Ystoria Judas
An edition of the apocryphal history of Judas Iscariot

Lennart van der Wielen
Studentnumber 4169719
Supervisor: Dr. Aaron Griffith
BA thesis Celtic Studies
Oktober 2015

Plagiaatverklaring

Hierbij verklaar ik dat ik bij het schrijven van dit eindwerkstuk geen plagiaat heb gepleegd.

Naam: Lennart van der Wielen

Handtekening:

Datum: 22-10-2015

Index

The text of Ystoria Judas has been edited before, but only once. This edition was written in 1892 by Robert Williams and based on the adaptation found in Peniarth 5. This was, however, not of an adequate standard. It lacked a methodology, an editorial policy and annotations, but it also contained various mistakes. No other editions have been made since and the text has not received the attention it is due. This edition will hopefully renew some interest in the text.

The next few paragraphs contain an introduction to the Ystoria Judas and the manuscripts in which it is found. After that a synopsis is given, since it is useful for the understanding of the subsequent paragraphs. This is then followed by a discussion of a possible Latin original and some short remarks about the purpose of the story. The last section contains the methodology and framework used for the edition and the annotated edition itself.

Introduction

Ystoria Judas is an adaptation of a popular medieval Latin text found as part of the Legenda Aurea, a popular collection of hagiographies by Jacobus de Voragine[1]. This collection was assembled around ca. 1260-1270, but the tale itself has been found in less elaborate forms in texts dating from the 12th century[2]. The first Welsh version of the tale has been written down not long after the Legenda Aurea was published, but it seems that the earliest of the extant texts are not actually based on the elaborate text found in the Legenda Aurea[3]. The Welsh texts have not lost the charm the Legenda Aurea text has, however. It is a magnificently written tale about the biblical figure of Judas Iscariot that manages to combine elements from the story of Moses and the story of Oedipus, whilst keeping close to the original biblical narrative of the character: a demonizing tale with patricide, theft, incest and suicide.

Ystoria Judas was a popular tale and that is evident. It is extant in at least eleven manuscripts according to Caerwyn Williams[4]. Seven of these manuscripts contain a complete story. The other four are either missing pages, such as NLW MS. Peniarth 3, or are notes or extracts. The oldest version, found in Peniarth 3, dates back to 1275-1325, but unfortunately exists as a mere leaflet.[5] The youngest Welsh text dates back to the 18th century, which shows the vitality of the text. These later adaptations came in the form of chapbooks, small paper-covered booklets. These chapbooks coincided with the resurgence of the tale in the rest of Europe[6]. Since then it has however seemingly been forgotten. It may be assumed that that might be because of the nature of the text and it not fitting in with the traditional biblical narrative.

For this edition the earliest three complete texts of Ystoria Judas will be used: those in NLW MS. Peniarth 5, 7 and 14, because these show great similarities in the structure of the tale and word-choice. Caerwyn Williams supposed that these all used the same Latin original[7] and that makes it easy to use these texts for variant readings and pointing out mistakes or scribal interventions. The next three paragraphs contain a small description of these three manuscripts including a short discussion on NLW MS. Peniarth 3.

---

1   Baum, 1916: 499.
2   Baum, 1916: 496.
3   They are most likely based on a precursor of this text, more on this is in the section on origin.
4   Caerwyn Williams, 1990: 363-364.
5   Caerwyn Williams, 1990: 364.
6   Baum, 1916: 631.
7   Caerwyn Williams, 1990: 365.

Manuscripts

NLW MS. Peniarth 5[8]:

This is the lesser known part of the Llyfr Gwyn Rhydderch (the White Book of Rhydderch). While Peniarth 4 contains the popular stories of the Mabinogion, Peniarth 5 contains a large number of religious texts ranging from hagiographies, such as Buchedd Catrin (the Life of Catrin), to less intricate texts such as Pymtheng Arwydd cyn Dydd Brawd (Fifteen Signs before the Day of Judgement). It also contains Ystoria Bilatus with Ystoria Judas thereafter. The end of Peniarth 5 contains several stories about Charlemagne, which have been written by a different hand than the religious texts. Peniarth 5 is dated at ca. 1350[9].

