

The Welsh Tiburtina: One Text, Two Translations

Nely van Seventer

PhD Thesis

Aberystwyth University

Supervisors: Simon Rodway, Bleddyn O. Huws, Marged Haycock

מיין טייערן ברודער אלבערטן - אין אַנדענק.

Contents

Foreword	1
Introduction	3
On the Origin of Sibyls	9
The <i>Tiburtina</i> and the Tradition	27
<i>Sibli Ddoeth</i> : the Welsh <i>Tiburtina</i>	43
A line-for-line comparison of the two Welsh versions and Sackur's Latin text	53
Textual Relationships	175
<i>Breudwyt Sibli</i> : Peniarth 14 pp. 45-58	195
<i>Proffwydolyaeth Sibli doeth</i> : Red Book of Hergest ff. 139r. – 141r., with variants from the White Book of Rhydderch ff. 12r.-14r.	206
Bibliography	223

Foreword

This work is the result of a five-year process, in which I had many ups and downs. It has not always been an easy road, and I am grateful to everybody who helped me along the way:

My parents, for making this project possible.

My supervisors, Simon Rodway, Marged Haycock and Bleddyn Huws, for their patience and help, both academic and more personal.

Bethan Miles, my landlady and friend, for all the support she has given me, the countless meals we shared, and for providing me with a safe haven in Plas Hendre.

All my friends who have been there for me through this time, in Wales, the Netherlands, Breizh and beyond.

Robin Chapman for moral support and being a de facto tutor.

Erez Lévy, for always believing in me and in this project, and giving me a hand with the Yiddish.

Steve Hewitt, Barry Lewis and Guto Rhys who, all those years ago in Trier, talked me into writing the e-mail to Marged that started this whole project off. Without them I might never have found the courage.

Jean-Alain Thomas who has helped me on several accounts with my work, and was so kind to translate a whole Spanish article for me.

Robert Ireland, who keeps Latin and Greek alive in Aberystwyth, selflessly tutors our little group in these languages and literatures, and gave me a few useful hints for the first chapter.

And lastly, Albert Bock a"h, my *brider* and best friend, who rejoiced with me in the good times and held me in the bad ones, whose intelligence and vast knowledge have contributed to this work, and his kindness and love even more.

Throughout these five years, I have had help and support from many people: I am sure I forgot to name some. But I am grateful to each and every one of them. And although I have been helped along the way by many, all mistakes in this work are strictly my own.

Nely van Seventer

Introduction.

Before you lies my thesis about the Welsh Sibyl. Sibyls were prophets. Not only were they prophets, but they were *female* prophets. Moreover, there were female *pagan* prophets. But for all their being female and pagan, they gained themselves a place of honour in the western medieval world, which is no small feat. These pagan prophetesses, with their roots in ancient Greece, were credited in the Middle Ages with predictions about the coming of Christ and the Last Judgment. In many places, their stories became part of the traditions surrounding Christmas. Two Sibyls in particular stood out: the *Erythraea*, for her prophecy of the End of Times, and the *Tiburtina*, for her prophecy about Christ's birth. These two Sibyls and their lore became fused in the *Sibylla Tiburtina*, a text in which the Tiburtine Sibyl explains the dream of a hundred senators (judges according to some versions) of Rome. The senators dream of nine suns appearing in the sky, each one more terrible than the one before. The Sibyl explains this dream as a dream about the ages of men, in which mankind starts out as free of guilt and guile, but in each following generation they become more guilty and sinful, and wars and natural disasters are their lot. A brief respite is offered in the time of Christ, and the Sibyl goes into detail about His life and Passion. His Second Coming is predicted too, after a long political prophecy about rulers to come, and their virtues and vices.

This text gained great popularity in the Latin West, and was translated into various vernaculars. One of these vernaculars was Middle Welsh: not one but two independent translations into this language are extant, one of them in Peniarth 14,

and the other in both the Red Book of Hergest and the White Book of Rhydderch.

The Middle Welsh versions of this prophecy are the subject of this thesis.

In the first chapter, 'The Roots of the Sibyl', we study the Classical Sibyl and her path to Christianity. This is *not* an in-depth study of the Sibyl in classical texts: for such a study, read H.W. Parke's excellent book on the subject.¹ We only study certain strands of the pre-Christian tradition which had influence on how the Middle Ages perceived this character. First, an overview of some key classical authors and what they said about Sibyls; second, the way the character was picked up by Jewish authors, which was a necessary step towards her Christianisation; and lastly, the patristic sources that ensured her place in medieval thought.

In the second chapter, 'the *Tiburtina*', we discuss the *Sibylla Tiburtina* proper, and look into the different parts of the narrative and their provenance. We also discuss the place of the *Tiburtina* in the 'Sibylline Tradition', the body of Sibylline lore that was known in the Middle Ages. We discuss Anke Holdenried's thesis that the *Tiburtina* cannot be understood correctly without its context in the Sibylline Tradition; we take this idea one step further and argue that the *Tiburtina* is *part* of the Tradition, and that the distinction between *Tiburtina* and Tradition is a false one. For this purpose, we will explore the apparitions of the Tiburtine and Erythraean Sibyls in texts other than the *Tiburtina*.

In the third chapter, '*Sibli Ddoeth*, the Welsh *Tiburtina*', we turn our attention to the Welsh Sibyl. We localise and date our texts, and discuss the context of the

¹ Parke, H.W., McGing, B.C. (ed.), *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, London and New York, 1988.

manuscripts in which they are found. Also, we discuss other Middle Welsh texts featuring our heroine.

The fourth chapter is the core of our thesis. Here, we compare the Middle Welsh texts line-for-line with their Latin source as edited by Sackur in 1898.² We not only analyse the translation processes, but also provide a running commentary. The final part of the text, the translation of the Erythraean Sibyl's *Iudicii Signum* is not treated here, because it is a translation from poetry to prose, which is inevitably very free, and therefore doesn't really lend itself to this type of study.

The fifth chapter, 'Textual Relationships' outlines the conclusions drawn from the line-for-line comparison. We provide a characterisation of both translations, discuss noteworthy variations between our texts, and propose a theory about how our texts relate to each other. Furthermore, we prove that not only do both Middle Welsh versions translate the same source version, but that this version had to be Latin.

Although the exact source of these translations is unknown at this point, we provide some clues from our texts that would help towards identifying this source text, and draw our final conclusions.

To finish, we provide our editions of both Welsh source texts, first the Peniarth 14 version, then the Red Book text with variants from the White Book. Transcriptions of the texts are available online: the Peniarth 14 text on the Aberystwyth prose manuscripts from the thirteenth century website,³ the other two on the Cardiff

² Sackur, E., *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen : Pseudomethodius Adso und Die tiburtinische sibylle*, Halle 1898.

³ <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/5827> (last visited 19/01/2019)

website of medieval Welsh prose.⁴ We have also checked the correctness of these transcriptions against the online facsimile of the Red Book⁵ and a microfilm of Peniarth 14. In editing these texts, we have taken the approach of the 'little red books' edited by DIAS: we have provided modern punctuation and capitals to accommodate the reader, silently resolved abbreviations where applicable, and replaced the *6* character and *ll* ligature by their appropriate modern counterparts: *u* or *w* for the *6*, *ll* for the ligature.

There are also subjects we have decided not to discuss: unfortunately, we have not found the time and space to delve deeper into the place-names that feature in our Welsh texts. More importantly, we have decided against a chapter on medieval translation in general and translation into Middle Welsh in particular. While doing the research necessary for such a chapter, we found that there simply has not yet been written much about the subject. Certainly, there are publications like *The Medieval Translator* series from the *Cardiff Conference on the Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, a conference series organised by Brepols. We have had the privilege to attend the eleventh *Cardiff Conference*, held paradoxically in Vienna in 2017. More specifically about translation in the Celtic languages there are works like *Übersetzung, Adaptation und Akkulturation im insularen Mittelalter*,⁶ and many other books and articles have been written about the translation processes of individual texts. In fact, we have not been able to find any work that moves the study of medieval translation beyond the case study. As I am writing this, I have in

4 <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/> (last visited 19/01/2019).

5 <http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=jesus&manuscript=ms111> (last visited 19/01/2019)

6 Poppe, E. and Tristram, H.L.C., *Übersetzung, Adaptation und Akkulturation im insularen Mittelalter*, 1999.

front of me a book titled *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia*.⁷ A promising title. But when we move to the contents, we see that each chapter of this book is a case study: Marie de France's *Lais*, the Old Norse version of *Le Chanson de Roland*, the Old Norse and Middle English versions of *Le Chevalier au Lion*, and the Middle English versions of *Partonopeu de Blois*. And so it is with all publications we have seen. Many of these works are excellent, but do they provide context for the present work? In some cases they do, where we see similarities or parallels between the works discussed in these books, and the Welsh *Tiburtina*. In these cases, we take note – we do, for example, use Paul Russell's study of *Breint Teilo* as a comparison.⁸ But the present author is unconvinced that, in general, quoting lists and lists of other case studies do anything to enlighten the present case study. We have been disappointed to see that no synthesis, no general theory of medieval translation has been written, or even a synthesis of translation into the medieval Celtic languages. But then, on the other hand, each translation is individual. Every medieval translator was an individual, working to his own best insights. Already in the two different translations of the Welsh *Tiburtina*, we see marked differences according to the preferences and character of each translator. So maybe, no synthesis is possible. Maybe we can only further our insights into medieval translation, theory and practice, to borrow the phrase from the Cardiff conference, by studying as many cases as possible.

7 Rikhardsdottir, S., *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia*, Cambridge 2012. And yes, this little paragraph is a case study of case studies.

8 Russell, P., *Priuilgium Sancti Telai and Breint Teilo*, in *Studia Celtica* 50 (2016), pp. 41-68.

Here is my hope that the present work will do something towards this furthering of insight.

On the Origin of Sibyls

Strand one: the classics.

The word Sibyl might conjure up different images to different readers: they may have heard about the Sibyls of antiquity or not, and they might think of some kind of mystical, fortune-telling figure, or they might think of the miserable Sibyl of Cumae, living in a jar, described so poignantly by Petronius, who wrote in Nero's time at the end of the first century CE:

Et la Sibylle, donc! À Cumes, je l'ai vu de mes yeux suspendue dans une bouteille, et quand les enfants lui demandaient «Sibylle, qu'est-ce que tu veux?» elle répondait: «je veux mourir».⁹

This is the Sibyl who famously figures more elaborately in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,¹⁰ written in the era of Augustus. Ovid writes about Aeneas' visit to the Sibyl, a legend probably originating in the now lost work of Naevius, a poet and dramatist from the third century BCE, although in Naevius, it is the Cimmerian Sibyl whom the hero visits, not the Cumaean.¹¹ In Ovid, the Sibyl guides Aeneas to the underworld to meet his father's ghost. On the way back from the underworld, Aeneas takes the Sibyl for a goddess, and promises to build a temple for her and honour her with incense. The Sibyl answers by saying she is no goddess and that no such honour should be bestowed on her, and tells the sad story of how Phoebus (Apollo) desired her and said he would grant her any wish. She then took a handful of dust and asked for 'as many years of life as this handful contained in grains of dust'. She

⁹ Petronius, *Satyricon*, XLVIII, in *Pétrone: les Satiricon*, Alfred Ernout (edition and translation), Paris 1950, p. 46.

¹⁰ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, XIV, in *Ovide: Les Métamorphoses tome III (XI-XV)*, Paris 1962, pp. 93-95.

¹¹ Parke, H.W., McGing, B.C. (ed.), *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, London and New York 1988 (hereafter: Parke), p.72.

forgot however to ask for eternal youth, and Apollo would have given this favour to her, too, if she would sleep with him. But she refused, and by the time Aeneas went to visit her, she was already seven hundred years old, and would have to live another three hundred, with all the weight of age on her shoulders, and becoming smaller and smaller, until only her voice would be perceptible to the human senses.

Virgil, an older contemporary of Ovid, was also inspired by Naevius, and writes extensively about Sibyls in Book VI of the *Aeneid*.¹² His Sibyl, too, is the one of Cumae, in her cave, and Virgil also links her to Apollo: he tells she is *magnam cui mentem animumque Delius inspirat vates aperitque futura*, 'to whom the Delian Prophet (a cult name of Apollo) inspires a great mind and spirit, and foretells the future'.¹³

He also mentions a temple of Apollo on the same site that would have been built by Daedalus, adding that Cumae lies opposite Crete (*Cnosia tellus*),¹⁴ on the other side of the sea.

The Virgilian Sibyl is a frightful phenomenon: her voice is amplified by the many tunnels leading to the cave of her *adytum*, or inner shrine, so that, when she speaks in riddles, they are 'wrapping truth in darkness'.¹⁵ She appears as a kind of madwoman in full frenzy, with wild hair, violently raving, when she is possessed by Apollo. The possession by the god also gives her voice a special quality of immortality, as if he lends her his divinity, adding even more drama to the scene.

12 We used this edition: Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*, H.R. Fairclough (edition), G.P. Goold (revision): Cambridge (Massachusetts) and London, 1999 (hereafter: *Virgil*).

13 *Aeneid*, VI, ll. 11-12.

14 *Aeneid* VI, l. 23.

15 *Aeneid* VI, l. 100.

Virgil calls her Deiphobe, and names her priestess of Apollo and Trivia (Hecate).¹⁶ In this story, too, Aeneas is the querent, or seeker of supernatural knowledge – as one would guess, given that this is the *Aeneid* – but this encounter with the Sibyl is quite different from the one Ovid describes. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas goes immediately to see the Sibyl when he lands on the shores of Italy. When she tells him to pray, he first prays to Apollo, promising to build a temple for him and Trivia and organize feast days in the name of Apollo. He then goes on to promise a shrine to the Sibyl too, and to keep her oracles. He addresses her as *sanctissima vates*, ‘most holy prophet’.¹⁷ According to the Loeb Virgil, this ‘shrine’ refers to the secret place where the Sibylline books were stored at this time, under the statue of Apollo.¹⁸ Aeneas also promises to ordain chosen men; this is clearly a reference to the college of priests who read and interpret the oracles when needed.

After this, the Sibyl starts to prophesy. True to the nature of her kind, she predicts disasters: wars and bloodshed, but also safety in the place that would later become Rome. When she has finished raving and raging, Aeneas asks for another favour: to go to the underworld and see his father. Virgil here blends the Cumaean Sibyl with the Avernian one: Aeneas identifies the place of action (Cumae) with the place where the gate to Hades is, and addresses the Cumaean Sibyl as the one who was chosen by Hecate to rule Avernus. Avernus here becomes a synonym for Hades. The Sibyl then guides Aeneas through the underworld: his adventures there form the rest of Book VI of the *Aeneid*. They are less relevant for our purpose here, save for

¹⁶*Aeneid* VI, ll. 35-36.

¹⁷*Aeneid* VI, l. 65.

¹⁸ *Virgil*, p. 537.

telling us about this side of the Sibyl character, the Sibyl who has the power to go to and fro between our world and the other at will, and has the skill to guide Aeneas, the knowledge to explain to him the wonders he sees, and the power to bring him back from the other side – the greatest feat of all.

There is also another Virgilian Sibyl, to which we will return later:¹⁹ this one is found in the Fourth Eclogue, which was much discussed by the early Church Fathers who took an interest in pagan prophecy.

This is the Sibyl of Petronius, Virgil, and Ovid. They all write within a century of one other, and all about the Sibyl of Cumae in Italy. Cumae had been an early Greek colony and it is no coincidence that it was there that the oldest known Italian Sibyl resided: originally, the Sibyls came from the east, from Asia Minor in the west of Turkey. Parke, basing his argument on Pausanias, argues that the village of Marpeesus in the Troad has the best credentials to be the birthplace of Sibylline oracles, and maybe even of a woman named Sibyl, although he does not dare to draw firm conclusion about this:²⁰ there seems to have been a rivalry between Marpeesus and Erythrae about which place had the right to call itself the home of the real original Sibyl.²¹ Potter, however, notes the similarities between Sibylline prophecy and prophetic traditions from Palestine, Mesopotamia and Egypt, and thinks therefore that the genre was borrowed from the East in the Archaic period. He

19 On pp. 22-23.

20 Parke, pp. 51-53.

21 Parke, pp. 25-26.

acknowledges that there is no eastern equivalent of a woman prophesying, but argues that within Greek society, female prophets are not unusual.²²

In terms of dating this earliest Sibyl, Parke writes that, because the early Sibylline material makes use of Homeric material (quoting, again, Pausanias who wrote that the Sibyl prophesied the birth of Helen), it cannot be much older than 600 BCE.²³ Indeed he dates the spread of Sibylline materials among the Greeks to the late sixth century BCE,²⁴ although the first evidence of Sibylline activity on mainland Greece comes from Athens in the early fifth century BCE.²⁵ The earliest reference to the Sibyl comes from Heraclitus (c. 500 BCE), as quoted by Plutarch: “The Sibyl with frenzied lips, uttering words mirthless, unembellished, unperfumed, penetrates through the centuries by the powers of the gods”.²⁶ Parke’s dating is not contested by other authors we read. We will not further discuss the Archaic Greek origins of the Sibyl in the present work, as it has very little bearing on the later medieval reception of the Sibyl, which is our focus, and virtually all scholarship on this subject depends on Parke.

Another strand of legend is found, for example, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who published his first book on Roman history in 7 BCE. Probably born around 60 BCE, and therefore a contemporary, again, of both Ovid and Virgil, he was a Greek, from Halicarnassus on what is now the west coast of Turkey. He left his hometown for

22 Potter, David S., *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1990 (hereafter: Potter), p. 104.

23 Parke, p.55.

24 Parke, p. 100.

25 Parke, p. 101.

26 Translation as given by McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the end: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*, New York 1979 (hereafter: McGinn), p. 19.

Rome in 30 BCE,²⁷ and wrote his *Roman Antiquities* in Greek prose. Not only is this book one of our main sources for the Romulus and Remus myth, but also for the myth about the encounter between the Sibyl and the Roman king Tarquinius Superbus. This story is well-known: the Sibyl, an old woman, appears before king Tarquinius Superbus and offers to sell him nine books of prophecy for an exorbitant sum. The king refuses, upon which the Sibyl burns three of the books. When she comes back to offer the remaining six books for the same price, the king laughs at her, and she burns another three books. In the end, the king buys the remaining three books of prophecy for the same sum as the original nine.²⁸ Not all versions of the legend state specifically that the Sibyl in question was the Cumaean, but because Varro did so (as we shall see later), and because he was as influential as he was, this version is the one that was transmitted into the Middle Ages. These are the fabled Sibylline Oracles, kept in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol.²⁹ Historically, these *Libri Sibyllini* were consulted by a special college of priests – consisting in very early times of two men, later ten, and ultimately fifteen – in times of disasters, or when a miracle happened, and the priests prescribed ritual action to counter the calamity.³⁰ They were destroyed during a fire in 83 BCE, and nothing is left of them. In 76 BC the consul Caius Curio ordered a mission to Erythrae to search for new Sibylline oracles.³¹ It is significant that the Romans saw Erythrae as the home of the Sibyl and the obvious place to find new oracles. The Sibylla Erythraea

27 Denys d’Halicarnasse, *Antiquités Romaines*, Tome 1; Fromentin, V (edition and translation), Paris 1998, p. XII.

28 Parke, pp. 76-77.

29 Mc Ginn writes “whether such an overtly Greek element in Roman religion really goes that far back is disputable” (McGinn, p.19) but offers no further arguments.

30 Parke, p. 137.

31 Parke, p. 138.

will also play an important role in later Christian tradition. The expedition proved less fruitful than the Romans had hoped, so the Senate again sent collectors of oracles, now to other places of Sibylline fame, to find more.³² In 28 BCE, Augustus moved the new Sibylline books to his newly completed temple of Apollo on the Palatine.³³ He then proceeded to have these new Sibylline oracles, along with other prophecies he could lay his hands on, examined and purged of any 'unsuitable' material, which was burned. His successor Tiberius then burned some more.³⁴ And in the end, at the beginning of the fifth century CE, a Christian, the general of the Western Empire, Stilicho, ordered that what remained of the oracles should be destroyed. Virtually no Roman Sibylline verses survive.³⁵ The Pagan Sibylline texts that do survive show, as Momigliano writes, 'that most often they predicted individual events, or advised on how to avoid undesirable events.'³⁶ He cites oracles 'predicting' (*post eventu*, of course) the beginning and end of the Macedonian empire, advising the Roman state to built a first temple for Ceres, several others advising the introduction of new gods into the state cult, the prescription of human sacrifices in 226 BCE, and one prescribing the consultation of Apollo in Delphi.³⁷ These very practical, and to the point Roman oracles are extremely different from the Sibylline texts preserved in Christian form.

32 Parke, pp. 138-39.

33 Parke, p. 141.

34 Parke, p. 142.

35 Parke, p. 211.

36 Momigliano, A, *From the Pagan to the Christian Sibyl: Prophecy as History of Religion* in: Dionisotti, Grafton and Krayer (eds), *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, London 1988 (hereafter: Momigliano), p. 5.

37 Momigliano, p. 5.

Varro, an older Roman contemporary of Ovid and Virgil, wrote about Sibyls in his *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum*. Although the text is lost to us, this account is very important, because Varro's listing of ten different Sibyls would, cited by Lactantius and later by Augustine, become a recurring theme in the medieval traditions around the Sibyl. He was not the first to list ten Sibyls: Nicanor did so before him, although his full list has been lost. In the surviving fragment, he states there were ten Sibyls, and that the first was called Sambethe, and that she was Chaldean, or Hebrew, and the daughter of Noah.³⁸

This is one of the strands of narrative that made up the medieval Sibylline tradition. But in order to fully understand the development of Sibylline lore, we need more than just the classical texts. We need to go to the east, to the Jewish communities of Hellenistic and Roman Alexandria, before we return to the Church Fathers.

Strand two: the Sibyl of the Jews

The *Oracula Sibyllina*, or *Sibylline Oracles*, are a collection of prophecies attributed to a group of Sibyls. They are the fruit of a Jewish reworking of pagan Sibylline oracles, with some Christian interpolations. We must spend some time exploring this Jewish strand of the *Sibylline Tradition*, as Holdenried calls it³⁹ because, although there much uncertainty about how the Sibylline Oracles relate to the *Sibylla Tiburtina*, the traditions are interwoven, and before the Sibyl of the *Oracula* became Christian, she

³⁸ F. Gr. H. (F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin (1923-)), 146.

³⁹ Holdenried, Anke, *The Sibyl and her Scribes – Manuscripts and Interpretation of the Latin Sibylla Tiburtina c. 1050-1500*, Aldershot/Burlington, 2006 (hereafter: *The Sibyl and her Scribes*), pp. xxi-xxii.

was Jewish. The first non-pagan Sibylline Oracles were produced by Hellenistic Jews, probably in Alexandria. Why did they do this? Parke thought that the goal of the operation was outreach to pagans; by impersonating a prophet well-known and well-respected in pagan circles, and implementing the literary conventions proper to the genre of Sibylline prophecy, they would create goodwill for their faith among neighbours and maybe even convince them of the tenets of the Jewish faith.⁴⁰

Lightfoot, however, discussing the *Oracula Sibyllina*, dismisses this view as dated.

Citing the works of M. Goodman and S. McKnight, he says “the advocates of

Hellenistic Jewish ‘mission’ to the Gentiles have had their case rendered

considerably more problematic over the last decade”.⁴¹ And citing M. Hengel, he

proposes that the ‘external audience’ of the Sibylline Oracles may be ‘fictive’, and

that the Oracles were actually written as ‘assertion and self-confirmation’ among

Jews, especially those of the Greek-speaking, intellectual persuasion.⁴² He remarks

as well that, although the genre of the Sibyl is borrowed, none of the famous pagan

Sibyls like the Cumaean or the Erythrean have been used, which according to him

would have been the ‘obvious strategy to reach pagans’⁴³ and implies that the

assumption that this Sibyl was written to convert an external audience is mostly

based on the fact that the later, Christian Sibyl overtly attempts to do so.⁴⁴

Momigliano takes a conciliatory stance: he writes that it is ‘obvious’ that ‘Jews and

Christians who produced Greek hexameters in Sibylline style were seeking to attract

40 Parke, pp. 5-6.

41 J.L. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books*, Oxford 2007 (hereafter: ‘Lightfoot’) p. 45.

42 Lightfoot, p. 46.

43 Lightfoot, p. 47.

44 Lightfoot, p. 50.

pagans', but that they also had a 'potential public of proselytes', people who had an interest in Judaism or Christianity without the necessary need to convert, and a few lines later he concedes that

the outsider is not necessarily the first or even second target. The Jewish and Christian Sibylline oracles are a Jewish and Christian product, for Jewish and Christian consumption in the first instance; though it is ultimately important to know which pagans were attracted, and whether the operation was successful.⁴⁵

Both Parke and Lightfoot explain the choice for the Sibyl as their literary vehicle, instead of, for example, the Pythia or another mystical figure, as being based on the affinity between Sibyls and Old Testament prophets. Where the Pythia gave advice to those who came to seek her, and had therefore quite a specific audience, the Sibyl did not give advice at all. She rather came out of nowhere and dumped her prophecies of doom on society, affirming they were inevitable fate. In that respect, says Parke, she resembles the writers of apocalypses, a Jewish genre.⁴⁶ Lightfoot, too, expands in detail on the similarities between the Sibylline corpus and apocalyptic material.⁴⁷

So what was the subject matter of the Jewish Sibyl? We can retrace her words in the *Oracula Sibyllina*, under the Christian veil. Her work was written in the pagan style, in hexameters, and spoke about typical Sibylline themes like the Trojan War, which the Pagan Sibyl was alleged to have predicted, and various disasters such as floods and earthquakes. Some pagan oracles made it into the *Oracula Sibyllina* in paraphrased form, maybe because the original was too obviously pagan. Other lines

45 Momigliano, p. 6.

46 Parke, p. 7.

47 Lightfoot, pp. 58-59, 70-77.

strongly suggest that were taken over verbatim, like oracles predicting disasters for cities in Greece and Asia Minor. But it is hard to arrive at sound conclusions about the original context and date.⁴⁸

Apart from this rather traditional material, Sibyl preached monotheism and the superiority of the Jewish religion. And the Sibyl, or rather the concept of the Sibyl, underwent substantial change during her conversion to Judaism. From a local wise-woman who gave advice on local matters, the Jewish Sibyl became, in Lightfoot's words, 'a grander, more transcendent figure, than anything imagined by a pagan; one who increasingly floats free of space and context'⁴⁹. And indeed, the scope of this Sibyl's vision is grand. Perhaps the best synopsis of the *Oracula* is in Potter's work on the 'Thirteenth Sibylline Oracle'.⁵⁰ The extant *Oracula*, however, are a later revision, and heavily influenced by Christianity. Potter, writing about the Third Oracle, remarks that there are older layers discernable in the extant collection: some Ptolemaic material, pagan material, and indeed Jewish material since this is the Oracle that identifies the Sibyl as the daughter of Noah:

the preservation of such diverse material serves to indicate that texts with overtly Jewish intent are still acceptable to Christians on the grounds that they provided Old Testament material which dated the Sibyl to deepest antiquity, and thus illustrated the truth of Christian doctrine.⁵¹

We will now move on to the Sibyl of the Christians who, as Momigliano says so succinctly, were taught by the Jews to forge Sibylline oracles.⁵²

48 Parke, pp. 4-5.

49 Lightfoot, p. 6.

50 Potter, pp. 95-102.

51 Potter, p. 97.

52 Momigliano, p. 11.

Strand three: the Christian Sibyl.

The Christian Sibyl is the one that has been preserved for posterity: it is in their ultimate, Christian form that the *Oracula Sibyllina* have come down to us. We should not speak of this Sibyl in the singular. The list of ten Sibyls created by Varro in the first century BCE became canonical through its citation by Lactantius;⁵³ two more Sibyls were added to the list in the Middle Ages to arrive at a final count of twelve, mirroring the twelve apostles.⁵⁴ In this chapter, we shall not focus on the redaction and transmission of the final collection of the *Oracula Sibyllina* since many other authors treat the subject in detail. We shall look, instead, at the way the Christian Sibyl(s) were transmitted into the Middle Ages, before turning our attention to the Tiburtine Sibyl proper.

Lactantius.

The work of Lactantius is key in mapping the reception of the Sibyl in the Middle Ages. He was one of the earliest Church Fathers, converted to Christianity around the year 300.⁵⁵ He understood that the intellectuals of his time were repelled by Christianity because of the 'simplicity' of its writings,⁵⁶ and, one may add, the bad Greek of the gospels. Lactantius wanted to win over pagan intellectuals by adopting their style: his *Divine Institutes* are an apologetic work written in the Latin of Cicero, often quoting Cicero too, as well as other pagan authorities. He tried to fight

53 Parke, p. 30; Potter, p. 95.

54 Parke, p. 1.

55 Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes, book I-VII*, Sister Mary Francis MacDonald, O.P. (translation), Washington D.C. 1964 (hereafter: Lactantius) p. XIII.

56 Lactantius, p. X.

paganism with its own weapons: rhetoric, reason, and an appeal to the most respected authors – and by doing so he wrote a compendium of Christian teaching.⁵⁷

In these *Divine Institutes* he makes ample use of Sibylline lore as pagan ‘proof’ for the truth of Christianity, and preserves it thus for posterity: Varro’s work would be lost if it were not cited by Lactantius. The context in which Lactantius writes about Sibyls is interesting: in the first instance, in Book I, chapter 6, he mentions the Sibyl immediately after a paragraph about Hermes Trismegistus, who was identified with the Egyptian Thoth, and to whom a corpus of metaphysical lore was ascribed. In this corpus, Lactantius tells us, Hermes teaches about a single godhead who does not need a name.⁵⁸ And after this touch on Hermetic theosophy, Lactantius proceeds to call on the testimonies of ‘the oracles and the sacred verses’ and introduces Varro. He paraphrases Varro at great length, telling us that the Sibylline books are not the work of one woman, but that there were multiple Sibyls, and cites a fanciful etymology for the word *Sibylle*. After that follows the famous enumeration, called the ‘Sibylline Canon’ by Potter,⁵⁹ of ten Sibyls which will echo through the whole Middle Ages.⁶⁰ The list has been printed and commented on by Parke.⁶¹ Here we will draw attention to the *tenth* Sibyl, as she is the object of the present study: the Tiburtine Sibyl, called Albunea, who was ‘reverenced at Tibur as a Goddess, near the

57 Lactantius, p. XIV.

58 Lactantius, pp. 31-32.

59 Potter, p. 95.

60 Lactantius, pp. 33-34.

61 Parke, pp. 30-35.

banks of the river Anienis, in whose depths her image is said to have been found, holding a book in her hand.'⁶²

Lactantius continues by saying that all the Sibyls proclaim one God, but the Erythraean Sibyl even more so than the others, and cites verses, attributed to her, that proclaim monotheism.⁶³ A humorous note can be found (for the modern reader) in Book II, chapter 16:

Through demons have been discovered astrology, divination, the practice of augury, and those very practices which are called oracle-giving, necromancy, magic, and whatever other evils that men practice either openly or secretly. All these are false of themselves as the Erythraean Sibyl testifies: 'Because all these things are deceiving, just as foolish men are finding out this day'.⁶⁴

Throughout his book, Lactantius cites the Sibyl in order to defend Christianity in a way acceptable to the pagans, alongside other authorities, be they spiritual like Hermes or Orpheus, or philosophical like Plato and Cicero. Another favourite is Virgil: he is cited throughout the work, from the *Aeneid*, the *Georgics* and the *Fourth Eclogue*. The *Eclogue* is especially important because by using this work, Lactantius turns Virgil into a witness of the Last Judgment. It is cited in book 7, chapter 24, where Lactantius cites various Sibyls, painting an idyllic picture of life immediately after the Last Judgment and Second Coming. The present author is especially charmed by the vision of brightly coloured sheep, that will make the dying of cloth no longer necessary,⁶⁵ a vision taken straight from the *Fourth Eclogue*. This mysterious text, presented as a prophecy of the Cumaean Sibyl, describes a golden age to come which is remarkably similar to that found in Jewish and Christian

62 Lactantius, p. 34.

63 Lactantius, p. 34.

64 Lactantius, pp. 155-56.

65 The present author is a knitter.

oracles, and Lactantius quotes it at length, amidst other Sibylline verses. For this reason, Virgil and the Sibyl were intimately linked in medieval traditions about the 'pagan prophets of Christ'.⁶⁶

Augustine

A century after Lactantius, Augustine wrote about the Sibyl, too. He writes quite extensively about the Erythraean Sibyl in the *City of God*, book 18, chapter 23. Here, as in many other places, Augustine quotes Varro, whom he must have read with great interest. We will first discuss Augustine's 'Sibylline Gospel', and then his introduction to the Sibylla Erythraea: for reasons of clarity the discussion takes his writings in reverse order.

Therefore, we start with the second half of the chapter, where Augustine combines, as he writes, Sibylline prophecies about Christ in Lactantius' work: "But I have thought fit to combine in a single extract, which may seem long, what he has set down in many short quotations".⁶⁷ Augustine mentions that Lactantius does not say which Sibyl is quoted here, but Anke Holdenried tells us it is a quotation from the *Oracula Sibyllina*.⁶⁸ The text as assembled here by Augustine will later become known as the 'Sibylline Gospel', and the first part will be incorporated verbatim in the *Tiburtina*.

⁶⁶ Massip, Fransesc, *La Sibila como personaje dramático: Textos y contextos escénicos*, in *Viator* 42 (2011), pp. 239-264, p. 239.

⁶⁷ Augustine, *the City of God*, book 18 chapter 23, translation <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120118.htm> (last visited 24/09/2018).

⁶⁸ *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 62.

Dabunt autem alapas Deo manibus incestis et in vultu sacro expuent venenata sputa. Dabit vero ad verbera simpliciter dorsum sanctum et colaphos accipiens tacebit. Ad cibum autem fel et ad sitim acetum dabunt.

We treat it in our Comparison, part 26.

Before this important fragment, Augustine concentrates on another seminal Sibylline text: the so-called prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl, of which he knew from a manuscript that was shown to him by a man called Flaccianus. This Greek manuscript purportedly contained an acrostic about the Signs of Judgment, the first letters of each line spelling *Iesous Christos Theou Uios Soter*, 'Jesus Christ, the son of God, the Saviour'. Augustine does not give the original Greek verses – they can be found in the *Sibylline Oracles*, book 8, lines 217-50⁶⁹ – but he does give a Latin translation, which will reverberate through the Middle Ages; as part of the works of Saint Augustine, of course, but also as a part of the liturgy of Christmas Eve.

Fransesc Massip has written extensively about the Sibyl in liturgical plays - dramatic performances about Biblical figures or pertaining to the lives of saints, in- or outside the church building - especially within the Catalan language area.⁷⁰ He writes that the original ceremony on Christmas Eve was called the *Ordo Prophetarum*, or Procession of the Prophets. This ceremony was a performance of the prophets of the Old Testament prophesying the birth of Christ, and of pagan 'prophets' announcing the same event. It did not only feature the Sibyl, but also Virgil, and 'Nabucodonosor', better known to us as Nebuchadnezzar. The ceremony was based on the sermon *Contra Iudaeos, Paganos et Arianos Sermo de Symbolo*, attributed to

69 McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*, New York 1998, p. 21.

70 We paraphrase here from Massip, *La Sibila como personaje dramático*.

Augustine but probably written by his disciple Quotvultdeus, according to Massip; Holdenried has no doubt at all that the sermon was Quotvultdeus' work.⁷¹ In this ceremony, the Sibyl would 'testify' with the words of Augustine's Erythraean Sibyl, better known as the *Iudicii Signum*, or the Song of the Sibyl.

The text was put to music, and in this form, the Song of the Sibyl would come to be sung from the eighth century onwards as part of the liturgy of Christmas night.⁷²

Although the Council of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century put an official end to this practice, the *Canto de la Sibila* is, though no longer part of the *Ordo Prophetarum*, still sung to a medieval Gregorian melody in Majorca,⁷³ and, as Jorge Guillermo writes, allegedly in Sardinia.⁷⁴ And although a full review of the textual transmission of the *Erythraea* is beyond the scope of the present work, we should, in the context of the Brythonic languages, draw attention to the existence of a Middle Breton version of the text, edited by Herve le Bihan.⁷⁵ Although the surviving text is from 1650, Le Bihan dates it a century earlier, about 1550. This is a late vernacular version of the *Sibylla Erythraea*, translated into Breton verse complete with the internal rhymes that are obligatory in the Middle Breton style. Interestingly, the surviving text comes from Tanguy Guegen's *Novelou ancien ha devot*, which is a compendium of Christmas carols. So even at this late date and in a remote part of Europe, the Song of the Sibyl is still associated with Christmas.

71 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 62.

72 Guillermo, Jorge, *Sibyls: Prophecy and Power in the Ancient World*, New York/London 2013, p. 100.

73 Massip, *La Sibila como personaje dramático*, p. 239.

74 Guillermo, Jorge, *Sibyls*, p. 101; There are recordings available of the Song of the Sibyl, most notably by Jordi Savall: *EL CANT DE LA SIBIL·LA*, Alia Vox 1988.

75 Le Bihan, Herve, *An Dialog etre Arzur Roe d'an Bretounet ha Guynglaff*, Rennes 2013, pp. 162-65.

In conclusion we may say that Augustine's chapter on the Sibyl may be short, but it is nevertheless of paramount importance for the medieval reception of the Sibyl.

The *Tiburtina* and the Tradition

We will now discuss the Tiburtine Sibyl, or *Tiburtina*. This text was edited by Ernest Sackur in 1898; no newer edition is available.⁷⁶ Like all Sibyls, she is named after her place of origin; in this case Tibur, modern Tivoli, near Rome. She is the subject of the text studied in this work. The story of the Tiburtine Sibyl is briefly as follows: one night, a hundred judges or senators (this depends on the version) all have the same dream. They dream of nine suns that appear one after the other, carrying different symbols. The suns go from light and bright to dark, bloody and frightening. The judges/senators bring this dream to the emperor of Rome who decides to invite the Tiburtine Sibyl to explain the dream. The Sibyl comes and explains the dream: the nine suns are nine generations, and they will go from good to ever darker and more bloody, with an interruption in this steady decline in the time of Christ.

This is the basic text. Other elements have been added to it through the ages:

The (in)famous *Kings' List*: this is the long prophecy of future kings directly following the prophecy of the ninth sun. A few kings are called by their names, others only by their initials. This part of the prophecy has been heavily edited by many different scribes, all wishing to 'update' the list to add their own rulers, and either praise them, as is done with Charlemagne (37 in our *comparison*) or else to record a less favourable opinion, as happens with Otto III (42).

⁷⁶ Sackur, E., *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen : Pseudomethodius Adso und Die tiburtinische sibylle*, Halle 1898.

The Last *Emperor* motif is ultimately based on an apocryphal text called the *revelation of Pseudo-Methodius*. This text, originally written in Syriac but known through its Greek and Latin translations/adaptations, originates from the time of the Arab invasions in Mesopotamia, around the year 700. It predicts the Last Roman Emperor, the 'king of the Greeks' who will defeat the Arabs and there will be much rejoicing, until the Antichrist comes. Then, the Last Emperor will go to Golgotha, lay his diadem on the Cross and give over his rule to Christ.⁷⁷ Paul Alexander wrote, in an appendix to his article on the legend, that the Latin *Tiburtina* contains an older reference to the Last Emperor. He also signals that there are 'significant differences' between Pseudo-Methodius and the Sibyl: in the first, Gog and Magog are killed by an archangel, in the second by the Last Emperor himself. Also, in the first the Arabs are the ultimate enemy that is defeated, in the second Pagans and Jews are converted to Christianity.⁷⁸ But this kind of adaptation makes sense in a prophetic tradition where texts are adapted to their new circumstances in transmission. The transfer of the Gog and Magog motif from the archangel to the Last Emperor is a very minor adaptation, and the change from Arabs to Pagans and Jews made the text more relevant in the Latin West, that was not (yet) dealing with Arabs when the motif was added to the *Tiburtina*, as the text was translated into Latin before the First Crusade. The essentials are too similar for the texts to be of independent origin. And although this is the same scholar who earlier published his book on the *Oracle of Baalbek*, and although he concedes that the Greek Sibyl does not feature the Last Emperor motif,

77 Alexander, Paul J., *The Medieval Legend of the Last Emperor and its Messianic Origin*, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol 41 (1978) pp. 1-15, pp.1-3.

78 Idem, pp. 14-15.

he takes it for granted that, because later versions of the *Tiburtina* feature the Last Emperor motif, earlier Latin versions should do so as well. But there are no extant Latin texts from before the year 1000, and therefore no proof of an early inclusion of this legend into the Latin *Tiburtina*.⁷⁹

Also interpolated were the prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl as recorded by Augustine, and his 'Sibylline Gospel', as we discuss elsewhere, and lastly, there is an introduction instructing the reader about sibyls in general, and listing Varro's canonical ten Sibyls.

The original, bare text, written in Greek, is supposed to come from the fourth century.⁸⁰ we will also discuss the extant Greek versions as researched by Paul Alexander in his important groundbreaking work on this text, *The Oracle of Baalbek*.

In this chapter, we will not only discuss the *Tiburtina*, but also attempt to place the text and the figure of the Tiburtine Sibyl in the context of the Sibylline Tradition, that is the body of Christian texts and lore about Sibyls that was available to the medieval public, as outlined in the preceding chapter. Anke Holdenried remarks that before her, no scholars had considered the interaction between the *Tiburtina* and the

79 Bernard McGinn takes it for granted that the Last Emperor motif in the *Tiburtina* originates in *Pseudo-Methodius*, and even uses *Pseudo-Methodius* as a *terminus post quem* for the Latin Sibyl – assuming that the first Latin version already incorporated this motive. McGinn, *Oracular Transformations: The "Sibylla Tiburtina" in the Middle Ages*, in *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari: mito, storia, tradizione : atti del convegno*, Macerata-Norcia, 1994, pp 603-44, p. 613. (note continues on next page) See also Boura, Christopher, *When Did the Legend of the Last Emperor Originate? A New Look at the Textual Relationship between the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius and the Tiburtine Sibyl*, in *Viator* 47, pp. 47-100. Boura discusses the controversy of the origin of the Last Emperor myth and argues that it does in deed originate in *Pseudo-Methodius*, and not in a lost fourth-century version of the *Tiburtina*. Like the present author, he is of the opinion that the Last Emperor myth is a later insertion into the *Tiburtina* tradition.

80 McGinn, *Visions of the End*, p.40.

Tradition,⁸¹ and in her work *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, she argues that the *Tiburtina* cannot be interpreted correctly if divorced from its context in this Tradition. We will quote extensively from this work, as it is the only modern monograph on the subject of the *Tiburtina*. We will also take Holdenried's argument one step further, and explain why, in our opinion, the distinction between the *Tiburtina* and the Tradition is artificial: the *Tiburtina* is *part* of the Tradition, because it was read and interacted with in that context.

This distinction between *Tiburtina* and Tradition has been brought into being by scholars who treated the *Tiburtina* as a political text only, while genuinely prophetic or religious interpretations were ignored.⁸² Holdenried writes that the *Tiburtina* is most widely known for its 'regnal list' of Lombard and German rulers, including a prophecy of a battle between the Antichrist and the Last Emperor,

because medieval copyists interpolated accounts of contemporary events and rules (identified by their initials only) into this part of the ancient prophecy. It has been thought that fears about the End arising out of the experience of political crisis (especially in the twelfth century) prompted the *Tiburtina*'s use as a propaganda tool to promote – or diminish– the role of individual German kings and emperors in the history of mankind's salvation from evil.⁸³

For these scholars, writes Holdenried, the *Tiburtina*'s Christological material only served to enhance the credibility of the Last Emperor motif,⁸⁴ and that the *Tiburtina* is 'currently' regarded as 'a piece of political propaganda dressed up as a prophecy,⁸⁵ and that it is to this that the text owed its popularity.⁸⁶ But this vision of

81 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. xxii.

82 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. xviii.

83 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. xxii.

84 *Idem*.

85 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 3.

86 *The Sibyl and her scribes*, p.15.

the *Tiburtina* is very much a result of a scholarly tradition surrounding the text that is rooted in nineteenth-century German nationalism,⁸⁷ and even more the editorial choices Sackur made in his nineteenth-century edition of the text: his focus on the regnal list 'at the expense of other textual variations'⁸⁸ has very much coloured the way later scholars approached and interpreted the text. Because Sackur failed to report these other textual variations, scholars were unable to see that the medieval interest in the *Tiburtina* was not at all confined to an interest in the Last Emperor motif. In order to study the *Tiburtina's* textual development, Holdenried had to go back to studying the manuscripts for herself.⁸⁹ She found out that there are over sixty post-twelfth century manuscripts that do not interpolate the regnal list at all. This means that for the makers and readers of these manuscripts, the interest of the text lay elsewhere,⁹⁰ even though political use of Sibylline tropes is attested for this period.⁹¹

Holdenried examined 98 out of the 112 known *Tiburtina* manuscripts for textual variances, marginalia, tituli and rubrics, to get an idea about what passages were deemed important by the medieval public. It was not possible for her to see the remaining manuscripts, but she still used catalogue information about them.⁹² She contends, based on her research, that, although political interpretations of the *Tiburtina* did exist, the Christological material was far more important than the Last Emperor motif, because it enabled medieval readers to use the text in their

87 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 31.

