THE APOCRYPHAL ADAM AND EVE IN MEDIEVAL EUROPE

Vernacular Translations
and Adaptations of the
Vita Adae et Evae

BRIAN MURDOCH

OXFORD

THE APOCRYPHAL ADAM AND EVE
IN MEDIEVAL EUROPE

This page intentionally left blank

The Apocryphal Adam and Eve in Medieval Europe

Vernacular Translations and Adaptations of the Vita Adae et Evae

BRIAN MURDOCH

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

To Oscar and Adam Murdoch

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

The story of the fall and the expulsion from Eden as related in Genesis leaves open a range of questions concerning the life of Adam and Eve in paradise and thereafter. Their story, however, is of enormous importance, given the historical and theological position afforded to Adam and Eve not only as the progenitors of humanity, but as the originators of sin. The gaps in what the Bible tells us of their lives were filled in early and medieval times partly by Jewish and Christian commentary according to the *sensus litteralis*, and also by—to use a whole range of sometimes interchangeable designations—midrashim, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, or legends. One sequence (Christian in its full form) contains details of the postlapsarian life of the first couple such as their attempt to return to paradise by undertaking a formal act of penance and cleansing by fasting whilst immersed in a river (which sometimes stands still as a gesture of support), and from which Eve is tempted a second time by the devil (disguised this time as an angel). It also gives information on the ways in which Adam and Eve coped with such novelties of human existence as childbirth and death. These Adam narratives exist in many versions, and were widespread in the Middle Ages and even beyond the Reformation. They are part of a very broad tradition, with extant material in many of the early languages of Christianity, such as Greek, Syriac, Armenian, or Ethiopic, and there is also (late) material in Hebrew. For western Europe, the most significant texts are first of all a Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, and in particular its related Latin version, the *Vita Adae et Evae*. However, this is not really a single text, but rather a more or less flexible accumulation of episodes grouped around a core, and there are very many variations within the substantial number of extant versions.

The earliest stages and putative origins of this whole tradition have been examined in some detail, but studies in Old Testament apocrypha rarely take into account the continued development in vernacular writings which are not just descended from, but which develop and augment the Latin. If we add the iconographical tradition, the range widens still further. This can contribute to the study of the apocryphal tradition as such, and it can at the same time throw light on what was a very widespread European tradition, an aspect of European culture that disappeared to a large extent (though it did not die out completely) at the time of the Renaissance and Reformation, with their renewed insistence on canonicity and on the establishment of a foundation

text for works of antiquity. The present investigation looks in detail at the ways in which the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* continues its development in different vernacular cultures, adapting and varying the content, as it places the material into different contexts and changes the form from prose narrative to verse or to drama. It thereby extends the already varied life of the apocryphon in a truly protean manner. The Latin text—although there is really no single basic text even in Latin—was especially well known in most (though not all) areas of western Europe, and there are also some translations or adaptations into eastern European languages of the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, even though there is a separate Slavonic tradition with variant motifs not represented in the Latin.

The question, which is already by no means straightforward even with canonical Bible books, of precisely what constitutes an apocryphal or pseudepigraphic text, can thus be opened further. The usual backward-searching procedures for establishing a definitive (usually a synonym for original) medieval or pre-medieval text are not necessarily appropriate for the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, which does not have a single stable form. To an extent the problem is already there with the Greek text. Source study for the vernacular works is correspondingly difficult, given that variations found in such works might have appeared at any stage, might have been in the source, might be deliberate on the part of the vernacular writer, or might simply be errors. Chronology, too, is problematic, given that the extensive manuscript tradition of the *Vita Adae et Evae* is not particularly early (nor, once again, is the Greek tradition). The limitation in the study of the Adambooks to versions preserved only in the ancient Christian languages is artificial, and the ongoing reception of the work requires consideration of the vernacular texts just as much as the Latin ones. Attention must be paid, too, to the general concept of apocrypha itself, and to the extent to which these stories are integrated with canonical biblical narrative, and whether the material was felt or shown to be apocryphal at all. Often the material is simply included with biblical narrative as part of the medieval popular Bible—what was presented as biblical, that is, to those unable to read it for themselves. The generic variety found in the vernacular texts adds a literary dimension to the study of the story.

The *Vita Adae et Evae* is a Christian Old Testament apocryphon, concerned with the origins of human life, with penance, and with the prophecy of the redemption. Vernacular adaptations in particular provide occasion for an extended typology which links events of the New Testament with figures such as Adam, Eve, and Seth, even though their deeds as recorded here are not canonical. Both Latin and vernacular versions of *Vita Adae et Evae* append or include other religious legends, such as those of Adam's formation from eight elements, or his naming from the four quarters, and where he was

buried. But there is an especially strong link, already very clear in some versions of Latin text, with the equally widespread and equally flexible Latin legends of the Holy Rood, the story of the cross before Christ. The *Vita Adae et Evae* concludes with a journey undertaken by Eve and Seth to paradise, where in some versions they obtain the seeds that will grow into the wood of the cross. The Holy Rood stories effectively start with this, so that there is an overlap which is not always very clear. The resulting expanded apocryphon is found in contexts which include chronicles and narrative Bibles.

A work of this nature requires a substantial authorial apology in advance. Although there are relevant texts known in most western European languages (there is a curious gap with the Iberian peninsula) and also some eastern ones, the texts discussed or noted here will hardly constitute a complete list. Furthermore, a few of those that *are* known have necessarily had to be considered principally through the works of others (the Old Bohemian versions are an example). Other versions remain unedited, and although attention may be drawn to them, we have perforce to wait for editions (and preferably translations) by specialists in the relevant languages. The time-consuming nature of that exercise was made clear to me when I edited Hans Folz's German prose text from his autograph manuscript, and later the English poem from the Auchinleck codex. A few early printed texts (some of them surviving only in a single copy), have also proved impossible to track down, but it is again to be hoped that bibliographical reference to them here will inspire others to investigate. There is, in fact, a particular gap in the study of early printed versions in Latin and in the vernaculars. It is equally patent that, while it is possible to cope with many of the major languages of western Europe, help (or good fortune) is needed with others. Luckily the Breton dramatic version has (mostly) been translated, and as far as the extremely important Irish *Saltair na Rann* is concerned, I was delighted to work on this together with David Greene and Fergus Kelly, for whose translation I supplied a commentary, which in its turn (and this was a salutary lesson) assisted with points in the translation. For texts not translated into a more familiar language—be they in Welsh or Polish—I have had to rely on the assistance of others to bolster my own sometimes extremely limited resources. I have also been privileged, however, to meet, work, or correspond over the years with a great number of those concerned with and interested in this complex of Adam motifs, especially (my long list is alphabetical, with apologies for any omissions): Linda Archibald, Michael Benskin, Andrew Breeze, John Carey, Graeme Dunphy, Hans-Martin von Erffa, Kurt Gärtner, Ken George, Christoph Gerhardt, the late David Greene, Mary-Bess Halford-Staffel, Fergus Kelly, Gwenaël Le Duc, Martin McNamara, Bob Miller, Evelyn Newlyn, the late Friedrich Ohly, Oliver Padel, Jean-Pierre Pettorelli, Esther Quinn, Ute

Schwab, Michael Stone, Jackie Tasioulas, Hildegard Tristram, Annette Volfing, Jon and Maíre West. All credit goes to these colleagues, and no blame for any errors that I may make in using their work. I am also indebted to Kerstin Pfeiffer for practical help and for many discussions on the topic, as well as to Simon Gymer, whose guidance around the internet helped me to access works in the remotest of libraries. I began my university career with a doctoral dissertation in Cambridge suggested by and under the expert guidance of Roy Wisbey on the representation in early German verse of the canonical Adam and Eve narrative, and I have over the years been able to work on many of the vernacular versions of the *Vita Adae et Evae*. I find it fitting to enter upon emeritus status with a study of the apocryphal tradition which brings that material together and places it into a wider context. In this and every one of the earlier studies I have of course enjoyed the support, patience, and assistance of my wife Ursula.

Stirling   B.M.
2008

Contents

Conventions of Reference

Bible

Biblical references are, since this is largely a study of western medieval texts, to the Vulgate: *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robert Weber (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 4th edn. 1994). Any divergences from this are noted.

Vita Adae et Evae

The Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* is referred to and cited from the edition of Wilhelm Meyer unless otherwise stated; more recent editions of other versions usually follow his chapters/sections, and where another version of the text (by Mozley, by Pettorelli) has been used, this is noted: Wilhelm Meyer, '*Vita Adae et Evae*', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.philol. Kl. 14/iii (1879), 185–250. The abbreviation *VAE* is used throughout to refer to the Latin text.

Holy Rood Legends

The same applies to the basic version of the Holy Rood legend, although it is equally variable: Wilhelm Meyer, 'Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christi', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.philol. Kl. 16/ii (1882), 101–66.

Abbreviations

EETS	Early English Text Society (Ordinary, Extra, and Supplementary Series)
ITS	Irish Text Society
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
PG	*Patrologia . . . Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857–66)
PL	*Patrologia . . . Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1844–64)
PRIA	*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*
RC	*Revue celtique*
VAE	The Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*

This page intentionally left blank

1

Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, the Adambooks, and the *Vita Adae et Evae*

Recent literary criticism has made an abstract issue (sometimes somewhat artificially) out of what is meant by the very concept of a text. More straightforwardly, philological and bibliographical questions (which become increasingly complex as we move back in time towards Gutenberg) must always be taken into account in the establishing even of a definitive printed text for a given work.[1] The question of what precisely constitutes a text when it *predates* the age of printing altogether, however, is difficult in a whole range of additional ways, the difficulties increasing once more as we go back further in time. Paul Grosjean, speaking about establishing the text of St Patrick's *Confession* in 1958, used words like 'unscrambling' and 'detective work', 'clues' and 'tricks', in a neat little introduction to one single fifth-century work.[2] Initial questions are the pragmatic ones of manuscript survival and simple decipherment. Furthermore, a work surviving in a single manuscript presents one set of problems, but there are different ones with multiple transmission, when a lead manuscript and a stemma have to be set up and the 'best' readings established. When there are several, or indeed many, manuscripts, too, they may fall into groups, and some may exhibit more variations than others. Theologians are familiar with the enormous apparatus attached to Tischendorf's Greek New Testament, for example, while literary medievalists regularly use printed editions which have to offer variant texts printed in parallel columns, such as the Early English Text Society's multi-volume *Cursor mundi*, the French *Vie du Pape Saint Grégoire* (a bulky folio, necessary to be able to present all the versions more or less synoptically), and so on. Modern projects in medieval studies now frequently involve

---

[1] Of course, authorial manuscripts are also taken into account when these are available. See Herbert Kraft, *Editionsphilologie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990) for an instructive overview.

[2] 'The Confession of Saint Patrick', in John Ryan (ed.), *Saint Patrick* (Dublin: Radio Eireann, 1958), 81–94. The piece was one of the Thomas Davis lectures and is noted for its direct presentation of a (fortuitous) single example.

digitization of all the known manuscripts of a work to make them accessible to scholars by way of the computer, something which can be a mixed blessing. A problem especially pertinent to early theological writings in particular, too, is that not only is the discrepancy between the age of the manuscript and of the original text potentially great, but a work may even have survived in a language other than that of the (presumed) original. The degree of certainty to which such an original can be demonstrated or presumed at all (this is done usually on linguistic grounds) is also variable. All of these problems make it difficult to establish what is meant by *the* text of an early work.

All of these problems might also apply—as indicated already with the reference to Tischendorf—to each one of the collection of separate books referred to as the Bible, and since the Bible is a collection, or rather two (and arguably three or even more) collections of texts comprising the Old and the New Testaments (and the Apocrypha), a further problem arises in that particular case of what is or is not to be included. There are numerous variations on what actually constitutes the Bible even now, so that it is entirely defensible to claim that there is no such thing as *the* Bible. Reference is normally made, however, to a *canon* (a Greek word perhaps derived from Hebrew, meaning a measure, a standard, or by extension an approved list), a set of individual works gathered together and authorized by some official body, so that there can theoretically be no additions or omissions. The two Testaments are each made up of variously transmitted ancient texts originally composed in different languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek) which have been copied and recopied and also translated over centuries. Not even the collection as such is static. One of the earliest more or less complete manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments, the Codex Sinaiticus in the British Library, includes (part of) a work called *The Shepherd* of Hermas and the *Epistle of Barnabas*; on the other hand, the canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews is questionable and it does not always appear in early manuscripts, though it *is* in the Sinaiticus.[3] T. S. Pattie's little book on Greek Bibles in the British

---

[3] See on the canon G. W. H. Lampe, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ii: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); on the Old Testament see H. H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament* (London: Hutchinson, 3rd edn. 1967), and on that of the New Testament Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, rev. C. S. C. Williams (London: Duckworth, 1954) and Bruce Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). In the so-called *Muratorian Canon*, a Latin text based on a supposed Greek original of the second century, the *Shepherd* is given the same sort of status as the Apocrypha in the Protestant Bible, namely worthy of reading, but not part of the Bible. Similar comments on the work and the *Epistle of Barnabas* and others are made by Eusebius, who is, however, also dubious about the canonical Apocalypse (Revelation): see Henry M. Gwatkin, *Selections from Early Writers* (London: Macmillan, 1902), 37 (*Muratorian Canon*, 82–9) and Henry Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church* (1943; 2nd edn.

Library makes the important point that even on a very minor textual level, it is possible that no existing manuscript has now what may be seen as a 'correct' text. Pattie cites Galatian 4: 25 in illustration of this: 'Sinai', that verse notes, 'is a mountain in Arabia.' All manuscripts have this statement, and it is there in all the versions, Latin and vernacular, although it makes very little sense in the context, and it was argued as early as 1729 that this was originally just an explanatory marginal gloss to the preceding verse, which had been copied into, and thus become part of, the text.[4]

In terms of the Old Testament canon, an informally approved list of accepted books of the Jewish *Law* or the Pentateuch existed before about 400 BC. The Samaritan tradition, which only accepts the Pentateuch, coincides with the Jewish tradition here, so that the list was clearly fixed before they split apart. A fuller official list was discussed (if not necessarily decided) probably at the latest by AD 90–100 at the so-called Council of Jamnia or Jabneh (near Jaffa), although it now seems more likely that this was just a meeting of rabbis. However, rabbinic schools do seem to have agreed by about AD 70–100 what should be in the canon, although there was argument about some of the later books (the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther). But by about AD 100 an Old Testament canon was fixed, and it was adopted by early Christian theologians. The canon described above left out, however, a number of Jewish religious books which actually *had* been included in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures from the third century BC, a translation called the Septuagint (LXX), made in Alexandria and originally just of the Pentateuch (the dates of the translation of other books are not always clear), which constitutes—although it is not itself in Hebrew—one of the oldest witnesses for the Old Testament as a whole.[5] The additional books include Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus[6], Tobit,

---

London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 41. The Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus manuscripts of the Bible both omit, incidentally, the *Adultera* pericope from John's Gospel.

[4] T. S. Pattie, *Manuscripts of the Bible* (London: British Library, 1979), 12, referring to Daniel Mace's Greek New Testament of 1729, which leaves the sentence out. Pattie offers a variety of significant similar examples.

[5] See for example Albert Carl Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964) and Donald Harman Akenson, *Surpassing Wonder: The Invention of the Bible and the Talmuds* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1998), esp. 526–37, with reference to the value also of the Syriac *Peshitta*. See also the earlier standard word by Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934). The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls of course provided very early comparative material for some texts.

[6] The case of Ecclesiasticus, also known as Sir(ach), is an interesting one. Known principally in Greek and other ancient languages, it was assumed that a Hebrew (or Aramaic) text existed from internal evidence and report, but such a text was not discovered until the early part of the twentieth century, and then only a partial one. Modern discoveries of ancient text collections

Judith, and Baruch, with some extra parts of Esther. Further, the LXX did not offer precisely the same text as some of the Hebrew texts in any case—Job is shorter in the LXX, for example. But those additional books were not accepted by the later rabbis, and Jerome, too, translating material into Latin for his Vulgate, afforded them a slightly different status, because he did not have Hebrew originals for them. They remained nominally part of the Old Testament, but were seen as a separate collection, the deutero-canonical books ('second-list') of the Catholic tradition. Ultimately they came to be dubbed the Apocrypha in the Protestant tradition, and in the various Protestant Bibles they are physically more clearly separated from the other books. The use here of the word *apocrypha* (from the Greek meaning 'hidden things'), however, is—or can be—confusing, and sometimes hinders, rather than assists in, the definition of an apocryphon.

The basis of the New Testament is the Gospels, of course, and even here the three synoptic Gospels, Mark, Luke, and Matthew, are as clearly linked to each other (albeit with differences) as they are unlike John. There are also plenty of (usually slightly later) non-canonical Gospels, referred to as apocryphal Gospels, and often deriving from those eventually established as part of the canon. Alexander Souter's book on the canon of the New Testament notes that 'there was an immense amount of evangelic matter floating around' in the second century. In the middle of that century, Marcion declared a canon containing only one Gospel (Luke) and ten Pauline Epistles, and he disregarded the Old Testament completely; but nothing as radical as this took hold, and he was excommunicated as a heretic. From the same century of the Christian era, however, came the first moves towards a fuller canon of the New Testament, adding to the eventually established four Gospels first of all Paul's letters (the Canonical, Catholic or Apostolic Epistles), of which even Marcion had accepted all but three. It is not quite clear when other works were added, such as Acts, the Catholic Epistles (John, Peter), and the Apocalypse (Revelation). The last was read in churches in Asia, and to an extent the canon tended to be local in the early stages of Christianity, with some variation in different churches. Reference has been made to *The Shepherd* and to Barnabas, and works like the *Didache* (Teachings of the Apostles) were also seen as Scripture in some areas. Not until the Council of Laodicea in 363 do we get a fixed canon (even this is not really clear, and it omits the Apocalypse). In 397, however, a council

(Cairo Genizah, Nag Hammadi, the Dead Sea Scrolls) have changed the concept of Old Testament canonicity considerably, with fragments of what are now regarded as apocrypha or pseudepigrapha indicating by their numbers that these works, too, were held in high esteem at an earlier stage. The *Book of Jubilees* is a case in point.

met at Carthage, with St Augustine present, where a list was approved which pretty well matches the present New Testament.[7]

What is meant precisely by references to Old or New Testament apocrypha, then, other than the deutero-canonical works, or by the related concept, pseudepigrapha, is somewhat unclear in the secondary literature. The position becomes even more complex if quasi-technical Hebrew concepts such as 'midrash' (used even sometimes of the entirely Christian Holy Rood story), or later blanket and culturally less specific terms such as 'legend' are added, the more so as all of these terms can and sometimes do overlap to some extent. Achim Masser has noted that *apocryphus* in the Middle Ages usually means uncertain or unreliable, *incertus*, *dubius*, *spurius*, and the basic sense of the word apocryphon seems to be an anonymous or pseudonymous early (prose) work. The Old Testament examples are usually of Jewish origin, composed in a Semitic language or in Greek, dating probably from around the beginnings of Christianity into late antiquity, and which consist usually of narrative expansions on the lives of biblical characters or biblical themes. Their original composition was probably in Hebrew or Greek, even though they might well have survived only in, say, Latin, or in a different early Christian language altogether, such as Ethiopic or Syriac or Armenian, or even in a relatively late written language, such as Old Church Slavonic. These are extremely numerous, extremely varied, and above all else hard to define in rigid terms.

One of the major earlier scholars, R. H. Charles (1855–1931), who produced two massive volumes called *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* in 1913, refers to the deutero-canonical texts as the 'Apocrypha proper',[8] but a simple retention of the capital letter will probably serve to distinguish between those deutero-canonical texts and the numerous *other*

[7] The outline of the development is clearly put in Souter, *Text and Canon*, rev. Williams, 137–87, with a selection of relevant documents. The group of works which come close to the New Testament, as it were—the *Didache*, Hermas, Barnabas, the two Letters of Clement, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and the *Acts of Paul* (with a few other works)—all constitute a kind of New Testament 'second canon', but have not had the same status as the Old Testament deutero-canonical Apocrypha. See Souter, *Text and Canon*, rev. Williams, 163–6. All had canonical status in some churches, however, which distinguishes them from, say, other apocryphal Gospels. Usually they are referred to as the 'Apostolic Fathers': see *Early Christian Writings*, trans. Maxwell Staniforth (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), which omits the *Shepherd*, and the Loeb edition of *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Kirksopp Lake (Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1912–13), which includes it. Staniforth notes in his introduction the fact that these works, now hardly known, might—had things turned out a little differently—be as well known as the present New Testament.

[8] See R. H. Charles, *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914; repr. 1956), 184–5. On the problem of the origins, see James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or Other* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

apocrypha and pseudepigrapha—two generic terms which overlap very considerably indeed—some of which are the subject of this study. The two terms, apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, cannot really be distinguished in the last analysis, and their usage seems to depend partly upon convention and partly upon personal taste. The word *apocrypha* (with a lower-case initial) is applied regularly to many works additional to the New Testament, but not part of the canon, whereas *pseudepigrapha* seems to be applied only to Old Testament-related works. Neither application is consistently done. The somewhat tenuous distinction between the two terms, if there is one at all, possibly goes back to the German biblical scholar Johann Albert Fabricius (1668–1736) from Leipzig, who published not only an edition of some of the deutero-canonical works (simply giving their names in the title of his book), but also a two-volume *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (in 1703, with a third volume in 1719), and then a *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* in 1713 (with a *volumen alterum* in 1723). Fabricius seems to be the first user of the word pseudepigrapha in modern times. These pseudepigrapha, 'spuriously attributed works' do not constitute a fixed group, and indeed are not always attributed at all.[9] As has been noted,[10] the 'Life of Adam and Eve' referred to amongst the pseudepigrapha is not actually ascribed to anyone, falsely or otherwise (although the Greek version was for quite a long time spuriously dubbed the 'Apocalypse of Moses'), so that it is not technically pseudepigraphic. Hedley Sparks, editing a collection of what he deliberately called *apocrypha*, dismisses pseudepigrapha as an ugly and not very accurate word, avoids it altogether, and stresses that the works usually subsumed under this head do not constitute some kind of 'trio-canonical' collection. However, the word is probably likely to last.

Most of the relevant texts are thought to date in some form from the last centuries BC in a Jewish milieu, at least in origin, although they undergo many changes, especially as we move into Christian times. They include the *Book of Jubilees*, *The Assumption of Moses*, and the various Enoch books as very early examples, but there are many others of whose ancestry we are not at all sure, and which are correspondingly difficult to date, since it is unclear from which stage which kind of text existed. Fabricius' early use of the Greek formulation *pseudepigrapha* in a Latinate form possibly also adds some confusion even in the word itself; a singular, 'pseudepigraphon', might be appropriate given the

---

[9] There is a clear, brief introduction to the history of the terms by James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 6–17.

[10] Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 183.

existence with a different and more specific meaning of 'epigraph' in English, but 'pseudepigraph' again seems to have established itself. As noted above, Sparks's *The Apocryphal Old Testament* contains a selection of works referred to elsewhere as pseudepigrapha, and his use of the alternative designation certainly does not imply Charles's Apocrypha proper.[11] The term pseudepigraph seems not to be commonly used of extra-canonical works on New Testament themes, however, where the word apocryphon/apocrypha has established itself since Fabricius' time, even though non-canonical Gospels and acts of the apostles and especially the very many oddly ascribed apocalypses are indeed often spuriously attributed, so that the designation would certainly fit. Given the literal meaning of a work ascribed to someone other than the real author (usually intended to lend greater authority to the work), the term might apply perfectly well to a number of canonical biblical books (as well as some of those in the deutero-canonical group), and this would also include the Gospels, perhaps especially those of Matthew and John.[12] Indeed,

---

[11] R. H. Charles's own major collection is divided into two volumes, the first containing his Apocrypha proper, the second, called *Pseudepigrapha*, overlapping largely with the more recent volume by Sparks and with those texts in James Charlesworth's even larger collection, which comes back to the term pseudepigrapha. These titles give a good indication of the terminological confusion, and many studies simply bracket the two, referring to 'apocrypha and pseudepigrapha', though not, happily, to 'Apocrypha, apocrypha and pseudepigrapha'. The main texts are R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, i: *Apocrypha*; ii: *Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913; repr. 1963); H. F. D. Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984); James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: Longman and Todd, 1983–5). Sparks (or OUP) probably based his title on the parallel volume of *New Testament Apocrypha* by M. R. James (see below, n. 11). See Sparks, *Apocryphal Old Testament*, p. xvii, for comments on the words. The pattern is as confused in other languages. E. Kautzsch in German matched Charles in his *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900) but more recently others have matched Sparks, as in the Spanish collection *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, ed. A. Diez Macho (Madrid: Editiones Christianidad, 1983) and, bridging the testaments, A. Schindler, *Apokryphen zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Zurich: Manesse-Bibliothek, 1988). Others follow Charlesworth, as in E. Hammerhaimb, Johannes Munck, et al., *De Gammeltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1953–76), or avoid the issue entirely: Paul Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (1928; repr. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1966). The last-named text begs a different question by including the *Life of Adam and Eve*, the Jewish origins of which are a cause of much discussion. See finally Wilfried Lechner-Schmidt, *Wortindex der lateinisch erhaltenen Pseudepigraphen zum Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Francke, 1990) and also Albert-Marie Denis, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament* (Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1987), as well as Charlesworth's survey (above, n. 9).

[12] Albert-Marie Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), p. xii, notes that the term 'est amphibiologique et d'ailleurs impropre, car plusieurs livres de la Bible canonique pourraient se le voir appliquer'. Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924; repr. 1975); the title has been retained in the revision by J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) and there were also early text collections by Constantin Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (1852; 2nd edn. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1876) and by B. Harris Cowper, *The Apocryphal Gospels* (3rd edn. London: Williams and Norgate,

a pamphlet by a one-time Franciscan, published in the 1920s, now only of socio-historical interest at best, bears the deliberately provocative title *The Forgery of the Old Testament* and dwells upon the supposed authorship of the Pentateuch by Moses, and on the lack of unity in Isaiah.[13]

As far as New Testament material goes, there is a further overlap with apocryphal material in the shape of (usually later) Christian legends or bodies of legends. The word *legend* (from the Latin for 'to be read' and famously linked by Martin Luther with the German word *lügend*, 'lying') has a very broad and often partisan range of meanings, but it is used (also) for Christian narrative expansions of biblical themes, its present usage being a chronological one, designating later, usually medieval writings. Thus in a case which will play a large part in the present study because it intersects at one point with the apocryphal lives of Adam, the legend of the Holy Rood, the story of the growing tree of the cross before Christ, is once again not a single text, but a fluid legend cycle with some more or less constant basic elements. Although based on a centrally Christian element, the cross itself, much of it has to do with Old Testament figures, such as Moses, David, or Solomon, so that it, too, might be designated a Christian-Latin Old Testament apocryphon. It can at least be seen as bridging the two Testaments with the physical tree of the cross as a concrete symbol of redemption.

The Holy Rood material is, it might be noted, quite distinct as a cycle from that associated with the cross *after* Christ, the so-called Invention of the Cross, which culminates with St Helena. Certainly, like many apocrypha/ pseudepigrapha, the Holy Rood legends are in the Middle Ages integrated into otherwise biblical narratives without clear indications that they are not

---

1870). See also the two volumes by Edgar Hennecke and revised by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung* (3rd edn. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959–64), the English translation edited by R. M. Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha* (1963–4; repr. London: SCM, 1973). See also Aurelio de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* (Madrid: Autores Christianos, 1956). The three-volume collection of apocryphal acts, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. Constantin Tischendorf, Richard Lipsius, and Maximiliam Bonnet (1891–1903; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1990), is instructive for the variety of versions, the index to vol. i listing for example a number of works grouped under the heading *Passio Pauli*, with additions like 'gnostica prolixiore', or 'breuiore'. Many of these texts are translated in Elliott, and also in older collections, like that in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library by Alexander Walker, *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1870). Constantin Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae* (1866; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966) contains the Greek *Life of Adam*, which was in his text ascribed pseudepigraphically to Moses, however, and Montague Rhodes James, *Apocrypha Anecdota* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893) also contains a text of the *Testament of Adam*, which is thus pseudepigraphic.

[13] Joseph McCabe, *The Forgery of the Old Testament* (Girard, Kan.: Haldeman-Julius, 1926). The series, called Little Blue Books (of which this is no. 1066), also contains his autobiographical *My Twelve Years in a Monastery* published in 1927, although numbered 439.

part of the Bible. More specifically New Testament legends include the life and indeed more interestingly the post-mortem experiences of Pilate, the story of the Vernicle, and others, many of which are attested early enough for them to be included, for example, in collections of apocrypha such as J. K. Elliott's revision of the well-known anthology by M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*. The earliest versions of the Rood legend are too late for collections like this. Only convention, then, seems to determine the nomenclature for what are, in a working definition only, usually prose works which may have dubious ascriptions, but which are linked with biblical-canonical writings by involving the same characters. Whether they are to be called apocrypha or pseudepigrapha or even legends is less important than other considerations, however. Questions of age and origin, of language of preservation, and of textual stability—indeed, of what constitutes a text in this context—are in most cases complex.

In spite of the Jewish origins assumed for most of the Old Testament apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, Hebrew or Aramaic versions of Old Testament pseudepigrapha are rarely extant, and indeed it is not often clear whether they even existed in a recognizable form, rather than as individual haggadic midrashim, that is, in originally exegetical expansive narratives on biblical episodes. Sometimes a fair case can be made (sometimes, indeed often, on philological grounds) for there actually having been a precursor in Greek or even Hebrew, but this is not always the case, even when it is claimed in the surviving transmitted text or its later tradition. Nor do even philological clues—the retention of Greek words in a Latin version, for example, or a word-play which functions only in Hebrew—necessarily tell us what the original was like, nor how full it was, nor give much idea of its date. The claim is made, for example, of the apocryphal narrative of Adam and Eve in a later fourteenth-century English rhymed version called the *Canticum de creatione* (vv. 1189–91) that it was translated from Hebrew into Latin, and then into English, but this hardly constitutes evidence, and it is indeed unlikely to be true. Further, even when a Greek text, or one in Armenian, Coptic, and so on, has survived, its manuscript transmission may well be very late. Finally, extant Hebrew texts—there is a post-Christian one of the Adam apocrypha, for example—often raise more questions than can comfortably be answered.[14] As we shall see with the *Life of Adam and Eve*, the overlap between the Old and New Testaments is an additional complexity.

At all events, Old and New Testament apocrypha and pseudepigrapha were frequently popular not only in early Christian times, but on into the Middle

---

[14] See Robert A. Kraft, 'The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity', in John C. Reeves (ed.), *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 55–86.

Ages to the time of the Reformation, whatever the Church might have thought officially. Sometimes they survived beyond that. The crucial factor, however, is that because all these texts were non-canonical, they were never officially standardized in any language or form in the way that the canonical books were fairly regularly examined with a view to establishing a standard text. They were, on the other hand, sometimes officially proscribed. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, a fourth-century collection of ecclesiastical laws including indications of the canon, contain a list of texts proscribed by the Church, and the *Gelasian Decree*, itself spuriously attributed to the fifth-century Pope Gelasius (and sometimes to other popes, notably Damasus I) but dated usually to the sixth century, not only gives a canon for the Bible, but lists and condemns a whole group of apocryphal writings. This important work is sometimes known by the title *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, acceptable and non-acceptable books, some clearly identifiable, others less so, and the long list of the latter includes, pertinently, something referred to as 'The Penitence of Adam', which is probably related to the works at the centre of this study.[15] The work referred to in the *Decretum* has been identified with various different Adambooks, extant and otherwise; it is not entirely clear what was meant, and we are unlikely ever to be certain, but it is clear that a book of Adam's penance had a long history. The penitential aspect is certainly there in the *Vita Adae et Evae* in the core story of Adam and Eve's attempt to regain paradise after the fall, a penance which sounds, in any case, far more like medieval penitential practice than, say, the ritual mikva, or perhaps earlier Jewish midrashim which hinge upon plays on river names.[16] A putative

---

[15] On the text of the *Decretum* see Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs*, pp. xi–xx, with useful comparative charts of such works. The *Decretum Gelasianum* is (in part) in *PL* 59, 157–61, and see J. Chapman, 'On the *Decretum Gelasianum De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*', *Revue bénédictine*, 30 (1913), 187–202 and 315–33. The standard edition is by Ernst von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912). See in general M. R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1920), pp. x–xiii. Although apocryphal writings in general were often condemned, the proscription was sometimes qualified. The *Admonitio generalis* of Charlemagne in 789 condemned in paragraph 78 apocryphal writings and those of uncertain authorship, insofar as they were expressly contrary to the Catholic faith: see P. D. King, *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Kendal: King, 1987), 218.

[16] There is a very full analysis of this central episode by Gary A. Anderson, 'The Penitence Narrative in the *Life of Adam and Eve*', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 63 (1993), 1–38 and Michael E. Stone, 'The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 44 (1993), 143–56. Both are reprinted in Gary A. Anderson, Michael Stone, and Johannes Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 3–42 and 43–56. Anderson's view is that the penitence section was part of the original (as evidenced by the Latin, Armenian, and Georgian traditions) and was truncated in the Greek *Life*. This is possible, and represents one answer to the still unresolved problem of the precise relationship between the Latin and the Greek versions. See on the penance as a Christian point in vernacular development my paper 'The Origins of Penance: Reflections of

third-century reference in Tertullian is far too vague to be conclusive, however, and another to a *Life of Adam* in the early ninth-century chronicle of the Byzantine George Synkellos is also hard to identify, although it does not sound much like the *Vita Adae et Evae*.[17] On the other hand, at the end of the Middle Ages, and certainly as late as the second half of the fifteenth century, an English chronicler called John Capgrave patently knew about it, though he was not especially clear on the details of the penance. He did know, though, that this was in a book 'whech is clepid *Þe Penauns of Adam*, but which was itself 'cleped *Apocriphum*, whech is to sey "whan þe mater is in doute" or ellis "whan men knowe not who mad þe book"'. But he still asserts the truth of the story.[18] It is not unusual in vernacular writings to come across what looks like evidence of a sketchy knowledge of the material, even after the *VAE* had become well established, and especially when its star was waning.

In spite of the varying papal ascriptions of the *Decretum* (which make it, in a sense, a pseudepigraph in its own right), that work seems itself to have had no official status, and although many of the works listed are either unidentified or known only in a single version, some were clearly widely known and widely used over a long period. New Testament apocrypha such as the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, or some of the apocryphal acts, and even some of the apocalypses, retained an influence throughout the Middle Ages and beyond. Purely Old Testament apocrypha other than the Septuagint exclusions are somewhat rarer. A recent study of the use of apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon writings refers, beside a number of New Testament apocrypha, effectively only to the Books of Enoch and to the Adambooks.[19] The latter enjoy,

Adamic Apocrypha and of the *Vita Adae* in Western Europe', *Annals of the Archive of Ferran Valls I Taberner's Library*, 9/10 (1991), 205–28. Also Friedrich Ohly, *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte: Vom Leben mit dem Schuld* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1976), 43–56, trans. Linda Archibald, *The Damned and the Elect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 43–61. There is a rather unconvincing quasi-feminist reading of the devil's second temptation in Pamela Norris, *The Story of Eve* (London: Picador, 1998), 100–7, which considers that the episode links Eve (sexually) with the devil. The devil is more concerned to have Adam linked with him, and stresses their similarity.

[17]   The last part of Tertullian's *De paenitentia* (12: 9, *PL* 1, 1360), written around 200, has been thought of as alluding to a text involving Adam's penance, but this is far from convincing: see P. de Labriolle in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes*, 1 (1911), 127–8. *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, trans. William Adler and Paul Tuffin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 6. Synkellos is interested in, say, the number of days spent in paradise, but there is no sign of a penance scene. He refers to what is clearly the *Book of Jubilees* as a separate text, however.

[18]   *John Capgrave's Abbreuiacion of Cronicles*, ed. Peter J. Lucas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983 = EETS os 285), 12. The work is discussed in Chapter 3, below.

[19]   Kathryn Powell and Donald Scragg (eds.), *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003). See the important summary by Joyce Hill, 'The Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England: The Challenge of Changing Distinctions', 165–8.

however, a unique position in that Adam's story is of primary importance to Christianity and most of them are, so to speak, specifically Christian Old Testament apocrypha. Why the books describing details of the life of Adam should be so widely and enduringly popular is not hard to guess. There is no need to speculate upon any conscious or unconscious resistance to the canonical writings, when the answer is simply that the biblical account of Adam and Eve is patently too short, and people wanted to know, in crude terms, what happened next. As the relentless questioner puts it in the six-teenth-century *Monarche ('Ane dialog betwix Experience and ane Courteour, off the miserabyll estait of the World')* by the Scots writer Sir David Lyndesay (Lindsay) of the Mount: 'Quhat kynd of lyfe | Led Adam, with his lustye wyfe | Efter thare bailfull banesyng?' The answer, predictably enough, is that it was one of permanent lamentation.

Since the Bible itself always enjoyed the status of a sacred work, efforts were made at various times to settle upon and standardize its constitutive texts, especially in the ancient languages, the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New in Greek, but also the Old Testament in Greek and both Testaments in Latin translations: the Septuagint, Jerome's Vulgate, Alcuin's revisions in the early Middle Ages, the work of Lorenzo Valla, Erasmus, Melanchthon, and Luther in the Renaissance and Reformation, the Clementine and more recent versions of the Vulgate, as well as the recent reconstructions of the pre-Jerome *Vetus Latina/ Itala* versions. This treatment of the canonical Scriptures is extremely important, and it throws into stark relief how much more complex is the issue of what constitutes an apocryphal text at any period, since these works have largely *not* benefited from the status of canonicity in any way, so that no one ever bothered to standardize them. The study of the precise nature of these works, especially from the nineteenth century onwards, has never been on a particularly clear footing, and the presentation of any text of these works is likely to pose as many questions as it answers, and certainly will require a certain pragmatism of approach.

While it makes sense, if considering the whole range of these works, to restrict the area of study to the early period of Christianity,[20] this need not be the case with the study of a single work or group of related works. To be sure, even a consideration of the whole spectrum of apocryphal Adambooks requires a chronological distinction, and the works by de Jonge and Tromp and especially by Michael Stone and Gary Anderson take this on board.[21]

---

[20] As does D. S. Russell, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: SCM, 1987) or indeed Charles, *Religious Development*. Russell does examine the Adambooks, 13–23.

[21] The most useful reference tool is Michael Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), and see also Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997). Both works demonstrate how complex the whole range of Adambooks is. There is a great amount

If, however, the focus is, as here, on one aspect of that tradition, the Adamic apocrypha represented first by the Greek but, as far as western Europe goes, especially the Latin lives of the protoplasts, then there is no justification for looking only at versions in those two languages. Indeed, the whole point of what is from the beginnings a dynamic, even a protean, narrative tradition is that it *does* continue in a process of adaptation, and varies all the time, so that establishing or defining what the text is at almost any given stage will be difficult whether we are looking at the Greek, Latin, or vernacular versions.

The present study is based, then, on the apocryphal stories of Adam and Eve after the fall as represented in the *Vita Adae et Evae*. The immediate forerunner of this work seems to have been the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, which may in its turn have had some Hebrew origins; there may have been a series of isolated midrashim, rabbinic stories, but although the precise origin has been and will continue to be debated, an actual Hebrew original text is very unlikely. Furthermore, not only is there no extant single Hebrew or Aramaic original—it is now generally assumed that there never was one[22]— but no single Greek or Latin text either. What we do have are variable Greek texts (a far later Slavonic version may also point to a different Greek tradition), and Latin texts, which are clearly related, though also in themselves far from uniform. The manuscript tradition of both is relatively late. The twenty-six manuscripts of the Greek *Life* edited by Tromp include one from the eleventh century and the rest much later; the many more manuscripts of the Latin text do not take us back much beyond the tenth and again many are

---

of extremely important material in the collection edited by Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*. See also in general the extremely important work by Hans Martin von Erffa, *Ikonologie der Genesis* (Stuttgart, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989–95), i. 255–316, with a full bibliography on the apocrypha and their vernacular parallels. See my review in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 42 (1991), 289–97 and 47 (1996), 560–3. Details of all the related texts may be found in these secondary studies, but there is a very useful working tool in Gary A. Anderson and Michael E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994, revised considerably in a second edition in 1999). The Armenian, Georgian, Greek, Latin, and Slavonic texts are all available in English (with the *VAE* also in Latin) on the website maintained by Michael Stone and Gary A. Anderson devoted to the subject: <www3.iath.virginia.edu/anderson/>. There is a useful short survey in Paul Schwarz, *Die neue Eva* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1973), 44–59 (which also takes account of vernacular versions in an integrated manner).

[22] See various papers in the collection by Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, especially the paper by Gary Anderson on 'The Original Form of the *Life of Adam and Eve*: A Proposal', 215–31, and that by Marinus de Jonge, 'The Christian Origin of the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*', 347–63. The discussion will doubtless continue. See also Michael D. Eldridge, *Dying Adam with his Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 233–64 and Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) on the Greek *Life*.

much later, often contemporary with or later than vernacular versions or adaptations.

There are a great many Adambooks beside the Greek and Latin texts, of course, which provide for the lives of Adam and Eve more detail than is found in Genesis, and the attempt to represent as a family tree the interrelationships of these Adambooks would probably be less clear than the biblical genealogies of Adam's progeny. The post-biblical development of the rather spare narrative of Adam and Eve in Genesis, itself a rather awkward, internally conflicting, and slightly late part of the biblical book as such, takes in early midrashic embellishments, a whole range of Judaic and early Christian apocrypha/pseudepigrapha, and later on individual legends or sequences of legends, as well as Jewish and Christian exegesis according to the literal sense. As examples of all these kinds of text we may cite the great rabbinic midrash on Genesis, *Bereshith Rabbah* (which comments that the serpent in Paradise was like a camel);[23] Genesis apocrypha such as the *Book of Jubilees*, the work known as the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo, or the many Adambooks which include our Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*; individual legends concerned for example with Adam's place of burial and, as a longer sequence, the tale of the cross, the wood for which grows from seeds planted in his grave. Exegesis ranges from, say, the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan and the writings of Philo of Alexandria to works such as Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram*, and later in the Middle Ages Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, with an enormous amount in between. Other sources for extra information about Adam and Eve are early chronicles in prose and verse, and indeed iconography. Some works are hard to classify, such as the late rabbinic tract *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (which is certainly not by Rabbi Eliezer), or the Coptic *Discourse on Abbatôn*, a text difficult to fit in anywhere.

There is a large and particularly complex tradition of the Adambooks in the broadest sense, the standard examination and presentation of which is that by Michael Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, from 1992. Stone distinguishes between what he terms primary (Jewish) and secondary Adambooks, this distinction being largely chronological; in the first category he notes related but different extant texts, specifically the Greek *Life*, the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, Slavonic, Armenian, and Georgian Adambooks, and some Coptic fragments. The precise relationship between them is difficult to plot. The Slavonic version has a distinctive motif, that of the cheirograph, but it and the Greek text have only truncated versions (or none at all) of the penance undertaken by Adam and Eve after the expulsion, a scene which *is*

---

[23] *Midrash Rabbah*, trans. Harry Freedman and Maurice Simon (London: Soncino, 1939; 2nd edn. 1951), i. 149 (= *Bereshith Rabbah* 19. 1).

present in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin traditions.[24] In his very broad secondary grouping Stone includes works of various kinds: later Adamic narratives which may or may not have a relationship with elements in his primary versions, other works to do with Adam, and finally those which clearly derive directly from known texts, principally from the *VAE*. In this general secondary category, then, he places unconnected Greek texts, the Syriac work known as the *Cave of Treasures*, which has Arabic (*Kitab al Magall*) and Ethiopic (*Qâlementos*, plus the separate but parallel *Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan*) relatives, later Armenian, Georgian, Slavonic, and Coptic (including the *Discourse on Abbatôn* ascribed, as usual probably spuriously, to Timothy of Alexandria) works to do with Adam, the medieval Hebrew *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, an Irish text (which does derive from Latin), and other adaptations in the Middle Ages of the *VAE*.[25] Some of the more remote examples from the broad later group (even in Ethiopic and Hebrew) do contain the penance motif which is central to the primary section, even though it is not in the earliest known forms of the Greek text. Two further important aspects of Stone's indispensable study need to be noted. He discusses early references and testimonies to Adamic works which cannot always be identified; and he devotes a chapter (written together with G. Bohak) to a very thorough consideration of the arguments adduced for a Semitic original. The point is of course a crucial one. If—as was once supposed—there was a coherent Semitic original, then there was a Jewish origin for the Greek *Life* and hence the *Vita* as such; if the earliest (it begs too many questions to use the word original) language was Greek, as is now assumed, then the origins are Christian. Arguments both ways have been vigorous, but one fact needs to be remembered: no extended Hebrew text actually exists, and the longest Hebrew example we have, the *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, is late and probably depends upon a Christian version.[26] Arguments have been made, however, for a Hebrew original on linguistic grounds, and Stone and Bohak analyse all the ingenious (it is their word, and it is a telling one) attempts to prove the existence of a Hebrew original; although they

---

[24] Gary A. Anderson links these three traditions in his perceptive study 'Adam and Eve in the "Life of Adam and Eve"', in Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 7–32. He gives details of editions and translations of these versions which are, however, less relevant to a study of texts in most of the western vernaculars. The Coptic texts (on which see Stone, *History*, 34–41) are too fragmentary to play a proper role, but presumably indicate a lost larger text.

[25] Details of these texts may be found in Stone, *History*. The dates suggested for many of these texts vary considerably. For a recent study of one important strand, see Alexander Toepel, *Die Adam- und Seth-Legenden im syrischen Buch der Schatzhöhle* (Louvain: Peeters, 2006).

[26] See Stone, *History*, 117. The intrinsically interesting text is translated by Gerald Friedlander, *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, 1916).

remain cautious, they find none of them compelling. The most likely possibility, then, is that the earliest form of the work as such was composed in Greek, though of course there could have been older (Hebrew or Aramaic) elements incorporated into it, albeit probably not the penance scene. The intricacy of the whole question of Adamic apocrypha is illustrated in general terms by the appearance of some elements in remote texts. The story of the penance is in the *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*. Lucifer's refusal to bow down to Adam is found in Armenian, in the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, in the Koran, and in some Russian manuscripts of a quite different apocryphon, *III Baruch*.[27] Details of Seth's preservation of the whole story in two pillars, one of marble and one of brick or clay (to withstand flood and fire respectively), are found already in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*.

Of course, the fact that such individual motifs appear elsewhere might point to independent sources. A legend of the naming of Adam from the four cardinal points, often found together with the *VAE*, appears in the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (*II Enoch*) and in other sources, and another about his creation from eight parts also linked with the Latin apocryphon is also widespread independently.[28] The motif of the river which stands still in order to assist Adam to pray for forgiveness, for example, has an interesting and ramified history both before and after the *VAE*, in which it is prominent, and is probably linked with the same motif at Christ's baptism, found in New Testament apocrypha like the *Protevangelium Jacobi*.[29] The promise made to

---

[27] See Harry E. Gaylord, 'How Satanael Lost his -el', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 33 (1982), 304–9 for a text of the *Baruch* apocryphon and comments on the tradition of Lucifer's fall.

[28] See the texts of the Slavonic *Enoch* in *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, trans. W. E. Morfill, ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), 35–41; see also Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 449–50, and Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, i. 150–3. Studies include Max Förster, 'Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung: Ein lateinisches Fragment des sogenannten slawischen Henoch', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 11 (1907–8), 477–529; R. Köhler, 'Adams Erschaffung aus acht Teilen', *Germania*, 7 (1862), 350–3; and more recently J. M. Evans, 'Microcosmic Adam', *Medium Aevum*, 35 (1966), 38–42; J. E. Cross, 'The Literate Anglo-Saxon: On Sources and Disseminations', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 58 (1972), 67–100, esp. 72–4; Hildegard L. C. Tristram, 'Der *homo octipartitus* in der irischen und altenglischen Literatur', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 34 (1975), 119–53; Brian Murdoch, 'The Old Frisian *Adam octipartitus*', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 40 (1994), 131–8. These all give an idea of how widely known the motifs were. The fall of angels is too familiar and too ramified to require separate documentation.

[29] See my 'The River that Stopped Flowing: Folklore and Biblical Typology in the Apocryphal Lives of Adam and Eve', *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 37 (1973), 37–51. The motif is probably linked with Christ's baptism, and indeed iconographical representations of Adam surrounded by praying fish may be matched by similar illustrations of the baptism: see that in a late twelfth-century Psalter in Oxford (Bodleian Library Gough liturg. 2; S.C. 18343, fo. 17) in *Scenes from the Life of Christ in English Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1951), pl. 9, discussed below, Chapter 6.

Seth in some versions of the *VAE* of a redemption after a fixed time first appears in the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (*Acta Pilati*).

Since there is no single text of the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, nor of the *Vita Adae et Evae*, to speak of either as *an* apocryphon even at this early stage is inaccurate, and each represents in itself a changing, dynamic tradition; Michael Stone has used the useful word polymorphy. The recent edition of the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* shows how very varied even that text is,[30] and although the Latin tradition presumably derived at some stage from a Greek original, the relationship between the two is difficult in many respects. It is probably safer, if far more cumbersome, to say that *they* derived from various Greek *originals*. M. D. Johnson notes in the introduction to the translation in Charlesworth's collection that 'three episodes in the Latin have no direct counterpart in most manuscripts of the Greek . . . The Greek text, moreover, shows clear signs of composite sources.' In her introduction to the text in the Sparks collection, Molly Whittaker, who concentrates on the Latin text, notes how 'medieval copyists . . . had no scruples about altering or expanding the phraseology of their original whenever they felt so inclined, or about incorporating odd scraps of additional material that came their way whenever it seemed appropriate'.[31] The Latin tradition alone becomes dynamic, varying in detail, absorbing other legends, and adding small elements, and its context, too, is a separate issue, the works with which it is found associated in different manuscripts.

At which point may we say of any of the Adambooks, then: this is the text? Text-critical practice would presumably demand the establishing of a single text based on as early a version as possible, with a consideration of variant readings to achieve a 'correct' reading in each case. The various redactions have additions and omissions, and since there are vernacular versions which pre-date most, if not all, of the extant Latin versions, we may be able to identify earlier readings through them. We may also ask about the absolute value in this case of trying to establish a single original text at all. To illustrate the problem: in most versions of the *VAE*, Adam sees at one point a chariot,

---

[30] Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); see my review in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 58 (2007), 173–6. There is an earlier edition by Daniel A. Bertrand, *La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1987). Tromp discusses the history of scholarship (especially the work of J. L. Sharpe and M. Nagel on the manuscripts). See also John R. Levison, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) on the separate versions. The first edition (based on four manuscripts) was by Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae*, 1–23 (with the title *Apocalypsis Mosis*). The Italian scholar of apocrypha Antonio Maria Ceriani published another text a year or two later.

[31] Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 251; Sparks, *Apocryphal Old Testament*, 143.

'currum', with fiery wheels. Most of the English manuscripts, however, have instead the word 'choros', angelic choirs, and this passes into the vernacular as well. The former reading is clearly the 'correct' one if a certain text-editorial procedure is being followed; but the fact remains that a not inconsiderable Latin and vernacular tradition has the variation. The modern establishing of a single text is at best a working convenience; when and in what context such a thing ever really existed is a different matter.[32]

A further single illustration from the tradition of the *VAE* can make the difficulties especially clear. Cain, at birth, runs immediately and fetches 'herbam', meaning a reed, a blade of grass, or an ear of corn, and gives it to his mother. We are then told that he is called Cain: 'et peperit filium et erat lucidus. et continuo infans exsurgens cucurrit et manibus suis tulit herbam et dedit matri suae. et vocatum est nomen eius Cain' (21: 3). Although in the first clause 'lucidus' sometimes appears as 'lugidus' (shining/miserable, and in one English manuscript we have the interestingly odd variation 'animalibus suis', with his animals rather than in his hands), the fetching of the 'herbam' is found in virtually all manuscripts of the *VAE*. The idea is not in the Greek *Life* at all, but has to be accepted as a fixed reading for the Latin work, in which it is nevertheless barely comprehensible. The passage has been noted particularly in the past as one of considerable significance to the whole tradition, because it has been interpreted as incorporating a word-play on the name origin of Cain in Hebrew. It might therefore stand as evidence for a Hebrew motif (albeit it cannot justify the assumption of a postulated Hebrew Adambook as such, and it is absent not only from the Greek, but also from the *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*). It is present in the Armenian and Georgian versions. The motif may depend—and even this requires a certain amount of assumption—upon an etymology of Cain as related to 'reed' (*qneh*) rather than *qanithi* 'I have gotten' (which is the basis for the etymology in Genesis 4), or indeed, as found later, with *qinah*, 'dirge'. The Midrash *Bereshith Rabbah* refers to a reed, which is also the weapon used to kill Abel later.[33]

We are unsure of the original significance, then. What is more, the motif changes in European vernacular adaptations of the Latin, almost always with the loss of even an implicit link to Cain's name, so that the incident as such takes centre stage. Where it is retained at all in vernacular adaptations, the

---

[32] See Kraft, *Editionsphilologie*, for an overview and for some interesting insights (as on the hagiological approach to text editing, the backward search for a 'pure' text), with reference largely to modern editions; with a manuscript tradition, especially, as here, a large one, the problems are multiplied.

[33] See von Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 353–5, referring to Freedman's *Bereshith Rabbah*, i. 181 and 187. On the whole question of the Cain etymology, see John Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 133.

closest idea is that Cain brings his mother herbs for healing the pain of childbirth (in German versions), or flowers (in the English *Canticum*); in the Irish *Saltair na Rann* it becomes an indication that Cain would later cut the grass for his parents. Indeed, the latter idea is not too far in some respects, at least, from the Armenian and Georgian versions, where Cain falls or leaps from the hands of the (angelic) midwife and plucks up the grass from near the hut. In these, however, there follows an interpretative development of Cain's actions, namely that he is a destroyer; in the Georgian *Life of Adam*, the midwife is in addition delighted not to have to hold the infant Cain.[34] The naming point, far from explicit already in the Latin, is easily lost, and the whole incident is seen simply as miraculous, with emphasis on Cain's skills, rather than what is actually fetched, which is a detail sometimes omitted when the rest of the incident is maintained (as from the French chronicle by Jean d'Outremeuse). Sometimes the entire incident is missing. Hans Folz, translating an unknown Latin version into German prose in 1479, merely refers to Cain as 'nearly grown-up' when he is born, has no reference to the naming, and it is Adam who now fetches sweet herbs for Eve to eat; when Folz reworked the story into a poem for publication, he left out even what had remained of the passage.[35] It is possible that by the late fifteenth century, even Latin versions were already beginning to drop or change a motif which was never clear. To be sure, in such quasi-etymological naming passages it is, even with the oldest canonical texts, sometimes difficult to determine philologically precisely what is going on. One celebrated case is the etymological naming of the twin sons of Tamar in Genesis 38: 29–30. Where Perez, who makes a *breach* for himself, depends upon a plausible etymology in Hebrew (for which there is however no close equivalent in Aramaic), the name of the other twin, Zerah, whose wrist is bound with a red thread, can be linked with the *Aramaic* word for 'scarlet', which has however no etymological equivalent in Hebrew, where the name would mean 'rising, shining forth'. The name has, to be sure, also been linked with a Hebrew word meaning 'native', but this does not account for the emphasis on the red thread, which sounds like an aetiological etymology. In what language, then, was the original story?[36]

Scholarly investigation of the manuscripts of the Latin text alone (recent research has pointed to around a hundred) over more than a century has

---

[34] Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, 18. Oliver F. Emerson, 'Legends of Cain, Especially in Old and Middle English', *PMLA* 21 (1906), 831–929, takes note of the *VAE* and of material which he spells as 'apochryphal' throughout, but does not seem particularly familiar with it.

[35] Full details of the vernacular versions referred to here are given in the relevant chapters in which the works are discussed.

[36] See S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis* (London: Methuen, 1904), 331. I am indebted to my colleague Oron Yoffe for a detailed explanation of the Hebrew and Aramaic etymologies.

reinforced the point that there is no definitive text of the *VAE*, and that to refer to it as a *single* text at all is a large (if necessary) simplification. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there has been no full edition since 1878, when Wilhelm Meyer printed what is still, *faute de mieux*, the standard text, even if this has led inevitably to interpretative problems,[37] although Jean-Pierre Pettorelli's work towards a new overview is changing the picture radically. Even Meyer divided the manuscripts known to him into separate classes, and this has been refined considerably by Pettorelli. Impossible as it may be to determine an original text even of the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, however, it is nonetheless expedient to epitomize the narrative in its fullest form. Although different versions may vary in structure and indeed selection, the basic narrative is as follows:

Adam and Eve, missing the delights and benefits of paradise and complaining of hunger and cold after the expulsion, build a hut and spend a long time looking for food, but can find only the food eaten by the beasts. Eve asks Adam to kill her, but Adam refuses to lay hands on his own flesh and blood, suggesting instead (and then instructing Eve, who enquires about its nature) a penance by fasting, whilst standing on stones in the river up to their necks for a set (though variable) number of days. The hope is that God will then forgive them, and perhaps restore to them the benefits of paradise. Adam will stand in the Jordan (the river of Christ's baptism rather than one of the four that flowed out of Eden) and Eve in the Tigris (which is one of the four). Their hair flows on the water, they are not to speak, but must pray, and in some versions Adam's voice becomes hoarse. The Jordan (or both rivers) remains static, as may all the animals and birds as well, to assist the penance. Sometimes angels also come to converse with Adam for a number of days. Lucifer or the devil is perturbed or angered by this penance, disguises himself as an angel, and tells Eve that the choirs of angels have begged God to forgive the protoplasts. Eve is tempted away from her penance, and thus succumbs to the devil, fainting as she leaves the river, green as grass

---

[37] Details of the various printed texts are as follows: Wilhelm Meyer, '*Vita Adae et Evae*', in the *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.-philol. Kl. 14/iii (1879), 185–250; Carl Horstmann, 'Nachträge zu den Legenden 10: Vita prothoplausti Ade', *Archiv*, 79 (1887), 459–70; Lajos Katona, *A Teleki-codex legendái, Magyar tudományos akademia*, köt. 18, sz. 10 (Budapest: Hungarian Academy, 1904) (= the incunabulum text, '*Vita Adae et Evae*', 70–80/734–44); J. Mozley, 'The *Vita Adae*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 30 (1929), 121–47; S. Harrison Thomson, 'A Fifth Recension of the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*', *Studi medievali*, NS 6 (1933), 271–8; Gerhard Eis, *Beiträge zur mittelhochdeutschen Legende und Mystik* (Berlin: Akademie, 1935), 214–55; J. P. Pettorelli, 'Vie latine d'Adam et d'Ève', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 57 (1999), 5–52 (this text will normally be referred to as 'Vie latine'). See also Pettorelli's other studies towards a new edition: 'La Vie latine d'Adam et Eve', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 56 (1998), 5–104; 'Vie latine d'Adam et Ève: familles rhénanes I', ' . . . II', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 59 (2001), 1–73, and 60 (2002), 171–233; 'Deux témoins latins singuliers de la Vie d'Adam et Ève', *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 33 (2002), 1–27; 'Essai sur la structure primitive de la Vie d'Adam et Ève', *Apocrypha*, 14 (2003), 237–56. See finally Stone, *History*, 25–30.

from the cold.[38] The devil then takes her to Adam, who recognizes the devil in spite of the disguise, plunging Eve into despair yet again.

Challenged by Eve and by Adam, Lucifer tells Adam the story of his own rebellion against God and his own fall, claiming that his case and Adam's are similar, and that his fall was Adam's fault. He refers partly to his own desire for power (linked with the death-song of the King of Babylon in Isaiah 14), but mainly to his refusal to worship the image of God in Adam when he was commanded to do so by Michael. Hence he became Adam's enemy out of envy. Adam asks God to get rid of the devil, the devil leaves, and Adam completes his penance.

Adam and Eve separate—Eve is guilt-ridden and desires death again, but instead goes away to the west (to the setting of the sun), although she is now pregnant. When the birth pains start, Eve calls upon the sun, moon, and stars for help in informing Adam, who is sometimes afraid that the devil has attacked her again. Adam's prayers do lead God to provide angelic assistance, twelve angels (and two Virtues) acting as midwives at the first birth, with help especially from the archangel Michael. Cain, who is sometimes shining at birth, at once runs and fetches grass or herbs or a reed for his mother. In some versions Eve asks Adam to kill the child before it kills them, as it has nearly killed her, but he points out that it is their flesh and blood. Michael in some versions shows her how to feed the child, and also teaches Adam about agriculture. The story of Cain and Abel is told briefly; Eve is afraid that one will kill the other—sometimes she dreams of Cain covered with or even drinking Abel's blood—and Adam separates them, to no avail. Adam has a vision of the future of man. Cain kills Abel, but Adam and Eve have another child when Seth is born, and thereafter many other children, usually thirty (more) sons and thirty daughters. The non-biblical names of Cain and Abel's sisters (Calmana and Delbora) are sometimes mentioned, though they are not part of the *VAE* tradition.[39] Adam recounts to Seth how he had been taken up into heaven and then returned by Michael, and goes on (in some versions only) to report an apocalyptic vision of the future.

After 930 years, Adam realizes he is dying and, gathering all his by now very numerous children, tells them about the fall and the seventy pains inflicted upon him. Adam then sends Seth together with Eve (who expresses the desire to take on some of Adam's pains) to paradise to try to obtain the oil of mercy. Seth is attacked by the serpent on the way, but Eve confronts him, and Seth repels him. Seth is (in some versions) given as the oil of mercy the promise of a redemption by Christ after a set time (usually 5,500 years, but also variable, sometimes 5,199, expressed as '5,200 less one'; this passage presumably originates from the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*),[40]

---

[38] Attention is sometimes paid to this image, but it is, while slightly unusual, not in fact particularly striking or problematic. J. R. C. Cousland has noted parallels in classical literature: '"Her Flesh was as Grass": *Vita Adam et Evae* 10, 1', *Biblica*, 81 (2000), 507–10.

[39] Rabbinic writings provide alternative names for Cain and Abel's sisters, of course, although in the west these are usually Calmana and Delbora, as in Peter Comestor's hugely influential *Historia scholastica* (*PL* 198, 1076), for example. Sometimes Delbora is Seth's wife.

[40] The first Christian version of Seth's journey is found in this part of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Esther C. Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: Chicago University

and he obtains four herbs or spices, and in other versions also seeds or twigs to plant with the dead Adam. In some versions Seth accidentally drops the twigs into the Jordan, but is able to retrieve them after confessing to Adam what has happened. These twigs, eventually planted in the grave at Adam's head, grow into the wood of the cross, of course, and the legend of the origins of the Rood is sketched in to greater or lesser extents in different versions. The death of Adam and his burial follows, with Michael and Uriel bringing three shrouds (for Adam, Abel, and presumably Eve). Death and what to do after death is another novelty in the new world, and the question of what happens to Adam's soul is also raised (and it is sometimes explained in detail where the angels—at God's behest—take it for safe keeping until the Redemption). It may be taken to paradise, placed in limbo, or placed in some (usually upper) region of hell. There is a recapitulation of the fall itself in detail by Eve, who is told that she will not survive Adam for long. She also prophesies the destruction of the world by fire and water. Eve dies after six days (in most versions), after which Seth records, as she had asked, the whole story on tablets of clay and stone respectively (to withstand the fire and water); he places these in two *stelae* for safe keeping and the instruction of future generations, having used a special written language created for this purpose and with his hand guided by an angel. Some versions take the story further down to the reading of the tablets by Solomon (again with angelic or archangelic assistance), who names the letters *achiliacae*, a word the form of which varies very considerably, and for which different interpretations are offered in the text itself, ranging from 'without lips' to 'without books'.[41]

This all-purpose epitome does not, as indicated, reflect any individual version, but tries to cover most of them, so that not all elements appear in all versions (some indeed are mutually exclusive), and as is already apparent there are considerable differences between versions, especially towards the end. Further different motifs appear, of course, in Adambooks outside the Latin tradition—thus only the Slavonic group includes the notion of the pact with the devil in the written form of the cheirograph.[42] Some elements, on the other hand, are exclusive to the Latin tradition, such as the vision by Adam of the future, and Seth's preservation of the story of the fall to withstand fire and

Press, 1962) discusses this on 32, and in detail in the whole of her second chapter; she also notes the derivation of the notion of an oil of mercy from a play on the Greek words *elaion* (oil) and *eleos* (mercy). For the Nicodemus text (in the *decensus* portion of the work) see Elliott, *New Testament Apocrypha*, 186–7 (section 3 (19). 1).

[41] This final section, an addition to *VAE* 51, is seen by M. D. Johnson in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 294, as an appendix, a late and separate tradition, noting that it occurs in manuscripts of Meyer's class II, in Mozley's manuscripts, and in English and German versions. Whether there is a justification for separating it off in this way, since it does occur in such a high number of places, is highly debatable.

[42] See the full study of the cheirograph tradition by Michael E. Stone, *Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2002).

water respectively. The additional Adamic legends referred to already, and which are often found independently as well—that of the naming of Adam from the initial letters of the four cardinal points in Greek, his creation from eight parts, and his place of burial or indeed creation (often Hebron in both cases)[43]—may be found at the beginning, at the end, or occasionally integrated into Latin texts, but they are so regularly associated with what has been taken as the basic text that it could be argued that they are in fact part of the apocryphon. The biblical narrative of Genesis 1–3, too, sometimes precedes this material, and the story of Cain and Abel from Genesis 4 can be interpolated as well.

One important set of interpolations requires special consideration. The *VAE*, which concludes in many versions with the quest of Seth and Eve to paradise for the oil of mercy, also absorbs to a greater or lesser extent a different narrative cycle: the so-called Holy Rood legends, the story of the cross before Christ. After the eleventh or twelfth century these legends provide a narrative sequence of the history of the cross as it grows from seeds which are given to Seth when he visits paradise just before the death of his father, and which are buried with Adam, usually in his mouth. In the Holy Rood legends Seth (who travels alone rather than with Eve) is still, as in the *VAE*, allowed to see into paradise, and not only is he given a promise of the redemption, but sometimes he is shown the Christ-child or even a *pietà* in one of the trees of paradise before he is given the seeds or twigs that will grow into the cross.[44] In the ongoing legend of the Rood as such, the tree which grows on Adam's grave is tended by Moses and David (who writes the Psalter beneath it), Solomon fails to incorporate it into his temple, it is used as a bridge, thrown away, and Maximilla becomes the first martyr when she sits on the wood, her clothes catch fire, and she calls anachronistically but prophetically upon Christ. For this she is martyred for invoking an as yet unknown

[43]　There is overlap again with the Holy Rood narrative here: see for example Georges Duriez, *La Théologie dans le drame religieux en allemagne au moyen âge* (Paris: Giard/Tallandier, 1914), 117–18.

[44]　There are plenty of variations even on these legends. The *Bible en françois* of Roger d'Argenteuil, a thirteenth-century narrative text with an amount of non-biblical material, translated into English in the fifteenth century, has the story of how Adam and Eve themselves brought a branch of the apple tree out of paradise, which grew into a tree with leaves bearing a red cross. That same text also has later parts of the known Holy Rood legends: *The ME Prose Translation of Roger d'Argenteuil's Bible en françois*, ed. Phyllis Moe (Heidelberg: Winter, 1977), 46 and 61–2. Even in a major vernacular version of the *VAE* itself, the German poem by Lutwin discussed in detail below, Chapter 4, Seth journeys to paradise twice, the second time on his own, and gets both seeds and a branch from the tree of knowledge, together with the half-eaten apple of the original fall.

deity. Holy Rood narratives as such tend to end at this point, being concerned with the history of the cross before Christ.[45] This is known in its basic form as the *Legende* (also as *Post peccatum Adae*),[46] and the most convenient version for this text is that by Wilhelm Meyer, the first editor of the *VAE*—appropriately enough, given the connection between the two sets of narratives. Esther C. Quinn provided a good introduction to the overlap of the two cycles, at the quest of Seth to paradise to obtain the oil of mercy.[47] A further and different sequence of legends—referred to as the Invention of the Holy Cross—is also widespread in the Middle Ages about the story of the cross *after* Christ, associated with its discovery by St Helena. The Holy Rood material as such is often hard to separate from the *VAE* because the journey of Seth and Eve is the ending of that work, while the same journey (though with Seth alone and with variations in detail) is the starting point of the Holy Rood story legends. These legends seem to have appeared too late to have acquired the designation of apocrypha.

---

[45] Additional smaller legends attach themselves to the narrative here, however, such as that of the smith who refuses to make the nails for the crucifixion, and whose hands are miraculously made to appear leprous (his wife eventually makes the nails). The build-up of narrative is incremental.

[46] Wilhelm Meyer, 'Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christi', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.-philol. Kl. 16/ii (1882), 101–66; J. R. Mozley, 'A New Text of the Story of the Cross', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 31 (1930), 113–27. See also Betty Hill, 'The Fifteenth-Century Prose Legend of the Cross before Christ', *Medium Aevum*, 34 (1965), 203–22, and Mayumi Taguchi, 'The Legend of the Cross before Christ: Another Prose Treatment in English and Anglo-Norman', *Poetica*, 45 (1996), 16–61 (I am indebted to Mayumi Taguchi for information and a copy of this study). The main English texts are in Richard Morris, *Legends of the Holy Rood* (London, 1881 = EETS os 46) and Arthur S. Napier, *History of the Holy Rood Tree* (London, 1894 = EETS os 103). See also von Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 400–13.

[47] See Quinn, *Quest of Seth*; in her first two chapters she discusses the origins of the quest narrative, its appearance in the *Vita Adae* and the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and then the development of the Holy Rood legend as such. See also Andrew Robert Miller, 'German and Dutch Versions of the Legend of the Wood of the Cross before Christ' (D.Phil. diss., Oxford, 1992); regrettably this remains unpublished, but there is a substantial introduction in his 'Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen der Kreuzholzlegende "Post peccatum Ade"', *Vestigia Bibliae*, 24/4 (2002/3), 289–342 (= the papers of a Trier conference in 2000, *Metamorphosen der Bibel*, ed. Ralph Plate and Andrea Rapp). See also the recent study by Barbara Baert, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), esp. 289–33. The first full study was that by Adolfo Mussafia, 'Sulla leggenda del legno della croce', *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Cl. 63 (1869), 165–216 (with a good survey of examples across European literature). The whole legend complex, the history of which is bound up with, but eventually separated from, the *VAE*, aroused considerable interest in the late nineteenth century: see for example Sabine Baring-Gould's appropriately titled *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages* (London: Rivingtons, new edn. 1888), 341–85. Baring-Gould also contributed a preface to the attractive bibliophile volume *The Legendary History of the Cross*, by John Ashton (London: Fisher-Unwin, 1887).

Looking at the material as a coherent whole, the *Vita Adae et Evae* is a Christian apocryphon, whatever (minor) Hebrew elements might have contributed towards it at some early stage. The concept of penance is central, and penance is here provided with an aetiology. The role of the devil is interesting, too: at one level the second temptation of Eve may provide clearer grounds for blaming her more exclusively (she breaks the rules but Adam on this occasion does not); at another, the incident of the new temptation with the devil taking the form of an angel provides an object lesson to demonstrate that the devil—or temptation—must be intrinsically recognizable, because Adam knows at once, whereas Eve was fooled. The moral precept is patent. The story also permits development of the motivation of the devil, however, and hence an explanation of evil. Traditionally the notion of the devil is associated with Lucifer, an angel who fell because he wanted to set himself up above God. Why the devil—which is what Lucifer, cast out from heaven with his followers, becomes—should be so inimical towards Adam is a different matter. Here the devil himself explains matters by explaining that he was commanded to worship the image of God in the new creation, Adam, and refused. This places the fall of the angels after the creation of Adam, and can lead to some chronological confusion, although the *VAE*—where the whole matter is in the devil's mouth anyway—also refers to the simple arrogance motif. Adam's debate with the devil after Eve has been tricked for the second time significantly permits the devil to insinuate that he and Adam are somehow equal, having both been ejected by God.

The devil's decision to trick Eve a second time (playing on the promise that she will now be given food again—she is very hungry by this stage) when she is logically and clearly some way away from Adam places the guilt more squarely on her shoulders, and indeed it is a regularly posed question in the exegesis of Genesis 3 of whether they were apart at the time of the first fall. The devil attacks, too, because it looks as if the penance strategy is going to work. However, the notion of redemption is there throughout the narrative. Adam completes his penance and God drives the devil away for the moment, but the idea of divine forgiveness is developed at the end of the story, when the dying Adam sends Seth and Eve for the oil of mercy, which in the earliest forms is interpreted as the promise of the redemption. In the development of the story with the gradual integration of the Holy Rood legends, we move towards a very concrete illustration of the redemption in that the first and second Adam, in Pauline terms, are linked by the physical presence of the Holy Rood. In later texts, incidentally, some ingenuity is brought into play to move Adam's body from his original burial place to Golgatha, but the iconographical motif of a skull at the foot of the cross, with the blood of Christ apparently washing or baptizing, or even

falling eucharistically into the mouth of, Adam, is both widespread and of great longevity.[48]

Meyer's achievement in editing the work in a scholarly fashion for the first time is still significant. But it is also double-edged, in that it effectively provided what seemed to be—but is not—an authorized, even canonical, text of a work which is in fact far from standardized. Meyer attempted a division of the versions known to him (about fifteen German manuscripts, all in Munich, from the tenth to the twelfth century) into four classes, of which only three are really distinctive. He noted a few other manuscripts and an incunabulum version, and he did print one additional text from a Paris manuscript which he placed in the ninth century, but which has now been reassigned to the tenth. A great many of the surviving manuscripts are from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in fact. Meyer edited the work under the title *Vita Adae (et Evae)* and there are variations on this (*De Adam et Eva*, *Historia*, *Vita prothoplausti*, etc.), though it may appear without a heading, or as *De expulsione*, or *Paenitentia Adae* (the first episode), or with the latter as a pericope heading alongside others. The *Vita Adae* title is, however, sometimes used in manuscripts for what turns out on inspection to be effectively a Holy Rood story.[49] In the vernacular, in fact, things are just as difficult: in Welsh the work entitled *Ystoria Adaf* (and once even more confusingly named as the *Gospel of Nicodemus*!) is actually a Holy Rood story, while the title *Ystoria Adaf ac Eua* is used for a version of the *Vita*. Even the title *Pénitence d'Adam* in French can sometimes also refer to Holy Rood material.[50]

Meyer used a version attested in three relatively early manuscripts, which he called class I, as his base text. Meyer's classes II and III (class IV is a variation of class II) and the incunabulum version were defined in terms of

---

[48] As fortuitous but deliberately distant examples, the *Crucifixion* by Alberto di Sozio in the sacristy at the cathedral of Spoleto (1187) has the blood falling into the mouth; in an Armenian missal from Taxtayalen in the Library of Congress (1722), the blood baptizes Adam's skull. See Juan Ainaud and André Held, *Romanesque Painting*, trans. Jean Stewart (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), pls. 43–4, and *Adamgirk': The Adambook of Arak'el of Siwnik'*, trans. Michael Stone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), fig. 5, 248.

[49] On the manuscripts, see: M. E. B. Halford, 'The Apocryphal *Vita Adae et Evae*: Some Comments on the Manuscript Tradition', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 82 (1981), 412–27, and 83 (1982), 222; Jean-Pierre Pettorelli, 'La Vie latine d'Adam et Eve: analyse de la tradition manuscrite', *Apocrypha*, 10 (1999), 195–296. Pettorelli gives the titles and incipits of the versions. See also the earlier catalogue by Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* (Madrid: Instituto Francisco Suárez, 1940–76), i. 25–9 and vii. 7–8.

[50] Paul Meyer, 'Fragments d'une ancienne histoire de Marie et de Jésus', *Romania*, 16 (1887), 248–62, esp. 252. Meyer described a French Holy Rood text in: 'Les Manuscrits français de Cambridge II: Bibliothèque de l'Université', *Romania*, 15 (1886), 236–357, see 326ff. on Cambridge UL G.G.1.1 (with another text in Trinity College 0.1.17). The Welsh texts are discussed in Chapter 3, below.

additions to or omissions from class I, although in fact the so-called class II is the nearest to a standardized version. Meyer divided his basic text into fifty-one numbered chapters, which remain useful as markers, even though lettered additions have to be made to them as different recensions are established. Meyer's class II (based on four much later Munich manuscripts) contains two passages not in his basic text: the vision of Adam in 29 is extended to add an apocalyptic passage in which Adam looks at the immediate future, a motif also in Meyer's class III; and especially an extension of 51, describing how the tablets and the pillars set up by Seth are later discovered. The second of these is not in his class III (four fifteenth-century manuscripts), which does, however, add at the end of 42, 43, 44, and 48 elements of Seth and the Holy Rood story (including the tale of Seth seeing a child in the branches of a dry tree in paradise). Thus there are many potential variations, especially in the Sethite quest and the overlap with the Holy Rood legends. The nature of the attack on Seth by the serpent, what he is given in paradise, and his dropping of the twigs into the river Jordan are all variable passages.

The incunabulum version of the story (noted by Meyer and used in his apparatus, though a text was printed by Lajos Katona in 1904) seemed to constitute a separate class, or more specifically a sub-class of Meyer's class III, but with material prefaced to the story based on the first part of the biblical Genesis, adapted to fit, as well as a number of omissions and variations in the Sethite part of the narrative. The Genesis contextualization, however, is not uncommon; Meyer noted at least one manuscript where the first three chapters of the Vulgate Genesis were simply prefaced to the text (again a German fifteenth-century manuscript now in Munich), and in 1933 a version of the *Vita* discovered in a manuscript in the Huntington Library in America (MH 1342, mid fifteenth century, probably of English provenance) had an adapted contextualization like the incunabulum text; this was printed by S. Harrison Thomson, who described various incunabula and (mostly English) manuscript versions which also have this contextualization. Just after this a further Latin version was published by Gerhard Eis in 1935 from two thirteenth-century Austrian manuscripts from Admont and Zwettl. The text is once more close to that of Meyer's class II, but there are two important side issues associated with Eis's edition. The first is contextual, namely that this version appeared in manuscripts of a collection of saints' lives, the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum*, albeit set apart from the regular calendar saints and placed at the end (just as in England Latin and vernacular versions were added to copies of the *Legenda aurea*). Secondly, Eis himself wanted to establish this text as the actual source for a vernacular poem, Lutwin's *Eva und Adam*, composed in German in the early fourteenth century; but it was very soon demonstrated that matching a given vernacular version (especially one in

verse) with a very specific source was impossible. Meyer himself had tentatively linked Lutwin's poem, which incorporates the story into a Genesis context, with the version he knew only from an incunabulum version, although, as Meyer was well aware, it pre-dated printing, and he speculated further on the source when he came to edit the German work. The inherent difficulties of *Quellenforschung* are clear from Meyer's own comments on this vernacular adaptation, which he himself edited later. Having made a link with the incunabulum version, he points out that the treatment is very free, suspects a class III source, notes that an omission points to class I, and thinks that the knowledge of a class II text is 'nicht wahrscheinlich' (unlikely). Even when he came to edit Lutwin, he still found the source question extraordinarily difficult. As a corollary to all this, a fairly recent paper on some fourteenth-century stone carvings representing a couple of scenes from the story on a church in Alsace links these specifically with Lutwin's version, though there is, equally, no compelling reason for making such a direct connection with a single version in any language.[51]

More important, and slightly earlier than the studies by Thomson and Eis, was the work of J. H. Mozley, who in 1929 had investigated a variety of English manuscripts of the Latin *Vita*. He demonstrated thereby what looks like one more new class of the basic text, and he raised incidentally some interesting contextual and reception issues. Mozley's versions are all more or less close to Meyer's class II, but he drew attention to a number of shared variations and errors, some small, some more substantial. Some details can be attested outside the English tradition (such as the reference to the hair of the protoplasts floating on the water during their penance), and he was aware of this. But he noted as specific textual errors common to the English manuscripts the reading 'lugidus' for 'lucidus' at the birth of Cain in an already ambiguous passage, and—coincidentally—of 'lucide' for 'lutee' in a reference to the tablets made by Seth. These errors are reflected in the English vernacular versions and there are other more significant changes as well. Of the various manuscripts examined by Mozley one, MS VII from Winchester Cathedral, is a highly abbreviated version of the text, while other later texts are less radically shortened. One (Queen's College, Oxford, MS 213, fifteenth century) had already been printed by Carl Horstmann in the 1880s; it follows the *VAE* with a Holy Rood text, and this is the case with other manuscripts. Mozley also

---

[51] See A. C. Dunstan, 'Lutwin's Latin Source', in *German Studies Presented to H. G. Fiedler* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938), 160–73, on the views of Eis. Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 216–18, discusses the source of Lutwin's poem, which had not at that time been edited, something he undertook a year or two later: *Lutwins Adam und Eva*, ed. Konrad Hofmann and Wilhelm Meyer (Tübingen: Stuttgarter literarischer Verein, 1881), see Meyer's 'Nachwort', 128–32. On the sculptures on the church at Thann in Alsace, see below, Chapter 6.

looked at incunabula versions, but two of his variant versions are of particular interest. The first, represented only by Balliol College Oxford MS 228, again of the fifteenth century, integrates the *VAE* and the Holy Rood material, rather than simply appending the one to the other, and then adds the naming and creation of Adam, the whole being attached to a text of the *Legenda aurea*. Of even greater significance, however, is what Mozley calls the Arundel Class (the name is from MS Arundel 326 in the British Library), and later referred to by Pettorelli, who revised and amended Mozley's work, as the English redaction. Mozley had grouped together eight manuscripts from the fourteenth (one perhaps thirteenth) and fifteenth centuries. Broadly speaking, these add to the text known from Meyer's class II small but significant points which are sometimes omitted from other English manuscripts, such as a scene in the visit by Seth to paradise, when he is attacked by the serpent and here bitten specifically in the face. This is in fact a corruption or misreading of *VAE* 37: 'uenit bestia impetum faciens et morsit Seth', where 'making an attack' ('impetum faciens') is turned into a wicked biting of the face: 'uenit serpens bestia impietatis et faciem Seth momorsit'. The passage is a useful touchstone in source studies, and we do indeed find it reflected in some English vernacular versions, but not elsewhere.[52] It is this redaction which has the reading 'choros' for 'currus' in the passage where Adam sees angelic choirs/a chariot, something found in English-language versions, but again not elsewhere. The Arundel manuscript itself, finally (though not most of the others related to it), also has Seth see in paradise not just a baby in the dry tree, but a full *pietà*, a seated Virgin with the crucified Christ. This kind of addition is striking because of its rarity, but the English redaction frequently appends the octi-partite creation legend and the naming story to the end of the text (and were seen by Mozley as sections 55–7).

Friedrich Stegmüller, in his *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* in 1940, had listed several manuscripts of the *VAE*, and in 1981 Mary-Bess Halford looked again at the manuscript tradition and described seventy-three of them, noting how deceptive headings can be in confusing the *VAE* and the Holy Rood legends. Stone, in his history of the literature of Adam and Eve, made it very clear that Meyer's choice for his class I version had in fact done a disservice to later studies of the work. He rightly drew attention to the fact, too, that A. C. Dunstan in a study in the early 1930s on an English work had pointed

---

[52] In Lutwin's German text the snake bites Seth on the cheek, but this might depend upon the rhyme 'slange' and 'wange' in German, although it is possible that the confusion of 'faciens' and 'faciem' might have appeared in continental Latin versions as well (though Meyer does not note the variation). A. C. Dunstan draws attention to the point in his paper on the source question for an English vernacular adaptation: 'The Middle English *Canticum de creatione* and the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*', *Anglia*, 55 (1931), 431–42.

out the simple, but in this context extremely important, fact that differences in vernacular versions can almost always be explained simply by reference to variant versions in Latin.[53] Meyer's edition, valuable as it is, needs to be used with very careful attention to the apparatus and notes which are, it must be said, full and helpful. Just as recent research has extended our knowledge of the Adambooks as a whole, and there has also been a new edition of the Greek *Life*, our knowledge of the Latin material, too, has been augmented in a series of publications by Jean-Pierre Pettorelli, who lists and discusses 106 manuscripts in an analysis designed to 'lay the foundations of a critical edition', in which he proposes a division into five major redactions, with various subdivisions.[54] Pettorelli calls the oldest attested form the southern German redaction (close to Meyer's class I); then he notes a tripartite Rhenish redaction (largely Meyer's class II); then a Bohemian redaction, again largely class II; an English redaction (based on Mozley's Arundel group); and two variants of a late redaction (involving the Holy Rood material). It is yet another indication of the fluidity of this apocryphon that Pettorelli also noted a very interesting extra additional redaction which is close to the Greek *Life*, found in manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (3832) and (a later text) in the Ambrosiana (O35 supra) in Milan.[55] It does not by any means match the main outlines of the Greek *Life*, however. He noted (as Tromp has also done) that there are some versions of the Greek *Life* which contain the penance pericope known in all the Latin versions and in the Georgian and Armenian texts, even though it is in a different place in those Greek texts, and retold by Eve. In his Latin texts it is in its usual position. Pettorelli published these two Latin versions separately, and they are of very specific interest in that they match a number of unusual motifs in a vernacular work of the tenth century in early Middle Irish, the so-called *Saltair na Rann*. Although Pettorelli's Latin texts are later and geographically distant from the Irish poem, it is still clear that a Latin text related to them (but not the same) was known by the poet.[56] The number of manuscripts still extant, quite apart from the early printed versions, gives an idea of how popular the work has been over the centuries, since the extant manuscripts can represent only a proportion of those actually produced. The evidence of the Irish *Saltair na Rann* (which cites Latin words), for example, clearly indicates that a Latin

---

[53] Stone, *History*, 15–30.

[54] 'Analyse'; see 195 for the quotation.

[55] See in addition to the two texts already mentioned Pettorelli, 'Deux témoins'.

[56] 'Analyse', 260–5. He makes clear the importance of these (and of the evidence of the *Saltair*) on 265, and they do not really fit into his taxonomy, though he groups them with the English class. The texts are in his 'Vie latine'. He speculates in the conclusion to the first paper on the routes of dissemination. Chapter 2, below, discusses the *Saltair na Rann*.

text similar to some now known once existed. The extant manuscript transmission of the Latin *VAE* really takes us back only to the tenth century, from which time different redactions circulated. Estimating the date of 'the' text before that is very difficult indeed, and can only be guesswork, although the in any case episodic (penance, birth of Cain, death of the protoplasts) version that we have was presumably put together in the centuries before that. Although references are sometimes found to supposed dates of composition as early as the fourth century, an estimated origin in the eighth is more plausible; but all this is guesswork.[57]

The question of the contextualization even of the Latin texts has not really been examined in detail. Ideally one needs to take into consideration not only the date and provenance of each manuscript, but the configurations of texts around that of the *VAE*. Thus—to take a single example as representative— that contained in Queen's College, Oxford, MS 213, a medium-sized parchment manuscript written in 1449 or earlier in England, containing the name Nicholas Warde as possible scribe (and acquired by the college in the seventeenth century), has the *Vita Adae et Evae* (headed *Vita prothoplausti Ade*) on the first seven folios in a version assigned by Pettorelli to his 'Bohemian' grouping. It is followed—after a blank page, so that there is no question of continuity—by the Holy Rood *Legende* (*De ligno sancte crucis*) on fos. 8^r to 11^v; then comes Genesis 49: 1–30 (*Testamentum Iacob in Genesi*), 12^v–13^r; and finally Robert Grosseteste on the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*Incipit expositio testamentorum . . .*), 13^v–50^v. The proximity of the Holy Rood narrative is very common indeed, as might be expected, although the *Vita* text as such is independent, even if it is thought to belong together with the Rood legends and appropriate to place beside a part of the biblical Genesis.[58]

Neither Meyer nor Mozley gave much information in the way of context for the individual texts, beyond noting where appropriate the presence of prefatory material from the Vulgate Genesis or the additional legends of the creation and naming of Adam and that of the Rood. Pettorelli's list of manuscripts gives details of folios and completeness of text (in some manuscripts not all of the work is present), provenances where possible, and the various

---

[57] Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), refers in a time chart, p. xx, tentatively to the mid fourth century, but this might refer to the whole complex in general terms. The (important) book prints the Armenian *Life* in translation as an appendix, and also the relevant portions of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Locating the origins of the Latin work in a more or less recognizable form in the eighth century is probably safe.

