

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

David C. Fowler, 'The Middle English Gospel of Nicodemus in Winchester MS 33', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 19 (1988), 67-83

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123690&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

The Middle English Gospel of Nicodemus in Winchester MS 33

David C. Fowler

Until recently manuscript 33 of the Warden and Fellows' Library, Winchester College, was best known for its dialogues of *Lucidus and Dubius* and *Occupation and Idleness*, both now available in a facsimile edition by Norman Davis;¹ but in 1978 Kathleen H. Power first identified the English prose *Nicodemus* in this manuscript (ff.74r-93v) as the translation of John Trevisa,² and it is my purpose to compare this text with the edition of Trevisa's *Gospel of Nicodemus* prepared some years ago by H.C. Kim.³ My assessment of the Winchester *Nicodemus* will proceed from the negative to the positive, beginning with the kinds of defects I have noticed and concluding with such variants as seem to require revision of Kim's text. In an appendix I will print the unique chapter of the Winchester manuscript, together with what I take to be its Latin source in MS Bodley 556.⁴

Omissions

The most dramatic deficiency of the Winchester manuscript is its omissions. There are scores of them, ranging from single words or phrases to passages of more than one hundred words. Taken together, these omissions represent a loss of perhaps 12.5% of the text. To the best of my knowledge such great losses are not common, even in late medieval manuscripts, but the reason for the losses here is discoverable in many cases: the scribe's eye has skipped material because of the repetition of a word or phrase. The following examples will illustrate this phenomenon of eyeskip and indicate the kinds of losses that this manuscript has suffered.

Eyeskip can of course occur in Latin as well as English, but the presence of these omitted passages in the other two English manuscripts shows that in Winchester 33 (W) the losses occurred during the transmission of the English text.

This is especially evident in instances such as the following, in which the repetition causing the loss is a peculiarity of the English translation, as can be seen by comparison with the Latin (x.1.9-10):

Et steterunt populi. Et irridebant eum principes, seniores et iudices eorum inter semet ipsos dicentes:

This follows the biblical text very closely (Luke xxiii 35), but Trevisa, drawing perhaps on Matthew xxvii 39-41, reads as follows (quoting from Salisbury Cathedral MS 39 unless otherwise indicated):

þe people stod and *skornede hym*. þe princes, þe aldur men and þe Iuges *skornede hym* amang ham sylue and seyde:

The phrases in italics provide the repetition that causes the scribe of W (or an ancestor) to write as follows (f.80r):

The peple stode and skorned hym amonge hemself and seide:

Thus a repetition which is not in the Latin, but confined to Trevisa's English, causes an omission of ten words.

A few lines later we encounter a passage with similar repetitions in the English translation. There is no need to quote the Latin in each case, but I shall continue to use the chapter, paragraph, and line numbers of Kim's Latin edition to identify the English passage quoted (x.1.16-19):

Saue þou þy selue, 3yf þou art *kyng of Iewes*. In presens of Seiymlus þe wryter, þe Iustice het wryt in lettres of Ebrew, Greu and Latine as þe Iewes hadde yseyde: þes ys *kyng of Iewes*. On of þe þeues þat þer was anhange . . .

Here is the same passage in W (f.80r):

Saue thou thiself if thou art kyng of iewes. Than one of the thefis that hyngre there . . .

The repetition of "kyng of Iewes", though separated by some twenty-seven words,

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

is responsible for the loss.

The largest omission in W occurs at the end of Part I and the beginning of Part II (The Descent into Hell). Over half of chapter xvi and the opening lines of chapter xvii are lost (xvi.1.14 to xvii.1.6), with no sign of a break in the manuscript (f.85r line 1): ". . . the face of alle peplis / But now taketh hede to . . .". This gap represents a loss of some 342 words, possibly representing a full page of the exemplar (W has 300 to 325 words per page). There is of course no sign of a repetition here that could be the cause of such a leap. But perhaps this is simply the ultimate example of a carelessness which I take to be the basic reason for so many omissions in this text: a page is turned without having been copied.