NLW MS. Peniarth 7[10]:

Peniarth 7 is similar to Peniarth 5 in content. It contains an assortment of religious texts, but also several stories about Charlemagne, an incomplete version of Peredur, and The Song of Roland. It is interesting to note that Peniarth 7 also contains Ystoria Bilatus just before Ystoria Judas along with various other texts that also appeared in Peniarth 5, such as Y Groglith (The gospel of Good Friday), Elen a'r Grog (Helen and the Cross) and Ystoria Adda. Peniarth 7 is the oldest of the three manuscripts, dating back to ca. 1275-1325[11].

NLW MS. Peniarth 14[12]:

Peniarth 14 is a composite of two manuscripts and comes in four parts. Part four contains Ystoria Judas, along with several other religious texts that have previously appeared. It also contains a complete version of Peredur. Peniarth 14 is dated to ca. 1300-1350[13].

NLW MS. Peniarth 3[14]:

Caerwyn Williams did not include Peniarth 3 in his list of manuscripts sharing the same Latin original along with Peniarth 5, 7 and 14. There are some reasons to assume this, for example Peniarth 3 does not include any of the texts apart from Ystoria Judas that the other three share with each other, but this was probably not the main crux. While we can only speculate on the real reason why Caerwyn Williams omitted Peniarth 3, it is probably due to the awful state the text of Ystoria Judas is in. There are many faint and unreadable parts and it is missing most of the text. That makes it hard to compare. It can be assumed that this too, however, is based on that same Latin original. This possibility will be discussed the next few paragraphs discussing the purpose of Ystoria Judas in the medieval world and the possible Latin originals. Peniarth 3 dates back to ca. 1275-1325[15].

---

8   Luft, Thomas and Smith, 2013: http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?ms=Pen5.
9   Huws, 2000: 58.
10   Luft, Thomas and Smith., 2013: http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?ms=Pen7.
11   Huws, 2000: 58.
12   Luft, Thomas and Smith, 2013: http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?ms=Pen14.
13   Huws, 2000: 59.
14   Luft, Thomas and Smith, 2013: http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/ms-home.php?ms=Pen3.
15   Huws, 2000: 58.

Synopsis

On the evening that Judas was conceived, his mother Ciborea received a vision of her son being the cause of the damnation of their tribe. This sparked such fear that his mother cast out her son in a wicker basket into the sea. The basket eventually stranded on the beaches of Iscariot, where he got his name from. The queen of that land found him and pretended he was one of their own. Not long after that, the queen got pregnant from the king. Judas and the king's boy quarrelled often. The queen then told him Judas was not one of their own, but a foundling. Judas felt so ashamed and angry that he killed his foster-brother and fled to Jerusalem.

Here he became a servant to Pilate. He did everything that was asked from him and Pilate loved him so much that he gave him all of his possessions. One day, Pilate saw an orchard with beautiful apples. He requested that Judas take some of them to him. Judas went to the orchard and tried to pick some apples, but he was met by the owner of the orchard, Ruben, his father. They fought and did not recognize each other. Judas eventually killed him and took the apples with him. Pilate gave Judas Ciborea as a reward for his deeds.

Ciborea was sad and explained to Judas what mishaps had happened to her and she knew then that Judas killed his own father and that he wed his mother. She went to Jesus to confess her sins and to ask for forgiveness. Judas was allowed to become a disciple and an apostle. He eventually betrayed Jesus and hanged himself. His mouth was spared, since it kissed the mouth of Jesus, but because of his betrayal he was cast into hell.

Origin

Versions of the story circulated well before the introduction of the legend in the Legenda Aurea by Jacobus de Voragine[16]. According to Paul Franklin Baum the legend of Judas can be divided into five types[17]:

> Type A: This is the earliest known Latin version of the text. It is only found in one manuscript and lacks many of the elements found in later versions.
>
> Type R: This is a more developed type that is most commonly found in Latin.
>
> Type L: This version contains many new narrative elements. The Legenda Aurea contains a Type L. Type L is seen in many languages. It is uncertain whether Type L developed from a Type R.
>
> Type H: This is a later type that introduces new humanistic elements to the story.
>
> Type P: This type is used to categorize versions in poem form.
>
> Type M: Baum uses this type to categorize any thing that does not fit in the other types.

