

A note on the death of Judas in Papias

Moss, Candida

DOI:

[10.1017/S0028688519000080](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688519000080)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Moss, C 2019, 'A note on the death of Judas in Papias', *New Testament Studies*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 388-397.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688519000080>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This article has been published in a revised form in *New Testament Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688519000080>. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © copyright holder

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

A Note on the Death of Judas in Papias
Candida R. Moss
Department of Theology, University of Birmingham,
Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT
c.moss.1@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

In early Christian literature the death of Judas is broadly understood as a fitting end to the life of the betrayer of Jesus. Papias' description of Judas' death can be illuminated by comparison with ancient biographical and medical literature, in which edema and parasitic infections are a consequence of greed, and also apocalyptic texts, in which worms become an emblematic form of divine punishment after death. Viewed in this context the death of Judas serves a pedagogical function as a warning about the dangers of greed.

Keywords: Judas, Papias, Death, Ancient Medicine, Worms.

As history's archetypal traitor, the fate of Judas was always going to be a source of interest to early Christians.¹ The man who betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver, has been an enigma to commentators ever since.² According to the canonical evangelists, Judas died shortly after betraying Jesus to the chief priests. In Matthew, Judas hanged himself, while in the first chapter of Acts his middle is split open and his bowels spill out.³ By the second century, Christians had begun to expand upon and develop the Lukan and Matthean traditions about the death of Judas. In a fragment of Papias preserved only in the fourth-century Christian writer Apollinaris of Laodicea, we learn that Judas's flesh was so bloated 'that he was unable to pass through a place where a wagon passes easily'.⁴ And, after some period of agonizing existence, 'he finally died in his own place'.

Papias' description of the death of Judas goes to great lengths to highlight the exaggerated grotesqueness of his bodily form. His head alone was so bloated that it could not fit through a thoroughfare intended for wagons, and his eyelids were so swollen 'that he could not see the light' (τὸ φῶς μὴ βλέπειν). His eyes were not only obscured from view by his eyelids but were so sunken beneath the surface of his face that they could not be seen even with the aid of doctor's tools. His penis, too, was disfigured by the swelling and when he urinated 'pus and worms' (ἰχώρας τε καὶ σκώληκας) passed from every part of his body. After his eventual death the place of his passing was perpetually marred by the stench of his body. According to Papias' source, 'To this day no one can pass that place unless they hold their nose, so great was the discharge from his body and so far did it spread over the

¹ I am enormously grateful to Anna-Rebecca Solevåg and Jennifer Barry for sharing their work with me, and to Joel Baden, Meghan Henning and Francis Watson for their constructive comments and criticisms.

² Acts 1.18 states that Judas used the money to purchase a field for himself. In Matt 27.3 Judas attempts to return the 'blood money' before he hangs himself. The field is purchased by the priests after his death and becomes known as 'the field of blood.' Judas appears in the *Gospel of Judas* preserved in the Tchacos Codex, is discussed by a number of ancient commentators including Papias, and generated considerable media interest when the Gospel attributed to him was published in translation by the National Geographic Society in 2006.

³ Matthew 27.3-10 and Acts 1.15-26.

⁴ The death of Judas is preserved in Apollinaris in two distinct yet compatible versions. Version A is taken from his *Catena in Evangelium S. Matthaei* while version B appears in *Catena in Acta SS Apostolorum*. The former is found with variations in Oecumenius' commentary on Acts (late tenth century) while the latter appears, also with small variants, in Theophylactus' commentary on Acts (eleventh century).

ground.’⁵ The already graphic scene in Acts 1.18, in which Judas’ bowels burst out of his body, gains greater definition.

The purpose of this article is to examine this depiction of Judas and his death in light of broader ancient medical, biographical, and physiognomical literature and to explore the ways that the presentation of his physical condition and the manner of his death are intimately connected to the perception of his moral failings. It will further propose that his portrayal be understood in light of a broader ancient conversation about the corrupting and irreversible effects of acquisitiveness, or greed.