88 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 18.

89 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 20.

90 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p.20.

91 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p.21.

92 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p.32.

devotional life: they would meditate on the Passion of Christ, or their personal salvation on Judgment Day, two themes covered in the *Tiburtina*.⁹³ The text is therefore most often paired in manuscripts with other texts dealing with religion.⁹⁴ Also, great interest in the Passion is shown both by marginalia and reworkings of this part of the text.⁹⁵

This does not mean that this text was only read for these reasons in the Middle Ages: *Tiburtina* texts have been found in compilations of other genres, too. There are *Tiburtina* texts incorporated in manuscripts dealing with history: not just the history of German kings, as one might expect based on earlier scholarship, but most often material about mythical heroes from Rome and Greece, mostly Dares Phrygius' account of the fall of Troy and texts concerning Alexander the Great, as well as geography and legendary events.⁹⁶ One sees easily how the *Tiburtina*, as a story from antiquity featuring the Roman Emperor and Senate, would fit into such company.

Holdenried herself writes that the *Tiburtina* often 'cross-fertilized'⁹⁷ with the Sibylline Tradition, and that medieval audiences read the *Tiburtina* against the background of other Sibylline material, such as Augustine and Isidore's works.⁹⁸ She also acknowledges that the *Tiburtina*, in its final form, contains passages that come straight out of the works of these authors in the Prologue, the Sibylline Gospel and the Acrostic attributed to the Erythaeon Sibyl.⁹⁹ She writes that it has never occurred

93 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 167.

94 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 78-80.

95 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 167.

96 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, pp. 72-73.

97 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p.53.

98 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, pp. 59-60.

99 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 60-62.

to earlier scholars to look into how the Sibylline Tradition was applied by medieval readers of the *Tiburtina* while interpreting the latter.¹⁰⁰ This is very curious indeed, given that the parallels and overlaps are obvious. Holdenried again blames this glaring omission on the preoccupation earlier scholars had with the Last Emperor motif.¹⁰¹

Let us now turn to an early Greek version of the *Tiburtina* (although she was not yet called by that name¹⁰²), without the additions mentioned above: the so-called *Oracle of Baalbek*.¹⁰³ This version edited by Paul J. Alexander is a Greek version existing in three manuscripts: one from the twelfth, one from the fourteenth, and one from the fifteenth or sixteenth century.¹⁰⁴ This Greek text is not the only oriental version: there are versions of the *Tiburtina* in Karshunic, Ethiopic and Arabic,¹⁰⁵ too, although sadly we have no access to these texts.

Alexander writes that the manuscripts of this Greek *Tiburtina* come from a common archetype, written before the ninth century, and probably in the fifth or sixth century.¹⁰⁶ Based on the chronology of certain *vaticinia*, he is even able to date the text as precisely as having been written between 502 and 506.¹⁰⁷ This version starts with Sibyl's entrance into Rome, and the senators of the Latin versions are here judges. There are still a hundred of them, and they still all dream the dream of the

100 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 64.

101 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 64.

102 McGinn, "*Oracular Transformations*", p. 611: McGinn thinks the *Tiburtina* was given her name by the Latin translators/adapters, after the last Sibyl in the Varronian list.

103 Alexander, Paul J., *The Oracle of Baalbek : the Tiburtine Sibyl in a Greek Dress*, Washington 1967.

104 *The Oracle of Baalbek*, p. 6. The manuscripts are *cod. Athos 1527 (Karakallou 14)*, *cod. Vat. Gr. 1120*, and *cod. Atheniensis Bibl. Nat. 2725*.

105 *Oracular Transformations*, p. 611, n. 21.

106 *The Oracle of Baalbek*, pp. 6-7.

107 *The Oracle of Baalbek*, p. 42.

nine suns. Sibyl explains the dream, and apart from some minor details, this part is the same as in Sackur's Latin version, and our own Welsh texts. Some of the differences are local references, to the area of Heliopolis-Baalbek in Lebanon, which serves as proof that this particular version originates from that area.¹⁰⁸ The Greek *Tiburtina* also names many (eastern) rulers in her relation of the nine generations, which the western texts do not do. The text ends with a poignant prophecy about the destruction of civilization and land in the east, diabolical rulers, and the near destruction of mankind. This part differs quite substantially from the western versions, but it is followed by the return of Enoch and Elijah, who come to save the day, and finally by the coming of Christ, who will rule with the angels.

Alexander makes the argument for a lost fourth-century version of the *Tiburtina*, which is the ancestor of both the Latin and Greek texts. He founds this theory on a prophecy in the Greek version, that the city of Byzantium will rule for three times sixty years. This same prophecy occurs in several Latin *Tiburtinas*, but there, Byzantium is granted only sixty years. This, writes Alexander, must be the older version, and it must have been written between 324 or 330 (the alternative dates of the foundation of the city) and 384 or 390 (sixty years later). Therefore, there must have been a fourth-century *Tiburtina*.¹⁰⁹

We do not know whether the original *Tiburtina* was written in Latin or Greek, although Alexander is in favour of a Greek original based on linguistic grounds: the Greek text contains no Latinisms, but there are residues of Graecisms in the Latin

¹⁰⁸ *The Oracle of Baalbek*, pp. 42-47.

¹⁰⁹ *The Oracle of Baalbek*, pp. 53-55.

texts.¹¹⁰ We must, however, apply Holdenried's criticism to Alexander's work: he bases his analysis of the Latin *Tiburtina* solely on Sackur's research, written over a century earlier, and his dating of the Latin texts seems to depend in its entirety on the regnal list. Nevertheless, his linguistic argument for a Greek original holds good. Holdenried, in *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, takes a Greek original for granted.¹¹¹ Her dating of the Latin translation in this work is 'uncertain', but 'at the latest, by the reign of Emperor Otto III (996-1002)'.¹¹² Alexander makes the case for a much earlier Latin version, written between the death of Emperor Valens and before the apostasy of Emperor Julian. He bases this on a reference to Valens' death in both the Latin and Greek versions, and an absence of Julian's apostasy in both.¹¹³ McGinn however remarks that the absence of any evidence of such an early Latin version casts serious doubts on its existence, and that a date between 600 and 1100 is much more likely, because in that period 'the connections between eastern and western apocalypticism were especially alive'.¹¹⁴ He also posits that the Last Emperor motive was present in the (lost) Greek version that was translated into Latin somewhere in this timeframe in Italy,¹¹⁵ which we find unlikely, as explained above.

Be all this as it may, until recently it was academic orthodoxy to assume that the *Tiburtina* was based on a fourth-century Greek text that was translated into Latin somewhere around the year 1000. Then Holdenried published an article which can

110 *The Oracle of Baalbek*, p.60.

111 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p.xvii.

112 *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. xvii.

113 *The Oracle of Baalbek*, pp. 63-64.

114 *Oracular Transformations*, p. 613.

115 *Oracular Transformations*, p. 613.

only be described as a ‘bombshell’. In this article,¹¹⁶ she draws attention to the capture of Bari and Taranto (46 in our text) which has been identified by Möhring with the capture of Bari by Arabs in 840. But Möhring, writes Holdenried, never considered that this passage could really have been added to the *Tiburtina* in 840. She, however, using the principle of *vaticinium ex eventu* (the principle that ‘prophesied’ events are added to the text by contemporaries or near-contemporaries of these events) suggests this might actually be the case.¹¹⁷ Then she draws attention to the passage about a king A and the capture of Pentapolis (44 in our comparison). She identifies this Pentapolis with a Byzantine town on the Italian coast, that was briefly captured by the Lombard king Aistulf in the 750s. Following *vaticinium ex eventu*, this must be an eighth-century entry. This passage *follows* the description of the Ottonian rulers, meaning that the Kings List is not chronologically correct. Holdenried explains this by a process she calls ‘sedimentation’: in her theory, the text was gradually altered and interpolated over time, filling it up with newer events, by different authors who were not all concerned with, or conscious of, the chronological order of the text.¹¹⁸ Holdenried conjures up the vision of a Latin *Tiburtina* that already existed in the eighth century at the latest, and was subsequently interpolated by various scribes with equally various point of view. This explains for example the very different appraisals of the Ottonian rulers in this text, reaching from admiration to harsh criticism. Indeed, in Holdenried’s view, even

116 Holdenried, A., *Many Hands Without Design: the Evolution of Medieval Prophetic Text*, in *The Medieval Journal*, vol. 4 (2014), pp. 23-42. I thank Dr. Holdenried for her kindness in sending me this article.

117 *Many Hands Without Design*, p. 29.

118 *Many Hands Without Design*, pp. 31-32.

the Ottonian passage, formerly seen as a *terminus ante quem*, is an interpolation.¹¹⁹ She imagines one single manuscript of the Latin *Tiburtina*, lying around somewhere in a Greek monastery in Rome — a Greek monastery would explain the presence of a text with Greek roots, and Rome, because there were many Greek monasteries there, as well as an interest in imperial matters, Lombard rulers, and a local strong dislike of Otto III.¹²⁰ This one copy was interpolated from time to time, throughout the centuries, by different scribes, probably in the form of marginal notes. Then, in the eleventh century, this text somehow got out into the wider world, maybe because of one copyist who decided to copy out the new text, with all these accumulated marginal notes as part of the main text. This new text forms the root of the Latin *Tiburtina*.¹²¹

It is an interesting picture that Holdenried paints, and one that is a mix of sound arguments and a creative imagination. Her theory about a Greek monastery in Rome cannot be proven right or wrong, because there simply is no evidence. However, the idea of a single copy being added to through time before a more or less final version goes out into the world seems to us at least more likely than the current orthodox opinion that somewhere in the eleventh century, a single author added all the passages about all these different rulers in one go. It is of course possible that a single editor would have access to the historical material needed for such a task, and it is even possible that his sources were conflicting, as we see reflected in the *Tiburtina*. But for an eleventh-century editor, the events chosen to figure in the text

119 *Many Hands Without design*, p. 36.

120 *Many Hands Without Design*, pp. 37-39.

121 *Many Hands Without Design*, pp. 39-40.

would seem a bit random. Why would an eleventh-century Salian be interested in the capture of Bari, centuries ago and far away, or the short-lived capture of Pentapolis by Aistulf? It seems to us that it is far more probable that these events were added to the text when they were of immediate importance, 'current events', so to speak. Therefore, the idea of a single copy that was added to as history went by is a revolution in the historiography of the *Tiburtina*, and pushes the *terminus ante quem* of the text back by two centuries at least. However, we must issue a caveat: the problem with medieval history in general, and the *Tiburtina* in particular, is that the newest research and the newest 'proven' truths in the field are only truths until the next discovery, the next paradigm shift. How exactly the *Tiburtina* came to Latin Europe, and how the transmission process went cannot be said with certainty. The state of the art on the subject is only our current last step on the path towards understanding.

And let that be our last word on the origins of the *Tiburtina* – it is time to turn our attention to how this text fits into the so-called Sibylline Tradition.

Let us start by defining what the Sibylline Tradition is. Anke Holdenried defines it simply as 'all the other sources of information [about Sibyls] which were available in the Middle Ages'.¹²² In the preceding chapter, we have named a few of these sources: there were the classics, especially Ovid, who was widely read from the twelfth century onwards, and the patristic works by Lactantius, Isidore and Augustine, as well as the *Sibylla Erythraea* based on Augustine's work. We have seen that the *Erythraea*, in medieval traditions, had a life of its own and became part of the

¹²² *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. xviii.

Ordo Prophetarum, a play that was part of the liturgy of Christmas Eve in the early Middle Ages. Although the play died out, the Song of the Sibyl stayed a part of the liturgy up to our days in a few places in southwestern Europe, and an association between the *Erythraea* and Christmas has been attested as late as the seventeenth century in Brittany, far from the area where the *Song of the Sibyl* has survived the longest.

The Sibyl also occurs in the *Legenda Aurea*, or *Golden Legend*. The importance of this book, written by Jacobus de Voragine around 1260, cannot be overestimated. About a staggering 900 manuscripts have been attested, and between 1470 and 1530 it was the most-printed book in Europe.¹²³ It was the first book that priests would turn to when searching material for their homilies. If something is attested in this book, it was part of mainstream medieval culture. The entries about the Sibyl are especially significant, because she is mentioned twice in the chapter about Christmas. This is the first entry:

Now regarding transparent pervious or corporeal beings: in the night of the Lord's birth the darkness of night was turned into the brightness of day. In Rome it also happened (as attested by Orosius and Pope Innocent III) that a fountain of water turned to oil and burst into the Tiber, spreading very quickly all that day; and the Sibyl had foretold that when a fountain of oil sprang up, a savior would be born.¹²⁴

The second passage, which follows the first one immediately, is rather longer:

Then there are luminous corporeal creatures, such as the supercelestial: these too revealed the Nativity. For on that very day, according to what the ancients relate and Chrysostom affirms, the Magi were praying on a mountaintop and a star appeared above them. This star had the shape of a most beautiful boy

¹²³ <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/basis/goldenlegend/>, last visited 30/10/2018.

¹²⁴ De Voragine, J, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, translated by William Granger Ryan and introduction by Eamon Duffy, Princeton and Oxford, 1993, p. 40.

over whose head a cross shone brilliantly. He spoke to the Magi and told them to make their way to Judea, where they would find a newborn child. That same day three suns appeared in the East and gradually melded into one solar body. This signified that the knowledge of the one and triune God was about to be given to the world, or that he in whom soul, flesh and divinity were united had now been born. In the *Scholastic History*, however, it is said that the three suns appeared not on the day of the Nativity but some time earlier: Eusebius in his chronicle puts it after the death of Julius Caesar. The emperor Octavian (as Pope Innocent says) had brought the world under Roman rule, and the Senate was so well pleased that they wished to worship him as a god. The prudent emperor, however, knowing full well that he was mortal, refused to usurp the title of immortality. The senators insisted that he summon the sibylline prophetess and find out, through her oracles, whether someone greater than he was to be born in the world. When, therefore, on the day of Christ's birth, the council was convoked to study this matter and the Sibyl, alone in a room with the emperor, consulted her oracles, at midday a golden circle appeared around the sun, and in the middle of the circle a most beautiful virgin holding a child in her lap. The Sibyl showed this to Caesar, and while the emperor marveled at the vision, he heard a voice saying to him: "This is the altar of Heaven." The Sibyl then told him: "This child is greater than you, and it is he that you must worship." That same room was dedicated to the honor of Holy Mary and to this day is called Santa Maria Ara Coeli.

The emperor, understanding that the child he has seen was greater than he, offered incense to him and refused to be called God. With reference to this, Orosius says: "In Octavian's day, about the third hour, in the limpid, pure, serene sky, a circle that looked like a rainbow surrounded the orb of the sun, as if to show that the One was to come who alone had made the sun and the whole world and ruled it". So far Orosius.¹²⁵

So far Orosius indeed. This is the *Ara Coeli* legend, on which there is surprisingly little modern scholarship. The parallels with the *Tiburtina* are immediately apparent:¹²⁶ a vision of multiple suns in the sky, Rome as its location, and the summoning of a Sibyl, presumably the Tiburtine, who explains the vision by prophesying the coming of Christ.

125 *The Golden Legend*, pp. 40-41.

126 Although apparently not to everybody: Holdenried refers to Shields (*Le Livre de Sibylle by Philippe de Thaon*, London 1979, pp.7-8) who 'cautiously speculates on cross-fertilization between the *Ara Coeli* legend and the *Sibylla Tiburtina*'. *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, p. 66.

Like the *Erythraea's Song of the Sibyl*, the *Ara Coeli* legend was made into a liturgical play for Christmas Eve. Massip cites two instances of liturgical plays involving this legend, one in Barcelona, one in Valencia. He calls the Sibyl starring in these plays, without hesitation, '*Tiburtina*'.¹²⁷ From the end of the fifteenth century he cites a play in which the *Tiburtina* and *Erythraea* have become fused into one person: this Sibyl, when enjoined to pray to the pagan gods with the emperor, refuses, and then prophesies the birth of Christ, as in the *Tiburtina*, before singing the *Judicii Signum*, attributed to the *Erythraea*.¹²⁸ Let us remember that in the medieval *Tiburtina* text itself, the *Judicii Signum* is also supplemented at the end of the prophecy. So we have different instances in which the prophecies of the Erythraean and Tiburtine Sibyls are merged.

Holdenried writes that 'the *Tiburtina* contains passages which can be found verbatim in key texts from the Sibylline Tradition'.¹²⁹ True, and the Tradition contains passages, or rather tropes, that come from the *Tiburtina*. The Tradition treats the *Tiburtina* story just like other Sibylline material: it can be enriched, changed, fused with other Sibylline tropes. There are the liturgical plays, and the *Ara Coeli* legend, which are directly based on a Sibyl in Rome who predicted the coming of Christ to the Emperor. In the later forms of the *Ara Coeli* play, the *Tiburtina* and the prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl are merged, as they are in Sackur's Sibyl.

The *Tiburtina* and the Tradition influenced each other, were in a cultural dialogue with each other, and were seen by the medieval public as part of one big web of both

127 Massip, *La Sibila como personaje dramático*, p. 245.

128 Massip, *La Sibila como personaje dramático*, pp. 245-246.

129 *The Sibyl and Her Scribes*, p. 60.

scholarship and popular lore about the Sibyls, the pagan prophetesses who predicted the first and second Coming of Christ. Holdenried correctly pointed out that the bias of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship accorded far too much importance to the Kings List and the Last Emperor myth as political devices and imperial propaganda. The Kings List was interpolated, certainly, and made 'up to date' by scribes. The *Tiburtina* has been used for political ends, as virtually every prophetic tradition from antiquity. But for the larger public, these political interpretations were simply not valid. There are many copies of the *Tiburtina* without any emendation of the Kings List, as Holdenried writes. Similarly, in our Red and White Book Welsh versions for example, heavy interpolation in the Christological material shows us clearly where the interests of the time were concerning the *Tiburtina*.

Holdenried wrote that the *Tiburtina* was researched too much as a political prophecy while the relationship with and context of the Sibylline Tradition did not receive enough, if any, attention. We propose now a paradigm shift in which the Tradition and the *Tiburtina* are no longer seen as two different areas of research, two different textual networks. They are one and the same. The *Tiburtina* is part of the tradition, both the text and the heroine, the Tiburtine Sibyl, are enmeshed in the medieval web of Sibylline lore. The distinction between *Tiburtina* and Tradition stems from a scholarly paradigm in which the Tradition is religious and the *Tiburtina* political. This is now an outdated vision, stemming from an outdated, essentially nineteenth-century methodology. The *Tiburtina* is at its core a Christological text and was read as such by the far greater part of its medieval audience.

Sibli Ddoeth: the Welsh Tiburtina.

At a certain point in the Middle Ages, the *Tiburtina* was translated into various vernaculars. There are several translations and adaptations of the *Tiburtina* in Old French, in poetry and prose. These French texts are, like the Welsh versions, based on the text Sackur edited, although important variants appear in the French texts, much more than in the Welsh versions. Haffen and Baudoin have done a lot of work on the study of these variants,¹³⁰ and Shields has written an article on the verse *Tiburtina* by Philippe de Thaon, which explores what happens when Latin prose gets translated into hexasyllabic French verse.¹³¹ Incidentally, this versified *Tiburtina* from the middle of the twelfth century is the oldest vernacular *Tiburtina* we have.¹³²

Surprisingly little work has been done on the vernacular *Tiburtina*; so little that we have not been able to find any studies on versions in languages other than Old French and Middle Welsh. The Welsh versions have been studied in an article by Marged Haycock from 2005,¹³³ which is the year before Holdenried's *The Sibyl and her Scribes* came out. So, although the work is fairly recent in terms of medieval studies, it is at the same time in need of re-evaluation, as it came out before Holdenried called attention to the biased way the *Tiburtina* had been studied up to that moment. Because of this, it is unsurprising that in this article, Haycock describes

130 Haffen, Josiane and Baroin, Jeanne : *La prophétie de la Sibylle Tiburtine*, Paris 1987.

Haffen, Josiane : *Contributions à l'étude de la Sibylle médiévale : études et édition du Ms B.N.F.FR 25 407, fol. 169-172v* : Le Livre de Sibille, Paris 1984.

131 Shields, Hugh: *Oral Techniques in Written Verse: Philippe de Thaon's « Livre de Sibille »*, in *Medium Aevum*, vol. 49, No. 2 (1980), pp. 194-206.

132 Haycock, Marged: "Si abl fodd, Sibli fain: "Sibyl in Medieval Wales, in *Heroic Poets and Poetic Heroes in Celtic Tradition: A Festschrift for Patrick K. Ford*, CSANA Yearbook 3-4, 2005 pp. 115-130, p.116.

133 Haycock, Marged: *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*.

the Sibyl as being associated with political prophecy ‘in particular’¹³⁴- this was the mainstream view. But although this view now seems a bit dated, the article is still very important, not only because it is the only study of the Welsh *Tiburtina*, but also because Marged Haycock gives ample attention to the manuscripts in which we find *Sibli Ddoeth*, as she is called in Welsh, the associated content found with our text, and the textual life of Sibyls in medieval Wales in general. We will refer to her work throughout this chapter.

Let us first localise our texts. There are two versions of the Welsh *Tiburtina*: one is found in what is now the first volume of the White Book of Rhydderch (Peniarth 5), from circa 1350,¹³⁵ 12r-14r and the Red Book of Hergest (Jesus 111), from around the turn of the fifteenth century,¹³⁶ 139r-141r; the other version is in Peniarth 14 (pp. 45-78) from the end of the thirteenth century. The latter manuscript is therefore our earliest witness to the Welsh Sibyl, although the beginning is unfortunately missing: the narrative starts in the middle of a phrase, with the entry of Sibyl into Rome. The Red and White Book texts are complete, the greatest omission being only one line in the description of the sixth sun in the Red Book. The title of the text in the Red Book is *Proffwydoliaeth Sibli Ddoeth*, ‘The Prophecy of Sibyl the Wise’; in Peniarth 14 the text is called *Breuddwyd Sibli*, ‘Sibli’s Dream’. *Breuddwyd*, ‘dream’ is a title used for

134 Haycock, *Sibyl in medieval Wales*, p.116.

135 <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/cy/ms-home.php?ms=Pen5> , last visited 20/11/2018;

see also Huws, Daniel, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, Cardiff 2000, pp.227-268.

136 <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/cy/ms-home.php?ms=Jesus111> , last visited 20/11/2018 . See also Daniel Huws’s description of the MS (‘Llyfr Coch Hergest’ in Daniel, I., Haycock, M., Johnston, D., and Rowland, J., (eds.), *Cyfoeth y Testun: Ysgrifau ar Lenyddiaeth Gymraeg yr Oesoedd Canol*, Cardiff, 2003, pp. 1-30).

native Welsh works, such as *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy*, as well as translated texts, such as *Breuddwyd Pawl/ Visio Pauli*. There is no title in the White Book.

Marged Haycock has called attention to the 'associated content' of our text in these manuscripts: one can often learn a lot about the reception of a text by the company it keeps. She identifies the text following *Breudwyd Sibli* as the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew.¹³⁷ In the colophon, the text is called *Prol yr Esgyp*, 'The Prologue of the Bishops' because the text opens with letters between Jerome and the bishops Chromanus and Heliodorus. Haycock also identifies both texts, *Sibli* and *Prol/Pseudo-Matthew*, as having been written by the same hand.¹³⁸ These are the only two texts in this part of Peniarth 14: two other parts, pp. 1-44 and pp. 79-90, were originally not parts of the same book and were probably written in different areas of Wales.¹³⁹ A fourth part of Peniarth 14, pp. 101-190 is a bit younger, dated by Daniel Huws to the fourteenth century.¹⁴⁰ Further, she notes that the same hand who wrote *Breuddwyd Sibli* also wrote *Proffwydoliaeth Myrddin*, 'the Prophecy of Merlin' in Peniarth 16 iii.¹⁴¹

In the Red Book, which is an extremely varied manuscript covering virtually all medieval genres except for law and (interestingly) religious prose, *Proffwydoliaeth Sibli Ddoeth* is preceded by the aforementioned *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy*, and followed by the poem *Cyfoesi Myrddin a Gwenddydd*, 'the Prophecy of Merlin and Gwenddydd, Gwenddydd being Merlin's sister.

137 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p. 118.

138 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p. 118.

139 See the references cited in Rodway, S., *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal System*, Aberystwyth 2013, pp.40-41.

140 Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p.59.

141 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p.118.

In the White Book, Sibli has a poem about the Signs of Judgment before her, and after her a Life of Mary. As Haycock remarks, the White Book Sibyl is part of a collection of apocryphal texts, notably *Ystoria Adda*.¹⁴² Daniel Huws writes that this whole sequence of apocrypha, taking up the four first quires of the book, stands apart from the rest of the White Book so much that it 'can hardly be conceived as part of the same programme'¹⁴³ as the rest of the book. These four quires, written by the same scribe, differ from the rest of the book both in appearance and content. While the rest of the White Book is written in two columns per page, Scribe A, as Huws calls him, writes lines that fill the whole page.¹⁴⁴ While the rest of the White Book contains texts we could call secular, Scribe A's works are 'wholly didactic or devotional'.¹⁴⁵ Huws speculates that the work written by Scribe A was destined for a cleric. Which means that the *Breudwydd Sibli* was, in this collection, without any doubt perceived as a religious work in the first place, as it probably was in Peniarth 14. Both in Peniarth 14 and the White Book, the Sibyl is coupled with a text about the life of Mary and the birth of Christ. And given the nature of her prophecy, it is particularly apt that the text is directly preceded by a work on the Signs of Judgment in the White Book.

The Red Book is a bit different. We saw that the immediate neighbours of the Red Book Sibyl are *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy* and *Cyfoesi Myrddin a Gwenddydd*, both of them Arthurian texts. Haycock touches on the link made by some scholars between the

142 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, pp. 118-119.

143 Huws, Daniel, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p. 245.

144 Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p.232.

145 Huws, Daniel, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p. 244.

Sibyl and Arthurian material, especially material concerning Merlin. She mentions¹⁴⁶ that Geoffrey of Monmouth names the prophecies of the Sibyl in the same breath as those of Merlin,¹⁴⁷ and calls on Sibylline authority for the prediction that Arthur shall be the third British king to rule Rome,¹⁴⁸ and that it has been suggested that the first known French (Anglo-Norman) version of the *Tiburtina*, *Le Livre de Sibile* by Philippe de Thaon, was made in order to make a work associated with the fashionable Arthur more accessible.¹⁴⁹ She also concedes that, on the contrary, both Geoffrey and Philippe might have been inspired in their works by the fashion of Sibyls.¹⁵⁰

Holdenried mentions the supposed link between Merlin and the Sibyl but rejects it. She cites Shield's conjecture that Geoffrey's association of Sibyl and Merlin made the *Tiburtina* often appear alongside Arthurian material, but retorts that most British *Tiburtina* manuscripts do *not* associate the Sibyl and Arthuriana, and that making a connection between the two should therefore 'be treated with caution'.¹⁵¹ Be that as it may, in the Red Book the *Tiburtina* is irrefutably associated with Arthurian and secular prophetic texts, one of them about Merlin. The fact that the Peniarth 14 scribe also wrote down a *Proffwydoliaeth Myrddin* is more circumstantial evidence, but it does seem fair to say that, based on the little Welsh evidence that we have, the *Tiburtina* in Wales is classified either as a religious text or as a prophecy, or both

146 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p.116.

147 Geoffrey of Monmouth, Lewis Thorpe (transl.), *The History of the Kings of Britain*, London 1966, p. 283.

148 *Idem*, p.234.

149 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p.116.

150 Haycock, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, pp. 116-117.

151 Holdenried, *The Sibyl and her Scribes*, pp.24-25.

those things. Merlin material is seen as close enough to the *Tiburtina* to immediately follow it in a manuscript as carefully planned as the Red Book. Based on the evidence of associated manuscript content, we see no reason at all to believe that the *Tiburtina* was read as a political prophecy in medieval Wales.

As Haycock writes, Sibyl also turns up in other Middle Welsh texts.¹⁵² In *Ystoria Adda*, she is conflated with the Queen of Sheba who visits King Solomon. *Ystoria Adda*, 'the Story of Adam', is the Welsh version of the legend of the Wood of the Cross, a story that was developed in the twelfth century.¹⁵³ This legend, too, was found in the *Legenda Aurea*,¹⁵⁴ which means that in the later Middle Ages, it was known all over western Europe. There are many variants of the legend, in Latin as well as in vernacular languages.¹⁵⁵ The identification of the Queen of Sheba with the Sibyl was not new in the Legend of the Cross: already in the ninth century, a Byzantine chronicler wrote about 'the Queen of Sheba, who was Sibylla among the Greeks'.¹⁵⁶ In Welsh, too, there are quite a few manuscripts of this text, most notably in the White Book, in the same sequence of religious texts copied by Huws' Scribe A as the *Tiburtina* text. The different texts of *Ystoria Adda* show a lot of variants, which have been studied in depth by Sarah Rowles in her MPhil thesis.¹⁵⁷

152 Haycock, M., *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, pp.123-125.

153 Baert, B., *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*, Leiden 2004, p.291.

154 Baert, B., *A Heritage of Holy Wood*, p.294.

155 Baert, B., *A Heritage of Holy Wood*, pp. 300-301.

156 Dronke, P., *Medieval Sibyls, their Character and their "auctoritas"*, in *Studi Medievali* 36 (1995), pp. 581-615, p. 599; the chronicler was Georgios Monachos. Dronke also mentions a 'still older' tradition of this identification, in a Greek apocryphon called *The Testament of Solomon*, but does not date this text.

157 Rowles, S., *Golygiad o Ystoria Adaf*, MPhil thesis, Aberystwyth 2004.

Ystoria Adda, or the Legend of the Wood of the Cross, describes the history of Christ's Cross, which supposedly grew from a sapling of the Tree of Life in Paradise. The sapling was grown from three seeds which Adam and Eve's son Seth brought back from Paradise, when he was sent there by his father in a quest to seek God's mercy before Adam died. Seth brings back the seeds as he was instructed by the angel guarding the gates of Paradise, and from the three seeds three saplings grow. These saplings, through various adventures and meetings with Moses and King David, become one tree. The trinitarian symbolism is obvious. When, during the time of King Solomon, the tree is cut down to form the largest beam in the Temple, the wood miraculously won't fit, however hard the builders try. The wood is then first placed in a place of honour in the temple, until a woman called Maximillia sits on the tree and, inspired with prophecy, declares her faith in Christ. The woman is stoned for this 'insult' and the wood is discarded and serves as a bridge. When the Queen of Sheba, in this story called Queen Sibyl, comes to Jerusalem, she recognises the beam of the tree for what it is, and prays to it and prophesies the fifteen Signs of Judgment.

The prophecy this Sibyl gives is the one originally attributed to the Erythraean Sibyl. But the dispute with Solomon is mentioned in Philippe de Thaon's *Livre de Sibile*,¹⁵⁸ which is a *Tiburtina* in verse. We should not be surprised: the prophecy of the Signs of Judgment is incorporated in most Latin *Tiburtinas*, and in all the Welsh ones, and we have already seen the amalgamation of the Tiburtine and Erythraean Sibyls.

What is surprising, however, is the early date of this text: being written around 1140,

158 Haycock, M., *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p.117.

the *Livre de Sibile* precedes, as far as we know, the fully-developed version of the *Legend of the Cross*.¹⁵⁹

Peter Dronke writes about a mid-twelfth century Anglo-Norman play, the *Jeu d'Adam*.¹⁶⁰ The play is followed by a uniquely detailed and dramatic version of the prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl about the fifteen signs of Judgment. It is much more elaborate than the traditional Latin verses, and, as Dronke writes, it is full of 'specific, unexpected details that make the moral censure vivid and compelling'.¹⁶¹ Some scholars, he writes, question whether the prophecy originally belongs to the play; Dronke disagrees with them. The play, he writes, consists of scenes about Adam and Eve, then Cain and Abel, and then a procession of prophets foretelling the coming of the Messiah. We immediately recognise the *Ordo Prophetarum* from chapter 1, and so does Dronke.¹⁶² He argues that, in this setting, it is traditional that the prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl 'dwarfs those that are uttered by the men who precede her: as always, it is far larger in scale as well as darker in tone'. We do agree with him, and see here another strand of medieval lore that starts with the Beginning, with Adam and Eve, and naturally progresses to an end, The End, prophesied by a Sibyl.

Another medieval Welsh text featuring the Sibyl is *Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, or 'the three kings from Cologne'. The three kings in question are the ones who, according to legend, visited the new-born Christ child and gifted Him gold, myrrh and

159 Dronke, *Medieval Sibyls*, p.599.

160 Dronke, *Medieval Sibyls*, p.589.

161 Dronke, *Medieval Sibyls*, p. 592.

162 Dronke, *Medieval Sibyls*, p. 590.

frankincense. In the middle ages, these kings were known as ‘from Cologne’ because of the presence of relics reputed to be theirs in Cologne cathedral.¹⁶³ The story describes the adventures of the three kings in finding Jesus, and the adventures of their gifts, that will all play a part in Christ’s Passion, especially the thirty gold coins given by one of them, that will later be used to pay Judas for his betrayal. Of special interest for us is the appearance of the Queen of Sheba, called *Sibli* in Llanstephan 155 and *Sibli Ddoeth* in Llanstephan 117, thus ‘equating her with the Virgilian Sibyl’, as Piper writes.¹⁶⁴ Why exactly Piper mentions Virgil’s Sibyl when he writes in the next line that this Sibyl was known mostly for the ‘Sibylline Prophecies’, we do not know. Piper writes that only in the Welsh text, not in the Latin and English versions, the Queen of Sheba called Sibyl.¹⁶⁵ Unfortunately, Piper does not tell us the role of the Queen of Sheba/Sibli in the text, and we have not been able to track down this text. However, even this little nugget of information tells us something. Llanstephan 117 is from the mid-sixteenth century,¹⁶⁶ Llanstephan 155 is from the late sixteenth century.¹⁶⁷ That is several centuries later than our extant manuscripts of the Welsh *Tiburtina*. This text tells us that the Sibyl was not just a fashion that went out unnoticed. In the sixteenth century, she was still interesting enough to stay in the mind of copyists, who in the *Tri Brenin o Gwlen* gave the Queen of Sheba the name Sibli, just like in *Ystoria Adda*. She was there to stay.

163 Piper, Prydwyn, *Ystori Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, in *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, vol. 20/21 (2000-2001), pp. 130-140, pp. 131-132.

164 Piper, Prydwyn, *Ystori Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, p. 138.

165 Idem.

166 Piper, Prydwyn, *Ystori Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, p. 132.

167 Piper, Prydwyn, *Ystori Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, p. 134.

Marged Haycock illustrates this even more clearly with her description of how a fifteenth-century Welsh poet, Gwerful Mechain, the first female Welsh poet of whom we have a surviving oeuvre, wrote about the Sibyl.¹⁶⁸ Gwerful uses the Sibyl as an argument in the ongoing *querelle des femmes* – she portrays the Sibyl as an exemplary woman, who in her poem does not just *prophesy* the Last Judgment, but judges herself, too.¹⁶⁹ As Haycock writes, Gwerful is not the only poet to use the Sibyl as a symbol of female wisdom, as many continental writers had done so before her, and other Welsh poets also used the trope, especially in fifteenth-century praise poetry.¹⁷⁰

The Sibyl came to Wales as a stranger, a Latin text in fashion on the continent, so much so that it was enough of interest to be translated twice from the same manuscript. She then made guest appearances in the *Ystoria Adda* and *Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, and even starred in Welsh poetry. The Sibyl entered medieval Welsh culture to stay there, and became in poetry and prose a part of the medieval Welsh literary landscape. One might say that she went native.

168 Haycock, M., *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p. 126

169 Haycock, M., *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, pp. 126-127.

170 Haycock, M., *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, pp. 127-128.

A line-for-line comparison of the two Welsh versions and Sackur's Latin text.

1. **Sackur:** *Fuit igitur hec Sibilla Priamidis regis filia ex matre nomine Hecuba procreata, vocata est autem in Greco Tiburtina, Latine vero nomine Albunea.*

This Sibyl, then, was the daughter of king Priam born of a mother called Hecuba; she is called *Tiburtina* in Greek, but *Albunea* in Latin.

- Red Book:** *Sibli oed uerch y Priaf Urenhin o Eccuba y mam, gwreic Priaf. A honno a oed arnei amryuaelon ennweu: yn ieith Roec y gelwit Tyburtuna, yn Lladin Albunea.*

Priaf and *Eccuba* are Priam and Hecuba, the king and queen of Troy in the Iliad. The same names are used in other manuscripts. *Gwreic Priaf*, 'Priam's wife' is an integrated explanatory gloss in the Welsh text; it is not found in any of Sackur's texts.

A honno a oed arnei amryuaelon ennweu, 'and she had various names' is an addition in the Welsh text, again without a parallel in Sackur. *A honno* was probably added to make clear that *Sibli* is the subject, not Hecuba.

2. *Hec circumiens diversas partes orbis predicavit Asiam, Macedoniam, Erotochiam, Agaguldeam, Ciliciam, Pamphiliam, Galaciam.*

Wandering through different parts of the world, she preached in Asia, Macedonia, Erotochia, Agaguldea, Cilicia, Pamphilia, Galatia.

- Sibli a damgylchynawd amryuaelon vrenhinaetheu y dwyrein, nyt amgen: yr Asia, a gwlat Alexander mawr, a Galilea, a Cicilia a Phampilia, a Galacia.*

The Welsh translator skips over the verb *predicavit*, 'to preach', and adds *nyt amgen*, 'no other (than), that is to say'. This use of *nyt amgen* is typical of medieval Welsh prose writing, and is very similar to Latin *id est*.

A damgylchynawd translates *circumiens*, substituting the Welsh preterite for the Latin participle. This construction makes much more sense in Welsh, but changes the structure of the phrase.

The translator also omits *Erostochoia* and *Agaguldea*, probably because he did not know about these places. This is no wonder: these toponyms, if they are real toponyms, are only known from different versions of the *Sibylla Tiburtina*. Nothing is known about what these names might mean.¹⁷¹

Macedonia has been replaced by *gwlat Alexander Mawr*, 'the land of Alexander the Great', which may originally have been a gloss. I have not found *Macedonia* referred to in this way in other texts. Indeed, the name itself comes up but rarely in the Cardiff prose corpus. It occurs in the following passages:

Peniarth 20, p.40, in a kings' list in *Y Bibl Ynghymraec* ('The Bible in Welsh'):¹⁷² *Phylip yn vrenhin yn Macedonia. Antigonus yn vrenhin yn Asia. Tholomeus vab lagi. yn vrenhin yn yr Eifft.*

Cardiff MS. 3.242 (Hafod 16), p. 108, in *Fel y rhannwyd yr Ebestyl*, where *Macedonia* is assigned for evangelising to the apostle Matthew: *Y deudec ebystyl a gymerassant*

171 Or as Sackur (p. 176) says: *Einzelne Länder, wie Erostochoia und Agaguldea, sind weder zu konstatieren, noch quellenmässig zu belegen*, "Certain countries, like Erostochoia and Agaguldea can neither be found nor are there sources that provide evidence for their existence".

172 More information about this manuscript on <https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/chronicle-of-the-princes/> (last visited 8/1/2019).

ranneu y byt y bregethu. nyt amgen. Pedyr a gymerth Ruuein. Andreas. Achiam. Iago yr Yspæen. Thomas yr India. Jeuan yr Asia. Matheus Macedonia. Phylip Galilea. Bartholomeus Liconia. Symon Zelotis Egyptum. Mathias Judea. Jago brawt yr arglwyd Kaerusalem.

And it is found twice in the Red Book version of *Delw y Byd*, on page 245r and 245v. In the first of these it is mentioned as one of the provinces of Asia, in the second as a part of Greece. In none of these texts is Macedonia directly coupled with Alexander the Great.

It is called *Magidawn* in poetry to do with Alexander: see LPBT p. 429 and 421; where our prose texts seem to prefer the Latin form, poetry uses this loanword, which is a linguistically completely regular Middle Welsh form.

3. *Cumque hanc mundi partem vaticiniis repletset, inde venit Egyptum, Ethiopiam, Bagadam et Babiloniam, Africam, Libiam, Pentapolim, Mauritaniam, Palarinum.*

And when she had completely filled this part of the world with prophecies, she came to Egypt, Ethiopia, (Bagdad) and Babylon, Africa, Libya, Pentapolis, Mauritania, (Palm Island).

A gwedy daruot idi eilennwi y rann honno o'r byt o'e dewindabaetheu, odyne hi aeth hyt yn Ethiopia, gwlat y Blewmonyet. Odyne y Babilon y doeth, a'r Affric, a Libia, a Phentapolis, a Mawritania, ac Ynys y Palym.

Bagadam and *Palarinum* do not appear in the *Orbis Latinus*¹⁷³ or the *RBSM/BSC Latin Place Names File*,¹⁷⁴ and their translations are my own conjecture.

Repleo, the verb translated here as *eilennwi*, can mean both ‘to fill again’ or ‘to complete’. Lewis and Short¹⁷⁵ refer to Romans 15.13, *replevi Evangelium*, ‘I have thoroughly spread the Gospel’, which suggests how we should interpret our phrase. The Welsh translation *eilennwi*, from *ail+lenwi*, literally re-fill, does not carry this meaning of ‘to complete’ or ‘spread thoroughly’: this must have escaped our translator, who chose to convey the wrong meaning of Latin *repleo* in the Welsh text.

Gwlat y Blewmonyeit ‘the land of the Moors: *Blewmon* is a loanword from Middle English *bleo-man*, *bleo-mon*, meaning ‘blue man, black person’ (GPC). The first attestation given in GPC is from the fourteenth century, in the *Hengwrt Manuscripts*, ii. 276.

Gwlat y Blewmonyeit is not a part of the Latin text, but rather a gloss on Ethiopia. It might originally have been marginal, but either the translator or a later copyist might also have added it himself, as an explanation. In *Delw y Byd*, *Gwlat y Blewmonyeit* is indeed used in combination with Ethiopia: *a gwedy yd el ygkylch Ethiopia gwlat y Blewmonyeit trwy yr Eifft y withyr yn seith le* (Red Book of Hergest, p. 122 r.).

Odyna y Babilon y doeth, ‘from there she came to Babylon’: the Welsh text has rendered in two phrases what Latin says in one longer phrase, which just lists the

173 <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/contents.html> (last visited 07/01/2019).

174 <https://rbms.info/lpn> (last visited 07/01/2019).

175 Lewis, C.T. and Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879, reprint 1975.

places where Sibyl has been. *So odyna* ‘from there’ and *y doeth* ‘came’ are additions in our text. The Welsh text also omits Egypt and *Bagadam* as places where Sibyl has travelled.

4. *Omnes has provincias predicavit et spiritu prophetie repleta prophetavit bonis bona et malis mala. Scimus namque, quia in preconiis suis vera annuntiavit et que in novissimis erant ventura predicta.*

She preached in all these provinces and, filled with the spirit of prophecy, she prophesied good to the good and bad to the bad. And indeed we know that she related true things in her proclamations, and also her predictions of coming of the Last Things.

Yn yr holl wledyd hynny y pregethawd. Ac o daroganeu prophwytolyawl y kyflenwis pethei [sic] da y'r rei da; petheu drwc y rei drwc. Nyni a wdam yr uarnu ohonei hi yn y bardonyaetheu petheu a delynt rac llaw: y rei diwethaf yn amlwoc y ardangos.

Yr uarnu ohonei ‘she has judged: the conjugated pronoun *ohonei* is used here in combination with a verbal noun to denote the subject, which is again a Cambricism, described in GMW §181.¹⁷⁶ The *yr* here is not the article *yr* as might be thought, but a variant of the perfective particle *ry*, denoting the judging has happened in the past.¹⁷⁷

In Latin, the phrase is *scimus namque, quia in praeconiis suis vera annuntiavit et que in novissimis erant ventura predicta*, ‘indeed we know that she related true things in her

¹⁷⁶ Evans, D.S., *A Grammar of Middle Welsh (GMW)*, Dublin 1964, p.161.

¹⁷⁷ GMW, p.169.

proclamations, and that she predicted the coming of the Last Things'. A lot has happened in the translation of this phrase: the verb *annuntiavit* 'to relate' has been replaced by *barnu* 'to judge', and instead of a conjugated verb, the verbal noun construction is used. *Vera*, 'true things' has been lost, but *yn y bardonyaetheu* 'in her poetic arts' has been added, as well as the last part of the phrase *yn amlwch y ardangos* 'she demonstrated clearly'.

5. *Audientes igitur eius famam principes Romani, statim nuntiaverunt in conspectu Troiani imperatoris. Mittens ergo imperator legatos ad eam, fecit cum magno honore deducere Romam.*

So when the leaders of the Romans heard of her fame, they announced it in the presence of the emperor Trajan. Sending messengers to her, the emperor then had them bring her to Rome with great honour.

Wrth hynny tywyssogyon Ruuein, pan glywssant clot y racdywededic Sibli, wynt a'e kannadassant, a hynny yg kyuedrychedigaeth Traean amherawdyr Tro. Yr amherawdyr a anuones attei gennadeu, ac a beris y dwyn y Ruuein yn anrydedus.