Amid so many losses, could there not be cases where our manuscript preserves something lost in the other copies? Such appears possible in the next case, but to show this let me first quote the Latin (xviii.1.15-22):

Terra Zabulon et terra Neptalim trans Iordanem *Galileae gentium*. Populus qui sedet in tenebris uidebit lucem magnam, et qui sunt in regione umbrae mortis lux fulgebit super eos. Et nunc aduenit et inluxit nobis in morte sedentibus.

Et cum exultaremus omnes in lumine quod superlucit nobis.

The translation as preserved in the Salisbury and Additional manuscripts is as follows:

And þe londe of Zabulon and þe londe of Neptalym, þe wey by þe see-syde beyonde Iordane, þe people þat sytteþ in derknesse schall see grete *lyght* and *lyzt* schall schyne apon ham þat buþ in þe kyngdom of þe schadow of *deþ*. And now it is ycomen and schyned apon hame þat sitteþ in *deþ*.

And we criede [alle] in þe *lyzt* þat byschone vs.

Observing the repetitions of "lyght" and "deþ" in this passage, we see the consequences in W (ff.85v-86r):

The londe of zabulon and the londe of Neptalym the wey by the see-side beþonde / Iordon *the peple* of galile. *the peple* that zede in derkenes sey a grete lizt to the dwellers in the kyngdom

of the shadowe of deth, liȝt is spronge to hem.
and we criden alle in the lyȝt that beshone vs.

The repetition of "deþ" has caused the simple disappearance of a sentence: "And now it is ycomen and schyned apon hame þat sitteþ in deþ". But the repetition of "lyght" seems to have triggered a loss that is not easily reconstructed because someone apparently caught the error and attempted to repair it. This may have happened in stages, with the correction made by a later copyist from the biblical source, since W has "ȝede" (Isaiah ix 2 "ambulabat"), rather than Trevisa's "sytteþ" (*Nicodemus* xviii.1.16 "sedet"). But the Latin also reminds us that W has one phrase not in Kim's text, "the peple of galile", from "Galileae gentium" (Isaiah ix 1). The consequent repetition of "peple" (italicized in the above quotation) may well have caused the loss in the Salisbury and Additional manuscripts, and perhaps should be restored to the critical text of Trevisa's translation. The only reason I hesitate in this case is that the Latin manuscript closest to Trevisa's exemplar, Bodley 556, instead of "Galileae gentium" has "maritimam" (f.8v), leaving open the possibility that "the peple of galile" was restored in W from Isaiah ix 1.

The second longest omission in W is found near the end of chapter xxiv (f.90v). The tendency of the saints to respond to each of the Old Testament prophecies with "amen", "alleluia" has caused our scribe to omit the entire prophecy of Micah and the corresponding response of the saints (xxiv.3.5-16). This shows how far the eye can wander, for there must have been at least ten lines (110 words) separating the repeated phrases that presumably caused the eye to skip.

Our final example will show that the eye can travel backwards as well as forwards. Here the sons of Simeon report the circumstances of their resurrection, first in Kim's text (xxvii.1.4-12):

Mychel þe stedefast angel seyde to us: Goþ wyt ȝoure breþerun in to Ierusalem, for ȝe schul be in ȝoure bedus cryngge and worschypynge þe resureccioun of oure Lord Ihesu Crist þat rerud ȝou with hym sylue from deþ to leyue. And ȝe schal speke with no man, bote ȝe schal be as hyt were dombe forto þat tyme come wanne oure Lord grantuþ ȝou leue to telle þe misterye and þe preuyte of ys Godhed. *Mychel þe arcangel* het us wende ouer Iordan . . .

The same passage in W reads as follows (f.91v):

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

myghel the stedefast angel seide to vs. Myghel the *stedefast*
archangel bad vs wende ouer flom Iordon . . .

From this it would appear that the repetition of "Mychel . . . angel" caused the initial leap, but that in the course of copying the eye strayed backwards, causing the recopying of "stedefast" (second occurrence partly erased), but with no apparent awareness of the complete omission of the archangel's speech.