Worms

Judas’ death seems to be the result of what we moderns might call a parasitical infection. The pus and presence of worms as symptoms of Judas’ condition are familiar in a somewhat different way to ancient audiences as well. Death by worms was something of a professional hazard for evil kings and emperors.⁶ It is reminiscent of Elijah’s prophesy of King Jehoram’s death, and Pausanias describes the death of Cassander in a similar, less detailed account: ‘He was filled with dropsy and from the dropsy came worms while he was yet alive’.⁷ Antiochus IV of Syria, too, met an unpleasant end when his body ‘swarmed with worms... his flesh rotted away’ and people refused to carry his litter because of the repulsive stench that emanated from his form (2 Macc. 9.10). And, according to Josephus, Herod the Great died from a combination of swollen midsection, gangrenated nether regions, ulcerated bowels, and worms.⁸

Judas, of course, is no ruler, but, as Jesse Robertson has noted, Papias follows an emerging literary trope about the retributive and punitive deaths of bad rulers.⁹ Over the following centuries the literary genre would reach maturity in Lactantius’s *On the Death of Persecuting Emperors*, which regularly involved painful, worm-swarmed ailments (e.g., of Galerius in 33.6-8). The same trope is turned on heretics, for example in Ps-Martyrius’s *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* and in the reception of the death of Arius.¹⁰

⁵ Papias, *Frag* 4.2-3 [trans. Ehrman, LCL]. The corresponding verses in A. W. Zwiép, *Judas and the Choice of Matthias: A Study on the Context and Concern of Acts 1.15-26* (WUNT 2/187; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004) 112-15 are *Frag* 3.4-13.

⁶ For an excellent survey of these see Robertson, *Death of Judas*, 128-39. See the deaths of Herod the Great in Josephus *Ant.* 17.6.5; Galerius in Eusebius, *H.E.* 8.16.3-5. Compare also Memnon on Satyrus (*FrGrHist* 434.2.4-5) and Lucian on the death of Alexander the false prophet (*Alex.* 59). On the use of dramatic death scenes in ancient novels see Ruth Webb, ‘Rhetoric and the Novel: Sex, Lies and Sophistic’, *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (ed. I. Worthington; Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World; Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007) 526-41.

⁷ 2 Chr 21.11-19; Pausanias, *Descr.* 9.7.2. [trans. Jones, LCL] For a discussion of the infection of worms in tyrants, see Thomas Africa, ‘Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History’, *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982) 1-17. In the majority of sources, retributive justice tends to have focused on men; the clear example is Pheretime, Queen of Cyrene, who utilized brutal strategies to harm her enemies (Herodotus, *Hist.*, 4.205).

⁸ Josephus, *Ant.* 17.168-171 [trans. Marcus, LCL]. See discussion in David J. Ladouceur, ‘The Death of Herod the Great’, *Classical philology* 76:1 (1981) 25-34 and W. Nestke, ‘Die Legende vom Tode der Gottesverächter’, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 33 (1936) 246-69. Luke records that Herod (almost certainly Herod Agrippa) died after being struck by an angel and consumed by worms in Ac 12.23. It is worth noting that he does not use identical language for the death of Judas.

⁹ Robertson, *Death of Judas* 135-39 followed by Anna-Rebecca Solevåg, *Negotiating the Disabled Body: Representations of Disability in Early Christian Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2018) 127.

¹⁰ For a discussion of this genre see Ellen Muehlberger, ‘The Legend of Arius’s death: Imagination, Space, and Filth in Late Ancient Historiography’, *Past and Present* 77 (2015) 8-10; T. D. Barnes, ‘The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom (BHG3 871 = CPG 6517)’ *SP* 37 (2001) 332-34; and Jennifer Barry, ‘Diagnosing Heresy: Ps.-Martyrius’s Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom’, *JECS* 24:3 (2016) 395-418.