[58] The catalogue of manuscripts from the Queen's College, Oxford, is currently (2007) available online: <http://www.queens.ox.ac.uk/library/ms>. The Latin text has been printed by Horstmann, 'Nachträge zu den Legenden', 459–69.

titles, incipits, and explicits. In many (though not all) cases he also gives an idea of what else is in the manuscript, and this is of considerable interest. The text is usually found occupying a relatively small part of sometimes quite large manuscripts, but that in the Dresden Landesbibliothek (A. 182) contains only the *VAE*, plus a brief summary of the creation of Adam from eight parts. Oxford Bodleian Selden supra 74 has the text followed by a poem based on the naming legend, and the same legend follows the *VAE* in Prague National Library MS X.E. 13. As Eis already made clear, the versions in manuscripts from Zwettl and Admont are added as an appendix to the collection of saints' lives, the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum*, while that from Vienna (Cod. Vindob. 2809) has the work tacked on at the end of the German *Christeherre-Chronik*.[59] The manuscript in Balliol College Oxford, MS 228 (discussed in detail by Mozley) has the *VAE* preceded by a brief section on Adam's octi-partite creation, his naming, and his sins (as does the early MS Paris BN lat. 5327), but uniquely combines (rather than juxtaposes) the Holy Rood mate-rial at the end, and the whole is itself appended to a text of the *Legenda aurea*, as it is with the Alba Julia manuscript noted by Pettorelli. There is a different, but equally complex, compilation involving the Holy Rood material in Munich clm 11601, and in that now in Ljubljana.[60] The Holy Rood material is also added after the *VAE* as if it were a formal continuation in the Prague MS in the National Library V.A. 7, and it follows the *VAE* in a number of other manuscripts as well (Paris BN lat. 3768; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 275; Queen College, Oxford, 213; Strängäs, Cathedral Library Q 16; Schlägl, Stiftsbibliothek 156). Pettorelli makes clear how the Holy Rood material becomes part of the later recensions. Munich MS cgm 3866 precedes the *VAE* with three chapters based on the biblical Genesis, and the Brussels MS Bibliothèque royale IV 715 has a prefatory passage on the primal sin, also based on the Bible. In MS Munich clm 21534 the first fifteen sections of the *VAE* constitute a sermon incorporated in the *Speculum Ecclesiae* of Honorius Augustodunensis, although it is not in the edition of that collection in the *Patrologia Latina*, for example. The text is elsewhere sometimes described as

---

[59] Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 213–14, cites the ascription of the German work to Rudolf von Ems, although the text is in fact the *Christherre* world chronicle for the first part, with the later part of the chronicle of Rudolf von Ems attached as the second part. The Rudolf chronicle and the *Christherre-Chronik* (and mixed versions) sometimes include a rhymed German version of the penance scene. Other manuscripts have material in vernacular languages and Latin: thus the Munich manuscript cgm 3866 has the sermons of the so-called Schwarzwälder Prediger, and in addition to the Latin *VAE* also the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

[60] See R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College, Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 230–7. The *Legenda aurea* occupies fos. 11–202, with the *VAE* on fos. 203ʳ–206ᵛ. After that comes the apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*. See Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 222 on the Munich manuscript and 285–6 on that from Ljubljana.

a *sermo*, and can appear as part of or associated with a treatise on penitence. It is difficult to discern a pattern beyond the frequent combination with the Holy Rood narratives. So too, a title such as *De poenitentia Adae* or some variation thereof will have had a different effect on the reader from one entitled *Vita Adae et Evae*.

When he prepared his edition of the Latin *VAE*, Meyer was not fully aware of the extent of available manuscripts and printed versions of the Latin text. Although he was also—and more understandably—unaware of the full extent of its adaptations into western European vernaculars, it is enormously to his credit that he took as full an account as possible of the existence of that vernacular tradition. Not very many of the vernacular adaptations had even been edited at that stage but Meyer took account even of manuscripts and early printed texts, with extracts from some of them cited in his notes as variations on given motifs.[61] He described with some accuracy (mainly under the heading of his class II manuscripts of the Latin *VAE*, though with a few works placed elsewhere) a number of sometimes quite obscure vernacular texts, making clear that the tradition was not restricted to the Latin texts alone. Constantin von Tischendorf's edition of the Greek *Life* in 1866 was the first modern scholarly edition of a related text, but Meyer offered the first printed version of the Latin *VAE* since the incunabula texts. Johannes Tromp referred in a conference paper in 2001 primarily on the Greek *Life* to a translation of the *VAE* into French by the early printer Colard Mansion, from Bruges (a translation that was not in fact printed), as an early edition, after which he claims that the work was lost sight of in European culture, apart from some possible (and questionable) reflections in Vondel and Milton, until Tischendorf's edition of the Greek *Life*. However, Meyer himself had referred to later manuscript and printed texts. An early Welsh poem, too, which clearly shows knowledge of the text, appeared in print in 1777 (with a sixteenth-century translation into Latin), then again with an English version in 1841, and then in a popular translation of the *Mabinogion*, first published in 1849 and consistently in print until the Second World War. That one of its sources was the *VAE* was not made clear until 1995, but it remains, curiously enough, the most regularly printed related text.[62] Vatroslav Jagić provided in

---

[61] Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 210–14, gives twelve vernacular examples, plus some more in the footnotes. He adds Lutwin under the heading of the incunabula versions (because these normally have biblical Genesis material preceding the text), aware of the importance of a text which he would later edit, and gives a synopsis from the manuscript (the great Ambras compilation manuscript, now in Vienna).

[62] See Johannes Tromp, 'Zur Edition apokrypher Texte: Am Beispiel des griechischen Lebens Adams und Evas', in Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 189–206 (see 190: 'Vorher war sie [die Schrift] zum letzten

his introduction to the Old Church Slavonic version of the Adambook in
1893, which is itself more closely related to the Greek *Life*, an amount of
material on the Latin *VAE*, bringing to light an Old Bohemian (Czech)
version and referring also to a then only recently republished printed text in
Polish from 1551, both with later offshoots. Lajos Katona printed a Hungarian
text (the manuscript of which is from the first half of the sixteenth century)
in 1904. As far as early printed texts are concerned, beside a Danish version
printed in 1514 and the early Italian *Fioretti*, both noted by Meyer, and the
Czech and Polish texts discussed by Jagić, we also have a poem written and
printed by Hans Folz in German in 1480. Furthermore, there are various
German folk plays and more especially a Breton mystery play which use *VAE*
material and which survive in manuscripts of the eighteenth and nineteenth
centuries, and were being performed up to the early nineteenth century.

   Vernacular adaptations in fact ensured that the *VAE* never really disap-
peared from European cultural consciousness. Some in fact appeared in print
before Tischendorf's and Meyer's editions, although the source of those
adaptations did, of course, sometimes occasion questions. In 1855 Louis
Moland wrote a long piece in the *Revue contemporaine* analysing first of all
the then newly published early Anglo-Norman play *Mystère d'Adam*, which
(probably) does not reflect the *VAE*, but going on to examine also the
apocryphal Adam-traditions, of which he gave a summary in considerable
detail, covering the penance, but with the Holy Rood quest of Seth, rather
than the journey of Seth and Eve and the encounter with the serpent. He
based his study on the Andrius version in French, plus that by Colard
Mansion, and also upon a Latin incunabulum, probably that printed in
Rome in the 1470s, though his copy had neither place nor date. 'Nous allons
analyser cette fable,' he said, 'dont l'origine n'est pas saisissable, mais dont
l'invention première appartient indubitablement aux rabbins convertis.' That
over-confident and highly questionable final judgement aside, the presenta-
tion is a scholarly one.[63]

   Moland's speculative ignorance of the origins of the text was set aside, of
course, by the appearance in print of Tischendorf's and especially Meyer's
editions. However, the very large number of vernacular adaptations of *VAE*
material in the Middle Ages and beyond make clear that the work remains a

---

Mal ca 1475 ediert worden, als Colard Mansion . . . beauftragt wurde, sie aus dem Lateinischen
ins Französische zu übersetzen'). The Welsh poem is discussed in more detail below, Chapter 3.
Whether Vondel, Milton, or any comparable writers (such as Grotius) of that period were aware
of the text is fairly unlikely.

   [63] Louis Moland, 'Le Drame et la légende d'Adam au moyen-âge', *Revue contemporaine*, 20
(1855), 5–38.

dynamic, a protean apocryphon, changing and developing in the western European vernaculars just as it did in the Latin texts. It takes on different shapes and emphases, and account has to be taken of various elements in each case. First, the possible Latin source type (a precise identification of the source is almost never possible); secondly, the genre of the translation or adaptation (prose, verse, drama, iconography); thirdly, the context—whether it was independently presented, or integrated with canonical biblical material, what was added to it or integrated with it (especially, but not only, the legend of the Holy Rood), whether it was part of a chronicle, say, or a penitential tract. In versions which do integrate the narrative with that of the biblical Genesis, the basic distinction between canon and apocrypha in general can be blurred, although in some texts the awareness of the work's non-canonical status is apparent. While the *VAE* needs to be analysed with reference to as many of the versions as are known and accessible, it is hardly possible that all will be found.

Of value as an aspect of European culture, the vernacular versions may also serve as keys to lost Latin versions, or may reflect the development of the Latin tradition. A concrete illustration of the benefits and the problems of considering vernacular texts as part of the tradition may best be exemplified, perhaps, by the reception history of a late version in German which has been referred to already. In the late fifteenth century the Nuremberg barber-surgeon Hans Folz translated the *VAE* into German prose in a notebook for his own private use. The resulting German text is interesting and has some revealing errors, some of which are easily recognizable as no more than translator's slips. But in some cases what Folz has in German can cause us to wonder precisely what was in the Latin version from which he was translating. There is evidence that he was translating from a manuscript rather than an incunabulum (which might have been possible), but it would presumably have been a late version. Even a manuscript copy of an incunabulum text is by no means unthinkable in the 1470s. Folz's German prose does not, of course, constitute a new version of the apocryphon as such, since it was for the use of one person only and was not for dissemination. But Folz used it—correcting or omitting as he did so—to produce a poem out of the material, which he himself then printed, so that this version *was* (relatively well) disseminated.

The ongoing tradition of the apocryphon in vernacular languages, parallel with the Latin tradition for long periods, has been irregularly treated in the past,[64] but needs to be looked at on a far broader basis. To focus only upon the

---

[64] My *Adam's Grace: Fall and Redemption in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2000), chapter 1 (pp. 21–49), has a survey.

(Greek or) Latin text(s) even within the Adambook tradition as a whole assumes that the developmental process of the apocryphal text is somehow finite, when a whole range of vernacular versions present us with what is essentially a series of related but new and sometimes different apocrypha. The question is one of reception as well as of development, too, and we must consider a spectrum from straightforward prose translations down to references and allusions, sometimes very small, which nevertheless indicate very clearly a knowledge of the narrative; between these extremes lie versions of the material contained in the *VAE* in every genre in a wide range of languages. Some obvious points perhaps need to be made. It is rarely useful in considering texts in a European vernacular to note that an apparently unusual motif appears in, say, the Greek or Armenian or some other version. The source will almost certainly always have been Latin (even though the vernacular writers themselves sometimes make fanciful claims), and that unusual motif might have been in the source, or might be a deliberate addition in the vernacular version. It might also rest upon a misunderstanding of the Latin. In most cases the point will indeed have been in the source. So too, some variations are far less significant than others. There are, for example, a great deal of numbers in the Latin text—the days spent by the protoplasts searching for food, the days spent on their penance, the amount of time before the devil tempts Eve again, the number of angels attending the birth of Cain. These vary from text to text even in Latin, and although one can in some cases perhaps determine that a given number was probably the original, there is such variation that this becomes meaningless. It is a recurrent feature of work in this field, finally, that critics have regularly tried to link specific vernacular works with one particular Latin version. Establishing a direct source for a given vernacular version has almost always proved impossible, or at least, has usually been very easy to refute given the extent and fluidity of potential sources other than the Latin versions used by Meyer.

Scholars concerned in particular with the apocryphal texts as such have tended to play down, or indeed ignore completely, the vernacular tradition.[65] In secondary studies in recent years Michael Stone in his survey does look at

---

[65] Or in one case even to garble the information: I have commented elsewhere in my *Adam's Grace*, 30–1, on the *VAE* in Charlesworth's collection; the brief notes on vernacular texts by M. D. Johnson in an otherwise useful introduction to the translation in Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 256, are largely erroneous (few of the works named can actually have been examined). Most other modern collections of the pseudepigrapha fail to mention the vernacular works at all, such as those by Charles and Sparks, and also those in other languages, for example Hammerhaimb, Munck, et al., *De gammeltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer*, ii. 509–47 (= Hammershaimb, 'Adamsbøgerne'). There are a few references in Bertrand's *La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève*, but not in Tromp's more recent edition of the Greek *Life*.

these versions, however, as does Hans Martin von Erffa in his massive work on the iconology of Genesis, but beside these only those scholars actually writing about or editing other vernacular examples have paid much attention to parallel representations of the tradition. There is no readily available reasonably full list of such vernacular versions, and the very process of establishing such a list is itself ongoing. In spite of the great help afforded by the internet, some texts, even when in print, remain hard even to track down, such as the Danish translation printed by Poul Raeff in 1514 and noted by Meyer, and the versions in Croatian. Some, such as the Hungarian version, require specialized linguistic competence. Others which remain in manuscript must await editions and translations by specialists in the relevant languages, from the direct French translation by Colard Mansion to a Russian adaptation of a Polish work which contains some of the *VAE* material, before they can be assessed. Probably the fullest (and bibliographically most useful) survey is that provided by Bob Miller in his edition of a German version in Heinrich von München's world chronicle.[66] Miller distinguishes, however, between longer and shorter versions of the source material, effectively separating off the penance story from the full story of the protoplasts down to their deaths. Some vernacular texts do seem to know only the penance version, but the distinction is not a very clear one and cannot really be sustained through a study of the different versions.[67] Having drawn attention to several otherwise uncommented and often unedited texts himself, Miller rightly points out, finally, that there may well be more texts to be discovered.

It may be noted that the position of the printed texts, both in Latin and in translation, is of special interest, and has largely been neglected. As noted, the version used in the early incunabula is roughly like Meyer's class III, but often with considerable sections omitted (*VAE* 33–9) or abbreviated, and with biblical material drawing on Genesis, but rearranged and adapted, prefacing the text. There are several known copies of the Latin text, which may have been edited a little, the earliest printed in Rome by Johannes Gensberg (or by

---

[66] Bob Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung der lateinischen *Vita Adae et Evae* in der *Weltchronik* Heinrichs von München', in Horst Brunner (ed.), *Studien zur 'Weltchronik' Heinrichs von München* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998), i. 240–332. His indispensable introduction covers an enormous amount of territory and provides a full survey also of the apocryphal tradition as a whole. I am indebted to Dr Miller for keeping me up to date with his work from the completion of his dissertation onwards.

[67] Thus on 256 he suggests that the *Saltair na Rann* poet did not know the whole *VAE*, just a 'penitence of Adam' text; Miller's work pre-dates Pettorelli's, however, on the Paris/Milan version of the *VAE*. In any case the position with the *Saltair* is very difficult. To illustrate the complexity of the situation, there is indeed evidence elsewhere in Celtic languages of knowledge of the whole text, notably in Welsh; however, these may have been influenced by the English tradition, both in Latin and in the vernacular.

Johannes Schurener) in around 1473.[68] As has been noted, the Bruges Printer Colard Mansion seems to have translated but not printed the work, and there are printed texts in Czech and Polish, but the 1480 poem by Folz is probably the first printed vernacular adaptation. The immediate post-incunabula period is less well charted. Meyer used a copy from Venice (1515) of the Italian *Fioretti della Biblia hystoriati* and refers to Raeff's Danish print, but unknown to him was the later printed text in Polish, dated 1551, noted by Jagić, which is pretty certainly based on an incunabulum version; and there is also an early Czech printed text. The coincidence of the Reformation with the rise of printing might well have meant that printed translations would be rare or restricted to Catholic territories. The Danish text was from a Catholic source, though copies might well not have survived. Early Latin and vernacular prints (including the poem by Folz) pre-date Luther. At all events further study is required on the early printed versions as such and especially those few in vernacular languages, though it is hard to find bibliographic information on some of them, let alone extant complete exemplars.[69]

The development of motifs from or versions of the *VAE* continues, then, in vernacular languages in all genres, right down to the time of printing and beyond. Translations or reflections of the (or a) Latin *VAE* in prose, verse, or drama, independent or part of biblical narratives or chronicle, full or partial, are found, as far as is thus far known, in (alphabetically): Breton, Croatian, Czech (Old Bohemian), Danish, English, French, German, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Polish, Russian, and Welsh. It is interesting that there seems to be no evidence of the reception of the text in the Iberian peninsula at all.[70] Irish has the earliest extant version, English and German probably the largest number of representations.

---

[68] S. Harrison Thomson discusses the early prints, 'Fifth Recension', 274, referring to the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1925–32, with an online version in process), nos. 205–9. There is a copy of the Rome text in the Bodleian. See Alan Coates, *A Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century Held in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 56 (s.v. *Adam*). This is the *Gesamtkatalog* no. 205. No printer, place, or date is given. There seems to be another impression with the name St[ephanus] Planck and another printed in Rome or Naples. GW 210, incidentally, is not a version of the *VAE*. See below, Chapter 4.

[69] See Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 213–16. The text in the *Fioretti* version consulted by Meyer contains *VAE* 1–35 (in chapters 30–45, 47, and 55–66), with the Holy Rood material completing this. This is the pattern of the incunabula versions, though Meyer lists the work (213) under his class II texts.

[70] Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 252 makes the point with reference to Portuguese, Castilian, Catalan, and indeed also Provençal. If this is correct—and certainly no texts are known at present from these cultures—it poses intriguing questions, especially given the theories that postulate apocryphal texts moving to Ireland via Spain.

In the case of independent texts of the equally fluid Holy Rood story, secondary studies have treated the vernacular versions far more regularly beside the Latin versions, and the influence on medieval literature in general is more fully documented. The texts are also found juxtaposed in individual vernacular versions, in spite of the continuity problem occasioned by the different versions of the Sethite quest at the end of the *VAE* and the start of the Rood legends. Indeed, as far as vernacular versions of the *VAE* are concerned, for most of the Middle Ages it is unusual to find a text without any indication whatsoever of the Rood legends. The very early Irish *Saltair na Rann* is one of the few full-scale works that restricts itself purely to the *VAE* narrative, and towards the end of the period the Holy Rood legend may be thought of as supplanting the *VAE*.

To summarize: the notion of an apocryphal Adambook is a very broad one indeed, and the tradition of developing the brief narrative of Genesis 1–5 is both enormous and very diffuse. Details of the extra-biblical life (and after-life) of Adam crop up in various Old and New Testament apocrypha and even outside Judaism and Christianity, but there are numerous books which survive as separate entities in a whole range of languages, with names like *The Testament of Adam*, the *Book of the Cave of Treasures*, the *Life of Adam*, and so on. One group of Adambooks is formed by related texts extant in Greek, Slavonic, Latin, Armenian, and Georgian, although the relationship between these is itself loose and sometimes quite difficult to determine, with cross-influences between them. The ultimate source and the exact relationship to Judaic tradition is unknown; manuscripts are often late for all of them, so that dating is very difficult; and there is, strictly speaking, in each case no established text. Of the two which pertain most clearly to (western) Europe, the Greek and Latin texts vary considerably in their manuscript versions, although a late nineteenth-century edition of the Latin gave the world of scholarship a misleadingly fixed impression. The Latin versions alone test the concept of text to the limits, and it is best not to think of a single work in any sense, but a protean apocryphon, changing from version to version in a tradition far larger than implied by the artificial concentration on the ancient languages. In view of the difficulty of establishing relationships even between, say, the Greek and Slavonic versions, the European vernacular versions have as much right to be viewed as part of the development of the apocryphon as the others. Gradually, however, the *VAE* gives way in European writing to the overlapping Holy Rood story, and is indeed supplanted by the more specifically Christian legend.[71] Adam's penance becomes less important as a

---

[71] See Steven Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee: A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, rev. edn. 1982), 167–8.

narrative, and the Holy Rood material comes to pre-eminence towards the end of the medieval period. The late medieval French dramatist Arnoul Greban spoke against the use of apocryphal stories, but his great *Mystère de la Passion* uses (admittedly only in the prologue to the drama) the Sethite quest and the Holy Rood legend, although not the *VAE*.

This study proposes to offer as far as possible a systematic survey of the known vernacular versions of the *VAE* in Europe in terms of age, form, and context, considering the reception of the work and looking at the way it develops new features. Various approaches might be taken to the arrangement of the vernacular works to be investigated, all of them with advantages and disadvantages. One such might be purely chronological, but while a rough overall chronology can be established—the drama, for example, is pretty well invariably late in the cultures with which we are concerned[72]—more precise dating is not always easy, and questions of manuscript transmission, too, can distort the overall picture. A generic arrangement might equally be possible, but not every individual culture covers all the genres; furthermore, the norm for narrative in the Middle Ages in many vernaculars varies between verse and prose. An arrangement along the lines of individual cultures, which is roughly geographical, seems to be the most appropriate, considering direct prose translations, prose adaptations, metrical versions, and (where extant) drama within specific language or language-family areas. Even here, however, the definition sometimes needs refinement. In the Celtic languages, for example, the Irish tradition is quite separate from the (limited) Welsh and Breton materials, which are themselves distinct, so that it makes sense in that case to treat the relatively limited Welsh materials beside the English texts, and to take the Breton text—a late drama—in the geographical context of France and southern Europe. Although, too, it is convenient to take the Holy Roman Empire as a unit, which would embrace northern and southern German versions, as well as, say, Bohemian texts, there are considerable divergences. We have to move, in fact, from tenth-century southern Ireland with the *Saltair na Rann*, to sixteenth-century Kraków with Krzysztof Pussman's *Historyja*, or to an even later Polish book about the devil's rights which was translated into Russian. Finally, iconography—which is relatively limited— represents a special case, and may be treated separately.

---

[72] In consequence, perhaps, the quest of Seth in the Holy Rood context is far more regularly found than the version in the *VAE*, though the overlap makes it difficult to tell sometimes which version is being followed. Breton, Italian, and German plays definitely use the *VAE*. Again, not every culture has the Holy Rood material—there is no evidence of it in English, though it is there in Cornish. See for a very general introduction Lynette R. Muir, *The Biblical Drama of Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 68–73 (Adam, Cain, Seth).

Each work, then, has to be treated as an individual text, given that the *Vita Adae et Evae* itself is not uniform in any case. In the case of free-standing translations, but more particularly in the case of adaptations into verse or drama, we may continue to think of the vernacular versions as developments of a protean apocryphon, offering new variations on the basic framework. In other cases—especially those where the material is integrated into the structure of the biblical Genesis—the contemporary vernacular audience would in addition not (necessarily) have been able to distinguish canonical from apocryphal material, although in some cases directives are given which may or may not be enlightening. One German text, for example, tells us of the *VAE* material that the author is about to present: 'I am not speaking of the Bible . . . but of a book called Adam', which is then ascribed— pseudepigraphically, of course—to St Methodius.

2

Ireland

Jean-Pierre Pettorelli noted in his survey of the manuscripts of the Latin *VAE* that the range covers the period from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries, with a geographical spread from Great Britain (he might perhaps have said 'the British Isles') to the eastern marches of the German empire, and certainly adaptations into the vernacular are known from the furthest west—from Ireland—to Germany and indeed beyond. The dangers of adopting even a roughly cultural or language-group approach to those vernacular texts, however, is immediately apparent from the Celtic adaptations of the *VAE*. The Irish language evidence—represented by one primary work in verse, the *Saltair na Rann*, and a number of direct prose derivatives—is important and, in its verse form, is of considerable antiquity, and since it is the earliest of the vernacular derivatives in western European languages, it may be treated first. As far as other Celtic versions of the *VAE* are concerned, however, there are two attendant problems. First, the *Saltair* is completely different from the later reflections of the *VAE* in Celtic languages found elsewhere in the British Isles, specifically in Welsh, and also from a continental version in Breton which is different again; moreover, the Irish poem differs from these (and indeed virtually all other vernacular versions) in view of its source. Secondly, the Welsh and Breton versions are far later, so that only the Irish text really merits being treated in first position. There is, as far as is known, no Scots (or Manx) Gaelic text (although one of the manuscripts of the relevant Irish prose recensions of the *Saltair* is currently in Scotland), and the Cornish links are both late and only tangential at best. Accordingly, the various Celtic strands must be treated separately, and it needs to be stated that direct links between the Irish versions and those in the other Celtic languages are extremely unlikely. The Welsh, Breton, and—if it is there at all—Cornish reflections might in some respects link with other English or continental versions, while the Irish material is completely independent. There are, finally, no early manuscripts of the Latin *VAE* still preserved in Ireland. Only one late manuscript, fairly closely related to a known English type, is currently held in Dublin, for example. The situation differs, therefore, from that in England or Germany, where there is a ramified tradition of the Latin text in each case.

There is a very—indeed, amazingly—extensive tradition of apocryphal writing attested in Irish as such: works like the *Visio Sancti Pauli* seem to have been widely known, and there are some notable examples of apocryphal writings apparently known only through Irish vernacular texts, such as 'The Evernew Tongue', *An Tenga Bithnua*. The apparently high tolerance, indeed interest, in Ireland for such writings has long been noted by scholars, and possible routes for the introduction of apocryphal material into Ireland have been discussed, one possibility being via Spain in the Old Irish period, before about 900,[1] although the Iberian peninsula seems to have no tradition of the *VAE*. As far as non-canonical Adamic material is concerned, we may note the appearance in Irish texts of the nine choirs of angels, and the creation of Adam from different parts of the world, found with other material in the ramified chronicle *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, for example. The poem *Athair Caīch Coimsid Nime*, which is interpolated into some recensions of the *Lebor Gabála Érenn* and also found independently, contains non-biblical details concerning paradise and Adam which, like the other elements in the chronicle, do not reflect the *VAE*.[2] Even cases where one might expect allusions to motifs from the *VAE* do not in fact provide conclusive evidence. The Irish *Sex aetates mundi* refers to Adam's transgression on a Friday, as does the poem on the *Works of the Sixth Day* but this is not from the *VAE*,[3] and the celebrated (and

---

[1] The fullest and most recent studies include those by D. N. Dumville, 'Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation', *PRIA* 73C (1973), 299–338; Martin McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975), and the introduction by the latter's introduction in Máire Herbert and Martin McNamara (eds.), *Irish Biblical Apocrypha* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1989). See also my own paper on 'Preaching in Medieval Ireland: The Irish Tradition', in Alan J. Fletcher and Raymond Gillespie (eds.), *Irish Preaching 700–1700* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 40–55. The first serious research (as noted by McNamara) was carried out in the early part of the twentieth century by the indefatigable investigator of apocryphal writings M. R. James (on *The Evernew Tongue* in particular) and St John D. Seymour in a whole series of papers, many for the Royal Irish Academy: see especially his 'Notes on Apocrypha in Ireland', *PRIA* 37C (1926), 107–17. There is a bibliography by Donnchadh Ó Corráin available on the web at <www.ccc.ie/celt/Apocrypha.pdf>. Tracing the actual progress of (Greek) apocrypha via Spain is extremely difficult, however, given the problems faced over the most relevant centuries by Spanish monasteries; of course, the debt to Moorish Spain in the knowledge of Greek philosophers (probably translated from Syrian versions, however) is well established. See J. B. Trend, 'Spain and Portugal', in Thomas Arnold and Alfred Guillaume (eds.), *The Legacy of Islam* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931; repr. 1945), 1–39; see 29: 'The transmission of Greek learning to the West began at Baghdad.'

[2] See the first volume of the edition done for the Irish Texts Society by R. A. Stewart Macalister, *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, i (Dublin: ITS, 1938; repr. 1984). On the complex work as a whole see John Carey's *A New Introduction*, published separately (Dublin: ITS, 1993). The poem referred to is on 172–3 and is found also in Herbert and McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*, 17–18, taken in this case from the text in the Book of Uí Maine.

[3] Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (ed.), *The Irish Sex aetates mundi* (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1983), see 20; Maura Carney, 'The Works of the Sixth Day', *Ériu*, 21 (1966), 148–66, see 163.

fine) early poem *Mé Eba, ben Ádaim uill* (known in Kuno Meyer's translation as 'Eve's Lament') has some slight similarity with a motif in the *VAE*, but Eve's rhetorical notion that she is the one who should have been crucified is quite unlike, say, the brief demand by Eve that Adam should kill her in the Chester play in English, which does point far more clearly to our apocryphon.[4] The works of the poet Blathmac, probably writing in the eighth century, contain some apocryphal material which relates to Adam, but, as has been pointed out, there is again no direct link.[5] Later works such as the *Harrowing of Hell* poem from the Book of Fermoy, or the *Hosting of Death*, also have material concerned with Adam, but again, there is no connection with the *VAE*.[6] It seems that the *VAE* definitely made its mark in Irish at one particular point in time, but was perhaps not widely known enough for isolated elements or partial motifs to be reflected subsequently.

IRISH

The substance of the *VAE* appears in a very large rhymed work in Middle Irish, and in a number of later prose redactions of that single text. The Early Middle Irish rhymed biblical-historical poem known as *Saltair na Rann*, literally the 'Psalter of Quatrains'—although it now has 162 cantos, it seems originally to have had 150, hence the nominal link with the Psalms—can be dated (in spite of a little scholarly dissent) both linguistically and through an allusion to an historical event with some confidence to the end of the tenth century.[7] It has attracted steady attention in Irish

---

[4] First published by Kuno Meyer in *Ériu*, 3 (1907), 148, the poem has been much anthologized, as in Meyer's own *Selections from Ancient Irish Poetry* (London: Constable, 1911; repr. 1928), 34 and in David Greene and Frank O'Connor (eds.), *A Golden Treasury of Irish Poetry* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 157–9.

[5] See Dumville, 'Biblical Apocrypha', 307. *The Poems of Blathmac Son of Cú Brettan*, ed. James Carney (Dublin: ITS, 1964).

[6] Both pieces are in Osborn Bergin, *Irish Bardic Poetry*, ed. David Greene and Fergus Kelly (Dublin: Institute of Advanced Studies, 1970; repr. 1974), translated on 296–8, 304–5.

[7] The only full edition in Irish remains Whitley Stokes (ed.), *The Saltair na Rann: A Collection of Early Middle Irish Poems Edited from MS. Rawlinson B 502, in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1883 = Anecdota Oxoniensia: Texts, documents, and extracts chiefly from manuscripts in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries: Mediaeval and Modern Series. Volume 1, part 3), which is available electronically as part of the CELT corpus of electronic texts project at University College, Cork. The relevant sections for the study of the *Vita* are in: *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair na Rann*, ed. and trans. David Greene and Fergus Kelly; ii: *Commentary* by Brian Murdoch (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1976). There is a partial English translation (including the relevant

studies over the years.[8] Recorded complete in only one manuscript, itself dated to the first part of the twelfth century, the poem contains one of the most substantial early vernacular adaptations of the *VAE*, and one which, moreover, pre-dates much of the manuscript tradition, at least, of the Greek *Life*, and is appreciably older, too, than the manuscripts of the Latin text which is now known to be closest to it; that itself is the Latin recension which is itself closest to the Greek. The *Saltair* is accordingly a very important witness both to the history, and to the development and ongoing tradition, of the apocryphon, and although its basic generic difference is patent—it is a rhymed poem, with various patent poetic features—it offers too a number of motif variations, many of which may (now) be traced to one distinctive variant version of the *VAE* itself, but some of which, and certainly the structuring, may be presumed to be of local origin or to depend upon imagination or authorial (mis)understanding of the original at some stage.[9] The contextualization of the material in this Irish work is also of interest, since it is placed within a poem based on the Bible in its popular form, that is, incorporated fully into a version of Genesis giving the biblical narrative of the creation and fall with some— usually familiar—non-canonical elements, and itself preceded, as was usual, by the fall of the angels. The distinctive penance section of the *VAE* and the death of Adam are followed by further canonical biblical passages. The manuscript in which it is found—Rawlinson B 502 in the Bodleian Library (formerly thought of as the 'Book of Glendalough'), written about 150 years after the composition of the work—places it together with other

portions) in Eleanor Hull, *The Poem-Book of the Gael* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1912), 1–50. Other small sections have been edited separately or in anthologies, or rendered into modern Irish: see McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 14. There are extracts translated in Herbert and McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*.

[8] Relevant studies of the work as a whole (not referred to elsewhere) include: St John D. Seymour, 'The Signs of Doomsday in the *Saltair na Rann*', *PRIA* 36C (1921–4), 154–63; Eleanor Knott, 'An Index to the Proper Names in *Saltair na Rann*', *Ériu*, 16 (1952), 99–122; Gearóid Mac Eoin, 'The Date and Authorship of *Saltair na Rann*', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 28 (1960/1), 51–67; David Greene, 'The Religious Epic', in James Carney (ed.), *Early Irish Poetry* (Cork: Mercer, 1965 = Thomas Davis Lectures, 1959/60), 73–84; Gearóid Mac Eoin, 'Observations on *Saltair na Rann*', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 39 (1982), 1–28; John Carey, 'Cosmology in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 17 (1985), 33–52; John Carey, 'The Heavenly City in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 18 (1986), 87–104; John Carey, 'Angelology in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 19 (1987), 1–8; John Carey, '*Visio Sancti Pauli* and the *Saltair*'s Hell', *Éigse*, 23 (1989), 39–44; Caoimhín Breatnach, 'Rawlinson B. 502, Lebar Glinne dá Locha and *Saltair na Rann*', *Éigse*, 30 (1997), 109–132. I am indebted especially to John Carey for information over many years on his work on the *Saltair*.

[9] See in this general context Robert E. McNally's paper 'The Imagination and Early Irish Biblical Exegesis', *Annuale medievale*, 10 (1969), 5–27.

quasi-biblical pieces, such as the Irish *Sex aetates mundi*, which follows it, though the manuscript as such is essentially historical-genealogical.[10]

The *Saltair* in its verse form is recorded in part only in a few other manuscripts: canto X is in verse in the Leabhar Breac (Royal Irish Academy 23 P 16), compiled in about 1400; the sixteenth-/seventeenth-century MS 24.P.27 in the Royal Irish Academy has some of the first eight cantos, and Martin McNamara has noted two even more recent fragments.[11] There is a more extensive tradition of prose recensions, however. The date of the *Saltair* and the range of the prose versions make it important in terms of reception of the apocryphon, and hence in the ongoing life of the work, for the usual double reason. In reception terms, we may see that the *VAE* was known (in a particular form) from the tenth century onwards in Ireland; and the basic text develops and establishes (through the prose versions) further variations. Very strikingly, finally, the *Saltair* and hence the Irish tradition does not seem to have been affected by the overlap with the Holy Rood legends to any extent. Indeed, Seth and the journey to paradise for the oil of mercy play no part in this text at all, and the sole reflection of this role is found in Ireland in the Irish *Gospel of Nicodemus*. It can only be assumed that the episode in the *VAE* in which Eve and Seth return to paradise when Adam is dying was simply not in the Latin source.

The work was probably composed by Airbertach Mac Cosse Dobráin of Ros Ailithir, that is, Rosscarberry in County Cork. Earlier ascriptions to Angus the Culdee (Oengus Célé Dé) have been rejected. The very long canto XI in particular is clearly based upon the *VAE*, and we may add canto XII on the death of Adam, although it does not, as indicated, have the motif of the return to paradise. Earlier cantos (certainly IV, dealing with the fall of Lucifer, and possibly also VIII, on the devil and the serpent, and IX–X on the fall of Adam) must also be taken into consideration, in that they contain elements clearly taken from the *VAE*, although not in the order of the Latin work. Canto XII and some of the earlier ones contain, however, much that was thought originally to be found only in the Greek *Life* (albeit the immediate source was patently Latin, because of the use of Latin words). Our view of the source

---

[10]   There is a facsimile of the Rawlinson B manuscript (the text of the *Saltair* is on fos. 19–40) edited with an introduction and indexes by Kuno Meyer, *Rawlinson B. 502: A Collection of Pieces in Prose and Verse in the Irish Language Compiled during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909).

[11]   See McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 14. The reference to the poem in the Leabhar Breac should read 10 rather than 11 (it comes in the middle of a prose recension). He notes that the corrupt modernized copy in Royal Irish Academy 23 G. 25 does contain canto 11, which has *VAE* material, and that RIA MS 24.P.27 (sixteenth/seventeenth century) and National Library of Ireland MS G 167 (1727) go as far as v. 1197 (ending therefore in canto VIII).

has now been radically modified in the light of Jean-Pierre Pettorelli's edition of the Paris (and Milan) versions of the Latin text, but problems still remain for three reasons: the twelfth-century Paris manuscript is geographically and chronologically at some distance from tenth-century Ireland; the Irish work rearranges the structure seen in the Paris text; and there are still major differences, such as the absence of the Sethite quest.

The verse *Saltair* was itself adapted in a series of prose redactions in Irish (known as *Scél Saltrach na Rann*, 'the story of *Saltair na Rann*'), which of course included the *VAE* material, and these portions are attested in a variety of manuscripts in different forms, some of them relatively late. Principal among these are the Leabhar Breac, the Yellow Book of Lecan (Leabhar Buidhe Lecain, Trinity College Dublin MS 1318, formerly H 2.16; late fourteenth century), the 16th century Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne (Royal Irish Academy 24 P 25), the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum (Royal Irish Academy 23 O 48), and MS 72.1.40 (formerly Gaelic XL) in the Advocates' Library collection in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh. Other parts of the prose adaptation of *Saltair na Rann*—post-Adamic biblical history—are found in a range of other manuscripts, the tradition of which is complex. We are concerned principally with the *VAE* material, and here the pattern is as follows. The prose version in the Leabhar Breac (the most substantial of the prose texts relevant here, the language of which places it not long after the composition of the original) covers cantos II, IV, VI–IX, and XI (breaking off just after the end of the penance scene); the first canto is found in prose in another manuscript—BL Egerton 92 of the fifteenth century, with a shorter version in BL Egerton 1782, sixteenth century[12]—and canto X is in verse in the Leabhar Breac. The Liber Flavus Fergusiorum and MS BL Egerton 136 contain the passages concerned with the fall of Lucifer and of Adam, but the central body of *VAE* material, parallel with the Leabhar Breac text, notably the penance, is found in the Yellow Book of Lecan, the Liber Flavus, and the Royal Irish Academy MS 24 P 25. The penance pericope is also in the Advocates' Library MS, where, interestingly, it has the distinctive heading *Pennaid Adaim*, 'Penance of Adam', matching many of the Latin texts. The death of Adam (canto XII) seems to be absent from the prose recensions.

Not connected with the *VAE* material, of course, but of general significance is the tradition noted above of prose recensions of the *post*-Adamic biblical history from the later parts of the *Saltair*, also found in a number of the manuscripts. That in the Book of Uí Maine (Royal Irish Academy MS D. ii 1),

---

[12] The story of the creation of Adam from various components, often found together with the *VAE* material, is translated from this MS by Herbert and McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*, 1.

also compiled in the late fourteenth century, and set by McNamara against the Leabhar Breac as the second major prose redaction, has the intriguingly pseudepigraphic heading 'Epistil Matusalem Inso Sis 7 Scél Saltrach na Rann ainm aile dó' ('Epistle of Methusalah, and another name is the story of *Saltair na Rann*') and begins with Abraham. The language is linguistically even older than that of the Leabhar Breac prose. This material is also in the Yellow Book of Lecan (twice), the Book of Ballymote, and MS Trinity College Dublin H.2.12, as well as in the Leabhar Breac itself.[13]

The question of the source used for the *Saltair* was debated for some time, since no direct Latin source matching the poem was known in Ireland or indeed elsewhere. Frequently, unusual motifs were claimed as being especially Irish, sometimes even when they were in fact quite familiar parts of the basic story. More important, however, was the apparent puzzle in the fact that some motifs found in the *Saltair* seemed to be present not in the *VAE* but only in the Greek version, then still known as the *Apocalypsis Mosis*. Since the source was clearly a Latin one (there are Latin words, albeit occasionally not very clear ones, in the Irish text), various possibilities were explored. R. C. Thurneysen suggested in the 1880s a composite document based upon the Latin and Greek versions, but in Latin. He also noted the absence of the Sethite parts of the narrative, and commented that there was probably additional material there as well. St John D. Seymour in the 1920s thought of two separate texts available to the Irish poet, and in the absence of other evidence my own commentary on the work in the 1970s assumed an unknown Latin text, although it was patent that the Irish poet did not 'know' the Greek *Life* in any real sense, and by then it was clear that there was no definitive text of the *Vita* in any case. Michael Stone continued to speculate on the source question in the early 1990s, but Jean-Pierre Pettorelli's very valuable researches into the whole tradition of the *VAE*

---

[13] On the texts see Hildegard L. C. Tristram, *Sex aetates mundi* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1985), 165–7. The prose position is described in McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 14–20, and in detail with a stemma by Myles Dillon, 'Scél Saltrach na Rann', *Celtica*, 4 (1958), 1–43, who prints a text and translation of the 'Epistle'. The material in the Leabhar Breac is in print with a translation in B. McCarthy, *The Codex Palatino-Vaticanus No. 830* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1892 = Todd Lecture Series 3), 38–71. There are translations of some of the prose versions of the *Saltair* and other related material in Herbert and McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*, including the Egerton creation of Adam, the creation and fall from the Leabhar Breac (and the Liver Flavus), the penance scene from RIA MS 24 P 25 (collated with the Leabhar Breac and the Yellow Book of Lecan). The penance from the Edinburgh manuscript is edited and translated by Alan O. Anderson, '*Pennaid Adaim*', *Revue celtique*, 24 (1909), 243–53. McCarthy's text from the Leabhar Breac, Anderson's from the Advocates' Library MS, and that by Herbert and McNamara from RIA 24 P 25 (noted as MS 25 P 25) are the only relevant prose versions available in print and/or translation. Many of the manuscripts are available in facsimile electronically as part of the Meamram Páipéar Ríomhaire (Irish Script on Screen) project of the Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies.

eventually clarified assumptions about the source of the *Saltair* by providing us with concrete evidence of—as should have been expected—a different Latin text of the *VAE*, very close in some respects to the Greek *Life*, and one which matches the material provided in the Irish poem.[14] He printed a highly significant Latin text with oriental or Greek elements from the manuscript in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (MS Lat 3832, twelfth century, originating probably in western France), with a parallel in the Ambrosiana in Milan (O 35 supra, fourteenth century), which *do* match the unusual elements in the *Saltair*, such as that in canto XII, where for example the story is told (as also in the Greek *Life*) of how after his death Adam is sent to the 'third heaven' by Michael to await the day of judgement.[15]

Pettorelli's edition of the Paris text of the *VAE* is patently important for the source study of the *Saltair* and thus of the dissemination of the *VAE* as such. Because the two manuscripts he adduces are later than the *Saltair* and from continental Europe, however, the Latin and Irish versions are interdependent in the pursuit of the tradition. Commenting on the passage, Pettorelli notes that 'le *Saltair na Rann* dépend très probablement d'un témoin plus ancien du texte transmis par *Pr*' (scil. the Paris text). This is probably as close to a solution for the source question of the Irish poem as we are going to get, that it was an earlier text of the redaction represented in these two manuscripts. It must be noted that the Paris recension as we have it does not fully represent the source because there are still very considerable differences, apart from

---

[14] See McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 15–16 on the earlier background. R. Thurneysen, '*Saltair na Rann*', *Revue celtique*, 6 (1883/5), 96–109 and 371–3, St John D. Seymour, 'The Book of Adam and Eve in Ireland', *PRIA* 36C (1921–4), 121–33; Brian Murdoch, 'An Early Irish Adam and Eve Story: *Saltair na Rann* and the Traditions of the Fall', *Medieval Studies*, 35 (1973), 146–77, and in the introduction to my commentary to the partial edition, *Irish Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 32–4. Dumville, 'Biblical Apocrypha', 307, touches on the *VAE* question. The question of source and poetic originality led the late David Greene, the most generous—and for that reason most scholarly—of scholars, to propose the collaboration which led to the edition and commentary, and the work of Jean-Pierre Pettorelli has moved the study on further. See finally Stone, who continued to speculate on what was, before Pettorelli's work, hypothesis about the *Saltair*, in his 'Jewish Tradition, the Pseudepigrapha and the Christian West', in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament ss 166, 1993), 431–49 (438–41 with speculations on the *Saltair*). See also his *History*, 112–15 (esp. 113 n. 127); his interesting comments on the Armenian and Georgian Adambooks (which also show mixed-form texts) again pre-date Pettorelli's work. All this illustrates yet again the fluidity of the so-called Adambook as a text.

[15] Pettorelli, 'La Vie latine' (1998), 5–104, with the Paris text in the second paper, 'Vie latine' (1999), 5–52. See 38–9 of the latter for the comments on the *Saltair* and 25 for the relevant text; Pettorelli (to whom I am again indebted for information on his research) illustrates in the first paper the huge complexity of text types, as well as the problems of determining the relative importance of Latin and vernacular versions. In his 'Analyse', 260–5, he discusses in detail and notes the importance of this redaction, which comes closer in some respects to the oriental versions and the Greek *Life*.

those depending upon the literary structure of the Irish poem. In some respects the Milan version is slightly closer, but it is even later. It is interesting, finally, that the death of Adam, where this version of the *VAE* is of special importance, is not much represented in the later prose redactions of the *Saltair*.[16] There may possibly still be some genuinely Irish motifs in the poem, but they are likely to be few. The basic apocryphon moves on a stage in the Irish poem, therefore, and then yet again in the prose recensions, from the base of an unusual version known in some form by the poet at a very early stage.

Saltair na Rann

The substance of the *VAE* in *Saltair na Rann* itself is found principally in canto XI, although as indicated we need to look at the death of Adam in XII, which matches quite closely the version in Pettorelli's Paris redaction, and also at earlier cantos, because the *Saltair* is arranged according to (quasi-)biblical history, and the question of contextualizing (and of merging apocryphal and canonical material pretty well seamlessly) remains important. Thus the fall of the angels is out of position and adapted in canto IV, but patently depends upon Lucifer's own narrative of his fall as told to Adam in the *VAE*, though in the poem it is presented objectively. The creation of Adam in canto VI depends on a legend often found associated with or appended to the *VAE* (though not the Paris text), but the story of the fall itself, clearly biblical and exegetical in the first instance, has also been expanded from the canonical text with points also taken from the *VAE*; the poet seems to have used not only the biblical Genesis 3, but also the narrative of the fall delivered by Eve to her children when Adam is dying. Adam himself recalls a few aspects of his fall, but his recapitulation seems not to have been used. Beside its substantial use in canto XI, then, the *VAE* has been used for other parts of the poem, diffused and integrated completely. Some major elements that are present in the Paris version are, on the other hand, entirely absent from the Irish poem. Of the prose versions, the main redaction in the Leabhar Breac (and indeed also that in the Yellow Book of Lecan) follows the pattern of the poem. The Advocates'

---

[16] Herbert and McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*, present the death of Adam from the *Saltair* itself, and note sensibly on 167 (a decade before the publication of Pettorelli's work) that the source was a Latin Adambook with the material found in the Greek *Life*. They also note that Seth and the oil of mercy are completely absent and known in Irish only from its other source in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, an Irish text of which they also translate: see 79 and 178–9 on the origins of the text (here from the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum). On the complex Nicodemus apocryphon see McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 68–75.

MS *Pennaid Adaim* and the text in the Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne, for example, present only the penance, and in doing so match many other vernacular texts in other languages, underlining its existence as a separate episode.

The source of the very long canto XI, which contains nearly 140 quatrains, is the *VAE,* beginning with the penance scene immediately after the expulsion, and moving on to the story of Cain and Abel and then the birth of Seth. The canto is therefore a direct version in rhymed quatrains of the basic apocryphon. Because this post-expulsion material is set in a context of continuous biblical history, events which happened earlier but which are recapitulated in the *VAE* are retold in a different manner, objectivized or placed in a different context. Canto XI has some apparently unusual elements, but broadly speaking does not contain very much that suggested the Greek *Life* to earlier commentators, because the penance itself is not present in most texts of the Greek *Life* in any case.[17] The Paris text does explain other small anomalies, but broadly speaking this part of the poem corresponds with most versions of the Latin.

The first part of the *VAE* is closely followed, but is also expanded, so that we have a development of the apocryphon not explained even by newly discovered Latin texts. That Adam and Eve do not here make the hut ('tabernaculum') mentioned in virtually all Latin versions is one minor difference, as is the reference to the coldness they feel. The latter—a reasonable enough expansion of 'in magna tribulatione' (*VAE* 1)—is a commonplace of the presentation of the expulsion into the hostile world, and it also occurs elsewhere in vernacular versions, while the reference to hunger is present in all the Latin versions. The reproaches of Adam to Eve, which occupy eleven quatrains, are, however, a major extension and a new (albeit again logical) development to known texts, which refer simply to the pair as weeping and wailing, 'lugentes et clamantes'. In the *Saltair* Adam reiterates the joys that have been lost, including, interestingly, 'frequent converse with angels'

---

[17] I have commented in detail on the canto in my *Irish Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 101–37, so that some points will be summarized here. However, all citations from the *Vita* in the discussion of the Irish texts are now from Pettorelli's edition of the Paris (and Milan) versions, 'Vie latine'. This uses the section numbers of the Meyer edition, so that passages may easily be located, although there are often small verbal variations ('clamantes' rather than 'lamentantes', 'tribulatio' for 'tristitia', and so on). The sole *Vita* MS noted in Ireland by Halford, 'Manuscript Tradition', 422, and Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 233, is Trinity College Dublin MS 509, a fifteenth-century parchment of a redaction closer to some of those considered by Mozley in the English tradition, most notably Balliol 228, with Holy Rood material. It is clearly unconnected with the *Saltair* tradition. It remains an open question how the unusual earlier Latin version came to Ireland and what precisely it looked like. For the penance scene in the Greek versions (in late manuscripts), see Tromp, *Life of Adam and Eve*, 180–1.

(v. 1496), and in poetic terms develops the aspect of safety—that fire, water, weapons, and sickness were unable to hurt them. In theological terms, the culmination of this catalogue is more significant: Lucifer was not able to harm them as long as they remained under the law. This has literary force, given that Lucifer will shortly be able to attack them again. Adam summarizes with a reiteration of their own guilt. Other Adambooks (such as the Ethiopic text) and several vernacular versions of the *VAE* expand (without using the same motifs) Adam's feelings, and one German text even has the title *Adams Klage*, 'Adam's Lament'. Although in the *Saltair* Adam's blaming of Eve is not as severe as is sometimes found, it does also lead on to the next motif, Eve's demand that she be killed because she was the transgressor. Here the Latin is followed, both for Eve's self-reproach and for Adam's firm refusal, in which, however, a reiterated fear of Lucifer is an addition in the poem. The next section continues with *VAE* 2 and the hunger of the pair, followed by Adam's attempt to find food; the small rearrangement to place Eve's request for death first was presumably a deliberate change rather than a variant in the source. I have noted elsewhere that this is effective, basing the desire for death on pure regret, rather than despair following the hunger.[18] The *Saltair* follows the Latin with Adam's suggestion of penance and Eve's query as to what penance is. Smaller details here are of interest, but are not yet conclusive in terms of source. The rivers are as usual and the variable numbers of days (even the Paris and Milan versions differ) are as in the Paris text (forty-seven and thirty-three, although it is not entirely clear, and these times appear elsewhere too).[19] More importantly, that Eve's hair floats upon the water is not in Meyer's edition, nor in the Greek *Life* in the late versions that contain this story (though it is found in other versions). In Latin texts from England there is (*VAE* 7) a parallel reference to the hair of both of them, and in the Paris recension it seems (depending upon a possessive adjective and on the context) to be only Adam's hair that is thus described. There are variations in other vernacular texts, however. The suggestion that they both ask all creatures to pray with them is also unusual; in the *Saltair* it is initially put by Adam as a suggestion to both of them, whereas in all the Latin texts only Adam asks the creatures, and then only when he is in the water. This may well be an anticipatory addition by the poet, and hence a further development of the text, although it is not clear that Eve actually does so when she begins her penance, even though both pray (quatrain 1641–4). However, there are other

---

[18] *Irish Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 105.
[19] Pettorelli, 'Vie latine', 12: the Milan version has thirty and forty days respectively for Eve and Adam. The Paris text refers first to forty-seven and then to forty days. See Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 222–3, for the variety of times given in different manuscripts.

vernacular versions where the Tigris also stands still and the development is an understandable one. Far less understandable is quatrain 1621–4, which seems to say that Adam and Eve both complete their set times in the rivers; however, it is not entirely clear, especially comparing the parallel passages in the Irish prose versions, whether this is actually what is meant, or whether this is simply a recapitulation of the time they were intended to spend.

Once Adam is in the river, too, he is ministered to by angelic voices. Quatrain 1625–8 of the Irish poem is slightly problematic, but seems to indicate an angelic ministration for nineteen days, itself unusual in the Latin tradition, although they do assist Adam to pray in the Armenian, Georgian, and Greek texts. In the Paris text, angelic voices come daily, 'per singulos dies', in the Milan version seventeen times, 'per singulos dies decem et septem'; the time is usually that applied to Adam's prayers to God, so long, according to the Arundel manuscript and indeed to English vernacular versions, that his voice became hoarse. Thus the 'text' of the *VAE* may simply have the animals and the river assisting Adam, or a similarly formulated addition may have his voice becoming hoarse, or angels coming to him. Variations in the number of days involved are common, and one of the English Latin texts printed by Mozley has 'decem et nouem', in a slightly different context for the same passage, and it is likely that the source text actually referred to nineteen.[20] The Irish poet may nevertheless be adapting at this point too, however, because Adam's prayer to the Jordan and to the animals (the latter point anticipated in an earlier quatrain) comes in the *Saltair* after, rather than before, the references to the angels. The Paris text of the *Vita* concludes the passage (*VAE* 8) with the idea that the beasts all wept for eighteen days: 'completi sunt autem dies xviiitem, quibus lugentia erant omnia animantia Adam' (a variant of), which may also have affected the number. It is not in the Milan version.

The Irish poem continues now with the earlier part of *VAE* 8, with the motif of the static river and all the creatures praying to the nine orders of angels, who in their turn pray to God. This enhanced and mediatory role of the angelic hosts is a further new development. The concept of angelic intervention is hardly unusual, and they have a role in the Slavonic version of the story. However, there is a further extremely important variation to the *VAE* as a text in the following quatrains, in that God expressly forgives Adam

---

[20] See Greene's and Kelly's notes, *Adam and Eve Story*, i. 67 n. 4. Seymour suggests that the notion is based on a misreading of the text, 'Book of Adam', 125, but this solution is unnecessary in the light of Latin textual variants; see my commentary: *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 111–12. In different texts time indicators like this might refer to the prayers of Adam, or of the animals and the river. The formula 'facte sunt ad eum' is slightly awkward.

at this point. In all versions of the Latin text, the adversary ('adversarius Sathanas', later 'diabolus') now notices what seems as if it will be a successful penance: Adam has fasted for a portion of the set number of days (seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen) and the angels are ministering to him, and the devil is therefore worried by this. The *Saltair*, however, is more specific: because of the angelic intervention, God forgives Adam's sin and that of his descendants, which sounds in theological terms like the redemption from original sin, even if the quatrain (1653–6) is still slightly enigmatic. The motif is more significant in view of the fact that the entire question of the oil of mercy and the promise of the redemption is entirely absent from the rest of the work. It is when the devil ('Demun dub', 'the black devil', v. 1661) hears of this actual forgiveness that he decides to act, and goes 'in a good shape' to Eve again. In fact he actually spells out for us what he proposes to do, namely to disturb her devotion and destroy her work (when she has been tempted out, Adam indeed asks her in most versions what happened to her penance, 'ubi est opus . . . tue penitencie', *VAE* 10). In the Latin, Satan (referred to as Lucifer as well as devil in the Irish) is simply 'conturbatus', disturbed, and thus goes in the form of an angel to the Tigris. Lucifer was, after all, an angel.

The second temptation of Eve follows with some variations once again. The poet of the *Saltair* rationalizes Eve's thoughts in the first quatrain after the supposed angel comes to her by noting that she presumes the angel is speaking with pity (an idea which he actually voices a little later). The *Saltair* does not have the point invariably made in *VAE* 9 that all the angels have prayed, as a result of which God has sent the speaker as a messenger. In the *Saltair* we have just been told, ironically, that all the hosts of angels actually have assisted Adam to gain God's forgiveness. Either the poet of the *Saltair* misunderstood the point (which seems less plausible), or he has omitted Lucifer's comments here deliberately because they might clash with the forgiveness motif. At all events, an aspect of the *VAE* has been changed. Further, there is no reference in the Irish poem to the provision of food for Eve: in the *VAE* the devil plays strongly upon Eve's hunger. Eve leaves the water immediately, but the less than clear motif that she is as green as grass from the cold at this point is not present at all, although in fact vernacular texts more often than not retain it verbatim. It is here perhaps subsumed in the devil's earlier comments to Eve that her form has changed.

When she leaves the river, she simply faints as if dead, as in the *VAE*, but a further important change follows. Where in *VAE* 10 Eve is led to Adam once she recovers, the *Saltair* pauses to explore Eve's state of mind. The statement in *VAE* 9, that Eve believed the words, is not rendered, but she does now at least begin to doubt, albeit belatedly, although we are told (vv. 1689–90) that she does not recognize Lucifer. The point of this narrative unit is that the devil

actually *is* recognizable—Adam knows at once who he is—but Eve, who is referred to with sympathy by the poet, is at least in doubt, so that Lucifer has to reassure her as he leads her to Adam that he actually has come from God. This is matched in no other version of the *VAE*, and recalls only comments such as those in the Anglo-/Old Saxon *Genesis B*, that Eve at the time of the first temptation acted in good faith.

Adam, as indicated, recognizes Lucifer at once and reproaches Eve; Adam's reaction in horror in vv. 1707–8 is a logical expansion, and is encountered elsewhere in the vernacular. He now turns to the devil (it is not always clear in Latin who speaks first, though it is Adam in the Paris version), but while Adam's words follow the sense of the Latin text closely, they are expanded in a poetically effective manner. The single comment that he and Eve were not responsible for Lucifer's loss of his previous honour and glory is repeated in varied form over six quatrains (1729–52), the first five of them anaphoric ('Ní sinn . . .', 'It is not we who . . .'). This is a poetic feature rather than an actual development of the apocryphon as such, and it is noteworthy that the prose recensions in Irish cut this section down again. A final quatrain (1753–6)[21] reiterates the question (which is put in different ways in Latin versions) of why the devil is behaving as he does.

The devil's response again demonstrates the poetic aspects of the *Saltair*, in that we have six anaphoric quatrains ('In cuman lat a Ádaim', 'Do you remember, O Adam')—this time omitted entirely from the prose texts—rendering freely the devil's sorrowful but brief complaint in *VAE* 12, blaming Adam for his banishment to hell, which the Irish text elaborates upon by using commonplaces from descriptions of hell. The passage culminates in a pair of quatrains (1781–8) in which the devil states that both he and Adam were cast out of heaven, an implied solidarity not always perceptible in the Latin, although the use of the word 'equidem' (meaning here that Adam did the same to him, in fact) which appears in the Paris text (it is not found in other texts, including Milan) may possibly lie behind it. The *Saltair*, like the *VAE*, now has the devil recount the story of the fall of the angels, although it has already been given in a somewhat truncated form, but based nevertheless on the *VAE*, in the nine quatrains of canto IV (canto V is a description of hell) objectively by the narrator. Here it is presented more fully and subjectively by Lucifer himself, the passage taking up around twice as many quatrains as in canto IV.

The actual narrative as given by Lucifer is not an exact match; there are expansions and repetitions, and also one or two more substantial variations.

---

[21] In the Greene–Kelly edition, *Adam and Eve Story*, i. 75, a typographic slip has garbled the line numbers here.

In quatrain 1813–20 Lucifer is summoned first to worship Adam. *VAE* 14 in all versions states clearly that Michael does so first. What is clearer is that Lucifer addresses his refusal and the reasons for it (that Adam is the junior creation) in the *Saltair* to God, rather than to Michael. This, incidentally, is true too in canto IV, in which Michael does not appear at all. The Paris version, by being somewhat abbreviated in comparison to other texts, also seems to afford less prominence to Michael. Finally, a third of the angels support Lucifer (vv. 1837–40), where most versions of *VAE* 15 have something along the lines of 'ceteri angeli qui sub me erant', or '. . . sunt mecum', implying only those originally subordinate to Lucifer. Some texts, however, including the Paris version, abbreviate this so that we are left with 'ceteri angeli', and the Milan version has an even less specific 'alii angeli'. The specificity of the Irish text may represent a development by the poet or it may have been in the source.

The echo of Lucifer's boast, based on Isaiah 14, that he will set himself above God, is not reflected in canto XI of the *Saltair*. Consideration must be given at this point, however, to the objective narrative of Lucifer's fall in canto IV. The chronology of the various falls is here made illogical by the fact that Lucifer's fall, again for refusing to worship Adam, is placed before Adam is actually created. There is, of course, a ramified tradition of the fall of the angels and the devil's rebellion, which, albeit non-biblical, is encountered regularly in narratives of Genesis. The most familiar is that based entirely on the death-song to the King of Babylon in Isaiah 14 (with parallels in other apocryphal writings such as the *Secrets of Enoch*); Genesis has no devil, but biblical authority of a sort is provided by Wisdom 2: 24, Apocalypse 20: 2, Luke 10: 18, Matthew 25: 41, 2 Peter 2: 4, and Jude 6. Isaiah 14: 12–14, the death-song in which the arrogant King is referred to as Lucifer, the daystar, who tried to set up his throne above that of God, leads to an identification of Lucifer with the devil and Satan (though these are sometimes separate), and Lucifer's arrogance therefore leads to his fall and that of his followers without reference to Adam, who is sometimes created to replace the fallen choir of angels. The position normally occupied by this narrative in vernacular adaptations of Genesis is, in spite of the logic, filled in the *Saltair* by the alternative version from the *VAE*. In *VAE* 15 (in many versions), in the devil's own account, there is also an allusion to the desire to place his seat above that of the highest, echoing Isaiah 14. Two quatrains of canto IV (849–56) have Lucifer expressing his superiority and asserting that there will be no king above him, which is not quite the same as the boast of the King of Babylon, but is at least close. It is, however, absent from Lucifer's own retrospective narrative in canto XI, which makes good sense, as Lucifer would be unlikely to express his own guilt. It leaves us, however, with a source problem.

The reference to Isaiah is present in most versions of the *VAE*, and indeed in many vernacular adaptations, which thus preserve the two views of Lucifer's reasons for rebellion; it is not, however, in the Paris and Milan recensions. Since the *Saltair* has it in the earlier canto, it must have been known to the poet, so that we may assume that it was either present in the source and left out on the second occasion deliberately, or that it was not present in the source (like the existing Paris text) and was added in canto IV because this was the usual place for a familiar account of the diabolical fall. In other vernacular works which combine the biblical Genesis story with the *VAE*, the fall of the angels may be omitted, or the Isaiah story only is used before Adam is created. In one case (the Middle English Vernon prose text) the tale is told twice, as here, but in the first case it does come after the creation of Adam, thus preserving the logic. In German the problem is even addressed directly with a sophisticated reference to the contemporaneity of all events in the mind of God.[22] To look briefly at the rest of canto IV: we are given, essentially, an objective narrative of what Lucifer tells Adam in XI. God demands that he give reverence to Adam, Lucifer refuses because he is older, and with the echo (which does match the position in *VAE* 15) of Isaiah, he asserts his own superiority, after which he is expelled to the prison of hell, which is described in the following canto V in great detail.

Returning to canto XI, the conclusion to this portion again diverges from all versions of the *VAE* in a significant manner: *VAE* 17 is a prayer from Adam to God to rid him of the devil, after which the devil retreats and Adam completes his penance. In the *Saltair*, God has of course already granted forgiveness to Adam and his kin, so that here the devil can do no more than reiterate his everlasting enmity (and threats) towards Adam, who himself dismisses the devil before he emerges from the river (quatrain 1881–4). There is no reference to his having completed the penance, as there is in pretty well all the Latin versions.

There is no canto division at this point in the *Saltair*, but the penance section effectively ends here, and we turn instead to the later life of the protoplasts in a rather brief form. The separate text of the prose *Pennaid Adaim* breaks off at this point, as does indeed the more extensive prose text of

---

[22] The theme is much discussed. See Brian Murdoch, *The Medieval Popular Bible: Expansions of Genesis in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), the first chapter of which considers the introduction of the devil into Genesis. On the exegesis of the Isaiah passage, see Émile Turdeanu, 'Apocryphes bogomiles et pseudo-bogomiles', *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 138 (1950), 22–52, esp. 38–49, and 139 (1951), 176–218. On the links with the apocryphal narrative from the *Secrets of Enoch*, see my commentary on the *Saltair*, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 42–5, where I note comparable vernacular versions of the *VAE*, and cite one German text; others are discussed in Chapter 4, below.

the Leabhar Breac, which ends its version of canto XI here with an enigmatic 'et cetera'. In the *Saltair* itself, various further new details appear: Adam and Eve live in more or less abject misery for a further year, but there is no reference to the important motif of Eve's departure, and their separation towards the east and the west, something found in all *VAE* versions, for example. That the pair are described as living in caves is also interesting, given the construction of the hut ('tabernaculum') referred to at the start of most *VAE* versions; significantly it is not present in the opening of the Milan text, however, so that it may have been absent from the poet's source, who then substitutes the idea of the cave.[23]

That the pair are without clothing ('cen hétach', v. 1892), on the other hand, is an assumption sometimes made elsewhere in the vernacular tradition in spite of the biblical Genesis 3: 21. In illustrations, Adam and Eve are shown as naked after their penance, although they may be depicted with the garments that God provided for them before they enter the river. The pair are also spoken of earlier in the *Saltair* (quatrains 1293–6, 1353–6) as having lost their garments at the time of the first fall, however, which is a reflection of an exegetical commonplace about the garments of innocence.[24]

The new pericope on the birth of Cain is very sudden in the *Saltair* in comparison even with the Paris and Milan versions of the *Vita*, which do retain the interesting passage in which Eve appeals to the heavenly bodies to tell Adam, Adam appeals to God, and angels minister to Eve during childbirth. That this is not part of the *Saltair* is the more surprising since the quatrains in which Eve does give birth makes clear that the *VAE* in a recension otherwise akin to the Paris or Milan texts is still behind the work. The relevant quatrains read:

Eve brought forth a child—fair the deed—he began to walk immediately; good was his prudent service to his household, cutting the grass for his father.

   With this, the colour of his limbs is measured—as bright as one of the stars; fair, strong-limbed, famous, swift, cruel, fierce, truly wild. (1897–1904)

Greene and Kelly note that the syntax is not entirely clear in the second of these quatrains in the reference to the star. There are two elements here that

---

[23] I have speculated on possible sources for this motif in *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 127; seductive as the possible links with the *Cave of Treasures* may be, it seems more likely that this is a spontaneous (and fairly obvious) assumption on the part of the poet. That he did not know or remember the 'tabernaculum' may indicate, however, that it was not in his source, so that the Milan text is important here.

[24] See for a history of the exegesis my *The Fall of Man in the Early Middle High German Biblical Epic* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1972), 106–18, and as 'The Garments of Paradise' in *Euphorion*, 61 (1967), 375–82. See also *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 87–9.

require consideration, however: first, the reference to the grass, and secondly that to the star. Both elements are problematic within the history of the apocryphal Adambooks, and both have special relevance here.

The notion of Cain cutting the grass seems to be unique to the *Saltair*, and seems very likely indeed to be an Irish interpretation of what is in any case a complicated motif. That Cain in most versions of the *VAE* immediately runs and fetches grass or herbs for his mother is usually viewed in terms of the now opaque etymology of Cain in Hebrew as 'reed', which differs from that provided by Genesis 4 (and which has been used as an argument for a Hebrew origin of the whole apocryphon or for the existence of a separate midrash). In vernacular versions, Cain's instant and specific activity is usually taken simply as an example of a miraculous event. Whatever the original sense of the motif may have been, once the etymology has become unrecognizable, Cain may bring healing or nourishing herbs or sometimes just flowers to his mother, and the point—no longer clear in Latin—is regularly reinterpreted in the vernacular. The inventive (and endearing) notion of Cain later cutting the grass for his parents is a nice indication of the protean nature of the apocryphon.[25]

The reference to Cain being bright as a star is of equal interest, but rather different, and in source terms more important. Most *VAE* texts have, after Cain's birth, the phrase 'et erat lucidus', 'and he was radiant'. The origin of the notion is unclear,[26] but only the English redaction has the alternative reading 'lugidus' (associated with *lugeo* or *lugubris*, 'sad', and hence more readily applicable to Eve than to Cain, which is grammatically possible), and some texts clarify things very slightly to read 'filium lucidum', 'radiant son'. Most significantly, however, the Paris text (and the Milan analogue) read 'eratque ut stella lucidus' ('erat lucidus sicut stella'), 'as a star'. In fact both the Armenian and Georgian versions also have the star parallel, but these are within slightly more complex contexts.[27] However small, the detail is an important link with the Paris version as a source type, even if it still remains impossible to go much further than that, since in spite of the star image, the striking motif of the assistance of the angels at the birth is still missing entirely from the Irish poem. Does this mean that the Latin source used was even more abbreviated

---

[25] See my *Adam's Grace*, 34–5, and *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 128. In the prose texts, the Leabhar Breac, for example, does not continue the story that far; nor, of course, do those texts that only cover the penance in any case.

[26] Meyer speculates, '*Vita Adae*', 227–8 n., on a link with the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Genesis 4: 1 which refers to an angel, but he refers also to the alternative name of Cain given at the start of the Greek *Life*, Diaphotos or Adiaphotos, which Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 267 n. links with this idea. He also refers to the *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* 21.

[27] Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, 17.

than the Milan version of what Pettorelli designates *VAE* 21b, with his 21a
entirely absent? Involuntary or deliberate omission of that kind of detail
seems unlikely on the part of the poet. Whatever the reasons, this vernacular
version has changed the shape of the apocryphon somewhat. There is no
name etymology, comprehensible or otherwise, for Cain in the *Saltair*, which
matches none of the known apocryphal versions. In one further respect,
however, the *Saltair* demonstrates once more its dependence on something
akin to the Paris/Milan recension, since it echoes—though does not match
exactly—the comment by Adam, made in these, but not in other Latin
versions, that God was just in not permitting Adam to kill Eve ('Iustus est
dominus qui non permisit ut manibus meis caderes').[28] The indication yet
again is for a briefer text, such as the Milan version. The departure of Adam
and his family to the east is omitted, however, although the motif that
Michael provides seeds and instruction for Adam *is* present. That Michael
spreads the seeds or herbs out on a clean (flag-)stone ('licc glain', v. 1925) does
seem to be an addition, and this was commented upon already by Dean
Seymour. Absent from the *VAE*, too, is the idea that Michael also told Adam
how to tame the beasts, but the addition is a plausible one and is found in
other vernacular adaptations. It is worth noting that the Paris and Milan texts
do not contain the notion of Michael instructing Eve on childcare, which is
found in other Latin and indeed in vernacular versions.

In the *Saltair*, Abel is born after seven years. Most versions of the *VAE* do
not specify a time, but the Paris text has three years and the Milan version
notes 'post annos', so that presumably this was indeed in the source. The Paris
text has a name etymology for Abel ('virtus'), which is absent from the Milan
version; the Irish text inserts a quatrain (1937–40) describing Abel as the
chosen one of God, however, which might reflect this, or might just rest on
the medieval commonplace of Abel as a type of Christ.

Eve's vision follows, with the striking image of Cain drinking Abel's blood;
versions of the *VAE* vary in this motif, but not much detail is given here.
However, that the *Saltair*, v. 1944, refers to all of Abel's blood (which is equally
specific in the Greek *Life*) may be significant, even if it is not in the Paris text
that we have, which does, however, have the notion of Abel asking for some to
be left, which implies that Cain drinks it all. This particular detail is not in

---

[28] This point was not clear when I prepared the commentary, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 129,
and illustrates again the value of Pettorelli's work, although the passage in the Greek and Latin
tradition is more complex. Pettorelli discusses who is being addressed, 'Vie latine', 28–30, but
does not consider the *Saltair* at this point, where Adam is clearly speaking to Eve, so that that
was how the Irish poet understood his source.

other versions. The unpleasant addition in the Greek *Life* of Cain regurgitating the blood is (happily) not present in Irish or, as far as is known, in Latin.

In the three quatrains (1957–68) of the *Saltair* which follow, God instructs Gabriel to tell Adam of the impending murder of Abel, but not to tell Eve. Adam is not to be concerned because he will have another son; indeed, the following quatrain (1969–72) assures him that he will have many more sons and daughters. In my 1976 commentary[29] I noted that this was an unusual motif, adding that the closest parallel was again in the Greek *Life*, in which, however, the archangel Michael (not Gabriel) tells Adam at God's behest not to tell Cain (after the murder of Abel) about the prophecies of future children. That does not provide, of course, a very close parallel, and the answer lies yet again in the tradition represented by the Paris *Vita*. In the extended *VAE* 23 God says 'ad archangelum' (the name is not specified, but Gabriel and Michael are interchanged elsewhere in the *Saltair*) that Cain, who is a son of the devil ('filius diaboli'; v. 1964, 'mac . . . Díabul') will kill Abel, but that Eve is not to be told. All the Latin texts refer now to the birth of Seth and then of the other children, but, interestingly, the *Saltair* does not do so at this point. Not until quatrain 2009–12 is there a specific reference to the birth of Seth 'after a time', which at least echoes *VAE* 24 'post haec', and is not in the Paris text. The Irish poet seems clearly to have been following a source in that tradition, however, so that the small point may have been his version. The Paris version tells us that Adam has 123 children in all, 52 boys and 72 girls (Abel presumably accounting for the discrepancy of one). These figures, as usual, all vary throughout the Adambooks, though the *Saltair*'s figures of 72 of each sex is unusual. At least the girls match the Paris version, and a scribal variation between 52 and 72 is not implausible; most other versions of the Latin text have 63 in total (30 boys, 30 girls, Cain, Abel, and Seth). The number 72 is a commonplace for the descendants of Noah, however, a tradition which goes back to Augustine.[30] This represents the end of a thematic unit in the *VAE*, which in most versions moves on to Adam's narrative of his being taken to paradise and his vision, then (*VAE* 30) to Adam's death. The Paris text does not have the translation/apocalypse (nor is it in the Greek *Life*), but moves directly to the point where Adam recognizes his imminent death.

The *Saltair* follows neither version. The remaining quatrains of canto XI (1973–2020) recount the biblical story of the mark of Cain, and then give a version of the death of Cain which is extremely unusual and which does not

---

[29] *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 132.
[30] See James E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill (eds.), *The Prose 'Solomon and Saturn' and 'Adrian and Ritheus'* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 75.

involve his usual nemesis, the blind Lamech. Here Cain dies when he is struck by a bent tree in the Vale of Jehosaphat. This whole legend complex is a ramified one, but is not reflected in any versions of the *VAE*.[31] As already indicated, only quatrain 2009–12 seems to echo the *VAE* with a reference to the birth of Seth. The following quatrain tells how Seth did not procreate for forty years, which contrasts with Genesis 5: 6 (105 years), but chronological details like this are always variable.[32] The final quatrain is simply a standard conclusion of the type found throughout the *Saltair*, echoing the opening of the canto.

The following canto XII, which begins with quatrain 2021–4, is problematic as regards the source question, and although some of the difficulties—elements which match the Greek *Life* but not, apparently, the Latin—are once more clarified by reference to Pettorelli's Paris text, the source of the *Saltair* is still far from clear. In any case we have in the *Saltair* a differently structured version of the apocryphon, and one which misses entirely the quest of Seth and Eve to paradise. Eve's desire when he is dying to take on Adam's sufferings is also absent from the poem. Nor are there, at this stage in the Irish work, any of the recapitulations of the first fall by Adam or slightly later to her children by Eve, as found in the Greek (or indeed the Paris) text, but simply a concentration on Eve's preparation for Adam's death. Yet Eve's retelling of the fall with what look like echoes of the Paris version has—as will become clear—in fact been used already in the chronological position of the actual events in the *Saltair*, transformed into an objective narrative. Canto XII, however, moves from the numbering of Adam's years as in *VAE* 30 to Eve's actions at the death of Adam, in Pettorelli's additional section 44/31. Those actions are close to the Greek *Life*, and not to the other Latin texts of the *VAE*.

Adam's death at the age of 930 is also biblical (Genesis 5: 3). In the Irish poem, Adam now announces that he is dying and Eve wishes that she could go first. In the last part of the Paris redaction, Eve wonders why she cannot die, albeit in less florid style, and Adam's reply also matches the Latin: 'non enim post me diu tardebis' (you will not wait long after me); this is closer than *VAE*

---

[31] Murdoch, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 135–6, and in more detail (focusing on Lamech, however) *Medieval Popular Bible*, chapter 3. The bent tree is also associated with legends of Judas Iscariot.

[32] In *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 136 I refer to other Adambooks, though there are no precise analogues. I also cite the comment in the *Chronography* of George Synkellos from the beginning of the ninth century, about Seth visiting heaven at the age of 40 (as indeed Adam does). Synkellos, incidentally, cites as one of his sources the *Life of Adam* (though this may be a reference to *Jubilees*). See the *Chronography of George Synkellos*, trans. Adler and Tuffin, 13 and 6. At all events, the work provides a good example of the allocation of years to events. Seth, we are informed, was born in Adam's 230th year and weaned in his 243rd year (and taken to heaven therefore in Adam's 270th year).

35 in other redactions, where Eve asks for a part of the sufferings, and in response Adam sends her with Seth to paradise. There is no parallel for the precise figure of nine months until the death of Eve in any known Greek or Latin version, although it may link with an earlier point on the creation of Eve (quatrain 1057–60).[33] Eve's question about what to do with Adam's body is implicit, and Adam's instructions (vv. 2053–72) match the Paris Latin fairly closely in the request that his body is not touched or moved; Eve is to pray to God to take charge of Adam's soul, and he does not know whether God will be angry or merciful (44/31). The parallels are, as we have come to expect, not exact. Eve is here specifically instructed to perform a cross-vigil which may well be, as assumed in earlier criticism, an Irish addition. There is a slight change of mood in that Adam appears in the *Saltair* less worried that God might be angry with them than aware that God has a right to be. In the Irish text, Eve is told that if God refuses to come to Adam, then Michael should be invoked instead, which is a reflection of what actually happens in the Paris *VAE*. The lamentations of Eve to God, to which five quatrains (2077–96) are devoted, mirror the extended lament in the Paris text (with repeated 'peccaui', 'I have sinned'; in the Greek *Life* there is a repeated 'hamarton'). Michael is sent directly in the Greek *Life* and the Paris *VAE* without the prior announcement in the *Saltair*. Once again the *Saltair* is close to this Latin recension (and indirectly then to the Greek *Life*), but is neither exact nor complete. The simple 'plorauit', 'she wept', is expanded in Eve's excessive lamentations, which do however, throw into relief Michael's comments that she should observe how Adam's soul enters God's gates (vv. 2113–20; Pettorelli 44/32). That Adam's soul is lifted by a seraph is not exactly paralleled in Latin or Greek, though the seraphim do carry him off, and there is indeed a reference to golden wings (as v. 2132). Slightly before this in the Latin text is a reference to Eve seeing eagles ('aquilas'), the number unspecified, who are so bright that she cannot look at them, another point mirrored in the Irish poem. The angels then burn a herb called 'odoramentum' which wafts over the heavens, and this too is included in the Irish poem, even if the name is corrupted to 'ornamentum'; this always indicated at least an immediate Latin source, however.[34] The angelic plea to God to forgive Adam is expanded in the Irish poem, where celestial images are in any case much liked, but the main point is there: that Adam is in the image of God. The Irish includes several

---

[33] Murdoch, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 140. The notes for all of this section refer to the Greek *Life* because the Paris text was not yet known.

[34] The Irish 'ornamentum' was already spotted by Seymour as an error for Latin 'odoramentum'; although only the equivalent passage in the Greek *Life* was known, it at least demonstrated a Latin source. Murdoch, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 142–3.

points which indicate the use of the Paris-type text, but not necessarily in the same order or used in quite the same way. Thus in the Latin an angel ('angelus magnus') sounds a horn to summon the choirs only after the plea for forgiveness has been made. In the *Saltair* this comes a little earlier, but the point is fully covered. That God then sends seraphim is mirrored in the *Saltair* (quatrain 2177–80) where a seraph takes Adam's soul.

The following quatrain (2181–4) is a difficult and much-pondered one in the *Saltair,* but again the Paris text can afford some help, even if not a complete answer. The Irish says that Adam's soul is bathed in the stream ('sruth'): 'indatinum ciriasu' (v. 2184). The Greek *Life* refers here to the Acherusian Lake (Greek *Life*, 37), and there are variations on the form of the name in Greek (such as 'gerousias') and in related texts, such as the Slavic parallels.[35] The Paris text reads: 'duxitque eum in stanno cerosio ibique eum baptizauit' (44/37). The name 'Cerioso' (from *Acherousi-*) more or less matches the Irish, though the corruption of 'in stanno' (or even *stannum*, classical *stagnum*, a pool or lake) to 'in datinum' is slightly harder to visualize. A reading of v. 2184 as 'in stannum Ciriasu' makes metrical and rhyme sense, however. The idea of baptism is not in the *Saltair*.

So too the following part of the canto (vv. 2185–208), where the *Saltair* tells how Adam, having emerged from the lake, prostrates himself for three hours, after which God places his hand under Adam's head and gives him to Michael to place in paradise, in the third heaven, which is called Ficconicia, until the Resurrection. Scholars have tried in the past without success to make sense of the name. All of this can be matched in the Latin, bearing in mind always that the Paris text we have is later than the *Saltair*, so that as before we are reconstructing a Latin source text from, at the same time as establishing the source of, the Irish work. Many of the actual motifs were known earlier from the Greek *Life*, to which the Paris version is close, but it is the Latin which now explains some of the more puzzling elements of the Irish. The Latin portion reads:

Deinde eum adduxit in conspectu domini dei, eratque prostratus in facie sua tribus horis. Extendit ergo dominus deus manum suam sedens super tronum claritatis eius, et eleuans Adam tradidit eum Michaeli archangelo dicens: Pone eum in paradiso in tertio celo, usque in diem dispensationis qui dicitur economia. (Pettorelli 44/37)

Then he brought him to the sight of God and he was prostrate for three hours. Then God, sitting on his throne of light, stretched out his hand, and raising Adam, gave him

---

[35] See Tromp, *Life of Adam and Eve*, 166, for variations, and for comments Murdoch, *Story of Adam and Eve*, ii. 143–5. I attempted to read 'indatinum' as 'inundatio', but this would not scan, so that it must be *in* followed by a noun. Seymour suggested *in lacu*. The motif is known in other apocryphal writings.

to Michael the Archangel and said: place him in paradise in the third heaven until the day of judgement, which is called *economia* . . .)

Although there is some overlap with other Latin versions (*VAE* 48), and although there are some omissions (the Irish poem does not refer to God's throne), the parallels are close, even though the Latin is itself problematic. For the passage 'qui dicitur economia' presumably referring to the third heaven, Pettorelli postulates a fairly complex misreading, and conjectures 'feci(t) omnia'.[36] If this is correct, then it provides us at last with an explanation for Ficconicia, which has become simply an exotic-looking name for the third heaven, which is itself only named at all in this Latin recension. The third heaven is referred to in the Greek *Life* without a name (and indeed is omitted entirely from some versions). If the twelfth-century Paris text could corrupt the name to 'economia', especially from something like 'feci omnia', then certainly the Irish text could corrupt the same passage to provide in this case what has become simply a proper name of a type not unfamiliar in early Irish literature.

The last part also corresponds with the last section of the Paris text (Pettorelli's section 44/40). In the Irish poem the angels place the oil of mercy and the herb 'odoramentum' on the body, provide three shrouds, and bury Adam beside Abel in Hebron.[37] It remains there, we are told, until the flood carries Adam's head to Jerusalem. In the Latin, the first part of this is present, though not in the same order. God asks Michael to do what is presented as having been done in the poem, and specifies three shrouds before the oil of mercy (which seems to be the same as the herb); however, when the body is buried beside Abel's, the shrouds are mentioned again in any case. Adam's place of burial is not in Pettorelli's text, but it is in some versions of the *VAE*, and the link with Golgatha, the place of the skull, is familiar in later writings.

The existence of the Paris version is invaluable as a source type for the *Saltair*. The biblical chronology of the Irish poem, however, means that a Latin *VAE* of the Paris type and the *Saltair* will always have differed structurally, quite apart from the complete absence in the poem of the quest of Seth.

---

[36] 'Vie latine', 32, referring to 'dispensatio' and 'economia' in Irenaeus.
[37] For a discussion of the burial place (and place of creation) of Adam, see Anthony Hilhorst, 'Ager Damascenus: Views on the Place of Adam's Creation', *Warszawskie Studia Theologiczne*, 20 (2007), 131–44. I am indebted to Dr Hilhorst for his comments and a copy of his work. See also the very early but still informative study by F. Piper, 'Adams Grab auf Golgatha', *Evangelisches Jahrbuch* (1861), 17–29, and the more recent work by Thomas O'Loughlin, 'Adam's Burial at Hebron: Some Aspects of its Significance in the Latin Tradition', *PRIA* 15 (1992), 66–88, and in detail in his book *Adomnán and the Holy Places* (London: Clark, 2007), 84–94, on Adomnán's *De locis sanctis* and the tomb of Adam.

That the angelic fall of the *VAE* has been used but in a different position in canto IV has been noted, but the reception of the *VAE* in a recension of the Paris type is confirmed by three other relevant cantos, VIII–X. These cover the fall of Adam and Eve, and in the Irish poem are in the biblically appropriate place. They are clearly based on more than the Bible narrative, however, and it was thought once again by Seymour that some of these cantos, too, derived from a version of the Greek *Life*. He felt specifically that the objectively presented fall of Eve derived from Eve's own first-person historical narrative of the fall to her children in the Greek apocryphon. This view may now be reassessed in the knowledge of the Paris Latin manuscript. At Adam's death in this version of the *VAE*, first of all Adam himself recapitulates the fall (matching an early part of the Greek *Life*) and then Eve does so (something which comes rather later in the Greek version). After this, Eve and Seth go to paradise in search of the oil of mercy, and Adam dies on their return and is buried. The crucial section in Pettorelli's text is 44/15–30, which matches Eve's tale in the later part of the Greek *Life* far more closely than any other *VAE* versions, and this is reflected in the *Saltair*. But even with the knowledge of this close Latin version, the arrangement of motifs is still rather different in the Irish poem.

In the objective narrative of the fall of man in cantos VIII–X of the *Saltair*, the relationship between the devil and the serpent presented in canto VIII is also mentioned in Eve's recapitulation of her own temptation in the *VAE*. But there are many details found in the *VAE* which are not present in the *Saltair*, such as the division into male and female beasts and the devil's disguise of an angel (somewhat confusingly supporting the serpent). On the other hand, there are elements in the Irish poem which are not in any version of the Latin *VAE*; a striking instance is the serpent's bargain with the devil, in which the serpent is offered everlasting fame for permitting the devil to enter his body. However, the notion that Eve has to let the serpent into paradise *is* present with slight differences both in the Paris *VAE* (and the Greek *Life*, though not other versions of the *VAE*) and the *Saltair*, as is Eve asking the serpent to fetch the apple once she has admitted it through the door ('paradisi ianua', Irish 'dorus'). That it then rushes to the tree in the *Saltair*, however, is not in the *VAE*, but could well be a gratuitous addition. The idea of the serpent having to be admitted before passing Eve the fruit is of course not remotely biblical, so that the source was again very clearly a version of the *VAE* like the Paris manuscript. Since the text parallels are not exact, it is possible that the poet, who is using a part of the *VAE* text in a different context, may have been working from memory at this point.

The picture is similar with canto IX, where Seymour once again considered that the *Saltair* was following the Greek *Life* (and thus, we may now say, the

Paris-type *VAE*), again using Eve's own narrative of the fall to her children (and we may recall that Adam also recapitulates the fall in some versions of the *VAE* other than the Paris text, *VAE* 33). Here, however, there are fewer useful parallels in any case. In the *Saltair*, Eve's body changes after eating the fruit, she realizes she is naked, and cries out to Adam. In the Paris *VAE* she calls out specifically in order to get him to come and eat the fruit; in the Irish poem Adam sees that she is different, deprived of her covering, and she only agrees to tell him why when he has eaten the fruit and become naked himself. It is a number of quatrains before we reach the fig leaves, although the Paris text refers to them immediately. What follows in the Paris *VAE* (44/22), however, *is* significantly closely matched in the Irish work, namely the summoning by Gabriel of the angelic hosts to discuss the fate of Adam. This is in the Greek *Life* (22) as part of Eve's recapitulation of the fall, and gives us an idea of the putative earlier version of the Latin text as well. In the *Saltair* vv. 1365–88 the parallels with the Paris version are far closer than with the equivalent passage in other versions, even in view of the fact that the Latin text from which we have to work is far later than the putative actual source. Gabriel (Michael in the Greek text) summons with his trumpet the ranks from the seven heavens. God sits 'super Hirumphim' (scil. Cherubim) and it is noteworthy that the Irish text reads 'Dessid Hiruphin' at this point (v. 1381).[38] The two angels referred to next in the Latin are not present, but the trees prostrate themselves in both texts (though not in the Greek *Life*). The *Saltair* rather oddly omits the specific biblical question in Genesis 3: 7 to Adam ('ubi es?') which is retained in the apocryphal tradition. The Paris *VAE* and the Irish poem both have Adam's (biblical) blame on Eve as the immediate answer to God's rebuke, however, and since the *Saltair* does not have Adam give the other biblical excuse of nakedness, the source remains fairly clear. The speculative notion (quatrain 1409–12) that if Adam had repented he would have been forgiven, while known elsewhere in vernacular literature beside the *Saltair*, is not in the *Vita* or the Greek *Life*, and may be an addition by the poet.

Quatrains 1413–40 (towards the end of the canto) are more problematic. Adam is expelled from paradise, but begs the angels to let him taste the fruit of the tree of life, and he is refused. The first of these quatrains has an exact match in the Paris *VAE* with God's orders to the angels to expel Adam, but

---

[38] The Irish formulation matches the Latin very well, and is commented upon as unusual by Greene and Kelly, *Adam and Eve Story*, i. 49 n. 2. Pettorelli, 'Vie latine', 32, notes the rendering of the word usually given as 'Cherubim', and comments: 'Cette transcription pourrait peut-être donner un indice sur l'origine de la traduction transmise par *Pr.*' See my speculations on the source, *Adam and Eve Story*, ii. 94–5, and the differences from the (then) known *VAE* texts, as well as on the later motif of the trees which bow down.

Adam's request for the fruit (and its rejection) is not in the Paris *VAE*, although it is found as a separate motif elsewhere in the tradition. In the Paris version, Adam is himself given four herbs ('quatuor odoramenta, nardum crocum et calamum et cinamomum', 44/29); in other *VAE* versions, these are the four herbs or spices taken back from paradise by Seth and Eve (*VAE* 43). In the Greek *Life* (24), however, Adam does ask first for the fruit of the tree of life, and then is given the herbs.