We should allow the possibility that the high incidence of omissions in the Winchester manuscript is the cumulative result of a century of transmission of Trevisa's text, rather than a consequence of the carelessness of one particular scribe. But the fact is that, whatever the cause, these omissions are perhaps the most serious problem confronting the editor who uses this manuscript in establishing the text of Trevisa's translation.

Aberrations

Most of what I call the aberrations of W are simple departures from the text as attested in the Latin and confirmed by the English of the Salisbury and Additional manuscripts. In the following list I cite first the Latin, followed by the reading of Kim's English text, and then the reading of W.

iii.1.2	solem: sonne, somme.
xii.1.32	ira: wrapþe, wreche.
xiii.1.6	aspectus: sy3th, lygth.
xviii.1.12	lumen: son, signe.
xxii.1.4	sedibus: setus, cytees.
xxiii.1.32	requirere: ysou3t, sayde.
xxiii.1.33	ratione: resoun, enchesoun.
xxvii.4.6	sollicitudine: besynasse, blissednes.

Occasionally a difficulty in the earlier copies leads to further corruption in W. Thus in the opening of Nicodemus' speech (xv.1.1-2), "*Recte* loquimini, filii Israel", "*Recte*" appears in Salisbury as "ryt folylch" and in Additional as "right f llich" (partly erased). Obviously there has been a scribal urge to make Nicodemus speak more severely to his audience, turning "rightfully" into "foolishly". This tendency achieves completion in W: "3e spoken folily 3e chyl dren of israel . . ." (f.83r).

A most interesting corruption in W occurs in the join between the second and third paragraphs of chapter xi. The wonders of the crucifixion have been reported to Pilate, who addresses the Jews (xi.2.4-3.3):

Uidistis quae facta sunt? Responderunt presidi: Aeclypsis facta est solis secundum consuetudinem.

Stabant autem *omnes noti eius* a longe et mulieres quae secute eum erant a Galilea, uidentes haec omnia.

Here is Trevisa's translation (Kim's text):

Sey3 3e þe wondrus þat buþ byfalle? þe Iewes answerude and seyde: þe clyps of þe sonne ful at þys tyme as hyt hys yfunde.

Al ys aqueynt and wemen þat hadde ysewed [hym] out of Galyle stode þar and ysey3e alle þese wondurful dedes.

The same passage in W (f.80v):

Sawe 3e the wondris that are befallē? The iewes answered and seide to the iustice, The klypse of the sunne fille at this tyme as it is wonte *for alle his quentyse*.

and wommen stoden there that sewed hym out of Galile and sawen alle the wonderfull dedis.

The scribe of W evidently did not understand "al ys aqueynt" ("omnes noti eius"), but decided that it was part of the Jews' reply to Pilate. Since they had accused Jesus of witchcraft, it perhaps seemed natural to have them allude to this in dismissing the darkening of the sun as a natural phenomenon: "despite all his esoteric devices (i.e. magic), this was merely an eclipse". Such, I take it, is the force of "for all his quentyse" intended by the scribe. With this example we come close to what might be called editorial additions, to which we may now turn.

Editorial Additions

At some point in the transmission of the English text of *Nicodemus* represented by Winchester 33 a copyist has introduced details from the legends of

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

three worthies who find a place in this gospel. One is Longinus miles (x.1.15, though in Trevisa's exemplar the mention of him comes after Christ's death in xi.1.8), referred to by Trevisa simply as "Longius þe knyȝth", whereas W reads "Longeus the *blynde* knyght" (f.80v). This is an allusion to the more developed form of the story popularized in the *Golden Legend*, which appears also in the poetic translation of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*,⁵ and the prose version from MS Harley 149.⁶ The latter reads as follows:

Than the Jewes toke a speere to a blynde knyght, named Longeus, and sette yt to the ryght syde of Jhesu and comaunded hym for to putt. And so he dyd. And oute of that wownde ranne bloode and watyr, whych aualed downe by the speere and touched hys honde, wher-wyth he rubbed hys yghen. And forth-wyth-al he sawe clerely and bare wytnes of trouthe.