Clot y racdywededic Sibli 'the fame of the aforementioned Sybil': the Latin does not refer back to Sybil by name, but simply states *fama eius*, 'her fame'. The translator must have felt a need for clarification.

Traean, 'Trajan' is an insertion in the Red Book, not found in the White Book or the Latin text. The common noun *traean*, often spelled *trayan* in the manuscripts, also means 'a third part' and is found frequently in medieval literature with that

meaning, especially but not only in law texts, and this is the only instance I have found of the word *Traean* meaning ‘Trajan’. For this name, the form *Traianus* is used in a version of *Brut y Brenhinedd*:¹⁷⁸ this is the only instance of it in the Cardiff corpus, and it does not occur in the Aberystwyth corpus of 13th century prose at all.¹⁷⁹

Amherawdyr Tro means ‘Emperor of Troy’, which is also the designation found in the Latin and Old French versions. *Tro* is also used in:

Peniarth 5 p. 2.v, *Delw y Byd*: *Bitonia Tro Vechan*

Peniarth 5 p. 2.v: *Ac yno y mae Tro a enwit y gan Troius vrenin; ac Ylion a enwit y gan Ilius Vrenin.*

In the Red Book version of *Delw y Byd* we find the same (p. 245r): *Nessaf y honno yw Ffrigia. A enwit y gan Ffrigijs uab Europa. honno a elwit Ylyon y gan Ylon Urenhin. A’r gaer honno a elwit kaer Tro.*

Equally attested, however, is the form *Troia*:

In Cotton Cleopatra B V part I, in *Brut y Brenhinedd*, the same text where we found *Traianus*, on p. 22r: *canys herwyd hen deuaut gwyr Troia y mab hynaf a dyllyei y teilygdawt.*

¹⁷⁸ *Cotton Cleopatra B V* part I, p. 43v, as consulted on rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk.

¹⁷⁹ The Aberystwyth corpus can be found at <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/5812> (last visited 8/1/2019).

And we have quite a few instances of *Troia* in Peniarth 47, part I: e.g. *Priafvrenin Troia*, in *Ystoria Dared*. All the other examples in the Cardiff corpus come from this same text in this same manuscript.

6. *Centum igitur viri ex senatu Romano somnium unum in una nocte singuli viderunt. Videbant singuli in visu quasi novem esse soles in celo, qui singillatim divisi diversas in se figuras habebant.*

For a hundred men from the Roman senate had each seen the same dream during the same night. Each one of them saw it in a vision, as if there were nine suns in the sky, which had, each of them separately, different figures in them.

Can wyr o hennauyeit Ruuein a welsynt bob un yn un nos yr vn ryw ureudwyt. Yg gweledigaeth yr dangossit udunt trwy eu hun bot yg goruchelder Nef megys naw heul yn ymdangos, y rei yn wahanredawl pob un ar neill tu a dangossynt yndunt figureu amryuaelon.

Hennauyeit, literally 'elders' is a good translation for 'senators', etymologically related to Latin *senex*, 'old'. It also occurs in Cotton Cleopatra B V part I, p.117r, in *Brenhinoedd y Saeson*, spelled as *hennavieit*, but it is found more often spelled with one n: *henafyeit* occurs in *Brut y Tywysogyon*, for example in Peniarth 18, p. 15r, and in *Ystoria Adda*, in Shrewsbury 11, p. 95r, and in the same manuscript again on page 106 in *Y Groglith*; it also occurs four times in the Red Book of Talgarth, once in *Mabinogi Iessu Grist* and thrice again in *Y Groglith*. There are also variants, like *henafgwyr*,

occurring in various spellings throughout the medieval corpus and *henafion*, which is also widespread.

Yg gweledigaeth yr dangossit udunt, 'in the vision that was shown to them', is a passive translation of the Latin text's much more active *videbant singuli in visu*, 'they all saw in a vision'. The *yr* in *yr dangossit* is the perfective particle.

Trwy eu hun 'through, by means of their sleep', and *goruchelder* 'highest point' are additions not found in the Latin original. The details do not add meaning to the text, but may have been added to appeal to the imagination of the reader by making the story more colourful, easier to imagine.

7. *Primus sol erat splendidus et fulgens super omnem terram. Secundus sol splendidior et magnus etheream habens claritatem.*

The first sun was bright and shining over the whole earth. The second sun was brighter and large, having an ethereal clarity.

Yr heul gyntaf oed yn loyw, ac yn goleuhau yr holl dayar. Yr eil heul oed vwy a goleuach, ac yndi eglurder iawn awyrawl.

First of all, it must be noted that the Red Book and the White Book disagree about the gender of the *heul*, 'sun'. As Marged Haycock has noted,¹⁸⁰ the word *heul* is

180 Haycock, Marged, *Sibyl in Medieval Wales*, p.123.

treated as a feminine noun in the Red Book, causing lenition to the following adjective, but masculine in the White Book.¹⁸¹

In Latin, the second sun is *splendidior et magnus*, 'brighter and large', while in the Red Book it is *vwy a goleuach*, 'larger and brighter'; our translator has put both adjectives in the comparative, instead of just *splendidior*. *Awyrawl* is a good translation of *etheream*, 'ethereal'. The word has meanings both in the field of 'ethereal, lofty, insubstantial', but can also mean 'well-ventilated' (GPC¹⁸²). In medieval texts it shows up in *Brut y Brenhinoedd*, *Elen a'r Groc*, and *Delw y Byd*. *Etheream* is a loanword from Greek, and does not figure in most modern dictionaries, but our translator must have been familiar with it. *Ether* also figures in the Black Book of Carmarthen, in *Gogonedauc Argluit*, in the phrase *a'th uendicco de awir ac ether*.¹⁸³

8. *Tertius sol sanguineo colore flamigerans, igneus et terribilis ac demum splendidus satis.*

The third sun, carrying flames with the colour of blood, was fiery and terrible and only moderately bright.

Y dryded heul o waedawl liw yn ymlosci, tanawl oed ac aruthur, ac yn y diwed eglur digawn.

181 The word *heul* was normally feminine in Middle Welsh. See Johnston, D., Edwards, H. M., Evans, D.F., Lake, A.C., Moras, E., and Roberts, S.E. (eds.) *Cerddi Dafydd ap Gwilym*, Cardiff 2010, p. 708.

182 Unfortunately, GPC does not give a date for the rather modern-sounding 'well-ventilated'.

183 Haycock, M., *Blodeugerdd Barddas o Ganu Crefyddol Cynnar*, Llandibie 1994, p.43; *Gogonedauc Argluit* in BBC ff. 18r-18v. The Black Book of Carmarthen can be read online at <https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/theblackbookofcarmarthen> (last visited 8/1/2019).

Yn y diwedd, 'in the end' is a surprising translation of *demum*. This word may indeed mean 'at last, at length, in the end'; this is the most common meaning. But in this context another possible translation, 'just, only' seems more appropriate; this way, the dim third sun is opposed to the preceding brighter ones.

9. *Quartus sol sanguine rubicundus, quattor ex eo iterum erant meridie radiantēs.*

Quintus sol erat tenebrosus, sanguineus et lampans sicut in tonitruo tenebroso.

The fourth sun was red like blood, but the four [suns] out of it were shining in the south. The fifth sun was gloomy, bloody and shining as if in a dark thunderstorm.

Y pedwyrred heul cochach no'r gwaet, ac yndi pedwar paladyr yn goleuhau. Y pymhet oed dywyll a gwaedawl, ac yndi megys llugwrn yn taranawol dywyllwch.

Cochach no'r gwaet, 'redder than blood', is stronger than Latin *sanguine rubicundus*, 'blood red'. The Latin text is ambiguous as regards what is coming out of the fourth sun. We may infer more suns, as it is usual in Latin to suppress a noun if it is the same as the subject of the phrase. Welsh supposes *paladyr*, whose primary meaning is 'shaft, spear', but is also commonly used metaphorically for a ray of light. Also, in Latin, the four rays (or suns) come out of the fourth sun (*ex eo*), in Welsh, they stay in it (*yndi*). The Latin word *meridie*, 'in the south' has not been translated.

The translation of the second phrase is interesting. The Welsh phrase translates 'the fifth was dark and bloody' and then 'and in it like a lamp in a dark thunderstorm'. That the word *sol* is untranslated is understandable, as it is not needed in a context

which is clear by itself. But while *lampans* is the participle of the verb 'to shine', *llugwrn*, 'lamp' is a noun. And why the *yndi*? It changes the whole meaning of the phrase: instead of having a shining sun, something in the sun is shining. Maybe the repetition of *yndi* is copying error, where the eye of the scribe skipped to the preceding line, or otherwise, maybe *yndi* was inserted because the translator mistook *lampans* -the participle- for *lampas* -the noun 'lamp'; considering that in medieval manuscripts the *n* (and *m*) were often not written out, but expressed as a line over the preceding letter, this is not impossible, and it would explain *llugwrn*.

Megys, 'like, as if', is one of our translator's favourite words: he uses it everywhere in the same way Latin uses *quasi*, or *sicut*, but not only as a translation of *quasi*. He also inserts it on his own account, as we see here.

10. *Sextus sol tenebrosus nimis, habebat aculeum, sicut stimulum scorpionis.*

The sixth sun, extremely gloomy, had a sting, like the sting of a scorpion.

Y chwechet a oed diruawr y thywyllet, ac yndi pwynt blaenllym megys pwynt yscorpion. Prif yw yscorpion, bychan y gorffolyaeth, vnveint a chwoyl eryr. Ac oerach y wenwyn no dan.

Again, the *sol* has not been rendered in Welsh. The second phrase is not found in the Latin versions: here, the translator needs to explain for his Welsh public what a scorpion is. The word *yscorpion* itself is a loanword from either Middle English or Old French (GPC).

Chwyl eryr is an interesting spelling of *chwileryn*. This word may mean 'chrysalis, aurelia, pupa, grub, maggot, serpent, or viper' (GPC). The White Book spells it as *wchileryr*, which is equally surprising, and it seems safe to assume that something had gone wrong in the textual transmission of their common ancestors. *Chwileryn* is used as either the singulative of *chwiler* (which in that case is taken as a plural form) or as a diminutive, with *chwiler* as a singular. It is a rare word in the medieval corpus, which might explain the faulty transmission in our text.

11. *Septimus vero sol terribilis erat et sanguineus, tetrum habens in medio gladium.*

Octavus autem sol effusus et sanguineum colorem habens in medium. Nonus autem sol erat nimis tenebrosus, unum tantum habens radium fulgentem.

The seventh sun, then, was terrible and bloody, having a hideous sword in its middle. But the eighth sun was discharging, and had a bloody colour in its middle. Then the ninth sun was extremely gloomy, having only one fiery ray.

Y seithuet oed dywyll heuyt, ac aruthyr o liw gwaet. Ac yndi megys cledyf pedwarmennyawc. Yr wythuet oed ordineuedic, ac yn y pherued lliw coch waedawl. Y nawuet heul oed ry dywyll yn y chylch ogylch, ac yn y pherued un paladyr yn goleuhav.

In Latin, the seventh sun *terribilis*, 'terrible' *et sanguineus* 'and bloody'. This is translated as *aruthyr o liw gwaet*, 'terrible, with the colour of blood', but the translator adds that this sun was *tywyll heuyt*, 'dark too'. The source text, in the versions we know, gives no reason for this assumption. Is this the imagination of the translator at

play or did he have a version that did say this sun was 'dark too'? Or did he add it automatically, after all the preceding suns that were described as *tenebrosus*?

Pedwarminnyawc, 'four-edged' gives us a glance at our translator's education. A four-edged sword may be hard to conceive, but this is how he translated *tetrum* . . . *gladium*, a 'hideous sword'. *Taeter*, *teter* in medieval spelling means 'hideous, nasty, awful, repugnant', but *tetra-* is the Greek prefix for 'four'. Our translator was thinking in Greek.

Describing the eighth, our translator has left out the word 'sun' again. He has also added the word *coch*, 'red'. The Latin text has simply *sanguineum colorem habens in medium*, 'and having a bloody colour in its centre', leaving it to the reader to imagine what that colour looks like. *Effusus* is the past participle of *effundere*, 'shedding, pouring'. It is translated as *ordineuedic*, an adjective/past participle that is not found in GPC, and only once in the Cardiff corpus in either lenited or unlenited form: in our text. We do have the verb *gorddinau*, *gorddineuo*, which indeed means 'to shed, to pour', and *gorddineuedigaeth*, 'a shedding (of blood)'. (*G*)*ordineuedic* seems to have been built by our translator from the verb, following the example of the Latin participle, and shows creative use of language as part of his translation strategies. Paul Russell notes this same tendency to translate Latin past participles and adjectives in *-tus* or *-sus* into Welsh with *-edic*, or in his case, the older form *-etic*, in *Breint Teilo*.¹⁸⁴

184 Russell, P., *Priuilegium Sancti Telai and Breint Teilo*, in *Studia Celtica* 50 (2016), pp. 41-68, p.60.

Yn y chylch ogylch, ‘in its entirety’, is an addition in the Welsh text, as is *yn y pherued*, ‘in its centre’. Latin is more ambiguous with *unum tantum habens radium fulgentem*, ‘having only one fiery ray’, not telling us where that ray might be. The verb *habere* is particularly difficult to translate into Welsh, which has no verb ‘to have’, expressing possession, but rather works with prepositions and the substantive verb. In this case, the translator has apparently judged that localising the ‘fiery ray’ was his best choice.

12. *Cumque Romam ingressa esset Sibilla, videntes eam cives Romani, admirabantur nimiam pulcritudinem eius. Erat autem venusto vultu, aspectu decoro, eloquens in verbis atque omni pulcritudine satis composita, suis auditoribus dulcem prebebat alloquium.*

And when Sibyl had entered Rome, the Roman citizens, seeing her, admired her great beauty. For she was charming of face, with a beautiful appearance, eloquent with words, and composed pleasingly, with every comeliness, [and] she offered her listeners sweet conversation.

Pann echdywynnawd Sibli y gaer Ruuein y myon bwrgeisseit y dinas, pan y gwelsant a ryuedassant yn uawr am y thegwch, o enrydedus osged tec, ac erdrym y phryt yg golwch pawb, huawdyl y geireu doethinabus, ac o pob tegwch arderchawc y chorf. Ac y'r gwarandawyr y hymadrawd oed safwryus, a melys ymdidan a gyfrannei.

Echdywynnawd is the 3 sg. preterite of a verb ‘to shine’, while Latin has *ingressa est*, ‘had entered’. The Welsh phrase means ‘when Sibyl shone in the city of Rome’.

While *echdywynnawd* is a preterite, *ingressa est* is a pluperfect. *Echdywynnawd* does not seem to be a misspelling for another verb, closer in meaning to the Latin, but maybe the Latin exemplar used by the translator had a verb in this position different from any of the variants noted by Sackur. Another possibility is that our translator made Sibyl shine because he was still thinking about the description of the suns in the section before.

The Welsh version makes Sibyl shine amongst the citizens of Rome, using *y mywn*, 'inside, amongst'. In Latin, her special relationship towards the Roman citizens is not explicit; it states merely that the Roman citizens saw her – *videntes eam* – and marvelled at her beauty. This is also expressed in Welsh with *pan y gwelsant*, 'when they saw her'; the *y mywn* is an addition. It is a difficult phrase to interpret, and it is very possible we are dealing with a corruption; as noted, *echdywynnawd* is odd, and so is the placement of *y mywn* behind *gaer Ruuein* – one would expect the opposite syntax. Actually, both the Welsh and Latin versions use a somewhat convoluted syntax here.

*O*¹⁸⁵ *enrydedus osged tec*, 'because of [her] beautiful (or noble, majestic...), honourable appearance': in the Latin, a new phrase starts here, starting with *Erat autem venusto vultu, aspectu decoro*, while the Welsh keeps the same phrase going with the preposition *o*, here meaning 'on account of, because of'.

185 In the Old Welsh glosses, *o* is used to convey an ablative (Falileyev, A., *An Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh*, Tübingen 2000, pp.122-123). Although we prefer the reading given in the main text (*o* meaning 'because'), this alternative reading could be considered, although there is no evidence of using *o* this way in continuous text.

The Latin description of Sibyl's appearance, with its use of descriptive ablatives, calls to mind Einhard's description of Charlemagne in his *Vita*, which was greatly inspired by Suetonius *De Vita Caesarum*. Compare this passage from the *Vita Karoli Magni*, and its excessive use of descriptive ablativi:

Corpore fuit amplo atque robusto, statura eminenti, [...] apice capitis rotundo, oculis praegrandibus ac vegetis, naso paululum mediocritatem excedenti, canitie pulchra, facie laeta et hilari. Unde formae auctoritas ac dignitas tam stanti quam sedenti plurima adquirebatur; quamquam cervix obesa et brevior venterque projectior videretur, tamen haec ceterorum membrorum celabat aequalitas. Incessu firmo totaque corporis habitudine virili; voce clara quidem, sed quae minus corporis formae conveniret.¹⁸⁶

This extremely dense style does not lend itself easily for translation into Middle Welsh, which does not have an ablative or indeed any surviving grammatical cases.

Welsh *o enrydedus osged tec, ac erdrym y phryt yg golwc pawb, huawdyl y geireu doethinabus, ac o pob tegwch arderchawc y chorf. Ac y'r gwarandawyr y hymadrawd oed safwryus, a melys ymdidan a gyfrannei* translates as 'because of [her] majestic, fair appearance; and her face was beautiful in everyone's eyes, her wise words were eloquent, and her body was composed of every excellent beauty. And her speech was delicious for the listeners, and the conversation she took part in was sweet.'

Although both the word order and the grammar have been changed completely, the translator has been able to convey the Latin meaning. He goes even further than his exemplar, adding *doethinabus* 'wise' where the Latin has only *eloquens*, 'eloquent'. He emphasizes Sibyl's intellectual powers even more by doubling the last statement about her conversation skills: where Latin says once *suis auditoribus dulcem prebebat alloquium*, 'she offered her listeners sweet conversation', Welsh says it twice, calling

186 <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ein.html>, paragraph 20 (last visited 07/01/2019).

her conversation first delicious, *safwyrus*, and then *melys*, 'sweet'. These little additions make a big change: they tip the balance from a description focussing mostly on Sibyl's physical beauty in Latin, to one focussing on her wisdom in Welsh.

The Peniarth 14 text starts here:

13. Sackur: *Venientes autem et viri, qui somnia viderant, dicunt ad eam: 'Magistra et domina, quoniam magnum et valde decorum est corpus tuum, quale umquam in feminis praeter te non vidimus, precamur, ut somnium, quod omnes nos in unam noctem vidimus, quid futurum premonstret aperias'*

And when also the men who had seen the dreams came, they said to her:

'Mistress and lady, because your body is greatly and truly graceful, such as we have never seen in women before you, we beg you, because of the dream that all of us have seen during the same night, to reveal to us what the future predicts.

Red Book: *Yna y doethant y gwyr ry welsynt yr vn vreudwyt attei, ac y dechreuassant wrthi yn y mod hwonn eu hymadrawd: "Athrawes ac arglwydes, mor wedus gorff a'th teu ti, y kyfryw arderchocrwyd bryt ar wreic kyn no thi ar wreic o'r holl dayar nys gwelsam. Kan gwdost, manac ynn rac llaw yn damweineu tyghetuennawl".*

Peniarth 14: *'...nys wyt kemryt ac na welsam ni ac na chlywsam ymplith e gwraged dy gyffelip di o bryt kyn no thi ac na byd wedy ti; agor yn betheu o'r a uo rac llaw.'*

The first part of this phrase is identical in the Red Book (RB) and Latin versions, and it is worth noting that *gwelsynt* is the first time a Latin pluperfect has been translated exactly in this text! The second part, *dechreuassant wrthi yn y mod hwnn eu hymadrawd*, ‘and they began their story to her like this’, is much longer than the Latin, *dicunt ad eam*, ‘they said to her’.

RB text has not translated the word *quoniam*, which starts the eulogy of Sibyl’s beauty in Latin. This is significant, because *quoniam* means ‘because’! So the Latin text makes the senators ask for Sibyl’s help ‘because your body is greatly and truly graceful, the like of which have never seen in woman’. In Welsh, the senators also praise Sibyl’s physical beauty, but give another reason for their request for help: *kan gwlost*, ‘since you know it’. This little phrase is absent in Latin. The translator seems to imply that knowledge is a better ground than beauty to ask somebody’s help in interpreting a dream.

Kan is used rather than later *canys* (*can* + copula) which is the form used in the White Book. *Kan*, being more archaic, must have been the form used in the exemplar of the scribe of the Red Book.

Kan gwlost, manac ynn rac llaw yn damweineu tyghetuennawl, ‘because you know it, tell us hereafter our fated events’ is a short and straightforward phrase that has a much longer equivalent in Latin. Our Welsh translator has cut out the already known information about ‘the dream we all have seen the same night’, and replaces the long formulaic phrase by a direct request to predict the future.

The first part of this phrase is missing in Peniarth 14 (hereafter: P). *Nys wyt kemryt...na byd wedy ti* seems to be a fairly literal translation of the Latin, *nys* being *ny* 'not' with the infixed pronoun third singular *s*,¹⁸⁷ 'they are not', and *kemryt* is *cymhryd*, 'as beautiful as', from *cym+pryd* (GPC). Therefore, the fragment we have here means 'they are not as beautiful as you are, and amongst the women we have not seen or heard [of] your equal in beauty before you, nor will there be after you'. What follows, *agor yn betheu a uo rac law* 'reveal to us the things that will be in the future', is even shorter and more to the point than RB, cutting the whole reference to 'the dream that we all saw during the same night' like RB –it might have been absent in their shared ancestor- and not adding anything in the way the RB adds *kan gwddost*.

14. *Respondens Sibilla dixit ad eos : 'Non est equum in loco stercoribus pleno et diversis contaminationibus polluto sacramentum huius visionis detegere ; sed venite et ascendamus in Aventinum montem et ibi vobis pronuntiabo que ventura sunt civibus Romanis'.*

Answering, Sibyl said to them: 'it is not proper to reveal the sacrament of that vision in a place full of filth and polluted by various contaminations; but come, and let us go up to Mount Aventine, and there I will announce to you what things are coming to the Roman citizens'.

Red Book: *Hitheu ual hynn a atebawd: "nyt kyfyawn yn lle kyflawn o betheu budyr, a llygredic amryuaelon brouedigaethu, dangos rinnwed gweledigaeth a del*

187 GMW p. 55.

rac llaw. Namyn deuwch gyt a mi ym penn y mynyd racco, yr hynn yssyd oruchel ac eglur. Ac yno mi a uanagaf ywch yr hynn a del rac llaw y dinas Ruuein'.

Peniarth 14: *Ac ateb ual hyn a oruc Sibli udunt: "nyt kyuyawn en lle halauc ual hon o dom a budred datot rinwedeu gweledigaeth; namen awn yr menyd, ac eno mi a dangosaf yuch beth a damweinyo rac llaw y dinassoed Ruuein."*

The two Welsh translations show some interesting parallels, and differences. P uses a periphrastic construction *ateb... a oruc* while RB uses a conjugated verb, 3 sg. pret. *atsebawd*. Both Welsh versions add a *ual hynn*, 'like this' to *respondens*. This *ual hynn* is a conventional phrase, as common as, for example, *nyt amgen*.

Aventinum montem becomes in RB *y mynyd racco, yr hynn yssyd oruchel ac eglur*, and in P simply *y menyd*. It is characteristic of our RB translator to add a description and make the text livelier; he has also added *gyt a mi*, 'together with me' to Sibyl's invitation to climb the mountain, indeed the kind of dramatic detail that make a text come alive, and aid visualization.

Sackur's edition has no variants where the name of the mountain is omitted, but it gives the variant *Apenninum* in its apparatus. The early 6th-century Greek version, based on an older fourth-century text, which is edited by Alexander in *The Oracle of Baalbek*,¹⁸⁸ gives the Capitoline hill as the place where Sibyl prophesied.¹⁸⁹ According to Alexander, the Capitoline hill was the original place, chosen because it was the spiritual centre of Pagan Rome, and because of its association with Sibylline prophecy (it was here, in the temple of Jupiter, that the Sibylline books were kept).

188 Paul J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: the Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek Dress*, Washington DC, 1967.
189 Idem, p. 10.

Later, the place of action was moved to Mount Aventine, exactly because of the strong pagan connotations of the Capitoline hill, while Mount Aventine was a strong Christian cult centre from the fourth century.¹⁹⁰ As neither of our Welsh versions name the mountain at all, although RB adds a description, it is possible that the name had 'fallen out' of their common Latin ancestor already, or was illegible.

Civibus Romanis, 'to the citizens of Rome' is translated as *dinas Ruuein*, 'the city of Rome' by RB, and as *dinassoed Ruuein*, 'cities of Rome', in the plural, by P. Did their original have a form of *civitas* instead of *cives*? Note that in 12, Rome is called a *caer*, a fortress, citadel or fortified city.

A del rac llaw, 'what may come in the future', is another RB addition without its parallel in Latin, as the Latin just speak of a 'vision'. *A del rac llaw* has a formulaic quality to it, and is a turn of phrase often used in prophetic texts.

15. *Et fecerunt, ut dixit. Quos interrogans visionem quam viderant narraverunt ei.*

At illa dixit ad eos: "Novem soles, quos vidistis, omnes futuras generationes presignant. Quod vero dissimiles eos in se vidistis, dissimilis et vita erit in filiis hominum.

And they did as she said. When she asked them about the vision they had seen, they told it to her. And she said to them: 'The nine suns which you have seen foretell all future generations. So what you have seen of difference in them, will also be different in the life of the sons of men.

¹⁹⁰ Paul J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: the Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek Dress*, pp. 52-53.

Red Book: *Ac yna y doethant y gyt mal y herchis hi, ac idi hi yno y managassant eu gweledigaeth, a'r breudwyt a welsynt. A hitheu a dywawt: "Y naw heul a welsawch a arwydockaant y kenedloed a delont rac llaw, ac amryuaelder oed arnadunt a dengys amryuael vuched y abit y veibon y kenedloed hynny.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ual y dywaut y gwnaethant. Ac ena, gwedy gouyn ohonei udunt eu gweledigaeth, e datcanassant idi. Ac ena e dywaut hitheu: "naw heul a welsauch chwi a arwydoacaant er holl toeu kiwdodoed rac llaw. Ac vegys e gwelsauch chwi amravael liwoed arnunt hwy, ual henne e byd amravael defodeu y kiwdodoed y doant rac llaw.*

RB *Ac yna y doethant y gyt mal y herchis hi*, 'and there they all came, as she had asked', is quite a free and interpretative translation of the more concise Latin *et fecerunt ut dixit*, 'and they did as she said'. P on, the other hand, translates this phrase literally. The next part, *quos interrogans... narraverunt ei* is also translated word-for-word in P, while RB makes significant changes, inserting the *breudwyt*, 'dream', and leaving out the *quos interrogans*, 'when she asked them'. This *quos interrogans* is a grammatically somewhat complicated construction, with the participle *interrogans* and the relative *quos* in the accusative plural. *Quos*, coming from *qui*, 'who', can be translated in different ways, the most straightforward being the interrogative (who?), but here it is used as a personal pronoun to refer to the senators, as 'them', and it is in the accusative because it is the direct object of the verb *interrogare*. This piece of grammar may have been a bit too complicated for our translator, who elsewhere, too, stumbles over Latin constructions, which may be the reason he omitted it.

Quod vero... in filiis hominum, however, is translated literally in RB, while P interprets the differences between the suns as differences in colour, *amravael liwoed*. *Amravael*,

in its various spellings, is used interchangeably with singular and plural nouns in both our texts, although the word has its own plural, *amravaelion*. Our texts are not unique in this: we find this same feature for example in Peniarth 11, in the *Ystoriau Saint Greal*, p. 53v: *ac o beblyleu yndi am can y gant o amrauael liwyoed*. Or in Peniarth 19, in *Brut y Brenhinoedd*, p. 44r: *a gwneuthur amryuael beiryanneu ymlad a'r gaer yn drut ac yn galet a orugant*. And in the same text again, p. 54v: *...a'ch kynhalyaf chwi yn enrydedus y'm teyrnas ac awch kyuoethogaf o amryuael rodyon*. And so forth.

It also seems to be the case that the differences in life, *vita*, become differences in habits or ritual, *defodeu*, in P, but unfortunately the manuscript is too damaged at this point to say with certainty that *defodeu* is the correct reading.

Abit, in *amryuael vuched y abit y veibon y kennedloed hynny* is puzzling. It could be the Welsh word *abid* 'habit, dress, attire, profession', or Latin, from the verb *habere*, 'to have'. But *abid* does not really make sense in context, and *habere* is a long e-stem and does not have the form *habit*. It seems most likely we are dealing with a corruption of *amryuael vuched a vyd y* [= Modern Welsh *a fydd i*] *veibion y kennedloed hynny*, 'the different life the sons of those generations will have'. The use of *bod* with a preposition or dative infixed pronoun to express possession is well attested in GPC, and here we are dealing with the future form. This would be a fine translation of the Latin phrase, and also has the merit of not containing any puzzling Latin forms in a Welsh text. Another possibility is that *abit* was originally a gloss on *vuched*, explaining that 'life' in this case denotes 'profession' or 'livelihood'. The gloss would then later have been incorporated in the main text. In this case, *ac amryuaelder oed*

arnadunt a dengys amryuael vuched y abit y veibon y kennedloed hynny would mean ‘and the difference that was to them shows the different life, i.e. profession the sons of those generations will have’.

16. *Primus autem sol prima generatio est. Erunt homines simplices et clari, amantes libertatem, veraces, mansueti, benigni, amantes consolationes pauperum et satis sapientes*

The first sun, then, is the first generation. Men will be artless and bright, loving freedom, truthful, mild, benign, loving the consolation of the poor, and wise enough..

Red Book: *Yr heul gyntaf a uenyc y genedyl gyntaf, yn yr honn y bydant dynyon mul, ac eglur y garu rydit. A gwiryon vydant, a byuawl, a thrugarawc, ac a garant y tlodyon, a digawn eu doethet.*

Peniarth 14: *Er heul gentaf yu e giudaud gentaf. Ac ena e byd denyon mul, ac eglur eu caryat e rydit, hynaws, rybunchedic, ac a garant tlodyon, a digawn eu kymenhet.*

RB brings in some subtlety by stating *yr heul gyntaf a uenyc y genedyl gyntaf*, where *uenyc*, the lenited form of *menyc*, 3 sg pres. of *mynegi*, *menegi* ‘to express, to indicate’ replaces Latin *est*, ‘is’. So instead of equating ‘first sun’ and ‘first generation’ in a sign=signified way, the Welsh translator sees a difference between the sign and its meaning: when Sibyl states that the first sun *expresses* or *indicates* the first generation, she is far less absolute, and more conscious of her own act of interpreting the signs, than her Latin colleague who bluntly equates sign and signified in an absolute way.

This is surely significant, since it would have been easy for the translator to just write *yr heul gyntaf yw y genedyl gyntaf*, like his Latin exemplar. Deviation from this is appears to be a deliberate and considered choice.

P translates *generatio* as *ciudaut*, which is a loanword from Latin *civitas* (GPC), ‘the body of citizens, nation’. It is noteworthy that *enedyl* in RB has a very similar meaning, and that neither is a translation one would expect for *generatio*.

Rybuchedic is a good translation of *benigni*, while *byuawl*, ‘lively’ in RB does not quite hit the mark. The only variant of *benigni* Sackur gives is its superlative, *benignissimi*, so it seems unlikely RB uses another textual tradition.

17. *Secundus sol secunda generatio est. Erunt homines splendide viventes et crescentes multum Deum colentes sine malicia conversantes in terra.*

The second sun is the second generation. Men will be living brilliantly, multiplying a lot, worshipping God, living together on the earth without evil.

Red Book: *Yr eil heul, yr eil kenedyl. A dynyon uydant a uchedockaont yn eglur, ac a ymlhawynt yn vawr, ac a diwhyllant Duw heb drycdynyaeth. Ac y gyt y uchedockaont ar y dayar.*

Peniarth 14: *Er eil heul er eil giudaut yu, ac ena y byd denyon a uchedocao en hard, ac a uydant amyl, ac a anrydedant Duw, ac a gyuachwelan bop drwc en e byt.*

The RB translation here is literal, while P is more of a paraphrase: while *ymlhawynt* indeed translates *crescentes*, ‘to grow in number’, *ac a uydant amyl* means ‘and they

will be many'. The end result might be the same, but P's verbal form arguably loses the sense of movement, of becoming more than was before, of L and RB. L *sine malicia* (sic.) 'without malice' is in RB translated as *heb drycdyniaeth*, but has been lost in P. Or has it? The last part of the phrase, *ac a gyuachwelan bop drwc en e byt*, 'and they will turn every evil in the world', is puzzling at first sight. *Cyfachwelan* means 'they (will) turn', and is here a faulty translation of *conversantes*, 'living together'. Instead of the verb *conversor*, 'to live together' the translator read *converto*, 'to turn', in later Latin also 'to convert'. *Malicia* is translated by *drwc*. But *sine* 'without' has been lost, and replaced by *bop* 'every', while the case *malicia* in the ablative does not fit the translation either, which would call for an accusative. It seems that the translator, once snared by *conversantes*, more or less made up the rest of the phrase using what he understood to create something he thought would make sense: people 'converting' every evil in the world (to goodness, one presumes).

18. *Tertius sol tertia generatio est, exurget gens contra gentem et erunt pugne multe in Roma.*

The third sun is the third generation; people will rise against people, and there will be many wars in Rome.

Red Book: *Y dryded heul, y dryded genedyl. Ac y kyuyt kenedyl yn erbyn kenedyl, a llawer o ymladeu a uyd yn Ruuein.*

Peniarth 14: *E dryded heul y dryded giudaut. Ac ena e kyuyt e genedel en erbyn y gilid, ac ena e byd ryuelus Ruvein.*

RB translates literally, if we accept that he left out the Latin copula *est* in favour of a more elliptic *Y dryded heul, y dryded genedyd*. P changes the syntax of the last part: *erunt pugne multe in Roma*, ‘there will be many wars in Rome’ becomes *ena y byd ryuelus Ruvein*, ‘then Rome will be warlike’, where the noun *pugne* has been replaced by an adjective *ryuelus* describing Rome’s state in those times. *Ryfelus* is such a rare adjective that GPC gives two examples of it out of this text in Peniarth 14, and otherwise just examples from thesauri and dictionaries; in the Cardiff corpus it occurs only in three manuscripts of *Ymborth yr Enaid* (Jesus College MS. 119 (= The Book of the Anchorite of Llanddewi Brefi) , Llanstephan 27 (= The Red Book of Talgarth), and Peniarth 190).¹⁹¹ In the Aberystwyth corpus it occurs only in Peniarth 14, in our text.

19. *Quartus autem sol quarta generatio est. Erunt homines quod verum est abnegantes et in diebus illis exurget mulier de stirpe Hebreorum, nomine Maria, habens sponsum nomine Ioseph et procreabitur ex ea sine commixtione viri de spiritu sancto filius Dei nomine Iesus et ipsa erit virgo ante partum et virgo post partum.*

The fourth sun, then, is the fourth generation. Men will be denying what is true, and in those day there shall rise a woman from the tribe of the Hebrews called Mary, who will have a spouse called Joseph, and from her the son of God, called Jesus, will be born, without intercourse with a man, from the Holy Spirit, and she shall be virgin before giving birth and virgin after giving birth.

¹⁹¹ <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk>.

Red Book: *Y pedwyred heul, y pedwyred lin. Ac yn yr amser hwonnw y daw dynyon a wattont gwirioned. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y kyuyt gwreic a Meir uyd y henw, ac idi y byd gwr, Joseph y entw. Ac y creir o'r Meir honno mab heb gyt gwr a gwreic, trwy rat yr Yspryt Glan; yn vab, yn wir Duw, a'e entw uyd Iessu. A Meir a uyd gwyry kynn escor a gwedy escor.*

Peniarth 14: *Petwared heul yu e betwared giudaut, a rei henne a emwadant a gwiryoned. Ac en er amser hwonnw e kyuyt gwreic, Maria y henw, ac entw e gur priaut uyd Ioseph. Ac a greir o honno - heb gyt gur namen o'r yspryt glan - mab Duw, Yessu uyd y entw, a gwyry uyd hitheu a chyn esgor a guedy.*

The phrase *et in diebus illis exurget mulier de stirpe Hebreorum, nomine Maria*, echoes Luke 1:39 in the Vulgate: *exurgens autem Maria in diebus illis, abiit in montana cum festinatione, in civitatem Juda*, which in the King James Bible is translated as 'and Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Juda'. The line in the Sibylline Gospel, however, introduces the figure of Mary, while the Biblical verse is part of the passage where Mary hears of her own pregnancy and that of her cousin Elisabeth. The author of the Sibylline text obviously had, consciously or not, this verse in mind when he wrote this line.

Unlike the RB translator, who changes his translation of *generatio* here from *enedyl* to *llin*, presumably for the sake of variation, the P translator continues with *kiudaut*.

Where RB translates in *diebus ille* twice, first as *yn yr amser hwonnw*, then as *yn y dydyeu hynny*, P only translates it in the second instance, like Latin. It is interesting though that *yn y dydyeu hynny* is the literal translation of in *diebus illis*, while *yn yr amser hwonnw* is a paraphrase, and it is that literal version which has been lost while

the paraphrase is still there. It makes one suspect that the predecessor of text P must have had both wordings, like RB, but that a copyist with love for brevity crossed out one of these two adverbial phrases – and (unwittingly?) kept the unoriginal one.

Where RB uses the double translation as a way to link the first and second phrase in this fragment together, P contracts this same passage; *erunt homines*, ‘there will be men’ is skipped over as our translator chooses a more economic, but also more generalising *petwared heul uy e betwared giudaut, a rei henne...*, ‘the fourth sun is the first generation, and those...’, losing the nuance between ‘in this generation there will be men like this’ and ‘the fourth generation is like this’.

Both translators skip over *de stirpe hebreorum*, ‘from the tribe of the Hebrews’. Either this information was not deemed important enough to be translated, or it was omitted in a shared ancestor manuscript. As both our versions omit this information, the latter is likely, but the original omission might still have occurred because Mary’s ethnic identity was either not deemed important, or assumed to be common knowledge.

The word *mulier*, ‘woman’ is translated in both versions as *gwreic*. A *gwreic*, in Middle Welsh usage, is explicitly a woman who has a man (*gwr*), and is no longer a virgin. It can be used in the wider sense to describe a ‘woman’ as opposed to a ‘man’, but in general, the word *gwraig* denotes non-virginhood.¹⁹² In *Math uab Mathonwy*, Goewin tells Math to find another virgin to hold his feet after she has been raped by Gilfaethwy: ‘*arglwyd*’, *heb y Goewyn*, ‘*keis uorwyn a uo is dy draet weithon gwreic wyf i*’,

¹⁹² McAll, C., *The Normal Paradigms of a Woman’s Life in the Irish and Welsh Law Texts*, in *The Welsh Law of Women*, ed. Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen, Cardiff 1980, pp. 7-22, p. 15.

“Lord’, Goewin said, search a maiden who will be under your feet from now on, I am a woman’’.¹⁹³

It would have been more fitting to translate *morwyn* in Mary’s case, but then, the Latin word, *mulier*, is also a word applied to a grown-up, so supposedly sexually active women. Like its Welsh counterpart, the word is also used in the meaning of ‘wife’. One would expect *virgo* or even *puella* to describe Mary. The ‘fault’ here, then, is on the Latin author, but nevertheless it strikes me that the Welsh translator, who is very orthodox in many cases, as we shall see, has not emended to *morwyn*. He is in a way — because Joseph is in the same sentence — already thinking of her as his companion. She does have a husband, even if technically she has not known him sexually.

Ac y creir o’(r Meir) honno, ‘and from this (Mary) will be created’ is almost a word-for-word translation of *et procreabitur ex ea*, ‘and from her will be created’, the only change being that the RB translator has deemed it fit to render *ea* by the precise *y Meir honno*. The precision of a relative pronoun occurs again later in this section, where Latin has *et ipsa erit virgo ante partum et virgo post partum*, ‘and she will be a virgin before birth and a virgin after birth’ and RB translates *ipsa* ‘she’ with *Meir*, ‘Mary’. P has *hitheu*, closer to Latin *ipsa*. Both our translators show a love for brevity by omitting the second *virgo*: they use the word *gwyry* only once — and she will be virgin before and after birth. This is certainly just as intelligible to the reader, but takes away some of the stress on Mary’s virginity.

¹⁹³ *White Book of Rhydderch*, part 2, page 23r.

20. *Qui ergo ex ea nascetur, erit verus Deus et verus homo, sicut omnes prophete prophetaverunt et adimplebit legem Ebreorum. Et adiungit sua propria in simul et permanebit regnum eius in secula seculorum.*

Thus the one that shall be born from her shall be true God and true man, as all the prophets have prophesied, and he shall fulfil the law of the Hebrews. And he shall join his own together, and his kingdom shall endure for ever and ever.

Red Book: *Yr hwonn a anener o honno a uyd gwir Duw a gwir dyn, megys y managassant yr holl prophwydi ac yd eilenwa kyfreith gwyr Efrei, ac y kyssyllta y petheu priawt ygyt, ac y tric y deyrnas yn oes oessoed.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac urth henne er hwn a enir ohonei a uyd gwir Duw a gwir den; mal y racdywedassant er holl broffwydi. A hwonnw a gyflaunhaa kyureith er Ideon, ac a gyssylla yr eidau enteu y gyt a honno, a'e deyrnas a uyd parhaus tragywyd.*

The first phrase of this passage, *Qui ergo...Ebreorum* is translated almost literally in both versions. Note that RB skipped over the *ergo*, 'therefore', which P does translate, as *urth henne*. *Racdywedassant*, 'they have foretold' is also a more precise translation of *prophetaverunt* 'have prophesied', than *managassant* 'have stated'.

The second part, 'and he shall bring his own together and he shall reign for ever and ever', is puzzling. What does 'and he will bring his own things together' mean?

Alexander tells us that the Greek Tiburtine Sibyl, his 'Oracle of Baalbek', tells us that Jesus 'will destroy the law of the Hebrews and establish his own law', which conflicts with the canonical gospels, where Jesus says, 'Do not believe I have come to destroy the law and the prophets; I have come not to destroy but to fulfil' (Matthew

5:17). In Latin, this heretical statement has been replaced by *et adiungit sua propria in simul*, which appears to be a compromise; the orthodox religion is served by mouth, but still, Jesus does more than just fulfilling the Law – he adds his own words to it.¹⁹⁴

Yr hwonn a anener o honno: anener is not a word in Welsh, and obviously a scribal error for *a aner*, maybe influenced by an eye skipping to *phan aner* in the next phrase.

21. *Nascente autem eo exercitus angelorum a dextris et a sinistris erunt, dicentes:*

‘Gloria in excelsis Deo et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis’. Veniet namque vox super eum dicens : ‘Hic est filius meus dilectus, ipsum audite’.

Then, when he is born, there will be a host of angels from the right and from the left, saying: ‘glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth for the men of good will’. And then a voice will come over him, saying: ‘This is my beloved son, listen to him’.

Red Book: *A phan aner hwonnw y daw llong o egylyon ar y deheu ac ar y asseu y dywedut: ‘Gogonyant yr goruchelder Duw ac yn y dayar tangneued y’r dynyon’. Ac a daw llef y dywedut:’ hwonn yw vy mab i karedic, yn yr hwonn y rengeis i vy mod yndaw’.*

Peniarth 14: *Pan aner enteu y byd llu engylyon o bop tu idaw en canu ‘Gogonyant e Duw ac yg goruchelder neuoed, ac ar e daear heduch y denyon da eu hewylllys’. Ac a daw llef o dyarnaw a dyweto: ‘hvn yu uy mab i, en er hvn y ryngais i vy mod ymi en da’.*

¹⁹⁴ Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek*, p. 122.

The RB translation of *exercitus, llong*, actually means 'ship'. P translates correctly with *llu*, 'army'. RB *llong* must be a copying error, as WB has *lleg*, for *lleng*, 'legion', especially of the Roman army (GPC), and also for angels, for example in *Y Groglith* we find *mwy no deudec*, 'more than twelve' *lleng o engylyon* 'armies of angels' (Peniarth 7, 57r), and on the other hand there is *a lleng o dievyl*, an 'army of devils' in the *Ystoria Carolo Magno* in Peniarth 8 part I, p. 24.

RB *gogonyant yr goruchelder Duw* is very strange, as it is quite awkward to make a grammatically correct phrase out of this –it would be *gogonyant i'r goruchelder Dduw*, 'glory to the God in the highest', in which *goruchelder* 'majesty, highest point' is preceded by an article that should not be there, because this noun is followed by another in the possessive, *Dduw*. GPC has an example from the fourteenth century from *Revue Celtique* xxxiii, 219v, *gogonyant yn y goruchelder y Duw*, 'glory in the highest to God', which works much better grammatically. It is a literal, word-for-word translation that looks and feels not quite right, because Latin and Welsh don't work the same way. P *gogonyant e Duw ac yg goruchelder neuoed* 'Glory to God and to the height of heavens', may not be a strictly literal translation, but it works as a Welsh phrase.

Where RB has skipped over L *super eum*, 'over him', it is translated in P: *o dyarnaw*. (i.e. *oddi arnaw*).