Most of these types can be differentiated from each other by looking at their narrative. In each of the types a new element gets either introduced or an elements gets taken out. The table below compares the Welsh texts we will be dealing with to the archetypes A, R and L, using the narrative differences that distinguish the types from each other.

	Type A	Type R	Type L	Welsh versions (Pen 5, 7, 13)	Peniarth 3
Named parents[18]		X	X	X	x
Foster-brother incident[19]		X	X	X	x
Appearance of attendants of the queen[20]	X				
Moralizing text after Judas' death[21]			X	X	Possibly
Father and son explicitly don't recognize each other[22]			X	X	Possibly
Tribe of 'Dan' as Ruben's tribe[23]			X		

---

16 Baum, 1916: 485-489.
17 Baum, 1916: 489-490.
18 Baum, 1916: 492.
19 Baum, 1916: 492.
20 Baum, 1916: 541.
21 Baum, 1916: 517.
22 Baum, 1916: 517.

As can be seen in the table above, the Welsh texts that we are dealing with are most similar to type L, but they lack one specific element. Most type L texts are copies from the Legenda Aurea and include the mention of the tribe of Dan as the tribe of Ruben. The Welsh adaptation, while it has everything a regular copy from the Legenda Aurea has, does not mention the tribe of Dan, but instead mentions the tribe of Judah and Issachar. There is subtype in L that also has Judah as the tribe and it is seen as a precursor to Jacobus de Voragine's version of the text[24].

Peniarth 3 was included in the table to show that it seems very similar to the other Welsh versions, even though most of the story is missing. While it can not be said with certainty, it does seem likely that Peniarth 3 is not a copy from the Legenda Aurea and might even be translated from the same Latin original.

What makes it even more likely that the Welsh texts found in Peniarth 3, 5, 7 and 14 are not copies from the Legenda Aurea is that none of the manuscripts include any other texts found in the Legenda Aurea. Instead, however, there is a peculiarity that might bring us closer to the Latin original. Peniarth 5 and 7 include Ystoria Bilatus right before Ystoria Judas. Ystoria Bilatus seems to be the biographical account of Pilate as found in the *Passion of our Lord* chapter in the Legenda Aurea[25]. This same peculiarity shows up for various English manuscripts from around the same time[26]. It is very unlikely that an intermediary first chose this specific set tales from the Legenda Aurea and then reordered them, because of the dates of our manuscripts. If the Legenda Aurea was written in 1270 and our earliest manuscripts of are dated back to 1275-1350 that leaves very little room for an actual intermediary to exist. It seems likelier that an independent Latin precursor containing at least these texts in this same order circulated the British Isles.

Caerwyn Williams listed several possible precursors of the early Ystoria Judas[27], namely MS Laud Misc. 633, Royal 8E VII, Royal 9A XIV, St. John's College Cambridge 258 and Pembroke College Cambridge MS. 258. Unfortunately, with knowledge of Baum's types and its connection with Pilate most of these seem ill fit to be actual precursors. The precursor must be a type L and preferably connected with the story of Pilate. The suggested MS. Laud. Misc 633 is a Type R, and thus lacks certain elements the Welsh texts have, and it is not connected with Pilate[28]. Royal 9A XIV would also be unlikely since it omits the moralizing text after Judas' death[29], one of the most characteristic elements from type L. It is however preceded by Pilate. Pembroke College Cambridge MS. 258 also seemed unlikely. It is not preceded by Pilate and it has a multitude of saints' lives from the Legenda Aurea following it. This makes it a younger type L[30], but one that has been copied from the Legenda Aurea itself. The only likely candidate that Caerwyn Williams supposed is that of Royal 8E XVII, which is a type L that is also preceded by Pilate. From the list of Baum very few manuscripts actually fit the exact profile. The likeliest of candidates, apart from Royal 8E XVIII is CCCC 323[31]. CCC323 is a type L that is preceded by Pilate. There also still the possibility that the precursor manuscript simply does not exist any more. While it is out of the scope of this edition, it would be interesting to see how similar either of the possible precursors are to the Welsh version.

