" (*ibid.*, 246), such that the greatest number of their debtors were not nobles or ecclesiastics taking out large loans but members of the agrarian and small-landowning classes.

62. Roth repeatedly gives Edward I credit for being "well-meaning" and "conscientious" (*A History of the Jews in England*, e.g., 71, 73) in the provisions of the *Statutum de Judeismo* that were supposed to compensate for the loss of moneylending as an occupation, but the web of Catch-22-style interactions of the *Statutum* with other laws and restrictions, which Roth (*ibid.*, 70ff.) himself so well summarizes, made it, de facto, a fairly comprehensive legal attack on England's Jewish communities. Mundill too takes the *Statutum's* intentions at face value; he (*England's Jewish Solution*, esp. 246–48) evaluates it as a partial success rather than a complete failure as Roth does, largely owing to his divergence from Roth's earlier interpretation of the financial status of English Jewry.

63. Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 78–79. This increase in seriousness about converting Jews to Christianity represents a late English adoption of trends that had developed elsewhere in Europe, on which, see Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth Century Christian Missionizing and the Jewish Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

64. Instances of conversion under fear of death are scattered throughout Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*; for the quotation, see *ibid.*, 75. Jews had been hanged in England from time to time since 1189, but the large-scale slaughter in London and other cities in 1278 was notorious. I would suggest that the poet's interpretation of Judas's body finds its best fit with social circumstances in the period following the issue of the *Statutum de Judeismo*, in the decade 1275–85, and more likely in the latter part of that period than the earlier, during the relatively intense English concentration on conversion starting about 1280. If so, then it begins to appear more probable that its gesture to Judas's body as a sign intended by God for the Jews alludes obliquely to the executions of 1278.

65. Cf. also the hostility toward Jews and their sympathizers in lines 611–12 and 2441–50.

66. *Opera homiletica*, 212, ll. 100–107.

67. “Hieronymus super cviii psal. quia magis offendit Judas Deum, quando se suspendit, quam in hoc quod eum prodidit” [Jerome, on Psalm 108: for Judas offended God more when he hanged himself than in betraying him] (Comestor, *Historia scholastica*, col. 1625A). James H. Morey (“Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase, and the Medieval Popular Bible,” *Speculum* 68 [1993]: 6–35, at 10) summarizes the evidence for the date of the *Historia scholastica*.

68. E.g., *Speculum Christiani: A Middle English Religious Treatise of the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Gustaf Holmstedt, EETS o.s. 182 (London: Oxford University Press, 1933; reprint, Oxford: Early English Text Society; and New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1971), 73, ll. 19–22, and 207, ll. 26–29 (Middle English versions at 72, ll. 19–23, and 206, ll. 31–34, respectively); *Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook*, ed. and trans. Siegfried Wenzel (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), ll. iv.73–185, referring to Judas at ll. 77–78; and *Jacob's Well: An English Treatise on the Cleansing of Man's Conscience*, ed. Arthur Brandeis, EETS o.s. 115 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1900; reprint, Millwood, NY: Kraus Reprint Co., 1975), 113, ll. 11–16. On the transmission of statements such as this one in collections of patristic epitomes, and on the awareness among some medieval writers of the hazards of such decontextualizing practices, see Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 216, 228–30; and M. A. Rouse and R. H. Rouse, “Florilegia of Patristic Texts,” in *Les Genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales*, Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales, 2nd ser., 5 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1982), 165–80, esp. 170–74.

69. See n. 1 above.

70. 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.

71. The manuscript witnesses are listed by Morey (*Book and Verse*, 242–43) and described by B. D. Brown (*The Southern Passion*, xvii–xxiv), supplemented by O. S. Pickering and Manfred Görlach, “A Newly-Discovered Manuscript of the *South English Legendary*,” *Anglia* 100 (1982): 109–23.

72. E.g., *Ministry and Passion*, ll. 53–54, 1343–46, 2007–8. Two passages critical of negligent clergy have more flesh on their bones: ll. 1673–80 and 2855–68.

73. The last one mentioned, however, replaces a brief parenthetical remark in the earlier text that Jesus, who cast out the money changers and merchants from the Temple, must be very irritated by people who chatter in church nowadays (*MP*, ll. 2007–8).