Neither of the Welsh versions translates *hic est filius meus dilectus, ipsum audite*, 'this is my beloved son, listen to him'. Both give, with slight differences, the same variant: 'this is my (beloved, RB) son, the one I find pleasure in'. This variant is found in

Sackur's manuscripts *Vr* and *M*, as *in quo mihi complacui*. However, it features there as an addition to *audite ipsum*, not as a replacement as we see here. The two versions are based on two different Biblical verses: *ipsum audite*, 'listen to him', comes from Luke 9:35, Matthew 17:5, and Mark 9:7, where a voice from heaven speaks these words to the disciples after Jesus comes back from a mountaintop, where he conversed with Moses and Elijah. *In quo mihi complacui*, 'the one who delights me' is found in Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11, and Luke 3:22, where a voice from heaven speaks these words after Jesus's baptism in the Jordan.

22. *Erant autem ibi ex sacerdotibus Ebreorum, qui audientes hec verba indignati dixerunt ad eam: 'Ista verba terribilia sunt, sileat hec regina'. Respondens Sibilla dixit eis: 'Judei, necesse est ista fieri, sicut dictum est, sed vos non credetis in eum'.*

But there were some of the priests of the Hebrews, who hearing these words said angrily to her: 'Those words are terrible, let this queen be silent'.

Answering, Sibyl said to them: 'Jews, it is necessary that this will happen, as has been said, but you will not believe in him'.

Red Book: *Yno y dywedynt effeireit gwyr Effrei, rei yn gwarandaw, ac y dywedassant wrthi ual hynn: 'Yr ymadrodyon yssyd aruthur tawet y urenhines honn'. Sibli a atebawd udunt: 'O Jdewon, agheu [sic] yw bot uelly. Ny chredwch hagen idaw ef.'*

Peniarth 14: *Eno yd oed rei o effeiryait yr Ideon en gwarandau y geiryau hyn, ac a dywedassant urthi hitheu: 'aruthyr yu e geiryau hyn, tawet e vrenhines!' ac wynt bellach. Ac ena y dywaut Sibli en atep udunt: 'or [sic] Ideon', hep hi, 'dir yu bot henne, ac ny chreduch chwi idaw ef'.*

The first part of this excerpt, *erant autem.... hec regina* is translated literally by both Welsh versions: P gives a full translation of every Latin word, while RB skips over *hec verba*, 'these words', translated by P as *y geiryau hyn*. The phrase *respondens... dixit*, 'answering...said' is fully translated in P, as *y dywaut...en atep*, while RB shortcuts with a simple *atsebawd.*, 'answered'. P is also more correct in translating *ex sacerdotibus Ebreorum*, '[some] of the priests of the Hebrews' with *rei o effeiryait yr Ideon*, while RB simply has *effeireit gwyr Efrei*, 'the priests of the Hebrews'.

P also translates *erant*, 'there were' with the verb 'to be', *yd oed*, while RB does not translate 'there were', but reduplicates *dixerunt*, 'they said': *Yno y dyweddynt gwyr Efrei...ac y dywedassant ual hyn*. WB has *yno yd oedynt effeireit gwyr eurey rey yn gwarandaw, ac y dywedassant wrthi val hynn*, 'there were priests of the Hebrews, those that were listening, and they spoke as follows', with *yd oedynt* translating *erunt*. It is possible that the RB scribe simply slipped.

The following *ac wynt bellach*, 'and they further' in P is puzzling, as its meaning is at this stage not clear to me, and it does not occur in either RB, WB, or Latin.

Rei yn gwarandaw: 'some listening' or 'the ones that were listening'. A translation of *qui audientes*, '(the priests of the Hebrews), who, when they heard...' The RB translator is trying to render a Latin participle-construction in Welsh. But where in

Latin the participle confers a temporal clause, no such meaning is possible in Welsh. And whether it was done on purpose or not, the insertion of *rei*, when translated as ‘some’ or ‘certain persons’ does some justice to the Latin *ex* that was left out in the preceding fragment, by making clear, in this way, that indeed certain, but not necessarily all, of the priests of the Hebrews were listening.

Effrei, *Efrei*, *Idewon*: in our two texts, we find variation in the terms used to denote ‘Jews’. *Effrei*, with double *f*, occurs only once in the Cardiff and Aberystwyth corpora, namely in this position in the Red Book. The White Book has *Eurey*, which is a spelling occurring only in this manuscript, in the Sibyl but also in the texts *Elen a'r Grog*, *Mabinogi Iesu Grist*, and *Efengyl Nicodemus*, all part of the first four quires of the White Book, written by the scribe Daniel Huws dubbed ‘Scribe A’,¹⁹⁵ and standing apart from the rest of the manuscript both in content and format. *Effrei* in the Red Book might have been an error, especially because the scribe used *Efrei*, with one *f*, a few lines earlier. *Efrei* also occurs 19 times in the Cardiff corpus. *Idewon*, occurring 61 times, is a very regular term.

23. *At illi dixerunt: ‘Nos non credemus, quia verbum et testamentum dedit Deus patribus nostris, et auferet manum suam a nobis?’*

And they said: ‘We will not believe, because God gave the word and covenant to our fathers and will He take His hand away from us?’

195 Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, p.232.

Red Book: *Wynteu a dywedassant: 'Na chredun, kanys tystolyaeth a geir a rodes an tadeu ynn, ac ny duc ef y law y wrthym ni.'*

Peniarth 14: *'Na chredun', hep wynt, 'canys rodes y an reeni tystyolaeth a geir, ac ny duc y nerth y genhym'.*

RB makes *patribus* the agent in this phrase: 'because of the word and testimony our fathers gave us'. *Patribus*, however, is in the dative, and on the 'receiving end' of the 'word and testimony'. P, like RB, leaves out the quite crucial word *Deus*, 'God', but is otherwise correct. As neither version translates *Deus*, it is possible that the Latin source was corrupted at this point.

P translates *manum* 'hand' as *nerth*, 'power, strength, support, virtue' (GPC).

Although this is not a literal translation as with RB (*law*), it confers very well the idea of God's protecting power, which is the meaning behind the image of God's hand in Latin and RB.

Ac ny duc ef y law e y wrthym ni/ ny duc y nerth y genhym 'and he will not take his hand/force away from us': while this Welsh phrase is negative, its Latin source is a question, as indicated by the 'doubting' subjunctive: *Et auferet manem suam a nobis ?*, 'and would he take his hand away from us?' This turns a rhetorical question into an affirmation of faith. But again, the variant is shared by both our Latin versions, and their Latin source text might very well be responsible for it.

24. *Respondit eis iterum: 'Deus celi sibi geniturus est filium, ut scriptum est, qui similis erit patri suo. Et postea, ut infans per etates crescet, et insurgent reges in eum*

et principes terrae. In diebus illis erit cesari Augusto celebre nomen et regnabit in Roma, et subiciet omnem terram sibi.

She answered them again: 'God of Heaven will give birth to his son, who will be similar to his Father, as is written. And afterwards, when the child shall grow through the ages, the kings and princes of the earth will rise against him. In those days, Caesar Augustus will have a famous name, and he will reign in Rome and subject the whole earth to himself.

Red Book: *Hitheu eilweith a atebawd udunt: 'Duw nef a enir megys y mae yscriuennedic, kyffelyb vod o'e dat. A gwedy hynny mab drwy oessoed a tyf, ac y kyuodant yn e erbyn brenhined a thywysogyon y daear. Yn y dydyeu hynny y byd y cesar arderchawc enw, ac a wledych yn Ruuein, ac a darestwng yr holl dayar idaw.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena eilweith yd atebaud udunt: "Duw nef", hep hi, "e genir mab idau a uyd kyffelip y'u dat, ac ual e del y oet e tyf. Ac en e erbyn e kyuodant brenhined a thywysogyon e daear. En e dydyeu henne e byd anrydedus enw Augustus Cesar ac a wledycha en Ruuein, ac a darystung idaw er holl daear.*

P has not translated *ut scriptum est*, 'as it written', while RB has *megys y mae yscriuennedic*. RB has also translated *per etates*, 'through the ages' literally as *drwy oessoed*, while P paraphrases with *ual e del y oet*, 'as he comes to age'. P has kept the Latin *Augustus*, 'venerable, august' as the name of the emperor, while RB translated it as a title with *arderchawc*, which can carry the same connotations of 'eminent, illustrious, noble' (GPC).

RB *Duw Nef a enir*, 'the God of Heaven will be born': in Latin, *Deus celi*, the God of Heaven, is the Father, in the Red Book, it has become his son. The Latin seem to present our translator once again with a challenging piece of grammar.¹⁹⁶ *Geniturus est* is a periphrastic conjugation of the future participle in the active voice. It means 'he shall beget, he shall give birth'. The subject of this verb is *Deus celi*, 'God of Heaven'. So our translator was right in making him, or rather Him, the subject of his own phrase. It seems to me that he has not recognized that *geniturus est*, which looks like a passive verb indeed, is in fact active. In the case of this verb, the correct translation is not that God 'shall be born' but that 'he shall beget' a son, *filium*, which is the object of *geniturus est*. The translator, in his confusion, has chosen an approximate translation. P, on the other side, has understood the construction, and translated it correctly.

In diebus illis, 'in those days': this formula, again, seems to echo one of the best known of the verses of Luke's Gospel: the opening of the Christmas story. The second time we encounter the formula in our text is also the second time we encounter it in Luke: *factum est autem in diebus illis, exiit edictum a Cæsare Augusto ut describeretur universus orbis* (Luke 2:1), translated in the KJV as 'and it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed'. As above in fragment 19, the line in the *Tiburtina* is not a translation of a real Biblical verse, but rather a conscious or unconscious allusion to a verse containing the same elements, here the introduction of Emperor Augustus.

196 It was tough for me, too. I would like to thank my friend Mona NicLeod for explaining this phrase to me.

The placement of the adjective *arderchawc* in front of *enw* in RB, rather than after it is the norm in medieval Welsh, according to GPC.

25. *Posthec convenient sacerdotes Ebreorum contra Jesum, propter quod multa signa faciet, et comprehendent eum.*

After that, the priests of the Hebrews will conspire against Jesus, because he will perform numerous miracles, and they will arrest him.

Red Book: *Odyna y kyudant tywysogyon o'r offeireit yn erbyn Iessu, yr hwnn a wna llawer o wyrtheu, ac wynt a'e dalyant ef.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac odena e kyounant effeiryet er Ideon en erbyn Yessu canys gwyrthyeu mawr a wna, ac y dalyant ef.*

RB has three mistakes in this phrase, none of which is present in P: *propter quod*, 'because, on account of' has in RB been taken for the antecedent of a relative clause, *yr hwnn*, while P correctly translates *canys*, and *convenient* indeed means 'will come together', as P translates with *kyounant*, and not 'will rise', as RB *kyudant*. The similarity between the two words, and the fact that *kyudaf* is one of the most frequent verbs in this text, may have caused confusion. This glitch made its way into WB as well, so we cannot blame the scribe, Hywel Fychan. The third mistake is the translation of *sacerdotes*. This is 'priests', as in P *effeiryet*, and not 'princes', as in RB *tywysogyon*. Of course, a priest is a leader, and the word *tywysawc* has the etymological meaning of 'he who leads', but as, until now, Sibli was in dialogue with the *effeireit* of the Hebrews, this translation seems off the mark. But only two phrases

earlier, the Sibyl prophesied that *brenhined a thywyssogyon y daear*, 'the kings and princes of the earth', will rise against Jesus, in exactly the same formula. It is therefore likely that the translator-interpreter assimilated those *tywyssogyon* with these *sacerdotes*.

26. *Dabunt autem alapas Deo manibus incestis et in vultu sacro expuent venenata sputa. Dabit vero ad verbera simpliciter dorsum sanctum et colaphos accipiens tacebit. Ad cibum autem fel et ad sitim acetum dabunt. Et suspendent eum in ligno et occident et nihil valebit eis, quia die tertia resurget et ostendet se discipulis suis et ipsis videntibus ascendet in celum et regni eius non erit finis'.*

And they will strike blows on God with filthy hands, and they will spit in the holy face with venomous spittle. But he will simply give his holy back to the whips, and receiving fists he will be silent. For food they will give him gall, and vinegar as a drink. And they will hang him on wood and slay him, and it will not serve them at all, for he will rise again on the third day and show himself to his disciples, and he will ascend into heaven while there are watching, and there will be no end to his reign.'

Red Book: *Ac wynt a rodant idaw bonclusteu o ysgymynyon dwylaw, ac yn y wyneb kyssegredic y poerant poer gwennwynawl. Ac a dyry ef y geuyn gwerthuawr udunt o'e uadeu, ac yr kymryt amarch y gantunt. Efa deu. Yn vwyt idaw y rodant bystyl, ac yn diawt idaw gwin egyr a wallonyant. Ac ar brenn diodeifeint a'e crogant, ac a'e lladant. Ac ny rymhaa udunt hynny o dim, kanys y trydyd dyd y kyuyt o*

ueirw, ac yd ymdengys y disgyblon, ac ac wynt yn edrych yd yskynn y'r nef, ac ar y deyrnas ny byd diwed'.

Peniarth 14: *Ac a rodant e Duw uonclustyeu oc eu hysgymunyon lawoed, ac en er wynep kysygreddic y poerant haliw gwenwinic. Ac enteu a ryd y gyssygreddic keuyn en war y'u uaedu, ac a gemer tacuaeu en dawedauc. En lle bwyt idau y frowyllir, ac y'u sychet y rodir pystyl idaw, ac ym mewn prenn e crogant, ac e lladant; ac ny thal henne dim udunt, canys e trededyd e kyuyt ac yd ymdengys y'u disgyblon ac ac wynt en edrech arnaw a esgyn y nef, ac ny byd teruyn ar y wledych.'*

Here we have the 'Sibylline Gospel', quoted straight out of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*.¹⁹⁷ It is common to all Latin versions.¹⁹⁸ In *De Civitate Dei*, it is featured in the chapter on the Erythrean Sibyl and her prophecy (the famous *Judicii Signum*, with which the *Tiburtina* ends), where Augustine is mainly quoting Lactantius. This 'gospel' is also quoted from Lactantius. Augustine cites it as being foretold by 'some other Sibyl', noting that Lactantius does not provide a name.¹⁹⁹

The first phrase is translated word for word by both versions, except for *Deo*, 'to God', which is indeed translated as such in *P e Duw*, but RB has *idaw*, 'to him', which might be a copying error.

In the second phrase, P solves a problem for RB. Where it seemed earlier to me RB *o'e uadeu* meant something along the lines of 'motivated by forgiveness', where L

¹⁹⁷ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, book XVIII, chapter 23.

¹⁹⁸ Holdenried, Anke, *The Sybil and her Scribes: Manuscripts and Interpretation of the Latin Sybilla Tiburtina c. 1050-1500*, Bristol 2006, p. 61.

¹⁹⁹ I have used the translation provided on <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/schaff-a-select-library-of-the-nicene-and-post-nicene-fathers-of-the-christian-church-vol-2>, translated by the Rev. J.F. Shaw and the Rev. M. Dods (last visited 9/1/2019).

Dabit...ad verbera...torsum 'he gave his back to the whips' became 'he gave his back in forgiveness', showing a different approach to Jesus' suffering, P teaches us that *uadeu* is a scribal error for *uaedu*, 'beating' (the verb is Mod. W. *maeddu/baeddu*). So Jesus gives his back to the beating, which is closer in sense to the Latin, where he 'gave his back to the whips'.

P *en lle bwyt idau y frowillir, ac y'u sychet y rodir pystyl idaw*, 'Instead of food for him he is beaten and for his thirst he is given gall': *frowillir* comes from the verb *ffrewyllio*, variant *ffrowyllo*, meaning 'to whip, to beat' (GPC). This is at variance with the Latin text, as is the next part, where Jesus is given gall as a drink, while in Latin and RB gall is given as food, while vinegar is the drink. *Frowillir* has probably entered the text because the previous phrase was about beatings, rather than being a misreading of whatever example the copyist had in front of him. The whole phrase is problematic.

RB *wallonyant* is a corruption of *wallofyant*, 'they serve' The White Book has *ballofuyant*, probably as a result of misreading the 6 character, thus leaving us with not a single manuscript with a correct form in this place.

The last part of this section, *et suspendent eum in ligno...non erit finis* is translated literally in P. RB adds a few flourishes: L and P's simple 'wood' becomes *prenn diodeifeint*, 'the wood of the passion', and Jesus doesn't just rise, but he rises 'from the dead' *o ueirw*. These particular additions probably spring from a mind infused with Christian literature and liturgy, in which these turns of phrase are omnipresent.

27. *Dixitque principibus Romanorum: 'Quintus sol quinta generatio est et eliget sibi Jesus duos piscatores de Galileam et legem propriam docebit eos dicens: 'Ite et doctrinam, quam accepistis a me, docete omnes gentes, et per septuaginta et duas linguas subicientes omnes nationes'.*

And to the leaders of Rome she said: 'the fifth sun is the fifth generation, and Jesus will elect two fishermen from Galilee for himself, and he will teach them his own law, saying: 'Go, and teach the teachings you have received from me to all the peoples, and through seventy-two languages all nations will be subjected'.

Red Book: *Wrth wyr Ruuein y dywawt Sibli: 'Y bymhet heul y bymhet lin a arwydockaa. Ac yn yr oes honno yr ethyl Iessu deu byscodwr o Alilea, ac o'e briawt gyfreith y dysc wy, ac y dyweit: 'Ewch, a'r dysc a dyscoch y gennyf, dyscwch hwnnw y'r holl bobloed. A thrwy deg ieith a thrugeint y darestyngir yr holl bobloed awenus'.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e dywaut urth dywysogyon Ruuein: 'Pymhet heul pymhet kiudaut, ac ena yr ethola Yessu idau deu byscodwr o wlat Galylea, ac e dysc wynt o'e briaut dedyf, gan dywedut urthunt: 'euch, a'r dysc a gymerasauch y gennyf ui, dysgwch yr holl genedloed ac a darystyngant kiudodoed deudeng yeith a thri ugeint'.*

This passage has been translated almost verbatim in both versions. True to its style, RB expands a bit, and breaks the first phrase Sibyl utters in two, starting the second with a *ac yn yr oes honno*, 'and in that time', which is absent in Latin.

RB *Arwydockaa*, 'means, signifies': the Latin simply states *Quintus sol quinta generatio est*, 'the fifth sun IS the fifth generation', but the RB translator retains the subtler

expression we have encountered in our discussion of the first sun in fragment 16 already, where Latin also uses the copula *est*, and Welsh uses the verb *menyc*. The alternation of synonyms lends a certain richness to the text, and gives the impression of a genuine literary effort.

Ethyl and *Ethola*, both meaning 'he selects' are two interesting forms of the verb *etholi*: the regular third singular present is *ethol*. I have only found *ethyl* in our text in its WB and RB forms, and *ethola* does not seem attested outside P. *Ethol*, on the other hand, is widely attested.

Quam accipistis, 'which you received' has been rendered by *dyscoch* 'you may learn' in RB, but P agrees with WB in choosing *gymerasauch* 'you have received', a closer translation.

RB translates *et per septuaginta linguas (lege linguas)* as *thruwy deg ieith a thrugeint*, 'through seventy languages', with the proposition *per* 'through' translated correctly, but omitting *et duas*, giving seventy languages instead of seventy-two. It is an interesting variant, as both numbers, seventy and seventy-two, have Biblical tradition to back them up. Tristan Major explains that seventy-two was the number of the nations of the earth according to the Christian interpretation of Genesis 10.²⁰⁰ Jewish authors, on the other hand, claimed that the number was seventy, a number with strong symbolic connotations in Judaism. Major explains that the shift from seventy to seventy-two came about in the Hellenistic period, when the Jewish tradition was influenced by the Greek, in which the number seventy-two was of

200 In: Major, T., *Number Seventy-two: Biblical and Hellenistic Beginnings to the Early Middle Ages*, in *Sacris Erudiri* 52 (2013), pp. 7-45.

great astronomic importance. Jewish authors in general, though, clung to the old interpretation.

It is almost a pity that P gives the 'correct' number of seventy-two, making it much more likely that the RB translator simply forgot the *et duas*, than that we are dealing with a different interpretation of the Bible.

Awenus in RB is odd. The White Book has *y'r holl genedloed*, 'all the peoples', like P; the *awenus* must be an invention that came very late to the textual transmission of our text, perhaps added by the scribe of RB itself. It is an exciting word, because according to GPC, *awenus* has not been attested before the 20th century, in which it appears as a neologism meaning 'inspired', and Stefan Zimmer does not list it with his ancient Welsh formations ending in *-us*.²⁰¹ Yet here we are: *awenus* undeniably exists in the Red Book.²⁰²

28. *Sextus sol sexta generatio est et expugnabuntur in istam civitatem annos tres et menses sex.*

The sixth sun is the sixth generation, and in that one the city will be oppressed for three years and six months.

(RB omitted)

²⁰¹ Zimmer, S., *Studies in Welsh Word-Formation*, Dublin 2000, pp. 535-38.

²⁰² Or is it? Patrick Sims-Williams suggests (in personal communication) that it might be a corruption of *a chwe mis*, the end of section 28, which has been left untranslated in RB. It is possible that the eye of the scribe skipped; this would explain the omission of 28 in RB. If it is a deformation of *a chwe mis*, the resulting *awenus* is still interesting; it was penned down by a Welsh-speaking scribe, and it therefore may still be a real word that was used at the time. Unfortunately, there is no way to know for sure.

Peniarth 14: *E chwechet heul y chwechet kiwdaut yu, a'r dinas hwn a adawant teir blyned a chwe mis.*

This phrase is omitted in both RB and WB.

Adawant does not mean *expugnabuntur* 'they will be conquered, they will be oppressed', but rather 'they will leave'. The *in* has not been translated – the proposition would not go with the meaning of the Welsh phrase. The translator might have been led astray by the prefix *ex-*, which means 'out of' and could be thought to denote a movement of leaving, going away, by someone who does not know the verb *expugnare*.

29. *Septimus sol septima erit generatio, et exsurgent duo reges et multas facient persecutione in terram Hebreorum propter Deum.*

The seventh sun will be the seventh generation, and two kings will rise and they will wreak many persecutions in the land of the Hebrews, because of God.

Red Book: *Y seithuet heul y seithuet genedyl vyd, ac y kyuodant ac y gwnant lawer o laduaeu yn daear gwyr Efrei yr Duw.*

Peniarth 14: *E seithuet heul y seithuet giwdaut uyd, a rei henne a gyuodant ac a distrywyant wlat yr Ideon en dial Duw.*

Neither RB nor P has translated *duos reges*, 'two kings'. In both texts, it seems that it is the seventh generation that will rise. In RB, this causes a syntactical problem, as

genedyl, 'generation', is in the singular, and the verb *kyuodant*, 'they will rise' is third person plural. P solves this problem adding *a rei henne*, 'and those', referring to the *giwdaut*, 'generation', but either RB has lost the *rei henne* that saved the syntactical logic, or P has added it for the sake of this same logic.

The second part of the phrase, *et multas...propter Deum* has been interpreted differently in both versions. RB translates *persecutiones*, 'persecutions, harassment' as *laduaeu*, 'massacres'. P says 'they' (*rei henne*) will 'destroy' (*distrywiant*) 'the land of the Jews' 'as God's vengeance' (*en dial Duw*). This is again a step further away from the original that states there will be persecutions *in* the country 'because of God' (*propter Deum*). RB translates *propter* as *yr*, which has the same ambiguity as *propter*: does *propter Deum/yr Duw* mean that the persecutions took place because the persecuted believed in God, or were they carried out by people who thought they were fulfilling God's will by doing so? P clearly chooses the latter option with its interpretation *en dial Duw*.

30. *Octavus autem sol erit generatio octava et Roma in desertatione erit, et
pregnantes ululabunt in tribulationibus et doloribus dicentes: 'Putasne,
pariemus?'*

The eighth sun then will be the eighth generation, and Rome will be a wilderness, and the pregnant will howl in afflictions and pains, saying: 'do you think we will give birth?'

Red Book: *Yr wythuet heul, yr wythuet genedyl vyd. Ac y megys yn digenedlu y byd Ruuein, a'r gwaged beichawl a vydant yn eu trallodeu a doluryeu, ac a dywedant: 'a debygy di a escorwn ni?'*

Peniarth 14: *Er wythuet heul yr wythuet giwdaut uyd, ac ena e digenedla Ruuein. A chwynuan e gwaged beichyauc yn eu trallodeu, a dywedant 'a debygy di a esgorwn ni?'*

The first part, *Octavus... desertatione erit* has been translated faithfully in both versions. Note that RB inserts *megys*, 'like, as if', which gives the quality of a metaphor or hyperbole to the idea that Rome will be depopulated; Latin and P, however, state directly that Rome will be abandoned or depopulated.

The pregnant women howl in their tribulations and pains in Latin (*tribulationibus et doloribus*) and in RB (*eu trallodeu a doluryeu*), but P simply has tribulations (*trallodeu*) without the tautological 'pains' added to them. P translates the *ululabunt*, 'they will howl, cry out' as *chwynfan*, 'complaint, moan', while RB leaves this word untranslated.

31. *Nonus autem sol nona generatio est et exurgent principes Romani in perditione multorum.*

The ninth sun is the ninth generation, and the Roman leaders will rise to the destruction of many.

Red Book: *Y nawuet heul, y nawuet lin vyd, ac y kyudant gwyr Ruuein yn ormes ar lawer.*

Peniarth 14: *Nauuet heul yu e nauuet giudaut ac ena e kyuyt tywyssauc Ruuein yg kyuyrgoll y lawer.*

An almost literal translation in both versions, but both stumbled over the word *principes*, 'leaders'. Where RB left out the word entirely, letting the *Romani/gwyr Ruuein* rise on their own, P translates the plural form as a singular *tywyssauc*, 'leader', which may mean that its exemplar had a singular *princeps* rather than the plural *principes*.

This is the last phrase of the *explanatio somnii* proper. We are now about to plunge into detailed political prophecy.

32. *Tunc exurgent duo reges de Siria et exercitus eorum innumerabilis sicut arena maris, et obtinebunt ciuitates et regiones Romanorum usque ad Calcedoniam, et tunc multa erit sanguinis effusio. Omnia hec, horum cum reminiscuntur, ciuitas et gens tremiscunt in eis et disperdunt orientes.*

Then two kings from Syria will rise, and their army will be innumerable like the sand of the sea, and they will gain the cities and regions of the Romans as far as Calchedonia, and then much blood will be shed. When they remember all this, the city and people will tremble in them and they will destroy the people of the East.

Red Book: *Odyna y kyudant deu urenhin o Siria, ac eu llu ny ellir rif arnaw mwy noc ar dywot y mor. Ac wynt a gynhalyant dinassoed, a brenhinaetheu gwyr Ruuein,*

hyt yg Kacedonia. Yna y tywelltir amylder o waet. Y petheu hynn oll pan y coffaont y dynassoed, a'r kenedloed a ovynhaant yndunt, ac a wahanant y'r dwyrein.

Peniarth 14: *Ena y kyuodant deu urenhin o Syria, ac ny byd haus riuau eu llu no tyuaut y weilgi. A rei henne a oresgynnant dinassoed Ruuein hyt yg Calcedonia. Ena y byd amy l gwaet o'r calaned, a phan del e gof henne rac llaw yd ofnaant e rei a aner ena.*

We see here the literary choices made by different translators. *Excercitus eorum innumerabilis sicut arena maris*, 'the army [will be] uncountable like the sand of the sea' has been translated idiomatically by RB with *eu llu ny ellir rif arnaw mwy noc ar dywot y mor*, literally 'no number can be [placed] on their army, not more than on the sand in the sea' (the difficulty in translating this literally goes to show how idiomatic this is...), while P chooses a straightforward but equally approximative translation *ac ny byd haws rywau eu llu no tyuaut y weilgi* 'and it will not be easier to count their army than the sand of the ocean'. 'As innumerable as the sand of the sea' is a Biblical expression that is found three times in the Old Testament: in Genesis 22.17, where God promises Abraham that his descendants will outnumber the sand on the seashore; in 1 Kings 4.29, where God gives Solomon wisdom as much as there is sand on the seashore; and in Psalms 139. 18, where the thoughts of God outnumber the grains of sand. The Sibyl uses biblical discourse to strengthen her own authority as an Old Testament-style prophet.

The second phrase *et obtinebant...sanguinis effusio* has been translated literally in RB, if one takes into account RB's habit of translating *regiones* 'regions' with *brenhinaetheu*, 'kingdoms'. P does not translate *et regiones* at all, but only translates

civitates as *dinassoed*, 'cities'. P also expands *et tunc multa erit sanguinis effusio*, 'and then much blood will be shed' to an explanative *ena y byd amyl gwaet o'r calaned*, 'then there will be much blood because of the massacre'.²⁰³ This time, it is P that adds an *a rei henne* to link the two phrases with each other, while RB adds an *ac wynt*, 'and they' with the same function.

RB *Kacedonia* is scribal error for Chalcedonia. The White Book has the same form, so it must already have featured in the common example of the Red Book and the White Book. Calchedonia, or Chalcedonia, was a town in the far west of Turkey, near Byzantium.

The last phrase of this fragment is mysterious in Latin, and it is no surprise that both Welsh versions have stumbled over it. The Latin reads 'all this, when they will remember; the city and the people in it will shudder, and they will destroy the people of the East' This is all very puzzling, and maybe *disperdunt* 'they will destroy' should be emended to *dispergunt* 'they will scatter', taking *orientes* as an accusative of direction, yielding a meaning 'and they will scatter towards the east', 'they' being the shuddering people.

RB actually translated *dispergunt* rather than *disperdunt*, with *wahanant*, which can indeed mean 'disperse, scatter' (from the verb *gwahanu*).

P does not translate most of the phrase: *a phan del e gof henne rac llaw yd ofnaant e rei a aner ena* means 'and when they will remember this in the future they will be afraid, the ones that will be born then'. This first part of this phrase is an approximate

203 Or: 'because of the corpses.'

translation, but *ofnaant* seems to translate a form of *despero* 'to despair' instead of *disperdunt*. However, in that case, the form understood would be *desperant* (present) or *desperabunt* (future), both of which would be quite a stretch from *disperdunt*. It is easier to confuse two verbs from the third conjugation (*dispergo* and *disperdo*) than a verb from the third (*disperdo*) with one from the first (*despero*).

Another possibility is that *ofnaant* translates *tremiscunt*, 'they will tremble': it is not clear from P which verb is translated. The Latin for 'they will be afraid' is *timebunt*, which is about as much of a stretch from *tremiscunt* as *desperant*/*desperabunt* is from *dispergunt*; or *ofnaant* is an interpretation of *tremiscunt*. It is hard to see which explanation is the most plausible; and it is even harder to explain *e rei a aner ena*, 'the ones that will be born then'. It is a very logical thing to write when dealing with prophecy, so it might be that the translator, unable to understand the text in front of him, simply improvised.

33. *Et post hec surgent duo reges de Egypto et expugnabunt quattor reges et occident eos et omnem exercitum eorum et regnabunt annos tres et menses sex.*

And after that two kings will rise from Egypt, and they will subdue the four kings and slay them and all of their army, and they will reign for three years and six months.

Red Book: *A gwedy hynny y kyudant deu vrenhin o'r Eifft, ac a ymladant a phedwar brenhin, ac a'e lladan ac eu llu. Ac a wledychant teir blyned a chwe mis.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac odena y kyudant deu urenhin o'r Eifft, ac y gurthladant petwar brenhin, ac y lladant ac wynt ac eu holl luoed, ac y goledychant teir blyned a chwe mis.*

Though the wording in both Welsh versions is slightly different, both are literal translations of the Latin. P takes *exercitum*, 'army' as a plural, *lluoed*, while RB does not translate the word *omnem*, 'all'.

34. *Et post eos consurget alius rex C. nomine, potens in prelio qui regnabit a. XXX et edificabit templum Deo et legem adimplebit et faciet iustitiam propter Deum in terram.*

And after them, another king will rise, called C., mighty in battle, who will reign for thirty years, and he will build a temple for God, and fulfil the law, and do justice on earth for the sake of God.

Red Book: *A gwedy hynny y kyuyt arall, C. y entw rac kyfoethawc yn ymlad. Yr hwonn a wledycha deg mlyned ar hugeint, ac a adeilha temyl y Duw, ac ef a lawnhau [sic] y gyfreith, ac a wna wiryoned yr Duw ar y dayar.*

Peniarth 14: *A guedy e rei henne ef a gyuyt arall blaengar en emlad, a'e entw o. C. lythyren, a hwonnw a wledycha deg blyned ar ugeint, ac a adeila temyl y Duw, ac a geidu y dedyf, ac a wna gwiryoned y Duw en e daear.*

RB *A gwedy hynny*, 'and after that': the phrase just before this one also started with *a gwedy hynny*, as a literal translation of Latin *et post hec*. This phrase, however, starts with *et post eos*, 'and after them', in all the versions Sackur examined, but one, the version he termed E. P has *a gwedy e rei henne*, 'and after those', which is the literal translation of *et post eos*; RB's variant is very probably a repetition caused by the words that were still ringing in his head.

Neither RB nor P translates Latin *rex*, 'king'; this might be because it is clear from the context we are dealing with kings here. The rest of the passage is translated literally by both versions, though in very different words: *adimplebit*, 'he will fulfill' is translated as *lawnhau* in RB, and *geidu* in P; *legem*, 'law' is *gyfreith* in RB, *dedyf* in P; but both, interestingly, translate *iustitiam*, 'justice' as *gwiryoned*, which primarily means 'truth'.

35. *Et post hunc surget alius rex, qui regnabit paucis temporibus et expugnabunt et occident eum.*

And after that another king will rise, who will reign for a small amount of time, and they will subdue him and slay him.

Red Book: *A gwedy y rei hynny y kyuyt brenhin, yr hwnn a wledycha ychydic o amseroed, ac wynt a ymladant ac ef, ac a'e lladant.*

Peniarth 14: *A gwede e rei henne ef a gyuyt brenhin arall, a wledycho ychydic o amseroed, ac a urthuynebant idau ac a'e lladant.*

Although Latin *hunc* is a demonstrative pronoun in the singular, both P and RB translate it as a plural with *y rei hynny/ e rei henne*.

Ychydic o amseroed, 'a small amount of time', used by both our translations, is a strange construction. Modern Welsh would naturally have *ychydic o amser*, without the plural. The only occurrence of *ychydic o amseroed* in the Cardiff corpus is indeed this one, against many occurrences of *ychydic o amser*. It seems that our translator was influenced by the formula of his Latin example, *paucis temporibus*, which indeed gives 'times' as a plural.

Expugnare means 'to subject, to be victorious over, to capture, conquer'. Both our texts, however, have translated it as *pugnare*, 'to fight, to battle'; RB with *ymladant*, 'they will fight, battle', and P with *urthuynebant*, 'they will oppose, resist'. Either our translators were not aware of the subtle difference, or our Latin source had a form of *pugnare* rather than *expugnare*.

36. *Post hunc vero erit rex per B nomine et de B procedet rex Audon, et de Audon egredietur A et de A procedet A et de hoc A generabitur A, et ipse secundus A erit bellicosus nimis et preliator et de ipso A nascetur rex per R nomine et de R nasciturus est L et potestatem habebit super decem et novem reges.*

But after that there will be a king called B, and from B king Audon will come forth, and from Audon will come A and from A will come A and from that A, A will be born, and this second A will be very warlike and a fighter, and from

this same A a king called R will be born, and from R L shall be born, and he will have power over nineteen kings.

Red Book: *A gwedy hwnnw y kyuyt brenhin, B. vyd y entw, ac o hwnnw y kyuyt Andon, ac o Andon y daw A. ac o A. y daw A., ac ohonaw ynteu y daw. A.. A'r eil kyntaf. A. a uyd gwr ymladgar a diruawr ryuelwr, ac o'r A. hwnnw y daw. R., ac o'r R. hwnnw L., ac y hwnnw y byd medyant ar vn vrenhinyaeth eisseu o vgein.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac wedy hwnnw e byd brenhin a dechreu y entw o lythyren B., ac o'r B. hwnnw y kerda brenhin a dechreu y entw o lythyren A., ac o'r A. hwnnw y kerda A. arall. A'r eil brenhin hwnnw o A. a uyd ryuelwr, ac o'r A. hwnnw e kerda brenhin a dechreu y entw o lythyren R, ac o hwnnw e genir brenhin a dechreuo y entw o lythyren L., ac y honnw e byd un urenhinyaeth eissyeu o ugeint.*

The wording of the RB translation does not reflect the variation in vocabulary of the Latin: where Latin uses different verbs to introduce a next king, RB stubbornly repeats *y daw, y daw, y daw*. Latin uses the following verbs, for each *y daw* respectively: *egredietur*, 'will come', *procedet*, 'will come forth', *generabitur*, 'will be born', *nascetur*, 'will be born'.²⁰⁴

Audon becomes *Andon* by a confusion of minims.

P translates, or rather interprets, *per B nomine* 'called B' as *a dechreu y entw o lythyren B.*, 'whose name will start with the letter B.' This formula is repeated for the first A., for king R., and king L. The verbs indicating the next kings are hardly more varied

²⁰⁴ Or as Paul Russell writes: 'translation tends to flatten and reduce the variation in nuance or the original rather than multiply it.' Russell, P, *Priuilegium Sancti Teliaui and Breint Teilo* *Studia Celtica*, 50 (2016), 41-68; p. 59.

than in RB: here we have the verb *kerda*, 'will come forth', repeated, but for the last king in the row it is changed to *genir*, 'will be born'.

Furthermore, P skips over *Andon*, has only two kings A. instead of three, and translates *bellicosus nimis et preliator* 'very belligerent and a warrior' simply as *rywelwr*, 'a warrior', where RB has a more complete *gwr ymladgar a diruawr ryuelwr*, 'a bellicose man and a great warrior', where *nimis* has moved from qualifying *bellicosus* to *preliator*.

Potestatem habebit super, 'he will have power over' is translated in RB as *y hwnnw byd medyant*, 'that one will have power over, will possess'; P states *ac y hwnnw y byd* 'and to that one there will be', which is not wrong, but neither does it have the same force as the formulae used in Latin and RB

Un eisseu o vgein, 'one lacking of twenty' meaning 'nineteen' is a very idiomatic way of counting, and it is used by both our versions. Both versions, too, translate *reges* 'kings' as *vrenhinyaeth*, 'kingdom'. Did their shared source have *regna* instead of *reges*? The singular instead of plural is explained by Welsh grammar, but the use of 'kingdom' rather than 'king' in both versions, together with the shared formulaic way of saying 'nineteen' makes up an interesting parallelism.

37. *Et post hos surget rex Salicus de Francia de K nomine. Ipse erit magnus et piissimus et potens, et misericors et faciet iustitiam pauperibus. Tante namque in eo erit virtutis gratia, ut per viam gradiens arborum contra eum inclinentur*

cacumina. Aqua namque in occursum eius minime tardabit. Similis autem ei in imperio Romano rex ante eum non fuit nec post eum futurus erit.

And after those a Salian king will rise from France, called K. That one will be great and most devout and mighty and merciful, and he will do justice to the poor. Really, the grace of virtue will be so great in him, that when he steps on the road the tops of the trees will incline towards him. And even water will not at all delay him, when it meets him. There was no king similar to him in the Roman Empire before him, nor will there be after him.

Red Book: *A gwedy y rei hynny y kyuyt Salitus o Ffreinc. K. y henw. Hwnnw a uyd gwr mawr, a gwar a chyuoethawc. a thrugarawc, a hwnnw a wna kyuyawnder, a gwiryoned ac aghenogyon. Kymeint yyd rat hwnnw yn y wirioned, a phan vo yn kerdet y ford, ac y gostynghant y gwyd eu blaenwed idaw yn y erbyn, a'r dwfyr yn y erbyn yn y erbyn ny hwyraa. Kyffelyb y daw ynn amherotraeth.*

Peniarth 14: *A gwede e rei henne e keuyt brenhin o Freinc a dechreuo y enw o lythyren .K.. Hwnnw a yyd gur maur, a'r gwarhaf a chyvoethauc a thrugarauc, ac a wna kyuyaunder a chyreith a'r tlodyon. Canys kymeint uyd rat y nerth ac y gostyngo idaw bric e gwyd pan gerdo y a danunt, ac nyt erwyrha y duuyr heuyt dyuot en y erbyn. Ac ny byd en amperodraeth Ruvein na chynt noc ef na gwedy e gyfelip.*

The king K in this section is Charlemagne.

The last phrase of RB seems to be broken off, and I think it is best to replace it with the WB variant: *kyffelyb idaw yn amherodraeth Rufein kynnoc ef ny bu, ac ny daw rac llaw.*

Salitus must be *Salicus*; a confusion of *c* and *t* is easily made in certain medieval scripts, and *yn y erbyn* has been written twice by a scribal error.

The Latin word *piissimus*, a superlative of *pius*, has a complex meaning. *Pius* does not just mean 'pious', in the sense of religious; it also carries meanings like 'mild, devoted to family/ tradition/the country, tender, holy ...' RB translates it with *gwar* and P with its superlative, *gwarhaf*. This word lies in the same (wide) semantic field as *pius*, but misses its religious connotations.

Iustitiam, 'justice' is translated as *kyuyawnder a gwiryoned*, literally 'rightness and truth, or justice' in RB, and as *kyuyaunder a chyureith*, 'rightness and law' in P. Both, remarkably, agreed that a translation of two Welsh words for a single word of Latin was in place here,²⁰⁵ although they do not agree on the second of those two words.

The *pauperibus*, the poor, are *aghenogyon*, 'needy' in RB, and *tlodyon*, 'poor' in P.

Vituti gratia, 'the grace of virtue' becomes *rat yn y wirioned* in Rb, *rat* meaning grace, and *wirioned*, once again, having this whole semantic field behind it of truth, justice, rightness, etc. 'Virtue' is not a literal translation given by GPC, but as Latin *virtus* has also a great semantic field, ranging from 'manliness' to 'courage' to 'excellence' and in the Middle Ages to 'supernatural powers', one could say that these fields do touch each other when we read *gwirioned* in its meaning of 'rightness' and *virtus* as 'moral excellence'.

205 Again we quote Russell, '...Welsh tends to operate with rhetorical doublets in an inclusive sense.' Russell, P., *Priuilegium Sancti Teliaui and Breint Teilo*, *Studia Celtica*, 50 (2016), 41-68, p.58.

P translates *virtutis* as *nerth*, which means ‘power’, also ‘protective power’ or indeed ‘virtue’. In both cases, a Latin word with many abstract but culturally strong connotations is translated with an equally abstract but important concept in Welsh.

P ac nyt erwyrha y duuyr heuyt dyuot en y erbyn, ‘and neither will the water delay to meet him’. *Dyuot yn y erbyn* might be understood as one verb, translating Latin *in occursum eius*, ‘meeting him’. Latin uses a noun, *occursus*, ‘meeting’, to express this, and the Welsh text has a verbal noun. But unlike Latin, P does not give us a preposition that places the noun in a syntactically meaningful context. It is possible that the preposition got lost in transmission, if this is not a case of a translation where meaning gets lost because of a too literal rendering of the original.

38. *Et veniet rex post eum per L et post hunc regnabit B et post B procedunt XXII B et de B egredietur A et ipse erit nimis bellicosus et fortis in prelio et multum erit persecuturus per aqua sive per terra. Et non dabitur in manus inimicorum et morietur exul extra regnum et anima eius in manu Dei.*

And after him a king [known] by L will come, and after that one B will reign, and after B twenty-two B’s, and from B A will come forth, and this one will be extremely warlike and strong in battle, and he will chase a lot over water as over the earth. And he will not be given into the hands of enemies, and he will die exiled of his kingdom, and his soul [will be] in the hand of God.

Red Book: *Gwedy L. y daw B. a gwedy B.xxdecem B. enw pob un onadunt. Ac o’r B. y daw A., a hwonnw gwr aflonyd vyd, kadarn yn ymlad, a*

llawer a gerda o vor a thir, ac ny cheiff y elynyon le llaw. ac ef a uegys yn deholedic odieithyr y deyrnas, a'e eneit o'r diwed a a y teyrnas nef ar Duw.

Peniarth 14: *Ac en ol hwnnw ef a dau brenhin a dechreu y entw o L. Ac en ol hwnnw e gwledycha un a dechreu y entw o lythyren B. Ac o'r B. hwnnw e kerda un a dechreu y entw o lythyren A. A hwnnw a uyd ryuelgar a chadarn en emlad, a llawer o uor a thir a gerda. Ac ny's keiff y elynyon, ac a uyd diholyledic o'e deyrnas, a'e eneit a dal yn llaw Duw.*

RB misses the first part, *et veniet rex post eum per L*, 'and after him, a king L will come', just as it misses the last part of the preceding phrase; the scribe is copying from a manuscript where this passage was damaged. WB does have the translation: *Ac gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin, L y entw. Gwedy L. y daw B. ac gwedy B. y daw xxx a in B entw bop un onadunt*, 'and after that one a king will come, L his name. After L comes B, and after B, thirty will come, and B will be the name of each one of them'. The use of *in* before *B entw pop un* is somewhat mysterious. It might translate Latin *per*, but in this specific phrase, at least our Latin critical edition does not have *per*. It is not translated by either P or RB, but these manuscripts do not usually translate *per*, and neither does WB.