---

23 Baum, 1916: 496.
24 Baum, 1916: 496.
25 Ellis, 1900: 29.
26 Baum, 1916: 531.
27 Caerwyn Williams, 1990: 367-368.
28 Baum, 1916: 486.
29 Baum, 1916: 486.
30 Montague Rhodes, 1905: 233-237.
31 Baum, 1916: 487.

Purpose

Since Baum has written extensively about the themes and purpose of the story of Judas, remarks here will be kept brief. Baum wrote that the theme of redemption became more central to the story as it developed, but that the story is generally about blackening the name of Judas[32]. There is no reason to stray from this statement, especially not in the specific case of Ystoria Judas. The inclusion of the foster-brother quarrel and murder and its pairing with the Ystoria Bilatus, which shows the wickedness of Pilate, makes it clear that this was still the main purpose of the story, even though the redemption element was expanded upon in these later works. It never has been paired with other stories of redemption and often sits isolated at the end of the manuscript in our early Welsh manuscripts. It probably became less popular due to the fact that blackening Judas' name did not align with the tradition of the Church.

Baum mentions that similar stories of redemption are not uncommon. He references to several saints' lives in which there are incestuous relationships, but that eventually end in a life of penance, for example that of St. Andreas, St. Albanus and St. Gregory[33].

Methodology

The practice of editing can be approached in a multitude of ways. It is important to give an overview of these approaches and their merits, so that it becomes clear why a particular approach is avoided or chosen. The article of Kevin Murray[34] on the practice of editing and the subsequent responses by Breatnach[35] and Uhlich[36] are used to refine this overview and to approach the practice itself more critically.

In the article Kevin Murray lists five approaches. The first of which is the critical edition. According to him the critical edition is built upon Lachmannian principles in the field of editing. These principles are concerned with the reconstruction of an archetype. The principles are as follows: by finding common errors within the readings of various manuscripts, one can posit a relationship between the manuscripts. This process is called 'recensio'. From this, one can create a stemma, a genealogical model that can be used to see whether readings are original or not original. According to Murray this approach has worked well for certain writings, such as poetry, where metrical patterns can prove invaluable for a possible reconstruction. It has worked less so in other materials. Bédier criticized this approach, because recensio in combination with actual editing too often led to the creation of two-branched stemmata.[37]. He argued that these two-branched stemmata were not correct stemmata, but that they came to be because of the preference of the editor. A two-branched stemmata is easier to work with, thus the involvement of the editor made the approach unreliable.

That is why Bédier promoted another method. This one is also briefly discussed by Murray. Bédier's approach made use of a 'codex optimus'. That means, foremost, that an editor should use

---

32   Baum, 1916: 481.
33   Baum, 1916: 595-599.
34   Kevin Murray, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 51-70.
35   Liam Breatnach, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts: A Brief Final Response', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 71-74.
36   Jürgen Uhlich, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts: A Brief Final Response', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 75-79.
37   Haugen, 2002: 8.

the best possible manuscript available. The 'best possible manuscript' can either mean most complete, most elaborate or oldest. The editor should also refrain as much as he could from actually changing the text. This method has the obvious benefit of not being able to bring forth something that is not actually there. A negative is that it disregards any possible relationships with other manuscripts. They are there, but you are not meant to do any thing with them. The Bédierist method does not offer any solution for establishing such connections and is thus not suitable for editors whose purpose that is.

The third approach Murray discusses is that of the semi-diplomatic edition. According to him this is a rather fluid term that changes depending on the preferences of the editor. For some it simply means giving a transcription with abbreviations expanded in italics, along with punctuation and capitalization. For others it also means adding diacritics to the text, or removing diacritics that do not belong. So there is a wide range of possibilities here that simply seem to depend on the editor's preference.