Death by worms is not always the consequence of poor leadership. When Plutarch describes the death of Sulla (whose bowels had become ulcerated, rotten, and transfigured into worms), it is presented as the direct result of his own licentiousness. Had he not spent so much time with theatrical types and harpists, he would not have aggravated a minor condition.¹¹ Plutarch is also aware of other, less celebrated, individuals who suffered from the same ailment: Acastus the son of Pelias, Alcman the lyric poet, a slave who led a rebellion in Sicily, a lawyer, and even a jurist.¹²

Certainly in the ancient imagination being eaten alive by worms was a particularly horrific form of death.¹³ A first-century CE curse tablet discovered near modern Frankfurt in Germany wishes that ‘worms, cancer, and maggots’ penetrate the ‘hands, head, feet...limbs and marrow’ of a thief who stole a cloak.¹⁴ Worms were also associated with death, decay and punishment in ancient Jewish and Christian literature. The connection between Gehenna, unquenchable fire, and worms is established in Isaiah 66.24 and proved influential in the following centuries. Jesus appears to endorse Isaiah’s punitive worms in Mark 9.47-48.¹⁵ Several tours of hell describe the unceasing consumption of the body by worms as a feature of the tortures of hell (Acts of Thom. 56, Apoc. Pet. 9, Apoc. Paul 39, 42).¹⁶ The excretion of worms appears as a tool of punishment in the descriptions of hell found early Christian apocalypses. In the *Apocalypse of Paul*, for example, the deacon who ate up the offerings and committed fornication wades through fire as ‘worms came out of his mouth and from his nostrils and he was groaning and weeping and crying’ (Apoc. Paul 36).

In her work on the apocalypses, Meghan Henning has noted that parasite infections are frequently identified as a womanly condition in medical literature. In the Hippocratic corpus, *On Diseases* goes so far as to identify the uterus as the only place in which tapeworms and roundworms could be formed. Henning’s suggestion that punishment by worm consumption feminizes the punished in hell may play some role here. Even though Papias (and his sources) were composed while the logic of hell was still being developed, the death of Judas can be understood as anticipating the post-mortem retribution that would face the enemies of God. And, rhetorically speaking, the tortures of hell and the death of Judas serve the same pedagogical focus: they educate their audiences about the perils of sin.¹⁷

Dropsy

The description of Judas’ death is not merely a description of the last moments of his life but also of his medical condition and physical appearance. The references to his inability to pass through a passageway and the inability of a doctor to find his eyes raises the narrative possibility that Judas had tried to enter the city and seek medical assistance. We might infer

¹¹ Plutarch, *Sulla* 36.

¹² Plutarch, *Sulla* 36.

¹³ So Jürgen Blänsdorf, “‘Würmer und Krebs sollen ihn befallen’: Eine neue Fluchtafel aus Gros-Gerau”, *ZPE* 161 (2007) 61-65, in which he argues that being devoured by worms was one of the most gruesome deaths that could be imagined in antiquity.

¹⁴ Daniela Urbanová, ‘Latin Curse texts: Mediterranean tradition’, *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 57:1 (2017) 57-82 [80].

¹⁵ See discussion in Martha Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 109, 118-19 with assessment in Meghan Henning, ‘Metaphorical, Punitive, and Pedagogical Blindness in Hell’, *SP* 81.7 (2017) 139-52. For the reception of this passage see Judith 16.17; Sir 7.17; Joshua B. Levi frag; *Ged. Mosh.* 18; Apoc. Pet. 9; Apoc. Paul 42; Gk. Apoc. Mary 18, 23; Apoc. Ezra 4.20; Vis. Ezra 34; Eth. Apoc. Mary 64.

¹⁶ See Meghan Henning, *Hell Hath No Fury: Gender and the Conceptualization of Bodily Suffering in Early Christian Depictions of Hell* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, forthcoming).