RB states that from the first B, *xxdecem* will come. Two times the Roman number ten, the X, plus *decem*, 'ten'. The total sum is thirty, and although the way of writing out the number is surprising, the number itself agrees with the White Book. Latin has *XXII B*, 'twenty-two B's', in Sackur's edition, but he gives *XX* and *XX tres* as variants. *XX tres* has the same oddity as RB: it also gives the first two Roman numerals as such, and writes out the last part of the number 'twenty-three'. The

Latin sources differ on the exact number, and the number in our text is different from the ones in known editions. But as Red and White Books agree, we can assume their common source also did. However, it is impossible to say anything about their Latin source: either we are dealing with yet another version in Latin, which is likely, or the Welsh translator made a mistake, which is also a possibility. Unfortunately, the long succession of B's has been omitted from P, which otherwise might have shed some light on the matter.

The first B that comes after L *regnabit*, 'will reign' in Latin and in P, which has *gwledycha* 'will reign', but he will simply 'come' *daw* in RB: as before, the translator does not display a lot of creativity in the way he treats these verbs announcing new kings. P is uncharacteristically wordy with *ac en ol hwnnw e gwledycha wn a dechreu y enw o lythyren B.*, 'and after that one a king whose name starts with the letter B. will reign', which is a full phrase of fourteen words, while L has five words with *et post hunc regnabit B*, like RB, with *gwedy L. y daw B*.

The A that follows on our indeterminate number of king B's, who is *nimis bellicosus et fortis in prelio* 'very warlike and strong in battle' in Latin, is called in Welsh *aflonyd*, 'restless', or even 'anxious' in RB, while P is closer to Latin with *ryuelgar*, 'warlike'. Both translate *fortis in prelio* as *kadarn yn ymlad*, a literal translation.

Et non dabitur in manus inimicorum, 'and he will not be given in the hands of his enemies'. RB translates *ac ny cheiff y elynyon le llaw*, which is an incomplete phrase. The complete form is found in the White Book: *ac ny cheiff y elynyon le llaw arnaw*, 'and his enemies will not get hold of him'. The Welsh expression is idiomatic, and

translates Latin *et non dabitur in manus inimicorum*, 'and he will not be given into the hand of enemies'. Our translator makes Welsh of the Latin, and the way in which he 'recycles' the word *manus*, 'hand' into the Welsh idiom *cael lle llaw*, 'to get hold' (GPC: *lle llaw* hold, grip, grasp (lit. the place of a hand, room for a hand)) shows a certain wit only appreciated when one has access to both the Latin and Welsh texts.

P does translate the meaning of the Latin metaphor in plain Welsh: *Ac ny's keiff y elynyon*, 'and his enemies won't get him'. P does, however, take the metaphor of the hand in the final clause of the Latin phrase, *et anima eius in manu Dei*, 'and his soul will be in God's hand'. P translates *a'e eneit a dal yn llaw Duw*, 'and his soul will remain in God's hand'. RB translates the Latin metaphor with a different Welsh one: *a'e eneit o'r diwed a a y teyrnas nef a'r Duw*, 'and in the end his soul will go to the Kingdom of Heaven, and to God'. The Latin text is, from a modern perspective, somewhat inelegant by giving us two metaphors concerning hands in one paragraph. Repetition was much less frowned upon in medieval literature, indeed it was an acknowledged rhetorical device, but maybe our translators had nevertheless a feeling that they could put in some variation, and chose each of them a different 'hand' to be replaced by something else, be it a simple paraphrase or a different metaphor.

39. *Tunc exurget alius rex per V nomine ex una parte Salicus et ex alia Langobardus et ipse habebit in terra potestatem contra pugnantes et contra omnes inimicos.*

Then another king, called V will rise, Salian from one part and Lombard from the other, and he will hold power over the land against warriors and against all enemies.

Red Book: *Odyna y kyuyt gwr, B. y enw, Ffrannc o'r neillparth, Lumbart o'r llall. A hwonnw a uyd medyant idaw yn erbyn y elynyon, ac a ymladont ac ef.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e keuyt arall a dechreu y enw o lythyren U.²⁰⁶ o'r neill parth idaw en Salicus, ac o'r parth arall en Longobard. Ac ef a oruyd ar a emlado ac wynt ac ar e holl elynyon.*

P translated *alius*, 'another', with *arall*, but omits *rex*, 'king'. RB does not translate *rex alius* literally, but replaces it with *gwr*, 'a man'.

In P, too, *V* has stayed *V*, while in RB he has become *B* – at the same time, its 'sister manuscript' WB has *V*. Did a scribe decide to 'de-mutate' the form?

RB *Ffranc*, 'Frank': Latin has *Salicus*, 'Salian', and Sackur does not give variants. The Salians were a subdivision of the Franks, so the Welsh text is correct. It is not possible to say whether the Latin source already had 'Frank', or whether our Welsh translator was well-versed in continental history as available in various annals.

In the last part of the Latin phrase, *et ipse...omnes inimicos*, RB and P leave out *in terra*, 'on earth'. RB translates *habebit potestatem*, 'he will hold power' with *hwonnw uyd medyant idaw*, which means the same. P paraphrases with *ac ef a oruyd*, 'he will be victorious'. In the last part, *contra pugnantes et contra omnes inimicos*, P translates word-for-word, with *ar a emlado ac wynt ac ar e holl elynyon*, 'over those he will battle

206 U: the manuscript has 6.

with, and all his enemies' while RB inverts the clauses with *yn erbyn y enlynyon, ac a ymladont ac ef*, 'against his enemies, and those that fight against him'. Note also that RB translates *pugnantes*, those who battle' correctly as the persons that fight this king, while P conveys the meaning, but does not translate what the Latin actually says.

40. *Et in diebus illis procedet rex per O nomine et erit potentissimus et fortis et bonus et faciet iusticiam pauperibus et recte iudicabit.*

And in those days a king called O will come, and he will be most powerful, and strong and good, and he will do justice to the poor and he will judge rightly.

Red Book: *Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y daw brenhin O. y enw. A hwonnw a uyd kyuoethoccaf a chadarnaf ac a wna trugared y'r tlodyon, ac a uarn yn iawn.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac en e dydyeu henne y kerda brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren O., ac a uyd kyuoethauc, a chadarn, a da, a wna gyuyaunder a'r tlodyon, ac a uarn yawn.*

Yn y dydyeu hynny 'in those days' is a direct translation of Latin in *diebus illis*, a formula with strong Biblical connotations, as we have seen in the lines *ac yn y dydyeu hynny y kyuyt gwreic a Meir uyd y henw*(19) and *yn y dydyeu hynny y byd uy Cesar arderchawc enw*(24). This third instance of the formula is the first one without any Biblical connotations, giving a certain solemn or even sacred ring to the rise of king O.

As we have seen before, P uses the formula *brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren*, 'a king whose name will start with the letter', while L and RB simply state 'O his name', *per O nomine, O y enw*.

P, again, translates the full phrase in the same formula as L, while RB leaves out *bonus*, 'good', and translates *iusticiam* this time with *trugared*, 'mercy', where it translated the same word earlier with *gwirioned*, 'truth'. P uses *gyuyawnder*, in effect 'justice'.

RB *Kyuoethoccaf a chadarnaf*, 'most powerful and most strong': Latin has *potentissimus et fortis et bonus*, 'most powerful, strong and good'. *Fortis*, 'strong' is no superlative, but the translator decided to give one in his text, presumably for reasons of style. The RB translator has shown before, notably in the section about Christ, that he likes hyperboles. In his enthusiasm he seems to have forgotten to translate *bonus*, 'good', or he deemed this information superfluous; it is already implicit in the second part of the phrase. A man who has mercy towards the poor and judges rightly is of course a good man.

41. *Et de ipso O procedet alius O potentissimus et erunt sub eo pugne inter paganos et christianos et sanguis Grecorum fundetur et cor eius in manu Dei et regnabit annos VII.*

And from that O another, most powerful O will come forth, and under him there will be wars between the Pagans and the Christians, and the blood of

the Greeks will be shed, and his heart will be in the hand of God and he will reign for seven years.

Red Book: *Ac o hwinnw y daw O. arall mwyaf y allu, ac ydanaw ynteu y bydant ymladeu y'r cristonogyon a'r paganyeit. A llawer o waet a dywelltir a .vii. mlyned y gwledycha, ac y nef yd aa y eneit.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac o hwinnw y kerda arall a dechreu y env o lythyren O., kyuoethocaf, ac en y oes e byd emlad y rung Paganyeit a Christyonogyon, ac eu gwaet a dineuir, a'e eneit en llaw Duw. A seith mlyned e gwledycha.*

'A llawer o waet a dywelltir, 'and much blood shall be shed': The Latin edition has *et sanguis Grecorum fundetur*, 'and the blood of the Greeks shall be shed' in its main text. Sackur's manuscript M has *sanguis eorum*, 'their blood' instead of *Grecorum*, and manuscript B has *Grecorum eorum*, 'their Greeks'! There was a confusion between the two. Our translator does not mention Greeks; the Welsh versions rather seem to be based on the *eorum* variant found in M.

Sub eo, 'under him' meaning 'during his reign' has been translated literally by RB with *ydanaw*. P paraphrases with *en y oes*, 'in his age'.

RB has also inverted the phrases *et cor eius in manu Dei et regnabit annos VII*, paraphrasing *et cor in manu Dei*, 'and his heart in God's hand' with *ac y nef yd aa y eneit*, 'and his soul will go to Heaven', while P kept the order and exact wording of the Latin.

42. *Et ex ipsa muliere nascetur rex per O nomine. Hic erit sanguinarius et facinorosus et sine fide et veritate, et per ipsum multa erit malitia et multa sanguinis effusio atque destructe erunt ecclesie in ipsius potestate. In aliis namque regionibus tribulationes erunt multe et prelia.*

And from that woman a king called O will be born. He will be blood-thirsty and criminal, and without faith or truth, and on account of him there will be much evil and much bloodshed, and under his dominion churches will be destroyed. And in other regions there will be many tribulations and wars.

Red Book: *O hwnnw y daw brenhin, O. y enw, a hwnnw a beir lladuaeu a gwr mawr y drwc, a heb ffyd yg gwirioned. A thrwy hwnnw y bydant llawer o drycoed, a gwaet a diwhyllir yn amyl, ac yn y allu ef y distriwir llawer o eglwysseu. Yn y brenhinyaetheu llawer o drallodeu a vydant.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac o hwnnw e genir brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren O.. Gwaetlyt a phechadurus uyd hwnnw, hep na fyd na gwiryoned, a thrwy hwnnw e byd llawer drwc, a llawer gwaet y redec, a distriw yr egluysseu en e gyuoeth ef, ac ym brenhinyaetheu ereill llawer o drallodeu.*

Both P and RB have left out *ipsa muliere*, ‘that woman’ and replace her with *hwnnw*, ‘that one’, in the masculine, which must have been in their common Latin ancestor. *Ipsa muliere* seems to refer back to an earlier mentioned woman. Old French has *et de le feme de celui roi*, ‘and from the wife of this king’. In the Latin text, it is not indicated that the ‘woman’ is the wife of the preceding king. It is a surprising and puzzling phrase, because it is not at all clear who *ipsa muliere* might be. Something must have been lost here very early in the transmission of the Tiburtina. The French version has

dealt with this problem by deciding this anonymous woman must have been the wife of the king mentioned just before. The Welsh solution, changing this befuddling referral to *hwynnw*, clearly meaning the O. from the paragraph above, enhances the inner logic of the text.

Both versions have a completely different translation of *sanguinarius et facinorosus*, 'blood-thirsty and criminal; RB has *hwynnw a beir lladuaeu a gwr mawr y drwc*, 'he will cause massacres, and a man of great evil', which is a paraphrase, and P has *gwaetlyt a phechadurus*, 'blood-thirsty and sinful', which is a more direct translation. The rest of the fragment is likewise similar, but different, in both translations. This section clearly illustrates our theory that both Welsh text must have been translated from a same Latin version, but independently of each other.

RB translates *sine fide et veritate* as *heb fyd yg gwirioned*, 'without faith in the truth'. The new phrase still makes sense both within the context of this fragment and in the wider worldview of our medieval Christian translator: one has faith in the Truth, that is, the Bible. P has *hep na fyd na gwiryoned*, 'without faith or truth'.

Both versions translate *regiones*, 'regions' as *brenhinyaetheu*, 'kingdoms, as seen earlier, and both leave out *et prelia*, 'and wars'; it was probably missing in their Latin example.

43. *Tunc surget gens adversus gentem in Cappadociam et Pamphiliam captivabunt in ipsius tempore, eo, quod non introerit per ostium in ovile. Hic namque rex regnabit annos IIIIor.*

Then people will rise against people in Cappadocia, and they will capture Pamphilia in that one's age, for this reason: because it did not enter through the door into the fold. And this king will reign for four years.

Red Book: *Ac yna y kyuyt kenedyl yn y teyrnas a elwir Capadocia, a theyrnas Pampilia a geithiwant yn amser hwinnw am nat yntredant drwy drws y dauatty. Hwinnw a wledycha teir blyned.*

Peniarth 14: *Ena keuyt e giudaut en erbyn y gilid yg Capadocia, ac en oes hwinnw e keytheir Pampilia, cany doeth trwy e drws yr keil. Hwinnw a wledycha pedeir blyned.*

RB *Y teyrnas a elwit Capadocia, a theyrnas Pampilia* 'the realm that is called Cappadocia, and the realm of Pamphilia': as in the phrase about the scorpion (10), our translator takes it upon himself to explain to his public, who have presumably never heard of Cappadocia or Pamphilia, that these are the names of kingdoms.

These regions are both situated in modern-day Turkey.

Instead of four years, the RB king reigns only three. This must be a misreading from the Latin numbers, and because P does not share this variant, the numerals mentioned in the Latin source text probably agreed with those in Sackur. The Red Book also fails to mention that one people *will rise against the other*; it only states *ac yna y kyuyt kenedyl*, 'and then a people will rise'. The White Book shares this omission.

Quod non introerit per ostium in ovile, 'because it did not enter through the door into the fold' is a reference to John 10.1: *amen, amen dico vobis : qui non intrat per ostium in ovile ovium, sed ascendit aliunde, ille fur est et latro*, translated in the KJV as 'verily,

verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.’ This passage effectively accuses Pamphilia of thievery. RB translates this part as *am nat yntredant drwy drws y dauatty*, ‘because they will not enter through the door of the sheep pen’, the plural surely referring to the people of Pamphilia. This translation is not as strong as the Latin, because of the word *dauatty*, ‘sheep pen.’ Latin *ovile* has the same meaning, but in the Christian period it also developed the metaphorical meaning of ‘the fold’, the community of Christians. In Welsh, *dauatty* or *dafaty* is a rarely attested word in the first place, and it does not seem to bear the same metaphorical meaning as its Latin counterpart. As our RB translator has shown himself keen on translating meaning rather than exact sequences of words, and committed to making Welsh out of his Latin exemplar, it seems that both the metaphorical meaning of *ovile* and the biblical reference have escaped him, leaving us with an odd Welsh phrase that is incomprehensible without its Latin context. *Keil*, on the other hand, the word P has chosen, does mean both ‘sheep pen’ and ‘herd of sheep, fold’.

44. *Et post cum surget rex A nomine, et in diebus eius erunt pugne multe inter Agarenos et Grecos. Inter paganos namque multe prelia et pugne erunt. Syriam expugnabunt et Pentapolim captivabunt. Ipse rex erit ex genere Langobardorum.*

And after him a king called A will rise, and in his days there will be many wars between Hagarenes and Greeks. And between the Pagans, too, there will be many battles and wars. They will conquer Syria and capture Pentapolis.

This king will be from the people of the Lombards.

Red Book: *A gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin H. y enw. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny ymladeu llawer a uydant. Ac ar Samaria y ryuela a brenhinyaeth Penntapolis a geithiwa. Y brenhin hynny a hanoed y genedyl o Lwmbardyeit.*

Peniarth 14: *O hwnnw y kerda brenhin a dechreuo y enw o H.. En dydyeu honnw e byd emladeu mawr. Hwnnw a oruyd ar Samaria ac a geithiwa Pentapolim. Hwnnw a henuyd o'r Longobardyeit.*

Both RB and P have *H*, not *A*, as the initial of this king. This is a variant given by Sackur for his manuscripts *M*, *B*, *G* and *Vr*. Both text have also left out the passage inter *Agarenos et Grecos...pugne erunt*, which Sackur also notes for versions *Vr*, *M* and *B*. *Syria* has been changed to *Samaria* by both, which is *not* a variant known to Sackur and could be a good indicator of the source text, if it were found.

P has also mistranslated *pugne multe*, 'many wars' as *emladeu mawr*, 'great wars', and has kept the Latin case ending of *Pentapolim*, while RB has correct *Pentapolis*.

Agarenos, 'Hagarenes' are Muslims, see 46.

45. *Tunc exsurget rex Salicus E nomine et expugnabit Langobardos et erunt prelia et pugne. Ipse autem rex Salicus erit fortis et potens et paucis temporibus erit regnum eius.*

Then a Salian king called E will rise, and he will subdue the Lombards and there will be wars and battles. This Salian king then will be strong and mighty and his reign will last for a little while.

Red Book: *Odyna y kyuyt brenhin C. y entw o Freinc, ac a ryuela ar wyr Ruuein, ac y bydant ryueloed ac ymladeu. a hwnnw a vyd gwr kadarn galluawol, ac ychydic o amser y gwledycha.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e keuyt brenhin o Salic a dechreu y entw o C., ac a urthwynepa y'r Longobardyeit, a ryueloed ac emladeu a uydant. Hwnnw a uyd cadarn a chyuoethauc, a bychydic amser e para.*

Both RB and P have C instead of E, which is a very common variant. There is no variant where king E or C fights against *wyr Ruuein*, the Romans, as happens in RB, instead of against the Lombards as in L and P. RB also interpreted-translated *Salicus*, 'Salian' as *o Freinc*, 'from France'. Here again we see our translator (or his forerunner?) glossing the text, making it more accessible for his contemporaries. P has *o Salic*, 'from Salic', which is not an existing place but a logical interpretation of the adjective *Salicus*, if one doesn't know what it means. Neither RB nor P translates *Salicus* the second time it occurs, *ipse autem rex Salicus*, 'this Salian king, then'. Both use *hwnnw*, 'that one', instead.

46. *Tunc exurgent Agareni et tyranni et captioabunt Tarentum et Barro et multas civitates depredabunt et volentes venire Romam non est qui resistat nisi Deus deorum et Dominus dominorum.*

Then the Hagarenes and the tyrants will rise, and they will capture Tarentum and Barro, and they will plunder many cities, and when they will want to

come to Rome, there will be no one who might resist, save for the God of gods and the Lord of lords.

Red Book: *Odyna y kyudant gwyr o Agaria, a gwyr creulawn ygyt ac wynt, ac y keithiwant lleoed a elwir Carentus a Haii.o., a llawer o dinassoed a anreithant. A gwyr Ruuein, pan vynnnon dyuot, ny byd a wrthwynepo udunt onyt Duw y dwyweu ac Arglwyd yr arglwydi.*

Peniarth 14: *Ena e kyudant Agareni, gwyr kreulawn ac a geithiwant Tarentum, a Harro, a llawer o dinassoed a anreithyant. A'r pryt na mynno e Rwminyeit dyuot, nyt oes a wrthwynepo udunt onyt Duw e dwyweu ac Argluyd er argluydi.*

Gwyr o Agaria, 'men from Agaria': Latin has *Agareni*, 'Hagarenes'. The Red Book translator obviously did not know that the word 'Hagarenes' does not refer to people from a certain country, but is a term for 'Muslims'. The name refers to Hagar, mother of Abraham's son Ishmael in the Bible, who was thought to be the forefather of all Arabs.²⁰⁷

P and RB both translate *tyranni*, 'tyrants' as *gwyr creulawn*, 'cruel men'; but where RB says the 'cruel men' would come 'together with' (*ygyt ac*) the Hagarenes, P interprets the Hagarenes and the *gwyr creulawn* to be the same people. The Latin leaves room for both interpretations.

RB *Lleoed a elwir*, 'places that are called' is again a gloss of our translator, who wanted to make clear to his readers that these presumably unknown terms are placenames.

207 Rodriguez, J., (ed.), *Muslim and Christian Contact in the Middle Ages – a Reader*, Toronto 2015 p. xi.

RB has c-t confusion in *Tarentum* and makes a complete botch out of *Barro*, with *Haii.o*. The place-names here should be emended to their counterparts in the White Book, *Tarentus* and *Cairo*. P, too, has *Tarentum*, but give *Harro* for *Barro*.

It is interesting that both RB and P read the B in *Barro* as H, while the White Book has *Cairo*. The most straightforward explanation would be that the scribe of the White Book was confronted with something like *Haii.o.*, and decided to emend this to a place-name he knew about, somewhere in the exotic east where this part of the prophecy takes place.

The places named in the Latin text are modern-day Taranto, in the far south of Italy, and Barro, in Spain.

RB and P share a grammatical misinterpretation: *volentes venire Romam* means 'when they want to come to Rome', with *Romam* as an accusative of direction. They interpret this as 'when the Romans want to come' (*A gwyr Ruuein, pan vynnnon dyuot*, RB) or 'when the Romans do not want to come' (*a'r pryt na mynno e Rwminyeit dyuot*, P), which is the negative version of RB's interpretation, probably caused by a (minim) confusion of *uolentes*, 'they want' with *nolentes* 'they do not want'..

47. *Tunc venientes Armenii Persidam disperdent, ita ut non recuperentur civitates, quas depredabunt. Et accurentes Persi ponent fossata iuxta orientem et expugnabunt Romanos et obtinebunt pacem aliquantisper.*

Then, when the Armenians come, they will spoil Persia, so that the cities they will plunder may not be regained. And when the Persians will come running,

they will make trenches in the east and they will sweep away the Romans, and they will gain peace for a while.

Red Book: *Ac yna y daw yr Eidon ac y diwreida Persiden, megys nat achuper y dinessyd a wediont. A phan delont y ymgysuaruot y gwnant ffos geyr llaw y dwyrein, ac yr ymladant yn erbyn gwyr Ruuein, ac y llunyeithant tangneued yryngtunt.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e daw yr Ideon y Bers ac e gwasgarant hyt na delont y'r dinasoed anreithyedic, a gossot klaud y rygthunt a'r dwyrein, a gurthuynebu y'r Rwminyeit ac y caffant ychydic dagneued.*

Armenii: Sackur's manuscripts Vr and M have *Iudei*, 'Jews', which is the tradition our Welsh manuscripts follow.

The first part of this fragment has been translated literally by both versions, although the two Welsh texts use different translations for almost every Latin word. RB has mistranslated *quas depredabunt*, 'that will be plundered' as *a wediont*, 'that will pray'; Latin *depraedor*, 'to plunder' has been mixed up with *depraecor*, 'to pray'. P has *anreithyedic*, 'plundered'. Although this is not a third person future, as in Latin, but a verbal adjective, the sense has been transmitted.

The fact that RB contains a mistake that can only be made when one translates directly from the Latin, and that P does not contain this mistake, is a strong argument for assuming that both texts have a common ancestor in Latin, but are independent translations.

Accurentes, 'running towards', can have the meaning 'rushing into attack', but translating it as *delont y ymgysuaruot*, 'they come to meet', as RB does, is a bit of a

stretch. P has not translated this word at all. In both RB and P, the syntax leads us to believe it is the Jews who build a wall, while in Latin, the Persians are doing this.

Iuxta orientem is translated as *geyr llaw y dwyrein*, 'near the east' in RB, which is correct, while P uses a more idiomatic expression, *y rygthunt a'r dwyrein*, 'towards the East', literally 'from them[selves] towards the East'.

Aliquantisper means 'for some time', and it has not been translated by RB; this is quite a literary, high level of speech word, and our translator may well not have been acquainted with it. As we have seen before, he uses his tactic of avoidance, that is, unless *yryngtunt*, 'between them', was his guess at what *aliquantisper* might possibly mean. This would explain the addition of this qualifier. P translates *aliquantisper* as *ychidic*, 'some', a temporal sense attested in GPC.

48. *Et intrabit vir belligerator rex Grecorum in Iheropolim et destruet templa ydolorum. Et venient locusta et brucus et comedent omnes arbores et fructus Cappadocie et Cilicie ac fame cruciabuntur, et postea non erit amplius.*

And a man of war, a king of the Greeks will enter Hierapolis, and he will destroy the temples of the idols. And locusts and locust larvae will come and they will eat all the trees and fruits of Cappadocia and Cilicia, and they will be tortured by famine, and after that there will be no more.

Red Book: *Ac yna y daw gwr ryuel dyborthawdyr brenhin Groec y dinas Ierapolis ac y distriw temloed y geudwyweu. Ac yna y doant kylyon mawr a chwilot, ac y*

bwytaant yr holl wyd, a holl ffrwytheu brenhinyaeth Capadocie a Acil a yssant, ac o newyn yd hir gystegir. A gwedy hynny ny byd.

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e daw ryuelwr brenhin Groec hyt en Ierapolim ac y distryw temleu y geudwyweu, ac y doant y locuste a'r brucus ac yd yssant frwyth e gwyd, a frwyth gwyd Capadocie a Cilicie, ac y poenir o newyn, ac odena ny byd bell ach.*

Vir belligerator rex Grecorum means 'a belligerent man, the king of Greece'. RB translated *gwr ryuel dyborthawdyr brenhin Groec*, which would mean 'a man of war, supporter of the king of Greece'. *Ryuel dyborthawdyr* should not mean 'supporter of war' as the genitive should come after the noun that governs it in Welsh. GPC gives only two instances of the word *dyborthawdyr*, one of them being the text discussed here, and the other the *Brut Dingestow*, which has *prynu eu kyureidyau megys kenedyl dyborthawdyr hedvch*, 'buying their supplies like a people supporting peace', with *hedvch*, 'peace', following *dyborthawdyr*, not preceding it as in our text. In any case, for some reason, the warrior-king of Greece has morphed into a mere supporter of this same king in RB. P translates *vir belligerator* simply as *ryuelwr*, 'warrior'.

RB has translated *locusta et brucus*, 'locust and "bruchus"', i.e. locust larva', as *kylyon mawr a chwilot*, 'big flies and insects', which is a fair try at translating the names of animals that do not exist in your language. *Bruchus*, with a *ch* is a Greek loanword that appears in ecclesiastical Latin with the meaning 'locust': it occurs eight times in the Vulgate, and half of those times together with *locusta*. It also occurs in the Greek Tiburtina in the original Greek spelling, *βροῦχος*, 'locust larva', of which Alexander

notes that it is 'even more voracious than the grown animal'.²⁰⁸ As this word is not even translated in the Vulgate, it is no wonder our RB translator had a hard time with it. P doesn't even try: following the example of the Bible, they simply translated '*y locuste a'r brucus*'. It is fascinating to see how (with a little bit of help from the authority of the Vulgate) an originally Greek word from a Byzantine text survives two translations, one from Byzantine Greek to Latin and another from Latin to vernacular, an unknown amount of transcriptions with all the risk of editorial meddling this contains, to finally turn up in a thirteenth-century Welsh manuscript.

In Latin, it seems *omnes arbores et fructus Cappadocie et Cilicie* goes together as one semantic unit: 'all the trees and fruits of Cappadocia and Cilicia'. The two Welsh versions have a different interpretation: RB takes 'all the trees' as one item, and then translates *omnes*, 'all' a second time, to go with *ffrwytheu brenhinyaeth Capadocie a Acil*, 'all the fruits of the kingdom of Cappadocia and Acil (sic, WB *Atil*). P, on the other hand, leaves out *omnes*, and translates *fructus et arbores* 'fruits and trees' twice, first on its own, as *frwyth y gwyd*, 'the fruit of the trees', rather than 'the trees and the fruit', and then again, as *frwyth gwyd Capadocie et Cilicie*, 'the fruits of the trees of Capadocia and Cilicia', while it appears only once in the Latin text. Both RB and P translate freely here, and different editorial choices have been made.

RB *ac o newyn yd hir gystegir*, WB *ac o newyd* (sic) *yd hir gystegi* translate Latin *fame cruciabuntur* 'they will be tortured by hunger'. The Red Book reading is the better one: not only does it spell *gystegir* 'they will be brought low, subdued, subjugated'

²⁰⁸ Paul J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: the Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek Dress*, Washington DC, 1967, p. 35.

(GPC) correctly, *newyn* 'hunger; dearth' is also a better translation than *newyd* 'news' – undoubtedly a scribal error. The whole phrase probably means 'and for long they will be brought low by hunger' if we read *yd* as the verbal particle; if we read it as a variant of *hyd*,²⁰⁹ the translation reads 'and they will will be brought low by hunger for a long time'. Although both variants produce very similar translations, there is a genuine difference between them in the source language.

Et postea non erit amplius, 'and after that, there won't be [anything] anymore' is translated in RB as *a gwedy hynny ny byd*, after there there will not be [anything], and in P as *ac odena ny byd bell ach*, and after that, no further'. RB has not translated *amplius*, P has rendered it as *bellach*, 'anymore', but in both versions, the phrase does not make sense unless one reads the Latin text and realises the object of the verb has been lost.

Dinas Ierapolis, brenhinyaeth Capadocie; throughout the text, the RB text feels the need to put qualifiers before place-names, be it 'city', 'kingdom' or something else. This internal glossing would have helped the Welsh reader to understand what these foreign words meant, if they were not able to deduce the meaning from the context.

49. *Et consurget alius rex Salicus vir fortis et belligerator et indignabuntur contra eum multi vicini et parentes. Et in diebus illis tradet frater fratrem in mortem et pater filium et frater cum sorore commiscetur et multa nefanda hominum malicia*

209 Cf. *ac yt Vrawt parahawt gan gerdoryon (yt = hyt)* 'and they will be perpetuated by poets until Judgment' in: Haycock, M. (ed.), *Legendary Poems from the Book of Taliesin*, Aberystwyth 2007, 8.28.

erit in terra, senes cum virginibus cubabunt et sacerdotes mali cum deceptis puellis.

And another Salian king will rise, a strong man, and warlike; and many neighbours and kinsmen will be angry with him. And in those days brother will betray brother to death, and father, son; and brother will have intercourse with his sister, and there will be much unmentionable evil of mankind on earth; old men will lie with virgins, and bad priests with deceived girls.

Red Book: *Ac y kyuyt brenhin arall gwr ymladgar R. y enw. Yn wir y gwledycha. A gwybyd ditheu yn lle gwir yd anteilyngant yn y erbyn llawer o'r gwyr nessaf a'r rei kyuoethaw [sic]. Ac yn y dydyev hynny y bredycha brawt y llall y agheu, a'r tat y mab. A'r brawt a gyttya a'e chwaer. A llawer o bechodeu ysgymun a uyd yn y daer. Yr henwyr a wnant gywelyach a'r morynyon, a'r dryc offeireit gyt a'r twylledigyon werydon.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac odena e kyuyt brenhin arall o genedel Salic, gur ryuelgar, B. dechreu y enw. A gwybyd en wir e gwledycha hwonnw, a llawer o'e gymydogyon a ulyghaant urthaw a charant, ac en e dydyeu henne e llad e braut y gilid, a'r tat e mab, ac ymhalogant e braut a'r chwaer, a llawer o bechodeu ysgymun a uyd ena ar e daear. A'r henwyr a orwedant gyt a'r morynnyon, a'r effeiryait drwc y gyt ar morynyon twylledic.*

Here our Welsh versions disagree with each other for the first time. RB does not translate *Salicus*, 'Salian', but gives *R* as the initial of this king. A few manuscripts known by Sackur give an initial instead of *Salicus*, but they all give an *H*, not an *R*. P translates *Salicus* as *o genedel Salic*, and then proceeds to give an initial, *B*. Only

Sackur's ms Vr gives *Salicus* and an initial, but, it is a *H. B* and *R* can look quite similar in majuscule, they resemble each other more than *H* resembles either of them, so this is not a hard argument for a different provenance for both texts. Especially because both Welsh versions then continue with a turn of phrase that is not found in Sackur's variants: 'And know as a truth...', *A gwybyd ditheu yn lle gwir* in RB, and *A gwybyd en wir* in P. What must be known as a truth is different in the two versions: RB has *yd anteilyngant yn y erbyn llawer o'r gwyr nessaf a'r rei kyuoethaw*, 'that against him many of his closest men, and the powerful, will rise in anger', which is close to Sackur, where his neighbours and family members, *vicini et parentes*, will rise against this king, but *rei kyuoethaw*, 'the powerful' seems to translate *potentes* 'the powerful' rather than *parentes* 'parents, family'. In P, we are told to 'know as a truth' that 'he will reign', or to know 'he will truly reign', *en wir e gwledycha*, which is not found in other versions. The *gwybyd (titheu)*, 'know' in the imperative second person singular, is very surprising, as this is the Sibyl speaking to the senators of Rome, a group, not an individual. The direct address also forms a remarkable breach of style in a text where the only other instance of Sibyl interacting with her audience is the dialogue with the Hebrew priests.

After that, the text goes on telling us that many of his neighbours and relatives will be angry with this king, *a llawer o'e gymydogyon a ulyghaant urthaw a charant*. P gives an exact translation of the Latin, but adds 'but know that he will truly reign', while RB is paraphrasing to a certain extent, but adds only 'and know as a truth', not the 'he will truly reign' part. The *parentes*, 'kinsmen' are translated in both WB and RB as

potentes 'the powerful people', so this may be a variant that goes back to a corruption in their common source's translation of the Latin text. As P translates correctly, the source text very probably had *parentes*, and the mistake must be made by the translator of RB and WB's prototype.

Tradet frater fratrem in mortem, 'brother will betray brother into death' is translated just like that in RB, *y bredycha brawt y llall y agheu*. P has *e llad e braut y gilid*, 'one brother will kill the other', which is less precise, as it doesn't translate the Latin verb.

P has also not dared to translate *commiscetur*, 'to have intercourse with', and uses the euphemism *ymhalogant*, 'they will defile themselves'. RB uses *Gyttya*, 'will have sexual intercourse': an interestingly spelled form of the 3 sg. pres. of verb *cydiaw*, with provection of the -d-. Simon Rodway explains this provection is caused by an earlier -h- in the verbal ending -ha- for third person singular in the present.²¹⁰

After this, our poor translators have to translate 'old men will lie with virgins'; in RB, these women become concubines, living together with the men, as *wnant gywelyach*, 'they will make a joint bedding' implies. P is less afraid this time, and boldly translates *a'r henwyr a orwedant gyt a'r morynnyon*, 'and the old men will lie with the maidens'.

²¹⁰ Rodway, S., *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal system*, Aberystwyth 2013, pp. 50-51. See also *GMW* p.118.

50. *Episcopi malefactorum sectatorum erunt et fiet effusio sanguinis in terra. Et templa sanctores pollutent et erunt in populo fornicationes immundie et sodomiticum scelus ita, ut visio ipsorum in contumeliam eis appareat.*

Bishops will be part of the followers of evildoers, and there will be a shedding of blood on earth. And clerics will defile the temples, and amongst the people there will be filthy fornications and the sin of sodomy, so that the sight of them will appear to them as shameful.

Red Book: *Yr esgyp thrwy y drycweithredoed ny chredant yn iawn. A gordineudigaeth gwaet a vyd ar y dayar. A themleu a lygrir trwy ledradawl budrygyt. A chytyaw a wna y gwyr a'r lleill, yn y ymdangosso eu gweledigaeth udunt yn waratwyd.*

Peniarth 14: *A'r esgyb a lwybrant y dryc weithredoed, ac ena yd ellyngir gwaet ar e daear ac yd alhogir temleu e seint, ac e byd fynigrwyd gurthoun a phechaut sodoma eny del dial amdanunt ar oleu.*

Malefactorum sectatorum erunt, 'they will be (part) of the followers of evildoers', has been translated by RB as *thrwy y drycweithredoed ny chredant yn iawn*, 'they will not believe correctly because of their evil deeds', and by P as *lwybrant y dryc weithredoed*, 'they will wend their way to evil deeds'. RB clearly did not understand what *sectatorum* means - 'followers' - and translated it as 'believing wrongly'. The P translation is free, but accurate. The verb *llwybraf*, 'to walk, go one's way, to guide' (GPC) is semantically not that far from *sectatorum*/followers, even though it is a rough paraphrase, which seems to indicate that P also had trouble with this use of the genitive to indicate that the priests were part of a larger whole.

Alhogir is a misspelling for *halogir*, from the verb *halogi*, ‘to defile, sully, pollute, corrupt, profane, violate’ (GPC). It translates Latin *polluent*, ‘they will defile, pollute, make dirty’. RB translates as *lygrir*, which also means ‘they will be polluted, defiled’. Although they use different words, both Welsh translations have chosen, independently of each other, to translate the Latin active phrase ‘they will pollute the temples’ as a passive ‘the temples will be polluted’. One of Sackur’s manuscripts, E, had *templa polluentur*, ‘the temples will be polluted’, so it is possible that our Welsh manuscripts stem from a Latin predecessor which had this formula, or something close to it.

Sodomiticum scelus, ‘the sin of sodomy’ has been translated as *pechaut Sodoma*, ‘the sin of Sodom’ in P, but RB has interpreted rather than translated, with a *chytyaw a wna y gwyr a’r lleill*, ‘and one man will have sex with the other’. Sodomy, as a word, might have been largely unknown to the Welsh public, so here we have another appearance of an explanation, which might or might not have been in a gloss originally, taking the place of the actual word.

Ita, ut visio ipsorum in contumeliam eis appareat, ‘so that the sight of them will appear to them as shameful’ has been translated as such by RB, but P has *eny del dial amdanunt ar oleu*, ‘so much that punishment shall come for them in public’.

Contumelia also bears the meaning of ‘reproach’, from which the translator may have extended that meaning to ‘punishment’, and fashioned a whole new phrase from there on.

51. *Et erunt homines raptores, contumeliosi, odientes iustitiam et amantes falsitatem et iudices Romanis inmutabuntur. Si hodie ad iudicandum admittuntur, alio die inmutabuntur propter pecuniam accipiendam et non iudicabunt rectum, set falsum.*

And there will be plundering men, insulters, hating justice and loving falsehood, and the judges of the Romans will be changed. If they will be allowed to judge today, they will be changed the other day because of money that has been accepted and they will not judge correctly, but falsely.

Red Book: *A'r dynyon yna cribdeilwyr vydant, a threisswyr yn kassau gwirioned ac yn karu kelwyd. A brawtwyr Ruuein a symudir. Os hediw y danuonir y uarnu heb rodi udunt trannoeth wynt a atuarnant yr vn vrawt yr da. Ac ny uarnant y iawnder, namyn geu, a ffalst vydant.*

Peniarth 14: *Ena e byd treiswyr a deneon atcas a gasaont gyuyawnder ac a garont e cam. A brautwyr Ruuein a amgeuant, o hediw hyt trannoeth, er da, y uarnu e cam ac adaw yr yawn.*

Both our Welsh texts predict that there will be *treis(s)wyr*, 'oppressors' or even 'rapists', apparently as a translation of *raptores*, which most often means 'plunderers' or 'bandits', although 'rapists' is possible. *Contumeliosi* comes from the same root as *contumeliam* in the preceding fragment, and moves in the same semantic field of 'shame, insult, reproach'. It most commonly means 'insulters'. The word is translated as *deneon atcas*, 'loathsome, evil, repulsive men', while RB has *cribdeilwyr*, which is rather a synonym of *treiswyr*, but a version more focused on stealing other

people's valuable goods, as it means 'oppressors, spoilers, plunderers' but also 'speculator, profiteer' (GPC). It rather seems to be a second translation of *raptores* than one of *contumeliosi*. It seems that for our translators, the sentiment of general obnoxiousness of these men was more important than a precise translation. But in the light of the previous fragment, where P also failed to provide a translation of *contumeliam*, it is possible that this translator simply was not familiar with the word, and reached for a generic translation of 'evil men', knowing from context *contumeliosi* should mean something along those lines.

P *amgeuant* should be emended to *amgenant*, 'they will change'. The confusion of *minims* shows that P is cannot be the author's own version of this translation, as *minim* confusions take place in the process of copying texts. It translates Latin *inmutabuntur*, 'they will be changed', in the passive voice, while Welsh is active. RB has *symudir*, 'they will be changed, which is a passive like in Latin.

The part *si hodie ad iudicandum admittuntur, alio die inmutabuntur propter pecuniam accipiendam et non iudicabunt rectum, sed falsum*, has been greatly changed in both our versions. Where the Latin text blames the appointers of the Roman judges for their corruption, RB blames the judges themselves, as is clear from the *wynt a aduarnant*, 'they (= the judges) will revise their judgement'. He also understood the *pecuniam accipiendam*, the 'received money' as a bribe to the judges themselves, as is clear from the statement that *os hediw y danuonir y uarnu heb rodi udunt trannoeth wynt a atuarnant yr vn vrawt yr da*, 'if they are sent today to judge, without giving to them, they will revise their judgment of the same case the next day, for the sake of goods'. Whereas in Latin the judges themselves are changed by a higher authority as a result

of bribery, in Welsh the judges are the ones receiving the bribes and changing their judgement on a case as a result. Where the judges are mere minions of a corrupt system in Latin, they become active agents of corruption in RB.

A few smaller notes on the RB version:

Anuonir, 'are sent': Latin has *admittuntur*, 'are allowed'. Both verbs make sense in this context, the Welsh one maybe even more than its Latin counterpart.

Heb rodi udunt, 'without giving to them' has no direct counterpart in the Latin text; *propter pecuniam accipiendam*, 'because of the money [they have] received' is more literally translated as *yr da*, 'for the sake of goods'. As noted above, the meaning of this phrase has been considerably altered in this translation

A ffalst vydant, 'and they will be false', is an addition in Welsh we do not find in any of the texts used by Sackur, nor in P.

P translates *immutabuntur* with an active verb, *amgenant*, and then shortens the next phrase quite a bit, simply stating that they will be changed *o heddiw hyt trannoeth*, 'from today to tomorrow', *er da*, 'for the sake of goods'. The last bit of the phrase has been jumbled up, as P tells us the judges will *uarnu e cam ac adaw yr yaww*, 'judge what is wrong and permit what is right', i.e. behave like decent judges, which is exactly the opposite of what L and RB have, and it also clashes with P's own denunciation of corruption *er da*.

52. *Et erunt in diebus illis homines rapaces et cupidi et periuri et amantes munera falsitatis et destruetur lex et veritas et fiet terre motus per loca diversa et insularum civitates demersione dimergentur et erunt per loca pestilentie hominum et pecorum et mortalitas hominum, et terra ab inimicis desolabitur et non prevalebit consolari eos vanitas deorum.*

And in those day men will be plundering and greedy and perjurious, and loving the rewards of falsehood, and law and truth will be destroyed, and there will be earthquakes in various places, and the cities of the islands will be flooded by flood, and in places there will be pestilences of men and cattle and the death of men, and the earth will be depopulated by the enemies, and the vanity of the gods will not avail to console them.

Red Book: *Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y bydant dynyon cribdeilawdyr anudonawl, ac yn kymryt rodyon dros pob kelwyd, ac y distryw kyfreith a gwirioned. Ac y kryn y dayar yn amryuaelon leoed. ac ynyssed a dinassoed a brenhinyaetheu a sodir o voduaeu. Ac y bydant tymhestloed ac aball ar y dynyon. A'r dayar a diffeithir trwy y gelynyon. Ac ny rymhaa gwacter y dwyweu eu didanu.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac en e dydyeu henne y byd deneon ysgyluat anudonyl a garont gobreu yr kelwyd, ac y diueir kyureith a gwiryoned. Ac ena e byd kynuryf e daear en llawer o leoed ac en dinassoed yr enyssed, a brenhinyaetheu a sodir, ac en lleoed e byd ball ar deneon, ar daear a edewir en diffeith o'e gelynyon ac ny eill vn dillin eu didanu.*

Both P and RB translate *rapaces*, 'rapacious, plunderous': P as *ysgyluat*, RB as *cribdeilawdyr*. Both texts translate *periuri*, 'perjurers' as *anudonawl/anudonyl*. But neither of them translates *cupidi*, 'greedy', although this word is not omitted in any

of Sackur's versions. It is possible that *cupidi* was not in their common Latin source, but maybe both translators thought *cupidi* was somewhat redundant, as it is followed by *amantes munera falsitatis*, 'loving the rewards of falsehood', which is an example of greedy behaviour. P translates this part as *a garont gobreu yr kelwyd*, 'they will love the rewards of falsehood, which is a literal translation, while RB paraphrases with *ac yn kymryt rodyon dros pop kelwyd* 'and taking gifts over every falsehood'.

Insularum civitates means 'the cities of the islands'. RB translated *ynyssed a dinassoed*, 'islands and cities' while P has, like Latin, *dinassoed yr enyssed*, 'the cities of the islands'. Both RB and P mention *brenhinaethyeu*, 'kingdoms' that will be flooded, and these do not figure in Sackur's critical text. But he does give an added *et regiones*, 'and regions' – a word both our text have translated with *brenhinaethyeu* before- as a variant in mss D, G and B. Our texts must have been translated from a version that contained this variant. This is yet another argument for a single Latin source to both our Welsh translations.