Canto X is the judgement of God spoken to Adam, and this is not part of Eve's retelling of the fall in the Paris text. It has some parallels with the Greek *Life* 8 (Adam's narrative in this case) and, in the injunction to guard against the devil, with Greek *Life* 28, which is part of Eve's story but which is not matched in the Paris Latin version. The first part of the canto in the Irish poem (vv. 1441–56), promising Adam misery in the world, is far more specific in Greek and Latin, where he tells his sons how he was promised a specific number of maladies (seventy in the Greek *Life* and in most versions of the *VAE*, twenty-one in the Paris version). Adam's brief recollection of the fall is unlikely to be the source for the general promise of misery in the Irish work. In the Paris text and in the Greek *Life*, however, Eve's retelling of the fall ends with a general warning that her children should not be duped as she was, and this is the sense of the last part of canto X of the *Saltair*. It seems clear that Eve's account of the original fall has been used by the poet in *Saltair na Rann*.

The question of the relationship of the *Saltair* to other versions of the life of Adam and Eve is a complex one because of the manuscript situation. In summary, the tenth-century Irish poem is based upon a Latin *VAE* text which it has in any case adapted in terms of structure to fit a biblical chronology. That *VAE* text is now most closely represented by the existing Paris and Milan texts edited by Pettorelli, even though they are both continental and date only from the twelfth century onwards. The significant feature is that they are themselves close to the Greek *Life*. The Irish poet's source is unlikely to have been exactly the same as the Latin text we now have because it almost certainly lacked major elements, motifs which the poet would have been unlikely to omit of his own choice, most notably the quest of Seth. In the section concerned with Adam's death in particular, however, the *Saltair* matches the Paris *VAE* closely. While we may use the Paris text to make more informed assumptions than were previously possible about the source of the Irish poem, the poem itself remains important within the Adambook tradition because it offers evidence of a different Latin version which is known early, since we may date the *Saltair* to the late tenth century. We have, then, early evidence of an Adambook which has the penance, details of the fate of Adam's soul, but not the quest of Seth in any form. That the source was a Latin one is patent since there are Latin phrases (sometimes now made

explicable by reference to the Paris version), but major and perhaps unan-
swerable problems still remain, such as by what route and in what form that
source was known to a poet in early medieval Ireland.

Having established that the *Saltair* is based upon a source which we do not
in fact have, it is equally appropriate to consider the *Saltair* as a development
of the apocryphon in its own right, since whatever the source, it has clearly
been adapted, and not only into verse form and biblical chronological order.
In contrast with what might have been thought in the past, there are probably
relatively few individual motifs that have been added by the poet: that of Cain
cutting the grass is a pleasant, though not in fact very significant example. In
Adam's account, too, of the joys of the lost paradise, the fact that nothing,
including fire, could hurt them while they were under the law is an interesting
addition. The assumption of a name for the third heaven is not surprising
in early Irish writing, and it does seem to have had a garbled Latin source,
even if it has led to a new and genuinely apocryphal proper name. Of greater
significance are the points of emphasis which differ more radically from other
versions, and the chief of these is the notion that God forgave Adam during
the penance. In a sense this obviates the need for the quest of Seth, which
culminates customarily in the promise of the redemption (something made
increasingly firm by the development of the Holy Rood accretions). So, too,
Eve is treated more sympathetically, and while she is tempted for a second
time, she does at least begin to realize her error even before Adam tells her.

The prose adaptations: Leabhar Breac, RIA 24.P.25, *Pennaid Adaim*

In content, the prose texts based upon the *Saltair na Rann* are relatively
(though not completely) uniform, though there are sometimes variations in
selectivity. Overall, of course, not only has the apocryphon represented by the
Saltair been adapted back into a prose form which is usually briefer (often
with the loss of more poetic passages of the *Saltair*), but it is also found in
different contextualizations. Some texts follow the *Saltair* itself, so that the
VAE material appears, as with the *Saltair*, within the chronological biblical
context. However, two texts at least separate off the penance story, and in one
case even provide it with a title. Whether the latter point demonstrates the
separate influence of Latin *VAE* texts—there is nothing to match the heading
in the *Saltair* itself—or whether it was just added ad hoc by the writer is not
clear. It does, however, say something about the inherent independence of the
penance episode, and to have a separate version of this pericope does avoid
the chronology problem seen in the *Saltair* in canto IV, on the fall of the

angels. The death of Adam is not represented, however, and so once more we have no evidence that the Sethite quest material was known at all in Irish.

Of the relevant prose texts available, the fullest edited version is that in the Leabhar Breac, and this contains much of the first eleven cantos of the *Saltair* in prose, though not XII, with canto X still in verse, and with canto XI breaking off just after the penance section. Other Irish manuscripts of the prose tradition such as the Liber Flavus—where the material is again incomplete—also retain the *VAE* penance section in the biblical chronology, again however, without the death of Adam. The *Pennaid Adaim* in the fifteenth- or sixteenth-century Advocates' Library manuscript in Edinburgh contains Irish literary (heroic) texts as well as our piece, a homily on St Columba and other works, but our text is entirely separate and not integrated with other biblical material. It differs, therefore, strongly from the original version in the *Saltair*, and indeed even from its closest parallel in the Yellow Book of Lecan, which has Lucifer's fall and that of Adam preceding it. The Edinburgh text begins with the heading 'Pennaid Adaim annso sis' (Here is the Penance of Adam) and ends after a brief description of Adam and Eve and their subsequent suffering in the world with a very clear 'FIN[I]T amen'. The equally close version in RIA 24.P.25 (122–3) translated by Herbert and McNamara is also isolated, though there is no heading and simply an indication of the end of the section: 'F[init]'.[39] The evidence seems to point to the penance section as being thought of as a separate unit, and it is appropriate to look first at that episode, taking the treatment in the Leabhar Breac, where it is fullest, as the lead version, and comparing it with the versions in the Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne (RIA) and the Advocates' Library manuscript.

---

[39] The vellum MS XL in the Advocates' Library MSS now in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh has the present press mark Adv. MS 72.1.40: see the *Summary Catalogue of the Advocates' Manuscripts* (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1971), 40, 45. It is described in detail in Donald Mackinnon, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts in the Advocates' Library* (Edinburgh: W. Brown, 1912), 91–2 and 153. The contents are varied and the MS seems to be made up from material of different dates and in different hands. It combines secular and ecclesiastical material, and seems to have been given to the library in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the Highland Society in London as part of a group (MSS XXXVI–LII in the original numbering, which contained the Book of the Dean of Lismore). Mackinnon refers to the illuminated capitals of the *Pennaid Adaim* section (45b–48b) and to the analogues in the Leabhar Breac, the Yellow Book of Lecan, and the *Saltair*. Further details of provenance remain unclear. The full contents are also given in John MacKechnie, 'The Gaelic Manuscripts in Scotland', *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 1 (1963–4), 223–35, described on 233. Herbert and McNamara's notes refer still (very tentatively) to the possibility of influence from the Greek *Life* in their translation of the RIA version, but the point is once more covered by Pettorelli's Latin text. The (older) translations of the Leabhar Breac version and that in the Edinburgh MS are both somewhat awkward and occasionally misleading.

The Leabhar Breac text follows canto XI closely, including details such as the fact that fire, illness, or even Lucifer could not harm them as long as they remained obedient.[40] The *Pennaid Adaim* and RIA versions truncate this, and do not mention Lucifer, nor the fact that they were quite safe while obedient to the law, although the self-blame is still there. Eve's desire for death and Adam's rejection of the idea is present in all the versions. As far as the proposal for the penance is concerned, most of the details are the same as in the *Saltair*, including the lengths of time (thirty-three and forty-seven days). Where the poem and the Leabhar Breac have Eve doing penance in the Tigris ('i sruth Tigir', v. 1590), however, the other prose versions refer to the Tiber, presumably as a simple misreading, or assuming a more familiar river name, though this does happen in some Latin texts.[41] The flagstone and (only) Eve's flowing hair and raised hands are in all the prose versions, as is the injunction to silence. Significantly, all the prose versions reproduce the quatrain which seems to state that Adam and Eve completed their penance. The angels who converse with Adam are present, as is the motif of the static river with the creatures in it assisting Adam's prayers. The extended prayers of the nine orders in the *Saltair* are not in the Leabhar Breac in full, although the creatures of the earth pray to them. The striking quatrain 1653–6, in which God grants full forgiveness to Adam, and the next (1657–60) granting forgiveness also to Adam's descendants are both reproduced fairly closely in the prose of the Leabhar Breac. They are, however, slightly differently handled in the independent prose versions: the versions in the RIA and Edinburgh manuscripts say just that these are all the things prayed for, and there is no mention of their having actually been granted; the difference is a significant one. Where in the *Saltair* the devil hears that Adam actually has been forgiven, in the independent prose texts he presumably simply hears the prayer. The version in the Yellow Book of Lecan refers to the devil hearing what was said *to Adam*, however, which seems to imply the reply from God, but is not clear. It is interesting that precisely this important passage should become obscured in the different (later) texts.[42] In effect the nature of the *VAE* has been changed and then changed back again.

[40] Greene and Kelly use the reading of the Leabhar Breac text to determine that of *Saltair*, quatrain 1505–8: *Adam and Eve Story*, i. 59 n. 1.

[41] See Anderson, '*Pennaid Adaim*', 250 n. 3. The manuscript has the name contracted as *tib-*, and this is the river in other prose versions. The Advocates' MS (and the Yellow Book of Lecan) garbles the name Jordan as well, however: 'sruth orthanan'. Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 223, notes that the fourteenth-century MS currently in Dresden, Landesbibliothek A.182f has the reading *Tibris* on two occasions for Tigris, and suspects an Italian origin for the manuscript involved. The names are clearly susceptible to confusion.

[42] Anderson, '*Pennaid Adaim*', 246 n. 1 and 251 n. 2 discusses the variations in the *Saltair* and in the Yellow Book of Lecan.

In the narrative of Eve's temptation out of the river there is again a slight gradation: in the *Saltair*, she at least has doubts after she has emerged, and this seems to be presented in the prose versions simply as bewilderment on her part. In Adam's challenge to the devil, the 'It is not we . . .' anaphora is reduced, and the devil's answering anaphora ('Do you not remember . . .') is missed entirely. There are also some minor discrepancies between the various prose versions of the devil's complaint. *Saltair na Rann* v. 1801 refers to Adam having worshipped God as 'the king of the seven planets' ('rig na secht rinn', 'heavenly planets' in the Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne); the Leabhar Breac has 'the king of the angels' ('rig na n-aingel') and the *Pennaid Adaim* what is translated rather freely by Anderson as 'the king of the Psalms' (rendering 'ri na rann'). Manuscript misreadings or scribal errors, and perhaps deliberate adaptations have all played their part to give small variations here, and within a manuscript culture—which obtains for much of the history of the *VAE*—precisely differences like these *can* become substantial variants, although this one (which is not found in any of the known sources in any case) is not of great significance. A third of the host again falls with Lucifer. Once more, however, the ending of the passage is of interest. In the *Saltair* Adam simply leaves the water and sends the devil away. The prayer found in the *VAE* that God might help him achieve this is absent. In the prose texts Adam comes out of the river specifically after having completed the penance (the time of forty-seven days is again given), and Lucifer leaves. The prose adaptation goes on until *Saltair* v. 1896, with the reference to the pair living in caves, and then comes the contraction for 'et cetera' in the Leabhar Breac, and this is where the other versions end too.

The version of the *Saltair* found in the Leabhar Breac also includes as indicated the earlier cantos. Interestingly, there is a difference in the adaptation of canto IV, the fall of the angels. After the refusal (as in Lucifer's own tale in the *VAE*) to bow down to the junior, Adam, Lucifer's general expression of arrogance based on the Isaiah passage is far clearer in prose. In the *Saltair* Lucifer merely says that he will be above other kings, while in the prose text he promises to build a dwelling in the north-east of heaven. The relevant part of Isaiah reads: 'In caelum conscendam super astra dei exaltabo solium meum sedebo in monte testamenti in lateribus aquilonis ascendam super altitudinem nubium, similis ero Altissimo.' The enigmatic reference to the north in the Vulgate version causes considerable difficulties in vernacular versions of the Bible, however.[43] Lucifer's own story of his refusal to worship Adam has

---

[43] I discuss the various cardinal points at which Lucifer's throne is to be set up in vernacular biblical writings in my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 28–9. The precise position can sometimes depend upon the rhyme in the relevant language.

necessarily to be changed when it is placed into the chronological context, and material could also be added. This is the case already in the *Saltair*, where we are told (the source is unknown) that a thousand years passed between the formation of Lucifer and his fall. The Leabhar Breac takes this up, but offers the fairly radically different alternative (supported by verses) that it might have been thirteen and a half hours.

The prose version follows the poem closely in the narrative of the fall of man, including the persuasion of Eve to open the gates of paradise for the serpent/devil and her methods of persuading Adam. The judgement scene is also close, although Michael instructs Gabriel to sound his horn (thus bringing together the two archangels mentioned in the Greek *Life* and the Paris *VAE* respectively). God sits once again above the cherubim ('for Hiruphin'), and at the expulsion, Adam asks for (and is refused) a taste of the fruit of the tree of life, an element which is still known only from the Greek *Life*, but which may have been in the Latin source used by the *Saltair* poet instead of the reference to the four herbs which Adam actually does receive in the Greek version and in the Paris text.

The Irish world provides, then, a reception of the apocryphon in general terms in which we may perceive new and theologically important emphases, most notably the forgiveness granted at the very time of the penance, some new minor elements, and also a reception of the *VAE* which adapts the Latin prose text into verse and fits it into a biblical chronology. The poet's interest is clearly aroused by dramatic passages, such as the debate between Adam and Lucifer. This very early metrical text is then readapted into prose, however, whilst retaining in some cases the adaptations and the re-siting of the individual tales of the fall of the angels and of Adam and Eve. The absence from this version of the quest of Seth at any stage also remains significant. The *Saltair na Rann* and its derivatives are extremely important within the history of the *VAE* tradition. They are, however, isolated within that tradition.

3

England, Wales, and Cornwall

There is a particularly full tradition of the *Vita Adae et Evae* in England, first in Latin, where the text appears in a group of manuscripts in a distinctive redaction, and is found too in other independent versions, in one case very fully integrated with the Holy Rood material. In the vernacular it appears in developed form in two lengthy Middle English versifications, there is a broad tradition of prose translation and adaptation, and although there is no real dramatic reflection, the narrative was at least known, and is referred to, in important literary monuments such as the N-Town plays. The concept of Adam's penance, finally, was clearly still fairly familiar at the end of the Middle Ages. The knowledge of the Holy Rood legend, too, was also especially widespread in England. Beyond English, the *VAE* was known in at least one, and perhaps two of the Celtic languages used in Britain: certainly in Welsh, and just possibly in Cornish, which does, however, show an interesting use in the drama of the Holy Rood material. Although there is *VAE* material both in Irish and in Breton, however, it is not possible to delineate a specific Celtic strand.

LATIN

The tradition of the Latin *VAE* in England is strong. As early as the 1930s Mozley distinguished an expressly English group of manuscripts (many still preserved in Britain) which he referred to as the Arundel group after the oldest of the manuscripts; Pettorelli took over this grouping, referring to it as the 'rédaction anglaise', and noting that the variants in the few extra manuscripts not known to Mozley do not substantially change his text.[1] Mozley's Arundel group contained eight manuscripts from the fourteenth (one

---

[1] Mozley, 'Vita Adae'; Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 252–65. The pattern is discussed in Brian Murdoch and J. Tasioulas, *The Middle English Lives of Adam and Eve* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2004). In my 'Legends of the Holy Rood in Cornish Drama', *Studia Celtica Japonica*, 9 (1997), 19–34, three unfortunate typographical errors affected the discussion of Mozley's Arundel

perhaps earlier) and the fifteenth centuries, with as the lead text London BL Arundel 326.[2] Mozley linked it with the fourteenth-century MSS BL Royal 8 F. XVI and BL Harleian 526; London, Lambeth Palace MS 352 is late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and the further fifteenth-century manuscripts considered by Mozley were BL Harleian 275 and 2432, and Cambridge, St John's College, MS 176 (G8), and Corpus Christi College, MS 275. Mozley referred also to BL Sloane 289, a fifteenth-century manuscript which he described as a close copy of the Arundel codex, and pointed out that these all agree closely. To these may be added, from the researches of Halford and Pettorelli, the late thirteenth-century Oxford manuscript Bodleian MS 3462 (Selden supra 74),[3] three more from the fourteenth century, Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS U 65, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 3768 (Baluze 895), and Hengwrt 239 (NLW MS M335A) in the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth, and another fifteenth-century MS from the library of the Inner Temple in London, Petyt 538.36. As usual, the titles vary— *De expulsione, De penitentia, Vita protoplasti*, and so on. The text in the Corpus Christi College and Bibliothèque nationale manuscripts is followed by a Holy Rood legend, and that in Bodley Selden supra 74 has a verse about the naming of Adam. Mozley drew attention to the additional elements in this group against Meyer's base text, and Pettorelli has developed this.[4] All have the interpolation of the prophecy of Christ's coming from the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, for example, after a (notoriously variable) set time, here usually 5,228 years. The Arundel MS 326 itself (and Sloane 289), too, has an interesting addition to the Sethite quest, in that when he looks into paradise, he does not see (as in other Holy Rood and some *VAE* texts) a baby in the tree, but a full *pietà* of the seated Virgin with the crucified Christ: 'uidit . . . uirginem sedentem et puerum crucifixum in manibus tenentem.' This sentence is not in

group, first relating it to Meyer's group III rather than II, then listing BL Sloane MS 289 as 285, and finally giving Bodley 3462 as Selden supra 72 rather than 74.

[2] Pettorelli notes, 'Analyse', 252–3, that Arundel 326 is made up of two different codices, of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and our text is incomplete. According to N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London: Royal Historical Society, 2nd edn. 1964), 2, the manuscript (which he dates to the twelfth and the later thirteenth centuries) came from the Benedictine Abbey of the Virgin at Abingdon. The manuscript as it now stands consists of a calendar portion from the second or third quarter of the twelfth century and (the major part of the present combination) a miscellany including chronicles and legends dated to the first half of the fourteenth century.

[3] Pettorelli points out that the designation of this MS is confused in Halford's (*recte* M. E. B. Halford) list in her paper 'Manuscript Tradition', which is indeed the case; it should be noted that the error was corrected in a later note in the same journal, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 83 (1982), 222.

[4] Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 122–7, and Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 258–60.

the other versions in the group, however. There are as usual small additions and variations; the interpretation of the obscure word 'achiliacae', for the letters used by Seth with angelic assistance to write down the story of his parents, is variable in all versions, here including the interpretations 'sine labiorum doctrina', varied as 'librorum' or 'laboris'. It is, indeed, possible to determine that one of the English vernacular poems must derive from a source which contained the last of these readings, although it is found both outside and within the English group.

Mozley noted several other manuscripts which Pettorelli does not assign to the English group, and indeed several of these are strikingly different. Pettorelli sees as part of his own Bohemian redaction, based on shared variations, the manuscripts London, BL Harleian 495 (fourteenth century), and Oxford, Queen's College, 213, dated 1449. Mozley considers that Dublin, Trinity College, MS 509, also of the fifteenth century, is akin to these two, but Pettorelli sees it rather as part of the second redaction. Of special interest are two remaining English manuscripts, one in Balliol College, Oxford (MS 228, fifteenth century), the other in Winchester Cathedral Library (MS VII) of the thirteenth century. The first, placed (slightly tentatively) by Pettorelli with the second redaction texts, not only has as prefatory material three additional Adam legends (formation, naming, and in this case also sins), but integrates the main part fully with the Holy Rood material. Referred to in the manuscript as a 'tractatus', it is appended to a text of the *Golden Legend*.[5] The Winchester text is treated by Pettorelli as an isolated version, albeit an abridgement and simplification of something like the first redaction. Mozley links it with the Balliol text and indeed with the Queen's College and Dublin manuscripts to form a separate group, but Pettorelli rejects this.[6] Mozley notes, finally, the existence of two incunabula in the British Library.

Pettorelli discusses in the context of the English redaction and its variations the very divergent Paris and Milan manuscripts (and indeed the variations reflected in the *Saltair na Rann*), a version of which Latin text he thinks might have been known to the first English redactor. Pettorelli wonders, however, 'pourquoi le rédacteur anglais, si'il avait sous les yeux un texte de même structure que Pr [the Paris MS BnF lat. 3832], ne l'a utilisé que pour les douze

---

[5] See Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College*, 230–7. The *Legenda aurea* occupies fos. 11–202, with our text following, and after that comes another apocryphal work, the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*. Jackie Tasioulas kindly provided me with a number of the readings from this manuscript.

[6] Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 126–7, and Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 242. The arguments are not especially convincing either way for the Winchester manuscript, especially in view of its abridgement. Pettorelli suggests that the copy text might have been missing a folio.

premiers paragraphes de sa propre édition'.[7] Questions simply do remain even in the Latin tradition (and even the most recent division into groups need not be absolutely definitive), and we are faced once more with the fact that there just is no 'text' of the *VAE*.

ENGLISH

Medieval English literature offers two poetic and a number of prose versions of the whole *VAE*, and while there is no full-scale dramatic reflection, one motif at least appears in one of the mystery cycles.[8] It is as usual likely that relevant materials have been lost. Examination of the existing texts seems to indicate this, and R. M. Wilson's study of lost medieval literature in England notes a reference to a work in the possession of a Lollard which was apparently concerned with how Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise, although it is unclear what this actually was.[9] Rather earlier, in the Anglo/Old Saxon *Genesis B* the devil appears in the first temptation in the form of an angel of light, as he does to Eve in the *Vita*, albeit in her second temptation; whether this is linked with the *VAE* motif is not clear, and the orthodox parallel is 2 Corinthians 11: 14, but links have been made between the Saxon poem and both the *VAE* and indeed the French *Mystère d'Adam*.[10]

References to the *VAE* in other works are limited. There is a very full tradition in English of the Holy Rood material in prose and verse which

---

[7] 'Analyse', 265. See also his n. 147.

[8] See the introduction to the Murdoch and Tasioulas edition of the *Apocryphal Lives*. See also the brief survey in James H. Morey, *Book and Verse: A Guide to Middle English Biblical Literature* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 121–5 (and later consideration of the *Golden Legend*, 154–7).

[9] R. M. Wilson, *The Lost Literature of Medieval England* (London: Methuen, 1952; 2nd edn. 1970; paperback text 1972), 140, referring to various Lollards in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, that in question being Thomas Mann.

[10] See Rosemary Woolf, 'The Fall of Man in *Genesis B* and the *Mystère d'Adam*', in *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur* (Eugene, Ore.: Oregon University Press, 1963), 187–99, esp. 189–92, and in Rosemary Woolf, *Art and Doctrine: Essays on Medieval Literature*, ed. Heather O'Donoghue (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 15–28. The essay is an important one, especially on the inherent recognizability of the devil. For the text, see A. N. Doane, *The Saxon Genesis* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 221. The devil is clearly depicted as an angel in the temptation scenes in the Junius MS (Bodleian Junius 11): see S. Humphreys Gurteen, *The Epic of the Fall of Man* (New York: Putnams, 1896), facing 210, and Charles W. Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems* (1916; repr. Gloucester, Mass.: Smith, 1965), 209–11. The latter has a translation of the *Genesis B* text: see esp. 26. On the text see also Teresa Paroli, 'Santi e demoni nelle letterature germaniche dell'alto medioevo', *Settimane di studio de Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto medioevo*, 36 (1989), 411–98.

merits some attention here; once again it is not found in English drama, although it is used well in the drama in Cornish. In 1881 Richard Morris edited for the Early English Texts Society, for example, a series of metrical and prose pieces concerned with the Rood, two of which have the quest of Seth (rather than of Seth and Eve) for the oil of mercy. Morris included *Hou þe Holy Cros was ʒ-founde* from the *South English Legendary*, which contains the early history: God promises Adam the oil of mercy when he is banished (to Hebron); after the death of Abel Adam wants no more sons, but after 200 years Eve bears Seth, who, when Adam is dying (this time at 932 years), is sent, following the withered path; Seth sees the child in the tree, and is then given the grains that will be placed under Adam's tongue when he dies; the cross tree then grows from this. The death of Adam and then the quest is the starting point for the version from the *Northern Passion/Northern Homily Collection*, also included by Morris from BL Harley 4196, which is, however, closer to the *VAE* in some details. Seth throws dust on his head, for example, when he reaches paradise, sees the child in the tree, and receives the seeds, but Adam's death is treated in detail, and singing angels accompany his body to be buried in Hebron.

The early history of the cross is found also in the massive *Cursor mundi*, in which once again Adam is promised the oil of mercy immediately after the expulsion. He is, however, in contrast with the biblical Genesis, either actually naked ('pore and naket' in one manuscript) or nearly so ('nerehand nakid' in another) when he leaves paradise, and even later seems to dress in leaves and grass. Later on the text contains a reference to Adam's sons and daughters, and then when he is dying we have once more the Sethite quest, following the track left by Adam and Eve. The angel cherubin permits Seth to look into paradise and see the child in the tree who shall be the oil of mercy, the seeds are given to him, and he returns. The seeds are buried with Adam in Hebron. This time we have the additional details that Adam's soul is sent to hell for (in most manuscripts) 4,304 years until the harrowing. Seth then marries Delbora, who has not been mentioned before.

The story based on the *Legende* version as published by Meyer appears in English in other places; but many more are to do with the Invention or Exaltation of the Cross and linked with the liturgical feasts. Accordingly the later Rood material is most notably found in collections such as the *Golden Legend* (to which the *Vita* itself is sometimes added, but only as an attachment at the end), Mirk's *Festial*, elsewhere in the *South-English Legendary*, and so on. Arthur Napier also published a prose twelfth-century *History of the Holy Rood-Tree*, which takes the story from Moses onwards, but other prose versions (such as that in Cambridge, Worcester Cathedral MS F 172,

Magdalene College, Pepys 2125) have the early history.[11] Those texts which look at the early history can come close to the *VAE* in small details.

Middle English verse

There are in Middle English two quite distinct metrical versions of the *Vita* narrative as such, the Auchinleck *Life of Adam* and the *Canticum de creatione*, both of which adapt the *Vita* material. A moderately detailed examination of the differences between the two poems and Meyer's text was provided in the first period of interest in the material, in 1891 in a doctoral dissertation for the University of Rostock by Friedrich Bachmann, *Die beiden Versionen des me. Canticum de creatione*. His comments are useful, and take account of the Holy Rood material, but the author was of course unaware of the distinctive English tradition in the Latin *VAE*. In 1931 A. C. Dunstan took up (and referred to) Bachmann in a technically important paper comparing the *Canticum* and also the Auchinleck poem and some of the prose texts with different versions of the *VAE*, noting how 'editors of medieval Latin texts are usually more concerned with establishing an original text than with giving all the readings, and those readings which are obviously corrupt are often neglected. But in many cases it is precisely these "corrupt" readings which are of value, since they throw light on passages in versions in a vernacular which would otherwise remain obscure.' Dunstan was able to use Mozley's initial version of the English redaction, and his paper also remains both a useful and a salutary one.[12] It is, finally, an arbitrary decision as to whether the

---

[11] Morris, *Legends of the Holy Rood*, 18–27 and 62–72; Napier, *History of the Holy Rood-Tree*. The full texts are in: Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill (eds.), *The South English Legendary* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957; repr. 1967 = EETS OS 235–6), i. 167–70; Frances A. Foster and Wilhelm Heuser (eds.), *The Northern Passion* (London: Oxford University Press, 1913, 1916, 1930 = EETS OS 145, 147, 183), i. 134, 146–7; iii (Supplement), 95–6 (there is some variation in the arrangement of the various parts of the legend in different texts of the *Legendary*); Richard Morris (ed.), *Cursor mundi*, EETS OS 57–68 (London: Oxford University Press, 1874–93; repr. 1961–6), i. 64–5, 68–9, 78–91. The Winchester text is edited by Hill, 'The Fifteenth-Century Prose Legend', and see for the Pepys MS the English (and also Anglo-Norman) prose materials edited by Taguchi, 'The Legend of the Cross'. For an overview, see Frances A. Foster, 'Legends of the Cross', in J. Burke Severs and Albert E. Hartung (eds.), *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500* (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–89), ii (1970), 443–6, and also Quinn, *Quest of Seth*. I have noted in my study *Adam's Grace*, 31, how Adam weeps for the oil of mercy in the medieval English text *The Devils' Parliament* (ed. C. W. Marx (Heidelberg: Winter, 1993), 76–7). I comment further that of the two versions of the *Devils' Parliament*, one (B, 347–8) refers only to weeping and sighing, while the other even has the notion of repenting (A, 315–16).

[12] The Auchinleck text was first edited by David Laing, *A Penni worth of Witte; Florice and Blauncheflour: and Other Pieces of Ancient English Poetry Selected from the Auchinleck Manuscript*

metrical or prose versions should here be treated first, as both metrical reworkings and some prose versions date from the fourteenth century; the prose versions do extend later into the Middle Ages, however.

The Auchinleck *Life*

The incomplete Auchinleck *Life of Adam* is named for its preservation in the Auchinleck manuscript in the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, presented originally to the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh by Alexander Boswell, Lord Auchinleck, and now with the designation Advocates' MS 19.2.1. The important (and large) manuscript is from 1330–40 and contains religious and primarily romance material. Forty-four separate texts remain in the incomplete manuscript; five pieces seem to be missing from the beginning and three at the end. The manuscript is also missing other folios and most of the miniatures. Some of the missing folios have been recovered, and this is relevant to our poem, since one of the fragments concerned preserves some (but not all) of the missing part of the *Life of Adam*. Originally owned by David Laing, the first editor, and previously used as notebook covers, the recovered folios (now Edinburgh University Library, MS 218) are in poor condition, so that the first surviving part of our poem is difficult to read.[13] As indicated, most of the miniatures have been removed, and the *Life of Adam*—the beginning of which is missing—may have been preceded by a relevant miniature.[14] The *Life of Adam* began presumably with the creation of the world and then of the angels, and then the creation of man, but what we have begins with Lucifer's refusal to worship Adam and also his attempt to set himself above God, which results in his being cast out. The ending of the preceding text in the manuscript is also absent (perhaps about sixty lines),

---

(Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1857), 49–75, and the *Canticum* by Carl Horstmann, '*Canticum de creacione*', *Anglia*, 1 (1878), 287–331. Both were printed later by Carl Horstmann, *Sammlung altenglischer Legenden* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1878), 124–38 and 139–47; the most recent edition of both texts is Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 35–62 and 63–98 respectively. This last edition is that cited, and for fuller details on both texts, see our introduction and notes. See Friedrich Bachmann, *Die beiden Versionen des me. Canticum de creatione* (Hamburg: Lütcke and Wulff, 1891), 36–49, and Dunstan, 'The Middle English *Canticum*'.

[13] There is a facsimile of the whole manuscript: Derek Pearsall and I. C. Cunningham (eds.), *The Auchinleck Manuscript: National Library of Scotland Advocates' MS 19.2.1* (London: Scolar Press, 1977). There are also ultraviolet photographs of the Edinburgh fragments in the National Library in Edinburgh (MS 8894).

[14] See Timothy A. Shonk, 'A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century', *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 71–91; see 81. On the text in general, see Laura Hibbard Loomis, 'The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330–1340', *PMLA* 57 (1942), 595–627.

and it is assumed that up to 120 lines of the Adamic poem are missing, probably including a title. What remains begins on the first bifolium of the Edinburgh fragment (E1^{ra}–E2^{vb}). There is another gap at the end of this, probably of another 170 or so lines, and the extant text continues on fo. 14ra of the main part of the Auchinleck manuscript, ending on 16rb. In all we have approaching 800 lines in rhymed couplets of (usually) four-beat iambic lines.

The text opens, then, in the middle of the narrative of the fall of Lucifer, which is therefore, as in other versions, such as *Saltair na Rann*, placed out of the context of the *VAE* itself (where it comes in the debate with Adam). Often when the fall of the angels is placed at the beginning, the notion of his pride, based on the death-song to the King of Babylon in Isaiah 14, is given greater prominence, but here Lucifer's fall is linked with Adam and the refusal to honour the later creation. Less usually in the *VAE* context, Lucifer is here initially called Liȝtbern,[15] although it is changed to Lucifer a few lines later (v. 8); a change of name for the devil is not unusual as such, but later still we are told that (v. 38) 'Satanas is now his name' (v. 38).[16] The poem adds other details not in the *VAE*, and refers as a source to 'lettrure', simply 'writing', which is contrasted with 'holy scripture' (vv. 49–50).[17] It remains unclear precisely what is meant.

Since the angelic fall is out of place as far as the *VAE* is concerned, the narrative from the *VAE* effectively begins only after a brief description of the fall of man based on the biblical Genesis. The *VAE* is rendered fairly freely, and we are told, for example, first precisely how the protoplasts made their dwelling places ('fecerunt sibi tabernaculum') by using boughs and grass, and then that they were (in spite of Gen. 3: 21) naked. The former point is unusual within the tradition, although the latter is not uncommon, and serves perhaps as an indication of their suffering. Whether Adam and Eve are clothed or not after the expulsion is variable throughout the entire tradition of Adam in popular writing, however. That they are hungry for six days (rather than seven) points, however, towards the English redaction of *VAE* 1, although where in the Latin texts Adam searches for food twice at this stage, here he does so only once. Eve asks Adam to kill her, and he rejects the idea of laying hands on his own flesh and blood (only flesh is mentioned in the *VAE*

---

[15] The name appears in the Middle English *Genesis* as Ligber (OE *lig-baer*, 'flame-bearer') (Morris, *Legends of the Holy Rood*, v. 271). 'Lightburne' appears beside and separate from 'Lucifer(e)' in the Chester creation play, where Lucifer also claims 'I beare the light'.

[16] The identification of Lucifer with Satan is a commonplace: see the English *Cursor mundi* (Trinity MS, 477–80): 'þis was þe fend þat formest fell | For his pride from heuen to helle | For þenne his name chaunged was | Fro lucifer to Sathanas.'

[17] See Graeme Dunphy, 'The Devil's See: A Puzzling Reference in the Auchinleck *Life of Adam*', *Medium Aevum*, 73 (2004), 93–8.

at this point, but this is a set phrase and the full form is found later in the *VAE*). When Adam proposes the penance Eve does not—as in all versions of the *VAE*—ask Adam what penance is, but her fears about not being able to complete a penance are present. Adam sends her to the Tigris to stand on a stone for forty days, while he will stand for forty-six in the Jordan. Latin texts have either forty-seven or forty for Adam, but the number is variable throughout the tradition either for accidental or possibly also for typological reasons. The figure of forty matches Christ's fast in the wilderness, and forty-six is a gematric equivalent of the name ADAM (1+4+1+40).

Although the poet refers from time to time to what seems to be a source text of the *VAE* as such ('þe boke', v. 233), this version omits entirely the scene of the static river and the assistance of the fish and indeed all of nature to assist with the penance. This omission is striking, given that it is such a central (and indeed interesting) part of the narrative. Instead we move more or less directly to the second temptation, which comes about after twenty days (rather than eighteen or nineteen), and the devil is here simply described as 'þe fende' (v. 243). The question of precisely what kind of source the poet had is raised again in another unusual omission, namely that this time the devil does not explicitly take on angelic form. Even in texts where this is not stated at the outset, it is usually clear from what he says (claiming that all the angels have prayed to God on her behalf) that Eve at least thinks she has an angel in front of her. Here the idea is at best truncated, the devil saying 'þi lord sent þe word bi me' as the sole indication of his putative disguise. Other elements of the temptation are also missing, however: there is no mention of food, and Eve's reactions on leaving the water (green with the cold, fainting) are also absent at this point. Again this is hard to explain, unless the poet was working from memory. It presents the apocryphon in a different and limited light, especially if the devil is not even disguised. Adam does, however, recognize him at once, which implies that Eve had been somehow tricked. When Eve understands what has happened, she then falls into a faint and remains there for an hour, merging the response in *VAE* 11 (Arundel text) 'et cecidit super faciem terre' with her earlier faint, in which she stays for nearly a whole day. Adam confronts the devil, and since the latter's story has been given already, the poet offers only a very brief version at this point. Adam prays for deliverance, then remains in the water for the forty-six days specified in this version.

Eve's departure from Adam is treated freely, and represents an interesting development of the apocryphon. She does so expressly as a renewed penance, and that she goes into the darkness and out of the light (vv. 335–6; the words 'þesternesse', 'þester', 'darkness', are repeated four times) is a clarification of her usual decision to depart towards the west. In virtually all the versions, *VAE*

18 has her say: 'nunc separa me de lumine uite huius et uadam ad occasum solis', after which we are told: 'Et cepit ambulare uersus partes occidentis, et cepit lugere et amare flere cum gemitu magno, et fecit sibi habitaculum habens in utero conceptum trium mensium.' The first part might be taken as a further desire for death, but while the poet does not mention the west at all, he certainly wishes to emphasize the loss of the light, perhaps taking 'occasus solis' also to imply darkness. Vernacular adaptations vary in their treatment of this whole passage—both in terms of Eve's motivation and where and how far she goes, and how she lives. Here the motivation—a second penance—and the stress on darkness are the key features in the development of the basic narrative. The other elements, including her pregnancy, are included, however. When she realizes that she is about to give birth and wonders how to tell Adam, the Edinburgh fragment breaks off, and there are probably 170 or more lines missing before the poem can be taken up from the Auchinleck manuscript proper. We do not, therefore, have the prayer of Adam, Michael, and the angels at the birth of Cain, the miraculous behaviour of the child, Abel's birth, and the fratricide. The surviving text resumes after Adam's translation into heaven and the beginning of Adam's final illness, at *VAE* 34 and the reference to the various diseases visited upon him: here sixty, although virtually all other versions have seventy. Eve wishes to take on some of Adam's pains, but she and Seth are sent instead for the oil of mercy. The serpent attacks Seth 'in þe visage' (v. 407), in accord with the English tradition, although it is not made clear that the devil flees from the image of God in Seth. The poem (though not the *VAE*) stresses that Seth is less guilty, but omits the instruction that the pair should throw dust upon their heads.

Seth speaks to an angel (not named as Michael) and is given the prophecy from the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, here expressed incompletely and even more oddly than usual (perhaps for metrical reasons) as 'five thousand and one, and twenty-five and more' although a little later (vv. 551–2) the known figure of 5,228 appears. Seth is given nothing else in this version, not even the four spices, and there is no sign of the Holy Rood links with the receipt of twigs or seeds. Indeed, the whole section is truncated. When Eve and Seth return, however, Adam sees and comments on the wounds suffered by Seth. When Adam dies, the sun and moon are darkened, and Eve and Seth mourn him—there is another reference at this point to 'þe boke' (v. 535), and indeed the poem seems to follow *VAE* 46 fairly closely. An angel takes Adam's soul, which is then given to Michael until the redemption (it is at this point that the 5,228 years are mentioned). The soul is simply to be kept 'in custodia tua' in most versions of the *VAE*, but here the poet returns to his theme of darkness, as it must be kept 'in sorwe and þesternisse, | Out of ioie and alle liȝtnisse'

(vv. 549–50). Angels bury the bodies of Adam and Abel, using shrouds (the number, which can be confusing, is not mentioned), and after six days Eve too realizes that she is to die. Eve commands Seth to write down the lives of his parents, but the usual pattern of clay and stone is missing. Once again a motif has been reduced, even though the poet refers yet again to 'þe boke' (v. 677) as his source, and only part of the original motif and the reasoning behind the two kinds of tablet remains: 'In ston alle þe letters he wrot, | For fir no water opon mold | Neuer greuen it no schold' (vv. 678–80). For all that, Seth places 'þe bok' (even though it seems to be carved in stone) where Adam used to pray, echoing quite specifically *VAE* 52 (Arundel text): 'in oratorio ubi orabat Adam.' The last part is also followed fairly closely, as Solomon finds the text but cannot read it, and is instructed by an angel, but the word *achiliacas* does not appear. This effectively concludes the *VAE* material; the last fifty-five lines of the poem run quickly through Genesis 6–9 with some additional biblical references, and the whole work ends with a reference to the redemption which has now saved Adam.

The question of source is difficult, because this is in any case a poetic adaptation, so that some changes in content or emphasis might be deliberate, but not all the changes can be seen in this light. The references to 'the book' do not really help very much. Sometimes the poem is very close to the *VAE* in the English redaction, which is to be expected, but the omissions are striking and these seem to imply that the poet did not have direct access to a source. The loss of major motifs like that of the static river early on, or of the prophecy behind the need for two tablets later, are the best examples. Even if the poet were working from memory, surely the static river would have remained in his mind. That some passages are fairly closely rendered increases the problem. Added to this we have to cope with the fragmentary nature of the text (one wonders how the miraculous birth of Cain would have been handled), and there are places—such as Eve's departure from Adam—where the text is presumably being interpreted carefully. In spite of these problems, however, even this fragmentary poem permits us to see the development of the narrative, most notably perhaps precisely in the reaction of Eve after the second temptation, when she embarks on a new penance in darkness.

Canticum de creatione

The *Canticum de creatione* is preserved in Trinity College, Oxford, MS 57 (now in the Bodleian Library), a compilation of religious texts. The text of the *Canticum* includes a date—the year 1375, when 'þis rym y telle yow | Were turned into englisch'. The manuscript is of the late fourteenth century, and

contains part of the *South English Legendary*, then our text on fos. 157ᵛ–164ᵛ, followed by a romance and then another religious text.[18] Unlike the Auchinleck *Life*, this 1,200-line poem uses the so-called tail-rhyme strophe characteristic of Middle English romances, a six-line strophe of two four-beat and one three-beat lines rhymed *aab*, the pattern repeated for the second set of three lines, these rhyming *ccb* (a few strophes rhyme *aabaab*).

After a brief introduction indicating that the theme is to be both the fall of man and also 'the rode treo' (v. 10) and then a summary of Genesis 3, the eighth strophe begins what is for the most part a close version of the *VAE*, following one of the English Latin versions, with some variations (partly depending upon the metrical form, which is more complex here than in the Auchinleck text), but also with some interesting and possibly free additions. The opening of the *VAE* is followed closely, with the pair searching for food for six days and then eight (these can vary), and a close rendering of the comment by Adam 'magna est in celo et in terra creatura eius; aut propter te aut propter me, nescio', which is not in Meyer's continental versions. Eve asks Adam to kill her, is refused, and after a further search for food the penance scene is followed very closely indeed. Eve asks the meaning of the word and they determine to stand for forty and forty-seven days in the Tigris and Jordan fasting, exactly as in the English redaction. They stand on stones up to their necks, with their hair floating on the water, a detail not always included, and Adam begs the Jordan and also all the fish in the river for help. In some versions, it is not quite clear whether only the fish or whether all of creation assists him. Some Latin versions have 'natantia', but the Arundel MS itself has 'omnia animancia que intra te sunt', which presumably means the fish in any case (some MSS have 'animancia Iordanis'). Adam's voice becomes hoarse, again as in the English redaction. Most of the Latin texts have this lasting for eighteen or nineteen days, and the *Canticum* has 'seuentene dayes and more' (v. 175), the formulation presumably chosen for the sake of rhyme.

The devil now flies (the verb may again be for the sake of the rhyme) in the form of an angel to Eve. He is unnamed (though usually 'Satanas' in the *VAE*), and he acts here out of envy, rather than concern or anger. Eve's green colour when she leaves the river is as in the Latin, and she falls down in a faint as if dead for almost a day; when she is taken to Adam (who recognizes the devil on sight) she again falls 'flat here face to grounde' (v. 221). This is not quite the 'super faciem terre' of the Arundel MS, but the version found in Meyer's edition—'cecidit super faciem suam super terram'—is closer. Although

---

[18] See Gisela Guddat-Figge, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Middle English Romances* (Munich: Fink, 1976), 296–7, for a description.

Mozley does not note it in his apparatus, Queen's College MS 213 also has a version of this reading ('super faciem suam in terra'), although it differs in other respects.[19]

Adam challenges the devil directly (it is not always entirely clear who first speaks to him; that Adam does so is assumed here), and the devil's own narrative of his rebellion is as in the *VAE*, this being of course a major difference from the Auchinleck text, where it comes at the start. Adam prays that the devil should leave him, and the devil vanishes, this last idea occupying the first two lines of a strophe. The rest of that strophe, the next two, and part of a third introduce an entirely new motif into the apocryphon, however, the first major deviation from the *VAE*. An angel is sent to Adam to instruct him about the need for tithing. Other vernacular versions of the *VAE* (including one in Welsh) do insert material from time to time on the question of tithes, but that an angel should give instructions is very much in line with the rest of the *VAE*. The notion is of a burnt offering of a tithe of the goods (echoing Lev. 27: 30), but it is linked here with the idea of the tenth order of angels originally constituted by Lucifer and those who fell with him (v. 340). The notion of the tenth choir is by no means unknown, either in general terms or indeed in vernacular versions of the *VAE*, although not in this precise context.[20] In view of its unusual nature, this section may be an expansion by the poet, though it is very plausibly integrated, and the work continues (still within a strophe) to complete *VAE* 17.

Eve again asks Adam to kill her. This derives from her words 'Et nunc separa me de lumine uite huius', although she goes on to say in the Latin that she will leave and go to the west, the motif interpreted by the Auchinleck poet as her desire for darkness. If the poet of the *Canticum* took the 'separa me' passage to be another request for death, however, he also offers an alternative: 'Or hyde me fro Godis siȝt' (v. 361), and she now goes indeed into the west. The poet here introduces another completely new motif over two strophes (vv. 373–84). Eve is so ashamed that she adopts a white veil, and this is then presented as the reason why women cover their heads (as in 1 Cor. 11: 5–6). The poet apparently indicates that this is not in his source with the comment 'as seiþ þys rym' (v. 376). Again the poem moves back thereafter to a close rendering of the Latin with the sufferings of Eve in pregnancy, her calling of Adam, and the birth of Cain, but once more there are some differences: as in

---

[19] Horstmann, 'Nachträge zu den Legenden', 460. However, that text does not have the earlier reference to her faint lasting for nearly a day, and there the devil is referred to as 'angelus diaboli'.

[20] Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 115–16, refer to Paul Salmon, 'Der zehnte Engelchor in deutschen Dichtungen und Predigten des Mittelalters', *Euphorion*, 57 (1963), 321–30, and note that references to the tenth choir are frequent in sermons.

other vernacular texts (and some Latin versions), the presence of the two Virtutes is omitted, although Michael performs his usual roles. Of interest, however, is the miraculous behaviour of Cain, who in the *VAE* fetches grass or herbs for his mother. The poem does not render directly the problematic word 'lugidus', one of the key distinctions in the English Latin texts, but it may be echoed. A. C. Dunstan considers that the words 'sethen he wroȝte care' (v. 447) render 'lugidus', the reading of the English redaction. On the other hand, that Cain would later cause sorrow is hardly unfamiliar.[21] At all events, Cain collects flowers for his mother, which is a small change, but the event as such is interpreted not expressly as a miracle, but as play: 'þus he pleyde wiþ his dame' (v. 445).

Abel is born, and Eve has the dream of Cain drinking Abel's blood.[22] The fratricide is related fairly briefly, and is followed by the motif of Adam's sexual abstinence for 200 plus years prior to the begetting of Seth on God's instructions. This is not in the *VAE*, but is found in the Holy Rood material: 'abstinuit autem ab ea ducentis annis et plus. post quos per praeceptum domini eandem cognouit.' It is, however, added in the Balliol MS, which refers to 200 years (as does the Cornish *Ordinalia*), and does not have the angelic or divine precept. The point is also found in vernacular versions of the Rood story, with the period ranging from thirty-seven to 300 years. There is a fairly close parallel in the English prose text of the Vernon MS, which will be discussed below: 'Theraftur an hundred yeer Adam with Eve engendrede no fruit, ac evere he was in serwe and in wepyng. Tho the hundred yeer weoren passet him com aleggaunce of his wo. Crist sent his angel.'[23]

There is a close relationship with the English redaction of the Latin and the details of the children, although the precise number varies elsewhere in vernacular writing. Here Adam and Eve have a further thirty boys (after Cain, Abel, and Seth), and thirty-two girls, as in the Arundel text. It is at this point in the *VAE* that we have the translation of Adam into heaven, as related to Seth (*VAE* 25–9, sometimes with Adam's apocalyptic vision). In this case the source text may have lacked the whole passage, as the *Canticum* moves directly to the narrative of Adam's last days, and he tells his children

[21] Dunstan, 'The Middle English *Canticum*', 439.

[22] Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 117, note that the idea of Cain and Abel living together originally ('Et manebat Caym cum Abel in unum', *VAE* 23) is supported by the comment (v. 466) that this appears 'in writ', although it is non-biblical.

[23] Meyer, 'Geschichte des Kreuzholzes', 132; Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 117–18. The Vernon MS is cited from N. F. Blake, *Middle English Religious Prose* (London: Arnold, 1972), 113. A German prose text has Adam abstaining for 100 years, there is a version of the motif in Josephus, and it appears in rabbinic writings and in Christian exegesis. The source question is an open one here.

the tale of the first fall and the origin of sickness. The Latin, 'ecce inducam in corpore tuo septuaginta plagas de diuersis doloribus', is echoed as 'dyuerse siknesse' (v. 590), but the number is given as sixty-two, perhaps based on a misreading of LXX as LXII. The Auchinleck text has a reference to sixty wounds, and the Vernon prose *Life* an unusual 'vii and thritti'.

The quest for the oil of mercy follows, with Eve and Seth instructed to put dust on their heads (as in the *VAE*), but with Seth given directly the instructions on how to find the way by the withered grass, the Holy Rood motif sometimes interpolated here (as in the Balliol MS). That Eve and Seth go to paradise together makes this motif from the Rood story a little superfluous, since Eve presumably knows the way. The *Canticum* then follows *VAE* 37–9 in the English redaction when Seth is bitten in the face, the serpent ('addere', 653) argues with Eve, and is driven away by the image of God; the match with the *VAE* is closer than the abbreviated Auchinleck version. Seth at the gate of paradise also follows the *VAE*, and he is promised the oil of mercy in the form of the promise of the redemption in 5,500 years by Michael. The length of time before this can happen is of course variable in different texts, and may be useful as a source indicator even within a given Latin tradition. The version of *VAE* 42 given in Meyer's edition is that the oil shall be granted 'quando completi fuerint quinque milia et quingenti anni'. The Arundel MS has 5,000 years plus 'ducenti viginti et octo anni', but the 'quingenti' reading is in the Queen's and Harleian MSS, and others reading 'ducenti minus uno', and alternatives range from 5,199 to 6,500 in Latin and vernacular writings, with a good number of variations in between.[24] As indicated, the Auchinleck text refers first to the imprecise figure of '5,026 and more', and then definitely to 5,228.

Seth is now invited to look into paradise and sees the dry tree, the serpent round the tree, and then the child in the tree, again motifs essentially from the Holy Rood narrative, although incorporated into versions like the Balliol MS, and present (albeit in a different form) in the Arundel MS. The integration of the Holy Rood material continues in that Seth is given three seeds (rather than the spices, which are omitted) to be buried with Adam, and when Adam hears of this he laughs. Adam dies at the age of 930, and with this we return to the *VAE*. The darkening of the sun and moon in *VAE* 45 is not in the Holy Rood legends, but is in our poem, and angels sing as Seth sees God give

---

[24] For a full discussion of this point with further variants, see the notes in Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 129. The time of 5,500 years (in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*) is frequent. In oriental texts this can be found as five and a half *days*, taken to mean 5,500 years in view of 2 Peter 3: 8. Five thousand five hundred is the period in Holy Rood versions, in the *Golden Legend*, and in the Chester play. Adam also spends different amounts of time in hell.

Adam's soul to Michael to keep ('in peynes', v. 885). However, while in many Latin versions Adam and Abel are buried in paradise, here it is again in Hebron, with the seeds in his mouth, which is again far more closely associated with the Holy Rood tradition ('Quem Seth sepeleuit in ualle Ebron et grana iam dicta sub lingua in os eius posuit').[25] There is no reference to the shrouds, nor to Eve's impending death, but the *VAE* is used for the story of the tablets of stone or earth which Eve causes Seth to make. It is not entirely clear how many tablets are to be made. First of all we are told: 'Eue to Seth þus gan seye: | "Tak and make tables tweye | Of al oure lyf anon"' (vv. 898–900), but then the text specifies 'Tweye of erthe and tweye of ston' (v. 901). After Eve's death and the requisite mourning, Seth does so. When Solomon finds them and is helped by the angel to read them, he calls the letters 'archilaykas' (v. 944), which is then interpreted as 'wiþoute trauaylle | and wiþouten wit' (vv. 946–7). The rendering of the word itself varies enormously, but the gloss provided also differs, even within the English redaction, as 'sine labiorum doctrina', 'sine librorum doctrina', 'sine laboris doctrina'. The last of these variations (found for example in Cambridge, Corpus Christ College, MS 275, with a close variation in the Winchester MS) seems to have been in the source, therefore.

From this point the poem makes a more definite and this time deliberate shift to the Holy Rood material, as indeed was promised in the introductory comments: 'Of þis matere now lete we be' (v. 955), says the poet, and the last part, around 200 lines, follows the *Legende* version to Moses, David, Solomon, and the Maxi(mi)lla legend. The poet has therefore continued in detail the material already partly integrated in the Sethite quest, aware that this is a separate narrative; he thus combines a Holy Rood text with a *VAE* which already has material from that legend cycle integrated with it in any case. The work ends with a brief indication of the ages of the world, a strophe containing (vv. 1186–7) the date at which the poem was written, 1375, and also some interestingly specific and certainly spurious information about the source. The date, we are told, is when the poem ('þis rym') was turned into English, and the poet goes on to claim that it was first in Hebrew, then turned into Latin, and then into English. This means presumably that the original was indeed Latin, meaning either the *VAE* or the Holy Rood legend, neither of which is likely to have had a Hebrew antecedent, although that it should even be claimed is interesting. Greek is not mentioned, and the word 'archilaykas', which is garbled in any case, was presumably not even thought of as being Greek. It still remains unclear, too, whether the immediate source for the

---

[25] Meyer, 'Geschichte des Kreuzholzes', 138.

Canticum was a Latin text or an English translation or adaptation. The known English prose versions do not provide an exact match, however. The reference to Hebrew is presumably no more than a link to the Old Testament and a claim for authority. Overall, this poem is in many respects close to the *VAE*, although two features are important in terms of the development of the apocryphon as such, aside from the fact that the material has been rendered into a more complex metrical form, which will have occasioned some of the changes. First, the Holy Rood material has been integrated in the Sethite quest portion, and then added in detail at the end of the work. Secondly, otherwise unattested motifs have been added which are well integrated, even though they are not in any known Latin version: the angelic words about tithing, and the wearing of the veil.

The English prose versions

The prose texts are in the main recorded in late manuscripts. It has been suggested that the earliest—a text found in a particularly well-known source, the Vernon manuscript in the Bodleian in Oxford—may be a prose reduction from a verse original, though this has been questioned. The Vernon text is of independent literary value, whilst the others differ from it considerably and are more straightforward translations.[26] The other two full prose versions, moreover, very clearly belong together, although they fall into two groups and the order in which to treat them is also of necessity an arbitrary decision. With the Vernon text we have a version preserved in a single manuscript; with the others, we have one form of the text in two manuscripts, and the other in approaching a dozen, though there are variations. There are also some prose reflections of parts of the *VAE*.

The Vernon Prose *Lyff of Adam and Eue*

The earliest of the English prose versions is that in the large and important Vernon manuscript (Bodleian MS 3938, Engl. Poet. a 1, fos. 393ª–394ᵇ), a collection of English religious texts (with some in French and Latin) dated between 1370 and 1400.[27] It includes what is called, significantly, a 'tretys' on

---

[26] For an overview see Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 19–23. The Vernon manuscript is referred to by name to distinguish it from the quite different recension in Bodley 2376 (the Bodleian version).

[27] There is a facsimile edition of this important manuscript edited by A. Doyle, *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. Poet. a.1* (Cambridge: Brewer,

Adam and Eve (as the Balliol Latin text is called a 'tractatus', for example) which begins with the biblical creation, the naming legend, the fall of the angels, and the biblical fall of Adam and Eve. The narrative of the *VAE* follows logically, with some Holy Rood elements, the whole ending with the account of Seth's recording of the story. It has been asserted that the text is based on a metrical version, and similarities were claimed between this text and a version in the *South English Legendary* manuscript in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.25 (605), which is a fifteenth-century, and hence rather later, transmission; the most recent editor, N. F. Blake, is less convinced of this kind of origin.[28] At all events, the version is an interesting one as such, with several unusual variations, so that this is very much a development of the apocryphon. It has the title (in the index of the manuscript) *þe lyff of Adam and Eue*, and in the text itself claims that the *tretys* is of how the world was created and how Adam and Eve lived.

The entirely Christian nature of the work is underlined in the opening statement addressed to 'Alle that bileeven on Jesu Crist', which is in accord with the manuscript as a whole, and the first description is of the creation and then the fall of the angels. Very unusually indeed, the devil in this version is originally called Sachel and only later named Lucifer, and it is unclear where the name comes from. The text moves to the creation of paradise and then of man (in the Vale of Hebron), and there is an extended version of the naming

---

1987). A project based on the digitalization of the manuscript is (2008) in progress at the University of Birmingham (Department of English). See Derek Pearsall (ed.), *Studies in the Vernon Manuscript* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1990), esp. N. F. Blake, 'Content and Organisation', 45–59. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this collection of fourteenth-century religious material, and this in its turn underlines the importance to the history of the apocryphon of the Vernon 'tretys'.

[28] The text is in Horstmann, *Sammlung altenglischer Legenden*, 220–7; it is cited here from the edition by Blake, *Middle English Religious Prose*, 103–18 (which resolves thorn and yogh); see his introduction, 103, on the possibility of a rhymed origin, an idea which, by and large (and almost certainly correctly), he rejects. Blake refers to the putative poetic origin as that in the Trinity College manuscript of the *South English Legendary*, and Andrew Breeze, 'Master John of St Davids, Adam and Eve and the Rose amongst Thorns', *Studia Celtica*, 29 (1995), 225–35, esp. 231, also notes that elements of the story appear in some (unedited) manuscripts of the *Legendary* including the Trinity College MS. The text-historically complex *South English Legendary* focuses typically, however, on the Holy Rood aspects, and the Trinity MS precisely has such a full Holy Rood section (fos. 90–95[a]). Blake is aware how intricately connected the Holy Rood and *VAE* materials are, and the examples he gives of residual rhymes are biblical, rather than recognizably from the *VAE*. Mabel Day had provided in her 1921 edition of the Wheatley text (see below) a few lines of what a rhymed original might have looked like, but although indeed from a *VAE* section, the passage is not especially convincing. Correlations, finally, between the Vernon text as such and an early Welsh poem (*Ef a wnaeth Panthon*) containing *VAE* material have also been noted by Andrew Breeze, but it seems more likely that these are based upon shared sources: this issue is discussed later in the present chapter under the Welsh material.

legend from the four quarters, as angels fly back with the initial letters of stars in each direction. This can be found at the end of the English Latin redaction.[29] There follows the legend of Lucifer's refusal to worship the image of God in Adam, the story that he himself tells later on. At this point he is still referred to as Sachel. His claim is that he is the elder creation ('I was er Adam'), and it is in this case particularly well integrated with the Isaiah material in that when Michael warns Sachel of God's anger, Sachel claims that if this is the case, then he will set up his throne in the north. He insists a second time on his greater antiquity, but this time, and the literary effect is impressive, he is trumped: 'And a vois seide aboven: "I was er then thou",' and he (referred to now as Lucifer) is banished by God, with those who had taken his part. There is an interesting aside about the fallen angels, who seem to have become the evil spirits who bewitch men (Blake notes the unusual words 'elve-inomen' and 'elve-iblowe', 'bewitched by elves', which are now applied to the fallen angels).

Adam and Eve are placed in paradise, and they are given two angels to attend them (as in Adam's account in *VAE* 33, here again integrated into the biblical Genesis context). The fall is retold as in Genesis 3, although when God interrogates Adam and Eve, he also asks the serpent why he acted as he did, and the serpent, established as the devil in any case, says that he acted out of envy. After the expulsion, the wretchedness of the pair is stressed, especially their cold as well as their hunger, and their sufferings are emphasized far more than in any version of the Latin, in a manner akin to that in the *Saltair na Rann*. Adam makes a house for the pair, and there is a reference to the commonplace that Adam has to toil while Eve spins. They are placed, too, in the Vale of Tears, which is associated with Hebron, 'ther he was imaad'. The 'magna tristitia/tribulatio' is here expanded to note that they are cold as well as hungry, snakes might sting them, beasts and birds tear them to pieces, and water drown them: 'Ofte heo weoren acold and sore ofhungred; eddren mihte hem styngen; foulis and beestes hem mihte totere; the watur that bifore hem bare hem mihte adrenche.' It is stressed in the Irish *Saltair* that things that could not harm the pair in paradise can now do so. The pair live there for eight days 'in muche teone', which does echo the *VAE* text, and then Adam goes off for fourteen days by land and sea ('all the land' in *VAE* 2; the numbers always vary). Eve expresses her desire for death, Adam refuses, and proposes the penance; in this case, Eve does not enquire what penance is, but is told as usual by Adam to do penance according to her ability. The precise details

---

[29] Mozley takes this as sections 56–7 of the *VAE* as such ('*Vita Adae*', 147–8). Most of it is lost from the Arundel text, but Mozley supplies it from Lambeth Palace 352. The Vernon version does not have the octipartite creation, however.

seem not to match any of the English Latin texts: thirty days for Eve in the Tigris, forty for Adam in the Jordan is the pattern in the incunabula versions and some manuscripts. The injunction against speaking is present, but not the detail of the flowing hair, nor indeed that she should stand on a stone. More significantly, the motif of the static river is completely absent from this text.

Eve remains in the Tigris for eight days (usually the time is given as eighteen days, and linked with the static river) and the devil in the likeness of an angel simply comes to her—there is no indication of why he does so. His story is, however, the familiar one, offering the food of paradise. Eve believes the 'corsud angel', the accursed angel (the Balliol Latin text has 'angelus siue diabolus', and the Queen's MS and Harleian texts have 'angelus diaboli'), and when she emerges from the water her body is green as grass.[30] Adam's reaction when Eve is brought to him follows the *VAE*, as does his question to the devil, but the devil's response is given in a shortened form, since the whole story of his own expulsion has been included in the logical place. However, the devil does say that he had refused to worship Adam, and goes away after Adam's prayers.

Adam completes his penance, and the Vernon text adds here the unusual point that immediately afterwards Eve and Adam beget Cain, the act being preceded by a blast of thunder: 'And tho he hedde don his penaunce he com up and a thunderblast come, and he and Eve, his wyf, wenten togedere and tho was Caym biyeten.' This is again an unusual circumstantial development of the narrative, which seems to be attested nowhere in the Latin tradition, although it does not seem out of place. The actual begetting of Cain is usually implied rather than described, however. Eve departs now because of her guilt, the *VAE* reference that takes her simply 'to the west' being expanded here to the 'worldes ende into the west'. The Latin narrative is expanded further in that she makes a hut (as in *VAE* 18), of which the writer explains that this kept her from snow and frost and wicked weather. The text now notes—following the *VAE*, but in fact superfluously—that she is with child, and also seems to indicate that the pregnancy lasts for twelve months. At the time of the birth, however, she does send word 'bi the hevene' (rather than specifically by the moon and stars, 'luminaria caeli') to Adam, who is afraid that the devil has attacked her again. At his prayer, twelve angels are sent and Cain is born. This passage is also much abbreviated, however; there is no mention of Michael, not of the two Virtues, and there is nothing of the miraculous events at the birth of Cain. Adam is now given seeds by God (rather than through Michael), and the writer adds at this point a new set of ideas related to

---

[30] Blake's notes, 110, imply that the original meant that Eve was trembling like grass; however, the colour is almost always mentioned in this most durable of motifs.

tithing. God asks for a 'tithe dole', at which Adam offers a half. God refuses with the enigmatic explanation: 'hit schal the tyme come that the tithe dole schal beo binomen me for fals couetyse of the fendes lore.'[31]

Eve's fears regarding Cain after the birth of Abel are voiced, the narrative of Cain and Abel is given in considerable (biblical) detail, which expands the brief mention in the *VAE*, and Cain departs with his sister and wife Calmana. The time lapses are now recorded, Adam having waited for a hundred years before (on the instructions of an angel sent by Christ) begetting Seth. This returns us to *VAE* 24, although again the numbers of Adam's children are varied (thirty sons and many daughters, plus Cain and Abel). The *VAE* is once again adapted, however, in that the Vernon text adds a description of the two family lines, and the prohibition of intermarriage between the Sethites and the Cainites, an interpretative commonplace throughout medieval religious literature; the *Saltair na Rann* has material on the miscegenation, and so do many later works on Adam and Eve in general. It is a major theme in a play by the Swiss Protestant Jakob Ruf as late as the mid sixteenth century, where the products of the prohibited unions are usually seen as having all drowned in the flood, as happens here too as we look on towards Noah.

The Vernon text now moves to *VAE* 30, and there is no translation or apocalyptic vision of Adam (as with the Paris manuscript edited by Pettorelli and other vernacular texts). Adam now lives for more than 900 years (the usual specific number is not given), and calls his sons together and sends Eve and Seth to paradise. The Vernon text has Seth ask Adam how to reach paradise, and the motif of the dried grass from the sinful steps is invoked. This is of course from the Holy Rood quest narrative, and is as with the *Canticum* illogical here since Eve is going with Seth.[32] This time the devil/serpent ('the fend as a neddre') stings Seth—significantly not in the face—at which Eve invokes the image of God and Seth curses the serpent. They reach paradise, where instead of the oil of mercy Seth receives (as in all the English versions) the *Gospel of Nicodemus* prophecy of a redemption; instead of the (in English Latin texts) usual 5,228, or the equally familiar 5,500 years, the Vernon text has 5,100 years. Seth is also given an apple (which he is told Adam knows well), and three apple seeds, as well as sweet spices (unspecified, however), which combines motifs from both traditions. The three seeds are to be placed in Adam's mouth and nostrils. Seth returns and delivers the

---

[31] The motif of tithing is raised in the early Welsh text discussed by Breeze, though the context is rather different (this is discussed below). It is nevertheless interesting that both texts raise the question of tithing, which is not present in most other versions.

[32] Blake, *Middle English Religious Prose*, 114, points out the illogicality, but revealingly comments that 'in many versions Seth goes to paradise by himself'. Those versions are of course Holy Rood and not *VAE* versions.

angel's message, at which Adam laughs (as he does in the Holy Rood *Legende* and in the integrated Latin Balliol text). The merging of the *VAE* with the Holy Rood stories becomes even clearer as Adam eats the apple brought from paradise and then dies. Seth finds him, but the *VAE* material predominates again after the death of Adam, as the angels sing and God's hand is seen over Adam, whose body is then commended to Michael. Two angels, Michael and Uriel, bring two (rather than three, which can seem unclear) shrouds, although Adam and Abel are buried in the Vale of Hebron (rather than close to paradise, as in the *VAE*), and this corresponds more closely to the Holy Rood narrative (the Balliol Latin text, which merges the Vita and the Rood material to a great extent, in fact combines the two with a most unusual reference to 'in monte Ebron in partibus paradisi', although a later Polish translation of the *VAE* also refers to Hebron as a hill).[33] The English reference to the nature of the shrouds ('clothes of sendel and of bijs') is clearly and closely from a text of Latin *Vita* 48 ('tres pannos de sindone bissinos'), so that the change to two rather than three (which might require an explanation) seems to be deliberate. At Adam's death the skies are darkened, although not for the seven days usually mentioned in the *VAE*. Later, we are told, the three rods which will become the Holy Rood grow from his grave, so that the later Rood narrative is clearly anticipated. The writer now moves to consider the question of Adam's soul, which he tells us remains in the uppermost prison of hell for 4,604 years until the crucifixion.

With that, the text returns again to the *VAE* and to the death of Eve, which takes place after eight, rather than six, days. She tells the children to make the two tablets, of clay and stone, and inscribe the story of the lives of them all. Eve's children mourn for a week, but Michael tells them to weep no more on the seventh day, invoking the days of the creation, as in *VAE* 51. A Latin text is clearly being followed closely at this point, as Seth writes out the tablets and places them 'in Adames oratorie' ('in oratorio', *VAE* 52). After the flood ('deluvie', 'post diluvium', *VAE* 52) no one can read them until Solomon asks God for help, and is instructed by Michael as to what the tablets say. There is a difference between this passage, however, and those Latin versions which have the motif. There is no mention (and hence no explanation) of the term 'achiliacas', but even Michael's description of what happened is unusual. In most versions of the *VAE* which contain this passage, an unnamed angel holds Seth's hand as he writes with an iron stylus or simply like iron. The Vernon text reads: 'Ich heold Sethes finger the whiles heo weoren awritynge withouten

---

[33] For the Polish text, see Chapter 4. It is certainly striking that two such remote versions as the Balliol Latin and the Polish translation (from an incunabulum version) refer to Hebron as a hill. It may relate to the concept of Golgatha.

iren or steel in the harde ston, and so he duden.' The sole Latin text to come close to this is that represented by Balliol 228 (as is the case with other motifs, such as Adam's laughter). The angel is the archangel Michael once more, and the Balliol text has: 'Ego sum qui tenui manum Seth ut ascriberet digito suo sine ferro in lapidibus et in luto.'[34] There is no reference to the clay in the English text. Solomon then makes a temple for the tablets, and the work is brought to a close.

It is not easy to relate this extremely well-crafted narrative to a particular redaction of the Latin *VAE*. In terms of indicators, it contains the final description of Seth and the tablets, but not the vision of Adam, nor that of Seth being bitten in the face, as in some of the English Latin versions, so that the text associated with the Arundel manuscript seems not to be a possibility. Of the English Latin versions, the closest is that in the Balliol manuscript, with a match at some very significant points. The match is by no means exact or consistent, but something related to the (equally important and individual) Balliol version is at least possible as a source. Other parts have also clearly been abridged or developed. However, to ask for the source of this work or even to associate with it Meyer's class II (to which it is indeed closest) is in a sense to pose the wrong question. This work represents of itself an important development in the life of the apocryphon, and brings back to mind the question of what, in fact, is to be seen as the text as such. We may recall once more not only the variety in Latin versions, but also the fact that many Latin texts contain the naming legend, for example; its presence here, too, might well confirm that as a standard element of the life of Adam and Eve. This treatise (the designation is also significant), in a major collection, which presents most of the basic narrative common to the majority of Latin versions, with some adaptation and expansion with reference largely to the Bible, but also to other sources (Calmana's presence, for example, is a familiar instance), is simply a version of the apocryphon in its own right. It is a late fourteenth-century text in English which is contemporary with many of the Latin (and Greek) manuscripts and older than others. There are still some puzzling features: the odd behaviour of Cain at birth has gone, as have confusing names like 'achiliacas'. But the narrative of the *VAE* has been integrated with the biblical material with considerable artistry, just as elements of the Holy Rood narrative have been brought in with some skill. Placing the detailed story of the fall of the angels into chronological context (with a brief recapitulation only after the second temptation of Eve) is

---

[34] Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 144. Blake emends 'finger' to 'finger(s)', but this is not supported by any version of the Latin; he renders 'and so heo duden' as 'and thus they did', which does require the plural for fingers. To be sure, 'in lapidibus' is made into a singular in the English version.

particularly noteworthy, as is the introduction of God's ultimate assertion of antiquity. In considering the question of what actually constitutes the apocryphal life of Adam and Eve, in this case we have an entirely valid individual version.

The Bodley version

The second independent prose version—although in fact it may be grouped together with the remaining version (exemplified by that in the Wheatley manuscript), while being quite distinct from the Vernon text—is that found principally in another Oxford manuscript, Bodleian MS 2376 (596), this time of the early fifteenth century (around 1430). The manuscript opens (fos. 1^r–12^r) with a text which again has a complex version of the naming legend and then the octipartite creation but which then moves to the *VAE* proper, again down to Seth and the inscription of the tablets, this time, however, staying very close indeed for the most part to the Latin version of the English redaction (related to Meyer's class II text with the extended ending, and with the identifying point that Seth is again bitten in the face), represented by Mozley's Arundel text.[35] An unedited version in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R.3.21 (601), fos. 249^r–256^v, a large and varied miscellany of poetry and prose in English from the later part of the fifteenth century, is related to this version. The Bodley and Trinity manuscripts both entitle the work *Lyfe of Adam*. This version is, as indicated, close to the Wheatley version and its copies, and is frequently bracketed together with them, but it is quite different from that in the Vernon manuscript. The Bodleian manuscript has subheadings indicating the content.

The Christian tone of the whole is again set by the opening statement, which has Adam created in Bethlehem ('in the same place that Jhesu was borne'), seen as the middle of the earth, after which the archangels fetch materials from the four quarters (and thus give Adam his name); this passage

---

[35] Horstmann, 'Nachträge', 459–70. The Bodleian text is printed with London, BL Harleian MS 4775, which is discussed in the context of the Wheatley manuscript, below. Horstmann refers to various other English versions, notably to MSS in which the text is attached to the *Golden Legend,* 345 n. (but read Douce 372 rather than 872) correctly as being essentially the same but with some variations and augmentations. He sees the Latin text in Oxford, Queen's College, MS 213, as 'the Latin original', however, though it is not entirely clear what he means by this. The text is cited from Horstmann, and the Latin citations given here from the Arundel or Queen's manuscripts are from Mozley. Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 125, considers that the Bodley text and also that in Harleian 4775—which belongs to a different tradition—both derive from the Latin version in the Lambeth MS 352 rather than any others. This does not stand up to close scrutiny, especially as the two English texts are rather different from each other.

is followed by the somewhat contrasting narrative of the octipartite creation, and then the text of the *VAE* begins. All this material is found at the end of the manuscripts of the English Latin redaction (Mozley, sections 55–7), and although here the two legends are in reverse order, the translation is close. The match with the Latin text is, as indicated, very close throughout, although it is still not possible to establish an absolutely precise source amongst the English Latin manuscripts within the group. The type can be established, however, and at all events, the source was manifestly *not*—as Horstmann states—Queen's MS 213 (part of Pettorelli's Bohemian group), but it provides a pretty well exact translation of the English redaction as such. This is clear from the start, where the English ('there thei were six dayes...in grete tribuacioun') matches the Arundel reading 'ibi fuerunt sex dies...in maxima tribulacione', rather than the Queen's manuscript: 'ibi fecerunt septem dies...in maxima tristicia.'

The English continues to follow the Latin (represented by the Arundel MS, although, as will be seen, that particular manuscript is not the source as such) very closely; thus after Eve's request for death they seek food again (but not 'septem diebus', as in the Queen's text), and then the penance is proposed, with terms of forty-seven and forty days respectively, as in the Arundel text, but once more not the Queen's MS version. The English remains close to the Arundel version, with the full amount of Adam's speech to the creatures in the Jordan, for example, and the first apparent divergence comes when the devil transforms himself to tempt Eve; the word 'angel' is, oddly, not mentioned, but he changes 'into a feire louely liknesse', although he does refer to himself as an angel later. Her flesh is green as grass when she emerges from the water, and again she faints. In the confrontation between Adam and the devil, too, since there has been no prior version of the fall of the angels, the *VAE* material is treated in full, with the devil, indeed, not only asserting his prior creation, but emphasizing his beauty ('I am fayrer thanne he'). Eve departs, now three months pregnant, and variations between this version and the Arundel text are again slight; her prayer to the 'luminaria celi' in *VAE* 19 is directed towards 'yow seruauntes vnto my lord god in heuene', and when the twelve angels and two Virtues are sent, the translator adds as an explanatory note to the latter 'that is to seye two other ordres of angeles'.

A definite clue to the nature of the source may be had, however, from the actual birth. The English reads: 'and she bare a sone, but she was full with sorwe.' This indicates that the reading being followed was not 'lucidus', referring to the newborn Cain, but, as in the Arundel group texts, probably 'lugidus', which is referred to Eve herself, and taken to mean sorrowful. Even some other English Latin versions have the reading 'lucidus'. The miraculous events at the birth are faithfully translated, however, as Cain 'arose vp and

ranne forth and toke an erbe in his hondes and toke it his mother'. The match is exact, including the singulars and plurals. Eve's dream includes the vision of Cain drinking Abel's blood (absent from the Vernon text), and after the death of Abel the numbers of years recorded in *VAE* 23 for the age of Adam (130 years) is matched, but not, interestingly, Abel's age. There is no deviation from the Arundel text in the next section, however, in which Adam is 800 years old when Seth is born, and the couple's children are given as thirty sons and thirty-two daughters. Adam's narrative of his translation and apocalyptic vision (with all the additional material in *VAE* 29) is included, the English rendering of which is well handled, given the complexity of the original, although there are some far-reaching points at issue here which will be examined in the context of the Wheatley version.[36]

Adam dies at the age of 930, and once more the Arundel version is closely followed, Adam first recounting the story of the fall and his seventy wounds, and then sending Seth and Eve to paradise. On this occasion Seth *is* bitten in the face, and the English adds a (this time slightly tentative) link with the devil: 'ther come an eddre, a foule best with-oute pite, as it were a fende, and boote Seeth wykkedly in the face.' When the serpent is driven away, however, the addition 'et Seth plagam dentibus dimisit' (and variations) is not translated. Michael gives Seth the prophecy of Christ's coming, here in 5,228 years as in the Arundel text. At this point in the Arundel text as such (though not in other versions of the English redaction), however, Seth sees the *pietà,* and then returns from paradise with the four spices. It is clear that the source for this English translation did not have this detail, since the Latin is otherwise followed very closely indeed, including the names of the four spices. Seth reports back to Adam, and when the latter dies, his soul is commended to Michael until the day of judgement. God asks for 'thre clothes of sendel & bismos' and Adam is buried in paradise.[37] The death of Eve and the story of the tablets also matches the Latin of the English redaction exactly. Seth makes the tablets of 'stoon . . . and shynyng clay' (352), however, and this reflects the reading of the Arundel Latin, which has—as Mozley points out[38]—the error 'tabulas de terra lucidas' (shining tablets of clay). The reading in other Latin versions is 'tabulas luteas' (of earth). This is not in other English versions. When Solomon is able to read the letters written with iron, he names them 'Achilacos, þat is to seye with-oute teching of lippes', which matches the gloss

---

[36] Horstmann, *Sammlung altenglischer Legenden*, 350, also signals a problem with the translation of the Arundel reading 'Et impii ponent Adam in regno suo' as 'Wikked mene schul putte Adam out of his kyngdome'.

[37] Horstmann again indicates surprise (by an exclamation mark) at this. The English follows the Latin exactly, however.

[38] '*Vita Adae*', 125; he considers this a late error.

in the majority of the manuscripts (and probably the original meaning as well). That in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, is slightly different at this point, and can therefore, like the Arundel manuscript itself, be disregarded as a source. Mozley's final sections (54–7) are absent from the English translation at this point, although, as indicated, the naming legend (56–7) is placed at the beginning of the work, and may have been known independently.

This is a very different text, then, from the earlier Vernon version. It is a close (and only rarely expanded) translation, rather than a literary adaptation. It is, on the other hand, a well-made, fluent, and careful, rather than slavish, translation, usually clear as such, although in a few places (where the original also remains opaque) further explanation might have been added. It is not possible to establish one of the known manuscripts of the English redaction as a source (though some may be set aside), because the English translation goes only as far as Mozley's section 53, and not all of the remaining material is included at the start.

The Wheatley manuscript and its tradition

The third prose text, or, perhaps more accurately, the second of the second group, is very close to the Bodleian translation, with which it presumably shares a common English-language source, since for considerable passages the texts are identical. There are, however, clear and sometimes significant differences which permit them to be treated as independent versions; although it is, of course, once again quite different from the Vernon text, the precise relationship of this version with the Bodley one is a matter of debate. Although a printed text with a very full apparatus is now available in Richard Hamer's edition of the *Gilte Legende*, it is still most convenient to use as the representative version (because it is complete and the rubrics are clear) that found in a manuscript which dates once again from the start of the fifteenth century, again of religious poetry and some prose, the whole of which was edited for the Early English Text Society: London, BL Additional MS 39574 (known as the Wheatley manuscript), fos. 59^r–88^v. The work is striking in that it is divided into sections of varying length (sometimes quite short) by rubrics, and is, like the Vernon text, named in the title as a treatise: 'a tretys of Adam and Eue oure former fadir & modir'; at the end it is referred to as 'thys blessid tretys of oure Fadir Adam'.[39] To be sure, the decision to take the

---

[39] Mabel Day (ed.), *The Wheatley Manuscript* (London: Oxford University Press = EETS OS 155, 1921), 76–99 (text, cited by page number). See the very full introduction, pp. xxii–xxxii. The manuscript was named for H. B. Wheatley, the former secretary and treasurer of the Early

Wheatley version as the representative text rather than that printed by Hamer is again somewhat arbitrary, because, apart from its independent status, there are a few places where it differs not only from the Bodley text but indeed from all the other texts in its own group; such places are limited, however.

The rubrics in the Wheatley manuscript are more extensive than the narrative indicators in the Bodleian text: thus the latter has 'Beestes made sorow for Adam' as a heading when he is in the Jordan, but the Wheatley text has the more extensive 'Se now how alle lyuynge þingis sorowiden to-gydere wiþ Adam'. There are several other surviving copies of this Middle English version, many of them enumerated (and the minor variations discussed in her introduction) by the editor, Mabel Day. One, the Harleian MS 4775, was printed by Horstmann. As indicated, the precise relationship of these texts to each other, and to the Bodleian (and Trinity) version, would require much more detailed study, as would the question of source. It would seem probable that all the English prose versions apart from that in the Vernon manuscript may derive ultimately from one English-language source, though variations may have been introduced possibly with reference back to the Latin. Mabel Day says in her introduction that 'in many passages the language is so similar that it is impossible that the two versions can be derived from independent translations even of the same Latin text . . . in others they are evidently derived from different Latin texts'.[40] The switch from reference to a shared derivation from a translation to a reference to variant *Latin* texts is confusing. In fact the Bodleian text can at times seem closer to the Latin, though, as will be demonstrated, it seems to derive immediately from an English-language original; and the redactor of the Wheatley text may not only have known and perhaps adapted that version, but maybe did so with reference either to the Latin original or to another translation. The question of relationships is extremely complex. The readings of the Arundel manuscript and Pettorelli's English group may be seen, however, very clearly behind the two versions, to which we may give the names of the lead texts as shorthand titles: the Bodley and the Wheatley variations.

Some examples of the text represented by that in the Wheatley manuscript are appended to English texts of what is now better referred to as the *Gilte Legende* rather than as the *Golden Legend*,[41] but which has led to the

English Texts Society, which purchased the vellum codex and presented it to the BL in his memory in 1920. Account is taken of this version in the new edition of the *Gilte Legende*.

[40] Day (ed.), *Wheatley Manuscript*, p. xxix.

[41] The so-called *Legenda aurea*, one of the most influential works of the Middle Ages, a collection of saints' lives by Jacobus de Voragine (the form of the name varies), was augmented and translated into French by Jean de Vignay as the *Légende dorée*. Two English traditions exist, one directly from the French, made in 1438 by 'a synfulle wrecche', and an expanded and again

designation of this version as the 'Golden Legend Adam and Eve', even though
it appears in that context only in five of the eleven known texts,[42] and is not in
all versions of the *Gilte Legende*. When it is, the text is added on at the end of
the work; the recent new edition of the *Gilte Legende* has it as the penultimate
chapter (chapter 178), followed only by 'Five Wiles of Pharaoh'. The unusual
Latin *VAE* in Oxford, Balliol College, MS 228, is of course also appended to a
Latin *Legenda aurea*, and there are Latin texts similarly attached to the
Magnum legendarium Austriacum as well. The Wheatley text itself is not
added to the *Gilte Legende*. The version printed by Horstmann in his 'Nacht-
räge zu den Legenden', from London, BL Harleian 4775, fos. 258[v]–264[r], is,
however, one of those attached to the *Gilte Legende*, as are Oxford, Bodleian
MS 21947 (Douce 372), fos. 158[r]–161[v], which is incomplete; London, BL
Egerton MS 876, fo. 321[r] (also incomplete); BL Additional MS 35298 (Ash-
burnham), fos. 162[r]–165[r]; and finally Lambeth Palace MS 72, fos. 423[r]–431[v].
All these are of the fifteenth century. Further versions which are, like the
Wheatley text, not found in conjunction with the *Gilte Legend* are: the very
small Oxford, Bodleian MS 21589 (Douce 15), fos. 8[v]–77[r]; BL Harley MS

---

rather different one by Caxton in 1483 based on French, Latin, and other materials. The most
recent edition of the former is entitled the *Gilte Legende*, with Caxton's text referred to as the
Golden Legend, a distinction well worth keeping even if the latter, available in an edition from
1900 (and on the web), is further from the *Legenda aurea*. The new edition of the text is
important: Richard Hamer and Vida Russell (eds.), *Supplementary Lives in Some Manuscripts of
the Gilte Legende* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 = EETS OS 315) and Richard Hamer
with Vida Russell (eds.), *Gilte Legende*, i and ii (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006–7 = EETS
OS 327–8). A volume of notes is in progress. In Latin: *Jacobi a Voragine Legenda aurea*, ed.
Theodor Graesse (1850; repr. Osnabrück: Zeller, 1969). There is a modern English translation of
the Latin *Legenda aurea* by William Granger Ryan: Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend:
Readings on the Saints* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). Like other collections of
saints' lives arranged liturgically, the most relevant part in the present context is the summary of
the Sethite quest at the start of the reading for the feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross. This
contains a revealingly worded passage rendered into Middle English as follows: 'And verreley in
a stori of the Grekes, thou it be apocrifie, it is wretin that the aungell toke hym of the tree of
whiche Adam hadde synned and saide hym that whanne the tree shuld bere fruit his fader shulde
be heled. And whanne Sethe come ayein home he fonde his fader dede, and than he planted this
bowe on his faders tombe, and whanne it was planted it grewe and become a gret tree and dured
vnto the tyme of Salamon. But whedir these thingges be true or none that leue I in the will of the
reder, for thei be not redde in no cronicle ne in no stori autentik' (Hamer (ed.), *Gilte Legende*,
i. 309). See finally on the text and on Caxton (discussed below) Miller, 'Eine deutsche Vers-
übersetzung', 257 n. 59.

[42] Thus Frances A. Foster, 'Legends of Adam and Eve', in Severs and Hartung (eds.), *Manual*,
ii (1970), 441–2 and 635–6. In her discussion of the Adam material she notes the close
relationship with the Holy Rood texts, which she discusses in English texts in the same volume,
443–6. In her edition of the Wheatley manuscript, Day keeps the Vernon text separate but treats
the Bodleian MS (2376) 596 as of this group, while remaining aware of its differences.

1704, fos. 18ʳ–26ᵛ;[43] BL Harley MS 2388, fos. 20ʳ–35ᵛ. These, too are all fifteenth-century manuscripts. The new edition of the *Gilte Legende* by Richard Hamer includes the text, the printed version based principally upon the incomplete Douce 372 (and Harleian 4775 where the former is defective), and has a full apparatus which takes into account all the nine earlier manuscripts of this English version, whether or not they are appended to the *Gilte Legende*.[44] Why indeed this text (and that of the 'Wiles of Pharaoh') should have been appended to the *Gilte Legende* at all is an open question, since they fall outside any obvious liturgical connection (they are preceded in the manuscripts of the *Gilte Legende* by sections on the dedication of a church and on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception). The only other possible connection with the rest of that work might be the reading for Septuagesima Sunday or, more significantly, and overlapping as usual with the Holy Rood material, the various feasts of the cross, but the text does not continue with the Holy Rood material.

Of marginal interest, finally, are two later independent witnesses to this redaction, dated 1559 and 1610: Oxford Bodleian MS 6909 (Ashmole 802), fos. 9ʳ–48ʳ and Bodleian MS 7419 (Ashmole 244), fo. 187ʳ⁻ᵛ, large manuscripts with astrological material, other information about Adam and Eve and their children, and bearing the name of the notorious sixteenth-century alchemist, astrologer, and doctor Simon Forman (1552–1611).[45] Day notes that Ashmole 802 is very close indeed to the Wheatley version, and probably a direct copy of it, without the rubrics. By then the texts would have been accepted as apocryphal works, but the very phenomenon of English copies at this stage is interesting.

The opening section contains the biblical creation, the creation and naming legends of Adam, returns to Genesis 3 and the biblical fall *in extenso* (unlike the Bodleian version), and then gives the *VAE* text. Mabel Day's edition of the Wheatley manuscript makes clear that the connecting narrative from Genesis itself follows a Wycliffite text and may be dated to after 1388, which gives us a *terminus post quem* for the compilation, at least.[46] The pair construct a

---

[43] As Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 213, notes, Thomas Wright's edition of the Chester plays prints on 240 a small portion of this text (§§ 25–29ᵃ): Thomas Wright, *The Chester Plays* (London: Shakespeare Society, 1843), 239–41.

[44] Hamer (ed.), *Gilte Legende*, ii. 991–1014. A glance at the apparatus makes clear that the differences between texts are limited in importance. Hamer notes that his usual lead manuscript, BL Egerton 876, is very close to the Wheatley version.

[45] See Barbara Howard Traister, *The Notorious Astrological Physician of London: The Works and Days of Simon Forman* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2001). See Day's introduction, p. xxxi.

[46] Ibid., p. xxv.