74. The detail of their eagerness derives from Mark 14:11 and Luke 22:5, where the chief priests, when Judas offers to betray Jesus, “audientes gavisī sunt et promiserunt ei pecuniam se dāturos” [hearing it were glad; and they promised him they would give him money] (quoted here from Mark).

75. The source is Matthew 26:15: “Quid vultis mihi dare et ego vobis eum tradam/at illi constituerunt ei triginta argenteos” [What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you? But they appointed him thirty pieces of silver].

76. Prompted by *MP*, ll. 2087–88: “þrow vertu of þe masse Goddys flesch & his blood/In þe obley & wyn is purelyche as he schadde on þe rood.”

77. Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament According to the Theologians, c. 1080–c. 1220* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 181n71.

78. The doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine had by this time become normative, and at Lateran IV the language of the council's constitutional first canon ratified the view of most contemporaneous theologians in accepting transubstantiation as the mode of that presence. See Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 1:230–*230;

and on the major contributions to Eucharistic theology during the preceding period, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)*, vol. 3 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 184–204; Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 14–35; Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*; and Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2:551–83.

79. B. D. Brown's marginal summary of these lines in her edition is mistaken. Missing the poet's distinction between the transubstantiated Host and merely blessed bread, which is enforced by the phrase "as hit were" in line 862, she took the statement to refer to partaking of the Eucharist in a spiritually unprepared state.

80. For discussion of this question as addressed in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries by Guibert of Nogent, Peter of Poitiers, Stephen Langton, and William of Auxerre, see Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, 81–82, 101–2, 121, 135.

81. The statement that the guilty "want to take holy (= blessed) bread" could be argued to be ambiguous, there being no definitive way to tell in line 862 whether the verb *wolleþ* indicates their specific desire to receive blessed bread instead of the consecrated Host or merely a desire to *receive*, without determination of what they are receiving (and thus with the implication that they believe they are getting the body of Christ and are unaware of a priestly substitution). Both the syntax and the choice of words make the first reading seem very much more natural to me, and it is the interpretation I will adopt, but I would allow the second as a conceivable possibility.

82. The prepositional phrases make clear that the verb *take* in this passage is used not for the disciples' act of receiving but for Jesus' act of delivery: he "to his disciples tok /... his owe fflesch and blode" (SP, ll. 856–57), and "alle his disciples bote Iudas : he tok his fflesch so, /Ak to him he tok a mossel : þat was yn his disch ydo" (SP, ll. 859–60).

83. Even if the passage is read according to the alternative interpretation allowed in n. 81 above, in which the celebrant has deceived the would-be communicant with a substitution of unconsecrated bread, the analogy would remain inexact. In that case the discrepancy would lie in the fact that in the poem Judas never believed himself to be receiving the same thing the other disciples received, whereas the latter-day parishioner, in that scenario, would. My larger point would still stand, namely, that the asserted parallel between the particular abuse highlighted by the poet and the case of Judas in the harmonized version of scripture is somewhat forced.

84. Judas greets Jesus in Mark 14:45 but receives no reply; in Luke 22:48 Jesus addresses Judas, but Judas has not previously spoken. Jesus' reply in the *Ministry and Passion* incorporates what he says to Judas in Luke as well as the content of his answer from the dialogue in Matthew 26:49–50.

85. This passage is represented in an abbreviated form by lines 1907–90 of B. D. Brown's edition. O. S. Pickering ("The 'Defence of Women' From the *Southern Passion*: A New Edition," in *The South English Legendary: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Klaus P. Jankofsky [Tübingen: Francke, 1992], 154–76) edits the full version and argues persuasively that it is all the work of the *Southern Passion* poet.

86. Likewise MP, lines 2743–44, which again call attention to the fact that Jesus appeared first to women, present a mild enough challenge to antifeminism with their statement that "ry3t gret loue [Jesus] schewid to hem, for I wil þe not ly3e."

87. While he does mention the blame of women conveyed in "bokes," it is in conjunction with "songes" and "rymes" in the same line (SP, l. 1926), and his greater concern seems to be with earthier and more spontaneous expressions of antifeminist sentiment. Pickering, "The 'Defence of Women' From the *Southern Passion*," offers analysis of the poet's argument and interests.

88. E.g., Augustine, *De sermone Domini in monte*, bk. 1, ll. 1813ff.