RB translates *demersione dimergentur*, 'they will be flooded by floods' as a *sodir o voduaeu*, 'they will be sunk by floods', while P simply states *a sodir*, 'they will be sunk', apparently feeling *demersione* as a redundancy. It seems to me that the repetition of the word-root in 'flooded by floods' is an attempt at imitating the style Old-Testamentical prophets, as this kind of repetition is a Hebraism we find in many places in the Bible, but the *figura etymologica* is a feature of native Welsh as well. Therefore, it is not hard to reproduce this figure of style in Welsh, but our translators either did not pick up on it or did not think it worthwhile to maintain it in their texts.

P *kynuryf* should be *cynnyrf*, 'tremor, commotion' - *cynwrwf* and *cynwryf* are a well-attested variants in GPC.

RB has *ac y bydant tymhestloed ac aball ar y dynyon*, 'and there will be tempests and pestilence to humans' as a translation of *erunt per loca pestilentie hominum et pecorum*, which means 'there will in places be pestilences to humans and livestock'. Sackur does not give any variants mentioning tempests, and neither do they feature in P, which has *ac en lleoed e byd ball ar deneon*, 'and in places there will be pestilence to humans', omitting the livestock, just like RB, but not adding tempests. It is possible that in the source text, the word *pecorum* was damaged, causing RB to make something up, and P to omit the word altogether. Both have also omitted *et mortalitas hominum*, 'and weakness/death of humans'. As this comes immediately after *pecorum*, my conjecture is that the whole passage was unreadable. If one were to look for the exact Latin source, damage at this point in the text would provide a useful clue.

Et non prevalebit consolari eos vanitas deorum, 'and the vanity of the gods will not have the power to console them' is translated by RB as *ac ny rymhaa gwacter y dwyweu eu didanu*, 'and the weakness of the gods will not avail to console them', but P has *ac ny eill vn dillin eu didanu*, 'and no thing of beauty can console them'. There is no variant in Sackur that could explain this oddity, and neither can I.

53. *Post hec surget rex per B nomine et erunt sub illo bella et et duobus annis regnabit. Et post hunc surget rex per A nomine et veniens obtinebit regnum*

aliquanto tempore et veniet Romam et captioabit eam et non mortificabitur anima eius in manu inimicorum illius in diebus vite sue, et erit bonus et magnus et faciet iustitiam pauperibus et ipse vivet longo tempore.

After that one a king called B will rise, and there will be wars under him, and he will reign for two years. And after him a king called A will rise, and when he comes he will obtain the reign for some time, and he will go to Rome and subject her, and his soul will not be destroyed in the hands of his enemies in his days, and he will be good and great and he will do justice to the poor, and this one will live for a long time.

Red Book: *A gwedy hynny y kyuyt brenhin K. y enw. A phan del ef a wledycha ennyt, nyt amgen dwy vlyned, ac ymladeu a wnant yn y amser. A gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin A. y enw, ac ef a gynnheil y deyrnas drwy yspeit o amser, ac ef a daw y Ruuein ac a'e keithiwa. ac ny allant rodi y eneit yn llaw y elynyon. Ac yn dydyeu y vuched ef a vyd gwr mawr, ac a wna gwiryoned y'r tlodyon, ac a wledycha hir amser.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac odena e keuyt brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren B. A ryuelus uyd y oes, a dwy ulyned e gwledycha. Ac odena y kyuyt brenhin a'e enw o A., a thrwy yspeit ef a geiff vrenhinyaeth ac a oresgyn Ruuein, ac ny byd marw en llaw y elynyon. A thra uo e dyd gur da uyd, a chyuyaunder a wna a'r tlodyon, a hirhoedlauc uyd*

RB has a king K here, while P agrees with L in having a king B. Sackur gives V, L, and H as variants, but not K. It is far from unusual in the many versions of the *Tiburtina* to see the kings' initials changed to fit political purposes, but there is no way of knowing whether that happened here, or whether a copyist read the initial

incorrectly, or a scribe 'corrected' the initial to what he thought it should be, without any political intent.

RB, often a bit more 'chatty', also adds a comment on the length of this king's reign, calling it *ennyt*, 'of a short duration'. P does not add this comment. *Erunt sub illo bella*, 'there will be battles under him' is an idiomatic expression, and our two Welsh sources translate it both in their own way: RB says *ymladeu a wnant yn y amser*, 'they will perform battles in his time', while P opts for *ryuelus uyd y oes*, 'his age will be warlike'.

RB translates *et veniet Romam et captivabit eam*, 'and he will come to Rome conquer it' has word-for-word, as *ac ef a daw y Ruuein ac a'e keithiwa*. P shortens the phrase by simply stating *ac a oresgyn Ruuein*, 'and he will conquer Rome'.

The next part, *et non mortificabitur anima eius in manu inimicorum illius in diebus vite sue*, 'and his soul will not be killed in the hands of his enemies in the days of his life' has been translated differently by both our Welsh versions. RB has *ac ny allant rodi y eneit yn llaw y elynyon*, 'and they will not be able to put his soul the hands of his enemies', and 'in the days of his life' has been moved to the beginning of the next phrase, *ac yn dydyeu y vuched et a vyd gwr mawr*, 'and in the days of his life he will be a great man'. The Latin text might not have had interpunction, which allows for some freedom in interpretation; but *in diebus vite sue* is not preceded by an *et*, but has *et* between *in vite sue* and *erit bonus*, making these two parts clearly belong to two different semantic units.

P ac ny byd marw en llaw y elynyon, 'and he will not die in the hand of his enemies' translates *et non morteficabitur in manu inimicorum*, ignoring *anima eius*, 'his soul'. The text then pursues with a new phrase, *a thra vo e dyd gur da uyd*, 'and as long as his day will last he will be a good man', where *in diebus vite sue* has been paraphrased rather than translated, and taken with *et erit bonus et magnus*, like in RB. It is possible both translators have made the same mistake – another possibility is that their shared Latin source had misplaced the *et* and put it in front of *in diebus vite sue*, rather than after it.

The Latin states this king will be *bonus et magnus*, 'good and great', but RB only translates *magnus*, as *gwr mawr*, whereas P only translates *bonus*, as *gur da*. In the eyes of a medieval Welsh writer, 'good and great' might have been a tautology, rendering one of the two components redundant. In which case it would be a strange coincidence that our two translators have independently come to that same conclusion, but proceeded to make two different choices as regards to what element should be left out.

54. *Post hunc vero surget alius rex per B nomine, et de ipso B procedet XII B et erit genere Langobardus et regnabit annos centum.*

But after that one another king called B will rise, and from that B twelve B's will rise, and he will be from the people of the Lombards, and he will reign a hundred years.

Red Book: *A gwedy ef y kyuyt brenhin arall, B. y enw. Ac ohonaw ynteu y kerdant deudec. B. enw pob un. A'r diwethaf a henuyd o Lwmbardi, ac a wledycha can mlyned.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac en ol hwynnw e kyuyt brenhin arall a dechreu y enw o B.. Ac o'r B. hwynnw y kerdant deudec a dechreu env pob vn onadunt o'r vn dechreu hwynnw. A Longobard uyd o genedel, a chan mlyned e gwledicha.*

Where Latin's *et erit genere Langobardus*, 'and he will be from the people of the Lombards' seems to refer to the first B, the one that will have twelve other B's emanating from him, RB explicitly makes the last of the line, *a'r diwethaf*, come from Lombardy. The translator might have felt that the Latin phrase, although it is grammatically correct, lacked something that would justify the jump from a plural 'twelve B's' to the third person singular of *erit*. In Latin it is perfectly regular to have a considerable amount of syntactical 'space' between subject and verb, but it is generally a feature of the higher literary linguistic strata, and it might have felt wrong to our translator, causing him to find a 'solution' for this 'problem', and an elegant solution it is.

Latin's simple *et de ipso B procedet XII B*, 'and from that B, twelve B's will come forth' gets enhanced a little bit in RB, with *ac ohonaw ynteu y kerdant deudec, B enw pob un*, 'and from that one, twelve will come, B the name of each one of them', while P translates with an even longer formula, which sounds somewhat biblical in its repetition of *dechreu* (we encountered this Hebraism in Latin in fragment 52): *ac o'r B hwynnw y kerdant deudec a dechreu env pob vn onadunt o'r vn dechreu hwynnw*, 'and from

that B twelve will come forth, the name over each one of them beginning with that same one beginning'.

55. *Tunc post eum surget Salicus de Francia B nomine. Tunc erit initium dolorum, qualis non fuit ab initio mundi. Et erit in diebus ipsius pugne multe et tribulationes multorum et sanguinis effusio et terre motus per civitates et regiones et terre multe captivabuntur. Et non erit qui inimicis resistat, quia tunc Dominus erit iratus in terra.*

Then, after him, a Salian from France called B will rise. Then will be the beginning of woes the like of which had not been since the beginning of the world. And in those days there will be many wars, and the afflictions of many, and shedding of blood, and earthquakes in the cities and the regions, and many lands will be taken captive. And there will be no one who might resist the enemies, because the Lord will then be angry with the world.

Red Book: *Gwedy hynny y daw brenhin o Freinc B. y enw. Yna y byd dechreu doluryeu y kyfryw ny bu yr dechreu byt. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y bydant ymladeu llawer, a thrallodeu, a gordineuedigaeth gwaet. Ac ny byd a wrthwynneppo y'r gelynyon. Ac yna heuyt y cryn y dayar drwy dinessyd a brenhinyaetheu. A llawer o deyrnassoed a geithiwir.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac en ol hwnnw e kyuyt brenhin a dechreu y enw trwy B.: Salic o genedel, o Freinc, ac ena e dechreu brat ny bu y gyoryu er dechreu byt, a ryuelus uyd en e dydyeu henne, a thrallaut uaur a gordineu gwaet, ac ny byd a emurthlado a'e*

elynyon a churyf eu daear trwy e dinassoed a'r teyrnassoed, a llawer o daearoed a geissiwir.

RB omits *Salicus*, 'Salian'. It has had problems with this word before, and he probably did not really know what it meant. P does know: *Salic o genedel*, 'Salian by nationality'. P's translation of *dolorum*, 'woes' as *brat*, 'treachery' is less expected; RB translates *doluryeu*, a direct borrowing of the Latin word.

Brenhin, 'king', is an addition in RB. Although virtually all manuscripts studied by Sackur simply have *Salicus de Francia*, 'a Salian from France', we find one instance of *rex per F nomen Salicus de Francia*, 'a king called F, a Salicus from France' (ms P 1.2). One may note that the initial is different in this version; the *B* in our versions agrees with the standard chosen by Sackur, and with most of his manuscripts. It seems unlikely that the addition of *rex* in P 1.2 suggests a link between that version and RB: it is more likely to be another 'internal gloss', a little explanatory addition, to which this translator is so prone.

Erit in diebus ipsius pugne multe, 'there will be many wars in those days' is translated in the same construction in RB, *yn y dydyeu hynny y bydant ymladeu llawer*. P paraphrases with a *ryuelus uyd en e dydyeu henne*, 'and it will be warlike in those days', making an adjective *ryuelus* out of the Latin noun *pugne*. L's *tribulationes multorum* 'many tribulations' become *trallodeu* 'tribulations' in RB; the 'llawer' of the preceding clause may be taken to go with *trallodeu* as well. P translates as *trallaut vaur*, 'great tribulation', in the singular, seemingly arguing that 'many tribulations' form together one big tribulation. 'And in those days' is one Sibyl's stylistical tricks

when she wants to sound biblical: and beginning with *yna y byd dechreu doloryeu* we are indeed leaving the political ‘prophecy’ of the so-called ‘King’s list’ and re-entering the realm of prophecy proper, the type that made the Jews of Alexandria adopt the Sybil so easily, as her style was similar to that of the Biblical prophets.

Both RB and P lack the final phrase of this Latin excerpt: *Et non erit qui inimicis resistat, quia tunc Dominus erit iratus in terra*: ‘and there will be none who might resist the enemies, because in that time, God will be angry with the earth’. It was probably omitted in their shared Latin ancestor.

56. *Roma in persecutione et gladio expugnabitur et erit deprehensa in manu ipsius regis et erunt homines cupidi, tiranni, odientes pauperes, oprimentes insontes et salvantes noxios. Eruntque iniusti et nequissimi et damnatores exterminii captivabuntur, et non est in terra qui eis resistat aut eruat illos propter malitias eorum et cupiditates.*

Rome will be defeated by persecution and the sword, and she will be seized by the hand of that king, and men will be greedy, tyrants, hating the poor, oppressing the innocent and saving the guilty. And they will be unjust and most licentious, and condemners of the destruction will be caught, and there will be no one on earth who might resist them or root them out because of their evilness and greed.

Red Book: *Ruuein a diwreidir o dan a chledeu. Ruuein a gymerir yn llaw y brenhin hwnnw. A dynyon treisswyr a uyd chwannaawc a chreulaw'n, ac yn kassau y tlodyon*

ac yn kywarsanghu y rei diargywed, ac yn iachau y rei a argywedwys. Ac yna y bydant y rei argywedussaf, ac enwiraf. Ac arglwydiaetheu yn eu teruynau a geithiwir. Ac ny byd a wrthwyneppo udunt, ne nac eu diwreidho oc eu chwant ac eu drycdynyaeth.

Peniarth 14: *Ruuein a wrthuynebir ena o drallaut ac o gledyf ac en llaw e brenhin hwnnw e byd dalyedic. Ac ena y byd denyon ysgylyuat creulawn a gasaont e tlodyon, ac a lethont e rei gwann ac a yachaont e rei camgyllous, ac enwir uydant, a'r eithauoed a geytheir. Ac ny byd a wrthuyneppo udunt, nac eu hamdiffynho am eu drwc ac eu chwant.*

RB chooses to repeat the word *Ruuein*, Rome, to create a dramatic parallelism, and strangely translate *persecutione*, 'persecution' as *dan*, 'fire', creating a phrase meaning 'Rome will be demolished by fire and sword'. P translates this word, again, as *drallaut*, 'tribulation, sorrow', which does not really cover the meaning of Latin *persecutione* either. The translator might still have had this word on his mind from the preceding sentence. Because both our translators opt for a word that does not translate the Latin one, the source manuscript might have been damaged here.

The next phrase, *et erunt...noxios* is translated literally by both versions, although in totally different vocabulary, which in itself is interesting. *Insontes* is translated as *y rei diargywed*, 'the innocent' in RB, which is indeed the first meaning of this word, while P opts for *e rei gwann*, 'the weak', which also carries a secondary meaning of 'harmless'.

RB translates the following *eruntque* as *ac yna y bydant* ‘and then there will be’, which makes one think that following on the earlier bad men, now even worse men will come. Latin *eruntque*, however, means ‘and they will be’, making it clear in Latin that we are still discussing the same wicked people. P has understood this. *Iniusti et nequissimi* means ‘unjust and most harmful’. RB translates both words with superlatives, *y rei argywedussaf ac enwiraf*, ‘the most harmful and wicked ones’, making *iniusti* and *nequissimi* change place in the process. P only translates *iniusti*, with *enwir*, ‘wicked’.

Et damnatores exterminii captivabuntur, ‘and the condemners of the destruction will be caught’ becomes in RB *ac arglwydiaetheu yn eu teruyneu a geithiwir*, ‘and lordships on their borders shall be enslaved’. What has happened here? *Yn eu theruyneu* is an idiomatic phrase meaning ‘completely’ (GPC), but that does not seem to be the meaning here. *Captivabuntur* may indeed be translated as *geithiwir* into Middle Welsh. But where do the *teruyneu* and *arglwydiaetheu* come from? One of Sackur’s variant readings, in *M*, gives *conterminii*, which must pass for a genitive singular or nominative plural of *conterminus*, ‘bordering on, sharing a border with’. These forms end in a single *-i* though, not in a double *-ii* as seen here, so we may be sure we are dealing with a corruption of *exterminii* here. If we suppose our translator was confronted with an exemplar featuring this corruption, we have now explained where *teruyneu* comes from. And the *arglwydiaetheu*? Sackur gives no variant readings for *damnatores*. But in a hard to read manuscript, the word may easily be confounded with one of the derivatives of *dominus*, ‘lord’ in English and *arglwyd* in Welsh, one of them is the verb *dominor*, ‘to rule’.

P has *a'r eithauoed a geytheir*, 'and the furthest ones shall be enslaved'. *Eithaf* means 'extreme' or 'furthest away', or indeed 'border'. This must be P's interpretation of the corrupt form *conterminii* that also must lie at the base of RB's version – we have by now ample evidence that both versions must be based on a single Latin source. The 'lords' or 'condemners' have been left out in this version: in our corrupt source manuscript, *damnatores* must have been damaged or hard to read, making the RB translator have a go with a guessed interpretation, and causing P to just ignore the word.

Cupiditates means 'greed', and has been translated as such by P, with *chwant*. RB chooses a more general *drycdynyaeth*, 'evilness'.

57. *Et tunc surget rex Grecorum, cuius nomen Constans, et ipse erit rex Romanorum et Grecorum. Hic erit statura grandis, aspectu decorus, vultu splendidus atque per singula membrorum liniamenta decenter compositus. Et ipsius regnum C et XII annis terminabitur.*

And then a king of the Greeks will rise, whose name is Constans, and this one will be king of the Romans and the Greeks. That one will be of great stature, elegant of look, splendid of face, and handsomely composed through the alignment of each of his body parts. And his reign will be ended after a hundred and twelve years.

Red Book: *Ac yna y kyuyt brenhin o Roec, Constans y enw. A hwnnw a uyd brenhin yg Groec ac yn Ruuein. Hwnnw a uyd mawr yg corffolaeth, a thec o'e*

*edrychyat, ac echtywynnedic o'e olwc, a gwedus lun ar y gorff yn adurnyat
enrydedus. A'e teyrnas deudec mlyned a chant.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e keuyt brenhin Groec, Constans y enw, a hwonnw uyd brenhin
ar Groec a Ruuein. Gur abruysgyl e ueint uyd hwonnw, gwedus o'e welet, canneit y
wynep a gwedus e lun em pob aelaut, ac ugein mlyned a chant e parha y argluydiaeth.*

Both P and RB translate *rex Romanorum et Grecorum*, 'king of the Romans and the Greeks' into 'king of Greece and Rome', with slightly differing prepositions, *brenhin yg Groec ac yn Ruuein*, 'king in Greece and Rome' in RB and *brenhin ar Groec a Ruuein*, 'king over Greece and Rome' in P. Not only have Greece and Rome changed place, but the king of two peoples has also become the king of two places. The development of kingship from being regarded as a relationship to a people to it being regarded as a relationship to a country is historical, and took place during the Middle Ages. Earlier kings ruled people, later kings ruled states. This cultural change is reflected in this change of formula.

RB *Hwonnw a uyd mawr yg corffolaeth, a thec o'e edrychat, ac echtywynnedic o'e olwc*, 'that one will be of great stature, and beautiful for what concerns his look, and brilliant of eye' is, considering our translator's evident difficulties with advanced Latin grammar, a surprisingly good translation of *hic erit statura grandis, aspectu decorus, vultu splendidus*, in which the adjectives are in the nominative and the things they qualify in the ablative. The description of King Constans' physical appearance does, like the description of the Sibyl herself in fragment 12, call to mind Suetonius and Einhard.

P does not stretch the *x o'e y* construction that far, using it only in *gwedus o'e welet*, 'fair concerning his appearance', and chooses a Welsh idiomatic genitive construction in *gur abruysgyl y ueint*, 'a man, enormous his size'. The *abruysgyl* 'enormous' is a bit of a hyperbole, *grandis* only means 'big'. Although P has more variation in the constructions it uses, RB has a more varied lexicon, using *tec* 'fair' for *decorus* 'fair' and *gwedus* 'handsome' for *decenter* 'handsome', while P uses *gwedus* to translate both *decorus* and *decenter*.

Per singula membrorum liniamenta decenter conpositus, 'and handsomely put together through the alignments of his body parts' is at first sight a strange phrase, and hard to understand, let alone translate. RB gave it a fair try, with *a gwedus lun ar y gorff yn adurnyat enrydedus*, 'and with a handsome body shape as a noble decoration', which does not translate the words literally but does transfer the gist of it. P has a simpler *a gwedus e lun em pob aelaut*, 'and his shape handsome in every part of his body'.

In the Latin, King Constans will reign for a 112 years, as in RB. In P however, we see *ugein mlyned a chant*, a 120 years. 112 is written in RB as *deudec mlyned*. *Deu ddec* literally means 'two ten' or 'two tens' in Welsh, and might have been mistaken for another way of saying 'twenty'. This mistake is only possible if the direct source of P was also in Welsh, so this might be a clue manuscript P had at least one other medieval Welsh manuscript between itself and L.

58. *In illis ergo diebus erunt divitiae multe et terra abundanter dabit fructum, ita ut tritici modium denario uno venundetur, modium vini denario uno, modium olei denario uno.*

In those days there will be many riches and the earth will yield fruit abundantly, so that a measure of wheat will be sold for one *denarius*, a measure of wine for one *denarius*, and a measure of oil for one *denarius*.

Red Book: *Yn yr amser hwnnw y bydant goludoed amyl, a'r daear a dyry ffrwytheu yn gyn amlet. Ac na werther y messur gwenith ywch no cheinawc, a'r messur olew yr keinawc.*

Peniarth 14: *En e dydyeu henne e byd amdler goludoed, ac e ryd e daear y frwyth en ehelaeth, ual y caffer messur gwenith yr keinnyauc, a'r messur gwin er keinnyauc, a'r messur olew yr keinnyauc.*

P has translated word-for word, RB transforms *tritici modium denario uno venundetur*, 'a measure of wheat shall be sold for one *denarius*' into a negative *ac na werther y mesur gwenith ywch no cheinawc*, 'and the measure of wheat shall be sold for not more than a penny'. *Ita ut*, 'so that' has been replaced by the more neutral conjunction *ac*, 'and, with'; P has *val y*'so that'. *Modium vini denario uno*, 'a measure of wine for one *denarius*' is missing in RB and WB, but not in P: the eye of the RB/WB translator -or a later copyist- must have skipped.

59. *Et ipse rex scripturam habebit ante oculos dicentem: 'Rex Romanorum omne sibi vindicet regnum Christianorum'. Omnes ergo insulas et civitates paganorum*

devastabit et universa idolorum templa destruet, et omnes paganos ad babtismum convocabit et per omnia templa crux Iesu Christi erigetur.

And that king will have a piece of writing in front of his eyes, saying: 'The king of the Romans will claim for himself the reign of all the Christians'.

Therefore, he will sack all the islands and the cities of the pagans, and he will destroy the entirety of the temples of the idols, and he will call all the pagans to baptism, and in all temples the cross of Jesus Christ will be raised.

Red Book: *A'r brenhin hwonnw a vyd a llythyr geyr y vronn yn wastat. Ac yn y llythyr yn yscriuennedic: brenhin , ar darestwng idaw pop teyrnas Gristonogawl, holl dinassoed ac ynysed y paganyeit a distriw, ac eu themloed a diwreida, a'r holl paganyeit a dwc y Gret. Ac r holl temloed y werthuawr groc a dyrcheuir.*

Peniarth 14: *A rac bron y brenhin hwonnw e byd yscrioen en dywedut: 'brenhin Groec a geiff idaw e hun pob teyrnas Cristonogyon'. Ac urth henne holl enysed a dinassoed Panonia a darystung, a holl temleu y dwyweu a distriw, a'r Paganyeit a eilw ar uedyd, a thrwy e temleu oll a lehaa croc Crist.*

RB has misunderstood the Latin here, coming up with a mish-mash of words that does not make sense in Welsh, and doesn't follow the meaning of the Latin text, either. In Latin, we are dealing with two phrases here. The first phrase tells us about the text king Constans has in front of him, and what it says: *et ipse rex scripturam habebit ante oculos dicentem: 'Rex Romanorum omne sibi vindicet regnum Christianorum'*, 'and this king will have a text before his eyes, saying: 'The king of the Romans shall claim the reign over all the Christians for himself'. The second phrase tells us what the king will do: *Omnes ergo insulas et civitates paganorum devastabit et universa*

idolorum templa destruet, et omnes paganos ad bap̄tismum convocabit et per omnia templa crux Iesu Christi erigetur, ‘therefore, he will sack all the islands and cities of the pagans, and destroy all the temples of the idols, and he will call all the pagans to baptism, and in all temples the cross of Jesus Christ will be raised’.

Reading a manuscript that probably did not contain interpunction, our poor RB translator got this hopelessly messed up. The first part, *a’r brenhin... yn wastat* is alright, even though one may object that there is no *yn wastat*, ‘all the time’ in the source text. But then, *ac yn y llythyr yn yscriuennedic brenhin, ar darestwng... distriw,* ‘and in the text, written, the king, in order to submit every Christian kingdom to himself, will destroy all the cities and the islands of the Pagans’. This phrase makes as little sense in Welsh as it does in English – it is not idiomatic. We could expand this to, and in the letter [it is] written [that] the king, in order to subject every Christian kingdom to himself, shall destroy the islands and cities of the pagans’. This is already much better, but it is not what the Latin says. The Welsh translator has merged two independent main clauses, making the first clause subordinate to the second.

True to his style, the RB translator stumbles upon a religious passage and adds his own devout flourishes to it. Therefore, the ‘Cross of Jesus Christ’ becomes *y werthuawr groc*, ‘the precious cross’. The pagans are also brought to the Faith, *y Gret*, rather than simply to baptism as in Latin and P.

P has translated literally: *a rac bron y brenhin hwnnw e byd yscriven en dywedut: brenhin Groec a geiff idaw e hun pob teyrnas Cristnogyon,* ‘and in front of this king there will be

writing, saying: 'the king of Greece will have every kingdom of Christians for himself'. It is followed by the conjunction *urth henne*, 'therefore, accordingly', translating *ergo* and starting the second main clause, like in Latin.

P has *brenhin Groec*, 'the king of Greece', instead of *rex Romanorum*, 'king of the Romans, and *Grecorum*, 'of the Greeks' is a variant known to Sackur, in MSS *Vr* and *M*. RB simply has *y brenhin hwynnw*, 'that king', but at this point we may safely assume its Latin source text had *rex Grecorum*, too. It is understandable RB simplified to 'this king', as *Constans* was already designed as *rex Grecorum* a few phrases ago.

The insulas et civitates paganorum, 'the islands and the cities of the pagans' become *enyssed a dinassoed Panonia*, 'the island and cities of Pannonia' in P. Pannonia was a province of the Roman Empire that contained a large part of Eastern Europe, including Austria, Hungary and parts of the Balkan.²¹¹ Our scribe must have been quite well-read in history and geography to come up with this mistake.

60. *Tunc namque preueniet Egiptus et Etiopia manus eius dare Dei. Qui vero cruce Iesu Christi non adoraverit gladio punietur, et cum completi fuerint centum et viginti anni, Iudei conuertentur ad Dominum, et erit ab omnibus sepulcrum eius gloriosum. In diebus illis salvabitur Iuda et Israhel habitabit confidenter.*

Then he will begin to surrender Egypt and Ethiopia to God. Whoever will not worship the true cross of Jesus Christ will be punished by the sword, and when a hundred and twenty years will be fulfilled, the Jews will be converted

²¹¹ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Pannonia>, last visited 07/10/2019.

to the Lord, and his grave will be glorious to all. In those days Juda will be saved and Israel will live without fear.

Red Book: *Yna y dechreu ef rodi Ethiopia a'r Eifft yn dwywawl wasanaeth, ac ar ny wediaw y'r groc kyssegredic o leas cledyf y teruynir. A phan gwplaer cant ac ugein mlynedd, yr Idewon a trossir y gret yr arglwyd, a'e ved ynteu gwynuydedic a uyd gogonedus y gan bawp. Yn y dydyeu hynny yd iecheir Iudea a gwlat yr Israel yn ffydlonder a presswyla.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e dechreu yr Ethyop a'r Greifft rodi llaw y Duw. Ac ar nyt adoloe e groc yr Argluyd llad y benn. A phan gupplaer odena ugein mlyned a chant yd emchwel yr Ideon ar yr Argluyd ac ena yd adola paub bed er Argluyd en ogonyanhus. En e dydyeu henne yd yecheir Iuda ac y presswylya er Israel en emdiryedus.*

This passage has been translated quite literally by both Welsh version, and the places where they decide to translate a bit more freely are different. The first part, *Tunc... manus eius dare Dei* 'then, he will begin to surrender Egypt and Ethiopia to God', literally means 'then, he will begin give to give his hand Egypt and Ethiopia to God', but *manus dare* is Latin idiom for 'to be shackled', metaphorically 'to surrender'. RB has translated this freely, but true to the sense with *yna e dechreu ef rodi Ethiopia a'r Eifft yn dwywawl wasanaeth*, 'then, he will begin to give Ethiopia and Egypt to godly service', while P translated *ac ena e dechreu yr Ethyop a'r Greifft [sic] rodi llaw y Duw*, 'and then, Ethiopia and Egypt will start to help (literally 'give a hand') to God. The mistake is easily made: The names of the countries are in the nominative, but Latin often doesn't decline foreign toponyms, and the Latin idiomatical expression of

'giving a hand' meaning 'to surrender' becomes confused with the Welsh idiom 'giving a hand' which means 'to help'. *Greiff* is interesting: it seems to be a hybrid between *Eifft*, 'Egypt' and *Groec* 'Greece'. This, too, is an easy mistake: the only thing that has to happen is a scribe taking the *r* in *a'r*, 'and the' as the first letter of the country (there was no space between the article and the noun behind it in manuscript), and suppose it to be a lenited word originally beginning with a *g*. It also support our earlier hypothesis that at least one unknown Welsh manuscript stands between P and its Latin source, as this is not a mistake one would make based on a Latin-language manuscript – it is a Welsh scribal error.

Qui vero cruce Iesu Christi non adoraverit gladio punientur means 'who will not adore the true cross of Jesus Christ will be punished with the sword', but our Welsh translations take it a bit further: RB's *ac ar ny wediaw y'r groc kyssegredic o leas cleddyf y teruynir* means 'and who will not pray to the sacred cross will be slain by the slaughter of the sword'. This formula has a formulaic 'taste' to it because of the biblical-style repetition. It is, however, not a literary formula in Middle Welsh, and the biblical effect might have been intended. The Christian and Jewish Sibyls were after all modelled on the Old Testament prophets. In addition to that, our RB translator often shows a love for drama and hyperboles in religious passages, and the parallelism does achieve a certain dramatic effect..

P's *ac ar nyt adoloe e groc yr Argluyd llad y benn* means 'and those who may not give adoration to the Cross of the Lord, the cutting of [their] head'. Note that neither translations directly names Jesus, and also that RB gives in to its habitual urge for flourishes around subjects to do with Jesus, calling the cross *kyssegredic*, 'blessed,

sacred'. *Adoloe* is the third singular present subjunctive of *ad(d)oli*, 'to adore, to worship' (GPC); the regular ending of this case is *-(h)o*,²¹² but *-wy* and *-oe* are also attested.²¹³

Et erit ab omnibus sepulcrum eius gloriosum, 'and his grave will be glorious to all' has been translated in the same construction, using a preposition to express the ablative, in RB: *a'e ved ynteu gwynnydedic a uyd gogonedus y gan bawp*, 'and his blessed grave will be glorious for all'. *Gwynnydedic*, 'blessed' has been added as a little religious flourish. P has *ac ena yd adola paub bed er Argluyd en ogonyanhus*, 'and then all will adore the grave of the Lord gloriously', which is freer. *En ogonyanhus*, 'gloriously' seems a bit strange, like *gogonedus y gan bawp* – we do get the gist, but the constructions do not 'feel right'. This goes to show how hard it can be to translate an ablative construction into a language without cases.

61. *In illo tempore surget princeps iniquitatis de tribu Dan, qui vocabitur*

Antichristus. Hic erit filius perditionis et caput superbie, et magister erroris, plenitudo malicie, qui subvertet orbem et faciet prodigia et signa magna per falsas simulationes.

In that time the Prince of iniquity will rise from the tribe of Dan, he will be called Antichrist. This will be the son of perdition and the head of pride, and the master of error, full of evil, who will overthrow the world and create miracles and great omens by means of false simulations.

²¹² GMW p.115.

²¹³ GMW p.129.

Red Book: *Yn yr amser hwonnw y kyuyt tywywyssawc [sic] enwir o lwyth dan. Yr hwonn a elwir Antichristus. Hwonn a uyd mab kolledigaeth. A phenn syberwyt ac athro kyueilorn, kyflawn o drycennwired. Yr hwonn a trossa y byt, ac a wna arwydon a bredycheu drwy ffalst dystolyaetheu.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac en er amser hwonnw e keuyt tywysauc enwired o lwyth Dan, ac a elwir Antycrist. Hwonnw a uyd mab e kyuyrgoll a phen syberwyt, ac athro kyueilyorn. Kyulauder drwc ac enwired hwonnw a drossa e byt, ac a wna gwyrthyau ac anryuedodeu maur trwy dechymygyon geu.*

RB *tywywyssawc enwir*, 'evil prince': The White Book has, just like P, *enwired*, the noun, resulting in the translation 'prince of iniquity' which is more faithful to the Latin *princeps iniquitatis*, 'prince of iniquity'.

RB *drycennwired*, 'evil wickedness' and P *drwc ac enwired*, 'evil and wicked' both translate Latin *malicia*, 'evil'. Either *drwc* or *enwired* would have sufficed, but both our versions have opted for a double translations. This whole passage is rendered remarkably uniform by both our versions.

RB *A bredycheu drwy ffalst dystolyaetheu*, 'and [he will spread] deceit/fear through false testimonies'. *Bredych* has a double meaning of treachery or deceit, and fear; GPC even gives 'surprise'. Latin has *signa magna per falsas simulationes*, which means 'great omens by means of false simulations': in Latin, the Antichrist is a false oracle. It is the interpretation of our Welsh translator that these false oracles have the intention to spread fear. P has *ac a wna gwyrthyau ac anryuedodeu maur trwy*

dechymygyon geu, 'and he will perform miracles and great marvels through false schemes', which is closer in meaning to Latin than RB.

62. *Deludet autem per artem magicam multos, ita ut ignem de celo descendere videatur. Et minuentur anni sicut menses et menses sicut septimana et septimana sicut dies, et dies sicut hore, et ora velut puncti.*

For he will deceive many by means of magical arts, so that it will seem that fire descends from heaven. And years will be diminished like months, and months like weeks, and weeks like days, and days like hours, and hours like seconds.

Red Book: *Ef a dwyll drwy hudolawl geluydyt Jawnder, yn gymeint ac y gweler ef yn anuon y tan o'r nef. Ac y lleihaer y blwynyded megys y missoed, a'r missoed megys yr wythnosseu, a'r wythnosseu ual y dydyeu, a'r dydyeu ual yr oryyeu.*

Peniarth 14: *Ef a dwyll lawer trwy hudolyaeth, ual y gweloent hwy e uo en anvon tan o nef. Ac ena y byrhe[...] blwydyned val missoed, a'r missoed mal yr wythnoseu, a'r wythnosseu mal e dydyeu, a'r dydyeu mal yr oryeu.*

RB has *ef a dwyll drwy hudolawl geluydyt Jawnder*, 'he will deceive righteousness with magic tricks', while both Latin and P state that 'many' will be deceived: *multos* in Latin, *lawer* in P. *Jawnder*, especially written with a capital, may have been and incorrect reading of *lawer*, a word that looks quite similar. *Jawnder* does make sense in context. If it is a misreading of *lawer*, this means that at least one Welsh

manuscript stands between RB and its Latin original, just as we have concluded earlier on for P.

Et ora velut puncti, ‘and hours like seconds’ does not figure in either of our Welsh texts, but it does not figure in many of the texts examined by Sackur either, so this variant does not teach us much about the provenance of our text.

63. *Et exurgent ab aquilone spurcissime gentes, quas Alexander rex Indus inclusit, Gog videlicet et Magog. Hec autem sunt XXII regna, quorum numerus est sicut arena maris.*

And from the Northeast the most impure people will rise, whom Alexander, the king of India, imprisoned; that is to say, Gog and Magog.

These are twenty-two kingdoms, whose number is like the sand of the sea.

Red Book: *Yna y kyudant o deheu y dwyrein kenedyl kyhynet o'r rei a werthwys Alexander, nyt amgen Gog a Magoc. Yno y mae dwy urenhinyaeth ar hugeint riuedi y rei ny wys, mwy no'r tywawt yn y weilgi.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e kyudant o'r gorllewin y giwdaut ysgymunaf o'r gogled, a warchayus Alexander urenhin, nyt amgen Gog a Magog. Sef yu eu riuedi: dwy urenhinyaeth ar ugeint, ac eu riuedi ual tywaut e mor.*

Ex aquilone means ‘from the northeast’. RB has transformed this into *o deheu y dwyrein*, ‘from the southeast’ and P into *o'r gorllewin*, ‘from the west’. Might it be that both translators knew that *aquilo* is one of the compass directions, but were not sure

about which one it might be? The names of the winds were different in different systems used in the Middle Ages. The Red Book version of *Delw y Byd*, for example, calls the northeastern wind *Boreas*, which is the Greek term.²¹⁴

Kyhynet, 'as old', does not figure in either GPC or GMW. GMW p. 40 has a blank space where the equative of *hen* should be, and in the Cardiff corpus it is only found in this particular text. Therefore we seem to be dealing with a rare form, as straightforward and regular (*ky*+adjective+-*et*) as it may look. *Kyhynet o* must be a mistake, as equatives go with the particle *a*, not *o*. Also, it should translate *spurcissime*, 'foulest', while it clearly doesn't.

P translates *spurcissime* as *ysgymunaf*, 'most despicable, most horrid', which covers the meaning of the Latin well.

Rex Indus, 'king of India', only appears in certain manuscripts used by Sackur. It looks like our Latin source was not one of them. P adds *vrenhin*, 'king' to Alexander's name, but as it is not featured in RB, and as neither of our manuscripts styles him 'king of India', it is more probable that this was an editorial addition in P.

RB *werthwys*, 'he sold', also does not translate *inclusit* 'enclosed, locked up', although it might mean 'betrayed', in which case the RB translator might have thought Alexander locked up Gog and Magog by deceit.

RB *Mwy no*, 'more than': Latin has an equative, *quorum numerum sicut arena maris*, 'the number of which [is] as the sand of the sea'. We have seen this same Biblical trope already in 32. The RB comparative comes from the best-known verse

²¹⁴ RB, p. 247v.

containing the trope, the promise of God to Abraham, while the Latin's equative figures in 1 Kings and Psalm 139. The translator must have recognised the reference from the Genesis verse and translated a comparative without thinking. P has translated word-for-word.

64. *Cum autem audierit rex Romanorum, convocato exercitu debellabit eos atque prosternet usque ad internicionem et postea veniet Ierusalem, et ibi deposito capitis diademate et omni habitu regali relinquet regnum Christianorum Dei patri et Iesu Christo filio eius.*

And when the king of the Romans will have heard this, he will , having assembled his army, beat them and vanquish them into total destruction, and after that he will go to Jerusalem, and, when he will have taken the diadem off his head and surrendered all regal adornments, he will give the reign of the Christians to God the Father and Jesus Christ his son.

Red Book: *Pan welo y brenhin y Ruueinyeit y geilw y lu, ac y ryuela ac wy ac y llad hyt y teruyn eithaf. a gwedy hynny y daw y Gaerusalem. Ac yno y gwrthyt coron y teyrnas, a phop brenhinawl abit y dedyf y deyrnas y Duw dat ac yn harglwyd ni Iessu Grist.*

Peniarth 14: *A phan welo brenhin Ruuein y petheu henne, kynullaw lluoed en eu herbyn ac emlad ac wynt hyt y angheu. Ac odeno e daw y Gaerusalem, ac eno e diyt e goron y am y ben ac y burw y abit brenhinyaul, ac y gurthyt y deyrnas ar Duw Tat a'r Argluyd Yessu Grist e uab enteu.*

Both RB and P have translated *audierit* 'he will have heard' as *welo* 'he will see'; this is not a variant given by Sackur, but as it occurs in both texts, it might point us towards their Latin ancestor, which might have had *uiderit*. A misreading of *audierit* as *uiderit* is unlikely, as both our translators independently made this same 'mistake'.

RB contains a glitch here. *Pan welo y brenhin y Ruueinyeit y geilw y lu* means 'when the king will see the Romans, he will call his army'. The article *y* in front of *brenhin* makes *y Ruueinyeit* look like the object of the verb, while in Latin, *Romanorum* is a genitive depending on *rex*. The White Book has *brenhin y Rufeineit*, without an article in front of *brenhin*, thus producing the meaning 'when the king of the Romans will see [it], he will call his army', as in Latin and P.

Et ibi deposito capitis diademate et omni habitu regali relinquet regnum christianorum Dei patri et Iesu Christo filio eius, 'and there, having taken the diadem off his head, and having surrendered all regal adornments, he will give the reign of the Christians to god the Father and Jesus Christ, his son'. This phrase has been translated slightly different in both our versions, both adding and omitting words at different places:

Et ibi deposito capitis diademate has been translated literally by P, or as literally as one can translate Latin into a language that does not use the ablative absolute: *ac eno e diyt e goron y am y ben*, 'and there he will take the crown off his head'. RB translates less literally: *Ac yno y gwrthyt coron y teyrnas*, 'and there he will refuse the crown of the kingdom'. *Gwrthod* can mean 'to reject, to repudiate' as well, but in any case, the physical action of taking off a crown has become the moral action of rejecting it. *Y teyrnas*, 'the kingdom', is an addition.

Omni habitu regali, 'all kingly adornments' is a *phop brenhinawl abit*, 'and every kingly adornment' in RB – a literal translation. P has *ac y burw y abit brenhinyaul*, 'and he will throw off his kingly adornments', not translating *omni*, 'every', but adding a verb.

Relinquet regnum christianorum Dei patri et Iesu Christo filio eius: Neither RB nor P translates *christianorum*. Instead of 'the reign of the Christians', the king leaves *y deyrnas*, 'his kingdom' to God. RB uses *dedyf*, 'he will give' to describe *relinquet*, 'leave'; P has *gurthyt...ar*, 'renounce for the sake of'.

Iesu Christo filio eius, 'Jesus Christ, his son' becomes simply *yn harglwyd ni Iessu Grist* 'our lord Jesus Christ' in RB, adding the reverential title, and leaving out the son. P has *a'r argluyd Yessu Grist e uab enteu*, 'and the lord Jesus Christ, his son'. The 'lord' has been added here too, but not at the cost of the 'son'.

65. *Et cum cessaverit imperium Romanum, tunc revelabitur manifeste Antichristus et sedebit in domo Domini in Ierusalem. Regnante autem eo, egredientur duo clarissimi viri Helias et Enoch ad annuntiandum Domini adventum et Antichristus occidet eos, et post dies tres a Domino resuscitabuntur.*

And when the Roman Empire will fail, then the Antichrist will be revealed clearly, and he will sit in the house of the Lord in Jerusalem. And when he reigns, two of the most noble men, Elia and Enoch, will arrive to announce the coming of the Lord, and the Antichrist will kill them, but after three days they will be resurrected by the Lord.

Red Book: *Yn y oes ef y deuant y deu egluraf, nyt amgen Ely ac Enoc, y uenegi bot yn dyuot rac llaw, ac y llad yr Anticrist y rei hynny, a'r trydyd dyd y kyudant trwy Duw.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ene gwledycho honno y de[...] deu wr eglur, Helyas ac Enoc, y gennatau dyuodedigaeth Duw, a'r Antycrist ac eu llad wynteu. A'r trydydyd e kyuyt er Argluyd wynt.*

Et cum cessaverit imperium Romanum, tunc revelabitur manifeste Antichristus et sedebit in domo Domini in Ierusalem, 'and when the Roman Empire will fail, then Antichrist will be revealed clearly, and he will sit in the house of the Lord in Jerusalem'. This phrase is missing from all our Welsh texts, RB, WB, and P, so it is safe to presume it was missing from their shared Latin ancestor. Sackur does not mention this phrase is omitted in any of his versions.

Ad annuntiandum Domini adventum, 'to proclaim the coming of the Lord' becomes in RB *y uenegi bot yn dyuot rac llaw,* 'to proclaim to be coming in the future'. *The rac llaw,* 'in the future' does not appear in Latin, while the person who is coming – the Lord – does, but this person has been omitted in Welsh in both RB and WB. It is featured in P, as *dyuodedigaeth Duw,* 'the coming of God'. This omission must have come from an ancestor shared by RB and WB, but not P.

66. *Tunc erit persecutio magna, qualis non fuit antea nec postea subsequetur.*

Abbreviabit autem Dominus dies illos propter electos et occidetur virtute Domini Antichristus a Mikaele arcangelo in monte Oliveti.

Then there will be a great persecution, as there hadn't been before nor will follow afterwards. But the Lord will shorten those days for the chosen and Antichrist will be killed by the Archangel Michael, through the power of the Lord, on the Mount of Olives..

