

THE SALOMITES

At some uncertain date, probably late in the eleventh century, and most likely in Normandy or England, a legend came into existence which had a perceptible influence upon popular belief and upon art. This was the story of the triple marriage of St Anne, the mother of the Virgin. Several reasons contributed to the making of it, two in particular. There was the desire to establish the fact that the Virgin Mary had never borne children save our Lord. In the fourth century, one Helvidius had stated that she did, and that the persons mentioned in the New Testament as brethren of the Lord were younger sons of Joseph and Mary. St Jerome wrote a very angry tract against Helvidius, and his view never gained ground. There was also the wish to identify and account for the several Marias who appear in the Gospels, besides the Virgin and Mary Magdalene. By way of making these matters clear, a genealogy was constructed and embodied in certain verses which, in many forms, are commonly met with in medieval manuscripts from the twelfth century onwards. Professor Max Förster of Munich has devoted a very interesting article to the 'Legend of the Trinubium of St Anne'¹ in which he prints many forms of these verses; what may be regarded as a standard form of them, which is that adopted in the *Legenda Aurea* (in the chapter on the Nativity of the Virgin) shall be given here:

Anna solet dici tres concepisse Marias
 Quas genuere viri Ioachim, Cleophas, Salomeque.
 Has duxere viri Ioseph, Alpheus, Zebedaeus.
 Prima parit Christum, Iacobum secunda minorem,
 Et Ioseph iustum peperit cum Symone Iudam
 Tertia majorem Iacobum volucremque Iohannem.

The fabulosity of this need not be pointed out in detail. One feature in it, however, was seized upon very quickly, and that was the third husband of St Anne, viz. Salome. The Salome of the Gospels had been assumed to be a woman: here she is turned into a man!

Now how does Salome appear in the Gospels? Only twice in all, and both times in St Mark: once in xv 40 as standing by the cross: 'Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome', and then in xvi 1, as coming to the tomb: 'Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome': obviously the same three women, one would say, and no possibility, no loop-hole left for making one of them into a man. Nevertheless, in the interests of

¹ In *Festschrift f. J. Hoops: germanische Bibl.* ii 20.

the mythical genealogy, efforts were made, and in the second passage it was said that we must supply *filia* before Salome and understand the words thus 'Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and daughter of Salome'! And that which I have set out to narrate is that in the twelfth century there were enough people in this country supporting this ridiculous view to be christened Salomites, and give rise to quite a lively little controversy; but it was a very one-sided affair.

In two manuscripts known to me, both at Oxford (Lincoln Coll. Lat. 27 and Bodl. Hatton 92), documents of this controversy are preserved, and no other copies of them have hitherto emerged. I have transcribed the texts, and think it worth while to give some extracts from them.

All of them are from the pen of a writer unknown to the older bibliographers such as Bale and Tanner,—one Maurice, Prior of the Augustinian house of Kirkham in Yorkshire. He does not appear among the Priors named in the *Monasticon*, but his date is not doubtful, for two of his tracts are addressed to Gilbert of Sempringham who died, aged upwards of 100, in 1189, and another to Roger, Archbishop of York from 1154 to 1181. He also mentions Bartholomew of Exeter (1161-1184) and Cuthbert Prior of Gisburne who occurs before 1184.

His longest tract is that in the Hatton MS, where it occupies ff. 4a-38a, written in a small and current hand of the fifteenth century, with many abbreviations. It is addressed to Gilbert of Sempringham, and speaks of a letter which he, Maurice, had previously sent to Gilbert on the subject. It consists of a prologue and five parts.

The Lincoln College MS is of the twelfth century, containing on ff. 3-5 (then reverting to f. 1, 2), a shorter form of ff. 4-17 of the Hatton tracts, addressed to Gilbert. But this, again, is not the first utterance of Maurice, for in its opening words it, too, speaks of a former epistle in the same terms that are used in the Hatton copy.

Then, on ff. 30b-38a the Hatton MS gives a letter of Maurice to Roger Archbishop of York. Maurice had heard that Roger had misunderstood his views and writes to correct him. 'If you had read what I wrote to Gilbert of Semplingeham, you would never have said what I am told you did say.' Some very bad Latin rhymes of Maurice to Roger and Roger to Maurice (recanting all incorrectitude) follow the epistle.