¹⁷ For the argument that tours of hell serve a pedagogical role: Meghan R. Henning, *Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 279-354.

from the description, therefore, that he lived with this condition for a period of time. Indeed we are told that he travelled in a kind of counterpoint to the apostolic mission. He did not, therefore, spontaneously swelling up moments before his death.¹⁸

Moreover, the description of Judas' body is intended to conjure up images of his life as well as his death. Recent scholarly analysis of the death of Judas has rightly noted the rhetorical and generic function of the description of Judas' body.¹⁹ Christopher Zeichmann argues that the passage is a form of literary *ekphrasis* that follows the conventions of description outlined in Aphthonius and other rhetoricians.²⁰ Using the related frameworks of monster theory and disability studies, Anna-Rebecca Solevåg has highlighted the monstrous and disabling character of the description of Judas.²¹

In medical literature, broadly speaking, swollen bodies were a symptom of dropsy (known today as edema) or ὕδρωψ.²² As a condition, dropsy was characterized as an inability to process fluid coupled with an unchecked thirst.²³ Though it was not difficult to cure in the beginning, the patient's inability to modify their thirst made dropsy difficult to contain and treat.²⁴

Ancient accounts of edema refer to different forms of the condition that affected different parts of the body. The common element, though, is swelling, which could afflict the legs, the whole body, the genitals, or face.²⁵ The second-century physician Galen refers to a specific form of dropsy that affects the whole body due to a swelling of αἰδοῖα, the same term used of Judas' genitals.²⁶ The diagnosis of dropsy is not explicitly made here, but some of the language used to describe the swollenness of Judas' body also appears in Aretaeus of Cappadocia's description of the disease. Additionally, Aretaeus identifies swollen genitals,

¹⁸ Although, given the ancient Jewish view that the distinction between life and death was not merely biological but qualitative, Judas' state may well mark him as being 'dead' though actually alive.

¹⁹ One recent trend in scholarship on Papias has advocated for reading him in light of ancient rhetorical and literary conventions. On this Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2006) 210-11 and, *ibid.*, 'Did Papias write History or Exegesis?', *JSTS* ns 65.2 (2014) 463- [484]; Josef Kürzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments* (Eichstätter Materialien 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 1983) 9-87; W. R. Schoedel, 'Papias', *ANRW* 27.1.255-65. For criticisms of this approach see M. Black, 'The Use of Rhetorical Terminology in Papias on Mark and Matthew', *JSNT* 37 (1989) 31-8 and Martin Hengel, 'Probleme des Markusevangeliums', *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982* (ed. Stuhlmacher, P.; WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983) 244-52. At stake here, of course, is the larger question of Papias' value as a historian and preserver of oral traditions about Jesus. Elements of Papias' version of the story seem reliant upon now-canonical traditions. The gate through which the bloated Judas struggles to enter is reminiscent of Jesus' statement that it is easier for a 'camel to pass through the eye of the needle' (Mark 10.24-27; Matt 19.23-26; Luke 18.24-27), and the reference to Judas dying at home in a place that is now notorious gestures in the direction of the Field of Blood Judas purchased with his blood money in Matthew and Luke.

²⁰ Christopher B. Zeichmann, 'Papias as Rhetorician: Ekphrasis in the Bishop's Account of Judas' Death', *NTS* (2010) 428. See Hermogenes *Prog.* 10; Aphthonius *Prog.* 12 and Nicolaus *Prog.* 11.

²¹ Solevåg, *Negotiating the Disabled Body*, 117-32.

²² Jörg Kurz, 'Wassersucht,' *Antike Medizin: ein Lexicon* (ed. Karl-Heinz Leven; Munich: C. H. Beck, 2005), 914-15.

²³ Hippocrates describes one patient as 'yellow; the whole body is oedematous; the face is red; the mouth is dry; he is thirsty; and when he eats, respiration quickens.' (*Internal affections* 21). Celsus describes dropsy as 'a chronic malady [which] may develop in those patients who suffer from a collection of water under the skin' (*De Medicina*).