Murray's own preference is what he terms the 'multiple-version' or 'multiple-text' approach, in which he tries to present all extant texts in a diplomatic transcription together with an edition based on any of the more critical approaches listed above. He ends this section with a note on how he believes that no method is superior to another. All methods have their own advantages and disadvantages and editors often have their own reasons for using a particular method.

Liam Breatnach gave a response to this article, but for the most part his response dealt with Murray's criticisms on an earlier response by Breatnach, which is something that will not be talked about here. He also gave some brief comments on the practice of editing. These comments can be boiled down to one sentence: meddling with the text should be done in a consistent matter and that changes are useless, if there is not a good underlying reason for said changes.

Jürgen Uhlich has also written a response. In this he criticizes Murray for presenting the different approaches as equal options that can be selected according to editor's taste or due to a national tradition as long as the method is suited for the text. Uhlich thinks there is definitely some sort of hierarchy in the methods. Some of these methods are more invasive and require more editorial intervention, but these result in a more advanced level of analysis. He warns that the perception of these approaches as equal options should not be an excuse for avoiding editiorial intervention.

When it comes to my own edition, tough decisions had to be made. More involved methods that have a higher level of editorial intervention take more time. This thesis is limited by time, so I had to choose a method with less intervention. This is why I have decided to use one text, the text in Peniarth 7, as the base text or the codex optimus for this edition. The other texts found in Peniarth 5 and 14 are used in footnotes to solve errors in Peniarth 7 and sometimes to showcase differences. Peniarth 7 has been specifically chosen, because there was no previous edition of this particular text, and because it is the oldest[38]. These texts have been pre-transcribed and their diplomatic editions are available at http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/. The next paragraph will contain the editorial policy which I have held to.

---

38   See the section on manuscripts.

Editorial policy

Capitalization and punctuation has been added to improve the general readability of the text. I have also added paragraphing in the instances where Robert Williams supplied his edition with paragraphs, so that it is easier to compare the two texts for further use. Furthermore words have been separated and the modern use of adding an apostrophe in situations like *o'r, a'r, a'e* has been adopted as well.

The edited text and translation

<div align="center">

Ystoria Judas Ysgarioth

</div>

§1. Gwr a oed gynt yng Kaeruselem a Rvben oed y henw. Ereill a'y galwei Simion o lin Judas ac o lin Iacar[39] herwyd ereill. A Ciborea[40] oed hynny y wreic. A nossweith wedy bot kyt idaw a'y wreic. Breudwyt a weles y wreic a phan diffroes y wreic y datkanawd y breudwyt o'y gwr gan gwynvan ac ucheneidiaw. 'Myvi' eb hi, 'a welwn vy mot yn esgor mab bonhedic ac ef a vydei achos y gyvyrgolli kenedyl.' 'Ysgymvn[41] a datanyat[42]' eb ef, 'yw y tev di ac nyt o rat duw yd wyt yn arwein dy seithvc.' 'Os beichiogi a gevis[43]' eb hi, 'nyt seithvc namyn gweledigaeth.'

§2. A phan doeth oet ac amsser idi y esgor mab a esgores ac ovyn mawr a delis racdaw a rac meint vv eu hovyn racdaw y kawssant yn eu kynghor rac y divetha yn disgvyt. Gwneithur boly croen[44] a'y roi yn hwnnw a'y vwrw yn y mor a'r mor a'y byryawd y'r tir a elwir Ysgarioth ac o hynny y kavas y henw nyt amgen Judas Ysgarioth. Ac yno y bedydywyt. Ac yd oed brenhines y lle honno diwyrnawt yn gorymdeith gan lan y mor. Ac yna y darganvv y boly croen a'y agori a wnaethbwyt. A gwelet yndaw mab gordethol y bryt a dywedut a oruc y vrenhines dan vcheneidiaw. 'Ef a allei ymi' eb hi, 'caffel digriuwch o'r etived hwnn ymi rac adaw vy tyyrnas[45] heb etived?' A pheri magv y mab a oruc y dan gel.