Indubitably Prior Maurice was on the side of truth and common sense: the Salomite position was totally indefensible. But so disastrous a writer is he that one almost wishes he had been in the wrong. The prolixity and above all the repetitiousness in which he indulges make the transcriber's spirit faint within him. He is fairly obsessed with Salome and with the depravity of those who err on the subject; and he

would have been a bold man who ventured in Maurice's presence even to breathe her name.

In spite of his tediousness, however, his books present some interesting and picturesque features. In the first place, he had access to a good collection of patristic authorities. Of primitive writers outside the New-Testament he knows Josephus well; duly quotes Hegesippus and Poly-crates (from Eusebius), and Irenaeus, from the same source. Jerome contra Helvidium, ad Hedibiam, de viris illustribus, Augustine's sermon on John, two Isidores, Bede, Magister Hugo's Chronicle, Rufinus's version of Eusebius, Peter Damian, St Bernard, Haimo on the Epistles, the Homily-books, the Martyrology, make up the list. In the Prologue he has this sentence: he knows that Gilbert's opinion agrees with his own, 'quam (sententiam) et uos olim sicut dixistis ab illo magno et insigni doctore uestro Anselmo habuistis, cuius apud nos in psalterio tractatus et glosule ab annis ferme xl^{to} et v^{que} (*Hatton Mss.* xlv) habentur'. This is Anselm of Laon.

Another interesting indication of Maurice's learning is one which deals at some length with his knowledge of Hebrew (*Hatton*, f. 10 sq.). He has said that Salome is an indeclinable name in Hebrew, and goes on:

Quia uero Ebraice lingue et litteris adiscendis ego emulatus Jeronimum quondam adolescentulus sub tribus annis studium impendi et de psalterio Ebraico iuxta exemplaria domini Gerardi quondam Eboracensis archiepiscopi (*d.* 1108) xl psalmos manu mea scripsi, Judeis quoque ipsis literarum eleganciam admirantibus; Idcirco lectorem breuiter ammoneo ut nouerit Ebraicam linguam et usuaem eius literaturam omnia nomina sua habere indeclinabilia, sicut habet et Anglica, cui pre ceteris omnibus apud nos linguis uicinior et in multos similior esse uidetur.

The occurrence of Hebrew MSS in Christian hands early in the twelfth century is notable: in the thirteenth the Franciscans owned a number, and so did the monks of Ramsey. But York, as we know, had a great colony of Jews.

Maurice proceeds to enumerate the various persons named Salome in Josephus:

Harum omnium nulla unquam uel a uiro uel a uico nomen accepit, ut seductus ille (*sc.* the author of an insertion in a Paschal homily) et multos seducere uolens diuinator putat. Cum ergo tot regie stirpis mulieres eo tempore Salome dicte sint, quis estimet quante mulierum multitudines in uniuerso Iudeorum populo tali tunc nomine censi potuerint?

There is, too, a masculine equivalent for the name, viz. Salomon :

Salom quippe pax dicitur, unde dominus die Pasche advesperascente discipulis apparens salutavit eos dicens *Salom alehem*, hoc est *Pax uobis*.

May Maurice be credited with composing this Hebrew equivalent? He continues :

Salome uero, sicut omnia utriusque sexus nomina, tam in Hebraica quam in Anglica lingua, in prima sillaba totum accentum habet. Et si fuerit trisillabum, prima producitur, secunda uix tangitur, tertia neglecta, quandoque nec auditur. Sicut etiam qui Anglice loquens uulgaria nomina in E desinencia pronuncians non multum curat utrum in E uel in A desinant, oris hiatu neglecto, ita et apud Hebreos intelligendum est fieri, dum hoc ab audiente uix possit discerni. Hac igitur decipula captus esse uidetur prauus expositor ille, qui cum audiret in euangelio *Maria Jacobi et Salome* putabat, ut prediximus, Salome genitiui esse casus. Nam quia audire solebat in scolis *Musa Muse*, uolebat similiter declinare *Saloma Salome*. . . . Hebraica namque lingua uel locucio sicut et Anglica plana est in se et libera et nullis omnino regulis obnoxia Latinitatis, unum tantum casum habens in numero singulari et unum in plurali, prepositis tantum articulis. Verbi gracia, *Dominus* Hebraice *Aadon* dicitur, et est omnis casus et indeclinabile. Huic secundum diuersos casus articuli sic preponuntur, ut a magistris accipi: nominatiuo *ha aadon*, genitiuo *me aadon* Datiuo *la aadon* Accusatiuo *le aadon* Ablatiuo *ba aadon*.