²⁴ Celsus describes compliance as the primary issue. He refers to Metrodorus, a student of Epicurus, who was unable to abstain from drinking and, thus, used to drink and then vomit. See discussion in S. Jarcho, 'Ascites as described by Aulus Cornelius Celsus (ca. A. D. 30),' *American Journal of Cardiology* 2 (1958) 507-508.

²⁵ See discussions in Hippocrates, *Int.* 22, 61; *Morb.* 2.61; *Epid.* 7.20; Aretaeus, *CA* 2.1; Soranus in Caelius Aurelianus, *De Morb. Chron.* 3.8.104.

²⁶ Galen, *Galenii definitiones medicae* 279 (19K). As noted in Robertson, *Death of Judas*, 129.

the excretion of pus, discharges from the body, and repulsive smells as symptoms of the condition (*Sign. diut.* 2.1). The prognosis for the sufferer was difficult: the condition was notoriously difficult to treat, being consistently painful and regularly fatal. Aretaeus writes, 'Dropsy is indeed an affection unseemly to behold and difficult to endure; for very few escape from it, and they more by fortune and the gods, than by art; for all the greater ills the gods only can remedy' (*Sign. diut.* 1.13). One Hippocratic text recommends draining the excess liquid via an incision, but notes the dangers involved in such a procedure: 'Whenever cases of empyema or dropsy are treated by the knife of cautery, if the pus or water flow away all at once, a fatal result is certain' (*Aph.* 6.27).²⁷

The Sins of Judas

Recent scholarship is in agreement that the description of Judas's body coupled with the narrative of his death are intended to illustrate his disreputable character.²⁸ Papias himself supports their conclusions, describing Judas as wandering the world as a 'great example of impiety (Μέγα ... ἀσεβείας ὑπόδειγμα).'²⁹ The more precise question for us, therefore, is what kind of impiety Judas exemplifies for Papias.

In physiognomic handbooks, obesity is associated with a cluster of vices related to excess consumption, primarily gluttony, fornication, excessive drink, greed, and a lack of intelligence.³⁰ A swollen head indicates not pride, but stupidity: 'lack of knowledge and understanding, and indifference.'³¹ Swollen eyes, in particular, had a particular position of prominence as they served as the 'gateway to the heart' and the source of 'the truest information' about that of the subject.³² Thick lower eyelids, Polemon writes, are a sign of a philanderer, while heavy upper eyelids suggest a slothful layabout. Heavy lids, furthermore, are a sign that the subject is contemplating evil and should be judged for 'treachery and faithlessness'.³³

Judas' form, however, and the likelihood that ancient readers would have understood him to suffer from dropsy, directs us to think of Judas as greedy. Dropsy is specifically noted as a disease of the wealthy in a wide variety of ancient texts. Lucian includes dropsy, along

²⁷ Draining the oedema is the prognosis even in more supernatural cases: in a case of dream incubation a young girl's mother dreamt that her afflicted daughter's head was cut off and reattached once the liquid had been drained (*IG IV*², 1, nos 121-22, B21). Treatment by excisions and fire (cautery) was in general considered especially dangerous in ancient medical texts see Hippocrates, *Aph.* 87; *Med.* 8; Galen *Ad Glauconem* 2.3 (89K).

²⁸ Robertson, *The Death of Judas*, 139; Solevåg, 122. On the question of physiognomy and its role in descriptions of the grotesque see Rosemary Garland, *The Eye of the Beholder* 23-26. On the pedagogical function of ekphrasis in the context of judgment see Meghan R. Henning, 'Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth' as *Paideia* in *Matthew and the Early Church* (WUNT 2/382; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

²⁹ Papias, *Frag.* 4.2

³⁰ Polemon states, 'Largeness of the stomach and great fleshiness, especially if it has softness and droop, indicates much movement, drunkenness, and love of sexual intercourse. If it is very fleshy and strong, that indicates wickedness of deeds, malice, deceit, cunning, and lack of intellect', B14 trans. Robert Hoyland, 'A New Edition and Translation of the Leiden Polemon', *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul: Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam* (ed. Simon Swain; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 329-464 [405]. On physiognomy in general in the ancient world see, Mladen Popovic, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) and Maud W. Gleason 'The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning in the Second Century CE', *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (ed. Froma I. Zeitlin; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990) 389-416.