'tabernacle' (80; *VAE* 'tabernaculum') where the Vernon text has 'house' and the Bodleian 'dwellyng-place', and they experience great hunger after seven days (as in most Latin texts: the other two texts have eight and six days respectively). However, the response to Eve's desire that Adam kill her is interesting. Latin texts have Adam refuse on the grounds that he cannot lay hands on his own flesh ('ut manum mittam in carne mea'). The Vernon text handles this fairly freely and expands it slightly with a reference to flesh and blood, perhaps a pre-echo of the refusal to kill the newborn Cain, which does have the double expression in Latin versions, though it is clearly a set doublet in English in any case. However, both the Bodleian version and the Wheatley text, while first rendering the phrase literally, have Adam explain what he means by it. The Wheatley text has 'þat is to seye, how myȝte it be þat I schulde sle my fleisch' (81). The Bodleian text has almost the same phrase, with some variations in spelling and the last phrase expanded to 'myne owen flesshe'. The source was clearly common, but the Wheatley scribe seems to have been a little unsure of himself here, repeated one of the phrases, and also wrote 'soule' as the final word, before crossing it out and replacing it with 'fleisch'.

The penance is undertaken, and for long passages the formulation is very similar between the Wheatley and Bodleian texts. There are still verbal differences, however, which are sometimes significant: 'penaunce' is used in the Wheatley version against 'forthenking' in the Bodleian, for example, and there are also small variations in detail. In the Bodleian text we are told that Adam took a stone with him ('habens secum lapidem' in most versions of *VAE* 7) and stood on it, his hair spreading out on the water. Much of the formulation is the same in the Wheatley text, but here the first reference to the stone is when Adam 'leyde his stoon in þe botme of þe watir' (82). Adam's plea to the Jordan to assist him also differs slightly between the two versions, but in both the 'omnes animancia' of *VAE* 8 is expanded to encompass all living things. The Bodley text has 'alle lyfynge thinges that were in contre of Jordon, fisshe foule and beeste', while the Wheatley has 'alle lyuynge þingis on erþe, fisch, foul and beest', which extends the motif from the Jordan alone. Adam's voice becomes hoarse, as in the English Latin texts, and the water stands still ('soruyngly' is added in the Wheatley version as yet another emphasis on the participation of all creation). This episode was (oddly) missing from the Vernon text. The motif of angelic ministration during the penance is not found here, but it must have been absent from the Latin source version, although the passing of nineteen days is in accordance with the English *VAE* texts.

The second temptation is once again verbally close to the Bodley text in that the adversary takes on 'a fayr ymage'—the word angel is once again not

used here (as it is in the Latin and Vernon texts), but is mentioned only later. There is a substantial difference, however, at this point in the Wheatley text, in an addition made to the devil's actual blandishments. Having claimed that God has forgiven them, and promised Eve food, the Wheatley text has the devil say, with great significance: 'for Adam þi lord is out' (83). The other English prose texts do not have this, nor is it found in the Latin versions. This extra and crucial piece of persuasiveness *is* encountered elsewhere in the vernacular tradition, albeit rarely: it is in the late dramatic version in Breton, for example, in a slightly more developed form. The effect of this additional motif on the question of Eve's guilt is interesting in literary terms. Behind the whole concept, we may recall, lies the idea that the devil has to be recognized—in some vernacular versions she is warned quite specifically to be on her guard about this—even if he is in disguise as an angel (the motif of 2 Cor. 11: 14). But the subtlety of the extra indication, and indeed of the formulation 'Adam þi lord', makes Eve's task that much more difficult. As in the *VAE*, Eve is green as grass from the cold, faints, and lies there for nearly a day (the latter point is not in the Vernon text), and then she is taken to Adam. Adam's dispute with the devil follows according to the Latin, and he completes his penance of forty-seven days.

Eve departs as usual for the west, and the texts of the Bodley and Wheatley manuscripts both gloss the reference to the Virtutes in the same explanatory fashion. When Cain is born, the Latin behind the text was patently the reading 'lugidus' rather than 'lucidus', although the formulation differs from that of the Bodleian version (Wheatley: 'sche childide a sone wiþ sorwe', 86). The Wheatley rubric refers to 'þe midwyues', however, whereas the Bodley text refers simply to the help she had. The newborn child brings 'gras' to his mother (it was 'an erbe' in the Bodley manuscript) but the nature of the miraculous event is again not developed.

The Wheatley text, like the Bodley version, continues with the *VAE* down to the birth of Seth, although again there are small variations between the two versions, as where the Wheatley text summarizes the number of children (sixty-five in all), something the Bodleian version omits. At this point, however, the Wheatley text has a major insertion. Even though the death of Abel at Cain's hands has already been mentioned (and Seth's birth viewed as a replacement), the Wheatley version adds a whole section based on Genesis 4, telling in detail how Cain came to slay Abel and the vengeance of God. In this, of course, it matches the Vernon text, although here the passage is clearly separated off with a reference to Genesis ii[i]j° at the start and the conclusion of the passage (87–8; the concluding reference is merely parenthetical here, however, and is absent from other examples of the same version). This biblical material takes us down again to the birth of Seth, and the citation of Genesis

4: 25–6 with which it ends itself repeats what has been said already from the *VAE*.

The Wheatley text now resumes the *VAE* narrative with Adam's account of his being carried to heaven (which is absent completely from the Vernon text and indeed also from the metrical versions). This episode in the Wheatley version differs only slightly from that in the Bodleian text in terms of verbal variations and augmentations, but one shared point is of interest for the transmission of the narrative as a whole. When Adam is carried into heaven, the Latin versions edited by Meyer have Adam say: 'vidi currum tamquam ventum et rotae illius erant igneae' (*VAE* 25), referring to the 'chariot like the wind' with which he is taken into heaven. The Arundel Latin text, however, has the not particularly comprehensible reading 'choros tamquam uentos et rota illius erat ignea'. Other English manuscripts (those belonging to different redactions in the groups determined by Pettorelli) have the usual continental 'currum tamquam ventum' (thus the Balliol manuscript) or a variation of it.[47] The Arundel text must have been based on a miscopying of 'currum' or more probably 'currus' as 'choros', and then interpreted as (angelic) choirs. We cannot say when the error entered the tradition, although the Arundel MS, or rather the portion of it containing our text, is the oldest of the known English redactions. It must be recalled that a little later in the same section of the *VAE* there is a reference to the multitudes of angels surrounding the throne of God. The fiery wheels then require some ingenuity if sense is to be made of the whole. This version, nevertheless, clearly lies behind both the Bodleian and Wheatley English versions, which are nevertheless not the same as each other; it is difficult to establish from this passage which of them is earlier. The Bodleian version is briefer: '& I sawe ordres of aungeles as thikke as mots in the son, being in a feire cercle' (349). If 'choros' was the reading, here interpreted as orders of angels, the next part has been adapted with the idea of wind replaced by specks in the sun. The 'feire cercle' presumably depends for the latter word upon 'rota', but 'feire' presents us with a new problem. It would seem to be a corruption from an earlier English version with something like *fier-*.[48] Since the Wheatley text also has 'a fair cercle', we need to postulate

---

[47] Harleieian 495 has 'currus tanquam ventus'. According to Mozley (apparatus), Queen's Oxford 213 has 'victus' instead of 'ventus', but Horstmann's printed text ('Nachträge zu den Legenden', 462) has 'currus tamquam nutus'. It is most likely that the correct reading of the last word should actually be 'uentus'. The reading 'currus' is itself grammatically problematic, even if it is taken as an accusative plural, but presumably it was that form rather than 'currum' which lay behind the misreading 'choros'.

[48] See Day's introduction, *Wheatley Manuscript*, p. xxix, on the passage as a whole, and on 'fiery', see her notes, 115, with reference to the Bodley version. She notes, however, that the writer of the Bodleian version 'is a careful translator, and uses a different MS'. This seems to

a shared English source, the Latin source for which already had the 'choros' error. The Bodley version is closer here to the Latin in some respects, in that Adam is 'rauysshed in to rightwisse paradys', which renders 'raptus in paradiso iusticie'. The Wheatley text simply has 'raueschid in-to Paradys'. The Wheatley translation of the passage under discussion is rather more complex, however. The relevant passage reads: 'and I say [= saw] ordris of aungels as þicke as wynd beynge in a fair cercle, and I say a chare, and þe whelis þerof as fier' (89). This of course combines the two readings. The notion 'tamquam uentos' is rendered more literally with the word 'wind', but the comparator is still 'thick'. The 'fair cercle' as a false translation of 'rota ignea' is present again, but this version now seems to interpolate in addition the correct reading, with 'currus' as a chariot with wheels of fire.

What is one to make of this on the face of it relatively small point? In terms of the history of the *VAE* as such, we have two vernacular versions, known in several manuscripts, which introduce what is apparently a new motif, the fair circle of angels. In the English translations the idea makes sense, and is presented with quite striking, if unusual, imagery—angels crowded as thick as the winds or as motes in the sunshine. Even in Latin we have several manuscripts which tell us how Adam saw 'choros' rather than a single 'currum' or even a plural 'currus'. Of course, in text-critical terms, 'currum' is clearly the correct reading; continental versions have it fairly uniformly and it makes sense. However, the dynamic progression of the narrative is demonstrated by the way the point is treated in these English texts.

Assessing the evidence of the related English versions represented by the Bodley and Wheatley manuscripts requires a clear statement of the known facts. The two versions are not the same: Wheatley has the corrupt idea of the choirs and the wind, matching the Arundel text closely, but has in addition the more authentic reading of the chariot with fiery wheels which is found in other English versions of the Latin. Bodley, on the other hand, has only the notion of the choirs, but changes the image of the winds, perhaps independently, so that it makes better sense. Although the two texts are not the same, they seem nevertheless to have a common source. 'Choros' is in both cases rendered as 'orders of angels' and the use of the words 'as thick as' to render 'tamquam' appears in both, as does also the 'fair circle', the latter phrase making it likely that the immediate source was in English, and it contained already the erroneous translation of 'fair' instead of 'fiery', since both have it. That version in its turn must have been translated in the first instance from the Arundel version, to have taken up 'choros',

presume that these are two quite independent translators from the Latin, though it is unlikely that they would have made the same error independently, while choosing identical but slightly unusual phrases elsewhere (such as 'orders of angels' for 'choros').

and either the translator, having interpreted 'rota' as a circle, did not know what to make of 'ignea', or wrote something like 'a fiery circle'. We are beginning to run the risk of requiring Occam's razor, but the fact that we genuinely need to postulate a series of source stages means that we do have evidence here for one or more lost manuscripts, certainly in English. The remaining problem is how we are to account for the addition—it is not actually a correction—in the Wheatley tradition, of the original reading. Again we might speculate that the first writer of this English text also had access to a different Latin version, but in effect, questions like this can rarely have definite answers, and require too many assumptions. Nevertheless, the consideration of this small passage in the transition from Latin to Latin, and then Latin to English and perhaps English to English as well, can epitomize the fluidity of the apocryphon as such, and this raises once more questions of the nature of text in terms of the traditional methods of textual analysis. Of course the reading 'currum' is the correct one, and presumably the original; but—and the word of caution is important—the majority of Latin texts in England, a well-represented redaction, do *not* have it, and the erroneous reading is there too in all the English prose versions apart from that in the Vernon manuscript, another quite substantial number of extant manuscripts, in some cases even retained beside the correct reading. The circle of angelic orders would have been accepted by the English readers.

When Adam is ejected from paradise, the Wheatley and Bodley texts reflect the Arundel version in rendering 'de medio paradisi uisitacionis et uisionis Dei' in *VAE* 29 as far as the latter part is concerned, 'visitacions and sighte' (rather than the variant 'iussionis'). The Wheatley version omits the reference to the *middle* of paradise altogether, while the Bodley text has Adam cast *into* the middle of, rather than out of, paradise. Meyer's versions of the text do not have the reference to the middle of paradise in any case, but whether the omission in the Wheatley text was intentional, accidental, or source-based is unclear. Even more confusingly, the Arundel manuscript itself and some of those related to it do in fact have the reading 'in medio' at this point, which could indicate more clearly that the translation represented by the Bodley text came from one of the four manuscripts listed by Mozley with this reading (Arundel, Royal, Harley 275, and Harley 2432). Once more, how the Wheatley text, with otherwise very close parallels, seems here to have followed a text with the 'de . . . paradiso' reading is unclear.

One further error based on a misreading appears a little later in the Wheatley version, however, which is not in the Bodleian version.[49] When

---

[49] See Day (ed.), *Wheatley Manuscript*, 115, and Horstmann's edition of Bodley, 349. In spite of Day's notes, according to Mozley, Harley 526 does not have the reading 'in medio', in fact.

Adam is returned to earth, we are told in the Latin text that he is brought back 'in locum paradisi ut rapuit me' (*VAE* 28). This is the reading of the Arundel text, although Meyer's texts omit the word 'paradisi' (and in any case, Adam was outside paradise when he was taken up into heaven). The Bodleian text has 'to the place fro the whiche he rauysshed me' (349), without the reference to paradise, but Wheatley has 'in-to þe place of Paradys fro þe whiche he rauishide me' (90). It is possible that the Bodleian version has simply omitted the reference to paradise on the grounds of logic, rather than having been based on a different Latin original at some stage, because the phrasing is otherwise the same. The Wheatley text now makes a curious addition, however, repeating that Michael led Adam away, but this time 'to þe lake þere he rauishede me' (90). This double reading is found in all versions of the Wheatley text. The two notions are clearly variations, and the second is (as Day surmised) based on a misreading at some stage of 'lacum' for 'locum'. The word 'paradisi' seems to have been absent this time, so that the second version of the same point in the Wheatley prose seems to be based on a misreading of a Latin version other than the Arundel text. This error seems not to be in any of the known Latin versions, so that once again a lost Latin text has to be postulated. Why the Wheatley version has two versions of what is effectively the same idea is an open question; the pattern is the same as with the 'choros'/'currum' duality. Day refers in her notes to the possibility of marginal corrections in a previous version which were later added in to the basic text, and this again is a possibility; it is not uncommon in manuscript terms.

Adam, now dying, sends Seth and Eve to paradise, and on the way Seth is bitten in the face. After Seth asks for the oil of mercy Michael tells him that the redemption will come in 5,228 years, and the prophecy of the coming of Christ is given a separate rubric. Significantly, this passage is slightly different in the Bodleian text, which matches the text of the Arundel version very closely. The Latin and the Bodley texts state that Christ will be baptized in the Jordan, and when he emerges, he will anoint Adam with the oil of mercy and then all men. Then Christ will lead Adam into paradise. At this last point, the two English texts again run parallel, but the Wheatley version of what will happen immediately after the baptism of Christ reads more like the Creed: 'and he schal dye and rise aȝeyin and go to hell and anoynte þere Adam' (95). Seth and Eve return to Adam with 'swete oynementis' in some of the manuscripts of this version, added as a gloss on 'odoramenta' (which is used in the Wheatley text itself, and also the only word used in the Bodley version). Where the Bodleian text simply has the four spices enumerated as in the Latin, the Wheatley text adds 'and Canel' (95). 'Canel' is a gloss on cinnamon (cf. modern French *canellier*), but the conjunction might indicate that the

writer of the last version did not actually know this and incorporated the (interlinear or marginal) gloss as if it were an addition.[50]

When Adam dies the sun and moon and stars are darkened for eight days in both English versions (seven in Latin; the Vernon text does not specify how long), but when he is mourned by his wife and son, there is another addition in the Wheatley manuscript itself, but not elsewhere in the same tradition, in which we are told how they sometimes knelt and sometimes sat down by the body. The sentence is absent from the Bodley version and indeed from all the other manuscripts of the Wheatley text, which makes it a particularly interesting addition, although there seems to be no Latin source for it anywhere.[51]

Adam is buried, Seth sees the hand of God over him, and his soul is commended to Michael. Michael brings as in the *VAE* the three shrouds, but where in the *VAE* and in the Bodley version and most of the other versions in the Wheatley/*Gilte Legende* group these are to be placed over Adam and Abel (who are already dead), and the Vernon text reduces it logically to two shrouds in any case, the Wheatley version itself (plus its close copy in Ashmole 802) anticipates the use of the third shroud, which is to be spread 'ouer Eue' (96) even though she is not at this point dead. Some texts in Latin seem to imply that one shroud is for Adam and the others (plural) are for Abel.[52] Once more (as with the reference to kneeling or sitting) we have a case where the Wheatley text stands alone against all of the others, including the Bodley version.

Adam is buried, and once again the Wheatley text diverges a little from some of the other manuscripts. Adam's body has various resting places, of course, and the Arundel, and continental, Latin versions say that the body is buried 'in paradiso' (*VAE* 48). This is matched in the Bodleian text and also exactly by the Wheatley version, but the other manuscripts, including all those where the text is part of the *Gilte Legende*, not only add in the 'vale of Ebronne', which is not at all unusual within the tradition as a whole (even with variations such as the 'mount of Hebron' in the Balliol text) and is found

---

[50] Day (ed.), *Wheatley Manuscript*, 116, notes that the two additions were originally glosses.

[51] See ibid. 116; Day is inclined to think that there is evidence that it was omitted from other manuscripts of the same version (although this is not entirely convincing). See Hamer (ed.), *Gilte Legende*, ii. 1012, for the variant readings.

[52] The point is variable in the Latin tradition. See Meyer's edition, '*Vita Adae*', 212 ('alias sindones'). Day (ed.), *Wheatley Manuscript*, 117, notes that the Latin in Harley 526 has a similar variant, but it is not registered in Mozley. The Arundel text has 'tres sindones . . . unum . . . alium', which is not immediately clear. Day also notes that the reference to Eve is not in the other English-language manuscripts (it is unique to the Wheatley and Ashmole texts); see Hamer (ed.), *Gilte Legende*, 1012, which has three cloths and two singular references, like the Bodleian text. In some continental texts, Adam and Abel are provided with three shrouds *each*, which is another solution to the problem and makes sense from the Latin.

as such in the Vernon version, but also states that this is as the 'Maister of Stories telleth', a reference to the input of Peter Comestor on Adam's burial place, although it is found in the Holy Rood legends and in a great variety of other places.[53]

Eve now gives her prophecy of the destruction of mankind and instructs Seth to make the two tablets, which he does exactly as in the *VAE*. Interestingly, the erroneous adjective 'lucidus' in the English Latin texts—which *is* present in the Bodley version—is now left out. As Day notes, the first few lines of *VAE* 52—but no more than that—are rendered differently in the two versions. Thereafter, however, the texts are very close once again. 'Achiliacas' is interpreted once again as 'wiþ-outen techyng of lyppis' (98), although the Wheatley manuscript itself is once more unique in its own tradition and against the Bodley text and indeed the Latin by specifying that the letters were written by Seth's *right* hand. This version concludes with the generations of Adam.

Assessing the Wheatley and Bodley traditions, especially in relationship to one another, is difficult. Additions and doubling (with alternative readings) are easier to spot than omissions, of course. There seems to be a common source behind the two versions—too much of the text is too close for coincidence—but it is very hard to see a pattern, or guess what the postulated archetypal translation must have looked like. It is possible—although we are really in the realms of speculation here—that the writers of the two basic versions may each have been comparing an already existing English translation with a (different) Latin version. Equally it is possible that the version closest to the original is that represented by Bodley 596, which does, difficult as it is to make a judgement, give the impression of being the elder of the two; it seems itself to derive ultimately (perhaps at one remove) from that sub-set of Mozley's Arundel group which in the section in which Adam is taken to paradise not only had the reading 'choros', but also 'in medio paradisi'. The Wheatley version looks more like a reworking, either set against a Latin text which had the correct readings of 'currum' and 'de paradiso', or one which had marginal glosses and correction which were mostly incorporated wholesale, whether or not they made sense or offered duplication, and in unpredictable order (as with the double reading 'lacum' and 'locum'). The author of the Wheatley version may have made changes and additions of his own. All this can, as indicated, only be speculative, however, and what we are left with here is two related versions of the apocryphon in English, one preserved in a good number of surviving texts and in a prominent context, which offer us

---

[53] Hamer (ed.), *Gilte Legende*, ii. 1012.

interesting variations on and developments even of the English redaction of the Latin *VAE*.

William Caxton

Caxton's version of the lives of the saints together with other biblical material was first printed in 1483 and also entitled the *Golden Legend* (even though it is further from the Latin *Legenda aurea* than the other English versions known as the *Gilte Legende*). While it merits brief consideration in view of the link with the *Legenda aurea*, which in Latin and English versions has the *VAE* attached on occasion, Caxton's *Golden Legend* has a largely negative interest in our context, since it contains a narrative of Adam which seems to have no very clear elements from the *VAE*, although it does have a small passage from the Holy Rood narrative.[54] It does not use at all the version actually appended to the *Gilte Legende*. Caxton's text as a whole begins with Advent and other feasts of the church year, including that of the Dedication. There follows then a series of stories of the Bible beginning with 'The Life of Adam', with the subtitle: 'The Sunday of Septuagesima beginneth the story of the Bible, in which is read the legend and story of Adam which followeth.' The narrative is largely biblical, with additional elements such as the creation of Adam in the Damascene field (and he is placed there after the expulsion). Cain and Calmana are born, and the story of the death of Abel (whose sister Delbora is born at the same time as him) is told in detail from the biblical account. One passage that might indicate knowledge at some remove of the *VAE*, however, is that when God sends Adam into a sleep (during which he creates Eve from his rib), while he is in that trance Adam has an apocalyptic vision, this time of the ultimate destruction of the world 'which afterward he told to his children'. This rearranged or reassigned motif (there is a different version of it in the Chester creation play) may echo the apocalyptic vision of Adam in the *VAE*, although the idea of the destruction is in fact voiced by Eve. David Fowler, who draws attention to the motif in Caxton and in the Chester play, has referred also to the visionary sleep of Abraham in Genesis 15: 12–16 as a parallel.[55]

---

[54] The most readily available text is that edited by F. S. Ellis (originally published in 1892) and published in 1900 in seven volumes of the Temple Classics, *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints, Englished by William Caxton* (London: Dent, 1900; repr. 1922 and 1931). See i. 169–81. The text is available online in the Medieval Source Book website.

[55] Caxton, *Golden Legend*, i. 172. See David C. Fowler, *The Bible in Early English Literature* (London: Sheldon, 1977), 22–3. His introduction to Caxton is useful. See also his *The Bible in Middle English Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974), 30–1.

Adam begets Seth (after some initial reluctance and angelic prompting following the death of Abel), and we are given the numbers of sons and daughters of Adam and Eve, though here there is report of confusion, some writers, we are told, saying thirty of each, others fifty. 'We find no certainty of them in the Bible' (i. 180). When Adam dies, it is the Holy Rood legend that is followed, as Seth is sent alone to paradise for the oil of mercy, receives certain grains instead, and returns, at which Adam laughs before he dies. Adam is buried in Hebron and the grains grow ultimately into the tree of the cross. Sarah Horrall has pointed out that there is apparently no influence from the *Gilte Legende* text, and considers that this idea comes from the *Cursor mundi*, which uses the Holy Rood material more fully. Caxton's narrative now moves on to Noah and beyond (the story of the two tablets is found later, this time ascribed to Jubal). The reference to Adam's burial is there too in the section on the Passion, where Caxton's text (i. 77) points out that it is 'not authentic' that he was buried on the mount of Calvary. Caxton is aware of apocryphal writing, incidentally, and signals that the narrative of Pilate (which he gives in detail) is found 'in one apocryphum' (80). The later narrative of the Rood is there in the invention of the cross chapter, and also is continued in the exaltation section. In effect, then, the *VAE* material—which is likely at least to have been known to Caxton—is removed completely, and only a very condensed version of the overlapping start to the Holy Rood narrative, plus the place of Adam's burial (probably from the *Historia scholastica*), remain.[56]

John Capgrave

One final reference to the *VAE* in Middle English prose requires mention: in his *Abbreuiacion of Cronicles*, written in 1462–3, the Augustinian friar John Capgrave (1393–1464) makes clear that he certainly knew the tale of Adam's and Eve's penance, and he discusses it in learned fashion.[57] His source seems to have been both the *VAE* and the Holy Rood material. Capgrave's work is a decade or so earlier than Caxton's *Golden Legend*, at least in the printed form,

---

[56] See in general Sister Mary Jeremy, 'Caxton's *Golden Legend* and Varagine's *Legenda Aurea*', *Speculum*, 21 (1946), 212–21, N. F. Blake, 'Biblical Additions in Caxton "Golden Legend"', *Tradition*, 25 (1969), 231–47, and (on the Adamic material in particular) Sarah M. Horrall, 'William Caxton's Biblical Translation', *Medium Aevum*, 53 (1984), 91–8, esp. 94. Horrall points out the use by Caxton of the Comestor and of the *Cursor mundi*.

[57] *Abbreuiacion of Cronicles*, ed. Lucas, with a useful introduction to Capgrave's universal chronicle. There are two manuscripts, Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.4.12 (contemporary) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 167, written around 1500. The first is an autograph manuscript, but there seems to have been a previous autograph manuscript from which this and the CCC MS were copied. There are also two later antiquarian copies.

but where Caxton's text needs to be considered in the context of the *Gilte Legende*, even if to show only how much it differs, Capgrave's evidence is quite separate and can be treated, therefore, out of a strict chronological order. Nevertheless, although the evidence of knowledge of the *VAE* with which he provides us is slight, it is clear that he *did* know of it, and his actual presentation is of some interest.

Capgrave is writing a chronicle, which begins of course with *Anno Mundi* 1, in which Adam is created in the Damascene field; we are told, too, that he lived for 930 years and was buried in Hebron, after which his head was carried by the flood to Golgatha (11). This combines biblical material (the 930 years) with traditions associated with Adam and found either in or in conjunction with many texts of the *VAE*. In the year 15, Eve bears Cain and Calmana, then later Abel and Delbora. Capgrave does go on to say that Eve gave birth regularly to a male and female child, but the first pairings are again fairly commonplace additions to the Adamic tradition, and are found regularly in Latin (the Balliol text), English, and other vernacular versions of the *VAE* and many other places, such as the revelation of Pseudo-Methodius, which Capgrave patently knew.[58] Methodius' name appears regularly in the *VAE* context. Capgrave also wonders about how many sons and daughters Adam and Eve actually had, suggesting that 'we rede þat' there were thirty of each (again echoing the *VAE*, perhaps), but noting that Moses actually mentions only four (which surely should read three?) and possibly did not know how many others there had been. How and where we may 'rede þat' when Genesis is uncertain is not explained. Adam, we are then told, prophesied that flood and fire should destroy the world, this again being supported with the notion that

---

[58] Lucas, in his edition of Capgrave, appears unaware of how extremely well known the tradition of sisters born together with Cain and Abel actually is, and refers only to a post-Koranic Cain and Abel legend, 253. Aside from the Comestor, the point is found in most chronicles. Indeed in the Malmesbury *Eulogium* the word 'gemini' is even used of them in both cases: *Eulogium*, ed. Frank Scott Haydon (London: Longman/Rolls Series, 1858–63), i. 20; see also *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden . . . with the English Translation of John Trevisa etc.*, ed. Churchill Babington and Joseph R. Lumby (London: Longmans/Rolls Series, 1865–86), ii. 220–1 (with reference to Methodius); and Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London: Longman/Rolls Series, 1872–83), i. 3, for example. Lucas might have considered (as a possible source for Capgrave) the well-known Pseudo-Methodius tract translated by John Trevisa in the fifteenth century in: *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum . . . AND Methodius: þe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes, by John Trevisa*, ed. Aaron Jenkins Perry (London: Oxford University Press, 1925 = EETS OS 167), 95. Lucas seems also to be unfamiliar with the Pseudo-Methodius text, which is important in this and in other Adamic contexts: in a note on 253 to 15 of the text and the notion, ascribed in the chronicle to Methodius, that in the year when Adam died, the generations of Seth and Cain separated, Lucas refers to 'Methodius' lost commentary on Genesis'. The idea is taken directly, however, from the same Pseudo-Methodius tract, as is that of the begetting of giants (Capgrave 19 refers again to Methodius): *Dialogus*, ed. Perry, 95–6.

this is written ('Eke we rede . . .', 11–12). Again a text of the *VAE* is possible as a source, although Eve makes the prophecy there, and in any case this time Adam himself writes it down on pillars of brass and tile. The idea (applied to Seth rather than Adam) is in the *VAE*, of course, but it is also in other sources as far back as Josephus, and other early biblical figures undertake the task, so that this is not conclusive indication of knowledge of the *VAE*, the more so as the materials specified are unusual.[59]

When he arrives at the year 130, Capgrave, who is after all a chronicler, speculates on the chronology of various events, which he says are disputed by chroniclers in general. Moses, he says, claims that Seth was born when Adam was 130, but other places say Adam was 230. It is true that Adam's age varies considerably at the point when Seth is born, and for his alternative here Capgrave is probably following the Pseudo-Methodius *þe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes*, as he does elsewhere, where Adam is indeed 230 at the birth of Seth in one of the manuscripts (in another he is 330).[60] What is far more significant is the way in which he accounts for the discrepancy: 'the cause of þis dyuersité is assigned be studious men þat Moises counted nowt þat hundred зere in whech Adam ded penauns for his sinne and so ded Eue' (12). As an alternative, Capgrave mentions the legend of Adam's vow of abstinence, after which he is encouraged once more by an angel to break that vow, and that is sometimes reckoned at 100 years. But the notion of actual penance, here voiced for the first time, can refer only to the *VAE*. This is made even clearer in the entry for the year 201:

Thow it be soo þat þe book whech is clepid *þe Penauns of Adam* be cleped *Apocriphum*, whech is to sey 'whan þe mater is in doute' or ellis 'whan men knowe not who mad þe book,' зet in veri soth we rede þat he ded penauns in a place fast be Ebron, for þere is зet a vale clepid þe vale of weping. (12)

Although this points not only to a knowledge of the *VAE*, but to an awareness that the work is apocryphal (Capgrave in fact gives us a virtual gloss of 'pseudepigraphic'), his knowledge does not seem to be extensive, since the nature and outcome of the penance is unclear, nor does the hundred years implied earlier match the forty or forty-seven days. Eve, too, is not criticized as having failed. A little later, Capgrave moves (for the year 230) to the Holy Rood stories, still aware of the non-canonical nature of what he is reporting. According to 'the trewer opinion' he tells us that Seth was born in the year 230, and since he has already told us that Seth was born when Adam was 130,

[59] See Murdoch, *Medieval Popular Bible*, 67.
[60] *Dialogus*, ed. Perry, 95. The text in BL Additional 37049 has 230, Harleiean 1900 has 330.

this implies that he has indeed accepted the idea of a century-long penance. Seth is sent to paradise:

In othir bokes, þat be not of so grete auctorité as is þe scripture, is told þat Adam schuld a sent Seth onto þe gates of paradys for þe oyle of mercy, and Michael gaue him þis answere, þat he must abyde v þousand and to hundred ӡere and þanne schuld he haue þat oyle. (12)

Although the promise of the redemption is found in some versions of the *VAE*, this seems closer to the *Gospel of Nicodemus* or the Holy Rood *Legende*, although the question of authority is again interesting. Adam dies and is buried in Hebron, which is on this occasion neither a valley nor a mountain, but has become a 'cité of Inde' (15). As has been noted, Adam is buried in a variety of places, including the Cave of Treasures, Bethlehem, and Calvary. Sometimes his body (or just his head) has been taken from Hebron in the Ark by Noah and reburied at Calvary, or just washed there in the flood. Capgrave seems to combine quite a lot of elements, first making a city out of Hebron, then noting that it was at one time called Arbe. This idea depends upon Joshua 14: 15, referring to Hebron having been called Arba (Cariatharbe, Kirjat-Arba, city of Arba), which Capgrave actually quotes. This text adds 'Adam' in the Vulgate version, although Luther corrects it. But as has been noted, the linking of Hebron with Adam depends upon this confusion, with Jerome establishing Hebron as Adam's burial place. It is also seen as the burial place of other patriarchs, which Capgrave also notes, and the reference to Mambre, which he gives as another alternative name, is also found in quasi-chronicles such as Sir David Lyndesay's *Monarche*. Capgrave reconciles things neatly by making them all the same place.[61]

  The *Abbreuiacion of Cronicles* is not a major witness to the development of the *VAE*, but it is important in terms of reception, indicating that in the latter part of the fifteenth century it was still known about as an apocryphal work. Some of the details in Capgrave need not have come from any knowledge of the *VAE*, but the central point of the apocryphon—the penance of Adam and

---

[61] von Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 81, explains the complex point in some detail, with all kinds of parallels; see also i. 408–13 on his grave. Adam is taken to have been created where he is buried, hence Hebron, with the 'ager damascenus' an addition. Hebrew 'adamah' is the masoretic text version of 'de limo terrae'. Rabbinic tradition also seems to refer to Hebron. Of the later sources provided by von Erffa, in the late medieval French drama *Mistére du Viel Testament* the 'ager' is the field that Adam is given to labour in after the fall. On Calvary as the burial place, see Florentino Díez Fernández, *El Calvario y la cueva de Adán* (Estella/Navarra: Verbo Divino, 2004), esp. chapter 6. On Mambre, see for example Lyndesay's *Monarche*, 1140–2, in Sir David Lyndesay, *Works*, ed. J. Small and F. Hall, EETS os 11, 19, 35, and 37 (London: Oxford University Press, 1863–9), ii/i. 37.

Eve—must have done so, even if the legends of the two pillars and the account of the promise of the redemption need not have been connected with it.

The prose tradition

The whole picture of English prose versions of the *VAE* is difficult to summarize, and it is no surprise that earlier studies indicated groupings that are not actually sustainable. The text in the Vernon manuscript is a unique and a very free version even when compared to the English Latin texts, although it is of course related to them. It has the status of an independent version of the apocryphon, notably with the addition of material from the Holy Rood stories. At the other end of the scale comes Caxton's *Golden Legend*, from which the *Vita* material seems to have given way completely to a Holy Rood passage which is itself not extensive, although Capgrave seems at least to have known about the material at this late stage. The real problem lies in the period between, with the English translation which lies behind both the Bodley text (and the Trinity manuscript) and the separate but related tradition represented by the Wheatley, other independent, and *Gilte Legende* manuscripts. Although the Bodley and the Wheatley/*Gilte Legende* versions are for much of the time virtually identical, sharing unusual formulations and indeed errors (such as the 'fair circle'), at other times there are noticeable variations. The Wheatley/*Gilte Legende* tradition contains more in the way of additions, which perhaps indicate the interpolation of what were originally glosses or corrections at some stage, even if the technique preserves sometimes both an erroneous and a good reading. The Wheatley text itself even adds small details to the narrative tradition from time to time (Seth's right hand is an instance of this). Drawing up a stemma which would take account of the variations between the two latter traditions would be a daunting task, and much work will need to be done to demonstrate precise relationships; the chronology is likely always to remain problematic. All the versions move away to some extent even from the English redaction of the Latin, although it is the ultimate source, so that the apocryphon continues to develop in the English language, and it remained known until the end of the fifteenth century at least.

Drama

There is no full-scale version of the *VAE* material in early English drama, nor indeed very much in the way of allusion to it, in spite of the treatment of the fall of man in all the great English mystery cycles. As noted already, the

creation play in the Chester cycle has, as later in Caxton's *Golden Legend*, Adam reporting a vision during his sleep while Eve is being created. In the first part of the play this is very brief, Adam simply noting that he saw 'wonders that . . . hereafter shall be wiste'. Later on, however, after the expulsion, he elaborates on his vision to his children, and this to an extent reflects *VAE* 25–9, at least in its placing, although Adam refers back to the pre-fall period when he tells how his 'ghost to heaven ravished was'. He prophesies, however, at some length the destruction of the world by water or fire, and this in the *VAE* is associated with Eve's later comments which lead to the instructions to Seth to make the two tablets: there is nothing of that in the Chester plays, which now move on to Cain and Abel.[62]

Only in one other of the cycles—the one not associated with the trade guilds—is there in the Adam and Eve section a very clear reflection of the *VAE* in its proper place. This is found in the fall of man pageant in the N-Town plays in BL MS Cotton Vespasian D.VIII from the end of the fifteenth century, known previously and variously as *Ludus Coventriae* or *The Plaie called Corpus Christi*, and it is a brief reflection only.[63] Once Adam and Eve have been ejected from paradise (this time by a seraph with the flaming sword), the seraph dismisses them

> Tyl a chylde of a mayd be born
> and vpon þe rode rent and torn
> to saue all þat ȝe haue forlorn.

The biblical Genesis specifies a cherub ('cherubin', Gen. 3: 24), and in other cycles, such as the Chester plays, it is clear that the angelic order of cherubim is involved. In the *VAE*, when Seth and Eve return to paradise for the oil of mercy the archangel Michael gives this kind of prophecy to Seth, and other orders of angels (including seraphim) are sometimes present when Adam dies. After the expulsion, Eve now expresses her wretchedness and especially her hunger, and the echo of *VAE* 2–3 is found when she suddenly voices the idea that Adam should kill her, although without the reasoning that he might

[62] See Fowler, *Middle English Literature*, 30–1. For the text, see R. M. Lumiansky and David Mills (eds.), *Chester Mystery Cycle* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974–86 = EETS ss 3 and 9), vv. 139–40 and 441–72 of the drapers' play.

[63] K. S. Block (ed.), *Ludus Coventriae or The Plaie called Corpus Christi* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922; repr. 1960 = EETS es 120), 27–8, and Stephen Spector (ed.), *The N-Town Play: Cotton MS Vespasian D.8* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991 = EETS ss 11), i. 34 (cited); the relevant passages are vv. 374–6, 389–90, 393. On the play, which is rather different in various ways from the other cycles, see Alan J. Fletcher, 'The N-Town Plays', in Richard Beadle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 163–88.

then be returned to paradise. She is also quite specific, although the *VAE* is not:

> wrythe onto my neckebon
> with hardnesse of þin honde.

As in the *VAE*, Adam refuses with the argument that 'I wyl not sle flescly of my flesch', expanding on the *VAE* text 'ut manum mittam in carne mea' by saying that this would mean that he would be killing himself. The same gloss is found in the Bodley/Wheatley/*Gilte Legende* version of the *VAE*. However, the narrative is not further developed in the play. Adam instructs Eve not that they should do penance, but that they should delve and spin. In the York plays, Eve does (at the end of the armourers' play) wish in general terms that she were dead, but there is no desire for Adam to kill her. Eve's wish for death at Adam's hand in the N-Town play seems very likely to have come from the *VAE*, and Adam's response, with the explanatory gloss, also echoes the text (which might have been known in Latin or in English), so that something of the *VAE* was at least known to one or two of the great medieval English dramatists.

WELSH

The *VAE* was known in Middle Welsh, which is not particularly surprising considering the number of Latin manuscripts of the *VAE* and also the English-language versions in England. In Welsh we may point to a prose translation attested in eight manuscripts (from the fourteenth century onwards, but including modern copies); to an early poet who makes interesting use of the *VAE*; and to a number of lyric poems which offer evidence of knowledge probably of the Holy Rood legends at the point of linking (the Sethite quest), through reference to individual motifs. Prose translations of the Holy Rood story are also known, and are sometimes found in proximity to the *VAE* versions. Furthermore, in Welsh as in other languages, the Holy Rood story and the *VAE* itself sometimes have extremely easily confused titles, the former appearing as *Ystoria Adaf* (the story of Adam), and the latter as *Ystoria Adaf ac Eua y wreic* (the story of Adam and Eve, his wife). J. E. Caerwyn Williams pointed out in his full and useful survey of medieval Welsh religious prose that there are very few translations of the canonical Scriptures in Middle Welsh; however, beside the *VAE* and the early history of the Holy Rood as representatives of Old Testament apocrypha (albeit Christian), there are several translations of specifically New Testament apocrypha, including the

Transitus Beatae Mariae, *Epistola Pilati*, the infancy Gospel (*Protevangelium*) of Pseudo-Matthew, and the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.[64] Other non-biblical Adamic stories appear to have been known outside this ambit. Caerwyn Williams and others use the word 'midrash' fairly freely, perhaps too much so, when referring to the *VAE*, but the essentially rabbinic legend of Adam in shining garments (here, however, apparently made of flint) is found in an early poem in the Black Book of Carmarthen; while this is a midrashic legend, Christian exegesis also attributes many qualities to the garments of paradise stripped from Adam and Eve when they fell.[65]

Welsh prose translations

The Welsh prose version of the *VAE* appears without a title in the earliest version, in MS Peniarth 5 (like all the rest, in the National Library of Wales), the so-called White Book of Rhydderch (Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch), written in the early decades of the fourteenth century, on fos. xxviii[b]–xxx (there is a version of the Holy Rood material earlier in the same manuscript).[66] Of the

---

[64] J. E. Caerwyn Williams, 'Medieval Welsh Religious Prose', in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Celtic Studies* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1966), 63–97, see esp. 79–81 on the Adamic material. Speculating on why the apocryphal narratives had apparent precedence, Williams notes their narrative appeal. See also D. Simon Evans, *Medieval Religious Literature* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1986), 16–17 and 70 (the latter on the Adam material), and Andrew Breeze, *Medieval Welsh Literature* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997), 65, on the prose material. Several of the earlier investigations (like some in English studies) regularly use the word 'midrash', both for the *Vita Adae* material and, somewhat incongruously, for the Holy Rood legends. Indeed, Caerwyn Williams seems not to distinguish between apocrypha and midrash at all.

[65] See on the unlikely nature of the substance and its shining or glittering attribute Dafydd Jenkins and Elin Phillip, 'Nodiadau Amrywiol: *Callestrig(i)awl*', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 25 (1973), 118–19. See my *The Fall of Man in the Early Middle High German Biblical Epic* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1972), 106–18, on the widespread nature of the exegesis and indeed the varieties of the tale. In rabbinic narratives the original covering of the protoplasts was horn (of which the fingernails are a remnant). This sounds equally uncomfortable. It is discussed also by Stephen N. Lambden, 'From Fig-Leaves to Fingernails', in Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer (eds.), *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden* (Sheffield; Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 74–90, on the earliest traditions.

[66] The White Book was divided into two, now MSS Peniarth 4 and 5, of which the latter was originally the first part, and consists largely of religious tales. Peniarth 4 contains the *Mabinogion*, and has consequently attracted far more attention. Peniarth 5 also contains the oldest of the three translations known of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. See the Historical Manuscripts Commission's *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language*, I/ii Peniarth (London: HMSO, 1899), 306–16, esp. 310. The reference there indicates in error that the piece is also in MS Peniarth 14, but that, indeed, is a Holy Rood text, headed 'Ystoria adaf yw honn' (This is the story of Adam). The *Report* does not notice that the text of the piece referred to as the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in Peniarth 5 is the same, even though parts are cited; see 333.

other manuscripts, Llanstephan 27 (the Llyfr Coch Dalgarth, Red Book of Talgarth, written around 1400, on fos. 76–80, again with a Holy Rood version, this time immediately following on fos. 80–4) has the title 'Ystoria Adaf ac Eua y wreic', as does NLW 6209 (1700) and the nineteenth-century NLW 9203. There are variant titles in NLW 5267 (mid fifteenth century), Wrexham 2 (sixteenth century), and the simplest in Hafod 23 (1605), where the work is called 'Buchedd Addaf', corresponding to *Vita Adae*. There is a copy in the nineteenth-century Cwrt M. 1155 of the Revd Robert Williams. This apparently large number of manuscripts does not, however, indicate necessarily that the work was particularly well known, since two at least and perhaps three are antiquarian copies. Once again, however, it is clear that here too the work was not lost sight of after the fifteenth century. It has been edited by Caerwyn Williams from the Peniarth manuscript, with the Llanstephan textual variants.[67] It is, as he notes, important to distinguish the text, easily confused not only by title but also to an extent by context and content, from the Holy Rood story, usually given as indicated the title 'Ystorya Adaf' (but which is—to provide yet further confusion—headed 'Euangel Nicodemus' in the Peniarth manuscript).[68] J. Gwili Jenkins noted in his study of that work the use by a number of Welsh poets of individual motifs associated with the Holy Rood story after around 1300. Thus Gruffudd ap Mareddudd (around 1350) refers to the cross grown from seeds, Madog Dwygraig (*c*.1370) refers to Seth's journey to paradise (probably a reference to the Holy Rood version, therefore, and not the *VAE*), Iolo Goch (late fourteenth century) and others

---

[67] J. E. Caerwyn Williams, 'Ystorya Adaf ac Eua y Wreic', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 6 (1949), 170–5 (with details of the manuscripts in the National Library and their relationships). Caerwyn Williams refers to the Latin versions in English manuscripts, and also to the Irish versions, where a relationship is less likely, but not to the English texts as such. Like the Peniarth MS, the Llanstephan MS also has the Holy Rood story, in this case immediately following it.

[68] J. Gwili Jenkins, 'Medieval Welsh Scriptures, Religious Legends, and Midrash', *Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1919–20 (1921), 95–140. The (Welsh) text from Peniarth 5 is on 121–9. Jenkins notes that it follows the Latin (*Legende*) of Bodleian Library Laud 471. He refers also to Welsh texts in MSS Peniarth 7 and 14 (as noted above, with the 'Ystorya Adaf' title), and Jenkins gives variant readings from the latter and from Havod 22. See 136–40. On 129–31 he notes allusions to this text in the Welsh poets (also mentioned in Evans, *Religious Literature*, 16–17) See also the unpublished thesis by T. G. Jones, ' "Ystorya Adaf" a "Val y cauas Elen y Grog": tarddiad, cynnwys ac arddull y testunau Cynraeg a'u lledaeniad' (MA thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1936). In MS Peniarth 5 the Holy Rood legends and the legends of the invention, edited here, are found with the Passion story according to Matthew between them as a link. Other manuscripts are referred to in an important paper by Sarah Rowles, '*Ystorya Adaf*: Golwg ar un o ffynonellau cyfiethwyr y chwedlau crefyddol', *Llên Cymru*, 29 (2006), 44–63; she edits the text from Llanstephan 27 and provides not only Meyer's version of the *Legende*, but also a text of a close Anglo-Norman version printed by Angélique Prangsma-Hajenius, *La Légende du bois de la croix dans la littérature française médiévale* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1995).

refer to Adam and Hebron, and Tudur Aled (late fifteenth century) and Wiliam Llŷn (sixteenth century) know the idea of shoots from the grave. More interesting is Gruffydd ab Adda ap Dafydd (who died in around 1344), who refers to the failure of things to grow after Adam and Eve left paradise. The idea is there too in a poem by Iolo Goch. Although Rachel Bromwich has linked this with Genesis 3: 17 and the cursing of the ground, it is more probably to do with the notion of the withered grass which Seth is instructed to follow to find his way to paradise on his (solo) quest in the Holy Rood legends; it is known in medieval English texts in the *Cursor mundi*, but in fact also in the *Canticum de creatione*, which is a version of the *VAE*, and it is included as a motif in the Balliol manuscript version of the *VAE* in Latin, and also in the Vernon English prose, which integrate Holy Rood materials. Although this is indeed one of the interchangeable motifs, the general influence of the Holy Rood material seems again to be the answer here.[69]

With the Middle Welsh prose text of the *VAE* itself, the question arises of whether the source was indeed a Latin version or one in English text, but it is difficult to determine this. The rare use of Latin words from the original ('tabernakyl') may well point to a Latin source, but overall, while sometimes the Welsh is close to the Latin, at others it seems fairly free: thus in *VAE* 18, when Eve departs to the west, where she weeps, 'contra partes occidentales et coepit lugere et amare flere', the Welsh has 'a occident yn trist doluryus'. At all events, the text, though close to the familiar versions, is truncated in some respects and there are interesting omissions, such as the name of the river in which Eve undertakes her penance (Adam is in the Jordan). There are, on the other hand, some (learned) additions, such as the incorporation into the text of the sisters of Cain and Abel (and, without a name, of Seth). The last part of the work overlaps with the Holy Rood material, which is of course also found in the two major manuscripts, in the White Book and in close conjunction in the Red Book.

The first part of the text is close to the *VAE*. The penance is set for twenty-four and forty days respectively, the former time being fairly unusual, and as indicated, there is no reference to where Eve is to undertake hers, and the quite specific words of *VAE* 7 'Et ambulavit Eve ad Tigris flumen' appear as 'Eua a aeth yr dvfyr' (Eve went to the water, modern Welsh *dwfr*, water), where Adam as usual goes to the 'ffrut iordan' (*ffrwd*, stream). The devil tempts Eve a second time after eighteen days, as is usual, and he is referred to simply as

---

[69] Jenkins, 'Scriptures', 130. See Rachel Bromwich, 'Llwybr Adda(f)', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 19 (1980), 80–1. See Kari Sajavaara, 'The Withered Footprints on the Green Street of Paradise', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76 (1975), 34–8, on the motif in various medieval English texts. On the Balliol text additions, see Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 139–40.

'gelynn' ('adversarius'), which again matches the Latin texts. When she emerges from the water her flesh is, interestingly, 'kinn lasset ar llinos' (as pale/green as a linnet (or as flax?), for 'viridis sicut herba', *VAE* 10)[70] from the cold. There are further minor but notable variations in small points later. For example, when Cain is born his sister Calmana is born at the same time: 'ac yna y ganet cayn. a chalmana y chuaer' (and she bore Cain and Calmana his sister). However, he does—exactly as in the manuscript forms of the *Vita*— then rise up and bring herbs (a regular reading of 'herbam' in this context) in his hands ('herbam . . . in manibus suis', 'llysseu . . . yn y lav'), which makes the inclusion of Calmana at this point more unusual. Similarly the traditional sister of Abel, Delbora, is added a little later (the name alone is given in the Peniarth version, expanded as 'delbora y chwaer', Delbora his sister, in the Llanstephan text) just before the *Vita* passage in which Eve foresees the spilt blood of Abel. It looks rather as if the detail of the sisters—the names are found in such standard works as the *Historia scholastica* (*PL* 198, 1076)—has simply been added on in each case, and certainly neither much disturbs the pattern of the *VAE* text, though the sisters have no further role; however, there is also a correspondence with the Balliol *VAE* printed by Mozley in his apparatus, which takes at this point material from the Holy Rood *Legende*, and also refers to both Calmana and Delbora.

Numbers are all variable in this context, and here Abel dies at the age of 130, with Seth born 122 years later. The text runs only to the birth of Seth in *VAE* 24 and the ending is truncated. Adam's age is not mentioned (as it is in *Vita* 24), but we are told (the text is slightly unclear at this point) of the thirty sons and thirty daughters, plus three sons and three daughters. The texts usually add on the three sons (Cain, Abel, and Seth), and sometimes name them, but the two daughters have here been mentioned already, and the third here must imply the unnamed sister of Seth. The Balliol *VAE* in fact mentions Calmana and Delbora by name at this point, but no others. The text ends with a reference to Adam living afterwards 'y lyn ebronn' (in the Valley of Hebron), once more something found in the Balliol *VAE* text, and regularly seen as the place of Adam's burial, normally so in the Holy Rood stories, and also in the English Vernon text, though the Balliol Latin version is rather different at

---

[70] The passage is interesting as a variant, and the translation is conjectural. The adjective *(g)las-* (here with the equative ending -*ed/et*) has a wide range of meanings, involving pale colours, including green, which does reflect the sense of the passage, which otherwise follows the Latin very closely in referring to her flesh and the coldness of the water. The noun 'llinos' (presumably implying a green linnet or greenfinch) seems an unusual replacement for 'herba'. Caerwyn Williams makes no comment on the word, nor does he give any variation in the Llanstephan text. If the text is not correct, one might consider *llin*, flax. Later (*VAE* 21), where Cain brings 'herbam', the word 'llysseu' (*llysiau*), 'herb', is used.

Adam's burial, as has been noted.[71] As far as the *VAE* is concerned, then, the Welsh text is somewhat different from known Latin and English versions in the omissions and additions, but it is also brief, essentially offering only the penance narrative as such, albeit with the Holy Rood material found nearby.

Ef a wnaeth Panthon

A rather different, but extremely interesting, case in the reception of the *VAE* is presented by the twelfth-century poet known as Master John of St Davids, presumably master of the cathedral school there, attested to between 1148 and 1176. Only identified relatively recently (his poems were attributed to the quasi-legendary sixth-century bard Taliesin), and with five poems now ascribed to him, Master John has three poems in the late twelfth-century Black Book of Carmarthen, but that which is of interest in our context survives now only in late manuscripts.[72] Beginning 'Ef a wnaeth Panthon' (He made all things . . .), the poem is also known as *Yr Awdyl Fraith* (mixed ode, *Awdyl Vraith*; it is an *awdl*, a long ode in *cynghanedd*, that is, with complex alliteration and internal rhymes) and like the others was ascribed originally to (and for a very long time firmly attached to the name of) Taliesin. If this poem is indeed by Master John in the twelfth century, then it provides significantly early evidence for knowledge of the *VAE* in some form, and indeed also of the Holy Rood legend. The work has been known in a variety of sources (and in slightly different forms) for a very long time. It appeared in the *Myvyrian Archaiology*, a printed collection of early Welsh texts from various sources (some spurious) first published in the first decade of the nineteenth century and reprinted in 1870; indeed, it had been printed with a translation into Latin (dated 1580) as early as 1777, and appeared in print again in 1841 with a translation into English. It was, finally, included by Lady Charlotte Guest in the Taliesin section of her rather over-full translation of the *Mabinogion* in 1849, a translation which remained consistently in print for the rest of that century and was taken over into the popular Everyman's Library in 1906, where it remained through numerous reprintings until replaced by a new edition without the pseudo-Taliesin material in 1948. One suspects that

---

[71] 'yglyn ebron' (Jenkins, 'Scriptures', 121: Peniarth 5); 'yn dyffryn ebron' (Rowles, 'Ystorya Adaf', 47: Llanstephan 27, with French source 'en le val de Ebron'). To be sure, Adam sometimes lives and is buried elsewhere, as in the valley of Mambre in Lyndesay's *Monarche*, for example, ed. Small, i. 37 (vv. 1140–2).

[72] Breeze, *Medieval Welsh Literature*, 41–7, esp. 45–6. He notes the implications for the library at St Davids in the twelfth century. See also his separate study, 'Master John of St Davids, a New Twelfth-Century Poet?', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 40 (1993), 73–82.

this makes it—oddly enough—one of the most long-standing reflections of the *VAE* in print in any vernacular language. Andrew Breeze has edited the poem, translated it, and discussed the relevant parts in the context of the *VAE*, taking his text (which differs from the so-called Myvyrian versions) from a late sixteenth-century manuscript in Bangor, University of Wales, MS Gwyneddon 3; he notes that there were twenty-six manuscripts known, all sixteenth century or later.[73] This version also contains a number of Latin and indeed Greek words. It is somewhat harder to argue for an early date on thematic rather than on the linguistic grounds used by Breeze, especially in the light of the Holy Rood reference (which is very clear), although it is still possible. Breeze speculates on a possible Irish influence, but the Holy Rood legends are not part of their tradition, and there are other fairly marked differences between what is present in the earlier *Saltair na Rann* (and its prose redactions) and what we have of the *VAE* here. Breeze also notes quite correctly that there are similarities between motifs in the poem and the English-language version in the Vernon manuscript; the comment is perceptive, and there are indeed several parallels, but they have to be tested first for closeness, and then with consideration of whether or not the points involved are not commonplaces known in other contexts. Thus the notion that God created 'fair woman' ('iesin ffoemina', 12) might be no more than an all-purpose adjective, chosen to suit the verse form, and it is not especially close to the Vernon text, which actually has an explanation of why women have

---

[73] Breeze, 'Master John', esp. 225–31. I am (as often) greatly indebted to Andrew Breeze for much assistance with Welsh, and especially for drawing my attention to this work. His dating of it to the twelfth century and linking it with other poems by Master John is done largely on linguistic grounds ('New Twelfth-Century Poet?', 78–80). Thus he discusses and rejects the earlier assumption (also on linguistic grounds) of a date in the latter part of the fourteenth century, as proposed by Sir Ifor Williams. See on the manuscripts Breeze, 'Master John', 226–7, and 'New Twelfth-Century Poet?', 78. The Gwyneddon manuscript was edited by Ifor Williams, *Gwyneddon 3* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1931), with the text on 267–71. Breeze provides ('Master John', 225 n. 2) references to the Myvyrian texts: Owen Jones, Edward Williams, and William Owen Pughe, *The Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales* (1801–7; repr. Denbigh: Gee, 1870). The work appears as 'A Celebrated Poem of Taliesin' in N. Owen, *British Remains, or a Collection of Antiquities Relating to the Britons* (London: Bew, 1777), 123–8, with a Latin translation (in Sapphic verse) by David Jones, vicar of Llanfair-Duffrin-Clwydd, which can be dated to 1580; it appears as 'Yr Awdl Fraith', with an English translation, in the correspondence section of *The British Magazine and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information*, 19 (1841), 663–8. This was the June issue, and the presentation of the work is an editorial response (presumably by Samuel Roffey Maitland) to a correspondent called only 'Ordovix'. The editorial comments there about the 'British Remains' are a little confused. Both of the last-named texts can be found on the internet. Lady Guest's translation (made between 1838 and 1849) was used in the Temple Classics and then in Everyman's Library in 1906 and various subsequent years. The text is on 281–5 of the edition *The Mabinogion* (London: Dent, 1937) and is different in a number of places from that in the manuscript printed and translated by Breeze.

fairer skin than men. The postulation probably has in any case to be not of a shared (Latin) source, but of a similar source type in some respects, probably at some remove. Breeze refers too, also pertinently, to the Balliol Latin text, which is a fifteenth-century manuscript, and the various dates make absolute decisions even on shared sources difficult, the more so as the Welsh poem in question, while very well attested as part of the Taliesin apocrypha, survives only in late manuscripts.[74]

The opening refers to the creation of Adam in Hebron, and Breeze points out that this point is made in the Vernon text, even though it is not commonly found in the *VAE*. Adam is regularly buried at Hebron (this is a fixed element in the Holy Rood tradition rather than the *VAE*), but his creation there is less usual, though not unknown. One English Latin text has him created at Bethlehem, and this is reflected in translations. Hebron is, however, quite a well-known independent commonplace from the twelfth century onwards (it is there in Honorius Augustodunensis, around 1156). Certainly it is familiar later on—as evidenced by the stage direction to a Low German play by Arnold Immessen in the fifteenth century, much influenced by the Holy Rood material: 'Et [Deus] descendit in Ebron et accipit globum terre et format hominem. interim angeli cantant: "formavit igitur dominus hominem de limo terre"' (God descends to Hebron and forms man out of a ball of earth, while the angels sing 'And God created man').[75]

The next motif, that Adam was 500 years old before God gave him a soul, is extremely unusual, as is the idea that they were in paradise for seven hours before the fall. This kind of speculation as such, however, is frequent, and Breeze notes that Adam and Eve are sometimes in paradise for seven years. The Middle English *Cursor mundi* refers (in some versions) to three hours, and medieval question-and-answer texts such as *Adrian and Ritheus* have him there for thirteen years, but more significantly for this text, a period of seven hours is in fact quite common. It is present in Anglo-Saxon (in Ælfric), and in Peter Comestor, down to Dante and later chronicle writers such as Andrew of Wyntoun. It is therefore not insignificant that the point is not in the Vernon text, and it looks very much as if these are simply collected commonplaces about the creation, some of which *also* appear in the Vernon *Life* and other

---

[74] Breeze, 'Master John', 229, notes an interesting variant Myvyrian reading on Adam's children in lines 25–8.

[75] See Hilhorst, 'Ager Damascenus', and von Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 81. The Honorius reference is in the *Elucidarium* (*PL* 172, 1116–17). See also Breeze, 'Master John', 228. Adam is thought of as having been created in the *ager damascenus* near Hebron (sometimes confused with Damascus, as in the *Golden Legend*), and the starting point does seem to be Adam's burial in Hebron, which is, as Hilhorst shows, very common (especially in the Holy Rood legends).

vernacular versions of the *VAE*. Similarly the Vernon text does not mention the left rib, again a commonplace of very considerable antiquity and durability.[76]

The cold and hunger experienced by the pair after the expulsion is not particularly close to the Vernon text. The pair are indeed cold in that version, but the rest of the passage is not matched in the Welsh piece, which seems to echo Genesis 3: 17–19 and then 3: 23, going back to 3: 16 for the reference to bearing sons and daughters in pain. The cold is a reasonable enough expansion of 'in magna tribulatione' (*VAE* 1) and a commonplace of the presentation of the expulsion into the hostile world, which occurs elsewhere in vernacular versions of the *VAE*. It is in *Saltair na Rann*, and in a German prose text based on the *VAE* Adam complains about the chill wind. The reference to tribute over the land of Asia (apart from the need for rhyme, which is often persuasive) is hard to explain; traditionally the dominion of Asia is granted after the flood to Noah's son Shem (Ham acquires Africa and Japheth Europe), a commonplace found in such standard texts as the *Glossa ordinaria* (*PL* 113, 113) or Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* (*PL* 198, 1087), and this may be behind the idea. Something as simple as the exigencies of form might explain the age of Adam given here as 908 ('Naw cant gyd ag ŵyth') rather than the biblical 930: this kind of adaptation is not unusual in biblical verse in vernacular languages.[77] There may be, as Breeze surmises, some confusion with Gen. 5: 4: 'et facti sunt dies Adam postquam genuit Seth octingenti anni. genuitque filios et filias.' The reference to the birth of Cain and Abel and their natures need again only be biblical, and so too, in fact, the point that Adam is given a spade may simply reflect Genesis 3: 23, where Adam is to till the ground. At all events, the poet seems thus far to be following the Bible plus very widespread commonplaces of literal interpretation, and has not necessarily needed any kind of *VAE* text. Equally, however, the antiquity of most of the motifs does not interfere with the dating of the Welsh poem. Elements from the *VAE* and indeed a version of the Holy Rood narrative appear in the next portion of the work.

The matter is not yet entirely clear, however, since an angel now brings seeds to Eve. In some versions of the *VAE* Michael gives Adam seeds, and in all

---

[76] *Cursor mundi*, ed. Morris, i. 64 (v. 982); the timing is not entirely clear, and the point is not in all the manuscripts. On the other variations and the seven hours in particular see Cross and Hill (eds.), *The Prose 'Solomon and Saturn'*, 127–9 (on the left rib, see 129–30).

[77] I have, as already indicated, given various examples in my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 28–9, for the relocation of Lucifer's throne depending upon rhyme or alliteration in the given language. The confusion postulated by Breeze in the Gwyneddon version is possible, but the alternative readings he offers are also of interest. On Adam's children, Breeze's text has them as a mixture of masculine and feminine (v. 28), while the Myrvyrian reading, cited on 229 (with a translation in the Guest *Mabinogion*, Everyman edition 282), is 'twice five, ten and eight'.

he teaches him to grow food, but giving them to Eve is odd. The crux of the legend seems to be that of the tithing, based upon a new misdemeanour of Eve's in withholding a tenth. Breeze notes, interestingly, that the Vernon text refers to tithing in the Adamic context and it is there too in the *Cursor mundi*, given as another means of regaining God's grace. That Eve's stolen tenth grows into black rye rather than wheat, and becomes a warning against theft, is most unusual, and sounds like an independent folk tale. Breeze postulates as a source a variant *VAE* here, but in the known versions there is no sign of such a variant; it is interesting that the poem goes on to refer to a prophecy of Daniel as a source here, although it is again unclear what this means.[78] The response as an actual aetiology of tithing is unusual in the context, although references to the origin or nature of tithing as such in the context of corn are, since it is biblical in any case (Deut. 12: 17 etc.), predictably not too unusual in the Middle Ages. Thus the fourteenth-century *Fasciculus Morum*, an all-purpose handbook for preachers, in its section on tithing refers to a story involving various saints and their tithes of grain, while the section refers also to Augustine, interpreting him as indicating that only those who pay a tithe can become part of the lost tenth choir of angels.[79] As a folk tale, it is likely to have been familiar, and the precise legend aspect is missing from the Vernon text, and is known in no *VAE*. If the bringing of seeds to Eve (rather than Adam) at least has a kind of echo of the *VAE*, the next few lines clearly do indicate knowledge of the narrative, although it is not in fact much more than that of John Capgrave, who knew just that Adam did penance. Here the key is that Adam, when he was old, did penance fasting in the Jordan up to his jaws, and there Raphael seems to have brought him books in secret from God:

> Llyfrau yn ddirgel o law Emanuel
> a ddug RAPHAEL i'w rhoi i ADDA.
> Pan oedd ef yn hên hyd tros ei ddwy-ên
> yn -nwr Iorddonen yr-nirwestfa. (71–4)

(Raphael brought books secretly from the hand of Emmanuel to give to Adam, when he was old, up to his jaws in the waters of Jordan, fasting.)

---

[78] One might even think of late texts like Hans Sachs's *Schwank* (fabliau) *Die ungleichen kinder Eve* of 1558 (The unequal children of Eve), where Eve hides her ugly or dirty children, who are then given lower-class status. Sachs reworked this tale in various different forms as verse or drama, and all texts, plus parallel materials, are in Theo Schumacher, *Hans Sachs: Fastnacht-spiele* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957); see 28–30, 103–19, and 188–99. Tithing is a major theme (in the context of Adam and of course of Cain) in the Cornish *Origo mundi*. The reference to Daniel requires further study.

[79] *Fasciculus Morum*, ed. and trans. Siegfried Wenzel (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 81–5.

The penance up to the neck in the Jordan is a familiar feature, as is the fasting.[80] There are various additional points of difficulty here, however: first, the reference to Adam having done so when he was old ('ef yn hên'). Again this is quite likely to be a gratuitous addition depending upon the demands of *cynghanedd* internal rhymes. More difficult is the provision of books by Raphael. Breeze notes references later in the *VAE* tradition to the book written with angelic assistance by Seth, but this is more likely to echo the notion in some versions of the *VAE* that Adam, during his penance, conversed with angels. While Adam is in the river, he asks the river and all of life to pray with him, and creation duly does so; in some versions, however, he is joined in this by the angels (this is the case in the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions), and indeed this is a feature too of the redaction represented by the Paris and Milan versions, which are closer to the Greek *Life* than others, and a related version of which was used in some form by the poet of *Saltair na Rann* in the tenth century. Of course, the motif is by no means the same, but in those texts angels speak or come down to Adam for some (or seventeen) days. The Paris *VAE* is not in fact entirely clear: 'et facte sunt ad eum uoces angelice per singulos dies' (Milan: 'per singulos dies decem et septem'). In the English manuscripts of the Latin *VAE* the notion is different, referring to the way in which Adam's voice becomes hoarse, although the formulation is similar: 'et rauce facte sunt fauces eius per singulos dies, et facte sunt dies decem et nouem.' In the *Canticum de creatione* (v. 172), too, we are told how 'His voys wax hors'.[81] Where the notion of books comes from, however, remains enigmatic: 'fauces' and 'uoces' might be confused, but not with books. The notion of secrecy (if it is not once again dictated by *cynghanedd*) is also very unusual.

What we have here, then, is a very reductive version indeed of the penance scene in the *VAE*. Only Adam's penance is mentioned, with a variation on the angelic ministration, if that is what is meant. Nothing is said of Eve's penance and temptation, which is given such prominence in the Vernon text that Adam's penance is not actually described, a somewhat unusual step, involving as it does the loss of interesting motifs such as that of the static river. Here of course the important second temptation of Eve is not even mentioned. The fragmentary nature of the knowledge of the *VAE* is also apparent in what now follows. We are told how four angels and twelve saints attend Eve, though it is not made clear why.[82] As Breeze correctly notes, this is surely a reference to

---

[80] The stress on the fasting in the *Saltair* and this text was pointed out by W. Bonser, 'Praying in Water', *Folklore*, 48 (1937), 385–8.

[81] Pettorelli, 'Vie latine', 12. Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 130. See Chapter 2, above, on the *Saltair na Rann*.

[82] This is not in the version translated by Lady Guest in the *Mabinogion*.

the later passage in the *VAE* when Eve, about to give birth, prays for help, Adam asks for assistance for her, and God then sends Michael, twelve angels, and two Virtues to act as midwives. The numbers here are rather different, and there is no reference to pregnancy—indeed Cain is not mentioned.

Much of what remains before the text changes to the quite different theme of the Saxon conquest of Britain is once again biblical with literal expansions, with one exception which may be linked with the Holy Rood legends, and another which might possibly refer once more to the *VAE*, at least to one with the augmented Sethite ending. The reference to the 150 days of the flood is biblical (Gen. 7: 24 and 8: 3), and although Noah's expertise as a vintner is not usually divided between red and white wine, the notion is a nice one, and certainly there is a great amount of variation on this aspect of the Noah story throughout medieval literature.[83] The two elements that are of interest to us here, however, are the comments that Moses discovered three rods on a Sunday, and the clearly corrupt mention of Solomon in the Tower of Babel learning all the arts. Both of these could have come from a Holy Rood story, and Breeze notes an early text (fully represented in Oxford Bodleian MS 343 of the twelfth century, but with earlier fragments) which does indeed begin with Moses finding the rods, albeit not on Sunday.[84] There is none of the intervening material to do with the Sethite quest, which links the *VAE* with the Rood material. The reference to Solomon is far less clear, even in itself, than that to Moses. Breeze correctly notes that the reference to Babel presumably means the Great Temple, and there are references to it in the Holy Rood story when Solomon attempts in vain to incorporate the wood that will become the cross into the building. But he also, in some versions of the *VAE*, interprets the story of Adam and Eve written down by Seth with angelic help. The allusion here is so vague, however, that it is difficult to be dogmatic, or indeed to confirm that a *VAE* version of any sort is the source at this point.

The Welsh poem is very difficult to assess in terms of the reception of the *VAE*, as indeed it is difficult in most respects. It does not seem very likely that the source was a coherent version of the *VAE*, even one like the Vernon *Life*, although certainly some of the elements were (imperfectly) known. It looks more like a version of Genesis, that is, the biblical material with some (usually commonplace) augmentations according to the literal sense, plus a very few elements from the *VAE* (certainly the penance in the river and the angelic assistance for Eve, even if why they are there is indistinct). Curiously, perhaps

---

[83] See my *Medieval Popular Bible*, chapter 4, on the legends of Noah. The augmentations provided in tale CLIX of the *Gesta Romanorum* are especially far-fetched: *Gesta Romanorum*, trans. Charles Swan, rev. Wynnard Hooper (London: Bell, 1905), 305–6 (with notes).

[84] Breeze, 'Master John', 231. The full text is in Napier, *History of the Holy Rood Tree*.

the closest parallel is with the two sculptures on the church at Thann in Alsace, to be discussed under the iconography of the *VAE* below. Far less certainly linked with the *VAE* are the narratives of Eve and the seeds, and of Solomon and the arts. The role of Moses is from the Holy Rood story, which, if the text is as early as claimed, would be likely to have been a separate source. *Ef a wnaeth Panthon* remains a fascinating document, but it is not really an apocryphon in its own right, simply an indication that the penance story and subsequent events in the *VAE* were known, or, perhaps better, that the narratives of the *VAE* were seen as part of the Adamic narrative. There is no distinction as to what is apocryphal and what is not. It is of separate interest that (partly through the ascription to Taliesin) it commanded some interest in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and appeared in print and translation then.

CORNISH

Cornish, with a medieval literature which is both sparse and relatively late, provides no absolutely indisputable evidence of knowledge of the *VAE*, although the Holy Rood legend plays an unusually dominant and extremely important role in the Cornish biblical drama.[85] Thus we have no penance of Adam, but we do have the quest of Seth (alone, as in the Holy Rood stories) in different forms. The relative strength of the Holy Rood material in England at this later stage is clearly dominant here, in contrast with Brittany, where we have more striking evidence of the knowledge of the *VAE* and of its dissemination at an even later stage. The Cornish medieval plays, however, do occasionally contain motifs which look as if they belong in an Adam apocryphon (or sound like expansions of parts of the *VAE*), but which are not elsewhere attested. Two works are relevant. The first is the major trilogy of fall and redemption known as the *Ordinalia*, notably the first play, the *Origo mundi*. There is one early manuscript of the *Ordinalia* (Oxford, MS Bodley 791), plus several later copies, and there has been speculation about lost copies. Bodley 791 is in a hand of the fifteenth century, though the date of composition is probably in the later fourteenth century and, from the place

---

[85] In spite of Stone, *History*, 120 (who refers to the *Origo mundi* as partly dependent upon the *VAE*, albeit qualified by a 'directly or indirectly'). This is less likely; probably a Holy Rood version (in English) was known. Stone refers at the same point to the Breton play which does indeed very clearly develop the *VAE*. It does not have any very specific connections with the Cornish drama, however, although such a link might have been expected. On the Holy Rood material, see Fowler, *Middle English Literature*, 9–10.

names in the text, from the area of Glasney/Penryn, a major centre of literary activity in Cornwall.[86] The use in a drama of the legend cycle of the Holy Rood material—which is very much the case here—is unique in England, though it is more regularly found in continental drama, including Arnoul Greban's *Mystère de la Passion* and the *Mistére du Viel Testament* in French, and in two plays in Low German, the paradise play of Arnold Immessen and the slightly earlier *Redentiner Passion*. The version found in the *VAE* of the visit to paradise by Eve and Seth seems not to have been known to the writer of the *Ordinalia*, but the Holy Rood material was, since here Seth goes alone to paradise and receives the seeds of the cross, after which the history of the cross is then traced through Moses, David, Solomon, and so on. Because English terms are used at specific points in the Cornish the dramatist may well have known the legend in English.

After the death of Abel in the *Origo mundi*, Adam initially refuses to lie with Eve again, but an angel persuades him, and Seth is born. When Adam is dying, this third son is sent to paradise for the oil of mercy, but there is a reference to the oil of mercy even at the time of the creation (v. 327), when Adam asks God directly for it. God replies that he and Eve shall receive it 'at the end of the world'. A similar idea, incidentally, is expanded considerably in the Breton play, where God explains already at this point the whole Sethite quest, but the Cornish text is a brief exchange only. Later in the play, Seth leaves for paradise, following the withered footprints which burned the earth as the protoplasts left in shame, a motif found in the Holy Rood legends and also independently, and encountered already in Welsh, for example. Seth sees the fountains of paradise, then a dry tree with roots reaching to hell, with a serpent in the tree. The third time he looks, Seth sees a child in the tree which the cherub tells him is the Son of God, who is also the oil of mercy promised to Adam and Eve. He is given three seeds to place in Adam's mouth when he dies, and these will become the Rood. Seth does all this, and a separate passage shows the devils dragging Adam's soul to hell to join that of Abel. In the play, the ongoing story of the Rood—which need not be considered further here—is integrated into a more or less biblical chronology, so that we get the story of Noah, which is not in the Holy Rood legend, although the Ark lands at Calvary, which ties in with the notion that Adam's grave was on Golgatha, linking Adam and the cross

---

[86] Text and translation in Edwin Norris, *The Ancient Cornish Drama*, 2 vols. (1859; repr. London: Blom, 1968); line references are to this edition, and the *Origo mundi* is in the first volume. See on the works (with details of later editions) Brian Murdoch, *Cornish Literature* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1993), and the earlier studies by Robert Longsworth, *The Cornish Ordinalia: Religion and Dramaturgy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967) and Jane A. Bakere, *The Cornish Ordinalia: A Critical Study* (Cardiff: University Wales Press, 1980).

again. The dramatist knew the Holy Rood material and exploited it well, but his source was certainly a Holy Rood *Legende*.[87] It is unlikely that this work is influenced by the *VAE*.

As an aside, it may be noted that the dramatist adds an unusual motif apparently not in any of the Adambooks, but with all the feel of a midrash. In the *VAE* tradition, Michael teaches Adam the rudiments of agriculture, but here the ground itself takes an active role. Adam is commanded to till the soil, but when tries to do so, the earth itself cries out (as it does biblically, of course, at the death of Abel) and refuses to let him until God commands it. Adam now bargains with God about the amount of earth he can till—first of all a spade's length, then two, and then, since Adam explains that he has to feed his family, God gives him all he needs. This is good (and comical) drama, but the source is unclear.[88] God goes on, however, to impose a tithe of crops upon Adam, to be sacrificed on Mount Tabor (*Origo mundi*, 426).

The second and perhaps more relevant Cornish work, an incomplete later drama, the first and only surviving day of a two-day cycle, is known usually by the Cornish title of *Gwreans an bys*, although the manuscript carries the English version *The Creacion of the World*. The work survives in a transcript of an earlier version made by William Jordan of Helston, and dated 12 August 1611 (MS Bodley 219 in Oxford), and there are later copies from this original. Jordan's source was probably a prompt copy.[89] It is not the same work as the

---

[87] The Rood passages were even extracted as a coherent unit by F. E. Halliday, *The Legend of the Rood* (London: Duckworth, 1955), the editor having been impressed by the unique and intriguing use of the material in Britain. See also my paper 'Legends of the Holy Rood in Cornish Drama'.

[88] See my *Cornish Literature*, 50, and *Medieval Popular Bible*, 61. The passage is in the *Origo mundi*, vv. 371–416.

[89] First edited by Davies Gilbert, *The Creation of the World with Noah's Flood, Written in Cornish in the Year 1611 by Wm. Jordan, with an English Translation by John Keigwin* (London, J. B. Nichols, 1827), with a translation; there have been several modern editions: Whitley Stokes, *Gwreans an bys: The Creation of the World* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1864); R. Morton Nance and A. S. D. Smith, *Gwryans an bys* (1959; rev. edn. E. G. R. Hooper, Redruth: Truran, 1985 = modernized 'unified Cornish'); Paula Neuss, 'The Creacion of the World' (Ph.D. diss., Toronto, 1970), published as *The Creacion of the World: A Critical Edition and Translation* (New York: Garland, 1983) (cited). See also Donald R. Rawe, *The Creation of the World (Gwryans an bys)* (Padstow: Lodenek Press, 1978) for an English acting text. On the work see my *Cornish Literature*, and my papers 'Creation, Fall and After in the Cornish *Gwreans an bys*', *Studi medievali*, 29 (1988), 685–705, and 'Dos piezas dramáticas en verso del Génesis, una germana y una celta, de finales de la Edad Media', *Acta poetica* (Medieval), 16 (1995), 349–68. Earlier views were sometimes confused: William Jordan was not the author and did not 'borrow' from the earlier play; far from being an (inferior) reworking of the *Ordinalia* (a view sometimes encountered), it is an entirely independent work with some striking differences. The play has been produced in modern times: see Donald Rawe, *The Creation of the World*, 137–41 and frontispiece, and Paula Neuss, 'The Staging of *The Creacion of the World*', *Theatre Notebook*, 33 (1979), 116–25.

Origo mundi: there are, it is true, something over 170 lines which do come from the *Origo mundi*, 127 of them from the role of God, and it has been suggested that this implies reconstruction from an actor's memory.[90] The language of *Gwreans an bys* in the surviving text is the (later) Cornish of Jordan's time, but the substance of the work would seem to indicate a date of composition in the decades before the middle of the sixteenth century. I have noted elsewhere the difficulties of using the few relevant theological changes associated with the Reformation in a Cornish work: here Adam is expressly taken to limbo after death, a concept questioned in the English Reformation,[91] but it is not even entirely clear what is actually meant by limbo in the play, let alone precisely how long it took for theological points to reach Cornwall. The Reformation question would, of course, have a bearing upon the use or otherwise of the *VAE*–Holy Rood material.

As with the earlier play, the dramatist seems to have known of the quest for the oil of mercy from the Holy Rood material. However, in this case very small points might just indicate that the *VAE* itself was known, although the overlap between the *VAE*, the Holy Rood legends, and the *Gospel of Nicodemus* makes the matter far from clear. When Adam nears death, he again sends Seth (alone) to paradise to obtain the oil of mercy, as in the Holy Rood version, but the dramatist uses the material less fully this time, and the differences between this play and the *Ordinalia* are marked, even though some motifs are the same (the withered grass on the road to paradise). In this text Seth sees a tree which goes from hell to heaven, but this time sees the Virgin with a child in the tree. He also sees Cain in hell. A stage direction (these are in English) tells how Seth sees (unusually) two trees, 'and in the one tree sytteth Mary the Virgyn, and in her lappe her sonn Jesus, in the tope of the Tree of Lyf' (stage direction at v. 1804). The Arundel version of the *VAE* has this motif. Seth is again given three seeds, as in the Holy Rood story, which are to be placed in Adam's mouth and nostrils (precise details of this motif are variable), and from them a single tree (rather than three rods, as in the *Ordinalia*) will grow. *Gwreans an bys* also uses the familiar motif (in the *VAE*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, and the Holy Rood legends) that the redemption will come after 5,500 years.

When Adam dies he does not simply go to hell, as he does in the *Origo mundi*. Lucifer declares that Adam will go not to hell but to limbo, which is seen as the highest point of hell ('Yn Lymbo, barth a wartha', v. 2017), and an

[90] Paula Neuss, 'Memorial Reconstruction in a Cornish Miracle Play', *Comparative Drama*, 5 (1971), 129–37.

[91] See A. G. Dickens and D. Carr, *The Reformation in England* (London: Edward Arnold, 1967), 77, on the Ten Articles of 1536.

angel (rather than a devil) now carries Adam there, while Cain is in the lowest part of hell. Adam has not yet been redeemed, but has repented and thus will not have the greater pains of hell. This set of ideas is the strongest indication of knowledge even at some remove of the *VAE* by the dramatist, even though the penance scene is not present. Versions of the *VAE* contain the idea that the (arch)angel(s) takes Adam's soul at his death, told by God to keep it in custody until judgement day. The idea is present in Latin and also in the vernacular versions of the *VAE*, such as the *Saltair na Rann*, although the parallels are not close, and the reference there is to the third heaven. It may, however, be that the Cornish dramatist had some knowledge of these ideas.

In this later Cornish play, too, Adam refers to his sixty-six children. *VAE* 24 enumerates the children, referring in the basic form to thirty sons plus thirty daughters plus three. The Welsh translation of the *VAE* also increases the sum to sixty-six, including implicitly the three sisters/wives of Cain, Abel, and Seth, and the tradition varies in any case. Even medieval sources (such as the *Collectanea Bedae*) admit that different traditions were known, but a memory of the *VAE* might again lie behind the motif here.[92] A final possible connection with the *VAE* (again indicating that it might have been known from memory), is a speech by Seth in which he foretells the flood by reference to the stars and planets; in the *VAE* Eve tells Seth of the two impending destructions, urging him to write the story and ensure its preservation in the case of destruction either by fire or water.[93]

The Cornish drama may, then, in one case possibly demonstrate some knowledge of the *VAE*, although this is not entirely certain. Curiously enough, the earlier of the works concerned, while using the Holy Rood material fully and well, presents little or no evidence of knowledge of the *VAE*. Whether the scholarly community at Glasney College[94] knew the Holy Rood *Legende* (since the dramatist plainly knew it in great detail) in English, but had no immediate access to the *VAE*, is a possibility. The later work, *Gwreans an bys*, on the other hand, *does* seem to contain some specific motifs which point at least to a memory of some elements of the *VAE*. As indicated, the later date makes this slightly surprising. Two comparisons present themselves, however: first, the Breton mystery play, the original of which is probably roughly contemporary

---

[92] See Cross and Hill (eds.), *The Prose 'Solomon and Saturn'*, 88–9, with details and examples. The *Legenda aurea* notes that opinions differ as to whether Adam had sixty or 100 children.

[93] *VAE* 50. Henry Jenner, 'The Cornish Drama I and II', *Celtic Review*, 3 (1906–7), 360–75, and 4 (1907–8), 41–68; II (68) refers to the *Historia scholastica*. For a full discussion of the point, see Neuss's edition, 233, with details of the *Mistére* version.

[94] See on Glasney itself Thurstan Peter, *The History of Glasney Collegiate Church* (Camborne: Camborne Printing, 1903) and recently James Whetter, *The History of Glasney College* (Padstow: Tabb House, 1988).

with *Gwreans an bys*, very clearly did know the *VAE*; and secondly, the one allusion in the major English mystery cycles to either of the narrative complexes is in fact very specifically to an episode in the *VAE* rather than in the Rood legends, even though it is that sequence of legends which comes to dominate in English and Cornish.

4

The Holy Roman Empire and Beyond

A deliberately broad geographical title has been given to this chapter—which is in any case the fullest—in order to include all the various languages covered, even though the principal material here is in German, either from what is now Germany or Austria, or from areas which are no longer part of the German-speaking world, such as Silesia. Some attention must be given, too, to literature in Low German, although material there depends mainly upon a strong tradition of Holy Rood material. There is one manuscript translation in Middle Dutch, however, and a brief passage in a *Historienbibel*. In the northern Germanic world, beside a Danish text printed in 1514 and noted by Meyer, we have only Holy Rood material in Old Icelandic.[1] To the east, Bohemia is still within the Holy Roman Empire, and there are Old Bohemian versions of the Latin *Vita Adae*, as well as some from still further east, in Polish; one Polish text which makes some use of the Latin *VAE* (rather than the Old Church Slavonic *Life*) was even translated into Russian. Versions in Croatian and in Hungarian, finally, exist and are of some interest, but will require detailed investigation in the future by those with the necessary linguistic expertise. Both are relatively late prose translations. The Hungarian text (which was edited in 1904) is found in an early

[1] The Danish text, which Meyer links in his edition with the incunabulum version, was printed by the early Danish printer, the canon Poul Raeff in Copenhagen in 1514 or 1515 (with the title *De creatione rerum*), and Meyer refers to the *Dänische Bibliothek oder Sammlung von alten und neuen gelehrten Sachen aus Dännemark* published in Copenhagen and Leipzig by Jacob Langebeck and Ludvig Harboe in 1738–9, ii. 301–14 (not seen). Bob Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 254 n. 45, describes this as a poem combining the *Vita* and the Rood material again, by Her Michael, written perhaps in 1496 and more closely linked with the biblical Genesis. He refers also to the edition by Christian Molbech, *Praesten i Odense: Herr Michaels tre danske Riimvaerker fra A. 1496* (Copenhagen, 1836), these being *Jomfru Mariae rosenkrans*, *Om skabelsen*, and *Om menneskets levned*. As far as the Latin *VAE* in Scandinavia is concerned, the one manuscript currently in Copenhagen listed by Pettorelli is not of local origin, and the provenance of the Lund MS is unclear, as is that in the Domkyrkobiblioteket in Strängnäs: Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 226–7, 233, 276. That now in Uppsala is of particular interest, however, 224. See on the Icelandic Holy Rood material Mariane Overgaard, *The History of the Cross-Tree down to Christ's Passion: Icelandic Legend Versions* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1968).

sixteenth-century codex together with other legends, produced for the use of nuns to read.[2]

LATIN IN THE GERMAN-SPEAKING TERRITORIES

The tradition of the Latin *VAE* in German-speaking territories is extremely extensive, and the majority of the manuscripts listed by Pettorelli are still held in, or originated from, the Holy Roman Empire. Only the English tradition is a clear and separate group. Wilhelm Meyer based his edition and established his classes largely on manuscripts held in Munich—there are approaching thirty now known. The texts representing Meyer's first class (which lacks some of the apocalyptic vision of Adam) are from the southern German-speaking area, principally Bavaria or Austria, with representative manuscripts from the major monasteries of St Emmeram, Tegernsee, and others, and Pettorelli refers to this redaction as the south German version. Pettorelli's second redaction (again approximating to Meyer's class II) is subdivided, but seen overall as Rhenish. Pettorelli's third redaction is the Bohemian group, so that what remains is the English redaction, and various late groups, as well as the incunabulum version. It is worth noting that Pettorelli drew attention to a text included as part of a penitential tract, again represented by four manuscripts of the later fifteenth century from Aldersbach, Ebersberg, and Tegernsee,[3] and it has been noted already that versions of the story are attached to the collection of saints' lives known as the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum.* The context otherwise is as varied as would be expected. Sometimes it is predictable, as with, for example, the version in the fourteenth-century

---

[2] Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 254, notes Katona's edition, *A Teleki-codex*, of 1904, 17–23, of the Hungarian text. The Hungarian version is in the Teleki Codex (in the Teleki Bolyai Library in Marosvásárhely in Transylvania), a collection of legends written for nuns in 1525–31. The text has *VAE* and Holy Rood material; see on the net: 'Ádám és Éva története' at <www.neumann-haz.hu/scripts/SGML/BHISGMLtr?kozep/kozep0037.sgm> (accessed 10 June 2008). There is a study available on the internet on the figure of Adam beneath the cross which refers to and cites this codex: Borbála Lovas, 'Ádám a kereszt alatt' (Adam beneath the cross), <http://magyar-irodalom.elte.hu/arianna/plaustrum/OILBoriD.html> (accessed 10 June 2008). More detailed study will need to be provided by a Hungarian specialist. For the Croatian version, Miller cites Rudolf Strohal, *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priče i legende* (Bjelovar: Weiss, 1917), 63–70 (neither he nor I have been able to consult a copy). Emil Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 437–8 refers to this text as part of the Latin tradition, and notes that Strohal's (sole) printed text is a seventeenth-century one. It is also discussed in Biserka Grabar, 'Apokrifni u hrvatskoj srednjovjekovnoj kniževnosti', *Croatica*, 1 (1970), 15–28; see 18–19. Vatroslav Jagić, 'Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen', *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), Philos.histor. Kl. 42 (1893), 1–99, refers to Croatian (Glagolitic) texts in the different eastern tradition.