The statement about the accent of the name Salome being on the first syllable may be surprising to some; but it is borne out by the old hymn *O filii et filiae* in these lines :

Et Maria Magdálene
Et Jacobi et Sálome.

and I think that what Maurice says about the pronunciation of English, and indeed the whole extract, will be found interesting.

But probably, now that something has been set forth about Maurice and his learning in general, it will be most convenient to go through his Epistle and note the more curious passages.

Severe criticism is dealt out to 'quidam doctor erroneus', who made up an exposition of the Easterday Gospel, stealing somewhat from Bede's homily *Super Vespere Sabbati*, somewhat from Gregory's *de die Pasche*, and between them inserted his own forgery, shrewdly attributing the whole to Bede, 'qua nefaria exposicione quorundam secularium

lectionarios codices corruptos et coinquinos inuenimus,' while others have been corrected.

In this 'leprous' exposition it is said that three Marias visited the tomb; and after speaking of Mary Magdalene and Maria Jacobi,

mox de tercia quam de corde suo finxerat ita subiecit: *Maria*, inquit, *Salome uel a uico uel a uiro dicta est. . . Tradunt enim illam duos uiros habuisse, Cleopham scilicet et Salomeum, ipsamque uolunt esse que alibi Maria Cleophe nominatur, O miserum et infelicem hominem, &c.*

Three Marias, then, are postulated here—Magdalene, Jacobi, Salome. But this by no means agrees with another Salomite exposition, embodied in a set of verses which Maurice quotes. Disentangled from his comments they run thus (not being identical with any of the sets quoted by Förster):

- (f. d. 6) Tres tribus Anna uiris legitur peperisse Marias
 Tresque uiri Joochim, Cleophas, Salomeque fuere
 Virque prior Joochim genuit domini genitricem
 Hac sponsa Joseph frater domini decoratur (!)
 [quod hic dicit, Joseph sponsum b. Marie fratrem domini fuisse
 friuolum est et actenus inauditum].
 Fit gener Alpheus Cleophe, Salome Zebedeus.
 Alpei sponsam Cleophe fore scito Mariam.
 (i.e. Mary daughter of Cleophas married Alpheus).
 Ex hac hic genuit Joseph Jacobumque minorem.
 Iudas Taddeus domini germanus habetur.
 (Joseph here is our Joses: Simon is omitted).
 Stirps generis Salome Jacobus fuit atque Iohannes
 Est horum genetrix Jacobi Salomeque Maria
 De nato 'Jacobi', 'Salome' de patre uocatur.
 (i.e. this Mary is called Maria Jacobi after her son and Maria
 Salome after her father !)
 Ergo due non tres domini uisere sepulcrum.
 (i.e. only Magdalene and Maria Jacobi).

Whence incidentally we gather that a picture of the women at the Sepulchre which shews only two women ought to be a Salomite picture: and that to talk of the three *Marias* at the sepulchre also brands one as a Salomite. Certainly this versifier deserves all the abuse he gets: his statement in line 4 about Joseph is quite unaccountably absurd, and his penultimate line wretchedly obscure. Moreover, he does his best to create a schism among the Salomites.

It would be worth while to make some examination of Lectionaries and ascertain what proportion of them contain the sophisticated

Homily. Such as do ought not, according to Maurice, to be monastic: he more than once shews some hostility to the secular clergy.

An interesting extract from a writer of whom as yet little is known occurs later (15 *b*):

Hiis consentire uidetur etiam Clemens Lanthonie prior in continuacione sc. euangeliorum sic scribens: Lucas ait *Stabant omnes noti eius a longe, et mulieres que secute sunt eum a Galilea hec uidentes.* Marcus ita: *Inter quas erant Maria Magd. et Maria Jacobi minoris et Joseph mater, et Salome.* Matheus: *mater filiorum Zebedei scilicet Salome.* Et cum esset in Galilea sequebantur eum et ministrabant ei. Nuper quidam de nostris in partes Romanas uenientes et apocrifas picturas cernentes de Salome tercio marito Anne, mouerunt inde questionem in curia domini pape: et cum inde diu disceptaretur, tandem nostris postulantibus martirologium domini pape, in medium allatum est. Et cum ibi legeretur 'xi. Kal. Nouembris S. Salome que in euangelio legitur circa domini sepulcrum sollicita, stupor apprehendit omnes et nostri uicerunt.'