§3. A dywedvt y may beichyawc vvassei a geni mab yn eidi e hvn a dywedvt hynny wrth bawb a'y honni a llawn vv hynny gan bawb o'r tywyssogyon. A magv y mab a wnaethbwyt yn amgledus[46]. Ac yn gyvagos y hyny y kavas y vrenhines beichiogi o'r brenhin. A mab a anet o'r beich[47]. A magv y de vab a wnaethbwyt yn vn amgeled ac yn vn vrdas. Ac wedy gallu o'r meibion ymeviniaw ac ymrysson, gwneithur wylaw mynych a wnei Judas y'r mab arall. Ac ny bv da hynny gan y vrenhines a'y waard[48] a oruc. Ac yn y diwed dywedvt a oruc nat oed vab ef idi hi namyn mab dywan[49]. A chewilidyaw a oruc Judas yna a llidiaw a llad mab y brenhin a orvc. A pho ygyt a chedymdeithion a orvc hyt yng Kaervselem. Ac ymwasgv a oruc a llys Bilatus a oed racglaw yno yna. A gwneithur a wnei hyn a archei Bilatus idaw ar yr amneit lleiaf, yny oed garvaf gan Bilatus o'y holl weision. Ac yny rodes idaw medyant y holl daed[50].

---

39 Pen 14: *Isakar*, Pen 5: *ysachar*
40 Pen 5: *Cylorea*
41 Latin loan. from *excommunis*. Used here as something bad, something that is not from God.
42 Should be *datkanyat*, similar to: Pen 14: *datkan*, Pen 5: *datkannyat*
43 Should be *geveis*. similar to: Pen 14: *geueis*, Pen 5: *geueis*.
44 Can also be translated as 'leather bag', but wicker basket fits better with its parallels to other similar stories.
45 Should be *tyrnas*, mistakenly written as *tryrnas* in Pen 14. Pen 5 has *teyrnnas*
46 Should be *amgled*, as is found in Pen 14 as *amgeled*.
47 Should be *beichiogi*, but is unreadable.
48 *gwahard* as is found in Pen 14.
49 *mab dywan*, see additional notes.
50 *daed* is the plural of *da*, written as *daoed* in Pen 14. It means wealth/goods in this case.

§4. A diwyrnawt y darganvv Bilatus o'y lys e hun perllan dec a'y llawn ffrwyth arnei o avalev mawr da a Ruben bieuoed y berllan. A damvnaw a orvc Pilatus caffel rei o'r avaleu hyt na allei vot hebdunt. Ssef a oruc Iudas yna mynet y'r berllan a chymryt peth o'r avalev. A dyvot Rvbenn ataw ac ymwaravvn ac ef ac nyt atnabv yr vn onadvnt y gilyd. A chywira a wnaethant am yr avaleu ac ymlad. Ac yn y lle llad o Judas Rvben a'y adaw yn varw yn y berllan. A dyvot a ffeth o'r avaleu y Bilatus a menegi kwbyl o'y damwin[51]. Ac yn agos y'r nos y kaffat Rvben yn y berllan yn varw. A thyygv[52] y may o damwein arall y daroed y kyvrang hwnnw. Ac y rodes Pilatus Ciborea wreic Rvben yn wreic y Iudas a holl daed Rvben genthi.

§5. A diwyrnot tristaev[53] a orvc Ciborya ac vcheneidiaw. A govyn a orvc Judas idi paham yd vcheneidyei. 'Am' eb hi 'vy mot yn direitiaf gwreic o'r gwraged.' 'Vn mab a vv ym' eb hi 'a bwrw hwnnw a wneithvm y mewn boly croen yn y mor pan anet. A chaffel y dat yn varw yn y berllan ac am hynny yd wyf yn vcheneidiaw. Ac anghwanegv a oruc Pilatus y'm dristyt am vy rodi yn wreic yn ty.' Ac yna y dwot yntev y damwein o'y vam. Ac y gwybv arnaw llad y dat a bot yn wr priawt o'y vam. Ac yna yd aeth Ciborea y ymwelet ac Iessu Grist a'y wediaw a oruc am drugared a madeueint o'y ffechodev[54]. A hi a'y cavas mal y herchis. Ac a gymyrth y mab yn disgybyl idaw ac yn enw vn o'r devdec ebost[55]. Ac ef a vv vaer[56] Iessu Grist ac ef a arwedei y llestri y bydei yndunt hynny a rodet y Grist.