One is reminded also of the crucifixion scene in the chancel window of Fairford Church, Oxfordshire, which shows an assistant guiding the hand of Longinus as he pierces Christ's side. The incident itself, of course, is derived from John xix 34, but the knight's name, his blindness and its miraculous cure all come from a legend that was very popular in the late Middle Ages, and evidently known to the copyist responsible for inserting the word "blynde" in our text.

Another hero of biblical legend is Seth, who is encouraged by his father Adam to tell the saints of his journey to paradise in quest of the oil of mercy. This story was widely disseminated in England through being retold in *Cursor Mundi* (c.1300),⁷ and is fully treated in the Cornish *Ordinalia* (c.1350-1375).⁸ A vivid feature of the legend is Seth's privileged glimpse of the trees in the Garden of Eden, especially a great tree in the centre of the garden under which reclined the soul of Abel, and in whose branches Seth could uncomprehendingly see a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes. Michael the guardian angel allows Seth to have three seeds from the fruit of this tree and tells him that after the death of his father Adam he is to plant them under Adam's tongue. Three trees later spring from Adam's grave, representing the Trinity and the promised redemption through Christ. With the importance of trees in this legend in mind, we may now notice a curious variant in the Winchester manuscript at the point in the narrative when Michael is telling Seth to seek no longer for the oil of mercy (xix.1.14-16):

Tibi dico enim, Seth, *noli laborare lacrimis* orando et

deprecando propter oleum ligni misericordiae . . .

which Trevisa translated as follows:

Seth, ych tell it to þe, *trauail þou nocht on terus* for to pray
God of þe oile of mercy . . .

The same passage in W reads (f.86v):

Seeth y telle to the *trauayle thou nat into the trees* for the oyle of
mercy . . .

A third worthy among those receiving special attention in the Winchester manuscript was Enoch, who with Elijah comes forth from paradise to greet the arriving saints. These two had in common the reputation of never having tasted death, Enoch because he walked with God and God took him (Genesis v 24), and Elijah because of his spectacular ascent in the fiery chariot (II Kings ii 11). When the saints ask them how they were able to reach paradise without experiencing death, Enoch replies for them both (xxv. 6-11):

Qui estis uos qui nobiscum in inferis mortui nondum fuistis et in
paradyso corpore conlocati estis? respondens unus ex eis dixit:
Ego sum Enoh qui uerbo Domini translatus sum hic. Iste autem,
qui mecum est, Helias est Thesbites, qui curro igneo adsumptus
est hic.

Here is Trevisa's translation:

Wo buþ 3e þat buþ nouzt dede noþer wyt us in Helle bute here
in Paradyss in fleizsche and blod? Ich am Ennok, quaþ þat on,
þat was translatus hedur by Godus word, and ham here *in*
Paradyss; and þes þat hys here wyt me hys Helyas Tesbytes þat
was ytake hedur [in a] vuyry chaare.

By now we have learned to expect trouble in W when we see repetitions, as here of the phrase "in Paradyss". But in this case the loss was detected, and it is the repair work of the scribe that provides the interest (f.91r):

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

What be ze that were nat deed nother within helle but here in paradise? This that is here with me is helias trebiutus that was take hider in a firy chare *and Ennok in a whirlwynde*.

Clearly the copyist saw too late that his eye had skipped the identification of Enoch, so he inserted it after Elijah and added a detail that is not found in the Bible or in *Nicodemus*, but rather in one of the pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament: "And in those days a whirlwind carried me off from the earth and set me down at the end of the heavens" (I Enoch xxxix 3).⁹

Glosses

A more neutral feature of the Winchester manuscript is its modernization of Trevisa's language, which was about a hundred years old when W was being copied. Perhaps the best way to indicate the extent of this modernization is to list the word or phrase found in Trevisa's text as edited by Kim, followed by the gloss in W that replaces it.