By the 'continuacio' of the Gospels I take the Concordia of Clement to be meant rather than his Commentary; but I have not made any examination of either: copies of the former are not uncommon. It is noteworthy that the legend of the three husbands of Anne was not only current in Italy, but represented pictorially. I have not encountered any instance of this earlier than the fifteenth century, when, in Germany, groups of 'Die heilige Sippe', including all the husbands and children, were rather popular. The quotation suggests the probability that other anecdotal matter may be found in Clement.

At the beginning of Part IV (f. 17) we are told of a 'mendacious title' which an evil-disposed person had written on the fly-leaf, I conjecture, of a book. Maurice found a copy at a monastery and gave orders to obliterate it or cut out the leaf and burn it.

Contigit me aliquando inter hospites de tanto scelere conqueri, qui cum dicerent fabulam ipsam cum eodem titulo apud se haberi affuerunt et alii 'tres boni fratres' (the words are a well-known beginning of a charm) magne cuiusdam scole sic dicentes, hanc scripturam domi se habere in communi collectaneo descripto et eundem titulum preponentem.

Maurice was greatly grieved to learn how widespread was the error: for though no article of the faith is contravened by it, it is a lie and came from the father of all lies. This was the title, prefixed apparently to some one of the numerous sets of verses of which we have heard.

Ex testimoniis iij^{or} euangelistarum et epistola b. Jeronimi contra Eluidium, S. Maria mater domini, et Maria mater Jacobi Alpei

et Joseph, et mater filiorum Zebedei Jacobi scilicet maioris et Iohannis euangeliste tres sorores fuerunt.

The statement is, as we are told at great length, a gratuitous falsehood, not least in its citing Jerome against Helvidius. Maurice has more to tell. Some years before 'quidam garrulus' was defending the position that the sons of Zebedee were brethren of the Lord. 'What is your authority?' Maurice asked. The other, aware that the letter was not in the room, replied 'Ieronimus contra Eluidium hec dicit'. Maurice had the letter brought 'ad tronum lectoris in refectorio' and publicly read 'Et epistola . . . perlecta cum ab eo quererem inquiring "ubinam est, frater, quod dicebas S. Ieronimum . . . dixisse" ille demisso capite et summissa uoce respondit "Sic putabam."' This was an unqualified success, and another will be reported.

On ff. 19, 20 there are quotations from 'Iohannes noster glosatus, quam ante annos xlv habuimus'.

On ff. 20, 21 Jerome comes in for some criticism, mildly expressed. In answer to Hedibia's questioning he stated that Maria Jacobi and Maria Cleophe were distinct persons, which, though not supporting the Salomites, is still very incorrect. But any blame arising is thrown on the unfortunate widow Hedibia. The substitution of certain lections from this letter for some taken from Paul's Epistles is gravely criticized.

Plures tamen rei nouitate pellecti apostolice auctoritatis euangelio uerba muliercule illius pretulerunt et in suis codicibus scripserunt et aliis scribenda tradiderunt. Unde religiosus quidam nostri ordinis, uir literatissimus, cum, sicut ipse nobis retulit, in uicino monasterio cuidam fratri assisteret easdem sibi lectiones in Sabbato sancto conscribenti, mox indignatus 'Aufer', inquit, 'sordes illas et scribe pocius epistolam Pauli apostoli iuxta decreta ss. patrum, &c.' Quo audito paruit ille, et columpnam unam iam fere perscriptam cultro suo penitus abrasit, et epistolam illam S. Pauli *Christus assistens pontifex* sollicitate descripsit.

In the fifth Part (f. 23 *sqq.*) Maurice deals with certain futile guesses of the Salomites.

Vertunt se ad uulgare quoddam argumentum, dicentes plerasque mulieres a uiris sibi nomina solere mutuari: uerbi gracia ut Alexandra Thomasa Eustachia Willelma (Reginalda is added in another tract) et plura huius modi . . .

Huic ego scolasticum quendam satis acriter insistentem taliter adorsus sum. Num, inquam, baptisterio aliquando astitisti cum baptizarentur infantes? At ille 'Eciam,' inquit 'sepius'. Tum ego 'Num ibi audisti quemquam masculini sexus puerum nominari Beatricem uel Gunnildam uel Matildam seu Godiuam (seu

Leueam)' . . . ? Tum ille 'Nequaquam'. Ad quod tunc, ridentibus uniuersis qui aderant, ita subintuli. 'Ergo nec apud Hebreos hoc estimes fieri solere ut masculis suis muliebria nomina uelint imponere? Pigris enim et inertibus et omnino effeminatis mulierum nomina uel cognomina imponuntur, non a baptismi origine sed a uiciosa uite qualitate, sicut nobis olim uerbi gracia quendam infamem ob turpitudinem Rob' Godiua novimus appellari.