³¹ Hoyland, 'New Edition', 421.

³² Hoyland 'New Edition', 341.

³³ Hoyland, 'New Edition', 345.

with gout, consumption, and pneumonia, in a list of the maladies of the rich.³⁴ Stobaeus notes that ‘Diogenes compared money-lovers to dropsies; as dropsies, though filled with fluid crave drink, so money-lovers, though loaded with money, crave more of it, yet both to their demise. For, their desires increase the more they acquire the objects of their cravings’.³⁵ In the case of Polybius, the incurable greed of a man named Scopas is explicitly compared to the condition of dropsy on the basis that neither Scopas nor a dropsy-sufferer can be sated.³⁶ As Chad Harstock describes it, ‘The victim drinks because he or she is thirsty, but the body retains the fluid rather than processes it; thus the victim remains thirsty and continues to drink until something bad happens, like the bursting of organs. Dropsy, then, is an appropriate metaphor for wealth and greed, as the victim thirsts for more and more wealth, only to find that the insatiable thirst for wealth is eventually his or her undoing’.³⁷

Perhaps pushing further, into the philosophical underpinnings of ancient medical diagnoses, can be of some assistance here, particularly when it comes to the association of Judas’ body with greed. After all, the association of girth with a voracious appetite for food and drink seems instinctive to modern readers who understand weight gain as the consequence of overconsumption, but its association with monetary greed is more obscure. The question here is not, ‘from where does Papias get the idea that greed and gluttony are bad?’ -- any cursory reading of ancient literature will reveal a dislike of greed, gluttony, and debauchery – but rather, ‘how and why are they linked and what does this link tell us about the fate of Judas?’

An initial distinction can be made between the moral character of wealth and greed. Judas has not made himself wealthy by acquiring thirty pieces of silver but at least one tradition, likely unknown to Papias describes Judas as a thief who skimmed money from the common purse (John 12:6). While they will often be used as a gloss for one another, wealth and greed are not identical: the former can be morally neutral while the latter is always negative. In prophetic texts as well as the writings of followers of Jesus, the wealthy are often condemned for their failure to assist and care for the poor.³⁸ For Roman writers directing their compositions to the elite, wealth was a potentially dangerous state of affairs. In spending their money on luxurious goods – architecture, dress, and elaborate banquets – the wealthy might come to suffer from the more damaging vice of greed, or acquisitiveness. We might think here of the case of the rich young man who intended to become a follower of Jesus but was unable to give up his possessions (Matt 19:16-30). It is not his wealth that is his problem, but rather the manner in which it has corrupted him. It is not accidental that both Judas and, metaphorically speaking, the rich young man are unable to pass through the gates of the city.

³⁴ Lucian, *Gall.*, p. 23. The socioeconomic connotations of dropsy are noted with respects to Luke in Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 227.

³⁵ Stobaeus, *Flor.*, 3.10.45

³⁶ Polybius, *Hist.* 13.2.1-2

³⁷ Chad Harstock, ‘The Healing of the Man with Dropsy (Luke 14:1-6) and the Lukan Landscape, *Biblical Interpretation* 21:3 (2013) 341-54 [341]. This exemplary article investigates dropsy in Luke 14 in light of the ancient rhetorical and metaphorical use of dropsy as a signifier for wealth and greed. My argument somewhat differs from Harstock in arguing that dropsy is not only a metaphor for greed it was, in ancient medical thinking, a direct consequence of greed. On the metaphorical work done by dropsy in Luke see also Willi Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14* (SNTSMS 85; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); John Paul Hail, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience Oriented Approach* (SBLMS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 199) 99-113.