[3] Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 286–7.

manuscript in the Bavarian State Library in Munich clm 11601 from Polling, which is found together with a partial version of the Rood legend. Others are less predictable: Munich clm 21534 (twelfth century, from Weihstephan, and the same text as clm 11601) has a portion of the *VAE* presented as a sermon in the *Speculum Ecclesiae* of Honorius Augustodunensis.[4]

Germany from the Rhineland to the south and then to Bohemia is very much the heartland of the *VAE* in Latin, and this is reflected in the vernacular development of the text, which is also associated principally with those areas, and which is the most extensive in European languages.[5] Translations or adaptations exist in verse, prose, and drama. It must be said at the outset, however, that in spite of assertions from time to time in secondary studies, it is, as usual, always impossible to establish a precise source amongst the Latin versions for any of these vernacular texts; at best, only the source type can be indicated. The extant prose versions are relatively late, found principally in the late medieval *Historienbibeln*, and are usually resolved versions of metrical originals found in the rhymed world chronicles. There is, however, also a late and interesting case parallel to, and in fact rather more significant than, that of Colard Mansion in French: in 1479 the Nuremberg poet Hans Folz translated the *VAE* into prose for his own benefit—his version, which has several errors, survives in what is probably an autograph manuscript—and then in the following year printed a poem based on the *VAE* to give us what seems to be the first printed vernacular version of any kind.[6] Drama is

---

[4] Ibid. 222–3. These are examples only. The text is not in the *PL* edition of the *Speculum Ecclesiae*.

[5] Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 213–18, refers to two *Historienbibel* prose texts, to an independent metrical version, and to one in a world chronicle; he also gives a full description of the poem by Lutwin, which he edited a few years later. He was unaware of Heinrich von München, Folz, the dramas, and some other prose material. I offered an initial survey of the position in a paper read in 1973: 'Das deutsche Adambuch und die Adamlegenden des Mittelalters', in W. Harms and L. Johnson (eds.), *Deutsche Literatur des späten Mittelalters* (Berlin: Schmidt, 1975), 209–24; this has since been developed, of course, and some texts were not known to me at the time (such as that by Heinrich von München). See also my entries 'Adambuch', 'Adams Klage', 'Lutwin', in K. Ruh (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–2006), i. 44–7, 61–2; v. 1087–9. Miller, *German and Dutch Versions*, 151–66, considers various German texts, but his main interest was the Holy Rood material, and he looks in detail only at Lutwin, Folz, and Heinrich von München, although he mentions most of the other relevant texts. His more recent and extremely useful studies, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung' (with a text of Heinrich von München) and 'Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen', present an updated survey of the material.

[6] It may be noted that the entry in the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrücke*, 210, and referred to by Harrison Thomson, 'Fifth Recension', 274, as a German translation of the *VAE* is in fact not such a translation. Miller has established in his paper 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 257 n. 61, that this incunabulum text (Bamberg, Hans Sporer, 1493), which exists in only one copy in the Bibliothèque nationale, is a chimera here; the text is a tract about the fall and the redemption in the *Cur deus homo* tradition. He discusses it in his entry 'Die Erschaffung Adams', in Ruh (ed.),

always later, but the reflections of the *VAE* in German-language paradise plays may be compared with the equally late transmission of the story in the Breton mystery: the *VAE* is indeed reflected in drama, but in folk plays of relatively late preservation, for all that the material is clearly earlier. The effects of the Reformation and of Luther's approach to the Bible, even in the Catholic areas of Germany, will have taken their toll.

HIGH GERMAN METRICAL VERSIONS

Metrical versions of the *VAE* in Middle High German are in general terms earlier than versions in other genres, and may again be treated first. Indeed, two of the metrical texts are rendered into prose for inclusion in different versions of the *Historienbibel.* There are three early full-scale texts in rhymed couplets: a brief independent poem focusing on the penance, which is also found in an adapted form (sometimes with minor changes) incorporated into biblically based world chronicles; a long and rather different version in another metrical chronicle; and a major independent poem combining biblical and apocryphal material by a poet named Lutwin. All add details to and shift the emphases of the Latin apocryphon. In verse, too, there are occasional references in other works which show knowledge of the *VAE*, and indeed we may also perceive elsewhere in literature a possible influence even if it is not directly reflected. The early New High German poem by Hans Folz printed in 1480, finally, requires separate treatment.

The great survey of medieval German literary history by Gustav Ehrismann made perceptive comments on the reception of the narrative in German verse in particular in the 1930s, noting that the story of Adam and Eve from the *VAE* clearly struck a popular chord in its moving depiction of the life of the first couple after the expulsion. Certainly the metrical German texts as a whole lay emphasis on the human aspects as well as the theological. God's anger is still there—directed especially at Eve—but the way in which she copes with it is often interestingly presented. The apocryphon is developed in a number of ways.[7]

Verfasserlexikon, xi. 419–20. In this ramified tradition, pruning as well as addition is sometimes needed. The sole German incunabulum version, then, remains Hans Folz's poem. Miller rightly reminds us, of course, that there may well also be texts yet unknown.

[7] Gustav Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1922–34), ii/2/ii. 357–8.

Adams Klage and the chronicle insertion

An independent German poem composed probably in the later thirteenth century, the central German language of which points to Thuringia or Hessen, and which has been given the titles *Adam und Eva*, *Adams Buße*, or—in the text itself—*Adams Klage* (Adam and Eve, Adam's penance, or Adam's complaint), has been preserved in a number of manuscripts. It is found too in a slightly later, reworked, and shorter version which is interpolated in a quite specific (but somewhat involved) context, namely that of the biblical verse chronicle, in some adapted versions of the *Weltchronik* of Rudolf von Ems (d. *c.*1252), which is itself sometimes merged with the chronicle known as the *Christherre-Chronik* (later thirteenth century). The two versions of this Adam poem (A and B) are not fundamentally different, but the second version has been adapted somewhat to fit into the new context. The text—or rather, some of it—was also turned into prose and appears in some *Historienbibeln.* It is of incidental interest that the two metrical versions of this text were studied and edited in the nineteenth century well before the Latin *VAE* was published by Meyer; the independent version appeared in 1850 in the great *Gesammtabenteuer* collection of medieval German poems published by Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen, and Hermann Fischer published the second version in the journal *Germania* in 1877, both editors providing scholarly details on manuscripts and relationships. Furthermore, the literary historian A. F. C. Vilmar had already published as early as 1839 a study of the rhymed world chronicle of Rudolf von Ems which drew attention to several of the relevant manuscripts and noted, epitomized, and cited a small part of the *VAE* interpolation. Vilmar knew of the existence of the then unpublished von der Hagen text, although Fischer, in spite of having used Vilmar's work, explains in a postscript to his article that he had not realized that his text was a shortened version of that in von der Hagen's collection. The similar contextualization of the material in another metrical German world chronicle, that of Heinrich von München, is an entirely separate version.[8]

---

[8] The independent text is in Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer* (1850; repr. Darmstadt: WBG, 1961), i. 1–16 and iii. 702–3. In a very general discussion of the source, von der Hagen refers only to the (in fact fragmentary) Latin *Vita* in the Vienna MS Cod. Vindob. 2809 (olim 3006; Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 213–14), which contains the German *Christherrechronik*, albeit without our insertion; see *Gesammtabenteuer*, i, lxix–lxxiv, and iii. 790. The B-version is in Hermann Fischer, 'Die Buße Adams und Evas', *Germania*, 22 (1977), 316–41 (text 316–24); his 'Nachschrift' is on 341. These versions are cited. See A. F. C. Vilmar, *Die zwei Recensionen und die Handschriftenfamilien der Weltchronik Rudolfs von Ems* (Marburg: Liwerts, 1839), 39–53, on some of the chronicle manuscripts. He describes the text and its interpolation into Rudolf's chronicle, and cites part of it on 30–2; see 32 n. on von der Hagen.

The independent poem printed in von der Hagen's *Gesammtabenteuer* is known from four manuscripts, three of them major collections containing a wide variety of German poems—the Heidelberg MS cpg 341, the Viennese Cod. Vindob. 2677, and the so-called Kálocsa Codex, now in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana in Geneva-Cologny (Cod. Bodmer 72). All these are fourteenth-century collections. It is also found incomplete—the first fifty-two lines only—at the end of another fourteenth-century manuscript (Vienna, Cod. Vindob. 2709) which contains an extensive poem about the Virgin Mary, a work also used for the New Testament portion of world chronicles. The poem covers the story of the expulsion and the penance down to the birth of Cain, after which there is a brief summary only of Adam's children and his death. This version has 426 lines in rhyming couplets, and it seems to be based (as Meyer himself noted) once again on his class II version.

That this is an independent work is clear from the formal opening and closing of the piece, which starts with the invitation 'Welt ir ez vernemen' (v. 1; Would you like to hear . . .) and ends with a thirteen-line summary announcing that 'Mîn mære hât ein ende . . . Daz mære heizet Adams klage' (vv. 414–17; My tale is at an end . . . my tale is called the complaint of Adam) concluding with a valediction. Within these formal poetic bounds, the work follows the penance sections fairly closely. The pair make a hut, they hunger for seven days and then for two more (a minor variation) and find only grass and leaves. Eve asks for death, but Adam reproaches her for even saying such a thing, which might cause God to punish them more. That she is his flesh is not mentioned, but Adam suggests penance. Eve does not ask what penance is, but comments that she ought by rights to undertake more, and adds a new emphasis when she says explicitly:

> doch bin ich, lieber herre mîn,
> Dir vil gerne gehôrsam (vv. 70–1)

(But I shall gladly be obedient to you, my Lord.)

She affords to Adam, therefore, very clearly the role of the imposer of the penance, which she seems already to understand as a concept.[9]

There is at this point a striking variation in the apocryphal narrative in the precise nature of the penance imposed by Adam upon Eve, something which he does in detail before there is even mention of his own penance. The external details are as in the *VAE*; she is to stand in the Tigris on a stone up to her neck without speaking. What is notable, however, is that only Eve's

---

[9] See my 'The Origins of Penance' on this point, noting the importance of the text in the study of penitential practice.

penance is described: where most Latin *VAE* versions have Adam describing the penances together (with his own always mentioned first), and the ratio-nale for the details being put in terms of their common unworthiness ('in-digni sumus', 'labia nostra'), here it is all directed at Eve: 'Wan dû des niht wirdik bist . . . wan dû tæte, daz er uns verbôt' (vv. 81–4; Because you are not worthy . . . because you did what he forbade us to do). Only after the blame has, in contrast with the *VAE*, been placed quite securely upon the in any case self-abasing Eve do we hear of Adam's proposed penance. She is to stand for thirty-four days, he will go to the Jordan for forty. She watches him go with some sadness.

If the penance in the *VAE* itself was indeed common and neither was worthy of speech, the German poem makes things more logical in that Adam, of course, does speak, asking the river to assist him, and here in fact also the fish and even the birds and animals. The inclusion of the birds is unusual, although it does appear in the Slavonic version; it may either have been in the source or have been a (very simple) invention on the part of the poet, although it is a regular feature of German versions down to Folz.[10] All the creatures do indeed stay still for eighteen days. It is now that the devil acts, explicitly worried that God might indeed forgive them, which is based as elsewhere on the reading '(con)turbatus' rather than 'iratus', and transforms himself into an angel, something which the poet points up by a condemnatory interjection—'der valsche lugenære' (v. 124; the false deceiver!). The devil's speech at this second temptation of Eve follows the *VAE* versions, with small variations: thus he opens with a sympathetic comment about how lonely she is (picking up the earlier point of her sadness in the poem); and while he claims in most Latin versions that God has heeded both of their sorrows—'gemitum vestrum' (*VAE* 9)—this time he ('mit grôzer âkust'; with great deceitfulness, v. 130, notes the poet) says:

> Dîn weinen ist ze Gote komen,
> er hât Adams gebet vernomen; (vv. 131–2)

(Your [Eve's] weeping has reached God | he has accepted Adam's prayer.)

Even in these small variations of number the poet is adapting the material to distinguish throughout between Adam and Eve. Here, of course, it is a diabolical subtlety.

The motif of her cold and specifically grass-green skin is retained, as is her faint. She is taken to Adam, whose reaction is even stronger than in Latin ('A wê dir, Eva, wê dir, wê!', v. 155; Oh woe to you, Eve, woe to you, woe!) and

---

[10] Murdoch, 'Das deutsche Adambuch', 216.

she faints again (though no specific times are given). It is of interest again, however, that the 'et exclamavit' of *VAE* 11, which is in many cases taken as Adam challenging the devil, since the devil speaks to him directly in reply, is here assumed to refer to Eve, since she is the last person referred to. Adam addresses the same question to the devil in *VAE* 12, and the repetition is retained here, as it is by Heinrich von München and others. The devil's tale follows the *VAE*, namely that he had refused to worship Adam and also wanted to place his throne in the north. Adam prays at some length—this passage is expanded over the Latin—and God drives the devil away; the poet augments the passage further with a homiletic insertion stressing that this is how God behaves when penance is genuine. Returning to the *VAE*, Adam completes his forty days, after which Eve leaves him, emphasizing her own guilt, but once more the poet expands the apocryphon with a number of small additional details in human terms. The parting, he tells us, was a sorrow for both of them, Eve might have wept tears of blood, she was quite alone, at the mercy of the weather, and when she makes herself a dwelling place the poet tells us that she really wasn't very good at it ('des si vil lützel kunde', v. 284; of which she had little or no idea).

We now hear that she is pregnant, and her pleas, when the labour pains begin, are again extended until she decides to call upon the sun and moon to tell Adam. The poet even adds that God is still angry with her and therefore does not hear her pleas, and she is aware of this. Adam's prayers are effective, however, when he stresses to God that his wife is about to have a child which will increase God's glory. God sends twelve angels (including or with Michael), but not the two Virtues, although Michael stands at one side, the other angels at the other. Again the human side of the incident is developed: the poet reminds us that Eve has had no experience with childbirth, and Michael instructs her and 'half ir mit der hant dar zuo' (v. 364; and helped her with his hand).[11] The poet adds a further comment of his own that no empress would ever have had such impressive midwives. Eve gives birth to a 'schoenez kint' (v. 375; beautiful child, perhaps rendering 'et erat lucidus'), who is named Cain. We now have the motif (in the *VAE* it comes before the naming) that he at once stands up and brings Eve 'ein gruenez kriutelîn' (v. 379; a green herb), but there is no explanation or further comment (in spite of the additions elsewhere), and there is no link at all with the name. The content of *VAE* 22 is again expanded, in that not only is Adam taught by

---

[11] In some Latin texts Michael teaches Eve how to nurse and feed the child. This is perhaps not the case here, although he does advise her 'according to women's customs' ('Nâch wîplîchem sit', v. 359) at the birth.

Michael to tend the earth and plant seeds but also to distinguish between clean and unclean beasts, which is another unusual motif. Effectively this is the end of the *VAE* adaptation. We are told only that Adam has thirty sons and thirty daughters and dies at the age of 930, and these last points may have come from any source. Overall, this is a poetical version, with a number of largely human expansions or additions, of the penance narrative and the birth of Cain. How this related to a source is unclear: what we have follows largely Meyer's class II, and the title given within the work as 'Adams klag(e)' might easily reflect *Planctus Adae*, which is sometimes found as a title for the Latin version.

The adapted B-version of this text found in chronicles is known from another eight manuscripts; it is found as an insertion into some manuscripts of the rhymed world chronicle of Rudolf von Ems (Fulda, Landesbibliothek cod. 184; Vienna, Cod. Vindob. 2690; Stuttgart, Landesbibliothek, MS Bibl. f. 8; Weimar, Archiv der Landesbibliothek, MS fol. 416. The first three are fourteenth century, the last perhaps fifteenth). It is found too in mixed versions of the Rudolf chronicle and the *Christherre-Chronik* (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, MS Aug. 8/4°; Stuttgart, Landesbibliothek HB XIII 6; Kassel, Murhard/Landesbibliothek 2° Ms. theol. f. 4. These are again all fourteenth century manuscripts). It is also added in a manuscript which has the *Christherre-Chronik* preceding the second part of Rudolf's text (Heidelberg cpg 321, fifteenth century).[12] The relative intricacies of the (pseudo)Rudolf text and the *Christherre-Chronik* are well beyond the scope of this study, and, as indicated, the basic texts of Rudolf's *Weltchronik* and of the *Christherre-Chronik*—both of which are well attested—most frequently do not have our material. A third major rhymed chronicle of the period, that of Jans Enikel, does not contain *VAE* material at all, although it has the Holy Rood legend, which is found also in late manuscripts combining Rudolf and the *Christherre-Chronik*.[13] All these chronicles, plus the great rhymed

---

[12] Up-to-date details are in my entry 'Adam und Eva' in Ruh (ed.), *Verfasserlexikon*, i. 45–6. See Vilmar, *Recensionen*, and Fischer, 'Buße', 331–4, for more details, but of course some of the manuscript designations have changed. See also Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 263.

[13] Texts are: Rudolf von Ems, *Weltchronik*, ed. Gustav Ehrismann (Berlin: Weidmann, 1915); the *Christherre-Chronik* has not been published in full, but a text is available on the web: *Christherre-Chronik: Text der Göttinger HS 2o Cod. Ms. philol. I88/10 Cim (Olim Gotha, Membr. I 88)*, transcribed by Monika Schwabbauer as part of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft project led by Kurt Gärtner: <http://dtm.bbaw.de/Christh. pdf>. See her valuable study: Monika Schwabbauer, *Profangeschichte in der Heilsgeschichte: Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Incidentien der 'Christherre-Chronik'* (Bern: Lang, 1996). There is an excellent introduction to the various chronicles by R. Graeme Dunphy, *History as Literature: German World Chronicles of the Thirteenth Century in Verse* (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Western Michigan University Medieval Institute, 2000) with extracts and translations.

chronicle, that of Heinrich von München (which does contain the *VAE* material), have a complex relationship to one another: there is an illustrated manuscript of the *Christherre-Chronik* in Munich cgm 4 which has interpolations from Jans Enikel and Heinrich, and other manuscripts compile parts of different chronicles. However, two overarching points remain significant: that the independently known narrative of the penance was inserted into a number of copies of world chronicles and viewed as a part, therefore, of a biblically based world history; and that the basic text was adapted further for that purpose, so that we can see the apocryphon, or part of it, developing from the Latin to the A and then to the B-version. The B-version consists of 328 lines, the beginning and end trimmed, and with a few changes in the body of the text. The literary opening of the A-text is not needed in the B-text, of course, so that the B-text as interpolated after a reference to Adam and Eve's expulsion begins with v. 17 of the independent version and their seven-day sojourn. One change is insignificant: Eve's penance is to be thirty days rather than thirty-four in the interpolated version (v. 70), but that is in any case a variable; in some of the chronicle manuscripts (Heidelberg cpg 321 and the Weimar manuscript) Adam's own penance (v. 72) is given as 'vierzehen' (fourteen) rather than 'vierzig' (forty) days. Far more important is the loss in B of the devil's story of refusing to worship Adam, which makes the work fit better into a biblical context, but loses the specific connection with Adam. The devil claims that he is more beautiful and wiser than God: v. 183, 'sich', refers back to God, rather than 'dich' in the rather different A-text, v. 199, which refers to Adam. In B he falls simply because of his own pride, and tells us so.[14] The interpolation ends when Cain fetches his mother the herb, and the chronicle text continues with the birth of Calmana. The summary and naming of the work are not present.

Enikel is in Jansen Enikel, *Weltchronik*, ed. Philipp Strauch (Hanover: MGH, 1891–1900). Dunphy discusses the whole question of chronicles in context in his *Daz was ein michel wunder: The Presentation of Old Testament Material in Jans Enikel's Weltchronik* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1998), see esp. 63–6 and 64 on editions of the *Christherre-Chronik*; see also 94–6 on Seth. See finally Gabriel Viehhauser, *Die Darstellung König Salomos in der mittelhochdeutschen Weltchronistik* (Vienna: Praesens, 2003), 12–31, on the rhymed chronicles and the *Historienbibeln*, and 173–8 on the Holy Rood material. Fischer, 'Buße', prints on 338–41 the Sethite narrative which is found in two of the manuscripts in which the *VAE* material is incorporated (the Kassel manuscript and Heidelberg cpg 321).

[14]   J. van Dam notes the point in the entry on the poem 'Adam und Eva' in the first edition of Wolfgang Stammler and Karl Langosch (eds.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933–55), i. 6.

Heinrich von München and his *Weltchronik*

The chronicler-compiler Heinrich von München of the early fourteenth century, of whom very little indeed is known, put together a work which in some versions can run to 100,000 lines, combining the *Christherre-Chronik*, Jans Enikel's chronicle, and other texts.[15] Miller's edition of the relevant part of the text is based principally upon a late fourteenth-century illustrated manuscript from Vienna itself, now in the Austrian National Library in Vienna, Cod. ser. nova 9470, in which the *VAE* section (including Holy Rood material) takes up 2,233 rhymed lines, and Miller also adds extra material from a further manuscript now in Vienna, Cod. Vindob. 2768, 34^{vr}–35rb (death of Eve) and $26^{ra–va}$ and $30^{ra/vb}$ (Adam's children), and *VAE* 50 and 50^a, which are not in his principal manuscript, and which he considers to be later. This manuscript was probably written in Munich. He also provides a clear summary of the *VAE* material included, and notes that Heinrich used in his compilation here a central German poem of around 1,500 lines based on a Latin text of Meyer's class III. Of special interest is the fact, to which Miller draws attention, that Heinrich himself tries to justify in an interpolation discrepancies between the *VAE* and other traditions (such as the reasons for Lucifer's fall). The text here is quite different from the shorter chronicle interpolation edited by Fischer, although some late manuscripts of the *Christherre-Chronik* have the death of Adam and the Rood legends interpolated from the *Legenda aurea*. There are around 1,140 lines directly adapting the *VAE* in the chronicle, this including the Holy Rood material and a number of linking passages. As Miller again notes, Hans Vollmer had printed parts of the text from other manuscripts of Heinrich von München's chronicle (it was thought of at the time as an expanded *Christherre-Chronik*, 'Schwellhandschriften') in 1908 in the apparatus to his edition of the prose reduction found in an *Historienbibel*.[16]

---

[15] See Viehhauser, *Darstellung*, 26–7, referring to three versions and eighteen manuscripts in all. See also Dunphy, *Daz was ein michel wunder*, 64–5. Heinrich's text is in Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 273–332, here cited. Miller presented the Holy Rood material in his dissertation, 'German and Dutch Versions'.

[16] Bob Miller provides the text of the relevant passage, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 273–332 (cited), after a detailed discussion of the background. This appeared in the first of the important five-volume set: Brunner, *Studien zur 'Weltchronik' Heinrichs von München*, representing the results of an extended Würzburg project on the work. There are further comments on the manuscript (which is illustrated) in Chapter 7, below. Part of the text from other manuscripts, several in Vienna, is in the apparatus to Hans Vollmer's edition of the prose *Historienbibel* version, *Ein deutsches Adambuch* (Hamburg: Lütcke und Wulff, 1908); see Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 257. Miller (262) refers to the view that the poem as such has

It is interesting that in his extended (and slightly repetitive) introduction to the material, Heinrich von München himself distances it specifically from the Bible and gives as his source an Adambook:

> Doch sprich ich von der wibel nicht,
>   do man das Angeng an sicht:
> Ein puoch haizzet Adam,
>   dar ab ich ir leben name.
> Daz han ich bericht in taewtsch zung . . . (35–7)

(But I am not referring to the Bible, in which you will see the creation. There is a book called Adam, from which I took their lives. I have put it into German . . .)

Similar claims are made in the *Canticum de creatione* in English and by Andrius in French, but the apocryphal nature—that it is not canonical—is certainly made clear. Heinrich's statement is sandwiched between two very similar comments about the state of the protoplasts in general after the expulsion (in which we are told that they would have begged for food, but there was nobody there to ask), and is immediately preceded by an assertion of the truth of what will be said. The *VAE* proper begins when Adam and Eve make their dwelling place, here specifically a chamber constructed 'aus laub' (v. 43; from foliage). This is followed by an extensive extract from Jans Enikel developing Adam's general complaint at the loss of paradise and more specifically his attack on Eve, which runs to nearly seventy lines, and which has no parallel in the *VAE*, which is picked up again with a reiteration of their hunger and Eve's request that Adam kill her. Heinrich (or his source, since he is a compiler) expands matters throughout in small ways: Eve, he tells us, was young and beautiful, as was Adam, and although (as in the *VAE*) he refuses to slay his own flesh, he sums up with 'ich pin dein man, du pist mein weib' (v. 159; I am your husband, you are my wife), an expression of human mutuality foreign to the Latin texts. Small additions and shifts of emphasis like this demonstrate the development of the apocryphon in popular form.

To Eve's question (as in the *VAE*) of what penance is, Adam explains in great detail in a passage which goes well beyond the Latin. He tells her how goodwill can calm the anger of God, and explains that he will have to give careful thought to her penance since she is weaker than he is. This echoes the *VAE* 6, but Adam's dominant role as the giver of the penance is consistently

---

been linked with the Latin text in Munich, clm 4756 (Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 285. The *incipit* does not match closely, however, and the usual caveats must apply in the question of source matching). Miller's useful summary on 259–61 matches verses in the chronicle with chapters in the *VAE* (and in the Holy Rood legends), but of course the German text expands and shifts emphasis very considerably throughout, so that the match is sometimes approximate.

and strongly emphasized. He will do penance for forty days, she for thirty on a stone in the Tigris; he reminds her of the eating of the apple, and warns her to keep her thoughts pure ('dein gedanck sol wesen rain', v. 248). They separate (at which point the text adds 'as the writing tells us', v. 264) and Adam goes to the Jordan. The Jordan and all the creatures in and around it are asked to assist him, and they stand still. The same, however, seems to happen with Eve (v. 285–6), which is not as usual.

The devil makes his approach after twenty-one days (this period is one of the most variable), and acts out of anger and sorrow at their repentance, transforming himself into an angel. The passage follows the *VAE* closely, but Eve's state on emerging is treated logically; the green colour is absent (something which is in fact unusual in vernacular versions), and she is simply 'plaich und chranch' (v. 321; pale and ill) from the coldness of the water. She is taken to Adam, who again recognizes at once what she has done, and she faints once more. It is she who first addresses the devil, however, in the rendering of the 'et exclamavit' in *VAE* 11, but instead of simply asking why he is persecuting them, she refers back to the first temptation. It will be recalled that the Latin text has no identified speaker in the first challenge, which should logically be Eve as the last referent, although the devil replies directly to Adam, who puts pretty well the same question to the devil a little later. Here the devil responds to Eve (he speaks in the *VAE* directly to Adam) and claims that his own misery is *their* fault (not just that of Adam, which the singular implies in the Latin); here it is 'von ewren schulden' (v. 359). As in the von der Hagen text (where the devil does not reply to Eve), and in the *VAE* itself, Adam repeats the despairing comment, and this time the devil is able to reply, as in the Latin, that his predicament comes 'von deinen schulden' (your [singular] fault, v. 371). Various strategies are used to emend or clarify the text at this point, and either Eve's or Adam's (the latter in the English Latin tradition) name may be added to clarify either the speaker or the person addressed. The point is a small one, but it does indicate the way in which something not entirely transparent in many Latin texts is variously handled in the vernacular.

The devil's reply follows the *VAE* with the refusal to worship Adam since he is nobler and indeed older; he tells how he wanted to set up his throne above God, and was cast out, and the section ends with the devil's emphasis on the link between himself and Adam, in this case describing them both as 'ellende', exiles, a word often used of Adam (and mankind) as exiles from the 'patria paradisi'. The permanent problem remains, of course, that the account of Lucifer's expulsion is at odds with the narrative in the popular Bible tradition (though not, of course, in the canonical text; there are no devils or fallen angels in Genesis), namely that Lucifer fell before Adam was created. The

poet—perhaps Heinrich himself, since it is a comment on the narrative—now takes up this vexed question in an explanatory passage of more than thirty lines. The creation and fall of angels in Heinrich's biblically arranged chronicle is from the *Christherre-Chronik*, and he has therefore already said, he reminds us, that Lucifer fell before the creation of Adam, but will now explain the discrepancy. He does this by emphasizing the worship of the image of God and playing with the notion of time; God demands of the angels that they worship his image, whilst promising the creation of man, so that Lucifer's refusal is effectively that he will not worship Adam when he is created. To be sure, the passage is a slightly clumsy one, but it provides a good illustration of an element in the apocryphon which clashes with an idea which is in fact equally unbiblical, but well established, being very consciously integrated. Other works, such as the *Saltair na Rann*, take the devil's narrative out of its context in the *VAE* and place it in the biblically appropriate place, but this does not always work in a satisfactory manner. Heinrich offers a solution.

The text returns to the *VAE* with Adam's prayer for the dismissal of the devil and the completion of his penance. Eve's apparent request for death in *VAE* 18 is also provided with an additional detail (in the shape of an *if*-clause) in explanation of why Adam does not respond as he did before, and why she simply leaves:

> Von dem leben mich nv schaid!
>   tuost du dez nicht, mein tagwaid
> Die muoz werden an die stat,
>   da die svnn vnder gat;
> Da wil ich sterben . . . (vv. 507–11)

(Take me from life! If you do not, my dwelling must be in the place where the sun goes down; I shall die there.)

Adam explicitly does not answer, but the poet tells us that nature now compels him to lie with Eve, so that she is pregnant. The *VAE* is unclear on precisely when Eve becomes pregnant, so that this passage is again a clarification, but it concludes on a telling human note: 'die lieb ir daz hertz brach' (v. 518; love broke her heart). This is an indication of a new motif that will be developed in Lutwin's poem in particular.

There is no reference to her making a dwelling place, but we move on to the birth of Cain (the poet inserts a comment that she is about to give birth to a future fratricide). The poet is aware that Eve's pregnancy is a novelty in the strictest sense and draws deliberate attention to the fact that while the cause and effect of sexual behaviour might now be known, it was unknown to Eve. She wishes to call for help, but assumes that her prayers to God are unanswered because she is unworthy (which again expands the *VAE* somewhat).

The poet stresses her isolation in that even the beasts flee from her (v. 568, another new motif), so that she then calls, as in the *VAE*, on the sun and moon and stars to tell Adam, who is afraid that the serpent is attacking her again. Adam's prayers lead to the sending of twelve angels, two Virtues, and Michael. When Cain is born, Eve asks Adam to kill the creature (whose birth she attributes to eating a bitter herb), which he refuses because it is his flesh and blood. This is a motif known from class III and the incunabulum text. Cain stands up and goes this time to the woods ('wald', probably for the sake of a rhyme on 'pald', swiftly) and fetches a sweet herb ('dulcissimam' in class III versions) for his mother. Adam links this with his name, but although there seems to be some awareness of a link between the unusual deed and the name with a reference to Cain's intelligence ('sin', 'sense'), we are then told that an angel has determined the name on God's behalf. This is by no means close to the Latin in any version, but looks like a vernacular development which recognizes, but does not understand, a no longer clear etymology.

Michael instructs Adam and Eve (and indeed Cain) about agriculture, having, however, unusually transported them to India (v. 650). Moreover, Abel is born seven years later, and although the motif of Eve's prophetic dream from the *VAE* is present, she sees Abel's blood only on Cain's hands, rather than seeing him drinking it. To be sure, the Latin varies on this point, and the drinking motif is sometimes absent. Versions of Heinrich's chronicle vary, and Miller prints a section from the Munich manuscript which comes in at this point with details of Adam's first four children—Abel, Cain, Kalmana, and Delbora. The passage overlaps to some extent with Miller's main Viennese manuscript. In the section leading up to Adam's vision, more details are given of Adam's children, and this is more closely in line with the *VAE* in that there is a reference to sixty-three, including Cain, Abel, and Seth.[17] Adam separates Cain and Abel, and Heinrich's chronicle now includes a detailed version of their story from elsewhere (in this case nearly 200 lines from the *Christherre-Chronik* or Enikel). The brevity of the fratricide narrative in the *VAE* invites the interpolation, and it is not uncommon in vernacular texts. There is a return to *VAE* 23 in the comment that Abel was 122 years old at his death, and the poem continues with the birth of thirty sons and thirty daughters as in *VAE* 24. Curiously, however, there is no mention of Seth's birth. The treatment of *VAE* 23–4 is a kind of interruption to the fratricide narrative

[17] Miller 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 328–32, from the Munich manuscript (now Vienna, Cod. Vindob. 2768), noting the overlaps. The prose *Historienbibel* version edited by Vollmer (discussed below) based on Heinrich's chronicle includes this passage. There is a source reference here to Methodius, and, as seen already in the context of John Capgrave, the work of Pseudo-Methodius (translated into English by John Trevisa as *þe Bygynning of þe World*) does contain this material. His name is invoked elsewhere in the tradition in German prose.

(vv. 785–804), and the poet now informs us that he returning to the story of Cain. He picks up the thread of the *VAE* once again with another self-conscious statement, this time about returning to Adam (vv. 876–8), but the Latin text is not in fact followed as closely as before.[18] There is a reference to Adam's sixty children, but still no mention of Seth, whose actual birth is not recorded for some time. What is stressed is that the children are now 'chomen zuo verstandigen iaren' (v. 882; old enough to understand), and Adam now delivers the story of his translation and his apocalyptic vision.

Two things are striking. First, the speech of Adam is not directed at Seth, as in most versions of the *VAE*, but to all the children; and secondly, Adam places it after his completion of the penance, not after the expulsion from paradise. The rapture into paradise and the sight of God is treated in some detail, and the additional material, the apocalyptic vision proper and the future of humanity, found in classes II and III is also included, with extra material on the nature of the trees in paradise. The poet now turns his attention to Adam's progeny, and especially the Cainites, Lamech, and the death of Cain, covering more than 500 lines. Immediately after, however, the poet returns to Adam and more specifically to the birth of Seth, which seems to be biblically based, rather than on the *VAE*. It remains striking that the *VAE* and the Bible accounts are clearly being coordinated in this respect. However, Seth is born here when Adam is 230 years old (v. 1563); in the *VAE* this is another variable (the English Balliol version is especially confused), but Adam is 130 at this point in Genesis 5: 3 and also in *VAE* 24, even though the separate legend (known to Capgrave, for example) of Adam's deliberate abstention from intercourse means that a hundred years elapse before Seth is born, which would make Adam 230, since he is 130 at the death of Abel in *VAE* 23. The abstention motif is not mentioned here, however. The name giving for Seth follows Genesis 4: 25 in the reference to seed, and the poem then moves on to the Sethite line, returning to the *VAE* after a bridge passage (vv. 1670–84) signalling a new theme, the death of Adam and Eve.

Chapters 30–40 of the *VAE* are followed fairly closely, from a class III text, so that, for example, 15,000 of Adam's progeny (less the women and children) actually appear (vv. 1699–701). Seth asks about the food of paradise, and Adam recounts the story of the fall and of his seventy diseases. Eve asks to take on some of Adam's pain, but he insists that he has to bear it himself (this is an addition) and instead asks Eve and Seth to go to paradise. The move from

---

[18] Miller's summary, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 260, is not entirely clear, in that *VAE* 23–4 are indeed treated in the chronicle, and the return in v. 879 actually picks up *VAE* 24 rather than 30, which is on Adam's death. The absence of a report of Seth's birth is extremely unusual, however.

VAE 35 to 36 is thus effected smoothly. In the manuscript edited by Miller (and also in others) they are to ask for 'obs' (fruit, v. 1811) although, as Miller points out, the sense (and the source) demands 'oles' (oil), since it flows from the tree. It is plausible enough as a scribal error, although it could also change the sense in which the whole was understood. However, there is a reference to fruit in the *Historienbibel* version based on this, so that it is possible that the reading is intended, especially as the pair do in fact seemingly take an apple from paradise with them. Of course there are many references to oil later ('dez oels', v. 1899; 'daz oel', v. 1934; 'der parmung oel', v. 1952, 'of mercy'). Seth and Eve set off, and Seth is wounded by the serpent. Eve invokes the image of God, and Seth drives the beast away. The pair come to paradise and begin their prayers. A brief section from another work is inserted at this point, and from now on, as Miller notes in his edition, the *VAE* material is integrated with that of the Holy Rood legend.

The prophecy of a redemption after 5,200 years is made, the time when the oil of mercy will be given to all believers after the baptism of Christ, and Seth is also given a three-leaved twig which is taken from the tree of knowledge at least at one remove: there is a detailed explanation, ascribed to 'old teachers' (v. 1974), of how a seed from the apple eaten in paradise fell to the ground and from this a tree grew, from which this twig was taken. When Eve and Seth return, we are told that they take with them 'ophel vnd anderr ding vil' (v. 2005), and the line is enigmatic. The second part means 'and many other things' but the reference to 'ophel' is unclear and seems to mean 'apples'.[19] The text published by Vollmer based on other manuscripts of the chronicle (it is not in the prose reduction) more clearly reads 'öpfel', but for them to be given apples does not match the *VAE*. Seth returns with the half-eaten apple from the tree of knowledge in a Holy Rood section of Lutwin's poem, which may be linked with this.[20] In the version of the apocryphon being followed here the pair take the twig and also a selection of 'odoramenta', and that is presumably what the poet has in mind, although the named spices seem to have turned into a vague reference. The poem is following the version of *VAE* 43[a]–44[a] found in class III and the incunabula texts, in which Seth drops the twig in the Jordan and is sent by Adam to recover it, which he does. The poet interpolates the comment 'alz ez got wolt' (v. 2007; according to the will of God) when the twig falls into the Jordan. Adam's death follows the *VAE* closely: the sun, moon, and stars are darkened for seven days, and Michael is

---

[19] Miller's text has 'apfel' elsewhere, as indeed does Vollmer's. The scribe may have been unsure of what he was writing.

[20] That the fruit of the tree, not specified in Genesis, was an apple, is well enough established not to require further comment. See my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 16–18.

instructed by God to have care of Adam until the redemption when Adam will be placed on the throne vacated by Lucifer. God also commands Michael to bring the three shrouds, but the influence of the Holy Rood material is apparent at this point in that Adam is buried at Calvary with the twig at his head so that it grows into the cross. Eve dies later, and there is nothing in the Vienna manuscript of her own speech to her children and the instructions regarding the tablets.

This material is found, however, at least in truncated form, in the originally Munich manuscript, now Cod. Vindob. 2768. Six days after Adam's death, Eve realizes that she is to die, makes the prophecy about fire and water, and instructs Seth to make stone tablets ('tauel . . . stainein', v. 32) after her death; he does so, and later on there is a reference to 'ziegel vnd stain', brick and stone (v. 73), although the reasons are not clearly elucidated. There is no reference to the angelic assistance, nor to the additional story of the later reading of the tablets by Solomon. Instead there is a reference to the death of Seth at the age of 912 (Gen. 5: 8). In this section the name Methodius is again cited.

Heinrich's text is an important one in the tradition in that it offers a detailed and full presentation of the *VAE* which is, furthermore, integrated into a biblically arranged world chronicle, implicitly affording the narrative the same status as the biblical stories, even if reference is made to a distinct book of Adam. The integration is more complete in Lutwin's poem, which does not even draw attention to any source difference. At all events, the story is presented as part of biblical history. Overall the human aspects are developed, passages where Eve is blamed are emphasized and the dominance of Adam is played up, but there is a stress too on the will and on the mercy of God. There are comments from time to time, such as those on Eve's pregnancy, and also factual additions—the reference to India is a case in point—as well as the attempt to smooth over apparent conflicts between apocryphal and quasi-biblical stories. While the merge with the Holy Rood material at the end is patent, the uncertainty about the precise nature of the *VAE* source text is indicative once more of the absence of any fixed text in the later Middle Ages, at least. There are, finally, places where the compiler has perhaps been less successful, as in the descriptions of Adam's children or with the birth of Seth. It is significant that in the final part the Holy Rood legend of the twigs taken from paradise is prominent, but the matter of the spices and the unexplained apples is both confused and confusing.

Both *Adams Klage* in its chronicle version and the text used in Heinrich von München's compilation are rendered into prose in the *Historienbibeln* of the late fourteenth to fifteenth centuries, something which was already noted by von der Hagen in 1850, and these prose reductions will be considered after the remaining metrical reflections of the apocryphon, one of which is earlier than

Heinrich's chronicle. There is also a separate prose text reflected in at least one chronicle.

Lutwin

Probably the fullest and most impressive literary version of the material in the *VAE*, and thus an important development of the apocryphal material, in any of the vernaculars is (beside the *Saltair na Rann*) a lengthy poetical work—nearly 4,000 lines in Middle High German rhymed couplets—composed in around 1300 by an obscure poet named Lutwin.[21] Indeed, that dismissive designation of the author is in fact his own; having named himself, he adds in a modesty formula 'sin nammen ist lutzel jeman erkant' (hardly anyone knows his name, v. 60); his name in the form Lutwin (the form Liutwin might have been expected) is underlined in red in the manuscript in v. 59 and someone else has noted it in the margin. He names himself again (as 'armer Lutwin', poor Lutwin, v. 1253), and nothing else is known by him. The work itself is named in a rubric at the end of the text itself with a reversal of the usual order of names, and without this depending upon rhyme: 'Hie hat Eua und Adam ein ende' (v. 3939; that is the end of Eve and Adam). This is the title adopted by its most recent editor, Mary-Bess Halford; its first editor was in fact Wilhelm Meyer, the editor of the *VAE*, who discussed the work in some detail in his introduction to the Latin text, and who published together with Konrad Hofmann first a separate study and then a text edition in 1881. The text survives in a single manuscript of 106 folios, the mid fifteenth-century Cod. Vindob. 2980 (Ambras 259) now in Vienna, and unusually it is fully illustrated. It is now known to have been made at the well-known workshop of Die(t)bold Lauber in Hagenau (now Haguenau) in Alsace, which produced many manuscripts between 1427 and 1470. The illustrations will be considered in a later chapter, but the text itself is both substantial and impressive,

---

[21] Mary-Bess Halford, *Lutwin's Eva und Adam: Study. Text. Translation* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1984). This text is cited here by verse numbers, which are slightly different in the older edition (translations of individual verses are mine, however, since Halford's translation is a continuous reading text). See her introduction on what is known of the author, and also on the editorial and literary-critical history of the work. The earlier edition is *Lutwins Adam und Eva*, ed. Hofmann and Meyer and noted already. See their paper 'Die Textkritik von Lutwins *Adam und Eva*', *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akad. der Wiss.* (München), philos.philol. Cl. (1880), 598–616. The manuscript is not particularly well written, and there are mistakes and omissions (see the careful apparatus to Halford's conservative edition; Hofmann and Mayer make corrections within the text). Elias von Steinmeyer, reviewing the edition by Hofmann and Meyer in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, 8 (1882), 222–30, noted that Lutwin used other medieval works, and refers to Wirnt von Gravenberg's *Wigalois* as well as to Konrad von Heimesfurt.

and integrates the *VAE* completely with the biblical narrative without distinguishing or indeed drawing attention to sources other than the Scriptures. Lutwin's text is one of the most humanized versions of the story, and his interpretations of some aspects are striking.

The text has not been studied extensively in spite of its importance to the *VAE* tradition. Indeed the text was initially dismissed fairly conclusively in terms of literary value, despite Meyer's interest. In 1929, after the publication of Mozley's texts of the English redaction, A. C. Dunstan pointed out that where Lutwin does not match Meyer's texts, his apparent deviations are indeed attested elsewhere. In 1935 Gerhard Eis (attempting at the same time to make personal and geographical judgements about Lutwin) tried to establish a specific source in the *VAE* text found as an appendix to the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum*, and some parallels are indeed convincing. Dunstan countered this in 1938 by showing—as has been seen so often—that it is impossible to pin down a precise source, given the fluidity of the text, although he admitted that there are points where omissions or indeed errors found in Eis's Latin texts are indeed strikingly matched in Lutwin, such as Eve's burial 'with great feasts', based on the *Legendarium* reading 'cum magno festo' for 'cum magno fletu', 'with great weeping', in *VAE* 51. Dunstan's view was that such passages are very few, and that there are divergences in other motifs, which is indeed the case.

Firm statements about Lutwin's source must here as elsewhere be treated with care; this is not a counsel of despair, but a statement of fact. The most that can be said is that the *VAE* source was probably some form of a class II manuscript; the apocalyptic vision of Adam is not there. The Holy Rood additions do not match those usually found in class III versions, and may of course have a different source anyway. Although there has been much debate on Lutwin's sources, perhaps more so than with any other vernacular version, we simply cannot go beyond an unspecific indication of a particular type of *VAE* text.[22] Certainly the discussion of the source does not help Eis's wish to place Lutwin in Bohemia, although there is a Bohemian redaction. Although, as Dunstan pointed out, apparently new motifs can usually be found

---

[22] See Halford, *Lutwin*, 3–4, 9–11. The relevant studies are: A. C. Dunstan, 'The Middle High German "Adam und Eva" by Lutwin and the Latin "Vita Adae et Evae"', *Modern Language Review*, 24 (1929), 191–9; Gerhard Eis, 'Heimat, Quellen und Entstehungszeit von Lutwins "Adam und Eva"', in his *Beiträge zur mittelhochdeutschen Legende und Mystik*, 25–106; see 40–58 on Eis's views of Lutwin's life, and 67–101 on the source question. See also Dunstan, 'Lutwin's Latin Source'. Eis, of course, also offered Latin texts from the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum*, 241–55, on which see Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 210–11. See finally Miller's dissertation 'German and Dutch Versions', 152–61, with interesting comments on the source, especially on the unusual Holy Rood text.

somewhere in the *VAE* tradition, it is equally clear that Lutwin may have added from other sources, and certainly he developed motifs himself. This is unsurprising, as he is of course producing a literary work. The language of the manuscript, which is relatively late, is west Alemannic, perhaps Alsatian, and not as previously thought Austrian/central German, and Eis's attempts to identify Lutwin with a known Leutwin, a clerk in Kuttenberg (Kutná Hora, just east of Prague in the Czech Republic), can only remain conjectural, as also must the date of composition, although the late thirteenth century is a reasonable enough guess. Whether he was a cleric or not is also a matter of debate. This text, however, preserved in a single but illustrated manuscript, merits attention from various points of view: philological, iconographic, apocryphal-theological, and not least literary.[23] Of initial interest with Lutwin's version is the contextualization of the material in a large-scale biblical work (3,939 verses). As indicated, the *VAE* material is built into a continuous narrative which begins (after an introduction on the theme of the redemption and the poet's self-presentation) with the biblical narrative of the fall and the naming of Adam from the four quarters (though this time not with the extra-biblical story of the fall of the angels), and concludes, after the *VAE* material (itself expanded by additions—as of the Cain and Abel story—and homiletic commentary passages, including a lengthy one on the nature of women), with an unusual Holy Rood story taken down to Noah and the flood. It is notable that we do not have the tale at the end of Seth and the tablets, nor is there any indication on Lutwin's part of the apocryphal aspects. He refers to the Bible as a source (v. 79) and to his own knowledge, but works throughout as a narrator and commentator. As an example, when he has reported the prohibition on the forbidden fruit (in any case somewhat expanded over Genesis) he then gives a brief tropological discourse on the benefits of listening to wise teaching, ending with a general statement on the truth of what his text is presenting (vv. 343–4). His source for the narrative portions, however, if he had a single one, may have been a *VAE* text with the Genesis 1–3 narrative

---

[23] For a brief overview, see my entry 'Lutwin', in Ruh (ed.), *Verfasserlexikon*, v. 1087–9. Our concerns here are with the third and fourth approaches. Halford, *Lutwin*, includes a good literary analysis in her introduction, and see also Brian Murdoch, 'Eve's Anger: Literary Secularisation in Lutwin's *Adam und Eva*', *Archiv*, 215 (1978), 256–71; Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 258, comments on the work. His judgement on the source is only speculative, of course (though he rightly points out the unusual nature of the Holy Rood version offered here). See also in literary terms my 'Das deutsche Adambuch', 219–23. One of the few other works to consider Lutwin in much detail is Gertrude Miksch, 'Der Adam und Evastoff in der deutschen Literatur' (Ph.D. diss., Vienna, 1954), but it contains little of interest, as Halford points out.

prefaced, and also the naming legend (though not the creation from eight elements).[24]

Even the introductory material from Genesis itself is expanded from the Bible text, and Lutwin offers us a description of the four rivers that flow out of paradise from learned sources (although when he tells us why Moors have black skins, he claims the Bible as authority, v. 210), and he gives an etymology of the name Eua from Greek *eu* 'good' and Latin *a* 'without'. This stigmatizing of Eve at a very early stage, while commonplace in medieval writing, is interesting in the context of the work as a whole.[25] The Genesis narrative, plus a homiletic section on the transitoriness of the body, the expulsion, and a eulogy to the Virgin, bring us to v. 810, and only now does the *VAE* material start, notably with Adam and Eve leaving paradise, provided with clothes. Adam makes a wooden hut, but they cannot find food, and Eve asks for death, the response to which is indicative of the human approach. Adam replies that he will not lay hands on his flesh and blood, as in the *VAE*, but the passage merits citation:

> ADam als ein byderman
> Sprach: 'die rede soltu lan,
> Din müt sye verwahssen.
> Wie möhte ich gelossen
> Myn hant zu ubel an ein wip?
> Du bist myn fleysche und lip.
> Dovon were es ungehört,
> Ob du von mir wurdest ermort.' (vv. 899–906)

(Adam, like a decent man, said: 'Do not say things like that, you must be crazy! How could I lay my hand on a woman for harm? You are my flesh and body, and it would be quite unthinkable for you to be murdered by me.')

The comments about Adam's sense (the word *byderman[n]*, 'sensible, capable, decent fellow', recurs for Adam) and the general expansion set the tone for what is otherwise a literal enough rendering of the motif as such. Possibly more strikingly, though less appropriately in a literary sense, when the pair continue to eat the food of the beasts, which Adam—soundly aware that he has to do *something*—finds for Eve, the poet interpolates a list of things that they would certainly have liked, such as a cooking pot and some salt, noting however that they were so hungry because they had gone without food 'Als ich

---

[24] The naming legend, vv. 141–53, patently has a line missing, since Dysis is not mentioned. Verse 148 however ends *gewis*, which is presumably the rhyme word. The MS is a little confused at this point: the rhyme 151–2 must be 'nam'/'Adam' and 153 is then outside the scheme, or is a triplet rhyme with the next two lines, which are, however, a new theme.

[25] See Halford, *Lutwin*, 303, on the sources.

die zale han gemessen | Drig und zwentzig tage' (vv. 948–9; according to my reckoning | twenty-three days). In the *VAE* Adam makes various expeditions to search for food, and this seems to reckon them up.

Once penance is suggested (Adam is again praised for coming up with a plan), Eve suggests that she alone should undertake it, but Adam establishes the forty days for himself, thirty-four for Eve, adding somewhat gratuitously to Eve that it is all because of her misdeeds. She goes to the Tigris and stands on a stone; but the cold of the water is stressed here already, as is her solitude. Verse 1025, where she is described as being alone ('allein'), is part of a triple rhyme and it has been suggested that in this case it should be excised, which would not be problematic in syntactic terms, although the idea is effective. The whole passage is slightly complex; the third rhyme for the word 'stein' (stone) and 'allein' is in the phrase saying that the cold water goes 'jr bitze auff das halbe bein' (v. 1026) which would mean that the water reaches halfway up her leg. Meyer and Hofmann emended the last two words to 'halsbein' (neckbone), which is probably correct, although in the illustrations, neither is upto their necks in the water. Adam definitely stands in the water up to his neck (vv. 1000, 1035), but the flowing hair is not mentioned in either case. Having established her in the Tigris, however, the poet, with nice irony, since she will of course *not* do it well, returns to Adam with the words:

> Nu lossent wir su büssen hie,
> Got gebe, das su gebüsse wol.
> Nü wil ich sagen, als ich sol
> Von der büsse, die Adam
> Zu gewynnen gottes hulde nam. (vv. 1028–32)

(Now let us leave her to her penance, and may God grant that she do it well. I have to tell you about the penance with which Adam tried to win God's grace.)

Adam begs the Jordan and all things in it to help him; there is no reference to the other animals, but the river itself and specifically the fish stand still, we are told, for forty days. In this instance the text and the illustration are close, as Adam is surrounded by open-mouthed vertical fish. After eight (a known variation for the most common eighteen or nineteen) days, however, Satan, unhappy to see the protoplasts doing something good, changes from his horrible appearance ('sin grüwelich bilde', v. 1066) into that of a shining angel and goes to tempt her.[26] When she is assisted from the water and faints,

---

[26] The word 'bilde', image, in v. 1066 may not be the original, since Satan now changes into 'eins liehten engels bilde', the image of a shining angel (rendering the 'claritas' of the *VAE*), but providing an identical rhyme; Hofmann and Meyer suggest *wilde* 'wildness, savagery'.

her flesh is green as grass from the cold. At this point Lutwin introduces one of his homiletic passages, this time on female inconstancy, underlining the fact that she ignored Adam's advice and believed the devil, behaviour which still echoes, he tells us, with some women now. He advises women to seek out trustworthy men, and men to avoid faithless women and look for virtue rather than beauty, and he invokes Samson and Delila as well as Adam and Eve (listing faithless women or men as love's slaves is a familiar topos). The excursus, while largely homiletic, nevertheless also recalls those of Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan* to a certain extent, and takes up more than 170 lines. Lutwin announces that he will resume his tale, but instead of simply offering the *VAE* text of Adam's immediate complaint against Eve, the poet tells us that the devil thought that he could also ensnare Adam. Adam, however, is not deceived:

> Doch was so wise Adam
> Wie doch der tüfel were schön
> Verkerent jn engels person,
> Das er sin glichsheit,
> Sin triegen und valscheit
> Zu stunde wol erkant . . . (1277–82)

(But Adam was so wise that, however beautifully the devil had been transformed into a likeness of an angel, he immediately recognized his trickery, deceit, and falsehood.)

This is of course the point of the pericope, the necessity to recognize evil in whatever guise, and Lutwin is at pains to make it perfectly clear, adding in effect a commentary to the *VAE* to explain what is not spelt out. He then returns to the *VAE* text for Adam's accusation and Eve's second faint, adding only that this was Eve's second misdeed. Although the *VAE* is not always clear about who confronts the devil and when, here it is Adam (still in the Jordan, we are reminded), who asks the devil why he hates them both. The devil gives a detailed reply just as in the *VAE*, which is here not problematic, because we have not already had an angelic fall, as in some other works. Adam's prayer causes the devil to vanish, Eve recovers her senses, and Adam completes his penance.

At this point Lutwin offers a major development to the *VAE*. What follows in Latin and most vernacular texts is Eve's despairing departure, although she is now pregnant. Only rarely do we hear when she actually became pregnant; usually the fact is just assumed. Lutwin not only addresses the question of relations between the protoplasts, but builds them into the narrative with great skill, drawing on techniques of the medieval love story, but in fact changing the *VAE* narrative by giving a new and

secular reason for Eve to depart in anger, rather than in despair at having transgressed a second time.[27]

Adam greets Eve lovingly, we are told, and then they are both overcome by the power of 'Die mynne und ir meisterschafft' (v. 1514; love and its mastery). Lutwin is using the vocabulary of the medieval German *Minne* tradition as found in the lyric and in the romance, and at the same time reinforcing the novelty of their action which he calls 'seltzammer gedat' (v. 1518; strange activities), through which she loses her virginity and becomes pregnant. Captivated by this new activity, Eve addresses Adam using what are in effect clichés of the love tradition (although of course they have never been spoken before) and stressing that this is a new love. However, she is unwise enough to say that she loves Adam more than paradise. Adam demurs, and firmly places paradise above this new love. Of course, he is speaking hypothetically: he has, after all, lost paradise. He does, however, iterate all the things they lost when expelled from paradise. In paradise he had no hunger, thirst, tiredness, or suffering (vv. 1569–72), whereas love hungers and exhausts him. Adam's catalogue of the good things in paradise has its closest parallel in the *Saltair na Rann* (vv. 1485–524), when Adam is, at the beginning of the *VAE* narrative proper, talking about their sorrows in the world. Lutwin's contextualization is quite different. Furthermore, it is a trigger for Eve's decision to depart:

> Die rede wart Eua ungemach,
> Jn zorne su zu Adam sprach . . . (vv. 1603–4)

(These words were most displeasing to Eve, who said to Adam in anger . . .)

Unhappy that he does not love her as much as she does him, she goes away to the west, commenting somewhat sulkily that her words of love seem to leave him unmoved, and the illustration underlines her mood:

> Mit zorne sü dannen schiet
> Als ir tumber müt riet,
> Und ging mit leide und yle
> Me danne tusent myle.
> Das was verre genüg. (vv. 1615–19)

(She left angrily, prompted by her foolish mind, and went in sorrow as fast as she could for more than a thousand miles. That was a very long way.)

The distance is a new motif, and Lutwin sends the sorrowing Adam away to the east. In another echo of (and play with) the secular love romance, he

---

[27] See my paper 'Eve's Anger' for a detailed analysis of this important section, and also 'Das deutsche Adambuch', 220–1.

wonders whether any two lovers were ever so far apart, and comments that he hopes to bring them together again. This allows him to return to Eve's predicament, still suffering because of her love for Adam until after forty weeks the unfamiliar birth pains begin. Her prayers—in vain, of course—bring her to realize that Adam was right and that paradise was indeed better than love (vv. 1694–6). Lutwin's treatment of the stars and sun motif is also original. Eve as in the *VAE* begs the sun to tell Adam of her suffering; he, it will be recalled, is living in the east, and Lutwin recasts the miracle into realistic terms. When the sun rises, Adam mysteriously realizes that something is the matter with Eve:

> Des morgens do den liehten tag
> Nach jrem sitte die sunne erluhte,
> Jch weis nit, was Adam dühte,
> Das er zu jme selber sprach:
> 'Eua clage und ungemach
> Jst von westen kummen mir.' (vv. 1736–41)

(The next morning, when the sun, as usual, lit up the bright day, I don't know what Adam was thinking, but he said to himself: 'Eve's complaint and discomfort has come to me from the west . . . ')

He is afraid, as in the *VAE*, that the serpent has attacked her again, goes to her (the thousand-mile separation seems no obstacle), and Eve describes fairly graphically what is going on. In answer to Adam's prayer there come in this case only twelve angels, and there is no mention of the Virtutes (which is not unusual), nor of Michael (which is less common).[28] Michael's role is taken over by an angel, and the child is born; there is no indication of the motif of wanting the child killed, but instead we have a great emphasis on the miracle of childbirth, into which Lutwin incorporates, with a lot of added detail, the incident with the grass or herbs, whilst retaining it as a miracle. The humanizing aspect of the poem is sustained in the whole episode, as both Adam and Eve marvel at the child (reflecting the adjective 'lucidus', perhaps).[29] The child

> . . . sumete sich lenger niht,
> Do es von der müter kam,
> Einen louff es yme nam

---

[28] Curiously, in Eis's text from the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum*, the Virtutes *are* present, but not Michael, and they seem to stand only at her left side. This differs from Lutwin.

[29] Dunstan, 'Middle High German', 194–5, considers that the reference to Eve's pains supports the idea that the source read 'lugidus', but the relationships between the words and the characters are unclear and 'wunderlich' (v. 1799), 'wondrous', might render the idea as easily as 'smertzen' (v. 1802), 'pains', with the quite different meaning.

> Snelliclich zu walde
> Und broht siner müter balde
> Würtzeln an dem armelin.
> Es sprach: 'liebe müter myn,
> Nym das laub und nusz ouch der,
> Die brahte ich von dem walde her.
> Jch weis das wol, du bist krang.
> Des dich manig stos betwang
> Des ich dir gein hertzen pflag
> Do ich in dinem libe lag,
> E ich kam her an den tag.' (vv. 1805–18)

(The child did not delay after he had been born, but went running quickly into the woods and swiftly brought his mother some herbs in his little arms. The child said: 'Dear mother mine, take and use this plant which I have brought you from the woods. I know you are unwell. Many blows caused you pain, blows that I aimed at your heart while I was still in your body before I came out into the daylight.')

The gesture and the miracle win Eve over and she hugs the child, and the angels teach her how to care for him. It may be noted that the incident is quite unconnected with the naming, since Lutwin adds at the end of the section that the child was called Cain 'as the Scriptures tell us'. The human aspect is developed further, too, when Adam gives his son Cain some paternal (and in the event ironic) advice on good behaviour and the love of God. His delight in his son is emphasized several times, and an angel (the role usually specifi- cally attributed to Michael) shows him the basics of farming. Adam's wisdom is also stressed several times.

A further addition to the narrative in the *VAE* gives an indication of how one originally obscure motif can actually develop further: not only is Cain's birth miraculous, but the poet adds that he grows twice as fast as other children and is given the faculty of speech, presumably from birth. Lutwin also returns to and reminds us of the motif of the plants that he brought to his mother. In reception terms, clearly Lutwin is aware of the striking nature of the motif and wants to clarify it as well as use it fully. He relates the bringing of herbs to the custom of women after childbirth, thus placing it on a kind of aetiological basis. Any links with the name (never clear in Latin) have long since disappeared completely and the motif has taken on a new life.

It is unsurprising that Lutwin should develop fully the narrative of the fratricide, and here he, like other vernacular writers, follows the biblical story. The division in the story is made consciously, as Lutwin leaves Cain to wander (v. 2097) and returns to the *VAE* narrative, resuming with the birth of Seth and the reference to the other children (*VAE* 24), then the story of the translation, which is directed to Seth. This episode follows the *VAE* very

closely, ending with the return of Adam, but there is nothing of the additional apocalyptic material attached to *VAE* 29 in class III manuscripts, reinforcing the idea of a class II source. Lutwin moves straightaway to *VAE* 30 and the impending death of Adam, his description of the suffering, the recapitulation of the fall, and the punishment of seventy diseases. Adam is, however, only referred to as 900 years old (v. 2141, with the additional thirty years added in v. 2283). The full tally of his descendants is not given. Eve and Seth are sent to paradise, and on the way are attacked by the devil disguised as the serpent— Lutwin spells this out. It is especially noteworthy that in Lutwin the snake bites Seth quite specifically in the cheek ('durch ein wange', vv. 2532–3) Dunstan considers the passage clear evidence that Lutwin's source (which cannot therefore have been that proposed by Eis) had 'faciem'. It leaves us, however, with a difficulty, since the biting of Seth's face is the marking feature of the English redaction, which is not to say that a similar confusion of 'faciens' and 'faciem' could not have been made elsewhere. However, 'wange' is not a direct translation of 'faciem', and it is also possible that the choice of the cheek depends upon the rhyme 'slange' (serpent) and 'wange' (cheek) in German, although this does not help us to decide whether Lutwin is following a source or not.[30] The debate between Eis and Dunstan on the source gains added confusion, however, in the rendering of *VAE* 38, when the serpent attacks Eve verbally with the words 'nunc autem non potes portare' ['si tibi incepero exprobrare' in class II texts], meaning you cannot bear it (if I reproach you). The text varies very considerably from version to version in Latin. Eis's texts have the odd reading 'Nunc autem non potes portare Seth'. Lutwin reads: 'Mahtu nit uff dinem kragen | Dinen sun von hynnen tragen, | Den ich do gebissen han?' (vv. 2554–6; can you not carry your son away from here, the one I have just bitten?). The German could be an expanded version of the Latin, if interpreted as a question. Even without the erroneous reference to Seth as a prompt, Lutwin might in any case have misinterpreted the verb *portare* in its literal rather than its figurative sense. In a single passage, then, we have verbal indicators which seem to argue strongly against, and then strongly for a source text like those attached sometimes to the *Magnum legendarium*. In fact neither case is particularly conclusive.

  Seth rids them of the serpent/devil, they reach paradise, and Seth is given an olive branch (he is later told that it is to be planted at Adam's head when he

---

[30] See on the passage Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*, 17–18. Dunstan does, however, consider the point in both of his studies of Lutwin, 'Middle High German', 192, and 'Lutwin's Latin Source', 161; he also discusses the motif (not with reference to Lutwin, however) in his paper on the source question for the English *Canticum*: 'The Middle English *Canticum*', 433–4. See Eis, *Legende und Mystik*, 71 and 74–5.

dies), and then the promise of the redemption in 5,200 years, with the details of the birth of Christ and the baptism in the Jordan. Adam's soul is to be held in hell until that time. Seth in this version fails to understand what is meant with the branch, and thinks that its fruit—the oil of mercy?—will bring Adam back to life; the narrator explains that it will grow into the cross. On their return there is none of the incident with the dropping of the twig, but Adam does reiterate Eve's guilt. This gives the narrator cause to interpolate another of his homilies, arguing that to curse Eve and also Adam for the first fall is itself a sin because it led to the redemption—it is the *felix culpa* argument.

When Adam actually dies we are informed (v. 2931) that Adam has sixty-two children (allowing for the death of Abel; see v. 2118),[31] and he is 930 years old—he tells his children this himself. He asks to be buried facing the east, as in the *VAE*, and (perhaps predictably) Lutwin dwells on the lamentations of Eve in particular. Not only is the sun darkened, but trees wither and springs dry up, and the beasts and fish again mourn for six days. Eve and Seth weep over Adam's corpse until Michael, who in the *VAE* simply instructs them, here actually reproaches them for exaggeration. God now prophesies the harrowing of hell, and Adam's soul is sent there. God commands this time that two shrouds be supplied (it is almost invariably three in Latin texts), one each for Adam and Abel, and there is a ceremonial funeral attended by the angels (though it is not entirely in line with some versions of the *VAE*). Precisely where he is buried is not mentioned.

In line with the image he has promoted throughout, Lutwin has his Eve die effectively of a broken heart, the loss of Adam surpassing all her other sorrows, and she lies dying prostrate by his grave after the others have ceased to mourn. It is here that the angel delivers further instructions to Seth on the nature and extent of mourning, as in the *VAE*. Before she dies Eve—who expresses in some detail once more her loss of Adam, which is the defining feature of the scene in Lutwin's poem—also gives her vision of the future, which in the *VAE* refers only to the judgements by water and fire. Eve's version here is far more expansive, as she elaborates on who will survive the flood and how the fire will consume everything. What she does *not* do is ask Seth to record their story. Rather she is buried[32] with Adam, and much attention is paid to the olive tree now growing from Adam's

---

[31] As Halford, *Lutwin*, 309, points out, Meyer seems to want to correct this, but is unclear why. Cain is after all still alive, although he is of course presumably not present (nor, one supposes, would Calmana be there either, although she is not mentioned in Lutwin).

[32] On the reference to feasts at her funeral (and the 'festo'/'fletu' error), see Eis, *Legende und Mystik*, 76; see Dunstan, 'Lutwin's Latin Source', 162, on the 'festo'/'fletu' error ('the one clear case'), although the 'portare . . . Seth' passage is also striking.

tomb. This takes us into the unusual Holy Rood material, in which the narrative now turns to Seth and a striking second quest to paradise. The guardian cherub appears with a branch from the tree of knowledge on which is the half-eaten apple of the fall. The angel explains that this was the cause of the fall, and just as this small piece of wood brought death, wood will also bring salvation; Seth is instructed to tend the olive tree. Seth returns with the branch to the oratory where Adam is buried, and it is kept carefully, and the tree is also tended. Noah takes the branch with him onto the Ark. When the flood subsides, Noah sends out the raven, which lands upon a corpse and eats until it is so full that it falls into the water and drowns, an explanation for its failure to return (the Vulgate biblical text is not entirely clear, in fact, whether the raven returns or not).[33] The dove returns eventually with an olive branch, which is, Lutwin tells us, from the tree which grew from Adam's grave. Lutwin does not go on to a full version of the Rood story, but merely says that Christ suffered on the tree, and concludes his poem of—as he puts it—Eve and Adam.

The literary aspects of the work are clear; Lutwin humanizes and secularizes the love story of Adam and Eve in a way which might not be suspected from the fairly terse *VAE* itself. At the same time, he takes it as a vehicle for Christian moralizing. There is no overt legitimizing of the narrative by the recording of the story by Seth, and we have nothing of the tablets. Instead, the merge with the Holy Rood, though by an unusual route, is striking. As indicated, it is difficult to go further on the source, since although there are various apparently firm pointers, they point in different directions. Lutwin knew a version well, however, and clearly found it a moral and edifying tale, which—although he has been thought of as taking the medieval misogynistic approach—in fact presents Eve with some sympathy. Lutwin's text is an important mediation of the *VAE* in the vernacular, not only with regard to individual details but also in structure and in overall Christian context. The strong elements of romance in it—what might be called the love relationship of Eve and Adam—are importantly balanced against the underlying theology of the whole.

---

[33] Murdoch, *Medieval Popular Bible*, 116–18, discusses this widespread legend in some detail. The Vulgate text reads either 'Noe . . . dimisit corvum qui egrediebatur et revertebatur donec siccaretur aquae', or it inserts the word 'non' before 'revertebatur'. The negative is missing from the Hebrew texts, and the post-Vatican II Vulgate leaves it out. Most medieval writings assume that the raven did not return, and the usual and frequent explanation is that it found some carrion: it is in the *Historia scholastica* (*PL* 198, 1085) and in very many vernacular works, and iconography. Lutwin is also playing with the language: 'asz' means carrion, and links well with the preterite of the verbs 'to eat' and 'to sit' (see vv. 3844–9).

Smaller references and allusions

As is the case with other languages, there are small instances of evidence that the *VAE* narrative was known to individual writers. I have suggested for example that the medieval Latin epic *Waltharius*, written in Germany perhaps as early as in the tenth century, may betray knowledge of the *VAE* when Hildegund, escaping with her lover Waltharius from the Huns, at one point asks that he should kill her, which he of course refuses. Is Eve's similar request to Adam at the back of the mind of a highly derivative poet whose work is in any case full of references to other texts, albeit mainly Virgil?[34] The link is really too tenuous to let us include *Waltharius* even tentatively amongst the analogues, however. Some references in specifically religious literature, of course, including very early ones, might refer to the *VAE*, but equally or more plausibly to the Holy Rood legends or to the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, as is the case with the mid twelfth-century German poem by the priest Arnold (of whom virtually nothing is known) called by its most recent editor *Loblied auf den Heiligen Geist* (Praise to the Holy Spirit) and earlier *Von der Siebenzahl* (Of the Number Seven). The poem, which is found in one of the early collective codices, the so-called Vorau manuscript (Chorherrenstift Vorau 276), tells how Adam 'phieng … oleum misericordie | mit deme oleo wart er rebarmet' (received the oil of mercy | he was redeemed with that oil). A good number of other German texts echo the Holy Rood material, either presenting versions of Meyer's *Legende*, or with allusions to the death of Adam or to Seth's quest, including several *Meisterlieder*.[35] Far more specific, however, is the later and somewhat isolated evidence provided by the poet Hugo von Montfort (1357–1423).[36] His penitential and anti-pagan poem in forty-three quatrains concludes with a general cry for assistance from God against the attacks of the devil, and the thirty-ninth quatrain reads:

---

[34] Murdoch, 'Origins of Penance', 215.

[35] Arnold's text is in Friedrich Maurer, *Die religiösen Dichtungen des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1964–70), iii. 53–85; see 71, vv. 481–2. On the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in German see Achim Masser and Max Siller, *Das Evangelium Nicodemi in spätmittelalterlicher deutscher Prosa* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1987). There is a full survey of all the relevant texts—such as the various *Meisterlieder*—in Miller, *German and Dutch Versions*, with examples. The overlap with the *VAE* in Seth's quest remains apparent.

[36] *Hugo von Montfort*, ed. Karl Bartsch (Tübingen: Stuttgarter Lit. Verein, 1871), 185–91, 190, vv. 153–6. I discuss the relevant poem, with text, in *Adam's Grace*, 14–17. On the poet, whose work is not extensive, and the manuscript transmission see Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, ii/ii/2. 449–51. The relationship of the poem to the *VAE* was noted already by von der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, i, p. lxix, and this was echoed by van Dam in his entry 'Adam und Eva', in Stammler and Langosch (eds.), *Verfasserlexikon*, 7. I refer in 'Das deutsche Adambuch', 214, to this and other allusions, although some may be to the Rood legends.

> Ich ruef dich an als Adam tet:
> Er stuond gen dir in buosse.
> Almechtig got, gwer mich der pet,
> Hilf miner sel uss böser sünde ruosse.

(I call to you as Adam did: | he stood before you in penance. | Almighty God, grant my plea, | help my soul from sin's evil pit.)

There is nothing more than the idea that Adam did penance, but the verb 'stuond', 'stood', is a clear indication, even if the location has disappeared. The context, however, is also a parallel, as Adam also asks for God's help to drive away the devil in the *VAE* at the end of the debate with the devil while he is still standing in the river.

It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the parallelism between the motif of the static river as an element of the penance section of the *VAE* and its appearance in the context of the baptism (or indeed birth) of Christ.[37] The Jordan standing still at the time of the baptism of Christ is referred to in early writings and appears in hemostatic charms in German and elsewhere as early as the tenth century, and the supernatural event was probably first associated with Christ and then with Adam.

In terms of reception of the *VAE*, and notably that of the penance section, it is, however, possible to perceive reflections in literary works such as the late twelfth-century legend poem *Gregorius* of Hartmann von Aue. To be fair, this particular example could have been made in the context of other languages, since Hartmann himself followed a French version, *La Vie du Pape Saint Grégoire* of about 1170, and there are Low German and English versions, as well as a Latin adaptation of Hartmann's own poem. But Hartmann's work is the major literary representation, and he develops the link with Adam particularly closely (a point taken up, though not in the context of the *VAE* but in that of the first fall, by Thomas Mann in his modern version, *Der Erwählte*, *The Holy Sinner*). The hero, Gregorius, having discovered that he has entered unknowingly into a marriage with his mother and is in any case the product of brother–sister incest, does penance on a rock surrounded by water. He is not standing in water, but his penance lasts seventeen years; in Hartmann's version when he is eventually taken from the island (to become pope, the representative of Christ) he is naked and ashamed, like Adam, and the terminology applied to Gregorius himself echoes that used regularly of

---

[37] See my paper 'The River that Stopped Flowing'. On the apocryphal basis for the static river at the time of the baptism, with very early material, see A. Jacoby, *Ein bisher unbeachteter apokrypher Bericht über die Taufe Jesu* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1902) and also F. Ohrt, *Die ältesten Segen über Christi Taufe* (Copenhagen: Levin and Munskgaard, 1938).

Adam ('der ellende', the exile—this is the case in the *Adams Klage* version, for example). There are many other influences behind the story—including the Oedipus legend, for example—but the notion of a figure parallel with Adam (and also with Christ) undertaking penance on a rock is likely to echo our material at some remove.[38]

HIGH GERMAN PROSE

There are various late versions in High German prose, usually in the *Historienbibeln*, but also once in a prose chronicle. There is also the private version made by Hans Folz for his own purposes prior to the publication of his (rather different) poetic version, but that must be treated separately.

Historienbibeln

As noted above, these vernacular narrative Bibles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries based on the Vulgate, plus other works including the chronicles of Rudolf von Ems, Jans Enikel, and Heinrich von München and the *Christeherre-Chronik*, with added additional material from apocryphal and legend sources, derive their versions of the *VAE* material from the probably originally independent verse texts themselves later incorporated into the various rhymed world chronicles. The *Historienbibeln* as such are preserved in a very large number of manuscripts indeed, often illustrated, largely from the Central and Upper German language areas (Alsace and Bavaria-Austria), but known all over the German-speaking area (though there are far fewer Low German examples). They are chronologically concentrated, too, in the middle of the fifteenth century and the decades thereafter (around 1440–80). They can be divided into many different types and subtypes, without much in the way of uniformity; beside the biblical base in the Vulgate they include material not only from the rhymed world chronicles, but from (among other texts) the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor, Bruder

---

[38] I have discussed this at length in the second chapter of *Adam's Grace*, 50–75, with details there of all the various vernacular editions. The main text by Hartmann is edited by Hermann Paul, *Gregorius*, 9th edn. by Ludwig Wolff (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1959); later texts and those in other languages are listed in my study. See also on this Adamic link my two papers 'Hartmann's *Gregorius* and the Quest of Life', *New German Studies*, 6 (1978), 79–100, and 'Adam *sub gratia*: Zur Bußszene in Hartmanns *Gregorius*', *Archiv*, 142 (1990), 122–6; and especially Ohly, *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte*, trans. Archibald, *The Damned and the Elect*, 43–61.

Phillip's *Marienleben*, and apocryphal and legend sources. They were used by the laity and perhaps by women in particular, but were supplanted, of course, by the spread of Luther's Bible.[39] While they have been studied and analysed to some extent, only some printed versions are available. J. F. L. Theodor Merzdorf differentiated in 1870 between two different classes, of which his class I, based on twenty-one manuscripts, many illustrated, included two chapters on the birth of Cain, and already in 1850 von der Hagen had included in his *Gesammtabenteuer* another version of this text, which is closely linked with that of *Adams Klage*, although it is rendered into prose. Merzdorf drew attention, too, to a subdivision of his second class, which included the version from Heinrich von München's chronicle. In the early part of the twentieth century Hans Vollmer undertook a major study and between 1912 and 1927 catalogued many more manuscripts, and indeed established many more types and sub-types (overall nine, plus an additional unclassifiable group).[40] Vollmer had in 1908 edited, however, as *Ein deutsches Adambuch*, the far more extensive *VAE* section from a mid fifteenth-century Hamburg manuscript already noted in some detail with extracts by Merzdorf,

---

[39] The best overview is that by Christoph Gerhardt, 'Historienbibeln (deutsche)', in Ruh (ed.), *Verfasserlexikon*, iv. 67–75. Gerhardt refers to the sixteen or seventeen illustrated manuscripts from the celebrated workshop of Die(t)bold Lauber (discussed in Chapter 6, below) as a mark of their popularity. There is another good brief survey of the position in Viehhauser, *Darstellung*, 28–31, with a summary of the various categories and sub-categories. See more recently Andrea Clemens, *Die Historienbibeln des Spätmittelalters: Religiöse Laienbildung zwischen Weltchronik und Lutherbibel* (Munich: Grin, 2004 = e-book), the title of which is significant. There are parallels to this kind of text in other languages, and we might note the existence of the so-called women's Bible in Yiddish, the *Tsena-Urena*, which is strongly narrative (but which does not, of course, have our material).

[40] J. F. L. Theodor Merzdorf, *Die deutschen Historienbibeln des Mittelalters* (1870: repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963, originally 2 vols. but through-paginated) with texts and details of manuscripts; parts relevant to this study are 119–25 (= his class I; his lead manuscript is a Wolfenbüttel codex of 1465). Von der Hagen's *Gesammtabenteuer*, iii. 703–4, has the chapters on the birth of Cain from a manuscript originally in the Benedictine Abbey of Neresheim, and now in the Fürst Thurn und Taxis Hofbibliothek in Regensburg, MS 175. The volumes of Hans Vollmer's study, *Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde des Mittelalters* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1912–27), surveyed the manuscripts; see especially the first volume, *Ober- und mitteldeutsche Historienbibeln* (*Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde des Mittelalters* I/1). The Neresheim text is described on 91–2. Hans Vollmer's *Ein deutsches Adambuch* (Hamburg: Lütcke und Wulff, 1908) is based on the illustrated manuscript Hamburg, Stadtbibliothek Codex ms. 8 in scrinio fol. Citations are from Merzdorf, and from Vollmer, *Adambuch*. Not all versions have the *VAE* material, and other apocryphal narratives are used as well. See Patricia McAllister, 'Apocryphal Narrative Elements in the Genesis of the Middle Low German *Historienbibel* Helmstedt 611.1', *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 25 (1989), 81–92; her study is of one of the half-dozen or so Low German versions (another is discussed below), and makes interesting comments on the redactor's digressions and his failure to mark non-Vulgate material as such.

and based on Heinrich von München's chronicle.[41] A great deal of work still remains to be done on the *Historienbibeln*, and there are relatively few printed texts available. Concentration here will be upon Merzdorf's brief version and especially Vollmer's Hamburg text.

The text printed by Merzdorf (and in fact already printed in part by von der Hagen) adapts the shorter *Adams Klage*/chronicle poem in part only, specifically vv. 293–400, referring not to the penance, but to the birth of Cain. Three chapters (von der Hagen prints only the first two), which are themselves abbreviated and in part adapted, cover Eve's pains, the return of Adam, and then the incident in which Cain brings his mother the herbs. The first stresses that God is still angry with Eve, and tells how she asks the sun and stars to fetch Adam. The second has Adam's fears that the devil is attacking her again and his accession to her request that he pray for help. When he does so, twelve angels are sent. At this point, however, unlike the *Adams Klage*/chronicle text, we have the motif found in class III and incunabula texts that Eve reacts in horror at the child and asks Adam to kill it; the angels, however, ask Eve to kiss the child, which she does. The version in Heinrich's chronicle, and indeed Folz's poem, both have the motif in different forms again; Heinrich's text (and the *Historienbibel* version based on it) has Eve complain that she had eaten 'arges chraut' (v. 624; bad herbs) which caused the birth of Cain and all her agony. Folz has her blame the serpent for having bitten her, and Merzdorf's text has this idea.[42] The reference then to these being the best midwives brings us back to *Adams Klage*.

The question of the name of Cain is complicated in this text, too. Eve comments that he is her dear child ('mein liebes kint, hertz [kint]'). In the next chapter, however, Michael announces to Eve that God's anger towards her has passed and Cain stands up and goes to fetch his mother the equivalent of the 'herba' of the Latin *VAE*. In the various versions on which Merzdorf based his edition this is rendered as 'krut' or 'krutelin' ([small] herb) or as '(grün) krenzlin' (small [green] garland) and brings it to her in the small hut where she is lying, another minor circumstantial addition. We are a very long way from the original word-play, if indeed it ever was one, and this is underscored by the fact that Eve now thanks God for the miracle and says: 'ich han ainen menschen durch got besessen' (I have got a man from the Lord), which is the Hebrew name etymology in Genesis 4: 1, though is not marked as such. This is effectively the end of the *VAE* material. In a later chapter, Seth is born, and it is he whom Adam sends to paradise for medicine (it is not referred to as the oil of mercy), where he receives a twig from the tree of knowledge. When

---

[41] Merzdorf gave it the categorization IIb, Vollmer IIIb.
[42] Murdoch, 'Das deutsche Adambuch', 222, discusses the point.

Seth returns, Adam is already dead, and the tree is planted which grows into the cross.[43]

The prose text printed by Vollmer from the large Hamburg manuscript Stadtbibliothek Codex ms. 8 in scrinio of 1458 (designated as *Θ* by Merzdorf), fos. 20[rb]–33[vb],[44] and based largely upon the metrical version in Heinrich's chronicle is divided in chapters of varying length, starting with a section on the penance. Much of what has been said about the chronicle version of course applies here, since the prose resolution takes up a lot of the metrical text, albeit increasingly abbreviated towards the end, so that new emphases and motifs appear once again, but simply in prose and in a different context— that Adam and Eve had no one to get food from, that they built a hut from foliage, and so on. The details of the penance are again forty days for Adam and thirty for Eve, with the devil's intervention after twenty-one days. Even lines like 'als die geschrift beweiset mich' (v. 264; as the book says) are taken over into the prose version ('Als mich dy geschrifft weiset . . .', 8). Heinrich's chronicle (unlike *Adams Klage*) simplifies the *VAE* motif about Eve's flesh becoming as green as grass as 'Si was plaich vnd chranch' (v. 321; she was pale and ill), and the prose version establishes this explanatory reading (as 'krank vnd plaich', 9). Both Eve and Adam specifically address the question to the devil of why they are being persecuted, and the latter tells of his own expulsion. The passage is retained, too, in which an explanation is offered for the chronological problem of Lucifer's fall having taken place before the creation of Adam.

It is worth considering closely a small passage to see precisely how the text continues to change as we move from language to language and then through genres. At the end of the devil's account of his own fall and his claim of equality with Adam now that they are both exiled (and in this text after the explanation of the contradictions), *VAE* 17 simply has:

Hac audiens Adam a diabolo exclamavit cum magno fletu et dixit: domine deus meus . . .

(Hearing this from the devil, Adam cried out with a great weeping and said: 'O lord God . . .')

---

[43] See also the Sethite narrative from the Hamburg manuscript, Merzdorf, *Historienbibeln*, 57–63.

[44] The manuscript is described in i. 150–1 of Vollmer's *Materialien*, as well as in Merzdorf, *Historienbibeln*, 54–7, and Vollmer, *Adambuch*, 48–51. He collates his text with two other manuscripts of the same prose version, a Berlin manuscript of 1472 and a fifteenth-century manuscript now in Vienna which once belonged to Prince Eugene of Savoy. As noted, he included in his apparatus text passages from Heinrich's chronicle based on several manuscripts, though not that used by Miller. The illustrations (only one is relevant) are discussed in Chapter 6, below.

This is augmented somewhat in the metrical version:

> do Lucifer der vngehewr
> Gen Adam vnd Eua sprach,
>   als ich e von im veriach,
> Vnd do Adam die red erhort,
>   sein hertz von laid sein fraeud zerstoert.
> Er sprach: herr . . . (vv. 474–9)

(when the *abominable Lucifer* spoke *to Adam and Eve, as I told you before*, and when Adam heard what he had to say, his *heart's joy was destroyed by sorrow*. He said: 'O Lord . . . ' [additions are emphasized])

Some of the additions (indicated in the translation) were occasioned by the need for rhyme ('vngehewr', abominable, for 'fewr', fire, in the preceding line), and the comment that this has been said before is perhaps a filler. However, the name of Lucifer (as well as the adjective) is absent from the Latin and the stress that both of the protoplasts are involved is interesting; so too, the simple weeping ('fletus') of the Latin has been augmented. In the metrical text printed by Vollmer in his apparatus (from a different manuscript from that used by Miller), that idea is slightly truncated: 'sein hercz von laid wart zerstört' (his heart was destroyed by sorrow, Vollmer, 14).

The prose version reads:

Do Lucifer gen Adam vnd Ewa sprach, als ich dy red vor lie, do Adam dy red erhört, sein hercz ward gelaidigt. er sprach: 'herr . . . '

(When Lucifer spoke to Adam and Eve as I told you before, and when Adam heard what he said, his heart was troubled. He said: 'O Lord . . . ')

The adjective for the devil has gone, but the name has been retained, and the back-reference too is kept because it is logical; although the expression of sorrow has been simplified even more than in the metrical text cited by Vollmer, it is still not the same as the Latin. All these points are very small, but they demonstrate the ways in which the basic narrative changes.

Occasionally passages occur in the prose which seem entirely new. Adam completes his penance, after which the prose text interpolates 'yedoch geschach im ain gros wunder, als ich hernach sagen will' (and then something miraculous happened to him, which I shall tell you about later, 13–14). There are also omissions. The prose version leaves out the actual conception of Cain and the effect of love upon Eve, moving directly to her lack of awareness that she is pregnant. The request to the luminaries, and the arrival, after Adam's prayer, of Michael and the angels, Eve's adverse reaction to the child, as well as the curious ascription of Cain's conception to having eaten bad herbs, an 'arges krawt' (15), are all included. Cain fetches once more a sweet herb and

brings it to his mother, after which Adam names him Cain because he has intelligence, so that the etymology remains as opaque as ever.

At this point the *Historienbibel* follows the text of Heinrich's chronicle represented by the Munich manuscript, printed as an appendix in Miller's edition. The passage ascribed to Methodius on the rest of Adam's children and the narrative of Cain and Abel is included, during which the *Historienbibel* uses the *Historia scholastica* (on the nature of Cain's sacrifice) and then introduces a passage on the loss by Abel's blood of the virginity of the earth which follows Wolfram's *Parzival* (and is found also in some of the chronicle manuscripts). Cain's kin and the story of Lamech's useful and ingenious children follows as in Heinrich's chronicle, Tubalcain inventing metalwork and war, for example; and then comes the death of Cain at the hand of Lamech.[45] The Sethite line follows, and only in the subsequent chapter do we return to the prophecy of Adam (again ascribed to Methodius) as in the version of Heinrich's chronicle from the Munich manuscript (with his story located after the penance in the Jordan). The section headed 'Von Adams tod' (Adam's death) abbreviates the rhymed chronicle version; Eve's desire to take on some of the pains is omitted, and it is noticeable that where in the rhymed chronicle Eva and Seth go to paradise, here only Seth does so. This change is very marked, and it is again worth comparing the two versions. The chronicle reads:

> Do die red allhie
> von Adam also ergie,
> Seth vnd Eua, die muoter sein,
> ir trew liezzen si do werden schein,
> Wan sie huoben sich an der stet,
> alz si Adam gepeten het . . . (vv. 1819–24)

(When Adam had made this speech, Seth and Eve his mother showed their loyalty and at once set off as Adam had requested . . .)

This follows the *VAE*, but the *Historienbibel* is plainly adapting this text to the Holy Rood: 'Do dy red von Adam geschach, Seth sein sun hueb sich auff vnd chert zu dem paradis . . . ' (When Adam had made this speech Seth set off and went to paradise . . . , 32). The rest is greatly abbreviated, although it seems still to be turning into prose the rhymed chronicle text. There is of course no mention of the withered grass motif, since this is not in the chronicle. It is curious that in some texts where it is patently superfluous (since Eve goes with Seth) it is included, but here, where it would now make sense, it is not. Since Eve is cut out entirely, there is none of the incident with the serpent.

---

[45] See Murdoch, *Medieval Popular Bible*, 78–95, on this complex of motifs.

As already noted, Seth asks initially for the fruit ('obs') of the tree of mercy (32), so that the reading of the rhymed chronicle may indeed be the correct one. Michael now gives the prophecy of 5,200 years and refers this time to the oil of mercy. He also gives Adam the twig taken (at one remove) from the tree of knowledge (the story is this time ascribed simply to 'some teachers').[46] The incident with the Jordan is also omitted, as is, of course, Adam's blame of Eve for the attack by the serpent. The account of Adam's death returns to the rhymed chronicle text closely, but again it is much abbreviated. Adam is buried (with the twig) at Calvary. There is no reference to the shrouds, but the emphasis on the cross does follow the chronicle. Eve's death clarifies to an extent the slight confusion (in the Munich text of the rhymed chronicle) about the tablets, and Seth is instructed to make two tablets, with the reasons clearly given as in the *VAE*. Seth makes the tablets, and then dies as in the biblical account, at the age of 912.