f. 25. Nuper eciam magnus aliquis cum in ceteris licet omnibus acerrime decertando succumberet, tandem subintulit dicens 'Prob, deus meus, quid magis ad b. Mariam matrem domini quam ad alias mulieres in terra Galilee pertinuit dicere *Vinum non habent*, nisi Johannes euangelista, cuius erant ille nupcie, cognatus eius et frater domini fuisset? Maurice at first feigned to approve this, but 'mox eleuans allisi et quasi uehementi quodam turbine contempsi dicens, 'Ergo mater misericordie, mater pietatis et gracie, nullius miseretur, nemini subuenit nisi cognatis suis?' with more to the same purpose.

Some errors of authors are now dealt with. Haimo on the Epistle to the Galatians all at once reckons the sons of Zebedee among brethren of the Lord! Peter Lombard on the Epistles inserts the Salomite fable! We must remember that Jerome admits of Origen 'aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus', that Augustine in his *Retractations* confesses to many errors, that Gregory in his *Dialogues* makes a bad mistake about one Romanus, that Chrysostom confuses the Herod who beheaded John Baptist with his father. Haimo and Peter Lombard, then, may be pardoned for introducing errors into their bulky compilations. Cuthbert, Prior of Gisburne, when staying with Maurice, was asked his opinion about Salome and gave the right answer. He went on to lament Peter Lombard's mistake, and palliate it. Maurice then quotes a mandate of Alexander III to William archbishop of Sens to summon a council at Paris and denounce an error of Peter Lombard's about the Person of Christ. 'Datuin Verolam.'

Certainly if either Haimo or Peter had read half the evidence here brought together they would never have countenanced this fable.

f. 28. Maurice condoles with Gilbert: a member of Gilbert's own order has been preaching publicly in the Salomite sense, and has adorned the fable with mystical and moral interpretations, which is no better than putting a gold ring in a sow's snout. The attitude of the great St. Bernard ought to have been enough for him, who speaks at some length of the mystical significance of Magdalene, Maria Jacobi, and Salome.

A solemn admonition is then pronounced against the public reading of the 'exposition' previously attacked. Men must not be led away by

its popularity. Custom must yield to truth, and there must be no respect of persons.

(f. 29). Quia et in breuiario domini T.¹ archiepiscopi miram inuenio abusionem de S. Maria Magd. ubi dicitur Iosephus scripsisse uitam eius aliam quam ecclesia habet, per transuersum quasi diceretur 'Virgilius super Lucam'. Sed et in breuiario Rogeri Archiepiscopi alia risu digne satis inueniuntur. . . . Nam quale est illud, ut in matrice ecclesia (York Minster?) die Paschalis solempnitatis furtiua quedam et friuola scripta necnon et manifesto mendacio responsa legi debeant, cum in monasteriis undique religiosorum absque ullo falsitatis () purissima b. Gregorii pape ipso die legatur omelia? Sed forte dicit aliquis: Scholares (i. seculares) illi clerici deliciis intenti non magnopere curant quid in diuinis obsequiis legant vel audiant, dummodo magnis cantibus et solempni uociferacione rem peragant et postea quisque in sua redeant: unde b. Ambrosius super Lucam *qui secularibus uanitatibus occupantur scire diuina non possunt*. Huic ita respondemus. Hoc, inquam, de cunctis secularibus clericis dicere non possumus, neque de omnibus negare. Some there are who are readily convinced by reason; others whom I have found difficult at first, who have become strenuous champions of the right view; and some who, though inwardly convinced of the truth, continue to uphold what is false.

This contrast between seculars and regulars is instructive. After another page of recapitulation Maurice ends his letter with the hope that the Salomite error may be uprooted from the hearts of Christians and that they may be turned to the wisdom of the just.