Red Book: *Ac yna y byd diwreid mawr, y kyfryw ny bu na chynt nac gwedy. Yr arglwyd a uyrhaa y dydyeu hynny o achaws y etholedigyon. A Mihangel a lad yr Anticrist ym mynyd Oliuet.*

Peniarth 14: *Ac ena e byd kymeint e drallaut ac na bu eryoet y chyuryw ac na byd rac llaw. Duw hagen a diuyrra e dieoed henne o achaws y etholedigyon. Ac o nerth Duw e lledir er Antycrist y gan Uihangel y Mynydd Oliuet.*

Persecutio is translated as *diwreid*, 'extermination' in RB, and as *trallaut*, 'tribulation, calamity' in P. Both words hint at great and large-scale misfortune, but *persecutio* has a primary meaning of 'persecution, chasing'. Because neither of our texts hints at that, it might be that our Latin ancestor-text had another word, although Sackur gives no variants.

P's translation of *autem*, one of these conjunctions that serve mostly as glue to keep a narrative together, as *hagen* is clever. It covers all the meanings of 'but, nevertheless, besides, further, in addition' etc. and as such is an ideal counterpart for the Latin word. P interpretes *Dominus* 'the Lord' as *Duw*, 'God', while RB uses *yr Arglwyd*, 'the Lord'. P is rather more 'wordy', in this section, putting in an *eryoet* 'ever' in the first phrase, emphasizing that something like this *persecutio* does not have its like anywhere in history. The last phrase, *et occidentur... Oliveti* is translated in a fashion

very close to the Latin. The Latin phrase reads ‘and Antichrist will be killed through the virtue of the Lord by the archangel Michael on Olive Mountain’; RB simplifies this to *a Mihangel a lad yr Antichrist ym mynyd Oliuet*, ‘and the archangel Michael will kill Antichrist on the Olive Mountain’, getting rid of both the passive voice and the instrumental ablative of *virtute Domini*. P, however, has *ac o nerth Duw e lledir er Antycrist y gan Uihangel y Mynydd Oliuet*, ‘and through God’s virtue, Antichrist will be killed by the archangel Michael on Olive Mountain’, keeping the passive voice, the instrumental ablative, and the whole meaning of the Latin phrase.

67. *Cumque Sibilla hec et alia multa Romanis futura prediceret, quibus etiam signis ad iudicandum Dominus venturus est, vaticinando intonuit dicens:*

And when Sibyl predicted these and many other future events to the Romans, she raised her voice to also prophesy to them the signs that the Lord is coming to judge, saying:

Red Book: *Gwedy racuenegi o Sibli y petheu hynn, a llawer o betheu ereill o’r a delynt rac llaw. Ac yma arwydon y daw Duw y uarnu, a Sibli a dywawt o dewindabaeth.*

Peniarth 14: *A phan daruu y Sibli traethu y petheu hyn a llawer heuyt yr Rwminyeit o betheu rac llaw, ena y mynegis pa ryw arwydyon a delynt pan del yr Argluyd y varnu y vraut gyhed:*

Cumque...prediceret, ‘and when Sibyl had predicted these and many other future things to the Romans’ has been translated more or less literally in both versions; RB

has omitted *Romanis*, 'to the Romans'. The second phrase, *quibus...dicens*, 'she raised her voice to also prophesy to them the signs that the Lord is coming to judge , saying' is a grammatically complicated phrase, with the relative dative *quibus*, meaning, 'to them', i.e. to the Romans, the future infinitive *venturus est*, and the gerund of *ad iudicandum*, 'to judge'. This might well be the most complicated phrase of the whole text. Therefore it is not surprising that both our Welsh versions simplified the phrase, while still getting the message across: RB with *ac yma arwydon y daw Duw y uarnu, a Sibyl a dywawt o dewindabaeth*, 'and here are the signs God is coming to judge, and Sibyl spoke in prophecy', and P with *ena y mynegis pa ryw arwydyon a delynt pan del yr Argluyd y varnu y vraut gyhed*, 'then she mentioned what kinds of signs will come when the Lord will come to judge the Last Judgment'.

Textual Relationships.

How do our different Welsh versions relate to each other and to their Latin source text? Surprisingly, all our versions, Red Book (RB), White Book (WB), and Peniarth 14 (P), come from one and the same Latin version, out of the hundreds of versions of the *Tiburtina* available. Two independent translations have been made of this one Latin version: one that would survive in P, and another which has been transmitted in RB and WB. In this chapter we will discuss the characteristics of both translations, as well as the relationships of our manuscripts to each other, and to their Latin source.

Latin?

One might ask whether the shared source was necessarily Latin. After all, there were also French versions of the text in circulation, and our Welsh texts might have been translated from one of those. But there are clues in the text that tell us that the original was definitely Latin. In 47, RB mistranslated *depredabunt*, 'they will plunder' as *a wediont*, 'they will pray', because the translator mixed up *depraedor*, 'to plunder' with *depraecor*, 'to pray'. P translates *depredabunt* as *anreithyedic*, 'plundered', which means the source text had the correct form, and must have been Latin, for such a mistake to have occurred.

The Red and White Books.

I. Characterisation.

It is evident that the Red and White Books share a source: the differences between these two texts are in the details, while large portions of text are verbatim clones of each other. The spelling of both texts is very different, which is in keeping with the general spelling differences between these two books. But because both texts are essentially the same version, we shall consider the characteristics of these two texts as if they were one and the same. Differences between the White and Red Books are discussed below, in the context of the relationship between these two texts.

The first thing that springs to mind when studying this version are the many additions and in-text glosses.

In 2, Macedonia is 'translated' as *gwlat Alexander Mawr*, 'the country of Alexander the Great'. It is possible that this designation once featured between the lines or in the margins, as a clarification, but as this is the form we find in both RB and WB, it is also possible that our translator simply replaced a largely unknown toponym with a description his readers could relate to. We find this again in 3, where *Ethiopia* is explained by *gwlat y blewmonyeit*. In this case the original word has not been replaced by the gloss, but they exist side by side. In 10, our translator feels compelled to tell his public what a scorpion is: *Prif yw yscorpion, bychan y gorffolyaeth, vnveint a chwyl eryr. Ac oerach y wenwyn no dan*, 'a scorpion is an insect, small-bodied, the same size as a viper. And its poison is colder than fire.' In 45, a *Salicus* gets translated as a king *o Freinc*, 'from France'. P translates *Salic*, so this is a change made by the RB/WB translator. The Salians were indeed a dynastic line of kings from France, but they belonged to history when our translation was written. The translator again shows how much he wants to help his audience to understand what they read, changing

the designation to a more contemporary, less obscure one. Only once he misses the mark: when he renders *Agareni* as *gwyr o Agaria*. *Agaria* is not a toponym, and the *Agareni*, or Saracens, are named after Hagar (or Agar), the mother of the Biblical Ismael who, according to legend, is the ancestor of all Muslims. Our translator obviously did not know this, and instead of clarifying the text he inadvertently muddied it here.

At other moments, the eagerness of our translator to 'help' the reader and clarify the text manifests itself in more subtle ways: In 15, for example, where the Latin simply states *et fecerunt, ut dixit*, 'and they did as she said', our translator has *ac yna y doethant y gyt mal y herchis hi*, 'and there they came, as she had asked'. Not happy to just tell his public that the senators indeed did what Sibyl asked, he feels a need to remind us what exactly her request was. Something similar happens in 5, where Latin has *fama eius*, 'her fame', and our translator renders this with *clot y racdywededic Sibli*, 'the fame of the aforementioned Sibyl', and in 19, where the Latin introduces Mary, then refers back to her with the words *ea* 'her' and *ipsa* 'she', and RB translates *ea* with *y Meir honno* and *ipsa* with *Meir*, just to avoid any confusion. This type of in-text glossing is typical of RB/WB, in contrast with P, which does not offer any explanations to its reader.

Apart from adding these explanatory interpolations, the translator of the RB/WB version also interpolates enthusiastically in religious passages about the life of Christ. In 26, the 'Sibylline Gospel' already has quite a few religious *epitheta ornantia* in the Latin text, but our translator adds a few extra. Jesus' back becomes his *geuyn gwerthuawr* 'precious back', and the 'wood' (of the cross) becomes the *brenn*

diodeifeint, the ‘wood of passion’. In 59, when we are back with religious imagery, the *crux Iesu Christi*, the cross of Jesus Christ, becomes *y werthuaawr groc*, ‘the precious cross’. Just after that, in 60, this same cross of Jesus Christ becomes *y groc kyssegredic*, ‘the sacred cross’, while *sepulcrum eius*, ‘his grave’ becomes *e ved ynteu gwynnydedic* ‘his blessed grave’.

Sometimes our translator is downright chatty. In 52 he is not content to just translate *et duobus annis regnabit*, ‘and he will reign for two years’, but writes *ef a wledycha ennyt, nyt amgen dwy vlyned*, ‘he will reign **for a short time, that is to say** two years’, judging and clarifying as much as translating. This kind of little alterations and interpolations makes our translator come to life, and contrasts him with his P counterpart, who has a much more sober style, as we shall see.

Not only does he expand certain passages: he also shortens others. He shows himself to be quite a pragmatist: for example, in 21, where the Latin has *respondens Sibilla dixit eis*, ‘answering, Sibyl told them’, translated faithfully by P as *ac ena y dywaut Sibli en atep udunt*, RB has a straightforward *Sibli a atebawd udunt*, ‘Sibyl answered them’.

The text is also a genuine attempt at writing Welsh literature; often, the translator chooses to translate freely, sticking to the spirit of the text rather than to the letter, and he is not afraid the change phrases to make them work better in the target language. Already in 2, we find this same *nyt amgen*, ‘that is to say’ that we mentioned in the preceding paragraph; one of those interjections that work as glue to keep Welsh prose texts together, and in 9, we find our first *megys*, ‘like’, another native filler.

In 4, the whole structure of the phrase has been turned upside down, in order to accommodate a more native style of expression, using a verbal noun construction: *y uarnu ohonei hi*. We see here the literary choices made by different translators. In 32, too, we witness our translator translating a Latin (Biblical) idiom into idiomatic Welsh: *excercitus eorum innumerabilis sicut arena maris*, ‘the army [will be] uncountable like the sand of the sea’ becomes *eu llu ny ellir rif arnaw mwy noc ar dywot y mor*, literally ‘their army on which no number can be [placed], any more than on the sand of the sea’; a phrase that is content-wise very close to the Latin text, but has its syntax turned upside down to accommodate a more idiomatic Welsh formula. In 38 our translator proves himself particularly clever, translating *et non dabitur in manus inimicorum*, ‘and he will not be given into the hands of his enemies’ as *ac ny cheiff y elynyon le llaw arnaw*, which means the same but is highly idiomatic. Thus our translator translates a literary Latin phrase into a Welsh expression, recycling the image of the ‘hand’ while he is at it. This playfulness and wittiness, and this palpable pleasure in handling and juggling languages show us something about the personality of our translator. It is also a sharp contrast with the P translation, as we will find out below.

His literary aspirations notwithstanding, our translator sometimes slips into repetition in a way that might bother the modern reader, although we should bear in mind that medieval audiences might have had a higher tolerance for repetition – it was part of the art of Latin rhetoric, certainly, and is also used to good stylistic effect

in native storytelling.²¹⁵ So, while 36's repeated *y daw, y daw, y daw*, using the same verb again and again to translate four different verbs in the source text might look like sloppy translating to us, it might not have had the same effect on a medieval audience. Peniarth 14 makes similar repetitive use of the verb *kerda*, changing only to *genir* for the last king in this paragraph. The same verb *y daw* is used again in 38, here to translate two different Latin verbs.

Our translator's grasp of Latin, however, seems to be imperfect, and he displays a few different strategies when working around passages he does not understand. In 47, we see him avoiding the word *aliquantisper*, which he probably did not know, and throwing in a wild guess with *yryngtunt*; the word certainly fits the context, but it does not mean *aliquantisper*, 'for a while'.

In 66, where the Latin reads *occidentur virtute Domini Antichristus a Mikaele arcangelo in monte Oliveti*, 'and the Antichrist will be killed through the virtue of the Lord by the archangel Michael on the Mount of Olives' with a passive voice and an instrumental ablative, RB writes *a Mihangel a lad yr Antichrist ym mynyd Oliuet*, 'and the archangel Michael will kill the Antichrist on the Mount of Olives': the passive has become active, and that complicated ablatival construction of *virtute Domini* is simply ignored.

II. Relationship to each other.

²¹⁵ See Davies, S., *Crefft y Cyfarwydd*, Cardiff 1995, pp. 40-42.

How do the RB and WB texts relate to each other? It would be tempting to think of WB as the exemplar of RB: WB is older and in most cases more correct. But there are indications that the two texts spring from a common ancestor (which we may call proto-RB/WB), making our two manuscripts siblings rather than parent and child. To complicate the picture even further, it seems to us that RB has not been copied from the same exemplar as WB. Rather, it seems that there is at least one manuscript between RB and proto-RB/WB, while WB might be a direct transcript of the proto-version. Let us have a look at the data.

Throughout the text, WB treats the word *heul* as masculine, while RB treats it as feminine.

In 5, RB gives the name of the emperor as *Traean*, which does not feature in WB or in the Latin texts. We are dealing with an interpolation by either the scribe of RB itself, or by a direct ancestor.

In 20, RB has *llong* instead of *lleng*, while WB has the correct *lleg* – an orthographic variant of *lleng*.

In 26, WB and P both have the correct *uaedu*, while RB has *uaedeu*, which is a scribal error. The mistake must have been made somewhere between the splitting of RB and WB traditions, and the RB text. It might even have been by the RB scribe himself.

Also in 26, both WB and RB have difficulties in the correct transcription of *wallowyant*. RB's *wallonyant* has minim confusion, while WB has *ballofuyant*, without minim confusion but with an incorrectly read 6-shaped *v*. These divergent variants do not necessarily mean anything; they are both very current errors. It might be that

in an earlier, shared ancestor manuscript this word was unclear, but the variants might just as well have developed independently of each other.

In 27, WB and P agree with each other and with the Latin text in *y dysc a gymerasauch*, while RB has a little glitch and writes *y dysc a dyscoch*, 'the learning you learned'.

This has a nice biblical ring but is probably just a mistake; it is very human to repeat a word that is already in your head, especially when it fits the context, while transcribing something.

As the end of 37 is missing in RB, and so is the beginning of 38, the direct source of this copy was likely damaged or unreadable here. From this it follows that RB must have been transcribed from a Welsh source text, and this source text was not WB, in which this passage is neither missing nor unreadable.

In 51, RB translates *non iudicabunt rectum, sed falsum* as *ac ny uarnant y iawnder, namyn geu, a ffalst vydant*, where *a ffalst vydant* seems to be an addition by the translator. WB offers an earlier version of transmission, with *ac ny varnant y iawnder namyn geu a ffalst*, where it becomes clear that originally, we were dealing with a case where a single Latin word undergoes a double Welsh translation. The RB scribe or one of his immediate predecessors must have thought this ending odd, reading *a ffalst* as the start of a new clause, and added a verb, *vydant*. In this instance, WB clearly represents an earlier stage of transmission.

And in 59, a small scribal error causes great havoc in the RB text – a confusion of *a* and *ar-* while WB provides us with the correct translation.

In 62, the Antichrist deceives *Jawnder*, 'righteousness' in RB, but *lawer*, 'many' in WB, as in the Latin, where he deceives *multos*. *Jawnder* is obviously a misreading of *lawer*, which may look quite similar in handwriting, and not a mistranslation of *multos*.

Like 37, this excerpt proves that RB must have been copied from another Welsh text.

We may therefore conclude that, although WB cannot be the source of the RB text, the WB text is in general more correct, and represents a slightly earlier stage of transmission than the RB text. Both texts must have been copied from other Welsh texts. RB contains many mistakes in places where WB is correct, and also contains 'newer' interpolations. These may have been written by the RB scribe or the scribe of an earlier text in this particular line of transmission, but after the RB tradition 'forked off' from the WB tradition.

Peniarth 14

I. Characterisation.

P is very different from the RB/WB; it translates the same Latin terms with different Welsh words, the syntax is different from the RB/WB, and the whole style is different, as we will discuss below. This text is definitely not a copy from a text in the RB/WB tradition. The Peniarth *Tiburtina* starts at what we have made excerpt 13 of the RB/WB text: the first page of this version appears to be missing.

The characteristics of the Peniarth text are most easily identified in comparison with the RB/WB text, because P is much more 'text true' in the modern sense of the word; it is a more literal translation, staying closer to the Latin example. Therefore,

without the contrast of the RB/WB tradition, it would appear that there is not much to say. Indeed, the text is most easily characterised by its lack of those tendencies we listed above for RB/WB, or at least a much lower frequency of substantial change of meaning, and virtually no editorial interpolation. The only interpolation is found in 32, where Latin has *tunc multa erit sanguinis effusio*, and RB/WB translate that as *yna y tywelltir amylder o waet* without comment. P has here *ena y byd amy l gwaet o'r calaned*, 'there will be a lot of blood **from the corpses**'. The text is free of the pious interpolations in the religious passages that so much characterize the RB/WB text.

Although less colourful than RB/WB, this translator, too, has his own style, and has imprinted the stamp of his personality on his text.

The first characteristic that catches the eye in this translation is the translator's love of brevity. Many phrases get shortened where this can be done without losing meaning, and he seems especially to dislike tautologies: in 30, where the women in Latin call out in *tribulationibus et doloribus* (*eu trallodeu a doluryeu* in RB/WB), they only suffer *trallodeu* in P. And in 36, where a Latin king *A* is *bellicosus nimis et preliator* in Latin and in RB/WB (*ymladgar a diruawr ryuelwr*), he is just *ryuelwr* in P.

P also employs some Cambricisms in its translation: in 14 we encounter our first *ual hynn*, a staple of Welsh literary dialogue. All our versions have added this interjection in their translation of *respondens Sibilla dixit at eos*, because, in medieval Welsh, one does not just answer, one answers *like this*.

Another formulaic phrase used throughout P is the translation of *(rex) per X nomine* as *(brenhin) a dechreu y entw o lythyren X*, which is, surprisingly perhaps, much more

verbose than the formula used by RB/WB: this text simply announces the coming of 'king X'.

And although most of the times it is the RB/WB text that paraphrases while P translates to the letter, there are another few instances where the opposite happens. In 17, for example, *crescentes* is translated literally by RB/WB with *ymlhawynt*, 'they will grow in number', while P translates *ac a uydant amyl*, 'and they will be many', which is uncharacteristic in both its inexactness and its wordiness: four Welsh words to translate one Latin one! Another little twist on the original is found in the next part, 18, where *et erunt pugne multe in Roma* gets a literal translation in the Red and White Books, with *a llawer o ymladeu a uyd yn Ruuein*, 'and there will be many wars in Rome', while Peniarth 14 changes the structure of the phrase, as well as a shade of meaning, with *ac ena e byd ryuelus Ruvein* 'and then Rome will be warlike'. *Ryuelus*, as an adjective, means 'warlike, aggressive' (GPC) which is not an exact rendering of the Latin text: the Latin merely states that there will be wars in Rome, rather than trying to describe Rome's attitude, which it seems P is doing. So here we find, in P, a free translation that also interprets or at least changes the meaning of the text. And we find another interpreting translation in 19, where *propter Deum*, 'because/for the sake of God', is translated by *en dial Duw*, 'as God's vengeance'. This is only one possible interpretation of this phrase, and RB/WB are more neutral with *yr Duw*, 'for the sake of God'.

But in 38, we see a clear example of how much closer to the Latin text P normally translates: *Et non dabitur in manus inimicorum (...) et anima eius in manu Dei* is translated by the RB/WB as *ac ny cheiff y elynyon le llaw arnatw (...) a'e eneit o'r diwed a*

a y teyrnas nef ar Duw, where RB/WB cleverly translate the Latin idiom of ‘he will not be given into the hands of his enemies’ with an equally idiomatic ‘and his enemies will not get hold of him’, recycling the image of the hand, and the figure of speech ‘and his soul [will be] in the hand of God’, is translated true to meaning with totally different words as ‘in the end his soul will go to the kingdom of Heaven, and to God’. Meanwhile, P treats this part very differently. ‘He will not be given into the hands of his enemies’ becomes an efficient *ac nys keiff y elynyon*, ‘and his enemies will not get him’ and ‘his soul will be in the hand of God’ as *a’e eneit a dal yn llaw Duw*, ‘and his soul will remain in God’s hand’, literally translating the Latin. The difference we want to point out is between the RB/WB translator’s enthusiasm in creating a Welsh text of the same literary level as the Latin text, replacing Latin idiom with equally coloured use of the Welsh language, daring to go for a totally different image in Welsh that would still have the same effect as the original, while P is efficient. Long-winded phrases get shortened down to the essentials, metaphors are either converted into plain Welsh or taken over word for word whether the metaphor works in Welsh or not. One could say the RB/WB translation is a creative, literary one, while P is more mechanical.

But on the other hand, P’s seems to be a better Latinist than the author of the prototype of RB/WB, and in many cases succeeds in correctly translating complicated grammatical structures where RB/WB fail. For example, in 24 the RB/WB translator stumbles over the grammar of *geniturus est*, but P translates it correctly with *e genir... idau*. And immediately after that, in 25, the RB/WB translator takes *propter quod* for a relative pronoun, while P translates it correctly as ‘because’.

To balance this, in 28, WB (RB does not have this phrase) correctly translates *expugnabuntur*, while this verb seems to be unknown to the P translator. And in 32, in the phrase *omnia hec, horum cum reminiscuntur, civitas et gens tremiscunt in eis et disperdunt orientes*, both our translators change things to create a more intelligible phrase. But where RB/WB opt for an emendation of *disperdunt* to *dispergunt* and thereby obtain a phrase they can work with, P translates the first bit freely, with *a phan del e gof henne rac llaw*, then interprets rather than translates with *yd ofnaant e rei a aner ena*, and fails to translate *et disperdunt orientes*.

II. Noteworthy variants between WB/RB and P.

Let us have a closer look at some meaningful variants between the two textual traditions of our text in order to establish how these traditions relate to each other.

In 14, neither RB/WB nor P give the name of the mountain, but where P has simply ‘the mountain’, RB/WB add *yr hynn yssyd oruchel ac eglur*, ‘the one that is high and easy to see’. It is typical of the RB/WB tradition to give more details, and to interpolate descriptions, giving the text a higher appeal to the imagination.

In 25, both RB and WB have *kyuodant* instead of *kyvunant*, which is the correct translation of *convenient* as given by P. As the mistake is shared by RB and WB, the error must have occurred in their shared ancestor, before the Red and White book traditions ‘forked’.

In 28, the description of the sixth sun is omitted in RB/WB, while it is not missing in P. We can therefore assume that this passage was not missing from our Latin source

text, but got lost in the early transmission of the RB/WB text, before these two traditions diverged from each other.

In 49, our versions disagree on the name of a king: *Salicus* becomes *R* in the RB/WB, but in P, he is described as *o genedel Salic*, and called *B!*

Sharing a same Latin source.

I. The evidence.

However, P does share significant variants with RB/WB. We list here a small selection of the ones that most irrefutably point towards a shared Latin source manuscript for all of our Welsh texts. Many of these shared variants are unique to our Welsh texts, and would help us to identify the Latin source version, should it be found.

In 21, both P and RB/WB omit *Hic est filius meus dilectus, ipsum audite*. Instead, both versions translate a variant from Sackur's Vr and M manuscripts, which have *in quo mihi complacui*, but without translating *audite ipsum*, which both Vr and M have. The P and RB/WB texts thus share a unique variant.

In 23, P and RB/WB agree in letting the 'fathers' give *tystyolaeth a geir* to the Hebrews, while in all known Latin variants, it is God who gives *verbum et testamentum* to the fathers. This is a very significant change, as it turns the whole phrase on its head.

But at the same time, P and RB/WB have very different translation of *sanguinarius et facinorosus*: RB has *hwynnw a beir lladuaeu a gwr mawr y drwc*, 'he will cause massacres

and a man of great evil', and P has *gwaetlyt a phechadurus*, 'blood-thirsty and sinful', which is a more direct translation. This apposition of similarity in meaning, but difference in wording clearly illustrates that both versions have a same Latin source, but are independent translations.²¹⁶

In 46, the RB text renders *Tarentum* and *Barro* as *Carentus a Haii.o*, while WB has *Tarentus a Cairo*. Both forms are corrupted, but the RB form seems, at a first glance, more corrupted than WB. WB has no c/t confusion, and *Cairo*, although incorrect, has the virtue of being a real placename. It is however very possible that *Cairo* is an invention of the WB scribe or one of his immediate predecessors, because P has *Harro*, which is closer to the RB form. This leads us to the rule of *lectio difficilior*, the idea that the less likely form is more likely to be the original. P and RB agree in having the second toponym beginning with a H. The WB scribe, or one of his immediate predecessors, was confronted with a toponym he did not recognize, maybe one as hopelessly corrupted as *Haii.o*, and changed it to a suitably exotic and similar placename he knew of, namely *Cairo*. It is very likely the Latin source text had *Harro*, or *Barro* with a B that was easily mistaken for a H.

II. Other significant variants: a few clues to identify our source text.

Now that we have established the relationships between our texts, we list for the sake of completeness a few other variants found in the Welsh *Tiburtinas* that are

²¹⁶ The Sibyl is not unique in this respect. In *The Welsh versions of Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'History of the Kings of Britain'* (personal communication, P. Sims-Williams) Patrick Sims-Williams describes the complicated relationships between many of the Welsh versions of that text, and its various independent translations into Middle Welsh from the same Latin Version.

especially interesting because they might help us to identify the exact Latin source text, should this manuscript have survived into our times.

In 29, none of our versions give a translation for *duos reges*, which makes it probable it was omitted in the Latin source text.

In 44, all our texts change *Samaria* to *Syria*. This is a variant unknown to Sackur, but as it features in both our Welsh manuscript traditions, their Latin source is bound to have *Syria* in this place, too. Also, all our texts give a king *H* instead of king *A*, which is a variant from Sackur's M, B, G and Vr. And the phrase *inter Agarenos et Grecos... pugne multe erunt* is absent in our versions, as in Sackur's Vr, M and B.

In 49, all our versions add a form of 'and know as a truth', which is unique and unknown to Sackur, but both translations use it a bit differently. RB has *yd anteilyngant yn y erbyn llawer o'r gwyr nessaf a'r rei kyuoethaw*, 'that against him many of his closest men, and the rich, will rise in anger'. P has *en wir e gwledycha*, which is not found in other versions. The Latin source must have some form of 'and know you (sg)', but as our versions contradict each other as to the exact function of the interjection, we cannot know how the Latin text used it until we will have been able to identify this source.

In 55, all versions omit Latin *et non erit qui inimicis resistat, quia tunc Dominus erit iratus in terra*; this was therefore probably missing in the Latin source text. Directly following on from that, in 56, the word *persecutione*, 'persecution' is translated by *tan* 'fire' in RB/WB, and as *trallaut*, 'suffering' in P. Both these translations are rather imprecise, so it is possible that the source manuscript was damaged at this point,

making the last line of 55 and the first part of 56 hard to read, and thereby causing our translators to omit the first and improvise on the second; both our versions improvise with classic tropes of misfortune that fit well in the context but do not translate the Latin.

In 64, all our versions translate *audierit*, 'he will hear' as *welo* 'he will see'. It is therefore probable that our Latin Source text contained a form of *videre* rather than *audire*.

The following clues are slightly more tentative, but may still prove useful:

In 42, both P and RB/WB replace *ipsa muliere* with a masculine *hwynnw*. Because this *hwynnw* solves a textual problem rather than creating one, it need not necessarily come from the Latin source; both translators may have come up with it independently. However, if a masculine pronoun is found in a manuscript that also contains our more positive clues, it would be an extra indicator that the correct source text has been found.

In 36, both WB and RB have *Andon* for *Audon*. P has A, so there is no way to know whether the variant comes from the Latin source or has come to existence later in the history of transmission.

III. Copies of copies

We have established now that RB and WB must come from a same, Welsh source, but that RB must be at least one copy away from the original. The same appears to be true for P: what we have is not the 'master copy' written by the translator himself,

but a direct or indirect copy of that text. We have a few arguments to support this thesis:

In 51, P says that the judges of Rome *amgeuant*, which should be emended to *amgenant*, 'they will be changed'. This is a straightforward example of minim confusion, a phenomenon that can only take place when one is copying a text from an exemplar in the same language.

In 57, P translates the number 112 as *ugein mlyned a chant*, while the RB/WB have a correct *deudec mlyned a chant*: this mistake can only come from a Welsh source, where *deudec*, 'twelve', but literally 'two ten', got misunderstood for 'two tens', that is, 'twenty'. On its own, this evidence is not very strong because numbers are always very fickle in textual transmission, but together with the other points, it becomes part of a bigger picture.

Lastly, in 60, P calls 'Egypt' *Greiff*, whereas the correct Welsh form is *yr Eifft*. In the context of this phrase, the exemplar would have had *a'r Eifft*; our scribe must have read this as **Reiff*, and interpreted it as the mutated form of *Greiff*. Again, a variant that is only possible if the copyist of P was working from a Welsh exemplar.

IV. Conclusions.

We may now state with certainty that the RB/WB translation and P are based on the same Latin text. None of our extant texts is the original version as penned by the translator, which points us to a considerable amount of lost texts. RB and WB are both based on the same translation, but their relationship is that of siblings rather

than that one text is a copy of the other; and from the scribal errors in both texts we may infer that both had at least one manuscript between each extant version and the original translation.

P is an independent translation by another author, again based on the same Latin text. As seen above, this version, too, is at least one manuscript away from the master copy. Therefore, we may conclude that our three extant copies point towards at least four lost manuscripts: both master texts, and the texts that stand between RB/WB and their shared ancestor. The Sibyl was more popular and more widespread in Wales than the extant evidence would make one think at a first glance. Not only are there two translators, who both translated according to their own education, taste and temperament and left us with two version which both have their distinctive flavour, but in the Middle Ages, there was a lively tradition of transmission of this text, in Wales as much as on the continent. The Sibyl is one of the great figures that captured the imagination of people in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, all over Europe, where she was celebrated in texts, visual art and even liturgy. She is everywhere: in December 2017, the Aberystwyth Choral Society sung Mozart's famous *Requiem*, with its powerful *Dies Irae* – *teste David cum Sibylla* it says, referring to the Erythraean Sibyl's prophecy of the Last Judgment. But how many people know this? Of all those great figures that shaped the minds of the West in that long period between the end of the Roman Empire and the Enlightenment, and even beyond, the Sibyl is perhaps the one that has been studied the least. About the Sibyl in Wales, we had one article. We hope that with this thesis, we have done our

little part to bring the Sibyl and the myriad ways in which she is entwined with the very roots of western civilisation as we know it, back into public consciousness.

Breudwyt Sibli

Peniarth 14 p. 45-58.

“...nys wyt kemryt ac na welsam ni ac na chlywsam ymplith e gwaged dy gyffelip di o bryt kyn no thi ac na byd wedy ti; agor yn betheu or a uo rac llaw.” Ac ateb ual hyn a oruc Sibli udunt: “Nyt kyuyawn en lle halauc ual hvn o dom a budred datot rinwedeu gweledigaeth; namen awn yr menyd, ac eno mi a dangosaf yuch beth a damweinyo rac llaw y dinassoed Ruuein.” Ac ual y dywaut y gwnaethant. Ac ena, gwedy gouyn ohonei udunt eu gweledigaeth, e datcanassant idi. Ac ena e dywaut hitheu: “Naw heul a welsauch chwi a arwydoçant er holl toeu kiwdodoed rac llaw. Ac vegys e gwelsauch chwi amravael liwoed arnunt hwy, ual henne e byd amravael defodeu y kiudodoed y doant rac llaw.

Er heul gentaf yu e giudaud gentaf. Ac ena e byd denyon mul, ac eglur eu caryat e rydit, hynaws, rybuchedic, ac a garant tlodyon, a digawn eu kymenhet.

Er eil heul er eil giudaut yu, ac ena y byd denyon a uuchedocao en hard, ac a uydant amyl, ac a anrydedant Duw, ac a gyuachwelan bop drwc en e byt.

E dryded heul y dryded giudaut. Ac ena e kyuyt e genedel en erbyn y gilid, ac ena e byd ryuelus Ruvein.

Petwared heul yu e betwared giudaut, a rei henne a emwadant a gwiryoned. Ac en er amser hwnnw e kyuyt gwreic, Maria y henw, ac enw e gur priaut uyd Ioseph. Ac a greir o honno -heb gyt gur namen o’r Yspryt Glan - mab Duw, Yessu uyd y enw, a gwryry uyd hitheu a chyn esgor a guedy. Ac urth henne er hvn a enir ohonei a uyd gwir Duw a gwir den; mal y racdywedassant er holl broffwydi. A hwnnw a gyflaunhaa kyureith er Ideon, ac a gyssylla yr eidau enteu y gyt a honno, a’e deyrnas a uyd parhaus tragywyd. Pan aner enteu y byd llu engylyon o bop tu idaw en canu: “Gogonyant e Duw ac yg goruchelder neuoed, ac ar e daear heduch y denyon da eu hewyllys.” Ac a daw llef o dyarnaw a dyweto: “hvn yu uy mab i, en er hvn y ryngéis i vy mod ymi en da.” “

Eno yd oed rei o effeiryteit yr Ideon en gwarandau y geiryteu hyn, ac a dywedassant urthi hitheu: “Aruthyr yu e geiryteu hyn, tawet e vrenhines!” ac wynt bellach. Ac ena y dywaut Sibli en atep udunt: “or [sic] Ideon”, hep hi, “dir yu bot henne, ac ny chreduch chwi idaw ef.”

“Na chredun”, hep wynt, “canys rodes y an reeni tystiolaeth a geir, ac ny dwc y nerth y genhym.” Ac ena eilweith yd atebaud udunt: “Duw nef”, hep hi, “e genir mab idau a uyd kyffelip y’u dat, ac ual e del y oet e tyf. Ac en e erbyn e kyudant brenhined a thywyssogyon e daear. En e dydyeu henne e byd anrydedus enw Augustus Cesar ac a wlodycha en Ruuein, ac a darystung idaw er holl daear. Ac odena e kyvunant effeiryteit er Ideon en erbyn Yessu canys gwyrthyeu mawr a wna, ac y dalyant ef. Ac a rodant e Duw uonclustyeu oc eu hysgymunyon lawoed, ac en er wynep kysygreddic y poerant haliw gwenwinic. Ac enteu a ryd y gysygreddic

keuyn en war y'u uaedu, ac a gemer tacuaeu en dawedauc. En lle bwyt idau y frowyllir, ac y'u sychet y rodir pystyl idaw, ac ym mewn prenn e crogant, ac e lladant; ac ny thal henne dim udunt, canys e trededyd e kyuyt ac yd ymdengys y'u disgyblon ac ac wynt en edrech arnaw a esgyn y nef, ac ny byd teruyn ar y wledych."

Ac ena e dywaut urth dywysogyon Ruuein: "Pymhet heul pymhet kiudaut, ac ena yr ethola Yessu idau deu byscodwr o wlat Galylea, ac e dysc wynt o'e briaut dedyf, gan dywedut urthunt: "euch, a'r dysc a gymerasauch y gennyf ui, dysgvch yr holl genedloed ac a darystyngant kiudodoed deudeng yeith a thri ugeint."

E chwechet heul y chwechet kiwdaut yu, a'r dinas hwn a adawant teir blyned a chwe mis.

E seithuet heul y seithuet giwdaut uyd, a rei henne a gyuodant ac a distrywyant wlat yr Ideon en dial Duw.

Er wythuet heul yr wythuet giwdaut uyd, ac ena e digenedla Ruuein. A chwynuan e gwraged beichyauc yn eu trallodeu, a dywedant: "a debygy di a esgorwn ni?"

Nauuet heul yu e nauuet giudaut ac ena e kyuyt tywyssauc Ruuein yg kyuyrgoll y lawer. Ena y kyuodant deu urenhin o Syria, ac ny byd haus riuau eu llu no tyuaut y

weilgi. A rei henne a oresgynnant dinassoed Ruuein hyt yg Calcedonia. Ena y byd amyl gwaet o'r calaned, a phan del e gof henne rac llaw yd ofnaant e rei a aner ena.

Ac odena y kyudant deu urenhin o'r Eifft, ac y gurthladant petwar brenhin, ac y lladant ac wynt ac eu holl luoed, ac y gvledychant teir blyned a chwe mis.

A guedy e rei henne ef a gyuyt arall blaengar en emlad, a'e enw o C. lythyren, a hwinnw a wledycha deg blyned ar ugeint, ac a adeila temyl y Duw, ac a geidu y dedyf, ac a wna gwiryoned y Duw en e daear.

A gwede e rei henne ef a gyuyt brenhin arall, a wledycho ychydic o amseroed, ac a urthuynebant idau ac a'e lladant.

Ac wedy hwinnw e byd brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren B.

Ac o'r B. hwinnw y kerda brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren A.

Ac o'r A. hwinnw y kerda A. arall. A'r eil brenhin hwinnw o A. a uyd ryuelwr.

Ac o'r A. hwinnw e kerda brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren R.

Ac o hwinnw e genir brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren L. Ac y hwinnw e byd un urenhinyaeth eissyeu o ugeint.

A gwede e rei henne e keuyt brenhin o Freinc a dechreu y enw o lythyren K..

Hwinnw a vyd gur maur, a'r gwarhaf a chyvoethauc a thrugarauc, ac a wna kyuyaunder a chyureith a'r tlodyon. Canys kymeint uyd rat y nerth ac y gostyngo

idaw bric e gwyd pan gerdo y a danunt, ac nyt erwyrha y duuyr heuyt dyuot en y erbyn. Ac ny byd en amperodraeth Ruvein na chynt noc ef na gwedy e gyfelip.

Ac en ol hvnnw ef a dau brenhin a dechreu y enw o L.

Ac en ol hwnnw e gwledycha un a dechreu y enw o lythyren B.

Ac or B. hwnnw e kerda un a dechreu y enw o lythyren A.. A hwnnw a uyd ryuelgar a chadarn en emlad, a llawer o uor a thir a gerda. Ac ny's keiff y elynyon, ac a uyd diholyedid o'e deyrnas, a'e eneit a dal yn llaw duw.

Ac ena e keuyt arall a dechreu y enw o lythyren U., o'r neill parth idaw en Salicus, ac o'r parth arall en Longobard. Ac ef a oruyd ar a emlado ac wynt ac ar e holl elynyon.

Ac en e dydyeu henne y kerda brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren O., ac a uyd kyuoethauc, a chadarn, a da, a wna gyuyaunder a'r tlodyon, ac a uarn yawn.

Ac o hwnnw y kerda arall a dechreu y enw o lythyren O., kyuoethocaf, ac en y oes e byd emlad y rung Paganyeit a Christyonogyon, ac eu gwaet a dineuir, a'e eneit en llaw Duw. A seith mlyned e gwledycha.

Ac o hwnnw e genir brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren O.. Gwaetlyt a phechadurus uyd hwnnw, hep na fyd na gwiryoned, a thrwy hwnnw e byd llawer drwc, a llawer gwaet y redec, a distriw yr egluyseu en e gyuoeth ef, ac ym brenhinyaetheu ereill llawer o drallodeu. Ena keuyt e giudaut en erbyn y gilid yg

Capadocia, ac en oes hwnnw e keytheir Pampilia, cany doeth trwy e drws yr keil.

Hwnnw a wledycha pedeir blyned.

O hwnnw y kerda brenhin a dechreuo y enw o H.. En dydyeu hvnnw e byd emladeu mawr. Hwnnw a oruyd ar Samaria ac a geithiwa Pentapolim. Hwnnw a henuyd o'r Longobardyeit.

Ac ena e keuyt brenhin o Salic a dechreu y enw o .C., ac a urthwynepa y'r Longobardyeit, a ryueloed ac emladeu a uydant. Hwnnw a uyd cadarn a chyuoethauc, a bychydic amser e para.

Ena e kyudant Agareni, gwyr kreulawn ac a geithiwant Tarentum, a Harro, a llawer o dinassoed a anreithyant. A'r pryt na mynno e Rwminyeit dyuot, nyt oes a vrthwynepo udunt onyt Duw e dwyweu ac Argluyd er Argluydi.

Ac ena e daw yr Ideon y Bers ac e gwasgarant hyt na delont y'r dinasoed anreithyedic, a gossot klaud y rygthunt a'r dwyrein, a gurthuynebu y'r Rwminyeit ac y caffant ychydic dagneued.

Ac ena e daw ryuelwr brenhin Groec hyt en Ierapolim ac y distryw temleu y geudwyweu, ac y doant y locuste ar brucus ac yd yssant frwyth e gwyd, a frwyth gwyd Capadocie a Cilicie, ac y poenir o newyn, ac odena ny byd bell ach.

Ac odena e kyuyt brenhin arall o genedel Salic, gur ryuelgar, B. dechreu y enw. A gwybyd en wir e gwledycha hwnnw, a llawer o'e gymydogyon a ulyghaant urthaw a charant, ac en e dydyeu henne e llad e braut y gilid, a'r tat e mab, ac ymhalogant e braut a'r chwaer, a llawer o bechodeu ysgymun a uyd ena ar e daear. A'r henwyr a orwedant gyt ar morynnyon, a'r effeiryet drwc y gyt a'r morynyon twylledic, a'r esgyb a lwybrant y drycweithredoed. Ac ena yd ellyngir gwaet ar e daear, ac yd alhogir temleu e seint, ac e byd fynigrwyd gurthvun, a phechaut sodoma eny del dial amdanunt ar oleu. Ena e byd treiswyr a deneon atcas a gasaont gyuyawnder, ac a garont e cam. A brautwyr Ruuein a amgeuant o hediw hyt trannoeth: er da y uarnu e cam ac adaw yr yawn. Ac en e dydyeu henne y byd deneon ysgyluat anudonyl a garont gobreu yr kelwyd, ac y diueir kyureith a gwiryoned. Ac ena e byd kynuryf e daear en llawer o leoed ac en dinassoed yr enyessed, a brenhinyaetheu a sodir, ac en lleoed e byd ball ar deneon, ar daear a edewir en diffeith o'e gelynyon ac ny eill un dillin eu didanu.

Ac odena e keuyt brenhin a dechreu y enw o lythyren B.. A ryuelus uyd y oes, a dwy ulyned e gwledycha.

Ac odena y kyuyt brenhin a'e enw o A., a thrwy yspeit ef a geiff vrenhinyaeth ac a oresgyn Ruuein, ac ny byd marw en llaw y elynyon. A thra uo e dyd gur da uyd, a chyuyaunder a wna a'r tlodyon, a hirhoedlauc uyd.

Ac en ol hwnnw e kyuyt brenhin arall a dechreu y enw o B.. Ac o'r B. hwnnw y kerdant deudec a dechreu env pob vn onadunt o'r vn dechreu hwnnw. A Longobard uyd o genedel a, chan mlyned e gwledicha.

Ac en ol hwnnw e kyuyt brenhin a dechreu y enw trwy B.: Salic o genedel, o Freinc, ac ena e dechreu brat ny bu y gyvryu er dechreu byt, a ryuelus uyd en e dydyeu henne, a thrallaut uaur a gordineu gwaet, ac ny byd a emurthlado a'e elynyon a churyf eu daear trwy e dinassoed a'r teyrnassoed, a llawer o daearoed a geissiwir. Ruuein a wrthuynibir ena o drallaut ac o gledyf ac en llaw e brenhin hwnnw e byd dalyedic.

Ac ena y byd denyon ysgyluat creulawn a gasaont e flodyon, ac a lethont e rei gwann ac a yachaont e rei camgylvus, ac enwir uydant, a'r eithauoed a geytheir. Ac ny byd a wrthuynepo udunt, nac eu hamdiffynho am eu drwc ac eu chwant.

Ac ena e keuyt brenhin Groec, Constans y enw, a hwnnw vyd brenhin ar Groec a Ruuein. Gur abruysgyl e ueint uyd hwnnw, gwedus o'e welet, canneit y wynep a gwedus e lun em pob aelaut, ac ugein mlyned a chant e parha y argluydiaeth. En e dydyeu henne e byd amdler goludoed, ac e ryd e daear y frwyth en ehelaeth, ual y caffer messur gwenith yr keinnyauc, a'r messur gwin er keinnyauc, a'r messur olew yr keinnyauc. A rac bron y brenhin hwnnw e byd yscriven en dywedut: "Brenhin Groec a geiff idaw e hun pob teyrnas Cristonogyon." Ac urth henne holl enyssed a

dinassoed Panonia a darystung, a holl temleu y dwyweu a distriw, a'r paganyeit a eilw ar uedyd, a thrwy e temleu oll a lehaa croc Crist.

Ac ena e dechreu yr Ethyop a'r Greiff rodri llaw y Duw. Ac ar nyt adoloe e groc yr Argluyd llad y benn. A phan gupplaer odena ugein mlyned a chant yd emchwel yr Ideon ar yr Argluyd ac ena yd adola paub bed er Argluyd en ogonyanhus.

En e dydyeu henne yd yecheir Iuda ac y presswylya er Israel en emdiryedus. Ac en er amser hwinnw e keuyt tywysauc enwired o lwyth Dan, ac a elwir Antycrist.

Hwinnw a uyd mab e kyuyrgoll a phen syberwyt, ac athro kyueilyorn. Kyulauder drwc ac enwired hvinnw a drossa e byt, ac a wna gwyrthyau ac anryuedodeu maur trwy dechymygyon geu. Ef a dwyll lawer trwy hudolyaeth, ual y gweloent hwy e uo en anvon tan o nef. Ac ena y byrhe[...] blwydyned val missoed, a'r missoed mal yr wythnoseu, a'r wythnosseu mal e dydyeu, a'r dydyeu mal yr oryeu. Ac ena e kyuodant o'r gorllewin y giwdaut ysgymunaf o'r gogledd, a warchayus Alexander urenhin, nyt amgen Gog a Magog. Sef yu eu riuedi: dwy urenhinyaeth ar ugeint, ac eu riuedi ual tywaut e mor.