The positioning of the narrative within a historiated Bible conveys a certain authority, although this particular text takes over from the rhymed chronicle the express initial assertion that the material is *not* biblical but from a book called Adam, this time ascribed to Methodius (which is not usually the case in the rhymed chronicles). The prose reduction of the rhymed chronicle is fairly clear throughout, with new motifs from that version retained. So too, the tales of Cain's kin, or of his death, from separate popular versions of biblical stories are integrated with the *VAE* narrative, so that the text has become something rather different. The chapter headings are also significant. What is perhaps most noticeable is the shift at the end towards the Holy Rood legend, with the loss of Eve in the quest for the oil of mercy, even though her death and the authority guarantee of the tablets is still retained.

Excerpta chronicarum 1459

Linked with the *Historienbibeln*—since they themselves are part based on rhymed chronicles and were used as historical texts—is the brief text found in a large compilation prose world chronicle which begins with biblical material and uses other material from the *Historienbibeln* elsewhere, the *Excerpta chronicarum* composed by the Nuremberg chancery clerks Johannes Platterberger and Theoderich Truchseß in 1459. It has unfortunately not been edited, but it is again interesting that the *VAE* narrative should still be found in a chronicle context as late as the mid fifteenth century, and indeed

---

[46] Vollmer, *Adambuch*, 33 n., refers to Meyer's edition of the Holy Rood *Legende*, 'Geschichte des Kreuzholzes', 137, and another vernacular version of this motif.

more substantially than in, say, its pretty well exact contemporary parallel, the *Abbreviation of Chronicles* by John Capgrave in England.[47] The text as such is not the same as the known *Historienbibel* versions, and was presumably translated directly from the *VAE*, rather than being a prose reduction. Vollmer himself, who printed in his catalogue of *Historienbibeln* a small amount of the text from the fifteenth-century manuscript now in Oxford, Bodleian Douce 367, notes that this version, which he claims is in some respects closest to his version from the Hamburg *Historienbibel*, nevertheless contains (as the Hamburg text does not) Seth's vision at Adam's death of Michael and the angels, and the matter of the shrouds.[48] The text here indicates that three shrouds brought by Michael and Uriel are placed over Adam and three more over Abel, which is a plausible interpretation of the text according to class II or III in Meyer's versions; classes II and III (but not I) have the phrase 'et sepelite Adam et filium eius', which is translated here, and the 'alias sindones' of the continental Latin tradition is rendered as 'annder drewe' (another three). The English Latin tradition, for example, having established three shrouds, then refers to 'unum . . . alium', leaving a problem about the third. The problem is obviated here as it is those texts that reduce the number to two.

The case of Hans Folz

Hans Folz's work on the *VAE* represents a separate milestone in the history of the work in the vernacular, and here we are able to trace a vernacular text from a prose translation of a Latin original, preserved in the hand of the author, to a printed German poem on the narrative, composed and indeed printed once more by the author himself. Hans Folz (*c*.1435–1513) was a barber-surgeon originally from Worms who settled in Nuremberg and who also wrote *Meisterlieder* and *Fastnachtspiele*, as well as longer poems in rhymed couplets, one of which is on the theme of the *VAE*. This was published by him in Nuremberg in 1480 in a text (with a woodcut frontispiece/title page) of which two copies remain extant (in Regensburg and in Munich). However, we also possess, in a

---

[47] The Nuremberg text is noted by Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 258. Details of the text and manuscripts may be found in the article on Johannes Platterberger by Lotte Kurras in Ruh (ed.), *Verfasserlexikon*, vii. 726–8. A major source was Vincent de Beauvais. The entry by Paul Ruf in the older *Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Stammler, iii. 901–2, refers to him as Plattenberger.

[48] See Kurras, 'Platterberger', on the manuscript tradition, and, with details of the Nuremberg manuscript and Douce 367, in which our text is on fos. 3vb–7vb, and also the extract, Vollmer, *Ober- und mitteldeutsche Historienbibeln*, i/1. 169–71. Vollmer notes that the date 1459 in the Douce manuscript presumably refers to the composition date and is taken from the Nuremberg original. Heinrich von Münchens chronicle, the basis of Vollmer's prose text, does have the matter of the shrouds, but it is rather different.

manuscript in what has fairly conclusively been identified as his own hand, a prose translation of the *VAE* itself. This manuscript is in the Thüringische Landesbibliothek, Cod. Weimar 566 (olim 43), fos. 154^r–159^r. The manuscript is a large paper manuscript in a sometimes rapidly written bastarda, with around sixty items, some also drafts or early versions of Folz's work, and there is the date 1479 on an earlier folio (57^r). Since the printed Adam text is clearly later and is itself dated 1480, we may assume that this prose version can be dated to 1479 or 1480.[49]

While it is possible that the prose version was copied from an existing German original, it is far more likely that this was Folz's own translation of a text in a manuscript like Meyer's class III or one of those classified by Pettorelli as the late redactions (his class F2 for example), or the in any case closely related incunabula versions. In my edition of the text I have argued from an analysis of the nature of the errors and corrections that this is Folz's own translation, and not a copy of an existing one. While some aspects of the wording, and the brevity of some passages, recall the incunabulum text, the argument for a manuscript source rests upon one especially striking error in *VAE* 43, which can really only have come about if a manuscript abbreviation in Latin was wrongly resolved and hence mistranslated; it would have been far less likely, though not entirely impossible, had a Latin printed text been the source. The problem is compounded by the fact that the *VAE* passage concerned does appear in the incunabulum version, so that we are very much in the borderland of written and printed texts (and furthermore, some early printed texts were occasionally written out as manuscripts). Folz's own text is almost certainly a private version that was not meant for publication; the prose is inconsistent and has gaps and uncorrected errors, and is probably a preliminary study. The precise relationship to the poem is also not without problems, however.[50] The match even with Meyer's class III,

---

[49] Brian Murdoch, *Hans Folz and the Adam Legends: Texts and Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1977). Both texts—prose and verse—are cited from my edition, which has a full commentary on both; there will inevitably be some overlap, although sometimes the material has been developed. The prose version has not been edited elsewhere; the verse text is also in Ingeborg Spriewald, *Hans Folz: Auswahl* (Berlin: Akademie, 1960), 95–108, and Hanns Fischer, *Hans Folz: Die Reimpaarsprüche* (Munich: Beck, 1961), 150–63.

[50] Murdoch, *Folz*, 15–27. I note in particular that haplography can come about when translating if the eye skips to a similar passage, and this may have happened here, if indeed the original had not already omitted a section. Other errors and corrections do not look like copy errors, but rather changes of mind. The error based on a misresolved abbreviation is discussed in detail below. In 1960 Ingeborg Spriewald, *Auswahl*, 241–2, concluded that the source was either a manuscript of the class III text or one of the earlier incunabula texts, and also that Folz was indeed translating the Latin rather than copying an existing translation. Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 258, considers that the prose was based on a class III text, but

Pettorelli's late redaction, or known incunabula texts is not exact, and there are elements already in the prose which seems to be in no known version. There are additional Christological motifs, a lot of the Holy Rood material, and a reduced vision of Adam, while other aspects are played down, although they may already have been weakened in the Latin copy text—some aspects of the miraculous but not very comprehensible birth of Cain are changed or omitted (completely from the metrical version), and the attack on Seth by the serpent is also reduced. Finally, there are fairly prominent uncorrected errors which may be present in the prose simply because Folz did not go back to change them (as when he names Adam's son twice as Noe—Noah—rather than Seth).

The first sections of the *VAE* are rendered fairly closely, with small variations which may depend upon the translator or on the original: 'in über grosen trupsal' (in very great misery) renders 'in magna tristitia'. Adam and Eve search for food for seven days, Eve asks for death and is refused, and they search for another nine before Adam suggests a penance. Eve does not this time ask what penance is, simply what her penance should be, but Adam's slightly convoluted speech about Eve's capabilities is absent. More significantly, Eve is sent towards the east to the Tigris (no directions are given in the Latin texts), and even more unusually, the pair will sit on the stones in the rivers ('siczen'); the Latin texts are unanimous in the use of 'stare' (stand). That the translation was being done rapidly and was not corrected is clear in the next section, where Eve is said to go towards the occident (56) and to the Jordan (a scribal anticipation of Adam in the Jordan) while Adam goes 'gen orient wercz' (towards the orient), also to the Jordan. The directions are not in the Latin anyway, so that these may be additions on Folz's part. The errors concerning the rivers are of course simply an accidental confusion in a work not intended for others to read, so that they cannot be seen as part of the textual tradition, which would only be the case if they were carried over into the printed poem, and they are not. That the pair sit rather than stand on stones *is*, however, found in the poem.

Adam asks the Jordan to help him pray, and also all things in it that are 'von seln' (57; with a soul, a precise rendering of 'animantia'). He extends his request to all living beasts and birds. The temptation by the devil in the disguise of an angel of light follows after nineteen days (the period in some class III manuscripts), and the devil is motivated by envy rather than anger, as also in many Latin texts. Eve is tempted out of the water, and although there is no reference to the cold, she is 'dem miß des wassers gleich geferbt'

---

that the poem also knew a class II version. It is again safer to consider that the source was something akin to the class III form.

(58; coloured like moss of [by?] the water). Once the devil takes her back to Adam and he has scolded her, Folz has Eve first put the question to the devil of why he is persecuting them, and the devil addresses his lengthy reply quite specifically to Eve ('zu der Eva', 58) with the same clarification as elsewhere in German: some Latin class III texts have 'ad eam', others 'ad Evam'. Here, both Eve's and Adam's questions are fairly freely and indeed differently rendered.[51] In the devil's reply, too, there is first of all a new note when the devil refers to seeing in the figure of Adam a future second Adam, who will come from Adam's seed, will combine humanity and divinity, and sit at the right hand of God. This is not in the *VAE* as such, although it is noteworthy that Meyer's class I text has the devil told to worship the image of God as Christ: 'adora imaginem dei IHU.'[52] Later, too, the devil offers a more extended account of his role in the first fall, and also a summary of his own plight, contrasting eternal life, which is an attribute of God, with his own eternal damnation. It remains open as to whether these were in the source. If they were, then Folz was translating a text augmented by theological-exegetical additions.

Adam's plea to God and his completion of the penance follow the *VAE*, and in Eve's despair the interpretation of her 'separa me' request is again seen as an alternative; if she is not killed, she will go to the west and die. The opening comment that she dared not look at Adam is unusual, but that Adam does not respond to her comments at all is a feature of Meyer's class III. She leaves in sorrow, but that she looks about her might depend upon the reading 'hoc videns', referring to Adam's lack of response, also in some class III texts. There is no reference to her making herself a dwelling at this stage, but it is referred to later in what looks like a pluperfect verb form, so that perhaps the idea was added later. Otherwise the narrative of her pains and the plea to the luminaries to inform Adam follow the *VAE*: Adam, however, does not express the fear that Eve is being attacked, but is shown as leaving the Jordan (where he has presumably stayed).

With the birth of Cain we may see behind Folz's translation the usual confusions associated with this complex section of the material. Twelve angels, two Virtues ('krefft engel', strong angels, 63, Latin 'virtus') and Michael are in attendance as usual, but when Cain (who is not yet named) is born, the whole motif of the herbs or corn is missing. It would be intriguing to know precisely what was in the source at this point; all we are told about the child is that he is a son, 'der da fast schembar waz' (63; who was almost of the

---

[51] In spite of my note, 92, on the rendering of Adam's question, the first part might simply be rhetorical and the second a very literal rendering of the Latin. The end effect is not especially clear.
[52] Meyer resolves this as Jehova, but it is a standard abbreviation for Jesu.

age of puberty). The reading is unusual and not entirely clear in any case; at best this seems to render 'et erat lucidus' but it is hard to see what is behind the translation.[53] The incident in class III and incunabula versions in which Eve asks Adam to kill the creature, and he refuses because it is their flesh and blood, is now included. Most interesting is the assumption made by Eve that Cain was the result of her eating the food of the beasts, a motif also present in the Hamburg *Historienbibel*.[54] The next passage in the German is equally significant, particularly if it reflects the original from which Folz was translating:

Und er leret sie ez mütern. Aber Adam liff auß zu suchen die aller sussesten wurczelin und kreutlin, und pracht ir die zu essen. (64)

(And he [scil. Adam, who has just been mentioned] taught her how to nurse. Then Adam went out and found the sweetest roots and brought them to her to eat.)

Some class III manuscripts (and the incunabula) add the motif that an angel 'ostendit Evae, qualiter puerum lactare/nutrire'. Just before this, the class III version has Cain fetch 'herbam dulcissimam' for his mother. Both of these points are reflected here, but they have been changed fairly radically in that Adam takes on both the role of the angel and that of Cain, with the incidents being transposed in any case. If the original motif of Cain's miraculous activity was originally linked with his name, in this version he does not acquire a name at all at this point and it is simply mentioned later on.

Abel is born (only now is Cain named), and Michael instructs Adam in the basics of agriculture, as in the *VAE*; however, at this point Adam names the animals, as he does in Genesis 2: 20. Eve's vision of the death of Abel does not involve the drinking of his blood, and the death of Abel is treated as briefly as in the *VAE*. Perhaps the least explicable element in Folz's version follows when we move very abruptly to the other children of the protoplasts. This is often a break-off point in vernacular versions, but in place of *VAE* 24, which records the birth of Seth and notes the precise number of Adam's and Eve's children, Folz seems closer to Genesis 5: 3–4, which refers to Adam as 800 years old and simply mentions sons and daughters. However—and the condition is a major

---

[53] The actual reading of the word is clear (the final *r* is on a backward loop as often elsewhere in the manuscript). It cannot, for example, be mistaken for some compound with *schein* (which 'lucidus' might suggest) and the qualifier 'fast' would also speak against that. One argument for the English translation proposed is that it would relate to Cain standing up and running as soon as he is born. Middle High German *schembart* can also mean an (ugly) mark, and Eve is certainly frightened.

[54] See Murdoch, *Folz*, 102. The idea is rare in the *VAE* tradition but not entirely unknown elsewhere.

one—Seth is referred to twice as Noe (Noah), an uncorrected error the basis for which is hard to imagine; either it was in the source, which is unlikely, or Folz simply had the wrong name in mind. Seth is not named until later.

The problems of the relationships between the source and Folz's version continue. In the Latin texts Adam now relates to Seth how he is taken to the heavens in a chariot and brought before God, then returned by Michael, and class III texts add Adam's apocalyptic vision to Seth. In Folz's version, Adam calls together his children (which anticipates *VAE* 30), then reverts to his narrative of the translation into heaven, which he normally tells Seth. There are frequently confusions at this point in vernacular versions, and the loss of the apocalyptic vision might point to an incunabulum text, although other material is there which is not present in printed versions. Crucially, Adam also sees a chariot like 'ein fligenden wint' (65; a flying wind), rendering 'ventum volantem', a reading which is noted by Meyer specifically as appearing in the Munich manuscript clm 2778 of 1432. This text, from the Cistercian Abbey of Aldersbach, is itself one of a late group of four manuscripts where the text is included in adapted form within a treatise on penance (*Electula*); in this particular codex, however, the text is also repeated in full without additions at the end, so that the position of this manuscript is itself a complex one within the tradition of the *VAE* as a whole, as noted by Pettorelli, who places the group within his second *rédaction tardive*. Various passages are missing from some of the texts in Pettorelli's second late redaction, and Folz's potential source might very well be sought here.[55]

After the truncated translation into heaven, Folz returns to what looks like *VAE* 30 and the congregation of all the children. The precise formulation of the numbers and the excepting of the women and children, which is included here, is again a pointer to class III or the incunabulum text. Adam recounts the first fall and we hear too of his pains, after which he sends Seth and Eve to paradise. The attack by the serpent is slightly unusual in that the serpent simply calls on Seth by name rather than attacking him. The German is in any case a little confused, although the actual reading is secure: 'so komt ein schlang und nennet mit Sethen mit dem namen' (68; literally 'a serpent comes

---

[55] See Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 286–9. I have discussed some possibilities regarding this passage as a key to the possible source, *Folz*, 106–8, including a reference to the manuscript series. Meyer linked Munich MS clm 2778 with clm 2800 (of 1468, also from Aldersbach) and 5976 (fifteenth century, Ebersberg), and Pettorelli adds the fourth, clm 18597 (1469–70, Tegernsee), though he only collated clm 2778. Pettorelli also notes as a nice historical triviality that someone—probably Meyer—has added cross-references to clm 2800 and 5976 in a margin in clm 2778. Certainly they are mentioned in the entry for clm 2778 in the *Catalogus* of Munich Latin manuscripts published in the 1890s, one of the editors of which was Meyer.

and names with Seth by name').[56] The final comment of the sequence, referring to the 'plaga dentibus', is missing.

Having reached paradise, Seth is given the promise of the redemption, this time after 5,201 years. The time is, of course, variable, from 5,500 or more (in *Gospel of Nicodemus* texts) to 5,228 to 5,200. Several texts have 5,199 expressed as '... ducenti minus unus', and Folz's variation is very unusual. Meyer was of the opinion that Jean des Preis had the same number in a French chronicle, but this is in fact probably not the case, but was rather a variation on the 'minus one' formula. Folz may have made a simple error, or been confused (as well he might) by the curious expression.[57]

Seth is given no spices, but the twig that will grow into the cross, so that we are now following the Holy Rood material in a class III *VAE* text. It is here that we find, however, the resolution error which speaks for a manuscript source. Michael takes 'ein zweiglin der sun der erden geprochen von dem paum dez wissens' (70; literally 'a twig of the sons of the earths, broken from the tree of knowledge'). The passage derives principally from one of the sections of the Holy Rood legend, rather than the *VAE* as such, although it is in the incunabulum-based text (as printed by Katona). There is of course a question mark over whether or not Folz was following a unified source: it has to be assumed in want of compelling evidence to the contrary that his source was a *VAE* text with Holy Rood material included. That text reads 'ramusculum trium foliorum fractum der arbore scientiae'.[58] Much of Folz's rendering is literal, but 'trium foliorum', 'of three leaves', must have been abbreviated with emphasis on 'trm' and 'flrm' and he expanded this as if it were 'terrarum filiorum'. The value of this in terms of the overall reception of the *VAE* is minimal. The version makes no sense, and was corrected by Folz when he came to write the poem, so that it is an ephemeral variation within a Holy Rood interpolation into the *VAE*, existing only in a private version; it tells us no more than that Folz initially misread a sentence. It does, however, serve as an illustration of how new motifs *can* occur, and they *can* become established—the *locus classicus* is

---

[56] The sense is also confirmed by the poem, in which the point recurs. One might possibly assume that an abbreviated 'momordit' was misread as some form of 'nomen', but the additional 'mit' (with) is hard to fit in. While manuscripts of the English group have Seth bitten in the face (mixing 'faciens' and 'faciem'), the rather different Balliol MS has the reading 'uenit serpens cum impetu et morsit Seth' (see Mozley's apparatus).

[57] See Murdoch, *Folz*, 116. It is not presented in the same way in the poem.

[58] Meyer, 'Geschichte des Kreuzholzes', 121. Dunstan, 'Middle High German', 193, refers to the passage in the context of a passage in Lutwin, which is not nearly as close. Katona's text omits 'fractum', which is, however, found here.

presumably the spectacular introduction of 11,000 virgins into the legend of St Ursula.[59]

The incident (found only in class III texts) in which Seth drops the twig into the Jordan and retrieves it, and in which Eve is again condemned by Adam for the attack of the serpent, is present here. Adam's death is close to the *VAE* with the darkening of the sun and the transmission of Adam's soul to Michael. The treatment of *VAE* 48 is again revealing, however. In the Latin texts, Michael and Uriel bring three shrouds and place them upon Adam and Abel, and the discrepancy between the numbers of corpses and shrouds is, as noted, resolved in different ways. Here God asks the archangels to bring 'drew' [. . .] (72; three [. . .]), followed by a longish gap in the lines, perhaps because Folz was not sure of the meaning of 'sindones bissinae'; he comes up with the term 'dekt', 'covering', later. The text continues with the request to 'spread this out over Adam's body'; but the words 'this out' have been crossed through, and over the deletion is an Arabic figure 2. Folz was clearly unsure of the whole thing, and there is another deletion before the reference to Adam's body. However, he solves the problem of the three shrouds by having two placed upon Adam and one on Abel. Yet again, however, this cannot be counted as part of the tradition, since by the time he came to write the poem, Folz (still perhaps concerned about the actual meaning) omitted the motif altogether. As with other German texts, the burial is at Calvary, and there follows now a brief summary of the rest of the legend of the Rood before Christ, another Holy Rood interpolation of some length before the death of Eve and her prophecy about the fire and flood. In this section, Folz's version is similar to that in Heinrich von München's chronicle, since there is a reference only to the making of stone tablets, which are admittedly to be raised high over the earth, but there is no link with the fire or flood, and no clay tablets. We are not even told that Seth makes them, however, and the text ends with Michael's injunction that they should not mourn for more than six days. The addendum with the later tale of the tablets is missing.

The position of this text in the history of the developing apocryphon is complex. The largely unanswered, and probably in fact unanswerable, question is whether Folz, if he was indeed himself translating a (single) Latin original rather than copying a German version, was adapting freely (sometimes perhaps trying to make sense of the original), or whether his source

[59] Either from a confusion between *miles* (soldier) and *mille* (thousand), or a misreading of an abbreviated XI MV (= 'undecim martyres virgines', eleven virgin martyrs) as 'undecim millia virgines' (11,000 virgins). The new motif was given added substance by the discovery in Cologne in 1155 of a burial ground with a large number of bones, was further backed up with forged materials, and developed into a cult, although St Ursula was removed from the calendar in 1969: see David Hugh Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 386–7.

already had some of the more unusual motifs and indeed errors. If the latter were the case, then this would point to another variant version in the Latin tradition, and experience with other vernacular texts has taught us that this is a likely solution; apparently unusual vernacular features or motifs very frequently do in fact depend on variations in the ever-fluid Latin originals. This makes Folz's private, incomplete, and in places confused translation a difficult text to assess without—for example—a very close comparison of a large number of specific Latin manuscripts (such as clm 2778 and its relatives), in case one might contain the abbreviation that Folz failed to recognize. Even this approach might in the event well prove inconclusive, and it must remain an open question, then, what was actually in Folz's original. There is an implicit difference in reception terms, of course. If Folz is adapting fairly freely, the matter is individual only; if he is translating closely what lay before him, then the implications for the development of the apocryphon as such are more far-reaching, because this would imply the existence of another variant text. Once we move to the poem, however, the position shifts yet again; literary considerations and metrical constraints will dictate some changes, but the actual material was being presented this time for an audience, and hence was treated more carefully.

The poem, probably the first printed vernacular adaptation, consists of 524 rhymed lines (plus an additional final line in which the author names himself as Hans Folz, barber-surgeon of Nuremberg), and it is broken up into sections with the paragraphing sign (with the first four lines indented to allow for a decorated initial).[60] It adapts the *VAE* narrative, often patently smoothing over material in the prose translation, which is unlikely to have preceded it by much time. Thus two introductory paragraphs set the themes as being the fall, and the image of God in man, and these are followed first by the tale of Lucifer's fall in the traditional, rather than the *VAE* form (hence without reference to Adam), and then the Genesis material of the first fall plus additional comments on it, which cover several paragraphs and stress that Adam's sin was pardonable, while the devil's was not. The last part of the

---

[60] The title page reads: 'Item wie adam vn(d) eua nach dem vnd sie aus de(m) | paradis v(er) dribe(n) worde(n) sei(n) ir ga(n)cz lebe(n) v(er)schlyssen | haben vnd was grosser puß sie auff sich genume(n) | haben ob in got verzeyhen wolt vnd sie wider | seczen in die lustperkeyt des paradises vnd wie | eua zu(m) andern mal v(er)fürt wart durch den satanu(m) | vnd wie sie peyd ydes in su(n)d(er)heyt ir lebe(n) seliclich | geent haben mit vast senlichem abschyd' (This is how Adam and Eve, after they had been driven out of paradise, lived out their lives and what a great penance they took upon themselves in the hope that God would forgive them and place them once again in the delights of paradise, and how Eve was tempted a second time by Satan, and how the pair decided to live separately with a loving farewell). Folz describes himself as 'warbirer', barber(surgeon).

whole introductory section—which comprises exactly 100 lines—anticipates the reference to Adam's wait in purgatory for around 5,000 years until the redemption. The actual narrative from the *VAE*, then, is told in not much more than 400 lines, so that the material is naturally presented in a very concise manner from time to time. On the other hand, the opening (at v. 101) is close to the original: the hunger is stressed as is the search for food, Eve's wish for death and Adam's refusal, and then the notion of the penance. In the analysis of a metrical text, of course, it is not always clear whether something has been omitted on poetic grounds, or for the sake of brevity, or because it was not understood. Thus Adam will do penance for forty days in the Jordan, but Eve's in the Tigris is for an unspecified time (although Folz knew the period from the prose text, so that in this case the exigencies of form are the probable reason). They go to the two rivers and again sit (as in the prose version) rather than stand on the stones, up to their necks, and it is noted by the poet that this is especially bitter for Eve. Thus some, but not all, of the wording of the original is maintained. Adam requests all the creatures in and around the river to complain with him, the river itself stops flowing, and nineteen days pass.

Satan is perturbed by such penance, and goes in the disguise of an angel to Eve and offers her the food of paradise. Folz does retain the idea that when she leaves the water she faints and her body is the colour of moss, though no reason is given. Taken to Adam and scolded at once, she faints once more. The double question to Satan (which in the Latin can lead to confusion) is treated neatly: Eve speaks first, and then Adam adds his voice to the same question, so that Satan may now, as in the *VAE*, speak directly to him. We have of course already had the fall of the angels (the Lucifer–devil–Satan link is not explained, as sometimes happens in medieval writing, but they are taken to be identical), and now Satan—referred to here as just the devil, though he was Satanas in the temptation—explains that he foresaw Adam's image in God. This is a slightly neater solution than in the chronicle of Heinrich von München (and the *Historienbibel*). It is quite complex theologically, in that what Satan is refusing to worship is the image he sees in God not only of Adam but what will come from Adam's seed, so that the notions of the first and second Adam are implicitly combined. Adam prays to God, the devil vanishes, and Adam completes his penance.

Eve's words on leaving Adam now are an economical and in fact clearer version of what she says in the *VAE*; she simply announces that she will go away until she dies. The details are omitted, and we move straight away to her labour pains and her request to the sun and moon. Adam's prayers on her behalf are efficacious, and she is attended by fifteen angels, a simplification of the original, in which she is attended by twelve angels, two Virtues, and the

archangel Michael. The poem does not distinguish them, but it does distribute them, six to either side, two (the 'kraft engel', Virtutes, in the prose) at her feet, and Michael at her head.[61] She is bewildered by the birth, afraid that the child will kill her, and asks Adam to kill it. Adam answers simply that it is their flesh and blood, and shows her how to breastfeed the child (v. 297). The rather involved version of this found in the prose has been reduced to a minimum, with none of the miraculous behaviour on Cain's part, and the whole motif of the sweet herbs omitted. The names Cain and Abel are simply assumed later on, when the fratricide is very briefly treated, although Eve's prophetic dream is present.

Where the birth of Seth and then the story of Adam's translation into heaven were also confused in the prose text, especially with the substitution of the name Noe, it seems possible that Folz went back to the original at this point in the poem, because the text is far clearer and also closer to the *VAE*. Eve bears Seth when Adam is 130, they have other children, and Adam recounts to his sons (not sons and daughters, who are gathered later) the story of his translation as in a dream (which it is not in the prose). This is again done very briefly and of course there is none of the extra apocalyptic material, but neither is there much of the detail of his return. Interestingly the chariot carries him quickly through the air, which sounds like the reading 'velocem' rather than 'volantem'. Overall, this part of the poem, albeit a succinct version of the *VAE* text, is nevertheless closer to it in some respects than is the prose.

The gathering of the children when Adam is about to die follows the *VAE* text closely, as does Adam's account of his pains and the request that Eve and Seth go to paradise. En route the serpent again names Seth by name, which confirms the unusual reading of the prose as a move from the Latin according to any version. The serpent identifies himself as Satan and Seth invokes God, but there is no detail as to how the serpent is driven away, so that the whole episode, albeit changed, is still retained as a rather obscure motif. At the gates of paradise Seth is told of the redemption in 'more than 4,000 years' (v. 377). He is also given a single twig, so that the mistakes in the prose have by this stage either been recognized or glossed over, since the three leaves are not mentioned. Missing too is the return and loss of the twig, and the burial of Adam is also abbreviated. There is no mention of the shrouds at all. The sun and moon are darkened, and Seth sees the hand of God, who commends

---

[61] In my notes, *Folz*, 164, I speculate (though not very convincingly) on whether the Roman 'xv' in the text ought really to be 'xij', as in the prose ('xij' or 'xii' misread as 'xv'). But that would have necessitated naming the Virtutes. On the other hand, 'zwelf' would scan better than 'fünffczehn'.

Adam to Michael until the redemption, when he will take over the throne lost by Lucifer. The last motif is less clear in the prose version. Adam is buried at Calvary and there is an interpolated Christological reference.

Verses 417–65, four paragraphed sections, summarize the story of the Rood after it has grown from Adam's grave, including the Saba/Solomon encounter, and with material not in the prose text, so that a separate Holy Rood source was presumably also used (or the story remembered). The text returns to the death of Eve seven days later, with her prophecy to the children of the two judgements of God to come, by water and then by fire. She instructs them to make two tablets of stone, and although the clay/stone variation is lost, she does ask them to set the tablets high, specifically so that neither fire nor water can reach them. The initial sense of the motif has gone, and it has been changed. The request is not made to Seth (who is not mentioned in this context), although after Eve dies, Michael tells him about the length of time for mourning. The last three brief sections of the poem (from v. 511) are effectively a concluding prayer.

Folz's first printed vernacular adaptation was clearly based to an extent on the prose translation, but that must be seen as a part only of Folz's research towards the poem. In terms of the transmission of the apocryphon, some details have been lost completely, some are adapted slightly, others have been changed considerably. The integration both in the prose to an extent, and separately and more expansively in the case of the poem, with the Holy Rood legend is typical of the period, and indeed, the Christian emphasis in the implicit linking of the old and new Adam merges the typological and the moralizing reading of this narrative of the protoplasts.

HIGH GERMAN DRAMA

There are no early versions of the material in German drama. Although even those dramatists of the Reformation who deal with the Adam and Eve material, such as Hans Sachs or the Swiss Jakob Ruf,[62] often adapt other legends associated with the protoplasts, or include extra-biblical details of, say, Adam's children, or the various devils (in spite of Luther's insistence on

---

[62] I have discussed these two writers on the Adamic material in the following papers: '"Schöpfung, fal und erlösung": Hans Sachs and Genesis 1–3', in R. Aylett and P. N. Skrine (eds.), *Hans Sachs and Folk Theatre in the Late Middle Ages* (Lewiston: Mellen, 1995), 63–80; and 'Jacob Ruf's *Adam und Heva* and the Protestant Paradise-Play', *Modern Language Review*, 86 (1991), 109–25. In the first of these I also refer to the use of Sachs's material in later folk plays.

sola Scriptura), we may point to the use of the *VAE* material only in a late transmission in a folk play. These folk plays also regularly contain other non-biblical matter, of course, especially a profusion of devils.

The Obergrund play

Only one play reflects our material proper, but the way in which it uses the material and the closeness to the Latin *VAE* is nevertheless remarkable. The Christmas play from Obergrund in Silesia (now Zlaté Hory, on the border between Poland and the Czech Republic), which has the title *Die Erschaffung der Welt sammt der Menschwerdung Jesu Christi* (The Creation of the World with the Incarnation of Jesus Christ) in its early nineteenth-century manu-script, was performed in the 1820s and 1830s. Although far shorter than a comparable Breton drama (examined in Chapter 5, below) it is also of at least sixteenth-century origin, and one indication of its age is precisely that it includes the penance and the second temptation.[63] The biblical temptation is treated fairly briefly, and a longer debate between Justice and Mercy leads to the judgement on Adam and Eve and the serpent as in Genesis 3: 14–21. The angel now sings an aria as he expels them from paradise, after which God tells the audience that one of the Trinity will take on human sins, at which Christ agrees that he will do so. The material from the *VAE* is now introduced in a dialogue between Adam and Eve which corresponds particularly closely to the Latin (the first part of which is largely dialogue in any case). Thus Eve's asking for death matches the *VAE*, as does Adam's reply, and the suggestion of penance, then Eve's question of what that means. Adam again tells Eve that she cannot undertake as much penance as he, and he sends her to the Tigris, saying that he will fast for forty days. She is to remain for thirty days, not speaking because their lips are unworthy.

A stage direction has them kneel, presumably leaving the audience to imagine the river, which Adam now implores to help him weep for his sins. There is in fact no specific mention of the river actually standing still. Another

---

[63] The *Obergrunder Weihnachtsspiel* is in Anton Peter, *Volksthümliches aus Österreich-Schle-sien I* (Troppau: n.p., 1865), 361–78. On its background, see pp. x–xi. See Carl Klimke, *Das volkstümliche Paradiesspiel* (1902; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1977), 82–3, with reference to the *VAE*; on 82 n. 1 he refers to later adaptations of the Obergrund play elsewhere. See Schwarz, *Die neue Eva*, 45 and (on the late dramatic versions) 59; and finally Murdoch, *Adam's Grace*, chapter 5 (with material on later drama in the sixth chapter), and *Medieval Popular Bible*, chapter 2, with reference to comparable plays which do not, however, have our material. On individual details such as the prophecy of a redemption in 5,200 years (usually not from the *VAE*, however), see Georges Duriez, *La Théologie dans le drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge* (Lille: Giard, 1914), 129, for example; the variations he notes are especially interesting.

direction has the devil come to Eve disguised as an angel (in performance this was presumably indicated by costume). The devil's words match the *VAE* once more, however, and Eve is swiftly tempted and taken to Adam (the fainting motif and of course that of the green flesh is not there). Adam responds as in the *VAE*, blames Eve, and then asks the devil directly why they are being persecuted. The devil gives a suitably brief reply, given that there has already been a fall of angels, earlier in the play and without reference to Adam, so that here there is no reference to the worship, simply a statement of envy of the devil's part. His short speech, however, ends as does the *VAE*, with his implicit attempt to link himself with Adam: that Adam has been expelled from paradise just as the devil has been expelled 'aus dem lieben Himmel' (from dear heaven). Adam prays and the devil disappears, after which Eve—her words again close to the *VAE*—departs 'von dem Licht aller Lebendigen' and goes 'bis zum Niedergang der Sonnen' (from the light of all living things . . . to the setting of the sun). Adam is left in sadness—a human note—and wonders whether the devil will tempt her yet again, which may anticipate the scene when Eve's prayers come to him and he is afraid that the devil actually *is* attacking her. At all events, the *VAE* material breaks off here, and the third act of the play (which began with the *ubi es?* of Genesis 3: 9) ends with 'freudige Musik' (cheerful music). Where in the *VAE* we are now given the birth of Cain and its attendant wonders, the reason for the music is clear in that what follows here is in fact a brief fourth act showing us the Annunciation, the miracles leading to the birth not of Cain but of Christ, which we see in the fifth act. However abrupt this may seem, in a short play the Annunciation is an appropriate balance for the temptations of Eve, which then become the main focus of the *VAE* material here, rather than, say, the static river or other (unstageable) miracles, or even details such as Adam's having completed his penance.

What is striking about the use of the material, however, is that it remains remarkably close to the Latin, however abbreviated. The Latin apocryphon was patently known well when the play was composed, and the text in German preserved it at a time when the apocryphon was certainly not much remembered, and would not appear in an edition for many decades. The penance in the (static) river—difficult enough in drama: we shall see different solutions in Breton and Italian to the staging problem—is not really dramatized here, but what we do have nevertheless echoes the *VAE*. Some details *are* present; Eve is to stand in the water up to her neck and in silence. Others are missing: we do not know how many days pass before the devil tempts Eve from the river, because this would not be easy to signal in a play. The material is shortened and simplified in terms of detail not just for the medium used, but for its specific sub-genre, the folk play. Although the Latin

is still surprisingly visible, there is not enough for us to point to a specific source type beyond Meyer's class II or (more probably) III, in the light of Eve's words to Adam (*VAE* 18). The transmission is late, but the material is still very much alive, reflects the original text in a new and specific context, and does so effectively. It even clarifies Eve's words about removing herself from the light. The loss of the devil's reason for hating Adam is entirely understandable, not only in view of the need for brevity, but because an alternative has already been given in the second act, and it is even placed in the mouth of the devil just before he tempts Eve the first time (365). In terms of the use of the *VAE* as a part of European culture, this folk play provides interesting evidence that the disappearance of the material after the Reformation was by no means as complete as might be thought.

LOW GERMAN

There seem to be no full versions thus far published in the continental Low German dialects. Bob Miller, however, has drawn attention to what seems to be the sole Middle Dutch text, which is included in a sermon on the creation and fall in a manuscript of about 1520 (Tilburg KUB KHS 16: Brabantische Katholische Hochschule cod. 16, 305–55a, olim 's-Hertogenbosch Provinc. Genootsch. 644). Miller, who is working on this text, considers that this is probably a mid fifteenth-century translation based largely on Meyer's class II, and written perhaps as 'erbauliche Lektüre', instructive reading matter for lay brothers and sisters in the *Devotio moderna*.[64] The text contains a number of variations which may reflect the source but which in any case present minor changes in the overall story: the birth of Cain is a case in point. On the other hand, some of the apparent variations are less significant and are possibly simply based upon misreadings; omissions may have been made deliberately in this in any case relatively short text, which cites Methodius as the author.

The couple search for food initially for two days, which need only be a misreading of some sort (VII misread or miscopied as II). Eve is instructed to stay in the Tigris for forty days and it is assumed that Adam will stay the same number of days in the Jordan; these times also vary considerably, and virtually all combinations are found. Adam stands on a stone up to his neck, and all the

---

[64] Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 258–9 and private correspondence. I am especially indebted to Bob Miller for letting me see some of his unpublished work on this text, most notably a transcript (upon which I have concentrated exclusively), and if I have misrepresented any elements, the errors are entirely mine.

beasts associated with the Jordan, and the river itself, stand still with him. Eve remains this time for twenty-eight days, and since eighteen is the most familiar (though in vernacular texts other times are found, including eight, for example) a simple error is presumably behind this variation once again. When Eve faints after leaving the water she is simply very ill (the notion appears twice), and the reference to her being green is not present, although this is one of the more durable unusual motifs. Adam challenges the devil, and the devil's reply is in line with the *VAE*. Eve leaves him to go to the west, makes a small hut, and we are told that she is three months pregnant. After she has alerted Adam and he has prayed, Eve is attended by three angels: this may again be a misreading of XII as III, and although the Virtutes are not present, Michael is. The child is born, and this time all we are told is that the child is beautiful (the 'lucidus' reading) and he seems to walk at once, although the point is made very briefly. He is named Cain, and the whole motif of the corn, herbs, or grass, and thus the miraculous element, is almost completely lost. Eve's dream is of Abel's blood on Cain's hands (without the drinking motif), and when Cain kills Abel, we are told that the latter was 12 years old and Adam 200. We are then told that Seth was born 'after this'; Adam lives another 300 years after the birth of Seth and has an (unspecific number of) sons and daughters. Once again the numbers of years vary and are susceptible to error, but the text seems closer here to the biblical Genesis 5: 3–5 in which Adam (as in the *VAE*) is 130 when Seth is born and lives for a further 800 years and has sons and daughters. One imagines that DCCC has been miscopied in the original or misread by the translator as CCC. Adam relates to Seth the story of his translation, and the passage immediately following is missing. Overall, this is a somewhat shortened text with changes which are not especially significant. As Miller comments, there may well be other Low German versions to be discovered.

One further partial reflection of the material is, however, found in a Dutch *Historienbibel*, though it is a small element only. The *Noordnederlandse historiebijbel* has a section headed 'Hoe Eva nog bedrogen wort' (How Eve was tricked again), in which the pair decide on a penance, Adam places Eve on a stone in water (there is nothing more specific given), and he does the same 'op een ander stede' (in another place). After forty days the devil appears 'een ghedaent van enen engel mit enen claren aensicht' (in the guise of an angel with a beautiful appearance, echoing the use of 'claritas' in the *VAE*) and tempts her out of the water. It is interesting that in this extremely brief version that rather specific detail is retained, and also that when she emerges, her body is 'al groen'—the greenness motif is also retained, which is not the case in the far fuller Tilburg text. The passage concludes with a brief moral passage dependent upon the fact that the penance is undertaken in different places,

and stresses that husbands and wives should stay together to avoid the risk of temptation by others. It is an interesting interpretation of the penance. Now, however, the text moves to Cain and Abel. This is an extremely reduced version of the penance episode, therefore, but still retains even quite small details of the original.[65]

The Holy Rood tradition as such, on the other hand, is especially well represented in Low German, and has been studied in detail most notably by Miller once again, specifically in his 1992 thesis, with reference to a number of works. That material goes beyond the scope of the present study, but it is noticeable that late works such as the Low German (and in literary terms impressive) drama of the fall and the redemption by the north German cleric Arnold Immessen, written in about 1480, should, like the Cornish dramas, for example, make detailed use of the Holy Rood material rather than the *VAE*. Immessen's play has an extensive fall of Lucifer and his fellows, though without reference to the *VAE* version, in the quasi-biblical position, the fall of man and the expulsion (with a lament by the protoplasts, but again with no motifs from the *VAE*), the fratricide, and then the (solo) quest of Seth and his return with three seeds. The biblical first part of Genesis is augmented, then, with the completely integrated non-biblical material relating to Lucifer's fall and to the Holy Rood, but not the equally non-biblical *VAE*.[66]

THE SLAV LANGUAGES

The Slavonic (Old Bulgarian, Old Church Slavonic) version of the *Life of Adam and Eve*, a separate element within the Adambook tradition, albeit relatively closely related to the Latin and more especially to the Greek versions, is marked especially by the specific motif of the cheirograph, studied in detail by Michael Stone and others, and the penance scene is related by Eve later in the work. There are also several different Adamic apocrypha extant in

---

[65] M. K. A. van den Berg, *De Noordnederlandse historiebijbel: Een kritische editie met inleiding en aantekeningen van Hs. Ltk. 231 uit de Leidse Universiteitsbibiotheek* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998), 230–1. The lead manuscript used, Leiden University Library MS Letterkunde 231 (olim S. 216), is illustrated and dated 1458. Van den Berg uses a range of others from the mid to the late fifteenth century, and also provides a useful introduction to the *Historienbibel* in general (in French, German, and Dutch).

[66] Arnold Immessen, *Der Sündenfall*, ed. Friedrich Krage (Heidelberg: Winter, 1913). See my entry 'Immessen, Arnold', in Ruh (ed.), *Verfasserlexikon*, iv. 366–8, with details of possible sources (a Middle Low German version of the Middle Dutch book of the Holy Rood—*Dat boec van den houte*).

various forms in Old Church Slavonic, Croatian-Glagolitic, Russian, and other languages, details of which sometimes remain sketchy, though several were printed in collections of apocrypha such as that by Nikolai Tikhonravov in 1863 and others in the latter part of the nineteenth century, when there was considerable interest in these apocryphal writings in the Slav world. The Slavonic *Life* was edited by Vatroslav Jagić in 1893 in a paper presented to the Viennese Academy the year before, and his extensive introduction is invaluable not only for details of the Slavonic versions as such, but, for the present study, also for his final section, in which he examines some relatively late reflexes of the Latin *Vita Adae* in Czech (Old Bohemian), Polish, and (tangentially) Russian. The study of the Old Bohemian material was extended by his colleague G. Polívka in Prague a year or two later.[67]

Jagić's study is full, detailed, and now well over a hundred years old, but it remains indispensable for his analysis of the use of the Latin *VAE* in Slav languages, something which has been largely neglected ever since, although additional material has been noted by Émil Turdeanu and by Bob Miller. In some cases the position regarding the study of the relevant texts remains difficult because they are still not readily available: manuscripts and even incunabula prints (which sometimes survive in a single copy) are not easy to consult, the more so when they are not satisfactorily catalogued, and even

---

[67] Vatroslav Jagić, 'Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen', *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), Philos.histor. Kl. 42 (1893), 1–99, discusses two different redactions of the Slavonic Adambook, and the text, printed as an appendix with a Latin translation, is 83–99. Jagić based his edition on various manuscripts including one version printed by Tikhonravov (see below), i. 1–15, 298–304, another in print from a Belgrade manuscript in Stojan Novaković, *Primeri književnosti i jezika, staroga i srpsko-slovenskogo* (Belgrade: Drzhavne shtamparije, 1877 and later editions), 418–24, and others (see 4–5). Jagić's section on the *VAE* (chapter 7 of the whole) is on 64–82. I regret that I have given the forename of the eminent Slavic scholar (1838–1923)—which also appears as Vratislav—in error as Victor elsewhere. See G. Polívka, 'Die *Vita Adae et Evae* in der altböhm. Literatur', *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 17 (1895), 186–91. On the cheirograph, see Stone, *Adam's Contract with Satan*. On other Croatian material, for example, on which we have little information, see Stone, *History*, 115–16. He refers later to Romanian texts in the Slavonic tradition. Jagić notes on 66–7 n. 1 the existence of a (fragmentary) verse legend in Old Bohemian about the origins of the Adam's apple. For details of other Slav Adam writings see A. I. Yatsimirskii, *Bibliograficheskii obzor apokrifov v yuzhnoslavyanskoi i russkoi pis'menosti*, i (Petrograd: Rossiyskoi akademii nauk, 1921), 76–81 (referring to Jagić), with actual texts in Nikolai Tikhonravov, *Pamyatniki otrechennoi russkoi literatury* (1863), repr. with preface by Michael Samilov (London: Variorum, 1973). See in general Vladimir Kuskov, *A History of Old Russian Literature*, trans. Ronald Vroon ([1977] Moscow: Progress, 1980), 47–8, on the Bogomil heresy and its influence in the spreading of apocrypha, including one clearly concerned with Adam as an object of dispute between God and the devil, with the octipartite Adam motif as well. A recent full survey of the Slavonic tradition is that by Turdeanu, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains*, 75–144 and 404–5 (the latter part on the octipartite creation), plus material on the Rood. One of the few writers to note (following Jagić) the reflection of the *VAE* in the Slav world is Paul Schwarz, *Die neue Eva*, 46.

such published editions as exist appeared usually in eastern Europe in the nineteenth or early twentieth century, and are hard to obtain. Two positive factors, however, must be noted. First, that the work by Jagić was very thorough and detailed, and he cites very extensively in his comparisons, as indeed does Polívka, so that although both used Meyer's text in the familiar way as if it were a standardized *VAE*, much work was done by them in establishing differences and variations, a point that Jagić was indeed aware of in his commentary. It is interesting that he notes the way in which errors in translation can establish themselves as new motifs. Secondly, in this area in particular the resources of the internet have made it easier to establish details, at least, of some of the manuscripts and early printed texts (though inevitably gaps remain); and in the case of Polish, both of the texts discussed by Jagić, which when he was writing had only recently been edited in Kraków in the 1890s, are now available online to the scholar by way of the Wielkopolska Digital Library.

In the Slav languages, then, the Latin *VAE* was known in Czech, or more strictly Old Bohemian, within the boundaries of the Holy Roman Empire, and where the knowledge of the text, which had a very strong German tradition, would be expected, so that we have texts not in the Slavonic tradition but dependent upon the *VAE*; and also in Catholic Poland, still very much part of the Latin Church, so that the knowledge of the *VAE* in Polish is also unsurprising. It must be recalled that the work was also translated into Croatian, where it is known from a late manuscript, and also (outside the Slav languages) into Hungarian. A reasonable number of manuscripts of the Latin *VAE* may still be found in libraries in the appropriate regions: Pettorelli, who distinguishes for the first time a Bohemian redaction of the Latin text as such, includes in his survey manuscripts now in Bratislava, Kraków (three manuscripts), Olomouc, and Prague (four manuscripts), many of them late redactions, and there will also have been incunabula copies available.[68]

The cases of Old Bohemian and Polish are, in fact, strikingly parallel, although the Bohemian material is earlier. One of the relevant Polish texts, too, seems to have moved further east and to have been translated into Russian. Indeed, the Polish prose *Historyja barzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemi* (The very miraculous history of the creation of heaven and earth) by a courtier, Krzysztof Pussman from Kraków, in the middle of the sixteenth

---

[68] Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 245–51, and see his location index. The manuscripts he included in his new group are currently in a variety of locations, however. There is also an interesting late text in Ljubljana; see 285–6. He was unable to comment in detail on the second manuscript of the *VAE* currently in Hungary (in Esztergom), 290 (that now in Budapest is assigned to the Bohemian group).

century, begins with the biblical creation story and follows this with the *VAE*, and may thus serve as a very late and remote opposite marker for the spread and detailed knowledge of the text, providing a formal, chronological, and geographical point of distance from, say, the Irish *Saltair na Rann*.

Old Bohemian

Jagić described in his study of the Slavonic Adambooks two manuscripts of an Old Bohemian prose translation of the *VAE*, one full and one fragmentary, with the (in fact correct) comment that there were presumably more versions of what was referred to as the *Kniha o Adamĕ a Evĕ* (Book of Adam and Eve). He noted that the two texts known to him had been printed for the first time by František Xaver Prusík in the literary-scholarly journal of which the latter was the editor, *Krok*, 2 (1888), nos. 5, 6, and 7. Prusík had used MS 3.F.22 of the Prague National Museum, which he dated to 1414, as well as another (later) fragmentary text covering only the first twelve sections, although he had considered (later studies rejected this) that the fragmentary version was older. G. Polívka drew attention to a third relevant manuscript, Prague University MS XVII B 15, of 1465. As indicated, both scholars used the Latin texts offered and categorized by Meyer as their yardstick. Jagić examined in detail the two versions printed by Prusík, and Polívka focused upon the University Library manuscript. A fourth (not edited) has been noted since.[69] Prusík had taken the Museum text and the fragment to be independent of one another, and had linked the former with Meyer's class III and the latter with class II. Jagić rejected this, noting that the two texts, though not the same, are nevertheless connected to one another, and further, that neither is consistently closer to the Latin. After section 13, in any case, no further comparison is possible with the fragmentary MS, so that the 1414 manuscript necessarily takes precedence, and it corresponds indeed to Meyer's class III. Thus Jagić

---

[69] Prusík's edition in *Krok* is difficult to obtain. Jagić gives some direct extracts from the text on 77–8 (describing the fragmentary MS as Francisc. Hs A, F. 3), and in his study discusses the text in detail in comparison with Meyer's versions. Sometimes it is not quite clear, however, whether Jagić is citing a Latin version or is himself translating the Old Bohemian (his translation of the Old Church Slavonic Adambook is into Latin). Polívka also considers the (unedited manuscript) text of the third version in some detail and quotes widely from the original, and we must be grateful for their efforts. Interestingly, the text in *Krok* was categorized under the general heading of *duchovní romány*, 'spiritual novels', and associated with, for example, *Joseph and Assenath*, which has been described as an early novella. See Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 254–5 nn. 46–7 and 51: he draws attention to a fourth manuscript of the same text from 1502 (254 n. 47), in the library of Křivoklát castle (Pürglitz), not far from Prague (MS I c 28).

demonstrates how the Old Bohemian text follows the motif, in Meyer's class III and the incunabula, of how 'the angel of the lord showed Eve how to nurse and feed the child'. Meyer's text reads, from three fifteenth-century manuscripts all now in Munich: 'angelus vero domini ostendit Evae, qualiter puerum (ab)lactare deberet et nutrire', which is almost exactly matched by the Old Bohemian: 'andiel pak boží Evie poviediel a nauczil ji, kterak by dieti krmila a chovati miela.'[70] Jagić provides a variety of similar examples underlining the fact that this version is based largely on what Meyer saw as class III, the text most widely used in Germany. In *VAE* 30 the versions of class III used by Meyer refer to Adam's progeny as 'XV milia virorum exceptis mulieribus et parvulis', which can be rendered as L and V rather than XV, and which is presumably a scribal error. Jagić considers it to be a scribal error, too, when in *VAE* 31 all the sons speak to Adam, rather than just Seth. This is entirely plausible, since just before, all the sons have spoken to Adam, and indeed, in some versions (Pettorelli's Paris text, for example) the second reference is just to 'filius eius', without Seth being named. A further minor mistranslation (which in this case makes little sense in the context) seems to occur in the description of Eve's and Seth's confrontation with the serpent on the way to paradise, which concludes (in Meyer's lead text) after Seth's assertion of the image of God with the comment: 'statim recessit plaga de dentibus a Seth.' Jagić notes that the Old Bohemian translation loses the idea of teeth and reads as if it were 'statim recessit a plaga'. That an error should occur here, however, is not especially surprising, since the passage—as a glance at Meyer's or Mozley's apparatus, or indeed at any of the other Latin versions (and translations) makes clear—was particularly prone to variation and indeed to misunderstanding or garbling ('dentibus' appears as 'sentibus' in one of the English manuscripts!).[71] As in class III texts, Adam is buried at Calvary, and the Holy Rood material is now appended. The variations noted, then, seem to be all insignificant or based on scribal errors.

Polívka presents a different Old Bohemian prose text from MS XVII B 15 in Prague University Library, dated to 1465, and this seems to be very close to that of Meyer's class I, much of it literally done. Thus even the frequently distorted passage referred to above after the serpent has left Seth is rendered literally. The somewhat florid title given to the text in this version, however, refers to the fact that three chapters of the biblical Genesis ('trzi kapitoly z Biblie') are prefaced to this 'book of the life and death of our father Adam and

---

[70] See Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 228 n., and Jagić, 'Beiträge', 65. It is not in the *Magnum legendarium Austriacum* texts.

[71] Polívka, 'Die *Vita Adae*', 188, gives the version from the third MS, which follows the Latin closely and accurately.

our mother Eve', underscoring presumably that what follows is therefore *not* in fact biblical. The title is therefore interesting. That the biblical Genesis material is used as an introduction is familiar enough, both in versions of the *VAE* and certainly in vernacular adaptations, and Polívka draws attention to the similarity with the Munich MS clm 3866, mentioned by Meyer, which has three Vulgate chapters in the same position. Again a number of passages in this Old Bohemian text seem to diverge from any of the Latin versions of the *VAE* used by Meyer; as we have seen so often, this may not necessarily mean that the translator is acting independently, but might simply point yet again to a version not known at the time (or still unknown). Polívka's fairly brief article draws attention to deviations from Meyer's class I text, but these are once again all relatively small, and Polívka even notes that sometimes these match Meyer's second class; yet this simply demonstrates the problems of taking one Latin version as any kind of standard. More interesting are the passages in which the Old Bohemian diverges completely from the known Latin texts; Polívka provides about a dozen instances, but again most are very minor variations indeed, and some occur in passages where the Latin itself is especially variable, while others, indeed, do not seem very much like actual variations at all. Polívka comments that Adam's injunction of silence during the penance, for example, is based upon the fact that their lips have been sullied by eating the fruit (emphasizing 'posskwrnieni', cf. modern Czech *skvrna*, 'blemish'), something which Polívka claims is found here and in the other Old Bohemian versions, but not in the Latin, although 'labia immunda . . . de ligno' is hardly very far away. Eve's comments on the birth of Cain (she names him herself) seem to match the biblical etymology of Genesis 4: 1, and she herself (rather than Adam) names Seth. However, the variation noted for *VAE* 29 ('de paradiso vistationis et iussionis dei') may very well rest on a variant in the Latin original. The Museum MS reads 'videnie', representing 'visionis', which is the reading in several Latin MSS, whilst in others the second genitive is missing entirely. Of course 'iussionis' might easily be mistaken for 'uisionis' in manuscript. This Old Bohemian version, which seems to refer to paradise as a place of the visitation and *dwelling* of God, might be a mistranslation, or a misreading, or was a variant in the original. In *VAE* 42, in the passage originating in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, Polívka notes that the reading in all the Old Bohemian texts refers to a resurrection after 5,199 years ('ducenti uno minus'), as in Meyer's class II and III versions. This again varies considerably across *VAE* texts in any case, and Polívka notes that some versions of the Nicodemus Gospel in Old Bohemian also show variation, possibly through scribal error. This Old Bohemian translation of the *Vita* ends with the passage about Seth's tablets and their reading by Solomon. Polívka cites the ending in full, noting that it appears only in some *VAE*

versions; the letters are called 'Achyleyky' and the interpretation refers to books.

The variations offered by the various Old Bohemian versions (for which an edition and translation is still a desideratum) do not seem to be particularly extensive, nor are they usually particularly significant in developing the apocryphon. Their importance is first in the evidence for a variety of prose translations in Bohemia presumably before the fifteenth century which spread the Latin *VAE* into Slav linguistic territory; secondly, however, the prefacing of what are expressly marked as biblical chapters to one version contextualizes the apocryphon in a particular manner. Bob Miller draws attention, finally, to a Czech text printed by the early printer Mikuláš Bakalář in or around 1498 which represents a compilation of the *Vita* and the Holy Rood material, which has again not been reprinted in recent times.[72] The sole (defective) copy is currently in the Strahovská library in Prague (D R IV 37/i) and it was printed in Plzeň (Pilsen). The text is entitled in the tailpiece 'Žiwot Adama a Ewy' (Life of Adam and Eve), and it merges the Holy Rood material—including for example the Maximilla episode—into the *VAE*; it ends with the injunctions to Seth about the length of mourning and Seth's inscribing the story of his parents on the tablets, which are therefore the final guarantee of the authenticity of the story. It is interesting, too, that the whole thing should be seen as the life of Adam and Eve, even though it clearly contains Holy Rood material in detail as well.[73]

Jagić rightly noted in his analysis that the Old Bohemian versions of the *VAE* become independent works, and it is of further interest and equally significant that one Old Bohemian translation seems to have been recontextualized for use within another later work, a text sometimes dubbed *Solfernus* (which is the name of a devil), and of which Jagić's nineteenth-century comment about its obscurity certainly still holds true, that 'das böhmische Werk in der europäischen Literatur wenig oder gar nicht bekannt ist' (he adds that it is also rarely mentioned by *national* literary historians). This second instance of the knowledge of the *VAE* in Old Bohemian comes in a work

---

[72] Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 254–5, and 'Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen', 297. A reprint and study of this text would be of interest in the context of other early vernacular prints (Danish, Italian, Polish).

[73] As Miller has noted, the text has been considered a *VAE* translation only. Mladen Bošnjak, *A Study of Slavic Incunabula* (Zagreb: Kubon und Sagner, 1968), no. 31. It is described in detail with photographs of the first and last pages, the latter with the title, in the internet database of early Czech printed books (<http://www.clavmon.cz/clvis/sstisky/repertorium/urb49.html>). Although listed as defective, it does not seem that much is missing; again further study is required, however.

which is described as a 'Teufelsroman', a 'book of devils',[74] and its complex literary history is described by Jagić in sometimes bewildering detail. The work is contained in various manuscripts, again respectively from the Prague Museum (3. F. 23) and University (XVII. F. 26) collections, all fifteenth century. There is also a Prague printed version by Syxt von Ottersdorf and Jan Kosořský from 1553, with various later prints into the eighteenth century. The title of the anonymous work is extensive and variable, and it is probably best to refer to it as *Ziwot Adamuw* (even if this merely means 'Life of Adam' and even though it is not the same as the *VAE*), with *Solfernus* as an alternative. Phrygonius (Ffrigonius), which is also found in reference texts, is the name in one of the manuscript versions for the supposed author, a 'Doctor Jerosolimitanus', allegedly a Jewish Christian convert who wrote the book in Arabic, from which it was supposedly translated into Latin.[75]

The text itself is long and complex, and Jagić usefully provides from the 1553 print a summary based on the ninety chapter heads, with translations. The work is in effect a *processus juris Satanici*, a legal debate with a plurality of devils about their rights, a type of literature that is itself part of a ramified tradition. Diabolical councils prior to the temptation of Adam are common,

---

[74] The term is a very general one, and the later Middle Ages of course devoted much time and space to the description and deeds of a plurality of devils, not always in the context of Adam and Eve, and certainly not always with the *VAE* material. As a very different example, the Karslruhe Codex 408, a large fifteenth-century collection of German narrative verse, contains a series of pieces on the creation of the angels, on Michael, and on Adam, which concludes with 'Das teuffel buch' (book of devils), which is simply a list of numerous devils with their special tasks: Ursula Schmid (ed.), *Codex Karlsruhe 408* (Berne: Francke, 1974), 472–8. There is a long and interesting study of the devils by Christoph Gerhardt, 'Von der biblischen Kleinerzählung zum geistlichen Spiel', *Euphorion*, 93 (1999), 349–97. Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 255, refers to the German *Belial* (translated from Jacobus de Theramo in the later fifteenth and much printed in the sixteenth century). The whole tradition of the *Processus Sathanae* is a complex one.

[75] As Jagić notes, the reference in J. G. T. Graesse's encyclopedic reference work *Trésor des livres rares et précieux* (1859–69; repr. Milan: Görlich, 1950), v. 277 to a work called *Phrygonius: Vita Adami vel alias antiquitus Solfernus . . . Pragae 1553* is in fact the work referred to already, simply described in Latin, rather than an actual separate Latin work. Jagić gives the Old Bohemian opening and a translation in his study, 68 nn. 1–3. On 67 he gives a version of the title and notes that accurate bibliographical descriptions of the print are hard to find, but again it is now slightly easier to find details of the text from copies referred to in earlier bibliographies: there was one, for example, in the Royal Library in Dresden. Karl Falkenstein, *Beschreibung der königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden* (Dresden: Walther, 1839), 728, which gives the title as: *Ziwot Adamuw a neb ginak od starodawna Solfernus, Knyha welmi Kratochwylna a vtiessena* etc. *MDLIII*. Jagić describes the later printed versions, and cites Josef Jungmann, *Historie literatury České* (Prague: Řiwnáč, 2nd edn. 1849), 113 (= III: 900); Jagić also refers, 69 n. 1, to a missing MS. In that note he seems to imply that Prague Museum MS 3 F. 22 (which contains the prose translation of the *VAE*) also contains this text. If this is the case, it is an interesting collocation, but it is not clear. Jagić also refers to the Old Bohemian prose translation of the *VAE* as *Život*, however.

especially in the later drama, where a multiplicity of devils is usual. There is a large literature, too, about the devil's rights, and councils of devils meet to discuss Christ, to worry about the harrowing (in the Nicodemus Gospel), or indeed to discuss the first temptation of Adam and Eve. The celestial debate about the fate of the protoplasts involving the four daughters of God or the debates between Justice and Mercy is another tradition.[76] In this work we have assertions of their rights by the devils, who have refused originally to do homage to God (Lucifer's name is changed to Luciper thereafter: the name-change motif is not unfamiliar in medieval literature),[77] their debate against God, Raphael, and Michael, and then a diabolical discussion of the over-coming of Adam. Adam and Eve are tempted and fall, but in chapters 54–6 they discuss their penance, whereupon the devils decide to tempt Eve again, this time out of the Tigris, and thereafter Cain and Abel are born. It is, however, expanded and adapted somewhat, since in this case (after some debate) a devil called Loquencius tempts Eve on Luciper's behalf, both in Eden and when she is in the Tigris, arriving in the latter case disguised as an angel and weeping, just like the devil in the *VAE*. Jagić provides parallels with the Old Bohemian prose text that demonstrates the closeness of this text with the versions of the *VAE* in the two manuscripts used by him, and Polívka confirms that this is the case, rather than the University MS recension of the prose *VAE* translation, drawing attention to the additional fact that in one passage at least the *Żiwot Adamuw/ Solfernus* version matches the Museum MS 3. F. 22 against both other Old Bohemian texts and indeed the Latin in a small point. That there are also omissions in the *Solfernus* version compared with that text is to be expected, and Polívka's correct conclusion is that the devil-book used a version like that in 3. F. 22.[78] The text continues with the death of Abel, and then the death of Adam and the reiteration (in chapter 60)

---

[76] Jagić's summary of the ninety chapters is in 'Beiträge', 70–6. See such studies as C. W. Marx, *The Devil's Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1995) and his edition of *The Devil's Parliament and the Harrowing of Hell* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1993). There is an earlier discussion in the context of Milton by Olin H. Moore, 'The Infernal Council', *Modern Philology*, 16 (1918/19), 169–93. The *Processus Paradisi* tradition and that of the 'four daughters of God' is also ramified: Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God*, Bryn Mawr College Monographs (Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Winston, 1907). The legalistic aspect of the cheirograph motif (in the Slavonic Adambook) is not part of this, however.

[77] See my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 31–2.

[78] Jagić, 'Beiträge', 77 n. 1: he draws attention to the expansion of the original *VAE* material by the addition of different and rather argumentative devil tempters rather than as in the Old Bohemian prose versions, where it is 'Ssathan aneb diabel', who goes in the likeness of an angel to Eve in the Tigris, following the *VAE* very closely. See also Polívka, 'Die *Vita Adae*', 191. Jagić also notes the name similarity between Loquencius and the devil Ljakuceus elsewhere in Slavonic apocryphal writing: 'Beiträge', 47, associated with Satanael in the Bogomil traditions.

of the story of the fall, after which he sends Seth and Eve to paradise for the oil of mercy ('Adam poslal Ewu a Sétha syna sweho k Branám Rayským pro oley milosrdenstwij'). This passage is curtailed, however, and there is no mention of the incident with the serpent en route for paradise. Adam dies and is sent to limbo, after which the devils, especially Solfernus, try to get him to join them, which he refuses, and God instructs the devils by letter not to torture him. The devils try to tempt Eve again even after death (this time without success) to go against God, but she and all those who follow remain in limbo. In the last part, Mercy wins the final trial and Christ is sent to the world. After the crucifixion, hell is harrowed and Adam released. We have in Old Bohemian, then, not only a continuation of the tradition with fairly close translations into the vernacular of the Latin prose, but a reasonably full adaptation of the text with some augmentation in the *Žiwot Adamuw* or *Solfernus*, a theological work very hard to classify, but one which lasts in print for a considerable time.

Polish and Russian

The position in Polish is in some ways similar to that in Old Bohemian, though the transmission is certainly later. Jagić also discusses the Polish reflections of the *VAE* in the final section of his study, but in this case we have more accessible texts of both of the relevant works, the first a translation, albeit from a printed text, and incorporated into an overall narrative of the biblical life of the protoplasts, the other once again a *Processus Sathanae*, which, although it is part of the same tradition, is not the same as the Old Bohemian *Žiwot Adamuw*. Both of these Old Polish texts were edited in the series of Polish documents (*Biblijoteka pisarzów polskich*) published by the Kraków academy in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The first, already mentioned, presents a prose translation of the *Vita Adae* within a context. Krzysztof Pussman's *Historyja barzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemi* (The very miraculous history of the creation of heaven and earth) was written in 1543 and published in Kraków in 1551.[79] The *VAE* material is here adapted,

---

See on this Turdeanu, 'Apocryphes bogomiles', especially the first part on Satanael. The article was reprinted in Turdeanu's *Apocryphes slaves et roumains*, 1–74.

[79] Krzysztof Pussman, *Historyja barzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemi 1551*, ed. Zygmunt Celichowski (Kraków: Jagiellonian University, 1890). Page references in the discussion of the work below are to this (sole) edition. Celichowski offers a brief introduction, and the edition reproduces the original title page (Kraków: [Hieronymus] Scharffenberg, 1551). The edited text is provided with descriptive indications, but not reproductions of the illustrations. The edition is available digitally in the Wielkopolska collection. The text is described and very briefly discussed in Jagić, 'Beiträge', 78–9, and even more briefly in Ole Michael Selberg, *Forelesninger over polsk middelalderlitteratur* (Oslo: Universitet i Oslo, 2001 = available at <http:\\home.c2i.

and the claim is made on the title page that this has been done 'teraz nowo na polskie z pilnością wyłożona' (now newly and diligently expounded into Polish), a claim repeated in almost the same words in the preface. As might be guessed from the full title, the biblical story of the creation and fall precedes the *VAE* material, which, although faithfully translated, has interpolations or expansions based on the Bible as far as the Cain and Abel narrative is concerned. The text, finally, is illustrated with woodcuts, but there are none relating to the *VAE* material, only to the biblical Genesis.

As the editor points out, we know virtually nothing about the Kraków author beyond what he tells us in his own dedicatory preface. He styles himself 'Krysztof Pussman Krakowczyk', and dedicates the work to Jadwiga Bonarowa z d. Kościelecka, chatelaine of Bieck; he had apparently been a courtier at the castle of Bieck, had fallen from favour, and was attempting to regain the grace of his former patron. As Celichowski points out, we do not know whether this worked, and in fact the dates associated with the text are interesting, although research into this goes well beyond the scope of the present study: the author's introduction is dated 14 August 1543 and the publication date is 1551. Jadwiga became chatelaine after the death of Burggrave Seweryn Bonar in 1549, since her sons were minors. She appears to have converted to Calvinism in 1552 and was accused of heresy. Bieck is in the voivodship of Kraków. The full set of titles associated with the family (including inspector of the salt mines) is given in the dedication. The precise context of this particular work invites speculation, especially given that it seems to have been written during the lifetime of Seweryn Bonar, but published during Jadwiga's regency as chatelaine, and it is to be hoped that the matter can be pursued by a Polish historian. The edited text is based on a copy from the Biblioteka Kórnicka by Poznań which is defective, the very last part being supplemented from another exemplar in the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków, probably printed later and without illustrations. In his brief discussion of the text, Jagić notes how the Polish text differs from the Old Bohemian version, the transmission of which is indeed older. The Polish version wants some

net/omselberg/>), 110, although it remains otherwise virtually unknown. Celichowski notes that in one earlier bibliographical text the name is wrongly given as Prussman. I have been unable to consult Maria Adamczyk, '*Vita Adae et Evae . . . (Apokalipsa Mojżesza?*) w apokryficznych wersjach starobułgarskiej i staropolskiej', in Mariola Walczak-Mikołajczakowa and Bogusław Zieliński (eds.), *Z małą ojczyzną w serzu (Festschrift for Tadeusz Zdanciewicz)* (Poznań: Uniwersitet im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2005). Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 255 n. 52, points out that the text is also in Julian Krzyżanowski, *Proza polska wczesnego renesansu 1510–1550* (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1954), 283–99. Miller also notes, 255–6, the existence of a further (unedited) Polish version in a seventeenth-century manuscript now in Russia in the National Library in St Petersburg (MS Polskia I 4° 13, fos. 31–6).

interpolated prayers, but against this expands the Cain and Abel section using the biblical Genesis 4. Some of the Sethite quest is missing in comparison with the Old Bohemian version (such as the attack by the serpent on Seth), and other passages are shortened. There are some differences in small detail, too. The burial place of Adam is here given as Hebron again, but that is absent from the Old Bohemian. In fact there is no reason why the Old Bohemian and Polish versions should be connected in any case, the Polish texts having their own direct Latin source. This sketch of the differences, however, leads one already to suspect that the source for Pussman's text is one of the incunabula versions: the loss of some parts of the Sethite quest and the initial Genesis contextualization both point to this conclusion, which is unsurprising given the date of the work in any case. At all events, we are presented here with a 'very miraculous history' described in the preface as a useful work, which does not claim biblical status as such, but which uses biblical material (and in some places is completely true to the Bible), and reinforces this with woodcut illustrations of the biblical elements of the story (the creation of Eve from Adam's side, Eve giving the fruit to Adam, and so on). It is divided into twenty-three unnumbered but headed chapters or sections, those headings giving a brief summary of the content, with the *VAE* material beginning at Chapter 6. The preceding material is based on Genesis 1–3 and does not contain, for example, the non-biblical fall of the angels.

The first *VAE* section (16) closely follows *VAE* 1–4, namely the search for food, and then Eve's desire for death and Adam's refusal, followed by the suggestion of a penance. The next, seventh, chapter head (17) matches the subheading or title of many Latin versions: 'O pokutowaniu Jadama i Jewy' (On the penance of Adam and Eve), and renders *VAE* 5–7. Eve is to stand on a stone for thirty days in the Tigris, not speaking because their lips are unworthy. Adam will stand for forty days in the Jordan, both periods being normal variations. Chapter 8 (18; *VAE* 8–11) describes how the Jordan stops flowing for Adam, in this case for eighteen days ('nie płynac przez ośmnaście dni'). In one of the English manuscripts noted by Mozley ('*Vita Adae*', 130, on line 17) a similar formulation is found—admittedly referring there to nineteen days— which is more specific than the basic form in which the river simply stops. Satan or the devil ('szatan', 'dyabeł') tempts Eve again in angelic disguise, and she emerges from the water 'jako ziele' ('like weed', an equivalent for 'sicut herba') from the cold. Incunabula versions omit the adjective 'green' in any case, and the closeness between this word and the normal adjective (*zielony*, green) renders it unnecessary in any case. The rest is close to the Latin, as indeed is the next chapter (9, 19–20), which renders *VAE* 11 to 16 and the devil's account of his fall, which has not been presented earlier. Chapter 10 (20–1, *VAE* 17–21) has the completion of Adam's penance, Eve's departure for

the west, her labour pains and prayers to the sun and moon, then Adam's intervention. Twelve angels assist the birth, though the two Virtutes are absent, as in the incunabulum text, and we also have the passage (supporting again an incunabulum text as source, though it is also in Meyer's class III texts) in which Eve expresses in her ignorance a desire that Adam should kill the child before it kills them, which he refuses to do; this reads: 'Eua vero ignorans [et admirans: not in all versions: see Mozley, 134; it is not in the Polish] quid hoc esset quod peperat dixit ad Adam: domine mi interfice hoc ne nos forte interficiamur per illud. respondit Adam; nequaquam sanguis enim et caro nostra est' (Mozley's text from an English incunabulum reverses the order to 'flesh and blood', which matches the Polish). As a demonstration of the closeness, the Polish offers an almost word-for-word translation: 'Jewa tedy, nie wiedząc, coby było to, co porodziła, rzekł a wnet ku Jadamowi: panie miły, zabij to, abyśmy snać nie byli sami pobici przez to. Odpowiedział Jadam: żadnym obyczajem, abowiem ciało i krew nasza krew.'[80] The question of Cain fetching herbs for his mother is replaced by this motif, and the vexed issue of the rendering of 'et erat lucidus' does not arise, since that too is not in the incunabulum text. Finally, the passage (noted also in the Old Bohemian text, which has been suggested as a supplementary source, but is found in other manuscript and printed versions) in which Michael shows Eve how to feed and nurse the child forms the conclusion to this chapter. The eleventh chapter of the Polish text (21–2) has an illustration showing Eve with Adam, who is cutting wood—an image acceptable to and perhaps taken from a biblical cycle—although the brief chapter renders *VAE* 22–3 without the last sentence referring to the death of Abel. The fratricide is taken up in the following, twelfth chapter (22–3): 'Jako Kaim zabił Abla brata swego i jako złorzeczył Bóg Kaimowi' (How Cain killed his brother Abel, and how God cursed Cain), which uses the single *VAE* sentence that Cain killed Abel, and then develops the story of Cain with reference to Genesis 4: 1–17, down to the birth of Enoch. The thirteenth chapter (23–4) looks ahead to Adam's death, but begins with the birth of Seth in *VAE* 24 and the fact that Adam had thirty sons and thirty daughters. As with the incunabulum version, the Polish text gives the age of Adam (normally 122 years, here 120, 'sto i dwadzieścia lat') at the birth of Seth. The *VAE* texts either note that the total of Adam's children is sixty-three, or spell out the names of Cain, Abel, and Seth after the reference to the two sets of thirty offspring, which is what the Polish text does. The Polish moves on then directly to *VAE* 30, giving Adam's (also biblical) age of

---

[80] Latin cited from Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 228. The incident is also in Folz, but there it is, as indicated, somewhat developed: Murdoch, *Folz*, 63–4, and there is evidence of both this and the herb-fetching idea.

930 at death. The omission of *VAE* 25–9 is yet again a feature of the incunabula versions, but there is a similar shift even in the far earlier Paris recension edited by Pettorelli, and thus there is a certain amount of variation across the versions at this point. *VAE* 30–4, Adam's speech to his sons, is followed, and then chapter 14 of the Polish text (25) covers *VAE* 35–6, in which Adam sends Eve and Seth to the gates of paradise for the oil of mercy. *VAE* 37–9 is omitted, so that there is nothing of the incident in which the serpent attacks Seth, a passage which *is* present in the Old Bohemian version, and chapter 15 (25–6) leads directly into the Holy Rood story, in that Seth is given three twigs (here 'trzech listów', three leaves) after the prophecy of a redemption after 5,199 years (here in direct imitation of the formulation 'quinque milia et ducenti uno minus' as in the incunabula and some manuscripts: 'pięć tysięcy lat i dwieście bez roku'). The narrative of Seth dropping the twigs in the Jordan and their recovery is the substance of chapters 16 and 17 (26–7), whilst chapter 18 covers the death of Adam in *VAE* 46. References to Uriel are missing (this is sometimes the case even in manuscript versions), Seth sees the hand of God over Adam, and he is buried in Hebron, which specifically and rather unusually is seen as a hill, the mount of Hebron, 'na górze Ebron'. Calvary might have been expected as Adam's burial place, and Hebron is usually a valley, although the Balliol Latin text does have Adam living 'in ualle Ebron', but buried 'in monte Ebron'.[81] The twigs from paradise are planted at his head. Chapter 19 (28–9; Celichowski's edition from this point follows the Kraków exemplar) provides a very brief description of the tree which grows from Adam's head, passing rapidly from Solomon to Christ. Chapters 20 and 21 are concerned (29–30) with the death of Eve (*VAE* 49); usually she dies after six days, here simply 'Po wielu tedy dni' (then after many days), but she calls her sons and daughters as in the *VAE* and tells them of the judgement by water and fire, then instructs them to write the story of the fall on stone and clay tablets. This is done in the next chapter (*VAE* 50–1), which concludes the text proper with an 'Amen'. The final two sections do not relate to the *VAE*.

It is clear, then, that the translation was made from one of the incunabula versions, and it is close in most respects as a translation. It adds little, therefore, to the apocryphon as such, the variations are very small where they do occur, and there is virtually nothing which cannot be attested elsewhere in the tradition. The interest lies again in the fact that the work, embedded (consciously) in a biblical context and illustrated (in the lead exemplar, at least) with pictures which do reflect the biblical Genesis, should

---

[81] Mozley, '*Vita Adae*', 135 and 144. See Hilhorst, 'Ager Damascenus', on the complexities of this motif.

have been composed and printed as late as the mid-sixteenth century in Poland. By the time of the incunabula versions, of course, the substance had settled considerably, and some of the notoriously enigmatic parts had been smoothed over (as at the birth of Cain). But the initial point of the penance is still there, still answering the question of whether Adam and Eve attempted to return to paradise. The Holy Rood link is present, but the summary after the planting of the twigs is fairly brief. What is present is the clear promise of the redemption, and the final substantive chapter gives St Michael the last word, offering the notion of Christ as the redeemer ('zbawiciel', 30).

The second Polish text was edited by Artur Benis in the same series two years later than the Pussman version, from a printed text of 1570, and in this case there seems also to be a Russian translation of it, indicating perhaps the furthest extent of the material as such, although the Russian version is less accessible. The Polish work is the anonymous *Postępek prawa czartowskiego przeciw narodowi ludziemi* (The devil's legal case against humankind), which, like the *Život Adamuw/Solfernus*, integrates a small amount only of the material into a rather different but loosely related work concerned with the devil's rights.[82]

The Polish work contains a profusion of devils, but as Jagić notes, Luciper is the devil's name throughout, without an original Lucifer form. The devils all have rather different names, all Polish sounding, and sometimes they are speaking names, such as Mrokot (Polish *mrok*, dark); local names for devils are often used in devil books and a profusion of devils is found in other vernaculars, from Cornish to German. The defective opening does indicate that the devil is expelled for refusing to worship Adam, and he does indeed protest that he was created first and that Adam should worship him (8), the motif in the *VAE* told by Lucifer himself after the second temptation. The first fall is brought about by the devil called Postawa (perhaps something like 'arrogance'), but there is no indication of the penance and second fall. We do, however, have the motif, attached to *VAE* 21 in class III and notably in the incunabula versions, that Eve wishes to kill her first-born son (20), which Adam resists by referring to the fact that this is their flesh and blood (here

---

[82] *Postępek prawa czartowskiego przeciw narodowi ludziemi*, ed. Artur Benis (Kraków: Jagiellonian University, 1892). Page numbers are given in the discussion of the work, below. Only one copy is known, and the print is defective. It carries the indication *Drukowano w Brześciu Litovskim u Cypryana Bazylika, 1570* (printed at Brest Litovsk by C.B.). The copy is from the Biblioteka Czartoryska collection in Kraków. Benis refers in his brief introduction to Pussman (2) and to the extent and complexity of the history of the *Processus Sathanae*, from which tradition this work is a compilation, 3–5. Jagić notes, 'Beiträge', 80, that the Russian translation, though rather later, can assist with the gaps in the Polish version, and gives the chapter heads in Polish and Russian on 80–2.

'krewci to nasza i ciało', 21, twice, and, unlike the Pussman text, in the order found in most versions of the *VAE*). She blames this urge of hers on the devil Mrokot. The devils debate too about the soul of Abel. Section 10 of the work is headed 'O śmierci Adama' (on the death of Adam, 56–60) and this has some interesting features. In fact it reads in some respects more like a Holy Rood narrative, in that Adam sends only Seth to paradise, and this time not for the oil of mercy but quite specifically to fetch the rods or twigs from the tree of life ('różdżkę z drewa żywotnego'), which an angel gives him. The incunabula versions in particular have the motif that Seth drops the twigs into the Jordan, but here they fall instead into the Tigris, which is an interesting confusion, and perhaps indicates some knowledge at least of the penance motif. At all events, the Tigris, as one of the rivers of paradise (which the Jordan is not), is more logical. The rods are placed at Adam's head when he is buried, and we then have a very rapid history of the Rood, moving to Solomon and Saba (Sheba), and then to Christ. Adam's soul is taken with those of Eve and Abel to limbo. There is not very much of the *VAE* here, and some of the material is a little garbled, but it does seem at least to have been known and used in this curious work, which was then translated into Russian. At all events, at this late stage and at this distance, only elements of the *VAE* have survived, and in a sometimes garbled form (Tigris for Jordan).

Jagić, noting that this text was translated into Russian (it is found in several manuscripts but has never been printed), refers to 1687 as the possible date of translation. He was, however, able to supply a list of the headings of the Russian version in parallel with the surviving Polish chapter heads, although it is unclear how much of, and how closely, the Polish was actually translated.[83] Thanks to Jagić, then, we are at least able to determine that elements of the *VAE* were known in Russia in the seventeenth century, so that our geographical end point for vernacular adaptations is in the awareness, if not the detailed knowledge, of a Russian text which has the title (or initial chapter head) *Protiv cheloveka vsyechestnago bozhiya tvoryeniya zavistnoye syzhdeniye i zloye povdeniye proklyatogo demona* (Against man, the most honourable of God's creatures, the wicked judgement and improper case by the accursed devil). The apocryphon is in its final stages.

---

[83] 'Beiträge', 80–2. He notes that references to manuscripts of the work are found in I. A. Shlyapkin, *Sv. Dmitrii Rostovskii i ego vremya* (St Petersburg: Transhel, 1891), 91, and in the catalogue of the Khludov collection in the State Museum in Moscow by Andrei Popov, *Opisaniye rukopisey biblioteki A. I. Khludova* (Moscow: Sinodal'noy, 1872), 494–5 (= no. 246). Jagić bases his material on the summary given by Popov. Attention was apparently first drawn to the text by Aleksander Brückner, 'Ein polnisches Teufelsbuch und seine russische Übersetzung', *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 15 (1892), 470–5. Miller refers to this article (473) as noting also the additional Polish text referred to above.

5

France, Brittany, and Italy

The Romance languages present a slightly uneven picture in the tradition of the *VAE*. In France there are manuscripts of the Latin text and at least three vernacular prose translations known, all associated with northern French-speaking territories.[1] One, by the otherwise unknown monk Andrius, is merged with the Holy Rood material, and the text is probably from Picardy; a second is embedded in the chronicle of Jean des Preis, from Liège, also with Holy Rood material; and one (or two)—unfortunately not yet edited—are by the Bruges printer Colard Mansion, who, unlike the German Hans Folz, did not give us a printed text. In French there is also a highly unusual verse reflection of the *VAE* by Robert de Blois, which may be treated first in that, although it is very different, it is probably contemporary with the Andrius text, the earliest of the prose versions, which themselves cover the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. There appears, perhaps surprisingly, not to be much evidence for knowledge of the *VAE* in early French drama, and it is most notably absent from the great late medieval mysteries, although both the Passion play by Arnoul Greban and the massive *Mistére du Viel Testament* have the Holy Rood material. The fall of the angels appears regularly, but not in a form which links it clearly with the *VAE*. We have to add in this geographical context, however, because the connections are more to French than to Celtic cultures (attractive as a direct Cornish connection might have been), an entirely fascinating version of the penance scene found in a Breton play still recorded in (and indeed edited from a manuscript of) the nineteenth century. In Italian (where there is again a full tradition of the Holy Rood

---

[1] This location is in some ways to be expected. The two edited texts have the Holy Rood material, which was widely disseminated in the Low Countries. Meyer noted these, and Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', refers 253 n. 43 to a possible fourth text (translated?) by Guillaume de Tignonville, Provost of Paris and translator of the *Dits moraulx des philosophes*; the work seems to be in a manuscript of 1454 from Chalon-sur-Saône, but is known from a catalogue only. It may well be a translation of the *VAE* and again its investigation remains a desideratum. Miller discusses the other versions. Meyer's reference, 'Vita Adae', 211 n. 1 (also at second hand), to a Paris MS containing a life of Adam and Eve in verse is also noted by Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 254 n. 44, but it is not clear what this actually is (Paris BN f. fr. 12790).

legend) we do have some indication of knowledge of the *VAE* in early verse, albeit in what looks in many respects more like a Holy Rood context, but this time we have clear and interesting evidence from the drama, in a late medieval play from Bologna which includes the penance episode. In prose there are only late indications of knowledge of the work.

In spite of theories on the possible transmission of apocrypha at an early stage through Spain to, for example, Ireland, there appears not to be an Iberian tradition involving the *VAE* (although there is some reflection of the Rood legend in church art, as indeed also in Italy, notably by Piero della Francesca), not even in the extensive metrical or dramatic survivals. The historical Bible (*General estoria*) of Alfonso X has nothing of it, nor does the Valencia drama *Misterio de Adán y Eva*, even though the latter is similar in some respects to those plays which do contain *VAE* references.[2] The same applies to writers like Gil Vicente in his Portuguese auto *Breve sumário da história de Deus* in 1527, even though there are again some superficially similar motifs.[3]

LATIN

There is a relatively small number of texts of the Latin *Vita Adae* from France, although Meyer printed as an appendix what he designated class IV, a Paris manuscript akin to his class II, which he dated to the ninth century. Pettorelli places the codex (from Saint Amand) in the tenth century, and there has been some discussion about Meyer's theories regarding its origins.[4] A later text (now in Valenciennes) also comes from Saint Amand, and there is another

---

[2] See Hermenogildo Corbató, *Los misterios del corpus de Valencia* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 1932). Had there been a connection, the material might have made it by this route to the New World, but, alas, does not seem to have done so: see Joseph Gillet, 'Valencian *Misterios* and Mexican Missionary Plays in the Early Sixteenth Century', *Hispanic Review*, 19 (1951), 59–61. For a general survey of the popular Bible in Spain, see Diego Catalan, 'La Biblia en la literatura medieval española', *Hispanic Review*, 33 (1965), 310–18.

[3] I have discussed his Adam and Eve drama in the context of other paradise plays in my *Adam's Grace*, 126–8. The text is in Gil Vicente, *Obras completas*, ed. Marques Braga (Lisbon: Da Costa, 4th edn. 1968), ii. 170–215. There are no direct and unequivocal links with the *VAE*. In the *Historia de Deus*, Abel is sent to limbo and joined there by Adam, and Death also appears. Adam, however, is similarly placed in limbo in the Cornish *Gwreans an bys* and in Arnoul Greban's French *Passion*, and in Immessen's Low German play Adam (having been taken to hell by the devils) is described in a stage direction as 'in limbo'; Abel's soul is sent to limbo in the Breton creation play.

[4] See Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 218–19, and Pettorelli, 'Analyse', 238–9. He associates it with the Rhenish versions.

from Rouen with a single folio of the *Vita* at the end of the large manuscript. Of special interest, of course, is the variant text in a manuscript now in Paris, a twelfth-century piece from western France which is close to the Irish *Saltair* and which Pettorelli has edited and discussed in detail. Very few manuscripts of the Latin *Vita Adae* are currently located in Italy, although one exception is the Milan version which, with the Paris text, has similarities to the Irish *Saltair na Rann*, as discussed in Chapter 2.

FRENCH

There is no reflection of the *VAE* in the great French versified Bibles of Evrat, Macé de la Charité, Jehan Malkaraume, or Herman de Valenciennes, although they do sometimes have the naming legends and the cross legends.[5] The Holy Rood material is well known in French in prose, verse, and drama.

Robert de Blois

Medieval French verse does provide evidence of knowledge of the penance section of the *Vita* in compacted and adapted form in a religious poem of the mid thirteenth century by the little-known Robert de Blois.[6] His religio-didactic poem known as *La Création du monde* (the text has the rubric 'C'est li formemanz du monde et de Adam et d'Eve', 'This is the formation of the world and of Adam and Eve', above the first line) of nearly 1,500 rhymed lines contains (vv. 397–460) a brief retelling of the penance in the river, with a moralizing conclusion. The work is preserved entire in MS Arsenal 5201, fos. 67ª–87ᵇ, from the last third of the thirteenth century, and was edited in 1895 by Jacob Ulrich. The dialect is apparently that either of Lorraine or Burgundy.[7]

---

[5] Thus for example in the late thirteenth-century versified Bible of Macé de la Charité, *La Bible de Macé de la Charité*, i: *Genèse, Exode*, ed. J. R. Smeets (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1967), 18–20. The work has a variety of sources, including the *Aurora* of Peter Riga.