quap	seide
heste	comaundement
hete	bid
raþer	before
bende	bowed
syggeþ	seyen
veng	reseyved
pannis	platis
areynede	frayned
lore	doctrine
sweue	dreem
yspousud	weddid
bade	comaundid
soþenese	treuthe
trespas	cause
heet	bad
dyspysyng	dispite
hote	comaunde
gryssettyde	grucchid

ʒonglyngus		ʒonge men
abydyng		lettyng
by-se		avise
temple cloþ		veyle
ouermuste . . . neþermuste		heyst . . . lowest
take		ʒeue
fange		reseyued
fulluþ		baptyse
funge		token
corsud		wykked
drede		fere
bydduþ many bedes		seith many praiseris
ygreyþed		made redy
coniure		require
fange		bare
ygreyþud		arayde
naciouns		folkis
blysse		ioye
ywonde		dwelled
arayned		asked
lefe		welbeloued
troweth		beleuen
yenstondeþ		withstondith
arayede		mayde
ʒaf		ʒelde
vyþaute ende		euerlastyng
sauacioun		helthe
worþe S	bycame A	turned W

Occasionally W's gloss is of use in dealing with corruption in the earlier copies. One such case is the translation of *uolatilibus caeli* (xii.1.23), for which the Salisbury manuscript has "fulus of þe fleyt leyt" ("fleyt" expuncted), while Additional absurdly read "vales of þy lust". Here W has (f.81r) "fowlis of the eyre". This gloss should perhaps encourage an editor to conjecture that Trevisa wrote "luft", certainly an archaic word by the time of the Winchester scribe, and one appropriately glossed as "eyre".

Although Trevisa is famous for his doublets (using two English words to

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

translate a single Latin word), I notice a few cases where W has doublets and the earlier copies single words to translate the Latin:

- iv.3.12 peccauerit: trespasuþ SA, trespasith and synneth W.
- xiv.3.2. lamentationem: sorwe SA, dole and sorowe W.
- xxi.3.5. uidens: se SA, herede or sye W.
- xxiv.1.4. damnati fuistis: fley & were dampnud S, were dampned A, were defouled and dampned W.

These could be cases where the original English word is retained and a gloss added; but the evidence seems inadequate for a decision, and the final instance suggests corruption of what may have been an original doublet.

Authentic Readings

We come finally to the question whether the Winchester manuscript, despite its own corruption and sophistication, has anything authentic to offer the editor. Fortunately the evidence suggests that original readings are preserved in well over a dozen cases:

- i.4.5 clamabant: seyde SA, cryden W.
- i.5.6 Non laudatis: Telle 3e nou3t gret prins S (poys A), Telle 3e nott grete price W.
- x.2.9 Amen dico tibi: Y telle hyt þe SA; Sothly y telle the W.
- xv.1.8 pater noster: 3oure fader SA, oure fader W.
- xv.1.9 assumptus est: a hys ytake SA, he is taken vp W.
- xv.2.10 Ammirati sumus: wondreþ SA, we wondren W.
- xv.3.1 vii uiros: men SA, vii men W.
- xv.3.9 domum: place SA, hous W.
- xvi.1.2 stupefacti: astenude and aferud SA, astonyed and abasshid W.
- xvi.1.3 super facies suas: nouelyng S, groueling A, noselynge W.

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

of the Latin in Bodley 556, which closely resembles Trevisa's exemplar (f.7r):

Benedictus dominus deus israel qui liberavit me ut non
effunderent sanguinem meum. Benedictus dominus qui
protexisti me sub alis tuis.

Next let us see Trevisa's translation, as preserved in the Salisbury and Additional manuscripts:

Yblessud be þou Lord God of Israel, þat delyueredust me vndur
þy wynges.

It is immediately apparent that the repetition of "Yblessud be þou Lord" has caused the loss of Joseph's reference to the shedding of his blood. Such is not the case in the Winchester manuscript, which reads (f.84r):

Blissed be thou god of israel that delyueredest me *and sauedist*
me that y shed nat my blood; blissed be thou lorde that
defendist me vnder thy wyngis.