A phan welo brenhin Ruuein y petheu henne, kynullaw lluoed en eu herbyn ac emlad ac wynt hyt y angheu. Ac odeno e daw y Gaerusalem, ac eno e diyt e goron y am y ben ac y burw y abit brenhinyaul, ac y gurthyt y deyrnas ar Duw Tat a'r Argluyd Yessu Grist e uab enteu. Ac ene gwledycho hvinnw y de[...] deu wr eglur, Helyas ac Enoc, y gennatau dyuodedigaeth Duw, a'r Antycrist ac eu llad wynteu. A'r trydydyd e kyuyt er Argluyd wynt, ac ena e byd kymeint e drallaut ac na bu

eryoet y chyuryw ac na byd rac llaw. Duw hagen a diuyrra e dieoed henne o achau
y etholedigyon. Ac o nerth Duw e lledir er Antycrist y gan Uihangel y Mynydd
Oliuet.”

A phan daruu y Sibli traethu y petheu hyn a llawer heuyt y’r Rwminyeit o betheu
rac llaw, ena y mynegis pa ryw arwydyon a delynt pan del yr Argluyd y uarnu y
uraut gyhed:

Kentaf arwyd – onadun gwlychu e daear o chwys. E brenhin esyd dragywyd a daw
o’r nef, en gyndrychaul, en y gnawt, y uarnu e byt. Ena y gwyl paub Duw, a chywir
ac agkywir. Ena e deuant paub en eu knaut a uoent en gorwed en e drein a’r
drysswch a’r mieri; en diwed oes byt y uarnu arnunt gyt a’r seint. A burw eu bedeu
ac a uo arnunt o bwys a wna y giwdaut. Ac ena y llysc tan e daear a’r mor a’r awyr,
a’r tan hwnnw a dyrr pyrth uffern en keissyau eu llosgi. E baup o’r seint y rodir
goleuat prytverth. Er rei pechaduruus a llysc tan flam tragywyd. Ac ena e dyweit
paub ac y datkud y weithredoed kudyedic, a dirgeledigaetheu eu calonnoed a egyr
Duw en amluc ena. Ena byd kwynuan a deinkryt ar baup. Gwres yr heul a
gripdeilir, ac eistedua e syr a balla, a’r furuauent a dreigliir, a’r lleuat a balla. A’r
brynnyeu a ostyngir, a’r glynnnyeu a dyrcheuir, ene vo kyuartal gwastadrwyd pob
lle, ual y traeth. Pob peth ena a orfowyssant, a’r daear vriwydic a balla. Ac ena y
llogant y gyt y fynhonyeu a’r auonoed gan e tan. Ac ena y tristaa paub gan lef e
corn od uch ben en kwynaw trueni pechaut e byt ac eu llauuryeu amrauel. Ac ena
yd ymdengys uffern a burw y daear y arnaw. Ac yg gwyd yr Argluyd tynnu e

brenhined y'u gwaelawt, ac am eu pen e digwyd o'r nef ena avon o dan a
brwmystan.

Ac val henne e teruyna breudwyt Sibli.

Proffwydolyaeth Sibli doeth

Red Book of Hergest ff. 139r. – 141r.

With variants from the White Book of Rhydderch ff. 12r.-14r.

²¹⁷Sibli oed uerch y Priaf²¹⁸ urenhin o Eccuba²¹⁹ y mam, gwreic Priaf. A honno a oed arnei amryuaelon ennweu: yn ieith Roec y gelwit Tyburtuna,²²⁰ yn Lladin Albunea.²²¹ Sibli a damgylchynawd amryuaelon vrenhinaetheu y dwyrein, nyt amgen: yr Asia, a gwlat Alexander mawr, a Galilea, a Cicilia a Phampilia, a Galacia. A gwedy daruot idi eilennwi²²² y rann honno o’r byt o’e dewindabaetheu, odynd hi aeth hyt yn Ethiopia, gwlat y Blewmonyeit.²²³ Odynd y Babilon y doeth, a’r Affric, a Libia, a Phentapolis, a Mawritania, ac Ynys y Palym. Yn yr holl wledyd hynny y pregethawd. Ac o daroganeu prophwytolyawl y kyflenwis pethei da y’r rei da; petheu drwc y rei drwc. Nyni a wdam yr uarnu²²⁴ ohonei hi yn y bardonyaetheu petheu a delynt rac llaw: y rei diwethaf yn amlwc y ardangos.

Wrth hynny tywyssogyon Ruuein, pan glywssant clot y racdywededic Sibli, wynt a’e kannadassant, a hynny yg kyuedrychedigaeth Traean²²⁵ amherawdyr Tro.²²⁶

217 WB : I.

218 WB : Briaf.

219 WB: Hecubbe.

220 WB : Tyburrina.

221 WB : Allumea.

222 WB :culenwi.

223 WB: Blomonyeit.

224 WB : venegi.

225 WB: *omitted*.

226 WB : Rufein.

²²⁷Yr amherawdyr a anuones attei gennadeu, ac a beris y dwyn y Ruuein yn anrydedus.

Can wyr o hennauyeit Ruuein a²²⁸ welsynt bob un yn un nos y²²⁹r vn ryw ureudwyt, yg gweledigaeth yr dangossit²³⁰ udunt trwy eu hun: bot²³¹ yg goruchelder nef megys naw heul yn ymdangos, y rei yn wahanredawl pob un ar neill tu a dangossynt yndunt figureu amryuaelon.²³²

Yr heul gyntaf oed yn loyw, ac yn goleuhau yr holl dayar.

Yr eil heul oed vwy a goleuach, ac²³³ yndi²³⁴ eglurder iawn²³⁵ awyrawl.

Y dryded heul o waedawl liw yn ymlosci.²³⁶ Tanawl oed ac aruthur, ac yn y diwed eglur digawn.²³⁷

Y pedwired heul cochach no'r gwaet, ac yndi pedwar paladyr yn goleuhau.²³⁸

Y pymhet oed dywyll a gwaedawl, ac yndi²³⁹ megys llugwrn yn taranawl dywyllwch.

227 WB: II.

228 WB : ry.

229 WB: *omitted*.

230 WB : dangossei.

231 WB: *omitted*.

232 WB : y rei yn wahanredawl amryuaelon *omitted*.

233 WB : nac.

234 WB : yndaw.

235 WB: *omitted*.

236 WB : Y trydyd heul losgi oed ac aruthyr. Ac yn y droet e dig.

237 WB : Tanawl oed... digawn *omitted*.

238 WB : Y petwired heul orch daeu ac yndaw petwar paladyr yn goleuheu.

239 WB : yndaw.

Y chwechet a oed diruawr y thywyllet,²⁴⁰ ac yndi²⁴¹ pwynt blaenllym megys pwynt yscorpion.²⁴² Prif yw yscorpion,²⁴³ bychan y gorffolyaeth, vnveint a chwyl eryr.²⁴⁴ Ac oerach y wenwyn no dan.²⁴⁵

Y seithuet oed dywyll heuyt, ac aruthyr o liw gwaet. Ac yndi²⁴⁶ megys cledyf pedwarminnyawc.

Yr wythuet oed ordineuedic.²⁴⁷ ac yn y pherued²⁴⁸ lliw coch waedawl.²⁴⁹

Y nawuet heul oed ry dywyll yn y chylch o gylch, ac yn y pherued²⁵⁰ un paladyr yn goleuhav.

²⁵¹Pann echdywynnawd²⁵² Sibli y gaer Ruuein y myvn bwrgeisseit²⁵³ y dinas, pan y gwelsant a ryuedassant yn uawr am y thegwch,²⁵⁴ o enrydedus osged tec, ac erdrym y phryt yg golwc pawb huawdyl y geireu doethinabus. Ac o pob tegwch arderchawc y chorf, ac y'r gwarandawyr y hymadrawd oed safwryus,²⁵⁵ a melys ymdidan a gyfrannei.

240 WB : thywylwch.

241 WB: yndaw.

242 WB: scorpion.

243 WB : scorpion.

244 WB : wchileryr.

245 WB : dim.

246 WB: yndaw.

247 WB : ardmenedic.

248 WB: y berued.

249 WB: cochwydawl.

250 WB : perued.

251 WB: III.

252 WB : ercheuynawd.

253 WB: bordesseit.

254 WB : y thegwch i.

255 WB : Safwryus.

Yna y doethant y gwyr ry welsynt yr vn vreudwyt attei, ac y dechreuassant wrthi yn y mod hwnn eu hymadrawd: “Athrawes ac arglwydes, mor wedus gorff a’th teu ti, y kyfryw arderchocrwyd bryt ar wreic kyn no thi ar wreic o’r holl dayar ny’s gwelsam. Kan²⁵⁶ gwdost, manac ynn rac llaw yn damweineu tyghetuennawl.” Hitheu ual hynn a atebawd: “nyt kyfyawn yn lle kyflawn o betheu budyr, a llygredic o amryuaelon brouedigaetheu, dangos rinnwed gweledigaeth a del rac llaw. Namyn deuwch gyt a mi hyt ym penn y mynyd racco, yr hwnn yssyd oruchel ac eglur. Ac yno mi a uanagaf ywch yr hynn a del rac llaw y dinas Ruuein”.

²⁵⁷Ac yno y doethant y gyt mal y herchis hi,²⁵⁸ ac idi hi yno y managassant eu gweledigaeth, a’r breudwyd a welsynt. A hitheu a dywawt: “y naw heul a²⁵⁹ welsawch a arwydockaant y kenedloed²⁶⁰ a delont²⁶¹ rac llaw, ac²⁶² amryuaelder oed arnadunt a dengys amryuael vuched y abit²⁶³ y veibon y kenedloed hynny.

Yr heul gyntaf a uenyc y genedyl gyntaf. Yn yr honn y bydant dynyon mul, ac eglur y garu rydit. A gwiryon vydant, a byuawl,²⁶⁴ a thrugarawc, ac a garant y tlodyon, a digawn eu doethet.

Yr eil heul, yr eil genedyl. A dynyon uydant a uchedockaont yn eglur, ac a ymlhawynt²⁶⁵ yn vawr, ac a diwhyllant Duw heb drycdynyaeth.²⁶⁶ Ac y gyt uchedockaont ar y dayar.

256 WB : canys.

257 WB : IV.

258 WB: *omitted*.

259 WB : ry.

260 WB : kenedloed.

261 WB: delwynt.

262 WB : ar.

263 WB : a byd.

264 WB: hynawys.

Y dryded heul, y dryded genedyl. Ac y kyuyt kenedyl yn erbyn kenedyl, a llawer o ymladeu a uyd yn Ruuein.

²⁶⁷Y pedwyled heul, y pedwyled²⁶⁸ lin. Ac yn yr amser hwnnw y daw dynyon a wattont gwirioned. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y kyuyt gwreic, a Meir uyd y henw, ac idi y byd gwr Joseph y enw. Ac y creir o'r Ueir honno mab heb gyt gwr a gwreic, trwy rat yr Yspryt Glan; yn vab, yn²⁶⁹ wir Duw, a'e enw uyd Iessu. A Meir a uyd gwyry kynn escor a gwedy escor. Yr hwnn a anener²⁷⁰ o honno a uyd gwir Duw a gwir dyn, megys y managassant yr holl prophwydi. Ac yd eilenwa kyfreith gwyr Efrei, ac y kyssyllta y petheu priawt y gyt, ac y tric y deyrnas yn oes oessoed. A phan aner hwnnw y daw llong²⁷¹ o egylyon ar y deheu, ac ar y²⁷² asseu y dywedut:

“Gogonyant yr²⁷³ goruchelder Duw, ac yn y dayar tangneued y'r dynyon.” Ac a daw llef y dywedut²⁷⁴: “hwnn yw vy mab i karedic, yn yr hwnn y rengeis i vy mod²⁷⁵ yndaw.”

²⁷⁶Yno y dywedynt²⁷⁷ effeireit gwyr Efrei, rei²⁷⁸ yn gwarandaw, ac y dywedassant wrthi ual hynn: “yr ymadrodyon yssyd aruthur, tawet y urenhines honn!” Sibli a

265 WB : amyhlhawynt.

266 WB: drycdyuyaeth.

267 WB : V.

268 WB: betwared.

269 WB : y .

270 WB : aner. The Cardiff website transcribes *aneuer* in RB; it is hard to see the difference because the minims look exactly the same. *Anener*, with duplication, looks like a more conceivable scribal error.

271 WB: llog.

272 RB : ar y ar y.

273 WB: y.

274 WB : ac a daw llef y arnad y dywedut.

275 WB: i. vod ymi.

276 WB: VI.

277 WB : oedynt.

278 WB : Eurey.

attebawd udunt: “o²⁷⁹ Idewon, agheu yw bot uelly, ny chredwch hagen idaw ef”.
Wynteu a dywedassant: “na chredwn, kanys tystolyaaeth a geir a rodes an tadeu
ynn,²⁸⁰ ac ny duc ef y law y wrthym ni”. Hitheu eilweith a attebawd udunt: “Duw
nef a enir megys y mae yscriuennedic, kyffelyb vod o’e dat. A gwedy hynny mab
drwy oessoed a tyf, ac y kyudant yn e erbyn brenhined a thywyssogyon y daear.
Yn y dydyeu hynny y byd y Cesar arderchawc enw ac a wledych yn Ruuein, ac a
darestwng yr holl dayar idaw. Odyna y kyudant tywyssogyon o’r²⁸¹ offeireit yn
erbyn Iessu. Yr hwnn a wna llawer o wyrtheu, ac wynt a’e dalyant ef. Ac wynt a
rodant idaw bonclusteu o ysgymynyon dwylaw, ac yn y wyneb kyssegredic y
poerant poer gwennwynawl. Ac a dyry ef y geuyn gwerthuawr udunt o’e uadeu, ac
yr kymryt amarch y gantunt. Ef a deu. Yn vwyt idaw y rodant bystyl, ac yn diawt
idaw gwin egyr a wallonyant.²⁸² Ac ar brenn diodeifeint a’e crogant, ac a’e lladant.
Ac ny rymhaa udunt hynny o²⁸³ dim, kanys y trydyd dyd y kyuyt o ueirw. Ac yd
ymdengys y disgyblon, ac ac wynt yn edrych yd yskynn y’r nef, ac ar y deyrnas ny
byd diwed.”

²⁸⁴Wrth wyr Ruuein y dywawt Sibli: “Y bymhet heul y bymhet lin a arwydockaa. Ac
yn yr oes honno yr ethyl Iessu deu byscodwr o Alilea, ac o’e briawt gyfreith y dysc

279 WB : oi.

280 WB : yn tadeu ny. hitheu.

281 WB : yr.

282 WB : ballofuyant.

283 WB : *omitted*.

284 WB : VII.

uy, ac y dyweit: “Ewch, a’r disc a dyscoch²⁸⁵ y gennyf, dyscwch hwnnw y’r holl bobloed.” A thrwy deg ieith a thrugeint y darestyngir yr holl bobloed²⁸⁶ awenus.²⁸⁷

Y seithuet²⁸⁸ heul y seithuet genedyl vyd. Ac y kyuodant ac y gwnant lawer o laduaeu yn daear gwyr Efrei, yr Duw.

Yr wythuet heul, yr wythuet genedyl vyd. Ac y megys²⁸⁹ yn digenedlu²⁹⁰ y byd Ruuein. A’r gwraged beichawl a vydant yn eu trallodeu a doluryeu, ac a dywedant: “a debygy di a escorwn ni?”

Y nawuet heul, y nawuet lin vyd. Ac y kyuodant gwyr Ruuein yn ormes ar lawer.

²⁹¹Odyna y kyuodant deu urenhin o Siria, ac eu llu ny ellir rif arnaw, mwy noc ar dywot y mor. Ac wynt a gynhalyant dinassoed²⁹² a brenhinaetheu gwyr Ruuein hyt yg Kacedonia. Yna, y tywelltir amylder o²⁹³ waet, y petheu hynn oll pan y²⁹⁴ coffaont²⁹⁵ y dynassoed a’r kenedloed a ovynhaant²⁹⁶ yndunt, ac a wahanant y’r dwyrein.

A gwedy hynny y kyuodant deu vrenhin o’r Eifft, ac a ymladant a phedwar brenhin ac a’e lladan ac eu llu. Ac a wledychant teir blyned a chwe mis.

285 WB : gymerassawch.

286 WB : genedloed.

287 WB : *omitted*.

288 WB : Seithuet.

289 WB : vegys.

290 WB : digenedylu.

291 WB : VIII.

292 WB : dinessyd.

293 WB : o’e.

294 WB : pony *instead of* pan y.

295 WB : coffawynt.

296 WB : ofnahant.

A gwedy²⁹⁷ hynny y kyuyt arall, C. y enw, rac kyfoethawc yn ymlad. Yr hwnn a wledycha deg mlyned ar hugeint ac a adeilha temyl y Duw. Ac ef²⁹⁸ a lawnhau²⁹⁹ y gyfreith, ac a wna wiryoned yr Duw ar y dayar.

A gwedy y rei hynny y kyuyt brenhin,³⁰⁰ yr hwnn a wledycha ychydic o amseroed. Ac wynt a ymladant ac ef, ac a'e lladant.

A gwedy hwnnw y kyuyt brenhin, B. vyd y enw.

Ac o hwnnw y kyuyt Andon.³⁰¹

Ac o Andon y daw A., ac o A. y daw A., ac ohonaw ynteu y daw³⁰² A. A'r eil kyntaf A. a uyd gwr ymladgar a diruawr ryuelwr.

Ac o'r A. hwnnw y daw R., ac o'r R. hwnnw L.³⁰³. Ac y hwnnw y byd medyant ar³⁰⁴ vn vrenhinyaeth eisseu o vgein.

³⁰⁵A gwedy y rei hynny y kyuyt Salitus³⁰⁶ o Ffreinc,³⁰⁷ K. y henw. Hwnnw a uyd gwr mawr, a gwar a chyuoethawc, a thrugarawc. A hwnnw a wna kyuyawnder, a gwiryoned ac aghenogyon. Kymeint vyd rat hwnnw yn y wirioned, a phan vo yn

297 WB: ac wedy.

298 WB: *omitted*.

299 WB : eflawna.

300 WB: brenhin arall.

301 WB: yr hwnn a wledycha ...y kyuyt Andon *omitted*, replaced by hwnnw y byd brenhin Andon.

302 WB : y daw *omitted*.

303 WB : y daw. L.

304 WB : ac.

305 WB : IX.

306 WB : Salicus.

307 WB : fferinc.

kerdet y ford, ac y gostynghant y gwyd eu blaenwed idaw³⁰⁸ yn y erbyn, a’r dwfyr
yn y erbyn³⁰⁹ ny hwyraa. Kyffelyb y daw³¹⁰ ynn amherotraeth.³¹¹

Gwedy L. y daw B., a gwedy B. Xxdecem,³¹² B. enw pob un onadunt.

Ac o’r B. y daw A.. A hwnnw gwr aflonyd vyd, kadarn yn ymlad, a llawer a gerda o
vor a thir. Ac ny cheiff³¹³ y elynyon le llaw.³¹⁴ Ac ef a uegys³¹⁵ yn deholedic
odieithyr³¹⁶ y deyrnas, a’e eneit o’r diwed a a y teyrnas nef ar Duw.

³¹⁷Odyna y kyuyt³¹⁸ gwr, B.³¹⁹ y enw: Ffrannc³²⁰ o’r neill parth, Lumbart o’r llall.³²¹

A hwnnw a uyd medyant idaw yn erbyn y elynyon, ac a ymladont ac ef.

Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y daw brenhin, O. y enw. A hwnnw a uyd kyuoethoccaf a
chadarnaf ac a wna trugared y’r tlodyon, ac a uarn yn iawn.

Ac o hwnnw y daw O. arall, mwyaf y allu. Ac ymdanaw³²² ynteu y bydant ymladeu
y’r Cristonogyon a’r paganyeit. A llawer o waet a dywelltir. A .vii. mlyned y
gwledycha, ac y nef yd³²³ aa y eneit.

308 WB : *omitted*.

309 WB : yn y erbyn yn y erbyn.

310 WB: idaw *instead of* y daw.

311 WB : kyffelyb idaw yn amherodraeth Ryfein kynna nybu. Ac ny daw rac llaw. Ac gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin L. y enw.

312 WB : ac gwedy B. y daw xxx. a in. B. enw bop un onadunt.

313 RB Ac ny cheiff. Ac ny cheiff y elynyon...

314 WB : +arnaw.

315 WB : ac efe a a vegys.

316 WB : dieithyr.

317WB : X.

318 WB : kyuoyt.

319 WB : V.

320 WB : Ffarnc.

321 WB : o’r parth arall.

322 WB : adantaw.

323 WB : yr.

O hwnnw y daw brenhin, O. y enw. A hwnnw a beir lladuaeu a gwr mawr y drwc, a heb ffyd yg gwirioned. A thrwy hwnnw y bydant llawer o drycoed, a gwaet a diwhyllir yn amyl. Ac yn³²⁴ y allu ef y distriwir llawer o eglwysseu. Yn y brenhinyaetheu llawer o drallodeu a vydant.

Ac yna³²⁵ y kyuyt kenedyl yn y teyrnas a elwir Capadocia. A theyrnas Pampilia a geithiwant yn amser hwnnw am nat yntredant drwy drus y dauatty. Hwnnw a wledycha teir blyned.

A gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin, H. y enw. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny ymladeu llawer a uydant. Ac ar Samaria y ryuela, a brenhinyaeth Penntapolis a geithiwa.³²⁶ Y brenhin hynny a hanoed y³²⁷ genedyl o Lwmbardyeit.

Odyna y kyuyt brenhin, C.³²⁸ y enw, o Freinc, ac a ryuela ar wyr Ruuein. Ac y bydant ryueloed ac ymladeu. A hwnnw a vyd gwr kadarn galluawl, ac ychydic o amser y gwledycha.

³²⁹Odyna y kyudant gwyr o Agaria,³³⁰ a gwyr creulawn y gyt ac wynt. Ac y keithiwant lleoed a elwir Carentus,³³¹ a Haii. o.³³² A llawer o dinassoed³³³ a

324 WB : ac a.dan y allu.

325 WB : yno.

326 WB : gyrcha.

327 WB : o.

328 WB : O.

329 WB : XI.

330 WB : Aria.

331 WB : Tarentus.

332 WB : a Hairo.

333 WB: dinessed.

anreithant. A gwyr Ruuein, pan vynnnon³³⁴ dyuot, ny byd a wrthwynepo udunt, onyt Duw y Dwyweu ac Arglwyd yr Arglwydi.

Ac yna y daw yr Eidon, ac y diwreida³³⁵ Persiden, megys nat achuper y dinessyd a wediont. A phan delont y ymgyuaruot y gwnant ffos geyr llaw y dwyrein, ac yr³³⁶ ymladant yn erbyn gwyr Ruuein, ac y llunyeithant tangneued yryngtunt.

Ac yna³³⁷ y daw gwr ryuel, dyborthawdyr brenhin Groec, y dinas Ierapolis. Ac y distriw temloed y geudwyweu. Ac yna y doant kylyon mawr a chwilot, ac y bwytaant yr holl wyd, a holl ffrwytheu brenhinyaeth³³⁸ Capadocie a Acil a yssant,³³⁹ ac o newyn yd hir gystegir.³⁴⁰ A gwedy hynny ny byd.

Ac y kyuyt brenhin arall, gwr ymladgar, R. y enw. Yn wir y gwledycha. A gwybyd ditheu yn lle gwir yd anteilyngant yn y erbyn llawer o'r gwyr nessaf a'r rei kyuoethawc.³⁴¹ ³⁴²Ac yn y dydyev hynny y bredycha brawt y llall y agheu, a'r tat y mab, a'r brawt a gyttya³⁴³ a'e chwaer. A llawer o bechodeu ysgymun a uyd yn y daear:³⁴⁴ yr henwyr a wnant gywelyach³⁴⁵ a'r morynyon, a'r drycoffeireit gyt a'r twylledigyon werydon. Yr esgyb trwy y drycweithredoed ny chredant yn iawn. A gordineudigaeth³⁴⁶ gwaet a vyd ar y dayar. A themleu a lygrir trwy ledradawl

334 WB: vonnon.

335 WB : diwreidant.

336 WB : y.

337 WB : yno.

338 WB: brenhinaetheu.

339 WB : a atil a yssan.

340 WB : gystegi.

341 WB : kyuoetaw

342 WB : XII.

343 WB: gyttyaw.

344 RB: daer.

345 WB : gyvelogach.

346 WB : gordmenedigaeh.

budyrgyt. A chytyw a wna y gwyr a’r lleill, yny ymdangosso eu gweledigaeth udunt yn waratwyd. A’r dynyon yna cribdeilwyr vydant, a threisswyr yn kassau gwirioned ac yn karu kelwyd. A vrawtwyr Ruuein a symudir. Os hediw yd anuonir y uarnu heb rodi udunt, trannoeth wynt a atuarnant yr vn vrawt yr da. Ac ny uarnant y iawnder, namyn geu, a ffalst vydant.³⁴⁷ Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y bydant dynyon cribdeilawdyr³⁴⁸ anudonawl,³⁴⁹ ac yn kymryt rodyon dros pob kelwyd, ac y distryw³⁵⁰ kyfreith a gwirioned. Ac y kryn y dayar yn amryuaelon leod,³⁵¹ ac ynyssed a dinassoed³⁵² a brenhinyaetheu a sodir³⁵³ o voduaeu. Ac y bydant³⁵⁴ tymhestloed ac aball³⁵⁵ ar y dynyon, a’r dayar a diffeithir³⁵⁶ trwy y gelynyon, ac ny rymhaa gwacter y dwyweu eu didanu.

³⁵⁷A gwedy hynny y kyuyt brenhin, K. y enw. A phan del ef a wledycha ennyt, nyt amgen dwy vlyned. Ac ymladeu a wnant yn y amser.

A gwedy ynteu y daw brenhin, A. y enw. Ac ef a gynnheil³⁵⁸ y deyrnas drwy yspeit o amser. Ac ef a daw y Ruuein ac a’e keithiwa. Ac ny allant rodi y eneit yn llaw y elynyon. Ac yn dydyeu y vuched ef a vyd gwr mawr, ac a wna gwiryoned y’r tlodyon. Ac a wledycha hir amser.

347 WB: *omitted*.
348 WB : cribdeilaw.
349 WB: *omitted*.
350 WB : distrywir.
351 WB: leod.
352 WB : dinessyd.
353 WB: ossodir.
354 WB : byd.
355 WB: a ball.
356 WB: diffeith.
357 WB : XII.
358 WB: gyneil.

A gwedy ef y kyuyt brenhin arall, B. y enw. Ac ohonaw ynteu y kerdant deudec,³⁵⁹

B. enw pob un. A'r diwethaf a henuyd³⁶⁰ o Lwmbardi, ac a wledycha can mlyned.

Gwedy hynny y daw brenhin o Freinc, B. y enw. Yna y byd dechreu doluryeu y kyfryw ny bu yr dechreu byt. Ac yn y dydyeu hynny y bydant ymladeu llawer, a thrallodeu, a gordineuedigaeth³⁶¹ gwaet. Ac ny byd a wrthwyneppo y'r gelynyon.

Ac yna heuyt y cryn y dayar drwy dinessyd a brenhinyaetheu. A llawer o deyrnassoed a geithiwir. Ruuein a diwreidir o dan a chledeu; Ruuein a gymerir yn llaw y brenhin hwnnw. A dynyon treisswyr a uyd chwannawc a chreulawn, ac yn kassau y tlodyon, ac yn kywarsanghu y rei diargywed, ac yn iachau y rei a³⁶² argywedwys.³⁶³

Ac yna y bydant y rei argywedussaf ac enwiraf. Ac arglwydiaetheu yn eu teruyneu a geithiwir. Ac ny byd a wrthwyneppo udunt, ne³⁶⁴ nac³⁶⁵ eu diwreidho oc eu chwant ac eu drycdynyaeth.³⁶⁶

³⁶⁷Ac yna y kyuyt brenhin o Roec, Constans y enw. A hwnnw a uyd brenhin yg Groec ac yn Ruuein. Hwnnw a uyd mawr yg corffolaeth, a thec o'e edrychyat,³⁶⁸ ac echtywynnedic o'e olwc, a gwedus lun ar y gorff yn adurnyat enrydedus. A'e teyrnas deudec mlyned a chant. Yn yr amser hwnnw y bydant goludoed³⁶⁹ amyl,³⁷⁰

359 WB : xij.

360 WB: hennyd.

361 WB : gordinenedigaeth.

362 WB : *omitted*.

363 WB : argywedus.

364 WB : neu.

365 WB: at.

366 WB : dryc.dyuyaeth.

367 WB : XIV.

368 WB : Hwnnw a uyd ... edrychyat *omitted*.

369 WB : goludogyon.

a'r³⁷¹ daear a dyry ffrwytheu yn gyn³⁷² amlet. Ac na werther y messur gwenith
ywch³⁷³ no cheinawc, a'r messur olew yr keinawc. A'r brenhin hwnnw a vyd a
llythyr geyr³⁷⁴ y vronn yn wastat. Ac yn y llythyr yn yscriuennedic brenhin,³⁷⁵ ar
darestwng idaw pop teyrnas Gristonogawl, holl dinassoed ac ynyssed y paganyeit a
distriw,³⁷⁶ ac eu temloed a diwreida,³⁷⁷ a'r holl paganyeit a dwc³⁷⁸ y gret. Ac yr³⁷⁹
holl temloed y werthuawr groc a dyrcheuir.

Yna y dechreu ef rodi Ethiopia a'r Eifft yn dwywawl³⁸⁰ wassanaeth, ac ar ny
wediaw y'r groc kyssegredic o leas cledyf y teruynir. A phan gwplaer cant ac ugein
mlyned, yr Idewon³⁸¹ a trossir y gret y'r³⁸² Arglwyd, a'e ved ynteu gwynuydedic a
uyd gogonedus y gan bawp. Yn y dydyeu hynny yd iecheir Iudea,³⁸³ a gwlat yr
Israel yn ffydlonder a presswyla.

³⁸⁴Yn yr amser hwnnw³⁸⁵ y kyuyt tywyssawc³⁸⁶ enwir³⁸⁷ o lwyth Dan. Yr hwnn a
elwir Antichristus.³⁸⁸ Hwnn a uyd mab kolledigaeth, a phenn syberwyt, ac athro

370 WB : *omitted*.

371 WB: ar y.

372 WB : yn gyn *omitted*.

373 WB : mwy.

374 WB : gar.

375 WB : + Groec.

376 WB : distrywa.

377 RB : diwreireida.

378 WB : dric.

379 WB : yn yr.

380 WB : dywawl.

381 WB : Ydeon.

382 WB : o'r.

383 WB : yn y dydyeu hynny y kyuyt y dyeithir Iuda.

384 WB : XV.

385 WB : Yn yr hwnnw amser.

386 RB : tywywyssawc.

387 WB: enwired.

388 WB: Antichrist.

kyueilorn, kyflawn³⁸⁹ o drycennwired. Yr hwnn a trossa y byt ac a wna arwydon a bredycheu drwy ffalst dystolyaetheu.³⁹⁰ Ef a dwyll drwy hudolawl geluydyt Jawnder,³⁹¹ yn gymeint ac y gweler ef yn anuon y tan o'r nef. Ac y lleihaer y blwynyded megys y missoed, a'r missoed megys yr wythnosseu, a'r wythnosseu ual y dydyeu, a'r dydyeu ual yr oryyeu.

Yna y kyudant o deheu y³⁹² dwyrein kenedyl³⁹³ kyhynet o'r rei a werthwys Alexander, nyt amgen Goc a Magoc. Yno³⁹⁴ y mae dwy urenhinyaeth ar hugeint; riuedi y rei ny wys mwy no'r tywawt yn y weilgi. Pan welo y brenhin y Ruueinyeit³⁹⁵ y geilw y lu, ac y ryuela ac wy, ac y llad hyt y teruyn eithaf. ³⁹⁶A gwedy hynny y daw y Gaerusalem. Ac yno y gwrthyt coron y teyrnas a phop brenhinawl abit; y dedyf y deyrnas y Duw Dat ac yn Harglwyd ni Iessu Grist.³⁹⁷ Yn y oes ef y deuant y deu egluraf, nyt amgen Ely ac Enoc, y uenegi bot yn dyuot rac llaw. Ac y llad yr Anticrist y rei hynny. A'r trydyd dyd³⁹⁸ y kyudant trwy Duw. Ac yna y byd diwreid³⁹⁹ mawr, y kyfryw ny⁴⁰⁰ bu na chynt nac gwedy. Yr Arglwyd a uyrhaa y dydyeu hynny o achaws y etholedigyon.⁴⁰¹ A Mihangel a lad yr Anticrist ym Mynyd Oliuet."

389 WB: kyn lawn.

390 WB: dangossedigaetheu.

391 WB: lawer.

392 WB: *omitted*.

393 WB: kenedloed.

394 WB : yna.

395 RB : Pan welo brenhin y Rufeineit.

396 WB: XVI.

397 WB : + y vab.

398 WB : trydydyd.

399 WB : goid.

400 WB : na.

401 WB : detholedigyon.

Gwedy racuenegi o Sibli⁴⁰² y petheu hynn a llawer o betheu ereill o'r⁴⁰³ a delynt⁴⁰⁴ rac llaw. Ac yma⁴⁰⁵ arwydon y daw Duw⁴⁰⁶ y uarnu. A Sibli⁴⁰⁷ a dywawt o dewindabaeth:

“Arwyd y uarn a wylch y dayar o chwys. O'r⁴⁰⁸ nef y daw brenhin rac llaw drwy oessoed yn y gnawt y uarnu y'r⁴⁰⁹ byt. Odyna ffydlawn ac anfydlawn a welant Duw goruchel y gyt a seint yr oes, yn y teruyn hwnnw. ⁴¹⁰Ac yna y deuant yr eneidu yn eu corforoed y'r uarn. Yna y bydant drem⁴¹¹ amyl yn y dayar anywylledic. Ac y bwrw y bedeu y uyny a uo yndunt. Ac y llysc tan y daear a'r awyr a'r weilgi, ac y tyrr pyrth y tywyll uffern. Ac y rodir y'r eneidu da ryd oleuat, ac y'r rei drwc flam tragywydawl ac eu llysc. Ac yna yd adef pawb y dirgeledigyon pechodeu. Duw a ardengys kedernit goleuat. Yna y byd kwynuan a chrynu⁴¹² danned. Yna y tywylla⁴¹³ yr heul, ac y dyrcheuir⁴¹⁴ gewri yn y syr. Ac y try y nef, ac y palla goleurwyd y lleuat.

Yna y gostyngir y lleoed uchel ac y dyrchevir y glynneu. Ny byd nac uchel nac issel ar y dayar ny weler⁴¹⁵ yn gynwastattet. Yna y gorffowys⁴¹⁶ pop peth, ac y palla y⁴¹⁷

402 WB: Sibilla.
403 WB : *omitted*.
404 WB : deloynt.
405 WB : ymha.
406 WB : Duw daw.
407 WB: Sibilla.
408 WB : r *omitted*.
409 WB : r *omitted*.
410 WB : XVII.
411 WB : drein.
412 WB : chrynn.
413 WB : twylla.
414 WB : drycheuir.
415 WB : wneler.
416 WB : gorffwyssant.
417 WB : yr.

daear yn dorredic. Ac yna y llysc tan yr auonyd a'r ffynhonneu. Ac yna y daw llef
o'r nef, corn o'r goruchelder praff y odwr. Ac y byd trist y rei truein yn kwynaw eu
pechawt oc⁴¹⁸ eu hamryuaelon lauryeu. Ac yna y dengys⁴¹⁹ y dayar uffernawl
defnyd, ac yg gwyd y dansodir pob peth ac y byrir. Ac yna y dygwyd tan
brwnstanawl⁴²⁰ o'r nef a dwfyr o'r un defnyd.

Ac ar hynny⁴²¹ y teruyna proffwydolyaeth Sibli,⁴²² gyt a'e Breudwyt.

418 WB : ac.

419 RB : y dengys y dengys.

420 WB : brwmstanawl.

421 WB : hyn.

422 WB : Sibilla.

Bibliography

Alexander, Paul J., *The Oracle of Baalbek : the Tiburtine Sibyl in a Greek Dress*,
Washington 1967

Alexander, Paul J., *The Medieval Legend of the Last Emperor and its Messianic Origin*, in
Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, vol 41 (1978) pp. 1-15

Augustine, *the City of God*, in Philip Schaff, *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-
Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (*St. Augustin's City of God and Christian
Doctrine*), Buffalo (NY) 1887, online version at *The Online Library of Liberty*, Library
Fund, Inc (ed.), 2004. Last visited 11/10/2019:

[https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/schaff-a-select-library-of-the-nicene-and-post-
nicene-fathers-of-the-christian-church-vol-2](https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/schaff-a-select-library-of-the-nicene-and-post-nicene-fathers-of-the-christian-church-vol-2)

Baert, B., *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*,
Leiden 2004

Daniel, I., Haycock, M., Johnston, D., and Rowland, J., (eds.), *Cyfoeth y Testun:
Ysgrifau ar Lenyddiaeth Gymraeg yr Oesoedd Canol*, Cardiff, 2003

Davies, S., *Crefft y Cyfarwydd*, Cardiff 1995

Denys d'Halicarnasse, *Antiquités Romaines*, Tome 1; Fromentin, V (edition and
translation), Paris 1998

De Voragine, J, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, translated by William
Granger Ryan and introduction by Eamon Duffy, Princeton and Oxford, 1993

Dronke, P., *Medieval Sibyls, their Character and their "auctoritas"*, in *Studi Medievali* 36 (1995), pp. 581-615

Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, online version at The Latin Library, editor unknown, release date unknown. Last visited 11/10.2019:

<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ein.html>

Falileyev, A., *An Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh*, Tübingen 2000

Geoffrey of Monmouth, Lewis Thorpe (transl.), *The History of the Kings of Britain*, London 1966

GMW: Evans, D.S., *A Grammar of Middle Welsh (GMW)*, Dublin 1964

GPC: *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, online version, Prifysgol Cymru (ed.), 2003. Last visited 11/10/2019 : <http://geiriadur.ac.uk/gpc/gpc.html>

[Dr. J. G. Th. Graesse, *Orbis Latinus*, second edition, Berlin 1909. Online version by The Electronic Text Service, Columbia University, 1996; last visited 11/10.2019. <http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/contents.html>](http://www.columbia.edu/acis/ets/Graesse/contents.html)

Guillermo, Jorge, *Sibyls: Prophecy and Power in the Ancient World* New York/London 2013

Haffen, Josiane : *Contributions à l'étude de la Sibylle médiévale : études et édition du Ms B.N.F.FR 25 407, fol. 169-172v* : Le Livre de Sibille, Paris 1984

Haffen, Josiane and Baroin, Jeanne : *La prophétie de la Sibylle Tiburtine*, Paris 1987

Haycock, M., *Blodeugerdd Barddas o Ganu Crefyddol Cynnar*, Llandibie 1994

Haycock, Marged: “*Si abl fodd, Sibli fain*”: Sibyl in Medieval Wales, in *Heroic Poets and Poetic Heroes in Celtic Tradition: A Festschrift for Patrick K. Ford*, CSANA Yearbook 3-4, 2005 pp. 115-130

Haycock, M. (ed.), *Legendary Poems from the Book of Taliesin*, Aberystwyth 2007

Holdenried, Anke, *The Sibyl and her Scribes – Manuscripts and Interpretation of the Latin Sibylla Tiburtina c. 1050-1500*, Aldershot/Burlington, 2006

Holdenried, A., *Many Hands Without Design: the Evolution of Medieval Prophetic Text*, in *The Medieval Journal*, vol. 4 (2014), pp. 23-42

Huws, Daniel, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, Cardiff 2000

Isaac, G. R., Simon Rodway, Silva Nurmio, Kit Kappahn and Patrick Sims-Williams (eds.) (2013), *Rhyddiaith y 13eg Ganrif: Fersiwn 2.0* (Aberystwyth), <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/11163>.⁴²³

Johnston, D., Edwards, H. M., Evans, D.F., Lake, A.C., Moras, E., and Roberts, S.E. (eds.) *Cerddi Dafydd ap Gwilym*, Cardiff 2010

⁴²³The whole of CADAIR is currently migrating to PORTAL, where the work should be discoverable via *Welsh & Celtic Studies* and *Rhyddiaith*. Cadair seems to be inaccessible at the moment of writing (27/10/2019).

- Lactantius, *The Divine Institutes, book I-VII*, Sister Mary Francis MacDonald, O.P. (translation), Washington D.C. 1964
- Le Bihan, Herve, *An Dialog etre Arzur Roe d'an Bretounet ha Guynglaff*, Rennes 2013
- Lewis, C.T. and Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879, reprint 1975
- Lightfoot, J.L., *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on the First and Second Books*, Oxford 2007
- Major, T., *Number Seventy-two: Biblical and Hellenistic Beginnings to the Early Middle Ages*, in *Sacris Erudiri* 52 (2013), pp. 7-45
- Massip, Fransesc, *La Sibila como personaje dramatico: Textos y contextos escénicos*, in *Viator* 42 (2011), pp. 239-264
- McAll, C., *The Normal Paradigms of a Woman's Life in the Irish and Welsh Law Texts*, in *The Welsh Law of Women*, ed. Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen, Cardiff 1980, pp. 7-22
- McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the end: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*, New York 1979
- McGinn, Bernard, *Oracular Transformations: The "Sibylla Tiburtina" in the Middle Ages*, in *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari: mito, storia, tradizione : atti del convegno*, Macerata-Norcia, 1994, pp 603-44
- F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Berlin (1923-)

Luft, Diana, Peter Wynn Thomas and D. Mark Smith. eds. 2013. *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300-1425*. Last visited 11/10/2019:

<http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk>.

Maxwell, Robert L., Lee, Harold B. (eds.), *RBMS/BSC Latin Place Names File*, 1997.

Last visited 11/10/2019: <https://rbms.info/lpn>

Momigliano, A, *From the Pagan to the Christian Sibyl: Prophecy as History of Religion* in: Dionisotti, Grafton and Kraye (eds.), *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, London 1988

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, in *Ovide: Les Métamorphoses tome III (XI-XV)*, Paris 1962

Parke, H.W., McGing, B.C. (ed.), *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*, London and New York, 1988

Petronius, *Satyricon*, XLVIII, in *Pétrone: les Satiricon*, Alfred Ernout (edition and translation), Paris 1950

Piper, Prydwyn, *Ystori Tri Brenin o Gwlen*, in *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, vol. 20/21 (2000-2001), pp. 130-140

Poppe, E. and Tristram, H.L.C, *Übersetzung, Adaptation und Akkulturation im insularen Mittelalter*, 1999

Potter, David S., *Prophecy and History in the Crisis of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1990

Rikhardsdottir, S., *Medieval Translations and Cultural Discourse: The Movement of Texts in England, France and Scandinavia*, Cambridge 2012

Rodriguez, J., (ed.), *Muslim and Christian Contact in the Middle Ages – a Reader*, Toronto 2015

Rodway, S., *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal System*,
Aberystwyth 2013

Rowles, S., *Golygiad o Ystoria Adaf*, MPhil thesis, Aberystwyth 2004

Russell, P., *Priiilegium Sancti Telau and Breint Teilo*, in *Studia Celtica* 50 (2016), pp.
41-68

Sackur, E., *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen : Pseudomethodius Adso und Die
tiburtinische sibylle*, Halle 1898

Savall, J.: *EL CANT DE LA SIBIL ·LA*, Alia Vox 1988
Shields, Hugh: *Oral Techniques in
Written Verse: Philippe de Thaon's « Livre de Sibile »*, in *Medium Aevum*, vol. 49, No. 2
(1980), pp. 194-206

Sims-Williams, P., *The Welsh versions of Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'History of the Kings of
Britain'* in Axel Harlos and Neele Harlos (eds), *Adapting Texts and Styles in a Celtic
Context: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Processes of Literary Transfer in the Middle Ages.
Studies in honour of Erich Poppe*, Münster 2016, pp. 53-74 .

Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*, H.R. Fairclough (edition), G.P. Goold
(revision): Cambridge (Massachusetts) and London, 1999

Zimmer, S., *Studies in Welsh Word-Formation*, Dublin 2000

[The Black Book of Carmarthen \(Peniarth 1\), online facsimile on The National Library of
Wales, by The National Library of Wales, release date? Last visited 11/10/2019:
\[https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-
ages/theblackbookofcarmarthen\]\(https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/theblackbookofcarmarthen\)](https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/theblackbookofcarmarthen)

The Chronicle of the Princes (Peniarth 20), online facsimile on *The National Library of Wales*, by The National Library of Wales, release date? Last visited 11/10/2019:
<https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/chronicle-of-the-princes/>

The Red Book of Hergest (Jesus College 111), online facsimile on *Digital Bodleian*, by The Bodleian Libraries, 2015. Last visited 11/10.2019:
<http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=jesus&manuscript=ms111>