[6] The work is referred to by James H. Morey, 'Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase, and the Medieval Popular Bible', *Speculum*, 68 (1993), 6–35; the apocryphal material is not his centre of interest, but he notes the appearance of the derivation of Adam's name, and also the twofold deception of Eve by the devil. He refers, however, only to N. F. Blake's edition of the Vernon English version, and here at least does not note the extent and variability of the *VAE* material, nor indeed that Robert's text represents an unusual version of it.

[7] *Robert von Blois, Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Jacob Ulrich (1889–95; repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1978). The creation poem is in vol. iii (1895: *Die didaktischen und religiösen Dichtungen Robert's*

The material from the *VAE* used by Robert does not constitute a particularly extensive portion of the poem, although it has penance as its overall theme. The poet gives what looks at first glance like an extremely brief version of the penance story which omits nearly all the significant motifs; it also changes the central part by not making it clear that the penance takes place in two separate rivers, indeed, seemingly having the penance in the *same* river, although it is referred to only as 'aigue', water, which is an equivalent for the word used frequently in the *VAE*, 'aqua'. Andrius has 'en l'aigue' and Jean des Preis 'en l'aighe' several times, although both establish (and name) the two rivers first. The first part of Robert's poem follows the biblical Genesis with the creation of Adam, although it includes (vv. 5–110) the legend of the naming from the four quarters. Eve is created, but the devil is envious when he sees Adam in such honour, and decides on the first temptation, a decision common outside the apocryphal tradition. There is no prior fall of the angels, but the biblical temptation itself is treated with some imagination, the serpent being selected because he is the most pleasant creature, and hence the most plausible. After the pair are evicted from paradise, a new section begins, and the rubric and first lines echo very strongly the *VAE*. The rubric immediately before the section (v. 379) reads: 'Quant il furent geté de paradis', and the section opens: 'Or sont de paradis chacié' (When they were expelled from paradise/now expelled from paradise), both matching *VAE* 1 'Quando expulsi sunt de paradiso . . .' The text beyond this is not close, but it is significant not only that this is clearly a separate section, but that the poet refers to a written source or book ('li escris', v. 400; 'cest livre', v. 460). This also separates it from the biblical material, although there is no indication of apocryphal status, and the origin of Adam's name was included in the biblical section.

Adam and Eve are in great sorrow, as in the *VAE*, but then devise a penance between themselves ('entr'aus', v. 389, thus losing the dominant role of Adam

as the quasi-priestly imposer of the penance and also Eve's desire for death). They will stand up to the chin in water—the element of total immersion is therefore preserved—but no river, or indeed that it is a river at all, is specified. They will remain 'en l'aigue' (vv. 392, 397) until God forgives them. They enter the water and stay there as long as they were in paradise ('so the writing tells us', adds the poet—a significant reference to a learned source) which is 'Dou(e)s ores et demie et plus' (v. 401; two and half hours and more). We presume they are together, and it is at this point that they see 'un ange venant, Si cler, si beaul, si reluisant' (vv. 403–4; an angel coming, so beautiful, so fine, so shining, the last adjective rendering, as do many other texts, the *VAE* 'in claritatem angeli'). We are not told that this is the devil in disguise, and that modification is effective, since we (like Adam and Eve) have to work it out for ourselves. The supposed angel tells them that God has sent him to say that they have been forgiven for all their sins. With no small amount of joy they emerge, but soon hear tidings, we are told, 'Que toute la joie perdirent' (v. 414; so that they lose all that joy). A real angel comes directly from heaven and tells them that they have made another mistake ('avez mespris malement', v. 418) and as a result have 'doublé votre mesfait' (v. 426; doubled your misdeed) because of lies. It is at this point that Adam, now despairing, wishes to kill himself (echoing Eve's desire before the second temptation in the *VAE*), although the real angel tells him that God—in the words of Ezekiel 33: 11— does not desire the death of the sinner. This becomes then the theme for a brief homiletic passage on misprision and the recognition of evil, on repentance, and on the good death. The angel then returns to heaven ('le ciel overt', v. 458), having delivered the brief homily, and the poet concludes the passage with a note that he will not say more because he has no more of this book.

This version of the central portion of the *VAE* is very different. It may be based on a memory (which is, however, quite detailed in parts) of what the poet says is a written source, but for whatever reason, the adaptation is effective. This is not biblical, as was the first part of the work, and it is marked off as a separate passage, but it does remain part of the *VAE* tradition, however much it has been adapted. We have lost a great deal of detail: Eve's desire for death, the two rivers, the second temptation of Eve and her response, Adam's debate with the devil. But the passage takes the main idea—the question of the recognizability of temptation and the need for proper penance—and focuses on the lies of the devil rather than on Eve's desires to end her penance and eat. The moral message, the warning against failing to recognize the devil, is that which Adam actually spells out to Eve in the Irish and Breton versions, for example, even though it is not made as clear in the *VAE* as such. If the poet is indeed working from memory (of a written source), he nevertheless reshapes carefully and poetically the essential part, the devil as an angel who is

apparently 'cler, beaul, reluisant'. The nature of the poet's learned sources is made clear again, in the fourth part of the poem, which presents another exemplum with the words:

> Un autre essample vos dirai
> Qu'en un livre lisant trovai. (vv. 929–30)

(I'll give you another example which I found in a book I was reading.)

Adam's first fall is recalled towards the end of the work once again (vv. 1216–24), and the story of Cain and Abel appears beside other biblical stories (vv. 1287–98). As far as the apocryphal Adamic material is concerned, however, the penance scene has been taken out of the apocryphon to be reshaped as an exemplum within a religious poem of general didactic import on the theme of confession and true repentance.

Andrius

The oldest and most extensive of the French prose versions is ascribed to a monk referred to as Andrius in a single manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds fr. 95 (olim 6769, from the Royal Library). The fine, large, and illuminated late thirteenth-century manuscript is largely Arthurian in content (it has Robert de Boron's *Histoire du Graal* in a prose redaction, plus other works) and has attracted attention for that reason, but the last part (fos. 380ʳ–394ᵛ) contains what is described in a (later) list of contents as Andrius' chronicle from Adam to Tiberius: 'La chronique fabulante depuis Adam jusqu'à Tibère translatée par le moine Andrius.' The Andrius text as a whole has been designated *La Pénitence d'Adam*, and this was used in English as *The Penitence of Adam* when it was first edited in full by Esther Quinn in 1980. The title refers really only to the first part, however, which is a close version of the *VAE* in something like Meyer's class II version. To this is added a very full and in some respects unusual version of the Holy Rood story, with the narrative of the tree before Christ, the Passion, and then the invention, with some added legends. Thirdly comes the story of Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, the Harrowing of Hell, the whole work ending with a rather fanciful version of the life of Tiberius and some rather misplaced Roman imperial history.[8]

---

[8] Edited by Esther C. Quinn, *The Penitence of Adam* (University, Miss.: Romance Monographs Inc, 1980). The French text and translation (which has useful indications of the *VAE* sections) are by Micheline Dufau and the appendix on the language is by Ursula Chen. The work is here cited by page reference; the translation, albeit sometimes adapted, is that by Dufau. There is a modern French translation of the *Vita Adae* section by Albert Pauphilet, 'La Vie terrestre d'Adam et d'Ève', *Revue de Paris*, 5 (1912), 213–24. Some of the second part of the text is in

The content and make-up of the whole is of interest, but in the present context the focus has necessarily to be on the first section, which renders the *VAE* fairly faithfully. That it is set within a kind of biblical and secular chronicle, however inaccurate the later stages may be (Tiberius as a Christian), is important. The language has been localized by Ursula Chen to the south-east of the province of Picardy. The manuscript, finally, has at the start of our section two miniatures, one of a scribe writing, and one of the protoplasts delving and spinning; the apocryphal material is therefore not illustrated.

The *VAE* text offered by Andrius claims at the outset to be a full and accurate translation of something 'escrite en latin', written in Latin, and translated 'mot a mot' (73; word for word) into French. The text is indeed very closely done, but there are not only small variations which may have been in the source (as in the numbers of days involved at various points),[9] but also embellishments and often a reinforcement of individual ideas, as well as an overall colouring added by the formal modes of address—this has been commented upon—such as *mesire, madame, bele dame.* When Eve asks for death and this is refused, Adam adds 'Eve tu es mout fol' (73; you are quite mad) to his rejection. Sometimes the rendering is unusual. In the Latin texts, Adam begins his description of the proposed penance by saying that he will fast for forty (or forty-seven) days: 'ego enim faciam quadraginta diebus ieiunians' (*VAE* 6). Andrius has, however, 'm'en irai .xl. jours avalle pais travellant' (74; I shall go through the land suffering for forty days). The specific concept of fasting is not mentioned, although it is implicit in that they have been unable to find suitable food in any case. Eve is to go to the Tigris for thirty-four days, Adam to the Jordan for forty. Adam begs the river and the creatures in it to assist him, and the river stops flowing for eight days. Once again, the time of eight days is unusual, but the Latin texts refer regularly to a period of eighteen days (or nineteen days) after which the devil becomes angry. The source text may have been misread, and a period of twenty-eight days is found elsewhere in the vernacular tradition; eight, eighteen, or twenty-eight might well be confused. Sometimes it is made explicit that the creatures of the Jordan weep with Adam for that period

---

Napier (ed.), *History of the Holy Rood Tree*, 40–63. Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 211, refers to it briefly and at second hand; it had not yet been edited or translated, of course. His footnote, and Quinn's comments on 10 and 13, indicate that some confusion has existed about this text for quite a long period. On the title see Quinn, *Penitence*, 11.

[9] The useful notes indicate for example, 138, that they wander around looking for food for eight days in *VAE* 4, although Meyer has nine, with seven as a variant in some manuscripts. Adam searches for food for eight days, earlier in *VAE* 1, in some versions, however.

(thus Mozley's texts and indeed Pettorelli's Paris version, though not Meyer's, which states simply that eighteen days pass).

The second temptation of Eve by the devil disguised as an angel 'plain de clarte et de lumiere' (75; full of brightness and light) follows the *VAE* closely, with additional modifications. Thus when Eve believes the angel/devil when he pretends to weep for her ('quasi condolens' in *VAE* 9, here more explicitly 'mout grant samblant', 75; with very great pretence) the comment is added that she was a fool to do so. On the other hand, the passage in which Eve is described as green as grass from the cold is imitated exactly. Adam's debate with Satan is equally closely followed. Quinn notes (142) that Adam challenges the devil in this case, whereas 'in L. [= the Latin *VAE*] it is Eve who asks'; it is not entirely clear in Meyer's text, and Adam does pose the question eventually, but in several of the Latin versions it is made clear that it is indeed Adam who, more logically, speaks first (explicitly in the English tradition and in Pettorelli's Paris text). The issue is, however, even more complex. In most versions, it is Eve's sorrow that is doubled when she emerges prematurely from the river (usually when she falls): 'duplicatus est dolor et gemitus et planctus ab ea' (*VAE* 11). In Andrius, it is Adam's sorrows which are doubled, something again found in Pettorelli's Paris recension: 'Igitur duplicatus est dolor et planctus Ade. Clamauitque cum gemitu magno dicens: Ve tibi diabole . . .'[10] Andrius has the triad of 'dolor et gemitus et planctus' grouped together, but otherwise is close to the other version. In any case, he adds additional imprecations towards the devil which are more likely to be the work of the French writer, rather than something in the source.

Adam completes his penance and Eve, already pregnant, departs from him to the west. An odd feature here, however, is that she makes seven dwelling places for herself ('et fist .vii. habitacles ou elle estoit', 77). This is not matched anywhere, and one might suspect that the translator misread 'et fecit sibi habitaculum' in *VAE* 18. Some texts have 'ibi', some 'sibi', and Meyer even notes one manuscript which has both. Both words make sense, of course. As far as Andrius is concerned, the 'ibi' might match 'ou elle estoit', although it might be a gratuitous addition. Either way, 'sibi', especially if abbreviated as 's' in the copy text (as was usual for much of the Middle Ages), might have been mistaken to mean 'septem'. Once again a translator's reading error could have led to a change in the apocryphon as such, giving us a portentous-looking, but quite spurious, new motif of seven dwelling places.

The narrative of the birth of Cain follows a version of the *VAE* although it is not clear what that version looked like exactly. Eve's suffering and Adam's

---

[10] Pettorelli, 'Vie latine', 13–14. It is not matched in the Milan version, which is closer to Meyer's class I at this point.

intercession is as in the Latin versions, but she is attended by two (rather than twelve) angels and two Virtues. The presence of two rather than twelve angels is attested in various manuscripts, and is an easily comprehensible variation. Cain is born, and we are told that he 'mout fu biaus' (78, was very beautiful = 'et erat lucidus', *VAE* 22). The difficult motif of his gathering herbs or grass is simplified, however, to: 'et si tost que li enfes fu nes si comencha a aler' (78; as soon as the child was born he began to walk).[11] Once again, whether this is an adaptation by the translator or whether the source had by then become simplified in view of the opacity of the original motif cannot be determined; certainly very similar simplifications are found elsewhere in the vernacular tradition (in the Dutch prose translation, for example). There is no reference to Michael's assistance, nor to Eve's desire to have the child killed. Eve's vision of the death of Abel and the (vain) separation of the brothers follows as in the *VAE*, although Abel is erroneously described as the elder child ('li aisnes', 78), and in her vision Cain strangles his brother ('il l'estrangloit', 78). The latter point is again unusual, the more so as Latin versions normally have a vision of Cain wet with and often drinking Abel's blood. Whether 'sanguinem . . . deglutiuit/deglutiebat' (*VAE* 23 varies in formulation) has been misread for some form of *strangulabat*, or whether this is a deliberate adaptation, is again unclear.

When Abel actually is killed, the method is not mentioned. Seth is born and we return to a closer translation once again. Adam is 130 years old when Cain kills Abel out of envy.[12] However, after the birth of Seth Adam lives for eighty years rather than the usual 800 in Vita versions, although it is difficult to see how this error could have arisen if the copy text had *DCCC* for the numeral, or indeed, even if written out. Even an awkward, but not unknown, form such as VIII C does not help explain it. The number of the children (30+30+3) is as in the *VAE* texts, however.

The Sethite quest begins after Adam's account of his translation to heaven (*VAE* 29 with the addition of Adam's apocalyptic vision), and then after the gathering of the children, his own account of the fall and the imposition of the seventy afflictions, still following the *VAE* fairly closely. Eve and Seth go to paradise, where the serpent attacks Seth, and here the material is augmented a little in Eve's slightly extended debate with the serpent. Quinn links this in her notes with the interpretation of Genesis 3: 15, and certainly the incident is

---

[11] Quinn's notes refer several times to the notion of Cain as a child of Satan. Since there is no indication of this motif in the Latin *VAE* tradition whatsoever, nor indeed in Andrius, the references are misleading.

[12] Quinn, *Penitence*, 145, notes the addition of envy and the error about the respective ages, but considers that the copy text from which Andrius translated had a reference to strangulation, which seems less likely in the tradition of *VAE* texts.

elsewhere merged with that verse (see below on Bonvesin da la Riva in Italian). The biblical verse is not invoked directly, however, and as usual, Seth's reference to the image of God drives the serpent away. When the pair reach paradise, Michael gives them the promise of the redemption in 5,500 years time, and they are given three sweet-smelling herbs (rather than the usual four: nard is absent), as is the case later with Jean des Preis (although he includes nard; the spices are different). Where in Jean des Preis they are also given the seeds that will grow into the Rood (as in Meyer's class III versions), however, this motif is absent from Andrius; they return to Adam, and when he dies, they see the hand of God over him, and he and Abel are buried by Michael and Uriel, though this time we are not told where (neither 'in partibus paradisi', as in the *Vita*, nor in 'Hebron', nor indeed in both, which sometimes happens). Unusual is the provision of four rich shrouds, rather than the usual (but confusing) three; they are instructed to spread these over Adam, and 'the others' ('les autres', 84) are to be placed over Abel. The passage remains slightly unclear. The extended sections at the end of the *VAE* are also present, as Eve, who dies after six days, gives her prophecy of the destruction of the world and the request that the story be recorded. Seth does so, and the tablets are discovered by Solomon, who this time dubs the writing 'athalaytas', interpreting it as 'sine librorum doctrina'. This reading of the usual *Vita* word 'achiliacas' is not implausible with *c/t* confusion (even in BnF f. fr. 95 it can be hard to distinguish *c* from *t*). The gloss is a known variant, however.

Andrius thus renders the *VAE*, in a version very close to what Meyer called class II, very closely, apart from the question of tone in the addresses (of Adam and Eve to each other, or indeed of Adam to God), and a few omissions (as at the birth of Cain). The small error which has Eve making seven habitations is interesting, and could have become part of the narrative. Other small elements (such as the four shrouds) compare with Jean des Preis, but there are sufficient differences. What is significant here is the context. Although the text moves on to the Holy Rood story as such, it is noticeable that the new section is completely separate and does not flow on. The tree of the cross is not, in fact, related to the quest of Seth, but begins very abruptly with Moses, following the earliest version of the Rood narrative.[13] In some versions there is a continuity problem given that Eve and Seth at the end of class III texts do bring the seeds of the cross, and the quest by Seth alone at the start of later versions of the Holy Rood *Legende* tells roughly the same

---

[13] See Quinn's notes, *Penitence*, 150–1, and also her *Quest of Seth*, 49–62. Napier, *History of the Holy Rood Tree*, includes this version as support for the twelfth-century English version in Oxford, Bodley 343, together with versions in Cambridge (University Library, MS Mm.5.29) and London (British Library, Harleiean 3185) Latin versions.

story (with new motifs). This can be confusing where the two texts are juxtaposed, but things are different here in that the Rood narrative is entirely separate, after a brief and rather homiletic comment about the need to glorify the cross. The move from one story cycle to the next is far smoother in the next prose version in French, that of Jean des Preis.

Jean des Preis dit d'Outremeuse

The prose chronicle of Jean des Preis (des Prez), dit d'Outremeuse (1338–99/ 1400), from Liège, *Ly Myreur des histors*, includes a great amount of material, legends, and general augmentation, and it was continued by Jean de Stavelot (1388–1449). The text is recorded in some half-dozen manuscripts, all now in the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique in Brussels.[14] Meyer refers in his edition to the work, from which he cites, and again places it with other vernacular works under his class II texts. The material from the *VAE*, followed by the Holy Rood legend (which Meyer describes as so interwoven that they can hardly be separated), is interpolated into the chronicle after the account of the birth of the Virgin.[15] Jean adds in the course of his chronicle a number of legends and stories, and his inclusion of the *VAE* at some length and in a form close to the Latin is prefaced with some material from the early part of Genesis, with some embellishments, but not the fall of the angels. The hexaemeron is sketched, with Adam created in God's image, but 'en jardin de Damas' (presumably the 'ager damascenus'), at the age of 30, to which Jean adds the two familiar Adam legends, first the creation from eight elements (here attributed to Jerome), and secondly his naming from the four quarters, as with many other versions of the apocryphon. There is no narrative of the biblical temptation and fall, and we are told then, somewhat abruptly, that Adam lives for 930 years, and at this point the *VAE* begins, clearly closely translated by the clerkly chronicler from a written Latin source. The opening, 'Chis Adam et Eve, quant ilhs furent jetteis four de paradis, ilh ploront continuelment VII jours' (310), matches *VAE* 1 in most versions, and the

---

[14] *Chronique de Jean des Preis dit d'Outremeuse*, ed. Ad. Borgnet and Stanislas Bormans (Brussels: Academie/Hayez, 1864–87). The six manuscripts are: Bibliothèque royale de Belgique MSS 10455–6, 19303–6, II 3030, and II 3029(1) of the fifteenth century, plus II 3029(2) of the sixteenth, and 10463 of 1596. The *VAE* and Holy Rood material is in i. 309–24 (here cited by page number). Meyer cites the text frequently in his apparatus in view of its closeness to the Latin, so that some of the differences have been pointed out.

[15] Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 310–11. Borgnet, preparing his edition more than a decade before Meyer's work, did not know the Latin tradition, and places material which he considered to be later additions into his apparatus; Meyer notes that most of them should in view of the Latin material be placed in the text proper.

close translation continues, with only the most minor details which are likely to have been in the source text. The penances are to be in the Tigris and Jordan for thirty-four and forty days, silent, up to the neck. The Jordan and its creatures stand still for Adam, and they do penance for eighteen days. Sathanas then transforms himself into 'une angele reluisant' (311, the word used by Robert de Blois) for the second temptation, although there is no reference to his anger, as there is in the *VAE* in most versions ('iratus', 'conturbatus'). There is an omission here, too, in that Eve's change of colour from the coldness of the water is not present, although she does fall to the ground. Whether the source text did not have the point, or whether Jean did not understand it, is open to question, although the former seems likely as he is otherwise translating so closely. Adam completes his penance of forty days.

The dialogue between Adam and the devil follows, with the devil (now no longer named) giving the account of the angelic fall, after which he departs at Adam's prayer. Eve departs (three months pregnant, as in *VAE* 18) for the east, and when assailed by labour pains calls upon the heavenly bodies to send Adam to her, and Adam prays to God for Eve's sake. One difference, however, is the aid given: *VAE* 21 says in most versions that 'venerunt XII angeli et duo virtutes', but there are some variations. Mozley cites texts which have 'duo angeli', and others which omit the two Virtues. Jean's version is of interest: 'et vinrent tantost dois angeles de gran virtus' (314). It is possible that he did not recognize 'virtutes' as an order of angels and took it as a general noun, and that his source text had 'duo' rather than 'duodecim'. The confusing passage about the birth of Cain is also somewhat different, but in this case it looks as if Jean himself is interpreting a text he did not understand rather than following a different version. In the basic versions of the Latin (*VAE* 21) we have the enigmatic comment 'et erat lucidus', followed by the description of how the child 'exsurgens cucurrit', and brought herbs to his mother. At the end of the passage comes the note (in a familiar biblical formulation) 'et vocatem est nomen eius Cain'. This last comment is added more or less verbatim as soon as the child is born: 'qui fut nommeis por son nom Caym.' However, only then do we have the rest of the narrative episode. The concept of 'lucidus' is lost, but we are told of Cain jumping up, running, and doing things immediately: 'tantoist qu'ilh fut neis salhit, corit et soy assiet, et fist mult de merveilles.' Here 'salhit' seems to render 'exsurgens' and 'corit' is 'cucurrit', but the rest may well come from Jean, who thus stresses at least the miraculous nature of his birth without knowing precisely what is going on. That he 'did many marvels' does not of course fit well with Cain as such, the more so as Eve very soon after has the vision of Cain killing Abel, so that the two boys have to be separated. Jean does not have the motif of Eve asking for Cain to be killed, nor

the notion of assistance in feeding the child, although the angels do teach Adam the elements of agriculture.

The fratricide is retold as briefly as in the *VAE* (rather than as in Gen. 4), and the ages are given as in *VAE* 23, which is variable even in Latin texts. Here Adam is 130 and Abel 22. We do have the additional motif of Adam refusing to lie with Eve, although the length of time is here given as two years. This motif, from the Holy Rood narrative, is found in some other *VAE* texts, such as the Balliol manuscript (Mozley, 'Vita Adae', 135). At God's command, however, they beget Seth, who is described in detail: 'douls et debonnars, dobtans er siervans son peire com fis obediens' (314; sweet and good natured, helping and serving his father as an obedient son). Cain, meanwhile, marries his sister Calmana and they have a number of children who are, we are told, a wicked generation, and are destroyed by the flood. This is a biblically based interpolation depending on Genesis 6.

After the biblical killing of Abel by Cain, Jean returns to the details of Adam's children, specifying first that he has three sons and two daughters, the latter being Cain's wife Calmana, and Delbora, who unusually (though not uniquely) is presented here as the wife of Seth. This again is an extended insertion as far as the *VAE* proper is concerned, but after a reference to Cain's progeny (Gen. 4: 16–24, with the familiar addition that Lamech killed Cain) he returns to *VAE* 24 and states that after the birth of Seth Adam begets 30 sons and 31 daughters, making 64 altogether (another manuscript has the more usual 30 sons, 30 daughters and a total of 63). The numbers vary in different versions of the *VAE*, and the mathematics seems confused in both cases, since there has been reference to Cain, Abel, Seth, Calmana, and Delbora already, which would give 65 or 66. Clearly the mention of the two sisters, who are not in the *VAE*, has not properly been integrated. Jean is at this point moving between the *VAE* and the Bible, as he now includes the Sethite generation from Genesis 5 before returning to *VAE* 25–9 and Adam's translation as recounted to Seth, although the apocalyptic vision is not given in full. With the equivalent of *VAE* 30—which gives Adam's biblical age of 930 years in any case—Jean adds that at this age Adam dies (Gen. 5: 5), and also that he does so in the Vale of Hebron, which is not biblical, but which is very common. Returning to follow *VAE* 30–5 closely, Jean has Adam recount the history of the expulsion and the promise of the 'LXX plagas' (as in *VAE* 34), although Eve's desire to take on these pains comes a little later. At this immediate point, however, Jean's version seems to merge a little awkwardly with the opening of the Holy Rood *Legende*, as Seth is apparently sent back alone to paradise, following the dried footprints. But then comes Eve's wish for the pains as in *VAE* 35, after which she *and* Seth are sent.

The attack by the serpent follows, and then the repulse by Seth, which is concisely told. Where the *VAE* has 'Seth et mater eius' continuing to paradise, Jean refers only to Seth, as if the Rood legend is at the back of his mind, although in a little while it becomes clear that Eve *is* still present, as the pair pour dust on their heads as in *VAE* 40. The promise of salvation is given, in the 'ducenti minus unus' formulation, which is even more complex in the French text ('Vm IIc I seul mons d'années', 319, interpreted by Borgnet as 'cinq mille deux cents moins un'). Seth looks into paradise, sees the fountain and the dry tree with the serpent, and then the child in the tree; he also sees Abel weeping for the sins of his parents ('pleure les pechiés de son pere et sa mere', 320), which is an unusual addition.

The move towards the Rood narrative (something already stressed by Meyer) is clear when Seth is given three seeds, which he is told will grow into rods of cedar, cypress, and pine, and which will then become the cross, as well as three spices (rather than four). This combination is unusual in its specificity, although the giving of a twig or branches is found in some versions of *VAE* 43 (notably in the class III or incunabula texts). Andrius also has three spices rather than four (and no reference to the seeds) but, as noted, the spices are quite different from those in Andrius. Adam is delighted when he hears of all this, and his death (with the accompanying celestial events) follows *VAE* 45–6. However, we have once more four rather than three shrouds ('sydoines' for 'sindones', 320, but there is no adjective), and they seem to be disposed as two for Adam and two for Abel. Adam and Abel are buried in the Vale of Hebron, the seeds are planted with Adam, and Eve dies six days later, as in *VAE* 49. She tells her children to make the tablets with the life of the protoplasts, and the columns in which they are to be concealed. Seth does so, aided by the angel, and they are later read by Solomon, who calls the letters used 'Achabaidas, c'est à dire doctrine sans libre de l'escripture Seth de son doit' (321; that is to say, doctrine without books of the writing by Seth's finger). Jean is thus following a *VAE* text with the expanded section 51, but does not really know—this is hardly unusual—what to make of the name (usually) found as 'achiliacas'. The guiding angel has been referred to already, so that the last part is more or less clearly 'digito Seth'. The reading 'sine librorum' is known and must have been the ultimate source. Jean moves now seamlessly (in contrast with Andrius' text) into the Holy Rood narrative, picking up on the three seeds planted in Adam's mouth, in the *Legende* form, from Moses down to the visit of Saba, after which he returns briefly to the death of Adam, and then inserts a detailed and non-biblical narrative of the death of Lamech.[16]

---

[16]   I discuss a large number of other medieval versions of the tale (though not this one) in my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 70–95.

Jean des Preis offers a fairly close vernacular translation of a particular version of the *VAE*, specifically one with the various additions attached to Meyer's classes II and III, and with some minor adaptations, notably where the text is not clear (as at the birth of Cain). The Holy Rood material runs on directly from the *VAE*; this may reflect Jean's source, although the point at which the two cycles merge is very slightly unfocused, and there is a slightly clumsy shift in attention to Seth and away from Eve. The earlier Adam legends (naming and formation) are there, too, however. The whole structure is quite close to the English *Life* in the Vernon manuscript in some respects, but it is of additional interest that it has been incorporated into a chronicle. As with the Andrius version, some of the changes are minor; it is perhaps of no great significance that both refer to three spices, or to four shrouds. Yet the work contains a wealth of detail, and these specifics are being presented as historical facts by Jean des Preis.

Colard Mansion

There is what is presumed to be a translation of the *VAE* with the title *La Pénitence d'Adam* made by the early Bruges printer and calligrapher Colard Mansion (who worked with Caxton in England) for a Flemish nobleman, Louis de Bruges, the Seigneur of Gruuthuse (1422–92), a noted bibliophile with an impressive library, and friend of Edward IV of England. Mansion translated several texts, but did not necessarily print them; it has been suggested that his decision was based upon economic reasons, whether he thought they would or would not sell, so that the fact that he did not print his *VAE* is itself of interest in those terms. The unedited manuscript, originally in the Royal Library, is in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, fonds fr. 1837 (olim 7864), together with another more extensive text (Arsenal Th. fr. 14), also unedited. According to Quinn, both of these cover only the *Vita* and not, as with Andrius and Jean des Preis, the Holy Rood material *in extenso*. Meyer refers (presumably, though not absolutely clearly) to the first of the manuscripts and dates it to around 1460, though it is probably later, and more recently Johannes Tromp dates it to around 1475, after the earliest known printed texts in Latin.[17] Jean Chrétien Ferdinand Hoefer in his *Nouvelle*

---

[17] Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 215; Meyer's comments at this point are far from clear, as he seems to be speaking primarily about the incunabula texts of the Latin *VAE*, and it is not clear from what he has to say that Mansion's text is in manuscript only. See Tromp, 'Zur Edition apokrypher Texte', 190. Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 253 n. 42, gives some bibliographic details, and notes that the work was certainly produced after 1461. The two Mansion texts are described in Quinn, *Penitence*, 13–14.

Biographie générale in the middle of the nineteenth century noted in general terms the 'histoire fabuleuse de la vie d'Adam', and added that *three* manuscripts of it exist,[18] meaning presumably the two by Mansion plus the Andrius text. Even earlier, Mansion's version in BnF fonds fr. 1837 was first noted (and cited) by Joseph Van Praet in his studies of Mansion in 1829 and of Louis de Bruges in 1831. Van Praet assumed, however, that Colard Mansion was the first translator, as he was unaware of the Andrius text and indeed of that by Jean des Preis. This error was pointed out as early as 1836 by Paulin Paris in his catalogue of manuscripts from the Royal Library, in which he described the Andrius version briefly.[19] Most recently, Miller refers to six manuscripts, including a dedication text presented to Louis de Gruuthuse and modern copies, and adds a reference to a further modern copy in Oxford, Bodleian, Douce 206.[20] The text may have been taken from a Latin incunabulum, but an edition and study of Colard Mansion's texts is a major desideratum within the study of these vernacular versions of the *VAE*.

French drama

At first glance the early (between 1146 and 1174) and important dramatic work the Anglo-Norman *Mystère d'Adam* does not seem to have in it anything of the *VAE*, nor indeed of the Holy Rood legends.[21] In the introduction to her edition of Andrius, however, Esther Quinn does make the suggestion that 'the use of non-biblical details suggests that the author [scil. of the *Mystère*] was acquainted with an apocryphal life of Adam and Eve', and the suggestion merits consideration. This could not, she notes, have been the Andrius version, which the play pre-dates, but could have been an earlier translation,

---

[18] (Paris: Didot, 1855), xi. 94.

[19] Joseph Van Praet, *Notice sur Colard Mansion, libraire et imprimeuer de la ville de Bruges en Flandre dans le quinzième siècle* (Paris: De Bure Frères, 1829), 13; *Recherches sur le Seigneur de la Gruthuyse* (Paris: De Bure Frères, 1831), 94–103 (on the translation and the incunabula). See Paulin Paris, *Les Manuscrits françois de la Bibliothèque du Roi* (Paris: Techener, 1836), i. 123–5.

[20] 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 253 n. 42, with reference to recent studies.

[21] Cited from the edition by Paul Studer, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1918; repr. 1949). It was first edited in 1854. See also the editions by Karl Grass, *Das Adamsspiel* (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 3rd edn. 1928) and Paul Aebischer, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Paris: Droz, 1963). There are English translations by Edward Noble Stone, *Adam* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1928) and Richard Axton and John Stevens, *Medieval French Plays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971). There is only one manuscript (Bibliothèque municipale, Tours 927), mostly of Anglo-Norman religious texts. See the facsimile and transcript by Leif Sletsjöe, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968). The literary importance of the work was recognized by Erich Auerbach, who devoted a celebrated essay to it in his *Mimesis* collection in 1946.

or the Latin version itself. It is possible at least, though it is very hard to be absolutely sure, that the dramatist had some awareness of the *VAE*.[22]

A link has been made, though not a definitive one, between the (presumed) disguise of the devil at the temptation of Eve in the *Mystère d'Adam* (and also the far clearer one in the Anglo-Saxon poem *Genesis B*), and the possible knowledge of the *VAE*, all as part of the important concept that the devil, even when disguised as an angel of light, ought still to be recognizable.[23] One other passage in particular indicates a possible influence, although there are other extra-biblical motifs in the work. When Adam and Eve are expelled from paradise, there is an extended (Latin) stage direction; it notes how the devil comes in and plants thorns amongst the crops, an extrapolation of Genesis 3: 17–19 which will be encountered again more fully in the Breton drama. Adam and Eve prostrate themselves, however, with formal gestures of culpability: 'prosternent se in terra, et residentes percucient pectora sua et femora sua, dolorem gestu fatentes' (v. 519, p. 26; prostrate themselves on the earth and while there beat their breasts and thighs, making gestures of sorrow). More significant, however, is the lament of the two. Adam bewails the loss and blames Eve, eventually raising his hand against her: 'Tunc manum contra Eva(m) levabit' (at v. 535, p. 27). This may just be a gesture of anger, but it does recall—though the sense is opposite—Adam's refusal in *VAE* 3, after Eve has asked for death ('ut mittam manum meam in carnem meam'). Eve does seem to desire death:

> Mort, car me prend! Ne suffre que jo vive!
> En peril sui, ne puis venir a rive. (573–4, p. 28)

(Death take me, permit me to live no longer! I am in peril, I cannot reach the shore.)

If the *VAE* scene is in the dramatist's mind (one might wonder, incidentally, about the choice of the image of the shore), it has been transformed. Adam does not lay his hand upon Eve in either version, and her insistence on having merited death is the same. For all that, she does not despair of grace, and concludes:

> Deus me rendra sa grace et sa mustrance
> Nus gietera d'emfer par [sa] pussance. (589–90, p. 29)[24]

(God will grant grace and favour, and will by his power pull us from hell.)

---

[22] Quinn, *Penitence*, 60.

[23] Rosemary Woolf, 'Fall of Man', has suggested that in the play the devil may be disguised as an angel, as in the *VAE*, but this is by no means clear.

[24] The last line of Eve's speech is difficult. The MS reads 'Gieter n' uoldra demfer par pussance', Sletsjöe, *Mystère*, 47 (v. 587), and Grass (whose line numbering is again different: this is v. 592) retains that form.

There is no firmer evidence that the dramatist of this early work knew the *VAE* beyond these smallest of hints. The affirmation of grace, however, which is usually expressed by Adam, is placed this time into Eve's mouth. If her desire for death does echo the *VAE*, then it has changed context to one of acceptance, and the whole underscores the notion of repentance.[25] In the next stage direction the pair are taken to hell in chains by rejoicing devils, and the action changes to the narrative of Cain and Abel.

The great French mystery cycles of the later fifteenth century do not have any material which is demonstrably from the *VAE*. Thus the best known of them, the *Mystère de la Passion* of Arnoul Greban of Le Mans, choirmaster at Notre-Dame, written in the mid fifteenth century (and revised by Jean Michel at Angers later on), has the fall of the angels and the quest of Seth, with the prophecy of redemption as in the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the story of the three seeds, as well as the removal (by devils) of the souls to limbo. This is all, however, relegated to the prologue to the work proper, sometimes called a 'brief creation story', 'creacion abregé', perhaps designed only for reading, and described in one of the manuscripts as a means only of demonstrating that man's sin was, unlike the devil's, redeemable. Greban famously had a key made for himself to the library of Notre-Dame, and presumably read a version of the Rood story there. A version of the *VAE* as such may or may not have been available, but the work was well represented in manuscripts in France. Greban also claimed not to have used any apocryphal material, and although his understanding of the word was patently elastic, he may still have considered the *VAE* to be an apocryphal Old Testament narrative—certainly writers like Capgrave associated the word with this text—whereas the Rood story was patently a Christian narrative (given the approval of inclusion in the *Legenda aurea*) and could thus more safely be used.[26] The vast *Mistére du Viel Testament*, later than Greban, and which we have largely in printed form from 1500 (though it was composed before that), similarly has the fall of the angels, led by Lucifer, with Sathan his second in command, at the beginning of the work, and then later, at the death of Adam, the Sethite quest in the Holy Rood form, with Seth bringing back the seeds that will form the tree of the cross

---

[25] See Lynette R. Muir, *Liturgy and Drama in the Anglo-Norman Adam* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973), 82–3.

[26] Arnoul Greban, *Mystère de la Passion*, ed. Gaston Paris and Gaston Raynaud (Paris: Vieweg, 1878), has the material in the extended prologue (since the days of the mystery proper are concerned with the New Testament story). See 19–24, vv. 1327–740. There are many surviving manuscripts. See Grace Frank, *The Medieval French Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 180–7, on Greban, and especially 184 on the position of the prologue and Greban's comments on apocrypha.

when placed in the mouth of the dead Adam.[27] At all events, Greban and the *Mistére* both clearly follow the Holy Rood material and do not seem to have direct knowledge of the *VAE*. The mysteries were banned by edict in Paris in 1548, viewed by different groups as old fashioned and as irreverent, partly perhaps from the extraneous materials; but one mystery play survives down to the nineteenth century with the *VAE* material preserved within it. It is, however, not in French but in Breton.

BRETON

The Breton testimony to the continuation and development of the *VAE* tradition is important, but is unusual in several quite different respects. It is an extensive mystery play in rhymed verse, with a manuscript tradition that takes us back, however, only to the seventeenth century at best, and the edition of the relevant parts is based on a text written out in 1825. The drama, which is long (in seven acts—the word is used in the text—or sections) was presumably performed over two days. Each section has an extended summarizing prologue (with epilogues at the end of the days) as well as the drama as such; it is in rhymed couplets with varying numbers of syllables. It seems to have originated in the Tréguier area, as do other middle Breton mysteries (of which there are several, largely saints' lives, but with a Passion play as well).[28] Evidence from the manuscripts take us back only to the later part of the seventeenth century, but the date of composition is clearly earlier, even though dating texts with this kind of transmission is always very difficult. The prime comparators, Cornish and French medieval drama, do not deal with the same material, and in the case of works like *Gwreans an bys* in Cornish the question of Reformation influence would obscure the issue as well. I noted in 1977 in a study of the Breton work within the Genesis

---

[27] *Le Mistére du Viel Testament,* ed. James de Rothschild (1878–91; repr. New York: Johnson, 1966). Rothschild's introductory materials are extremely useful for comparative drama, although of course the material is now outdated. The Sethite quest and the death of Adam is in i. 153–63, vv. 3699–4291, and see the introduction, pp. lxxii–lxxiv.

[28] Xavier de Planhol, *An Historical Geography of France*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 316, with reference to the (official) hostility towards the plays from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, although as indicated, they do seem to have survived. For a general survey of this kind of material in Breton, see Gwenaël Le Duc, 'Le Théâtre populaire breton: transmission écrite et orale. Problématique d'une symbiose', in Hildegard Tristram (ed.), *Text und Zeittiefe* (Tübingen: Narr, 1994), 233–92.

tradition as a whole that, while the overall structure of the Breton play can indeed be viewed in terms of the French *Mistére du Viel Testament* and the Cornish *Gwreans an bys*—two works which have regularly been compared with the Breton play since its first publication by Abbé Bernard, who dates its original somewhere between the two—this need mean no more than that they are all late medieval biblical plays centred upon Genesis. It was noted, for example, that the work contains, like *Gwreans an bys*, a scene in which Adam names the animals. However, the Cornish scene is brief and refers to domestic animals, while the Breton is very extensive indeed; and furthermore other (late medieval) works have the same thing—a pertinent example (because it is clearly unconnected with the Breton work) is the Swiss *Adam und Heva* of the Protestant Ruf, performed in 1550 in Zurich, in which a similarly large amount of space is devoted to the beasts as such. The figure of Death (Maro) who appears in the Breton play is a further pointer to a late medieval date for the composition of the work.[29] In comparison with the French *Mistère du Viel Testament*, too, assigning a (slightly later) sixteenth-century date to the Breton work would seem reasonable.[30] The latest editor of the Breton work, Noel Hamilton, considers the question of whether the work is based on French, noting the numbers of French words and that the stage directions are in French in the manuscript he uses (Bernard's are in Breton); but he reminds us too that Breton writers did use French words deliberately and that there are some Breton innovations. The question remains open, but given that we have a copy of the work from 1825, it is remarkable that the penance legend of the *VAE* was preserved in Breton at a time in which the Latin original had pretty well been forgotten.[31]

---

[29] Brian Murdoch, 'The Breton *Creation Ar Bet* and the Medieval Drama of Adam', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 36 (1977), 157–79; see 167. I did not then include Ruf's play, although I gave further illustrations, 169–77, with additional comparisons to other versions. For details of Ruf, see my papers 'Ruf's *Adam und Heva*', and 'Dos piezas dramáticas' (360 on Death as a character). Although there seems to be no indication of knowledge of the *VAE* in the early sixteenth-century Portuguese drama *Auto da história de Deus* by Gil Vicente, referred to above, it contains not only Death but also Time and World, who appear too in Spanish texts of the sixteenth century and after.

[30] *Mistére du Viel Testament*, ed. Rothschild, i, p. ix, discusses the penance of Adam, although it is not in the *Mistére* itself. He refers to the Breton play (as well as the Cornish texts), pp. xlviii–xlix, and notes that Émile Morice mentions a Breton mystery played in 1833. This does not, however, seem to be the same as our work: Émile Morice, *Histoire de la mise-en-scène depuis les mystères jusqu'au Cid* (Paris: Libraire Française, Allemande et Anglaise, 1836), 184–9. The play Morice describes (and the passage is of considerable interest as far as the actual staging and costume are concerned) contains the fall of the angels, but Morice does not mention a penance scene.

[31] Noel Hamilton, 'A Fragment of *La Création*', *Celtica*, 12 (1977), 50–74; see 50–1. Murdoch, 'Breton', 161.

The work is known in a variety of (incomplete) manuscripts, and most of it has been printed with a French or English translation. It was described, with an extract, in the *Chrestomathie bretonne* of J. Loth in 1890, with reference there to three manuscripts: one written by Claude le Bihan of Pluzunet in 1760, with a date reference in it to 1663; a similar manuscript, owned, like the first, by the scholar F. M. Luzel; and a third, written by Jean Le Moullec of (Loguivy-lès)Lannion in 1825 (now Paris, BN fonds celt. 12). The last of these was used as the basis for the edition of the first day of the drama (sections or acts I–V) by Abbé Eugène Bernard in the *Revue celtique* between 1888 and 1890, who gave a French translation which is, according to Loth, overly poetic. His introduction is not particularly accurate, however, even with regard to the substance. In 1977 another portion (the sixth act, taking us from the death of Abel to the story of Lamech) was edited and translated (this time into English) by Noel Hamilton from an incomplete manuscript in the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (one of several donated by the Breton scholar Roparz Hemon) and very similar to Bernard's text. The scribe was Yves Le Floch and the date given is 1795. The final part of the work (the end of act VI and the last act, concerned with Noah) has not been edited.[32]

In the Le Moullec manuscript, the title of the work is given as: *Istor d'eus a creation ar bet-man, ar formation an den he he vue, ar hentan philosoph a voa Adam, hac he varo, ha bue ar profet Henoc hac Eli, an diluj, ha bue Noe hac he varo* (History of the creation of this earth, the formation of man and his life, the first philosopher was Adam, and his death, the life of the prophet Enoch and Elijah, the flood, the life of Noah and his death). It is clear that the range of the play is extensive in biblical terms, and only part of it reflects the *VAE*. What is immediately important, of course, is that the apocryphal material is adapted without comment into an otherwise biblical structure. Anatole Le

---

[32] J. Loth, *Chrestomathie Bretonne*, i: *Breton-Armoricain* (Paris: Bouillon, 1890), 352–6 (the first temptation of Eve, from the two earliest MSS). See Loth's comments on 353 n. 1. The text is cited here from Eugène Bernard, 'La Création du monde: mystère breton', *Revue celtique*, 9 (1888), 149–207 and 322–53; 10 (1889), 102–211 and 410–55; 11 (1890), 254–317 (with the journal abbreviated as *RC*); and Hamilton, 'Fragment'. RC 11, 312–13 has the legend at the end of section V: 'Fin d'eus an devoes quentan' (End of the first day). For further details on the manuscripts see Loth; Bernard in *Revue celtique*, 10, 414; H. Gaidoz and Paul Sébillot, 'Bibliographie des traditions et de la littérature populaire de la Bretagne', *Revue celtique*, 5 (1880–3), 277–338, see 327–8; H. Omond, 'Catalogues des MSS. celtiques et basques de la Bibliothèque nationale', *Revue celtique*, 11 (1890), 389–423, see 408; Anatole Le Braz, *Théâtre celtique* (Paris: Calman-Lévy, 1904), 187 and 202; Hamilton, 'Fragment', 50 (the Dublin MS has a formidable scholarly pedigree); Murdoch, 'Breton', 158. Linguistically the work is too late for inclusion in the selection of the *Llawlyfr Llydaweg Canol* of Henry Lewis and J. R. F. Piette (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, rev. edn. 1966), but it is a pity that it was not in the recent anthology by Jacqueline Gibson and Gwyn Griffiths, *The Turn of the Ermine: An Anthology of Breton Literature* (London: Boutle, 2006).

Braz was unconvinced of the value of the work in his study of Celtic drama, commenting that the work contained nothing that could not have come from a French original. Curiously enough, Le Braz draws attention to the unusual status of the penance scene, which he grudgingly admits that the dramatist might have found in a 'légende apocryphe', adding that it was probably adapted, however, from a French drama. But there do not seem to be any French dramas which have the point, although there are of course French prose translations and adaptations which might have been known to the dramatist if he was not using (or remembering) the Latin original.[33] A prose translation into Breton is not known, and material from the *Vita* seems not to have survived to be used in the fairly numerous late Breton popular Bibles, which remained in print for a very long time.[34] The question of source is especially difficult in this case, therefore, this compounded by the fact that the central *VAE* passage, the penance, has been adapted considerably. This may simply be a function of the move to the dramatic genre, so that we cannot reasonably expect a close match with the text of the *VAE* in any case. Nevertheless, we have in this work a late—or perhaps more accurately, given the manuscript history, the latest stage of a more or less continuous—survival of a sixteenth-century version of the *VAE* which retains the central pericope (and really that alone) in an adapted form, and interpolates it fully into a very direct representational form, the drama, of otherwise essentially biblical material. The work is of some importance, therefore, in the history of the changing *VAE*. The use in the work of the Sethite/Holy Rood material ties in with the *Ordinalia*, *Gwreans an bys*, the French mysteries, and others outside France, but the use of the penance stands out.

The first scene (details of which are given in the prologue) is that of the fall of the angels. In popular biblical adaptations this is not unusual, and the basis is the familiar legend which develops from the Isaiah passage on the King of Babylon. Lucibel falls through simple pride (without reference to Adam), after the other angels plead with him. His name is changed from Lucibel to Lucifer by God, and this is another known motif.[35] Reference has been made to the extended listing of the animals in the creation scene, and it is closer to that in work like Ruf's Zurich play than to *Gwreans an bys*; it is not, it must be said, especially dramatic (the Cornish play might well have introduced domestic animals in open-air performance). The temptation and first fall take

---

[33] Le Braz, *Théâtre*, 279. Murdoch, 'Breton', 160 (n. 12 should read: 279–80).

[34] See for example the nineteenth-century edition *Histor an Testament Coz hag an Testament Nevez* by Aotrou Morvan [Abbé Morvan, 'History of the Old and New Testament'] (Quimper: Salaum/Le Fournier, 1871). The creation is, however, followed by the expulsion of Satan by Michael. Gwenaël Le Duc drew my attention to this and other texts of this nature.

[35] See my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 19–41.

up the second section, which depends largely upon Genesis but for a diaboli-
cal council at which Satan is sent to tempt Eve as the weaker of the pair. The
tempting is done, as in Genesis, by the serpent, who is presumably Satan
changed. Interestingly, the serpent claims to Eve that he is an angel who has
changed his shape ('Me a so un El guen en deus chanchet figur', v. 995; I am an
angel of heaven who has changed his figure, *RC* 9, pp. 342–3), which does
relate to the second temptation in the *VAE*, where the devil actually does so. In
the third section, Adam and Eve are expelled from paradise and sent into the
Valley of Hebron to live, but the connection with the *VAE* is not yet clear; far
from asking Adam for death, for example, Eve is more positive than her
husband, and although they are exercised by only having the food of the
beasts (as *VAE* 4) there are even small literal details in the staging, as when Eve
brings Adam 'good water for his thirst' in a shell (*RC* 10, pp. 208–9, stage
direction).

It is with the fourth part that the *VAE* material makes its appearance, and
this act covers the penance scene as a separate entity. It is a further develop-
ment that the instigation to undertake a penance comes not from Eve's
specific desire for death (Adam's suggestion of a penance is a response to
this in the *VAE*), but from the reality of death as such. The first scene shows us
God creating *Maro*, Death, who then goes to Hebron to make himself known.
This again is an important development. Eve does admit that she was guilty,
however, and merits punishment, although she in fact asks for forgiveness
rather than death. The echo of her plea in the *VAE* is clearly present, but has
been adapted, as has indeed the nature of the penance. Adam explains the
details, the rivers are the same, Tigris and Jordan, but both are to spend thirty
days not actually *in*, but rather by the side of, the river, in caves. A further
development is the insistence by Adam that Eve should not permit herself to
be tempted again, effective as dramatic irony and encountered elsewhere in
vernacular adaptations. They agree to meet again in the Valley of Hebron, and
Eve departs in sorrow. It is clear that this does not match the *VAE* especially
closely, and changes in the substance patently depend to an extent on the
dramatic aspects—having the pair do penance beside the river is a clear
dramatic necessity, and Eve (who is in any case afraid) announces as a kind
of teichoscopy that she can hear the river: 'Ha chetu ar rivier, me gelo moes an
dour' (v. 1641; here is the river, I can hear the noise of the water, RC 10,
pp. 432–3). All the circumstantial details—the stone, the flowing hair, and so
on—are of course lost. So, however, is the motif of the static water, which may
have been deliberate (as again difficult to portray in a drama) or may not have
been remembered, if the dramatist was working from memory rather than
from a text. The fasting is similarly not mentioned as such.

After four days (rather than the eighteen of the *VAE*; we hear this later in the play) Satan tempts Eve again, introducing himself once more in precisely the same phrase ('Me a so un El guen', v. 1654, *RC* 10, pp. 434–5) as for the first temptation, which makes the link between the first fall and the second all the stronger. In a drama, of course, objective comments in the *VAE*, such as the mention of the devil's anger, cannot really be put across, since what the audience has to see is Eve in conversation with what she thinks is an angel. A prior diabolical council would make the point, but there is not one in this case. The devil insists on his role as a messenger (an angel, therefore), claims that four days has been enough, and then delivers with enormous dramatic effect the clinching lie that Adam has already gone to Hebron. This again is not in the *VAE*, although there is a brief version of it in the English Wheatley manuscript, where the devil simply says that Adam is out of the water. The Breton play has none of the effects of the water on Eve, because this time she has not been in it. Adam's reaction on seeing her, however, is close to that in *VAE* 10, and the Breton dramatist does include, albeit fairly briefly, the challenge from Adam, that they are not the cause of the devil's misery, and Satan's reply (using the language that ought to come from Lucifer—how God had created him most beautiful of the angels).

Very significantly, Satan leaves with the Latin tag (rhymed into the Breton text): 'consolatio miserorum est habere pares' (the consolation of the wretched is to have those who share it; misery loves company), which expresses concisely the point of the episode, something which is underscored in a number of other versions.[36] Adam prays to God, not to be rid of the devil, who has already left, but for general assistance, and is promised the redemption in a passage which is significant for its anticipation of the Holy Rood legend, and for which there is a very much smaller parallel in the Cornish *Origo mundi*. God promises Adam (referred to as 'ma mignon Adam', my dear Adam) that before his death he will send one of his sons (Adam does not at this stage have any) to paradise, and that the son will receive three seeds which will grow into three trees which will go to make a cross that will be raised on Calvary for the Passion of Christ. This is clearly from a Holy Rood version, and more specifically one in which three separate trees grow. Adam and Eve now return to Hebron, and there is another new motif in the beginnings of agriculture. Only now does Adam build a dwelling, and, encouraged by Eve, sows corn. However, the devils now meet once again and decide to sow bad herbs ('drouc-lousou', v. 1847, *RC* 10, pp. 450–1) amongst them.

---

[36] Bernard notes on the line (v. 1716, *RC* 10, 438–9) that the scribe has given the Latin correctly apart from the last word, which appears as 'paret' to rhyme with 'bet' in the fore-going line.

This development of the biblical Genesis 3: 17–19 has been seen already in the Anglo-Norman *Mystère d'Adam*.

Act V shows us the birth of Cain and Abel—none of this is linked with the *VAE* text—and the fratricide in some detail, after which the soul of Abel is taken to limbo. His body is found in the next act. The sixth act, most, but unfortunately not all, of which is present in the edition by Hamilton, contains the material, signalled already, of the Sethite quest.[37] Here Adam asks Seth to return to paradise (rather than Seth and Eve, so that this is a Holy Rood story). An angel admits him and he sees not only the place of the creation of Adam and Eve, but the tree of life, which has a portrait of the child who will be the second Adam. Seth is then given the seeds (and a flagon of oil, presumably maintaining the oil of mercy idea), and told to place them in Adam's mouth and eyes. He returns to do so.

The presence of the penance scene, even in this changed form, can depend only upon the *VAE*, and other smaller elements may have done so (the fall of the angels, the souls in limbo). As indicated, a precise source is unclear, and indeed there may not actually have been a single source, neither a Latin *VAE* as such, although there is manuscript evidence of the work in various forms in France, nor a specific but lost (French) play of the sort suspected by Le Braz. The Cornish connection is not strong enough to draw any particular conclusions in this respect. At this stage, memory of the story from an earlier source might well have sufficed. The narrative was certainly known in medieval French in prose in the versions by Andrius and later by Colard Mansion, and the variant version by Robert de Blois provides extra evidence that the outline of the story, and notably the penance scene, was known. What we do have, however, is a late recording of an interesting version of the apocryphon which again makes no acknowledgement of its apocryphal nature, and indeed incorporates it unquestioningly into the Bible. The opening prologue is quite unequivocal:

> Ebars er bla present hon deus-hi composet
> Tennet divoar ar Bipl, e versio bresonec. (v. 23–4, RC 9, pp. 162–3)

(Within this present year we composed this piece and took it from the Bible into Breton verse.)

---

[37] Stone, *History*, 120, refers to Seth exploring paradise on his return, but this, while partly correct, comes from a somewhat misleading comment by Bernard in *RC* 9, 153. Bernard does not give us that section of the work, and his parallels with Virgil and Dante are also fanciful. As in the usual Holy Rood stories, Seth sees the trees in paradise, although he is also shown where his parents were created.

We do not know which year is implied, but we may presume that the audience were unaware of what was biblical and what was not, and will have accepted the text as a whole, including a version of the apocryphal life of Adam and Eve with a varied penance story. In terms of the development of the apocrypha as such, however, the Breton text, for all that it demonstrates only an incomplete recollection of the work, makes at least two striking developments. First, the inclusion of the figure of Death, created by God just before the penance, and thus providing a much better motivation for it, is an important development; Eve asks for death in the *VAE*, but in fact death had never been experienced and was as unknown to Eve as childbirth. Yet here this new phenomenon is made clear to the protoplasts and underscored by the very figure of Death, who causes terror in both of them and prompts the penance. Less significant, perhaps, but an interesting variation is the subtlety that the angel-devil, when Eve actually shows some signs of resistance to his second temptation after four days, tells her that Adam is already at what they have agreed to be the meeting place, and thus allays her fears. It is a point which is effective in a literary sense, and at the same time is a genuine—and of course late—development in the overall narrative, taking even further the brief indication of it in texts like the English Wheatley version. The Breton text in the 1825 manuscript and perhaps the dramas recorded equally recently in southern Germany probably represent the last developments of the changing apocryphon.

ITALIAN

In the vernacular there is a strong tradition of the Holy Rood legend in Italy, rather than one of the *Vita Adae et Evae*, at least in the early part of the Middle Ages. Adolfo Mussafia, professor of Neo-Latin in Vienna, and one of the first scholars to investigate the Holy Rood legend in recent times, noted in 1869 the *VAE* versions of Andrius and Colard Mansion, as well as the German text printed by von der Hagen, but does not refer to any Italian versions, although he does describe and give examples of the Holy Rood material in a variety of European vernaculars as well as in Latin. An Italian Holy Rood text (from a fourteenth-century manuscript) was edited in the following year and dedicated to Mussafia.[38] Nevertheless, there are some fairly clear reflexes in Italian

[38] Adolfo Mussafia, 'Sulla leggenda del legno della croce', *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.hist. Cl. 63 (1869), 165–216. Mussafia refers on 168–70 to French and German versions. His reference in n. 14 to MS Weimar Q 166 may refer to Weimar Q 566 (Han's Folz's prose translation). See for the Italian Holy Rood text the unfortunately titled

of the *VAE*, one each in verse, drama, and prose, two of them very much linked with the Holy Rood material, although interestingly the drama is not.

Bonvesin da la Riva

The Milanese poet Fra Bonvesin da la Riva was a member of the penitent order of (H)Umiliati, who was born between 1240 and 1250, and died around 1313/15. He composed a number of poems in the vernacular (in this case in his local dialect) as well as some works in Latin, and the Italian piece central to this investigation, *De cruce*, was not established until relatively recently, and was first published in 1979.[39] The fragmentary work does not provide a great deal of evidence of knowledge of the *VAE*, and the material is restricted to a handful of quatrains concerning the death of Adam and the quest to paradise for the oil of mercy, the point, of course, which overlaps with the legends of the Rood; the first editor discusses the text, indeed, as a Rood legend, as have others. However, it is significant that when Adam is dying, both Seth and Eve—the pattern of the *VAE* rather than the Rood *Legende*, where Seth is alone—go to paradise ('Andando Eva con Seth . . .', v. 35). Seth, again as in the *VAE*, is attacked by the serpent, this time with echoes of Genesis 3: 15 and the devil lying in wait for the heel, however, rather than following the *VAE* ('Ecco Seth da una serpa fo morso il so calcanio', v. 36). The sorrows ('plaga', v. 51, echoes *VAE* 39) are driven away from Seth, however, and he and Eve finish their journey, where they pray and weep for the ailing Adam ('ke sta in infirmità', v. 58). A seraph appears and tells them that Adam is to die. A gap in

---

La leggenda d'Adamo ed Eva, ed. Alessandro d'Ancona (1870; repr. Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1968). Although the text is indeed headed 'La legienda d'Adamo e d'Eva sua moglie', d'Ancona rightly calls it a 'leggenda dell'albero della croce' in his preface. Meyer's study and text in 1882 filled in the details, of course, and also noted the familiar confusion in the titles. See now also Federico Armiraglio, *La leggenda di Adamo ed Eva* (Milan: Skira, 2006).

[39] Bonvesin da la Riva, *De cruce: testo frammentario inedito*, ed. Silvia Isella Brusamolino (Milan: Pesce d'Oro, 1979); the relevant section is on 19–22 (*VAE* text on 65–8). The MS (illustrated in this edition) is from the Ambrosiana in Milan T 46 Sup., of the fifteenth century. There are various manuscripts, otherwise most notably that in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (Ital. qu. 26). See also: Bonvesin da la Riva, *I Volgari*, ed. Adrian M. Gökçen (New York: Lang, 1996), 213 (text from a different MS), and also Bonvesin de la Riva, *Volgari scelti*, trans. Patrick S. Diehl and Ruggero Stefanini (New York: Peter Lang, 1988). The earlier editions of Bonvesin's works by L. Biadene and V. de Bartholomaeis, and by G. Contini, do not contain the text. See finally Guiliana Albini, 'Bonvesin da la Riva, un intellettuale laico alla ricerca di uno dimensione religiosa nella Milano di fine Duecento', in Maria Bettelli (-Bergamaschi) and Grado Giovanni Merlo (eds.), *Lombardia monastica e religiosa* (Milan: Biblioteca francescana, 2001), 307–63, and in Albini, *Carità e governa delle povertà (secoli XII–XVI)* (Milan: Unicopli 2002), 19–53 (and on the web). This also takes the poem as a Rood legend, which it largely is.

the text is followed by two strophes on the death of Adam and on the death of both of the protoplasts. The poem has, then, an indication of the quest of Seth with Eve which is from a version of *VAE* 35–46 in very abbreviated form. As the title indicates, the poem is principally about the cross, and the second part contains a complaint of the Virgin. That Eve and Seth go together, however, indicates, as do other details, knowledge of the last part, at least, of the *VAE*, and one presumes that Bonvesin could as well have used a Holy Rood version of the quest, but did not. This vernacular reflection does not develop the apocryphon, although it does adapt the attack on Seth, but it does provide evidence that the text was known, and it may also perhaps indicate the way in which the text gradually gave way to the dominant Rood narrative.

The Bologna play

Meyer did not know (and it would not be published for more than half a century) of a religious play from Bologna from the second part of the fifteenth century which, like the Breton play, dramatizes the episode of the penance in the water. Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis published in his three-volume collection of medieval religious plays in 1943 a group from Bologna which begins with a *Rappresentazione ciclica* in ottava rima.[40] The work opens with the creation and first fall, in which the devil (simply *el demonio*) tries in vain to tempt Adam before turning his attention to Eve while Adam is asleep. Adam eats the fruit at Eve's persuasion 'per lo mio amore' (v. 248), and the pair are expelled from paradise. The *VAE* material is now used for a fairly small but quite distinct section of the work, occupying only seventeen ottava rima stanzas (vv. 345–480), and using only the penance episode. The devil is driven away after his debate with Adam, and there the episode ends; the play moves then to an equally separate section, a *processio* of the prophets. The use of the *VAE* is brief and limited, then, but it is far more than just an allusion, and forms an interesting part of the work.

The section begins with a stage direction which looks like a translation of the *VAE*: 'Quando furno fuori del Paradiso, dice Adam ad Eva' (when they were expelled from Paradise, Adam said to Eve . . .). The pair bewail their lot,

---

[40] Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis (ed.), *Laude drammatiche e rappresentazioni sacre* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1943), iii. 189–256; the MS is in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Rome V.E. 483, the compiler 'Thomas Leonis Bononiensis civis', a scribe whose name appears elsewhere in Bolognese documents. The editor also refers to the Florentine style of the work in his introduction. See Peter Happé, *Cyclic Form and the English Mystery Plays* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004), 196–8, and on other material in the manuscript Lynette R. Muir, *Love and Conflict in Medieval Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 32–3 (and n. 7).

and Eve asks Adam to pray for help from God (the motif of her asking for death is absent). Adam suggests a penance, and Eve, as in the *VAE*, asks what that is ('che cosa è penitenza', v. 374). Adam, who addresses Eve as 'my sister' ('sorella mia', v. 377 and later), explains that they are to stand in the water up to the neck fasting and without speaking, because they are not worthy to open their mouths. This uses the details of *VAE* 6, with the difference that Adam claims that he will stand for eighty days ('ottanto giorni', v. 380). The difference from the usual pattern is a striking one, and may simply be a scribal error for the expected 'quaranta', or it may have been changed to underline the next point, which is (as in *VAE* 6 again) that Eve cannot do as much as he. She is told to complete thirty days 'in l'acqua' (v. 396)—the name of the river is not given for her. Adam says that he will go to the Jordan, however, and does so. When he reaches the river, he asks the river itself and the fish in it to weep with him for his sin.

The devil, who is still referred to as 'el demonio', and does not seem to be disguised as an angel,[41] now comes to Eve, who is undertaking her penance in the water, and addresses her, as Adam does, as 'sorella'. Although the disguise is not mentioned, the devil says that he has come from God, and claims that he has interceded to God on her and Adam's behalf. He tells her that she may leave the water and break her fast ('manzare', v. 423) since God does not wish her to suffer, and indeed wishes her to live (an interesting variation on her desire for death, which is not used in this version). The *VAE* is clearly being followed, but the brevity of the passage means that a lot is left out. One wonders whether the disguise of the devil, which seems not to be indicated in the stage directions, is simply taken as read. There is no indication of Eve's reaction when she leaves the water, of course, nor do we know how long she has fasted, but when she is taken to Adam, his reaction is directed towards the devil, following the later part of *VAE* 12, rather than making a reproach to Eve. Adam also personalizes his question to the devil. Where the *VAE* text has Adam ask why they are being persecuted ('nos peserqueris'), here he wants to know 'perché mi vien tanto a perseguitare' (v. 426; why am I being persecuted so much?). The devil explains that after his ejection from heaven, Adam was created to take his place, and swears enmity to Adam and all his descendants. Three strophes remain. In the first, Adam addresses God and asks for help and for grace to be able to complete his penance; in a strophe directed to Eve, however, we leave the *VAE* when Adam tells her to return to the place she came from and continue to pray for God's compassion; God concludes the section then by returning to the biblical Genesis, telling them to increase

---

[41] I have commented on this point (together with other aspects of the Bologna and Breton plays) in my *Adam's Grace*, 43.

and multiply and fill the earth, and live from the fruits of the earth (Gen. 1: 28–31).[42]

The relationship of this work to the *VAE* is of considerable interest; it is unclear what the precise source may have been, and whether indeed it was a whole text or one just of the penance episode, but the material has been both accurately and neatly handled. This is an adapted version of the penance episode which patently knows the text of the original, since there are verbal echoes throughout, but it has been abridged and integrated into a larger whole. The essence of the episode remains, even if some details are (or may have been) omitted (the devil as angel, the Tigris) or changed (the eighty-day penance). We still have the need for penance, Eve's readiness to believe the devil because she is hungry, the envy and permanent threat of the devil, and the assistance of God in driving the devil away. The use of the dramatic form will have caused the loss of some elements, but the deliberate nature of the adaptation is also clear, especially at the end, where the return to the biblical Genesis is particularly skilfully done. The integration of the episode into a biblical play with no indication of any apocryphal status is also significant. Interesting, finally, is the absence here in a late work of anything of the Holy Rood, because we end the section with the fertility of Adam and Eve, not their deaths. Drama is a direct genre, and an audience would have been able to assimilate the central episode of the *VAE* in a compact form.

Italian prose

In other cultures, prose and metrical versions have preceded the dramatic, but the prose reflection of the *Vita Adae et Evae* in Italian seems to be late. Meyer refers in the introduction to his edition to the *Fioretti della Biblia hystoriati*, and notes that this text was frequently reprinted in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He cites an edition from Venice in 1515 as covering *VAE* 1–21, 23, and 25–35, with the Holy Rood material following on from that. He groups this text with his class II manuscripts.[43]

---

[42] On the importance of the verse, see Jeremy Cohen, '*Be Fertile and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It*' (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989).

[43] Meyer, '*Vita Adae*', 213. See Eduardo Barbieri, 'Tradition and Change in the Spiritual Literature of the Cinquecento', in *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, trans. Adrian Belton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 110–33, esp. 127–8. Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 252 n. 39, refers to the *Fiore novella estratto della Bibbia* printed in Venice in 1473 and reprinted between 1500 and 1552. See also the *Fioretti della Biblia hystoriati et nouauamente correcti* (Venice, 1515). As with several of the early printed texts, more attention needs to be paid to these.

An even later text (with a promising title), the 1640 *L'Adamo* of Giovanni Francesco Loredano the younger (1607–61), translated into English as *The Life of Adam* in 1659, contains much that is non-biblical and indeed entertaining as regards the post-lapsarian life of the protoplasts, but it seems not to be (much) influenced by the *VAE*.[44] Eve's pregnancy, however, is developed in detail with the aside that Adam suffered too, since having (as the English translation puts it) 'a wife, and a wife pregnant, is a species of martyrdome'. This time it is Adam, rather than Michael, who acts as midwife, although Eve gives birth to Cain and Calmana together, then Abel and Delbora. When he is about to die, Adam does gather his children and addresses them, especially Seth, and is buried in Hebron. Some of this seems more likely to depend upon Holy Rood material, but there may—and it is no more than a possibility—also be faint echoes of, or possibly a reaction to, the *Vita Adae et Evae.*

[44] *Giovanno Francesco Loredano, The Life of Adam . . . A Facsimile Reproduction of the English Translation of 1659*, ed. Roy C. Flanagan and John Arthos (Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles, 1967). The translation is signed T.S. See 58–9 on the birth of Cain and Calmana. Loredano published his *L'Adamo* in 1640 (Venice: Grisei) and it was reprinted several times; the work is described as an historical romance. The author's forename is spelt Giovanno on the title page of the English translation of 1659; in the original it appears in abbreviated form, hence presumably the confusion.

6

Iconography

There is not an extensive tradition of illustration of the various narrative elements of the *Vita Adae*, so that consideration of it is little more than an adjunct to the discussion of the literary tradition. Indeed, we may point only to one full set of illustrations in a late manuscript, and to some isolated further examples in manuscript and in monumental sculpture. One reason for this may well be the widespread and fully developed tradition of iconography of the *biblical* creation and fall, represented in the Middle Ages by such disparate and great monuments as the Vienna (Greek) Genesis manuscript, the St Mark mosaics in Venice, the bronze doors of Hildesheim or of Florence, stained glass, enamels, carved capitals, bosses and bench-ends, statuary, crosses, frescos and paintings, as well as innumerable illustrated Bibles in various traditions (including *Historienbibeln* and those in the typological *Biblia pauperum* tradition) and liturgical works (such as Books of Hours), other manuscripts and early printed books of all kinds, and even (regularly) medieval maps. The massive volumes of Hans Martin von Erffa's *Ikonologie der Genesis*, for example, make this clear.[1] The wealth of canonical material would tend to push the public or even the private representation of an apocryphal story into the background. To be sure, even ostensibly biblical illustrations regularly introduce non-biblical elements, of which perhaps the

---

[1] Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 170 and *passim*. To give only a very few examples: Sigrid Braunfels-Esche, *Adam und Eva: Sündenfall und Erlösung* (Düsseldorf: Lukas, 1957); Lutz Röhrich, *Adam und Eva: Das erste Menschenpaar in Volkskunst und Volksdichtung* (Stuttgart: Müller and Schindler, 1968); Penny Howell Jolly, *Made in God's Image? Eve and Adam in the Genesis Mosaics at San Marco, Venice* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997 (with illustrations from other sources)). There is a good brief survey by John Trapp, 'Iconography', in John Broadbent (ed.), *John Milton: Introductions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 162–85, looking at medieval examples and also at Michelangelo, Raphael, and others down to Dürer and Rembrandt. See also Diane Kelsey McColley, *A Gust for Paradise* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1993). The less well-known appearance of the protoplasts on medieval maps is documented by Ingrid Baumgärtner, 'Biblische, mythische und fremde Frauen: Zur Konstruktion der Weiblichkeit in Text und Bild mittelalterlicher Weltkarten', *Chloe* (Beihefte zu *Daphnis*), 34 (2002), 31–86. There is a very extensive secondary literature on the interface of Bible and illustration and on the typology tradition in the *Biblia pauperum* and elsewhere.

human (often female) face on the serpent is probably the most familiar. In our context, of course, it is interesting (though it may not be linked with the *VAE*) that the eleventh-century manuscript of Anglo-Saxon biblical poetry, Bodleian Junius 11, which contains *Genesis A* with the (originally Old Saxon) *Genesis B* interpolated, depicts in its drawings of the biblical temptation the tempter in angelic rather than serpentine form.[2]

Additional elements are sometimes more specific, however, and often originate from works like Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*. Thus as one small example, the fourteenth-century French so-called *Picardy Picture Bible* follows the expulsion with a picture of Adam delving while Eve spins—this is the most familiar image—but although Eve has an infant on her knee indicated as Abel, beside her stand together Cain and Delbora, again both labelled. Cain's sister and wife is usually Calmana, while Delbora is associated with Abel (or occasionally Seth).[3] Typically a biblical sequence might have the creation of the world, of Adam, of Eve from Adam's side, Adam naming the beasts, the temptation by the serpent, the expulsion, and then Adam and Eve at work, Adam digging the ground (as in Gen. 3: 23) and Eve with a distaff. There are sometimes additional depictions of Adam and Eve lamenting after the expulsion, however, although this image is not always present. The pair are frequently naked at the expulsion (although in fact God has clothed them beforehand, Gen. 3: 21), but then clothed in the work scene.[4] The biblical sequence of illustrations then moves to Cain and Abel.

Even in the one full collection of apocryphal illustrations the work for which the illustrations were prepared merges the biblical Adamic narrative with the apocryphal, so that we have in the illustrations a sequence of pictures of the life of Adam and Eve before, as well as after, the fall. This sole full collection of illustrations of the *Vita Adae* material is found in the mid fifteenth-century Cod. Vindob. 2980 (Ambras 259) in the Austrian National Library in Vienna of Lutwin's *Eva und Adam*, and the pictures have been reproduced in full and analysed by Lutwin's editor and translator, Mary-Bess Halford.[5] This manuscript has relatively recently been identified as coming

---

[2] See *The Caedmon Poems*, trans. Kennedy, 209. See also O. K. Werckmeister, 'The Lintel Fragment Representing Eve from Saint-Lazare, Autun', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 35 (1972), 1–30.

[3] See Gloria Cigman, 'The Word of God in Pictures', *History Today*, 49/7 (July 1999), 18–25.

[4] See Antony Eastmond, 'Narratives of the Fall: Structure and Meaning in the Genesis Frieze at Hagia Sophia, Trebizond', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 53 (1999), 219–36, with many illustrations, largely from Byzantine sequences. Eastmond also notes on the question of nakedness the tradition that the protoplasts were also sometimes clothed (allegorically) before the fall.

[5] Mary-Bess [= M. E. B.] Halford, *Illustration and Text in Lutwin's Eva und Adam: Codex Vindob. 2980* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1980). The illustrations are unfortunately in black and white, but Halford describes them in close and useful detail. See Chapter 4, above, for a

from the well-known and highly productive workshop of Dietbold or Diebold Lauber in Hagenau (now Haguenau) in Alsace. The workshop produced manuscripts from 1427 to around 1470, often with new cycles of illustrations. The output included *Historienbibeln* as well as a range of other books.[6] The location is of some interest, given that the one rather earlier representation of the material in statuary is in the pilgrimage church at Thann, also in Alsace, although this may simply be coincidence.

The Vienna codex contains the sole extant text of Lutwin's poem *Eva und Adam*, composed around 1300, a rhymed version of the *VAE* with the material integrated into a biblical context. The considerably later manuscript has twenty-nine pen and colour-wash drawings (averaging in size around 14 cm × 10 cm), the first group with rubricated descriptions. Halford suggests in her study that the immediate copy text was also illustrated (whether the original was is unknown), and that there may have been more copies. The first eight illustrations follow the biblical Genesis sequence outlined above, with the serpent crowned and with a female face.[7] Number 8, the final illustration in the biblical sequence, shows Adam and Eve, fully clothed in good-quality contemporary garments, with distaff and hoe. In fact, when the pair are ejected from paradise in illustration 7, they are naked, in spite of the biblical text (God clothes them in Gen. 3: 21, and they are expelled in 3: 24). Halford notes in her analysis of the individual pictures that this does not really match the Lutwin text.

Indeed, the incongruity of this scene is further underscored by the next one, illustration 9, the first of those dependent upon the *VAE*, and we appear to have gone back in time to the period immediately after the expulsion: Adam and Eve sit in a crude hut (it is in fact structurally impossible), Adam wearing on this occasion a fringed garment, presumably the biblical garment of skins, as in Genesis, while Eve is wearing what appears to be the same long dress as

---

discussion of the text. Halford, *Lutwin*, also discusses the manuscript. There are illustrations from the manuscript (from the Sethite portion towards the end) in Baert, *Heritage of Holy Wood*, figs 90a–i, and one is used for the cover illustration of Murdoch and Tasioulas, *Lives of Adam*.

[6] Liselotte E. Saurma-Jetsch, *Spätformen mittelalterlicher Buchherstellung: Bilderhandschriften aus der Werkstatt Diebold Laubers in Hagenau* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001), also with illustrations from the Lutwin manuscript. The useful website from the University of Heidelberg has a wealth of information on Lauber's workshop and that of its predecessor, the so-called Alsace workshop of 1418, with a detailed bibliography, some of it accessible on line: <www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/helios/fachinfo/www/kunst/digi/lauber>. See Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography*, trans. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990 = 2nd rev. edn. of 1986), 234, and also Ute von Bloh, *Die illustrierten Historienbibeln: Text und Bild in Prolog und Schöpfungsgeschichte der deutschsprachigen Historienbibeln des Spätmittelalters* (Bern: Lang, 1993).

[7] See John K. Bonnell, 'The Serpent with a Human Head in Art and in Mystery Play', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 21 (1917), 255–91, with reference to the Lutwin MS on 270.

in the earlier picture. The pair are discussing the penance, we are told in the rubric, and Adam is speaking, this indicated by the fact that he is pointing at Eve. The scene shows, then, the 'tabernaculum' of the *VAE*. Halford notes that the pair are represented as clothed in skins in a hut in the seventh-century Ashburnham Pentateuch, and Adam wears a fringed garment in a Byzantine mosaic from the twelfth century. In this manuscript the scene is a logical one. In the woodcut (9.4×6.3 cm) on the title page of Hans Folz's 1480 Nuremberg printed text containing his metrical version of the story, the pair sit in a similar crude hut, clearly in discussion, next to the gateway of paradise, in which hangs a sword, but they are on this occasion naked. This is presumably intended to underline their misery after the loss of paradise. It is not made clear in Folz's text, but elsewhere Eve complains of the cold, as in the *Saltair na Rann*.[8]

The next illustration in the Lutwin manuscript shows Eve in the Tigris, and that following has Adam in the Jordan, both immersed to the waist. Four fish, their heads out of the water, help Adam in his prayers. In illustration 12 the devil (we are told in the rubric) comes in the guise of an angel to Eve. The devil is not recognizable here, and is either standing in the water or on the shore, assisting Eve out of the river and away from her penance, something which clearly pleases her. The rubric for the next illustration reads: 'Wie der tüfel euam betrogen Vnd uß der büsse gefüret hette Vnd wie er adam ouch wolte betrogen haben' (How the devil tricked Eve and led her out of her penance, and how he wanted to trick Adam as well). This interprets the *VAE* a little: as Halford again points out, the devil's intention regarding Adam is not explained, and in fact Adam recognizes him immediately. Halford notes further that in this second picture of the devil, although he is still in disguise, his cloven feet are clearly visible.

For the next few illustrations, still following the *VAE*, the couple remain naked. In the fourteenth they are clearly in sexual contact (the rubric uses the phrase 'gar lieplich', 'very loving'), and in the next they separate to go (in this case) a thousand miles from each other. As Halford points out, the picture does indeed illustrate Lutwin's adapted version, where Eve leaves in anger (rather than in shame), an important variation in the narrative as such.[9] In the sixteenth picture, a still-naked and now clearly pregnant Eve prays to the sun to help her, so that Adam is called. His prayers lead to the angelic assistance in the *Vita*, and in the seventeenth illustration four angels surround

---

[8] It is illustrated and discussed in Ursula Rautenberg, *Das Titelblatt: Die Entstehung eines typographischen Dispositivs im frühen Buchdruck* (Erlangen-Nürnberg: Buchwissenschaft, 2004), 19.

[9] Halford refers to my paper 'Eve's Anger' in her discussion of the picture.

her, one holding the newly born Cain. There is no rubric on this occasion, but the child's full head of yellow hair may echo the 'lucidus' of the *VAE* text. The picture shows nothing of the miraculous happenings at Cain's birth, however, nor could the illustrator feasibly have included the number of angels and Virtues called for in the *VAE*. The angel by Eve's head is differently dressed, however, and is presumably either the archangel Michael or one of the Virtues.

From now on, the figures are dressed in contemporary costume. In illustration 18 an angel (dressed like all the other angels) shows Adam how to plough the ground. Since Michael does this, this may mean that the differently dressed angel in 17 is one of the Virtues. Cain kills Abel with a hoe or an adze in 19. Illustration 20, however, shows the translation of Adam into heaven, which he recounts to Seth. Two angels present the now ageing and bearded Adam to God the creator (who holds the orb of the world), within the crenellated walls of heaven. The next illustration moves on to Adam's death, though there is no rubric to this or any of the subsequent illustrations.[10] The aged Adam lies in bed attended by Eve (now wearing a white headdress to indicate her age), as well as Seth and another son and daughter. Seth and Eve appear again in the subsequent illustration, on the way to paradise, where they are confronted with the serpent. The serpent is depicted exactly as in illustration 5, and hence is clearly the devil once again, with a crowned woman's head, while Seth's hand gestures indicate that he is speaking to it, presumably driving it away by reference to the image of God, as in the *VAE*. In the next picture Seth is given a single twig with three branches by an angel, and, as Halford points out, this is the same kind of branch as shown earlier on the tree of life. Nothing else is visible of paradise (which is shown as a very small enclosure), and there is no rubric, so that this scene has to represent a great deal. It is of course well-nigh impossible to convey the idea of the prophecy and the oil of mercy, or indeed the spices. In the next scene Seth shows the branch to Adam, and in the next, the twenty-fifth, Adam has died and is being mourned by Eve, Seth, and another son. Following this is an illustration of a closed sepulchre, with Eve and Seth leaning over it and tears falling from their eyes. Halford rightly points out that there is no sepulchre mentioned in the *VAE*, since Adam's body is taken away, but the tradition that he was buried in Hebron probably lies behind this. Of interest too is the fact that so many illustrations are devoted to the death of Adam. Eve's death follows, with the deathbed attended by four figures, two male and two female. One of the male figures looks like Seth in the preceding pictures

---

[10] Halford points out, *Illustration*, 39, that this is unfortunate, as we come precisely at this point to the rather difficult overlap between *VAE* and Rood narratives.

(and this is supposedly only six days after the death of Adam), but the other is bearded and looks formal, almost priest-like. The motif of writing down the story of the protoplasts is not indicated, however. Following this is an illustration of Adam's tomb, from the centre of which a tree is now growing. Time has presumably passed, so that it is no longer clear who the surrounding figures are meant to be. Again there is a bearded and cowled figure, like a monk, whom Halford sees as Seth (which may be the case, although there is another figure who more closely resembles Seth as he is portrayed in the other illustrations) standing nearby, together with another bearded man and another clearly much younger one. This presumably indicates the increase in the generations. The final illustration is of Noah releasing the dove, who according to the text will settle in the tree on Adam's grave, an 'oleyboum', an olive tree, which is linked with the motif of the oil of mercy in the text.

As Halford has made clear in her analysis of the relationship between image and text, the artist has been fairly free with the story. What is of interest in the present context is the extent to which the illustrations may interpret, underline, or indeed modify aspects of the apocryphon. Sometimes, of course, space has dictated change, such as the number of angels attending Eve. Of special merit, perhaps, is the small but effective indication that the angel who tempts Eve from the river and takes her to Adam actually *is* the devil in disguise by the appearance of the cloven feet, and also the separation of Adam and Eve after the penance, which Lutwin's poem develops in an unusual manner in any case. Noteworthy too is the link between the serpent who attacks Seth and the serpent in paradise, although there is a clear break between the biblical illustrations and the *VAE* sequence after the picture of Adam and Eve at their labours. The slightly disproportionate number of illustrations associated with Adam's death is striking, and in these it is not always entirely clear who is present, especially at the end.

The more limited reflections of the *VAE* in sculpture on the pilgrimage church of St Theobald in Thann, also now in French Alsace, pre-date the manuscript from Lauber's workshop, having been executed in the mid-fourteenth century. The tympanum on the west façade has an extended sequence of biblical sculptures which include two that link with the *VAE*.[11] The most recent (and illuminating) study of these sculptures, by Assaf Pinkus,

---

[11] See Assaf Pinkus, 'The Impact of the Black Death on the Sculptural Program of the Pilgrimage Church St Theobald in Thann: New Perception of the Genesis Story', *Studies in Art History*, 6 (2001), 161–76. See 163–4 on the Lutwin connection. The paper itself is otherwise stimulating, but there is no reason for a direct link. Pinkus provides illustrations of the relevant carvings, as well as of comparable pieces. The sculptures are associated with the school of Peter Parler, and Pinkus refers to and provides examples of Genesis cycles on the cathedrals of Freiburg and Ulm.

considers Lutwin's poem as such to be the source, though this is unlikely in view of how well known the material was in general terms, and of the fact that Lutwin's version does not match these sculptures particularly well. Two scenes are included within the general creation and fall context, however. First, following the expulsion, is a combined version of the penance in the river. Adam and Eve are depicted together, up to their necks in water, with a number of fish heads appearing from the stylized waves. In the *VAE*, this would illustrate Adam's penance in the Jordan admirably, were it not for the presence here of Eve, whose position in the same river is presumably simply to indicate that they both did penance. In his discussion of the scene (which he, surely in error, sees as taking place in the Tigris, although it is the Jordan where the fish stand still), Pinkus sees it as a baptism (it is indeed like some baptism scenes of Christ), and also linked with the emphasis on penance at the time of the Black Death. Whether or not the merging of the two river penances was, as Pinkus argues, deliberate (rather than dictated by artistic necessity), to stress their collective destiny, is a matter of debate. Certainly, however, the penance is emphasized in a very forceful manner, and the failure to have a separate penance for Eve implicitly rules out the possibility of a second temptation.[12]

The other scene represented at Thann is of the birth of Cain, which follows that of the penance. Eve is depicted with Cain, an angel supporting him, and two other angels behind her. The angel with the child is presumably Michael, who in the *VAE* assists with the birth. Again the *VAE* usually calls for more angels, although the presence of Michael and just two others is not impossible even in the manuscript tradition. Once more Pinkus notes that this scene's inclusion stresses the mercy of God, and certainly the role of the devil, so prominent in the *VAE* as such, is nowhere reflected here, and specifically not in the penance scene, which can therefore more easily be matched with baptism. There is no further reflection of the narrative, however, and Pinkus' implicit link between these carvings and the Sethite scene in sculpture at Heiligenkreuz in Schwäbisch Gmünd in Baden-Württemberg may be misleading, even though the scene as such might also be connected with the period of the Black Death through the stress on divine mercy. The Münster of Heiligen-kreuz, which is of course dedicated to the Holy Cross, does indeed also belong to the prolific Parler school (Peter Parler, the architect of St Vitus' in Prague, was born in Schwäbisch Gmünd). The answer to Pinkus' question as to which version of the Sethite quest was used as a source at Schwäbisch Gmünd is

---

[12] Leonie Reygers identifies the scene in her article on 'Adam und Eva' in Otto Schmitt (ed.), *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1937–), i. 126–56 (with illustration).

clearly that it was a Holy Rood story, however, and to derive it from the unusual second journey by Seth in Lutwin is not necessary. The fourteenth-century sculpture at Heiligenkreuz may simply show the opening portion of the Holy Rood story, and this is hardly surprising given the dedication of the church. On the right of the carved panel, Eve tends the dying Adam, while on the left Seth receives from an angel at the door of paradise what seems to be a goblet, perhaps representing the oil of mercy. There is a tree visible inside paradise.[13] The structure of the double scene anticipates that by Piero della Francesca a century later in his Holy Rood cycle.

Further miniatures clearly illustrating the *VAE* narrative seem to be rare, although there is much scope for investigation here. Manuscripts of rhymed chronicles such as the *Christherre-Chronik* are sometimes illustrated, and Bob Miller notes in his edition of the *VAE* material from Heinrich von München's chronicle (which uses the *Christherre-Chronik* and other similar material) the illustrations in the Vienna manuscript cod. ser. nov. 9470. Here only a few of the illuminations can be unequivocally linked with the *VAE*. One shows Michael with Eve after the birth of Cain, while Adam holds the child, and three scenes in the Sethite part do seem to link with the *VAE*: Eve and Seth (rather than just Seth) receiving a twig from the tree, the return to Adam, and the burial of Adam. One other illustration from an earlier part of the narrative is far from clear; Miller suggests (tentatively) that it represents an angel worshipping the image of Adam, but other possible interpretations are radically different. Further illustrations in this manuscript, of 1370/80 from Vienna itself, are from the more familiar Genesis cycle.[14]

Hans Vollmer drew attention to (and reproduced) one illustration in a Hamburg folio manuscript of the Old Testament part of the *Historienbibel*, Cod. ms. 8 in scrinio, from just after the middle of the fifteenth century.[15] Here the miniature is at best a syncopated image, like that at Thann. Adam and

---

[13] Pinkus considers, in spite of his illustration, that Seth is being given a branch, 167–8. Halford, *Illustration*, 51 n. 60, describes it as a goblet.