§6. A ffan diodefawd yr arglwyd y bv drwc ganthaw na wrthyt yr aryant val y gallei yntev y dwyn y lladryatt. Ac ef a wrthawd yr arglwyd yr dec ar vgein. Ac ef a rodes yr aryant drachef yn o edivarwch. Ac yna yd ymgroges e hvn ac y rwygawd y voly yny aeth emysgar y'r llawr[57]. Ac yna yd arbetwyt y enev canyt oed deilwng am herchi y genev a vvasser wrth eneu Iessu Grist. Y gallon hagen a'r gwdwf a'r emysgar y medylywyt y brat yndunt yny vv godyant gan engylyon Crist a Christonogyon y dayar. Ac am hynny y byrywyt yntev vffern[58] tragywyd. Ac velly y tervyn etcetera.

The Story of Judas Iscariot

§1. Long ago there was a man in Jerusalem and Ruben was his name. Others called him Simion from the tribe of Judas, and according to others he was from the tribe of Issachar. And Ciborea was his wife then. And one evening he and his wife had slept together. His wife had a dream and when she awoke his wife related her dream to her husband by complaining and grumbling. 'I' she said, 'saw that I bore a noble son, but he would be the cause of damnation of a people.' 'An evil prophecy' he said, 'is yours and it is not from a blessing of God that you are conducting your deceit.' 'If I become pregnant' she said, 'it is not deceit, but a vision.'

§2. And when the moment and time of birthing a son came to her, she gave birth. And a great fear seized them against him and as a result it was of the greatness of their fear that they got their council in the face of the sudden destruction. She made a wicker basket and put him in that and she cast him into the sea and the sea cast him onto the land that is called Iscariot and because of that he got his name, which is none other than Judas Iscariot, and there he was baptised. And the queen of that place was strolling along the shore of the sea one day. And there she discovered

---

51 Should be *damwein*, which is found in both Pen 14 and Pen 5.
52 I suggest *thebygu*, to suppose or presume, for this form, since *tebygwyt* is found in Pen 5.
53 Oddly written verbal noun ending, expected form is *tristaw*.
54 Latin loan, from *peccatum*.
55 Should be *ebostyl*, similar to *ebestyl* in Pen 5 and Pen 14.
56 Latin loan, from *maior*. It is an administrative function.
57 See additional notes.
58 Latin loan, from *inferna*.

the wicker basket and she opened it. And in it was seen a nice looking boy and she spoke while sobbing. 'Is it possible' she said, 'that I got the pleasantness of this child as to not leave my kingdom without an heir?' And she caused the boy to be reared secretly.

§3. And she said that she had been pregnant and that a son was born to herself and she told that to everyone and that was maintained and cheered on by everyone from the kingdoms. And the boy was reared carefully. And in that same time the queen got pregnant from the king and a son was born from that pregnancy and the two sons were reared in the same care and in the same dignity. And after the boys were able to fight and quarrel, Judas often made the other son cry. And that was not good with the queen and she prohibited it. And in the end she told that he was not her son, but a chance son. And Judas felt ashamed then and he became angry and killed the son of the king and he fled together with a host up to Jerusalem and he approached the court of Pilate, who was governor there then. And he did that which Pilate requested from him, upon the least gesture, until he was the most loved by Pilate of all his sons. With the result that he gave to him possession of all goods.

§4. And soon Pilate, from his own court, perceived a beautiful orchard full of big and good apples and Ruben, the owner the orchard[59]. And Pilate desired to get some of the apples, until he could not be without them. Judas then went to the orchard and he took some of the apples. And Ruben came towards him and quarrelled with him and not did one of them recognize the other. And then they argued vehemently about the apples and fought. And in that place Judas killed Ruben and he left him dead in the orchard. And he brought some of the apples to Pilate and he related all of the incidents. And closer to the evening Ruben was discovered dead. And it was presumed that it was because of another incident by which he came to an end that time. And Pilate gave Ciborea, wife of Ruben, as a wife to Judas with all the goods of Ruben with her.