The letter to Archbishop Roger which follows (ff. 30-37) is, for the most part, a repetition of what Maurice had said in his larger work. It was prompted by this: Roger, conversing with a *frater* and *socius* of Maurice, had said that Maurice contradicted Gregory on the subject of the women at the sepulchre. Maurice was greatly surprised; and in this letter he first demonstrates that Gregory said nothing like what Roger asserted, and then goes on to set out the whole case. The only important addition to the testimonies is that of Bartholomew of Exeter, who said of Salome to an inquirer, 'Debes illam esse feminam intellegere'.¹

At the end (f. 37) he says:

Hanc tue caritati cedulam propriis manibus, senex, et tercium decimum etatis lustrum excedens, scribere sum aggressus. Et hoc

¹ Either Thomas (1108-1114) or more probably Thurstan (1114-1140).

certum habeas, quia si libellum nostrum . . . quem de hac re reuerendo et uere sancto patri Gilleberto de Semplingeham iam olim scripsi perlegisses, nunquam me diceres contra b. Gregorium sentire, qui nichil umquam in omni uita sua inde dixisse uel scripsisse reperitur.

The appended rhymes are perhaps just worth quoting :

(a) Roger to Maurice :

Librum de Salome quem scripsisti michi pro me
Hunc memorabo, pater, non semel immo quater.

(b) Maurice to Roger :

Quosdam uersus te scripsisse
Atque michi transmisisse
Sola tantum fama noui
(*a line gone ?*)
Sed iam precor scribe pro me
Quid uidetur de Salome.
An sit opus factum digne
Uel mittendum sit in igne ?
En rescriptum huic expecto ;
Ne torpescas me despecto,
Ut Mineruam tuam decet
Omne tortum inde secet
Quo placatus senex pater
Grates tibi ferat quater.

(c) Roger to Maurice :

Miror inexplete, pocius sed gaudeo de te
Quod mundum spernis, quem paucos spernere cernis,
Inuigilans studio toto conamine dio.
Scriptum de Salome donasti, uir bone, pro me :
Est nimis insigne, non ergo peribit in igne :
Nil ibi distortum, nil a ratione retortum.
Ignorant mille Salome sit an illa uel ille :
Hinc aberit certe, pater, ignorancia per te.
Cognatosque dei natos credunt Zebedei ;
Hiis quod non sit ita pandis, uerax Salomita.
Ergo Iohannitam seu Mauricium Salomitam
Amodo te dicam, Salome tibi dans in amicam.
Non euangelium, pater, attendit bene diuum
Nec bene gramaticam nouit, si fas tibi dicam,
Nomina—qui—tium Salome fecit genitium.
Pater (!) maioris foret (!) frater ergo minoris ;

Utque loquamur ita, Salome foret ermofrodita.
 Absit ! amica dei fuit hec uxor Zebedei :
 Cum Iacobo natus erat illi uirgo beatus
 Cui domini pectus fuerat post prandia lectus.
 Nemo prius certe (de) hiis tractauit aperte
 Que, pater, ostendis et falsis recia tendis.
 Dum Salome recolo, sacior meditamine solo :
 Ergo diu uita tibi sit, bone tu Salomita.

The archbishop has done his best to satisfy his pertinacious old correspondent, whose feelings he is evidently anxious not to hurt.

Little idea has been given in the above sketch of the merciless manner in which Maurice repeats his quotations and belabours a dead ass. And it has not seemed worth while to go through the remaining document—the letter in the Lincoln College MS—in detail, since that is for the most part a literal repetition of the Hatton tract, with omissions and no new matter.

There is not a great deal that I can say by way of a history of the Salomite myth. It subsisted, kept alive by the verse-genealogies of which we have heard, and by its inclusion in the *Legenda Aurea*, until the fifteenth century at least, when it was made familiar to the eye in the German pictures of the Heilige Sippe. But it was never, so far as I have seen, a popular subject of controversy, though the Trinubium was defended by several late writers.¹

The woman Salome figures as a midwife in the Infancy Gospels, and as an interlocutor with Christ in the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Coptic legend adapted to her the story of a female penitent saint. In the Provençal fable she accompanies other Mariés to the south and rests at the St^{es} Mariés in the Camargue : but the Italians sent her to Veroli, where her relics were found in 1209. It is curious to find Matthew Paris assuming that Veroli was Verulamium, and including a *Memoria* of Salome in his collection of poems which is now in the University Library at Cambridge (Dd. 11. 78).

Representations of Salome in English art are confined, I believe, to the pictures of the Mariés which occasionally appear on screens and in windows. But only once, so far as I know, on the screen at Houghton le Dale in Norfolk, does she appear with her incorrect name S. Maria Salome.

The only modern reference to the documents I have been quoting is one by Professor Powicke in his book on Aëlred of Rievaulx.

M. R. JAMES.

¹ Molanus, *de SS. Imaginibus*, p. 328, names Petrus Sutor Carthusianus, and Nataſis Beda who wrote against Faber Stapulensis.