[14] Miller, 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung', 282 and 287 (fos. 22va, 30ra, 30vb, and 31vb). Otto Mazal and Rosemary Hilmar, *Katalog der abendländischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 'Series Nova'… 5* (Vienna: Brüder Hollinek, 1997), 255–62 (and online), read the first image, on 21vb, as Adam, Eve, and the devil. In the catalogue the work is described as being by Heinrich von Mügeln rather than München. This is not the case in Hermann Menhardt's catalogue, *Verzeichnis der altdeutschen literarischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Berlin: Akademie, 1960–1), iii. 1521–2, where it is noted that the manuscript has 204 miniatures.

[15] The manuscript is designated *Θ* by Merzdorf, *Die deutschen Historienbibeln*. See Vollmer, *Adambuch*, who describes the manuscript on 48–50 and comments, 50, on the (poor) quality of the miniatures, which he considers to be by three different miniaturists. He notes that it was realized early that the text does not match the picture, which is reproduced on 51. See also Vollmer, *Ober- und mitteldeutsche Historienbibeln*, 150–1.

Eve are in water up to their necks together, while the angel-devil, robed and
winged, but with bat ears and an ugly face, and thus clearly a devil, speaks to
them, presumably trying to tempt them both from the water. If the quality is
perhaps not as bad as Vollmer suggests, he is nevertheless quite correct in
pointing out (as was noticed earlier, in fact) that this image is at odds with the
VAE in various respects. The devil is plainly recognizable, quite apart from the
fact that the two are in the water together. Only rarely do Adam and Eve do
penance together, as in the poem of Robert de Blois and in the carving at
Thann. The former is considerably earlier and rather different; the latter does
merge the two separate scenes because it contains also the praying fish. Beyond
this the sole parallel seems to be the quite different legend (which will be
described below) in which Adam and Eve weep a lake of remorseful tears
around themselves and stand together in it. In the Hamburg miniature, too,
we have none of the subsidiary motifs, such as the static river or praying fish.

The episode of the static river, however, has, as far as iconography is
concerned, a separate interest, in that in art, too, there is a clear link between
the *VAE* scene (as illustrated in the Lutwin manuscript and at Thann) and the
miracle at the birth or more notably the baptism of Christ. In a late twelfth-
century manuscript, a psalter written probably in the period 1170–83
(Oxford, Bodleian Library Gough liturg. 2; S.C. 18343, fo. 17), Christ stands
on a flagstone in the river for his baptism, flanked by St John and an angel,
with some of the fish standing upright in the river exactly as they do in the
pictorial representations of Adam's penance.[16] That particular illustration is
striking. Presentations of Christ's baptism normally show him standing in the
river with St John, or in the river with St John on one side and an angel—this
time a genuine one, of course—on the other, but without the fish.[17] In his
study of guilt in western culture, Friedrich Ohly also presents images of
Christ's baptism, with Christ standing on a stone which might be that on
which the pact with the devil was carved, and discusses other reflections of the
penance on the stone, either by Judas, or in literary terms in the case of
Gregorius, the German version of which consciously echoes the *VAE*.[18] The
connection between the penance of Adam and the baptism of Christ clearly

---

[16] *Scenes from the Life of Christ in English Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1951), pl. 9.

[17] See the two baptisms in London, BL, Harleiean 3240 and 2838 of the fourteenth and
fifteenth centuries respectively, illustrated in Rosemond Tuve, *A Reading of George Herbert*
(London: Faber, 1952), pl. IX. She also discusses the ramified symbolism of the Jordan in
medieval writings, 184. On typological parallels in general, and specifically the Adam–Christ
juxtaposition, see my 'River that Stopped Flowing'.

[18] Ohly, *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte*, trans. Archibald, *The Damned and the Elect.*
Chapter 3 is entitled 'The Penance on the Rock' (German edition 43–55, English edition
43–61). Ohly's (relatively late) illustrations do not have the praying fish motif.

has typological potential, and we may recall Pinkus' interpretation of the river scene at Thann. However, the highly developed scheme of medieval typology which balances *ante legem*, *sub lege*, and *sub gratia* scenes from the Old and New Testaments in works from the Klosterneuburg Altar to the *Biblia pauperum* might well have been a disincentive to illustrate the apocryphal text, partly on account of its non-biblical status and hence ineligibility for the provision of types (although Lutwin integrates the material with the Bible), but also because the biblical scenes were well established iconographically with equally well-established antitypes. In the guide for medieval painters, the so-called *Pictor in carmine*, the baptism of Christ is set against scenes involving Jacob, Moses, and Aaron, and the *Biblia pauperum* does not set the baptism against Adam but against Moses and the destruction of Pharaoh.[19]

It is very likely that more material will be found. In a paper published in 1933 Heinrich Jerchel referred to various illustrated manuscripts of the German world chronicles (notably those ascribed to Rudolf von Ems, sometimes in fact the so-called *Christherre-Chronik*) with illustrations. Most have illustrations from the biblical cycle, but two seem to have an additional illustration of Eve and the devil *after* the expulsion scene (Fulda, Landesbibliothek Aa 88 and Donaueschingen 79, now in Karlsruhe after the fairly recent break-up and sale of that collection).[20] *Historienbibeln* may provide a further possible source. Going beyond the precise illustration of the *VAE* itself, but perhaps tangentially related to one individual motif, is the manuscript image of Adam and Eve standing together in a lake in Ceylon, of which there is an example in the mid-fourteenth century *Livre des merveilles* (known in English, of course, as the *Travels of Sir John Mandeville*) in the Bibliothèque nationale. The text contains a reference to the separate legend of Adam and Eve weeping a lake of tears after their expulsion. This is at best only a late and slight connection with the *VAE* penance in the water, although the many (and frequently illustrated) versions of the very widely translated and popular

---

[19] Montague Rhodes James, '*Pictor in Carmine*', *Archaeologia*, 94 (1951), 141–66. It is a useful treatise on types and antitypes for artists, possibly by the Cistercian Adam of Dore at the start of the thirteenth century. See for example Avril Henry, *Biblia pauperum* (London: Scolar Press, 1987). In the case of creation standing still at the time of Christ's birth (in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*) and with Adam in the Jordan, we come close to apocryphal typology, of course: see my 'The River that Stopped Flowing'.

[20] Heinrich Jerchel, 'Die Bilder der südwestdeutschen Weltchroniken des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 2 (1933), 381–98; see 384. The point remains to be investigated. Donaueschingen 79 is a particularly richly illustrated version of the *Weltchronik* of Rudolf dated 1365.

Mandeville text sometimes contain images from the Holy Rood narrative (Seth at the gates of paradise, and placing the seeds in Adam's mouth), as in the so-called 'textless' pictorial version (London, BL, MS Add. 24189).[21]

In contrast, medieval illustration based upon the Holy Rood material (both the early history and the invention narrative) is very extensive indeed, with representations in various media including stone, wood, glass, and both manuscript and incunabula illustration. Once again the interest for the *VAE* lies in the overlapping point, the quest of Seth and then the death of Adam and the planting of the seeds that become the cross. Beside manuscript illustrations there is also a fine series of woodcuts of the Holy Rood story in the Dutch *Boec van den houte*, in a text printed by Jan Veldener at Kuilenburg in 1483.[22] The first three cuts form the overlap with the *VAE*: Adam sending Seth to fetch the oil of mercy not when he is on his deathbed, but while he is still standing, spade in hand; Seth at the gates of paradise being given the three seeds by an angel, presumably the gatekeeper cherub, who still holds a sword;[23] and Seth placing the seeds in the mouth of the coffined Adam.

Probably the most celebrated of the depictions of the Holy Rood narrative as such, the cross before and after Christ, are the frescos of the church of St Francis in Arezzo by Piero della Francesca, done on the commission of the Bacci family between 1452 and 1465, the first (and now partly damaged) scene

---

[21] Halford, *Illustration*, refers in her notes, 50 n. 54, to Louis Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien* (Paris: PUF, 1956–9), ii/i. 91 and to the illustration of Adam and Eve together in the lake in Ceylon. Some confusion has entered here, however; Réau (who considers the whole range of Adam and Eve iconography, 65–101) refers to the *Livre des merveilles* in the Bibliothèque nationale, but the two MSS mentioned in the note, BN 95 and 1837, are respectively the Andrius manuscript and one of the Colard Mansion texts, neither of which has such an illustration, although of course the two texts contain the penance motif as translations of the *VAE*. See however, as Halford also indicates, F. de Mély, 'Nos premiers parents dans l'art: Adam, Eve, Lilith', in P. Bergmans (ed.), *Mélanges Hulin de Loo* (Paris: Librairie nationale d'art et d'histoire, 1931), 116–22; see pl. 3. On the illustrations in Mandeville MSS see Rosemary Tzanaki, *Mandeville's Medieval Audiences: Studies in the Reception of the Book of Sir John Mandeville (1371–1550)* (London: Ashgate, 2003), 184; see 71–87 on illustrated manuscripts and 36 on that in London. Réau, *Iconographie*, ii/i. 94, describes as a motif, however, what he sees as a purifying bath *after* the birth of Cain, although he does refer also to the *VAE*. He notes as examples first the sculpture at Thann, which is from the *VAE* and takes place *before* the birth of Cain; and secondly one of the small medallions on the Portail des Libraires in the cathedral at Rouen which does not seem to be linked with the *VAE* at all.

[22] These are reproduced in J. P. Berjeau, *Geschiedenis van het heylighe Cruys, or History of the Holy Cross* (London: Stewart, 1863) and in Ashton, *Legendary History*. Quinn, *Quest*, uses the woodcuts as illustrations.

[23] Ashton refers to the angel as Michael the archangel, following the version in the *Golden Legend* and in Caxton's version; this may be the case, as Michael does frequently carry a sword, but the Dutch caption simply has 'die enghel'.

of which shows the dying Adam speaking to Seth, and Seth placing in his mouth the seeds that will grow into the cross.[24] As noted, the structure of the image is like that on the Heiligenkreuz sculpture in Schwäbisch Gmünd. Other churches have representations in various forms of the story of the cross, including such major examples as the cathedrals of Barcelona (again dedicated to the Holy Cross) and Toledo.[25] The clearly Christian theme and the regular dedications of churches to the cross make the more frequent use of the legends unsurprising.

In stained glass, there is a scene of Adam on his deathbed in the church of St Neot in Cornwall in early sixteenth-century glass which has aroused attention in that the Genesis illustrations in the creation window of which this is part might well have been influenced by the Cornish drama. The Cornish plays include the Holy Rood material, and while the cross legends as such are not depicted, the window illustrating Seth at the bedside of the dying Adam has him placing something in Adam's mouth, presumably the seeds that will grow into the cross. Behind the bed is a vision of a tree with a child in it, a motif found in one of the Cornish plays and in other literary texts, as well as in some English versions of the *VAE*. Evelyn Newlyn has made clear that this could very well be based upon a performance.[26]

Further echoes of what is really the Holy Rood narrative are found in iconographical traditions related to the crucifixion, either to the skull under the cross as that of Adam, or in the motif of the living cross, again growing from the seeds buried with Adam. Other legends, finally, which are regularly associated with, but not precisely part of, the *VAE* are also illustrated from time to time. Thus the creation legend of Adam as the microcosm, made from eight parts, is illustrated schematically in a *glossarium* from Regensburg dated

[24] See Kenneth Clark, *Piero della Francesca: Complete Edition* (London: Phaidon, 1951; 2nd edn. 1969), pls. 28–85, the death of Adam on pls. 28–9. See Erffa, *Ikonologie*, i. 114–19, with references 117 to similar cycles in Rome, Florence, and elsewhere, some in churches with the dedication to the cross.

[25] See Lourdes Suñe i Muñoz, 'La llegenda de l'arbre de la Creu al claustre de la Catedral de Barcelona', *Lambard: estudis d'art medieval*, 9 (1996), 231–56. The interpretation of this sequence has been the subject of some debate. On Toledo, see Angela Franco Mata, 'Relaciones artísticas entre la Haggadah de Sarajevo y la cerca exterior del coro de la Catedral de Toledo', *Espacio, tiempo y forma*, series 7/Historia del Arte 6 (1993), 65–80; Toledo has the quest of Seth, which is not present in the two comparators used in the article, the Sarajevo haggada and Salisbury Cathedral.

[26] Evelyn S. Newlyn, 'The Stained and Painted Glass of St Neot's Church and the Staging of the Middle Cornish Drama', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 24 (1994), 89–111 (the death scene, fig. 3, is discussed on 105–7). See also her comments in Sally L. Joyce and Evelyn S. Newlyn, *Cornwall: Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999, together with Rosalind Conklin Hays and C. E. McGee, *Dorset*), 408–9 (also with illustration).

to the middle of the twelfth century (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 13002), with the elements placed over a drawing of Adam's body.[27]

Like the late and limited dramatizations of the *VAE*, its representation in graphic art would have an immediacy and hence an importance for a potentially large audience. However, there seems to be such a limited iconographic tradition that the knowledge of the text would hardly have been extended. This may rest upon the apocryphal nature of the text, but it is true even in comparison with the Holy Rood material, the iconography of which would have been read especially clearly in those churches where the dedication was to the cross. In terms of manuscript illustration, the single miniature in the Hamburg manuscript has little to do with the text as such, and only the Lutwin illustrations from Lauber's workshop in Alsace have a close relationship with the text (in spite of some freedom) as a source for the pictures. They serve, therefore, simply to underline the narrative, and there is of course only the one manuscript now extant. Representations of the death of Adam fall mostly into the Holy Rood category.

The source of the Thann sculptures is debatable. The scene in the river does seem to depend upon the penance episode in the *VAE*, although it actually represents no known Latin version, nor indeed Lutwin's poem, unless it has been changed drastically. The carvings at Thann indicate an awareness of the legend that Eve needed angelic help when she gave birth, and before that, that Adam and Eve at least did penance, even if the details are unclear. As Capgrave said so succinctly in his Chronicle: 'ȝet in veri soth we rede þat he ded penauns.' The 'veri soth' of the statement would be reinforced by the public image of the pair doing so after the familiar biblical images and before the birth of Cain (also something which does occur in the Bible, even if not with explicit angelic assistance), especially if there is indeed a kind of retrospective typology provided by the scene for the baptism of Christ.

[27] M. W. Evans, *Medieval Drawings* (London: Hamlyn, 1969), 34 and pl. 81.

7

Litteras Achiliacas

Conclusion

There are two reasons for the study of the translations, adaptations, and reflections of the *VAE* in European vernacular literatures of the Middle Ages and later. First, because any consideration of the development of the apocryphon should not stop at the Latin versions. Transmission of the work in Latin continues through the Middle Ages, and some texts, indeed, are rather late, while vernacular versions run parallel to them and are indeed sometimes earlier. Latin might have enjoyed a more significant status as such,[1] but the vernacular works, many of which are demonstrably translated directly from Latin (whatever claims they sometimes make), may still reflect unrecorded versions. Wilhelm Meyer was aware of this in the preparation of his edition, although the awareness of the vernacular texts has been less prominent since. Secondly, the range of languages in which the *VAE* has been preserved in Europe should make clear that this is an important, but largely forgotten, part of medieval European culture, and indeed often part of the popular perception of the Bible, given the imprecisely understood notions of canonical and apocryphal.

The standard text-critical procedure for establishing a medieval or pre-medieval text by going back as far as possible to the oldest version is not necessarily entirely appropriate in the evaluation of a non-canonical, hence fluid and continuing, text such as the *VAE*, which even in Latin or Greek does not really admit of the establishment of what might have been an original form. Although a working, but strictly provisional, text is useful, the question arises of whether other approaches might as well or better be considered, given that the very concept of *the* text is problematic. In the case of the *VAE*, considering the evidence of vernacular versions, which are contemporary with and later (or even on occasion earlier) than the extant Latin versions, may be regarded as being just as valuable as the backward search for an elusive

---

[1] The effect of John 19: 19–20 is important. See Robert E. McNally, 'The "Tres Linguae Sacrae" in Early Irish Bible Exegesis', *Theological Studies*, 19 (1958), 395–403.

original. That the once-postulated Hebrew original has more or less proved to be a chimera is not without significance. It also establishes that the work we have (in all its forms) is a Christian text, and this is underscored by the inherent typological aspects (baptism, penance), which become gradually stronger as the Sethite/Holy Rood material takes over. This is not to invalidate textual studies in the Greek or Latin traditions, of course; Tromp's edition of the Greek text is now, and Meyer's and Mozley's Latin versions have long been, valuable (as is the complex textual work by Pettorelli). But one thing that they all make clear is the lack of uniformity. Of course it is possible to try, by comparing the various versions, to establish the original form of any given motif, but searching for a definitive text through consideration of the oldest versions or the most consistent motifs is only one of many possible approaches to the study of the *VAE*. In a wider context, too, the major anthologies of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha have almost always placed the Greek and Latin texts in parallel, however different they in fact are, and the extended model of Anderson's and Stone's synoptic five-column handbook (with the Greek, Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic versions) is as instructive as it is useful. This kind of parallel presentation could be applied to Latin texts, or indeed to vernacular texts either across the board, or even within one culture; a synoptic approach is possible at almost every level. Study of the Latin *VAE* has in any case necessitated for many years working somewhat awkwardly with an increasing number of different printed Latin texts. The *VAE* did not, however, come to an end with the Latin version.

That the large number of vernacular adaptations, translations, or reworkings in a different form of the *VAE* have largely been ignored in considering the apocryphon as such is difficult to understand. The absence of reference to these works, or worse, the confusion in the introduction to the *VAE* in Charlesworth's collection, say, is all the more inexplicable given that already in Meyer's first modern attempt to edit the Latin *VAE* a good number of vernacular texts were not just noted, but actually used in his apparatus as evidence. One work he did not know was the Irish *Saltair na Rann*, which has, in fact, commanded a certain interest, since it is appreciably older than many manuscripts of versions in Latin or Greek, and its relationship to the rather different redaction of the Latin *VAE* now identified is valuable evidence for the existence of that version in the tenth century. There has in recent times been some consideration of vernacular developments of the *VAE*; Michael Stone has referred to the vernacular versions within the study of the Adam-books as a whole, and most recently Bob Miller has increased the numbers of such texts with full bibliographic details, and has discovered interesting material himself, significantly by way of his interests in the Holy Rood legends. To the increasingly augmented list may be added also the poem of

Robert de Blois, Welsh and Irish prose texts, and the plays in Italian, German, and Breton. There are also instances where knowledge of the *VAE* is demonstrated by small but quite unambiguous references: Master John of St Davids, Hugo von Montfort, Bonvesin da la Riva. Doubtless more will become known. Even with those we do now know, there still remain inevitable gaps in our study of them, sometimes for linguistic reasons, and further study is needed of early printed versions in the vernacular. It is in the latter area that there may well be more texts to be found, perhaps especially in eastern Europe. That no versions from the Iberian peninsula have yet come to light remains intriguing; they may still do so. Attention will need to be paid in particular, finally, to the manuscripts of Colard Mansion.

To return to the precise value of including the vernacular adaptations in the study of the apocryphon: as with the *Saltair* in particular, they may provide evidence of the knowledge in a specific country of a specific version of the *VAE*, and others might give some indication of what was in the source text at different stages in its own development. Reception is of particular importance; even minor references will indicate that the text was known and felt to be worthy of use, and we may sometimes even be able to deduce how the work was accepted—whether it was felt to be apocryphal, or at least a separate text, or whether it could be incorporated without comment into its biblical context after the expulsion. Of course, many of the vernacular works are adaptations into a particular literary form. Supposedly closest to the prose versions in Latin are stand-alone, complete prose texts, although the context in which they are found is always significant; some versions are entirely independent, especially once we reach the period of printing, although at that late stage the question may arise—as perhaps in the case of the Polish version (albeit presented as a chronicle)—of whether the narrative was being preserved already at this stage for antiquarian reasons; Fabricius' presentation of pseudepigrapha in the early eighteenth century is a natural development in some respects, although his work is a reflection of the enlightenment in others. Even more or less straightforward prose versions of the *VAE*, however, either independent or based upon earlier metrical versions, may be incorporated into narrative Bibles (*Historienbibeln*), may be attached to works like the *Legenda aurea* (the independence of the Wheatley text, and the parallel attachment of very closely related versions to the English *Gilte Legende* is significant of itself), or into chronicles proper. The confusion manifest in the brief comments of the English chronicler John Capgrave, for example, indicates a belief in the reality of the penance, at least in historical terms, in a period when the biblical creation and early history of the world still stood at the start of chronicle history. Somewhat different, of course, are versions which are more clearly literary in intent, although the spiritual (and didactic)

dimension is always present in view of the theme and subject; this is seen most clearly in metrical or dramatic adaptations. The same comments may of course also be applied to canonical biblical narratives, and the concept of the popular Bible, that is, presentations of biblical narratives through the medium of the vernacular to an implied audience unable to determine exactly what is or is not in the canonical text, is an important one in European medieval writing, and the overlap between canonical and apocryphal is often not marked. Thus, to take examples based on the canonical Genesis, the Anglo or Old Saxon *Genesis B*, the Old German *Genesis* (also known as the *Wiener Genesis*), or Evrat's metrical Genesis in French, though probably not affected by the *VAE*, all contain other material which is not actually in the Bible. The *VAE* is not canonical, but it clearly commanded literary interest alongside the theological or indeed historical dimensions. Variations brought about by the exigencies of form are probably most marked in the dramatic versions, where the narrative line of the apocryphon has to be changed for stage purposes: the change of location in the Breton play to a penance *beside* the river, rather than in it, is a case in point.

The principal (and most obvious) value of the study of the vernacular texts in the context of pseudepigrapha and apocrypha studies, however, is because they are manifestations of the dynamic of the text as such. The narrative content of the *VAE* presents two kinds of literal material not found in the canonical narrative of Adam and Eve. First come the human details: the search for food other than that of paradise; natural birth as an unknown phenomenon; and the customs surrounding death and burial. In the biblical Genesis a paradisiacal life was established, and only at the expulsion are we told briefly of the future of man's labour and of women's pains in childbirth, with death as such presented as a benefit in Genesis 3: 22. In psychological terms, the *VAE* develops the first murder, which is found in more actual detail within the canonical text, in Eve's striking and fearful vision of Cain drinking the blood of Abel. The second aspect of the material is theological: the *VAE* narrative centres upon guilt, repentance, and penitence; on the ongoing malice of the devil, something which can be hard to recognize; and on the (sometimes mediated) grace of God, either immediate, as in the removal of the devil, or the angels sent to assist at the birth of Cain, or in the future, with the promise of the redemption as the oil of mercy. There are literal questions implicit here, too, of course, notably of why and how Adam and Eve attempted to regain the lost paradise. But the story of the penance is also the theological pivot and itself contains two central ideas: that penance can be a gesture of atonement; and that the devil can and will turn himself into a beautiful and plausible angel, and must therefore be recognized and resisted all the more firmly. Some vernacular versions even point this up

(or have Adam do so) before Eve commences her penance. It is in some respects incidental (though it, too, is occasionally highlighted) that in the second temptation only Eve falls, while Adam—who in priest-like manner actually imposes the penance and determines, in line with medieval penitentials, the appropriateness of the penance in the light of the abilities of the person to undertake it—both recognizes the devil at once and completes his own penance.[2] Subsequently, Adam is also recognized as the mediator with God, the priest figure whose prayers will be answered. The mediation is usually by means of Michael the archangel and he does seem to converse with angels; Adam does not speak directly with God again; his narrative to Seth of the rapture into heaven is of something that had happened before.

The *VAE* is a Christian apocryphon involving Old Testament characters, and the attachment to many versions of the *VAE* in Latin and in vernaculars of the additional tales of Adam's formation and naming, and indeed of that of where he is buried, again clouds the picture of how the text of the *VAE* is actually to be defined. The link between the Testaments is emphasized increasingly in all the vernacular versions even further by the merging with the legends of the Rood, but the way in which the Christian emphasis is made is also variable, and the theological aspect of each version is important. The implicit typological underpinning of the narrative is equally clear in earlier motifs not connected with the Rood: Adam's penance is always in the Jordan, even though it is not a river of paradise, whatever a presumed (but not recorded) proto-version of the central tale may have had.[3] Even the subsidiary motif of the static river can be linked with New Testament apocrypha on a typological basis,[4] and it is underlined in iconographic parallels. The expressly Christian notion of organized and appropriately imposed penance is the theological key to the work, linked as it is with the concept of divine forgiveness. Adam does not receive the oil of mercy, but he does customarily receive a promise of the redemption when Seth and Eve are sent to paradise. What happens to his soul after death is a further issue, but the Sethite quest represents another pivot, providing in some versions already in Latin the link with the Holy Rood legends, by which the Christian nature of the whole is

---

[2] On the nature of the penance and its relationship to medieval penitentials, see my paper 'Origins of Penance', 219.

[3] The evidence of the *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* as a late rabbinic text (ninth century) is not especially useful, although the river there is the paradisiacal Gihon. Adam does penance alone, fasts for forty-nine days, and his body is changed. This may be a relic of an older story, or may be part of what the translator referred to (p. lii) as 'floating traditions': see *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, trans. Friedlander, 147–8. The Ethiopic Adambook is again different, but the Latin tradition always has the Jordan.

[4] See 'The River that Stopped Flowing', on the motif.

underscored by the tree that grows from Adam's grave and becomes the tree of the cross (which is sometimes represented in art as a living tree). One thing the study of the vernacular versions makes abundantly clear is the virtual inseparability of the *VAE* and the Rood legends, and the gradual integration continues until the balance shifts in favour of the Holy Rood legends as such, and the loss of the *VAE*. The *Saltair na Rann* does not have the Rood story, but pretty well all later works do; Bonvesin da la Riva has an identifiable echo of the *VAE*, but significantly it is at the point where the Rood story begins, even though the presence of Eve on the quest speaks for the knowledge of the *VAE*. Towards the end of the Middle Ages we are faced with works such as the Cornish *Gwreans an bys* in which the Holy Rood material is clear, but we wonder whether there is anything of the *VAE* there at all. In other works it has more clearly gone completely, and the *VAE* has given way to another fluid work, widely disseminated in Latin and the vernaculars in the Middle Ages, but which never (perhaps because it was too late) acquired the designation of an apocryphon. To what extent the *VAE* can be separated from the Holy Rood material at any stage remains a difficult question. Aside from the major portions found in Meyer's class III, for example, vernacular texts in particular can add small elements known otherwise only in and presumably taken from the Holy Rood story, such as the motif of the withered grass on the road to paradise. This is found in *VAE* texts even though it appears there without much logic, since Eve is with Seth on his quest. The Rood legends are themselves, of course, also essentially apocryphal stories about Old Testament characters (Moses, David, Solomon) which have at their centre a Christian object, the cross itself. The importance of the legends in linking the two Testaments is perhaps best exemplified by the bizarre tale of Maxi(mi)lla in some versions, who sits on the cross and invokes Christ when her clothes catch fire, and is killed for calling upon a supposed idol, this making her a pre-Christian Christian martyr. In spite of the efforts of Marcion in the second century to remove the Old Testament completely from the canon, the ongoing development of Christianity depends on the interrelatedness of the two, on the specific fulfilment of prophecies, and on the whole sustaining hermeneutic of typology.[5] The *VAE* and the stories of the Holy Rood (which is itself once actually used as a bridge) constitute a bridge between the Testaments in the clearest of terms.

Quellenforschung in the nineteenth century was a positivistic approach and sometimes it claimed very positive results, even when they were not actually

---

[5] See such standard texts as Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les Quatre sens de l'Écriture* (Paris: Aubier, 1959–64) and Jean Danielou, *Sacramentum futuri: études sur l'origine de la typologie biblique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1950).

tenable. This has sometimes happened in the study of the vernacular versions of the *VAE*, although the work of A. C. Dunstan in particular tried to show that precise source identification was rarely possible. There are some very basic difficulties if we try to establish even the type of source for a given vernacular version. Variations in motifs within the text, and also omissions, may arise for all kinds of different reasons. They may reflect a type of source which we do not have; the immediate source may have had omissions or errors; the source might have been misunderstood or the (abbreviated?) Latin misread; the vernacular writer might have made changes deliberately for literary or some other reason. Pointing too closely at a particular *VAE* version or type as a source for a given vernacular work can be dangerous and even counter-productive. The discovery of the Paris text by Pettorelli was of great interest to the analysis of the *Saltair na Rann* because it clarified several problematic passages in the Irish work, but few cases are as clear, and in any case even there we still do not have a contemporary Latin text, and certainly not in Ireland. In more general terms if a vernacular text has, say, a reference to two angels at the birth of Cain, in a passage where most (but not all) Latin versions have twelve as the number, various conclusions may be drawn. We may wish to point to one Latin manuscript that has this reading, or we may even want to refer to the Armenian version, which also mentions two angels, though it is hardly likely as a source. But even if some Latin texts do have this reading, the usual number is twelve, and the vernacular writer (or the copyist of his source—it is rarely possible to determine exactly where an error enters and Occam's razor has to be borne in mind) might have had that in his original, or may as easily simply have misread or mistaken the number himself, whether it was given as XII or as a perhaps abbreviated *duo(decim)*. A salutary warning is provided especially by Eis's attempts to point to a very specific source for the German poem by Lutwin: in one single passage there is indeed a very close parallel to one manuscript, but in the very same passage there is something which points to exactly the opposite conclusion.

It is not always clear, of course, what precisely is meant by a literary version. The prose/verse/drama distinction is itself artificial in some respects, and borders are necessarily blurred. The early example of the *Saltair na Rann* is once again a case in point. The oldest known vernacular text is a metrical adaptation which is literary in other respects than the purely formal. It rearranges the order of events (most obviously in the positioning of the diabolical fall, which is told in retrospect in the *VAE*), it makes adaptations and additions, and it uses poetic devices such as anaphora. That the substance of the *Saltair* was later presented in prose versions as well is a further issue, and in German too we have prose reductions of metrical originals. Even other prose versions—such as that in the Vernon manuscript in English—are at some distance from pure translations of a Latin *VAE*.

The basic text of the *VAE* offers considerable opportunity for literary development and interpretation, and this is used in vernacular texts, which in its turn underlines another and distinct value in the study of these works, this time in their own right, rather than as continuations of the apocryphon as such. The use of the narrative on such a wide scale makes the tradition very much part of medieval European culture, a universal within that culture which is widely neglected, certainly as a large-scale and interlinked tradition. As with the canonical narrative of Adam and Eve, the potential tensions between the protoplasts are exploited, here even more so, as Adam apparently remains guiltless and completes his penance. It is interesting that the subsequent separation of the pair is treated in very different ways in the vernacular continuations of the tradition. The given details in the *VAE* are that Eve leaves, already pregnant, and perhaps (the text is not entirely clear) desiring death once again, even if not as explicitly as earlier. Where and how far she goes are literal questions left unanswered in the *VAE*, and can be embellished either by imagination (Lutwin's thousand miles) or error (the seven dwelling places she makes in French). But her psychology can be exploited by a writer: the two poles here are perhaps Lutwin, again, who has her leaving in anger at Adam's apparent lack of feelings for her; and her complete and quasi-suicidal *desperatio* in the *Canticum de creatione*. The miracles around the birth of Cain also permit imaginative adaptations and indeed inventions, especially as the original is not necessarily clear, certainly in respect of the name etymology.

The *VAE* functions in some respects as an extended commentary according to the literal sense on the question of what Adam and Eve did after the expulsion. At the same time it underlines the virtue of repentance and indeed formal penance, underscoring simultaneously the necessity of guarding oneself against the wiles of the devil, who is as keen now to establish equality of misery with Adam and Eve as he was keen to establish equality of majesty with God. The work is also apocalyptic: Adam is taken into heaven, and a vision of the future appears in some versions in the extended version of *VAE* 29, while Eve's vision of the destruction of the world by fire and water comes towards the end. The narrative, then, has various dimensions: it is historical and it is treated as such in the vernacular in chronicles and *Historienbibeln*; it is moral-penitential in warning against the devil and offering a formal answer, very notably so perhaps in the *Electula* versions; it is an expression of divine grace; it is, or can be, typological; and it is prophetic and apocalyptic. It can of course also be viewed as misogynistic, reinforcing Adam's dominant role, in a development of Genesis 3: 16 and the divinely ordained subjection of Eve to her husband; at the same time he is also the forerunner of a male priesthood, the determiner and imposer of penance. Any of these aspects can be developed in different ways in the vernacular, and further variations are possible, as

in the Dutch *Historiebijbel* version, which uses the story of the penance as an exemplum to warn married couples to stay together so that a third party does not have the opportunity to seduce one of them. This interpretative variety could be applied also to the canonical Genesis, and while on occasion vernacular writers do stress the apocryphal nature of the *VAE* narrative (albeit not always being very clear on what the term means), it is often treated implicitly as having the same validity as the Bible.

Vernacular versions of the *VAE* may both demonstrate and clarify what was not understood in the Latin. Some problems hinge upon simple comprehension. How and why does Cain bring herbs or reeds or something like that, immediately after birth? Some vernacular versions translate literally, some adapt it to flowers, or that he cuts the grass, or just walks at a precocious stage, or have Adam bring food instead. In some ways it is more instructive to note in this case when the vernacular writer abandons the motif entirely. Almost none, of course, link it with Cain's name. As another smaller example, the question may well arise of why God calls for three shrouds for Adam and Abel. The inherent problem can be resolved either by not specifying the number, or having three placed over each body, or by having two for Adam and one for Abel, or assuming that one is reserved for Eve (who dies not long after). That one text changes it to four is another variation, perhaps an error. Other changes in motifs may well depend upon the misreading of the manuscript from which any given text is copied, and this happens already in the Latin versions. The attack on Seth's face, mixing 'faciens' and 'faciem', is a Latin-only error which establishes itself as a new motif. As a vernacular example we may cite the chariot with *fair*, rather than *fiery*, wheels in some English texts, and, as a cross-over error, the instance of the name Ficconicia in the *Saltair na Rann*, derived from a garbled piece of Latin and only recently made apparent, is a good example. Variations between Tigris and Tiber perhaps also come into this category.

As motifs pass from one language to another, then—and it happens from the very beginnings with the Adambooks—they may change, and the significance of each change is variable, as is clear from the examples given above. The attack on Seth's face is a major motif; the number juggling with the various shrouds perhaps less so, although in another sense it is precisely the detail in a narrative of this kind which is significant. Small variations occur all the time—the flying ('volantum') rather than the rapid ('velocem') wind during Adam's translation into heaven is a further small example. Variations like this might help point to a specific source, but we return to the problem that a vernacular writer is equally capable of misunderstanding, forgetting, or deliberately changing what was in the source. That Hans Folz has the pair (pretty well uniquely) sitting on stones in the rivers, rather than standing, as

in virtually every other text, may seem trivial, but within the context of the idea of penance it is actually a considerable difference; it makes its way from Folz's private translation into his printed poem.

It is worth considering as a conclusion a motif of great importance in the *VAE*, which is found in some, though not all, of the Latin versions, and relates to the very concept of pseudepigraphic writing: the transmission of the narrative itself by Seth. Told by Eve to record the story, Seth makes (usually) two tablets, one of clay and one of stone, to withstand the prophesied destruction by fire and water, and inscribes the whole tale on them (his finger, we are later told, guided by an angel).[6] This is an inherent legitimization of the narrative, giving it additional credibility as an eyewitness account, at least partially, since Seth is born in Adam's (usually) 130th year and at least hears (as we are told in the text) the earlier parts of the narrative directly from his parents. He is also the successor, and after Adam's death, Michael instructs him. The legitimization is further reinforced by the reading of the by then unknown letters by Solomon, and the angelic intervention needed both for the writing and the reading of the story is a familiar enough legend, although the invention of writing as such is variously attributed in the medieval popular Bible tradition.[7] The obscure term 'litteras . . . achili(a)cas' is used by Solomon for the letters, however, and although there is a quite specific gloss provided in the Latin text, that gloss varies considerably in different versions. Meyer's edition gave 'sine verborum doctrina scriptas', with variations 'quod est latine lapideas id est sine labiis doctrina scriptas', or 'sillabicas hoc est sine librorum doctrina scriptas', while the texts adduced by Mozley offer (beside spelling variants of the word itself) also 'inlapidatas' or 'lapidicas', 'sine labiorum doctrina', 'sine labiis doctrina', 'sine laboris', 'sine labore doctrina'. Without words, without books, without lips, without work? It is indeed not without irony that the text is even more confused here than in many other places.

The passage is interesting, of course, in that precisely a garbled, but still identifiably Greek word is being used, although it is patently not clear in Latin versions what it is was ever understood to mean. Meyer suggested an original *acheiropoietous* (not made by hands), and this has been repeated, although it is the least likely in terms of origin. Not only is the form very different, but the letters precisely *are* made by hands, the angel's guiding Seth's. It is more than

---

[6] Section 52. There are various different versions in Latin: see Anderson and Stone, *Synopsis*, on this point.

[7] See my *Medieval Popular Bible*, 67. Enoch, Jubal, Ham (and occasionally Adam himself) are also credited with the first writing. The basic legend, too, appears to have survived into the first part of the nineteenth century, when it made its way to the New World in the angelic intervention and assistance claimed for the translation of the *Book of Mormon* from an unidentified language on gold plates subsequently removed by the angel.

likely that the actual sense is that involving lips, this implying something written as a lasting record, rather than spoken and thus open to corruption. Interpretations involving stone (*lapid*) may simply be based on the content, of course, since the stone tablet rather than the clay one would have been the one to survive the flood. Versions with *labor* and *liber* are plausible misreadings of *labia*. For the Greek word itself, the initial *a* has always been read as a negative (although in some Latin texts the word is changed, with a different significance, into '*archi*laicas'); a compound with *chilias* (one thousand) makes no sense, so that what lies behind the formulation was the Greek *cheilos*, 'lip' (which can indeed also mean 'word'). The form *acheilos* (lacking lips) is attested, so that a reading of the transliterated and then Latinized 'achiliacas' ought indeed to mean 'without lips',[8] even if we can derive very little from the fact that an originally *Greek* word is used at this point in what is often dismissed as an unimportant appendix to the Latin *VAE*. Since Solomon provides the name in the narrative, whether Greek would even have been thought of is debatable.

But the addition *is* important, for all that vernacular versions regularly vary the interpretation of this patently foreign but impressively exotic word depending upon what was in their (ultimate, Latin) original. That so-called appendix legitimized the text by explaining its very existence precisely as a fixed report, and it is especially interesting that it in fact seems to use a word of Greek origin for the letters. Sometimes it is claimed in vernacular versions that the *VAE* was translated from (Hebrew to) Latin to the vernacular, but Greek is rarely mentioned, in spite of the presumed ancestry of the *VAE*.[9] The whole passage, however, is at once ironic and emblematic of the *VAE* and the study of it. Seth preserves for posterity an account of the story of Adam and Eve which is, within the narrative, not only taken from the first-hand accounts of the principal characters, plus his own eyewitness experience, but which is then quite literally set in stone. But what letters he and his assisting angel used for the purpose is unclear. Their name varies from version to version, their original language is not explicit (in any case it pre-dated Babel, of course), and it required the wisdom of Solomon—and even then only with further angelic assistance—for them to be read at all.

---

[8] Tromp, *Life of Adam and Eve*, discusses, 30–1, the loss of diphthongs and the prevalence of itacism in Greek versions. The form *acheilos* is listed in the 1826 edition of the Greek–Latin lexicon by Hederich and Ernesti, for example.

[9] The reference in the English *Gilte Legende* to 'a stori of the Grekes, thou it be apocrifie' (it is translated from the Latin original, *Legenda aurea* LXVIII: see the Ryan translation, i. 277) is both rare and not very apposite. It comes in a context which sounds more like the Holy Rood (rather than even the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, which is mentioned separately), and Latin would have been more appropriate. See Hamer, *Gilte Legende* , i. 309 (LXI, Invention of the Cross).

Appendix
An Overview of the Vernacular Texts

This table contains the vernacular works discussed or mentioned as (possibly) using material from the *VAE*. The few not seen (or not discussed in detail) are marked with an asterisk. Dates are tentative and may refer only to the manuscript or printed text. Works are arranged alphabetically within each language group. Separate but closely related versions (such as the Irish prose texts or the German *Historienbibeln*) are not all listed, but one text is given to represent a group (thus the Wheatley *Life* in English stands for the various other versions found in the *Gilte Legende*).

Language	Author/title	Date	Description
Breton	*Istor d'eus a creation ar bet-man*	16th c.? MSS of late 17th to early 19th c.	Verse dramatization of *VAE*
Cornish	*Gwreans an bys* (The Creation of the World)	16th c.? MS copied in 1611.	Verse drama with possible influence; Holy Rood material
Croatian	(Translation of *VAE*)*	Versions known from 17th c.	Prose translation
Czech (Old Bohemian)	*Kniha o Adamě a Evě*	MSS of early 15th c.–16th c.	Prose translation of the *VAE* (various versions)
Czech (Old Bohemian)	*Žiwot Adama a Ewy**	Printed *c.*1498	Prose translation of *VAE* plus Holy Rood material
Czech (Old Bohemian)	*Žiwot Adamuw a neb ginak od starodawna Solfernus*	MSS of 15th c. Printed text 1553	'Devil book' with some elements of *VAE* penance
Danish	*Her Michael, De creatione rerum**	1496? Printed 1514/15	Verse with *VAE* material
Dutch	*Noordnederlandse historiebijbel*	MS of 1458	Prose narrative Bible with small elements of penance

Language	Author/title	Date	Description
Dutch	Tilburg manuscript	Mid 15th c.	Prose translation of *VAE*
English	Auchinleck *Life of Adam and Eve*	MS of 1330–40	Verse adaptation with biblical material
English	Bodley *Prose Life of Adam and Eve*	MS of *c.*1430	Prose *VAE*
English	*Canticum de creatione*	1375	Strophic verse adaptation with biblical material
English	John Capgrave, *Abbreuiacion of Cronicles*	1462–3	Prose chronicle with reference to penance scene
English	William Caxton, *Golden Legend*	Printed 1483	Prose; some reflections of *VAE*
English	Chester plays	16th c.	Verse drama with isolated motifs
English	*Genesis B*	Early 9th c. MS of 10th c.	Anglo-Saxon verse, originally Old Saxon; possible echo of *VAE* temptation
English	N-Town plays	15th c.	Verse drama with isolated motifs
English	Vernon *Prose Life*	MS of 1370–1400	Prose version of *VAE* with other material
English	Wheatley *Prose Life*	MSS of 15th c.–17th c.	Prose *VAE*, also found in *Gilte Legende*
French	Andrius, *La Pénitence d'Adam*	MS late 13th c.	Prose translation of *VAE* (modern title)
French	Guillaume de Tignonville*	Late 14th c.–early 15th c. MS of 1454	Prose translation of *VAE*?
French	Jean d'Outremeuse, *Chronique*	Later 14th c.	Prose chronicle with *VAE*
French	Colard Mansion, *La Pénitence d'Adam**	Later 15th c.	Two prose translations of the penance section and of the whole *VAE* (unedited)
French	*Mystère d'Adam*	Later 12th c.	Anglo-Norman verse drama with possible influence of *VAE* in small details.
French	Robert de Blois, *La Création du monde*	MS late 13th c.	Biblical poem, including penance narrative from *VAE*
German	*Adams Klage*	MSS of late 13th c.–14th c.	Metrical adaptation of *VAE* penance story; versions in the chronicle of Rudolf von Ems and in the *Christherre-Chronik*

Language	Author/title	Date	Description
German	Priester Arnold, *Von der Siebenzahl*	Mid 12th c.	Reference to oil of mercy from *VAE* or Holy Rood
German	Hans Folz, German translation of *VAE*	1479?	Prose translation of *VAE*
German	Hans Folz, *Wie Adam und Eva . . .*	Printed 1480	Verse adaptation of *VAE*
German	Hartmann von Aue, *Gregorius*	*c.*1190–1200	Possible use of penance narrative in verse legend (known in other languages)
German	Heinrichs von München, *Weltchronik*	Early 14th c.	Verse chronicle with *VAE* material
German	*Historienbibeln*	14th c.– 15th c.	Various prose narrative Bibles, sometimes adapted from verse originals, with varying amounts of *VAE* material
German	Hugo von Montfort, penitential poem	1357–1423	Reference to penance scene
German	Lutwin, *Eva und Adam*	*c.*1300	Lengthy poem combining biblical and *VAE*; illustrated MS of mid 15th c.
German	Obergrunder *Weihnachtsspiel*	16th c.? MS of early 19th c.	Prose drama with penance scene
German	Johannes Platterberger and Theoderich Truchseß, *Excerpta chronicarum*	1459	Prose chronicle with *VAE* material
Hungarian	(Translation of *VAE*)*	MS 1525–31	Prose translation
Irish	*Saltair na Rann*	10th c.	Lengthy biblical poem in quatrains, with *VAE* material.
Irish	*Scél Saltrach na Rann* (prose reductions of the *Saltair na Rann*)	Various MSS from 14th to 16th c.	Prose versions from the poem *Saltair na Rann*
Italian	Bologna play (*Rappresentazione ciclica*)	Later 15th c.	Stanzaic verse drama including penance episode from *VAE*
Italian	Bonvesin da la Riva, *De cruce*	Later 13th c.	Poem with a few motifs from the end of *VAE*
Italian	*Fiore novella estratto della Bibbia,* * *Fioretti della Biblia hystoriati et nouavamente correcti**	Printed 1473, 1515	Prose narrative biblical texts with parts of *VAE*
Italian	Giovanni Francesco Loredano, *L'Adamo*	Published 1640	Possible minor echoes of the *VAE*

Language	Author/title	Date	Description
Polish	*Postępek prawa czartowskiego*	Printed 1570	Prose 'devil book' with some smaller elements from *VAE*
Polish	Krzysztof Pussman, *Historyja barzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemi*	Written 1543, printed 1551	Prose *VAE* with Genesis material
Polish	St Petersburg manuscript*	17th c.	Unedited prose translation of *VAE*
Russian	*Protiv cheloveka vsyechestnago bozhiya tvoryeniya zavistnoye syzhdeniye i zloye povdeniye proklyatogo demona*	MSS of 17th c.	Translation of Polish *Postępek prawa czartowskiego* (prose 'devil book' with some *VAE* material)
Welsh	*Ef a wnaeth Panthon . . . (Yr Awdl Fraith)*	12th c.?	Poem with some elements from *VAE*
Welsh	*Ystoria Adaf ac Eua y Wreic*	MSS of 14th c.–19th c.	Prose *VAE* (titles vary)

Bibliography

I. Primary Apocryphal and Biblical Texts

The Latin VAE

Anderson, Gary A., and Stone, Michael E., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994; rev. edn. 1999).

Eis, Gerhard, *Beiträge zur mittelhochdeutschen Legende und Mystik* (Berlin: Akademie, 1935), 214–55.

Horstmann, Carl, 'Nachträge zu den Legenden 10. Vita prothoplausti Ade', *Archiv*, 79 (1887), 459–70.

Katona, Lajos, *A Teleki-codex legendái, Magyar tudományos akademia*, köt. 18, sz. 10 (Pest: Hungarian Academy, 1904) (see 70–80/734–44).

Meyer, Wilhelm, '*Vita Adae et Evae*', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.philol. Kl. 14/iii (1879), 185–250.

Mozley, J. H., 'The *Vita Adae*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 30 (1929), 121–47.

Pettorelli, J. P. [= Jean-Pierre], 'La Vie latine d'Adam et Eve', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 56 (1998), 5–104, and 57 (1999), 5–52.

Thomson, S. Harrison, 'A Fifth Recension of the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*', *Studi medievali*, ns 6 (1933), 271–8.

Manuscripts of the VAE

Halford, M. E. B., 'The Apocryphal *Vita Adae et Evae*: Some Comments on the Manuscript Tradition', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 82 (1981), 412–27 and 83 (1982), 222.

Pettorelli, Jean-Pierre, 'La Vie latine d'Adam et Eve: analyse de la tradition manuscrite', *Apocrypha*, 10 (1999), 195–296.

Stegmüller, Friedrich, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* (Madrid: Instituto Francisco Suárez, 1940–76).

The Greek Life of Adam and Eve

Bertrand, Daniel A., *La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1987).

Tischendorf, Constantin (von), *Apocalypses apocryphae* (Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1866; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966), 1–23 (with the title *Apocalypsis Mosis*).

Tromp, Johannes, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

Old Testament apocrypha in translation

Charles, R. H., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, i: *Apocrypha*; ii: *Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913; repr. 1963).

Charlesworth, James H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: Longman and Todd, 1983–5).

Diez Macho, A., *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (Madrid: Editiones Christianidad, 1983).

Hammerhaimb, E., Munck, Johannes, et al., *De gammaltestamentlige pseudepigrafer* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1953–76).

Kautzsch, E., *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900).

Riessler, Paul, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg: Filser, 1928; repr. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1966).

Schindler, A., *Apokryphen zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Zurich: Manesse-Bibliothek, 1988).

Sparks, H. D. F., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984).

New Testament apocrypha in translation

Cowper, B. Harris, *The Apocryphal Gospels* (3rd edn. London: Williams and Norgate, 1870).

Hennecke, Edgar, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, rev. Wilhelm Schneemelcher (3rd edn. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959–64), the English translation ed. R. M. Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha* (London: Lutterworth, 1963–4; repr. SCM, 1973).

James, Montague Rhodes, *Apocrypha Anecdota* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893).

——*The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924; repr. 1975); new edn. by J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993).

Santos Otero, Aurelio de, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* (Madrid: Autores Christianos, 1956).

Tischendorf, Constantin (von), *Evangelia Apocrypha* (1852; 2nd edn. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1876).

——Lipsius Richard, and Bonnet, Maximilian, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. Constantin Tischendorf (Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891–1903; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1990).

Walker, Alexander, *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1870).

Holy Rood texts in Latin

Meyer, Wilhelm, 'Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christi', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie* (München), philos.philol. Kl. 16/ii (1882), 101–66.

Mozley, J. H., 'A New Text of the Story of the Cross', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 31 (1930), 113–27.

Bible

Weber, Robert, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelge-
sellschaft, 4th edn. 1994).

II. Primary Vernacular Texts (*VAE* Material)

This list is restricted to printed editions (and published facsimiles of manuscripts) of
vernacular texts which comprise or contain (or may reflect) *VAE* material. The
arrangement is alphabetical by language, individual texts or authors are arranged
alphabetically, and editions of the same text are listed chronologically. Texts are
editions in the original language unless indicated otherwise. In the case of unedited
manuscripts, reference is given to the chapter in which they are discussed, where more
bibliographic details may be found. Texts not seen or not discussed in any detail are
indicated. In the case of edited incunabula or early prints, details of the originals are
given after the first modern edition.

Breton

Istor d'eus a creation ar bet-man

Bernard, Eugène, 'La Création du monde: mystère breton', *Revue celtique*, 9 (1888),
149–207 and 322–53; 10 (1889), 102–211 and 411–55; 11 (1890), 254–317 (with
French translation).
Hamilton, Noel, 'A Fragment of La Création', *Celtica*, 12 (1977), 50–74 (with English
translation).
Loth, J., *Chrestomathie bretonne*, i: *Breton-Armoricain* (Paris: Bouillon, 1890), 352–6
(extract: the biblical temptation of Eve only).

Cornish

Gwreans an bys (The Creation of the World)

Gilbert, Davies, *The Creation of the World with Noah's Flood, Written in Cornish in the
Year 1611 by Wm. Jordan, with an English Translation by John Keigwin* (London, J. B.
Nichols, 1827) (with English translation).
Stokes, Whitley, *Gwreans an bys: The Creation of the World* (London: Williams and
Norgate, 1864) (with English translation).
Nance, R. Morton, and Smith, A. S. D., *Gwryans an bys* (Padstow: FOCS, 1959; rev.
edn. E. G. R. Hooper, Redruth: Truran, 1985) (modernized Unified Cornish with
English translation).
Rawe, Donald R., *The Creation of the World (Gwryans an bys)* (Padstow: Lodenek
Press, 1978) (English translation).
Neuss, Paula, *The Creacion of the World: A Critical Edition and Translation* (New York:
Garland, 1983) (with English translation).

Croatian

Prose

Strohal, Rudolf, *Stare hrvatske apokrifne priče i legende* (Bjelovar: Weiss, 1917), 63–70 [not seen].

Czech (*Old Bohemian*)

Prose

Prusík, František Xaver, *Duchovní romány*, *Krok*, 2 (1888), nos. 5, 6, and 7 (extracts).

Jagić, Vatroslav, 'Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen', *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), Philos.histor. Kl. 42 (1893), 1–99 (see 64–82, summary and extracts).

Polívka, G., 'Die *Vita Adae et Evae* in der altböhm. Literatur', *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 17 (1895), 186–91 (extracts).

Prose (printed)

Žiwot Adama a Ewy (Pilsen, *c.*1498 [Mikuláš Bakalář]) (some pages on <http://www.clavmon.cz/clvis/sstisky/repertorium/urb49.html>).

Solfernus

See Prose (Jagić).

Žiwot Adamuw a neb ginak od starodawna Solfernus, Knyha welmi Kratochwylna a vtiessena etc. (Prague: Syxt von Ottersdorf and Jan Kosořský, 1553).

Danish

Her Michael, *De creatione rerum* (1496?) [not seen: all details from secondary studies].

De creatione rerum (Copenhagen: Poul Raeff, 1514 or 1515).

Langebeck Jacob, and Harboe, Ludvig, *Dänische Bibliothek oder Sammlung von alten und neuen gelehrten Sachen aus Dännemark* (Copenhagen, 1738–9), ii. 301–14.

Molbech, Christian, *Praesten i Odense: Herr Michaels tre danske Riimvaerker fra A. 1496* (Copenhagen, 1836).

Dutch and Low German

Noordnederlandse historiebijbel

van den Berg, M. K. A., *De Noordnederlandse historiebijbel: Een kritische editie met inleiding en aantekeningen van Hs. Ltk. 231 uit de Leidse Universiteitsbibiotheek* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998).

Tilburg manuscript

See Chapter 5.

English

Auchinleck *Life of Adam and Eve*

Laing, David, *A Penni worth of Witte; Florice and Blauncheflour: And Other Pieces of Ancient English Poetry Selected from the Auchinleck Manuscript* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1857), 49–75.

Pearsall, Derek, and Cunningham, I. C., *The Auchinleck Manuscript: National Library of Scotland Advocates' MS 19.2.1* (London: Scolar Press, 1977) (facsimile of manuscript).
See below: *Canticum de creatione* (Horstmann, Murdoch and Tasioulas).

Bodley Prose Life of Adam and Eve

Horstmann, C., 'Nachträge zu den Legenden: 3. *The lyfe of Adam*', *Archiv*, 74 (1885), 345–65.

Canticum de creatione

Horstmann, C., '*Canticum de creatione*', *Anglia*, 1 (1878), 287–331.
——*Sammlung altenglischer Legenden* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1878), 124–38 (*Canticum*) and 139–47 (Auchinleck *Life*).
Murdoch, Brian, and Tasioulas, J. A., *The Apocryphal Lives of Adam and Eve* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), 63–98 (*Canticum*) and 35–62 (Auchinleck *Life*).

John Capgrave

Lucas, Peter J., *John Capgrave's Abbreuiacion of Cronicles* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983 = EETS os 285).

William Caxton, *Golden Legend*

Ellis, F. S., *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints, Englished by William Caxton* ([1892] London: Dent, 1900; repr. 1922 and 1931).

Chester plays

Lumiansky, R. M., and Mills, David, *Chester Mystery Cycle* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974–86 = EETS ss 3 and 9).

Genesis B

Kennedy, Charles W., *The Caedmon Poems* (London: Routledge, 1916; repr. Gloucester, Mass.: Smith, 1965) (English translation).
Doane, A. N., *The Saxon Genesis* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

Gilte Legende

See Wheatley *Life*.

N-Town plays

Block, K. S., *Ludus Coventriae or The Plaie called Corpus Christi* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922; repr. 1960 = EETS es 120).
Spector, Stephen, *The N-Town Play: Cotton MS Vespasian D. 8* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991 = EETS ss 11).

Vernon Prose Life

Horstmann, Carl, *Sammlung altenglischer Legenden* (Heilbronn: Henninger, 1878), 220–7.
Blake, N. F., *Middle English Religious Prose* (London: Arnold, 1972), 103–18.
Doyle, A., *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. Poet. a. 1* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1987).

Wheatley Life/Gilte Legende

Wright, Thomas, *The Chester Plays* (London: Shakespeare Society, 1843), 239–41 (extract from related text).
Day, Mabel, *The Wheatley Manuscript* (London: Oxford University Press = EETS os 21, 1921), 76–99.
Hamer, Richard, with Russell, Vida, *Gilte Legende* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000– = EETS os 315, 327–8), ii. 991–1014.

French

Andrius

Pauphilet, Albert, 'La Vie terrestre d'Adam et d'Ève', *Revue de Paris*, 5 (1912), 213–24 (modern French translation).
Quinn, Esther C., and Dufau, M., *The Penitence of Adam: A Study of the Andrius MS* (University, Miss.: Romance Monographs Inc., 1980) (with English translation).

Guillaume de Tignonville

See Chapter 5 [not seen].

Jean d'Outremeuse

Borgnet, Ad, and Bormans, Stanislas, *Chronique de Jean des Preis dit d'Outremeuse* (Brussels: Academie/Hayez, 1864–87), i. 309–24.

Colard Mansion

See Chapter 5 and also Van Praet, Joseph (secondary literature, below; extracts) [not seen].

Le Mystère d'Adam

Studer, Paul, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1918; repr. 1949).
Grass, Karl, *Das Adamsspiel* (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 3rd edn. 1928).
Stone, Edward Noble, *Adam* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1928) (English translation).
Aebischer, Paul, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Paris: Droz, 1963).
Sletsjöe, Leif, *Le Mystère d'Adam* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1968) (facsimile and transcript of manuscript).
Axton, Richard, and Stevens, John, *Medieval French Plays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 1–44 (English translation).

Robert de Blois, *Création du monde*

Ulrich, Jacob (ed.), *Robert von Blois, Sämmtliche Werke* (Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1889–95; repr. Geneva: Slatkine, 1978); see iii (1895: *Die didactischen und religiösen Dichtungen Robert's von Blois nach der Arsenalhandschrift*), 81–129; rubrics, pp. xxx–xxxi (reviewed by J. Stürzinger, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, 18 (1896), 191–2).

German

Adams Klage (Rudolf von Ems, *Christherre-Chronik*)

Hagen, Friedrich von der (ed.), *Gesammtabenteuer* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1850; repr. Darmstadt: WBG, 1961), i. 1–16.
Fischer, Hermann, 'Die Buße Adams und Evas', *Germania*, 22 (1977), 316–41.

Priester Arnold

Von der Siebenzahl in: Friedrich Maurer, *Die religiösen Dichtungen des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1964–70), iii. 53–85.

Hans Folz

Spriewald, Ingeborg, *Hans Folz: Auswahl* (Berlin: Akademie, 1960), 95–108 (verse only) (Nuremberg: Hans Folz, 1480).
Fischer, Hanns, *Hans Folz: Die Reimpaarsprüche* (Munich: Beck, 1961), 150–63 (verse only).
Murdoch, Brian, *Hans Folz and the Adam Legends: Texts and Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1977) (prose and verse).

Hartmann von Aue

Paul, Hermann, *Gregorius von Hartmann von Aue*, 9th edn. by Ludwig Wolff (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1959).

Heinrich von München

Miller, Bob (= Andrew Robert), 'Eine deutsche Versübersetzung der lateinischen *Vita Adae et Evae* in der *Weltchronik* Heinrichs von München', in Horst Brunner (ed.), *Studien zur 'Weltchronik' Heinrichs von München* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998), i. 240–332.
See also *Historienbibeln* (Vollmer).

Historienbibeln

Merzdorf, J. F. L. Theodor, *Die deutschen Historienbibeln des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1870: repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963).
Vollmer, Hans (ed.), *Ein deutsches Adambuch* (Hamburg: Lütcke und Wolff, 1908).
See also *Adams Klage* (von der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, iii. 702–3).

Hugo von Montfort

Bartsch, Karl, *Hugo von Montfort* (Tübingen: Stuttgarter lit. Verein, 1871).

Lutwin

Hofmann, Konrad, and Meyer, Wilhelm, *Lutwins Adam und Eva* (Tübingen: Stuttgarter literarischer Verein, 1881) (reviewed by Elias von Steinmeyer, *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, 8 (1882), 222–30).

Halford, Mary-Bess, *Lutwin's Eva und Adam: Study. Text. Translation* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1984) (with English translation).

Obergrunder *Weihnachtsspiel*

Peter, Anton, *Volksthümliches aus Österreich-Schlesien I* (Troppau: n.p., 1865), 361–78.

Johannes Platterberger and Theoderich Truchseß

Excerpta chronicarum (1459): see Chapter 4 (extract in: Vollmer, Hans, *Ober- und mitteldeutsche Historienbibeln* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1912), 169–71).

Hungarian

Prose

See Primary Texts: Latin *VAE*, above: Katona, *A Teleki-codex*, 17–23.

Irish

Saltair na Rann

Stokes, Whitley, *The Saltair na Rann: A Collection of Early Middle Irish Poems Edited from MS. Rawlinson B 502, in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1883 = Anecdota Oxoniensia: Mediaeval and Modern Series I/3).

Meyer, Kuno, *Rawlinson B. 502: A Collection of Pieces in Prose and Verse in the Irish Language Compiled during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909) (manuscript facsimile).

Hull, Eleanor, *The Poem-Book of the Gael* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1912) (partial English translation).

Greene, David, and Kelly, Fergus, *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair na Rann*, i: *Text*; ii: *Commentary* by Brian Murdoch (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1976) (with English translation).

Herbert, Máire, and McNamara, Martin, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1989) (English translation of extracts, also of prose versions).

Saltair na Rann (prose reductions)

McCarthy, B., *The Codex Palatino-Vaticanus No. 830* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1892 = Todd Lecture Series 3), 38–71 (Leabhar Breac text with English translation).

Anderson, Alan O., 'Peannaid Adaim', *Revue celtique*, 24 (1909), 243–53 (Edinburgh text with English translation).

See also *Saltair na Rann* (Herbert).

Italian

Bologna play (*Rappresentazione ciclica*)

Vincenzo de Bartholomaeis, *Laude drammatiche e rappresentazioni sacre* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1943), iii. 189–256.

Bonvesin da la Riva

Brusamolino, Silvia Isella, *Bonvesin da la Riva, De cruce: testo frammentario inedito* (Milan: Pesce d'Oro, 1979).

Gökçen, Adrian M., *Bonvesin da la Riva, I Volgari* (New York: Lang, 1996).

Fiore/Fioretti [not seen]

Fiore novella estratto della Bibbia (Venice, 1473).

Fioretti della Biblia hystoriati et nouavamente correcti (Venice, 1515).

Giovanni Francesco Loredano

Loredano, Giovanni Francesco, *L'Adamo* (Venice: Grisei, 1640).

Flanagan, Roy C., and Arthos, John, *Giovanno* [*sic*] *Francesco Loredano, The Life of Adam . . . A Facsimile Reproduction of the English Translation of 1659* (Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles, 1967) (English translation).

Polish

Postępek prawa czartowskiego

Benis, Artur, *Postępek prawa czartowskiego przeciw narodowi ludziemi* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University, 1892) (Brest Litovsk: Cypryana Bazylika, 1570).

Krzysztof Pussman

Celichowski, Zygmunt, *Krzysztof Pussman, Historyja barzo cudna o stworzeniu nieba i ziemi 1551* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University, 1890) (Kraków: [Hieronymus] Scharffenberg, 1551).

Krzyżanowski, Julian, *Proza polska wczesnego renesansu 1510–1550* (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1954), 283–99.

St Petersburg manuscript

See Chapter 5 [not seen].

Russian

Protiv cheloveka vsyechestnago bozhiya tvoryeniya zavistnoye syzhdeniye i zloye povdeniye proklyatogo demona = translation of Polish *Postępek prawa czartowskiego*: see Czech (Jagić: extracts).

Welsh

Ef a wnaeth Panthon . . .

Owen, Nicholas, *British Remains, or a Collection of Antiquities Relating to the Britons* (London: Bew, 1777), 'A Celebrated Poem of Taliesin', 123–8 (with Latin translation from 1580 in Sapphic verse by David Jones, vicar of Llanfair-Duffrin-Clwydd).

Jones, Owen, Williams, Edward, and Pughe, William Owen, *The Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales* (London: S. Rousseau, 1801–7; repr. Denbigh: Gee, 1870).

[Maitland, Samuel Roffey], 'Yr Awdl Fraith', *British Magazine and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information*, 19 (1841), 663–8 (with English translation).

Guest, Charlotte, *The Mabinogion* (1849; London: Dent, 1937), 281–5 (English translation).

Williams, Ifor, *Gwyneddon 3* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1931), 267–71 (transcription).

Breeze, Andrew, 'Master John of St Davids, Adam and Eve and the Rose amongst Thorns', *Studia Celtica*, 29 (1995), 225–35 (with English translation).

Ystoria Adaf ac Eua y Wreic

Williams, J. E. Caerwyn, 'Ystoria Adaf ac Eua y Wreic', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 6 (1949), 170–5.

III. Selected Secondary Studies

The works listed here are those concerned principally and directly with apocryphal texts as such, and with the *VAE* in particular. The second part, which also includes some vernacular primary sources (such as the Holy Rood texts) not listed above, is intended as a guide to secondary studies concerned with the *VAE* in the vernacular and in iconography.

Canon, apocrypha, and the Adambooks

Akenson, Donald Harman, *Surpassing Wonder: The Invention of the Bible and the Talmuds* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1998).

Anderson, Gary A., *The Genesis of Perfection* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).

——'The Penitence Narrative in the *Life of Adam and Eve*', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 63 (1993), 1–38 (and in Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 3–42).

——'Adam and Eve in the "Life of Adam and Eve"', in Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (eds.), *Biblical Figures outside the Bible* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 7–32.

——Stone, Michael, and Tromp, Johannes, *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Bettenson, Henry, *Documents of the Christian Church* (1943; 2nd edn. London: Oxford University Press, 1963).

Bowker, John, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Chapman, J., 'On the *Decretum Gelasianum De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*', *Revue bénédictine*, 30 (1913), 187–202 and 315–33.

Charles, R. H., *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914; repr. 1956).

Charlesworth, James H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Cousland, J. R. C., '"Her Flesh was as Grass": *Vita Adam et Evae* 10, 1', *Biblica*, 81 (2000), 507–10.

Davila, James R., *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or Other* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

Denis, Albert-Marie, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

——*Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament* (Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1987).

Dobschütz, Ernst von, *Das Decretum Gelasianum* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912).

Eissfeldt, Otto, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).

Eldridge, Michael D., *Dying Adam and his Multiethnic Family* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

Evans, J. M., 'Microcosmic Adam', *Medium Aevum*, 35 (1966), 38–42.

Förster, Max, 'Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung: Ein lateinisches Fragment des sogenannten slawischen Henoch', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 11 (1907–8), 477–529.

Friedlander, Gerald, *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1916).

Gaylord, Harry E., 'How Satanael lost his el', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 33 (1982), 304–9.

Gwatkin, Henry M., *Selections from Early Writers* (London: Macmillan, 1902).

Hilhorst, Anthony, 'Ager Damascenus: Views on the Place of Adam's Creation', *Warszawskie Studia Theologiczne*, 20 (2007), 131–44.

Jacoby, A., *Ein bisher unbeachteter apokrypher Bericht über die Taufe Jesu* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1902).

James, M. R., *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1920).

Jonge, Marinus de, and Tromp, Johannes, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997).

Jonge, Marinus de, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Köhler, R., 'Adams Erschaffung aus acht Teilen', *Germania*, 7 (1862), 350–3.

Kraft, Robert A., 'The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity', in John C. Reeves (ed.), *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 55–86.

Lampe, G. W. H., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ii: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Lechner-Schmidt, Wilfried, *Wortindex der lateinisch erhaltenen Pseudepigraphen zum Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Francke, 1990).

McKendrick, Scot, and O'Sullivan, Orlaith A., *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: British Library, 2003).

Norris, Pamela, *The Story of Eve* (London: Picador, 1998).

Pattie, T. S., *Manuscripts of the Bible* (London: British Library, 1979).

Pettorelli, Jean-Pierre, 'Vie latine d'Adam et Ève: familles rhénanes I', ' . . . II', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 59 (2001), 1–73 and 60 (2002), 171–233.

——'Deux témoins latins singuliers de la Vie d'Adam et Ève', *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 33 (2002), 1–27.

——'Essai sur la structure primitive de la Vie d'Adam et Ève', *Apocrypha*, 14 (2003), 237–56.

Quinn, Esther C., *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1962).

Rowley, H. H., *The Growth of the Old Testament* (London: Hutchinson, 3rd edn. 1967).

Russell, D. S., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (London: SCM, 1987).

Souter, Alexander, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, rev. C. S. C. Williams (London: Duckworth, 1954).

Stone, Michael, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

——'The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 44 (1993), 143–56 (and in Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, *Literature on Adam and Eve*, 43–56).

——'Jewish Tradition, the Pseudepigrapha and the Christian West', in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (eds.), *The Aramaic Bible* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament/ss 166, 1993), 431–49.

——*Adam's Contract with Satan: The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2002).

——*Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Armenian Studies: Collected Papers I* (Louvain: Peeters, 2006).

[Synkellos, George], *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, trans. William Adler and Paul Tuffin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Toepel, Alexander, *Die Adam und Seth-Legenden im syrischen Buch der Schatzhöhle* (Louvain: Peeters, 2006).

Tromp, Johannes, 'Zur Edition apokrypher Texte: Am Beispiel des griechischen Lebens Adams und Evas', in Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch (eds.), *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 189–206.

On vernacular VAE *texts and iconography*

Adamczyk, Maria, '"Vita Adae et Evae"...("Apokalipsa Mojżesza"?) w apokryficznych wersjach starobulgarskiej i staropolskiej', in Mariola Walczak-Mikołajczakowa and Bogusław Zieliński (eds.), *Z małą ojczyzną w serzu (Festschrift for Tadeusz Zdanciewicz)* (Poznań: Uniwersitet im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2005) [not seen].

Albini, Guiliana, 'Bonvesin da la Riva, un intellettuale laico alla ricerca di uno dimensione religiosa nella Milano di fine Duecento', in Maria Bettelli(Bergamaschi) and Grado Giovanni Merlo (eds.), *Lombardia monastica e religiosa* (Milan: Biblioteca francescana, 2001), 307–63 (also in Albini, *Carità e governa delle povertà (secoli XII–XVI)* (Milan: Unicopli, 2002), 19–53).

Ashton, John, *The Legendary History of the Cross* (London: Fisher-Unwin, 1887).

Bachmann, Friedrich, *Die beiden Versiones des me. Canticum de creatione* (Hamburg: Lütcke and Wulff, 1891).

Baert, Barbara, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

Barbieri, Eduardo, 'Tradition and Change in the Spiritual Literature of the Cinquecento', in *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, trans. Adrian Belton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 111–33.

Baumgärtner, Ingrid, 'Biblische, mythische und fremde Frauen: Zur Konstruktion der Weiblichkeit in Text und Bild mittelalterlicher Weltkarten', *Chloe* (Beihefte zu *Daphnis*), 34 (2002), 31–86.

Bloh, Ute von, *Die illustrierten Historienbibeln: Text und Bild in Prolog und Schöpfungsgeschichte der deutschsprachigen Historienbibeln des Spätmittelalters* (Bern: Lang, 1993).

Bonnell, John K., 'The Serpent with a Human Head in Art and in Mystery Play', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 21 (1917), 255–91.

Bonser, W., 'Praying in Water', *Folklore*, 48 (1937), 385–8.

Bošnjak, Mladen, *A Study of Slavic Incunabula* (Zagreb: Mladost; Munich: Kubon und Sagner, 1968).

Braunfels-Esche, Sigrid, *Adam und Eva: Sündenfall und Erlösung* (Düsseldorf: Lukas, 1957).

Breeze, Andrew, 'Master John of St Davids, a New Twelfth-Century Poet?', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 40 (1993), 73–82.

——*Medieval Welsh Literature* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997).

Breatnach, Caoimhín, 'Rawlinson B. 502, Lebar Glinne dá Locha and *Saltair na Rann*', *Éigse*, 30 (1997), 109–32.

Bromwich, Rachel, 'Llwybr Adda(f)', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 19 (1980), 80–1.

Brückner, Aleksander, 'Ein polnisches Teufelsbuch und seine russische Übersetzung', *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 15 (1892), 470–5.

Carey, John, 'Cosmology in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 17 (1985), 33–52.

——'The Heavenly City in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 18 (1986), 87–104.

——'Angelology in *Saltair na Rann*', *Celtica*, 19 (1987), 1–8.

——'*Visio Sancti Pauli* and the *Saltair*'s Hell', *Éigse*, 23 (1989), 39–44.

Cigman, Gloria, 'The Word of God in Pictures', *History Today*, 49/7 (July 1999), 18–25.

Clemens, Andrea, *Die Historienbibeln des Spätmittelalters: Religiöse Laienbildung zwischen Weltchronik und Lutherbibel* (Munich: Grin, 2004 = e-book).

Dillon, Myles, 'Scél Saltrach na Rann', *Celtica*, 4 (1958), 1–43.

Dumville, D. N., 'Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation', *PRIA* 73C (1973), 299–338.

Dunphy, R. Graeme, *Daz was ein michel wunder: The Presentation of Old Testament Material in Jans Enikel's Weltchronik* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1998).

——*History as Literature: German World Chronicles of the Thirteenth Century in Verse* (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Western Michigan University Medieval Institute, 2000).

——'The Devil's See: A Puzzling Reference in the Auchinleck *Life of Adam*', *Medium Aevum*, 73 (2004), 93–8.

Dunstan, A. C., 'The Middle High German "Adam und Eva" by Lutwin and the Latin "Vita Adae et Evae"', *Modern Language Review*, 24 (1929), 191–9.

——'The Middle English *Canticum de creatione* and the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*', *Anglia*, 55 (1931), 431–42.

Dunstan, A. C., 'Lutwin's Latin Source', in *German Studies Presented to H. G. Fiedler* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938), 160–73.

Duriez, Georges, *La Théologie dans le drame religieux en allemagne au moyen âge* (Paris: Giard/Tallandier, 1914).

Eastmond, Antony, 'Narratives of the Fall: Structure and Meaning in the Genesis Frieze at Hagia Sophia, Trebizond', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 53 (1999), 219–36.

Ehrismann, Gustav, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1922–34).

Eis, Gerhard, 'Heimat, Quellen und Entstehungszeit von Lutwins "Adam und Eva" ', in his *Beiträge zur mittelhochdeutschen Legende und Mystik* (Berlin: Akademie, 1935), 25–106.

Emerson, Oliver F., 'Legends of Cain, Especially in Old and Middle English', *PMLA* 21 (1906), 831–929.

Erffa, Hans Martin von, *Ikonologie der Genesis* (Stuttgart: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989–95).

Evans, D. Simon, *Medieval Religious Literature* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1986).

Fowler, David C., *The Bible in Middle English Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974).

—— *The Bible in Early English Literature* (London: Sheldon, 1977).

Frank, Grace, *The Medieval French Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954).

Gaidoz, H., and Sébillot, Paul, 'Bibliographie des traditions et de la littérature populaire de la Bretagne', *Revue celtique*, 5 (1881–3), 277–338.

Gerhardt, Christoph, 'Historienbibeln (deutsche)', in K. Ruh (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–2006), iv. 67–75.

Grabar, Biserka, 'Apokrifni u hrvatskoj srednjovjekovnoj kniževnosti', *Croatica*, 1 (1970), 15–28.

Greene, David, 'The Religious Epic', in James Carney (ed.), *Early Irish Poetry* (Cork: Mercer, 1965 = Thomas Davis lectures, 1959/60), 73–84.

Guddat-Figge, Gisela, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Middle English Romances* (Munich: Fink, 1976).

Gurteen, S. Humphreys, *The Epic of the Fall of Man* (New York: Putnams, 1896).

Halford, Mary-Bess [= M. E. B.], *Illustration and Text in Lutwin's Eva und Adam: Codex Vindob. 2980* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1980).

Hill, Betty, 'The Fifteenth-Century Prose Legend of the Cross before Christ', *Medium Aevum*, 34 (1965), 203–22.

Hofmann, Konrad, and Meyer, Wilhelm, 'Die Textkritik von Lutwins *Adam und Eva*', *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akad. der Wiss.* (München), philos.philol. Cl. (1880), 598–616.

Horrall, Sarah M., 'William Caxton's Biblical Translation', *Medium Aevum*, 53 (1984), 91–8.

Jenkins, J. Gwili, 'Medieval Welsh Scriptures, Religious Legends, and Midrash', *Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1919–20 (1921), 95–140.

Jerchel, Heinrich, 'Die Bilder der südwestdeutschen Weltchroniken des 14. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 2 (1933), 381–98.

Jolly, Penny Howell, *Made in God's Image? Eve and Adam in the Genesis Mosaics at San Marco, Venice* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997).

Jones, T. G., '"Ystorya Adaf" a "Val y cauas Elen y Grog": tarddiad, cynnwys ac arddull y testunau Cymraeg a'u lledaeniad' (MA thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1936).

Klimke, Carl, *Das volkstümliche Paradiesspiel* (Breslau: Marcus, 1902; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1977).

Knott, Eleanor, 'An Index to the Proper Names in *Saltair na Rann*', *Ériu*, 16 (1952), 99–122.

Kurras, Lotte, 'Johannes Platterberger', in K. Ruh (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–2006), vii. 726–8.

Le Braz, Anatole, *Théâtre celtique* (Paris: Calman-Lévy, 1904).

Le Duc, Gwenaël, 'Le Théâtre populaire breton: transmission écrite et orale. Problématique d'une symbiose', in Hildegard Tristram (ed.), *Text und Zeittiefe* (Tübingen: Narr, 1994), 233–92.

McAllister, Patricia, 'Apocryphal Narrative Elements in the Genesis of the Middle Low German *Historienbibel* Helmstedt 611.1', *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 25 (1989), 81–92.

McColley, Diane Kelsey, *A Gust for Paradise* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1993).

McCulloch, Florence, '*La Création du monde* de Robert de Blois', *Romania*, 91 (1970), 267–77.

Mac Eoin, Gearóid, 'The Date and Authorship of *Saltair na Rann*', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 28 (1960/61), 51–67.

Mac Eoin, Gearóid, 'Observations on *Saltair na Rann*', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 39 (1982), 1–28.

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

Masser, Achim, and Siller, Max, *Das Evangelium Nicodemi in spätmittelalterlicher deutscher Prosa* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1987).

Mély, F. de, 'Nos premiers parents dans l'art: Adam, Eve, Lilith', in P. Bergmans (ed.), *Mélanges Hulin de Loo* (Paris: Librairie nationale d'art et d'histoire, 1931), 116–22.

Miksch, Gertrude, 'Der Adam und Evastoff in der deutschen Literatur' (Ph.D. diss., Vienna, 1954).

Miller, Andrew Robert, 'German and Dutch Legends of the Wood of the Cross before Christ' (D.Phil. diss., Oxford, 1992).

——'Fünf deutsche Prosafassungen der Kreuzholzlegende "Post peccatum Ade"', *Vestigia Bibliae*, 24/4 (2002/3), 289–342 (= *Metamorphosen der Bibel*, ed. Ralph Plate and Andrea Rapp).

Moland, Louis, 'Le Drame et la légende d'Adam au moyen-âge', *Revue contemporaine*, 20 (1855), 5–38.

Morey, James H., 'Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase, and the Medieval Popular Bible', *Speculum*, 68 (1993), 6–35.

——*Book and Verse: A Guide to Middle English Biblical Literature* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

Morris, Richard, *Legends of the Holy Rood* (London, 1881 = EETS os 46).

Muir, Lynette R., *Liturgy and Drama in the Anglo-Norman Adam* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973).

Murdoch, Brian, 'The Garments of Paradise', *Euphorion*, 61 (1967), 375–82.

——*The Fall of Man in the Early Middle High German Biblical Epic* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1972).

——'An Early Irish Adam and Eve Story: *Saltair na Rann* and the Traditions of the Fall', *Medieval Studies*, 35 (1973), 146–77.

——'The River that Stopped Flowing: Folklore and Biblical Typology in the Apocryphal Lives of Adam and Eve', *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 37 (1973), 37–51.

——'Das deutsche Adambuch und die Adamlegenden des Mittelalters', in W. Harms and L. P. Johnson (eds.), *Deutsche Literatur des späten Mittelalters* (Berlin: Schmidt, 1975), 209–24.

——'Adambuch', 'Adams Klage', 'Lutwin', in K. Ruh (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd edn. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977–2006), i. 44–7, 61–2; v. 1087–9.

——'The Breton *Creation Ar Bet* and the Medieval Drama of Adam', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 36 (1977), 157–79.

——'Eve's Anger: Literary Secularisation in Lutwin's *Adam und Eva*', *Archiv*, 215 (1978), 256–71.

——'Hartmann's *Gregorius* and the Quest of Life', *New German Studies*, 6 (1978), 79–100.

——'Creation, Fall and After in the Cornish *Gwreans an bys*', *Studi medievali*, 29 (1988), 685–705.

——'Adam *sub gratia*: Zur Bußszene in Hartmanns *Gregorius*', *Archiv*, 142 (1990), 122–6.

——'The Origins of Penance: Reflections of Adamic Apocrypha and of the *Vita Adae* in Western Europe', *Annals of the Archive of Ferran Valls I Taberner's Library*, 9/10 (1991), 205–28.

——'Jacob Ruf's *Adam und Heva* and the Protestant Paradise-Play', *Modern Language Review*, 86 (1991), 109–25.

——*Cornish Literature* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1993).

——'The Old Frisian *Adam octipartitus*', *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 40 (1994), 131–8.

——'Dos piezas dramáticas en verso del Génesis, una germana y una celta, de finales de la Edad Media', *Acta poetica*, 16 (1995), 349–68.

——'Legends of the Holy Rood in Cornish Drama', *Studia Celtica Japonica*, 9 (1997) 19–34.

——*Adam's Grace: Fall and Redemption in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2000).

——'Preaching in Medieval Ireland: The Irish Tradition', in Alan J. Fletcher and Raymond Gillespie (ed.), *Irish Preaching 700–1700* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 40–55.

——*The Medieval Popular Bible: Expansions of Genesis in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004).

Mussafia, Adolfo, 'Sulla leggenda del legno della croce', *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.hist. Cl. 63 (1869), 165–216.

Napier, Arthur S., *History of the Holy Rood-Tree* (London, 1894 = EETS os 103).

Neuss, Paula, 'Memorial Reconstruction in a Cornish Miracle Play', *Comparative Drama*, 5 (1971), 129–37.

——'The Staging of *The Creacion of the World*', *Theatre Notebook*, 33 (1979), 116–25.

Newlyn, Evelyn S., 'The Stained and Painted Glass of St Neot's Church and the Staging of the Middle Cornish Drama', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 24 (1994), 89–111.

Ohly, Friedrich, *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte: Vom Leben mit dem Schuld* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1976); trans. Linda Archibald, *The Damned and the Elect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Ohrt, F., *Die ältesten Segen über Christi Taufe* (Copenhagen: Levin and Munskgaard, 1938).

O'Loughlin, Thomas, 'Adam's Burial at Hebron: Some Aspects of its Significance in the Latin Tradition', *PRIA* 15 (1992), 66–88.

——*Adomnán and the Holy Places* (London: Clark, 2007).

Omond, H., 'Catalogues des MSS. celtiques et basques de la Bibliothèque nationale', *Revue celtique*, 11 (1890), 389–423.

Ordinalia: *The Ancient Cornish Drama*, ed. Edwin Norris, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859; repr. London: Blom, 1968).

Overgaard, Mariane, *The History of the Cross-Tree down to Christ's Passion: Icelandic Legend Versions* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1968).

Paroli, Teresa, 'Santi e demoni nelle letterature germaniche dell'alto medioevo', *Settimane di studio de Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 36 (1989), 411–98.

Pearsall, Derek, *Studies in the Vernon Manuscript* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1990).

Perry, Aaron Jenkins, *Þe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes*, in *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum . . . and Methodius: Þe Bygynnyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes, by John Trevisa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1925 = EETS os 167).

Peter, Thurstan, *The History of Glasney Collegiate Church* (Camborne: Camborne Printing, 1903).

Pinkus, Assaf, 'The Impact of the Black Death on the Sculptural Program of the Pilgrimage Church St Theobald in Thann: New Perception of the Genesis Story', *Studies in Art History*, 6 (2001), 161–76.

Piper, F., 'Adams Grab auf Golgatha', *Evangelisches Jahrbuch* (1861), 17–29.

Powell, Kathryn, and Scragg, Donald, *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003).

Prangsma-Hajenius, Angélique, *La Légende du bois de la croix dans la littérature française médiévale* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1995).

Rautenberg, Ursula, *Das Titelblat:. Die Entstehung eines typographischen Dispositivs im frühen Buchdruck* (Erlangen-Nürnberg: Buchwissenschaft, 2004).

Réau, Louis, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien* (Paris: PUF, 1956–9).

Reygers, Leonie, 'Adam und Eva', in Otto Schmitt (ed.), *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Metzler/Munich: Beck, 1937–), i. 126–56.

Röhrich, Lutz, *Adam und Eva: Das erste Menschenpaar in Volkskunst und Volksdichtung* (Stuttgart: Müller and Schindler, 1968).

Rothschild, James de, *Le Mistére du Viel Testament* (Paris: Didot, 1878–91; repr. New York: Johnson, 1966) (introduction to vol. i).

Rowles, Sarah, '*Ystorya Adaf*: Golwg ar un o ffynonellau cyfiethwyr y chwedlau crefyddol', *Llên Cymru*, 29 (2006), 44–63.

Sajavaara, Kari, 'The Withered Footprints on the Green Street of Paradise', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76 (1975), 34–8.

Salmon, Paul, 'Der zehnte Engelchor in deutschen Dichtungen und Predigten des Mittelalters', *Euphorion*, 57 (1963), 321–30.

Saurma-Jetsch, Liselotte E., *Spätformen mittelalterlicher Buchherstellung: Bilderhandschriften aus der Werkstatt Diebold Laubers in Hagenau* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001).

Scenes from the Life of Christ in English Manuscripts (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1951).

Schwabbauer, Monika, *Profangeschichte in der Heilsgeschichte. Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Incidentien der 'Christherre-Chronik'* (Bern: Lang, 1996).

Schwarz, Paul, *Die Neue Eva: Der Sündenfall in Volksglaube und Volkserzählung* (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1973).

Severs, J. Burke, and Hartung, Albert E., *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500* (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967–89).

Seymour, St John D., 'The Book of Adam and Eve in Ireland', *PRIA* 36C (1921–4), 121–33.

——'The Signs of Doomsday in the *Saltair na Rann*', *PRIA* 36C (1921–4), 154–63.

——'Notes on Apocrypha in Ireland', *PRIA* 37C (1926), 107–17.

Shonk, Timothy A., 'A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century', *Speculum*, 60 (1985), 71–91.

'Solomon and Saturn' and 'Adrian and Ritheus', ed. James E. Cross and Thomas D. Hill (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

Taguchi, Mayumi, 'The Legend of the Cross before Christ: Another Prose Treatment in English and Anglo-Norman', *Poetica*, 45 (1996), 16–61.

Trapp, John, 'Iconography', in John Broadbent (ed.), *John Milton: Introductions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 162–85.

Tristram, Hildegard L. C., 'Der *homo octipartitus* in der irischen und altenglischen Literatur', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 34 (1975), 119–53.

——*Sex aetates mundi* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1985).

Thurneysen, R., '*Saltair na Rann*', *Revue celtique*, 6 (1883/5), 96–109 and 371–3.

Turdeanu, Emil, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

Tzanaki, Rosemary, *Mandeville's Medieval Audiences: Studies in the Reception of the Book of Sir John Mandeville (1371–1550)* (London: Ashgate, 2003).

van Dam, J., 'Adam und Eva', in Wolfgang Stammler and Karl Langosch (eds.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933–55), i. 6.

Van Praet, Joseph, *Notice sur Colard Mansion, libraire et imprimeuer de la ville de Bruges en Flandre dans le quinzième siècle* (Paris: De Bure Frères, 1829).

——*Recherches sur le Seigneur de la Gruthuyse* (Paris: De Bure Frères, 1831).

Viehhauser, Gabriel, *Die Darstellung König Salomos in der mittelhochdeutschen Weltchronistik* (Vienna: Praesens, 2003).

Vilmar, A. F. C., *Die zwei Recensionen und die Handschriftenfamilien der Weltchronik Rudolfs von Ems* (Marburg: Liwerts, 1839).

Vollmer, Hans, *Ober- und mitteldeutsche Historienbibeln (Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde des Mittelalters* I/1) (Berlin: Weidmann, 1912).

Whetter, James, *The History of Glasney College* (Padstow: Tabb House, 1988).

Williams, J. E. Caerwyn, 'Medieval Welsh Religious Prose', in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Celtic Studies* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1966), 63–97.

Wilson, R. M., *The Lost Literature of Medieval England* (London: Methuen, 1952; 2nd edn. 1970, paperback text 1972).

Woolf, Rosemary, 'The Fall of Man in *Genesis B* and the *Mystère d'Adam*', in *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur* (Eugene, Ore.: Oregon University Press, 1963), 187–99 (and in Rosemary Woolf, *Art and Doctrine: Essays on Medieval Literature*, ed. Heather O'Donoghue (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 15–28.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

Note: the names Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Seth, Michael, Uriel, Lucifer and Satan are not listed, nor are the *Vita Adae et Evae* with Meyer's classes (there is a synopsis, 20–22) and the Holy Rood legends. Frequently recurring terms such as 'oil of mercy' are also omitted. Individual redactions or versions are listed under the determining key–word (such as 'Bohemian redaction *VAE*', 'Paris/Milan *VAE*'). Unless known by a title, vernacular translations of the *VAE* are listed under the relevant language (such as 'Hungarian *VAE*'). Manuscripts discussed (rather than noted) in the text are included under their present location.