³⁸ E.g. Amos 5.11; 8.5 Mic 3.9-10; Isa 5.8; Ezek 18.5-9. On the moral problems created by wealth in general for late antique Christians see Peter Brown, *Through the Eye of A Needle* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2010).

Acquisitiveness, broadly speaking, and its related vices of gluttony, drunkenness, fornication, and greed, is negative not only because of the manner in which it might be said to deprive or exploit others, but more directly because of the corrosive effects it has on the individual himself. In his essay *On the Love of Wealth*, Plutarch remarks, ‘From what other ills then does wealth deliver us, if it does not even deliver us from the craving for it? Nay, drink allays the desire of drink, and food is a remedy for hunger ... but neither silver nor gold allays the craving for money, nor does the greed of gain ever cease from acquiring new gains’.³⁹ He directly relates financial greed to gluttony when he concludes shortly thereafter that ‘as those who drink when no longer thirsty, or eat when no longer hungry, vomit up with the excess the rest as well that was taken to satisfy hunger or thirst, so those who seek the useless and superfluous do not even retain the necessary. Such then is the condition of one sort of lover of wealth’.⁴⁰

Not every moralist agreed with Plutarch that even hunger and thirst can be satiated by indulgence. In one of his less well-known psychological writings, Galen insists that even without a diagnosis of dropsy an insatiable appetite for food can corrupt the whole person and leave them both physically and morally compromised such that they are beyond the reach of any kind of assistance.⁴¹ The motif of the glutton, therefore, overlaps with that of the dropsy sufferer. Horace describes the glutton as a ‘man who is swollen and pale from excess [who] will find no comfort in oysters or sea fish or grouse’.⁴²

Roman law, too, worried about how greed, gluttony, and the indulgence of the appetites could corrupt the body politic. From the Republican period onwards legislators sought to fight the corrupting influence of luxury through the passage of sumptuary laws that would limit indulgence.⁴³ Indulgence and greed had the potential to corrupt individuals, cities, and entire empires.

If we consider the body of Judas in this broader cultural context, the moral diagnosis is one of greed. While Judas could have been condemned a lack of constancy, impatience, betrayal, or simply treason, Papias focuses on Judas’ financial gain, and indicts him for greed. His physical condition, whether he suffers from dropsy or a more mundane case of intemperate self-indulgence, is the outward manifestation of an internal corruption. In the same way that such conditions turned monarchs into pariahs, Judas’s condition isolated him from society; he must remain in a single location and is unable to move about freely. His death is a sign that he was properly punished by God for his offenses in a manner that was both consistent with the most gruesome deaths imaginable, and is also anticipatory of post-mortem punishments. In this way the description of the death of Judas both satisfies the need for divine retribution, and serves as a pedagogical example for other Christians about the dangers of greed.

³⁹ Plutarch, *Mor.* 523C.

⁴⁰ Plutarch, *Mor.* 524F.

⁴¹ Galen, *Aff. Dig.* 1.9 (45K) trans. Singer in *Galen: Psychological Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) 275. Horace, similarly remarks in a commentary on the dangers of hoarding wealth writing that neither dropsy nor love of possessions could be cured simply by supplying the sufferer with the thing they claim to want (*Carm.* 2.2). See also Ovid, *Faust.* 1.213-218.

⁴² Horace *Sat* 2.2.20.

⁴³ See discussion in Emanuela Zanda, *Fighting Hydra-like Luxury: Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 51-52. Pompei and Crassus (Dio Cassius, 39.37); Caesar (Suetonius, *Iul.* 1.33; Dio Cassius, 43.25; Cicero, *Att.* 7.1); Augustus (Suetonius, *Aug.*34; Gellius, 2.24.14-15).