Furthermore this is not likely to be a reconstruction from the Latin, unless we allow the possibility that the scribe happened to have a Latin text resembling Trevisa's exemplar. Not only does W have the same dislocation of Israel, but in the unique passage I believe is preserved the plural verb of Bodley 556, "effunderent", if we grant that "y shed" may be written for "hy shed", "they shed". This phenomenon can be seen elsewhere, for example when Jesus, speaking to Pilate of his accusers, observes (ii.2.3-4):

Si non haberent potestatem, non loquerentur,

which Trevisa translates as:

3yf hy hadde no puwer, hy schode nouȝt speke,

whereas in W we find:

If y had no power y sholde nat speke.

The evidence thus suggests that the Winchester manuscript is not a reconstructed text in these cases, but that it uniquely preserves authentic words and phrases in the very language of Trevisa, and is thus worthy of careful consideration in any subsequent edition of his translation of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.

APPENDIX

The Winchester manuscript divides the text of Nicodemus into chapters that have no relation to the divisions of the text, for example, in the Codex Einsidlensis as edited by Kim (used in the above essay to identify passages quoted). Thus the twenty-eight chapters in Kim correspond to fourteen chapters in Winchester. But there is also a fifteenth chapter in this manuscript which does not to my knowledge occur in any other English version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. I first thought that this might have been the scribe's own summary of the narrative, but subsequently found the corresponding Latin in MS Bodley 556, although there it occurs at the very beginning of *Nicodemus* rather than at the end. Because of the rarity of this "chapter" I quote it in both its English and its Latin forms.

MS Winchester 33 f.93r-v

Ca xv.

ioseph of aramathie anoyned cristis body with oynementis of swete smellis and leide it in his owen graue. and therefore he was take of the pryncis of preestis and closed and kepte in a celle. and they shewde more wodenes azens hym as pilatis gestis tellith and dedis that were sente to the emperour tyberius than alle other men. for as oure lorde was kepte of the knyztis, so ioseph was kepte of the preestis. But in oure lordis risynge the knyztis were astonyed and afraide by sȳt of the angel, and so he was nat founde in his grave. The wallis of the celle that ioseph was in weren hanged vp on hyȳ. and iesus delyuered hym oute of warde and of presoun, and the wallis were sette aȳen in here owen place. and whan the bisshoppis blamed the wardeynes and asked of hem Cristis body blissed with grete besynes the knyztis answerid / and seide, ȳelde ȳe ioseph to vs, and we shall ȳelde to ȳou the body of

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

iesu. But for to know the sothe, 3e may nat zelde to vs the body of ioseph, nother we to 3ou goddis sonne of heuene. Than thei were ouercome and the knyztis delyuered by that excusacioun. Oure lorde arose fro deth to lyf and disputed with his disciplis fourty daies of the kyngdom of god. and in here sizt he was taken in a clowde and borun vp into heuene and he sittith at his fadris rizt side. Thus pilate sendith to the emperoure Tyberius Cesar the dedis that were doon of criste and writeth the vertues of cristis passion and of his resureccioun, the which dedis sholde by wryten and kepte amonge vs. Tiberius the emperour shewde it to the senatouris of Rome, but thei weren wrothe and wolde nat heere thereof for thei hadden it nat first. Heere endith the testament or the pistel of Nichodeme the noble prynce of iewes, the which wrote of cristis passion, of his deth, of his vprisyng, and of his ascensioun. Explicit.

MS Bodley 556 fol. 1r

Epistole nichodemi de passione & resurrectione christi.