§5. And soon Ciborea became sad and complained. And Judas asked to her why she was complaining. 'About' she said, 'me being the most mischievous woman of all women.' 'I had one son' she said, 'and I cast him in a wicker basket into the sea when he was born. And his father got killed in the orchard and because of that I am complaining. And Pilate added to my sadness by giving me as a housewife.' And then his mother told him her mishaps. And she knew of him killing his father and him being a husband of his mother. And then Ciborea went to visit Jesus Christ and she submitted to him for kindness and forgiveness of her sins. And she received it as she asked. And he took her son as his disciple and in the name of one of the twelve apostles. And he was the treasurer of Jesus Christ and he would carry the vessel in which was that which was given to Christ.

§6. And when the lord suffered, he was sad that it were not traded for silver so that he would have been able to steal it[60]. And then he betrayed[61] the lord for thirty (pieces). And he gave the money back again as his repentance. And then he hanged himself and he tore his abdomen until the entrails went to the ground. And then his mouth was spared, because the mouth, which had been to the mouth of Jesus Christ, was not worthy of disrespect. The heart, throat and the intestines, however, the treachery was thought up inside them, with the result that the angels of Christ and Christians on earth were angry. And thereupon he was cast into eternal inferno. And thus was the end, etcetera.

---

59 See the additional notes
60 This follows John 12:3:6 in which Judas asks why a perfume was not sold and the money given to the poor, not because he cared, but because he wanted to steal it. I had to add an object here to make sense of it.
61 Literally 'sold'.

Additional notes

In paragraph three there is the mention of a *mab dywan*, literally a 'chance son'. This comes up in Peniarth 14 and Peniarth 7 as well. I have not been able to find any mention of it elsewhere, apart from a broken reference link in Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. What I assume is simply meant by this is a foundling. A child one happens upon, thus a *mab dywan*.

In the first line of paragraph five Pilate sees apples and *Rvben a bieuoed y berllan*, literally Ruben who owns the orchard. This doesn't flow well in English, since *bieuoed* is simply used to denote ownership here, I have opted to use 'owner of the orchard' instead.

In paragraph six there is a beautiful little sentence on the death of Judas. After throwing the money down on the ground in the temple, Judas hangs himself and tears his abdomen until his entrails fall out onto the ground. This combines two accounts of Judas' death, which might be seen as contradictory to some. The verses I am referring to are Matthew 27:5 and Acts 1:18. In Matthew 27:5 Judas hangs himself after having thrown down the thirty pieces of silver in the temple, in Acts 1:18 Judas presumably acquires a field, hangs himself, and it explicitly states his intestines come out. Whether the original writer was aware of the possibly contradictory passages and whether he explicitly tried to fit them together is an interesting, but unanswerable question.

Bibliography

Baum, Paul Franklin, 'The Mediæval Legend of Judas Iscariot', *PMLA* 31 (1916), 481-632.

Breatnach, Liam, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts: A Brief Final Response', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 71-74.

Caerwyn Williams, J.E., 'The Middle Welsh Text Ystorya Judas'; in: Ball, Martin J., et al. *Celtic Linguistics* (Amsterdam 1990), 363-371.

Ellis, F.S. ed., *Golden Legend* (1900).

Evans, Simons D., *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin 2003).

Haugen, Odd Einar, *The Spirit of Lachmann, the spirit of Bédier: Old Norse textual editing in the electronic age* (London 2002).

Huws, Daniel, *Medieval Welsh manuscripts* (Cardiff 2000).

Luft, Diana, Peter Wynn Thomas and D. Mark Smith. eds. 2013, Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300-1425. http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesolcaerdydd.ac.uk.

Montague Rhodes, James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1905).

Murray, Kevin, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 51-70.

Uhlich, Jürgen, 'Reviews, Reviewers and Critical Texts: A Brief Final Response', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 57 (2009) 75-79.

Williams, Robert, *Selections from the Hengwert MSS. Preserved by the Peniarth Library. Vol. II.* (London, 1892).