Apprehensus autem ioseph qui cum aromatibus conditum corpus iesu in suo monumento recondidit et in cellula includitur. Et ab ipsis sacerdotum principibus custoditur maiorem habentes in eum seuitiam ut gesta pilati ad tiberium imperatorem missa referunt quam in ipsum dominum. Ut cum ille a militibus hic autem ab ipsis sacerdotibus custodiretur. Sed resurgente domino custodibus uisione angelica territis et cum non inueniretur in tumulto. nocte parietes de cellula in qua ioseph tenebatur suspenduntur in sublimi. Ipse uero de custodia absolente angelo liberatur, parietibus restitutis in loco suo. Cumque pontifices exprobrarent et secundum corpus ab eis instanter inquirerent, dicunt eis milites, reddite uos ioseph et nos reddemus Christum. Sed ut uerum agnoscamus, neque nos benefactorem dei et neque nos filium dei reddere nunc ualemus. Tunc illis confusis, milites sub hac excusatione liberantur. Resurgens autem dominus per quadraginta dies cum discipulis de regno dei disputans, uidentibus illis in nube susceptus est, euectusque in celos ad patris dexteram residet gloriosus. Pilatus autem gesta ad tiberium cesarem mittit et ei tam de uirtutibus Christi quam de passione et resurrectione eius insinuat, que gesta hodie apud nos retinentur scripta. Tiberius autem hoc ad senatum recensuit, quod senatus cum ira respuit, pro eo quod non ad eum primitus aduenisset.

NOTES

¹ Norman Davis, "Two Unprinted Dialogues in Late Middle English, and their Language", *Revue des Langues Vivantes* 35 (1969) pp.461-72; and *Non-Cycle Plays and the Winchester Dialogues*, ed. Norman Davis, Leeds Texts and Monographs: Medieval Drama Facsimiles 5 (Leeds, 1979). The latter publication has the best and fullest discussion of the Winchester manuscript, pp.135-39.

² Kathleen Power, "A Newly Identified Prose Version of the Trevisa Version of the Gospel of Nicodemus", *N&Q* 223 (1978) pp.5-7. Dr Power questions whether Part II of the text (The Descent into Hell) is Trevisa's, but I find no evidence of a shift of exemplar and, as she points out, Trevisa's own note on "amen", "alleluia" occurs in Part II (f.90v).

³ H.C. Kim, "The Gospel of Nicodemus, Translated by John Trevisa, Now First Edited with Introduction and Complete Glossary", PhD thesis (University of Washington, 1964). Kim's edition is based on the Salisbury Cathedral Library MS 39 (S), with variants from British Library Additional MS 16165 (A), these being the two manuscripts of Trevisa's translation then known.

⁴ The Latin text normally cited here is *The Gospel of Nicodemus*, ed. H.C. Kim (Toronto, 1973), based on the Codex Einsidlensis (Einsiedeln Stiftsbibliothek MS 326). Occasionally I use the Latin of MS Bodley 556 (ff.1-12), which is closer to that of Trevisa's exemplar. I am indebted to Professor Kim for the work he has done on both the Latin and English texts of Nicodemus, and to Kathleen Power for her discovery and for kindly sharing with me the results of her research, including a copy of her transcript of MS 33. I wish to thank the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for permission to cite passages from MSS Bodley 556 and Digby 233. Thanks are especially due to the Librarian of the Winchester College Fellows' Library, Mr Paul Yeats-Edwards, both for permission to quote extensively from MS 33 and for his generous assistance in placing the facilities of that excellent library at my disposal.

⁵ *The Middle English Harrowing of Hell and the Gospel of Nicodemus*, ed. W.H. Hulme, EETS ES 100 (London, 1907) p.62, ll.625-36.

⁶ *A late Middle English Version of the Gospel of Nicodemus*, ed. Bengt Lindström (Stockholm, 1974) p.75.

⁷ *Cursor Mundi: A Northumbrian Poem of the XIVth Century*, ed. Richard Morris, EETS OS 57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 99, 101, 3 vols. in 7 parts (London, 1874-93), ll.1237-1432 (OS 57).

The M.E. Gospel of Nicodemus

- 8 *The Ancient Cornish Drama*, ed. Edwin Norris, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1859) I, pp.52-67, II.684-880.
- 9 *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ed. R.H. Charles, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913) II, p.210.
- 10 *The Apocryphal New Testament*, tr. M.R. James (Oxford, 1924) p.109.